THE SONS OF REMUS

Identity in Roman Gaul and Spain

ANDREW C. JOHNSTON

The Sons of Remus

THE SONS OF REMUS

Identity in Roman Gaul and Spain

❧

ANDREW C. JOHNSTON

Harvard University Press

First printing

Jacket credit: Brogi, Carlo (1850-1925). Inv. n. 8226.

Jacket caption: Photograph of a marble tondo portrait of Romulus and Remus on one
of the socles of the facade of the 15th c. monastery complex of Certosa di Pavia.

Jacket design: Annamarie Why

For Quinn

CONTENTS

✣

The Sons of Remus

INTRODUCTION

☙

Across the river Matrona (the modern Marne), one of the major physical and conceptual boundaries in Julius Caesar's imaginary geography of the North,[1] lay the territory of the Remi, whose central place was called, in the local language, Durocortorum (Rheims). Before the Roman conquest they had been among the most powerful peoples of Gaul,[2] and afterward they retained their prominence within the imperial hierarchy, receiving, in exchange for their uniquely steadfast loyalty to Rome during the otherwise universal Gallic resistance, the outmoded, honorific designation as a "state bound by treaty."[3] But, in the imagination of the Remi themselves, their connection to Rome ran deeper than just the nominal title of alliance. Adopting the well-established methodology of Greek ethnography—the tendency to reconstruct mythological ethnic origins by means of etymology—the Remi traced their own beginnings back to an eponymous ancestor: Remus, the ill-fated twin of Romulus. A late but detailed articulation of this tradition is found in the local history of Flodoard, a Christian priest at Rheims in the early medieval period:

> Concerning the founder of our city, or the originator of the name, we judge that the widespread belief is not to be wholly approved: the tradition is that Remus the brother of Romulus is the founder of the city and the source of the name, although we have learned from reliable writers that, after Rome was founded

by the twins, Remus was killed by soldiers of his brother; nor did Remus ever part company with his brother, since they are known to have founded the city after their twin birth, their upbringing by shepherds, and their time as bandits. After the quarrel had arisen and Remus had been killed, we read that Romulus named the city after himself. . . .

Therefore, it seems more likely that the thought is that our city was founded—or the people of the Remi was started—by the comrades of Remus after they had fled their country, since even the walls are distinguished by signs of Rome and the remarkable "Gate of Mars," in the opinion of the ancients, derives its name from the father of the Roman race, and it preserves its old appellation even up to our own times. Its arch we still see, showing—on your right as you come into town—the story of the she-wolf nursing little Romulus and Remus.[4]

The "Gate of Mars" (*porta Martis*), the monument in which the memory of the foundation of the city is embedded, survives to this day, along with part of the sculptural program detailed by Flodoard.[5] Just as the historian described, the ceiling of the vault of the easternmost arch is decorated with a relief of the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus. Around its perimeter runs a frieze of arms and armor that features four winged victories inscribing unknown texts on shields, perhaps an allusion to the treaty that the Remi claimed to enjoy with Rome. Elsewhere on the arch, a niche on the northwestern façade housed a statue group of Aeneas, Ascanius, and Anchises, while the vault of the central arcade was adorned with a relief depicting Mars Camulus, the chief divinity of the Remi, and twelve scenes from local agrarian life. We can thus read the monument as a coherent and comprehensive expression of the community identity and ideology of the Remi: represented are their own foundation myth and the Roman foundation myth, which are tied together by the hybrid divinity of Mars Camulus, who was central to the self-accounts of both peoples—Mars as the father of Romulus and Remus, Camulus as the tutelary warrior god of the Remi.[6] A fragmentary inscription from Durocortorum, dated to roughly the same period as the arch's construction, also seems to reflect this complex nexus of identities and memories. It is a dedication to Mars Camulus by a priest of the

college of the *Laurentes Lavinates*.[7] This antiquarian Roman priesthood was entrusted with the performance of the ritual commemoration of the origins of the Roman people, and took part in the periodic ceremonial renewal of the ancient treaty between Rome and Lavinium, the city founded, so the story went, by Aeneas and the Trojans upon their arrival in Italy.[8] The presence of a member of this priesthood among the Remi suggests one of many ways in which associations might have been strengthened between local and Roman myths of origin.

The monument of the Remi and its mythological program thus frustrate a straightforward reading as a mere index of acculturation or "Romanization."[9] In certain contexts, what would seem on the surface to be the most quintessentially "imperial" iconographies, symbols, or cultural forms—a triumphal arch depicting Romulus and Remus—were actually expressions of robust local identities, identities that, like the flight of Remus and his followers to northern Gaul, at times involved creative misappropriations of the Roman past that would have been unrecognizable or scarcely intelligible to the imperial center. Ultimately, the Remi are representative of the provincial experience in Spain and Gaul more broadly. Although the Remi may have, in certain respects, "become Roman," through local processes of communalization they also became something very different: not the "grandsons of Romulus," as the late republican poet Catullus famously called the Romans of his age, but rather the sons of Remus.[10]

Previous historiography on the Roman provinces of Gaul and Spain has been primarily concerned with the "grandsons of Romulus"; that is to say, with the processes by which the inhabitants of the western provinces supposedly came to be "distinctive among the emperors' subjects in being *only Roman*."[11] Inextricably bound up with interpretations of this "Romanization" of the West are the effacement of local identities and erasure of local memories and traditions. For almost two centuries, scholarship has been constrained by this preoccupation:

> Here is the dominant fact of this history: the Gauls wanted to be Romans, not only to obey the leaders of Rome, but to worship its gods, to speak its language, to copy its customs, to become part of its history, to lose themselves in its identity . . . Such was the forgetfulness by the conquered of their traditions.[12]

This assumption about the West, with deep roots in modern colonial and imperial rhetoric, stands in stark contrast to the Greek east, where localism and constructions of the past have received much recent attention.[13] In telling a different story about the Roman world, that of the sons of Remus, this book seeks to put forward a new model of western provincial complexity and diversity. Its central argument is that individuals from Spain and Gaul never became "only Roman," nor did they "lose themselves" in the forgetfulness of empire; their self-representations—in literature, inscriptions, and visual art—reflect robust identities that were rooted first and foremost in their sense of belonging to local communities, which were persistently reimagined, redefined, and made meaningful by the agency of the provincial actors themselves. While the term is not without its critics, identity is the most valuable analytical tool for understanding the local within the Roman world.[14]

Integral to this argument is the demonstration that, contrary to the previous scholarly consensus, social memory—an expression of collective experience that fosters cohesion within a group, giving it an awareness of its past and helping to define its aspirations for the future—factored essentially into the construction, renegotiation, and performance of these community and individual identities.[15] With the idea of "performance," I mean to emphasize that provincial identities were not natural, essential, inherent, or static. Identity is always something that one *does*, rather than something that one *is*; it is to be understood as an act, which is scripted by social ideology and hegemony.[16] Moreover, because it is the result of multiple and competing discourses, individual selfhood tends to be a complex and fragmented amalgam of plural senses of belonging to intersecting and overlapping groups, the prominence of which shifts depending on the context in which identity is articulated. Despite the objective reality that collective identities are dynamic and contested categories of practice, the subjective feeling of "sameness" within a group—both that the members of a group share something particular and important in the present, and that the current group has some deep, meaningful, and abiding connection that transcends the contingency of the moment—is continually rehearsed. Thus identity becomes the product of social and political action, as well as the basis thereof. Groups possess a "storiedness," a narrative repertoire that develops and changes over time and telling, which works to situate selves in relation to others; and so, social memories and constructions of the past not only represent, but

actually *constitute* the group, for "narrative location endows social actors with identities."[17]

These locally imagined identities and communities—from clan-like kinship units and rural villages to larger ethnic groups—almost never corresponded to the monolithic categories like *Galli* and *Hispani* into which the Romans classified imperial subjects; like the "Indians" of the new world, these names were little more than convenient ethnographic fictions.[18] Many provincial communities would have been all but invisible to the surveilling gaze of Rome, for "the premodern state was, in many crucial respects, partially blind; it knew precious little about its subjects . . . their location, their very identity."[19] Accordingly, it is upon these ongoing *local* processes of "communalization"—a pattern of action that promotes a sense of belonging together—and the meaningful units of belonging that they produced that this study will focus.[20] It must be emphasized, however, that such collective local practices were embedded within markedly asymmetrical social contexts. Before the conquest, the communities of Gaul and Spain were characterized internally by unequal distributions of power, wealth, knowledge, and access to broader networks of communication within different social institutions. In most cases, incorporation into the empire seems to have reinforced, rather than leveled, these hierarchical structures, and to have accommodated the persistence of the heterarchical relations between them.[21] Most of our evidence, therefore, is heavily weighted toward expressions of identity by various members of the local elite. But the status of individual members of the local elite was largely dependent upon their ability to maintain the cohesion of the community to which those further down the social hierarchy ascribed themselves, while fulfilling the various cultural expectations of this constituency; they had a vested interest in promoting communalization. The elite habitually made claims to representativeness, speaking or acting on behalf of the community as a whole; their public performances—rituals, negotiations, displays of euergetism, commemorations—are most often oriented toward their local audience, and in order to have been successfully converted into symbolic capital, must have aligned with the group's ideas of—or aspirations for—itself. Thus it is not unreasonable to take their statements as important contributions to and reflections of ongoing processes of collective identity formation. Regardless of the inequalities that in reality may have prevailed within the provinces, it was the

imagined horizontal bonds of still deeper significance that lay at the heart of the conception of community.[22]

That the history of the western Roman provinces is primarily a story of communities does not mean that imperial power did not have a profound effect on their development, for these provincials were inevitably forced to reimagine themselves and negotiate their identities in relation to Rome. Indeed, ethnogenesis—the emergence of a new ethnic group out of changing patterns of interaction, which can be understood as a specific type of communalization—is frequently closely connected to Roman imperialism.[23] Moreover, as in the case of the Remi, communalization involved the selective and strategic appropriation of elements from the Roman cultural vocabulary. Communities across the western provinces differentially navigated intersecting cultural regimes; there was wide variability in the patterns of material and relational entanglement that developed, through which the foreign and the familiar were transformed and recombined.[24] But the identities constructed in this process remained primarily—and in certain contexts, exclusively—as members of local communities, rather than as "Romans." Within these local conversations, "Roman" was not even an absolute point of reference, but a highly contextualized, subjective perception; ideas of what qualified as "Roman" or what "Roman" meant were discursively constructed, and thus what modern scholars unproblematically identify as "Roman culture" was in reality subject to widespread reinterpretation, distortion, and misunderstanding among the communities of Spain and Gaul. Indeed, in these provinces cultural malapropisms of the "Roman" abound—not entirely dissimilar to the "cargo cults" catalyzed by modern colonial encounters in Polynesia. To further complicate this picture, individual performances of identity often appropriated exoticizing and anachronistic imperial ethnographic stereotypes, exploiting the roles offered by the dominant power in order to acquire social, political, or economic status. From the point of view of the western provinces, the empire became an overarching, translocal framework that served to render local culture and local identity more readily intelligible as such.

On the other side, simplistic visions of "native" and "indigenous" or of straightforward "continuity" can obscure the histories of local communities in the provinces as much as an anachronistic ideal of "Romanness." Thus models of hybridity or transculturation, while they appeal in certain re-

spects as alternatives to outmoded interpretations of unidirectional cultural influence, present their own problems in the assumption of the existence of static and "pure" cultural forms among subaltern groups.[25] Since, on the one hand, communalization is always a constant process of renegotiation and reimagination, and, on the other, social memory, so central to communalization, is subjective in its representation of the past, the dichotomy between objective change and continuity that has traditionally preoccupied scholars is revealed to be somewhat illusory, and of only secondary importance in understanding the construction of local identities.

In thus privileging local choice, and a local choice between dynamic and equally valid, though by no means equivalent, cultural vocabularies, the Roman-centric and ideology-laden rhetoric of "civilization" and the "civilizing process" that has long pervaded work on these provinces can be eschewed. Although, in this and other respects, a communalization-based approach will attempt, as Webster has written of post-colonial theory, "the articulation of . . . *active* histories" for the local communities of Spain and Gaul, it will not be a "post-colonial" history, as I reject the post-colonial emphasis on seeking manifestations of "overt and covert *resistance*."[26] The cultural history of the Roman provinces is not one of "native" resistance versus collaboration with "the Romans," just as it cannot be understood through the simplistic binary opposition of "Roman" and "native." It was, to borrow a phrase from Dench, "more complex and interesting."[27]

This book has chosen to group together two sets of provinces that, for reasons that have much to do with modern national identities, are usually studied independently of one another; at the same time, the exclusion of the rest of the west is not arbitrary.[28] Spain and Gaul have not only shared a similar fate in modern historiography of Roman imperialism, but their historical trajectories in antiquity are close parallels. Both were vast and diverse regions whose communities, long before the Roman conquest, had sustained contact with the foreign prestige cultures of the Greek and Punic worlds. They were each gradually incorporated into the Roman empire from the middle of the republican period, beginning with the Mediterranean coasts and progressing northward, and were finally conquered and reorganized only by Caesar and his heir. Under Roman rule, their internal political and cultural dynamics varied according to patterns of geography, experiences

of the past, and levels of imperial interest, resulting in areas of intense col-
onization—Baetica and Narbonensis—and relatively isolated backwaters—
Cantabria and Aremorica. Ultimately, by including seven provinces in its
compass and framing local material within questions of broader cultural
historical import, this study hopes to escape Finley's criticism of "regional
histories."[29]

Rather than taking a chronological or geographical approach, this book
is primarily organized around a handful of key questions: How did local
communities define and identify themselves, and foster a felt sense of be-
longing together? How did interactions with other provincial communi-
ties or with "the Romans" reinforce these feelings of cohesiveness? What
role did social memories of the local past play in these identities, and how
were these memories articulated? To what extent did the "foreign" past of
the Romans become incorporated in the self-accounts of provincials? What
were the performative strategies of individual actors for expressing their
identities as something other than Roman? The five chapters that follow
attempt to make use of a wide range of literary, archaeological, and espe-
cially epigraphic evidence to address each of these questions in turn, and are
structured by a series of more narrowly focused themes. Chapter 1 demon-
strates the fundamental importance of local communities in constructions
of identity. It illustrates the ways in which these communities defined and
represented themselves, located themselves in time and space, and imag-
ined themselves through ritual practices. As a corollary, Chapter 2 explores
the negotiation of selves in relation to others, both closer to home and in the
distant centers of imperial power. Chapter 3 underscores the central place
of social memory of various forms—foundation myths, hero cult, geneal-
ogies, monuments, and landscapes—in the construction and performance
of these local identities. Along the way, it also explicates the Greek intellec-
tual discourse that ultimately precluded the incorporation of these kinds of
local memories of the west into the authoritative literary accounts of the
dominant cultural powers. Building on this discussion of foundation myths
and autoethnographies, Chapter 4 seeks to answer the question of how the
Roman past was remembered by provincial communities and incorporated
into local identities, and of how "Roman" this remembered past was, ex-
amining the ways in which communities innovated within pre-existing
traditions, reinterpreting Roman myth and history and integrating them

with the local past in order to create new myths and memories. Chapter 5 looks at individual performances of identity and social memory, especially as manifested in local patterns of office holding, "role-playing" and the appropriation of imperial stereotypes, and poetry as a process of "self-making." Throughout, the argument is driven by representative case studies; an exhaustive treatment of the subject is far beyond the scope of a single book, and well beyond the abilities of this author.

I

SELVES

☙

IN THE HEART OF GAUL, where a togate Roman might find all that mysterious life of the wilderness that stirs in the forest and in the hearts of wild men, was a thermal spring. The place was originally called *Neriomagos* by its Gaulish-speaking inhabitants, "the plain of Nerios," though it later acquired the Latin toponym *Aquae Nerii*, "the waters of Nerios."[1] The eponymous Nerios was a quintessentially local divinity, whose worship is attested nowhere else.[2] Sometime in the early second century CE, a local grandee set up the following dedicatory inscription to the god, memorializing the munificent building projects that he and his two sons had undertaken in the area surrounding the spring:

> To the godheads of the Emperors and the god Nerius, and for the use of the state of the Bituriges Cubi and the villagers of Neriomagus, Lucius Julius Equester, son of Equester, chief magistrate, priest of Rome and the Emperors, and likewise priest of the province of Aquitania, together with his sons Lucius Julius Cimber and Lucius Julius Equester, themselves priests of Rome and the Emperors, completed the construction of voting-buildings [*diribitoria*], shops, and porticoes by which the springs of Nerius and the public baths are enclosed, together with all of their ornaments, in honor of their election to the priesthood.[3]

This rich text presents the reader with a complex nexus of identities, mapped onto a series of communities that progressively widen in their compass: the town (*vicus*) of the Neriomagienses, the ethnic community (*res publica* or *civitas*) of the Bituriges Cubi, the province of Aquitania, and ultimately *Roma* herself, whose worship—through the institution of the imperial cult—bound together the far-flung and heterogeneous peoples of the whole Empire. As the Latin terminology (*vicus, res publica, provincia*) suggests, these concentric circles of administrative hierarchy can be understood to a certain degree as artificial Roman constructs imposed upon a preexisting cultural and political geography. But while such imperial overlays may at times obscure the contours of traditional sites of authority and units of belonging, they did not erase them; rather, complex accommodations on the part of the provincials themselves drew and redrew the boundaries of meaningful *communities* within the map of a new and Roman world. Thus, when viewed as communities, the Neriomagienses or Bituriges Cubi become fundamentally important objects of analysis as products of the agency of *local* actors, the results of continual processes of communalization.[4]

Despite the potential ethnogenerative impact of empire—the marked tendency of imperial encounters with steep imbalances of power to stimulate the formation of new ethnic groups among conquered peoples—these communities in the province of Aquitania had not sprung into existence *ex nihilo* with the advent of the Romans.[5] As was the case for most of the peoples in what came to be called *Gallia* and *Hispania*, the Bituriges had existed as a self-defined *ethnos* long before they were subject to the *imperium* of Roman magistrates or the representational power of Roman writers.[6] According to the historian Livy, who mentions the Bituriges in a digression on the historical population movements of the Gauls that culminated in the infamous sack of Rome, during the reign of the Roman king Tarquinius Priscus they were the most powerful group among the Celtae.[7] While the reliability of the Roman author's testimony, at a great temporal and cultural distance, is not beyond doubt, the Gaulish name of the Bituriges does mean "rulers of the world" or "perpetual kings," perhaps not entirely a misnomer from their own point of view in the sixth century BCE. In this backstory is presumably preserved an authentic kernel of local tradition, gathered by one of Livy's sources. Five hundred years later, however, Caesar upon his arrival in central Gaul found them in a comparatively humble position, under the

protection of the much more powerful Aedui.[8] In the final revolt of 52 BCE, the last gasp of Gallic freedom, the Bituriges treacherously broke from the Aedui and went over to the side of the Arverni at the instigation of the rebel leader Vercingetorix himself. Some twenty of their own towns were burnt as part of his scorched-earth strategy. Avaricum, "the safeguard and ornament of their *civitas*," was barely saved from the torches of their allies by the earnest entreaties of the Bituriges, only to become soon thereafter the site of the near-annihilation of almost forty thousand of its inhabitants and defenders at the hands of the Roman legions, who were anxious to avenge the recent slaughter of the garrison at Cenabum.[9]

In the wake of the Roman conquest, the Bituriges were divided into two states (*civitates*), called the Cubi and the Vivisci; the latter were resettled some three hundred kilometers to the southwest across the Garumna river (the modern Garonne) around Burdigala (Bordeaux), while the former remained in their original territory centered on Avaricum (Bourges).[10] This separation, both spatial and civic, catalyzed the formation of new identities, but the social memory of a continuous Biturigan past—a past that had once warranted the ethnonym "rulers of the world"—must have informed and shaped each of these communities.[11] Furthermore, the sub-ethnics of Cubus and Viviscus also implicate a memorial discourse: the pre-conquest coinage of the united Bituriges appears to attest to the preexistence of a subdivision between Cubi and Vivisci.[12] Although the nature and origin of this earlier division is uncertain, it was clearly appropriated as a meaningful continuity in the ethnogenesis of these two *civitates* in the late republican and early imperial periods. Discontinuities foster imagined continuities. Concomitant with these internal debates over the meaning of *Biturix* was the cultural confrontation of the Bituriges with the Aquitani, a historically distinct ethnic group whose constituent peoples had formerly emphasized the otherness of this "Gallic" *civitas*. The Greek geographer Strabo notes that in the Augustan period the Bituriges Vivisci were the only people of an ethnic origin different from the rest of the Aquitani in the region south of the Garumna, and that they did not participate in their confederation.[13] Indeed, the fact that the native languages of each group would have been mutually unintelligible must have fostered a felt sense of alienation: most of the Aquitani seem to have spoken a form of proto-Basque, a linguistic isolate, while the Bituriges spoke Gaulish, one of the now extinct members of the linguistic family of conti-

nental Celtic. But the abstention in the early imperial period of the Vivisci in particular from political interaction with the Aquitanian "others" in whose ancestral territory they were now settled gave way, in time, to a certain degree of cooperation, and a gradual incorporation of the Bituriges into the larger fold of the Aquitani. In this context, the attendant involvement of Biturigan elites—such as Equester—in Aquitanian politico-religious institutions reflects more than a geography of Roman power;[14] the locally generated meanings of Aquitania were not necessarily co-present or co-extensive with the externally imposed Roman meaning of the *provincia Aquitaniae*.

Ultimately, however, the deep-seated rhetoric of ethnic difference was not easily quieted by the superficial imposition of imperial unity. By the early third century, discord between the ethnic groups of the province compelled local elites of nine peoples of the Aquitani to take the initiative and venture upon an embassy to the emperor to seek official permission to form a new political community of their own, hereafter known simply as the "Nine Peoples" (*Novem Populi*). A verse inscription from Aquae Tarbellicae (Dax) provides insight into this process and its motivations, highlighting the role of a certain Verus, who had been one of the chief magistrates of the Tarbelli:

> Priest, as well as chief magistrate, financial official and overseer
> of the rural district, Verus, having performed his duty as legate
> to the Emperor, obtained on behalf of the Nine Peoples the right
> to separate themselves from the Gauls. When he had returned
> from the City [i.e., Rome], he dedicated this altar to the spirit of
> the rural community [*pagus*].[15]

It is striking that even more than two and a half centuries after being united in the same province, the local discourse of ethnic identity among the Aquitani was still characterized by complexity and diversity. The ethnogenesis of the community of the Novem Populi seems to have been predicated upon the representation of the *Galli* as "others."

Neriomagienses, Cubi, Bituriges, Aquitani, Novem Populi—these were all communities that, like Rome herself, were continually being reimagined,[16] whose members discursively renegotiated the bounds of inclusivity and exclusivity—ideas of the self and the other—and the meaning of those bounds. In such cases, where complex interactions that involved primarily local performances of identity were played out within or between provincial communities,

rather than between "indigenes" and "Romans," the shortcomings of bilateral core-periphery or top-down interpretations of the Roman imperial experience readily emerge.[17] Moreover, the construction of community and identity found in the multivocal inscription of L. Julius Equester does not allow a simplistic reading in terms of antithetical oppositions between change and continuity, "Roman" and "native," "acculturated" or "resistant." Provincials like Equester actively participated in constructions of identity that drew simultaneously upon multiple—and malleable—cultural vocabularies: his euergetism, while staged at an important place of memory in honor of a divinity with a Gaulish name, is nonetheless manifested in typically "Roman" cultural forms like the *porticus*. But porticoes, temples, statues, triumphal arches, monumental writing, imported luxury items, and grid-planned streets—in short the material culture that we are supposed to understand went along with the "complete ideological package"—are never mere indices of acculturation; recognizing how "Roman" the uses of such spaces, technologies, and goods were, or unpacking the meanings with which they were invested by the local viewer, is highly problematic.[18]

High in the foothills of the Pyrenees on the border of Aquitania and Iberia, a similar conversation conducted in a creole of Roman and local terms played out among another of the Nine Peoples, the Convenae. Unlike the Bituriges, their name does not evoke a vernacular past, but is rather a Latin noun meaning, most basically, "those who have come together," though the word more frequently carries a slight air of the pejorative or unfortunate: "the huddled masses, refugees, dregs." The earliest history of the community is shrouded in mystery: their chief place, Lugdunum (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges), shows no archaeological traces of occupation before the middle of the first century BCE, although it would eventually develop into a monumental urban center.[19] In the early imperial period, the Convenae attracted only the barest notice of Greek and Roman geographical writers: Strabo mentions their privileged legal status, advantageous geographic situation, and thermal springs, and gives a Greek translation of the ethnonym, while Pliny the Elder mentions them in passing as "having been united together in one town."[20] They do not appear in the literary record again until the first decade of the fifth century CE, when the Church father Jerome composed a bitter invective against a certain priest called Vigilantius, a native of the Convenae, whom he accused of opposing orthodox practices. In this

fierce polemical debate, the heresy of Vigilantius was attributed, in part, to the very origins of the community from which he sprang:

> Surely he reflects his race, as someone who was born from the seed of brigands and assembled rabble ["Convenae"], whom Cn. Pompeius, after Spain had been pacified and he was hastening to return to Rome in triumph, brought down from the heights of the Pyrenees and herded together in a single city: whence the community got the name of *Convenae*. In this manner he would be a brigand against the Church of God, and—being a true descendant of the Vectones, Arrebaci, and Celtiberians [three peoples of north-central Iberia]—he would raid the churches of the Gallic provinces, and would carry not the standard of the cross, but the banner of the Devil.[21]

This late and tendentious deployment of the trope of ethnic essentialism against Vigilantius constitutes the most detailed extant account of the foundation myth of the Convenae, an original, locally generated version of which Jerome's polemical agenda and ethnographic gaze seem to have twisted and recolored into the story as we have it.[22] There are some innocuous mistakes that show the potential distortions inherent in an outsider's telling, as with, for example, the mistaken names of some of the participant ethnic groups, the *Vettones* and *Arevaci*. Other problematic elements of the tale seem ultimately to stem from the kernel of the local tradition, and represent more meaningful rewritings of the past by the Convenae themselves. As we have mentioned, neither the archaeological evidence nor near-contemporary historical sources support the myth's insistence on a specifically Pompeian intervention in the foundation of the community; indeed, any Roman initiative or involvement in this development is difficult to discern clearly. Nevertheless, there are some intriguing parallels in community formation from the region: Pompelo (Pamplona), a city of the Vascones across the Pyrenees, appears to have been refounded and renamed as a result of interactions with Pompey during the war against the rebellious Roman commander Quintus Sertorius in the 70s BCE.[23] While the Convenae may well have coalesced from a mixture of indigenous Aquitanian and Celtic-speaking groups, together with far-flung survivors from among the collaborators or casualties of Sertorius in northern Iberia, it is rather more likely that this was only a

gradual process, with no defined (re)foundational moment like that experienced by their long-established neighbors at Pompelo. But it seems that the nascent Convenae of the early imperial period invented a new past for themselves, a convenient fiction that offered a narrative simplification of the complex dynamics of ethnogenesis. On analogy with Pompelo and other eponymous city foundations, this historicized myth of origins co-opted Roman agency and appropriated an epoch-making outside figure as the "founding father" of the community, defining for the Convenae a place on their own terms within the wider imperial world, while at the same time fulfilling all of the criteria prerequisite for a distinctly local sense of ethnic identity.[24] Such highly localized, instrumental uses of a reimagined Roman history to serve the needs of provincial communities, often overlooked in scholarship, allowed conquered peoples to both participate in the empire, and to "siphon off" some of its power to authorize their own alternative pasts, monuments, rituals, and hierarchies.

Despite Jerome's travesty of their invented tradition, it is evident from the remnants of the wonderfully rich epigraphic culture of the Convenae that they embraced the multiplex and polyphonous milieu attendant upon their hybrid origins.[25] Individuals with Aquitanian, Gaulish, and Latin names worshipped an extraordinary array of epichoric divinities attested nowhere else, either with Aquitanian theonyms like Aherbelste, Boccus Harauso, Ilixo, and Xubanus or whose Latin descriptors evoke quintessentially local cults of place, like "the six trees" (*sex arbores*).[26] The many subgroups that remained under the larger umbrella of the Convenae—rural communities (*pagi*) like the Gomferani, Neovates, and Harexvates—made collective votive offerings to their own particular tutelary deities, such as Erriapus and Oidritus.[27] Elites, both those who had acquired Roman citizenship and those whose status derived exclusively from alternative local systems of prestige, conspicuously projected and consolidated their power through the patronage of these groups. Men like Tiberius Publicius Sabinus, on the one hand, who provided the apparatus for public feasting to the village of the Florentini at his own expense, and Ombecco, on the other, who received posthumous public honors from his fellow members (*compagani*) of the Spariani, attest to the plurality of senses of belonging, and hint at the intricacies of identity politics among the Convenae.[28] But, as their origin myth implies, this vibrant internal multiplicity was subordinated to a unanimity

of *civitas* feeling in broader imperial contexts. Far from their remote mountain valleys, members of the community abroad—some traveling only as far as the Mediterranean coast on momentary political business, others permanently resident at Rome itself—announced their identity first and foremost as "citizens" and "natives" of the Convenae.[29] While those who left behind these various memorials undoubtedly ascribed dramatically different meanings to the process of "becoming Convenae" than Jerome, these combined testimonies of "self" and "other" bear powerful witness to the primacy and complexity of local identities in the empire.

In Spain, too, communities were being continually reimagined through the discursive construction of identities that were primarily local. In 15 BCE, shortly after the conclusion of the hard-fought wars against the Cantabri and the Astures that resulted in the final completion of the Roman conquest of western continental Europe, Augustus rewarded the Asturian people of Pameiobriga, of the larger ethnic group (*gens*) of the Susarri, who alone of the Astures had remained loyal to Rome, with permanent exemption from tribute (*immunitas perpetua*) and the formal recognition of their traditional territorial boundaries. Additionally, apparently at their own request, he bid the neighboring people of Aiobriga, of the ethnic group (*gens*) of the Gigurri, to share a common government with the Susarri. The decree, monumentalized in bronze, illustrates the dynamic interplay between imperial authority and local initiative:

> Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of the god, with the tribunician power for the eighth time and proconsul, says [as follows]: "I have learned through all my legates who presided over the province of Transduriana [across the Duero river] that the inhabitants of the town of Pameiobriga of the ethnic group of the Susarri, although the rest revolted, remained in their duties. Thus I grant them all everlasting exemption [from taxation], and whatever lands and territories they possessed when L. Sestius Quirinalis, my legate, obtained that province, I bid them to possess those lands without dispute. For the inhabitants of the town of Pameiobriga from the ethnic group of the Susarri, to whom I had previously granted that exemption from everything, I restore the inhabitants of the town of Aiiobriga from

the ethnic group of the Gigurri to their place, since their state
wishes it. I bid the same Aiiobrigiaecini to share a common gov-
ernment with the Susarri." Transacted at Narbo Martius on the
14th and 15th of February in the year when M. Drusus Libo and
L. Calpurnius Piso were consuls.[30]

In a fortunate chance survival, a local treaty document (*tessera hospitalis*)
involving the people of the Lougei and this same community of Aiobriga
is known from the principate of Tiberius, dated to 28 CE, which affords us
an invaluable glimpse into the cultural "microhistory" of the region across
roughly two generations.[31] What is particularly noteworthy in this text is
the ethnic identity of the Aiobrigiaecini after the passage of some time: their
ambassador, one Tillegus son of Ambatus, represents himself not as a *Gig-
urrus*, the ancient affiliation of the townspeople, but as a *Susarrus*, their new
partners in government. Having joined themselves with the Susarri, the
people of Aiobriga, formerly Gigurri, have "acculturated" on a small, but
clearly very meaningful scale.

What we see at work in one inscription in a small *vicus* in the center
of *Gallia Comata*, in another case study from the Aquitanian uplands, and,
finally, in a pair of documents from a remote hillfort in Asturia is represen-
tative of the provincial experience across Roman Spain and Gaul. Imperial
power brought with it other hierarchies of status, alternative pasts, new tech-
nologies of communication, and more conspicuous forms of display, but par-
ticipation in Roman citizenship or in certain cultural practices shared with
a wider Mediterranean world did not damn local identities and meanings
to obsolescence. On the contrary, the history of the Roman Empire is fun-
damentally a history of local communities. Perhaps the inhabitants of these
provinces do, in some ways, "go Roman," but Bituriges also become Bituriges
Cubi, and Bituriges Cubi become entangled with Aquitani; Aquitani splinter
into the Novem Populi; refugees of disparate ethnic groups come together as
the Convenae; the Gigurri of Aiobriga find a new identity as the Susarri of
Aiobriga. Accordingly, this chapter will build a framework for understand-
ing provincials of the Roman west as they chose to represent themselves, as
members of a diverse array of local communities—*vici* or *pagi* or *gentes* or
civitates—whose identities were firmly founded in social memory.

Naming and Definition

Names lie at the very heart of empire. Imperialism is, in a sense, an elaborate and iterative process of definition and redefinition, to which the power of naming is essential. To name is to know, to have conquered.[32] The irresistible image of Caesar that emerges from the careful rhetoric of his written commentaries on the war in Gaul is as an almost Adam-like surveyor and namer of things.[33] This inextricable connection between names and empire did not go unnoticed by his contemporaries. Cicero, who received at Rome frequent correspondence from the proconsul across the Alps, was moved to wonder aloud in a speech to the Senate: "Can I possibly be an enemy of this man, by whose letters, by whose messengers, by common talk of whom my ears are daily bombarded by the *new names* of peoples, tribes, and places?"[34] At the same time, for the vanquished, the continued belonging to self-nominating communities constitutes a meaningful reclamation of agency and subjectivity. To name is to remember, to remain. Tellingly, it was only *after* Caesar that ethnonyms began to appear prominently on locally minted coinage in Gaul, an already well-developed medium, but one which had previously tended to communicate other messages about individual elites.[35] In the generation of reorganization that followed the Roman conquest, men like Arus of the Segusiavi, Cantorix of the Turoni, Cisambos of the Lexovii, Orgetirix of the Aedui, and Acincovepus of the Petrucorii conspicuously advertised through coinage their membership in old Gallic *civitates*, whose uncertain place within the new Roman order must have provoked some anxiety; some peoples, like the Aulerci Eburovices and Mediomatrici, subordinated aristocratic competition to community identity, and produced coins with legends that bore only the name of the *ethnos*.[36]

A juxtaposition of two writers of the Flavian age who were the products of very different experiences of empire casts into still sharper relief the power of naming in the construction of selves and others, and some of the problems raised by the imperial rhetoric of "surveillance."[37] Pliny the Elder hailed from Novum Comum, in the north of Italy, and was among the foremost Roman intellectuals of his day. While he enjoyed a well-deserved reputation for antiquarian bookishness, he was more than an armchair historian; he had, through military service on the Rhine frontier and a series

of administrative appointments in the western provinces (procuratorships in Africa, Hispania Tarraconensis, Gallia Narbonensis, and Gallia Belgica), observed firsthand the dynamics of the extension and maintenance of Roman rule.[38] The breadth of Pliny's interests and expertise came together in his groundbreaking intellectual achievement, the *Natural History*, a voluminous work that is part catalog of culture, part inventory of empire.[39] The meandering but detailed circumscription of the European continent with which he opens his encyclopedic survey of the world and its contents—animal, vegetable, and mineral—is bookended by two important systematic treatments of the geography and organization of the provinces of Spain, which reflect a combination of historical research and contemporary concerns characteristic of Pliny.[40] Within the previous decade, Spain had undergone sweeping administrative reforms promoted by the emperor Vespasian, which had at least superficially altered the political and cultural landscape of these provinces, and had contributed to their rise to greater prominence on the imperial stage. While Pliny was, in light of his studies and recent events, aware of the potential for significant changes in the names, legal status, and relative importance of the various peoples of Spain over time, much of his data is culled from late republican and Augustan sources closely bound up with the wars of conquest: he cites, for example, the geographical commentaries of Agrippa, Augustus' commander against the Cantabri in northern Spain, which formed the basis for the great map of the imperial world in the Porticus of Octavia at Rome, as well as the inscription on the monumental trophies of Pompey set up in the Pyrenees (at that point a century and a half old), on which Pompey recorded the precise number of communities across Spain that he had subdued.[41]

The well-established discourse of imperial surveillance within which Pliny was writing was thus defined by a panoptic Roman view over the provincial landscape, inherent in which was a sharp imbalance of power: the objects of the gaze are constituted as a spectacle, denied the ability to return the gaze of the Roman observer. From his privileged, central, elevated position, the Roman—Pompey, Caesar, Agrippa, Pliny—counts, measures, compares, values, defines, and (re)names, performing intellectual work that perpetuates the system of power relations to which he owes his position. The encyclopedist represents the culmination of this discourse. Hundreds of places and peoples are named throughout the two surveys of Spain in the *Natural His-*

tory, but, equally importantly for the rhetoric of the text, still more are explicitly passed over in silence: at the beginning of the first catalog, Pliny tells the reader that he will restrict himself to "those who are worth mentioning or whose names are easy to say in the Latin language," and at the conclusion of the second, he confines his review of the tributary peoples of Lusitania to only "those whom it is not unpleasant to name." Elsewhere, discussing the fifteen peoples who make up the administrative district of Lucus Augusti (Lugo) in the northwest of the peninsula, he dismissively asserts as a justification for his brevity that "besides the Celtici and Lemavi, [they] are unimportant and have outlandish names," and similarly of the twenty-four states belonging to Bracara Augusta he ventures that "the Bibali, Coelerni, Callaeci, Equaesi, Limici, and Quarquerni might be named without inducing disgust in the reader."[42] The order brought about by the surveilling gaze combines aesthetic pleasure and authoritative information: peoples are conveniently selected, packaged, and sanitized for Roman consumption.

At the same time, for all the emphasis on the visibility and intelligibility of the provincials to imperial inquiry, there will have been certain communities, social formations, patterns, and practices of belonging that were invisible or impenetrable to Pliny's gaze. Moreover, such imperial practices of definition and surveillance were not without their discontents. However numerous and heterogeneous they must have been, the poet Martial is one of the few whose voice is not beyond the ability of the historian to recover. Martial came from Bilbilis (Calatayud) on the river Salo (the modern Jalón) in the middle Ebro valley, and he saw himself as a Celtiberian, a major ethnic group of east-central Spain that spoke a language more akin to Gaulish across the Pyrenees than to the Iberian dialects of the coastal regions of the peninsula.[43] He spent much of his life at Rome, where he carefully navigated the wearisome vagaries of the system of patronage, a "servant of servants" perpetually paying court in the "halls and homes of the powerful," though the self-image that he cultivated in his poetry as a mendicant and a cultural outsider is surely tinged with the conventional hues of literary hyperbole.[44] Nonetheless, Martial does seem to have maintained and performed a distinct Celtiberian identity throughout his thirty-year sojourn in the imperial capital. In the fourth book of his *Epigrams*, composed within a decade of the publication of Pliny's *Natural History*, the poet offers a survey of the landscape of his own native country quite unlike that of the encyclopedist:

Let us, born from the Celtae and Hiberi, not be ashamed to mention the harsher names of our country in pleasing verse: Bilbilis, renowned for its cruel iron . . . and Platea, ringing with the working of its steel, a place which the river Salo-that-tempers-arms goes round with shallow but turbulent waters; and Tutela [Tudela] and the dance of the Rixamae [local goddesses]; and the festivals of the Carduae; and Peteris [near Ablitas], blushing under a blanket of roses; and the ancient theaters of our fathers at Rigae; and the Silai [near Selas, southeast of Maranchón] skilled with the light javelin; and the lakes [perhaps the modern Laguna de Gallocanta] of Turgontum [Tornos?] and Turasia; and the pure streams of little Tuetonissa; and the sacred oak grove of Buradon [Beratón], through which even the tired traveler walks; and the fields of the vale of Vativesca, which Manlius tills with strong bullocks. Do you laugh at such rustic names as these, dainty reader? Go ahead and laugh. I prefer these rustic names to Butunti [Bitonto, Italy].[45]

Names are again the focus of the text, but here it is privileged local knowledge rather than the imperial gaze that confers the power of naming. From the opening lines, Martial champions a radically different aesthetics, in which dissonance to the Roman ear is a marker of local authenticity. His microtopography of Bilbilis and its environs is filled with evocative places of memory and sites of belonging that represent the very kind of outlandish, unpleasant, awkward names so disdained by Pliny. Communities like Rigae and the Carduae are otherwise unknown, and seem to have been constituted at a scale too small, too far down the settlement hierarchy to merit Roman attention: Pliny mentions Bilbilis, but the other names are indistinguishable or unintelligible to the stranger, unimportant to or incongruous with his project of inventory and domination. But for Martial, concerned not with administrative units but with meaningful communities, these groups and their rich associated traditions—dances, festivals, public spectacles, monuments, military training, sacred rituals—are of paramount importance in "being Celtiberian." The lack of orientation, explanation, or clarification for the outsider flaunts the fact that this is a local conversation in which the Romans are decidedly not invited to participate; a vocabulary intentionally

left untranslated creates spaces within their own empire that are inaccessible to the Romans themselves.[46] While it is difficult to demonstrate that Martial's poem is a direct engagement with Pliny's geography, it is clear that they are both responding, from opposite perspectives, to an omnipresent discourse of naming and definition that profoundly shaped the experience of conqueror and conquered.

This discourse and its limitations have continued to shape modern scholarship. Previous studies of provincial communities in the Roman west have often focused taxonomically on their legal or administrative statuses and rights. This is particularly the case in Spain, where the account of Pliny offers details of the organization and composition of the various administrative districts (*conventus*), and the discovery of the Flavian municipal charters of several cities has provided a wealth of evidence illuminating the prescribed internal workings of an idealized community with the "Latin right" (*ius Latii*), a formalized intermediary civic status in Roman law.[47] The situation in Gaul is somewhat more complicated. Although a significant part of what modern scholars refer to as the "provincial law" (*lex provinciae*) of Narbonensis survives, we know of no comparable document for the three northern provinces of "Long-haired Gaul" (*Gallia Comata*).[48] To obscure matters further, the standard system of chartered towns (*municipia*) and colonies (*coloniae*), elaborated most schematically in a well-trodden passage of Aulus Gellius and widely attested in Italy and Spain,[49] does not seem to have existed in the same form in Aquitania, Lugdunensis, and Belgica: there are no *municipia* documented as such from these provinces in either the epigraphic record or literary sources. Instead, it was the *civitas*—the coextensive ethnic-political community, like the Bituriges and Convenae—that constituted the basic unit of Roman administration in Gaul.[50]

But we are not chiefly concerned with systems and structures of rule, and it is not the objective of this section to detail the administrative hierarchy of the seven Roman provinces studied in this work. A shortcoming of legalistic approaches is that they tend to privilege a top-down view from the perspective of the Roman imperial center, marginalizing the diverse ways in which communities chose to represent themselves and so eliding the agency of local actors. Moreover, local variation and innovation, often demonstrably functions or manifestations of social memory, are largely unintelligible within prescriptive frameworks such as these.[51] As we have

seen, some communities are undetectable from the point of view of imperial administration. That is not to say that the administrative categories into which the Romans sorted provincial communities, and by which they made sense of an increasingly complex empire, were meaningless to the inhabitants thereof. The fact that local elites actively petitioned the emperor or his representatives on behalf of their communities for grants of special status—honorary promotion to the rank of *municipium* or *colonia*, for example—is an indication of the perceived or constructed value of such titles.[52] With such promotions, patterns of elite interaction shifted in a variety of ways: there could be new goals to be attained, a new vocabulary—both visual and verbal—to be deployed, new kinds of spaces for the performance and projection of local power and influence. But while Latin or municipal or colonial status might involve certain physical or political transformations within a community,[53] the magnitude of the changes brought about thereby should not be overstated. The municipal statutes themselves emphasize nearly as much continuity as they do innovation,[54] and from inscriptional evidence it appears likely that, even before formal grants of legal status, many communities had taken the initiative and instituted their own unofficial Roman-style magistracies.[55] Misunderstandings, misapplications, and even misappropriations of Roman law—a function, in part, of the difficulties of reliable communication across great cultural and geographical distance, as well as of the abiding self-interest of local populations—must have been widespread.[56] In short, the diversity of communities—even within a single *conventus* or a province—before the spread of legal privileges, and the diversity of their responses thereto, suggests that there were widely discrepant experiences of Roman power,[57] and thus attempts to define and categorize provincial communities are bound to tell only one side of the story. With legal status—as with other social and cultural phenomena—it is the *locally generated* meanings and the agency of the members of the community, in their roles as viewers, participants, interpreters, and authors, rather than the *imposed* imperial structures, upon which we shall focus.

In *Gallia Comata* the differentiation of status within the Roman order between communities was manifested from an early period in the labels "allied" (*foederata*), "free" (*libera*), or "tributary" (*stipendiaria*) variously attached to *civitates* in both literary and epigraphic sources, perhaps originally linked to the administrative (re)organization of Gaul in the immediate

post-conquest period by Julius Caesar.[58] As rewards for the loyal or incentives for the recalcitrant, such titles, the origins of which lay in the age of Roman expansion in Italy, were already somewhat of an archaism in the late first century BCE. Whether in Gaul the titles were mere community status symbols or whether they bestowed certain rights and privileges on a *civitas* is much debated, but it does appear that, by the principate of Tiberius, *civitates liberae* and *foederatae* enjoyed no tangible administrative or economic benefits.[59] One of the contributing factors in the revolt of Julius Florus and Julius Sacrovir in 21 CE was the oppressive debt incurred by many of the *civitates*, presumably from the payment of tribute.[60] Since the communities most disaffected were nominally *foederatae* (the Aedui) or *liberae* (the Treveri and Turoni), there seems to have existed no correlation between such status and immunity from tribute under Tiberius.

It is interesting, then, that *foederata* and *libera* continue to be employed by Roman writers like Pliny the Elder in their categorization of Gallic communities and by these communities themselves in their own self-definition. In fact, the only secure evidence for the usage of these titles on the part of *civitates* in Gaul dates to the period between Claudius and the late third century, well after these markers of status had ceased to possess real administrative significance.[61] As honorifics, then, the titles clearly remained meaningful in the construction of community identity and, by implication, in the construction of difference between *civitates*. The Treveri, who had formerly been elevated to the rank of "free state" (*civitas libera*), were even stripped of this privilege as a punishment, further evidence of the weight still given to these titles.[62] As honorary status denoted a special relationship to Rome embedded in the past, it was thus inextricably tied to social memory. It is perhaps not coincidental that at least two Gallic *civitates* that possessed the status of *foederatae*—the Remi and Aedui—invented foundation legends that closely linked their own origins to those of Rome.[63] Though in reality these grants were most likely owed to historical events of the 50s BCE—the abstinence of the Remi from the revolt of Vercingetorix and Caesar's desire to reconcile with the powerful Aedui—an imaginary connection to Rome could have been retrojected into the distant, mythical past.[64]

Besides *civitas*, *municipium*, and *colonia* one finds a multitude of other designations employed in the (self-)definition of groups and individuals in Spain and Gaul: a smaller village or settlement focus, like the previously

discussed Neriomagus, was commonly called a *vicus*; *pagus*, as we have seen among the Convenae, was used of a rural sub-community within a larger *civitas*.[65] Especially in the north and west of the Iberian peninsula, ethnic identities were expressed in the idea of the *gens*, "a people related by birth," like the aforementioned Gigurri and Susarri: these *gentes* ranged from major populations that were recognized by the Romans and well documented in historical sources—Cantabri, Vaccaei, Astures—to minor groups attested only epigraphically: Abanicii, Abilici, Ablaidoci, Arnicii, Cilurnigi, Pembeli, Ratries, Viromenigi, or "the Pintones from the village of Baedocum."[66] Even the more circumscribed ethnicities remained meaningful communities into late antiquity: in an epitaph dated to 267 CE, fifteen-year-old Ammaia Caelionica was identified by her father as "a member of the *gens* of the Penii," a people otherwise unknown.[67] The local adoption of all of these Latin terms already implicates a significant degree of reinterpretation on the part of provincials, whose understandings of the valences of such self-ascriptions must have differed from the taxonomic view of a Roman outsider.

But there are still other, less obvious cases, where Latin words were borrowed in radically creative ways to translate non-Roman political organizations and social relationships, resulting in imprecise approximations that couched vernacular meanings in the common language of empire. In the northwest of the Iberian peninsula, where Celtic languages predominated, the word *castellum* ("fort, stronghold") was used by indigenous populations in Latin inscriptions to render the sense of the toponyms of particular kinds of fortified hilltop settlements, which in local dialects were composed of the proper name of the place with the nominal suffixes -*briga* or -*ocelum*, both of which mean "hill-fort."[68] An epitaph from the province of Baetica, for example, records the community of Reburrus of the people of the Limici as *castellum Berense*, "the Berensian fort," which in his own language would still have been called *Berobriga*.[69] This monument is particularly evocative as it was set up far from Reburrus' homeland, in the country of the Turdetani, who had a considerably different cultural and linguistic heritage than the Limici. Reburrus' heirs assumed—or perhaps pretended—that their *Berobriga* would be unintelligible to outsiders, be they Turdetani or Romans. Behind this superficially standardizing act of translation, then, actually lies a meaningful rhetoric of difference that recognizes the historical distinctiveness of various provincial groups, and draws attention to the potential

incongruities between Roman political geography and traditional sites and modalities of belonging. So prevalent was this impulse toward (re)definition, that a common symbol (Ɔ) was developed as an epigraphic convention in the northwest of Spain to represent in shorthand this hybrid idea of a pre-Roman settlement focus turned provincial administrative unit. The symbol is strikingly and, perhaps, intentionally polyvalent: confronted with the toponym Ɔ *Olca*, as on the funerary monument of a young girl from Callaecia, a viewer conversant in this idiosyncratic vocabulary might interpret the sign in the vernacular or in Latin, read *Olcabriga* or *castellum Olca*.[70] Its ambiguity accommodates a spectrum of experiences and understandings of the renegotiated role of local communities within a Roman province.

Elsewhere, Latin was used to translate and preserve complexities within political and ethnic communities across transitional or potentially disjunctive moments. Old Roman institutions were adapted to provincial contexts, with an irregularity which suggests that this process was largely directed by local initiative rather than imperial administration. Within the wider *civitas* of the Carnutes, an important people of central Gaul, some rural groups preserved their Gaulish names, but referred to themselves in early imperial Latin inscriptions as *curiae*, groups that constituted one of the most archaic forms of Roman political organization. It is known from the laws of Irni (El Saucejo) and Malaca (Malaga) in Baetica that, upon the acquisition of municipal status, the town council of a community might be made responsible for organizing the population into several *curiae*, which were apparently named at the discretion of the community and served as the voting units in the election of local magistrates.[71] But the particular system of Baetican *municipia* cannot be mapped precisely onto the *civitates* of Gaul; and even if the *curiae* of the Carnutes are connected to transformations in legal status, they are significantly more prominent, active, and emotive communities than one would expect for novel and artificial electoral divisions with highly circumscribed functions. In the hinterland of the *civitas* capital of Cenabum (Orléans), the *curia Cassiciate* made a collective votive offering of a bronze horse to the god Rudiobus, and, at another sanctuary, the son of a local aristocrat (named Toutorix, "leader of the people") who does not appear to have possessed Roman citizenship assumed a principal role in the dedication of an altar for the well-being (*salus*) of his own *curia*, *Ludnomagus*.[72] These organizations appear far more closely tied to the countryside, to ritual practices,

and to traditional elite authority than to participation in Roman-style civic government. Among the Carnutes, it seems that the Latin word *curia* was employed rather idiosyncratically to approximate or translate a meaningful, renegotiated form of political or religious community that constituted a smaller part of the *civitas*.[73]

Through this process of translation, other antiquated divisions of the citizen body of early Rome found an unexpected place in provincial cities, even those that were, in theory, governed by standardizing imperial charters. Within the Flavian *municipium* of Arva (Alcolea del Rio), in the province of Baetica, there existed at least eight so-called *centuriae*, which possessed indigenous Iberian names—Ores, Manes, Halos, Erques, Beres, Arvabores, Isines, and Isurgutes—and which could act in concert on certain matters alongside the municipal council, such as publicly honoring local elites for their services to the town.[74] This usage of *centuria*—as a subdivision of a *municipium*—is otherwise unknown, and would have been only vaguely recognizable to a Roman outsider; it is rather another example of the reinterpretation and redeployment of a non-Roman concept in Roman guise.[75] Thus, at Arva, local innovation and variation accommodated the persistence of meaningful, smaller-scale group identities even after the promotion of the settlement to the status of *municipium*.

In fact, such promotions did not always even entail the complete replacement of traditional political structures and their participants by the new organs of Roman, "municipal" administration that were sanctioned and established by formal charters, as is evident, for example, at Singili Barba (Cerro del Castillon) in the Flavian period:

> For Gaius Sempronius Nigellio, member of the board of priests of the imperial cult in the Colonia Patricia [Corduba] and lifetime member of the board of priests of the imperial cult in the *municipium* of Singili by decree of the town councilors of the *municipium* of Singili. He accepted the honor, but defrayed the cost. To him, when he was admitted into the citizen body, the town council of Singili decreed as much as is possible to any freedman. Likewise to him the old town council of Singili decreed also in its own name the same things which above had been decreed by the full body.[76]

This inscription reveals that within this community, after it had received legal rights, two town councils or local senates (*ordines*) coexisted and apparently sometimes met in parallel, or as a body (*in universum*): the "new" *ordo Singiliensis* and the "translated" *ordo Singiliensis vetus*, which probably represents the kind of aristocratic body common to the region in the pre-Roman period.[77] Even if the "old order" had become, from the point of view of Roman imperial law, obsolete, it occupied a meaningful, reinterpreted place within the *municipium*, continuing to function independently and to retain, if only nominally, some of its traditional prerogatives and importance. Although here the two orders seem to work in harmony, the coexistence of multiple sites and sources of local power does raise the possibility of discord, of competing claims to representativeness. Indeed, the usurpation of the very "Roman" idea of the municipal town council by certain of the Singilienses to modernize an old oligarchic authority and the mimesis of certain of its typical public performances and communicative actions (decrees, inscriptions) demonstrate that even behind the most generic of Roman administrative categories and definitions, like the *municipium*, can lie much more complex local negotiations and memories. Rather than confirming the standard scholarly assumption that the municipalization of Spain in the last third of the first century CE was a profoundly homogenizing process, together the eight *centuriae* of Arva and the two *ordines* at Singili Barba suggest some of the ways in which diversity and pluralism persisted through local initiative, adaptation, and reinterpretation.

Such diversity and pluralism is to be found even within Roman *coloniae*, where historians have tended to expect the greatest degree of uniformity and oblivion of local cultures "through the process of 'crowding' or 'overlay.'"[78] At Valentia (Valencia), which could number itself among the oldest Roman cities outside of Italy, distinct memory communities with discrepant experiences of the colonial project seem to have endured for over four hundred years. Following his campaigns in Lusitania, in 138 BCE D. Junius Brutus had planted this settlement of veterans—predominantly Samnites, judging from the onomastics of the colony's early coinage—on a site which had originally been occupied, since at least the end of the fourth century BCE, by a city of the native Iberian Edetani, probably to be identified as Tyris.[79] In the civil strife of the 70s BCE the city sided with Q. Sertorius, and was partially destroyed during its reconquest by Pompey and his lieutenant L. Afranius

following the battle of the Sucro. Rather paradoxically, Afranius appears to have been instrumental in the city's subsequent recovery, and many years later he was honored back in his Italian homeland of Picenum as a patron by the "senators and colonists" (*conscripti et coloni*) of Valentia.[80] In the imperial period, however, this senate composed of *conscripti* drawn from the Roman colonists gave way to two distinct city councils (*ordines*), which at Valentia were called "the veterans" (*veterani*) and "the ancients" (*veteres*). These appear to have held occasional plenary sessions in which decrees were passed jointly "by the entire council of the Valentini" (*ab universe ordine Valentinorum*), but, based on the conventional epigraphic formulas *uterque ordo* ("each council") and *Valentini veterani et veteres* ("the veterans *and* the ancients of Valentia"), most of the decisions reflected in the extant monuments were undertaken by the two bodies at least nominally independently of one another. As an honorific inscription for a decurion of the council of *veterani* attests, membership was mutually exclusive.[81] Furthermore, the existence of unilateral public decrees only of "the veterans" suggests that the official legislative authority of the *colonia* was vested in them, and that the role of "the ancients," like the "old order" at Singili Barba, was primarily symbolic.

From this basic description the crucial question arises of the origins and significance of this dual community, of the division between *veterani* and *veteres* within imperial Valentia.[82] The inscriptions that mention these two *ordines* range in date from roughly the last quarter of the first century CE to the last quarter of the third century.[83] If the silence in the aforementioned monument to Afranius is any indication, this political structure had not yet been introduced—or at least fully integrated—into the *colonia* in the 50s BCE.[84] Therefore, the chronological window for the emergence of these institutions (ca. 50 BCE—90 CE) coincides with the period during which Latin rights and Roman citizenship spread most rapidly and thoroughly throughout the peninsula, and it stands to reason, especially on analogy with the developments in contemporary *municipia*, that this change may have been connected with the enfranchisement of the native Edetani and their fuller formal participation within the state. If so, then it is justified to think that those preexisting dividing lines within the community that would have appeared particularly salient to the Valentini at this transitional moment in their civic history generated and lent a depth of meaning to the "council of veterans" and the "council of ancients." Given that there is no evidence that Valentia ever received another

infusion of veteran colonists after the original foundation by Brutus, the a priori assumption that the *ordo veteranorum* refers to the first Roman-Samnite settlers and their descendants, imagined or otherwise, remains compelling. The corollary of this hypothesis is, of course, that the *veteres*, the group whose primary identifier in contradistinction to the *veterani* was their relative antiquity, were understood in some sense as the heirs to the pre-Roman Edetanian inhabitants of Tyris.[85] Such a highly negotiated political system, in which the *veterani* remained the authoritative group within the community, reveals an interesting tension between marginalization and incorporation, between enfranchisement and second-class citizenship. Local institutional innovation may have accommodated social memory of antiquity and priority on the part of the Edetani, but it may also have facilitated their continued segregation by the *coloni*, in theory if not in practice. It is, however, a remarkable testament to the deep-seated importance of this imagined division for constructions of Valentian identity—or identities—that it persisted for so long, outlasting even the spread of universal citizenship under the edict of Caracalla (*constitutio Antoniniana*) by two generations, in the face of which its purely symbolic function and highly artificial character must have been cast into still sharper relief. Ultimately, the microhistory of the two *ordines* at Valentia serves as a salutary corrective to the widespread scholarly assertion that, "in the west there is no institutionalized memory of the pre-Roman past,"[86] for this is exactly what the *veterani* and *veteres* represent. Perhaps like all *coloniae* in the western provinces, upon closer inspection Valentia does not conform to Gellius' simplistic definition as a "small-scale replica" of the capital, one in a series of generic reproductions of Rome and "Romanness" overlaid onto an indigenous landscape; being or becoming Valentian was itself a continuous, complex, and contested process, which produced multiple senses of belonging.

Returning to other forms of non-colonial communities, we find that a similar case of translation to those at Arva and Singili Barba occurs in another document of local diplomacy (*tessera hospitalis*) from Asturica (Astorga), which records a treaty of friendship (*hospitium*) dated to 27 CE between the "clan of the Desonci from the ethnic group of the Zoelae" and the "clan of the Tridiavi from the same ethnic group of the Zoelae":

> In the year when M. Licinius Crassus and L. Calpurnius Piso
> were consuls [27 CE], on the 27th of April:

The clan [*gentilitas*] of the Desonci, from the ethnic group [*gens*] of the Zoelae, and the clan [*gentilitas*] of the Tridiavi, likewise from the ethnic group of the Zoelae, renewed their ancient friendship [*hospitium vetustum antiquom renovaverunt*] and they all received one another into trust and clientage, for themselves, for their children, and for their descendants. Araus son of Ablecaenus and Turaius son of Cloutus and Docius son of Elaesus and Magilo son of Cloutus and Bodecius son of Burralus and Elaesus son of Clutamus transacted this through Abienus son of Pentilus, magistrate of the Zoelae, at Curunda.

In the year when Glabrio and Homullus were consuls [152 CE], on the 11th of July:

The same clan of the Desonci and the clan of the Tridiavi into the same clientage and the same treaties received, from the *gens* of the Avolvigi, Sempronius Perpetuus of the clan of the Orniaces, and, from the *gens* of the Visaligi, Antonius of the clan of the Arquies, and, from the *gens* of the Cabruagenigi, Flavius Fronto of the clan of the Zoelae [?]. L. Domitius Silo and L. Flavius Severus transacted this at Asturica.[87]

From the context of this inscription, and from comparison with other documents preserved in the Celtiberian language, it is clear that these *gentilitates*—the Desonci and Tridiavi—were smaller, suprafamilial kinship groups within the larger *gens Zoelarum*.[88] But this is a specific meaning of the word *gentilitas* unattested in standard Latin, and it thus represents an innovative coinage on the part of the Zoelae to communicate and monumentalize a pre-Roman social division that retained its local importance in the post-conquest period.[89] Indeed, the document claims that this was actually the renewal of an ancient alliance between the two communities, which would most likely then belong originally to the pre-conquest period. But there is a further dimension to the social memory in this text: the *tessera* itself dates to 152 CE, when these two *gentilitates* agreed to include in their compact (*foedera*) individual members of the neighboring *gentes* of the Avolvigi, Visaligi, and Cabruagenigi, and it was in the context of the expansion of the terms of the *hospitium* in the Antonine period that they had chosen to remember and to reinscribe the earlier pact of the Tiberian age, which in turn hearkened

back to a still more ancient, pre-Roman relationship. It is worth noting that, despite the proliferation of internal sub-ethnic divisions, the *gens* of the Zoelae, like the previously discussed Convenae, was still capable of communal action at a larger scale: interestingly, they maintained their own aristocratic council (for which they, too, borrowed the Latin word *ordo*), which seems to have existed outside of the formal provincial administrative system and possessed only nominal, locally delegated authority. But as an inscribed votive offering to the epichoric god Aernus shows, the decisions and communicative actions of the council of the Zoelae remained of some consequence.[90]

At Montealegre, only twenty kilometers northwest of Asturica, during the rule of the emperor Hadrian, in 134 CE, three individuals from the *cognatio* ("kin-group") of the Magilances from the town of Amallobriga—Granius Silo, Aemilius Sapienus, and Julius Proculus—also renewed an old pact of *hospitium* made long before by two individuals from their community—Cabrumuria and Paligo—with the *senatus* and *populus* of the town of Cauca, through their envoys, the chief magistrate (*duumvir*) M. Valerius Lentulus together with L. Sempronius Quadratus.[91] Like the *gentilitates* of the Zoelae, this *cognatio Magilancum* seems to have been a suprafamilial community, roughly analogous to a "clan." Although this social structure is translated with a Latin term only in this single bronze *tessera*, these so-called "gentilics" ending in -*cum* or -*qum* (or "genetivos de plural," as they are referred to by Spanish scholars) are widely attested in the northern regions of the Iberian peninsula, among the Celtiberians of the *meseta central* and the major neighboring ethnic groups to the north and west like the Vettones, Astures, and Cantabri.[92] These gentilician communities appear ubiquitously already in the earliest documents known in the Celtiberian language, from the second century BCE,[93] but hundreds of years later, even Roman citizens with "new" Roman-style family names (*nomina gentilicia*) continued to root their identity in these old gentilics. On epitaphs at the Arevacan cities of Uxama (San Esteban de Gormaz/Osma) and Clunia, for example, we find Lucius Valerius Silo Letondiqum, Lucius Licinius Seranus Auvancum, and T. Pompeius Urcaliocom; Popillius Hirsutus Lanciqum, son of Flavius Vendiecus, resident of the town of Vacoecum, was buried near Iria Flavia (Padrón); and at Segobriga (Saelices) a monument was set up by Quintus Valerius Argaelus Duitiqum.[94] That many of these local gentilics are demonstrably derived from non-Roman personal names (*Letondiqum* from the name Letondo, *Mel-*

maniqum from Melmanus, *Magilancum* from Magilo) suggests that a remembered connection to an eponymous ancestor, real or imagined, may have constituted an important aspect of these group identities.[95] Other, similar kinds of identities persisted in the north to which no labels were explicitly attached in Latin inscriptions, presumably because, as with most gentilician communities or clans, their nature and significance required no definition or translation for local audiences. In Asturia, a group of monuments was dedicated to an epichoric manifestation of the god Pentovius known as Tabaliaenus by a subset of the people of the Luggones who called themselves the Arganticaeni. This name, too, seems to be derived from a personal name, and these Arganticaeni were probably a family that enjoyed some special status among the Luggones, perhaps a traditional aristocratic clan, who may have been sufficiently influential even to leave a trace in modern place names of the region.[96]

These kinds of social divisions like the *gentilitas* and *cognatio*, subsumed administratively in the north of Spain within Roman institutions, would have been invisible to the surveilling gaze of imperial power, but the fact that they continued to be reenacted and remembered in processes of communalization well into the middle of the second century CE—sometimes being prominently traced back over the span of more than five generations, as in the case of the *tessera* from Asturica—demonstrates their central importance in local constructions of identity. In the end, using Latin did not always signify "becoming Roman," nor did formal incorporation into the administrative and legal hierarchy of the empire consign to oblivion communities and senses of belonging that did not map onto that hierarchy in patterns easily recognizable to the Roman surveyor, or with names easily pronounced by his tongue.

Space and Place

The world, as Augustus reminded it with his final words, belonged to the empire of the Roman people.[97] But that empire was not an undifferentiated whole; within the variegated patchwork of distinct peoples and cities, other senses of belonging, other conceptions of space persisted and proliferated. The aforementioned Augustan document relating to the fates of the towns of Pameiobriga and Aiobriga in the wake of the Roman conquest reflects

unmistakable anxiety on the part of the Susarri over the continued possession of their own ancestral "lands and territory," and careful attention on the part of the imperial government to preexisting borders. Clearly local practices of territory did not vanish. Thus alongside the need to disentangle local meanings and patterns of self-nomination from the imperial Latin vocabulary of law and administration, it is important to examine the strategies employed by provincial communities to define the physical boundaries that marked off selves from others. A shared sense of place constitutes an essential part of how a community imagines itself, and thus boundaries—representing as they do the differentiation of place from space—together with the associated idea of territory, must necessarily enter into any discussion of local identity and community.[98]

Recent scholarship in the field of political geography has increasingly problematized "territory" as a concept, and has emphasized the manifold ways in which it is produced and practiced.[99] The modern state has been the primary object of analysis, but the more nuanced understanding of territory and territoriality developed in the course of these debates is a potentially fruitful one with which to think about communities within the Roman Empire. Especially relevant is the call for new studies to work to escape the "sovereignty-territory nexus," and to analyze other configurations of space and identity.[100] While the communities of the western provinces were stripped of their sovereignty and subordinated to the *imperium* of the Roman people, they maintained the notion—if not always the extent—of their rightful "territory"; what, borrowing the language of the Romans, they would come to call their *fines*: the artificial physical boundaries dividing their community from others, and the associated political technologies to measure and control the space contained therein.

In the municipal charters from Spain, we can glimpse one way in which the territory of a community with Roman legal status might have been practiced: each year the *duoviri* were to put a measure to the vote of the *decuriones* as to whether a commission should be appointed to go around (*circumire*) and look over (*recognoscere*) the borders and lands (*fines et agri*) of the *municipium*.[101] Our evidence does not allow us to reconstruct a full picture of how such Roman conceptions and practices were integrated with local, pre-Roman conceptions and practices of territory, but there are indications that the one did not completely replace the other. For instance, ancient rock sanctuaries

in Celtiberia and Lusitania located at the frontiers between political or ethnic groups continued to be important venues for collective "interstate" ritual activities; some, like Lamas de Moledo, were monumentalized with bilingual inscriptions, in Latin and Lusitanian, that record the participation of members of multiple communities.[102] Gatherings at these "neutral sites," where memories and territories intersected, were opportunities for negotiation and competition that simultaneously reinforced the boundaries between the participants, while fostering a larger sense of belonging together. Another example is worth noting. Scattered throughout the northern and western regions of the Spanish *meseta central*, where the *gentes* of the Vettones and Vaccaei dwelt, are some four hundred massive stone statues of bulls and boars (standing up to 2.5 m high), which were erected over a remarkably long time span, from the fourth century BCE to the third century CE. One of the most convincing interpretations of these monuments—the so-called *verracos Vettones* ("boars of the Vettones")—and their geographical distribution is that they served as boundary stones between different communities, and possibly also as markers of winter pasturelands, imbued with some kind of religious significance.[103] Some were clearly adapted to mark new kinds of boundaries imposed by Roman rule: one boar from the eastern reaches of the territory of the Vettones bears a Latin inscription on each flank, reading "on this side is the province of Lusitania, not Tarraconensis," and vice versa on the other.[104] Well into the Roman period, these traditional zoomorphic statues continued to be viewed and deployed by the Vettones and Vaccaei as meaningful features in a memory-laden landscape: points of intersection between past and present, points of divergence between selves and others. Moreover, in the course of the early empire, newly commissioned examples of the genre became markedly more geometric, schematic, and minimalist, departing ever further from the increasingly pervasive influences of Roman visual culture. This reactionary trend toward false archaism demonstrates the importance of constructed continuities with local antiquity, the desire to project a timeless identity—a "sameness"—that was deeply rooted in a sense of place.

The ritual elements of territorial boundaries hinted at in the Iberian *verracos* are manifested much more clearly in certain kinds of votives from Gaul. The earliest example, a boundary marker from the country of the Veneti on the Aremorican coast, predates the Roman conquest. It bears a short inscription in the Gaulish language, most of which is decipherable: "Vrabos

dedicated [this] to the Fathers who protect the borders of . . ."[105] Although the proper name of the place or community that stands at the end of the text and whose borders the dedicant strives ritually to safeguard cannot be identified, the ritual act itself and the existence of a specific collective of patron divinities in this region whose purview encompassed the *agos*, or "boundary," suggests the great symbolic power and practical significance of territory in the mentality of late Iron Age communities. Indeed, read in this light, Caesar's consistent mode of reference in his roughly contemporary war commentaries to the *fines* of the various Gallic *civitates*, his constant awareness of the precise boundedness of the spaces in which he finds himself, is to be understood as more than a just rhetorical projection of his own intellectual mastery of Gaul; presumably this definite knowledge also reflects the discourse and practices of the local ethnic groups themselves.[106] There is evidence that the cult of borders, or of border-guardians, was a more widespread phenomenon in Gaul, and that after the conquest certain provincial communities found a renegotiated role for these divinities. In the hinterland of the southern provincial capital of Narbo (Narbonne), another altar, inscribed in Latin and set up by an individual who possessed Roman citizenship, was dedicated to the borders themselves: "Marcus Atilius Labeo fulfilled his vow to the Borders (*Finibus*) gladly and deservedly."[107] It is unclear to which *fines* Labeo refers, but the findspot of the inscription perhaps indicates the territory of a *pagus* or other local community, or even the boundaries of private land. This apparent translation of a pre-Roman religious concept into the conventional language of Latin votive dedications in a region that had been exposed to the earliest and most intensive Roman political reorganization and cultural influence is a powerful reminder that local meanings and definitions of place—and the emblematic ways of articulating them—were not entirely supplanted by the establishment of *coloniae*.

More conventional Roman-style boundary stones discovered from across Spain and Gaul—as from other parts of the empire—certainly reflect the anxieties of local communities under Roman rule over the (re)creation and practice of their individual territories.[108] For example, fragments of some seventeen stones marking the *fines* of the Roman colonial foundation of Aquae Sextiae (Aix-en-Provence) and the old Salluvian city of Arelate (Arles) make this the best-attested boundary in all of Gaul.[109] Such anxieties seem to have been particularly acute not only in certain localities but also during

certain periods: there are several inscriptions dated between 2 BCE and 6 CE from central Lusitania that define the *termini* of the Lancienses, Igaeditani, Mirobrigenses, Salmaticenses, Polibenses, Bletisamenses, and Valutenses.[110] Even on monuments that are not primarily concerned with the construction of territory, a keen awareness of the borders of surrounding communities is frequently in evidence: in northern Celtiberia, the epitaph of a traveler from the city of Augustobriga (Agreda), who was buried near the city of Trebago (Trévago), about fifteen kilometers to the west, declares that "he died at the border of Arcobriga" (near Monreal de Ariza), another city about fifty kilometers to the south.[111] The Roman military presence also stimulated a concern with boundaries. Full citizen colonies or semi-permanent legionary bases were carved out from the lands of preexisting local communities: in northern Spain, following the pacification of the Cantabri and the Astures, the *legio IIII Macedonica* remained in the country as a peacekeeping force for half a century, stationed in the midst of the territory of Iuliobriga (Retortillo) and Segisamo (Sasamón), where several boundary stones are extant with inscriptions establishing the *terminus* between the pasturelands (*prata*) of the legion and the lands (*ager*) of the Iuliobrigenses or Segisamonenses;[112] the *legio X Gemina* in the time of Claudius similarly marked their *prata* out from the territory of the *civitas* of Bedunia (Cebrones del Río).[113]

Epigraphic monuments demonstrate that territoriality was practiced even within the borders of a single *civitas*, between constituent rural groups that, although they identified with a broader ethnic community and shared common political institutions, still retained a sense of distinctiveness: in northern Gaul, the Caruces set up boundary stones marking out the territory of their own small *pagus* from the rest of the Treveri.[114] The territories of some ancient *pagi* cut across the *fines* of the relatively more recently defined urban centers upon which they were administratively dependent, resulting in complex configurations of space and identity. In the vicinity of the Narbonensian *coloniae* of Arelate and Aquae Sextiae, the aforementioned borders of which were so systematically delimited, there existed well into the mid-second century CE a semi-autonomous rural community that came together at a place known to them as *Gargarius*. The members (*pagani*) of this group—which at some point had received the Latin name *pagus Lucretius*—were probably a remnant of the Salluvii whose lands were restructured at the foundation of Aquae Sextiae in 123 BCE; remarkably, even

though after the organization of the Roman province part of the *pagani* ended up dwelling within the *fines* of Arelate and part within those of Aquae Sextiae, they remained a cohesive, discrete community.[115] It is possible that the persistence of this *pagus*, transgressing the careful order of the colonial landscape, factored into the anxieties over the border between these two cities.

Border disputes inevitably arose. Recourse to arms was generally no longer practicable under Roman rule, although there were occasional, interesting exceptions.[116] But violent border clashes between communities were rare; the disaffected parties would more often appeal to the imperial center for arbitration of the conflict. Several inscriptions attest to the intervention of the emperor in such cases: in northwestern Spain, Claudius settled the boundaries between the camp of the *cohors IIII Gallorum* and the *civitates* of the Luggones and the Bedunienses; Vespasian drew a new *terminus* between the Lacimurgenses and the Ucubitani of the *colonia Claritas Iulia* and sent a legate to adjudicate a border dispute between the Viennenses and Ceutronae in Narbonensis; in Baetica, the proconsul L. Antistius Rufus in 84 CE fixed the territory of Cisimbrium (Sierra del Torcal), and later Hadrian confirmed the decision of one of his *iudices* on the boundary between the three communities (*trifinium*) of the Sacilienses, Eporenses, and Solienses.[117]

A bronze tablet recently discovered at Fuentes de Ropel in northwestern Spain illuminates the outcome of one such local border dispute.[118] Unfortunately the first column of the inscription containing the larger context of the dispute and the magistrates involved in its resolution is almost entirely missing, and the rest of the bronze is fragmentary, but it is clearly an official legal decision (*sententia de terminis*).[119] Most interesting is that it contains a detailed verbal "tour" (*circumitio*) of the boundaries of a community: "[. . .] the hill in sight of Segusiona [. . .] thence to the left 145 *perticae* up to the lakes on this side of Cillobenda"; "from Amala to the right on the old Cariensis road"; "after Cauldobenda . . . to the right through the boundary on the hill." Several other Celtic place names are preserved in the text, all of which are otherwise unknown: Burriligia, Voligobenda, Vagabrobenda, Cadarnavaegium.[120] Some of these, like Vagabrobenda ("the low goat-hill"), may not have actually been settlements, but rather simply vernacular "microtoponyms," which would further mark this text as a product of a specifically local discourse of space, power, and identity. The authorization and

ßmonumentalization of this particular discursive statement would not necessarily have precluded other responses; successive generations of viewers of this "invitation to remember"—whether or not they could read its text—would have continually reinterpreted or contested its meaning in the present as they reimagined the space and places of their community.

But Roman methods of organizing provincial space left their imprint most indelibly in the patterns of centuriation still visible from the air in many parts of modern Europe. In the wake of the conquest and the establishment of Roman colonies, local communities—both those whose elite populations were in part incorporated into the civic life of the *colonia* and those who remained on the physical and cultural outskirts thereof—were confronted with this unfamiliar way of interacting with the landscape. The documentation of the measurements of *agrimensores* produced in this process of centuriation—namely cadastral plans—has been analyzed chiefly from the perspective of imperial administration.[121] But cadastral plans are also monumental visual representations of this drastic physical division of space; the question of the viewer—especially viewers from marginalized communities—is rarely taken into consideration. One can begin to explore these issues in a recently discovered fragment of a bronze cadaster that relates to the centuriation of land near Lacimurga (Navalvillar de Pela), proximate to the border between the provinces of Lusitania and Baetica.[122] The surviving portion of this cadastral plan depicts the *fines Lacimurgensium* in the upper left-hand corner, along the river labeled *Ana* (or Anas, the modern Guadiana), at the extreme margin of the grids of *centuriae*. There are three *coloniae* in the vicinity of Lacimurga with which this centuriation could conceivably be associated: the most important of these, Augusta Emerita (Mérida), can be ruled out;[123] that leaves Metellinum (Medellín) and Ucubi (Espejo). Although it does not provide incontrovertible proof for an assignation of this plan to Ucubi, the aforementioned *terminus* redrawn by Vespasian between the Ucubitani and Lacimurgenses near Mirobriga (Valdecaballeros) does reveal that in this region the territory of the *colonia* extended as far as the boundaries of that of Lacimurga, and renders probable an identification of the centuriated land in this cadaster with Ucubi.

The *Colonia Claritas Iulia Ucubi*, situated on the ruins of the Iberian *oppidum* burnt by the younger Cn. Pompeius, was almost certainly a foundation of Julius Caesar, who had bestowed upon it extensive lands taken from the

local supporters of Pompey, resulting in a vast territory, the northern reaches of which—bordering upon Lacimurga, over two hundred kilometers north of Ucubi itself—could hardly have been contiguous with the rest.[124] If this fragmentary cadaster is to be assigned to Ucubi, then the division and redistribution of land depicted thereon becomes, in certain respects, intertwined with the local memory of the war between Caesar and the sons of Magnus. The reorganization and fragmentation of the physical landscape, and the cadastral plan as a monument of the traumatic discontinuity represented therein, might have been read very differently by the Lacimurgenses who were excluded from the colony, and by the non-colonist, native Ucubitani who were included. The former were decisively marginalized, marked out as "other": the Roman landscape stops abruptly at the *fines Lacimurgensium*. The latter saw the name of their own community reappropriated for the new Roman-style urban center that had risen from the ashes of their former settlement and that had confiscated, measured out, and redistributed their ancestral lands.[125] Such discontinuities in land tenure were widespread in the peninsula. To the east, at Ilici (Elche), which shared a similar historical trajectory to Ucubi, an Iberian settlement upon which a Roman *colonia* had been imposed, it was the most fertile land—that in the plain of the river Vinalopó—that was centuriated and occupied by Roman *coloni*, while the original inhabitants were pushed back into the hills.[126]

The most complete and most significant cadastral plans from the western provinces, however, are those from the Roman *colonia* at Arausio (Orange) in Gallia Narbonensis, which was founded around the year 35 BCE. A little over a century after Arausio was planted along the Rhone, the emperor Vespasian implemented a reorganization and reassessment of its territory, culminating in the creation and publication of a detailed document:

> The Emperor Caesar Vespasian Augustus, chief priest, holding the tribunician power for the eighth time, acclaimed *imperator* for the eighteenth time, father of his country, consul for the eighth time, and censor for the purpose of restoring the public lands that the deified Augustus had given to the soldiers of the *legio Gallica* and that had been occupied by private individuals over some years ordered a plan of the fields [*forma agrorum*] to be published, with the yearly tax noted on each land division [*cen-*

turia], under the supervision of L. Valerius Ummidius Bassus, proconsul of the province of Narbonensis.[127]

Of this *forma agrorum*, some four hundred forty-three groups of fragments survive, from which can be reconstructed, with varying degrees of completeness, three monumental cadasters, the largest of which would have measured roughly 5.5 m x 7 m. Salviat built on the work of Oliver, who had in turn refined the earlier foundational hypotheses of Piganiol concerning the layout and orientation of the cadasters.[128] He further developed Oliver's convincing argument that the cadastral plan was originally displayed on the interior walls of a public building at Arausio in such a way that, as the viewer faced south, west, or north, the cadaster in front of him would be aligned with the direction of his gaze, as if he were looking "through" the wall onto the landscape beyond (that is, with south, west, and north at the top of each respective map).

As with the depiction of the Lacimurgenses on the outskirts of the system of centuriation at Ucubi, the cadasters from Arausio show several communities on the periphery of the land belonging to the *colonia*. For example, on the cadaster oriented to the south ("A" in the reconstruction of Piganiol) are found the Ernaginenses, whose territory was centered on the site of Ernaginum (Saint-Gabriel), and the Caenicenses, situated somewhere to the east.[129] On the central cadaster ("B"), some of the poorer land that was not arable (*inculta*) is labeled *Tricastinis reddita*, that is, restored to the Tricastini, one of the local peoples whose lands were originally in part confiscated and redistributed to the Roman *coloni*.[130] Indeed, one word—"restored" (*reddita*)—conjures up the whole duplex narrative of victor and vanquished, Roman and "other." While the exact date and circumstances of this restoration are impossible to determine,[131] its inclusion on the cadastral plan imparts a dynamic historical dimension to what is otherwise a static, timeless image of the landscape. Restoration constitutes an act of remembering for both parties involved, and suggests that the Tricastini, even when dispossessed of this part of their territory, had maintained a meaningful connection to it in their collective memory. The contemporary promotion of the central place of the Tricastini to the status of an honorary *colonia* at some point during the Flavian period, perhaps to be loosely connected with the return of their ancestral lands, must have been a moment of great ambivalence, bringing

to the fore tensions between remembering and forgetting, alienation and participation, the trauma of the past and the rewards of the present.[132]

As a localized construction of center and periphery, a projection of the dominance of *colonia* and *coloni* over this region of the plain of the Rhone, these cadasters lent themselves to a multiplicity of readings, to potentially discordant meanings. Although there are no inscriptions explicitly attesting to the presence at Arausio of members of the surrounding communities like Ernaginum, it can be plausibly inferred that their inhabitants would have had occasion to visit the city and maybe even to witness this grand display of Roman power over space.[133] In thinking about the potential viewers and meanings of this *forma agrorum*, it is constructive to consider another complex—but more obvious—monument at Arausio, the triumphal arch dedicated during the principate of Tiberius that stood on the road leading into the city from the north.[134] The iconography of the arch has long resisted satisfactory interpretation,[135] in particular the "Galatomachy" frieze found on the entablature, with its depiction of a fierce if lopsided battle between Romans and Gauls, and the four panels—two on the north face of the arch, two on the south—bearing reliefs of captured Gallic arms and armor, realistic down to the Gaulish inscriptions that were replicated on the shields of the vanquished. Like its counterpart at Glanum (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence) in the territory of the Salluvii, the arch at Arausio is strikingly polyvalent. In the eyes of the victorious Roman, the Galatomachy was a representation of the triumph of order over chaos, "civilization" over barbarism;[136] but the effect on local viewers—Ernaginenses, Caenicenses, Tricastini—who found themselves identifying more with the nude figures of the dying, outnumbered Gauls must have been a very different one. The approximate dividing lines—spatial and historical—between these two groups of viewers were etched, as we have seen, into the cadastral plan that lay through the arch at the heart of the urban center.

Fifty kilometers southwest of Arausio at Nemausus (Nîmes), the central place of the Volcae Arecomici, is another spatial monument, the so-called "inscription géographique."[137] This fragmentary marble base bears in a single column the names of eleven smaller satellite communities: Andusia (Anduze), Brugetia, Tedusia, Vatrute, Ugernum (Beaucaire), Sextantio (Castelnau-le-Lez), Briginno (Brignon), Statumae, Virinno, Ucetia (Uzès), and Segusion. The names of two of these places—Ugernum and Ucetia—are dif-

ferentiated from the rest: they appear in the genitive (possessive) case, are carved in larger letters, and are preceded by a *punctum*, suggesting that they occupied a position of importance in the local settlement hierarchy somewhere between Nemausus and the others.[138] That their names are given in the genitive case may indicate that the communities listed immediately below—Sextantio, Briginno, Statumae, and Virinno, in the case of Ugernum—were in some way subordinated to them. In his picture of the province of Narbonensis, Strabo may provide insight into the centripetal connection of these smaller settlement foci to Nemausus that we find monumentalized on this pillar:

> The central place [μητρόπολις] of the Arecomici is Nemausus, falling far short of Narbo in terms of the throng of foreigners and commerce, but surpassing it in terms of its citizenry. For it has under its authority [συντελούσας] twenty-four smaller communities [κώμας], of the same ethnicity [ὁμοεθνῶν] and abounding in able-bodied men, and it possesses the so-called "Latin right" . . . on account of this fact this people [ἔθνος] is not subject to the commands of the praetors sent from Rome.[139]

Interpreted in light of this passage, the inscription under discussion was very plausibly part of a larger monument that would have borne the names of all twenty-four κῶμαι or communities of the Arecomici, organized into meaningful subdivisions, the exact nature of which is now obscure. The detailed contours of this epigraphic "map" illuminate the workings of the territorial practice of the Volcae Arecomici; the compilation and permanent commemoration of an inventory of the ethnic community is a powerful statement of unity.[140] Its geography circumscribes the territory of the ἔθνος as a whole and implicitly marks them out from their neighbors: the larger western group of the Volcae—the infamous Tectosages, whose chief city was Tolosa (Toulouse)—and the Cavares to the east, from whose name and identity the Arecomici seem to have been increasingly compelled to distinguish themselves in the early imperial period, as Greek and Roman outsiders, careless of local ethnic self-ascription, had begun to label all of the "barbarians" in this region "Cavares" as a convenient shorthand.[141] Strikingly different in perspective as compared to the cadastral plans, this pillar at Nemausus is the product of an internal conversation of ethnic identity,

place, and community, a conversation from which the Romans are largely—and importantly—absent.

It is occasionally possible to glimpse how provincial communities envisioned their place within the geography of the wider Roman world. Among the Aedui, for example, there existed a monumental painted map of the "world" (*orbis terrarum*), as we learn from a panegyric delivered in the late 290s CE by Eumenius, who had taught rhetoric at their capital Augustodunum (Autun):

> Moreover, in those porticoes [at Augustodunum] let the youth see and daily look upon all the lands and seas and whatever cities and peoples and nations our invincible emperors either through their dutifulness restore or through their valor conquer or through their awesomeness constrain. Since indeed—as I believe you yourself have seen—for the sake of instructing the boys, so that the things grasped only with difficulty by hearing may be discerned more clearly by the eyes, the locations [*situs*], boundaries [*spatia*], and distances [*intervalla*] of all places [*locorum*] have been represented [*descripta sunt*] along with their names [*nomina*].[142]

A public visual representation of space on such a large scale is remarkable: its closest known parallel is the famous map of Agrippa in the *porticus Octavia* at Rome. Unfortunately, like that map, very little is known of this *orbis depictus* of the Aedui.[143] A fragmentary inscription survives from Augustodunum that gives the *nomina* and *intervalla* of some places in northeastern Gaul, but despite these basic similarities to the description of Eumenius, it is unlikely to belong to the same monument.[144]

Notwithstanding a resemblance in form or content between the map at Augustodunum and its counterpart at Rome, two such disparate contexts surely engendered divergent readings. A comprehensive map of imperial space at the very heart of the empire itself seems fitting, particularly in the context of Augustus' refashioning of the Campus Martius—at the southern limit of which was the *porticus Octavia*—into a projection of Roman (or his own) power over time and space.[145] To this power of Augustus was owed the very foundation of Augustodunum and much of its urban fabric, but ideal Roman viewers were created with far more difficulty than ideal Ro-

man cityscapes.[146] Already by the early first century CE the seat of the Aedui had acquired a reputation as a center of learning,[147] a role that, as Eumenius illustrates, it continued to play well into the late third century. Accordingly it attracted local elites not just of the Aedui but from the surrounding *civitates* as well,[148] whose diverse and complex identities would conceivably have colored their interpretations of this map sheltered under the porticoes of Augustodunum. Of these countless viewers we have only the highly enthusiastic, "Roman" reading of Eumenius, the former imperial functionary turned solicitor of funds to restore the town's schools. After directing the audience's mental gaze to the map in order to explore the far-flung *res gestae* of the tetrarchs by which they have restored stability not just to the war-torn capital of the Aedui but to the entire Roman empire, he sighs in conclusion, "Now, now at long last it is pleasing to look upon the painting of the whole world (*orbem . . . depictum*), since in it we see nothing that is not ours (*nihil . . . alienum*)."[149]

It is worth dwelling upon this upon final word, *alienum*, as it most clearly speaks to the underlying question, implicated by this monument, of conceptions of place versus space, self versus other. For Eumenius, quite understandably given the rhetorical imperative of this particular speech, the first person signifies the Roman, and *alienus* all that is not Roman; the borders with which he is here concerned are those of the *imperium*, inside of which exists a monolithic "us" (*nos*). But, given the anxiety found elsewhere over the constitution of individual territories, there must have been other possible readings of this map for viewers from among the Aedui or other *civitates*, readings with different significations of *noster* and *alienus*, wherein the *situs* and *spatia* of their own communities—Cadurci, Mediomatrici, Bituriges, Treveri—became the focal point, wherein local identities replaced "Roman" identities as the primary source of meaning. With the introduction of the map to Gaul, the Romans reinforced intra-provincial territorial boundaries, while at the same time giving the communities of Gaul a new way of visualizing themselves, the bird's-eye view.[150]

Ultimately, for all Eumenius' flattering rhetoric of universal empire, for all the self-conscious chauvinism of the Augustan poets centuries prior musing on the semantic collapse between *urbs* and *orbis*, the city and the world, an identity between center and periphery was of course never realized: "the world subject to the empire of the Roman people" always remained

something fundamentally different and diverse. From the republican period through late antiquity, the inventorying, ethnographic gaze of encyclopedists and emperors outward from the Roman center constructed Spain and Gaul as other spaces, or perhaps more accurately, as *others'* spaces.[151] Concomitantly, as we have seen in a few representative case studies, in these spaces provincials themselves negotiated local meanings and memories of place in response to Roman power and to their neighbors, and created or recreated territory as part of larger processes of community-building and identity formation.

Local Time

Provincial communities situated themselves in time as well as in space. A sense of a shared past, periodically rehearsed through collective rituals or bound up with collectively remembered events, helped to define local identities. The coordination of the rhythms of days and months and years and of the temporal distribution of communal activities is a powerful means of cultivating social cohesion, and thus groups tend to develop distinctive experiences and understandings of time that reinforce a felt sense of belonging together. Festivals were of particular significance as extraordinary and symbolically framed moments of performance when local communities celebrated and represented an image of themselves to themselves, broad participation in which renewed and rearticulated integral, collectively held truths.[152] Accordingly, this section will examine two separate modes of thinking about time that factored into the process of communalization: on the one hand the calendar, the rationalizing structure imposed upon the year, and the annual festivals of which it is composed; and on the other the era, through which the passage of years—and the flow of time—may be meaningfully measured.

Fragments of several calendars recording non-Roman timekeeping systems are known from Gaul, but the one discovered in 1897 near Coligny—a little over eighty kilometers northeast of Lyon in the ancient territory of the Ambarri—is by far the most complete and the best understood.[153] Because the fragments of this bronze calendar were found by chance rather than through systematic excavation, their archaeological context remains unclear. However, based on the regular way in which the tablet was broken, on

the fact that traces of a container for the fragments—over 150 in number—made of vegetal fibers were detected, and on the discovery of a bronze statue of a young male divinity—variously identified as Mars or Apollo—buried together with the calendar, the fragments seem to have been intentionally deposited.[154] Attempts at dating the document are founded upon stylistic analysis of the accompanying bronze statue and upon epigraphic analysis of the letterforms of the text itself: the statue has been dated to the second half of the first or the first half of the second century CE, the text to roughly the last quarter of the second century CE.[155] Conservatively, therefore, 150 CE is a reasonable *terminus post quem* for the engraving of the calendar; the date and circumstances of its seemingly ritual destruction and deposition can only be guessed at, but may have been linked to the abandonment—forcible or otherwise—of the sanctuary in which the tablet and statue were displayed, perhaps during the tumultuous decades of the third century. In the territory of the Sequani, neighbors of the Ambarri to the north, the temple at Ruisseau d'Heria, where a monumental bronze calendar very similar to that of Coligny was set up, seems to have been destroyed at this period as well.[156]

As for its content, the calendar of Coligny represents one quinquennial cycle, sometimes called a Gallic *lustrum*; with the insertion of an intercalary month every two and a half years, the cycle consists of a total of sixty-two months. Visually, the months are arrayed in a grid of sixteen columns of four rows each (with the intercalary months occupying two "panels" each) that progresses from top to bottom and from left to right across the bronze plaque. The name of each month (*mid-* in the Gaulish of the text) is inscribed in large capital letters,[157] and is labeled either *matu* ("mature, complete," i.e., a month in which the moon completes a full cycle) or *anmatu* ("not mature, incomplete," i.e., a month in which the moon does not complete a full cycle) depending on whether it comprises thirty or twenty-nine days respectively.[158] There follows, in smaller lettering, a numbered list of the days of the month, subdivided into two parts separated by the Gaulish word *atenoux-* ("reclining, lowering again," i.e., the waning of the moon); the first part of the month, before the full moon, always comprises fifteen days, the second either fifteen or fourteen depending on whether the month is *matu* or *anmatu*. Next to the numeral for each day is a hole, presumably to accommodate a nail that would be used to mark the current date. Various other designations are applied to the days of the month throughout the calen-

dar.[159] Previously, these notations were thought to refer to festivals or to the religious quality of the day (compare the Latin calendrical labels *dies fastus* or *nefastus*), but the work of Zavaroni has demonstrated the fundamentally lunar nature of the Gaulish calendar and has argued that the terms all relate to aspects of the lunar cycle: the calendar is thus devoid of explicitly religious or civic content.[160] The result is a vastly more coherent and internally consistent system.

Study of the Coligny calendar has primarily been the domain of Celticists and Indo-Europeanists interested in reconstructing the language, religion, or scientific knowledge of the peoples of pre-Roman Gaul.[161] On linguistic and astronomical grounds, there is near-unanimous agreement among modern scholars that the Gaulish lunar calendar as reflected in its extant exemplar could not have developed as late as the end of the second century CE; instead, the bronze of Coligny stood at the end of a long process of transmission—oral or textual or some combination thereof—stretching back to the late Iron Age, a span of some two and a half centuries at the least.[162] But the document cannot be understood merely as a fossilized artifact of a pre-Roman past. Rather, as products of social memory, as a performance of local identity, text and time merit discussion in the context of the cultural history of the Roman provinces.

What is striking about the calendar at first glance is how thoroughly *Roman* it is in appearance. Upon comparison with the monumental *fasti* from the Latin cities of Praeneste or Antium, for example, the influence of Roman visualizations of time is undeniable.[163] Thus, while the content of the Gaulish calendar may have been handed down over the course of centuries, its *form* was not. Its ideal viewer was one already familiar with the Roman *fasti*, who, in recognizing the superficial similarities, was all the more keenly aware of the differences.[164] Conspicuously absent are the standard elements of Roman imperial time: religious festivals, anniversaries of historical events, and important milestones in the careers of the emperors. Indeed, the whole "pageant" of the Roman past is forgotten;[165] the "remembering calendars" (*memores fastus*) celebrated by the poet Horace have been supplanted by a very different kind of memory.[166]

The self-conscious archaism or antiquarianism of the Gaulish calendar sheds interesting light upon the competitive discourse of the local elite of the Ambarri or Sequani in the late second century CE, for whom time, and

the manipulation and control thereof, was an abiding concern. The display of privileged local knowledge—statements in a cultural vocabulary that would have been unintelligible in any real terms to the dominant power— was clearly a viable, even a desirable, alternative to the projection of a more self-consciously "Roman" identity. Native erudition—or at least the notion thereof—had not been entirely abandoned in favor of the Latin schools of Augustodunum.[167] In this regard, the calendar is perhaps to be situated within the larger trend of local "revivalism" that developed in Gaul from the end of the second century CE.[168] Beyond its symbolic value, the propagation and proliferation of copies of the Gaulish calendar suggests that it retained a practical importance as well. As we have already noted, its design—with nail-holes for marking the current day—intended it for active use. Displayed in sanctuaries, ancient modes of tracking lunar time seem to have retained some functional significance for local cult and festival activity, for the mo- dalities of Roman time may have been ill-suited to the religious life of cer- tain communities. Among the Lemovices, for example, the *decamnoctiacis Granni*—a ten-night festival of the god Grannus that retained its Gaulish name—is attested in the early imperial period, and was almost certainly organized around the lunar calendar.[169]

Traditional folk celebrations like "the ten nights of Grannus" must have remained an integral part of the ways in which provincial communities measured the cycles of time, renewed connections with places in the land- scape, and dramatically reenacted "social facts" and group beliefs. Unfor- tunately, the details of the myths, histories, ideologies, and symbols that constituted this organization of collective meaning are, for the most part, irrecoverable to us as outsiders; we are almost never so fortunate as to have monumental records or written reflections created by the celebrants them- selves. Patronage and participation tended to manifest themselves in more ephemeral forms, since for the actors and audiences involved, the festival itself was the commemorative medium, the "cultural text."[170] But traces of "pagan" festivals tied to local patterns of time and places of memory, with roots extending deep into antiquity, are occasionally described—inevitably in pejorative terms—by late antique Christian authors, or are perhaps still more faintly discernible in the notices of certain folk traditions in medieval documents. Gregory, bishop of Tours in the sixth century and himself a na- tive of the people of the Arverni in the province of Aquitania, records details

of an annual festival among the Gabali, southern neighbors of his own countrymen, in the mountains of the Aubrac:

> There was a mountain in the territory of the Gabali [*in Gabilitano territorio*] called Helanus, where there was a very large lake [the modern Lac de S. Andéol, near Marchastel]. At a certain time of year, a great crowd of those who dwelled in the countryside [*multitudo rusticorum*] would gather at the lake and, as if making offerings to the lake itself, would throw into it linen cloth and the material used to make men's garments; some cast in sheepskins with the wool on them, and very many even offered molds for cheese, or wax, or bread, and a vast assortment of things of every variety that would, I think, be tedious to go through one by one. Moreover, they came with carts laden with food and drink, and for three days they sacrificed animals and feasted. On the fourth day, however, when it was time for them to depart, they would be caught in a great thunderstorm as they set out, and such a shower of rain and hail would descend upon them, that scarcely any of them might have expected to escape. This happened every year, and the foolish people was wrapped up in its delusion.[171]

This information, which Gregory derived from the eyewitness report of the local bishop Hilarius of Mende, who had attended the festival for the purpose of turning the rural Gabali from their "delusion," is partly corroborated by archaeological evidence of votive offerings at the lake stretching back into the pre-Roman period. While the churchman built a shrine to his canonized namesake, Hilarius of Poitiers, near the old temple on the site in an attempt to redirect the superstitious energies of the people, he failed to put an end to the old rituals associated with the place: well into the nineteenth century, the tradition persisted among the peasants of the Aubrac, who continued to reverence the lake as "the father of hail storms."[172]

There is evidence that a similar three-day mountaintop festival was celebrated by the Aedui, whose territory bordered that of the Arverni to the north, into the Roman period and beyond. Thirteenth- and fourteenth-century French sources describe the annual fair held for three days during the first week of May atop Mont Beuvray, then situated in the Duché de Bourgogne,

which culminated, perhaps not unlike the festival of the Gabali, in some sort of ritualized collective descent from the height; hence the vernacular name applied to the event, *la foire du descent de Beuvray*. This long-abandoned hill had once, in the late Iron Age, held the *oppidum* of Bibracte, central place of the Aedui, before most of the population moved down into the plain to Augustodunum shortly after the Roman conquest. Despite the absence of major permanent settlement, however, the material-cultural profile of the site suggests some iterative activity here throughout antiquity and the Middle Ages. In the Roman period, the Aedui seem to have made an annual pilgrimage to the place to celebrate the ancient rites of their community amidst the ruins of Bibracte, and to have continued to return long after Roman rule over the region had disintegrated, under a succession of Burgundian, Merovingian, and Carolingian rulers.[173] Local time outlasted imperial power.

Communities also found ways to innovate within the framework of Roman time, to inscribe civic meanings onto the imperial calendar. The provincial capital of Narbo serves as an excellent case study. The city kept an idiosyncratic festival called the *Iunilicia*, whose name is usually—and plausibly—interpreted as referring to the month of June. The nature of this festival is obscure, but its celebration seems to have been accompanied by the appointment of an honorary *dictator*, the prestige of which was great enough to merit special commemoration.[174] The remarkable liturgical inscription of the "Altar of the Godhead of Augustus" (*Ara Numinis Augusti*) at Narbo affords a further glimpse of the community's public calendar. Alongside the standard offerings to the *numen* of Augustus on important dates that were observed across the empire (e.g., his assumption of the *fasces* on the 7th of January),[175] memory of the local past of the community was incorporated as well: each year on the 31st of May, to mark the anniversary of Augustus' peacemaking intervention in an outbreak of factional strife in II CE, the citizens (*coloni*) and non-citizen residents (*incolae*) were to assemble and to perform cult acts.[176] Unfortunately, nothing further is known of the original incident at Narbo, which had involved an otherwise insurmountable disagreement between the town council (*decuriones*) and the common people (*plebs*); although the ethnic identities that prevailed within each of the two parties might have differed, it is unclear the extent to which the contours of this discord followed dividing lines between the descendants of the veteran colonists of the tenth legion (the *Decimani*) and the native Atacini. But if the

Iunilicia are indeed to be placed in June, it is tempting to connect them to the anniversary of the end of the struggle of the orders at Narbo on the day before the calends, as a sort of cathartic reenactment of the reconciliation, a yearly practice of community (re)building. That there was an officer of the festival whose fictive title rings of internal crisis and political exigency (*dictator*) might lend further credence to the hypothesis of an origin in the apparently intense civic conflict of the early imperial period.[177]

Festivals elsewhere in Gaul and Spain also attest to the weaving together of disparate strands into the ritual fabric of provincial communities. In 198 CE, the vernal games surrounding the *Floralia* in late April and early May were celebrated in the *vicus* of Beda among the Treveri.[178] They were held at the behest of a grandee of the Bedenses, who built a stage (*proscaenium*)— presumably for the rather lascivious comic performances typical of the *Floralia*—and endowed the *ludi* and the maintenance of the stage in perpetuity, entrusting the *curatores* of the *vicus* with the management of the funds.[179] Such festivals, tied to the natural flux of the seasons, were readily transferable outside Rome, and may even have melded with traditional observances. In some cases, they became so completely integrated into the calendar that they were incorporated into local legends and etiologies. There was a story told around Massilia (Marseilles) of Comanus, who was king of the Segobrigii of southern Gaul in the far distant past, shortly after the arrival of the Phocaean colonists from Greece. Comanus, it was said, used the occasion of the celebration of the Floralia at Massilia, when its gates would be open, to attempt an overthrow of the city—only to have his plans foiled by a Gallic maiden who had fallen for one of the Massiliote youths. Given that this festival was not introduced to Rome until the middle of the third century, at the very earliest, it is thus a clear anachronism in sixth-century Massilia. But it appears that in the Augustan age, the Massiliotes kept unusual customs on certain festival days, especially during the Floralia, and that their Gallic neighbors—like the historian Pompeius Trogus, of the Vocontii—adduced this romantic etiological fable to explain the original cause.[180] More surprising, however, is that provincial communities adopted some rites that seemingly were quintessentially Roman, embedded in the space and time of the city of Rome: the *Lupercalia*, chief among them, were transposed far from the *Lupercal* at the foot of the Palatine to both Nemausus in Gaul and the Balearic Islands.[181]

At Lugdunum (Lyon), local and Roman time collapsed together in the festival that took place annually around the first day of August. From its very inception, it was an attempt to create a synchronism between the rhythms of the Gaulish calendar and those of imperial power. In 12 BCE, Drusus, while on campaign in Germany, dedicated an altar to deified Caesar at Lugdunum and instituted the federal festival of the three provinces around it as a pretext (πρόφασις, according to the historian Cassius Dio) to settle the restive *civitates* of Gaul at his back.[182] Drusus' choice of date—the calends of August, according to the Roman calendar—seems to have been a carefully calculated one: it was to coincide with, even to subsume, the important annual festival of Lugus, the eponymous divinity of Lugdunum ("hill[fort] of Lugus").[183] The festival at the altar, and the assembly with which it became associated,[184] flourished well into the high empire, as Dio's phrase "and still now" (καὶ νῦν) suggests, and as epigraphic evidence indicates.[185] While the implantation of this cult was in many ways an imperial usurpation of Gallic sacred time, it did not preclude the (re)invention of other, and contentious, meanings by the elite who assembled annually to represent their communities at the capital.

Early in 176 CE, the Senate in Rome met to discuss the necessity of alleviating the financial burden placed upon provincial priests of the imperial cult who were compelled to provide ever more lavish spectacles in fulfillment of their office. Two documents from opposite ends of the empire preserve large parts of the pertinent minutes of the Senate (*acta senatus*) and taken together paint a fairly complete picture of the matter: the so-called "Marble of Sardis" (*Marmor Sardianum*) preserves the address (*oratio*) of the emperor, while the "Bronze of Italica" (*Aes Italicense*) relates the first reaction (*sententia prima*) delivered by an anonymous senator from Gaul. Most interesting for the discussion at hand are the extraordinary allowances granted to the priests of Gaul by Marcus Aurelius, and elaborated upon by the senator. First, the relevant lines of the *Marmor Sardianum* (MS):

> That class of two-sword fighters, the Gauls call them *trinqui*, is accused of a certain barbarous act, but, as each people has its own practices hallowed by ancient custom and sacred ritual, [we decree] that it be permitted for the *trinqui* to fight in the provinces of Gaul. Let that day be devoted to the ritual . . . so that the contest may be held.[186]

And of the *Aes Italicense* (AI):

> As for the provinces of Gaul [the same limits on gladiatorial expenses apply], but also for the *trinqui* who, on account of ancient custom and sacred ritual, are eagerly awaited in the *civitates* of the most illustrious provinces of Gaul, let no trainer charge a higher price than 2,000 [sesterces] each, since the great Emperors in their speech have announced that it will be the case that their governors will offer a condemned man to the trainers for no more than six gold pieces.[187]

From a synthesis of the two perspectives in the *acta*, imperial and provincial, a basic sketch of the cultural context that motivated this particular concession can be drawn. There existed a traditional type of gladiator (*vetus mos*: MS 13; AI 56) peculiar to the peoples of Gaul, whom they themselves called in their own language *trinqui* (MS 12; AI 56),[188] and who were employed in some sort of religious ritual (*sacer ritus*: MS 13; AI 56). The *trinqui* had at some point fallen out of use, but their return was eagerly awaited by the peoples of Gaul (*expectantur*: AI 56); this required special imperial permission (*liceat*: MS 13), which the elite must have sought by petition.[189] According to the *oratio* of the *principes*, those who had been condemned to die (*damnatum ad gladium*: AI 57) could now legally be purchased to perform the role of the *trinqui*, which was, presumably, to die in one fashion or another. A certain festival day was set aside (*is dies religioni condonetur*: MS 14) for the practice. To darken the picture, at the root of the original obsolescence of the *trinqui* appears to have been a rather grim accusation of the worst kind of "barbarism" (*inhumanitas*: MS 12).[190] In essence, what this *senatus consultum* authorizes, although in couched terms, is the reintroduction of an ancient form of ritual human sacrifice by the priests of the imperial cult at Lugdunum.[191] Though exceedingly rare, there were, in fact, other instances of tolerance of human sacrifice in the western provinces by the Romans as an accommodation of local religious traditions.[192] The day alluded to in the *Aes Italicense* for the performance of the rite, literally "given over to religion," is probably *the* significant date in the local calendar of Lugdunum, the calends of August.[193] Both aspects of this theory are further strengthened by the likelihood of a connection with events that transpired at the provincial capital the following year.[194]

The fifth book of the fourth-century ecclesiastical historian Eusebius opens with excerpts from a letter addressed by the Christian communities of Lugdunum and Vienna (Vienne) to their brethren in Asia Minor, which gives firsthand accounts of the deaths of several martyrs in the amphitheater at Lugdunum in 177 CE. These occurred during a crowded public festival to which people from all the *civitates* (ἔθνη) of Gaul had flocked;[195] although not further specified in the text, the occasion was almost certainly the festival of the three Gauls.[196] Some of the victims are said to have been used as stand-ins for the usual variety of gladiatorial combats, and they are represented as a kind of sacrifice (ἐτύθησαν).[197] Given the timing, the location, and the particular historical circumstances of these publicly staged deaths, a strong argument can be made for the identification of the martyrs as the recently reinstated *trinqui*. It is a testament to the malleability of the federal festival that, somewhat paradoxically, under the monstrous Caligula it could have been devoted to the noblest pursuits of Roman "high culture" (*humanitas*), while under the noble Marcus it was turned into a time for re-instituting that "frightful and barbarous custom" (*immanis ac barbara consuetudo*) of a pre-Roman past.[198] Based on clues in the *acta senatus* that condoned the custom, it may have been imagined by its advocates to have traditional associations with the pre-Roman stratum, perhaps only dimly remembered, of the first day of August. This antiquarian rekindling of the memory of the *trinqui*, the reassertion of non-imperial time, and the self-conscious enactment of an identity alienating to the Romans all bespeak, more generally, the viability of local agency and initiative, at the cost, from the point of view of the imperial center, of the breakdown of the "civic compromise."[199]

The impulse of communities to give their own structure—and their own meanings—to time extended beyond the days of the calendar to the succession of years. Though our evidence is more meager than for the diverse chronological patchwork that was the Greek east, local eras were certainly created in the provinces of the west.[200] Least well-known of these is that of Augusta Emerita. The colony of Augusta Emerita was planted by P. Carisius in 25 BCE, following his successful campaigns in the north against the Astures;[201] this accordingly became "year one" for its inhabitants, the watershed moment that anchored the local era, whose dates are given in terms of the foundation of the city (*anno coloniae*).[202] In the most recent studies of Roman time, the *annus coloniae* reckoning of Emerita has been over-

looked,[203] but the diversity of the communities in which it was employed and the relatively late date when it became most prominent reveal interesting dynamics of memory. If the surviving attestations are at all representative, the era seems to have acquired particular importance in the second century CE; it was likely only then that it was invented in hindsight by the people of Emerita, as an expression of the perceived momentous impact of the foundation of the *colonia* on the development of the region.[204]

But there is evidence that this mode of structuring time spread beyond the strict confines of the urban center of Emerita and into the indigenous communities of the hinterland, adopted by certain Lusitanian cities in order to meaningfully situate themselves and their pasts within the colonial narrative: a date "in the 204th year of the colony" is attested in a votive inscription from Turgalium (Trujillo), eighty kilometers northeast of Emerita.[205] Little is known of this place from literary sources,[206] although it is fairly well represented in the epigraphic record.[207] Given that at the foundation of the Roman city Turgalium had been stripped of a significant part of its territory and subordinated to Emerita, it stands to reason that the community may have experienced the colonial era somewhat differently than the *coloni Emeritenses*. As every era is nonsensical without its counterpoise, "year of the colony" necessarily implicates, on some level, "years before the colony"; and dates reckoned by eras so closely bound up with contested histories are never simply the disinterested calculations of some cold, unfeeling clockwork, nor are their meanings universal and absolute. The appropriation of colonial time by the colonized must have fostered alternative narratives and memories: in a process of complementary schismogenesis, in which the interactions between the two groups were predicated on remembered differences, the people of Turgalium may have conceived of the era primarily in terms of the discontinuities inherent in its turning point, with connotations of local trauma rather than imperial triumph.[208]

Far removed from the bustling provincial capital of Emerita, in the comparatively isolated region of Cantabria, the local peoples measured the passage of time according to their own idiosyncratic scheme, a "consular era" (*aera consularis*).[209] Since the first systematic study by Knapp was published, seven more inscriptions from Cantabria that employ the *aera consularis* have been brought to light, bringing the total number of inscriptions with legible dates to sixteen;[210] on two more texts, the numerals following the word *con-*

sulatu or *consularis* are illegible.[211] These monuments illustrate that this era was in use for well over a century and a half, at the very least (dates range from *aera consulari* 316 to 482), among several neighboring peoples of the broader ethnic groups of the Cantabri and Astures—some of which seem to have been closely connected through intermarriage.[212]

The starting point of this era has been the prime question of scholars since Mommsen, and, although plausible arguments have been made for several different dates, a satisfactory solution has remained elusive.[213] The most recent theory, which proposes the latest chronology, would tie the era to the Flavian grant of Latin rights to the communities of Spain, and to the attendant administrative reorganization of the peninsula, around 75 CE, which would supposedly have provided "Latin townships organized in Cantabria [with] an obvious and important starting point for a local era in the organization of the area in Latin units and the conducting of the first census."[214] But, even if the reforms of Vespasian were epoch-making for contemporary communities in Cantabria, a claim which itself is open to serious debate,[215] the era is first attested already in its 316th year, which, if we admit the Flavian date, would be 391 CE.[216] Even allowing for the accidents of survival, it is perhaps unlikely that the *aera consularis* was used continuously for three centuries, supposedly spanning a period in which the epigraphic habit reached its greatest height across the empire, without leaving any trace whatsoever in the inscriptional record. Thus, like most eras, that of the Cantabrians must have been founded in hindsight,[217] approximately three hundred years after its imagined watershed moment, not long before the earliest extant inscription (*aera consularis* 316) was set up.[218]

Its chronological anchor must have been a past moment remembered because of its perceived significance for local communities in the present, but it is not at all clear how "obvious and important" those Flavian reforms would have seemed to peoples like the Orgenomesci or Alioniges in the age of Theodosius, after the sweeping changes brought about by the universal grant of citizenship under the *constitutio Antoniniana* or the provincial reforms of Diocletian. The retrospective invention of the era also raises the question of the means by which a people as remote as the Cantabri, who had remained independent of Roman rule until as late as 19 BCE and who at various periods seem to have only been nominally under the control of imperial authority,[219] would have been able to ascertain from a distance of some

three centuries the date at which there had been an administrative restructuring of their territory that, as we have suggested, left few tangible and meaningful imprints on local communities. Documents through which the foundation for such an era could have been established may have existed, but the likelihood of this scenario is very slim. Furthermore, the extreme paucity of non-Christian inscriptions from Spain in late antiquity, especially in the isolated regions of the north, militates against assigning this corpus of eighteen monuments to a time and place otherwise characterized by the general disappearance of Latin epigraphic culture. In short, this chronology is best abandoned. In the absence of strong evidence to the contrary, there is little reason to doubt what would be the a priori assumption about the dating of these texts: that the 165 years in which the era was deployed epigraphically ought roughly to coincide with the greatest temporal density of the "epigraphic habit", that period during which the use of monumental Latin writing was most common in the north of the peninsula, from the middle of the first century CE to the middle of the third century. This interpretation fits well with the other internal evidence from the inscriptions—onomastics, ethnic identities, formulae, letterforms—and would thus place the crucial moment on which the Cantabri imagined their collective past to have turned somewhere in what we would call the "third century BCE".

Ultimately, the imaginative attempts by modern scholars to find the "real" starting point for the *aera consularis* buried somewhere in the annals of Roman history have been misguided, because, I suggest, one simply did not exist. That is to say, the era does not reflect or articulate Romano-centric conceptions of time and event, nor was it tied to a historical moment easily recognizable to the outsider. Instead, the era employed by the Cantabri is to be understood as a distinctly Cantabrian invention, whose "year one" was rooted in the collective imagination and social memory of the communities that participated in its propagation, the significance of which is unfortunately irrecoverable to us. As has been observed about the operation of "peasant memories" in more modern periods, the "great events" of the past are designated as such by sources of authority external to most rural communities; local ideas of what happened—and what mattered—in the past tend to be radically different to hegemonic narratives.[220] While, like the calendar of Coligny, the era makes reference to Rome, here in the form of the annual eponymous magistracy of the Roman state, it was motivated

by a similar sense on the part of the Cantabri of the insufficiency of imperial time for constructions of local identity.

These collectively produced patternings of time in the western provinces were integral to ongoing processes of community formation. Local temporality was entangled with social and political institutions, places of memory, ritual performance, the cults of epichoric divinities, and foundational narratives of pasts both historical and invented. Calendrical systems based on traditional knowledge contributed to distinctive local experiences of time and facilitated the continuance of festivals, punctuating moments in the annual cycle when the community publicly constructed and celebrated an image of itself.

Eponymous Divinities and Imagined Communities

All communities are imagined communities, for the process of communalization always contains an imaginative element; in the mind of each member "lives an image of their communion."[221] Within the diverse and pluralistic landscape of the Roman provinces of Spain and Gaul, this process—and these images—manifested themselves in many forms, but religion everywhere constituted one of the fundamental performative and commemorative practices by which peoples negotiated the basis and limits of collective identity, and individuals conspicuously advertised their participation in such collectivities. An intriguing case is found in southern Callaecia, in the northwest of the Iberian peninsula, where within the *civitas* of the Limici (around Xinzo de Limia) a woman with a Roman name—Rufonia Severa—dedicated a kind of crude altar called *crougin toudadigoe*, which literally means, in the local Lusitanian language, a "rock of the community."[222] Such unworked stone cult objects seem to have had an important function in ritual acts of community construction and definition in the region.[223] It is not unreasonable to interpret these forms as expressions of a totemic principle, in the way that the object of cult and the community itself are collapsed: "the god of the clan, the totemic principle, can be none other than the clan itself, but the clan transfigured and imagined in the physical form."[224] Through the ritual act, the *crougin*-rock *becomes* the Limici; religion can be understood, in essence, as the community imagining and worshipping itself.

Similarly totemic in their role in connecting communities with the past and with a sense of place, though decidedly less concrete than sacred boulders, eponymous divinities served as a means by which to foster a sense of belonging together. In Lusitania, Igaedus was worshipped by the Igaeditani;[225] Vesunna, Vasio, and Nemausus were the chief civic gods of Vesunna (Périgueux), Vasio (Vaison-la-Romaine), and Nemausus, respectively the capitals of the Petrucorii, Vocontii, and Volcae Arecomici of southern Gaul.[226] It is possible that some of these eponyms were emulous creations of the post-conquest period, for the invention of tradition is often stimulated by community anxieties over the erosion of cohesion from without or signs of fracture from within. Such distilled relationships between gods and peoples had great evocative potential, especially in focalizing group identity and marking off selves from others.[227] In this respect, the widespread cult of the tutelary Lusitanian goddess Bandua is striking, for this shared point of cultural reference actually became a way for communities of west-central Iberia to competitively differentiate themselves from other groups of worshippers, to flaunt an almost hyper-local identity. Inscribed votive altars and ritual objects from across the region in the first three centuries of the imperial period show that there were discrete manifestations of Bandua at the hillforts of Araocelum (*Bandua Araocelensis*) and Aetiobriga and Verubriga, alongside a Bandua of the Ituicenses (*Bandua Ituicensis*), and of many other small communities and ethnic groups: *Bandua Roudeaecom, Vordeaecom, Oilineaicom, Veigebreaegom, Cadogom, Horricom, Pellicom, Boleccom*.[228] This goddess—as patroness, protector, and embodiment—possessed an essential, inextricable connection to the identity of these communities. Every invocation of her divinity by these dedicants—"this altar consecrated to Bandua of Alaniobriga" or "this vow fulfilled to Bandua of the Callaici"—engaged in a strategic, competitive claim to a highly negotiated localism, which at times even involved the creative borrowing and reinterpretation of imperial symbols and visual culture.[229]

In this same region of Lusitania, the increased visibility of local tutelary gods, facilitated by new modes of communication and display, was complemented by fruitful misappropriations of Roman divinities, like the *lares*, which were put to similar ends as foci for expressions of group identities on various scales. The cult of the *lares* (or a singular *lar*) was among the most

archaic and ubiquitous aspects of Roman religion. Their original essence was all but forgotten by even learned Roman antiquarians, but at their most basic, the *lares* were gods associated with the household (*familia*)—perhaps spirits of deceased ancestors—and with crossroads (*compita*) that possessed an intimate connection to both people and place. In time, the imperial cult came to amalgamate, incorporate, and reinvigorate worship of the old *lares*, and it is almost certainly packaged in this form that these Roman divinities reached Lusitania in the first century CE.[230] While offerings to local interpretations of the *lares* are found throughout the Celtic-speaking regions of western Iberia, especially in Lusitania and Callaecia, it was at the city of Conimbriga (Condeixa-a-Velha) that they enjoyed a particular vitality.[231] Here they were adapted and redeployed in a number of different forms: there were "*lares* of the roads" (*lares viales*) and "*lares* of the ancestors" (*lares patrii*), alongside an unparalleled public cult of the *lares* of the city of Flavia Conimbriga (*lares Flaviae Conimbrigae*). Even within the *municipium* there were subgroups that usurped these gods in their own processes of communalization. Multiple dedications are known to the *lares Aquites*, which seem to have been the collective patron divinities of a minor constituent people (the Aquitici?) of the Lusitani resident at Conimbriga.[232] More explicitly connected to such a kinship group is an extra-mural monument, inscribed in first-century letterforms of the highest quality that stand in marked contrast to the extraordinarily poor Latin, which reads: "Consecrated [to] the *lares lubanci* of this community of the Dovilonici. Albuius, son of Camalus [set this up]."[233] Doubtless *these* Dovilonici, whom Albuius felt the need to distinguish from *other* Dovilonici elsewhere, are a gentilician "clan" (derived from the local name *Dovilo*). Beyond this identification, however, there are important difficulties in deciphering Albuius' meaning: the word *lubanci* is not otherwise attested, and while it could conceivably be a proper name, it is more likely to be an adjective in the Lusitanian language, which somehow further qualifies these *lares*. The apparent bilingualism of the text thus vividly mirrors the way in which it is, more generally, composed of two cultural vocabularies. Outside of Conimbriga, in offerings "to the *lares*-gods of the *gentilitas* of the Capetici,"[234] or "to the *lar*-god of Berobriga,"[235] the insertion of the Latin word "god" (*deus, dii*) to qualify this use of the *lar(es)* is an indicator of a certain perceived cultural distance, a significant token

gesture of explaining admittedly local forms to an imagined audience of outsiders. But the *lares lubanci* of the Dovilonici are unapologetic in their localism, demonstrating the extent to which imperial forms could at times be reinterpreted in such thoroughly vernacular terms that they ceased to be meaningful to those without the requisite insiders' knowledge, be they Roman visitors or modern scholars. These kinds of idiosyncratic products of the generative intersection between empire and community resist neat categorization within any of the usual dichotomies of modern scholarship (e.g., "Roman" v. "native"); moreover, it must be emphasized that such change in cult practice clearly does not amount to "becoming Roman," but rather reflects the development of a new repertoire of strategies for "being local." When considered in light of the destructive backlashes that accompanied the introduction of the imperial cult elsewhere in the west, this constructive translation of the *lares* into a means of symbolic differentiation between Lusitanian *municipia* and *gentilitates* is a reminder of the diversity of provincial responses to Roman power.[236]

We can observe a comparable kind of performative differentiation of identity through cult at work within the aforementioned *civitas* of the Carnutes in central Gaul. The ethnic group of the Carnutes, like the many of the other peoples of Roman Gaul and Spain that we have already examined, was composed of a number of subgroups, each of which was, of course, an imagined community in its own right. One of these was the Mogetes, whose territory was centered on the *oppidum* of Mogetodunum, a toponym which in Gaulish means "hill of (the god) Mogetis."[237] Mogetis was thus the eponymous divinity of the place and its people. In the early first century CE, the Mogetes set up a monument to the deified Augustus in conjunction with Mogetis at Cenabum, the capital of the Carnutes some twenty kilometers up the river Liger (Loire) from their town.[238] Like the monument of Equester with which this chapter began, this inscription presents an interesting nexus of identities: the location of such a display at Cenabum acknowledges its position as chief place of the wider ethnic group to which the Mogetes belonged, but it is still worship of their quintessentially epichoric god that defines and specifies them as a community, distinct from other Carnutes. Other small subgroups within *civitates* of Gaul demonstrably imagined themselves through similar cults. Several examples can be cited from the province of

Narbonensis alone: the inhabitants of the *pagus Baginiensis*, within the territory of the aforementioned city of Vasio, worshipped an eponym in several different incarnations: as an individual male figure, Baginus; as a female collectivity, the Baginiates; and in a more archaic form as the "Baginiensian mother-goddesses" (*matres Baginienses*).[239] Nearby, the rural community of the Budenicenses interpreted their god Budenicus as analogous to the Roman Mars.[240] At the long-abandoned hilltop site of an ancient, pre-Roman *oppidum*, in a countryside now populated by the villas of wealthy landowners with Roman citizenship and far-reaching economic connections, a minor people of the early imperial period called the Dexivates revived—or perhaps devised—the cult of the goddess Dexiva at a sanctuary with roots that seem to extend back into the late Iron Age.[241] Places of memory such as this, maintained by a "commemorative vigilance,"[242] lent an air of authority to (re)invented traditions, and served to consolidate collective identities by providing a firm grounding in the past and in the landscape. Thus while self-congratulatory Roman rhetoric may have construed contemporary Narbonensis as having become "more truly Italy than a province," this pleasant imperial fiction of the success of a *mission civilisatrice* ignores the complexity of other, more meaningful processes underway, which produced not Italians, but rather communities of Baginienses, Budenicenses, and Dexivates.[243]

Memory and community were implicated in the cult of the eponymous divinity further north at Bibracte, which, as mentioned above, had once been the capital of the important people of the Aedui, who had alternately been friend and foe of Caesar and the Roman people. In the Augustan period, however, the seat of the *civitas* was shifted several kilometers eastward from the Iron Age *oppidum* down into the plain, where a new grid-planned Roman city—Augustodunum ("Augustusburg")—was laid out.[244] In this transplantation, the Aedui brought Bibracte with them, in a sense: a goddess Bibracte (*Dea Bibracte*) is mentioned in several inscriptions at Augustodunum.[245] But Bibracte could not truly be at home in the city in the plain: as the goddess of the spring that flowed on top of the old mountain, her cult was inextricably tied to the ancient seat of the Aedui. And so, every year, the community seems to have made the journey back up the mountain to make votive offerings to Bibracte in her natural environs, participating in the cult

of the eponymous divinity of a community that now existed only in the collective memory, a *truly* imagined community. Bibracte remained, at least for some among the Aedui, a kind of fixed point in the ethnic consciousness, through which the discontinuity of displacement might be surmounted.

Throughout the provinces of Gaul and Spain, communalization was a multiplex process that produced a rich array of different senses and scales of belonging, many of which operated beyond the practical and discursive reach of the Roman imperial apparatus. These self-ascribing, self-nominating provincial communities defined locally the meanings and the limits of inclusion through a nexus of communicative, memorial, spatial, temporal, and symbolic practices. Although there were significant changes and developments in these practices over the course of Roman rule, the broad patterns of identity and affiliation remained remarkably stable from the conquest into the later imperial period: in Gaul, the large ethnic states (*civitates*) persisted, and in Spain, the complex nested hierarchies of peoples and clans in the north and west (*populi, gentes, gentilitates, cognationes*) and the well-established urban centers in the Baetis valley and on the Mediterranean coast. But many ancient communities vanished in the turmoil and instability at the end of the Republic, especially in Spain. In the 70s BCE, on the trophy that he left behind at the summit of the Pyrenees, Pompey had recorded his claim to have brought under Roman rule 866 *oppida* between the Alps and the borders of the province of Further Spain. A century and a half later, when Pliny the Elder compiled the material for his imperial catalog, it appears that he found little more than half that number still in existence.[246] Nevertheless, many hundreds of kinship networks, ethnic groups, and agglomerations at various positions within settlement hierarchies—from rural villages and remote hillforts to urban centers—endured. Moreover, vibrant new collectivities came into being as a result of the ethnogenerative forces of empire.

Local communities thus continued to be central to the provincial experience. While horizontal social bonds predominated in the process of communalization, communities were never internally undifferentiated. In local discourse, meanings and identities were always contested; there were discrepancies in wealth, authority, and status among their members, as well as divergent attitudes toward the past, competing loyalties to overlap-

ping units of belonging, and varying degrees and styles of participation in a broader imperial culture. In the end, however, these centrifugal forces were counterbalanced by intercommunity contacts with neighboring rivals and allies and by individual sojourns abroad among fellow provincials and Romans, interactions which powerfully consolidated community identities in contradistinction to "the other." It is to the dynamics of these relationships between selves and others that the next chapter turns.

2

OTHERS

☙

Tʜᴇ ᴄɪᴛʏ ᴏꜰ Eʙᴏʀᴀ (Évora) lay in the rich plains of the Alentejo in central Lusitania, at the intersection of two of the Roman roads that came increasingly to connect the ethnically distinct enclave of communities to which it belonged—called *Celtici* by the Romans—to the world beyond.[1] From his hometown here on the western fringe of the empire, Lucius Voconius Paullus embarked upon journey of several thousand kilometers, to the imperial capital and back again. Having already been elected to the chief magistracy of Ebora a remarkable six times, he had now volunteered to serve his city in a still greater capacity: as an ambassador to the Roman Senate. Upon his return, his grateful community honored him in an inscription, the main section of which runs as follows:

> On account of his faithful and unwavering defense of the cause and interests of his people before the Most Esteemed Order during the embassy that he undertook to Rome at his own expense on behalf of his state [*pro re publica sua*], the community of Ebora publicly decreed that this be set up in the forum.[2]

The exigencies that pressed the Eborenses—the "cause and interests" that Voconius traveled halfway across the Mediterranean to advocate—are unknown. But the terms in which the effusive praise of Voconius' countrymen is expressed are, for our purposes, more significant than whatever fiscal or

legal woes the city faced. The fundamental premise of the monument, so concerned with the location of loyalty and identity, is that *his* republic was not the *Roman* republic. A vast distance, spatial and otherwise, separated community and cosmopolis, subjective perceptions of Eborenses and "the Romans."

As was the case for their Greek sophistic counterparts, the embassies of the Latin-speaking elite of the west to the distant imperial capital were opportunities for the enhancement of social status within their home communities through the most conspicuous possible displays of local authority and patriotism.[3] The drama of the occasion and the composition of the audience must have highlighted the performative nature of the representation of selves to others. In this regard, the mission to Rome of the Aquitanian envoy Verus mentioned at the opening of Chapter 1 is worth revisiting since, unlike in the case of Voconius, its objective is specified: when he "obtained on behalf of the Nine Peoples the right to separate themselves from the Gauls," Verus' success depended on his ability to intelligibly locate Aquitani in relation to both Gauls and Romans, while constructing sufficient distance from them both to justify the creation of a new administrative arrangement. There are other examples to be found among the public monuments of western provincial cities. The petition of the ambassadors of the southern Iberian city of Sabora (Cañete la Real) to the emperor Vespasian, requesting permission to relocate their struggling community from its ancient hilltop site to a more economically advantageous location in the plain, communicated a multiplex past to an imperial audience: in the transition, the Saborenses wished to preserve both their ancient community identity, as well as the official privileges that they had received from Augustus decades earlier.[4]

Building on the framework of Chapter 1, which was principally concerned with the internal processes through which local communities defined, situated, and imagined themselves, this chapter turns outward, to explore the confrontations of selves with others in the broader imperial world. To some extent, the production of otherness was inherent in the process of communalization in the western provinces. Aquitani are not Gauls. Ebora is not Rome. Interactions between communities, whether diplomatic or antagonistic, reinforced their boundaries and distinctive identities. The sojourns of individuals like Voconius and Verus among peoples, both near and far,

from whom they felt a sense of estrangement served as powerful reminders of where and with whom they belonged. Such reminders persisted into the twilight of Roman power in the west. In his letters, Sidonius Apollinaris, who numbered among the leading citizens of the Arverni of central Gaul in the second half of the fifth century and served as their ambassador to the emperor at Rome, described the bonds that he formed there with others of his Arvernian countrymen: "foreign travel often makes friends of fellow citizens."[5] The status of all of these men as members of the local elite, which qualified them for these embassies and was augmented by their successful conduct of them, highlights the unequal distribution within communities of wealth and the opportunities attendant thereupon, such as public office, citizenship and legal rights, education, and access to imperial power. Nevertheless, it is telling of the primacy of group identity that the object of these missions and the language and media in which they were publicly commemorated emphasized and consolidated deep, lateral social connections. Ultimately, individual goals and collective projects tended to be mutually reinforcing: elite status was largely contingent upon public participation within, advocacy for, and investment in the community, while the material prosperity and basic viability of the community depended to a significant extent on the ability of its elites to connect to wider economic networks, cultural trends, patronage relationships, and political structures.

The contexts of community interaction in the west in which selves were defined in relation to others were as varied as the collectivities that took part. Accordingly, the dynamics of intercommunity differentiation operated at a wide range of scales: relatively circumscribed dialogs took place between several distinct *pagi* within a single *civitas*, or between clans within an ethnic group; there were regional networks of the *civitates* or *gentes* that comprised a larger ethnic group or *populus*, or of neighboring states of different ethnic affiliations; at the provincial level, the representatives of dozens of ethnic groups and city-states assembled at seats of imperial administration to vie with one another for prestige, privileges, and primacy. Such interactions might thus contribute to different senses of belonging, and larger social formations—cities, *civitates*, *gentes*—were continuously reshaped by both centrifugal forces—those loyalties to their constituent parts that threatened to predominate over the ties of citizenship and ethnicity—and centripetal ones—urbanization, civic administration, mythology. Many of

these patterns had long histories that stretched back into the pre-Roman period, focused on meaningful places in the landscape, where communities gathered either to rehearse internal ethnic bonds or to negotiate rights and fulfill ritual obligations with external groups. Although the coercive forces of empire promoted local collaboration over antagonism, rivalries nonetheless reemerged, and administrative arrangements only tenuously held together by Roman power occasionally devolved into fractious conflicts. Yet the Roman impact on the ways in which otherness was produced was momentous: apart from loci of imperial administration—the seats of provincial governors or the city of Rome itself—becoming crucial new nodes in regional networks, novel cultural and political ideas—especially the complex discourse around the definitions and meanings of "Roman"—were introduced as global referents that cast localness into sharper relief than ever before.

Patterns of Interaction: Spain

Rome exerted a powerful centripetal force on the periphery of its empire. From the provinces and beyond, persons, goods, petitions, and ideas were drawn to the cosmopolis. Martial, himself representative of this trend, eloquently captured its essence in a poem occasioned by the inaugural celebrations of the Flavian amphitheater: "What people is so remote, what people is so backwards, Caesar, that from it there is no spectator present in your city?"[6] Such gravitational pull is, in part, a natural function of all imperial encounters, but the seemingly inescapable centrality of Rome was also the result of specific Roman policies and practices. At various points in the course of its development and expansion, the Roman state had expressly forbidden certain kinds of interactions between communities that fell under its power, or even within its sphere of influence. At the dissolution of the Latin League in 338 BCE, a crucial turning point in the history of Roman imperialism, Latin cities were barred from any joint political action or from concluding independently any agreements apart from the bilateral treaty that each now possessed with Rome. The fraught extension of Roman hegemony into the Greek world in the first half of the second century BCE was punctuated by conflicts around the prerogatives of long-established federations of Greek cities, especially the Achaean League, which was, in the end, forcibly—if

temporarily—disbanded after the infamous destruction of Corinth by L. Mummius. By the beginning of the first century BCE, on the eve of the Social War, the greatest internal threat to its existence that the Roman state would ever face, the technical formula employed by the Romans to encapsulate the variety of relationships that constituted their "empire" implied that inter-state relations from which Rome was excluded were no longer practicable, or even conceivable.[7]

During the long period of the pacification and incorporation of western continental Europe in the second and first centuries BCE, the Romans sought to disrupt the interstate networks of potential local rivals for hegemony through the strategic use of violence, or through manipulation of the loom-ing threat thereof. From the earliest documents of the Roman occupation of the west, it is clear that the Romans went to work almost immediately establishing their role as the ultimate arbiters between provincial communi-ties. The oldest extant Latin inscription from Spain is a decree of L. Aemilius Paullus, commander of Roman forces in the region of the Baetis river (Gua-dalquivir) in the first decade of the second century BCE, monumentalized on bronze plaque and intended for conspicuous public display. In it, Paullus freed the people of Lascuta (Alcalá de los Gazules) from the yoke of the peo-ple of Hasta, whose dependents (or subjects, or slaves) they had evidently been for some time, and confirms them in the possession in their own right of the town and its territory.[8] Written in a language and a script understood by only a miniscule portion of the population, it was certainly meant to be *seen* rather than *read*, to serve as a reminder of the long reach of Roman power. The Roman interventionist policy—as the rhetoric of the text sug-gests—introduced new patterns of communication and sources of authority into Spain, which significantly affected the ways in which local commu-nities interacted with one another. Other examples abound. A generation later, in the other major Iberian theater, the valley of the Ebro, a new war broke out with the city-state of Segeda (Mara), the central place of a Celti-berian people called the Belli. The Belli had been at peace with the Romans for a quarter-century, but tensions arose when they began to absorb smaller towns in the vicinity into their orbit, allied themselves with the neighboring people of the Titthi, and undertook to resettle them at Segeda itself. Recent excavations of the city have brought to light archaeological evidence for this process of "synoecism": the original city was enlarged to accommodate the

larger population, a newly constructed neighborhood of more "modern," Roman-style atrium houses was planned out for the Titthian immigrants, and work on expanded fortifications was begun.[9] The Romans seized upon this local reorganization as a pretext to dismantle an alternative network of alliances that marginalized Rome, speciously alleging that such acts constituted a violation of the terms of the treaty that the Belli had previously concluded with Ti. Sempronius Gracchus.[10] A Roman army, under the command of the praetor Q. Fulvius Nobilior, routed the combined forces of the Belli and Arevaci and, in 153 BCE, destroyed the city of Segeda, its new circuit wall still unfinished. While the Belli soon refounded their community on a nearby hill overlooking the ruins of the old city, and resumed minting coins in their own language under the name Segeda, their influence among the Celtiberians seems never to have recovered.

Roman conquest necessarily entailed a loss of sovereignty and the reorganization of interstate politics: in certain respects, the imperial machine was meant to function like a gear, with Rome at the hub and subject communities as cogs, the primary movements of which were to revolve around and serve the interests of Roman power. Such a situation conforms, more or less, to that which one would expect based on standard descriptions by modern political theorists of the operation of the state in agrarian societies before the development of "the nation": local communities, it is thought, tend to be self-enclosed and insulated from one another, since "the state . . . has no interest in promoting lateral communication between its subject communities" and "the local group . . . is most unlikely to link its own idiosyncratic culture to any kind of political principle."[11] Nevertheless, despite such supposed limitations and restrictions, the situation on the ground was much more complicated and more interesting than the visions propounded by Roman imperial ideology or modern political theory. Provincial communities enjoyed, if not sovereignty, then at least a significant degree of autonomy, and other meaningful patterns of interaction emerged in the provinces besides simply bilateral exchange between the imperial core and its periphery. In the eastern Mediterranean, Greek cities under Roman rule continued to organize leagues (*koina*), conclude symbolic agreements of cooperation (*homonoia*), and recognize ties of mythological kinship (*syngeneia*) with one another, all with the tacit acceptance or even the active encouragement of imperial authorities.[12] The situation in the west was broadly

similar, although intercommunity relationships in Gaul and Spain attracted significantly less Roman interest owing to starkly unequal imperial valuations of the prestige attached to the different histories, material cultures, commemorative media, and local *clientelae* in these provinces. But in legal disputes and diplomatic agreements, collective acts of civic munificence or armed conflict, relationships *between* peer communities, in which Rome was either absent or was present on terms dictated by the locals themselves, were forged and broken, remembered and renegotiated.

While the increasingly sophisticated system of law that Rome imported to the west undoubtedly reshaped the ways in which provincials related to one another, communities continued to project their own local authority and influence by assuming prominent roles in the settlement of interstate disputes, at times usurping the prestige of Roman law for their own ends. One early case is recorded in an inscribed bronze plaque from the Celtiberian city of Contrebia Belaisca (Botorrita), which was, alongside Segeda, an important center of the ethnic group of the Belli.[13] This plaque was at one time prominently displayed on the wall of a public building in the heart of the community alongside a series of other public documents, in both the Latin and Celtiberian languages.[14] The document and the legal issue that it describes date to the year 87 BCE, only a few years before the outbreak of the revolt of Q. Sertorius, which, raging for almost a decade, would dramatically alter the political landscape of northeastern Spain and lead to the abandonment of Contrebia itself. It concerns a land dispute, and involves four communities of the central stretch of the valley of the Ebro River.[15] The Sosinestani had sold part of their public land to the Salluienses so that the latter might construct an irrigation canal, a necessary improvement to sustain agriculture in this arid region. The line of this *rivus* had been staked out, but before work could commence, it was halted by the intervention of a third people, the Allavonenses, who objected that this transaction had been completed without their express permission, without which the Sosinestani allegedly had no right to sell this public land.[16] The legal basis for their claim of the right to govern the distribution of Sosinestan land is not specified in the text, but it seems likely that the Sosinestani were dependents or otherwise under the power of the Allavonenses. At an impasse, the Salluienses appealed to the Roman governor at the time, the praetor C. Valerius Flaccus, who, after framing the issue in terms familiar to him

from Roman law, granted to an outside party—the community of Contrebia and its magistrates—the right to adjudicate the dispute, though under Sosinestan law and custom.[17] With ambassadors from the Romans, Salluienses, and Allavonenses present before the Contrebian senate, and with, in theory, four different languages spoken in the course of the presentation of the case and the deliberation (Celtiberian by the Contrebienses, an Iberian dialect by the Salluienses, a proto-Basque dialect by the Allavonenses, and Latin by the Romans), this adjudication must have had the feel of a truly international event, and must accordingly have redounded much to the prestige of the aristocracy of Contrebia. The senate ultimately decided in favor of the plaintiffs, the Salluienses, and set up this bronze to serve as a record of their judgment, complete with a list of the leading men of the community who participated in the decision.[18]

Previous attempts at explicating this complex document have focused on the technical aspects of Roman law upon which it bears, such as the formulary system, and have understood the case—specifically the role of the praetor Flaccus and the echoes of Roman legal procedure—primarily as a reflection of "the effective superiority of the Roman power over the indigenous communities of the Ebro valley."[19] But such readings tend to downplay the agency of the communities involved in the production of the document, especially Contrebia, and to ignore the potential for locally inscribed meanings: understood in context, the *tabula Contrebiensis* is as much a representation of Contrebian identity and prerogatives as it is a statement of Roman imperial power. The document cannot be read simply as an objective record of events, but must instead be appreciated as part of a larger rhetorical and political strategy. Indeed, the artfully arranged opening words of the text—*Senatus Contrebiensis*—hint that the *tabula* might not only—or even principally—be about the water rights of the Salluienses or the authoritative application of Roman legal formulae by Flaccus, but rather about the position of Contrebia and its ruling aristocracy in interstate politics in the region. Given the findspot and content of the bronze, there is no reason to think that the initiative for the monumentalization of the *sententia* did not belong to the Contrebian magistrates, nor is there cause to suspect that the arrangement and selection of material—within the constraints dictated by inclusion of the Roman formulae—do not reflect their careful choices. The text opens, as we have seen, with the foregrounding of the role of the Con-

trebian senate, and it closes with a notice that the matter was transacted at Contrebia; throughout, the unfolding of the case and its resolution are focalized through the lens of the Contrebian senate, with emphasis placed on its responsibilities, opinions, and actions, and in the important final section of the text, containing the *sententia* proper, six Contrebian elites are named. By contrast, the Roman Flaccus is a peripheral figure, appearing just once, and only in the context of his assignment of the adjudication to the senate of Contrebia.[20]

When read in its proper context, not against the erudite treatises of Roman jurists but with the other documents from the Contrebian past written in the Celtiberian language that constituted the monumental city archive, this bronze tablet clearly forms part of a meaningful local narrative that the Contrebian senators were actively working to construct. Three other bronze tablets from this archive are known, and are most plausibly dated to the decades immediately preceding the publication of the *tabula Contrebiensis.* The longest ("Botorrita III") consists principally of a list of names of over 250 individuals—predominantly though not exclusively of men—from various local communities (the so-called *"album gentium"*), which follows a brief introductory header section (the *"titulum"*) of uncertain meaning, but which seems to define the basic nature of the text as a register of those "foreign" (*eskeninum*) persons involved in some sort of legal or economic activity: perhaps a census for tax purposes, or an account of those receiving a (re)distribution of land.[21] Of another highly fragmentary document ("Botorrita IV") very little sense can be made, apart from the identification of individual words, such as *tirikantam* ("oligarchic body, senate"), *toutam* ("people"), and *kombalkez* ("decided"), which together suggest that it represents some kind of political, legal, or religious decree.[22] It is thus analogous to the most important and best understood of these documents ("Botorrita I"), a large bronze tablet bearing inscriptions on both sides: the recto is a lengthy (eleven lines, 110 words) decree detailing several prohibitions and regulations concerning the use of sacred spaces belonging, it seems, to divinities called Sarnikios and Tokoits, and implicating at least one other community outside of Contrebia (*Akaina*, otherwise unknown), while on the verso is a list of the names, in full formal style with filiation and gentilician community included, of thirteen individuals who participated in the decision-making process or the drafting of the decree.[23] The apparent leader—Ablu of the

Uboci "clan"—is named as "council-chief" (*kombalko-reś*) at the very end of the recto, as part of a clause that culminates in the first person plural verb "we decree" (*ruzimuz*); the rest of the principal actors, on the verso, are each identified as *bintis* ("magistrate").[24] This structure thus bears an unmistakable resemblance to the final section of the *tabula Contrebiensis*, where the adjudication ends in the verb "we judge" (*iudicamus*), followed by the identification of the chief of the senate—Lubbus, whose title of *praetor* seems to be a slightly awkward Latin translation of the idea represented by the Celtiberian office of *kombalko-reś*—and the other leading men, whose role as *magistratus* is a rendering of the local word *bintis*. These specific examples reinforce the general impression given by the other clear parallels in occasion, content, and structure between this Celtiberian document and the Latin *tabula* that the latter is thoroughly informed by the former, that they are both products of a distinctly local discourse that was very much concerned with the construction and projection of Contrebian power and identity.

As this archive from the public building of the city demonstrates, for some years before the arrival of C. Valerius Flaccus, Contrebia Belaisca had been an important regional center for the Celtiberian Belli, but had also played a prominent role in interstate relations—economic, political, legal, and religious—involving neighboring communities of the Vascones and Iberians. Thus it is not merely that there was symbolic capital to be gained in the adjudication reflected in the *tabula* because it had been assigned by the Roman praetor, or that prestige was attached to the novel use of technical Latin legal language; for the senate of Contrebia, this was an opportunity to construct a continuity with the past, at the same time as they translated and renegotiated their role in the present. Both the transitory performance and its permanent commemoration drew on local traditions, and were intelligible within preexisting patterns of interaction and communication, from which the ultimately rather superficial presence of Roman legal formulae should not overly distract. As a public representation of the authority of the Contrebian senate, the *tabula* was likely envisioned as a monument to be seen, more than as a text to be read. If the different languages of the bronze documents that adorned the walls told a story to the local viewership, it was that of Contrebia's evolving relations to—and active participation in—new configurations of power in the region.

Two centuries later, irrigation was still a vital concern in the central

Ebro valley, and the regulation of water rights through legal agreements undertaken in response to local pressures continued to shape the relationships and interactions between communities. The remarkable autonomy of some of these outlying country districts—with respect both to the urban centers upon which they were dependent and to Roman imperial authority—is discernible in the *lex rivi Hiberiensis*, a law of the age of Hadrian inscribed, as with the *tabula Contrebiensis*, on a bronze plaque that was publicly displayed in one of the participating rural communities.[25] This "law of the Ebro canal" involves three groups, belonging to the orbits of two different urban centers: the Celtiberian *pagus* or *civitas* of Belsino, connected to the *municipium* of Cascantum (Cascante); and, under the administration of the Roman *colonia* of Caesaraugusta (Zaragoza), the *pagus* of the Segardinenses and the *pagus* of "the Gauls" (*Galli*).[26] Before the introduction of the law, they had already together constituted an irrigation community, formed on local initiative, that transcended the geographical and political limits of the surrounding urban system of Roman *municipium* and *colonia*, and operated independently of, or in parallel to, its administrative framework. This rural association had developed some informal common institutions and mechanisms for communication and collective decision making, the workings of which this legal document is, in part, a product, but the faint suggestions of a conflict over the canal lurking behind the law—perhaps the overexploitation of the water by the Belsinonenses upstream from the Galli—show that this established system had its shortcomings.

Although the text of the inscription does not specify the extent to which the formalized provisions of the law that attempted to settle this conflict reflect change as opposed to continuity of practice, it seems likely that the resolution of the dispute would have entailed only minor modifications to the traditional customs and usages that had already been in place for some time among the inhabitants of the irrigation zone. Moreover, those changes that were introduced were, for the most part, negotiated locally, rather than imposed from outside: the terms of the new law that would govern these communities (*lex paganica*) were drafted and agreed upon in an assembly of the *pagi* (*conventio paganica*), before the bill was brought before the imperial governor, Fundanus Augustanus Alpinus, for ratification.[27] Based on what can be gleaned from the text or extrapolated from the organization of rural communities elsewhere in the empire, Alpinus' role in these events seems

to have been limited to the articulation of a formula for any cases brought to court under this law (§15), and to the final authoritative confirmation and validation of the law as previously voted upon by the *pagi* after he was approached by one of their magistrates (§16).[28] Much like in the *tabula Contrebiensis*, Roman agency appears rather minimal and reactive, while imperial authority was used instrumentally by local actors in order to realize and secure their own designs.

The institutions and patterns of interaction described in the document reveal the complexities of community dynamics in the provincial countryside. Each of the individual rural communities had, as was usual, its own executives (*magistri pagi*) and assemblies (*concilia*), but there were also complementary magistrates and financial agents who oversaw the operation of the trans-*pagus* irrigation community as a whole (*curatores, publicani*), as well as a regional assembly of all of the stakeholders in the canal held annually in midsummer at a "neutral site" on the border of the *pagi*, a joint treasury for works projects, and a common public calendar that synchronized the local rhythms of office holding and agriculture across otherwise autonomous political units. Although they dominate the epigraphic record because of the fundamental ways in which they structured most aspects of provincial life, urban centers—in this case, Cascantum and Caesaraugusta—appear, somewhat paradoxically, rather peripheral within the functioning of this network of agrarian communities, coming into play only in the event of breakdowns in the system: legal disputes arising under the law would naturally be settled, in collaboration with the rural magistrates, by the city official possessing the right of judgment (*duumvir iure dicundo*) within the territory of the *municipium* or *colonia* (§10, 14).

Auxiliary aspects of Roman law must frequently have intersected with local traditions, prompting experimentation with new forms of resolution and recording; where the parties were small, closely connected, and amicably disposed toward one another, mutually beneficial arrangements might be reached without deeming the involvement of Roman authority to be necessary. Because of their highly circumscribed nature, only rarely are such episodes able to be detected from our evidence, but one intriguing case has relatively recently come to light from the country of the Vettones, in the valley of the Tagus (Tajo). An agreement between four communities is documented in an inscription scratched on a disused roof tile, dated toward the

end of the first century BCE, which probably represents a draft version of part of the text intended for monumentalization on a more permanent medium like stone or bronze. It reads: "The Caluri and the Palantenses have used [this] with the express permission [*precario*] of the Coerenses and Calontenses."[29] This local arrangement makes reference to a paralegal, customary institution adapted from Roman Italy: *precarium*, a kind of permissive possession that was revocable by the grantor at any time without notice.[30] All of the other extant examples of *precaria* relate to the regulation of access to private land for various purposes: a right of way, a plot in a burial ground, use of a sacred space.[31] These two groups of Vettonian peoples must have had similar concerns; the choice to couch the resolution in borrowed terms may reflect the perceived insufficiency of indigenous custom for a case of unusual importance or complexity, the accumulating pressures on non-Roman legal institutions from imperial jurisprudence, the prestige attached to Roman law and the desire among the local elite to flaunt a new form of privileged knowledge, or some combination thereof. Certainly the legal pluralism that characterized the Roman empire left much room for local agency.[32] Indeed, a number of communities in this region had remained formally autonomous. A bronze tablet discovered in the vicinity records the terms of a treaty in which, some decades earlier, the *populus* of the Seanoci, a neighboring group of these four communities, was granted permission to retain their territory and continue to govern themselves by their own laws (*leges*).[33]

The responses to the exigencies of irrigation in the central Ebro valley or to rights of land access among the Vettones demonstrate that there was ample opportunity for communities at various positions within the settlement hierarchy to pattern their own political, economic, and legal relations with their neighbors, in ways that challenge traditional core-periphery models of the Roman empire. These networks of communication and collaboration between equipollent, interconnected provincial communities, which were structurally homologous and possessed a certain degree of autonomy, are instead more fruitfully understood through the lens of decentralized "peer polity interaction."[34] Innumerable small-scale historical dramas between peer polities such as those on the *rivus Hiberiensis* and among the Vettones must have unfolded across the western provinces. While most of these stories are irrecoverable to us, it seems that when Rome was given a part to play

in these local theaters, as we have seen with the role of law, it was often one carefully scripted by the locals themselves.

Outside of the legal sphere, provincial communities formed regional social networks with peer polities through various other kinds of interstate dealings that operated largely independently of the Roman imperial center and its representatives.[35] Through the organization of civic consensus, the assertion of local authority and autonomy, and the continued reconsolidation of a felt sense of belonging together in contradistinction to other neighboring groups, these diplomatic interactions were important in reinforcing a felt sense of community identity. In the Iberian peninsula, the most prevalent and the most formal of these intercommunity negotiations was the contracting of an official guest-friendship (*hospitium*) between two parties, the terms of which were recorded in a token document called in Latin a *tessera hospitalis* (or *caruo cortica* in Celtiberian). A few of these *tesserae* have already been discussed briefly, but dozens are known from Spain, dated from the pre-Roman period through the end of the second century CE.[36]

One of the more remarkable examples of the genre is a bronze token in the shape of a boar, probably the totemic symbol of one of the participant communities, found at Pisoraca (Herrera de Pisuerga) in Cantabria. It describes a diplomatic transaction in the year 14 CE between three designated representatives (*magistratus*) of the aristocracy (*senatus*) of the Maggavienses and a certain Amparamus, who hailed from the town of Cusabura, but who was apparently an influential chieftain within the wider ethnic group of the Cantabri.[37] The obverse of the token spells out the various honors accorded to Amparamus and his descendants by the Maggavienses, while the reverse, written in a different and much more legible hand, reiterates more or less the same details from the point of view of Amparamus. The Latin of the text is somewhat clumsy, and the grammar and syntax begin to break down when the scribe departs from the more formulaic expressions, but the sense is reasonably clear:

> [Obverse] On the first day of August, in the year when Sex. Pompeius and Sex. Appuleius are consuls. The magistrates Caraegius and Aburnus and Caelio and the senate of the Maggavienses grant honorary citizenship to Amparamus, of [the clan of] the Nemaioqi of the town of Cusabura, and to his

children and descendants, so that he might enjoy all of the same rights in the territory of the Maggavienses as a citizen of the Maggavienses. [Reverse] In the year when Sex. Pompeius and Sex. Appuleius are consuls. Amparamus, of [the clan of] the Nemaioqi of the town of Cusabura, contracted guest-friendship with the state of the Maggavienses for himself, his children, his freedmen, and his descendants, and all the Maggavienses received him, his children, his freedmen, and his descendants into a relationship with them and theirs of guest-friendship (*hospitium*), trust (*fides*), and clientage (*clientela*), so that he might be of the same status (*condicio*) in the territory of the Maggavienses as a citizen of the Maggavienses. Transacted by Caelio, Caraegius, and Aburnus.[38]

While the document is written in the language of the ruling power, or at least an approximation thereof, and authorizes itself, in part, with a reference to Roman imperial time, in the form of the consular date, it is otherwise the product of a discourse conducted in preponderantly local terms. The honorary citizenship (*civitas honoraria*) that is the focus of the agreement and to which great value is attached is not Roman, but Maggaviensian; the legal and political rights (*condicio*) promised to Amparamus are guaranteed not by imperial, but by Maggaviensian authority; the space (*fines*) in which these rights are valid is not determined by an official municipal statute or the surveys of Roman *agrimensores*, but is rather the product of traditional Maggaviensian practices of territoriality. These exchanges of symbolic capital between communities and elites in Cantabria were powerful moments of public ritual drama, and from them Rome was, for the most part, absent. Provisions for the continuance of the status and privileges of future generations show that there was an essential temporal dimension to most of these exchanges. As has already been observed in the case of the enduring relationship across the centuries between the *gentilitates* of the Desonci and the Tridiavi among the Zoelae or of the Magilances of Amallobriga with their counterparts from Cauca, *hospitium* looked backward as well as forward. The provisions of these pacts seem not only to have been scrupulously adhered to, but to have been periodically rehearsed, reintroduced, and reinscribed, proof of the extent to which social memory and commu-

nity identity factored importantly into a vibrant local politics of "obligation, exchange, and reciprocity."[39]

Occasionally, it is possible to reconstruct more of the breadth and complexity of local networks through the identification of multiple nodes of interaction, as in the case of Intercatia (Paredes de Nava), a town belonging to the ethnic group of the Vaccaei. Toward the end of the first century BCE, one of the leading men of the town entered into guest-friendship with the nearby *civitas* of Pallantia (Palencia), the chief city of the Vaccaei:

> On the fourth day of March, in the year when the emperor Caesar is consul for the fourteenth time. Acces, son of Licirnus, of Intercatia, made a *tessera hospitalis* with the state of Pallantia, for himself and his children and descendants. Through the agency of the magistrate of the Elaisici, Anenius, son of Ammedus, [into?] *hospitium* Ammius, son of Caenecaenus.[40]

The exact dynamics are unclear, but a magistrate associated with a third, smaller gentilician group (the Elaisici), seems to have played some role in mediating and authorizing the agreement, hinting at the potential complexities of even the most localized intercommunity negotiations. Although Pallantia was not the administrative center of the region after the reorganization of the Roman province—that was Clunia (Peñalba de Castro), in the territory of the Arevaci, one hundred kilometers away—it was of continued importance for members of the elite of Intercatia to make efforts to align themselves closely with the heart of the ethnic community. Complementary to other, civic senses of belonging, a broader Vaccaean identity was performed throughout the early imperial period, and reciprocity such as this must have been instrumental in the consolidation thereof.[41] Comparable interactions can be observed among the six traditional centers (*oppida*) of the Arevaci, eastern neighbors of the Vaccaei: an unusual decorated bronze plaque appears to record an agreement between a citizen of Uxama and one of his countrymen from nearby Termes (Montejo de Tiermes).[42] But the people of Intercatia also independently cultivated interstate relationships beyond the borders of the Vaccaei, and outside the *conventus* of Clunia, with places as distant as Turiaso (Tarazona), a Celtiberian community some 250 kilometers to the east in the valley of the Ebro, as is borne out by a *tessera* set up publicly at Intercatia:

> M. Titius Fronto of Turiaso made a *tessera hospitalis* with the
> *populus* of Intercatia [so that he might enjoy at Intercatia] the
> same rights [*ius*] and legal status [*lex*] as the Intercatienses.[43]

Despite the fact that Fronto already possessed *Roman* citizenship, rights and status within a parallel *local* system of legitimacy and authority were still meaningful enough for the people of Intercatia to offer them to a foreigner, and valuable enough for Fronto to advertise his receipt of them.

Alongside these interactions within and between ethnic groups, many of which constructed continuities with the more or less distant pre-Roman past, indigenous communities were compelled to come to terms with new Roman colonies planted in their midst, either refoundations of native centers or settlements created from the ground up, the presence of which profoundly impacted their territories, economies, and cultures. Many responded to this new landscape by attempting to bring these imperial *coloniae* into traditional local networks of guest-friendship, co-opting colonial elites as peers. Such subaltern strategies ran as a countercurrent to imperial intervention and control, which relied more obviously on practices of elite co-option. Ucubi, situated in the foothills of the Sierra Nevada above the valley of the river Baetis, is noteworthy in this regard. Originally an Iberian settlement, prominent enough to play a role in the rivalry between the great Roman commanders of the late Republic for power and influence, it was destroyed in the course of the Roman civil wars of the 40s BCE and soon thereafter refounded by Caesar, with an influx of veteran colonists, as "Ucubi, the Colony of Julian Splendor" (*Colonia Claritas Iulia Ucubi*).[44] This combination of long-standing local importance and newfound colonial status seems to have worked to ensure the city's eminent position within interstate networks in Baetica, even situated as it was in the shadow of the provincial capital of Corduba. Late in the principate of Tiberius, indigenous communities across the province emulously sought to forge connections with Ucubi: approached by ambassadors from Iptuci (Prado del Rey) in 31 CE,[45] and then Baxo in 34 CE,[46] the citizens (*coloni*) of Ucubi contracted *hospitium* with the aristocracy and people (*senatus populusque*) of each town. This region had a long-established Roman presence, extending back well over two centuries, which had so thoroughly impacted the cultural and political geography that the contemporary Greek observer Strabo might comment

that "most of them have become Latins, and they have received Romans as colonists, with the result that they are not far from being all Romans."[47] But despite this ethnographic impression of homogenization, both Iptuci and Baxo appear at this point in time to have possessed no formal Roman legal status; their institutions remained traditional in form, translated into Roman equivalents only to serve the needs of certain contexts, as in these "official" *tesserae*.[48]

While it would be useful to know more of the internal dynamics within the resultant dual community of Ucubi, and the extent to which the old Iberian population factored into the citizen body or shaped the cultural and political orientation of the colony, the evidence is unfortunately lacking. Based on analogy with other Iberian communities in the region that underwent similar processes of colonization and transformation, however, it is possible that there remained a significant and influential—if partially disenfranchised—Iberian substrate. At Ilici, for example, a place whose territory had been centuriated and redistributed to a wave of Roman colonists from Italy and elsewhere, domestic architecture and ornamentation, as well as the urban plan and material cultural profile of the site, reflect the persistence and even spread of Iberian traditions at least into the middle of the first century CE.[49] In the same period at nearby Acci (Guadix), another colonial refoundation (as *Colonia Iulia Gemella*, though the natives still self-identified as Accitani), the inhabitants continued to worship well into the imperial period a peculiar radiate image of the local solar divinity whom they called Neto, with an exceptional fervor that perhaps spread even to the immigrant Roman population.[50] The "council of ancients" at Valentia, as we have seen, retained some capacity for political and legislative action. Thus at Ucubi, although it was the *coloni* who signed their name to the documents, the extension of traditional rights of guest-friendship to other communities may have been in part effected through the interpretation, mediation, and advocacy of the native Ucubitani.

A short distance to the north, just across the border of the province of Lusitania, the aspirations of indigenous communities led them to negotiate relationships with a city that was, unlike Ucubi, an unambiguous imperial interloper: the *ex novo* veteran colony and provincial capital of Augusta Emerita. In 6 CE, a generation after the foundation of the city, its leading citizens agreed to terms of *hospitium* with the town of Ugia, which had only

recently been elevated to the formal rank of a *municipium* and given, commensurately, the honorific title *Martia*. The agreement is known from a *tessera* discovered at Emerita:

> In the year when M. Aemilius Lepidus and L. Arruntius are consuls. The town-councilors and citizens of the *municipium* of Martia, who were formerly called the Ugienses, contracted guest-friendship with the town-councilors and citizens of the *colonia* of Augusta Emerita for themselves, their children, and their descendants. The legates who oversaw the transaction were P. Mummius Ursus, son of Publius, of the Galeria voting-tribe, and M. Aemilius Fronto, son of Marcus, of the Galeria voting-tribe.[51]

Given the timing of this diplomatic agreement, probably occasioned by the promotion of the provincial community, and the exact parallelism constructed in the text between the two parties, each now with its Roman citizens and Roman institutions, Ugia Martia seems optimistically to have aspired to recognition as a peer of Emerita. The interaction is particularly interesting in the way that the Ugienses-turned-Martienses, caught between memory and erasure, strategically combined local and imperial forms: an old custom of symbolic exchange was used to project and reinforce new and prestigious Roman status.

Although the benefits of guest-friendship—either of purely symbolic value or highly circumscribed in geographic scope like honorary local citizenship or legal rights—were often an end in themselves, these same privileges could be conferred explicitly by a community in appreciation for extraordinary services rendered, rather than as part of the formal negotiations of *hospitium*. One of the more intriguing cases comes from the country of the Arevaci in the first half of the first century CE, and relates to the interactions between the ancient hillfort (*oppidum*) of Termes and the smaller settlement (*vicus*) of Dercinoassedum, which, though otherwise unknown, seems to have been located in the territory of Clunia, one of the other *oppida Arevacorum*, and was thus in close proximity to Termes.[52] The culmination of this relationship was memorialized in a decree of the Termestini expressing their gratitude to the Dercinoassedenses for their collective munificence at Termes, perhaps the construction and ornamentation of one of the public baths:

> The Dercinoassedenses, villagers [*vicani*] of Clunia, saw to the building of [some kind of public building] . . . together with its decorations . . . from their own funds for the people of the Termestini. The senate and people of the Termestini [*senatus populusque Termestinus*] granted to the Dercinoassedenses, villagers of Clunia, and to their children and descendants that they enjoy the same rights within the city of Termes as the citizens of the Termestini. During the magistracy of L. Licinius Pilus, M. Terentius Celsus, L. Pompeius Vitulus, and T. Pompeius Rarus.[53]

That the relatively minor village of Dercinoassedum invested its presumably modest resources so heavily in furthering the monumental development of—and ingratiating itself with—its fellow Arevacan city of Termes is indicative the strong pull of centripetal forces toward other, local centers of prestige and influence. In turn, the unmistakable imitation by the Termestini of the formulaic language of the Roman state—*SPQT* (*senatus populusque Termestinus*) usurping the place of *SPQR* (*senatus populusque Romanus*) in the granting of legal rights (*iura*)—suggests some of the strategies by which these local centers siphoned off the political rituals and beneficent ideology of imperial government in order to consolidate and augment their own authority. For the villagers of Dercinoassedum and the senate and people of Termes, these conspicuous euergetistic performances and exchanges of capital, symbolic and otherwise, were not undertaken with a view toward "becoming Roman," but rather as part of the renegotiation of the boundaries of the Termestine community.

There could be few more powerful reminders that the two were not one and the same, of the tenacious discrepancy between the imagined communities of the *populus Romanus* and the *populus Termestinus*, than the strange events that transpired between the Roman governor of the province of Nearer Spain and the Termestini during the principate of Tiberius—roughly the same generation that erected the decree for the Dercinoassedenses—and the subsequent memory of the episode in Roman historiography. In 25 CE, the praetor L. Calpurnius Piso, traveling on the road through the territory of the Arevaci near Termes, with his guard understandably relaxed in a region that had been at peace for well over seventy years, was assassinated in

an ambush by a Termestine peasant. After being caught in a manhunt that ranged throughout the countryside, the assassin gave a defiant speech "in his native language," before proceeding to kill himself lest he be tortured into betraying his confederates and divulging the full extent of the intrigue. But contemporary Roman officials—and the historian Tacitus, writing several decades later—suspected a general conspiracy of the Termestini, who resented the methods by which Piso was investigating the disappearance of funds intended for the public treasury, which were, according to Tacitus, "more harsh than barbarians could endure."[54] The choice of words to characterize the people of Termes—*barbari*—is highly unusual as a descriptor for the inhabitants of a province at this period, and is particularly ill-suited to a political community that had, already by the principate of Tiberius, developed a monumentalized Roman-style forum, erected lengthy public inscriptions in Latin, and constructed an aqueduct running into the city from the Sierra de Pela several kilometers to the north.[55] But the pejorative ethnographic label reveals the vast and enduring distance between Roman self and Termestine other inspired in the Roman imagination by this event, which may have been understood by both sides as factoring into a much longer history of violent assertions of local autonomy. As late as 54 BCE, the Arevaci had successfully come to the aid of Clunia against Metellus Nepos when the city revolted, but the series of conflicts stretched back into the second century BCE.[56] The Termestini were shrewd enough, however, to know the limits of imperial patience: an inscribed statue base reveals that in the year following Piso's assassination the state set up an honorific portrait of Tiberius in their forum, doubtless in a calculated attempt to demonstrate—or feign—compunctious loyalty in the aftermath of the seditious plot.[57] Local interstate networks required a delicate balance of forces: as Termes expanded or maintained its influence with small *vici* like Dercinoassedum and other peer-polities of the Arevaci like the *oppidum* of Uxama, it was simultaneously engaged in a back and forth with the Roman center, variously adapting imperial forms to Termestine contexts, rejecting imperial authority, and finding its way back into the fold once again.

While such bilateral exchanges were perhaps the predominant form of interaction among the cities of Roman Spain, collaborations involving broader networks that consisted of multiple states, whose fates had been intertwined through common culture and shared identity since long before

they were grouped together into Roman administrative units, continued to be an important aspect of provincial society. What had demonstrably in many cases once been ethnic alliances that marched to war together transitioned, under the Roman peace, into loose associations that were periodically reconsolidated when the political and economic interests of the member states aligned. Typically these meaningful constellations of communities were respected by imperial authorities, receiving promotions and legal status at the same time, often through a kind of collective bargaining. Such successes were frequently celebrated with elaborate, jointly undertaken public works that would have been far beyond the means of any single state to achieve alone.

One of the most eloquent witnesses to the power of local initiative, and to the persistence of intra-ethnic networks of provincial communities operating independently of administrative structures, is a work of engineering that has for a thousand years been seen as one of the most enduring symbols of Roman imperial "civilization": the great bridge over the river Tagus near the colony of Norba (Cáceres), at modern Alcántara (an Arabic name that means, fittingly, "the bridge"). Built in the first decade of the second century CE, it was a project planned, funded, and executed by an association of peoples who left behind a monumental inscription recording their names: the Igaeditani, the Lancienses of the hillfort (*Oppidani*) and the Lancienses across the river Cuda (*Transcudani*)*,* the Tapori, Interamnienses, Coilarni, Aravi, Meidubrigenses, Arabrigenses, Banienses, and Paesures.[58] While the inscription boasts of all them having attained the status of *municipia*, this claim appears not to have been strictly true; the Aravi, for example, were still designating themselves simply as a *civitas* under Hadrian, fifteen years later.[59] Whether or not there were those among them that falsely usurped the title of *municipium*, the dedication of the bridge to Trajan, accompanied by a temple in his honor, suggests that some imperial privilege may recently have been conferred on at least some of these communities, symbolic capital perhaps exchanged for the extraordinary investment of the "contribution amassed" by the eleven states. Despite the rhetoric of the text, which identifies the participants as "*municipia* of the *provincia* of Lusitania," in reality, the tie that binds them all is not a sense of belonging to Lusitania, but rather of belonging more precisely to the *Lusitani*. There were four major *populi* contained within the borders of the Roman province, but absent from this

list are any representatives of the other three: the Celtici to the south, the Turduli to the west, and the Vettones, whose territory began immediately to the east in the valley of the Tagus. Thus the rationale of the composition of this organization seems to be not political or geographic or economic, but ethnic.[60] Although, as an ethnicity, the Lusitani no longer corresponded to any political formation, having been supplanted by three arbitrary *conventus* (with new capitals at Scalabis, Pax Iulia, and Augusta Emerita) and one *provincia*, they clearly maintained a distinct identity, developing strategies to reinforce group cohesion without the existence of any institutional framework and capitalizing upon opportunities to conspicuously differentiate themselves from "others."

While the bridge over the Tagus is the most visible sign of this process, there is other evidence that the network of communities of the Lusitani had remained active and closely knit throughout the early imperial period, centered around the Igaeditani, whose pride of place in the two dedicatory inscriptions at Alcántara may reflect their leading role in this informal league. At their central place (modern Idanha-a-Velha) or at smaller settlement foci within their territory, members of at least five of those allied states who contributed to the bridge—the Paesures, Tapori, Lancienses, Interamnienses, and Meidubrigenses—left behind records of their visits to or permanent residence in the country of the Igaeditani.[61] But the relatively fluid regional circulation of people, goods, and ideas among these cognate communities did not erode their autonomy, or weaken the still more localized, sub-ethnic civic loyalties that were always of fundamental importance. Alongside such concerted efforts to foster unity, careful attention was paid in the first century CE to the policing of "internal" divisions between the various individual states of the Lusitani: extant monuments attest to the reestablishment of territorial boundaries by Augustus between the Igaeditani and the Lancienses Oppidani, and by Claudius between the Arabrigenses and the Coilarni, both apparently at the invitation of the locals themselves.[62]

Farther north at Aquae Flaviae (Chaves), a city of a little-known people called the Turodi that had recently attained the honor of municipal status under Vespasian,[63] a monumental columnar inscription (the so-called *Padrão dos Povos*) was erected in 79 CE as part of an act of public thanksgiving to the imperial house and various provincial officials by an organization of ten local states (*civitates*) of southern Callaecia: the Avobrigenses, Bibali, Coel-

erni, Equaesi, Interamici, Limici, Naebisoci, Quarquerni, Tamagani, and the Turodian Aquiflavienses themselves.[64] The column presumably served, in part, to mark the occasion of the receipt of the *ius Latii* by these Galician peoples some five years prior, but it seems also to have been connected to the more recent completion of a large-scale building project. Although the nature of the work is not made clear in the extant portion of the inscription, it must have been related either to the construction of an early phase of the bridge over the river Tâmega (which was finished in the first decade of the second century CE, when this inscription was apparently moved from its original position and placed on the bridge opposite a second column dedicated to Trajan),[65] or to development of the three major Roman roads that intersected at Aquae Flaviae and contributed to its rise to regional prominence; the "New Road" (*via nova*) that connected the *conventus* capitals of Bracara (Braga) and Asturica passed, at roughly its midway point, through Aquae Flaviae, and it seems only to have been completed early the following year.[66]

Interestingly, the local network responsible for this project at Aquae Flaviae was not coextensive with the imperial *conventus*, to which twenty-four *civitates* belonged, or with the broader ethnic group of the Callaeci.[67] While the absence of coastal Galician peoples like the Grovii, with divergent economic motives and communication routes, is understandable, the lack of participation by other inland states like the Caladuni, whose territory was in the immediate vicinity of the Equaesi, Quarquerni, and Turodi and was traversed by the *via nova* on its course westward from Aquae Flaviae to Bracara, is rather more unexpected.[68] Although relative to the Quarquerni or Turodi, whose thermal baths attracted significant outside interest from the first century CE onward, the land of the Caladuni remained somewhat of a backwater, it is certainly not the case that they were isolationist or uninvolved in provincial affairs, for inscriptions show that their citizens frequented the *conventus* capital at Bracara, and were involved in business as far afield as southern Baetica.[69] But while most of the *civitates* that recorded themselves on the *Padrão* had begun to adapt successfully to the new topography of imperial power, descending from lonely hillforts haunted by the monolithic statues of warrior-heroes of a bygone age to found new Roman-style centers like "the Forum of the Bibali" and "the Forum of the Limici" and "the Waters of the Quarquerni," the Caladuni seem to have fallen behind the developments of their neighbors: the wayside hamlet on the *via nova* to which

they gave their name never rivaled their ancient *castellum* that rose on the mountain north of the road, with its imposing monumentality and its commanding view over the landscape.[70] Loss of prestige did not, however, necessarily entail loss of identity: whether they found themselves just down the road or hundreds of kilometers away in another province, it continued to be important to members of the Caladuni to advertise themselves as such, even as they were marginalized by their fellow Callaeci. Ultimately, whatever the exact criteria for participation in the Aquiflavian confederation that came together in 79 CE, its selective composition, excluding those *civitates* that were judged by other kindred communities to be increasingly unimportant within evolving local hierarchies and systems of value, gives an impression of the dynamism and complexity of interstate cultural politics even in the more remote and overlooked regions of the western provinces.

As was the case for the Celtic-speaking groups of the Lusitani and Callaeci in the west and north of the peninsula, networks composed of communities that ascribed to a common ethnic affiliation of great antiquity continued to operate among the indigenous Iberian peoples of the Mediterranean coast and the interior. The Oretani, whose territory (Oretania) extended from the valley of the river Baetis northward over the *Oretana Iuga* (the Sierra Morena) up to the river Anas and the country of the Carpetani, were one of a handful of major populations whose identities were sufficiently clearly defined by the locals as to be able to be distinguished by the foreign powers that fought variously with or against them in the course of the third century BCE.[71] Their eponymous central place was Oretum (near Granátula de Calatrava), but there were many other cities within their orbit. Castulo (modern Cazlona)—a state "so powerful, renowned, and closely bound in alliance to the Carthaginians" that Hannibal had seen fit to arrange a diplomatic marriage into its aristocracy—and Iltiraka (later Salaria, modern Úbeda la Vieja) had continued minting coins in their own right bearing legends first in the Iberian and then (in the case of Castulo) in the Latin alphabet until the beginning of the first century BCE, when Castulo, backed by others of its Oretanian allies, had been provoked to rise up in revolt. The catalyst may have been the outrages committed by the undisciplined Roman soldiers wintering among them, but the Roman retaliation was swift and severe: the adult male populations of Castulo and other Oretanian cities that had abetted it were put to the sword.[72] Despite this outbreak of violence, the long-stand-

ing importance of these leading cities had been formally acknowledged by the Romans by the end of the Augustan age. Castulo was granted the rare privilege of becoming a "citadel of old Latium" (*oppidum Latii veteris*), while Iltiraka, under the new Latin name of Salaria, and Libisosa (Lezuza), the easternmost city of the Oretani, were promoted to the rank of *coloniae*.

With the passage of time, and the efforts of local actors, legal status spread further down the settlement hierarchy in Oretania. In the late first century CE, four communities that had only recently attained the rank of *municipium* under the Flavian regime—Vivatia (Baeza), Laminium (Alhambra), Tugia (Toya), and Baesucci (Vilches)—came together to honor posthumously a member of the elite of Baesucci, C. Sempronius Celer.[73] A series of inscriptions set up in his native place reads more or less as follows, with some minor variations in the order in which the cities and the elaborate honors that they conferred upon him appear:

> To C. Sempronius Celer, son of Celer, the Flavian *municipium* of Baesucci granted by a decree of the decurions the right to a public eulogy [*laudatio*] and funeral procession [*exsequiae*] and a ceremony at the community's expense [*impensa funeris*], in addition to a place of burial and statues to be set up in public. The Flavian *municipium* of Laminium granted by a decree of the decurions the right to a public eulogy and a statue to be set up in public. The Flavian *municipium* of Tugia granted by a decree of the decurions the right to a public eulogy and a ceremony at the community's expense, in addition to a place of burial. The Flavian *municipium* of Vivatia granted by a decree of the decurions the right to a public eulogy and a ceremony at the community's expense, in addition to a place of burial. The citizens and residents of Baesucci [voted] statues.[74]

Although the monuments do not specify the public services rendered by Celer that had earned him recognition as a champion of these cities, the composition of the group is noteworthy: none of the previously honored cities of Oretania (Salaria, Castulo, Libisosa) joined in this commemoration, nor those that, like Edeba (Valdepeñas) and Ilugo (Santisteban del Puerto), had been passed over for promotion yet again.[75] Moreover, the repetitive and emulous rhetoric of the texts, with their marked emphasis on formal

titles (*municipium Flavium*) and the workings of Roman-style local government (*decreto decurionum*), reinforces the impression of the novelty of municipal status and the local importance attached to it. The development that lies behind these monuments, and to which these cities all make implicit reference—municipalization—seems to be closely associated with the common patron whom they all honor. It is therefore a reasonable hypothesis that C. Sempronius Celer himself may have played some role in securing the promotion of these four cities; indeed, the Sempronii were a wealthy and politically influential family at Baesucci, the very kind of provincial grandees who typically advocated for the interests of their peoples before the *princeps* and the senate.[76] Higher order constituencies and identities, above the level of the civic, clearly remained significant: it has generally gone underappreciated that the only tie that bound these newly minted Flavian *municipia* together, scattered as they were across a relatively large region (almost 150 kilometers separated Vivatia from Laminium), and justified the extent of Celer's influence was their shared past and putative consanguinity. Thus although explicit evidence for self-ascription to the ancient ethnic group of the Oretani in the imperial period is scarce,[77] analysis of the patterns of interaction in the upper Baetis valley illuminates some of the ways in which the boundaries of this broader imagined community—the idea of Oretania—continued to shape the contours of politics and patronage.[78]

In the system of administrative districts (*conventus*) established in the early imperial period, the Oretani fell within the jurisdiction of Carthago Nova ("New Carthage," modern Cartagena), where they mingled with a diverse throng of representatives from the neighboring ethnic groups of the Bastetani (to the south), Carpetani (to the north), and Contestani (to the east), as well as citizens of the old Punic trading centers along the coast and on the islands like Abdera (Adra), Baria (Villaricos), Ebusus (Ibiza), and Mago (Mahon). The *conventus* capital was itself a former Carthaginian outpost, and despite the augmentation of its Punic population by a settlement of Roman veteran colonists toward the end of the first century BCE, memory of its original cultural alignment was carried on in the language of its monuments, its civic religion, and the interstate relationships that it forged.[79] In the Augustan age, the city developed close economic, military, and political ties with Juba II, client king of Mauretania (r. ca. 27 BCE–23 CE) and scion of the ancient Numidian royal house, whose capital at Caesarea Iol (Chercel,

Algeria), only 197 Roman miles to the southeast, was connected with Carthago Nova by an important maritime trade route.[80] In recognition of his patronage and influence, it conferred the greatest civic distinction possible on Juba by naming him as one of the two chief magistrates of the city (*duumvir quinquennalis*). Coinage from the local mint celebrates this occasion, and the symbols associated with the name of the king in these issues—Egyptianizing elements deployed elsewhere by the king in his own self-fashioning—demonstrate local receptivity to Juba's royal image program.[81] Royal euergetism staged at Greek *poleis* and the reciprocal conferral of civic honors is generally recognized as an important aspect of provincial politics in the late Hellenistic and early imperial east, but it is clear that similarly sophisticated networks operated in the western Mediterranean as well.[82]

An inscription for Juba set up by the citizens of Carthago Nova commemorates not only his patronage and his honorary office, but also his royal genealogy:

> For king Juba, son of king Juba, grandson of king Hiempsal, great-grandson of king Cauda, grandson of the great-grandson of king Masinissa, one of the two chief magistrates elected every five years, patron of the community. The citizens of the colony [had this set up].[83]

It is significant that the ancestry of Juba reaches back six generations to the king Masinissa (r. 206–148 BCE) and the period of the Roman conquest. Although this remarkable act of remembering is usually explained through the influence of imperial practices of ancestral representation or its supposed inclusion in an "Augustan" framework,[84] it is more likely to have been inspired by a distinctly local history. For, like the grandson of his great-grandson, Masinissa himself had close ties to Carthago Nova. Before its capture by Roman forces under Scipio Africanus in 209 BCE, he had, at the head of the formidable Numidian cavalry, conducted a series of successful operations against the Romans in defense of the city as an ally of the Carthaginians. After it fell, however, Masinissa, ever a calculating politician, abandoned the Carthaginian cause and crossed over to the Roman side.[85] It is almost certainly his relevance to the self-account of Carthago Nova that occasioned the memory of Masinissa, a memory which must have been intriguingly ambivalent: the historical arc of the hybrid city was embodied in

one evocative figure, who was a traitor from the point of view of its Punic past but a hero from that of its Roman present. Given that the initiative for the memorialization of this genealogy—stretching pointedly all the way back to Masinissa—came from the people of Carthago Nova, and that the full Numidian lineage is not paralleled on any other Juban monuments, this inscription would seem to reflect local rather than royal choices and meanings. Masinissa was good to think with. Bookending a long and complex history between the city and the Numidian-Mauretanian throne, Masinissa and Juba—both of them poised between an autonomous Africa and Roman empire—represent alternative patterns of interaction for a provincial community, and hint at alternative interpretations of the imperial past.

In this continued political and economic orientation toward the powers of North Africa, Carthago Nova was not alone. Other Punic colonies on the Iberian coast similarly cultivated diplomatic relationships with Juba, an emulative practice that seems to reflect a sense of cohesiveness—and competition—among these communities. At Gades (Cádiz), the most ancient and prestigious Punic foundation in the western Mediterranean after Carthage itself (where Masinissa had also been stationed as a Carthaginian ally), Juba held another honorary magistracy, a faint record of which the geographer-poet Avienus preserved centuries later:

> Here is the citadel of *Gadir* . . . In a bygone age it was a populous and wealthy city, but now it is poor, small, abandoned, a heap of ruins. . . . But on those shores in former times was such great energy and splendor that the proud and far-ruling king Juba, who at that time held sway over the Mauretanian people, though he was on most intimate terms with the *princeps* Octavian and always studying books and separated by the waves and sea, believed himself more distinguished on account of the magistracy of that famous city.[86]

In this poetic vision of patronage in the age of Augustus, independent diplomatic relationships between foreign monarchs and provincial cities like Gades are seen as conferring on both parties a prestige that is, in certain respects, more meaningful than that derived from their connection to the *princeps*. These symbolic exchanges between city and king, informed in complex ways by social memory, played an important role in the negotia-

tion of community identity, located—for Carthago Nova and Gades—somewhere between the civic, the ethnic, and the imperial.

Patterns of Interaction: Gaul

The early stages of the expansion of Roman power into Gaul were similarly marked by disruptions and reorientations of interstate systems. In the late 120s BCE, long-simmering regional tensions broke out into open hostilities between the Salluvii, an ethnic group settled along the eastern shores of the lower Rhone, and the important Greek coastal city of Massilia, a long-standing Roman ally. The Salluvian center (*oppidum*) at Entremont was situated only thirty kilometers inland from Massilia, and its development in the course of the third and second centuries reflects unmistakable signs of Hellenistic influence and exchange, from its grid-planned streets to the large quantities of Massiliote coinage found in excavations of the city.[87] At the same time, the expansion of Salluvian power southward into the traditional sphere of influence of Massilia and the consolidation of a confederation of previously independent communities seem to have alarmed the Massiliotes, and to have been one of the major precipitating factors in the outbreak of war, in which the Romans soon involved themselves. Following a crushing defeat at the hands of the Romans, the Salluvii and their king Toutomotulus sought the protection first of the neighboring Allobroges, and then in turn of the Arverni, who, under the leadership of their king Bituitus, had established themselves as the major hegemonic power in south-central Gaul.[88] At the head of this extensive alliance of Gallic states, the Arverni represented a dangerous challenge to Roman authority. Commensurate with the magnitude of the threat was the treatment, in the aftermath of Roman victory, of the defeated Bituitus and his son, Congonnetiacus. In order to permanently disrupt the Arvernian hegemony, Bituitus was sentenced to live out his days in custody at the Roman colony of Alba Fucens, in the central Apennines, while, in the manner of Hellenistic princes, Congonnetiacus was kept as a royal hostage at Rome, where he presumably received, like Demetrius, son of the Macedonian king Philip V, an education in Roman culture and an indoctrination in Roman imperial policy.

In the imperial period, patterns of intercommunity interaction are somewhat more difficult to trace in Gaul than across the Pyrenees in Iberia. The

practice of formal, documented guest-friendship does not appear to have been nearly as prominent. There is little evidence for bilateral agreements or regional cooperation between ethnic groups at the level of the *civitas*, although there are signs of occasional rapprochement between inveterate enemies of the pre-Roman period: when a prominent member of the Aedui visited Augustonemetum (Clermont-Ferrand), the capital of the rival Arverni, and offered a dedication to the tutelary deity of that people (*genius Arvernorum*), it may have been as an act of local diplomacy, rather than testament of a purely personal devotion.[89] To be sure, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence: accidents of survival or differences in commemorative practices may account for the apparent contrast between Spain and Gaul. But it does seem to be the case that the greater part of interstate relations between the sixty-four *civitates* was channeled through the "Council of the Gallic Provinces" (*concilium Galliarum*) that convened at the provincial capital of Lugdunum.

During the sporadic outbursts of violence that punctuated the provinces of Gaul in the first century CE, however, the configurations of *civitates* cast into relief contours of interstate politics, outside of the formal provincial structures, that are otherwise less distinguishable. In the uprising of Julius Sacrovir in 21 CE, the Sequani staunchly supported their neighbors and allies the Aedui (*contermini sociique in armis*) against the legions of the Roman commander C. Silius; this relationship, though not without its tensions, extended back into the pre-conquest period, and continued into the latter part of the century, when the two *civitates* were again aligned in support of the rebel Vindex in 68 CE, and against the retaliatory depredations of the army of Vitellius the following year.[90] Close ties persisted for at least another century: at the important rural sanctuary of the Sequani at Les Villards-d'Héria in the Antonine or Severan period, a monument was dedicated publicly by the Sequani to C. Licinius Severus, a prominent citizen of the Aedui who had held the provincial priesthood of the imperial cult.[91] To the northeast, the obstinate rebel alliance between the Treveri and the Lingones in 70 CE culminated in the bloody battle of Vincum against the Roman general Petilius Cerialis on the banks of the river Mosella (Moselle)—"where," as the Gallic poet Ausonius wrote three centuries afterward, "Gaul once matched the disaster suffered by the Latins at Cannae, and wretched corpses lie unwept across the fields."[92] The participants were not social marginals or rural

desperadoes, or merely the personal clients of a single aristocratic dynast: that over one hundred members of the local ruling elite of the Treveri (*senatores Trevirorum,* and doubtless Roman citizens) accompanied Julius Tutor, the leading man of the state and the firebrand of the rebellion, into battle suggests that the war was conceived of as an official state action.[93] Local identity could take precedence over imperial loyalty, especially at moments of political crisis, when the relative stability, unity, and resilience of *civitas*-communities and their alternative strategies of consensus-building acquired greater importance as a refuge against the dissolution of state structures on a larger scale: the Treveri and Lingones predated Caesar, and they long outlasted his Julio-Claudian heirs.

While these wartime alliances vividly convey the capacity of autonomous Gallic *civitates* for interactions independent of—and against—Rome, most of the stories to be told of collaboration and competition between communities in Gaul are of a peaceable nature, and play out on a more local level, within the confines of a single ethnic group. In the countryside of Vienna, the central place of the Allobroges, the villagers (*vicani*) of the Boxsani came together with their neighbors from the similarly small settlement of Noiomagus to publicly honor their patron Q. Valerius Macedo, a local magistrate to whom the emperor Hadrian himself personally offered senatorial rank, together with high office at Rome. Remarkably, Macedo had declined, perhaps in favor of cultivating his local influence and prestige among the various communities of the Allobroges; a monument shows that he was honored at the Allobrogian capital of Vienna, as well.[94] Elsewhere in Narbonensis, the Coriossedenses and the Budenicenses, two rural communities (probably *vici* called Coriossedum and Budenicum) near Ucetia in the territory of the Volcae Arecomici, made a joint votive dedication to the solar wheel-god, who was identified through the monument's iconography with pre-Roman conceptions of the divine, but in the Latin inscription with Jupiter.[95]

But one of the most complex and illuminating case studies of intra-*civitas* patterns of community interaction comes from the Aremorican people of the Riedones, situated in the northwest of Gaul. In the late Iron Age, an urban nucleus developed on the peninsular promontory formed by the confluence of the river Ille and the Vilaine (the ancient *Vicinonia*), and the advantageously situated agglomeration was aptly called *Condate*—"conflu-

ence"—in the local Gaulish language.[96] Despite participating in communication and exchange networks as far away as the Rhone valley before the conquest, within the framework of the Roman empire, they were a comparatively remote and unimportant *civitas*, all but invisible to the dominant power and leaving almost no trace in the literary record, apart from the barest mentions in administrative catalogs.[97] As a self-nominating ethnic community, the Riedones were not securely attested in the epigraphic record until discoveries of the last third of the twentieth century; but among the fragmentary spolia gradually brought to light from within the foundations of the late antique fortification wall of Condate over a century of excavation were seven public inscriptions, all of which seem once to have belonged to the same monumental religious complex at the heart of the city: the temple and great hall (*basilica*) of the local god (Mars) Mullo.[98]

The longest and most recently discovered of these seven inscriptions is the key to understanding the rest of the "archive." It is a large statue base carved of granite with a decorated molding, measuring a little less than one meter in height by three-quarters of a meter in width and depth, and bearing twenty-one lines of text in two sections with letterforms characteristic of the second century:

> For Titus Flavius Postuminus, priest [*sacerdos*] of Rome and the Augusti, the first man whom the *civitas* of the Riedones honored with a lifetime priesthood [*perpetuum flamonium*] of Mars Mullo, twice chief magistrate [*duumvir*] and having performed all of the duties among his own people, the *civitas* of the Riedones set up statues together with their ornaments at public expense, according to the decree copied below:
>
> "In the year when Lucius Tutilius Lupercus Pontianus and Gaius Calpurnius Atilianus were consuls [135 CE], they decreed in unanimous and hearty agreement statues for T. Flavius Postuminus, the most honorable citizen, on account of his services both to the community and to individuals, his generosity, and his most faultless character—on account of which they frequently thanked him publicly—which were to be placed in the hall [*basilica*] of the temple of Mars Mullo with this inscription, as well as places in the same hall for the statues that he had pro-

claimed that he would place for the divine essences [*numina*] of the rural communities [*pagi*]."[99]

Two inscriptions from the bases of the statues promised by Postuminus fortuitously survive: one is a dedication to the local god (Mercury) Atepomarus in honor of one of the *pagi* of the Riedones called *Matans*; another, more fragmentary text relates to a second *pagus* the name of which is only partially preserved (*-inus*), and was set up for a different divinity (some form of Mars, and not necessarily Mullo).[100] But Postuminus was not the only member of the Riedones to contribute to the monumentalization of the complex: the attraction of the basilica as a venue for elite display is demonstrated by another group of statue bases emulously set up in the same public space by L. Campanius Priscus and his son L. Campanius Virilis, both of whom had also held the position of priest of the imperial cult. On the basis of letterforms, content, and context they can be dated roughly to the same period as the monuments of T. Flavius Postuminus, even if relative chronology is difficult to establish, and thus they serve to adumbrate some of the dynamics of elite competition among the Riedones. From their resemblance in language and rhetoric, it is immediately apparent that these monuments of the Campanii are in dialogue with those of Postuminus. Three are extant, but, as with Postuminus, we might imagine that there were several others in the series: also in honor of the *pagus* Matans is a dedication to Mars Mullo; for the *pagus* Sextanmanduus, another to Mars Mullo; and for the *pagus* Carnutenus, one to another local instance of Mars, Vicinnus, whose name is clearly related to the local landscape and the river Vicinonia.[101]

In the countryside of the territory of the Riedones populated by the *Matantes*, *Sextanmandui*, and *Carnuteni* (as well as the incompletely legible fourth group), archaeology has revealed a vibrant and dynamic religious climate: several rural sanctuaries are known from the first century CE, mostly clustered in the near vicinity of the central place and located along known or hypothesized thoroughfares. One of the better known and more intensively investigated of these sites is at Sermon, twelve kilometers west of Condate.[102] Here, in the late Iron Age, roughly between the Roman conquest and the middle of the principate of Augustus, a rectangular sacred enclosure was laid out, bounded by trenches and perhaps accommodating a wooden superstructure, based on the presence of a number of postholes.

But this space seems to have been abandoned already by the principate of Tiberius in favor of a newly constructed sanctuary (*fanum*) only a few meters to the south. This comparatively monumental temple consisted of a highly unusual hexagonal-shaped *cella* within a walled square court (*peribolos*) measuring ten meters to a side, adjoined by a rectangular annex. At Bignon, only two kilometers away in the direction of Condate, there existed another *fanum*, apparently in use contemporaneously with its neighbor at Sermon. This temple too consisted of a *cella*—square in this case, rather than hexagonal—enclosed by a *peribolos*, which was left open at the eastern end. Northwest of Condate, similarly about twelve kilometers distant from the *civitas* center, were situated two other *fana* in close proximity to one another, at Launay-Bézillard and La Chapelle-des-Fougeretz.[103] Neither has been the object of systematic excavations, but based on data derived from surface finds and aerial survey, they both seem to have been in active use in the early imperial period, into the second century, and to bear strong resemblance to one another in their ground plans: each comprises two square *cellae* of unequal dimensions within a large, open *peribolos*-style court (measuring some fifty meters to a side at Launay-Bézillard). Survey at La Chapelle-des-Fougeretz, which has been interpreted as an important secondary settlement focus (*vicus*) involved in religious, commercial, and manufacturing activities, has recovered an abundant quantity of votive objects: particularly noteworthy are the over 400 identifiable fragments of terracotta figurines, the majority of them female and of recognizably local types of mother-goddesses ("*déesses-mères*") or "Venus."

The productions of this latter group participate in an archaizing artistic tradition, and show a significant degree of independence from Mediterranean aesthetic ideals in their minimalism and in their incorporation of religious symbols like the wheel that evoke pre-Roman conceptions and visualizations of the divine.[104] On the reverse of this class of figurines is an inscription, in the Gaulish language rather than in Latin, identifying the craftsman responsible for the mold: *Rextugenos Sullias avvot*. That is, "Rextugenos, son of Sullia, made this." New evidence from the recent excavations of a ceramic atelier below the modern Rue Saint-Louis at Rennes has shed light on these local artistic productions: the primary workshop of Rextugenos seems to have been located here at Condate, and to have flourished from the middle of the first to the middle of the second century CE.[105] From here

these objects achieved a wide circulation, not just to extra-urban sanctuaries within the *civitas* of the Riedones, but across Aremorica. While the monumentalized sacred spaces that proliferated in the orbit of Condate must, in practice, have been closely tied to their hyper-local communities—*vicus*, *pagus*, even a single *villa*—, their overall geographical distribution, architectural forms, and material cultural profiles suggest participation in a wider discourse, structured by relations and interactions at the level of the *civitas*, through which a range of individual and group identities were articulated. Although the divinities worshipped at these particular sanctuaries and the names of their devotees remain unknown, by the middle of the second century we are able to begin to recognize more clearly in the evidence from Condate some of the fascinating nuances of the complex interrelationship between rural cult, urban politics, and negotiations of identity among the Riedones.

Based on the inscriptional evidence, together with extrapolation from regional comparanda, the plan and program of the religious complex of Mars Mullo at Condate can be hypothetically reconstructed.[106] It seems to have been composed of at least two distinct spaces: the *templum* proper—probably broadly similar in layout to a rural *fanum*, with a cella containing an altar and cult statue, and perhaps delimited by the typical local *peribolos*—and the associated *basilica*, presumably some sort of great hall laid out along the same axis and providing the primary access to the sanctuary, adorned with, among other public monuments, honorific statues of members of the local elite like T. Flavius Postuminus. Despite the appropriation of a Latin word to describe this building, the Riedones did not necessarily conceive of or interact with the *basilica* in recognizably "Roman," forensic ways: we should be wary of assigning generically imperial uses and meanings to these kinds of provincial spaces, which always accommodated local innovation and reinterpretation.[107] Indeed, the six inscribed votive statue bases reveal the quintessentially local orientation of the complex. With its series of figural representations of the gods closely connected to the constituent rural communities of the *civitas* (*numina pagorum*), the remarkable sculptural program of the basilica of Mars Mullo can be read as a "pageant" of local identity—or, more accurately, *identities*, as "being *Riedon*" clearly did not preclude the meaningful ascription to other, still more narrowly defined units of belonging. Moreover, this gallery of statuary—presumably, given

the features of the bases and the accompanying inscriptions, executed in a classicizing style—was intended to produce a dramatically different experience for its ideal viewer than the archaizing terracotta images of the divine with a decidedly non-Roman aesthetic being produced contemporaneously at Condate in the workshop of Rextogenos and circulated amongst the *pagus* sanctuaries to which these *numina* may have been making reference. Like the multiplicity of local communities implicated in the gallery, the diverse visual culture that it reflects further reinforces the impression of strategic and contextual participation in, alignment with, and performance of variously intersecting identities among the Riedones. In the way in which each of these statues has a geographical referent, directing the viewer on a virtual tour of the territory of the *civitas*, the monumental space reflects a kind of cartography of the community.[108] But such a "federal" parade or map that not only acknowledges but celebrates the plurality of local identities seems also to anticipate the possibility of an underlying tension between centripetal and centrifugal forces, between *civitas* and *pagus*, between a sense of membership in the wider ethnic group of the Riedones and in smaller communities of *Matantes* or *Sextanmandui* or *Carnuteni*.[109] With other sanctuaries of a "federal" nature elsewhere in northern Gaul—such as among the Treveri—one might be able to detect similar tensions.[110]

Of the four rural subgroups of the Riedones attested in the inscriptions from the sanctuary of Mars Mullo at Condate, the *pagus Carnutenus* is the most immediately intriguing for an investigation of this tension. The name of this community appears to be derived, with a Gaulish denominative adjectival suffix in *-(e)n-*, from the ethnonym of the Carnutes, an important people of central Gaul both before and after the conquest, dwelling east of the Riedones in the Beauce between the Seine and the Loire rivers.[111] Thus this signifier would seem to mean "*pagus* of the Carnutes."[112] Circumstances at the end of the wars of Caesar, during the winter of 52/1 BCE , may have precipitated a population movement of some of the Carnutes westward into the country of the Riedones. Hirtius records that

> the Carnutes, overcome by the hardship of the winter and the dread of war, since, having been driven from their homes, they did not dare to linger in any place very long nor could they shelter from the bitterest storms in the refuge of the forests,

they scattered and dispersed among the neighboring *civitates*, though a large part of their population was lost.[113]

There are a few contemporary comparanda from Gaul for the emigration or the forcible resettlement of *civitates*—wholesale or in part—in the territories of other ethnic groups with which they had no preexisting connections, sometimes as dependents of their new neighbors.[114] If the *pagus Carnutenus* was of "foreign" origin, from beyond the borders of the Riedones, then there are potentially interesting consequences for our understanding of the plural and polyphonous nature of identity even within the confines of a single *civitas*. Social memory of ethnic difference—distinct if ultimately convergent collective experiences of the past—may have played a significant role in the construction and imagination of these discrete local communities, and the patterns of interaction between them, long into the imperial period. Alongside this persistent difference, however, one can trace a concurrent and equally significant centripetal, ethnogenerative process by which the refugee Carnutes "became" Riedones, well integrated into the political and religious structures of the *civitas* by the age of Hadrian and, presumably in certain contexts, capable of strategically emphasizing and capitalizing upon this meaningful, shared group identity. At least within the "civic ideology" articulated in the basilica of Mars Mullo at Condate, the Carnuteni seem to have been accorded a status and visibility equivalent to the other *pagi*.

The exact relationship between the *pagi* and these three gods—(Mars) Mullo, (Mars) Vicinnus, and (Mercury) Atepomarus, who represent instantiations of the divine essences of the rural communities (*numina pagorum*), if we are correctly interpreting the key text—is obscure.[115] Previous scholars have understood them as divine patrons, embodiments of the rural subgroups of the *civitas*, "whose identities took refuge in the domain of religion."[116] This hypothesis, while appealing, presents certain difficulties, since there is no clear one-to-one correspondence between *pagus* and *numen* in our inscriptions, and we cannot establish *the* god for any particular *pagus*: for example, Mars Mullo is associated with two—possibly three—different *pagi*, while one *pagus*—the Matans—is invoked by each dedicant, Postuminus and Priscus, in connection with a different divinity, Mars Mullo or Mercury Atepomarus. As we have already noted, the rural sanctuaries of the

Riedones have turned up no inscriptional evidence that might help us to establish a definite link with one of these gods. But perhaps it is misguided to expect a clearly perceptible, overarching consistency—with conveniently exclusionary homologies between divinity and community—in the local civic theology of the *numina pagorum*. It is likely that there was an underlying principle of the general "representative" or totemic power of the *numina*, while the particular manifestations—Mullo versus Atepomarus versus Vicinnus—were dynamic or situational constructs; meaningful choices from an array of available epichoric divinities, the exact rationale of which is unintelligible to those, like us, without the requisite local knowledge. Although nothing readily emerges from the wider distribution of the worship of these divinities that might enable us to draw precise conclusions about their valences among the Riedones, there are some interesting patterns: the cult of Mars Mullo is a distinctly Aremorican phenomenon, confined to the Riedones and their immediate neighbors: the Aulerci to the east, the Andecavi to the southeast, and the Namnetes to the south;[117] Mars Vicinnus is a *hapax*, a fact that may reinforce the idea of his quintessentially epichoric nature, closely tied to the landscape of the *civitas* of the Riedones and the river Vicinonia; the god Atepomarus is attested only once otherwise, identified in an inscription from the territory of the Bituriges Cubi to the southeast across the Loire with Apollo instead of Mercury, a slippage indicative of the perceived lack of a single satisfactory counterpart among the Roman pantheon for the apparently well-defined identity of Atepomarus. Thus each of the *numina pagorum* known to have populated the great hall of the Riedones is, at the very least, sufficiently marked as local in its orientation to raise strong doubts as to the validity of seeing public cult at Condate in the second century as an index of some kind of "rapprochement" with Rome.[118] Although it drew on a broad repertoire of available cultural forms, from the hyper-local to the regional to the imperial, public religion among the Riedones seems instead to have been largely an inward-facing practice, a significant part of ongoing processes of communalization. The "federal" sanctuary of Mars Mullo—a crucial site for the imagination of Riedones, as well as *Matantes*, *Sextanmandui*, and *Carnuteni*—is an eloquent witness to the pluralism of the group identities involved in these processes, and to the complementary strategies of both integration and articulation devised by local actors.

Intercommunity Conflict

Not all interactions within or between provincial communities were amicable or constructive, however, nor were those disputes that were settled by recourse to adjudication under Roman law necessarily resolved to the satisfaction of all parties involved. Lingering discontent with Roman power or rival communities could be exorcized by other, less conventional and less savory means. Magic, a primordial palliative for individual and collective anxieties, was employed at moments of crisis or last resort. One such case is found in the Flavian era at the city of Emporion (or Emporiae, modern Empúries), on the Mediterranean coast of Iberia just south of the Pyrenees. Emporion was, from a very early period, a complex and multi-ethnic community: the native Iberian Indicetani (or Indigetes) coexisted with Phocaean Greek colonists from Massilia, who had arrived in the middle of the sixth century BCE. Together they formed a stable, if segregated polity, based on common interests and mutual distrust, with a hybrid constitution that was an amalgam of Greek and Iberian laws. A minor people called the Olossitani, who may have been a branch of one of the larger ethnic groups of the Ausetani or Ceretani, occupied the mountainous inland region bordering on the coastal territory of the Indicetani; they seem to have minted their own coinage, which, although it bore legends in the Iberian script with their own ethnonym, in type and weight standard imitated the Greek productions of Emporion, a testament to the significant regional influence of a foreign, prestige culture.[119] Yet another element was introduced in 45 BCE following the defeat of the last of the Pompeian resistance in Spain with the implantation by Caesar of a colony of Roman veterans, who occupied their own district inland, just outside the walls of the old city that enclosed the distinct Greek and Iberian neighborhoods.[120] By the end of the Julio-Claudian period, Emporion had found an equilibrium between these competing forces and was ostensibly a placid and prosperous provincial community, but three lead curse tablets (*defixiones*) left at this time within a family tomb located in one of the major extra-urban necropoleis belie this otherwise harmonious appearance, and shed light on the delicate and at times strained relationships among the various ethnic and political groups in the city and its hinterland.

These magical texts, which can be reasonably dated based on their content to the later years of the rule of Vespasian (ca. 75–79 CE), all relate to the

same subject, and must have been inscribed and deposited at the same moment; similarly, the three cinerary urns in which they were placed appear to have been interred together, in a single funerary episode, although the burial cannot be dated more precisely than to the century preceding the inscription of the tablets. Based on the presence among the grave goods of an old coin minted by the indigenous, pre-Greek community of *Indika*, perhaps a kind of heirloom, the tomb may have belonged to social group that maintained and projected a distinct Indicetanian identity. It remains uncertain whether the tomb enclosure was carefully reopened by later generations for the concealment of the tablets, or they were placed with the remains of the three decedents at the time of burial, as part of a magical ritual that was enacted in the semi-public context of the funeral, with the knowledge—and perhaps the participation—of those present.[121] Regardless of the exact circumstances of their deposition, the texts themselves illuminate, however dimly, a darker aspect of interstate interactions. Typical of the genre, the *defixiones* are simple, thorough, and repetitive. They target a series of groups and individuals, identified as "enemies" (*adversarii*) of the unnamed caster, for a binding spell, "so that they not wickedly intervene." Those targeted are the community of the Olossitani as a whole, the ambassadors (*legati*) of the Olossitani, the ambassadors of the Indicetani, and the legal representatives (*advocati*) of the Indicetani, as well as three of the most important agents of the Roman imperial administration in the province of Tarraconensis—the two legates of the emperor, and his procurator—along with their legal advisors (*consilium*).[122] Beyond this, the tablets communicate vexingly little else. But the immediate historical context—in the midst of the Flavian municipal reforms—and the focus on what seem to be participants in a legal proceeding have led scholars reasonably to infer that the curse was precipitated by anxieties over the pending outcome of a dispute over territory or privileges that involved the Olossitani and Indicetani, peoples who would have received Latin status through a grant of the emperor Vespasian but may have been subjected to the redistribution of a portion of their lands.

While the basic contours of this reconstruction are most likely correct, previous studies have not satisfactorily resolved the question of the identity and motivation of the anonymous imprecator, or fully explored its ramifications for our understanding of the relationships between communities in Emporion and its hinterland.[123] From the texts it emerges that the In-

dicetani, although partly incorporated into the city of Emporion, were not coextensive therewith: the distinct ethnic identity that endured did correspond to certain political realities. If they warranted their own representatives in a case before the Roman government, the autonomous Indicetani, as a *civitas*, must still in the later first century have possessed their own territory, presumably extending to the west up to the borders of the Olossitani. That the curse omits from among its many targets the people of the Indicetani as a whole, singling out only their *legati* and *advocati*, may be linked to the fact that the tomb belonged to a family or collective that, although they were resident at Emporion, still identified with the broader group of Indicetani. Whatever its exact nature, the local dispute pitted Olossitani against Indicetani, which may have played on the kinds of economic and cultural divides between upland and lowland dwellers that are common in pre-modern societies, while clearly antagonizing the provincials against imperial authority to an exceptional degree, for direct magical attacks on Roman power are quite rare. But it also appears to have exposed deep divides within the Indicetani, such that some among them took pains to sabotage the official state mission, while sparing the state itself. Perhaps the imprecator personally owned land in the countryside that his community was about to concede in exchange for some consideration, or perhaps he was a local politician—a member of the *senatus* or *ordo* of the Indicetani—the failure of whose proposals in the matter of the Olossitani to gain adequate support had turned him vindictively against opponents both foreign and domestic. This conflict, threatening the immediate interests of the individual as well as the traditional rights or territory of the community, apparently justified the direst of responses. It reveals intriguingly complex patterns of interaction within and around a single city, and accentuates the wide range of the "others"—Greek Emporiotes, Iberian Olossitani, and Roman imperial agents—that were employed as counterpoints, or targeted as "enemies," in the triangulation of community and individual identities.

Magic was not the only alternative, unauthorized means of redressing grievances in the provinces. While interstate warfare was, in theory, unthinkable within the boundaries of the empire, since Roman power entailed a monopolization of legitimate state violence, in certain rare instances localized armed conflict erupted between communities, the culmination of long-simmering unrest that was informed by social memory of the pre-Ro-

man past. Take, for example, an often-overlooked incident between the *civitates* of the Boii and the Aedui of central Gaul, which is known only vaguely through the tendentious account of the Roman historian Tacitus. As an interlude in his narrative of the civil war between Otho and Vitellius in the year 69 CE, Tacitus relates the story of the invasion of a group of Boii, led by a self-proclaimed god called Mariccus, into the territory of the neighboring Aedui. After the Boii had seized and occupied certain outlying *pagi* that bordered on their own lands, the Aedui responded by marshaling a local militia force of select young men, supported by some of the auxiliary troops of Vitellius, and routed the war band of Mariccus, who was himself captured and ultimately executed.[124] The difficulty of interpreting this strange event is exacerbated by the external, moralizing perspective of our only source, who perhaps failed to discern the complexity of its underlying causes. While it was easy for Tacitus to hold Mariccus proximately responsible for this anomalous outbreak of interstate violence, it seems ultimately to have stemmed from latent tensions between the Boii and Aedui rooted in the history of the Roman conquest and its attendant population movements, which were successfully exploited by the charismatic leadership of the quasi-divine Mariccus at an opportune moment of imperial weakness and disorder.[125]

Over a century earlier, at the conclusion of the Helvetian War, the defeated Boii, who had taken part in the ill-fated migration of the Helvetii and abandoned their original homeland across the Rhine, had been forcibly settled on Caesar's command in part of the territory of the Aedui, at the *oppidum* of Gorgobina, at the request of the Aedui themselves.[126] The Aedui attempted to incorporate the Boii into their community, or at least their sphere of influence, in order to augment their own population as a bulwark against their enemies, especially the Arverni. In the course of the next century, however, the two ethnic groups remained distinct, at least ideologically if not politically. The Boii continued to assert their own independent identity and avoided subsumption entirely into the *civitas* of the Aedui: an individual is attested in a dedication at the Aeduan capital of Augustodunum in the first century CE with the name *Boiirix* ("chief of the Boii"), while outside of Aeduan territory, at Burdigala, a sojourner was able intelligibly to identify herself as "a citizen of the Boii" (*cives Boias*).[127] By the second half of the first century CE there was evidently sufficient discontent among this discrete, imagined community of Boii, and sufficient alienation from the

Aedui, for eight thousand of them to have been turned into a violent, frenzied mob (*fanatica multitudo*) by Mariccus. Tacitus, reflecting deep-seated Roman anxieties about a general uprising against Rome of the peoples north of the Alps, calls him the would-be "deliverer of the Gauls" against the Romans, but it seems that Mariccus' own self-representation may have been rather more as the deliverer of the Boii against the Aedui. Collective actions of subaltern groups—such as the Boian uprising—are usually supported by complex "peasant memories" and popular senses of the past, which tend to differ significantly from outsiders' narratives.[128] The aspirations of the rebel Mariccus, who drew on social memories and sources of authority and legitimacy that were clearly of tremendous power among his own people but hardly recognizable to imperial observers like Tacitus, were circumscribed and highly localized: he marched not on legionary bases or imperial colonies, but on Aeduan *pagi*. The results of the process of communalization among the Aedui, who failed to foster a sense of belonging in the Boii, diverge markedly from those that we have sketched among the Riedones, who appear to have more successfully integrated a historically distinct population of Carnutes into the structures—religious, political, and monumental—of their own *civitas*.

In attempting to understand interstate conflicts in the west, we are constrained by selectivity of our historical sources, which tend to be silent when local politics did not intersect with matters of greater import to the Roman state, or with themes of greater interest to its readers. But there are other cases from central Gaul that shed light on the dynamics of this important form of "resistance"—not to Rome, but to the local hegemonies of other provincial communities—and, more generally, on key aspects of processes of identity formation and communalization. In 70 CE, the Lingones, who were engaged in a project of local "imperialism" under the leadership of their self-proclaimed "Caesar," Julius Sabinus, marched to war against their neighbors the Sequani. As with Mariccus and the Boii, the reassertion of sovereignty was closely connected to a selective remembering and forgetting of the past: before the invasion of the country of the Sequani, the Lingones destroyed public monuments on which the treaty that the state had made with the Romans (*foedus Romanum*) was recorded.[129] Again, the ethnographic rhetoric of our Roman historical source—Tacitus—may obscure the nature of local state actions, along with the complexities of their moti-

vations and justifications: the "disordered crowd" (*inconditam turbam*) of the Lingones bears a superficial resemblance to the "frenzied mob" of the Boii, but this characterization of Gallic disorder and changeability can largely be written off as an old trope. In actuality, the episodes reflect the continued ability—and willingness—of these states to mobilize and arm their citizens for acts of aggression or self-defense, without the intervention of Roman power. As an attempted "reenactment" of pre-conquest styles of warfare, the pitched battle that was fought between the *civitates* of the Lingones and Sequani, from which the latter ultimately emerged victorious, is indicative of territorialities, loyalties, and identities that tend to be masked by the idealizing imperial slogans of "unbroken and secure peace" extending across Roman Gaul.

Interstate conflicts were not confined to indigenous communities. Hostilities ran deep in the Rhone valley between the rival cites of Lugdunum—a Roman colonial foundation—and Vienna—the capital of the Allobroges. Indeed, the origins of Lugdunum and of the feud were one and the same: the first settlers of the site at the confluence of the Rhone and Saone rivers that would ultimately develop into the *colonia* were Roman and Italic merchants who had been expelled from Vienna by the Allobroges during the brief but serious uprising led by their chieftain Catugnatus in 61 BCE. This reaction against the authority of the empire and the agents of its commerce was the product of maladministration of the previous decade. Operating in conjunction with a wave of opportunistic creditors, rapacious governors like M. Fonteius had exploited the Allobroges to finance foreign wars, and the resulting animosity and impoverishment—combined with the frustrated efforts of their leader, Indutiomarus, to obtain redress of their grievances through formal legal channels at Rome in 69 BCE—must have contributed to their initial support for the cause of the Roman revolutionary Catiline, who promised them an opportunity to exact their revenge and erase their debts.[130] Despite their wavering loyalties in the late Republic, the grandsons of the rebels saw their city granted the honorific status of a *colonia* by Augustus. By the middle of the first century CE, the emperor Claudius could cite Vienna—"that most splendid and influential *colonia*"—in a meeting of the Roman senate as an exemplary case study of a once-foreign place that now participated in Roman citizenship and imperial peace.[131]

But the political, cultural, and economic ascent of Allobrogian Vienna

rekindled old resentments among the colonists of rival Lugdunum, especially after a catastrophic fire in 65 CE left parts of the city in ruins, and perhaps some of its population looking downriver for a scapegoat upon which to vent their frustration.[132] The tumult in Gaul in the years immediately following provided ample scope for violence, and ready pretexts for lending it a vague semblance of legitimacy. During the insurrection of Vindex, the Allobroges marched northward and laid siege to Lugdunum, which had remained loyal to Nero; in a few short months, there was apparently frequent fighting between local militia forces in the region, with heavy losses on both sides. After Galba punished Lugdunum and honored Vienna upon his assumption of the purple, the Lugdunenses were all the more eager to inflame the troops of Vitellius against the Allobroges; their rhetoric, out of tune with that recently employed by Claudius, may have resorted to the same kinds of tropes deployed a century and a half earlier by Cicero against Indutiomarus: were Gauls—foreigners, barbarians, "the greatest enemies to the empire and the name of Rome"—to be preferred to Roman colonists? Only pitiable supplication and liberal bribery saved the city of Vienna from the Roman soldiery eager for plunder, and disappointed the hopes of its adversaries upstream.[133]

These cases of conflict in the western provinces reveal the potential for negative, even destructive byproducts of the process of communalization: all of those local discourses and traditions that worked to reinforce a cohesive sense of "selves"—common name, defined territory, rhythms of time, totemic gods, shared past—inevitably entailed some degree of alienation from "others." Under normal circumstances, these seams in the fabric of empire were inconspicuous. But at times of crisis, when imperial power was weak or when it applied unusual pressure on communities, the patchwork began to come undone, and local limits of the Roman peace were exposed.

PATRIA ET CIVES

Already from a very early period, when the inhabitants of southern Gaul were first adopting Greek-style monumentality under the influence of Massilia, the advertisement of community membership was a central element in projections of power and identity. In the third or second century BCE, at Vasio, the central place of the Vocontii, a certain Segomaros dedicated a sacred enclosure to the goddess Belesama. He hailed from Nemausus, the

capital of the neighboring Volcae Arecomici, and he emphasized this fact in the Gaulish inscription that he set up to record his munificence:

> Segomaros, son of Villoneos, member of the community of Nemausus [*tooutious Namausatis*], dedicated this grove/sacred enclosure [*nemeton*] to Belesama.[134]

In Iberia of the late second century BCE, there are traces of similar self-representations. At Salduba, a settlement of the people of the Sedetani, the site which was later occupied by the Roman *colonia* of Caesaraugusta, an important visitor from the neighboring Belli left a *tessera* inscribed in his native Celtiberian language: "Lubos, son of Ablo, of the *Alizoki*, from Contrebia Belaisca."[135] At home in one's own country and among one's own countrymen, other senses of belonging, such as those of lineage or kinship group, are most prominent. But abroad, as these dedications of Segomaros and Lubos illustrate, the articulation of ethnic or civic identity tends to acquire greater importance. Travel, as one modern historian has noted, "has always been the site of investigation of Otherness, whether through distant journeying or the crossing of a more local border."[136] The corollary of this assertion is, of course, that travel is also a site of investigation of Selfness. For individuals from Spain and Gaul, travels in the more immediate neighborhood of their homeland or *patria*—particularly to the provincial capitals of Tarraco, Augusta Emerita, Corduba (Córdoba), Lugdunum, and Narbo—and more distant journeys to the seat of empire at Rome served as explorations of self and other.[137] Memorials left behind amidst audiences of "others" by these merchants and wanderers, soldiers, slaves and sojourners, or dedications made by them upon their safe return home, bear witness to the power of travel in the process of individual and community constructions of identity.

Lugdunum, the capital of the three provinces of Gaul, exerted a centripetal force on the elites of the communities of Gaul in the form of the annual festival and assembly held in midsummer and as the nucleus of the imperial cult, as we have already seen. It was also an important commercial center, owing to its advantageous natural situation at the confluence of the rivers Arar (Saone) and Rhodanus (Rhone) and its position at the nexus of the road network built by Agrippa.[138] Members of well over two dozen *civitates* of *Gallia Comata* alone are attested in the epigraphic record of Lugdunum, an indication not only of the vibrancy of the city as a trans-regional focal point

for elite competition and display, but also of the preponderance of origins and ethnicity within the elite discourse at the capital.[139] Those elected to be chief priests (*sacerdotes*) of Rome and Augustus proudly proclaimed the *civitas* to which they belonged and in which they had gained political influence through the completion of a successful local career, prelude to and prerequisite for the provincial priesthood.[140] Merchants like Victorius Regulus of the Nemetes, a dealer in purple dyes, often advertised their local citizenship more prominently than their business.[141] Delegates to the provincial assembly recognized the community whose interests they advocated, on whose authority they were present, and in whose emotive representation as *patria* their own identity was vested. At times, *patria* and *provincia* competed for the hearts and minds of these elites; indeed, in reevaluating and rehabilitating the agency of provincials, more complex loyalties than merely those to imperial authority and its structures must be taken into account.[142] A transcription of a letter appended to an inscription honoring a local magistrate and former provincial priest named T. Sennius Sollemnis from the *civitas* of the Viducasses, set up at their chief place Aragenua (Vieux) and dated to 238 CE, provides invaluable insight into the dynamics of loyalties in conflict at Lugdunum:

> Aedinus Julianus to Badius Comnianus, greetings. While I was serving as imperial governor [*quinquefascalis*] in the province of Lugdunensis, I became acquainted with many good men, among whom was that Sollemnis, a priest from the *civitas* of the Viducasses [*oriundus ex civitate Viducassium*]. I began to grow fond of him on account of his seriousness and honorable character. Added to these qualities was the fact that, when they tried to bring a charge against my predecessor Claudius Paulinus in the council of the [three] Gauls, by the instigation of certain men who seemed to be threatened by his merits but as if it were by the universal agreement of the [three] provinces, my friend Sollemnis opposed their motion by an appeal, because when his homeland [*patria eius*] had made him a representative among the rest, they had given him no instructions regarding legal action [against Paulinus], but on the contrary had praised his gov-

ernance. The result [of this speech] was that everyone dropped the charge.[143]

There are a number of interesting features of this letter.[144] On a very basic level, the terms in which Aedinius Julianus introduces the protagonist, T. Sennius Sollemnis, are worthy of note: he is specifically identified as "of Viducassian origin" (*oriundus ex civitate Viducassium*). It is a piece of information that is relevant to the episode subsequently described, surely, but its inclusion also suggests that this ethnic identity was a prominent enough aspect of Sollemnis' self-representation in the context in which Julianus became well acquainted with him—at Lugdunum—that the *sacerdos* and his *civitas* were inextricably associated in the Roman governor's mind. The steadfast loyalty of Sollemnis to his *patria* had motivated his resistance to the vocal faction in the provincial council and his defense of the former governor Claudius Paulinus, at the risk of alienating his fellow *legati* from the other *civitates* of Gaul. This was a bold act for a priest from a relatively unimportant people like the Viducasses, but it ultimately served to springboard him to prestigious positions at Lugdunum, such as the overseer of the provincial treasury (*iudex arcae ferrariarum*), and beyond.

While the letter of Julianus is the only direct evidence for the texture of debate within the *concilium Galliarum*, it is not unreasonable to take the dynamics of the episode that it relates as paradigmatic. Reading the assembly as a forum for the enunciation of other loyalties runs somewhat contrary to one of the main threads of scholarship on the subject, the assumption that therein, "the imperial government at Rome sponsored an institution that allowed the Gauls to satisfy their aspirations for national union and identity."[145] Proponents of this view find an antecedent in the "national" and formal character that they attribute to the pre-Roman *conventus* of the Gauls, foregrounded in Caesar's *commentarii*.[146] Although a loose connection between *concilium* and *conventus* may not be entirely unfounded,[147] such interpretations tend strongly to overstate the significance of pan-Gallic sentiment in both pre- and post-conquest Gaul.[148] Furthermore, they underestimate the provincial assembly, and the capital more broadly, as sites of elite competition, a central aspect of which, as we have seen, was the performance of local ethnic identities.[149] If a functionalist explanation of the

importance of this institution for Gallic provincial society is to be sought, I would argue that it lies rather in this role, as a sanctioned space for political antagonism between elites and between communities, a participatory substitute, however pale, for the internecine rivalries, feuds, and hostilities of the pre-Roman period. The design of the amphitheater at Lugdunum can be understood in many ways as an analog for the *concilium*, a concretization of the contours of the body politic: superficially it was a single edifice, but within the subdivided seating (*cavea*) "others" were marked out, the seats inscribed with the names of the various *civitates* for whose members they were reserved.[150] *Arvernus* sat next to *Biturix*, but, ultimately, both amphitheater and assembly were spaces of discreteness and diversity as much as they were of togetherness and unity.

At the provincial capitals of Spain, one finds a similar proliferation and exhibition of local identities. Attested among the monuments of Tarraco are members of over thirty different communities from the Iberian peninsula alone.[151] In similar fashion to the inscription of Equester at Neriomagos discussed at the opening of Chapter 1, some individuals at Tarraco represented themselves as belonging to multiple and overlapping communities, complexes of identity that simultaneously reflected both the hierarchies of Roman power and negotiations of local cultural geography. One of the most striking cases is the honorific inscription set up by L. Antonius Modestus for his wife, who had been provincial priestess of Hispania Citerior.[152] The text constructs these two frameworks of identity—Roman and local—in parallel: both Modestus and his wife Paetinia Paterna came from the jurisdiction of the *conventus Cluniensis*, but within this Roman administrative unit they were each from different *gentes* and *populi*, he of the people of Intercatia of the Vaccaei and she of the Amocenses of the Cantabri.[153] This sort of triangulation of identity was actuated by the milieu characteristic of a provincial capital like Tarraco. Though less grand and less frequented than Tarraco, Augusta Emerita and Corduba also became similar foci for the inhabitants of Lusitania and Baetica.[154]

Apart from the provincial seats, there were numerous other places in Gaul and Spain where confrontation with the "other" catalyzed the consolidation and projection of self in response. The cosmopolitan nature of the trading center of Burdigala, for example, where voyagers from the far-flung cities of Greece, Bithynia, and Syria mingled with wayfarers from the Gallic

interior, seems to have effected such a reaction.[155] Monuments at Burdigala record the local ethnic identities of individuals from seventeen different communities of Gaul, a denser cluster than any other site outside Lugdunum.[156] A marketplace for the exchange of goods became a theater for the performance of ethnicity. Capitals of the Iberian *conventus* like Bracara Augusta, Lucus Augusti, and Clunia encouraged similar epigraphic displays.[157] The record from Asturica is especially rich. As at Tarraco, alongside simpler mentions of sojourners' communities of origin (Bracari, Seurri Transminienses), there are expressions of rather more complex nested identities: "Fusca Celtica, of the people of the Supertamarci, from the town of Blaniobriga," or "Fabia and Virius, of the people of the Lemavi from ⊃ *Eritaeco*," or "Proculus, member of the clan of the Tritalici, from Uxama, city of the people of the Argaeli."[158] This epitaph of Proculus is not the only indication of the presence here of the Argaeli—a people that belonged to the wider ethnic group of the Arevaci, whose territory lay more than two hundred kilometers east of Asturica: a woman called Flavia made a votive dedication "in honor of the Argaeli" to the goddess Degantia, who is otherwise known only from Uxama, the central place of the Argaeli.[159] Such an act of piety, of dutiful regard for her distant countrymen, illuminates further aspects of the responses of provincial individuals to travel abroad, and of their mindfulness of selves and others.

But elsewhere too, even at towns that might have been considered isolated backwaters in comparison to Burdigala or Asturica, provincials made an effort to distinguish themselves from the populations of communities in which they were only sojourners or resident aliens, to maintain a connection to their own imagined communities. Significant numbers of foreigners made their way to Complutum (Alcala de Henares), in the country of the Carpetani in central Spain, after the city moved down into the plain along the river Henares from its ancient hilltop site in the Flavian period in order to take advantage of developing communication routes.[160] The memorials from the necropolis attest to the presence of individuals from several Arevacan cities of the north—Segontia, Segovia, Clunia, and Uxama—and neighboring Celtiberian hillforts like Arcobriga, as well as peoples of the Callaeci like the Interamici, all of whom may have died in Complutum, but who maintained their distinctive identities.[161] Often these connections were explicitly rooted in an idea of *origo* ("homeland") or *natio* ("birth"). In Spain,

we can observe this phenomenon at small towns like Aurgi and Iliturgicola (Fuente Tójar) or at important Roman colonies like Italica. A brief epitaph from Italica characterizes one Rubria Julia as *incola Italicensis, origine Seriensis*; "a resident of Italica, but originally from Seria."[162] Similarly, a Q. Cassius at Aurgi is remembered in his epitaph as a member of the neighboring people of the Tuccitani, and only an *inhabitant* of Aurgi (*incola Aurgitanus*).[163] Although these inscriptions were set up posthumously, it seems likely that they echo, at least faintly, the self-representations of the decedents in life. It is telling of the power of these imaginary communities of origin that even acts of civic munificence for a new place of residence did not supplant the deeply felt sense of a person's *patria*: in the dedication of a statue group of the emperors Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, and Commodus at Iliturgicola in the mid-second century CE, C. Annius Praesens emphasized that he was but an inhabitant of the place (*Iliturgicolensis incola*), with only a partial sense of belonging. Resisting identification with his audience, he still proclaimed himself to be an *Ipolcobulculensis*, from Ipolcobulcula (Carcabuey) twenty kilometers to the southwest.[164] That he had held the office of *sevir Augustalis*, a specific priesthood of the imperial cult, suggests that Praesens was a freedman (*libertus*), a group that constituted the vast majority of the sevirate in Spain and Gaul; thus his sojourn in Iliturgicola may initially not have been voluntary. Perhaps in this performance of identity we can read a kind of *pothos* for a lost country, a reclamation of a community from which he had been forcibly alienated. At the same time, from the point of view of these host cities, offering strangers local citizenship—incorporating them into the imagined community—was a meaningful gesture, not undertaken lightly: an interestingly and relatively late example comes from the town of Pompelo, which in 185 CE made an exceptional grant in co-opting their *patronus*, who was from Damanium (possibly to be identified with Hinojosa del Jarque, some distance to the south), as an honorary *civis*.[165]

Epitaphs constitute the predominant category of epigraphic evidence for the identities of travelers: death in a foreign land was, understandably, a source of great anxiety; to be known through a monument, however modest, brought some consolation. While most of these inscriptions are brief and rather formulaic in nature, occasionally poems communicated more personalized and eloquent messages about the meaning of the *patria*. From somewhere in Celtiberia to distant Sacili (Adamuz), in the heart of

Baetica, a father traveled to pay his last respects to his deceased son, Q. Cassius, and there dedicated a verse epitaph to his memory. The surface of the stone is badly weathered, and only parts of a few verses remain legible, but it is immediately apparent upon inspection that the poem is framed, visually and conceptually, by the word *CELTIBER*, which occupies its own line, centered and in large block capitals; this ethnic adjective identifies the deceased as a foreigner at Sacili, and primes the reader to understand the key theme of the text, the tragedy of permanent separation from homeland and community:

> With violence done to the natural order of things, the elder must bury the younger, and lay him to rest far from his native citadel [*patria . . . ab arce procul*] . . . it would have been a softer blow to bury him in his homeland [*mollius in patria fuerat sepelire*]. . . .[166]

While many of the sentiments expressed in this epitaph are conventional, it is nonetheless a revealing attempt at coming to terms with the impossibility of repatriation. The inscribed identity remains, a *Celtiber* among Sacilienses.

Across the sea or beyond the lofty barrier of the Alps, provincials from Spain and Gaul found an even more alienating cultural landscape in Italy. Two poetic reflections upon travel and homecoming illuminate the evocative potential of the imperial center in constructions of self and other. The first is a votive offering to Jupiter Appenninus, composed in iambics, discovered at Arellano, about fifty kilometers southwest of Pompelo in northeastern Hispania Citerior:

> What vows as a suppliant I made with fearful mind when I set out for the high roofs of Rome, these now I, Flavus, as a successful and happy magistrate, dedicate to you, Appenninus, the guarantor of our safety. I ask only that you receive with a favorable mind these things that we dedicate to you—an altar, a palm, and a sacrifice.[167]

The altar on which this poem is inscribed was apparently occasioned by a successful embassy (*victor et laetus*) to Rome undertaken by Flavus in an official capacity (*magistratus*) on behalf of his community. It merits comparison with a second verse inscription, this one from Burdigala, written in elegiac couplets:

> I am a constant wanderer, I am carried around the entire globe,
> worshiper of the tutelary divinity of Onuava. Nor did the far-
> off places of a different world compel me, when in dire straits,
> to substitute vows to the glory of another. Certain is my trust
> in what is true: the divinity of Onuava carried me to the cita-
> del of Tiburnus [Tibur, near Rome], and the divinity of Onuava
> brought me hope and aid. Wherefore, O divine mother, it is
> proper for me to fulfill to you deservedly the vows undertaken
> when I was far off in the Ausonian land.[168]

Unlike the dedication to an Italian form of Jupiter in the previous text, the unnamed wanderer offers this dedication to a local divinity, Onuava,[169] making explicit his resistance to the religious influences of *Ausonia terra*, where some impulse had carried him to Tibur (Tivoli). Through the juxta-position of Tiburnus and Onuava, an implicit comparison is drawn between the communities in whose imaginations each factored prominently, Tibur and Burdigala. Though only fragmentary glimpses of Tiburnus survive in literature, a blend of local memory and Roman antiquarianism, they are sufficient to reconstruct a basic outline of the tradition of his connection to the foundation of the city of Tibur.[170] While the nature of the evidence does not allow such a sketch to be drawn for Onuava, it should not be assumed a priori that a similarly robust social memory did not exist at Burdigala. The invocation of the divinity in the penultimate line as *diva parens*, for example, hints tantalizingly at an underlying civic cosmology and an analogous role of Onuava as a sort of founding figure, which may have partly motivated the parallelism with Tiburnus.

In both of these texts, we follow the gaze of the traveler in an unaccus-tomed direction, from the provinces to the capital and back again. Our writ-ten evidence for movement within the western Roman world is dominated by imperial perspectives, constructions of space and narratives of travel in which Rome and Italy are center and starting point; the meaning-laden "return" almost invariably brings us back to Rome.[171] Thus these two epi-graphic poems serve as a thought-provoking counterbalance, a study in in-verted expectations: that which inspires fear is not the wild backwardness of the periphery, but rather the strange and imposing grandeur of the mon-umental city; the other world is not the shores of Ocean, but the ancient

citadels of Latium. These encounters with the "other" prompted reflection upon the *patria*, as a political community in the case of Flavus, or for the anonymous wanderer as a sacred space. Ultimately, the votive aspect of the altars ritualizes the act of homecoming and reintegration into the community, while the monumentalization of the travel narrative is a conduit for the performance of a renegotiated local identity.

For the vast majority of travelers to Rome from Spain and Gaul, however, we lack such richly textured reflections, but the epigraphic record does allow insight into their self-representation.[172] As Noy notes, it is important to keep in mind that "the evidence is heavily biased toward those who left evidence of separateness";[173] provincials at Rome could choose, at least epigraphically, to make themselves more or less undetectable as such. But many did leave "evidence of separateness," and the identities that these individuals chose to perform were overwhelmingly local, embedded primarily in their communities of origin.[174] Interestingly, there is comparatively little epigraphic evidence for an emergent sense of "national" identities—*Gallus* or *Hispanus*—among these provincials at Rome,[175] in contrast to many other expatriate experiences. Those monolithic categories or *Grossgruppen* defined by the Romans were cultural fictions of imperial power, and "had little significance for local groups and individuals and bore no correspondence to political formations."[176] That is not to say that acknowledgment of the subject's province of origin was not an important element of these inscriptions, or that, as we have seen in several cases, provinces or units of Roman administration were not appropriated as meaningful political communities in constructions of identity. But their presence in the epigraphy of Rome is at least partly an indication of the performative quality of the monuments, an accommodation made to the audience of the cosmopolis. It could probably not be assumed that the average passerby would know who or where the Ambiani or Pictones or Saetabitani were, but the specification *Ambiana ex provincia Belgica* or *Pictonis ex Aquitanica* or *Saetabitanus ex Hispania Citeriore* would have rendered the message more intelligible.[177] In the end, such performances for an audience of outsiders may have actually fostered a sense of belonging to these provinces as imagined communities in their own right.

On the rare monument, we find more fully articulated elements of the identities of provincials, beyond merely the ethnic or community label by which they designated themselves. An exemplary case study is the dedica-

tion of M. Quartinius Sabinus, a member of the *civitas* of the Remi of Gallia Belgica who served as a soldier in one of the praetorian cohorts at Rome.[178] At the top of this monument are figures of five divinities sculpted in relief, each of which is labeled; significantly, the first two are non-Roman gods, Camulus and Arduenna. Camulus, the warrior, is known to have been worshipped among the Remi,[179] while Arduenna was the eponymous divinity of the *Arduenna silva* (the modern Ardennes forest), which bordered on their territory.[180] The god is represented in typical fashion in the manner of Mars, with sword and spear, the goddess in the guise of Diana, holding bow and quiver. As Onuava had been for the anonymous author of the elegiac inscription at Burdigala, Camulus and Arduenna seem to have remained important facets of the identity practiced and projected by Sabinus at Rome, a meaningful connection to his native community of the Remi.

Not all journeys far from home necessarily brought provincial travelers to lands that they considered foreign; there is evidence that for some members of the Punic diasporic community in Spain, return to Carthage might have been part of the performance of identity, even conceived of as a kind of pilgrimage. When Valeria Atiliana, who hailed from the late Punic foundation of Mago on the smaller of the Balearic islands, died during a visit to the metropolis, she was praised on her funerary monument at Carthage as "a dutiful citizen of Mago" (*pia Magontana*).[181] Although *pius/a* is among the more common laudatory epithets in posthumous commemoration, the collocation of these adjectives—the qualification or specification of *pietas* by reference to place of origin—is unusual. When it appears in epitaphs, *pietas* is usually "concentrated on the vertical linkages between parents and children," and connotes a complex feeling of reciprocity, obligation, and affection—almost always involving action or the expectation of action—that served to bind the family unit together.[182] But the same sentiment, *mutatis mutandis*, is present in this inscription: Valeria Atiliana belonged to a Punic community in which former colonies were still imagined in hierarchical relationship to the parent city. Travel to the center of this empire of memory from its periphery articulated this relationship in meaningful ways. Presence at Carthage could be represented by visitors or construed by locals as an act—or part of a set of acts—of dutiful regard that reinforced a sense of kinship and collective experience among cities that had otherwise been divided and subsumed into a number of different provincial structures.

To close this section, I would like to read two final monuments in juxtaposition, each very different in form and occasion but both of which bear on the question of local identity within the broader empire, of selves versus others. The first is the cenotaph set up in Moesia on the Danubian frontier for the soldiers who had died in the Dacian campaign of Domitian in the late 80s CE,[183] on which one can observe a fascinating interplay between the rhetoric of the unity of the Roman Empire and the articulation of local identities. The altar that carries the inscription was explicitly dedicated, as the fragmentary opening of the text reads, "in memory of the brave men who have fallen on behalf of the *res publica*," a clear expression of the imperial ideology of the *communis patria*. At the same time, however, each of the fallen—several of whom are from Spain or Gaul—is identified by his community or ethnic affiliation.[184] Manipulating the looming specter of the barbaric Dacian other to catalyze a sense of self, the monument works to harmonize a patchwork of disparate communities into a single *res publica*, for the defense of which citizens of Italian Pompeii and Alpine Segusio, Asian Caesarea and Gallic Vienna, were all willing to lay down their lives.

A striking contrast to the strain of imperial patriotism found in the Domitianic war memorial is offered by the fragmentary epitaph of an unknown local elite at Ebusus, a city in the Balearic islands which had been an important Punic entrepôt since the seventh century BCE:

> . . . he bequeathed to the state [*res publica*] of Ebusus the sum of 90,000 sesterces, so that from that sum every year the tribute might be paid to the Romans, and lest his fellow citizens be compelled to pay tribute during hard times. [He instructed] that the remaining 6,000 sesterces were to be spent on his funeral rites, and from the interest games were to be given yearly on his birthday, with vessels containing lights.[185]

Clearly this text is about a very different *res publica* and motivated by a very different discourse of loyalty and identity. Local citizens and imperial center are rarely more clearly or more starkly differentiated than in the bequest of this *Ebusitanus* to his community. Indeed, the purpose clause "so that . . . tribute might be paid to the Romans" (*ut . . . tributum Romanis penderetur*) is almost jarring in its alienation of "the Romans." Despite the fact that this individual of the early first century CE knew Latin, participated in cultural and

legal practices associated with the Romans, emulated other imperial elites in the way in which he disposed of his great wealth through civic munificence, and, above all, almost certainly possessed Roman citizenship, "Romans" was not a category in which he included himself and his community, at least in the context of this, his final performance of identity.[186] There is little other direct evidence for local attitudes toward the payment of the *tributum*; but the monumentalized will of the Ebusitanian euergetist suggests that even compliance with the demands of Rome might be turned into a kind of "resistance," an annual rehearsal of difference and distance.

Together, these texts are powerful testaments to the potential for dramatically discrepant experiences of Roman imperial power. Throughout the western provinces, these experiences both produced and were the product of widely divergent constructions of self and other. Discordant or harmonious, the polyphonous invocations of *patria* and *cives*, fatherland and fellow citizens, could everywhere be heard.

Communalization in the west was necessarily bound up with practices of differentiation. Local identities were constructed in contradistinction to neighboring towns and peoples just down the road, as well as to a broad—if at times slightly nebulous—idea of otherness embodied by "the Romans." Communities and the individuals who represented them differentially navigated complex matrices of interaction: diplomatic and legal agreements, patronage, public building projects, travel, and even warfare contributed to the processes of self-definition that continued to shape the contours of the provinces of Gaul and Spain throughout the imperial period. Over time, patterns of interaction changed in response to the pressures and constraints of empire, but highly circumscribed networks of communities in which Roman power played little overt role persisted. Often these patterns demonstrably evolved out of antecedents embedded in local history, and involved active recollection of old alliances and enmities. Remembering is, more generally, a powerful socially constitutive act: time depth—a sense of a distinctive, shared past—lends definitions of selves and others a meaningful semblance of fixity. Accordingly, local pasts and the manifold ways in which social memories informed community identity comprise the subject of the following chapter.

3

LOCAL PASTS

❧

ᴇᴀʀʟʏ ɪɴ ᴛʜᴇ ʏᴇᴀʀ 70 ᴄᴇ, the uprising of the Treveri and Lingones under Julius Tutor and Julius Sabinus was gaining traction in north-eastern Gaul. According to Tacitus, an extraordinary assembly of *civitates* disposed toward a milder course of action was hastily convened in the territory of the Remi:

> A delegation of the Treveri was waiting for them there, Julius Valentinus being their keenest war hawk. In a studied speech he poured forth all the usual charges against empire, and reproaches and hostility against the Roman people, with a wild abandon to stir up revolt, captivating in his mad eloquence. But Julius Auspex, one of the leading men of the Remi, dwelling on the power of Rome, the benefits of peace, and the fact that while war could be taken up even by cowards, it could be sustained only at the risk of the bravest, and moreover that the legions were already upon them, kept the wisest men in check through their sense of respect and loyalty, the younger men through fear of danger. And so while they praised the spirit of Valentinus, they followed the counsel of Auspex. It is certain that the fact that the Treveri and Lingones had stood with Verginius during the uprising of Vindex had engendered opposition among the

Gauls. The rivalry between the provinces worried many: who would lead the war, whence would orders and auspices be sought, how—if all went well—would they choose the seat of the new *imperium*? There was not yet victory, but already there was discord, with some *civitates* boasting of their alliances, some of their wealth or power or the antiquity of their origins; through weariness in quarreling over the future, they settled for the present state of affairs.[1]

While the verisimilitude of speeches quoted in Tacitus must of course be treated with great circumspection, it is reasonably likely that in this rough sketch the historian has accurately preserved the general contours of the debate; as we shall see later, elsewhere in the *Histories* Tacitus demonstrably followed a source well apprised of the internal politics of Gaul.[2] That competing claims of great antiquity (*vetustas originis*) should have featured so prominently in the rivalry between Gallic *civitates* is striking. Certainly in the Greek east, the use of origin myths, foundation stories, or ancient history to authorize the present claims of one provincial community against another is well attested under Roman rule. Indeed Tacitus himself relates two such episodes in the *Annals*. In the first, Greek cities are called to account for potential abuses of the right of asylum. Each community in turn defends the claims of its sanctuary by appeal to the past, but ultimately it is determined by the consuls that, apart from Pergamum, most relied on beginnings hardly discernible on account of their antiquity.[3] Later, Tiberius attends a meeting of the senate to hear the debates between eleven cities of Asia over which was to have the honor of erecting a temple to the emperor, a competition which in the end comes down to Sardis and Smyrna.[4] Apart from presenting documentation of historical services rendered to Rome and treaties concluded with the Romans in various wars, each community dwells with pride on its foundation myth(s): the Sardians emphasize their Lydian identity and thus their fictive kinship with the Etruscans, while the people of Smyrna retrace their own ancient origins.

So the Greeks under Roman rule actively "remembered" their pasts, mythical and historical alike.[5] But comparable local conceptions of ancient origins are generally thought to be absent from Spain and Gaul; debates between communities in the memory-rich landscape of Roman Greece are

supposed to be of an essentially different texture from those in the "forget-ful west."[6] That Tacitus can, however, at least in certain instances, represent the function, if not the form, of social memory in the collective identities of Gallic *civitates* and Greek *poleis* as fundamentally similar must give us pause. Whatever the specific content of the *vetustas originis* maintained by the elites at this gathering in the country of the Remi, the fundamental point is that "the sense of belonging together is nourished by being cultivated in the fertile soil of the past . . . communalization is further strengthened by the conviction that what ties a group of people together is not just a shared past but a common origin."[7] Furthermore, in Roman Gaul the past was clearly a meaningful site of competition and negotiation: between elites, between communities, and between imperial power and local identity. This process exemplifies what anthropologists have argued more generally: that "at any moment socially organized knowledge of the past both reflects and affects the distribution and exercise of power . . . Contending versions of the past figure prominently in . . . the struggle for hegemony."[8]

In contradistinction to the almost parodic hyper-literacy of Tacitus' Greeks, who antagonistically cite obscure inscriptions and letters to buttress their positions, the memorial discourse of the Gauls in the passage of the *Histories* is markedly oral. Such a characterization reflects both a cultural reality and a historiographical precedent. Unlike situations that prevailed among the hegemonies, leagues, and organizations of the Greek east, there was no widespread custom in the west in the pre-Roman period of erect-ing public inscriptions that commemorated occasions of intercommunity exchange, or conspicuously projected the power of one community with respect to its neighbors.[9] This disparity in monumentalization between the eastern and western Mediterranean continued after the conquest: the new media introduced to the west along with empire—Hellenistic forms of pub-lic art and inscriptions—were implemented piecemeal and in limited con-texts, in order to communicate only a rather narrow range of messages, to audiences with specific expectations. On the whole, a localism of memory culture persisted throughout the empire. The fact that that culture in the Greek-speaking parts of the Mediterranean tended, as it had for centuries, far more often to express itself materially and literarily does not mean the west was "forgetful"; the non-adoption of the customs of others is hardly an argument for the oblivion of local traditions. Under the problematic in-

fluence of imperial and colonial discourses of the nineteenth century, how-
ever, scholars of the Roman world have been fixated on the existence or
absence of such histories and monuments, narrowly defined and evaluated
from the perspective of the modern western European viewer, as an index
of the sophistication of societies and their memory cultures. Accordingly,
they have found the provinces Gaul and Spain wanting in ways similar to
the dismissive treatment of the memorial landscapes of sub-Saharan Africa
by European powers: "There are no monuments of antiquity to repay the
traveler's search, no local history, and little tradition to supply its want."[10]
The internalization by historians of this trope of negation, characteristic of
colonial discourse, "whereby 'natives' are described in terms of lacks and
absences," has long complicated our understanding of the local communi-
ties of the west.[11] Many rich traditions were transmitted and rehearsed for
centuries without leaving traces in the epigraphic or historical record. To
the *civitates* assembled in the territory of the Remi, collective memories of
the past mattered a great deal; written records, organizing knowledge of
that past in forms intended for consumption by outsiders, did not.

Since at least the eyewitness account of Poseidonius, the existence of a
vibrant oral tradition had been a standard element of Greek and Roman per-
ceptions of the Celtic-speaking peoples of northwest Europe.[12] In the highly
schematic division of Gallic society found in the writings of Greek authors
of the Augustan period working within the Poseidonian tradition—namely
Timagenes, Diodorus, and Strabo—oral poets (βάρδοι) appear alongside
the druids (δρυίδαι) and the seers (ὀυάτεις) as an especially honored class.[13]
An important theme of the poetry of the βάρδοι seems to have been, unsur-
prisingly, the deeds of great men, especially those who had died well in bat-
tle,[14] but perhaps also heroic exploits more generally.[15] Most of the evidence
for the specific content of these bardic songs is embedded in the historical
context that occasioned Poseidonius' digression, the wars of the Romans in
121 BCE against the Arverni and their allies, who were led by the Arvernian
king Bituitus. Louernius, the father of Bituitus, was fabulously wealthy, and
had attracted the attentions—and the praise—of itinerant Gallic poets in
search of a patron:

> Once when [Louernius] had announced a banquet in advance,
> one of the poets of the barbarians arrived late and, meeting

the king on the way, extolled in song the king's generosity and bewailed his own misfortunate that he had arrived late. Entertained by the song, the king called for a bag of gold and threw it to the poet as he ran alongside. Picking it up, he again celebrated the king in song, saying that the very tracks in the ground upon which the chariot rolled bore gold and services for mankind.[16]

Bituitus himself was customarily celebrated in song by a poet (μουσικός), a kind of performance that the Romans themselves witnessed at a parley between one of his ambassadors and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus:

> The chiefs of the Salluvii, after their people [ἔθνος] had been defeated by the Romans, fled to the Allobroges. The Romans, having demanded their surrender, under the command of Cn. Domitius made war upon the Allobroges, who refused to hand them over. A richly bedecked ambassador of Bituitus, king of the Allobroges, met him as he was passing through the country of the Salluvii, and an array of bodyguards accompanied him, along with hounds . . . and a poet [μουσικός τε ἀνὴρ] followed, singing in barbarian verse [βαρβάρῳ μουσικῇ . . . ὑμνῶν] of the king Bituitus, then of the Allobroges, then of the ambassador himself and his ancestry and his courage and his wealth. For this very reason the prominent among their ambassadors bring them along.[17]

Thus this sort of oral poetry encompassed both praise of the present and memory of the past; in singing of the Allobroges, the bard may have recounted the story of the great migration of these "people from another country," which seems to have been current at this period.[18]

The fate of local oral traditions after the Roman conquest is unclear, owing chiefly to the tyranny of the evidence: explicit written evidence for orality, while not entirely paradoxical, is, as we have seen with Poseidonius, to be expected chiefly within the mode of ethnography, which tends to be conservative and antiquarian. Thus, the verdict of scholars has been generally negative, an argument from silence: if oral traditions had retained

importance, we would have more positive proof.[19] As for the disruptions in the transmission—oral or otherwise—of "native wisdom" due to alleged discontinuities in the provincial elite, they should not, as has been argued above in relation to the Coligny calendar, be assumed a priori to have been of the breadth and depth often stated by modern scholars.[20] There are three points to be considered in this regard.

Firstly, discontinuities are overstated. From the fact that the ancestries of "Gallic dynasts" of the Roman period cannot always be traced back to pre-conquest elites (very often they can),[21] or that certain religious practices associated with groups identified as *druidae* by the Romans were officially curtailed by the middle of the first century CE, it does not necessarily follow that there would have been profound "forgetfulness" in other aspects of local societies, such as genealogies, festivals, or origin stories.[22] It does not even mean that these kinds of now-taboo religious practices themselves were entirely forgotten, as we have observed in the previous chapters in the case of the sacrificial *trinqui*. Similarly, overemphasis on the adoption of Roman-style temple architecture at emerging urban centers does not support the general conclusion that empire entailed "a separation of people from their traditional sacred landscape."[23]

Secondly, even changes in the composition of the local elite would not have resulted in an untraversable rift between past and present, since knowledge and its oral systems of transmission in the communities of Gaul were probably not socially restricted (to three "classes") or rigidly delimited ("philosophy" v. poetry v. divination) to the extent suggested by Poseidonius and his intellectual inheritors. Caesar's claim, for example, that the *druidae* do not commit their memorized verses to writing "because they do not wish their learning to be spread to the masses," while it has been particularly influential in shaping scholarly perceptions of socially restricted knowledge in Iron Age Gaul, is transparently a highly Roman interpretation imposed by Caesar upon a cultural practice with which he struggled to come to terms.[24] The Greek (and Roman) ethnographic gaze made sense of the world in terms readily intelligible to the Greek (or Roman) mind-set, a common rationalizing tendency of which was toward analogical systematization, categorization, and classification.[25] The degree to which these rationalizations reflected cultural realities is indeterminate, but in the complex social landscape of early imperial Gaul, some imagined continuities at least did

not map simply onto the Poseidonian schema: the office of the *gutuater*—a priesthood with a Gaulish title that translates roughly as "voice-father"— was performed well into the second century CE, and implies a conservative oral component, if not a vibrant oral tradition.[26] Elsewhere, in Spain, local systems of knowledge—social and cosmological—demonstrably survived, at least in echoes, even the most potentially traumatic discontinuities like the obliteration of Numantia, and did so through non-monumental commemorative media like pottery.[27] In the vicinity of the Iberian city of Ilici, the painted decoration of locally produced ceramic vessels in the early imperial period hearkened back to the figural and vegetal styles of the third century BCE, and may have transmitted much cultural information that is now irrecoverable to us.[28]

Lastly, and in many respects most importantly, memory is not objective. It is a "social fact" in the Durkheimian sense; that is, it is the result of social and historical forces, and is therefore subjective and intimately bound up with self-representation.[29] Memory is thus not necessarily about authenticity, but rather about utility in such performances of identity. Authenticity is in turn rhetorically constructed in a discourse in which invention is also an important factor. Indeed, in this regard the dichotomy between authenticity and invention is a false one, for they are neither diametrically opposed nor mutually exclusive: some of the most "authentic" cultural forms are in fact historical fictions.[30] It must be emphasized that in Roman Spain and Gaul, objective continuities or discontinuities in social memory are not merely difficult to demonstrate, but, because they can be only incidental to ongoing discursive processes, they are actually less meaningful objects of analysis for the cultural historian than subjective, socially constructed continuities. Furthermore, while the Latin schools of Augustodunum or Corduba may have influenced the content of a memory of an event, they would have had much less effect on which sorts of events individuals and communities characteristically chose to remember, which are bound up with deeper patterns of identity.[31] Differences in commemorative choices are, generally speaking, internal to communities, not imposed from without.

Tacitus himself provides a caveat against uncritical reliance on the historiographical selectivity and commemorative priorities of Greek and Roman authors—whose perspectives we, as modern historians, have internalized to

a great degree—in the eulogy of Arminius, king of the Germanic Cherusci, with which he closes the second book of the *Annals*:

> Doubtless he was the liberator of Germania, and he dealt a blow to the Roman people not in its infancy, as other kings and leaders had done, but in its empire's full bloom. With mixed results in single battles, he remained unconquered in the war. He completed thirty-seven years of life, for twelve of which he was in power, and to this day he is the subject of song among the barbarian peoples [*caniturque adhuc barbaras apud gentes*], though he is unknown to the histories of the Greeks, who are interested only in their own affairs, and likewise not at all prominent in those of Roman authors, since, uninterested in recent events, we have celebrated ancient history.[32]

This is a fascinating and complex critique of the practice of history in the imperial period, which alludes to the existence of an alternative—yet significant—oral system internal to the communities of the *barbarae gentes* for the ordering and transmission of social memory that is almost entirely invisible in classical historiography.[33] Formulated differently, it is not that the barbarians were not telling tales of their past, but rather that Greek and Roman writers were generally not listening.[34]

There is indeed evidence for local poetic performances in the Roman imperial west. In Spain, from at least the time of the Sertorian War, "native poetasters" were composing verses negotiated at points of cultural and linguistic intersection, as at Corduba.[35] Such intersections continued to be generative: a fragmentary epitaph in hexameters from Pax Iulia (Beja) dated to the second century CE seems to refer to the activities of a wandering poet (*cantor*) among the towns of Roman Lusitania:

> . . . the world-wandering stars and all that which the earth brings forth, and the unconquered peoples, these together he sang from town to town.[36]

Among the themes of the poems that this individual performed were apparently the astronomical (*sidera mundivaga*) and the agricultural or mineralogical (*quae procreat omnia tellus*). But the third category—the "unconquered

peoples" (*indomitae gentes*)—is somewhat more problematic. Previous analyses have seen parallels between this text and poetic traditions known from Roman Africa.[37] Peña's suggestion, motivated by a comparison with the place of the barbarian *gentes* in the late antique epic of Flavius Cresconius Corippus, that the poems of this *cantor* were about barbarian peoples, at the fringes of empire, is ultimately difficult to sustain.[38] I would argue instead that, unlike the contemporary ethnographic rhetoric of Corippus, the *indomitae gentes* of this inscription—and these poems—are of the past, and that they are "selves," rather than "others"; that is, that the anonymous poet sang of local peoples *when* they had been unconquered, not the distant barbarians *where* they were still unconquered.

Support for this claim can be found in the close thematic correspondence between the poetry alluded to in this inscription and the *Georgics* of Virgil. Moreover, the specific Virgilian reminiscence of the phrase "he sang from town to town," which echoes the close of the famous "praises of Italy" (*laudes Italiae*),[39] situates our *cantor* more securely within the tradition of the bard of Mantua than that of the poetasters of North Africa.[40] Following to its logical conclusion this parallelism of the *Romana oppida* of book two of the *Georgics* and the (Lusitanian) *oppida* of this inscription, it is not unreasonable to read here reference to a kind of *laudes Lusitaniae*, a celebration of the region and its peoples.[41] In this reading, the *indomitae gentes* of the local past would be analogous to the golden age inhabitants of Virgil's *Saturnia tellus*,[42] though the content of the stories associated with them in this context are beyond our ability to reconstruct.

This interpretation raises a number of further questions, especially that of literary culture and the production and circulation of literary texts in the provinces. There were certainly other provincial authors of the late republican and early imperial periods working on local subjects within "Roman" genres: the Lusitanian L. Cornelius Bocchus composed a treatise on the natural history of the Iberian peninsula that was consulted by Pliny the Elder,[43] and the Narbonensian P. Terentius Varro Atacinus was the author of, among other works, a historical epic on Caesar's campaigns of the year 58 BCE (*Bellum Sequanicum*) and a work of geography (*Chorographia*), in which he seems to have located his native place of Narbo within the wider Mediterranean world.[44] Cn. Pompeius Trogus of the Vocontii wrote a world history into which he wove an account of his own people and family. Martial

vividly brought the Celtiberian periphery to the Roman center through Latin epigram. Pomponius Mela, a native of the Baetican city of Tingentera (Algeciras), composed a revisionist work of geography in the 40s CE that reflects a studied indifference both to the Homeric tradition that had long structured Greek descriptions of the world and to the map of Roman imperial power, and instead privileged a complex local worldview: that of a provincial who strongly identified as Phoenician, whose community had been forcibly transplanted by Augustus from the former Carthaginian colonies in North Africa (Tingis and Zilil) into the south of Spain.[45] The meanings of selves and others in his description of the world subvert Roman expectations: when he writes of inhabitants on the North African coast as "acculturated especially to *our* way of life," he means Phoenician, not Roman *ritus*.[46] Phoenician memories suffuse the text. At one point, Mela notes in passing that the Aegates islands off the north coast of Sicily are "worthy of memory because of the Roman disaster there," a reference that has long confused readers and earned the author a reputation as a careless historian: the Romans, as every schoolboy knew, *won* the battle of the Aegates islands in 241 BCE; it was, in fact, the decisive conclusion to the protracted conflict in which the Carthaginian hegemony in the western Mediterranean had first been challenged by Rome. But rather than carelessness, this is a careful local history, the "other side" of the imperial past. The phrase *Romana clade memorabiles* is ambiguous, as the memory of "Roman disaster" can refer to a misfortune either suffered or *wrought* by the Romans. If we recognize that Mela was writing from a *Phoenician*, not a Roman perspective, the meaning becomes clear: for the memory community at Tingentera, part of the Punic diaspora, the Aegates were the site of a trauma of profound historical significance. It was from this point that the old world of the Punic west began to disintegrate into Roman *provinciae*.[47]

Then there is the question of the extent and sophistication of local provincial engagement with the Latin literary canon. That the work of Livy was widely read in the cities on the coast of Spain already in his lifetime is clear from the anecdote, told by the younger Pliny, of a fan from Gades who traveled all the way to Rome just to meet the historian.[48] There is a fair amount of epigraphic evidence for the cliché and the commonplace in circulation in Roman Spain and Gaul: the first lines of the *Aeneid* appear in-

scribed on a brick from Italica,[49] and a miniature bronze statuette of a togate orator from a villa near Sostomagus (Castelnaudary) in Narbonensis bears the opening words of the first *oratio in Catilinam*.[50] But there were of course also more subtle readers, with tastes beyond Virgil, Livy, and Cicero, who recognized opportunities to appropriate Roman literature and redeploy it in local contexts enriched with new meaning(s): thus we find a challenging passage of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* inscribed on a votive altar to Lenus Mars, the warrior god of the Treveri in Belgic Gaul.[51] Such readers may plausibly have been attuned to "further voices" in canonical texts,[52] and may not have consulted the *Aeneid* as a straightforward and accessible summary of "Roman visions of the civilizing process," or have connected "Aeneas' mission" to the transformation of provincial cityscapes underway in the early imperial period.[53]

Turning back to our Lusitanian *cantor* in this context, it is unlikely that he understood Virgil simply as an architect of empire, as spokesman for a *mission civilisatrice*. In his own allusiveness, evident from only two verses, it seems that he did not miss the potential complexity of Virgil. Perhaps he was even deeply troubled by the inherent ambiguity of the fate of Turnus, who had stood in the way of Aeneas' mission, or saw in the *indomiti agricolae* of the pre-Roman landscape of the *Aeneid* an uncomfortable reflection of the *indomitae gentes* of his own country's imagined past.[54] The Saturnian age of the *Georgics* did, it must be noted, captivate the imaginations of other readers of Virgil on the periphery of the empire.[55] In short, this inscription aptly demonstrates the potential intricacies in the working of social memory and oral poetry in the western provinces: a Lusitanian poet, who represented himself in Virgilian terms, performed songs in which he remembered communities of an idealized pre-conquest past. These were perhaps not independent memories of the past, belonging to an indigenous oral tradition, but they were, at the very least, memories of an independent past that, through performance, may have become incorporated into new articulations of local tradition.

Building upon this groundwork, the present chapter will examine specific articulations of the local past in various forms, and will seek to elucidate the role that claims of mythical and historical *vetustas originis* or the identification with bygone *indomitae gentes* played in constructions of community and individual identity in Roman Spain and Gaul.

Local Foundation Myths

Foundation legends,[56] claims not only to great antiquity (*vetustas originis*) but also to shared origins (*communis origo*), are ubiquitous in processes of communalization. Though it has been argued that subscription to such myths is what distinguishes "ethnic" groups from other social collectivities,[57] this distinction seems to be too stark. To some degree all "imagined communities" negotiate their identity around a shared relationship to a meaningful point of inception in the past. The two foundation myths that will be dealt with in this section are those that I have termed "local," a designation which requires some explanation. By "local" I mean those myths whose primary actors (the "founders") are constructed either as indigenes, or as primordial, in the sense that they were members of no community before the act of foundation, without recourse to the etymologizing typical of Greek mythography.[58] While this definition is not unproblematic in its abstraction of the content of the myth from the nature and author of the source text, the fact that the agency of foundation in these stories is imagined to belong to locals ("selves"), rather than to Greeks or Trojans or Romans ("others"), makes them, I would argue, a valid and interesting category of analysis in their own right.

TARTESSUS

The Tartessian culture had flourished in the southwestern Iberian peninsula on the plain of the lower Baetis (Guadalquivir) since the 12th century BCE; trade connections with the eastern Mediterranean, especially the Phoenicians, are documented by literary sources and archaeological evidence from the tenth or ninth centuries, whereafter we find an increasing complexity in material culture and urban forms, as at the quasi-orthogonally planned and fortified settlement of Tejada la Vieja.[59] According to Herodotus, the Phocaeans, in their exploration and settlement of the western Mediterranean in the sixth century, were the first of the Greeks to establish contact with the Tartessians.[60] It was consequently in this period that the stock features of Greek perceptions of Tartessus began to crystallize, as discernible already in the lyric poetry of Anacreon: the idea, borne out of the experience of Greek traders, that the Tartessians were fabulously wealthy, and the attribution to them of fantastically long life, catalyzed by the deep symbolic associa-

tion in the Greek mind-set of the far west with death, or the transcendence thereof.[61] Stesichorus introduced a further element into this discourse, the location at Tartessus of the figure of Geryon,[62] who had previously, in the Hesiodic tradition, existed beyond the westernmost limit of the known world, in mythical space.[63] Thus, in a similar process to that by which Italy was intellectually incorporated into the Greek world through the Trojan wanderings or the returns (*nostoi*) of Odysseus, Tartessus, at the edge of expanding Greek geographical horizons, was made intelligible in space and time through Geryon. In later Hellenistic historiography—as we see reflected in the accounts of Timagenes and Diodorus, for example—Geryon is transformed from a mythical monster to a rationalized equivalent, a socially and politically transgressive barbarian tyrant.[64]

But, alongside this Greek mythographical tradition, there existed the following "local" foundation story told by Pompeius Trogus, writing in the late first century BCE, which survives in the later epitome of Justin:

> The Curetes inhabited the forests of the Tartessii, in which tradition has it that the Titans waged war against the gods. Their most ancient king, Gargoris, was the first to discover the use of gathering honey. When a grandson was born to him as a result of a tryst of his daughter, out of shame at the disgrace he attempted to have the child killed by a variety of methods. But, having survived all the hazards through some good fortune, he ultimately came into possession of the kingship, out of compassion for the many perils he had undergone. First of all, when the king had ordered him to be exposed and after a few days sent for the body to be found, it was discovered that the child had been sustained by the milk of various wild animals. Next, after he was brought home, the king ordered him to be cast into a narrow track through which herds were wont to pass; utterly cruel was he, who preferred his grandson to be trampled than to suffer a simple death. When there too he was unharmed and did not lack nourishment, Gargoris first threw him to hungry dogs who had been starved for several days, and soon even to swine. And so, when the child was not only unharmed, but even fed by the teats of some of the animals, he finally commanded that he

be thrown into the Ocean. On this occasion the intervention of some divine force was clear, and, as if he were carried upon the raging swells and heaving seas not by the waves but by a ship, he was washed up on the shore by a gentle current, and not long afterward a doe approached, which gave suck to the little one. From that point on through following his nurse around the boy developed quickness, and for a long time he wandered the hills and dales among the herds of deer, not any less fleet of foot, until finally he was captured in a snare and given as a gift to the king. Whereupon by the resemblance of his features and by the marks on his body, which had been branded upon the baby, he was recognized as the grandson of the king. In awe of the calamities and dangers that he had survived, the king designated him successor to the throne. The name given to him was Habis, and upon receiving the kingdom he proved to be of such greatness that he did not seem to have been spared by the power of the gods from so many perils without cause. Indeed he bound the barbarous inhabitants by laws and taught them to domesticate oxen for the plow and to sow crops, and, out of disgust at what he himself had endured, he compelled people to enjoy more civilized cuisine instead of their wild diet. (The trials of Habis would seem to be the stuff of myth, had not the founders of Rome been, according to tradition, suckled by a wolf and Cyrus, the king of the Persians, nursed by a dog). By this king slavish occupations were forbidden to the people and the population was divided into seven cities. Upon the death of Habis, the kingship was held by his successors for many centuries.[65]

This is a singularly remarkable myth, which has been overlooked or underappreciated by many scholars.[66] Interestingly, Trogus relates the Geryon myth as well, but in order to reconcile the coexistence of the stories, he has to set Geryon in another part of Spain, which results, at least in the abridged version of Justin, in a very muddled geography.[67] That Trogus was unable to fully integrate the two stories of the ancient history of the Tartessians with which he was confronted—Geryon and Gargoris/Habis—is yet another indication that these are two separate traditions, the one Greek, the other

local. Such a doublet of founders has been compared to that of Aeneas and Romulus/Remus,[68] a mythographical obstacle for writers on Rome that was eventually overcome by the Augustan age.[69]

Beyond the ascribed identities of the actors in this myth, there is a functionalist argument for understanding it as locally generated. Rather than serving primarily to situate and explain the Tartessians from the Greek perspective,[70] the core of the story of Gargoris and Habis is essentially an exegesis of internal social structures and cultural practices: the institution of kingship (perhaps even the genealogy of contemporary kings), the authority of the laws, the origins of social and political divisions, the establishment of cities,[71] and the more general Tartessian "ascent of man." Though we have only this tantalizing fragment of local lore, Habis, whose unlikely rise to power recalls numerous other legendary Mediterranean leaders,[72] seems to have been a central figure in the Tartessian imagination around whom aetiological traditions naturally accreted, for he is cast as part founder, part lawgiver, and part culture-hero.

The question of Trogus' source for this myth, or the specific point at which the story entered classical historiography from Tartessian tradition, is ultimately impossible to answer. It may have been derived most immediately from Timagenes, the importance of whose universal history for Trogus has been emphasized by scholars for well over a century,[73] or it could have come from one of his other Greek near-contemporaries with firsthand experience of Iberia like Artemidorus or Poseidonius or Asclepiades of Myrleia. There may very well have been a Latin source, perhaps from among the increasingly prominent families of Baetica. What is more interesting for our purposes than *Quellenforschung*, however, is the relationship of the myth to the workings of local social memory under Roman rule. Although archaeological evidence shows a period of transition in the Tartessian core region toward the end of the sixth century BCE,[74] it is now clear that Tartessian material culture was continued by the so-called "Iberian-Turdetanian" culture into the Roman period. In terms of cultural identity, there is a clear affinity expressed with the Tartessians in the names of the peoples who called themselves *Turduli* and *Turdetani*, ethnic groups first attested in the context of the Roman wars in southern Spain of the third and second centuries.[75] Even well into the imperial period within the Roman provinces of Baetica and Lusitania, these *gentes* differentiated themselves from the neighboring

peoples of the Lusitani and Celtici, who had settled in the post-Tartessian period in the territory that had historically belonged to the Turduli and Turdetani.[76] Along the coast of Lusitania, among the communities left isolated from the Tartessian heartland by these population movements, memory of comparative antiquity—perhaps a rhetoric that looked to the past to authorize certain claims in the present—seems to have factored into the identities of those who represented themselves as members of the *Turduli Veteres*, the "ancient Turduli."[77]

But there is evidence that local memory was organized and expressed in more complex forms as well. According to Strabo,

> [The Turdetani/Turduli] are reckoned the wisest of the Iberians and they make use of writing, and they possess collections of ancient memory and poems and laws in verse going back six thousand years, as they assert.[78]

It is certainly true that the Tartessians and their heirs made use of writing; an Iberian script referred to as "Southwest Paleohispanic" or "Tartessian" is widely attested on various monuments and inscriptional media from at least the sixth century BCE.[79] The claims of the Turdetani as they relate to their self-representation—the assertion of an autonomous, robust social memory and the subjective importance of this memory in constructions of community—are extremely significant. More broadly, the way in which the Turdetani seem to have represented language to themselves, as a vehicle for the expression and communication of knowledge independent of the immediate context, implies a well-developed ability to transmit their social memory in a logical and articulate form.[80] In the context of Roman imperial rule, these memories were propagated because they had legitimizing power in the present; the past was "reasserted in light of present needs for self-definition."[81] Even with the spread of the *ius Latii* to much of Turdetania by the Augustan period,[82] the body of traditional versified customs and laws (νόμοι ἔμμετροι) may have retained a meaningful—if renegotiated—place in society.

Finally, there are a few potentially illuminating points of contact between the Turdetanian claims reported by Strabo and the Tartessian foundation myth of Gargoris and Habis: each involves a long cultural continuum that connects the present with the deep past, and provides a source of social authority for the laws embedded in antiquity, while delimiting the

Turdetani/Tartessi as exceptional in relation to neighboring peoples.[83] Such an overlap leaves us to wonder whether the foundation narrative of king Gargoris was one of these collected stories of the ancient past actively remembered by the Turdetani,[84] a myth not developed in response to Greek (and Roman) cultural inroads, but possibly articulated in response to them as a performance of a self-confident local identity: their most ancient king was Gargoris, not Geryon; they were the descendants not of Hercules, but of Habis.

<div style="text-align:center">LUGDUNUM</div>

In sharp contrast to Tartessus, whose zenith as a Mediterranean entrepôt lay in hoary antiquity when Rome was little more than a cluster of huts on a hill, Lugdunum seems to have only come into existence as a political community with the foundation of the Roman *colonia* by L. Munatius Plancus in 43 BCE. Carved out from the territory of the Segusiavi,[85] this *colonia* was planted near the site at the confluence of the rivers Arar and Rhodanus where a small group of refugees from Vienna had settled some time before, after having been expelled by the Allobroges.[86] While there may have been limited occupation by the Segusiavi in the low-lying alluvial plain, archaeology has revealed no evidence for any substantial pre-Roman settlement on the hill that gave the city its name (*Lugu-dunum*, "hill of Lugus"), called today Fourvière (from *forum vetus*), where the heart of the Roman city developed.[87] Trenches discovered in the most recent excavations have suggested that there may have been some cult activity here in the late Iron Age, predating the foundation of the *colonia*, but the general impression of a site practically untouched by previous occupation remains.[88] As a result first of the administrative reorganization of Augustus that made it the capital of the three provinces of Gallia Comata, then of the construction of a road network radiating out from Lugdunum by Agrippa, and ultimately of the institution of the altar of Roma and Augustus just across the Arar at Condate, the city soon flourished as a political, economic, and cultural center.

Commensurate with its status within the empire as an "ornament of the provinces, to which it belonged and yet did not belong,"[89] Lugdunum developed its own mythological charter, which was on the one hand notably reminiscent of that of Rome, but on the other was markedly different in its retroactive assertion of local, non-Roman agency. The foundation myth

of Lugdunum derives in fragmentary form, ostensibly, from two Greek sources. The first is the *Galatika* of Kallisthenes of Sybaris, who related the following story about the genesis of the name of the river Arar:

> The Arar is a river of Keltika. . . . Previously it was called the Brigoulos; its name was changed for the following reason. Arar, having gone out into the woods for the sake of hunting, and having discovered that his brother Keltiberos had been killed by wild beasts, on account of his excessive grief wounded himself mortally and threw himself into the river Brigoulos, the name of which was changed to Arar after him. . . . Thus Kallisthenes of Sybaris relates in book 13 of his *Galatika*, from whom Timagenes of Syria has drawn his material.[90]

The other is the *Foundations* (κτίσεις) of Kleitophon, to which work an account of the origins of the community of Lugdunum was attributed:

> There lies next to the river [Arar] a mountain called Lugdunos; its name was changed for the following reason: Momoros and Atepomaros, having been cast out of power by Seseroneus, came to this hill in accordance with the command of an oracle, desiring to found a city. While the foundations were being dug, suddenly crows appeared and fluttered about, and they filled the trees all around. Momoros, being experienced in augury, called the city Lugdunum; for in their language they call the crow "lugus," and a prominent place "dunum," as Kleitophon relates in book 13 of his *Foundations*.[91]

Both of these "fragments" dealing with the Arar possess a certain unity, as they were incorporated into the same section of the work *On Rivers* of Pseudo-Plutarch, a peculiar text fraught with difficulties.[92] One of these difficulties is the author's penchant for excessive citation, which would have been admirable if only he had not invented most of his sources. Jacoby, despairing of discerning the "real" historians in the citations of the author from those who were pure fictions, smoke screens in an elaborate intellectual ruse, ultimately branded most of them as bogus, *Schwindelautoren*. Within this fraudulent framework, however, Pseudo-Plutarch does occasionally preserve reliable information. Kallisthenes and Kleitophon may be

invented, but there are good reasons to believe that the story transmitted under their names was in fact, at least in its basic outlines, the product of local discourse in early imperial Gaul.[93]

First, the onomastic evidence. *Brigoulos*, which in Gaulish would mean something like "forceful, impetuous," is not an entirely unsuitable name for the flood-prone Arar, and the etymology of Pseudo-Plutarch is now widely accepted by linguists.[94] Moreover, the river seems to have been generally susceptible to changes of name in antiquity: the modern name Saône derives from the goddess Souconna, whose worship at a spring upriver from Lugdunum at Cabillonum (Chalon-sur-Saône) was influential enough to begin to alter the common name of the whole river again by the fourth century.[95] As for the names of the actors in the foundation myth proper, Atepomarus is a fairly well represented Gaulish personal name and is also, significantly, the name of a divinity;[96] Seseroneus and Momoros are otherwise unattested, but might be valid Gaulish onomastic constructs.[97] The etymology of the toponym as "crow hill" is, though not uncontroversial in modern scholarship, probably accurate to some degree: *dunum* certainly means "hill" or "prominence," and it is very possible that *lugus* was a Gaulish metonym for crow, in addition to being the name of the eponymous divinity of the place.[98]

Then there is the iconographic evidence. That the crow was connected symbolically with Lugdunum is clear from several surviving representations of the patron divinity of the colony (*genius coloniae*).[99] On a series of ceramic medallions are depicted two figures: on the left, a togate man, perhaps a dutiful magistrate of the colony, extends a *volumen* with one hand, and on the right, the *genius* stands, nude but for a cloak over one shoulder, with his right hand on a scepter and the other holding a cornucopia, an allusion to the honorific title of Lugdunum (*Colonia Copia Claudia Augusta*); between them, perched on a rock, which is probably to be interpreted as an icon of the hill itself, is a crow.[100] The crow appears again poised upon a rocky outcropping on another medallion, with the *genius* pouring a libation on an altar.[101] A coin issue struck at Lugdunum by Clodius Albinus shortly before his defeat at the hands of Septimius Severus in 197 also deploys this theme, with the genius of the colony accompanied by a crow on the reverse.[102] Therefore not only does the story related by Pseudo-Plutarch have a local flavor, but it is even possible to see the civic iconography of Lugdunum and the foundation myth of Momoros and Atepomarus as drawing upon the same local vocabulary.

As an uncommonly well-preserved articulation of local social memory, then, this myth warrants a detailed analysis,[103] especially in the way that it epitomizes the invention of tradition for a community that had, as we have seen, essentially no past to speak of before the arrival of Munatius Plancus and his colonists. The complex dynamics of this invention are reflective of the social and cultural milieu of Lugdunum itself in the early imperial period. In this context, it is perhaps not inaccurate to characterize the myth as hybridizing in its rather seamless blending of local and Roman elements into a single, coherent whole. Modeled basically on the origins of Rome itself, the story casts Arar as the analogue of Tiberinus, who drowned in the Albula and thus bequeathed its eponym, Seseroneus as Amulius, and Momoros and Atepomarus as Remus and Romulus.[104] But despite the implicit authorizing importance of an imagined Rome revealed by such mirroring, Roman agency in the foundation of Lugdunum is, if not effaced, at least eclipsed by the role of Momoros and Atepomarus as *conditores*. Although nothing is known of the hero-god Atepomarus beyond his variable interpretation as Apollo or Mercury, he was honored by at least one individual who had served as provincial *sacerdos* at the *ara Romae et Augusti*, and it is conceivable that the adoption of Atepomarus as founder-figure capitalized upon certain preexisting mythological associations.[105]

The prominence of the crows during the act of foundation, only partly intelligible as a stand-in for the vultures of the Roman version, also suggests the integration of local religious traditions. Crows feature in divinatory practices elsewhere in Gaul that are reported by Greek writers,[106] and comparative evidence from the mythology of neighboring Celtic-speaking cultures, adduced with some circumspection, illuminates the manifold potential significance of the crow. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is their role in the Old Irish *Serglige Con Culainn* ("The Wasting Sickness of Cúchulainn") as revealers of *drúidecht* ("druidism, magical lore and arts") and harbingers of the hero Cúchulainn, who is, interestingly, the son of Lug (the insular Celtic reflex of the Gaulish Lugus).[107] Elsewhere in Old Irish tales, Lug has an even closer relationship with crows, as when they warn him of the approach of the hostile Fomorians, which has led some scholars to theorize that he was in origin a kind of crow-god.[108] Thus there may also have been a generative connection between the crow, Lugus, and Momoros/Atepomarus in the mythological universe of pre-Roman Gaul that underlies

the origin story of Lugdunum. More generally, though, crows are linked to omens in Old Irish folklore, and it is a cognate archetypical association that is probably at work on some level here.[109]

The articulation of the social memory of Lugdunum's past was, like all memories, context dependent. In the conversations between the younger Seneca and his friend Liberalis in the wake of the great fire of 65 CE that devastated the latter's native Lugdunum, it was the historical act of foundation by Plancus that was emphasized and used as a benchmark for measuring the relative newness of the *colonia*, still within the span of a single human life.[110] But the invented tradition of Momoros and Atepomarus served as a counterpoise to the newness and the "Romanness" of a city that had so quickly embedded itself at the very heart of Gallic society. Interpretation of this process of invention is complicated by, among other factors, a distinct lack of comparative evidence for an *ex nihilo* Roman colonial foundation whose origins were retrojected into a quintessentially non-Roman mythical past. It is indeed a rather unique inversion of the usual ethnographic methodology that we observed with Greek accounts of Tartessus, and to which we shall return below, whereby preexisting local cultures were fitted into the Greek (and Roman) worldview through fabricated mythologies and origins. In this case, Lugdunum is pulled in the opposite direction, retrofitted from Roman *colonia* to local *dunum*. On some level this development must have been a function of the exceptionality and importance of Lugdunum, especially paramount for the elites of the *civitates* of *Gallia Comata*, whose careers almost never took them beyond the confines of these provinces in the early imperial period.[111] But, whether or not the myth had its roots among this broader community of priests and politicians, all subject to the centripetal force exerted by the provincial capital and its institutions, Momoros and Atepomarus represented a reclamation of agency, and their act of foundation was the (re)creation of a place of memory, whose past was "remembered" because of its significance in present constructions of identity. As a negotiated synchronism was achieved between local and imperial time in the festival celebrated annually at Lugdunum on the first of August, so the mythical *conditores* seem to have coexisted with Munatius Plancus in the memorial discourse. When the eyes of the Gallic elite wandered up and away from the spectacles in the amphitheater at Condate to the summit of the hill of Lugus across the river, perhaps their imaginations were drawn not to the

monuments that now rose in brick and marble, but to the foundations once dug amidst flocks of crows.

Greek *Nostoi* and Hercules in the West

It is difficult to argue that the western Mediterranean was ever viewed by the Greeks as blank slate, a *terra nullius*. But there was a pervasive undercurrent in the Hellenic mind-set that engendered an interpretation of the west based upon its special place in the Greek experience, which took the form of a particular mode of dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the past of the west.[112] This domination was predicated not upon the power of empire but upon that of literary representation. The poet Stesichorus could, from half a world away, restructure the west through the relocation of Geryon to Tartessus, and thus authorize an imaginary geography from which Strabo, more than five centuries later, still could not extricate himself. It was ultimately not the endemic emphasis on alterity in Greek thought, but rather its somewhat incongruous parallel tendency toward synthesis that precluded the incorporation of the independent local pasts of the west.[113] As exemplified in the wanderings of Hercules and the "returns" (*nostoi*) of the combatants at Troy, Greek mythography was intellectually totalizing in its combination of an authoritative tradition and a malleable expansiveness: with the aid of etymology, the "Hellenic" origins of any place or *ethnos* could be "proven"; if a particular etymology was less convincing, the difficulties could be explained away by positing a "barbarism" of the Greek language. This "irksome attitude of Greek scholarship," as Bickerman calls it,[114] which came under attack even in antiquity by Jewish and Egyptian writers,[115] operated independently of imperial power, although Greek imperial and ethnographic projects did frequently enjoy a reciprocal relationship.[116] A case in point is the studied account of Roman origins elaborated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who could, at the height of Rome's power, undertake to prove that her founders were actually Greeks.[117] If the past of even the Romans, who by this point possessed a more or less "canonical" version of their own origins developed within some two centuries of Latin literary discourse, was susceptible to such historiographical revision, then it is not at all surprising to read in Greek ethnographies that the rustic and warlike Cantabri of northern Iberia had Spartan ancestors.[118]

Therefore, the fact that detailed literary records of native traditions of *origines gentium* generally do not survive is a consequence far more of Greek ethnography than of Roman empire.[119] For all of the debts owed to Greek ethnographic discourse by Roman writers,[120] it is difficult to find a comparable systematic restructuring of the pasts of the western provinces in Latin literature. Indeed, the Roman ethnographies that could be understood to be most closely tied to imperial motives—Caesar's excurses on Gaul and Britain in the *Bellum Gallicum*, the *Germania* and *Agricola* of Tacitus, and, to a lesser extent, Sallust's account of Numidian origins in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*—all avoid or undermine the typical Greek recourse to Hercules or Odysseus, and instead ostensibly privilege locals' accounts of their own origins, or are professedly agnostic in the results of their inquiries.[121] It was noteworthy to the Greek historian Diodorus that Caesar had found no traces of Dionysus and Hercules in Britain.[122] Furthermore, in marked contrast to the subtlety of the writings of Caesar, Diodorus himself invented a mythical foundation for the Gallic *oppidum* of Alesia (Alise-Sainte-Reine) by Hercules (Alesia from the hero's ἄλη, or wandering), which "as hearth and mother city of all Gaul" had remained unconquered until Caesar's defeat of Vercingetorix there in 51 BCE.[123] Rarely did a Greek ethnographic fiction stray so far from reality: at the time, Alesia was in fact a secondary, unimpressive settlement of a minor *ethnos* (the Mandubii), that had, as archaeological excavations have shown, been first occupied only a decade before it became famous as the site of the last stand of the Gallic resistance.[124] Diodorus thus used the imaginary Greek past, manifested in the presence or absence of Hercules at Alesia or in Britain, as a means of coming to terms with Caesar as conqueror at the edge of the world of his universal history, in a way that was rather alien to Roman, that is, Latin, imperial historiography.

In his ethnographic treatment of Germania, Tacitus, as we have seen in the case of Arminius, portrayed himself as listening to the tales of the barbarians that the Greeks, who were "interested only in their own affairs," generally did not hear. Purporting to have knowledge of the oral tradition of the Germani, "which is the only form of memory or record among them," Tacitus reports that they believed themselves descended from Mannus, the son of Tuisto, who was the "origin and founder of their people," and his three or more sons, depending on the variant to which one subscribed.[125] To this origin myth he gives more credence than to other writers' interpre-

tations of Greek inscriptions of the Rhineland as monuments of Odysseus' presence long ago.[126] There were similar opportunities for Greek scholars in the provinces of the Roman west to access and transmit local genealogical traditions, though they rarely availed themselves of them.

Asclepiades of Myrleia, who had taught language and literature (γραμματικά) among the Iberian Turdetani in the first century BCE and published a guide to the peoples of the region (περιήγησις τῶν ἐθνῶν), seems, as far as we can tell, to have ignored the rich local history alluded to elsewhere by Strabo and instead to have mapped the Homeric *nostoi* onto the landscape and its monuments. At a city in the mountainous hinterland of the former Phoenician settlement of Abdera called "Odysseia" (unattested elsewhere) he found a temple of "Athena," in which he claimed that shields and the prows of ships had been hung as memorials of the wanderings of Odysseus.[127] He further deduced that the founder of the small town of Ocelum in Lusitania must have been an otherwise unknown Trojan companion of Antenor, Ocelas.[128] With its title (περιήγησις), Asclepiades situated his work within the antiquarian genre of periegetic literature that had become increasingly popular during the Hellenistic period.[129] We thus might assume that, like the most famous of the periegetes, Pausanias, Asclepiades too had local "experts" as his guides, and wonder whether the stories of Odysseus and the Trojans had any local currency, whether they were told on what has recently been referred to as "the middle ground" between Greek and local cultures.[130] But given Asclepiades' intellectual background in the Pergamene school of Homeric criticism, and especially as a follower of Crates of Mallus, who had set the wanderings of Odysseus beyond the pillars of Hercules,[131] it is significantly more likely that he went looking for evidence in support of these claims and found it—at least initially—in spite of, rather than as part of, local traditions. Surely the community associated with the temple visited by Asclepiades, whatever its actual name and whatever divinity was in fact worshipped there, told their own tales to explain the monumental dedications within, but these were not the tales in which the Greek grammarian was interested.

But not every instance where we find *origines gentium* traced to Hercules or to Greek *nostoi* is necessarily reflective of an external, Greek claim to the past of the west, of the agency solely of bookish interpreters like Diodorus or Asclepiades. There are in fact cases where communities in Spain and Gaul

seem to have appropriated and rearticulated Greek mythological connections as expressions of local identities and social memories. Ammianus Marcellinus, who in the middle of the fourth century CE had crossed the Alps with his commander Ursicinus to depose the usurper Silvanus, claimed to have gathered during his experience in Gaul oral and written evidence of such memories:[132]

> However the inhabitants [*incolae*] of those regions [i.e., Gaul] affirm more than all else what I myself have read inscribed on their monuments [*monumenta*], that Hercules the son of Amphitryon hastened to destroy the cruel tyrants Geryon and Tauriscus, the former of whom was oppressing Spain and the latter Gaul, and that when both had been overcome he mingled with well-born native women and conceived many children, who in turn gave their names to the regions over which they had power.[133]

Ammianus, weighing this apparently contemporary testimony against the several hypotheses of Gallic origins that Timagenes had put forward four centuries earlier,[134] is unwilling to debate the various traditions at any length and ultimately confines his conclusions to the historical settlement of the Phocaeans on the Mediterranean coast. We should of course have liked for Ammianus to have given more information on the identities of the *incolae* with whom he spoke and more detail on the *monumenta* that he inspected, but even still there is much with which to work.[135]

The kinds of "barbarian" self-accounts alluded to by Ammianus that co-opted Greek heroes and their wanderings in the west, in which selves are framed by the imagined gaze of others, can be understood as a sort of "autoethnography."[136] Only impressionistic fragments of these provincial autoethnographies can be reconstructed: for example, if we take Trogus and Pliny at their word, by the Augustan period some peoples of the Callaeci of northwestern Iberia like the Heleni and the Grovi had to some degree internalized in their self-accounts the *origines* that Greek scholars like Poseidonius and Asclepiades had "discovered" for them.[137] Through such accounts, provincial communities placed themselves in Greek frameworks for understanding the world. But the place occupied by the Gallic or Iberian *incolae* in those frameworks was ambiguous: although they were descended from Greek ancestors, there was still a self-conscious undercurrent of "otherness"

in their half-indigenous origins. The "essential" ethnic characteristics that defined them were negotiated in this liminal autoethnographic space between Greek and barbarian.[138] Negotiations of identity in these self-accounts clearly seem to have moved beyond this binary, however: as the offspring of Mannus were for Tacitus' Germani, the sons of Hercules in turn become an etiology of local complexity and diversity as eponymous founder figures of the various *partes* of Gaul.

The *origines* that the *incolae* and *monumenta* of Ammianus affirm appear at first conventionally "Greek," and most scholars have treated them as such. It is, however, rarely noted that the figure of "Tauriscus" is nowhere else connected with Geryon, and in fact is nowhere else even attested; if this passage were derived from Timagenes, and ultimately from Poseidonius, we might expect this not to be the case. While the name Tauriscus is a patent Hellenism, at the root there is clearly some semantic association with the bull, which may actually betray a local Gaulish onomastic and mythological inspiration: the *tarvos trigaranus*. A pillar monument set up by the merchant boatmen of the people of the Parisii (*nautae Parisiaci*) during the principate of Tiberius at Lutetia (Paris) represents, among other subjects, the native woodcutting hero-god Esus battling a three-horned bovine creature labeled *tarvos trigaranus*, a Gaulish name meaning "the bull with three cranes."[139] This obscure myth seems to have been current well into the imperial period, at least in northern Lugdunensis and in Belgica;[140] on some monumental representations the individual figures of Esus and the *tarvos trigaranus* are not labeled, suggesting that they were generally recognizable elements in the cultural vocabulary.[141]

Although a full exposition of the dynamics by which this local myth may have come to lie behind the version in Ammianus is impossible, it is conceivable that Ammianus' northern Gallic informants pointed him to *monumenta* such as these, on which the basic elements of a narrative involving bull-monster and hero could have been discerned by the historian. In the course of the imperial period there may have developed variant local interpretations of the *tarvos*-Esus myth—perhaps the only variants that survived into the fourth century to be told to Ammianus—in which Esus was identified as Hercules and the three-crane-bull was rationalized as a tyrant called Tauriscus on analogy with Geryon. In other early imperial contexts, communities certainly found Hercules already in their midst: the Aquita-

nian Andossus and Ilunnus, for example, were reimagined as *Hercules Andossus* and *Hercules Ilunnus*; elsewhere, the Segusiavi adapted on their coinage Roman images of the hero to their own mythico-religious traditions.[142] Moreover, in some cases new mythologies were developed that made sense of these syncretizing acts of *interpretatio*. The Leuci of eastern Gaul seem to have traced the origins of their important local healing god, Grannus, back to Delphi, the famous seat of the Greek Apollo, if this is the meaning of an allusion found in the fifth-century Christian poet Claudius Marius Victor:

> Even before did Themis imitate the chatty winds from the exhaling earth and, afterward, lying Apollo tricked peoples and, compelled to change his residence hence, having been made the healer of the Leuci, now traversing the fields of Gaul as an exile he stirs up the German tribes with a harmful lie and deceives their barbarous hearts.[143]

Apollo in exile thus became *Apollo Grannus*.[144] Autoethnographic social memories like these did not necessarily obliterate previous traditions, but were in some cases clearly shaped by them and coexisted within a memory community. Since the expression of memory is socially conditioned and context-dependent, the nature of the *vetustas originis* articulated by an individual could have varied from one performance of identity to the next. Esus and Ilunnus were not always understood as Hercules, as Grannus was not always thought of as Delphic Apollo.

Hercules was a remarkably multiform and agglomerative figure in the ancient Mediterranean, behind whose name lurked any number of different divinities: Cicero famously enumerated six different "Herculeses," while Varro reckoned over forty.[145] Behind many of these manifestations of Hercules in Spain and Gaul lie local, non-Greek mythologies and memories, though only rarely can they be explicated. One of the most interesting cases is the Phoenician Melqart, who was worshipped as part mythical founder and part tutelary divinity.[146] Already from the fifth century BCE, Melqart had begun to assume the attributes of Hercules as a result of cultural contact between Greeks and Phoenicians, and ultimately this association spread to the extreme western edge of the Phoenician sphere of influence, where the god had an important sanctuary near the ancient colony of Gades.[147] Melqart appears in the guise of the Greek Hercules on the obverse of Carthaginian

coins minted by the Barcids at Gades from ca. 236 until the Roman conquest in 206, and, by the time Poseidonius visited the temple in the late second century BCE, it seems that he was regularly, if contextually, interpreted as *Hercules Gaditanus*.[148] According to the testimony of Philostratus, which derives from earlier an firsthand account, cults of the Theban and the local Hercules coexisted at Gades in the first century CE, and, in certain contexts, a syncretism between the two may have been possible.[149]

But the evidence of foreign observers suggests that the worship of Hercules Gaditanus retained an idiosyncratic character in the Roman period, for the cult practices of the sanctuary, as well the costume of its priests, are ubiquitously described as "Tyrian" or "Phoenician."[150] This characterization undoubtedly reflects to some degree the performed identities of members of the cultic community, predicated upon an emotive connection to an imagined ancestral *patria*; there was a heightened awareness of the boundaries between selves and others during the Gaditanian festival of the god (perhaps analogous to the major quinquennial celebration of the resurrection of Melqart held at Tyre), when foreigners seem to have been instructed to remove themselves from the island of the city.[151] In the wake of the Roman conquest, this cult bound together a wider memory community, beyond the confines of Gades. Between the expulsion of the Carthaginians from Spain in 206 and the uprising of Sertorius in 82 BCE, the former Phoenician colonies of Abdera, Sexi (Almuñecar), and Asido (Medina Sidonia) minted their own coinages depicting Hercules Gaditanus on the obverse.[152] Local traditions seem to have emphasized the role of Hercules Gaditanus/Melqart as mythical founder-hero: Sallust, who represented himself as having access to Punic knowledge through records compiled in the native language of the Carthaginians (*libri Punici*), relates that they believed that their Hercules (i.e., Melqart) had died in Spain,[153] and the geographer Pomponius Mela, himself a native of Tingentera near Gades, gives the further detail that his remains were supposed to have been housed there in the temple of Hercules.[154] Thus it was perhaps this aspect of Hercules Gaditanus—as a symbol of common origins—that catalyzed a sense of belonging together among these cities of the new Roman province of Hispania Ulterior, an ethnic identity renegotiated in the face of radical social and political changes.[155] Well into the imperial period, this divinity

occupied a prominent place in the consciousness of former Carthaginian colonies, as is evident in a votive altar dedicated to Hercules Gaditanus by two individuals at Carthago Nova.[156]

Neighboring non-Punic, Iberian communities of further Spain south of the Baetis river like Callet (Montellano), Iptuci, and Carmo (Carmona) also adopted, from about the middle of the second century BCE, the iconography of Hercules Gaditanus on their civic coinage, an indication of a more complex and nuanced place occupied by this divinity in constructions of identity than some scholarly interpretations of Phoenician continuity would suggest.[157] Like the Greek Hercules, his Gaditanian counterpart seems to have been deployed by "others" in their self-accounts; on one such issue of the Iberian hilltop city of Lascuta, the Punic script is even used on the reverse of the coin rather than the Iberian.[158] Clearly it was not just Greek frameworks into which early western provincial communities attempted to fit themselves through the co-option of "Hercules."

In Gaul there existed a similarly intriguing, though somewhat more obscure, local divinity masked behind the appellation Hercules. In his "introductory discourse" *Heracles*, the second-century Greek writer Lucian relates an anecdote in which he found himself confronted with a strange painting of Hercules in Gaul, whom he claims the locals call in their native language Ogmios.[159] Though some superficial elements of the iconography of this "Hercules" are intelligible to Lucian, like his club and lion-skin, the hero is otherwise unrecognizable: he is old and dark-skinned, with only strands of white hair left on his balding head, and, most remarkable of all, he drags behind him a vast throng of men whose ears are chained to his own tongue and who seemingly follow him with great eagerness.[160] As Lucian stands at a loss as to how to interpret the scene, wondering if by representing Hercules in this manner the Gauls are just "exacting pictorial revenge" for his offenses against the peoples of the west, a local wise man approaches him and, in good Greek with scattered erudite references to Homer and old comedy, explains its meaning:

> We Κελτοὶ, unlike you Greeks, do not connect eloquence
> with Hermes, but with Hercules, since he is by far stronger
> than Hermes. And if he is represented as an old man, do not be

surprised; for only eloquence is wont to achieve complete per-
fection in old age.[161]

Though many modern readers have wanted to see in the φιλόσοφος
τὰ ἐπιχώρια of this anecdote a veiled reference to a druid,[162] it has been
suggested that the unnamed Gallic interpreter of this passage is none other
than the sophistic philosopher Favorinus of Arelate, with whom Lucian may
actually have conversed during a sojourn in Gaul, or, somewhat more plau-
sibly, whose writings may have been reworked by Lucian in order to stage
a fictive and allusive literary encounter.[163] Writing in Greek for a learned
Greek audience, Favorinus does seem to have often adopted this kind of pos-
ture, to have self-consciously played the stereotypical "barbarian"; his ene-
mies in turn employed this *persona* against him in their criticisms, the noto-
riously Hellenocentric sophist Polemon referring to him pejoratively as "the
Celt."[164] But regardless of the specific identification of Lucian's anonymous
guide, he has provided an unparalleled glimpse into the local mythology
and local memory of Roman Gaul, presented through an autoethnographic
lens. What is particularly noteworthy about the content of the myth itself
is that behind a superficial syncretism actually lies a meaningful and deep-
seated rhetoric of difference, an act of remembering rather than forgetting:
though he carries a couple of the hero's token items, Ogmios is definitively
not Hercules, and, following from that, the cultural connotations and as-
sociations of rhetoric at Arelate and at Athens, even when practiced in the
same idiom, had the potential to vary widely. It is, of course, a great loss for
the historian that more "sound bytes" from local conversations on memory,
myth, and identity like this do not survive. But, even still, Hercules Ogmios
serves as a cautionary tale of the risks of oversimplified understandings of
interpretatio: in the space between the name of the Greco-Roman and the
local divinity we should not read an equal sign, but a question mark.[165]

Elsewhere, newly generated eponymous "Heraclid" founders of com-
munities in Spain and Gaul emerged in Greek and Latin literature of the late
republican and early imperial periods. As Erich Gruen has recently argued
in the case of Hellenizing stories of Jewish origins in classical ethnography,
these were not simply *interpretationes Graecae*.[166] Rather, they reflect to some
degree self-representations, active attempts by communities to situate them-

selves within a wider Mediterranean *koin*é through the ready apparatus of Greek mythography. The poet Parthenius of Nicaea, writing in the mid to late first century BCE, recorded that the namesake of the city of Nemausus in Gallia Narbonensis, the seat of the Volcae Arecomici, was a certain descendant of Hercules called Nemausus.[167] Hercules in Gaul was a topic that Parthenius treated in another of his works, the *Sufferings of Love*, where he traced the origins of the Celtae from Celtus, a son of Hercules and the native princess Celtine.[168] But ethnographies that etymologize from stereotypical ethnic labels like "Celt," which seem to have had little significance in the construction of local identities in the Roman period, are less likely to have been locally generated, and to be the kinds of autoethnographies in which we are primarily interested.

Nemausus, however, unlike Celtine and Celtus, was not an invention of Parthenius, but was actually in origin the local god of the spring that lay at the heart of the city.[169] The priority of the name of the community or the divinity is difficult to establish: the god of the spring, who had been worshipped since at least the second century, is only designated by name epigraphically from the middle of the first century BCE. It is perhaps most plausible that the eponym was only applied to the divinity in the post-conquest period, in a process of reimagining the community of Nemausus around a new focal point.[170] Roughly concomitant with, and perhaps connected to, the development of the eponym Nemausus and the divinity's acquisition of an illustrious Greek pedigree, his cult seems to have undergone some developments. First, toward the beginning of the first century BCE, the area near the sacred fountain was reorganized and monumentalized with a portico.[171] Later, in the early Augustan period, the basin of his spring was enclosed within a monumental sanctuary, and magistrates of the recently promoted *colonia* lavished their acts of munificence on him;[172] a *horologium* was dedicated to him, perhaps a further indication of his importance, at the center of civic time.[173] His divine sphere of competence was ultimately expanded beyond the confines of the spring, if inscriptions in which Nemausus appears alongside Jupiter are any indication, and the locally minted coinage of the colony from the triumviral period seems to contain allusions to his cult.[174]

The causal relationship between Parthenius' poetic mythologizing and the increased prominence of the god Nemausus archaeologically and epi-

graphically is impossible to reconstruct with any certainty, as is the degree to which any given local articulation of Nemausus was informed by associations with Hercules. But it is possible that the initiative for the invention of the Heraclid Nemausus lay with the people of Nemausus themselves, who sought, on the one hand, to focalize their community identity through an aggrandizement of their newly invented eponymous divinity, and on the other, to establish links between themselves and an increasingly interconnected Mediterranean world.[175] If this were so, both the fragmentary genealogy given by Parthenius and the monumentality of the sacred space would be responding to the same changes within the civic imagination. Parthenius' source for the myth must remain an insoluble question. Nemausus is entirely absent from extant Greek literature before Parthenius; indeed, this instance would be the first literary attestation of the city.[176] This fact makes it more likely that the poet was drawing upon a more contemporary source with some knowledge of the local discourse of Narbonensian communities, rather than the Hellenistic historiographical tradition that he is known to have used elsewhere.[177]

Like Nemausus, the Edetanian city of Saguntum (Sagunto) in Iberia laid occasional claim to Greek and, more specifically, to Heraclid origins. Saguntum is first known from a Greek commercial document, inscribed on a sheet of bronze, discovered at Emporium and dated to the second half of the sixth century BCE.[178] In the period of aggressive Carthaginian expansion in Iberia in the 230s and 220s, the Saguntines had forged an ill-fated diplomatic relationship with the Romans, which had guaranteed their autonomy and neutrality as a buffer state between the rival imperial powers; but the fall of the city to the perfidy of Hannibal had precipitated the outbreak of the Second Punic War. Its depopulated ruins were restored and reoccupied toward the end of the war, and it ultimately became a moderately prosperous town under Roman rule. Commensurate with its position at the intersection between Iberians, Greeks, Phoenicians, and Romans, the tradition surrounding its foundation was multiplex. The earliest evidence for the civic foundation myth of Saguntum is provided by Livy, at the end of the first century BCE, who gives only the bare notice that it was supposed to have been originally a settlement of Greeks from the island of Zacynthos.[179] This account seems prima facie almost unintelligible, for Zacynthos is not known to have planted any colonies in the west. But early Greek visitors and writers must have corrupted

the Iberian name of the city to *Zakantha*, from which an etymological and mythical connection to Zacynthos was no great stretch.[180] An unusual coin issue of Saguntum from the imperial period, on which the old Iberian script has been supplanted by Greek script, may reflect a community self-fashioning informed on some level by this invented memory of Hellenic origins.[181]

Local writers from the Iberian peninsula handed down the story of the Greek origins of the city as well. L. Cornelius Bocchus, a Lusitanian from the *municipium* of Salacia (Alcacer do Sal) whose career can be dated to the first half of the first century CE,[182] included an account of the foundation of Saguntum by Zacynthos in his work on the wonders of Spain, which was consulted extensively by Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History*:[183]

> And in Spain at Saguntum [there is] the temple of Diana, who was brought from Zacynthus with the city's founders two hundred years before the fall of Troy, as Bocchus writes; they have the temple below the *oppidum* itself—Hannibal, swayed by scruples, spared it—and its beams of juniper survive even to this day.[184]

Based on the detail of his description, Bocchus must have claimed first-hand knowledge of the temple: if the monumental remains of fifth-century Cyclopean masonry discovered near the modern church of Santa Maria are indeed to be identified with the *templum Dianae*, then he would appear to have located it accurately, in the lower city below (and to the northeast of) the imposing acropolis.[185] Therefore, it is also likely that the author was not merely parroting an earlier literary account, but that he had heard this particular version of the foundation legend articulated at Saguntum. It is clearly unconventional in its chronology, as compared to typical Greek ethnographic *origines*: any point "before the fall of Troy" obviously precludes the *nostoi*, while two hundred years can hardly be reconciled with the traditional date of Hercules. Furthermore, actual Greek *apoikiai* like Massilia did not retroject their foundations into mythical time.[186] The story told by Bocchus is thus suffused with a local color.

Due to its exceptional, if momentary, historical significance, Saguntum featured prominently not only in Roman historiography,[187] but also in historical epic, and it was the latter genre in particular that encouraged the further elaboration of its mythological foundations. Most noteworthy in this

regard is Silius Italicus' *Punica*, the first two books of which are devoted to Hannibal's siege and ultimate capture of the city, replete with tragic *pathos*. The poet introduces Saguntum through its threefold foundation: first by Hercules, whose companion Zacynthus died there on the return journey with the cattle of Geryon and so gave his name to the place; soon thereafter it was settled by refugee colonists from the island of Zacynthos itself; and ultimately its strength was augmented by a further influx of Rutulian youth from Ardea.[188] For the initial foundation by Hercules and the eponymous Greek hero Zacynthus, otherwise unattested, Silius has clearly followed a source other than Livy, from whom he otherwise derived much of his material.[189] It is noteworthy that this unknown source seems to have described a kind of *heroon* associated with Zacynthus on the acropolis, which may suggest knowledge of Saguntine monuments and the social memories in which they were implicated; perhaps the source was Cornelius Bocchus, with whose work Silius seems to have been familiar.[190] Archaeological evidence does point to the new local importance of Hercules in the years following the reconstruction of the city in the early second century BCE. As part of the reorganization of urban space, a temple was constructed above the "forum"; although the identity of the divinity to whom it was dedicated is uncertain, multiple images of Hercules—in ceramic and bronze—found in the immediate vicinity might suggest that this monument of "refoundation" reoriented the community around cult of the hero.[191] The argument that Hercules was a meaningful component of the civic discourse is further strengthened by the iconography of the coinage of Saguntum, on the obverse of which the hero appeared at this period and remained until the end of the second century.[192] As with Nemausus, the founder-hero Zacynthus seems to have been an eponym bound up with secondary processes of community formation. Through invented Heraclid origins, the city constructed a continuity with the deep local past that bridged the trauma of the Hannibalic war, and negotiated Saguntine identity at the intersection of Greek culture, Roman empire, and the Iberian landscape.

As these representative case studies have shown, the myth of Hercules in the west was highly malleable and susceptible to accretion: these were not cases of "identity theft," but rather reflect local communities exercising their own agency and innovating within the Greek tradition to (re)define themselves in the Roman world. In the process they discursively renegoti-

ated the meanings of monuments and public spaces, which were implicated in the shaping and expression of social memory.[193]

Landscape, Monumentality, and Memory

Dotted by thousands of variously organized communities, each with its own set of complex relationships to its hinterland and to regional settlement hierarchies, its own pasts, and its own monuments, the vast expanse of the west in the pre-Roman period was a tapestry of memory. Cityscapes and landscapes are repositories of immense amounts of cultural information, legible in various ways and to varying extents by different readers and viewers. Much of this legibility is dependent upon belonging to a particular memory community, for landscapes are inherently social spaces that are "produced, reproduced, and transformed through social practices"; the meanings of places within that landscape are embedded in the past and structured by long patterns of interaction.[194] Monuments, as calls to remember, are deliberate interventions in the ongoing processes through which such meanings are negotiated: they attempt to modify, fix, or appropriate the memories of places. Landscapes can themselves be monuments.[195] While the pace and results of historical change in these western memoryscapes varied widely after contact with Roman power, it is clear that the Augustan age was a fundamental turning point, as it was in Italy itself. The crystallization of a coherent imperial ideology, coupled with shifts in patronage and the emergence of new opportunities and incentives for elite competition, catalyzed the broader transformation of settlement patterns, as well as of individual cityscapes.[196] The expansion of epigraphic culture was an integral part of this process.[197] But it must be emphasized that the great wave of urbanization of the early empire did not produce a homogeneous provincial oblivion, an endless series of replicas of a model borrowed from the pages of Vitruvius. There remained remarkable diversity among the cities and countrysides of Spain and Gaul.

The Punic cities strung along the Iberian coast retained much of their character. The idiosyncratic temple complex of Melqart at Gades and the policing of urban space associated with its festivals, aimed at excluding "others," indicate the local limits of imperial homogeneity. The strikingly "Punic appearance" of Malaca was noteworthy to early imperial Greek

geographers, especially for the contrast that it offered to the cityscapes of neighboring Greek *poleis*; indeed, into late antiquity, the particular monumentality of Punic cities made their origins clearly legible to visitors.[198] Even at those former Carthaginian foundations whose urban spaces came to incorporate recognizable elements of a "Roman" town (forum, basilica, baths, theater, aqueducts), the inhabitants might promote an archaizing and "Punicizing" aesthetic in their extra-urban necropoleis: into the second century CE at Baelo (Bolonia), the architecture of tombs (for example, towers set on a quadrangular base topped by a pyramid), and the practices of funerary cult associated therewith, evince the representation and cultivation of different types of collective memories within a single community.[199] On the Balearic islands of Mallorca and Menorca, the megalithic towers (*talaiots*) and villages of the indigenous Talaiotic culture, such as those at Torre d'en Galmés and Torralba d'en Salort, already ancient when the first Punic settlers arrived, were occupied long into the Roman imperial period, and their enclosed sanctuaries (*taulas*), typified by arrangements of T-shaped monolithic structures, continued to house cult activity. While slight modifications were made to the arrangement of domestic spaces, and roofs of ceramic tile were introduced, these townscapes offered a dramatic contrast to Roman conceptions and experiences of urbanism.[200] At Ilici, in the coastal plain of Contestania, both domestic spaces and the overall urban layout were slow to imitate imperial models even after the implantation of a *colonia*.[201]

In the hinterland of Baetica, under the leadership of elites like "Urcestar, son of Tascasecer," old hilltop communities (*recintos*) like Lacipo (Alechipe), Iponoba (Cerro del Minguillar), and Ilurco (Cerro de los Infantes) negotiated the transition into provincial polities with Latin rights and Roman-style magistracies, while maintaining distinctively local monumentality ("Cyclopean" or other types of Iberian fortification walls) and characteristic features of pre-Roman town-planning (large cisterns).[202] Further north, among peoples like the Celtiberians, Vaccaei, and Arevaci, although settlement patterns began to shift toward the end of the first century BCE and many ancient hillforts were abandoned in favor of sites in the plain with better access to communication routes, some persisted, and their townscapes retained much of their pre-Roman character.[203] In certain regions, cities constructed in the Roman period seem to have been viewed as peculiar kinds of places, incompletely integrated into local ways of life: they served as monumental-

ized centers for periodic gatherings to participate in certain Roman-style activities, but were never occupied full-time by any sizable local population.[204] Even in Gaul, where many of the cities destined to become the capitals of *civitates* were laid out in the plain on greenfield sites in the early imperial period, the architecture of pre-Roman *oppida* seems to have possessed ideological significance, and to have exerted an influence on the monumentality of some of these new urban centers.[205] At towns further down the settlement hierarchy in Gaul, such as Mediolanum (Mâlain) in the country of the Lingones, the difficulty for archaeologists in readily distinguishing sacred from secular spaces or ritual from domestic contexts, either in their architecture or in their apparent functions, implies a "background level of continuity" for the local population of "special places, and the spaces in between."[206] A "disciplinary" Roman urbanism had its limits, and its discontents.

Examples of monumental writing in languages other than Latin offer another clear window into the plural experiences of viewing and participation in the urban centers of the western provinces, and suggest specific ways in which euergetists among the local elite attempted to script these experiences. At Tarraco, an architectural fragment from the façade of a late republican public building, spoliated and reused in the palaeochristian necropolis, reveals some of these dynamics. It consists of part of the capital of a column of the Corinthian order, together with the rightmost extent of the epistyle, which bore a bilingual Latin and Iberian inscription in finely cut block capitals, perhaps several lines long.[207] While the exact nature and location of the edifice is unclear, the combination of classicizing architectural elements with the indigenous language highlights the capacity of local communities to strategically deploy multiple cultural vocabularies in the monumentalization of their urban space, and contributes to a rough sketch of the complex memorial cityscape that was created as a result. As Tarraco, "the work of the Scipios" (*opus Scipionum*), was gradually transformed into a great provincial capital, successive generations of readers must have been compelled to respond to these invitations to remember. Down the coast at Saguntum, the Iberian script was used alongside Latin on monumental architecture at a still later date. A fragment of an architrave, probably belonging to a public building of the second half of the first century BCE, was inscribed with what appears to be a bilingual text—in Iberian with a Latin translation—recording the dedication of the building, or a part thereof, by M. Fabius Isidorus,

a freedman of an important local family well documented in the epigraphic record of the city.[208] Although, as with many other sites, there has been a tendency to minimize local agency in the monumental redevelopment of Saguntum from the beginning of the second century BCE in favor of the direct intervention of Rome (often with a settlement of Italians postulated as a convenient explanation for changes in material culture), the euergetism of Fabius, conspicuously acknowledging other identities and memories within the community, challenges such oversimplifications.[209]

Further inland, even within communities that had suffered still more recent traumas than Saguntum, where one might thus expect more profound discontinuities of tradition, monumental writing in non-Latin languages constituted an important means of reiterating connections with the collectively remembered past. The ancient city-state of Castulo, though it had been significantly depopulated following a doomed uprising against the Romans in the 90s BCE, nonetheless subsequently preserved many local cultural features in the public sphere. At the civic level, even after the script in which the legends of its coinage were written transitioned from Iberian to Latin, some local words seem to have been retained to refer to the magistrates on whose authority the issues were struck. Similar concerns with language and an awareness of the inappropriateness of Latin for the communication of certain meanings to audiences of "selves" are evident in the inscriptions. Toward the end of the republican period, an individual whose use of the *tria nomina* indicates that he was a Roman citizen—Marcus Folvios Garos, whose name may also appear on the civic coinage—set up an inscription at Castulo, five lines long and seemingly of a political nature, entirely in the local dialect. At a still later date, under the emperors, this type of strategic code-switching remained a viable choice available to the Castulonenses: an enigmatic inscription from the hinterland around the city lists the names of at least nine members of the local elite, who all possess Roman *praenomina* and gentilics (e.g., P. Aelius, M. Cornelius, C. Licinius), but record what appear to be their places of origin and their filiation in a traditionally Iberian onomastic style. While structured by vernacular concerns, the text is primarily written in Latin, and at least one individual had performed Roman-style magistracies (*duumvir*, *aedilis*, and *flamen* of the imperial cult). The final line of the inscription, however, switches fully into the native idiom, concluding with several words that, although their precise meaning is

lost to us, cultivate—perhaps affectedly—a sense of the untranslatability of some aspects of the local experience, of practices untouched and unknowable by imperial power. Monuments such as these reflect the resilience of localism in the face of the spread of Latin rights and the Latin language.[210]

Non-Latin epigraphy distinguished the townscape of Alesia in Gaul as well. The original *oppidum* of the people of the Mandubii had been reconstructed after its destruction by Caesar at the end of the wars of conquest, and, passing into the sphere of influence of the Lingones and then the Aedui, had gone on become a prosperous town in the early empire thanks to its metalworking industry.[211] But Alesia is a clear testament to the fact that material prosperity did not necessarily lead to homogenization and the loss of local forms of cultural expression or spatial memories: sanctuaries to quintessentially epichoric divinities like Moritasgus and Ucuetis utilized a particular kind of "interactive" architecture borrowed from the Mediterranean world—the portico—together with indigenous traditions.[212] Moreover, the monumentalized temples that developed in the Roman period at Alesia seem, in several cases, to have been located on the sites of earlier ritual activity, and the irregular orientation of some of them with respect to surrounding structures, such as the "forum temple" and its portico, may reflect continuities of place, and the integration of a meaningful emptiness; for, "in a group's memory, an apparently empty space may also be occupied by an earlier construction no longer visible, or its former location may have been marked in some fashion."[213]

It was in this memory-rich environment that in the late first or early second century CE, a public inscription in Gaulish—with no Latin translation—was erected at the sanctuary of Ucuetis:

> Martialis, son of Dannotalus, dedicated to Ucuetis this edifice ✆
> and for [or with] the smiths who worship Ucuetis in Alesia.[214]

With its subordinate clause and relative verbal form (*dugiiontiío*, "who worship"), this is among the most complex extant texts in the Gaulish language from the Roman period; at the same time, its letterforms and other visual conventions—such as the use of stylized ivy leaves as markers of important divisions in the text (*hederae distinguentes*)—conform to the contemporary epigraphic culture of the wider empire. But even these conventions were adapted in subtle yet sophisticated ways in order to convey further messages

in the local idiom: the *hedera* in the middle of the stone that separates the object of the dedication (*celicnon*, "edifice") and the conjunction (*etic*, "and") also divides the text into two parallel "verses," the poetics of which differ fundamentally from Latin. The inscription of Martialis at Alesia celebrates "an autochthonous Gaulish poetic tradition,"[215] and, similarly to other epigraphic monuments like the previously discussed Coligny calendar, its superficially "Roman" aesthetics flaunt, rather than mask, the perseverance of local knowledge.

Although, unlike Alesia, many ancient hilltop settlements had been abandoned by the end of the first century CE, their former sites were not forgotten by the communities that had transitioned to more economically advantageous locations nearby in the lowlands. These memoryscapes were revisited, as the traces of ritual observances demonstrate: a few kilometers uphill from Nertobriga (Fregenal de la Sierra) in "Celtic Baeturia," a group of votive terracotta figurines was deposited in the first century CE at the base of the wall of an *oppidum* (Higuera la Real) that had been vacant for over a century. The emptiness of the ruins must have offered a striking contrast with the municipal cityscape of Nertobriga, where in the Augustan period monumental building projects (forum, podium temples) had coincided with legal promotion and imperial honors (the title of *Concordia Iulia*).[216] In some cases the symbolic importance of these ancient places was commemorated through new inscriptions in non-Latin languages. In the second century CE in the territory of the Lancienses Transcudani, at the now depopulated site of a former Iron Age *castro* (Cabeço das Fráguas), a religious text in the Lusitanian language celebrating a sacrifice of sheep and pigs to a series of epichoric divinities was carved into a rock outcrop.[217] This ceremonial inscription, reflecting a pilgrimage into the past, must be understood in connection with the community of "descendants" at the foot of the hill, the *vicus* of the *Ocelonenses* (at the Quinta de São Domingos, near Pousafoles do Bispo), where there existed a small sanctuary dedicated to one of these divinities, Laepus. A number of altars, dated to the same period as the Lusitanian text on the height but inscribed with individual and collective vows in *Latin*, have been recovered from this temple.[218] Thus the two sacred spaces appear to be in dialogue with one another. The identity of the god casts into sharp relief the differences in language (Latin v. Lusitanian), media (Roman-style altars v. natural rock), ritual (votive object v. animal sacrifice), and landscape (occu-

pied *vicus* v. abandoned hilltop), which might be interpreted as "a systematic polarity," a consciously constructed series of oppositions that vividly reflect the negotiation of identity between past and present.[219]

There are numerous traces of other visual cultures, other monumentalities, and other memories in the cities, necropoleis, and rural landscapes of the western provinces. In the forum of Saguntum in the late republican period, a series of sculpted reliefs represented a complex narrative scene (or scenes) involving horses, dignitaries, combat with a monster, a gryphon, and a "laying on of hands." Although on stylistic grounds it is usually read as evidence for the post-conquest reorganization of the urban fabric along "Roman" lines and the production of "Roman" viewers, our difficulty in deciphering the content of the narrative problematizes such interpretations; the apparent structure of the monument to which these reliefs belonged, as well as some of their motifs, find their closest parallels in Iberian rather than Italian contexts.[220] Thus local mythologies may have adorned new public spaces at Saguntum, resulting in an amalgam of memories and monumentalities that gives the forum the feel of a careful allusion to, rather than a direct quotation of, an imperial "source." Among the Celtici of Baeturia or the Salluvii of southern Gaul, the inspiration behind certain architectural elements found on public buildings that otherwise echo Greek or Roman models seems to have been a rather grisly pre-Roman "architecture of human heads": the porticoed Hellenistic "prytaneion" at the Salluvian center of Glanum subtly incorporates references to head-cult to articulate a vision of the place of the local elite in the wider Mediterranean world, between tradition and cosmopolitanism; two centuries later at Arucci (Aroche) in the province of Baetica, archaizing architectural head sculptures may reflect the same tensions.[221]

Beyond the walls of the city, extra-urban funerary art of the first century CE often represents local cosmology and society alongside Latin epitaphs. Monuments from Aquitania depicting riders on horseback galloping between a sea filled with fantastical animals and the heavens, or the iconographic programs of stelae from Lara de los Infantes in the country of the Turmogidi that allude to popular motifs of the pre-Roman period—hunting scenes, equestrian figures, astral symbols—demonstrate complex commemorative strategies aimed at local viewers conversant in multiple visual and verbal languages.[222] Even in cases where Roman-era funerary rites

were ephemeral and no epitaph was erected, the landscape itself might serve as a monument. At Pozo Moro, near Saltigi (Chinchilla de Monte-Aragon), an important necropolis had developed at the end of the sixth century BCE around a princely tomb, a tower-shaped structure decorated in reliefs representing mythological monsters that constitutes one of the most fascinating examples of pre-Roman art from the peninsula. Over the next four centuries, the legacy of this individual attracted several dozen further burials. After a hiatus in the late republican and early imperial periods, funerary activity resumed under the Flavians; between ca. 70 and 120 CE, two individuals, whose grave goods comprise a mixture of local and Roman material, deliberately chose this rural location as their final resting place. The original *monumento turriforme* was no longer visible, but the significance of this site was clearly preserved in the oral social memory of provincial communities in the vicinity, certain of whose members sought to augment their own status or project a particular local identity by aligning themselves with the social and cultural authority of pre-Roman topography, constructing continuities with the distant past across very real discontinuities.[223] Conspicuous monuments of bygone ages continued to be important features in the landscape, not only as foci for burial, but also as evocative media for expressions of local anxieties as the cultural horizons of provincial communities rapidly expanded with increased integration into the world of the Roman Mediterranean. At Kervadol, in Aremorica, a monolithic conical pillar of a type that was widespread in the region in the Iron Age was reworked in the Roman period, carved with six figures in bas-relief across four panels that encircled the base. Although the minimalist iconography of these figures alludes vaguely to conventional representations of Roman gods—one bears an animal skin, another a caduceus—to identify them unproblematically as "Hercules" and "Mercury" obscures the inherent ambiguity and polyphony of the palimpsest.[224]

The landscape was turned into a place of memory in still more dramatic fashion at Ribemont-sur-Ancre, in the country of the Aulerci in northern Gaul. Around the middle of the third century BCE, within a large enclosure a kind of charnel house was constructed upon what appears to have been the site of a great battle, containing, and perhaps displaying in its architecture, the bones of hundreds, if not thousands, of dead men, along with their spoils.[225] Maintained throughout the second and first centuries BCE as a vic-

tory monument (or "trophée," as the excavators designate it), the structure
and its adjacent "esplanade" were used periodically for public ritual activity,
including the votive dedication of weapons and feasting; return, remem-
brance, and rehearsal indicate the continued importance of the place in the
imagination of the community. A generation after the Roman conquest, in
the early Augustan period, the monument was scrupulously dismantled and
the sacred enclosure carefully leveled, as preparation for the construction
of a wooden temple of a new style in its place, which was succeeded within
the first decades of the first century CE by one built in stone. In the course of
the imperial period, the complex underwent further monumentalization,
but these additions seem, for the most part, to have reiterated, rather than
obliterated, the previous significance of its spaces: the two quadriporticos
that were laid out in the Flavian period perfectly respected the original or-
ganization of sacred and profane areas that had been delimited by ditches
and wooded palisades. Besides the deliberate architectural reference to
earlier phases, artifactual evidence points to continuities in use (feasting
and assembly in the "esplanade" or forecourt), and suggests that the cult
remained fundamentally public in nature: somewhat unusually for a sanc-
tuary in Gaul, there is no trace of private, votive offerings. The meanings of
this place for the Aulerci were clearly informed by collective memories of its
past. Whether precise recollections of the ancient battle and the associated
"trophy" persisted across the centuries cannot be determined; if the scenes
from the monumental frieze that adorned the later temple are narrative,
the story that they tell resists interpretation. But it is certainly conceivable
that at least a vague reminiscence of a primordial conflict, central to the
self-account of the community, was perpetuated through the ritual revisita-
tion of the site. In the end, the remarkable unbroken sequence at Ribemont,
from the third century BCE to the third century CE, ought to encourage us
to reconsider the categorical assertion that, in the provinces of the Roman
west, "monuments did not celebrate historical events."[226] Knowledge of the
past is often organized and articulated in forms that are unrecognizable
to outside observers; that Ribemont does not at first glance resemble the
imperial war memorial in Moesia discussed at the end of the Chapter 2,
that its "historical" content is not immediately legible, does not negate its
monumentality. Its call to remember was not silent, but rather only audible
to a local listener.

Many of the local practices through which the rural landscape was imbued with meaning will have left no traces in the archaeological record. Among these was the cult of trees, which might be endowed with ritual and symbolic importance, becoming focal points for community meetings or otherwise shaping movement; in his survey of the countryside around his native Bilbilis, Martial refers to the "sacred oak grove of Buradon," through which it was apparently taboo to pass except on foot.[227] On rare occasions, epigraphic monuments render manifest otherwise invisible modes of interacting with natural features in the environment. In the countryside east of the city of Urso (Osuna), in central Baetica, a votive stele was set up to "the sacred tree" (*arbor sacra*), in accordance with a vision witnessed by the dedicant; near Segobriga, in the Meseta at the southern edge of Celtiberia, rock-cut reliefs and votive inscriptions from the Roman period preserve the memory of what has been interpreted as a pre-Roman sacred forest; among the Convenae of the Pyrenean foothills of Aquitania, another group of votive inscriptions attests to the cult of "six trees" or "six-tree god" (*sex arbores, sex arbor deus*); across the river Garumna in the country of the Santones, the "oak god" received cult alongside the *genius* of the place.[228] Well into late antiquity, these local sites of tree cult were still prominent enough to attract the notice of outside observers. Martin, the bishop of Caesarodunum (Tours) in the second half of the fourth century, was actively involved in the destruction of a number of traditional, monumentalized sacred spaces in the countries of the Turoni, the Aedui, and the Bituriges Cubi in central Gaul. In the village (*vicus*) of Leprosum (Levroux), southeast of Tours, he destroyed a temple of the god Cosusus, which had over the centuries been adorned with many votive offerings of the Bituriges. But elsewhere in the vicinity, he also targeted trees:

> When he had destroyed in a certain village a very ancient temple and then started to cut down a pine tree, which was near the shrine, the priests of that place and a crowd of locals began to oppose him. And although they had stood silently by . . . while the temple was dismantled, they would not allow the tree to be chopped down. Zealously he informed them that there was nothing sacred in its trunk . . . that it was proper for the tree to be chopped down, since it had been dedicated to a demon.[229]

That the locals did not intervene in the destruction of the monumental temple but resisted the removal the tree was proof, to the zealot, of the emptiness of their superstition; understood from a somewhat different historical perspective, it is rather a sign of discrepant modes of reading and valuing the memorial landscape.

The testimonies of vexed churchmen across the west highlight the continued reproduction by local populations of "alternative landscapes" articulated by other kinds of natural features: in the late sixth century, the bishop of Bracara in Callaecia wrote an exasperated attack against the persistent ritual practices of the inhabitants of the local countryside not just around trees, but also at rocks and bodies of water.[230] Sidonius, who went on to become bishop among the Arverni, smiled at the tales of the neighboring Gabali, whose locals (*indigenae*) told of a lofty city (*sublimis urbs*) that could be seen in a certain pool or well.[231] Taking an aloof and skeptical posture, he is uninterested in providing the reader with further details, but the oblique reference seems to hint at the kinds of stories or myths that might have been associated with such places. As with tree cult, it is clear that the ritual practices associated with sacred waters were far more widespread than can be reconstructed from the archaeological record, in which they left relatively faint traces because of their frequently ephemeral nature (such as throwing bread into a flowing stream). But many spring sites were ultimately monumentalized. Within Bracara itself, in fact, a water shrine was dedicated in the early imperial period to the god *Tongus Nabiagus* by Celicus Fronto, who hailed from Arcobriga, and belonged to the people of the Ambimogidi. As a member of the elite of one of the minor surrounding *gentes*, he was perhaps drawn by the centripetal force of the capital of the newly organized *conventus*, and, even as an "outsider," wished to acknowledge its sacred topography and to leave his own mark on its townscape. In both of these respects, Fronto's sanctuary was a success: many years later, one of his grandsons and two of his great-grandsons returned to Bracara and restored the monument, proudly proclaiming their ancestral connection to Celicus Fronto.[232] In Gaul, the cases of Nemausus and Bibracte, sacred springs and divinities at the heart of nucleated settlements, have been discussed already, but the healing sanctuary that developed in the country of the Lingones around the sources of the river Sequana and its eponymous goddess (*fontes Sequanae*, Saint-Germain-Sources-Seine), complete with a peristyle courtyard,

is another interesting example of the negotiation of the sacred landscape between authenticity and invention. Sequana was already drawing large numbers of worshippers from the early Roman period: among the extraordinary collection of hundreds of votive statuettes in both stone and wood recovered from her waters are many representations of pilgrims, wearing the distinctive local traveler's cloak (the *bardocucullus*).[233] While this particular genre of material devotion began only at the end of the first century BCE, concomitant with the first phase of building on the site and influenced by Hellenistic and Roman practices, the importance—ritual or otherwise—of Sequana and her spring to the Lingones and the surrounding peoples may have extended further back in time, or at the very least have been imagined to be more ancient than was the case in reality.[234] Such rural sites, closely connected to eponymous divinities, are fertile ground for the invention of tradition. The monumental verse inscription from a contemporary early first-century sanctuary dedicated to the unnamed water spirits (*nymphae*) who dwelt around the sources of the much smaller river Ura (Eure) near Ucetia explicitly reaches back into the past, and suggests that memories of meaningful places might have been especially curated within families or kinship groups:

> Sextus Pompeius, who is called by the cognomen Pandus, to whom this place passed down from his ancestors, built this shrine (*aedicula*) to the nymphs, since he often enjoyed this spring (*fons*) as an old man just as much as he had as a boy.[235]

Rock sanctuaries, the Bracaran bishop's other target for censure, also had a long-standing significance in the sacred topography of Iberia, especially in borderlands between communities and ethnic groups, and sites like Peñalba de Villastar, with its Celtiberian and Latin graffiti, provide dramatic evidence of the great lengths—and heights—to which local "pilgrims" in the Roman period were willing to go in order to connect with places of collective symbolic importance and inscribe them with renegotiated meanings.[236] In a similar vein, caves were another natural locus of memory. In the country of the Autrigones, a series of inscriptions carved in a cave above the valley of the river Neroua (the modern Río Nervión) record a remarkable spelunking adventure of a band of "brave men" (*viri fortes*) and their leader Nicolavus on the 27th of October, 235 CE.[237] About 350 meters from the en-

trance of the cave, in an area that shows evidence of having been frequented by torch-bearing groups in antiquity, is the first group of texts, now partly illegible, inscribed on a single "panel":

> Placidus came here, [in fulfillment of a?] vow.

> He who came here before, and wrote the words above, feared to go further. Read the right-hand wall here and when. . . .

> Ten . . . vow . . . [several words too worn to read] most dear. . . .

Near this panel is another, with a solitary graffito:

> Go four thousand steps further until Severus [illegible] . . . Nicolavus was here with a group of men numbering [illegible] on the 27th of October, in the year when Severus and Quintianus were consuls.

Beyond a deep pit, which presented an obstacle to further progress, the subterreanean passage continues. The exploration of Nicolavus and his companions ended some 300 meters deeper into the cave, where a final text was found:

> Here, brave men . . . came under the leadership of Nicolavus on the 27th of October, in the year when Severus and Quintianus were consuls. Nine men [made it this far].

The exact meaning of these graffiti, and of the activities that they commemorate, is unclear, but the cave seems to have been the venue for some local tradition. Mentions of vows being undertaken and the attention paid to the "failure" of some previous visitors to reach the "end" of the quest on account of fear give this the air of a rite of passage, or an initiation, or perhaps even a pilgrimage.[238] The relatively late date of the documented participation in this tradition illuminates the potential longevity of ritual topography.

Other caves in Roman Spain bear traces of a chronology of centuries, if not millennia, as sites of memory. At the Cova dels Moros, not far from Ilerda (Lleida) in the country of the Ilergetae in the northeast of Iberia, inscriptions in the regional Iberian script were scratched on the walls around remarkable prehistoric Levantine paintings of animals and dancing women, thousands of years older than the introduction of the alphabet. Subsequently,

toward the end of the first century BCE, an individual with a Roman name left a simple graffito in Latin: "Secundio made a vow." Some time later in the imperial period, a local poetaster added his own contribution, the textual arrangement of which adapted to the layout of the ancient paintings: "Here a boundary was not fixed, but I seek what hangs overhead, thus sings Novalis . . . he defends, for himself alone he makes ten."[239] When Novalis sang his hymn and scratched these obscure lines into the wall of the cave, he engaged with deeply layered local past; he could read the earlier Latin vow, and perhaps he vaguely recognized that the other texts, even if he could not read their script, were in the language of his pre-Roman ancestors; about the artwork, the antiquity of which he could not have fathomed, he may have heard stories, or invented his own.[240]

Landscape, monumentality, and memory coalesced in the cult of local heroes. In archaic, classical, and post-classical Greece, hero cult served as an important means to construct competing conceptions of the past and to cement a sense of community,[241] but the place of heroes in the Roman west has received comparably little scholarly attention.[242] This is in part due to the simple fact that *hero*—in the strict sense—is an essentially Greek linguistic and religious category, which finds no exact parallel at Rome, or among the cultures of Gaul and Spain. But, understood in a broader sense, local heroes can be seen to have fulfilled many of the same roles in the communalization processes of the western Mediterranean as they did in the Greek world. Nicander of Colophon, for example, writing in the second century BCE, described certain ritual practices among pre-conquest Celtic-speaking peoples that, even allowing for the analogizing tendencies of the Greek ethnographic gaze, bear comparison with hero cult:

> Concerning visions in the night we are met with the objection that the dead are often seen, and not without effect. For the Nasamones customarily receive private oracles through frequenting the tombs of their ancestors, as Heraclides and Nymphodorus and Herodotus write, and the Celtae for the same reason stay out all night at the graves of their heroes [*viri fortes*], as Nicander attests.[243]

For the purposes of this discussion, then, the "hero" is defined as an exceptional individual (Nicander's deceased *vir fortis*), whose commemoration, lo-

calized in a monument, was intended to link the contemporary community with a form of power embedded in the past.[244]

One of the most striking manifestations of this desire to link past and present is the genre of anthropomorphic stone sculpture widely distributed among the hilltop *oppida* ("castros") of the northwest Iberian peninsula, referred to as the "Lusitanian" or—more accurately—"the Galician warriors." With their small bucklers, short swords, and linen cuirasses, these figures accord very well with Strabo's description of the typical accoutrement of the Callaeci and Lusitani.[245] While their chronology is complicated by the general lack of reliable stratigraphic contexts, based on epigraphic evidence and the occupational phasing of the *oppida* with which they are associated, they can be dated with some confidence to the late first century BCE and the first century CE.[246] These statues have been convincingly interpreted as representations of heroicized *principes*, local elites who are known to have operated within the non-Roman power structure that prevailed in the area at least until the administrative reorganization under the Flavians.[247] The names and filiations of some of these *principes* are inscribed on their shields or tunics: Clodamus, son of Corocaudus; Malceinus, son of Dovilo.[248] On others of the warrior statues, such as one of those found at Monte Mozinho, the name of the subject is preceded by the qualification "god" (*deus*),[249] perhaps an indication of the potential fluidity of the demarcation between historical *princeps* and divinized hero.

Of great importance for understanding the social significance of these monuments is their relationship to the physical space of the *oppidum*. Those found *in situ* were conspicuously positioned overlooking the main gate, suggesting that they functioned as symbolic guardians of the community.[250] In conjunction with this tutelary purpose, the warriors can be further understood as the embodiment—quite literally—of the community. At Santa Comba, for example, the monumental statue was set up as a kind of totem by local artisans for the projection of their complex civic and ethnic identity: as citizens of Calubriga, and as members of the wider *gens* of the Albini.[251] But heroes are not stable entities; the past is continually contested, reappropriated, and obliterated. Local identities, like those focalized through the Galician warriors, are discursive constructs, and, as Brow has noted, "in the universe of discourse, the basis of community is always vulnerable to challenge."[252] We can observe the result of such challenges in the destruction of

the warrior statue at the *oppidum* of Sanfins in the first half of the first century CE. The feet were left *in situ* outside the main gate, while the other fragments were ritually deposited in a sacred space in the center of the settlement.[253] The specific meaning of this statement is difficult to reconstruct. It may have been a reaction against traditional forms of aristocratic authority like the *principes*, but at the very least it represents a civic reorientation, a reimagining of the community. There may have been similar tensions among other peoples of Callaecia at this period, differing interpretations of the past and divergent visions for the future. By the last quarter of the first century CE, the Quarquerni had shifted the seat of their community four kilometers south, from the ancient capital at the *castro* of Meidunium (Rubías) to a Roman-style planned town, complete with thermal baths, in the valley of the river Limia named *Aquae Quarquernae*, or "the Waters of the Quarquerni."[254] But the old site, haunted by statues of heroicized chieftains of the pre-Roman past, was not entirely forsaken, as an honorific inscription to Trajan set up there sometime after 100 CE makes clear.[255] Traditional local forms of monumentality continued at Meidunium, suggesting that the hillfort persisted as an important site of memory and an alternative, scenic venue for some forms of aristocratic display and collective performance. There was an awareness of something lost in the translation to the emerging spa-town in the plain below.

In Gaul, heroes were monumentalized in different forms, but ultimately to similar ends. Among the people of the Gabali in the province of Aquitania, an inscription records the dedication of an anonymous *heroum* on a rural villa site:

> Lucius Severius Severus, son of Lucius Severius . . . having performed all of the offices in his *civitas*, and who constructed this villa from the ground up, and Decimus Severus, the elder of his sons, constructed this *heroum* for the wellbeing of himself and his family.[256]

It is worth noting that the word *heroum* is only attested nine times in all of Latin epigraphy, with this being the only instance outside Italy; it is therefore a marked term, a meaningful choice. The specifically votive connotation of the dedicatory phrase *pro salute sua et suorum* renders it all but impossible that *heroum* here refers to a tomb of Severus and his family, that is,

a synonym for *sepulcrum* or *monumentum*; mere funerary edifices are never dedicated in this language.[257] Thus we seem to be confronted with a hybrid monument, one which borrows Greek vocabulary and cultural forms in order to commemorate an unknown local hero. Community and *heroum*, present and past are rhetorically linked through Severus' self-representation in this inscription; his performance of identity contextualizes his participation in the civic life of the *civitas* of the Gabali within a broader framework of social memory.

Monumental *heroa* modeled closely on those of Greek *poleis* but incorporating programmatic elements of local visual culture and traditions of collective cult practice lay at the heart of certain Gallic cityscapes of the south, where the influence of Massilia on the contours of urbanism in its hinterland was profound. At Glanum, after the Roman conquest, a complex that has been identified as a *heroon* (building XLV) stood throughout the second and first centuries BCE at the most prominent place in the city—on the thoroughfare leading from the gate and the extra-urban sacred spaces beyond through the central public space (a Greek-style *agora*, with a kind of *stoa*), adjacent to an important civic building (bearing similarities again to a Greek *bouleuterion*).[258] In its last phase, after the reorganization of Glanum ca. 125–90 BCE, this monument consisted of a central statue of a figure seated cross-legged on a pillar base, a type of representation of divinized ancestors or heroes widespread in southern Gaul since the sixth century BCE (the so-called "accroupis"); the "accroupi" was surrounded by sculptures of (severed) heads ("têtes coupées") and stelae carved with archaizing iconography. In a time of intense challenges to traditional sites of authority, the hero—conceived of as the ancestor of a particular aristocratic lineage or perhaps more broadly as the founder of the community—remained, at least for a time, a focal point for the inhabitants of Glanum under Roman rule, deeply embedded in the past and facilitating individual and collective narratives through which the disorienting discontinuities of the present might be transcended. But like the Galician warriors, the *heroon*—always a site for the renegotiation of religious practice, group identity, and social authority—was unstable: a previous "accroupi" had been removed from the *heroon* in the last quarter of the second century BCE and built into the new *"bouleuterion"*; by the last quarter of the first century BCE, the final "accroupi" was deliberately destroyed, along with the *heroon* itself, and buried at its former site. The extent to which

the abandonment of the monument implies the oblivion of the hero at the beginning of the Augustan age is a vexed question. It has been suggested that the altar set up in the adjacent *"bouleuterion"* shortly before the *heroon* was obliterated served as a replacement;[259] whether this new focus for the collective civic ritual of the urban elite redirected cult away from the hero, or reconstituted it in an "updated," more cosmopolitan form, analogous to the grand mausoleum of the Julii built in the 40s BCE just outside the city, is uncertain. But it is possible that memories of the hero of Glanum, which had been so central to the identity of the community and had proven remarkably resilient and adaptive over the previous centuries, persisted.

Not all heroes who received cult in the early imperial period were *already* located in the past. We can occasionally catch glimpses into processes of contemporary hero-making, as at the rural hilltop site of Les Cars, in the Limousin region of west central France in the ancient territory of the Lemovices, where a monumental religious complex developed in the second century CE.[260] Within the sacred enclosure are two buildings, which seem to have been contemporaneous: to the south a temple, and to the north—on the same scale and alignment and in the same construction technique—a funerary monument, at the center of which was a *cella* intended to house the remains of the deceased. That the tomb is not just in close proximity to the sanctuary, but actually programmatically incorporated within the sacred area of the *temenos*, suggests that the individual commemorated therein was conceived of as more than simply a member of the local elite—that there was an active attempt at heroization. Like the ancient *viri fortes* mentioned by Nicander, he may have been reinterpreted as an intermediary of the local deity, from whose cult oracular visions might be received. In its claims to the past, this monument can also be read as indicative of competition between memory communities within the wider ethnic group of the Lemovices, perhaps reflecting one family's elevation of an ancestor to the status of a kind of founder-hero as a source of power or prestige.

As previous studies of the memorial landscape of Greece have shown, hero cult or tomb cult did not always entail the creation of new monuments: preexisting monuments of bygone ages were invested with new meanings, and became places of invented memory.[261] The landscapes of Roman Gaul underwent similar processes. Perceptibly ancient monuments exerted an

enormous influence in the expression of social memory. In the region of Aremorica, in particular, megalithic tumuli became foci of intensive ritual activity in the Roman period.[262] Votive deposits connected predominantly to female goddesses, sometimes accompanied by inscribed altars as at Arzon, are widespread.[263] In conjunction with such cults, there is also extensive evidence for the reuse of these megalithic tombs as sites of new burials.[264] This phenomenon can plausibly be understood as the co-option of places of memory and their potential heroic associations by the provincial elite in order to garner and consolidate social status. It is further tempting to interpret such memorial practices to some degree as a cultural response to the monumentality of Roman-style urbanization; not resistance, *per se*, but rather part of a complex dialogue between city and countryside, the imperial and the local, the present and the past.

Family and Kinship Memories

Thus far the discussion of memory and community has dealt primarily with political communities, although with landscapes, as at the sources of the Ura, or hero cult, as at the sanctuary of Les Cars, we have seen hints that family and kin groups were also important memory communities, bridging the gap between individual and civic or ethnic identities, and contributing to the polyphony and multiplicity therein. As the testimony of Poseidonius examined at the beginning of this chapter makes clear, genealogical memories were an important element in the oral tradition customarily related by the βάρδοι when the Romans arrived in Gaul in late second century BCE. We should not dismiss the potentially generative intersections between such genealogical memories and wider collective traditions, or the significant contributions from one to the other.[265] At Rome, before the emergence of true historiography, family traditions and genealogies were one of the primary means of preserving memory of the past, and even annalists like Fabius Pictor and Claudius Quadrigarius seem to have emphasized and elaborated upon the role of their *gentes* in Roman history.[266] Indeed, the Augustan vision of the Roman past is, at its core, a family history of the Julii.

It is fitting, then, to begin this discussion with a tale of two Gallic Julii, both of whom were intimately bound up in the tumultuous events of the

year of the four emperors. One is C. Julius Vindex, an Aquitanian senator and the propraetorian governor of the province of Lugdunensis, the other C. Julius Sabinus, a distinguished youth of wealth and noble birth from the people of the Lingones. Vindex styled himself as being sprung from the stock of the kings of pre-Roman Aquitania,[267] and in this hybrid aspect he resembled certain elites in the Greek East, such as C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, who was a descendent of the last ruling monarch of the kingdom of Commagene and became suffect consul in 109 CE.[268] Though it is unlikely that Vindex was hailed as king in the same way that Philopappus was still called βασιλεύς by his friends, it is clear that genealogical memory informed his complex, contextually conditioned self-representation. In his *patria* among his fellow Aquitani, the regal identity performed by Vindex must have depended upon a wider social memory of the pre-Roman past in order for it to have been meaningful or intelligible to his local audience.[269]

At the same time, however, it was through appeals to the Roman past that Vindex sought to garner support for the rebellion that would ultimately prove his undoing. Shortly after he had declared his endorsement of Galba against Nero,[270] new coinage began to be minted under his authority. One of the most interesting types is a reissue of a coin of Augustus, the reverse of which depicts a comet with eight rays (probably the *sidus Iulium*) and bears the legend *Divus Iulius* across the field.[271] In hearkening back to Augustan ideology, Vindex represented himself not as the leader of a nativist or separatist movement, but rather as a participant in an "insiders' debate" about the meaning and direction of Roman *imperium*.[272]

Julius Sabinus, on the other hand, claimed descent from Julius Caesar himself through his great-grandmother, who was supposed to have charmed the Roman general during his campaigns in Gaul, and after the death of Vitellius he assumed the title *Caesar* and instructed his followers to salute him as such.[273] This act of remembering was accompanied by other conspicuous acts of forgetting: as has been mentioned previously, the self-proclaimed Caesar ordered the destruction of the monuments that recorded the treaty with the Romans within the *civitas* of the Lingones.[274] This seemingly paradoxical contrast between the genealogies of our two Julii and the ends to which they were deployed is thus intriguing, and suggests that there may be a more complex nexus of memories at work in the self-image of Sabinus. The tradition attached to the figure of Caesar here is vaguely reminiscent

of another foreign conqueror famous for his (ethno)generative liaisons with native women: Hercules. Like Hercules, Caesar does seem to have loomed larger-than-life in the imaginations of early provincial communities of the west: Roymans has argued that he was central to the ethnic "foundation myth" of the Batavians of the lower Rhine, for example.[275] It is possible that the genealogy of Sabinus was built upon local traditions in which Caesar was remembered more as a quasi-mythical, Hercules-like warlord than a historical Roman proconsul,[276] which would explain how Sabinus was able simultaneously to exploit a connection with an imagined "Caesar" in order to garner social status and influence within his *civitas*, and yet to obliterate the monuments of Roman imperial authority.

Contemporaneous with Sabinus and Vindex and also implicated, though less prominently and less obviously, in the memory of Caesar and the tumultuous conflicts that bookended the period of Gallic history interpreted by the Romans as "steady, unbroken peace" was a military tribune from the *civitas* of the Aedui named L. Julius Calenus. Tacitus tells us that this Calenus had sided with the ultimately doomed Vitellian faction, and was subsequently sent as an envoy to inform his people of the defeat of Vitellius at Cremona and, presumably, to advocate support for the now ascendant Vespasian.[277] Through two fortuitously surviving inscriptions, we can reconstruct a great deal of information about the family of this Calenus. His father, C. Julius Magnus, made an offering on his behalf to the local healing god Bormo and his divine consort Damona, at a rural sanctuary in the territory of the Aedui that appears to have been called *Aquae Bormonis* (Bourbon-Lancy).[278] This modest votive altar stands in marked contrast to the monumental inscription set up by Calenus' brother, C. Julius Proculus, which formed part of the epistyle of a temple or other Roman-style public building at Augustodunum, the capital of the *civitas* of the Aedui.[279] Of great interest is the identity of the grandfather of Proculus and Calenus (the father of Magnus): C. Julius Eporedirix. If we reasonably assume that Calenus was about thirty years of age when he served as a military tribune under Vitellius, and postulate an average generational length of about thirty years, then this C. Julius Eporedirix would have been born ca. 20 BCE. Given this chronology, the *civitas* to which he belonged, and his Gaulish cognomen, it is very possible that he was a son or grandson of the infamous Aeduan cavalry commander of Caesar, Eporedirix.[280]

This Eporedirix was "a young man, born into the highest position and of the greatest influence in his country," and a trusted confidant and ally of Caesar.[281] But when the revolt of Vercingetorix broke out in 52 BCE, the loyalty of Eporedirix to the Aedui proved too strong and he betrayed Caesar, taking the Roman garrison of Noviodunum by surprise and burning the town to the ground. Later, he was given the chief command (*summa imperii*) of the Gallic force assembled in the country of the Aedui to relieve the siege of Vercingetorix at Alesia,[282] but this is the final mention of Eporedirix by Caesar, and his ultimate fate is unknown. It is possible that he was killed in battle, or, like his fellow *dux* Vercassivellaunus, was captured alive in the final rout as a valuable hostage and later released to the Aedui with some twenty thousand others when the war was over and the terms of peace concluded.[283] Whatever the case, the sins of the father were clearly not an insurmountable obstacle to the acquisition of Roman citizenship by his descendants, who, as their onomastics demonstrate, must have attained it relatively early. It is remarkable that, over a century later, the family of Eporedirix was still of some importance within the community of the Aedui. Local power in Roman Gaul was not necessarily transmitted with ease from one generation to the next; status was expensively and precariously won and maintained.

As we have already seen with C. Julius Sabinus, the cultural memory of certain events or personalities of the conquest era continued to be expressed and renegotiated in the imperial period. Judging from the fragments of the local discourse represented by the inscriptions of Magnus and Proculus, the memory of Eporedirix among the Aedui was broadly similar, for both father and son actively attempted to demonstrate their connection to his line. Magnus presented his filiation in a rather unconventional manner: instead of either giving merely the abbreviation of his father's *praenomen* or alternatively his full name, he chose only the *cognomen*, Eporedirix, which allowed him to advertise his distinguished local ancestry, while seeming, quite deliberately, to elide his father's Roman citizenship. In his own monumental display of civic munificence, Proculus included the name of his grandfather, one more generation of his ancestry than was typical in either Gaulish or Latin epigraphy, in order to appropriate the memorial associations of Eporedirix. The constellation of

meanings attached to Eporedirix or to the other antagonists of Caesar re-membered under Roman rule is unclear.[284] Like the royal Aquitanian fore-bears of Vindex, there is little evidence that these figures were symbols of "resistance." But the public and performative quality of their genealogical invocation implies, at the very least, an interrelation between the social memory of kin groups and that of the wider ethnic community.

Concurrently among the Belgic Treveri, however, the auxiliary com-mander C. Julius Classicus invoked the memory of his ancestors to dramat-ically different ends, selectively articulating his genealogy in order to con-struct a continuity not only with the local pre-Roman past, but specifically with resistance to the Romans:

> After Hordeonius was killed, messengers passed back and forth
> between Civilis and Classicus, the commander of the auxiliary
> cavalry of the Treveri. In his birth and wealth, Classicus stood
> above the others: he came from a line of kings [*regium illi genus*]
> and his family had been distinguished in peace and in war, and
> out of his ancestors he used to boast of those that had been ene-mies, rather than allies, of the Roman people.[285]

Similarly to the self-representation of Vindex as an amalgam of Aquitanian king and Roman senator, the identity of Classicus seems to have been ne-gotiated somewhere between the memory of Treverian kingship and the practice of Roman citizenship.[286] And like the rebel C. Julius Florus, also from among the *nobiles* of the Treveri, a half-century earlier, the citizenship of the family of Classicus must have been owed to "the good deeds of his ancestors,"[287] but these services were, in the context of the Batavian revolt, conspicuously forgotten. Long before the revolt of Florus, the Treveri had been difficult and pertinacious enemies of Caesar, especially under the lead-ership of the *princeps* Indutiomarus and, subsequent to his death, his kins-men during the uprising of the years 54 and 53 BCE. While, at least according to Caesar, most of the family of Indutiomarus departed from the *civitas* after their defeat at the hands of the Romans, it is possible that this prominent kinship group was among the "ancestral foes" (*e maioribus hostis*) boasted of by Classicus in his rhetoric.[288]

Classicus' command of one of the "ethnic" cavalry contingents stationed

along the Rhine, the *ala Trevirorum*, consisting predominantly of members of his own *civitas*, would have allowed him a further opportunity to construct an imagined continuity with the pre-Roman past by playing the role of the traditional war-leader of his community, like Indutiomarus and his own *maiores*. The blurring of the distinction between *praefectus* and *princeps* would probably have been, to some degree, inevitable. The danger to the order of the Gallic provinces posed by this system of auxiliary cohorts composed of an ethnic community under its own officers was made abundantly clear to the Roman center by the revolt of Classicus, and the *ala Trevirorum* and other units of its kind were soon disbanded under Vespasian.[289]

Another genealogy of a Gallic Julius that reaches back to the pre-conquest period—although very different in its form, its context, and the tenor of its rhetoric—is found on a triumphal arch built at Mediolanum (Saintes), the capital of the *civitas* of the Santones, in 19 CE by a local grandee, C. Julius Rufus. On the top of the arch were originally placed statues, now lost, of three members of the imperial house, the Caesars Germanicus and Drusus and the emperor Tiberius, under which were inscribed dedications to each, enumerating their ancestries and offices. Below the statues and their accompanying texts, the inscription on the architrave on either face of the arch celebrated Rufus and his ancestors:

> Gaius Julius Rufus of the Voltinia voting tribe, son of Gaius Julius Catuaneunus, grandson of Gaius Julius Agedomopas, and great-grandson of Epotsorovidus, high priest of Rome and Augustus at the altar which is at the confluence [of the Arar and the Rhodanus at Lugdunum], prefect of the workmen, made this from his own funds.[290]

Most readings of this monument have focused on its relationship to the urbanization of the *civitas* of the Santones or on its implications for the collusion between provincial elites and the imperial house.[291] I would like to focus instead on its quality as a *monumentum* in the most literal sense, as a "call to remember." Performances of identity are inevitably conditioned by social context; a comparison of this arch at Mediolanum with the dedicatory inscription of the amphitheater that this same Rufus constructed at Lugdunum in fulfillment of his office as provincial *sacerdos* casts this fact into sharp

relief. In that text, he gives his filiation as formulaically and as concisely as possible, and in performing for an audience of perceived "others," he emphasizes his ethnic identity: "Gaius Julius Rufus, son of Gaius, from the *civitas* of the Santones."[292] The divergent choices made by Rufus in the articulation of his genealogy among the Santones and at the provincial capital are reflective of the interconnectedness of such family memories with the broader social memory of the political community, and their dependence upon collectively held traditions in order to be understood. The gathered provincial elite at Lugdunum might not be counted upon to remember Agedomopas or Epotsorovidus, but the Santones could.

Rufus was not the only member of the Santones in the early imperial period whose status was connected to this local aristocratic dynasty, and who worked to align himself conspicuously with their memory through new forms of monumentality. On the façade of the mausoleum of his cousin, C. Julius Victor, a parallel genealogical claim was inscribed, alongside another account of a distinguished career in the new imperial order:

> For Gaius Julius Victor, son of Congonnetodubus, grandson of Agedomopas. Prefect of the workmen, tribune of the First Cohort of Belgae, priest of Rome and Augustus at the confluence [at Lugdunum], C. Julius Victor, his son [built this].[293]

The omission of Roman citizenship from the genealogy is undoubtedly deliberate, and somewhat misleading; without the check offered by Rufus' version of the family history, the reader would reasonably assume that Victor was a first-generation citizen. Victor's *Agedomopas* has a memorial quality that is distinct from his cousin's *Gaius Julius Agedomopas*. In commemorating his father on his tomb, the young Victor chose to emphasize a more localizing aspect of his ancestry, which appealed more strongly, one imagines, to other sites of authority. Ancestors were clearly an important part of the self-fashioning of the local elite, but they were, as we see in this tale of two cousins, susceptible to being recast in different plots: dressed up in "Roman" guise, Agedomopas was a slightly different character than in his native costume.

The specific content of the traditions associated with the individuals remembered by Rufus and Victor at Mediolanum is, for the most part,

obscure, but the vague outline that can be reconstructed is thought-provoking. Agedomopas appears to have been the *princeps* of the Santones in the wake of the wars of conquest, perhaps one of its last quasi-independent "rulers": in the 40s BCE, he struck coinage bearing his own name on the reverse, with his newly adopted Roman names on the obverse (*GAI. IVL.*) as an advertisement of his recent receipt of Roman citizenship, likely through service to Caesar in the period of the civil wars.[294] Like his grandsons, Agedomopas was interested in consolidating and projecting his status at a time of transition among the Santones through new media that acknowledged—and exploited—broader shifts in the center of political gravity. The most remote ancestor on the monument of Rufus, Epotsorovidus, becomes, in light of even the faint biographical details of his son Agedomopas, a particularly ambiguous figure. He belongs to the pre-Roman past and to the age of the conquest, embodying memories of another political and cultural reality.[295] Through a subtle yet effective parallelism of word order, lineage, and offices, Rufus carefully establishes an analogy between Drusus and Germanicus and himself, the ultimate consequence of which is the perception by the viewer of a synchronism and correspondence between his great-grandfather Epotsorovidus and the deified Julius. Rufus can thus be seen as making his own dynastic claim to the past and present of the community through Epotsorovidus as a kind of founder-figure.[296] The carefully constructed continuities of the inscription—of the imagined community of the Santones, and of the line of Epotsorovidus at their head—whitewash discontinuities, anticipating potential objections and forestalling alternative interpretations. It is very possible that Epotsorovidus, like Eporedirix, was an antagonist of Caesar when the Santones revolted along with Vercingetorix and the Aedui, and that Rufus is therefore following a more subversive rather than collusive agenda; the juxtaposition of Epotsorovidus and Caesar plays with the memory of opposition, and the ambivalence in the use of local and imperial history—the trauma of the Santones and the triumph of the Romans—accommodates a multiplicity of readings.[297] It is indeed striking that the longest genealogy of any individual from Gaul of this period, one which hearkens self-confidently back to a pre-Roman past, is recorded on the most ostentatiously "Roman" of monuments, built to mark *the* quintessential Roman imperial practice, the triumph. "Roman" monuments can tell other stories, and

others' stories. In this regard it is fitting that the arch faces, Janus-like, in two directions, east toward Rome and west toward Mediolanum, for, like many of the case studies that we have examined in this chapter, Rufus' performance of identity, and the expression of memory bound up therein, is complex and multivalent, with an eye toward two audiences, the local and the imperial.

Comparable concerns with family legacy occupied the local elite at the Turdetanian town of Torreparedones, east of Corduba; the ancient name of the place is unknown, but its long-standing importance, stretching back to the sixth century BCE, is evoked in the imposing monumentality of its hilltop location and its massive fortifications.[298] In the first century BCE, members of a prominent kin group constructed a subterranean mausoleum to house the cremated remains of their deceased relations: the series of inscribed cinerary urns displayed in the tomb complex, which was in use over several generations into the first century CE, tell a fascinating story of the family's negotiation of the transition from an indigenous aristocracy to Roman-style municipal magistrates. The central niches (nos. 6 and 7) were occupied by urns inscribed with the names of "Ildrons, son of Velaunis" and "Igalghis, son of Ildrons"; based on their onomastics and their position within the space, these men are likely to have been the most ancient members of the family included in the mausoleum.[299] A son of Igalghis seems to have received a grant of citizenship from Pompey, perhaps connected to the events of the 70s BCE; although the urn of this "Quintus Pompeius" was not found within the tomb, two of his sons, Roman citizens but with Turdetanian *cognomina*, were included: Q. Pompeius Velaunis and M. Pompeius Icstnis. It is suggestive of the prestige still attached to the memory of distant ancestors that the former bears the name of the "founder" of the line, his great-great grandfather Velaunis; the latter son, Marcus, pursued new sources of social authority, boasting in his *elogium* of having been "the first *duumvir* from the family of the Pompeii." Such men paved the way for future generations of the family: Cn. Pompeius Afer, the last member of the Pompeii to be buried in the tomb, was *duumvir* and *aedilis*.

Genealogical memories of other "Pompeii" among the local elite of Gaul were preserved through other innovative media in the early imperial period. Cn. Pompeius Trogus, who undertook in the Augustan age to write a universal history of the Greek world down to the Roman conquest, wove

the story of his own family into the penultimate book of his work, as the course of the narrative made a sharp westward turn toward Rome, Massilia, and, ultimately, Gaul. This embedded local history does not survive in its original form, but a brief summary of its basic contours is preserved by the later epitomator, Justin:

> At the end of this book Trogus writes that his own ancestors [*maiores*] traced their descent from the Vocontii; his grandfather, Pompeius Trogus, received citizenship from Cn. Pompeius during the Sertorian War; his paternal uncle led cavalry contingents in the Mithridatic War under the same Pompeius; his father served in the army of C. Caesar, and was put in charge of his correspondence and embassies, as well as of his signet ring.[300]

As it stands, "the end of this book" is so incomplete as to be almost unintelligible: after relating an aborted war led by the chieftain Catumandus against Massilia (ca. 400 BCE), the epitomator obliquely mentions the Massiliote response to the sack of Rome by the Gauls (ca. 386 BCE), before concluding with this mention of Trogus' genealogy. A vast amount of material is missing.

There are good reasons to suspect that Trogus had originally bridged the three-hundred-year gap between the Gallic sack and the acquisition of Roman citizenship by his own family with a continuous account. As the epitomator tells the reader in his own short preface, he had excerpted from Trogus' much fuller history "whatever seemed most worthy of being known," and omitted "those things which were neither attractive for the pleasure of reading or necessary by way of example."[301] Like Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*, discussed previously, the *Epitome* compiled by Justin appears to have been addressed to the emperor, and the similarity in audience might have resulted in the cultivation of a similarly subjective "imperial" aesthetic; a semi-autobiographical local history of the Vocontii, even if it had been an important part of Trogus' project, might easily have seemed tangential to Justin—who was interested in the work primarily as a history of the *Greeks*—and thus superfluous. The dramatic extent of the abridgement as a whole—perhaps reducing the length of the original by as much as 95 percent—can be appreciated clearly from the one book where the epito-

mator breaks from his usual practice, and inserts a passage of Trogus' text verbatim into the *brevitas* of his own work.[302] Given the criteria for selection and the depth of the cuts, then, the unabridged version composed by Trogus must have gone into much greater detail about his ancestors and the Vocontii, connecting the local past to the Roman conquest in a more satisfactory and coherent narrative than is found in the extant epitome.

In this penultimate book, Trogus clearly began to pursue a different thread to the previous forty-two books, changing the orientation of the work from the history of the Greeks to that of his own homeland (*patria*). This book was intimately bound up with Trogus' own identity and self-representation. As such, the epitomator was forced to interrupt the course of the narrative, and to differentiate himself—for the first time since the preface—from the author, with an apology that perhaps echoes an original, programmatic "second preface" written by Trogus himself:

> Having related events in Parthia, the East, and almost the entire world, Trogus turns back to the beginnings of the city of Rome, as if coming home after a long sojourn, believing that it would be the duty of an ungrateful citizen if, although he had narrated the history of all other peoples, he passed over his own *patria* alone in silence.[303]

Trogus, however, subverts what might be an initial expectation of a homology between "home" and Rome, citizenship and identity.[304] The way in which the course of this book develops problematizes the location of the *patria*: after a cursory survey of the Roman mythical past up to the end of the regal period, through a synchronism with the foundation of Massilia by the Phocaeans the narrative shifts focus *away from Rome*, re-centering on the south of Gaul. Henceforth the work of the epitomator has robbed us of much of the rich complexity with which the "homecoming" culminated, but it is clear from the outline of its finale that the narrative shifted focus again, away from Massilia and to its Gallic neighbors in the hinterland. World history as written from the western provincial perspective of Trogus served as a triangulation of the self: he passed by Rome and its founders and ancient kings, for although he was a Roman citizen, he was not "only Roman"; he moved beyond the coast of Massilia and its first moments of colonial contact, for although from them "the Gauls learnt to practice a more refined way

of life," he was not Greek; in relating the events of the second century BCE, he must have differentiated the Vocontii from the rest of the Gauls, for it was from the Vocontii that "his own ancestors traced their descent." In this genealogy of citizenship and in the historiography of local identity, Trogus exhibited concerns that can be observed in contemporary Italian writers as well.[305] But the sophistication of Trogus' "glocal" history—a subtle negotiation of the place of the local within the global—was lost on his epitomator, who, like those writers criticized by Tacitus, was uninterested in listening to "tales of the barbarians."

While the vast majority of the inhabitants of Spain and Gaul left behind no mausoleums, no triumphal arches, and no works of Latin historiography through which to remember their ancestors, their voices and their memories, as we have seen throughout this chapter, are not entirely beyond recovery. The names of the past to which they reached back are more obscure to us than the prominent allies and enemies of Caesar or Pompey, and their practices of ancestral commemoration were intertwined with other local contexts. In the valley of the river Tagus in Lusitania, Onconer, son of Proculus, recorded that he had "fulfilled the vow which his grandfather Sailgius, son of Taius, had made to the god Eniragillus"; elsewhere in the same province, Albinus, son of Moculus, placed an altar in accordance with the vow of his grandfather, Pisirus, son of Boetelus, to "Cronian Arentius," a hyper-local divinity of the Igaeditani.[306] A woman called Julia set up an inscribed altar to another Lusitanian god, Endovellicus, as part of a ritual "bequeathed to her from her ancestors" (*relictum a maioribus*). To express concisely this local idea—the perpetuation of specific kinds of genealogical memories, religious traditions, and obligations to Endovellicus in part through votive offerings—a new Latin word (*relicticium*, "a votive bequest") was even invented by the participants in this cult, perhaps a translation of an already clearly defined vernacular concept.[307] All communities found themselves between memory and empire.

An assumption, more or less explicitly stated, has underlain scholarship on Gaul and Spain since the seminal works of Amédée Thierry, that, unlike the Greeks under Roman rule, the inhabitants of the western provinces were uninterested in their pasts; that, after the advent of the Roman empire, they had no desire to "[renounce] the customs or the social status that they con-

sidered as progress, and . . . [go] backward toward a past that was, in their eyes, no longer anything but barbarism."[308] Like their counterparts in modern colonial encounters, the peoples of the west "can be transformed by history, but they cannot make history their own."[309]

But the local past did matter to these communities. Foundation legends gave temporal depth to shared experience that reinforced senses of belonging together; myths were created and reworked at points of cultural intersection in order to help communities to place themselves into the context of a broader Mediterranean world, while still differentiating themselves from others. Genealogies interwove the stories of prominent individuals and families with larger histories, and became a vehicle not only for elite competition, but also for the expression of community; such narratives could articulate the distinctive local meanings that groups gave to time and to events, which could diverge markedly from hegemonic narratives. Landscapes and monuments lent powerful coherence to local identity, fostering close interconnections between people, places, practices, and the past. In short, the varied evidence demonstrates clearly that, from the first confrontations with Rome in the middle Republic through the dissolution of the empire in late antiquity, social memory was integral to the communalization process in the west. To be sure, not all that was local was ancient. Novel origins, invented traditions, fictive histories, and false archaisms also factored importantly into the ideas that provincial communities collectively held about themselves, but usually these blended rather seamlessly in the eyes of locals with authentic continuities from the pre-Roman period. In attempting to understand identity formation, the distinction between authenticity and invention ultimately proves somewhat illusory.

Like almost every aspect of the provincial experience, the past was not static, insulated from the impacts of empire; it became a highly dynamic site of exchange, negotiation, appropriation, and entanglement. The Romans introduced their own pasts, both mythical and historical, to the west. As Chapter 4 will illustrate, in the intersection between the imperial and the local, provincial communities in turn created new memories and new meanings, and made Roman history their own.

4

ROMAN PASTS

❧

IN THE ANCIENT TERRITORY of the Allobroges southeast of Vienna at the foot of the Massif de la Chartreuse, an unusual cult place developed in the course of the first two centuries of our era.[1] Amongst fragments of columns and marble statuary, two altars were discovered, dedicated to a divinity whose cult was previously unattested in Gaul: *Quirinus Augustus*.[2] The earlier and less fragmentary of the two altars was set up by men who, based on their lack of the *tria nomina*, seem not to have possessed Roman citizenship; moreover, one of them bears a Gaulish *nomen*.[3] Accordingly, the presence of Quirinus at this rural sanctuary should most likely be interpreted not as an import by the Italian merchants who frequented the urban center of Vienna,[4] but rather as an independent local appropriation by the inhabitants of the outlying rural *vici* and *pagi*. The local initiative behind this Narbonensian cult of Quirinus is cast into sharper relief when it is situated within the wider religious context of the early empire: there are no known private dedications to Quirinus at Rome after the second century BCE,[5] and the only other comparandum from the western provinces is a relatively recently published inscription of the third century CE from Giufi (Bir Mcherga), in Africa Proconsularis.[6]

By the late republican period, Quirinus had become an obscure, complex, and enigmatic divinity at Rome, around whom a number of different traditions, etymologies, and interpretations had accreted.[7] As such, he was

a favorite subject for the exegetical efforts of antiquarians, who explored his putative Sabine origins and connections to Titus Tatius,[8] but ultimately the polyphony surrounding Quirinus yielded to a prevailing identification of the god as the apotheosized Romulus.[9] It was in this capacity that Caesar strove to associate himself with Quirinus: one of several testaments to this desire was the statue of the *dictator* that was placed in the ancient temple of Quirinus on the *Mons Quirinalis* following his victories in the civil wars.[10] After the death and deification of Caesar, Augustus further revived and revised the cult of Quirinus: he constructed a new temple of Quirinus on the Capitol, and, in the *elogium* under the statue of Romulus in the Forum of Augustus, the *princeps* propagated what was to become the authoritative interpretation of the Roman founder, that upon his death he was "enrolled among the gods and called Quirinus."[11] The Augustan edition of the past took root, and in the imperial period there appears to have been an unequivocal identification of Quirinus with Romulus.[12] Indeed, roughly contemporaneously with the dedication of the first Narbonensian altar to Quirinus, Pliny the Elder seems to unproblematically conflate the two figures in his casual observation that "among the most ancient sanctuaries is reckoned that of Quirinus, that is, of Romulus himself."[13]

Therefore, the cult of *Quirinus Augustus* among the Allobroges in the first and second centuries is significant not only for the very limited extent of such a practice in the contemporary Roman world, but also because it represents a complex and negotiated provincial engagement with and construction of the mythical Roman past; what we might view as a kind of antiquarianism. As a discursive mode, antiquarianism is often assumed to be the prerogative of the Roman imperial center, its inquiries directed either inward, like so many of the etymological or topographical projects of Varro—the greatest representative of the Roman intellectual tradition—or occasionally outward, as a means of dominating and subjecting the periphery through the power of representation. But, in this case, the antiquarian gaze travels in the opposite direction, from a *pagus* sanctuary in transalpine Gaul to the *urbs Quirini*, a provincial quest for imperial origins.[14] Like the cult of *Roma et Augustus*, that of Quirinus here would seem to have served as a symbolic device to reify concepts of "Rome" and "Roman," and to naturalize—or even to obscure the nature of—asymmetries of power and status between the governing and the governed. Unlike the imperial cult, however,

this worship of Quirinus in the hinterland of Vienna was locally initiated from the bottom up, rather than imposed from the top down. This is a fundamentally important distinction.

Further valences of a Quirinus at the periphery can perhaps be illuminated by comparison with the other extant dedication to the divinity from outside Italy, the aforementioned third-century inscription from the African *municipium* of Giufi.[15] In this text, besides the epithet *Augustus*, the god is also qualified as *deus pater* and *genius municipii*, titles in which Ben Abdallah sees a potential parallelism that would connect Quirinus with both the origins of Rome and the recent refoundation of Giufi, formerly a peregrine *civitas*, under the emperor Alexander Severus.[16] While the Narbonensian cult of Quirinus is not so clearly linked to ideas of local (re)foundation, the continuity of cult at this site for multiple generations does suggest that the sacred space became, for reasons that are difficult to discern, profoundly associated with the divinity, and that here among the Allobroges, as at Giufi, memories of the "Roman" past could function as expressions of local identity. Moreover, the lack of comparanda from early imperial Rome or Italy for private cults of Quirinus challenges the assumption of the "Romanness" of such a practice; ostensibly "Roman" cultural signs and symbols could be adopted and recombined in local vocabularies in order to articulate local meanings that would be only dimly recognizable to the dominant culture.

The impression of the potential complexity of the uses of the Roman past in the provinces that emerges from this single case study problematizes the often reductively dichotomous picture of memory and identity painted by the literary sources. Around the same time that non-citizen provincials were dedicating an altar to Quirinus Augustus at a rural *pagus* sanctuary, Tacitus put the following speech into the mouth of Dillius Vocula, legate of the 18th legion, who addresses his troops on the verge of mutinously succumbing to the bribes of the Gallic rebels Julius Tutor and Julius Classicus, both of the *civitas* of the Treveri:

> If the Germans and the Gauls lead you to the walls of the City, will you bear arms against your native country? The soul shudders at the mere imagination of such a shameful act. Will you keep night watches for Tutor of the Treveri? Will a Batavian

give the signal for battle? Will you fill the ranks of the German forces? . . . I pray and beseech you, Jupiter best and greatest, whom we have for eight hundred and twenty years honored with so many triumphs, and you, Quirinus, father of the Roman city...[17]

In this passage, Tacitus' definition of Roman "selves" in opposition to Gallic "others" is deeply anchored in the past, and in the entwined relationship between origins, cult, and memory. For Vocula, what differentiates the Romans from the Gauls is the proper claim to the *urbs* as *patria*, and, bound up therein, the very ability to intelligibly and appropriately invoke "Quirinus, father of the city" (*parens urbis*). As exemplified by the cult of Quirinus near Vienna, however, such rigid definitions and differentiations are illusory: in the generative intersection between imperial power and local identities new memories, meanings, and traditions were invented. It is primarily upon *this* intersection that this chapter will focus: on the one hand, the ways in which provincial communities of Spain and Gaul came to terms with Rome through locally mediated versions of the Roman past; on the other, how these communities fitted themselves into Roman frameworks for understanding the world; how the stories that the Romans told about the Roman past were transformed into stories that local communities told about *their own* past. As peoples supposedly without memory, the communities of the western provinces have been characterized by some scholars as "distinctive among the emperors' subjects in being *only Roman*."[18] But even in their uses of the "Roman" past, these provincials were, I would argue, neither forgetful nor "only Roman."

The chapter begins with an exploration of two sides of the mythical and malleable Trojan wanderings, whose genealogical potential was exploited to various ends by communities of Spain and Gaul. Next, the discussion turns to the Roman founders proper—Aeneas and Romulus and Remus—and the various forms and contexts in which they were invoked and remembered. Lastly, several case studies of local memories of the republican past illuminate the inventive ways in which Roman historical figures were meaningfully incorporated in constructions of community identity in the first centuries of the imperial period.

Becoming Trojan

In 121 BCE, the Romans, under the command of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus, were at war with a great confederation of Gallic peoples, led by the Arverni and their king Bituitus.[19] The conflict seems to have begun as a border dispute between the Greek colony of Massilia and the neighboring Gallic Salluvii, but it rapidly escalated to engulf much of Transalpine Gaul. When Massilia called upon Rome to intercede, the Salluvii took refuge with the Allobroges, who in turn sought aid from the Arverni. Collateral damage in the movement of peoples and the shifting of alliances were the Aedui, whose territory was laid waste by the Allobroges and the Arverni.[20] Already at this early period, the Aedui seem to have claimed a special friendship with Rome, sufficient grounds for Domitius to retaliate against the inroads of the Allobroges. The exact origins of this alliance (*societas*) are obscure, as this is the first secure mention of the Aedui in the historical record,[21] but we are unusually fortunate in that we can trace the development of this relationship and its place in Aeduan constructions of identity over the course of the next five centuries.

Only two generations after the campaigns of Domitius, similar circumstances would again compel the Romans to intervene militarily in the affairs of Gaul. Beyond the province of Narbonensis, Gaul remained divided into two opposing factions, at the head of one of which stood the Aedui, of the other the Arverni. After such a protracted struggle for hegemony, the Arverni, together with the Sequani, finally summoned a vast number of mercenaries from across the Rhine under their chief, Ariovistus. The Aedui were soon forced to sue for peace, surrendering much of their territory and their influence. Soon thereafter, in 61 BCE, Diviciacus, the leader of the Aedui, undertook an embassy to Rome, hoping to secure assistance by appealing to the old treaty of friendship.[22] While abroad, he became an acquaintance of Cicero, who was intrigued by the druidic lore that he possessed,[23] but ultimately Diviciacus was unsuccessful and returned to his countrymen empty-handed. Cicero, writing to Atticus a year later, expressed anxiety for the welfare of the Aedui, who were now, in addition to their previous ills, increasingly hard-pressed by the incursions of the Helvetii from the east:

> And at this very moment the state is in the grip of fear of a Gallic war. For the Aedui, our kinsmen, have recently lost a battle, and

there is no question that the Helvetii are in arms and are making raids into the province [of Narbonensis].[24]

Noteworthy about Cicero's mention of the Aedui in this passage is their characterization not as merely allies—*socii*—but as kinsmen—*fratres*. Other sources make it clear that the rhetoric of kinship between the Aedui and the Romans had wide currency at the time. Though Diviciacus had failed during his embassy to convert this recognition into action, Caesar, in his *commentarii*, adduced the consanguinity of the Aedui as cause—or at least as pretext—to begin a new war against the Germani outside his province:

> And following those things many factors were compelling him to think that he ought to consider and to undertake that project [to intervene in Gallic affairs against Ariovistus], especially the fact that he saw the Aedui, often hailed by the senate as brothers and kinsmen, held in the slavery and control of the Germani.[25]

Such rhetoric, both in its general contours and in the specific case of the Aedui, must have been intelligible to Caesar's Roman readership. Cicero, our best evidence for contemporary reception of Caesar's propagandistic dispatches from Gaul, addresses the kinship of the Aedui again in his correspondence of late 54 BCE with his acquaintance C. Trebatius Testa, who was stationed with the legions in their winter quarters in Gaul.[26]

Kinship diplomacy had been practiced by Rome since perhaps as early as the late fourth century BCE, but it was particularly catalyzed by Roman intervention abroad in the First Punic War, and over the next century in the Greek east. Though the mythology surrounding the foundation of Rome was multiplex, it was increasingly her Trojan origins—and the wider kinship network implicated therein—that were foregrounded in these interactions. We should not think of this as a simplistic, diplomatic "comedy," as some have called it.[27] Rather, these invented traditions—claims to membership in wider imagined communities, beyond the *polis* or *civitas*—were actually meaningful vocabularies through which Greeks, Romans, and even *barbaroi* like the Aedui made sense of the world and their place in it.[28]

In light of the claims typical of Roman kinship diplomacy in the middle and late Republic, then, the most plausible interpretation of Aeduan *fraternitas* is that, at some point following the establishment of an alliance

with Rome, they began to represent themselves as likewise descended from the Trojans.[29] Diodorus, writing some two decades after Caesar, refers to an "ancient kinship" (παλαιὰ συγγένεια) that had endured down to his own day;[30] the adjective παλαιά would befit the antiquity of the Trojan wanderings, and the noun συγγένεια is certainly used of Trojan kinship by other Greek authors.[31] Furthermore, as we saw in the previous chapter, the Greek historian Timagenes, writing at Rome roughly contemporaneously with Diodorus, was at least vaguely aware of the Trojan ancestry ascribed to—or subscribed to by—some of the peoples of Gaul.[32] While the incorporation by the Aedui of a Trojan identity and a Roman past into their self-representation was in part a cultural response to Roman power, it was more complex than this. In the contest for hegemony among the various ethnic groups of Gaul before, during, and even after the Roman conquest, the Aedui were increasingly motivated to differentiate themselves from the Arverni, in a process that social scientists have termed "complementary schismogenesis."[33] Complementary schismogenesis is, essentially, competition by contradiction, in which one group organizes itself as the inverse of the other. Athens and Sparta around the time of the Peloponnesian War are perhaps the most obvious example of schismogenesis from the classical world, but I would argue that we can observe similar dynamics at work in the rivalry between the communities of the Aedui and Arverni. It was not simply that the enemies of the one became the allies of the other: the Aedui seem, to a certain degree, to have redefined themselves and reimagined their past in opposition to the Arverni. But, as with all identities, this "Trojan" identity was a situational construct, and the expression of memories of essential kinship with Rome was contingent upon social and historical circumstances, which could equally well demand the privileging of other remembered pasts, other connections. The revolt of the Aedui against Caesar and the Romans at the instigation of the Arverni in 52 BCE appears to have been such a case. Though absent from extant contemporary accounts of the Gallic wars like those of Caesar and Cicero, memory of an "ancient alliance" with other Gallic peoples that took precedence—ideological and perhaps temporal—over the *fraternitas* with the Romans that had so lately been successfully deployed, seems to have motivated at least some among the rebellious Aedui.[34]

In the post-conquest period, the memory of Aeduan origins was re-

hearsed and rearticulated. It was probably not coincidental that in 12 BCE the honor of holding the first priesthood of Rome and Augustus at the altar established by Drusus at Lugdunum was bestowed upon one of the elites from among the Aedui.[35] A half-century later, when Claudius spoke in favor of the citizens of *Gallia Comata* acquiring the right to membership in the Roman senate, in response to their petition, it was granted to the Aedui first of all the peoples of Gaul:

> A decision of the senate followed the speech of the emperor and the Aedui were the first to acquire the right to become senators at Rome. This was granted because of the ancient treaty and since alone of the Gauls they enjoyed the claim to kinship with the Roman people.[36]

The account of Tacitus connects this privilege with the memory of Aeduan exceptionalism, of *foedus* and *fraternitas*. It seems likely that it was the ambassadors of the Aedui who reminded the emperor and the senate of their ancient history, as deputations from other communities did in the early empire: under Tiberius, for example, the people of Segesta deployed their own Trojan connection to Rome in order to secure aid in rebuilding the temple of Venus Ericina,[37] and Ilium herself sought the honor of building a temple to Tiberius and Roma, recalling Troy as the "parent of the city of Rome."[38] Although less prominent than their counterparts in Magna Graecia and the Greek east, it is clear that communities of the western provinces could participate in a similar memorial discourse of kinship diplomacy, in which fictive claims to share the pasts of others were accepted currency in exchanges with the imperial center.

Even into late antiquity, memory of their essential connection to Rome through a shared Trojan past played an important role in shaping the community identity of the Aedui. The troubles of the third century had left the *civitas* of the Aedui and its capital of Augustodunum, like so much of Gaul, in dire straits: its public buildings were in a state of ruin, and the countryside seems to have suffered serious depopulation.[39] Preserved among the corpus of the later Latin panegyrics are three speeches of orators from among the Aedui of this period, which are either requests for imperial aid or speeches of thanksgiving for services rendered to the community by the emperors, which the Aedui had most likely merited through their loyalty to Claudius

Gothicus against the usurpers of the *Imperium Galliarum*.[40] The earliest, an anonymous panegyric dating to 297 or 298, is addressed to the Caesar Constantius, whose reconquest of Britain had contributed to the restoration of the city of Augustodunum by supplying it with an abundance of architects and craftsmen. For this reason, asserts the speaker, the *civitas* of the Aedui felt that it had obtained in Constantius a kind of second founder, and thus merited anew its old claim to kinship with Rome.[41]

A little more than a decade later, another anonymous oration was delivered by a different Aeduan speaker, on the occasion of Constantine's *quinquennalia*, the end of his fifth year of rule. This act of thanksgiving was prompted by the emperor's grant of generous tax concessions to the Aedui and the cancellation of five years' arrears, a significant boon to a still-struggling *civitas*.[42] Underneath its flattering rhetoric, the speech is a fascinating recapitulation of the local history of the Aedui and their special relationship with Rome. Even the ancient chief Diviciacus is brought back out onto the stage. His embassy to Rome is not only recounted with details unknown from any other source, drawn perhaps from local memory, but it is even at variance with the facts known from Caesar's contemporary account.[43] According to the anonymous panegyrist, the *Aeduus princeps* spoke in the senate while leaning on his shield, and having obtained Roman assistance he led the Roman army and Caesar into Gaul.[44] But in reality, as we have seen above, the initial mission of Diviciaus had failed to realize its objective through the rhetoric of kinship diplomacy and he had been forced to return to his embattled and subjugated *civitas*.[45]

Similarly to the memorial discourse of identity only dimly discernible in the passage of Tacitus on the admission of the Gauls to the senate, in this speech the Aedui define themselves by opposition:

> For what people in the whole world might demand to be placed before the Aedui in love of the Roman name? The Aedui who were the first of all among those rough and barbarous peoples of Gaul to be hailed in very many decrees of the senate as kinsmen of the Roman people and who, when not even peace, except an untrustworthy one, was able to be hoped for from the rest of the communities from the Rhone to the Rhine, were the only ones to take pride in the title of kinship.[46]

The orator constructs the past as a site of competition, using kinship with Rome to set the Aedui apart from the "other," those "rough and barbarous peoples" of Gallic antiquity.[47] The speaker goes on to distinguish, somewhat tendentiously, the kinship of the loyal Aedui from the mythical claims made by other communities like the Mamertini of southern Italy or even the people of Ilium themselves, who, he implies, had deployed *fabulosa origo* only to oblige the Romans to embroil themselves in their own conflicts, the First Punic War and the war against Antiochus III respectively.[48] Clearly this is, in a number of respects, a spurious argument, and a revisionist version of history, for the Aedui had not only pursued a self-serving agenda in promoting their kinship with Rome throughout the years, but had risen in rebellion on at least three occasions,[49] rebellions which are also conspicuously elided through the orator's emphasis on cooperation and unity in peace.[50] But, as with the new and improved version of the embassy of Diviciacus, such distortions should not surprise us: social memory is subjective, and closely tied to highly contextualized self-representations. The anonymous oration illuminates an intricate nexus of such subjective memories: ancient myths of Trojan kinship, historical cooperation with the imperial agenda of Caesar, and more contemporary loyalty to the legitimate emperors are woven together in this discursive construction of local Aeduan identity.

Having traced the enduring importance of the Trojan past of the Aedui, let us return now to the Arverni. After the Roman conquest, constructions of the more recent past played a central role in Arvernian community identity: Strabo alludes to the active memory among the Arverni of their struggles against the Romans, first in the person of Domitius Ahenobarbus and then Caesar,[51] and Plutarch relates that still in the early second century CE the Arverni kept in one of their temples a sword reportedly taken from Caesar, as a memorial to their victory at Gergovia.[52] Alongside these memories of an independent past, however, in the early imperial period the Arverni developed their *own* invented tradition of Trojan kinship with Rome.[53] The first reference to this fictive genealogy is found in Lucan's catalogue of the Gallic forces of Caesar, where the poet mentions that the Arverni "dared to style themselves a people descended from Trojan blood."[54] This "daring" act of local initiative was, I would argue, the product of a different form of communalization than we saw in the case of the

Aedui, one which sociologists have termed *symmetrical* schismogenesis: in this process, as opposed to one community organizing itself as the inverse of the other (that is, *complementary* schismogenesis), one community seeks to rival the other through essentially similar actions.[55] The arms race of the cold war is an apt modern example of symmetrical schismogenesis. If the Aedui could reap tangible benefits from "going Trojan," the Arverni, it seems, thought that they might as well. But this usurpation of the Roman past in a new Arvernian self-account appears to have failed to receive the approval of imperial authority: Lucan, at least, viewed it with indignation, and, at roughly the same period, the senate, as we have seen, recognized the exclusive claims of the Aedui to kinship with the Romans. Toward the end of the first century CE, however, there is evidence to suggest something of a rapprochement between the Aedui and the Arverni. Together these two *civitates* would appear to have been the most important supporters of the uprising of Vindex in 68 CE,[56] and roughly contemporaneously a prominent member of the Aedui, Sextus Orgius Suavis, set up a dedication at the Arvernian capital of Augustonemetum to the *genius Arvernorum*.[57] One is left to wonder whether, as in the Greek world, the shared Trojan myth factored at all into this local diplomacy between Gallic peoples.

Even though the Trojan myth of the Arverni does not seem to have gained wide acceptance outside the community itself, it remained a fixture in the local discourse: as we have already noted, commemorative choices are, generally speaking, internal to communities, not imposed from without by imperial power. Moreover, social memories like this one have a functional rationale; particular versions of the past are propagated because they have meaning in present constructions of identity.[58] Indeed, it was not the case, as other scholars have argued, that "the political relationship with Rome was the chief factor governing the success or failure of a claim to a prestigious descent tradition."[59] We can observe this at work in the context of the twilight of the Roman Empire in the west. By the middle of the fifth century, Roman control in central Gaul had been almost entirely eroded by continual incursions of Germanic peoples. The Arverni were one of the few *civitates* to have held out. One of their leading citizens was Sidonius Apollinaris, who had moved from Lugdunum to the country of the Arverni as a young man and had embraced it as a kind of second *patria*. In the year

456, he delivered a verse panegyric to the Roman emperor Avitus, who was also from the *civitas* of the Arverni. This identity, as a *civis Arvernus*, seems to have been a prominent aspect of the emperor's self-representation, and it factored significantly into the choices made by Sidonius in praising Avitus and establishing his own authority at the imperial court.[60] Capitalizing on a shared understanding of what it meant to be Arvernian was among the rhetorical imperatives of the panegyric composed by Sidonius, which, although it was delivered at Rome, can be read in some sense as an excerpt from an insiders' conversation among the Arverni. As such, it gives us a sense of the texture of local memories of the Arverni and of the communalization process in the face of formidable external pressures. Speaking through the mouthpiece of Jupiter himself, Sidonius praises his and Avitus' *patria* by reference to the dual foci around which Arvernian identity had been negotiated since the early imperial period, Troy and Gergovia:

> I [Jupiter] have a country, renowned for its men, which carries its head high as a kinsman of Latium. . . . Inhabiting this country, O Arvernian, you yield to no one in battle on foot, and on horseback you are a match for anyone. Let Caesar's attendant goddess Fortune be my witness, who was so terrified in this land, when his army was driven back from the hill of Gergovia and hardly halted its flight at the camp itself.[61]

In this rather strange "tale of two cities," the Arverni define themselves by their mythic *kinship* to Rome on the one hand, and by their historical *opposition* to Rome on the other. In order to be intelligible and successful, this rhetoric must, on some level, have played into the expectations, memories, and self-identification of the most important member of Sidonius' audience, Avitus.

Elsewhere, in his private correspondence with others of his countrymen, Sidonius provides further insight into this discourse of Arvernian identity. Even the local landscape had been invested with Trojan memories: in a letter about his rural estate, he gives a detailed description of a lake on which previous generations of the Arverni had recreated the *agon Drepanitanus*, the Trojan nautical game—here called a rite or *superstitio*—recounted by Virgil in the fifth book of the *Aeneid*:[62]

> In the middle of the deep part [of the lake on Sidonius' estate in the territory of the Arverni] is a small island. Here, a turning-post sticks up on top of the natural accumulations of stones. It is worn by the dents of oars dashed against in the course of the laps of the boats, and the collisions of the competitors upon it result in amusing shipwrecks. For here it was the custom of our forebears to re-enact the contest of Drepanum in the mythical tale of Troy.[63]

This lake, then, had been a kind of stage for the reenactment of a Trojan identity. Sidonius' ekphrasis evinces a fascinatingly dynamic and creative interplay between memory, myth, text, space, and performance, through which a part of the drama of Roman imperial origins was transmuted into a local pastime. Participation in collective rituals and the production of new, distinctly Arvernian meanings indicate that the myth had taken root in the social life of the community outside of mere imperial flattery, literary games, or intertextual allusions to Neronian poets. But other Arvernian landscapes reflected the complexity and ambiguity of local social memories that we have observed elsewhere in Sidonius' works: writing from Augustonemetum to his acquaintance Maurusius in the nearby countryside in a district called the *pagus Vialoscensis*, Sidonius makes reference to the more ancient name of the place, the *pagus Martialis*, which used to be so called, he claims, because it had once been the site of the winter quarters of Caesar's legions.[64] Such toponymical etymologies that activate latent memories of the Roman conquest reveal the existence of a fundamental tension of non-identity between selves and others that no mythical *fraternitas* could elide.

This tension remained through the end of Roman rule. In another letter to a friend some years later, when Sidonius had learned that the penultimate Roman emperor in the west, Julius Nepos, had just ceded the territory of the Arverni to the Visigoths,[65] he lamented the unworthy fate of his adoptive *patria*:

> Our freedom has been bartered for the security of others, the freedom of the Arverni (the indignity!), who, if ancient stories

be recalled, dared once to call themselves brothers to Latium and counted themselves a people sprung from Trojan blood.[66]

Echoing closely the language of Lucan to his learned correspondent, the bishop Graecus of Massilia,[67] Sidonius represents this betrayal as all the more acute because of the Trojan kinship. In a last, almost ironic role reversal, the indignant Arverni deploy the invented tradition that had once drawn the indignation of the Romans.

The Arverni continued to self-identify as a distinct community even after they were handed over to the Goths, and a final faint memory of their Trojan past can be found in a passage of the sixth-century historian Gregory of Tours. Although Gregory is most often thought of in association with Caesarodunum, the city of the Turoni in which he served most of his life as bishop, he was in fact an Arvernian by birth, and throughout his *Historia Francorum* he displays a keen interest in the history of his people.[68] His digression on the fateful expedition of the Arverni to capture the city of Arelate for the Frankish king Sigebert I in 569 CE exemplifies this self-interest:

> And when the army [of the Arverni] was wounded from behind by missiles and was overwhelmed by stones hurled by the townsmen, they headed for the river Rhodanus [Rhône], and there, floating on their shields, they made for the far bank. But many were carried away by the force of the river and drowned, and the Rhodanus did then to the Arverni what the Semoes is said to have once done to the Trojans [Verg., *Aen.* 1.100–1, 118]: "[the Semoes] carries men's shields and helmets and powerful bodies, dragged beneath the waves. Here and there swimmers surface in the wide, churning waters."[69]

This passage can be read, in a sense, as the swan song of the Arverni, and so it is fitting that Gregory depicts their downfall with a Virgilian brush: the Arverni, drowning in the Rhone, bear a tragic resemblance to their Trojan ancestors swallowed by the Semoes long ago.[70]

Ultimately, "becoming Trojan" was not a discourse about "becoming Roman," but rather part of an ongoing *local* conversation about what it

meant to be Arvernian or Aeduan, meanings continually renegotiated—from before the conquest through late antiquity—at the intersection between community and empire.

Becoming Rutulian

There was another side to the story of the Trojan arrival in Italy and the west, for Aeneas and his followers did not land in *terra nullius*. Under the leadership of the anti-Aeneas, Turnus of Ardea, the unconquered farmers and fierce youth in the fields of the Latins and on the shores of the Rutulians swore a common oath to resist the invader who claimed to be some fated king. This primordial conflict between imperial power and indigenous communities, between disparate memories of the past that authorized competing claims to the present, was long a productive mythical analog with which to think through the problems of Roman expansion. The ambivalence inherent in the Trojans' war against the Rutulians and Latins was captured most vividly in the second half of the *Aeneid* by Virgil, whose treatment of the inexorable human tragedy reveals signs throughout of the new meanings and complexities that the story had acquired in the course of the first century BCE. During this period in which Italy was repeatedly devastated by internecine strife, the foundational violence of the past was reinterpreted in light of the present, the tale reworked to reflect contemporary anxieties.[71] This continuous process of myth-historical revisionism must have been underway already since the early third century BCE, when the Romans first began to deploy the idea of "Trojan-ness" as an integral aspect of their identity in dealings with foreign peoples, many of whom, like the Aedui and Arverni, aligned themselves collaboratively with Roman origins in response, strategically remaking themselves and their pasts as "Trojan." It was equally possible, however, for adversaries and subjects to use Roman stories for their own ends in self-accounts that challenged, problematized, or even subverted the hegemonic narrative. Such appropriations participate in the "reproduction of difference," redefining local identity through creative adaptations and distortions of imperial culture.[72] At the Iberian city of Saguntum, on the ruins of which the foundations of the Roman empire in the west were laid, the scattered survivors who returned from a decade of captivity in the aftermath of the Second Punic War looked to the Italian past

for inspiration as they reconstructed the identity of the community along with its urban fabric. But in that past they did not find themselves identifying with the Trojans. Theirs was a story of becoming Rutulian.

We have seen already that early Greek writers had, through their etymologizing, variously connected the origins of Saguntum to the island of Zacynthus, or to a homonymous but otherwise unknown companion of Hercules, and that the Saguntines themselves ultimately came to incorporate these externally ascribed myths into their self-accounts.[73] But in the years following the restoration of their city at the end of the third century BCE, the Saguntines invented their own supplementary origin story, which intertwined the distant past of their city with that of the Romans, at the same time as it situated the recent sufferings of a historical period—betrayal, siege, conquest, destruction, diaspora, and enslavement—in a much deeper and richer epic paradigm of conflict, ruin, and displacement. This myth too had recourse to etymology, although of a decidedly vernacular nature: the Iberian legends on the early coinage of the city reveal that it actually had, like many cities of the region, a double name: *Arse-Saguntum*.[74] To explain the first element, Arse, the locals looked to Ardea, the city of the Rutulians on the coast of Latium, where Turnus had held sway long ago. Only a few snippets of this invented tradition are preserved. The historian Livy had found it mentioned among his sources that, in addition to the "original" Greek settlers from Zacynthus, "there had even been an admixture of certain men of the Rutulian people from Ardea."[75] A very odd idea, upon which the historian does not elaborate; nowhere else in the Roman mythographical tradition is an *Italian* city alleged to have founded colonies outside of Italy. This bare notice of the Rutulian origins of Saguntum is only slightly expanded in the first book of the Flavian epic of Silius Italicus on the war against Hannibal. As he sets the stage for the tragic pathos of the Saguntines, the poet recounts the first two waves of settlement of the city, by Heraclid heroes and Greek colonists, before concluding with its more proximate, Italian immigrants:

> Shortly thereafter these humble beginnings were strengthened by Daunian youths,
> Lacking lands of their own, whom Ardea of famous name sent forth,

> A city ruled by heroic kings and rich in the number of her sons.
> The freedom of the people and the glory of its ancestors were
>   guaranteed by treaty,
> And it was forbidden for the Carthaginians to rule the city.[76]

A basic outline of this third foundation legend can thus be reconstructed from the fragments. At some point not very long after the Zacynthians arrived in Iberia (which the locals placed some two hundred years before the fall of Troy), Rutulians from Ardea, driven by new population pressures, sailed westward and augmented the Hellenic beginnings of Saguntum, bestowing upon it a second name derived from their own homeland. It is probable that the Saguntines dated this final phase to the age of the Trojan wanderings, and understood it in relation to the most prominent appearance of Ardea in Roman myth: the resistance of the indigenous Italians, led by Turnus, the son of Daunus, against Aeneas. Turnus must be implied in the reference to the "heroic kings" of Ardea; moreover, in epic, "Daunian" is an adjective applied most commonly to Turnus (*Daunius heros*) and to the generation of Rutulians over whom he ruled (*Daunia gens*). Thus with the temporal marker (*mox*), the patronymic epithet, and the allusions to the *Aeneid*, Silius has implicitly but securely situated this peripheral episode within the frame of mainstream Roman mythical tradition. In this context, it is logical to connect the exigencies that beset the country and necessitated the emigration of some of the Rutulians with the devastation attendant upon the invasion and conquest of the Trojans and the death of Turnus.

While our knowledge of this myth of (re)foundation is mediated through these "external" sources, it is most likely to have been the product of the people of Saguntum themselves. There are several points that argue in favor of this interpretation. Firstly, the myth is redundant, from an outsider's perspective; Greek mythographers had already situated and explained Saguntum within their typical plot structures—a homonymous and thus genetic relationship to a Greek place, and to a Greek hero—and there was no pressing need for a third version. A functional explanation must look beyond the Greeks. More importantly, the indigenous name *Arse* was apparently unknown to Greek and Roman writers, who without exception call the city Saguntum or Zakantha; thus neither Livy nor Silius recognized the story as basically etymological in nature, and it is highly unlikely to have

been conceived of as such by any of their literary predecessors. Lastly, and most telling of a local point of origin, the story was not only unnecessary and methodologically inexplicable from the outside, but it is fundamentally incompatible with Roman tradition, and violates the generic conventions of *origines gentium*; a colony planted by Ardea (or any Latin city) in Hispania is unparalleled and would have been nonsensical to the Romans, for even in the malleable landscape of myth, Italians did not leave Italy to found cities abroad. Livy, for his part, constrained by this tradition, could not imagine a setting into which the episode would reasonably fit, and thus he left it a strange and undeveloped tangent.

It seems that this locally generated origin myth took shape in the context of increasingly close diplomatic and economic exchanges between the Romans and the Saguntines in the course of the first half of the second century. In 205 BCE, the community had sent an official delegation to the Senate at Rome to express their gratitude for the active involvement of the Romans in the restoration of the city, to make votive offerings on the Capitol, and to obtain confirmation of the privileges conferred on them by Roman commanders in the field. Having succeeded in its primary mission, the embassy made one further request:

> When the Saguntines asked permission to go on a sightseeing tour of Italy as far as was safe, guides were given to them and letters sent through the towns with instructions that the men from Hispania should be hospitably welcomed.[77]

It is not unreasonable to expect that among their stops was Ardea, only thirty kilometers south of Rome, and that the ambassadors, playing the part of ethnographic inquirers, had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the major central Italian origin myths that were current at the time, as well as the local variations thereupon. Such interactions may have inspired, in part, the creation of a new "sequel" through which the Saguntines might interject themselves and their past into this Italian discourse. As the first allied state of Rome in Iberia, Saguntum must have experienced anxieties—justified by the course of events in the war against Hannibal— over its precarious position as an outlier, geographically and culturally, in a network otherwise composed of states and peoples that shared significantly more history, fictive and otherwise; two generations earlier, during the first

war against the Carthaginians, the Elymian city of Segesta in Sicily had responded to similar concerns by advertising its own connection to the Trojan past of the Romans.[78] Although some scholars have attempted to connect transformations in the myths and material culture of Saguntum in the second century to an influx of Italian settlers or to the direct intervention of Rome, there is no compelling reason to postulate "colonization," cultural or otherwise, to account for the spread of ideas. Such interpretations deny the agency and capacity for innovation of provincial peoples.[79] Like the amalgams of local and imperial in contemporary Saguntine architecture, visual art, epigraphy, or town planning that were discussed in Chapter 3, the "discovery" of an Italian past reflects complex negotiations of identity and memory within the community. As to the means by which the Rutulian origins of Saguntum entered the Roman historiographical tradition, it would have been through a work written in Latin that covered the Second Punic War, by an author with some firsthand experience of this region of Iberia and an unusually keen interest in the mythical pasts and self-accounts of non-Roman peoples: the *Origines* ("Origins") of Cato the Elder, published around 150 BCE and extant only in fragments, fits this description well.[80]

This much can be said about the content of the remarkable and understudied foundation legend of Saguntum, and the circumstances in which it developed. Its implications are important. Such provincial engagement with and rearticulation of Italian myth created distinctively local meanings out of imperial culture and invented new pasts that were neither recognizably Roman nor entirely independent. In the flight of the Rutulians from Ardea to Arse, we are afforded the faintest glimpse into the dynamics surrounding the formation of a third, *provincial* generation of the Epic Cycle: just as a Greek story of disaster visited upon Trojan "others" (the *Iliad*) had been appropriated and retold in the origin myth of peoples who came to identify with those others (ultimately, in the *Aeneid*), a Roman story of disaster visited upon Rutulian "others" served as the kernel for the mythical charter of Arse-Saguntum. Antagonists become protagonists, others become selves; the triumph of the invader becomes the ruin of the emigrant, and the wanderers' progress is ever further westward. The resulting narrative, however, even if integrated without difficulty into the universe of epic storytelling, is less easily reconciled with triumphalist imperial interpretations of the Trojan mission to Latium. As with the end of the *Aeneid* itself, there is a deeply

disquieting ambiguity in the origins of Saguntum: if Lavinium was founded by the Trojans upon the tragic downfall of the Rutulians, what does this say about the relationship between the descendants of Aeneas and those of Turnus, Rome and Saguntum? In what way is history prefigured in myth? To interpret the revisionism of the story as a provincial critique of empire is to go too far; but insofar as Roman expansion into the west was predicated upon the catastrophe of the new Ardea at Saguntum, it is an eloquent analog for the discrepant experiences of conquered and incorporated peoples. Empire was a costly thing, as those who paid its tolls remembered. The uses of Mediterranean pasts by the Saguntines from the middle Republic into the early imperial period—from "going Greek" to telling tales of Rutulian origins—are another clear testament to the power of local initiative, and to the robust workings of social memory in the west.

Imag(in)ing Mythical Roman Foundations

Memories of the Trojan past were, as we have seen in these case studies, variously appropriated and revised as *local* traditions in the west. While through these innovative traditions communities situated themselves within Roman frameworks from the bottom up, concomitantly more canonical, imperial constructions of the distant Roman past—embodied especially in Aeneas and elaborated in Augustan ideology—also became deeply embedded in the visual and cultural vocabularies of the provinces. But even here local agency and initiative played a fundamentally important role. In the last decades of the first century BCE, an individual at Mediolanum, the chief place of the *civitas* of the Santones, adorned his tomb, designed in the Doric order, with a relief depicting the she-wolf suckling Romulus and Remus. This image, emblazoned on a kind of *clipeus* (shield), has been understood in relation to the visual language of the monument as a whole as part of a programmatic emphasis on the military prowess of the deceased, although some scholars have perhaps gone too far in suggesting that he had seen service in the Roman legions.[81] It is among the very earliest representations of the mythical scene of the wolf and twins in the western provinces, and thus it is remarkable that it comes from a private funerary context, in a non-colonial community.[82] Like other Roman-style monuments set up by elites of the Santones in the early imperial period that we have examined in the previous chapter, this

tomb focalizes a performance of identity that is locally directed, aimed at the acquisition and maintenance of symbolic capital and social status within the *civitas*. It is noteworthy that this local symbolic capital was garnered in part through the deployment of Roman symbols, whose meaning was likely to have been very different in Aquitanian Mediolanum than it was in, for example, Italian Aesernia;[83] perhaps here in Gaul this "icon" was a kind of act of "translation," which, like the service of Gallic elites in the Roman cavalry in the immediate post-conquest period, was a renegotiation of an increasingly obsolescent traditional aristocratic warrior ethos.[84]

An even more striking example of this process of the iconographic dissemination of the mythical Roman past is found at Augusta Emerita. The city was founded on the river Anas as a veteran colony in 25 BCE. It subsequently became the administrative capital of Lusitania, and, commensurate with its status, was adorned with the full complement of Roman public buildings. Later, in the principate of Claudius, a new monumental space was created to the northeast of the main *forum*, the so-called *forum adiectum*. The remarkable amount of architectural and sculptural evidence that has emerged from this sector of the ancient city has seen renewed scholarly interest in the last two decades, and deservedly so.[85] This was a porticoed space whose iconographic program was a reflection of that of the forum of Augustus at Rome, from the decoration of the attics with Caryatids to the series of marble statues in niches around its perimeter. The fragments suggest that these statues represented the legendary kings of Alba, dressed in the imaginary costume that Roman antiquarians had designed for them, and several togate figures, whose identities cannot be determined but who must have been excerpted from the parade of the historical "hall of fame" (*summi viri*).[86] But the focus of the forum, as in its Roman model, seems to have been a statue group of the fleeing Aeneas, carrying his father Anchises and leading the young Ascanius by the hand, of which substantial surviving fragments enable a plausible reconstruction.[87] The group was accompanied by an inscribed *elogium*, recounting the achievements of Aeneas.[88] A seemingly identical inscription, though also fragmentary, is known from the forum of Pompeii, outside the building of Eumachia.[89] Such a correspondence renders it almost certain that both inscriptions go back to a single exemplar, which must have been the original *elogium* in the forum of Augustus.

At Corduba, the capital of the neighboring province of Baetica, it seems

that there was also an attempt at monumentalizing locally the Augustan version of the Roman past through the replication of elements from the forum of Augustus. Within the forum of Corduba stood a copy, probably also Claudian in date, of Romulus carrying the *spolia opima*,[90] which at Rome was positioned opposite the aforementioned Aeneas-Anchises group: Romulus led the procession of the *summi viri*, Aeneas that of the Julian house.

Although here we are without explicit evidence, the initiative and the agency behind the implementation of these monumental programs were in all likelihood local, rather than imperial. Whether their conception and execution were purely civic or were part of a wider provincial undertaking, these public expressions of social memory in the *fora* of the provincial capitals of Spain, both dating to the middle of the first century CE, implicate a local conversation about the Roman past. Indeed, given that the comparatively small *forum adiectum* at Emerita probably did not contain the entire Augustan "hall of fame," we must assume that choices had to be made: relative weight, for example, seems to have been given, somewhat surprisingly, to the line of Alban kings, who were otherwise minor and undeveloped figures in the Roman mythical tradition. Thus we should not read these monumental public spaces as simply expressions of loyalty to the imperial order, but as contextualized, discursive constructions of the Roman past, much as Augustus' own version had been.

Unpacking the meanings with which such monuments were invested by provincial viewers is problematic; this is a question to which we shall return at several points. But it is clear that provincial capitals naturally served as important sites of mediation and transmission, and that the iconography of the mythical Roman past was gradually incorporated into the vocabularies of local, non-colonial communities, whose elites belonged to wider social networks. Corduba and the communities of which its *conventus*—or administrative district—was composed are a paradigmatic example.[91]

At the municipium of Obulco (Porcuna), two local magistrates—father and son—publicly dedicated a statue group of a sow with thirty piglets:

> Gaius Cornelius Caeso, son of Gaius and grandson of Gaius, of the voting-tribe Galeria, aedile, priest, and *duumvir* of the municipium of Obulco *Pontificensis*, together with his son Gaius Cornelius Caeso, priest of the municipal *genius*, donated and

dedicated a statue of the sow with thirty piglets at their own expense.[92]

This sculptural theme alludes to the discovery of the white sow and her piglets by Aeneas at the future site of Lavinium; or, in the alternate Virgilian version, the sow was a portent of the later foundation of Alba Longa by Ascanius.[93] Similar representations are known from Lavinium and the city of Rome itself from the late first century BCE.[94] What lies behind the choice of this theme in the context of Iberian Obulco, however, is more difficult to determine. But, given the connection of the sow in Roman mythology with the foundation of either or both of the profoundly important Latin cities of Lavinium and Alba, it is distinctly possible that this group could have been deployed as a symbol of the *ius Latii*, the Latin right, an honor which Obulco, like most of the communities of Spain, would have obtained through the sweeping grant of Vespasian.[95] What better symbol of "Latinness"? If this suggestion is correct, then the monument set up by the Cornelii at Obulco represents a complex civic response to Roman authority: beyond the administrative reorganization associated with the acquisition of the *ius Latii*—as reflected in the new municipal charters, for example—there was a deeper reorganization of community ideology. The reimagining of the sow as a symbol of the Latin right was, in a sense, a reinterpretation of the Roman past, in which a clear parallelism was established between the extension of Trojan power into Italy and that of Roman power into Spain, in which Obulco was cast as a kind of new Lavinium. Through the initiative of local actors, imperial iconographies like this were encoded with new meanings.[96]

Moving to the north, at the municipium of Epora (Montoro), a would-be member of the local elite, probably a freedman from the Greek east, judging from his position as a *sevir Augustalis* and his cognomen, set up a statue of the "Roman wolf":

> Marcus Valerius Phoebus, *sevir Augustalis*, whom the town council of the municipium of Epora on account of his merits allowed to join the town councilors at public dinners and to whom other honors were decreed, [. . .] a statue of the Roman Wolf to be placed.[97]

The epithet *Romana* for the she-wolf is unusual, and is otherwise unattested in the epigraphic record. Perhaps in the use of the adjective here we can detect a slight rhetoric of strangeness; though euergetism was still manifested at Epora in ostensibly Roman forms like the wolf, the externality inherent in their very *Romanness* is consciously marked out in a way not perceptible elsewhere. Such rhetoric does not participate in an "insiders' debate" about the Roman cultural package, but rather implicates an alternative, local conversation in which elements drawn from the cultural vocabulary of Roman power signified alterity. The *lupa* here at Epora would seem to be a token currency in a municipal symbolic economy, the value of which was derived from its perceived associations with imperial power.

There is one other interesting example of the potential uses of the legendary Roman past from this single *conventus*. At Singili, a short distance south of Corduba, we find yet another visual articulation of imperial mythology as an act of civic munificence, in the form of a statue group of the she-wolf and twins:

> I, Marcus Cornelius Primigenius, citizen of Singili, on account of the kindness that I received from the town council of Singili—a place in which I might place a statue of my son Marcus Cornelius Saturninus—have given as a gift a statue of the wolf with the two infants.[98]

In this inscription, as indeed in the others from Epora and Obulco, we are presented primarily with a local discourse of power and influence among municipal elites. Although previous scholars have tended to read all such discursive statements as expressions of "loyalty" to imperial authority,[99] I would argue that questions of loyalty are secondary, if relevant at all. At Obulco, the sow of Lavinium was a means to focalize a renegotiated community identity; at Epora, a social-climbing freedman used a token Roman symbol to ingratiate himself with the town council; and here at Singili, the donation of the statue group by Primigenius was a kind of *quid pro quo* for the opportunity to publicly monumentalize his family's prominence within the *municipium*. Under the influence of provincial capitals like Corduba, euergetism was increasingly conducted in a common imperial vocabulary to which a certain cachet was attached, but in the end, all politics was local.

Despite the prominence of Roman iconographies and Roman mythologies, it is important to emphasize that in these provinces there were certainly other monuments, other iconographies, and other symbols that represented non-Roman mythical pasts whose details and narratives are now beyond the ability of the historian to recover. At the comparatively insignificant Baetican *municipium* of Nescania (Sierra de Abdalagis), only a short distance south of the boundary of the *conventus* of Corduba, a member of the community set up a statue of a she-goat (*signum caprae*), dedicated to the local *genius*, in the public space of the *forum*.[100] This prominently monumentalized connection between the *genius municipii* and the she-goat bears a remarkable similarity to the case of the sow at Obulco or the she-wolf at Singili, and hints tantalizingly at the possibility of some comparable local foundation myth just beyond our grasp, one that perhaps coexisted—in the physical space of the forum and in the cultural milieu—with them.

The potential for the accommodation of local memories and imperial ideology through the adaptation of pre-Roman zoomorphic iconographies to Roman mythological parallels is evident in the development of the bronze coinage of the city of Iltirta (called Ilerda in Latin), in the country of the Ilergetae, in the course of the late republican period and the Augustan age. Multiple series struck by the semi-autonomous mint in the last third of the second century and the first third of the first century BCE represented a youthful diademed male figure—perhaps a god or hero—on the obverse, and a male wolf on the reverse, accompanied by the legend *Iltirta* in the local Iberian script.[101] These kinds of totemic animals, symbolic representations of the community, are a common motif on Iberian coinages, as well as in other visual media like *tesserae hospitales*. Under Augustus, when the city was promoted to the status of a *municipium*, the reverse type underwent slight but significant modifications: the civic legend was translated and transliterated into *Ilerda* and, more interestingly, the totem was transformed into a *female* wolf. The lupine sex change reflects the clever integration of imperial culture into local frameworks, an inverse directionality of "assimilation" to that which typically receives emphasis in scholarship; a recognizable icon of Rome is made meaningful as a totem of Ilerda, building on Iberian traditions, symbolic vocabularies, and modes of viewing. While the coin allows for two radically different and self-contained readings, its ideal viewer is an *Ilerdensis* who can put these histories in conversation with one

another. Though rarely as clearly legible or as evocative as the two wolves of Ilerda, instances of carefully constructed ambiguities, blurred boundaries, and subtle slippages between pasts Roman and local were widespread in the western provinces.

Not all instances of Roman foundation myths in Spain had primarily political or civic valences, however. More problematic in terms of the profound cultural distortion inherent in its construction and use of the mythical Roman past is a seemingly votive dedication to the *lupa Augusta*, "the Augustan wolf," at Baetulo (Badalona), probably of the late first or early second century CE.[102] Worship of the wolf itself, and not in the rationalized form of the goddess Luperca, is never securely attested at Rome, despite what the misleading polemics of later Christian authors like Lactantius and Arnobius would have us believe.[103] Such religious practice would scarcely have been recognizable or even intelligible to a Roman observer of the early imperial period. Somewhat similarly to the case of the cult of *Quirinus Augustus* with which we opened this chapter, worship of the *lupa Augusta* frustrates a simplistic definition as either "Roman" or "native." It represents a kind of cultural malapropism that is not uncommon in imperial encounters generally, and that must have been far more frequent in the western provinces than is usually detectable in the archaeological or epigraphic record. This inscription and its use of the she-wolf seems to reflect an aspirational effort on the part of the *libertus* and *sevir Augustalis* L. Visellius Tertius at achieving or imitating some constructed idea of "Romanness."[104] But one need not necessarily internalize the gaze of the imperial center and understand such an act as a failure, a poor counterfeit of culture; like the *lupa Romana* of M. Valerius Phoebus at Epora, the *lupa Augusta* at Baetulo may have been accepted currency in the local symbolic economy.

In coming to terms with such practices in the provinces, Melanesian "cargo cult" is in some respects a more apt model than more standard acculturative interpretations, in that these practices are predicated upon imperfect local constructions and deployments of the Roman cultural vocabulary, or of the very idea of "Roman."[105] A useful check against overestimating the universal intelligibility of imperial culture in provincial communities is offered by a Greek traveler's description of the local response in the hinterland of Baetica to the proclamation issued by Nero in the middle of the first century CE in reference to his success at the recent Olympic games:

> The city of Gades understood the victory, and that there was a famous competition in Arcadia, since they had a keen interest in Greek culture, but the neighboring communities did not recognize what "the Olympics" was, nor what was meant by "games" or "competition," nor for what reason they were made to perform sacrifices; instead, they were led to the laughable belief that this was a victory in war, and that Nero had conquered some people called "the Olympians."[106]

Not unreasonably, communities that had been repeatedly instructed over the years to celebrate, unhesitatingly and mechanically, an emperor's Parthic or Germanic or Britannic victories, understood this "Olympic victory" as one more in a string of conquests over distant tribes well off the edge of their mental map. As part of the attendant festivities, a tragic actor even undertook a tour of the province, where he met with misunderstanding and misadventure at the town of Ilipula (Niebla). The reaction of the inhabitants to this novel type of costume and performance, which they had never before seen, quickly turned from wonderment to terror, as the audience fled from the makeshift theater as if they had encountered a demon; "so backwards are the customs of those barbarians," concluded the Greek.[107] It is worth noting that these are the same peoples whom the geographer Strabo, as we have seen, had described two generations earlier as "not far from being entirely Romans"; perhaps that distance was greater and more enduring than it might at first appear. While our source for the travesty made of Neronian propaganda may have exaggerated the cultural disconnect and the ignorance of the local Iberian communities for literary effect, these stories are unlikely to be wholly fictions of the ethnographic gaze. We should be wary of assuming that there was not a great deal lost (or added, or distorted) in the translation of imperial messages and cultural forms to local provincial contexts. How did the Lusitani, for example, understand the object of their veneration in the votive altars scattered along the valley of the Tagus and its tributaries dedicated to *Toga*? This is probably an obscure epichoric divinity, rather than the "cargo cult" of Roman dress.[108] But in light of unexpected interpretations of Roman wolves and Olympic victories, there is room to wonder.

Aeneas

As has been emphasized throughout this discussion, images and imaginings of Roman myths of foundation in Spain and Gaul were not simple expressions of loyalty to imperial authority, but rather complex attempts to come to terms with Rome through locally mediated versions of the Roman past. Questions of loyalty inevitably raise the specter of disloyalty. In the attempts of the notorious Gallic usurper Carausius to legitimize his rule, constructions of the Roman past played an important role. Carausius, as Aurelius Victor informs us, was a man of humble birth from the *civitas* of the Menapii, a people of Gallia Belgica whose territory was situated immediately to the west of the mouth of the Rhine.[109] In 286 CE, while commanding the imperial fleet against Saxon pirates, Carausius revolted against the emperor Maximian, fled to Britain with his ships, and had himself proclaimed Augustus. Though we know little from historical sources of his seven-year rule of an independent empire in Britain and northern Gaul, a wealth of numismatic evidence provides insight into his self-fashioning and his imperial ideology.

Carausius minted a wide variety of types over a short period, which in their propaganda drew on the fundamental Roman myths.[110] Even the more derivative themes, like the she-wolf and twins on the reverse of an issue of silver denarii, minted perhaps at Londinium (London) in Britain or Rotomagus (Rouen) on the Continent, were supplemented by original slogans: on these coins, Carausius calls himself *renovator Romanorum*, "restorer of the Romans."[111] Perhaps even more striking is the acronym in the exergue: *RSR*. As scholars have long realized, it is unintelligible as a mere mint-mark. But a convincing argument has been made by de la Bédoyère, based on a re-reading of this coinage in conjunction with a series of commemorative medallions issued by Carausius that bear acronyms similarly difficult to decipher, and with poetical allusions in contemporary panegyric, that *RSR* here is an abbreviation of the famous line of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*: *redeunt Saturnia regna*, "the golden age returns."[112] Virgil is evoked somewhat more transparently on another coin type,[113] whose reverse legend, again unique to Carausius, reads *expectate veni*, "come, O long-awaited one," an echo of Tiberinus' appellation of Aeneas in book eight of the *Aeneid*.[114] These are, remarkably, the only Virgilian allusions known from Roman imperial coin-

age. Constructions—or re-constructions—of the Roman past thus factored prominently and innovatively into the ideological program of Carausius' upstart rule in northern Gaul and Britain, the communities of which seem to have been actively engaged in both the reception and the creation of its messages: Carausius was a new Aeneas, a new Augustus, who would usher in an age of peace and prosperity.[115]

In the western provinces, there were interpretations of Virgil's presentation of the mythical origins of Roman empire that ran contrary to the triumphalist Augustan reading, meanings of Aeneas that diverged from that of "long-awaited" hero-king. Relevant to this consideration is a mosaic that has recently come to light during excavations at Abelterium (Alter do Chão), in the province of Lusitania about thirty kilometers southwest of the ancient city of Ammaia (São Salvador da Aramenha). Found in the context of a rural villa, likely dated to the early fourth century CE, the mosaic illustrates the final scene of the *Aeneid*—the end of the fateful duel between Aeneas and Turnus—and poignantly captures the moment of hesitation on the part of the Trojan as he weighs his choice to execute or to spare the suppliant Rutulian king.[116] Representations of Roman myth were an important element of the cultural vocabulary utilized by provincial elites in the adornment of domestic spaces, as well as in public monumentality. The she-wolf, for example, is a reasonably widespread motif in mosaics of the Iberian Peninsula from the second century onward.[117] But the choice of the theme of Aeneas and Turnus on the newly discovered mosaic from Alter do Chão is extraordinary, unattested elsewhere in Roman art of the western provinces. The end of the *Aeneid* is a far more challenging and controversial subject than the usual stock scenes from the epic painted on the walls of Pompeii, for example. Clearly some western provincial readers did not miss the potential complexities and ambiguities of Virgil's text; perhaps they were even drawn to those passages that were most complex, most ambiguous. This piece of art was likely intended as a conversation piece, meant to spark discussion and debate amongst the dinner companions of the owner of this villa as they reclined around its perimeter. Indeed, the depictions of the two armies in the mosaic, which stand in stark contrast to one another, further the ambivalence already present in the literary model: the "Orientalizing" physiognomy and dress of the soldiers who flank Aeneas deliberately defamiliarizes the Trojans as

Phrygian barbarians and "others," encouraging, on some level, an identification of "selves" with the defeated Rutulian onlookers.

These viewers—or readers—were attuned to "further voices" in Virgil's *Aeneid*, which must have informed their interpretations of the scene, and thus their constructions of the Roman past and its implications for local identity. Contrary to the arguments put forward by some scholars, it seems unlikely that provincials such as these read Virgil as a straightforward textbook in Roman civilization. Perhaps the viewers of this mosaic were ill at ease with the inherently problematic end of Turnus, who paid the ultimate price for standing in the way of Aeneas' quest. Perhaps it prompted reflection on the cost at which Roman foundations came not just in Latium, but in Lusitania as well. While this is admittedly somewhat speculative, there is corroborative epigraphic and literary evidence from Lusitania that speaks to the potential existence of more critical interpretations of the Roman past, both historical and mythical. The previously discussed fragmentary inscription found at the colony of Pax Iulia, a short distance south of this villa, which records the verse epitaph of a wandering *cantor* who claims to have sung, in Virgilian fashion, of local "unconquered peoples," speaks to this point.[118] Therein the Lusitanian poet drew a subtle parallel between the idealized, pre-Roman past of his own country and the golden age landscape of Italy before the arrival of the Trojans. This allusive association between the local, pre-conquest Lusitani and Turnus and his Latins is tenuous, but, in connection with the mosaic under discussion, it is at least thought-provoking. For some western provincial readers constructing selves and others in the text of Virgil, it was possible to identify with the decline of the Ausonian land of Turnus rather than the rise of the Roman city of Aeneas.

The work of the late antique historian Orosius, who hailed from the city of Bracara Augusta in northwestern Spain, is also apposite to the cultural context of the Turnus mosaic.[119] While his Christian identity is usually emphasized in scholarship to the exclusion of his salient self-representation as a native of Callaecia, a religious agenda can only partially account for the critique of Roman empire that runs through Orosius' work; much of his tendentious account of Roman history as an uninterrupted cycle of violence and misery seems to activate latent provincial memories of conquest. For him, the series of transgressions against local populations could ultimately be traced back to the mythical founder of the empire, Aeneas:

The lessons of elementary school have burned in our memory
the warriors stirred up by the arrival of Aeneas in Italy after his
flight from Troy, the kinds of battles that he provoked for three
years, and the great number of peoples in whom he instilled
hatred and to whom he brought destruction.[120]

From this "imperial textbook," a provincial might learn lessons that di-
verged from the standard curriculum. It was through this lens that Orosius
interpreted the progress of Roman imperialism into the historical period. In
the fifth book of his work, the Galician historian frames his narrative of the
Roman conquest of Iberia in large part as a conflict between his own local
ancestors and aggressive imperial expansion. To quote excerpts from a par-
ticularly vivid passage of the opening section:

For two centuries Spain drenched her fields with her own blood,
and was unable to drive off or to resist her overbearing enemy,
who brought trouble to every home. . . . Our ancestors waged
wars, and, exhausted by wars, they sought peace and offered
tribute: tribute is the price of peace. We ourselves pay tribute to
avoid the renewal of war, and thus we have dropped anchor and
remain in that port to which our ancestors fled in order to escape
the storm of evils. . . . If anyone says that the Romans were easier
for our ancestors to endure as enemies than the Goths are for us
now, let him pay attention and learn how wrong he is.[121]

Still in the fourth and fifth centuries in the western provinces, then,
there were divergent readings of the Roman past, discrepant experiences of
Roman power, discourses of identity in which memories of ancestral resis-
tance to the "Roman other" played a significant role. Perhaps if Orosius and
the anonymous poet of Pax Iulia had ever reclined around the provocative
mosaic at Abelterium, there might have been a part of them hoping for Tur-
nus, not Aeneas, to prevail in that final duel.

Romulus and Remus

As there were variant readings of Aeneas in Spain and Gaul, so too there
were localized, unconventional, and non-canonical uses and understandings
of Romulus and Remus. The incorporation of Remus into the origin myth

of the Belgic Remi, discussed in the introduction, is perhaps the most star-tlingly inventive. But there were other episodes from the story of the myth-ical Roman founders—from the initial arc of their exposure, nursing, and discovery to their fatal confrontation to the ultimate death and apotheosis of Romulus—that captured the imaginations of provincials. One was their in-stitution of—and ill-fated running in—the Lupercalia.[122] This pre-urban fes-tival, connected with the cult of Faunus, was celebrated for the purposes of purification and fertility by the young shepherds, then dwelling at the foot of the Palatine hill near that spot where they had been exposed, the *Lupercal*. At its core, it consisted of the sacrifice of a dog and a goat, whose skin was then cut into strips, which were brandished as whips by the youthful priestly participants—*Luperci*—as they ran naked (or nearly so) around the Palatine striking the bystanders, particularly the young women.[123] This social ritual, which increasingly acquired a kind of carnivalesque texture, was performed at Rome throughout the republican and imperial periods. Given its religious and memorial significance for the Romans as "a celebration of the founders and the origin of the community," the Lupercalia had great evocative capac-ity, not just at Rome, but in the western provinces as well.[124]

One of the most intriguing pieces of evidence in this regard is a rela-tively recently published, highly fragmentary inscription from Palma on the *Baliaris maior*, which gives the *cursus honorum* of an unknown local elite who had thrice held the chief civic magistracy, had been *flamen* of Rome and Augustus, and, most important for the purposes of this discussion, had played the role of *lupercus*.[125] The full title of this priesthood on the stone can plausibly be reconstructed in one of two ways: held *in* the Balearic is-lands, or as a representative *from* them.[126] Although subtle, the differences are clearly of great importance for interpreting the inscription and the role of the provincial *lupercus*. While the latter reading would almost certainly place the performance of the office of *lupercus* unproblematically at Rome, the former would implicate a priest at a seemingly local Balearic celebration of the festival of the Lupercalia. The question of the celebration of the Lu-percalia outside of Rome is a particularly vexed one: the a priori assumption of many scholars is that such a practice would be a logical impossibility, a contradiction in terms, for the festival was inextricably tied to the space of the city of Rome.[127] But, besides this inscription, there are other attestations of *luperci* in the western provinces where the location of the festival at which

they fulfilled their priestly function is ambiguous. For example, at Cuicul (Djemila) in Numidia, one M. Papius Marcianus was made "*lupercus* for the sake of public rituals."[128] When *sacra publica* are referred to elsewhere in provincial epigraphy, invariably these refer to local, municipal rituals,[129] a trend which renders it not impossible that the priest with the title of *lupercus* at Cuicul was, perhaps like the anonymous *lupercus* from Palma, in fact responsible for some kind of local celebration of the Lupercalia. If the monument of Palma does indeed refer to such a festival on the Balearic Islands, it would be a testament to the innovative potential of local initiative in the appropriation and reinterpretation of imperial cultural practices. For a contemporary "Roman" audience (as for some modern scholars), this may have represented a problematic deviation from normative "Roman" practice, in which the Lupercalia were only intelligible and meaningful when staged at the Palatine *lupercal*. But the imagined Roman community and its mythical basis, in the form of founder-figures like Romulus and Remus and the rituals associated with their commemoration, were always subject to the provincial reimagination that was attendant upon local participation, as here in the *Baliares insulae*.[130]

Even if the fragmentary inscription is read elsewise—that is, as referring to a *lupercus* at Rome *from* the Balearic islands and not to a local instance of the festival *in* the islands—it raises interesting questions concerning the participation of "representatives" of provincial communities in the Lupercalia at the imperial center. There is certainly other evidence for western provincials running in the Lupercalia at Rome: two individuals of equestrian rank are mentioned as having "participated in the rites of the Lupercalia" in inscriptions from Caesarea Iol in Mauretania, and two equestrian *luperci* with other connections to the city of Rome are known from Nemausus in Gallia Narbonensis.[131] Indeed it seems that, by the early imperial period, participation in the Lupercalia had become a kind of initiatory rite for young *equites*, who flocked to the annual public revelry around the Palatine from across the empire.[132] As a ritual reenactment of the origins of the Roman community staged at one of the most significative Roman places of memory, the festival must have served an important integrative function for the equestrian sojourners from the provinces, not unlike the purpose that Roman tradition ascribed to the original proto-urban celebration of the shepherds

and villagers of the Palatine. Yet the performance of the office of *lupercus*, judging from the way in which it was prominently advertised, also appears to have bestowed on those who had played the role prestige or symbolic capital within their home communities.

As with other iconography of Roman origins like the statue groups of Aeneas and Anchises or of the she-wolf and twins, the visual vocabulary of the Lupercalia was diffused in the western provinces in the course of the early imperial period, through which a significant portion of the population may have at least become acquainted with its basic program and symbolism. Images of the *lupercal* itself are known from domestic spaces in Tarraconensis,[133] and representations of the actual activities of the festival appear, most famously, on the Mosaic of the Calendar from the House of the Months at Thysdrus (El Djem).[134] Less transparent in its referentiality, however, is a mosaic from the bath complex of the villa of Santa Vitória do Ameixal, from the *conventus Pacensis* in the province of Lusitania. The mosaic depicts a series of interesting—if somewhat obscure—scenes: in one, a group of three men seem to be running after each other, and in another, a man, clad in only a loincloth, beats a nude woman with what appears to be a bundle of branches.[135] This latter scene also bears an inscription, whose meaning has resisted various scholarly attempts at conclusive interpretation.[136] If the proposed word divisions are correct, the text would seem to make reference, through rather poor Latin syntax, to the worsting, in some form, of someone called Felicio by Cirdalus, after which a burned (*torritatus* could be an intensive adjective formed from the verb *torreo*) Felicio obtained some sort of reprieve, if this is the sense of *missus*. Whatever the exact nature of the activity illustrated in this tableau, its visual and textual specificity and idiosyncrasy suggest that it reflects an actual local practice, rather than a generic type scene. Interestingly, many of the basic elements of its performance bear a striking resemblance to the Roman Lupercalia: the running figures, the loincloth costume of the pseudo-*lupercus*, and especially the flagellation of the woman. One of the most convincing readings of this enigmatic mosaic has proposed that it represents a fertility ritual associated with the baths of Santa Vitória or their environs which was consciously reminiscent of the Lupercalia.[137] The cultural negotiation of this peculiar custom left it suffused with the symbolism of the Roman festival but of a quintessentially local flavor.

Elsewhere in Lusitania, at the bridge over the river Tagus at Alcántara, we find a different kind of reinterpretation of the mythology surrounding the Roman founders. The construction of this monumental work of engineering during the rule of Trajan was overseen by a local private architect named Julius Lacer, and, as an inscription informs us, was funded by contributions from several of the surrounding communities.[138] At one end of the bridge Lacer consecrated a temple to the imperial cult, noteworthy as one of only two Roman temples from Spain to have survived in their entirety. But of chief interest for us here is the content of the dedicatory verse inscription, composed in elegiac couplets:

> Consecrated to the emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacicus.
>
> Perhaps interested travelers, whom novel rumor delights, will ask by whom and with what sort of vow this temple was dedicated on the cliffs above the Tagus, filled with the presence of the divine and of Caesar, where art itself is surpassed by its medium. With godlike skill honorable Lacer has built a bridge that will endure into the eternal ages of the world, and he founded a temple to the deified successors of Romulus [*Romulei divi*] together with Caesar [i.e., Trajan]: fortunate in each cause of religion.
>
> Gaius Julius Lacer built and dedicated this in accordance with a decree of the town councilors, with his friend Curius Laco of the Igaeditani.[139]

In this text, Lacer makes explicit reference to his two munificent works: "a bridge that will endure into the eternal ages of the world," and a temple to the living Caesar (i.e., Trajan) and to the *divi Romulei*. While this is a unique epigraphic usage of the adjective *Romuleus*, the context makes it clear that the dedicant intends it as a synonym of *Augustus*: the *divi Romulei* thus stand as a poetic metonymy for the *divi Augusti*, the deceased emperors whose worship was the prime object of the imperial cult.[140] Such a bold association between the apotheosis of Romulus and the deification of the emperors is unparalleled in the imperial cult of the Latin west, and therefore most likely reflects a local reinterpretation of these kinds of public ritual practices, and

an invented connection to Roman myth. Octavian himself had originally contemplated taking the title *Romulus* rather than *Augustus*, but its connotations of fratricide, kingship, and assassination, particularly sensitive topics in the wake of the civil war, deterred him. Within this Lusitanian cultic community, however, emperor and founder *were* conflated, in a way; the conceptualization of the historical *divi* in relation to the mythical Romulus seems to have helped to make sense of contemporary practice. But it was a highly localized meaning, which would have been either uncomfortable or hardly intelligible to an outside audience. The temple at Alcántara can thus serve as a corrective to the standard view of imperial cult as a top-down, static, and homogenizing institution,[141] affording a glimpse into what may in some contexts have been a much more complex relationship between imperial ideology and local initiative, between official narratives and idiosyncratic provincial interpretations of the Roman past.

Memories of the Roman Republic

Memories of Roman pasts more recent than the Trojan wanderings and the nurslings of the she-wolf also informed constructions of local identity in Spain and Gaul. At communities like Saguntum, Iliturgi, Italica, and Vesontio, histories of the Republic—factual, fictitious, and somewhere in between—were told and retold through public monuments. After its fall to Hannibal and the Carthaginians in 219 BCE, Saguntum had ultimately been retaken in the course of the war by the Cornelii Scipiones, who endeavored to restore to the city its former inhabitants who had been sold into slavery throughout Spain.[142] Upon receiving the command after his kinsmen's deaths, Scipio Africanus continued this effort, picking out the Saguntines from the prisoners of every city of Spain that he captured. Three hundred years later, ruin and reconstruction still loomed large in the collective memory of the city. In the early second century CE, the people of Saguntum set up an honorific inscription to Scipio Africanus that commemorated his part in the reestablishment of the community:

> For Publius Scipio, consul, *imperator*, on account of Saguntum having been restored [*ob restitutam Saguntum*] in accordance with a decree of the senate during the Second Punic War.[143]

Similarly to their myth of Rutulian origins, this monument is a testament to the power that the trauma of the Punic sack exerted in shaping the civic identity of Saguntum and the city's conception of its fraught relationship to Rome well into the imperial period. But the emotive rhetoric of restoration in this text, transcending this trauma, fosters a sense of an imagined continuity with the *pre-Roman* past of Saguntum as well. The particular language in which this rhetoric is expressed is noteworthy, for there are significant verbal and thematic parallels between the inscription and the speech of the Saguntine embassy that came before the Roman senate to praise Scipio at the end of the war, as recorded in popular works of Roman historiography. Livy's version placed marked emphasis on the restoration of both the physical city and its citizens, and on the senate's official confirmation of the precarious status of Saguntum as an allied state; the historian has the senate declare "that both the destruction and the restoration of Saguntum (*restitutum Saguntum*) would be an example (*documentum*) for all nations of the enduring loyalty of an ally."[144] Behind the inscription may thus lie an local oral or written tradition of the embassy; but it is equally possible that the early imperial Saguntines were also close readers of the work of Livy, from which they selected events of particular significance for the community, rearticulating them in new forms invested with civic meanings. Scipio at Saguntum suggests the dynamic interplay of imperial historiography, local social memory, and monumentality in the provinces.

At the city of Iliturgi (Cerro Maquiz) in southern Iberia, it was an *invented* memory of the republican past that informed constructions of local identity. In the second century CE, a dedicatory inscription was set up by the *populus Iliturgitanus* to Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus as *deductor*, "colony-founder."[145] Gracchus, the father of the infamous revolutionary tribunes, had served as *praetor* of the province of nearer Spain with great distinction in 179 BCE. But there is no evidence that Iliturgi ever received Roman colonists, and at any rate it would have lain far outside Gracchus' province. Moreover, the only city foundation with which the historical record credits him is Gracchuris, far away in the valley of the upper Ebro in northern Spain.[146] As has been persuasively argued by Wiegels on these and other grounds, the claim made here by the Iliturgitani should be regarded as patently false, a case of historical fabrication that was perhaps, like the restoration inscription at Saguntum, informed by engagement with Roman historiography.[147]

Unlike Saguntum, however, Iliturgi was remembered as the site of treachery, rather than fidelity, to imperial power: Roman armies destroyed the city twice—under Scipio Africanus himself, and a decade later under M. Helvius—before it faded from historical prominence.[148] In the imperial period, the local community of Iliturgi may thus have been motivated to revise and supplement the historical record: firstly, to explain the origins of the present iteration of the city in the aftermath of Helvius' sack of 196 BCE as a collaborative, rather than combative undertaking; and secondly, to elide the more problematic aspects of their past by aligning their civic identity with a Roman commander who, more than any other, was "of a doubly famous name, in both Iberia and in Rome" for his carefully defined treaties and mutually beneficial city foundations.[149] Social memories are malleable, and the vague and erroneous geography of Roman writers on the early conquests of the Republic left room for such local smudging of imperial history. While this is a reasonable hypothesis, the exact motivations of the people of Iliturgi for inventing a Roman founder—and a moment of re-foundation—for themselves must ultimately remain unclear. But the story does seem to have become a social fact, if not a historical one; that is, in the self-account of the Iliturgitani, Gracchus was a meaningful figure, even if the exact contours of that meaning are obscure to us. As Pompey was appropriated as the fictive founder of the Aquitanian Convenae, so Gracchus evidently became a focal point for expressions of community identity among the Iliturgitani, and anchored local conceptions of the past.

Elsewhere, local histories were fleshed out with Roman characters that were adapted to play more tangential, if still meaningful roles. At Italica, a fragmentary marble inscription discovered in excavations in the area of the forum records a dedication to the *populus Italicensis* made by the *imperator* L. Mummius from the spoils of Corinth, which he had infamously captured and sacked in 146 BCE. The text, however, appears to date to the early second century CE, and the connection to an important republican commander appears again to be a figment of the local imagination.[150] While it was well-documented historically that Mummius had adorned many towns in Italy—and perhaps even some in the provinces—with statues and paintings plundered from Corinth (several *tituli Mummiani* are extant that record such dedications), contemporary Italica—then a distant backwater without any formal legal status, populated by the descendants of Italian veterans

wounded in the battle of Ilipa together with local Iberians—would almost assuredly not have attracted his euergetism.[151] But three centuries later in the age of Hadrian, who was himself a native son of Italica, the now booming city received an honorary promotion to the status of a *colonia*; it was likely at this time that the Italicenses were motivated to invent—and monumentalize—a past for themselves commensurate with their present importance in the affairs of the empire. The content of the dedicatory inscription implies a still more elaborate set of forgeries and falsifications: what it was that Mummius was thought to have sent to Italica from among the Achaean spoils is unknown, but presumably the community found objects that were suitable approximations, which were given new meanings and incorporated into new stories about the "history" of Italica.

Fabrications of the past are well-known from the Roman historiographical tradition, but rarely are they examined in the epigraphic record, or from the perspective of communities outside of Rome.[152] In this regard, these three monuments from Spain can be compared fruitfully to other contemporary inscriptions. One such text comes from Thuburnica (Sidi Ali Belkacem) in Africa, which commemorates the famous Gaius Marius as "founder of the colony" (*conditor coloniae*).[153] Thuburnica was not, however, a true *colonia*, and it only acquired the honorific title toward the end of the first century BCE; and while Marius may have granted land to some of his veterans in the area, it required much imagination to call him the founder of the community.[154] An even further-fetched claim was put forward by the people of Ostia, who, echoing the legend found in Livy, traced their colonial foundation to the mythical king Ancus Marcius.[155] Thus it seems that the Iberian cities of Saguntum and Iliturgi, along with the *colonia* of Italica, were participants in a wider antiquarian trend of the late first and second centuries, in which foundational figures of the republican past, or even of the more distant regal past, were remembered in light of present needs for community self-definition.

But not all local memories of the Roman Republic in Spain and Gaul were so closely or obviously connected to the foundation or restoration of the community. At Vesontio (Besançon), the capital of the *civitas* of the Sequani, a statue base with an inscription to P. Cornelius Scipio was found in the context of a monumental walled enclosure, which was probably a temple to the eponymous patron deity of the community, Mars Vesontius.[156]

Discovered nearby in secondary deposition was another statue base, which, although very fragmentary, appears to have been dedicated to Cn. Pompeius Magnus;[157] this may have originally belonged to the same monumental space as the statue of Scipio. To neither of these men could be attributed any real connection to Vesontio or to the Sequani, and thus the reasons for—and meanings of—their presence here are somewhat unclear. It has been suggested that there may have been an attempt by the Sequani to emulate, or at least to make allusion to, the statues of the historical *summi viri* in the Forum of Augustus at Rome,[158] an argument which is perhaps strengthened by the similarity in context: a public space associated with a temple to Mars. There are possible comparanda for such uses of the past from elsewhere in the western provinces.[159] But it is far from certain that Pompey had been included in the Forum of Augustus,[160] and therefore his commemoration at Vesontio may have been a particularly marked statement, indicative again of the scope of local initiative in constructions of the Roman past. Given the periodically troubled history of Vesontio in the imperial period—with violent uprisings against Tiberius and Nero, and unrest under Marcus Aurelius—the presence of conspicuous reminders of the Republic is especially difficult to parse.[161] While it is unlikely that "republicanism" was adopted as a mode of local "resistance" among the Sequani, these public monuments to Scipio and Pompey at Vesontio should at the very least make us rethink assumptions about the attitudes of western communities toward the collapse of the Republic and the rise of monarchic power; that "the provinces did not oppose that state of affairs, since the empire of the Senate and People had been discredited on account of the rivalries of the powerful."[162]

Constructions of the *Roman* past factored importantly into the creation and recreation of *local* community identities in Spain and Gaul. The stories that were created in this process would not always have been readily intelligible or even recognizable to a non-local, Roman audience; at times they seem to have been, at least in their initial articulations, "unauthorized" borrowings, as in the case of the Trojan Arverni; potentially problematic in practice, like the Balearic Lupercalia, or in ideology, as in the case of the deified "successors of Romulus" at Alcántara or Pompeius Magnus at Vesontio; or simply incompatible with the canonical version of the Roman past, as in the case of the Rutulian origins of Saguntum or Remus as the progenitor of the Gallic

Remi. But, altogether, they give a vivid impression of the complexity and diversity of local memories of Rome in the western provinces. In Chapter 5, we will delve beneath the level of the community to explicate the roles of individual actors, and the ways in which their performances of identity built on these memories of pasts both local and Roman.

5

PERFORMANCES
OF IDENTITY

☙

A T THE COSMOPOLITAN PORT of Burdigala, which, as we have seen, was increasingly frequented in the course of the early imperial period by traders and travelers from across Gaul and the Mediterranean world, a rather modest and unassuming funerary monument was set up by one Quintus Ignius Sextus for his brother Lucius Julius Mutacus sometime in the late second or early third century CE.[1] Mutacus, as his epitaph informs us, originally hailed from the *civitas* of the Sequani, a people situated on the western bank of the Rhine, far from the Atlantic coast. But the inscription is not the only window into the identity of the deceased: above the text is a sculpted relief portrait depicting Mutacus. Because of the comparative rudeness of its execution, this bust has been little studied by art historians, but its value for the cultural historian goes far beyond the aesthetic.[2] Mutacus is represented as middle-aged, with asymmetrically styled hair combed into thick clumps around the forehead and a full beard with bushy mustachios. His garment has been rendered only impressionistically by the artist, but its loose folds drape from the subject's shoulders in the manner of the traditional Gallic cloak, the *sagum*.[3] Most striking, however, is the heavy torque worn as an ornament around his neck.

In the eyes of Greek and Roman observers, the torque, usually wrought of gold, was a kind of ethnographic emblem of the Gauls,[4] although the archaeological record also attests to the importance of the torque in the

material culture of the Iron Age peoples of northern Europe. Its continued significance as a representative symbol of cultural identity for the peoples of Gaul themselves, even under Roman rule, is eloquently reflected in the choice made by Gallic provincials of a gold torque, one hundred pounds in weight, as a gift for Augustus.[5] Beyond his personal adornments and clothing, however, the styling of the hair and beard of Mutacus is also recognizable as a cultural tradition. The wellborn among the Gauls had a reputation for growing beards and mustachios, which obscured the mouth and, in the amusing description of Diodorus, served as a kind of strainer as they drank. Moreover, it had long been the custom of the Gauls to wash their hair in limewater, a treatment which not only accentuated its fair color, but lent it a thick and clumpy appearance; this they usually wore long, pulled back from the forehead to the crown of the head and down to the nape of the neck.[6] In this respect, the rather crudely represented hair of Mutacus can be profitably compared with a superbly executed bust of a young member of the local elite found at Durocortorum and usually dated to the second half of the second century CE, whose combination of spiky, "Gallic" locks and Roman *toga contabulata* suggest the complex negotiation of identity.[7] At least three other second-century portraits that have been interpreted based on hairstyle as being marked, "ethnic" representations of Gauls are known from Narbonensis. One, a bust of a young man from Arelate, exhibits the characteristic clumping, length, and arrangement of hair as described by Diodorus; the other two, whose provenance is the Villa de Chiragan, near Martres-Tolosane, some fifty-five kilometers southwest of Tolosa in the ancient territory of the Volcae Tectosages, show similar features, although the question of their subjects and of the agency behind their commissioning is somewhat more problematic.[8] Further afield, in Baetica, there are also examples of portrait sculpture that distinguishes local selves from Roman others. One female bust of the Julio-Claudian period from the necropolis at Carmo, with its plain square face and a hairstyle that sacrifices realism in favor of a more ornamental patterning, cultivates an aesthetic that aligns the elite subject much more with the likenesses of her ancient Iberian ancestors than her cosmopolitan contemporaries.[9]

Viewed in this context, the remarkably archaizing portrait of Lucius Julius Mutacus reveals an identity that is inherently "performative"; that is, it comprises—as the monument attempts to represent in static form—a set of

repeated, sustained, and stylized bodily acts (dress, adornment, coiffure), each of which must be understood as a discursive statement.[10] These discourses of identity were inevitably and intimately bound up with imperial power. It is, however, difficult to determine the exact meanings encoded in the ways in which this particular performative portrait was self-consciously positioned within the discursive field. One approach is to read it "straight," as a more or less naïve attempt by Mutacus or his brother to lay claim to and to participate in "authentic" cultural traditions. An alternative interpretation is to see its performance as a kind of subversive role-play, appropriating the Greek and Roman image of "the Gaul" together with its stereotypes in order to, in a sense, reframe the imperial paradigm of dominance and marginality. The most satisfactory analysis, as usual, seems to lie somewhere in between these extremes. While one should hesitate to attribute too much cultural naïveté to men who were, after all, relatively worldly Roman citizens, erecting a Roman-style monument, in Latin, at one of the most diverse and thriving commercial centers in Gallia Comata, at the same time such a bold and aggressive act of subversion or "resistance" is perhaps improbable. Therefore, the portrait can reasonably be understood as a self-conscious—and "other-conscious"—choice to "play the Gaul" through the selective incorporation—and rejection—of elements from two disparate cultural vocabularies, a performance of identity especially catalyzed by the diverse audience to be found at Burdigala. Like the togate, spiky-haired youth of the Remi or the self-consciously "Gallic" elite from Arelate or the "Iberianizing" woman from Carmo, or indeed any of the performances that we have examined throughout this work, identity was negotiated in the space between local community and Roman power, between remembering and forgetting.[11]

Although the emphasis of the monument is placed upon the visual representation of his brother, the dedicator Q. Ignius Sextus, bearing a Gaulish gentilic (Ignius) in the midst of a Roman-style *tria nomina*, raises another important aspect of the performance of identity in the western provinces: personal names. The naming of a child is always an inherently performative act, preserving memories of the past and projecting aspirations for the future; onomastic strategies reflect and communicate attitudes toward a multifaceted set of identity markers like language, kinship, community, and status.[12] Especially in the dynamic, polyglot milieux of the western provinces, the name inevitably positioned the named in relation to multiple sources of

social and cultural authority. Accordingly, there is wide variability in patterns of naming, especially among non-citizens, unconstrained by Roman onomastic conventions: in some regions, Roman names had become fashionable among the elite even before the conquest, while elsewhere, and further down the social hierarchy, they had still made little impact by the third century CE. But hundreds of the gentilics of Roman citizens attested in Spain and Gaul are demonstrably derived from pre-Roman languages, a statistic that demonstrates that acquisition of citizenship did not necessarily erase prominent markers of local origins. In some instances it is clear that these names were bestowed by fathers on their sons by flouting the rules of Roman practice, and instead following local patronymic traditions: in Gaul, for example, L. Sacratius Sacerianus was the son of L. Senicius Sacratus, and M. Ollognatius Secundus was the son of M. Ammutius Ollognatus. Although these men were all citizens, in decidedly un-Roman fashion the cognomen of the father (Sacratus, Ollognatus) became the root of the gentilic of the son (Sacratius, Ollognatius).[13]

There are indications that the vernacular meaning of these kinds of gentilics was remembered, sometimes activated or calqued by the choice of Latin cognomen: in the case of C. Ceraecius Fuscus, a local magistrate from remote Callaecia who had acquired political prominence well beyond his native country and was publicly honored at the provincial capital of Tarraco, his Roman third name (*Fuscus*, "dark, dusky") is actually a translation of his Celtic gentilic.[14] Our imperfect knowledge of the pre-Roman languages of the western provinces renders the full extent of this bilingual phenomenon difficult to ascertain, but there are other suggestive examples: the Gaulish family name of L. Segolatius Victorinus, a young boy posthumously commemorated at Narbo by his parents, means something like "victory-hero," which is aptly approximated by his Latin sobriquet. There were other kinds of onomastic translation across generations: among the Treveri, a woman called Artula ("little bear") followed local custom in naming her daughter after herself, but with a slight twist, rendering her own Gaulish name into the Roman equivalent, Ursula.[15] While the general trend in the imperial period was toward the adoption of Roman names as gentilics and *cognomina*, it was not irreversible: many individuals chose to give their children names that hearkened back to a local past, although they themselves bore Roman ones.

Being local in the Roman world was an active process. As exemplified in

the case of the two Sequanian brothers on the funerary monument at Burdigala, the inhabitants of the western provinces were always engaged in a varied repertoire of acts of self-fashioning. Understanding these acts, in the diverse forms and contexts in which they are found, as reflections of the performance of identity provides a useful vocabulary and an analytical framework through which to study the agency of individual actors, who are otherwise often assumed either to have passively conformed to indigenous traditions or equally passively to have been assimilated to the hegemonic culture. This approach to the evidence—artistic, epigraphic, or literary—for individual identities in the Roman west attempts to place any given expression in the context of its audience, its aims, and the array of other remembered selves; it operates on the premise that these pieces of evidence are not genuine, disinterested facsimiles or representations of a static self that exists outside of performance and discourse, but rather that the self is, in fact, continually constituted and triangulated over time through these performative acts.

In order to foreground the roles of individual actors, this chapter begins with an examination of performance at the confluence of social memory, community, and identity embodied in local patterns of political and religious office holding. Attempting, in part, to translate and broaden the idea of "autoethnography" beyond the purely literary realm, the second section explores the sophisticated ways in which provincials responded to, accommodated, and subverted the expectations of Roman and Greek audiences of the wider empire in their constructions and performances of identity. Four main typecast "roles" are considered: "the Druid"; "the Celt"; "the Dancing Girl"; and "the Furthest of Mankind." Recognizing that poetry is a powerful vehicle for self-production, the discussion turns to the place of localism in imperial literature, as represented by Martial and Ausonius. To close the chapter, a remarkable testamentary document from the country of the Lingones focalizes an examination of funerary rites and monuments as the final performance of identity.

Memory and the "Performance" of Local Offices

On the local stage, magistrates and priests were the leading actors, and their power was exercised—and conspicuously seen to be exercised—through a range of performative acts before a "co-present" audience.[16] These public

rituals were articulations of social memory, and constituted a rehearsal of community identity, and thus, despite the superficial trend toward the political homogenization and standardization of the "municipalized" provincial landscape, the parts to be played in the local drama were liable to be "recast" and its scripted "text" was subject to local revision, reinterpretation, and expansion. In this regard, imagined continuities with the pre-Roman past were integral to the development of individual and community identities in the provinces, and "traditional" forms of political or religious authority, discursively constructed as viable alternatives or supplements to "Roman" cultural practices, became meaningful performative choices.[17]

In the second and first centuries BCE, by far the most ubiquitous class of persons in Roman representations of the exercise of indigenous power in both Spain and Gaul are the ambiguous *principes*, "local elites" whose authority seems to span a spectrum from quasi-monarchical ("chief") to oligarchical ("rulers") to aristocratic ("leading men," often of a local *senatus*).[18] This cultural "translation," made by ethnographic observers based on analogy with the socio-political structure of the Roman state with which they and their readers were familiar, is reflective of a more widespread terminological ambiguity in the literary and the epigraphic sources regarding those individuals to whom we as modern scholars refer, often too casually, as "local elites."[19] Although there are problems inherent in the adoption of this imperializing term, it is productive as a category of analysis in so far as it was meaningful to the Romans, who attributed almost all indigenous agency to the *principes*, and to the local elites themselves, who ultimately appropriated the word to define their own status.[20] With conquest inevitably came rapid and radical challenges to traditional forms of local power. The idealizing Roman imperial narrative, which has so profoundly influenced modern interpretations of "acculturation" and the "civilizing process," was, most basically, one of dependence, emulation, and gradual incorporation, as exemplified in Caesar's account of two *principes* of the Narbonensian Allobroges, Roscillus and Aegus, sons of Abducillus:

> There were with Caesar among the cavalry two brothers of the Allobroges, Roucillus and Aecus, sons of Adbucillus, who had for many years held the *principatus* in their *civitas*, men of remarkable valor, whose excellent and brave services Caesar

had made use of in all of the Gallic wars. For these reasons he had commended the highest *magistratus* to them among the Allobroges and he had made efforts for them to be enrolled in their [local] senate although they were not yet of the customary age.[21]

This passage has a certain programmatic quality.[22] The local *princeps* is an individual who is initially able, through well-established forms of aristocratic authority, to mobilize a great retinue of followers and dependents.[23] Through services rendered to Rome, usually by fighting in the auxiliary cavalry, these followers find their allegiance transferred from their *principes* to the Roman state, while the privileged status of the *principes* themselves—both in relation to their native *civitas* and to Rome—is reconceptualized and formalized in the new political language of imperial power: *principatus*, in this narrative, is transformed into *magistratus*.[24]

But not all *principes* in the provinces of Spain and Gaul disappeared with the conquest and its attendant urbanization and municipalization.[25] An honorific inscription found at Forum Segusiavorum (Feurs), among the monumental remains of a public space that seems to have been the forum itself, bears witness to the importance of the local *princeps* within the community well into the post-conquest period:

> To Gaius Julius Jullus, their *princeps*, the *civitas* of the Segusiavi gave a public funeral and monument.[26]

The date of this inscription is difficult to establish with any certainty, but it is probably to be placed within the first half of the first century CE.[27] Implicated herein are a number of performative acts. Especially in the face of threats to "traditional" social structures and the emergence of new positions of formal authority within the "parallel" Roman administrative framework, Jullus' success in the role of *princeps* of the Segusiavi would have required the continual acquisition and maintenance of symbolic capital within the community and beyond, through a "poetics" or "theatrics" of power.[28] Reconstructing the details of the means by which this success was achieved is less important for the purposes of the argument at hand than the general point that this would necessarily have been an *active* process, not merely a passive "survival."[29] The *funus* too, as a final performance, a moment of

"public ritual drama,"[30] was designed as an exhibition of the community identity of the Segusiavi, embodied, in a sense, in the *princeps* himself.[31] In this respect, the emotive possessive adjective (*suo*) is particularly telling of the intimate association between the exercise of "traditional" authority and the imagined community.

In Spain as well, in the more remote regions of the northwest of the peninsula, there is epigraphic evidence of several local elites who represented themselves as *principes*. Unlike the situation in Gaul, however, where the remnants of traditional authority were informal and "alternative," the *principes* of these regions of Spain seem actually to have had a significant hand in the administration and governance of their communities throughout much of the first century CE. Within the *conventus Lucensis*, for example, *principes* are attested on at least two funerary monuments. One was found at La Corredoira, just south of the modern Portuguese border:

> Nicer, son of Clutosus, from the *castellum* of Cariaca, *princeps* of the Albiones, aged seventy-five years, is buried here.[32]

Similarly to the case of Jullus and the Segusiavi, here the power of Nicer is closely entwined with the identity of the *populus* of the Albiones. On an epitaph set up at Lucus Augusti (Lugo), the central place of the *conventus*, are found two *principes*, father and son, connected to another *populus*, the Copori:[33]

> Vecius, son of Veroblius, *princeps* from [Hispania Citerior?] from the *castellum* of Circine, aged sixty years, and Vecco, son of Vecius, *princeps* of the Copori [. . .] are buried here. Their heirs had this made.[34]

One of the most striking features of the local *principatus* among the Copori revealed by this text is that it may have been to some extent hereditary, as Vecius and his son Vecco each in turn held sway, to varying degrees and in different forms, perhaps, over the micro-region.[35]

While these elites exercised their authority as *principes* primarily in relation to the ethnic groups to which they belonged, in their self-representations they also closely associated themselves with a central place—in these cases Cariaca or Circine—that seems to have served as the seat of their

power. As we have previously discussed, one of the prominent features of these *castellum*-sites in Lusitania and Galicia—primarily within the cultural sphere of the ancient *conventus* of Bracara and Lucus Augusti ("A cultura Castrexa")—in the early imperial period is the presence of monumental statues of heroicized warriors, who are represented in traditional fashion.[36] The identification of these warriors as contemporary *principes* and their ancestral forerunners provides a sense of the performativity of this role and exemplifies the significance of a visual "poetics" of power in the maintenance thereof.[37] These central spaces were important stages for the *principes*, where the necessary symbolic capital could be accumulated through the manipulation of monumentality, memory, and community identity. Moreover, the fact that, among the Copori, Vecius was buried and monumentalized together with his father is further suggestive of the evocative potential of the past. In fact, burial was probably only the last in a larger series of ritual, "scene-making" acts intended to reinforce the social position of not only the deceased *princeps*, but also the surviving kinship group.[38]

The dynamics of the performance of local authority to the east, in Cantabria, seem to have been broadly similar. In the territory of the *populus* of the Vadinienses, perhaps as late as the Flavian period, a monument was set up to commemorate Doviderus, *princeps*:

> Doviderus, son of Amparamus, *princeps* of the Cantabri, is buried here. The people of [?] Deobriga [?] placed this monument.[39]

After over two centuries of vacillating allegiances and guerrilla warfare, the Cantabri, "never before tamed," had been the last of the major people groups of the Iberian peninsula to come under Roman rule, only during the principate of Augustus. Even then, the region remained only loosely organized and controlled from the point of view of the imperial center.[40] Situated within this context, the Cantabrian *principes* must have functioned somewhat analogously to "client kings," whether, with the population decimated in the wars against the Romans, power was usurped by certain individuals or devolved upon them *de facto*, or they were officially recognized by Roman imperial authority. Indeed the two are not mutually exclusive. The prevailing assumption is that, as institutions, these *principatus* must have received some formal endorsement and sanction, and that they were bestowed by

Augustus and Agrippa as rewards upon the leaders of the few collaborating (or at least less recalcitrant) *populi* of the Cantabri, among whom the Vadinienses are perhaps to be counted.[41]

There is epigraphic evidence that the Vadinienses expanded their territory to the north in the course of the first century, perhaps as a result of further favor shown them by the imperial center for their *principes'* maintenance of order, as other *populi* continued, on the contrary, to engage in widespread brigandage. In light of this progressive expansion of the local dominion of his *populus*, the claim of Doviderus to be *princeps Cantabrorum*, rather than merely *princeps Vadiniensium*, can be construed as a self-conscious, performative choice.[42] His father Amparamus, if he is to be identified with Amparamus of the *Nemaioqum* (a suprafamilial "clan") from Cusabura in the territory of the Vadinienses attested on a Cantabrian *tessera hospitalis* dated to the year 14 CE,[43] seems to have already worked to expand his influence among the wider *gens* of the Cantabri through local diplomacy, receiving an honorary grant of citizenship (*civitas honoraria*) from the *magistratus et senatus* of the *Maggavienses*. Thus it is possible that, in his rhetorical self-fashioning, Doviderus exploited these connections and constructions of larger, meaningful group identities (the *gens Cantabrorum*, as opposed to the *populus Maggaviensium* or *Vadiniensium*) in order to significantly increase his authority as *princeps*. Despite the Flavian reorganization of Spain, the *principatus* seems to have endured into the third century among the Vadinienses,[44] alongside their idiosyncratic system of reckoning time (the *aera consularis*) and their ancient form of ethnic organization.

In the south of the Iberian peninsula among the Turdetani, political power in the pre-Roman period seems to have been more institutional than charismatic, and vested in formalized offices and oligarchic councils. Within these communities as well, even when they did not yet possess legal status within the imperial system, there were attempts to translate traditional positions of authority to new contexts through usurping the titles— but not necessarily replicating the character—of Roman magistracies. The most vivid example comes from the city of Sabetum (La Rambla), south of Corduba, toward the end of the Republic. As much of Spain became embroiled in the civil war, the magistrates of the Sabetum saw to their own defenses, and in 49 BCE constructed a new city gate. The local leaders who were chiefly responsible for the work were Binsnes, son of Vercello, in his office as

decemvir maximus, and the aedile M. Coranus Alpis, son of Acrinus; the former was not a Roman citizen, while the latter appears to have been the first of his family to receive the franchise.[45] Both of these magistracies—a body of ten men chaired by one with greater authority than the rest, and a still higher executive office connected to public building projects—appear to be holdovers from Turdetanian civic administration, with roles only vaguely approximated by these imperial calques: *duoviri* and *quattuorviri*—a chief executive office shared among two or four men—are a regular feature of Roman municipal and colonial organization, but a decemvirate is unknown outside of Rome; similarly, the aedileship was only a mid-career position at Rome or within a provincial community with formal legal status, not the chief magistracy that it seems to have represented among the Turdetani.[46] In Turdetania beyond Sabetum, the position of "greatest of the ten men" (*decemvir maximus*) is attested at Turri Regina (Casas de Reina) and Ostippo (Estepa) into the post-Augustan period, and the names of *aediles* of similarly indigenous origin also appear on locally minted coinage of the first century BCE at Obulco and Acinipo (Ronda la Vieja).[47]

Old Punic offices, in Roman guise, also continued to be performed among the former Carthaginian cities of the islands. In 6 CE on the *Baliaris Maior*, the "senate and people of Bocchoris" drafted a *tabula patronatus*, a document whereby they formally co-opted a foreign individual as the patron of their community, which was overseen and transacted by two of their magistrates—Q. Caecilius Quinctus and C. Valerius Icesta—who held the office of *praetor*.[48] At first glance, the praetorship looks strikingly out of place at Punic Bocchoris, for this was not a Roman magistracy that was adapted to civic administration in the provinces of Spain. Although it has generally gone unrecognized, the two praetors of the Bocchoritani in this document are only intelligible as a local translation of the traditional, collegial chief magistracy of Carthaginian cities: the *sufetes*. Apart from the context, this identification is strengthened by the fact that, in historiographical sources, *praetor* was the word usually opted for as the Roman equivalent of the Punic *sufet*.[49] In North Africa under Roman rule, the office of *sufet* was an integral part of civic administration into the third century CE, reflective of the diaspora after the fall of Carthage and the enduring prestige of Punic culture.[50] Across the sea, elites in cognate cities continued to play this role; even if it was at times translated for the benefit of an audience not conversant in the

vocabulary or acquainted with the collective memory of Bocchoris, local power seems still in the Augustan age to have been conceptualized primarily in Punic terms.

Turning back to Gaul, alongside the informal authority of *principes* like Jullus of the Segusiavi, a number of formal, pre-Roman magistracies and priesthoods continued to be performed in the imperial period, albeit with renegotiated meanings, in new contexts, and with a novel repertoire of "acts." The most important of these magistracies was arguably the *vergobretus*, a form of local authority among the *civitates* of central Gaul which Caesar encountered during the first season of his campaigns:

> [Caesar] called their chief men together, of whom he had a great
> many in his camp, among these Diviciacus and Liscus, who held
> the highest magistracy, which the Aedui call a *vergobretus*, who
> is elected annually and holds the power of life and death over
> his own people.[51]

Despite the distortion inherent in the ethnographic lens, and the particular unreliability of Caesar as an ethnographer,[52] etymology would seem to support his interpretation on a basic level: *vergobretus* comes from the Gaulish roots **verg-*, "to do, make" (cf. Gk. ἔργον, Eng. "work"), and **bret-*, "judgment"; thus a *vergobretus* is essentially "one who makes judgments."[53] Roughly contemporary, locally issued coinage bearing Gaulish legends also appears to substantiate his impression of the authority of the magistracy.[54] While the *vergobretus* is little discussed, even obscure in the Anglophone literature on Roman Gaul,[55] it is a kind of "syndrome" or "obsession" of French scholars,[56] one which has at times contributed to the misreading of inscriptions in the hopes of "finding" more attestations of the magistracy.[57] Most of this scholarship has been concerned with details of "la pratique du vergobret," or with trying to establish the "realities" of the pre-conquest, "Celtic" *vergobretus*.[58] But these questions—ultimately insoluble—are of only secondary importance for understanding the enacting of social memory through office holding in the context of Roman provincial communities.

In the early first century CE, a dedicatory inscription on a monumental fountain at Augustoritum (Limoges), the capital of the Lemovices, recorded the munificence of the *vergobretus* of the community during a festival in celebration of an important Gallic healing god:

Postumus the *vergobretus*, son of Dumnorix, gave from his own funds the *aqua Martia* at the ten-night festival (*decamnoctiacis*) of Grannus.[59]

The gift of the *aqua Martia* is almost certainly a reference to the construction of the aqueduct by which this fountain was fed, the modern Aqueduc de Corgnac-Aigoulène,[60] a dedication well suited to Grannus, who in his role as healer is ubiquitously associated with water.[61] This monument, as part of the repertoire of performative acts of the magistrate Postumus, frustrates a simplistic reading as either "Roman" or "native": at Augustoritum, the quintessential Roman technology was employed in the service of a traditional local god, brought to fruition through an act of euergetism staged at a traditional festival with a Gaulish name by a traditional magistrate with a Gaulish title who advertised his seemingly prestigious local ancestry. Thus, as we have previously emphasized, using the presence or absence of elements from the "Roman material cultural package" as an index of acculturation is highly problematic, since within local communities, as here among the Lemovices, the contexts of their deployment, the functions that they served, and meanings with which they were invested need not necessarily have been particularly "Roman." Superficial surveys of cultural patterning in Gaul would surely include any aqueduct in the somewhat falsely dichotomous category of "imperial unity" as opposed to "regional diversity," but as this inscription reveals, the story of identity and performance behind even the most definitively "Roman" of monuments is often, if not always, much more complex, and much more interesting.[62]

The *vergobretus* is securely attested in one other Latin inscription, this from the neighboring *civitas* of the Santones immediately to the west of the Lemovices and dated only slightly later, to the principate of Tiberius:

For Gaius Julius Marinus of the Voltinia voting tribe, son of Gaius Julius Ricoveriugus, the first *flamen Augustalis*, *curator* of Roman citizens, *quaestor*, *vergobretus*, Julia Marina his daughter [placed this].[63]

The most striking feature of the *cursus* of Marinus, which constitutes the primary focus of this epitaph, is the capacity for performative "code-switching" that it reflects, the way in which his career—and his representation

thereof—draws upon two cultural vocabularies: Roman municipal mag-
istracies and priesthoods—note the boast of having been *flamen primus*—
coexist with an "alternative" form of local authority.[64] Unlike Postumus at
Augustoritum, at Mediolanum Marinus was a Roman citizen, the son of a
Roman citizen, even the *curator* of a local association of Roman citizens,[65]
a fact which renders his apparent participation in and commemoration of
traditional institutions all the more intriguing. Before the discovery of the
monument of Postumus, this was the only known instance of the *vergo-
bretus* in the Roman period, and thus Lejeune's rather subtle interpretation,
that on the epitaph it was effectively an archaizing "translation" of *duumvir*
rather than corresponding to any political reality, was eminently plausible.[66]
In light of the new evidence, however, it seems more likely that the role
was not merely a textual construct, but was in fact a "réalité politique," that
among the Santones a place was negotiated for the *vergobretus* even as the
community adopted the Roman-style offices probably associated with the
acquisition of the Latin right. In this context, playing the part of the tra-
ditional magistrate must have taken on new meanings for both actor and
audience, presenting as it did a self-conscious and stylized differentiation
from the other public roles now available to the local elite. This would ac-
cord well with the picture of the general complexity of constructions and
performances of identity within the memory community of the Santones
in the early imperial period, which we have already explored in the case of
Gaius Julius Rufus and his cousin Victor.[67]

Another attestation of the office of *vergobretus* has been found inscribed
in Gaulish on an *olla* that was ritually deposited at the heart of a *fanum* at
Argentomagus (Argenton-sur-Creuse) in the territory of the Bituriges Cubi,
the northerly neighbors of the Lemovices. Based on the material found to-
gether with it in the stratigraphic context, this inscription has been dated
to approximately 20 CE, and is thus roughly contemporaneous with the
monuments of Marinus and Postumus. It consists of two Gaulish words,
vercobretos readdas, which would translate roughly as "the vergobret offered
this."[68] Although the staging and "text" of this performance are in sharp
contrast to the other examples, the *vergobretus* of the Bituriges seems to have
had a fundamentally similar importance in ritually "acting for" the commu-
nity. The juxtaposition of these three *vergobreti*, so close to one another in
time and space and yet each so different from the others, reveals again the

remarkable complexity and diversity of the cultural landscape of first-century Gaul. Even the decision to enact the same "traditional" role manifested itself in various forms and took on divergent meanings within the different contexts of the communities of the Bituriges, the Santones, and the Lemovices, which again reinforces the necessity to move beyond an acculturative model and the cultural geography of imperial power, and to focus rather on the primacy of community and local choice.[69]

Beyond positions of supreme power like the *principes* and the *vergobretus*, rather mundane traditional magistracies, exercising authority over smaller communities and with more limited spheres of competence, could also be meaningful performative choices. At a rural place called Crutisium, a *vicus* in the territory of the Treveri, in the mid-second century CE, the inhabitants collectively from their own funds made a dedication to Mercury, which was realized through the agency of a certain Giamillus in his role as *dannus*.[70] This is a rather generic—if remarkably long-lived—Gaulish word for "magistrate,"[71] for which there is a comparandum in the pre-conquest period in the *argantodanos*, reasonably well attested in the numismatic record in Gaul as a local *civitas* magistrate in charge of coinage during the first half of the first century BCE.[72] Also pertinent to the interpretation of the *dannus* among the Treveri is the office of *platiodannus* known from Mogontiacum (Mainz), some 130 kilometers to the northeast of Crutisium in the neighboring province of Germania Superior, which seems to have been a magistrate at the level of the *vicus* responsible in some capacity for public roads and spaces (*platia* in Gaulish; cf. Latin *platea*).[73] It is thus noteworthy that as late as the middle of the second century, individuals like Giamillus who were not Roman citizens were holding local, non-Roman offices like the *dannus* that were seemingly tasked with a range of administrative and infrastructural projects within the subdivisions of the *civitas* of the Treveri.[74] Comparable Roman-style positions like the *magister pagi* or *magister vici* are attested in the immediately neighboring *civitas* of the Mediomatrici,[75] which casts the local choice represented by the performance of the *dannus* into even sharper relief.

A further variant of the local magistracy of the *dannus* is found in the form of the *cassidannus* at Condatomagus (Millau), in the territory of the Ruteni of Aquitania, where the famous pottery workshop of La Graufesenque was located. From the Augustan period, the site manufactured a significant

quantity of *terra sigillata* for export, with production reaching a peak toward the end of the first century CE.[76] In order to organize and track production on such a large scale, bilingual Latin and Gaulish documentary records or "kiln registers" were kept, which provide evidence not only for language contact and economic activity, but also for local administration, although this aspect is far less emphasized in scholarship. Below are the opening lines of three representative "kiln registers":

Tuθo · tr[itios
casidani · TRI(TOS) · MON[TANOS
Third group [to be fired] [during the period when] Tritos and
Montanos are *casidani.*

Tuθos · cintux
Luxtodos · casidanajone · le[gi]tum[
First group of the batch [to be fired] [during the period when]
Aione is *casidanos.*

Tuθos sextametos
cassidano MONTANOS
Sixth group [to be fired] [during the period when] Montanos is
cassidanos.[77]

Interpretation of this formula of *cas(s)idano/i* + personal name(s) is facilitated by the fact that on another *graffito* (no. 74a) it is rendered into Latin with the recognizable temporal ablative absolute, *flamine Crescente III*, "when Crescens was *flamen* for the third time."[78] Thus the *cassidanus* seems to have been a local religious official, analogous to a Roman *flamen*, the first element of whose Gaulish title perhaps has the sense of "venerable, pure, holy."[79] What is even more significant than the apparent role of the *cassidannus* in the religious practice of the Ruteni, however, is its function in structuring local time as a kind of eponymous magistrate. Such local eponymity finds parallels in Italy and rarely in Baetica,[80] but non-Roman magistrates or priests are unattested in this capacity elsewhere in the western provinces. The apparent centrality of the *cassidannus* to the daily business of the Ruteni of Condatomagus as an anchor of conceptions of time and community identity is suggestive both of the potential breadth of the roles and meanings

assigned to traditional forms of authority in Roman Gaul, and of the depth to which they became embedded in local imaginations.

Another priesthood with a Gaulish title, the *gutuater*, is attested in the epigraphic record with relative frequency from the early second to the early third century CE. The Gaulish word is most likely derived from the roots *⋆gutu-*, "voice, invocation," and *⋆ater*, "father, master," thus meaning something like "master of invocations."[81] One of the major problems in interpreting the priesthood of the *gutuater* is the seemingly inescapable influence still exerted by the Poseidonian schema of "Celtic" society on the imaginations of modern scholars. If, as we "know" (so the argument goes), there were only three classes of persons of any account in pre-Roman Gaul, and if, as it appears, the *gutuater* is a pre-Roman "survival" into the Roman period, then the *gutuater* must necessarily be connected to either the "druids" or the "bards" or the "seers" (*vates*). Given the religious nature of the office, arguments have generally been restricted to positing an identity with the *vates*[82] or, more commonly, the druids.[83] Complicating matters further is the testimony of Caesar and Hirtius regarding one "Cotuatus," who along with Conconnetodumnus, played a leading part in the revolt of the Carnutes in 52 BCE, a name which has been seen by some as a corruption—either of the text in transmission or of the historical facts by Roman observers—of the priesthood of the *gutuater*.[84] There is no need for a detailed refutation of these arguments, but let two major points suffice: first, the ethnographic schemata of Poseidonius and Caesar are not to be relied upon in reconstructing pre-conquest Gallic society, and therefore, in the absence of any evidence that the Gauls themselves conceived of the *gutuater* as part of a meaningful category of "druids," there is no a priori reason to identify the priesthood as such; and, second, regardless of the historical role of the "druids" or of local religious sentiment in the events of the Gallic wars, a question which is well beyond the scope of the present discussion, the passage of Caesar's *commentarii* almost certainly does not refer to the priesthood of the *gutuater*. Thus for the only secure instances and contexts, we must look to the epigraphic record of the second century CE.

A fragmentary but suggestive inscription from Anicium (Le Puy-en-Velay) in the territory of the Vellavi of Aquitania records the varied career of an anonymous individual who had occupied fiscal, religious, and political

offices, at least one of whose sons went on to hold prominent Roman-style priesthoods and magistracies within the community:

> [. . .] official in charge of tax collection from the mines, *gutuater*, pre-
> fect of the colony [. . .] before I went to rest here I saw both my sons
> [. . .] Nonius Ferox become *flamen* and *duumvir* twice […][85]

As in the case of the *vergobretus* Marinus, the interweaving of two vocabularies of authority in this *cursus* is indicative of the capacity of local elites to play different roles, in different contexts, for different audiences, in order to acquire different kinds of symbolic cultural capital within the local community and the wider province.[86] Two other individuals are attested at Augustodunum in votive offerings to the local god Anvallus as having performed the role of *gutuater* among the Aedui, one of whom bears the *tria nomina* of a Roman citizen; belonging to this same cult of Anvallus is a monumental early imperial dedicatory inscription in the Gaulish language.[87] The most extensive testimony of the *cursus* of a *gutuater*, however, comes from the settlement of Matisco (Macon), also in the territory of the Aedui:

> [. . .] of Gaius Sulpicius Gallus, son of Marcus, having performed
> all the offices among his own people, *duumvir quinqunennalis*,
> *flamen* of Augustus, *p . . . ogen . . .* of the god Moltinus, *gutuater*
> of Mars [. . .] for whom the council decreed statues to be placed
> in public, because he was an ideal and blameless citizen.[88]

The breadth and variety of the career of Gallus is similar to the fragments of that of the anonymous *gutuater* of the Vellavi.[89] In addition to the standard local political offices, he had seemingly held three different priesthoods for the cults of three different divinities (Augustus, Moltinus, and Mars).[90] Thus there was a fundamental non-identity constructed between the *gutuater* and other kinds of priests: being *gutuater Martis* was not the same as being *flamen Martis*. Whether this was a rhetorical difference—a falsely archaizing "translation"—or a practical one—a set of performative ritual acts specific to the *gutuater*—is perhaps impossible to determine, but it is evident that, at the very least, the social memory of difference was meaningful within these communities.

From these four inscriptions, a few conclusions can be drawn about the *gutuater* in the second century. First, it was clearly not the exclusive prov-

ince of a separate, priestly "class" who held themselves aloof from secular affairs. Second, given the participation of individuals who had been *gutuater* in the civic and economic structures of Roman rule, the performance of the priesthood should not be linked in any way to "indigenous resistance." Third, from the variety of contexts in which the title of the *gutuater* was invoked—explicitly associated with a "Roman" god like Mars or somewhat more implicitly connected with the cult of a local god like Anvallus or standing "absolutely" alongside other, non-religious functions—one gets a sense of the robustness of its conceptualization, even if the details of that conceptualization are irrecoverable. Lastly, it is noteworthy that all of the evidence for the *gutuater* seems to belong to the second century. It is possible that, in the first century CE, the *gutuater* had lain dormant in the face of the challenges and promises posed by a new, imperial culture or had "gone underground" in response to imperial pressures on certain forms of traditional religious practice perceived by Roman authority as potentially destabilizing and "druidic," but these interpretations seem less likely. Rather, I would argue, that the *gutuater* was neither an antiquarian "rediscovery" of the second century nor a "fringe" practice that became normalized, but that the relative prominence of the *gutuater* in self-representation of Gallic elites in this period is the function of an increased self-confidence in the performance and projection of local identity that is detectable not only in Gaul, but across the empire in the second century, exemplified most powerfully in the eastern Mediterranean as part of the movement of the Second Sophistic. Like the local knowledge represented by the Coligny calendar, or the desire to once again witness the ritual slaughter of the *trinqui*, or even social memories as quotidian as units of measurement (the Gaulish *leuga*) and pre-conquest ceramic forms and motifs (in the so-called "Argonne ware"), the role of the *gutuater* had probably been "quietly" remembered, rehearsed, and renegotiated as part of local identities throughout the first century, before it became clearly "visible" from the point of view of imperial power (and modern scholars). In this regard, the *cassidannus* is an instructive comparison: it occupied a central place in the local administration and identity of the Ruteni of the first century, but it was never performed or projected through Roman-style monumentality; without the fortuitous survival of the very un-monumental Gaulish kiln registers, we would have no evidence whatsoever of its existence.

Social memory of the local, pre-Roman past thus deeply informed patterns of office holding—political and religious—and the "shape" of the exercise of authority within provincial communities in Spain and Gaul in the first and second centuries CE and beyond. But, as we saw in the previous chapter, memories of the Roman past also factored prominently into negotiations of local identity. At Iberian Saguntum, in the early imperial period, constructions of Roman antiquity manifested themselves in the form of a peculiarly localized interpretation of one of the most dramatic and evocative of Roman cultural performances: the dance of the Salian priests. Several inscriptions attest to the presence of a college of Salii, directed, as at Rome, by a *magister*, which seems to have drawn its membership from the upper echelons of the Saguntine elite, comprising only men who had fulfilled the usual municipal *cursus honorum* and had been elected into the local college of *pontifices*.[91] Remarkably, this priesthood is otherwise never attested outside of the ancient towns of Latium,[92] and thus the exceptional initiative of Saguntum and the locally negotiated meaning of these provincial Salii merit attention.[93]

The primary functions of the Salii would not seem to belong at early imperial Saguntum. Chief among these were the ritual processions to open and close the war season in March (*quinquatrus*) and October (*armilustrium*) respectively, in which the holy shields of Mars (*ancilia*) were taken down from their place of honor in the *regia* (the ancient shrine in the forum associated with the semi-mythical kings) and purified (*lustratio*). During these processions the priests, adorned in old-fashioned military costumes and carrying the *ancilia*, paused at important locations within the city like the *comitium* and the forum and the Capitol in order to perform the elaborate triple-step weapon dance that gave them their name (*Salii ab salitando*, "dancers so-called from their dancing," according to Varro), while singing the ancient ritual song, the *carmen Saliare*.[94] The words to this song were in such archaic Latin that, by the late republican period, even the Romans themselves were no longer able to understand them.[95] It is therefore difficult to discern how, on the one hand, any of these dramatic ritual elements—so keyed to the monuments, topography, traditional knowledge, and seasonal rhythms of the imperial city—might have been rendered intelligible in the context of Saguntum, and, on the other, why the priesthood should have been appropriated by the Saguntines at all.

As for the first question, it is clear that there was an active, stylized, and performative aspect involved in being one of the Salii at Saguntum, rather than the title being merely an empty honorific: the monument to M. Baebius Crispus as *Salius* was dedicated by his *conlusores*, "fellow players," a *hapax* in Latin epigraphy which in this context seems to have roughly the sense of *conlegae*, those who "played the Salian priest" with him.[96] It is possible that, in a quest for authenticity, this "play" entailed attempts at replication, in some form, of the key "props" like the *ancilia*, and at imitation of the complicated choreography of their Roman counterparts, but in the process of translation, reinterpretation, and adaptation distinctly local variations and meanings must inevitably have been created.[97] As for the question of the motivations behind this interest in conspicuously performing the role of the Salii, it may have been bound up with the local social memory in the early imperial period of the unique historical and mythical connections between Saguntum and Rome, catalyzed, in part, by the influence of the antiquarian interest at Rome in the revival of traditional religious practices during the Augustan period. The events surrounding the Second Punic War were prominent in the contemporary discourse of Saguntine identity, as evidenced by the erection of the monument to Scipio that we have already discussed, and the Salii may accordingly have been imagined in relation to the ancient treaty obligations. But the point of cultural reference can be pushed still further back in time. Given the importance of fictive central Italian origins to the self-account of the community of Saguntum, the co-option and integration of this quintessentially Latin priesthood into the performative repertoire of the Saguntine elite may have been an outgrowth of the locally developed foundation myth that traced ancient Iberian *Arse* back to Ardea: if the Saguntines were Rutulians after all, they may have decided that they should start "acting" like Rutulians.

In light of the various performances that we have sketched in this section, the widely held opinion of many modern scholars that, in the western provinces, "it is difficult to see examples of local groups selecting from the new culture vocabulary to create distinctive local combinations and cultural forms" must be reconsidered.[98] Within provincial communities, individual actors did indeed make meaningful selections from local and Roman cultural vocabularies in order to construct and perform uniquely local identities.

Typecasting and Role-Playing

Imperial or otherwise dominant cultural powers tend to create ethno-graphic images of the exotic that ultimately serve the needs of that culture, which finds itself (or its "self") reflected in the mirror of the "other."[99] But the objects of this representational dominance, the exoticized, barbarized, marginalized others, themselves frequently come to claim political, so-cial, and economic status within the imperial cultural framework through "stereotype appropriation," defined as "a dynamic process of buying into, internalizing, and exploiting the roles offered by a dominant culture."[100] Through this imperial typecasting and "native" role-playing, local cultures continually undergo a complex series of negotiations and renegotiations, becoming, in one sense, "a stage for the dramatization of others' truths,"[101] while in another sense remaining meaningful sites of a constructed "authen-ticity." This playing out of the roles offered by imperial power is, like all cultural performance, highly contextualized, keyed to the audience and its expectations.

The druids of Gaul are among the most recognizable of these roles, enig-matic practitioners of "alien wisdom" who have long exercised the imagina-tions of ancient observers and modern scholars alike.[102] But between the literary constructs of Greek and Roman authors and the problematically stylized, archaizing portraits of early Irish texts, which generally present the "surviving" *druíd* of the sixth and seventh centuries as "heathen" ma-gicians (*magi*) in contradistinction to Christian saints, there is little reliable evidence for the practice and conceptualization of "druidism" (O. Ir. *drui-decht*, "the lore of the *druíd*") among local communities in late Iron Age and early Roman Gaul. Thus, while the druids were "real," that is to say not entirely a cultural fiction of Greek and Roman ethnography, representations of them in classical literature are invariably stereotypes that primarily fulfill the role(s) required by the dominant culture(s). This is evident from the ear-liest known reference to the druids, in the work on the "Successions of Phi-losophers" of the Alexandrian Peripatetic Sotion in the first quarter of the second century BCE, in which the Δρυΐδαι were essentially cast as "barbarian philosophers" (βάρβαροι φιλόσοφοι).[103] Although some details of the dru-ids and their place in Gallic society were fleshed out a century later by Po-seidonius from firsthand observation of the country, their ascribed identity

as φιλόσοφοι remained effectively unquestioned, and on the eve of Caesar's conquest this was the salient image of the druids at Rome, a doubly exotic admixture of Hellenism and barbarism.

During his embassy to Rome in 61 BCE, as a guest of Roman intellectuals like Cicero, the Aeduan Diviciacus, in response to the demands of the context and the expectations of the audience, seems to have appropriated to some extent the conventional Greek stereotypes and to have "played the druid." Before they met Diviciacus, almost all of the knowledge possessed by Cicero and his Roman contemporaries concerning the druids—and Gallic society more generally—would certainly have been acquired from Greek sources, Poseidonius chief among them. According to the testimony of Cicero, who reckoned Diviciacus among the druids of Gaul, "he claimed to possess that understanding of nature which the Greeks call 'natural science' (φυσιολογία)," a branch of knowledge which, significantly, Poseidonius had specified as one of the primary spheres of competence of the druids-as-philosophers.[104] Whether the learned Greek gloss of *naturae ratio* as φυσιολογία, with its specifically Poseidonian flavor, was originally part of Diviciacus' self-representation to his Roman hosts or reflects Cicero's own commentary, the code-switching in the passage suggests the extent to which interactions in this context would have been facilitated through the medium of Greek cultural "translation" and specifically Greek philosophical concepts.[105] Thus the typecasting by Cicero of Diviciacus as druid-philosopher and the strategic complicity of the Aeduan ambassador in playing this role in an attempt to achieve his political aims are in many ways paradigmatic.

With the Roman conquest and the successive restrictions placed upon perceived druidic practices like human sacrifice by Augustus and Tiberius, culminating in the famous ban by Claudius, it is the assumption of most scholars that druidism disappeared in the course of the first century CE,[106] although in all likelihood these policies had little substantial impact on the cultural practices of the local communities of Gaul, targeting as they did something which was in large part an ethnographic myth. Witch-hunts are not really about hunting down witches. Rhetorical uses and representations of druidism by the Romans—in politics or in literature—were, in general, subordinated to and determined by the requirements and constraints of particular imperial narratives. Politics and literature converged in Caesar's *commentarii* on the Gallic wars, in the course of which the druids are en-

tirely invisible, and are given no real agency. They only appear in the formal ethnographic digression of book six, which is a highly rhetorical set piece designed to contrast the *Germani* with the *Galli*. Herein, Caesar's primary objective is to justify the abandonment of his campaigns across the Rhine and the exclusion of Germania from the Roman world.[107] Thus the inclusion of the mostly conventional druids serves the textual objective of lending structure, order, and culture to Gaul in contradistinction to the spatial and cultural emptiness of Germania; indeed, as Caesar transitions from his account of Gaul to that of Germania, the rhetorical function of the druid as the emblem of a kind of oxymoronic "barbarous civilization"—only a slight variation on the Hellenistic βάρβαροι φιλόσοφοι—is clear in his very first observation that "the Germani differ very much from this culture, for they have no druids."[108] The disingenuousness of Caesar's attribution of great social and political importance to the druids within Gaul in this excursus is seemingly betrayed by the fact that, in the narrative itself, they are seen to perform none of the roles with which Caesar credits them here.[109] Early in the principate of Claudius, Pomponius Mela revisited the druids of Caesar in his ideology-laden geography, finding that now, after active Roman intervention, only traces remained of their more barbarous rituals; the druids—and their disappearance—here function as a kind of index of the success of the Roman imperial project.[110] In reality, the druids were probably no more or less perceptible to the dominant culture in Caesar's day than in Mela's; evidence of their prominence or their obsolescence was "discovered" in order to suit the narrative.

But, even under Claudius, it seems that certain Gallic provincials were still motivated to appropriate imperial stereotypes and to role-play the druid, in ways that both conformed to and subverted the expectations of Roman audiences. Pliny the Elder, in his discussion of eggs in the *Natural History*, mentions the "wind egg" (*urinum*), which is a kind of snake's egg supposedly very famous in the provinces of Gaul, where the druids were thought to possess detailed lore—or, less generously, they had a certain "clever shrewdness in disguising their tricks"—as to how it could be obtained. It must be caught in a *sagum*, and the catcher must flee the snakes on horseback, and all this can only be done during a certain phase of the moon. But for at least one Gaul the rewards promised to be tangible enough, although his hopes proved illusory:

> [This "wind egg"] is highly praised by the druids for providing
> favorable outcomes in lawsuits and access to kings. But this is
> such empty superstition, that a Roman *eques* from the people
> of the Vocontii was executed by the deified Claudius for having
> one wrapped up in the folds of his toga during a lawsuit, and for
> no other reason.[111]

Two pieces of information about the identity of this would-be druid are
significant. First, he was a Roman citizen of equestrian rank, a fact which
seems to have been rather surprising and noteworthy to Pliny, given its ap-
parent incongruity with his participation in "such empty superstition." Sec-
ond, he hailed from the Vocontii, a people of Narbonensis who would have
been for Pliny and his contemporaries among the greatest proofs that "with
respect to the *dignitas* of its men and customs . . . it is more like Italy than a
province."[112] Indeed the Vocontii had already produced several generations
of prominent Roman citizens, including historians like Pompeius Trogus,
an imperial *procurator* in Afranius Burrus, the senator L. Duvius Avitus, and,
if we are to follow the plausible suggestion of Syme, the equestrian father
of Cornelius Tacitus.[113] Thus our anonymous Vocontian actor belongs to
a social and cultural milieu in which one would not expect to find many
"druidic" practices. While further details are unfortunately lacking, this
performance of identity—in a law court, presumably at Rome, wearing a
toga—must have been highly stylized and self-conscious in its incorporation
of acts that, whatever their motivations, were recognizably "druidic" and
"other" to a Roman audience.[114]

Before the druids fade from view, at least temporarily, in the historical
record, they appear in Tacitus' account of the intensification of the uprising
in Gaul under Julius Civilis following the death of Vitellius:

> But nothing drove [the Gauls] to believe that the end of the em-
> pire was at hand more than the burning of the Capitol. In their
> empty superstition, the druids sang that the city had once been
> captured by the Gauls, though the empire had endured since
> the seat of Jupiter was preserved. But now a sign of divine anger
> had been given in the form of this fire ordained by fate, and uni-
> versal dominion was foretold for the peoples across the Alps.[115]

Given its late date and the boldness of its claims about their ideology with respect to Rome, few attestations of the druids have drawn more—and more vociferous—scholarly attention than this passage of the *Histories*.[116] But framing the "druids" who lie behind the utterance of this prophecy in terms of the kinds of role-playing that we have been exploring in this section allows us, I would suggest, to work toward a reconciliation of the widely discrepant interpretations. With Syme, we can accept the basic reliability of Tacitus' generally well-informed testimony on Gaul, that there were indeed "druids" who engaged in such performative acts of prophesying in 70 CE, while we can agree with the only superficially incompatible view of Drinkwater that "real" druids almost certainly no longer existed. Webster must be at least partly right, insofar as the *discourse* of druidism (not the kind of "indigenous" continuity of tradition that she imagines) could be appropriated within Roman Gaul as a political statement in support of a new (but still very much "Roman-style") imperial regime, while one cannot dispute Wiśniewski's argument that the kinds of "druidic schools" as conceived of by Caesar would not, had they existed in the first century CE (which one must seriously doubt), have been teaching Livian historiography or propagating the same kinds of social memories of the distant fourth-century past.

What I would argue, in the end, is that the "druidism" reflected in the Tacitean passage was primarily performative, that it was another instance of a stereotype appropriation, through which certain Gallic elites—probably men like Julius Sabinus and Julius Tutor, Roman citizens and participants in a wider political landscape within the Roman world, but whose authority and primary identity was vested in their local communities—exploited the potential of "the druid" that had been amplified by the dominant Roman imperial culture in order to further their political and social objectives. Assuming this versatile role, located in the cultural space between tradition and invention, enabled these elites strategically to present an interpretation of imperial disintegration and provincial violence that might be received differently by different audiences. On the one hand, amidst the kind of disorienting chaos that the communities of Gaul had not experienced since the age of the conquest, these "druids" appealed to a latent nostalgic discontent among their constituencies at home and availed themselves of an opportunity to shape the meaning of events, controlling the narrative of past and present in a way that restored agency to themselves. On the other, it inspired

dread abroad among the Romans by capitalizing on the outsiders' abiding misunderstandings of local practices and deep-seated ethnographic fear of Gallic disorder. Thus the rhetorical use of the Gallic sack of Rome, very much bound up with this druidic performance, becomes an interesting case study of the potential for the appropriation of history and reinterpretation of the imperial past by provincial communities, and the creation of complex and negotiated social memories.

After Tacitus, writing in the first decades of the second century, the druids disappear almost entirely, only to resurface in Gallic society and Latin literature in the second half of the fourth century.[117] Ammianus, as we have argued already, seems to have had local informants in Gaul, and these individuals may have represented themselves to their Greek interlocutor in the recognizable guise of the druid.[118] But a revival of the role of the druid is more clearly evidenced within the intellectual circles from which the professors of the universities of late antique Gaul were drawn. Ausonius, in his short verse biographies of the professors of Burdigala, written between 380 and 394, alludes to the self-representation of a family from Baiocassum (Bayeux) in Aremorica as descended from a line of druids associated with a sanctuary of the local god Belenus. Of the son, Attius Patera, he says:

> You, sprung from a line of Druids of Baiocassum [Bayeux], if the rumor is not mistaken, a sacred race from the sanctuary of Belenus the leader.[119]

And of the father Phoebicius:

> Nor shall I pass over in silence the old man by the name of Phoebicius, who, though keeper of Belenus, got no help thence; but nevertheless, as opinion goes, sprung from a line of Druids of the *gens* of Aremorica, by the efforts of his son he obtained a chair at Burdigala.[120]

In both of these cases, Ausonius treats the claims of the Aremoricans with some suspicion, which suggests that such druidism in the context of late fourth century Burdigala, or Gaul more generally, had more to do with the performance of identity than with any religious reality.[121] Indeed, arguments for a "druidic revivalism" in practice in the fourth century are demonstrably flawed, and can no longer be sustained.[122] But social memory of

the druids was clearly meaningful, and a person's ability to connect himself and his family to archaic forms of social and political authority seems to have been a means of acquiring prestige both within local communities and within the wider provincial intellectual culture of fourth century Gaul. It is possible that these *professores* of Burdigala found the current thriving academic milieu and their own roles as teachers prefigured in the vivid Caesarian portrait of the rigorous training of the druids and the transmission of traditional knowledge. On this point it is worth comparing the roughly contemporary interest of Protadius, a native of the *civitas* of the Treveri,[123] in composing a work on the ancient history of Gaul. For this project he seems to have consulted a copy of Caesar's *commentarii* sent to him by his friend and correspondent Symmachus, who told him in a letter dated to 396 that in that text he would find information on "the origin, geography, battles, customs, and laws of the Gauls."[124] Thus, in a quest for tradition and authenticity, the urban provincial elites of late fourth century Gaul seem to have found themselves, directly or indirectly, in the ethnographic image fashioned by Caesar, rediscovering, remembering, and reenacting the typecast role of the druid in particular as a way of encoding the functions of an imperial culture (e.g., *rhetor, grammaticus*) with a quintessentially local meaning.

Within the Greek and, to a slightly lesser extent, Roman ethnographic frameworks, the philosopher-druids were a defining feature of the society of "the Celts," a constructed *Grossgruppe* that had little significance for local communities and individuals and did not map onto any cultural or ethnic reality.[125] But, similarly to "the druid," the stereotype of the barbarian "Celt" could also be appropriated and performed by provincials to various ends. Its rhetorical potential is reflected most powerfully in the identity of the second-century sophist and philosopher Favorinus. According to the brief biography penned by Philostratus and included among his lives of the sophists, Favorinus was originally from Arelate (Arles) in Gallia Narbonensis, and he reckoned as one of the great paradoxes of his own life the fact that "although a Gaul, he had become Greek."[126] He began his studies at Massilia before settling at Rome, where he became a student of Dio Chrysostom and, later, the teacher of Fronto and Aulus Gellius, among others. Incidentally, the impressionable pupil Gellius seems to preserve a tantalizing snapshot of the autoethnographic interest of Favorinus in the story that he related of

his teacher's enchantment by the historian Claudius Quadrigarius' famous account of the single combat between Torquatus and the Gaul:

> When the philosopher Favorinus read that passage, he said that his emotions were no less excited and moved than if he were watching them fighting right before his eyes.[127]

Beyond his academic admiration for the literary artistry of Quadrigarius, this passage may have spoken to Favorinus more personally because of the ways in which it allowed him to explore issues of abiding interest to him through the tensions it enacts between imperial representation and 'barbarian' subjectivity, offering, from the sophist's point of view, a vivid image of the Gallic self as seen through the eyes of the Roman other.

The literary *persona* of Favorinus was thus formed in this progression from Gallic homeland, to Greek intellectual center, to Roman imperial capital, a fluid identity between locations of ethnicity, culture, and citizenship that was variously negotiated, triangulated, and performed as the context demanded. This complex nexus of self-representations as a "Greek," a "Roman," and a "Celt" is exhibited by Favorinus nowhere more clearly than in his *Corinthian Oration*, a speech mistakenly attributed in the manuscripts to another author. Herein, Favorinus rebukes the Corinthians for taking down the statue in their city that had commemorated him. Making effective use of prosopopoeia, he speaks through the mouthpiece of the statue, and asks the audience,

> Is it not fitting then for this man [i.e., Favorinus] to have a statue among you [at Corinth]? And indeed in every city: at Corinth, because although a Roman, he has become Hellenized, just as your own country has; at Athens, because he is Atticizing in his speech; at Sparta, because he is devoted to gymnastic exercises; and in all cities, because he pursues knowledge and has already not only encouraged many of the Greeks to share the pursuit with him, but has even allured no small number of the barbarians. For it even seems that he has been equipped for this very purpose by the gods: for the Greeks, so that the natives of Greece may have an example illustrating that the acquisition of culture

is not at all inferior in reputation to birth; for the Romans, so that not even those who are wrapped up in their own self-worth may disregard the acquisition of culture of real worth; for the Celts, so that no one even of the barbarians may despair of acquiring Greek culture, when he looks at this man.[128]

This is a reasonably well-trodden passage in recent scholarship, and rightfully so.[129] Through self-consciously appropriating the stereotypes of βάρβαρος and Κελτός, a bold rhetorical move for a Roman equestrian from the rather metropolitan *colonia* of Arelate, Favorinus casts his own "Hellenization" into sharper relief, which ultimately supports the fundamental argument of this passage that the acquisition of Greek culture through *paideia* is not necessarily inferior to being Greek by birth.

These arguments were situated within the larger context of the contemporary debates over Greek identity and the meaning and accessibility of Greekness to non-Greeks, which involved not only the prominent sophists of the day and the *poleis* in and around which they orbited, but even the emperor Hadrian himself. The establishment of the league known as the Panhellenion by Hadrian in 131 CE was a powerful statement within this discourse of Greek identity, since the requirements for membership specified that a city must be able to prove its descent from one of the constituent groups of the ancient Hellenes, namely the Ionians, Dorians, and Aeolians.[130] Thus, as a political entity, the Panhellenion reified an idea of Greekness that was defined by birth (*genos*) rather than education (*paideia*), the antithesis of the position of Favorinus, whose pervasive self-representation through and exploitation of Greek stereotypes were turned against him by his inveterate enemy, the arrogant sophist Polemon. A native of Laodicea in Phrygia and a descendent of the last king of Pontus, he was a prominent advocate of the closed, genealogical definition of Greekness and he pejoratively referred to Favorinus simply as "the Celt."[131] But Favorinus was not one to back down. His speech *On Exile*, mostly preserved on papyrus and dated probably between 131 and 138, seems to have been a tacit and vaguely satirical response by Favorinus to the institution of the Panhellenion. In it, he worked to undermine the importance of genealogy and conventional conceptions of the "homeland" (πατρίς), arguing, essentially, that a person's homeland is not where he was born, but rather wherever he dwells; or, more implicitly, it is

that place with which he identifies. This is Favorinus' metaphorical exile; as a Roman by citizenship and a "Celt" by birth choosing to write in Greek, he is never really at home.[132]

Although the dynamics of imperial domination, cultural performance, and the empowering appropriation of stereotypes play out very differently with regard to the "role" of the exotic and provocative "dancing girls of Gades," suffused as it is with complex issues of gender, sexuality, and class, the *Gaditanae* certainly fit within the general paradigm that we have been outlining in this section.[133] The first attestation of these dancing girls dates to the second half of the second century BCE, when, according to Poseidonius, the famous navigator and merchant Eudoxus of Cyzicus put in at Gades on his way to India (he proposed to circumnavigate Africa) and there loaded on board, along with doctors and other artisans, "slave-girls trained in music."[134] This special training in music and dance at Gades was connected by some of the ancient sources to the Phoenician origins of the city, a cultural inheritance which is generally accepted—though not further elaborated upon—by modern scholars.[135] Thus, despite the great popularity of the Gaditanae in the Roman period, particularly, it would seem, during the last quarter of the first century CE,[136] their dance was not an entirely "manufactured exoticism" of imperial power,[137] but rather represented a performance of cultural identity in the truest sense, since dance is defined by the repetition of a series of stylized bodily acts. Moreover, as has been increasingly recognized by modern theorists, non-inscribed, bodily practices are meaningfully transmitted in and as tradition,[138] and dance and the body are "primary vehicles for holding cultural memory and experience."[139]

From piecing together the scattered and impressionistic sketches of the Latin poets, a picture emerges of the highly erotic dance of the Gaditanae: set to the accompaniment of lewd songs with a distinctive regional beat, the scantily clad or even naked young women would erotically move their hips, provocatively yet skillfully shake their pelvis for long moments, lower their buttocks tremblingly to the ground, and go through a repertoire of arm movements, all while playing distinctive castanets or finger cymbals made of local bronze.[140] In its movements, costume, and staging, the dance of the Gaditanae has aptly been compared in certain respects to forms of belly dance.[141] Needless to say, such performances had a powerful effect on their Roman audiences.

Dance is a bodily practice and a cultural form, but it is also deeply en-
tangled with "the workings of capital and the shapings of class, gender, [and]
ethnicity."[142] This is especially true of the dancing girls of Gades, slaves—ei-
ther virtually or legally—performing for elites, provincials at the Roman
capital, female bodies exoticized and objectified by the male gaze. Unlike
most other constructs of imperial ethnographic discourse, the Gaditanae
were effectively a *commoditized* ethnic stereotype, a "good" whose economic
and social value to the Romans was in large part a function of their exotic
"otherness." But, although we have very little information on the lives of
individual "dancing girls,"[143] it seems that some of them were, in the end,
able to appropriate and to exploit the stereotype offered by the dominant—
and dominating—culture in order to improve their social and economic sta-
tus. Telethusa, the subject of one of Martial's epigrams, seems to have been
among the more successful of the Gaditanae at this "role-playing" of ethnic
identity:

> Telethusa, trained in performing lustful movements to the
> beats of Baetica, and in dancing in the fashion of Gades, who can
> arouse the quivering Pelias and excite the husband of Hecuba at
> the tomb of Hector, she inflames and torments her former mas-
> ter: he sold her as a slave [*ancilla*], he buys her back as a mistress
> [*domina*].[144]

This Telethusa also receives brief mentions in other erotic poetry of the time
as an "itinerant performer" (*circulatrix*), and as a girl who hung out in the
Subura, a particularly disreputable neighborhood of Rome.[145] It would ap-
pear that she was sold by one master, subsequently managed to purchase or
otherwise earn her freedom from another, and then returned to the former,
although this time on her own terms, and with the relations of power and
dominance inverted.

Although the mapping of the western Roman provinces was a dramat-
ically different project to populating the murky thought-world of Homer,
the discourses of empire and epic shared a fascination with "the edges of
the earth,"[146] and the strangeness of the customs of men and the wonders
of nature where the limits of the knowable collapsed with the limits of the
thinkable. To the north, the Belgic Morini, whose country was washed by
the Ocean and whose name in Gaulish means "the people of the sea," were

described by Latin poets as "the furthest of mankind" (*extremi hominum*); on the other side, at Olisipo (Lisbon), the westernmost point in the Roman world, where the promontory first "parts the earth from the sea and the sky," the wind blowing in to land from the vast expanse beyond was fabled by geographers to be the breath of life itself.[147] The Greeks imagined such a place to be a fitting destination for the wanderings of Odysseus, who was interpreted as its founder and namesake.[148] Thus uniquely qualified by their Odyssean origins and their liminal position at the end of the world, a crew of Olisiponenses was commissioned by the emperor Tiberius to embark on a voyage with a rather peculiar and difficult objective: to discover evidence of the existence of the mythical Tritons and Nereids. That these "furthest of men," already seen as inhabiting a landscape somewhere between myth and empire, were cast as explorers of the unreal is perhaps unsurprising; stereotypes in the west were powerful, and persistent. What is more interesting is that the sailors from Olisipo took the job, and, accommodating the emperor's expectations, actually "succeeded" in their quest: an embassy sent to Tiberius presented a report on the appearance and behavior of the Tritons that they had encountered playing conch-shells in a certain cave, and gave a more accurate description of the bodies of the Nereids.[149] It was in the financial interest (or, if the client was the emperor, the political interest) of a horse-breeder or a ship-captain from Olisipo to perpetuate the "accepted facts" about his country, to play the role offered him by the ethnographic imagination of the imperial center: foals conceived by the west wind fetched far higher prices than those born of more conventional parentage, and fishing trips that netted mythical creatures were more lucrative than those that hauled in mundane catches for the *garum* producers.

These shrewd negotiations of identity and appropriations of stereotypes—the druid and the dancing girl, the Celtic barbarian and the dweller at the edge of the earth—reveal the productive intersection between imperial fiction and local performance, and the complexity of individual agency in the western provinces.

Poetry as Performance: Martial and Ausonius

Literature—especially poetry—was an important form of elite social performance in the Roman world, but as with all forms of imperial culture, it was

not monopolized by "the Romans." That some modes of literary production and circulation were more or less restricted to a rather narrow group of cosmopolitan elites through conscious hegemonic strategies, or by the accident of certain economic and social realities, did not necessarily preclude the semi-autonomous participation of "subelites" among the provincials of Gaul and Spain.[150] Its performative potential could be tapped to serve new ends. Thus, rather than exclusively contributing "to the amalgamation of Roman identity to subject status" and reconstituting the provincial reader as the "subject of an imperial regime,"[151] written literature might provide a means for the expression of local *subjectivities*, other voices and identities. As has been argued for the Greek productions of the intellectual movement the Second Sophistic, it is clear, if comparatively underappreciated, that the literature of the western provinces was intensely engaged in a "process of self-making."[152] The chorography of Pomponius Mela, the scientific survey of Cornelius Bocchus, the history of Pompeius Trogus, the discourses of Favorinus—all of these texts of the first centuries of Roman rule in the west were, as we have seen, much concerned with locating selves and others through geography, memory, ethnicity, and culture. There must have been more whose authors and subjects are entirely lost to us. That they did not find lasting success in the imperial marketplace—surviving, if it all (with the noteworthy exception of Mela), only in fragments incorporated into more mainstream "Roman" works (Bocchus in Pliny the Elder), as epitomes by readers who ignored much of their local resonance (Trogus by Justin), or as misattributions to other more canonical writers (Favorinus to Dio of Prusa)—is a reflection more of the power of the normative hegemonic cultural forces that structured the *circulation* of literary texts, rather than of the absence of alternative sites, agents, or identities involved in their *production*.

It is thus not unthinkable that alternative literatures, which expressed subaltern voices, might intermittently have been composed in the western provinces, but their survival would have been impossible; in general, these voices must be sought elsewhere, in inscriptions, texts whose creation and continuance were governed by other factors. There were rare instances, however, of provincial authors whose local identities were prominent enough to be recognizable in their literary performances, but were carefully enough subordinated to the expectations and tastes of their imperial read-

ers that they met with a favorable contemporary reception, and survived the vicissitudes of textual transmission. Through an examination of two writers of different periods, provinces, and social statuses—Marcus Valerius Martialis and Decimus Magnus Ausonius—this section will examine Latin poetry as one particular "performative style" of local identity.

In this interest here in written selves, embedded in discursive systems, there is much overlap with ideas that have been advanced in recent years in relation to persona theory; indeed, the very concept of the *persona*—the actor's stage mask—contains connotations of performativity. As we have already suggested, *mutatis mutandis*, for various performances of identity in the "real world," recognizing, in poetic texts, "that selves are rhetorically structured and that they can change from poem to poem does much good in that it forces us to think of the self not as a skin-encased biological entity that crashes through time rounded, singular and hard."[153] The identities of poets—like those of other provincials in other contexts—were dynamic constructs produced through interaction between author and audience, conditioned by expectations, and situated in a matrix of possibilities constituted by a series of "remembered selves" from various pasts that were invoked as models. Therefore, for the purposes of a broader historical analysis of western provincial identity, these fundamental similarities seem to justify the inclusion of the fashioning of poetic personae under the larger umbrella of performance.

The literary self-realization of Martial certainly repays closer inspection. Much like the embarrassment of many modern commentators on Catullus faced with the poet's frequent references to his Italian hometown of Verona,[154] scholarship on Martial has tended to avoid, downplay, or even efface the prominent Celtiberian identity that he performs throughout his poetry, at times going so far as to falsely remake his parents into Roman colonists.[155] This is to ignore not only a key aspect of his writing, but arguably the clearest extended articulation of local identity that survives from the early imperial western provinces. As has been recently argued, his poems "re-map space, in provocative and mischievous ways", and they are "constantly testing the relationship between Rome and… 'not-Rome.'"[156] One of the longest poems in his corpus is a "Bilbilitanian conversation" with his countryman Licinianus, which deliberately alienates the Roman reader through flaunt-

ing a local topographical knowledge shared by author and addressee, the lack of which leaves the outsider wandering disoriented in an illegible provincial landscape:

> A man not to be passed over in silence by the Celtiberian peoples, and the boast of our Hispania, you, Licinianus, will see Bilbilis, distinguished by waters and arms, and the *Caius* old with white snows, and sacred *Vadavero* with its broken cliffs, and the delightful grove of charming *Boterdum*, which happy Pomona adores. You will swim in the calm shallows of the warm *Congedus* and the mild lakes of the Nymphs, and relaxed by these you will brace your body in the little *Salo*, which cools iron. There *Voberca* herself will provide animals to be taken at close range for your meal. The peaceful summer heat you will break in the golden *Tagus*, shaded by the trees. The fresh *Derceita* will quench your thirst, and the *Nutha* which is colder than the snows.[157]

Throughout his books, Martial actively aligns himself with Catullus, whom he viewed not only as a role model for the genre of epigram, but for the negotiation of localism within a literary culture preoccupied by cosmopolitanism. As the Italian poet had put Verona on the map for Roman readers, so Martial, "unashamed to mention the harsher names of our country in pleasing verse," had proudly celebrated Celtiberian Bilbilis; he expressed a desire to be read among the "old poets," and to be second in the esteem of his readers only to Catullus himself.[158]

Toward the end of his career, which had long kept him at the imperial capital, pondering his imminent return from Rome to his "rough" countrymen, he experienced a common expatriate anxiety of identity: after years in a foreign land, writing of a place revisited only in memory, one cannot truly go home again.[159] To facilitate his reintegration into the community, he reminded the Bilbilitani that he was their Catullus, that the relationship between poet and *patria* was reciprocal:

> Fellow townsmen, whom Bilbilis *Augusta*, girt by the swift waters of the Salo, parents on her steep mountainside, does the happy celebrity of your bard please you at all? For my renown

and recognition and reputation are yours. Verona owes no greater debt to her poor Catullus, and she might wish that I be reckoned no less as one of her own. While I have dwelled within the wondrous walls of Rome, mistress of the world, thirty-four summers have turned to harvest-time back home, where you make your rustic offerings to Ceres without me. Italian lands have changed the color of my hair. I shall return, if you welcome me with open arms. If your hearts are embittered, I won't hesitate to leave again.[160]

Martial's fraught homecoming is a central theme of this, the tenth book of his epigrams. In a careful inversion of the geography of Ovidian exile poetry, Martial, filled with nostalgia for the imperial periphery, Celtiberian Bilbilis, depicts Rome itself as having become his own place of exile.[161] In another poem, he acknowledged that this tendency for nostalgic valorization of his community was criticized by some, who claimed that he "spoke too often of his strange peoples for one who had grown old in the Latin city";[162] this assertion of provincialism, however, the policing of the boundaries between the "authentic" self and the other, served as a hypercorrection to "going Roman." Life in the city is vividly presented by the poet as a perpetual performance, a costume-drama: Martial is obsessed with the toga, which he constructs as a metonymy for all that is "Roman"; through this emblem of culture, identity, and performativity, he distinguishes Rome from his idealized Bilbilis, where, he claims, "the toga is unknown."[163] But even after three decades, Martial refused to lose himself in the Roman character that he played, to let himself be assimilated into the cast of the cosmopolis: when Carmenion, an urbane and effeminate Corinthian, attempted to characterize Martial as a kindred spirit, a fellow sophisticate, the poet responded with an exaggerated "autoethnographic" portrait of himself as a wild-haired Celtiberian outsider from a far-off place:

Since you boast that you are a citizen of Corinth (which no one questions), why do you call me your "brother"? I was born of the Celts and the Iberians. I am a citizen of the Tagus. Do we seem similar in appearance? You go out looking stylish with your hair slicked back, while my Spanish mane gives me an un-

ruly look; your skin is smoothed by daily depilatories; my limbs and cheeks are rough.[164]

Like the lesser-known western provincial visitors to Rome whose epigraphic testimonies we have examined, Martial chose to place emphasis on separateness; to project, in the shadow of the "wondrous walls of the mistress of the world," an identity located elsewhere, on the banks of the "ancestral Salo."

Upon his return to Bilbilis, the poet went quiet for three years. But around 100 CE, Martial published the twelfth and final volume of his epigrams, sending "a foreign book, from the *gens* of the gold-bearing Tagus and the harsh Salo" to the "lofty city of Remus."[165] The book reenacts the journey upon which its author had embarked long ago. In its preface, Martial offers an apology to Priscus for his recent lack of productivity "in this provincial wilderness," and, with a fresh perspective gained from time and distance, reflects on the difficulties of belonging and the alienation of homecoming:

> I miss the well-tuned ears in the City to which I had grown accustomed; here I feel like I am arguing a case in the forum of a foreign country. If there was ever anything pleasing in my works, it was the product of that audience.[166]

The man may have been a native of Bilbilis, but the poet was born at Rome. With this in mind, he cautions his friend not to judge these laborious "trifles" (*nugae*)—a falsely self-deprecating allusion to the prefatory poem of Catullus' collection—too harshly, "lest I send to you at Rome a book that is not *Hispaniensis*, but *Hispanus*." The subtlety of this play on the meaningful distinctions of identity in the provinces of Hispania is impossible to capture nearly as concisely in English. The former designation was used to refer to Italian veteran colonists who were settled in Spain and to their descendants who remained there, but maintained a felt sense of difference from "the natives"; the latter term, although almost never used by individuals to identify themselves, was the generic imperial label for the various indigenous peoples of the peninsula.[167] In closing the preface to his last book of poetry, the only one written in Celtiberia, with a playful yet poignant threat to give up the act and "go native," to slip into a version of

provincial identity no longer pleasing—or even intelligible—to a Roman audience, Martial once again reminds the reader of the performativity of his poetic persona. His epigrams are a series of stylized acts of self-translation, "code-switching" from a foreign language (*Hispanus*) into a regional accent of empire (*Hispaniensis*).

Ausonius was the product of quite different historical circumstances, and the remarkable success of his political career rendered the role of "provincial" rather more complicated to play convincingly; nonetheless, the poet-consul shared Martial's interest in assuming a literary identity drawn from local communities of origin. Born around 310 CE in Aquitanian Burdigala to a well-regarded physician, Ausonius was educated in his hometown and at nearby Tolosa, before joining the academy himself, first as professor of *grammatica* at Burdigala, and then of rhetoric. His meteoric rise to political prominence began relatively late in life, in the 360s, when he was summoned to the imperial court at Augusta Trevirorum (Trier) to serve as tutor to the young Gratian; the teacher converted this access into an opportunity for social mobility, both for himself and his family, and his rapid advancement through a succession of offices in the 370s culminated in the consulship in 379. During his subsequent retirement to his Aquitanian estates, he turned in earnest to the writing of poetry, the frequent autobiographical themes of which are representative of the contemporary spirit of a newly self-confident Gallic aristocracy of the second half of the fourth century.[168] It is in his treatment of local subjects that the originality of his poetic voice emerges.

As Catullus had offered Martial an Italian poetic precedent through which to explore tensions between *urbanitas* and local identity, so Cicero—statesman, writer, and proud citizen of the Volscian town of Arpinum—was adopted as a suitable model by Ausonius for his own self-fashioning. Ausonius concluded his poetic survey of the distinguished cities of his time, bookended by Rome and Burdigala, with a programmatic statement on the negotiation of the self between the poles of empire and community:

> Burdigala is my homeland (*patria*), but Rome surpasses all homelands. I love Burdigala, I revere Rome. In this city I am a citizen, in both a consul. Here is my cradle, there my chair of office.[169]

The influence of the famous meditation of Cicero on the problem of two homelands in his treatise *On the Laws* is readily discernible:

> I think . . . that all municipal men have two *patriae*, one of birth and one of citizenship. . . . Thus we call our *patria* both that place where we were born, and that state into which we were adopted. It is necessary for the latter to have first place in our affections . . . although that which gave birth to us is not much less precious than that which adopted us. Truly then I shall never say that my birthplace is not my *patria*, although Rome is greater, and Arpinum is encompassed within it.[170]

Ausonius had himself already elaborated upon this tension years earlier in the most acclaimed of his poems, on the river Mosella, written shortly after he arrived at the imperial court in Belgica:

> These things do I, Ausonius, boldly sing, though with scanty confidence. I who trace my line back from my own Viviscan origins but am acquainted with the hospitality of the Belgae through new bonds [i.e., at the imperial court]; I am Latin in name but in heart and hearth belong to the far reaches of Gaul and the lofty Pyrenees, where happy Aquitania softens my native character.[171]

As is clear in the works of other late antique authors from Gaul, those ancient ethnicities like the Bituriges Vivisci had not entirely ceded their place as meaningful units of belonging to a more city-centered conception of the *civitas*; membership by birth and citizenship in the community of Burdigala authorized the poet's rather specious claim to be one of the Vivisci, even if such an identity was not rooted in his ancestry.[172] For stronger, genealogical claims of ethnic identity, however, Ausonius looked elsewhere: to the Vasates, the Tarbelli, and the Aedui.

Indeed, whereas Martial had articulated his local identity primarily through topography, Ausonius, whose origins were more diffuse, placed emphasis instead on genealogy, which, along with ethnicity, is the central concern of the author's self-definition in the prefatory poem to the collection:

> Ausonius was my father, and I have the same name. So that you,
> good reader, might know who I am, I have written it here: my
> father's homeland is among the Vasates, my mother's family
> were Aedui on her father's side, and Tarbelli on her mother's.
> I myself was born at Burdigala: thus divided between four an-
> cient cities are the origins of my family.[173]

Remembering the various threads of his family's past—which implicated
four different *civitates*—was essential to explaining "who he was." Else-
where, he indicated that the "ancestral realms" that constituted his patri-
mony in the country of the Vasates had been handed down within the fam-
ily for at least four generations; he asserted that his father, while he had been
distinguished as a member of the *senatus* of both his native Vasates and his
adoptive city of Burdigala, had always thought of the former as his *patria*,
and the latter only as his place of residence.[174] Ausonius provided a some-
what more detailed history of his mother's line. His maternal grandfather,
Caecilius Argicius Arborius, son of Argicius, "bore a name derived from his
Aeduan ancestry, which embraced many noble houses of the province of
Lugdunensis and the powerful Aedui." But, in the tumultuous years of the
third century, when Victorinus and then Tetricus came to power within the
breakaway "Gallic empire" (ca. 270), the wealth and influence of the fam-
ily made them a target of the tyrants, and they were forced to flee their
Aeduan homeland westward into Aquitania, where they settled among the
Tarbelli and intermarried with the local elite (*proceres*).[175] Such was the com-
plex identity that Ausonius developed through his poetry: though consul at
Rome, he found himself at home among the Vivisci; though Latin in name,
he felt possessed of an inborn character that belonged in Aquitania; though
a professor at Burdigala, he traced his ethnic origins to the several different
civitates whence his ancestors had come.

   The voices of the inhabitants of the west are not often to be heard in the
extant remains of Latin literature, but they were not silent. Together, the
writings of these two poets allow us to approach, from yet another angle,
the generative intersection between community and empire. The personae
adopted by Martial and Ausonius, for all of their differences, point to com-
mon concerns and abiding tensions of the provincial experience. Both were

interested in drawing attention to points of friction between local identity and Roman citizenship, to privileged local knowledge of genealogies, histories, customs, and landscapes, and, ultimately, to the performativity of provincial selves.

Funerary Rites and the Final Performance

Preserved in a tenth-century manuscript discovered in the Bibliothèque de Bâle at Basel and first published in 1863 is one of the most important surviving records of an individual from the western provinces. This document, the so-called "testament du Lingon," records large fragments of the final will of a local elite with Roman citizenship from the *civitas* of the Lingones in the late first or early second century CE, in which the anonymous individual lays out instructions for the construction of his sepulchral monument—at a place called *Litavicrari*, perhaps near Andemantunnum (Langres)—and its upkeep, makes provisions for his own posthumous cult, and specifies the details of the celebration of his funeral. Based on the language, content, and form of the text, it has been reasonably assumed by most scholars that it represents a transcription from an original inscription set up on the funerary monument itself; this interpretation has only rarely been questioned since the text was included in the nineteenth century in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and indeed, thanks to the lapidary authority of that work, it is often not realized that this "inscription" is derived not from a stone, but from an early medieval manuscript. Recently, however, the "inscription theory" has been strongly—and rightly—challenged.[176] The intriguing alternative is that the manuscript ultimately derives from an actual documentary will of the early second century CE; such a process of textual transmission has significant implications for the existence of archives and the workings of local memorial and scribal practices in provincial communities. But what is most interesting for our purposes here is the performance of identity reflected in this document.

Three sections, from the beginning, middle, and end of the text as it survives (lacunae of indeterminate length precede and follow the extant page of the manuscript), are particularly significant:

> I wish the *cella memoriae* which I built to be completed to the
> specifications which I gave: there should be an *exedra* in that

place, in which should be placed a seated statue, made of the very best marble from across the sea, or of sheets of the very best bronze, not less than five feet tall . . . and an altar of the highest craftsmanship and of the very best Luna marble should be set up in front of that building, in which my bones might be placed, and let that building be closed with Luna marble in such a way that it may be easily opened and closed. And let that building and those groves and that lake be taken care of in accordance with the judgment of my freedmen Philadelphus and Verus. . . . And let the names of the magistrates in whose term that building was begun be inscribed on the outside of the building. . . . Moreover I wish that all my stuff, which I acquired for hunting and fowling, be burnt with me together with my spears, swords, knives, nets, snares, traps, birding-reeds, tents, game-frightening-ropes, bathing utensils, couches, portable chair, and every substance and piece of equipment of that sport, and my bulrush canoe, so that nothing might be carried off. . . .[177]

While the design and the materials of the funerary monument reflect, to some degree, patterns of consumption and elite taste that, like Luna marble, for example, would have been broadly recognizable across the Roman world, it cannot be said that the attempts by this elite to secure posthumous cult were "thoroughly Roman."[178] On the contrary, this tomb-temple funerary complex and its visual "poetics" of power are probably to be interpreted instead as a kind of "sanctuaire de héros," situated within a more local tradition of hero-cult such as we have previously discussed among the Gabali and Lemovices.[179] Thus the final performance of identity of this elite is, in large part, an act of self-heroization, embodied in the seated (possibly equestrian) statue, which may have had a special symbolic resonance locally among the Lingones.[180] And future generations, reading the names of the magistrates of the Lingones, whatever their titles, inscribed upon the monument, would have been further compelled to place this elite and his memory within a specifically local conception of time and of the past.

The funeral itself—comprising, most prominently, the burning on the pyre of the valued belongings of the deceased—must also be seen as a highly self-conscious and stylized performative act, albeit one in which participa-

tion took on a somewhat different meaning. The kind of testamentary provision found in the case of the Lingon is not a recognizably Roman practice; while particularly emotive objects were occasionally thrown onto the pyre by the attendees of a *funus*, wholesale combustion of portable property is unknown.[181] Furthermore, the fact that almost all of the valuables mentioned in the text have to do with hunting, a pastime that the archaeological record shows to have been important to the self-representation of Gallic elites before and after the conquest, is also noteworthy.[182] In order to make sense of this ritual act, then, it would seem to be worth comparing the ethnographic description of the funerals of the Gauls included by Caesar in the sixth book of his *commentarii*, presumably at least partly based on autopsy:

> The funerals [of heads of elite families] are, given the manner of life of the Gauls, splendid and costly: everything that is judged to have been dear to the deceased while alive is cast into the fire.[183]

Pomponius Mela, writing a century later under Claudius, describes apparently the same custom in the very brief ethnographic digression with which he prefaces his geography of Gaul, but he adds a causal explanation for the practice:

> One of these things which [the druids] teach—presumably so that they are better in battle—has become known to the masses, namely that the soul is eternal and that there is another life in the underworld. Thus they burn and bury with the dead things appropriate to the living.[184]

The doctrine of metempsychosis, or the immortality of the soul, was among the most common topoi in Greek and Roman ethnographic accounts of the druids, which need no further rehashing here. Similarly to these two Roman authors, Diodorus, perhaps reflecting the Poseidonian tradition, had also noted that, at the funerals of their kith and kin, some of the Gauls throw letters written to the dead into the fire, as if the dead would be able to read them.[185] Considered in the context of this suggestive ethnographic and material cultural evidence,[186] the funeral staged by the Lingon should not be dismissed as mere conspicuous consumption. Although, as part of the process of hero-making in which he was engaged, it was undoubtedly

designed to garner this kind of cultural capital and to project an image of the deceased as fulfilling certain traditional cultural and social roles within the community, it also seems likely that the act of burning those things most dear to him had cosmological underpinnings, informed by the social memory of pre-Roman systems of belief and elite ritual practices.

In the end, it is fitting that the Lingon individual in the text from the Bibliothèque de Bâle, in whose person the most important themes and problems and negotiations of the western provincial experience are embodied so eloquently, should have no name; for, in his anonymity, he is all the more powerfully representative. His testament, the longest and most detailed extant self-account of a western provincial from the first two and half centuries of Roman rule, reveals one of the most complex performances of identity.

The inhabitants of the provinces of Gaul and Spain have long tended to be represented as passive objects in the Roman world, rarely possessing meaningful agency of their own, and instead primarily acted upon by the forces of empire: pacified, incorporated, transformed, civilized, and acculturated, their choices and their voices have not usually been the stuff of history. But through the idea of performance, this chapter sought to work toward redressing that balance, and to recover some of the self-conscious strategies employed by individual actors in the identity politics that played out within their home communities or in interactions abroad. These performances of identity were manifested in a great variety of forms, of which only a select few broad categories were examined here. The repertoire of public acts that constituted the holding of traditional magistracies and priesthoods was a conspicuous means for elites to consolidate communities around themselves, and to tie these individual and collective identities to the past. By subversively appropriating ethnographic stereotypes and role-playing the parts scripted by imperial power, locals negotiated a place for themselves on their own terms. Provincial poets engaged with Latin literary culture, and did not shrink from exploring questions of localism and the limits of Roman universalism, nor from articulating—even flaunting—differences and discrepant experiences of empire. Funerary rites remained powerful moments of public drama, wherein heightened awareness of the precariousness of memory, status, and belonging encouraged displays of affiliation and rehearsals of tradition.[187] Despite the impression given by much modern scholarship, the

provincials of the west were not poor players, heard no more once they had fretted their hour upon the Roman stage; from the conquest until the end of antiquity, their performances were an animating feature of imperial history, and enabled them to actively make that history their own.

CONCLUSION

❧

I N THE SUMMER OF 137 BCE, a Roman commander found himself standing alone with his battle standard on the far side of the river Limia. Decimus Junius Brutus, who would later acquire the cognomen *Callaecus* from his conquests in the region, turned back to his army waiting in anticipation on the opposite bank. No Roman had ever come this far. The soldiers had refused to cross the stream, which they believed to be the end of the world; in their own language they called it not the Limia, but the *Oblivio*: "Forgetfulness." They had found the river Lethe of Greek mythology in the landscape of Callaecia, and once they should pass beyond that great boundary, there could be no return: they would lose all memory of who they were, their identities washed away in its waters.[1]

The popularity of this story in antiquity is a testament to the ways in which it resonated with Roman conceptions of the edges of the earth, and affirmed the glory of a city that had become coextensive with the known world itself. But the Limia is also an apt metaphor for the ideas that have long prevailed in modern scholarship on the provinces of Gaul and Spain: that moving westward from the Roman center, one reaches a point of imperial oblivion, beyond which the inhabitants cease to remember their pasts or to know themselves. The present study has offered an alternative interpretation based on the evidence of hundreds of different communities that made up the variegated patchwork of empire, and one final example is provided

by the very ethnic group that took its name from this river of supposed for-
getfulness: the Limici. For a relatively minor people all but unknown from
literary sources, they left a remarkably robust impression of themselves
in the epigraphic record.[2] Limici are abundantly attested not just in their
own country, but in their travels abroad, across the river and throughout
the Iberian peninsula; whether conducting diplomacy at Baetican Ilipula or
holding prestigious office at the provincial capital of Tarraco, members of
the Limici proudly proclaimed themselves as such.[3] But even those who be-
longed to this small Galician ethnic community did not imagine themselves
as being "only Limici": in the epitaphs of those who were laid to rest in other
lands, their friends and kinsmen took pains to inscribe still more narrowly
defined civic identities, commemorating the deceased as "a Limicus from
Talabriga," "a Limicus from the Berensian fort," "a Limicus from Arguce,"
or "a Limicus from Livairum."[4] The history of the Roman empire in the
west was a history of such local communities.

In a study devoted to the western provinces, it is perhaps inevitable that
the implicit counterpoint of the Greek east should loom large in the back-
ground. Since the first serious works of modern historical scholarship on the
provinces, this comparison has profoundly structured our approaches to the
Roman world. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Leonhard Schmitz, a
German classicist who had been Niebuhr's greatest student and had gone on
to teach in Britain, was among the first to pursue it seriously in his *History of
Rome*, the influence of which on the development of Anglophone historiog-
raphy on Rome was significant. Identifying a great divide in "civilization"
between the two halves of the Roman Mediterranean that shaped the prog-
ress of cultural change from the late Republic onward, Schmitz made an
argument that has been reiterated in one form or another by generations of
historians since:

> The Latin language was at this time understood, if not spoken
> . . . in the south of Gaul, in a great part of Spain, and in the west-
> ern islands of the Mediterranean; in all which countries Latin
> was ultimately to become the language of the people. In the
> provinces east of the Adriatic, on the other hand, no attempt
> was ever made to supplant the language spoken by the provin-
> cials. A perfect Romanization, therefore, took place only in the

northern and western parts of the empire; that is, in countries whose civilization, at the time of their conquest, was below that of the Romans.[5]

From its beginnings in the nineteenth century, this mode of comparing east and west has been deeply bound up with—and complicit in—the national, imperial, and colonial experiences, discourses, and aspirations of European powers. A full treatment of this subject is well beyond the scope of the present discussion, but most instructive for our purposes here is the way in which the explanation for the different historical trajectories of Gaul and Greece resorts to the rhetoric of "civilization" and to the arbitrary classification of peoples along an illusory, self-congratulatory spectrum of "development." Through such classifications, scholars since Schmitz have generated ideologically charged meanings from their perceptions of the "non-classical" cultures of the west, which tend to reinforce certain kinds of historical narratives and sites of authority.[6] Conveniently encapsulated in the new term that Schmitz introduced—for the first time—into the English vocabulary to describe the effects of Roman power in the west, "Romanization," these ideas have become part of a problematic intellectual inheritance bequeathed to the present.

One can observe clearly their legacy in the writings of the British archaeologist Francis Haverfield. His 1905 lecture, "The Romanization of Roman Britain" (revised and expanded twice by the author over the following decade), has had a momentous impact on Roman provincial scholarship in the English-speaking world.[7] In the introduction, after a brief discussion of the sophistication of the provinces of the Greek east, Haverfield presented the west as a stark contrast:

> The west offers a different spectacle. Here Rome found races that were not yet civilized, yet were racially capable of accepting her culture. . . . They were marked off, further, by no ancient culture, such as that which had existed for centuries round the Aegean. It was possible, it was easy, to Romanize these western peoples.[8]

In the west, Haverfield denied a priori the possibility of the memory of local pasts under Roman rule, which elsewhere, in his discussion of the Greek

east, he claims to be one of the insurmountable obstacles that "Romanization" faced there. Elaborating upon the great divide between east and west that had featured importantly in the first articulation of the concept in English by Schmitz sixty years prior, Haverfield dismissed the inhabitants of Gaul and Spain as peoples without history. This tradition of the negation of local cultures in the west has contributed to the insidious naturalization of colonial projects, ancient and modern, in several ways: conquered peoples are identified as pre-cultural, part of the natural world, an identification that colonial writing presents in turn as entirely "natural," as a simple state of what is, rather than a theory based in interest; moreover, it is implied that the active intervention of advanced societies that transforms and displaces primitive peoples is also part of a natural evolutionary process.[9]

Although there have been reassessments and critiques of the paradigm over the last century, fundamental misperceptions of the west propagated by this discourse still linger. Recently, for example, the late Simon Price, in his efforts to cast the historical memories of Greece into sharper relief, has summed up well the current consensus in modern scholarship:

> One of the major cultural processes of the ancient world is the fate of local cultures in the western parts of the Roman empire: Spain, Gaul, Germany, and Britain. It is very striking that (in contrast to the fate of local cultures in the eastern half of the empire . . .) in the west there is no institutionalized memory of the pre-Roman past (no local genealogies tied local elites to pre-Roman figures), and local cultures (and languages) were consigned to cultural oblivion through the process of "crowding" or "overlay."[10]

As we have illustrated, however, local cultures and local memories certainly did not vanish from the western provinces; institutions, genealogies, and languages that connected individuals and communities to the pre-Roman past persisted in meaningful ways. Arguments for a forgetful and homogenized west have always been based in large part on this misguided and misleading contrast with the east, which generally revolves around perceived differences in the utilization of a narrowly defined set of commemorative media like long public inscriptions, coinage, monumental narrative art, and vernacular literature.[11] But these are forms of expression that were, in ori-

gin, particular to the Greek world, which modern notions of "civilization" that underpin scholarly approaches to the provinces have tended to valorize as universal standards of culture. With all of this in mind, it becomes untenable to suggest that the fact that the communities of the west only selectively and strategically borrowed elements from the Greeks (and Romans) to articulate their own memories is an indication of "cultural oblivion." A thorough and careful study of the totality of the evidence for local practices and discourses of memory and identity reveals that there were ultimately far more similarities between the two halves of the empire than there were differences.[12]

Over the course of the preceding chapters, we have put forward three principal arguments. First, the provinces of Gaul and Spain have hitherto been unduly neglected in studies of local identity in the Roman world because of certain preconceived ideas of culture, civilization, and history. The genealogy of these ideas can be traced in branches of both ancient and modern thought. In the early second century CE, Tacitus commented critically on the general disinterest of contemporary writers in the stories told by the peoples of the west about themselves; instead, the cultural chauvinism of Greek intellectuals like Asclepiades or the surveilling gaze of Roman imperialists like Pliny the Elder led to the production of only specific kinds of ethnographic texts about the local inhabitants. For the Greeks, this mode of thought ultimately extended back as far as the sixth century BCE and Stesichorus's poem *Geryoneis*, in which, for the first time, a culture of this part of the Mediterranean—Iberian Tartessus—was assimilated into and subordinated to the ends of a Greek mythographical framework, its independent past ignored in favor of finding another etiological and etymological waypoint on Hercules's journeys. One might even see its basic features adumbrated in the wanderings of Odysseus through the insubstantialized thought-world of the west, peopled by the original "others" of the Greek ethnographic imagination.[13] More problematic than ancient ethnographic biases, however, has been the approach to the cultures of the west in modern scholarship, in which there has been, since the nineteenth century, much contamination from the discourses of nationalism and colonialism. In short, the erasure of the local from the western provinces was a *historiographical* development far more than it was a historical one.

Second, robust and well-articulated local identities and cultures were

a crucially important feature of provincial society in Gaul and Spain, and communalization—a pattern of action that promotes a sense of belonging together—was one of the driving historical processes throughout the Roman period. Self-nominating and self-ascribing communities constituted at various scales engaged in practices of territoriality, gave distinctive local rhythm and structure to time by means of festivals and eras, and through religion reimagined the nature and meaning of their communion. Interactions with "others," whether peer polities or the Roman imperial state, worked powerfully to differentiate "selves." Within communities, members did not passively conform to the prevailing norms of local custom or imperial culture, but actively performed complex and shifting identities that drew inspiration variously from Roman stereotypes or invented traditions or collective memories in order to acquire status abroad and consolidate authority at home.

Third, and finally, the inhabitants of the west were not forgetful "peoples without history"; they did not lose themselves in the vast oblivion of empire.[14] Rather, social memory—an expression of collective experience that instills a sense of identity in a group—was always a central component of the communalization process. Myths, monuments, landscapes, and genealogies served as repositories for memories of the local past, which were continually renegotiated in relation to changing political and cultural circumstances. At the same time, distinctly local memories of Roman pasts—new tales of Trojan wanderings, malapropisms of imperial mythology, or fabrications of historical events—became integral to communities' definitions of themselves within the broader Mediterranean world. Herein, in my view, lies the basis of the stability of the Roman empire, a singular and still, in many respects, enigmatic phenomenon: the encouragement of local identities, the accommodation of multiple understandings of imperial culture, the acceptance of pluralism and discrepancy, and, ultimately, the creation of a lasting unity out of an ever vibrant diversity.

And so, in the end, that historian of Rome seems to have been mistaken in his conclusion that "the empire belonged to Romulus alone" (*solus potitus imperio Romulus*).[15] As this book has worked to show, there was always a place for the sons of Remus.

ABBREVIATIONS

❧

AE	*L'Année Épigraphique*
BMC	Mattingly, H. (ed.) (1965) *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum.* London.
CAG	*Carte archéologique de la Gaule*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
CLE	*Carmina Latina Epigraphica*
CNH	Villaronga, L. (1994) *Corpus Nummum Hispaniae ante Augusti Aetatem.* Madrid.
EA	Mananes Pérez, T. (1982) *Epigrafía y numismática de Astorga romana y su entorno.* Salamanca.
EC	Iglesias Gil, J. M. (ed.) (1976) *Epigrafía* cántabra. Santander.
EE	*Ephemeris epigraphica: Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementum*
ELRH	Díaz Ariño, B. (2008) *Epigrafía Latina Republicana de Hispania.* Barcelona.
ERA	Diego Santos, F. (1959) *Epigrafía Romana de Asturias.* Oviedo.
ERAEmerita	García Iglesias, L. (ed.) (1973) *Epigrafía Romana de Augusta Emerita.* Madrid.
ERBeturi	Canto, A. M. (ed.) (1997) *Epigrafía Romana de la Beturia céltica.* Madrid.
ERC	Iglesias, J. M., and A. Ruiz. (eds.) (1998) *Epigrafía romana de Cantabria.* Bordeaux.
ERItalica	Canto de Gregorio, A. (ed.) (1985) *La epigrafía romana de Itálica.* Madrid.
ERPS	Jimeno, A. (ed.) (1980) *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de Soria.* Soria.
FRHist	Cornell, T. J. (ed.) (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians.* Oxford.

HE	*Hispania Epigraphica*
ICUR	*Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae*
ILA	(1991–2010) *Inscriptions Latines d'Aquitaine.* 7 vols. Bordeaux.
ILAstorga	Mananes Pérez, T. (ed.) (2000) *Inscripciones latinas de Astorga.* Valladolid.
ILGN	Espérandieu, E. (ed.) (1929) *Inscriptions latines de Gaule (Narbonnaise).* Paris.
ILN	Gascou, J., and Janon, M. (eds.) (1985–2013) *Inscriptions Latines de Narbonnaise.* Paris.
ILS	*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*
IRC	Fabre, G., M. Mayer, and I. Roda. (eds.) (1984) *Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne.* Paris.
IRCP	d'Encarnação, J. (ed.) (1984) *Inscrições Romanas do Conventus Pacensis.* Coimbra.
IRPL	Arias Vilas, F., P. Le Roux, and A. Tranoy. (eds.) (1979) *Inscriptions romaines de la province de Lugo.* Paris.
ISIS	Helttula, A. (ed.) (2007) *Le inscrizioni sepolcrali latine nell'Isola sacra.* Rome.
MLH	*Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*
RIC	Mattingly, H., Sutherland, C.H., and Carson, R. A. G. (eds.) (1923–1981) *The Roman imperial coinage.* London.
RIG	*Recueil des inscriptions gauloises*
RIT	Alföldy, G. (ed.) (1975) *Die Römischen Inschriften von Tarraco.* Berlin.
RPC	Burnett, A., Amandry, M., and Ripollès, P. (eds.) (1992–1999) *Roman provincial coinage.* London.
Schanz/Hosius	von Schanz, M., and C. Hosius. (1927–1959) *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian.* Munich.

For works of Greek and Latin literature, the standard abbreviations of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* have been used.

NOTES

✤

Introduction

1. Caes., *BGall.* 1.1.
2. See Caes., *BGall.* 6.12.
3. For the *civitas Remorum foederata* see *CIL* 10.1705; 12.1855; 12.1869–12.1870.
4. Flodoard, *Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* 1.1. All translations of ancient and modern languages throughout this work are my own, unless otherwise noted.
5. On the arch, see Derks (1998), 105–110. The monument probably dates to the Severan period.
6. On this role of Camulus, see Derks (1998), 94–110 passim.
7. *AE* 1935, 64. Cf. Derks (1998), 109–110.
8. On the Laurentes Lavinates in the imperial period, see Dench (2005), 202–203 and Thomas (1990).
9. On the contrary, see Wightman (1985), 162: "Various criteria can be used to establish an index of Romanity, whether for regions, cities, rural sites or individuals. Among the materials that lend themselves to such study are the stone monuments—statues, reliefs, and inscriptions."
10. Catull. 49.1. On "becoming Roman," see Woolf (1998).
11. Woolf (1996), 361. The italics are mine. For this emphasis in English-language monographs, see Curchin (2004) on Spain and Woolf (1998) on Gaul.
12. Jullian (1920), 535 (my trans.). The complex genealogy of this discourse can be traced back through Jullian and Haverfield (1912) to Mommsen (1885) and Thierry (1840).

13. See, for example, Price (2012); Whitmarsh (2010); Price (2005); Alcock (2002); Alcock et al. (2001); Jones (2001). Smith's recent survey of constructions of the past in the Roman empire for the Blackwell companion volume to the Roman empire (2006) passes over the west in silence.

14. In the social sciences, "identity" has been subject to some criticism in the last two decades as being an overly broad, ambiguous, and "soft" term, which risks reproducing or reinforcing the reification of categories of social practice; see especially Brubaker and Cooper (2000). But these objections to consistent constructivist analysis of "identity" seem to go too far; for a defense of the utility of identity as a category of analysis in the Roman world, see Mattingly (2014), 38–40, which has been influential on my conceptualization of the term here.

15. This definition of social memory is owed to Fentress and Wickham (1992), 25.

16. Judith Butler's ideas on performance theory are particularly germane here: see Butler (1999).

17. Somers (1994), 618, whose conclusions are summarized and questioned by Brubaker and Cooper (2000), 11–12.

18. Roymans (2004), 2–3; cf. also Lund (1996). On the various paradigms and classificatory schemes through which the Romans conceptualized and represented their domination over the provinces, see Lavan (2013).

19. Scott (1998), 2; quoted and discussed by Shelach (2014), 134.

20. See Brow (1990).

21. On the idea of "heterarchy," see Crumley (1995).

22. Cf. Anderson (2006), 7. Though Anderson has the modern nation in mind here, I argue that such imaginary "deep, horizontal comradeship" was a key aspect of various types of premodern communities as well.

23. As Roymans (2004) has recently shown for the Batavians on the lower Rhine.

24. See Miller (2015), 129–131, for a similar idea applied to ancient China.

25. Cf. the critiques of Jiménez (2011).

26. Webster (1996), with my italics.

27. Dench (1995), 220.

28. Britain was a relative latecomer to the empire and made an early exit, and in the meantime remained anomalous in many respects. Africa is fascinating in its own right and has similarly been unduly neglected, albeit to a lesser degree, in memory studies, but the shadow of Carthage looms still larger there, and would have swelled this project beyond manageable size. The status of the Germanies as a militarized zone for all of Roman imperial history gives them a fundamentally different character.

29. Finley (1985), 61–66.; cf. Dench (1995), 218.

1. Selves

1. Modern Neris-les-Bains. On the history and archaeology of the place generally, see *CAG* 3, 165–184.

2. The name most likely derives from the IE root **ner-* (cp. Gk. ἀνήρ, Lat. *nerio-sus*), and would have connoted ideas of manliness or strength; see Delamarre (2001), 198–199. Among the dedications to the god at Neriomagos is an inscription in which he is addressed as "Augustus Nerius" (*CAG* 3, 180).

3. *CIL* 13.1376 and 13.1377, from Aquae Neri.

4. For this term see Brow (1990). whose analysis is greatly indebted to Durkheim (1965) and Weber (1978).

5. Roymans (2004) is an excellent discussion of the relationship between empire and ethnogenesis in the western provinces, particularly on the Rhine frontier.

6. On Caesar's power over the representation of space and peoples, cf. Krebs (2006); Riggsby (2006).

7. Livy 5.34. Livy was writing the first pentad of his work in the 20s BCE.

8. Caes., *BGall.* 7.5.

9. Caes., *BGall.* 7.15. The dramatic culmination of the siege is described by Caesar (*BGall.* 7.28) with all the rhetorical flourish typical of the *urbs capta* motif in ancient historiography.

10. The etymologies of these two surnames remain obscure: see Falileyev (2010), s.v. The details of this resettlement, particularly its causes, remain unclear, although theories abound. It is possible that it was a punitive measure against the Santones and the Bituriges for their role in the final revolt of Vercingetorix in 52 BCE.

11. As the fragmentary inscriptions from the *cavea* demonstrate (*CIL* 13.1667a– 13.1667b), the Cubi and Vivisci were segregated in the seating of the amphitheater at the provincial capital of Lugdunum, which was constructed early in the principate of Tiberius. We find an archaizing unity in several inscriptions outside the provinces of Gaul, where individuals give their ethnic identity simply as Biturix, without further specification as Cubus or Viviscus: *CIL* 3.2065, from Salona in Dalmatia (*domo Biturix*); *CIL* 3.5831, from Augusta Vindelicorum in Raetia (*natione Biturix*); *CIL* 8.21024, from Caesarea in Mauretania Caesariensis (*natione Biturix*).

12. On this coinage and its implications for reconstructing the history of the Bituriges, see Hiernard (1997). Caesar observes the subdivisions of several other Gallic peoples (Aulerci: Brannovices, Cenomani, and Eburovices; Volcae: Arecomici and Tectosages), but not of the Bituriges.

13. Strabo 4.2.1. "Aquitani" (Ἀκυιτανοί) as opposed to "Gallic" (Γαλατικός) is the general rhetoric of ethnic difference reported by the geographer. Caesar him-

self had noted the linguistic and cultural differences between the Aquitani and their Gallic neighbors to the north and east (*BGall.* 1.1).

14. The nature of the priesthood found in the *cursus honorum* of Equester (*flamen provinciae Aquitaniae*), particularly its relationship to the *sacerdotium* of the Three Gauls at Lugdunum, is not known, as it is unattested elsewhere. There is only evidence of the participation at Lugdunum of the Ausci, Convenae, Tarbelli, and Vasates from among the peoples of the Aquitani; it is possible that the *flamonium Aquitaniae* was invented as an alternative.

15. *CIL* 13.412. Cf. Bost and Fabre (1988). The altar is usually dated on the basis of letterforms to the early third century CE.

16. Cf. Brow (1990), 2: "Communalization *always* contains an imaginative aspect." See also the highly influential definition in Anderson (2006), 5–6 of nations as "imagined political communities."

17. For various articulations and applications of the core-periphery model, see Woolf (1990) and (1993), and Webster (2001). Curchin (2004), 19 gives a brief critique, although he is still primarily interested in modeling a two-dimensional Roman-provincial interaction.

18. I have emphatically pluralized "uses" and "meanings." The quotation is from Zanker (1988), 332. Whittaker (1997) shares a similar focus on Roman agency, as does Wightman (1985), 162. For a more nuanced reading of the use of this common language of Roman monumentality, cf. Derks (2002), 543–544: "The great architectural diversity of sanctuaries constitutes an outstanding example of what Roman imperialism in religious matters ultimately meant to local communities: it enhanced the symbolic construction of local identities that were defined and negotiated in terms of their contrast with the global identity of the world-wide empire to which they belonged." On archaeologies of local identity, particularly vis-à-vis public buildings, see recently Revell (2009), esp. 110 ff. Woolf (2000) acknowledges the possibility of different experiences of Roman-style urbanism, although elsewhere (1997) he has a rather more monolithic view of "native" versus "Roman" material culture.

19. For the purposes of disambiguation with the provincial capital of the same name (modern Lyon), also called *Lugdunum Convenarum* by modern scholars. For a general introduction to the history and archaeology of the town, see May (1996). For the archaeological evidence for the foundation of the town based on recent excavations, see Schaad and Vidal (1992).

20. Strabo 4.2.1, 4.2.2. Plin., *HN* 4.108.

21. Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium* 4.

22. The question of Jerome's specific source need not overly concern us here; he elsewhere demonstrates quite detailed knowledge of Vigilantius' origins and

upbringing—like his hometown of Calagorris in the Pyrenees, little more than a wayside inn of which his father was proprietor—and it is possible that he is responding to Vigilantius' own self-representation in some literary form, though no writings of the heretic are known. Vigilantius may have advertised the origin story of the Convenae for his own purposes, which occasioned Jerome to turn it against him. For a detailed study of Vigilantius, see the old but thorough work of Gilly (1844).

23. See Strabo 3.4.10. One might also point to the city of Gracchuris in the Ebro valley a century earlier, founded by Ti. Sempronius Gracchus for displaced local populations (Livy, *Per.* 41.2).

24. Ethnic groups are self-nominating; they subscribe to a common origin story and have a consciousness of a shared past, which help to foster ties to a specific territory. Cf. Hall (2002), 9.

25. Several hundred inscriptions are known from the immediate vicinity of Lugdunum, making this among the more notable epigraphic "hot spots" in Roman Gaul. Most of these monuments are votive offerings, although epitaphs are also numerous. Public or civic inscriptions are relatively rare.

26. The relevant inscriptions for these divinities are: *CIL* 13.174 (Aherbelste); *CIL* 13.78–13.79 (Boccus Harauso); *CIL* 13.345–13.348 (Ilixo); *CIL* 13.130 (Xubanus); *CIL* 13.129, 13.132, 13.175 (*sex arbores*).

27. Gomferani: *AE* 1949, 126. Neovates and Harexvates: *AE* 2004, 911.

28. Ti. Publicius Sabinus: *CIL* 13.258. Ombecco: *AE* 1928, 13. Sabinus' gift of *mensae cum basibus* finds no exact parallel elsewhere in the provinces; presumably these were stone tables with bases, intended to accommodate communal dining in public. For the latter inscription, I have restored the fragmentary name on the stone O[. . .]co as Ombecco based on analogy with *CIL* 12.5381; it is the only known local name that would fit here.

29. *CIL* 2.6149 is an inscription from an honorific statue base dedicated in the early second century CE at the city of Barcino (Barcelona) by M. Antonius Antullus, "citizen of the Convenae" (*cives Convena*). *CIL* 6.2497 is an epitaph set up for Valeria Iustina, "native of the Convenae from Aquitania" (*nata Convena Aquitania*), by her husband, who was stationed at Rome in one of the cohorts of the Praetorian guard.

30. This information is recorded on a remarkable bronze tablet found at Bierzo in 1999: see *AE* 1999, 915. On this fascinating document, see the collection of essays edited by Sánchez-Palencia and Mangas (2000).

31. *AE* 1961, 96.

32. Cf. Dirlik (1998), 5, who makes a similar argument about the European mapping of the Pacific.

33. See esp. Krebs (2011) and Johnston (2017).

34. Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 22, with my italics.

35. When this phenomenon has been noted in work on Gallic numismatics or Gaulish linguistics, the implications have been, to my knowledge, underexplored. See, for example, Allen (1980), 125; Lambert (2003), 182–183.

36. Local elites mentioned on coinage of the 50s and 40s specifically in connection with their *civitas* of origin are: Arus of the Segusavi, Cantorix of the Turoni, Atisios of the Remi, Giamilos of the Senones, Cisiambos and Cattos of the Lexovii, Orgetirix of the Aedui, Suticos of the Veliocasses, and Acincovepus of the Petrucorii. At times these men are explicitly identified as magistrates (Gaulish titles like *vergobret* and *arcantodan* are used); otherwise, it may be assumed that they were either magistrates or other kinds of local big men (*principes,* chieftains) still operating within a non-Roman hierarchy. Local coinages minted on the authority of the *civitas*, without naming an individual magistrate or *princeps*, are those of the Aulerci Eburovices, Mediomatrici, and the Remi, although this last type seems to date to the late 50s, rather than properly to the post-conquest period. For an interesting recent study of the visual culture of the pre-conquest coinage of Gaul, see Cassibry (2016).

37. On the important and pervasive trope of "surveillance" (of which naming is a key component) in the rhetoric of empires, see Spurr (1993), 13–27.

38. Biographical information on Pliny the Elder is gleaned mostly from brief notices in his own work, from the letters of his nephew, and from Suetonius' fragmentary biography.

39. Carey (2003) is an excellent treatment of some of the cultural historical themes in the *Natural History*.

40. *HN* 3.6–3.30 and 4.110–4.120.

41. *HN* 3.17–3.18.

42. *HN* 3.8; 4.118; 3.28.

43. Burillo Mozota (2007) is the most comprehensive study of the Celtiberians.

44. These phrases come from *Epigrams* 2.18 and 5.20. For general studies of Martial's life and work, see Howell (2009) and Sullivan (1991).

45. Martial, *Ep.* 4.55, lines 8–29.

46. For an example of such a refusal to gloss or translate in provincial visual arts, see Johnston (2014), 67–68. In my interpretation of this poem, I thus disagree with the conclusion drawn by Rimell (2008: 205) that one of the consequences of Martial's project of reinventing epigram is that "there is no space left that isn't Roman."

47. Sherwin-White (1973) remains fundamental. For highly schematized views of the administrative framework of cities and their statuses, see Edmondson (2006) and, for local administration of Spain in particular, Mackie (1983). On the development of the formal *conventus* system of Spain, see Richardson

(1996), 210-213, and on the Flavian charters, see González and Crawford (1986); Galsterer (1988).

48. *CIL* 12.6038.

49. Gell., *NA* 16.13.6; 16.13.9: *"Municipes*, then, are Roman citizens in accordance with their own municipal charters and enjoying their own law, honored as equal partners in civic duties with the Roman people . . . *coloniae* seem to be a kind of small-scale model or a sort of replica of the Roman people."

50. Much ink has been spilled over the correct interpretation of the Gallic *civitas*. See e.g., Mann (1960) and (1961); Drinkwater (1979), 90–91. It is often translated as "tribe," but I have consciously chosen to avoid this term for (a) its misleading and ethically-laden evocation of modern imperial encounters with the indigenous cultures of the Americas, Africa, and the Pacific; and (b) its potential confusion with the *tribus* to which each Roman citizen belonged, that is, the "voting tribe" (e.g., *tribus Voltinia*). Referring to them as "states" can similarly introduce confusion. As a rule, then, I will retain the Latin term *civitas*, or use the neutral designation of "community." For a long-durée view of the *civitas* as the basic unit of administration and identification, cf. Lewis (2000).

51. For concrete examples of local variation in office holding as a manifestation of social memory, see Chapter 5.

52. In general, cf. Millar (1977), 537ff. on the "petition and response" model; for a recent defense of Millar's model, see Eich (2012).

53. The *Lex Irnitana* describes in detail the required public display of various documents relating to the community (§§ 63, 85–86, 95), monumental even if illegible to most of the populace. On the visual and social impact of the spread of Roman inscriptions in the provinces, see Woolf (1996a); Corbier (2006). The same statute (§§ F–G) details the requirement for the community to divide itself into *decuriae* and to nominate formal ambassadors.

54. The *Lex Irnitana* recognizes those who had performed the functions of aedile and quaestor prior to acquisition of municipal status (§§19–20), makes no changes to the composition of the local *ordo* (§30) and respects the previous local "law and custom" concerning the rather odd *"numerus clausus"* of sixty-three *decuriones* (§31), and institutes no new seating arrangement at public spectacles (§81). The chronology and significance of grants of *Latium* and promotion to the rank of *municipium* with respect to civic rights and local administration is debated: see *inter alios* González and Crawford (1986), 200–203.

55. For Gaul, cf. Drinkwater (1989), 89–91. An inscription from Pompelo (Pamplona) recording the reply of an imperial official to the local *duoviri* concerning the *ius magistratus* may also speak to this reality (*CIL* 2.2959).

56. See Galsterer (1986); cf. Fear (1996), 163–166.

57. On "discrepant experiences" see Mattingly (1997).

58. See Sherwin-White (1973), 174–189 for the early development and significance of these titles in the republican period.

59. Drinkwater (1983), 106 argues that, after Tiberius, in Gaul "the titles remained, but simply as badges of status." It is worth noting an inscription from Autessiodurum (Auxerre), in which the *civitas libera* of the Meldi, the *civitas foederata* of the Aedui, and the *civitas stipendaria* of the Parisii seem to be equally subject to the provincial *procuratores* (*CIL* 13.2924). There is some doubt (expressed by Mommsen, among others), however, as to the authenticity of the inscription, so its testimony must not be relied upon too heavily.

60. This is the cause given by Tacitus (*Ann.* 3.40).

61. The following are the explicitly datable epigraphic uses of the titles of *foederata* or *libera* as titles of *civitas* self-definition: Turoni, *civitas libera* (Claudius); Remi, *civitas foederata* (Trajan); Lingones, *civitas foederata* (Septimius Severus); Vellavi, *civitas libera* (Septimius Severus, Gordian III, and Decius); Segusiavi, *civitas libera* (Maximinus Thrax); Viducasses, *civitas libera* (238 CE); Petrucorii, *civitas libera* (Florianus).

62. Probably by Galba for their earlier opposition to Vindex and sluggish support for himself; see Tac., *Hist.* 1.53. Pliny, writing under Vespasian, says that the Treveri were *liberi antea* (*HN* 4.31). Wightman (1971), 39 believes that this status was lost earlier, in 21 CE, after the participation of the Treveri in the revolt of Florus and Sacrovir, but this seems unlikely due to Tiberius' general downplay of the gravity of the situation (Tac., *Ann.* 3.40–3.47; Velleius 2.129.3). Indeed, Pliny's *antea* seems to suggest a rather recent change of fortune. Maurin (1978), 154 claims that Pliny was relying primarily upon an outdated list of *civitates*, compiled ca. 20 BCE. This may be true, for Pliny fails to mention as *liberae* several *civitates* that later had this status, but for the Treveri he does possess current information. See also Clarke (1965).

63. For more on these foundation myths, see Chapter 4.

64. Fentress and Wickham (1992) have argued that, in general, events tend to be remembered—or invented—because of their power to legitimize the present, and to be interpreted in ways that closely parallel present conceptions of the world.

65. The definition of the *pagus* requires some comment. From the point of view of imperial administration, the *pagus* was a rural subdivision of various kinds of organizational units, either ethnic groups or urban centers: thus *civitates*, *gentes*, *oppida*, and *municipia* might all comprise multiple outlying *pagi*. Therefore *pagi*, although they possess their own clearly defined territories, are not independent, and do not occur outside of the framework of the larger "state." The *locus classicus* is Caes., *BGall.* 1.12 on the four *pagi* (like the Tigurini) into which the people of the Helvetii organized themselves in the period before the

conquest. In the most recent and most thorough treatment of the subject, Tarpin puts forward a thinly supported argument that the *pagus* (and *vicus*) in the western provinces are not of indigenous origin, and that these were creations of Roman power, "tools of imperialism" and "foci for acculturation" (2002: 4; 260). I disagree with the assumptions and analysis upon which this conclusion is based; cf. the review of Dondin-Payre (2004), many of whose questions I share. Instead, I argue that the *pagi* (and *vici*, for that matter) are the results of local initiative and organization: although there is certainly room for local variation, the Latin word *pagus*, as generally used by the local inhabitants of Spain and Gaul themselves, seems to be an attempt to approximate a pre-conquest division of the community into various sub-communities. Overemphasis on the abstract administrative or geographical definitions of the *pagus*—a space divorced from its inhabitants, like a "district"—comes at the expense of recognition of its essence as a self-ascribing and self-nominating *community* that constitutes itself in opposition to other groups of a similar order. Like an ethnic group, in many cases a *pagus* may also define its membership by reference to common origins and a shared sense of the past. There is much scholarship on the *pagus* in the western provinces: beyond Tarpin (2002), see, *inter alios*, Curchin (1985); Cortijo (1991).

66. Cantabri: *CIL* 2.4192, 2.4233; Vaccaei: *CIL* 2.4233, 2.6093; Astures: *AE* 1994, 553; Abanicii: *AE* 2009, 599; Abilici: *CIL* 2.2698; Ablaidoci: *CIL* 2.2710; Arnicii: *AE* 1997, 871; Cilurnigi: *AE* 1991, 1046; Pembeli: *CIL* 2.2707; Ratries: *CIL* 2.5749; Viromenigi: *CIL* 2.5741; Pintones: *CIL* 2.365.

67. *CIL* 2.5736.

68. On the *castellum* and its relationship to toponyms in –*briga* and –*ocelum* in northwestern Spain, see Luján (2011), though the relationship between Celtic languages and ethnicity, especially in the Roman period, must not be pushed too far.

69. *CIL* 2.5353, from modern Calañas, in the province of Huelva. This site is hundreds of kilometers from the historical territory of the Limici, in Galicia in the modern province of Ourense. The root toponym is *Bero, which in Latin is adjectivalized (*Berense*, "Berensian"), and in the local dialect receives the compound nominal suffix, -*briga*. Both end up meaning "Fort of Bero."

70. *HE* 6.764.

71. See Galsterer (1988), 81, 89.

72. *CIL* 13.3071 (found at Neuvy-en-Sullias) and *AE* 1968, 308 (found at Vienne-en-Val). In the former inscription, the dedication is overseen by Servius Esumagius Sacrovir and Servius Iomaglius Severus, whose *tria nomina* indicate Roman citizenship, but whose locally derived gentilics suggest that this was perhaps gained through individual office-holding (*per honorem*), rather than an imperial grant to the community of the Carnutes as a whole. In the latter

inscription, the name of the *curia* is abbreviated (*LVDN*); my reading of Ludno-magus, a viable Gaulish place-name, is based on analogy with *CIL* 13.5923.

73. On the *curiae* of Gaul and Germany, see Rüger (1972), who sees them as pri-marily cult associations; *curiae* of an apparently different nature are attested widely—and in greater detail—in Africa; on the demographic and economic aspects of these *curiae*, see Duncan-Jones (1982), 278–283. Given how little is known about institutions and social structures at this scale in Iron Age Gaul, the precise origins of local groups such as the *curiae* of the Carnutes are un-certain. While it is possible that they only came into being in the context of imperial reorganization, the distinctly vernacular flavor of the *curiae* and their exclusively locally oriented activities suggest that there were at least vague pre-conquest precedents.

74. *CIL* 2.1064. Cf. Galsterer (1988), 89. Despite the occasional loose transference of the idea of the *centuria* to other contexts in Iberia by Spanish scholars, there ex-ists only one other possible secure comparandum, which was, I believe rightly, included among the *falsae* by Hübner (*CIL* 2, *128). Reportedly found at Carmo (Carmona) by C. M. Trigueros but subsequently lost, it was supposed to have contained a list of *centuriae* belonging to various communities of Baetica. But, despite recent attempts at vindicating its authenticity, it is surely a modern forgery, dependent upon knowledge of this inscription from Arva. For discus-sion and bibliography, see *HE* 9.504 and *HE* 13.588.

75. The normal usage of *centuria* ("hundredth") was to refer to a division within the army, to a unit of agricultural land assigned to Roman colonists, or to an archaic voting unit of the Roman body politic. It is this last shade of meaning which probably influenced this translation at Arva.

76. *CIL* 2.2026.

77. This *ordo vetus* is probably roughly equivalent to the kind of oligarchic local body that Latin historiography on Spain of the third through first centuries BCE consistently "translates" as a *senatus*. On these two coexistent *ordines* at Singili, see Rodríguez Neila (1998), 116, and 43n.

78. Price (2012), 28–29.

79. On the foundation of Valentia by Brutus, see Livy, *Per.* 55.4; the chief city of the Edetani was Edeta (Liria), 25km to the northwest. Based on geographical clues, the pre-Roman *oppidum* is very plausibly, though not certainly, identified with the city of Tyris, mentioned only by the late antique poet Avienus (*Or. Mar.* 476–477), whose geography demonstrably drew on pre-Roman sources. García y Bellido (1972) remains a useful study of the origins of the colony in light of its later epigraphy. What had become a steadily growing scholarly consensus regarding the absence of an earlier Iberian settlement (Ribera 2006: 77) was cast into doubt by new archaeological evidence for Iberian occupation at Valentia,

with a significant Punic presence, from the fourth century BCE, which came to light through (as yet unpublished) excavations within the last decade at the intersection of the Calle Ruaya and Calle Saguntum in the northern area of modern Valencia (alluded to by Aranegui Gascó 2013).

80. The destruction of the city is mentioned by Florus (2.22.9) and Sallust (*Hist.* 2.98); on the archaeology of the foundation and the subsequent centuries, especially the first-century BCE destruction levels, see Ribera (2006). For Afranius' campaigns in Spain, see Konrad (1978); the inscription in Picenum set up by the Valentini after Afranius had been elected to the consulship is *CIL* 9.5275.

81. *AE* 1938, 22.

82. See Fear (1996), 212–213, for a discussion of the implication of these political structures at Valentia and other Roman veteran colonies, and the existence of "dual communities."

83. In chronological order, the inscriptions are: *AE* 1933, 5 (Flavian-Trajanic?); *AE* 1938, 22 (Flavian-Trajanic?); *CIL* 2.3745 (Flavian-Trajanic?); *CIL* 2.3746 (Flavian-Trajanic?); *CIL* 2.3741 (for M. Nummius Senecio Albinus, ca. 220s); *CIL* 2.3733 (for Julia Mamaea, ca. 222–235); *CIL* 2.3734 (for Sallustia Orbiana, ca. 222–227); *CIL* 2.3735 (for Decius, ca. 249–251); *CIL* 2.3736 (for Hostilian, ca. 251); *CIL* 2.3737 (for Claudius Gothicus, ca. 268–270; *CIL* 2.3738 (for Aurelian, ca. 275). The approximate dating of the first four inscriptions is based in large part on my own inspection of the stones, the very fine letterforms of which differ significantly from the third century examples, and bear the closest resemblance to those in a Valentian dedication to Titus (*CIL* 2.3732, 79–81 CE). This accords with the opinions of previous editors, on which see García y Bellido (1972), 255–256.

84. On the legal status of Valentia in the republican period, see Abascal (1996), 267–268.

85. This argument is strengthened by the cases of other Iberian cities where a new Roman colonial foundation coexisted with an ancient indigenous settlement, both of which bore the name of the latter, with a suitable epithet: for example, Astigi *vetus* and Astigi *Augusta Firma* (Ecija); Tucci *vetus* and Tucci *Augusta Gemella* (Marto); see Plin., *HN* 3.7–3.12. Given the epithets of the communities, these distinct populations might well have been known as *veteres* and *veterani*, as at Valentia, although epigraphy offers no evidence.

86. Price (2012), 29.

87. *CIL* 2.2633. For further discussion of these *tesserae*, see Chapter 2.

88. The best point of comparison from the pre-Roman period is the bronze of Luzaga, a Celtiberian document that records a local *caruo cortica*, a "friendship contract" concluded between several parties in the vernacular language, similar to a Latin *tessera hospitalis*. Three of the parties in this text are kinship

groups similar to those among the Zoelae, and the syntax is parallel: they are defined by Celtiberian word *kenis*, a "clan" which seems to be the rough equivalent of *gentilitas*, with their proper names expressed in the genitive plural. See the edition and commentary of Meid (1994), 38–44.

89. Although the word *gentilitas* only occurs here and in two other inscriptions (*CIL* 2.804 and *AE* 2009, 512), Blázquez (1989), 576ff. and others use it rather carelessly (like the *centuriae* of Arva), applying the term to the unspecified subdivisions of communities found throughout the regions of Cantabria and Asturia. When they do explicitly define themselves by a Latin word, which is rather uncommon, these groups generally self-identify as *gentes*. One must imagine that—especially in the early imperial period—they still primarily conceived of their social relationships in the vocabulary of their native idiom.

90. *CIL* 2.2606, from Castro de Avelãs, about 80 km east of the regional center of Aquae Flaviae (Chaves). For an ethnic group or *gens* to maintain its own *ordo*, independent of a particular settlement or political center, appears to be unusual; I can find no exact parallel to the case of the Zoelae from Spain.

91. *AE* 1985, 581. The syntax of the text is difficult, and its explication not without some controversy. For the most comprehensive study of this bronze tablet, see Velaza Frias (1989). Cf. Curchin (2004), 120. Elsewhere, a *cognatio* made an honorific dedication to an individual identified as "their kinsman" (*gentili suo*); see *HE* 7.1173.

92. In the previous text of the Zoelae, note that Sempronius Perpetuus of the Avolvigi is identified by this kind of gentilic, as *Orniacum*. For a more or less complete list of the known gentilics in *–cum* and *–qum* from the region of Cantabria, see Mangas and Martino (1997), 325. For Celtiberia, see also Curchin (2004), 117–120, although his discussion of "constructing a Roman identity" in the following pages (121–123) is rather unnuanced in its binary opposition of "the past" and "the present," and "Roman" and "indigenous." For a discussion of the "state of the field" regarding the "la tesis gentilicia o tribal," which has at times been highly controversial and politicized in Spanish scholarship, see Santos Yanguas (1999), with Santos Yanguas (1984). Despite their prominence in the Latin and Celtiberian epigraphic records, the exact nature of these groups remains uncertain.

93. See esp. Botorrita Bronze I and III. The latter text consists in large part of a list of some 220 individuals, and to almost all of their personal names is attached a gentilic ending in *–cum*.

94. These inscriptions are *EE* 8.2, 145a; *CIL* 2.2827; *CIL* 2.2800; *EE* 8.2, 283; and *ERPS* 162, respectively.

95. It is worth noting that Roman family names originated in much the same way, the suffix *–ius* being an old patronymic marker. Thus Antonius was the "de-

scendant of Anton," the Pomponii the "descendants of Pompon," the Calpurnii the "descendants of Calpus." By the late Republic, elaborate mythologies had been invented to flesh out these ancestors, whose true stories were lost in hoary antiquity. The most famous of these mythologies is the Aeneid, which tells the story of Aeneas' son Julus, progenitor of the Julii, the family of Caesar and his adopted son, Augustus. For these kinds of mythologies, see Wiseman (1974).

96. *AE* 1965, 109. The Luggones call themselves, unusually, *Luggoni* in this text. It has been suggested that the modern town of Argandenes, about 20 km from the findspot of this inscription at Villaviciosa, owes its name to these Arganticaeni.

97. Augustus, *Res Gestae*, preface: "These are the deeds of the deified Augustus, by which he brought the world into the empire of the Roman people." On the complex development of the official language and ideology of empire at Rome from the middle Republic through the early imperial period, see Richardson (2008).

98. Casey (1997) remains the most lucid study of the concept of place. See Hall (2002), 9 for "association with a specific territory" as an inextricable component of ethnicity.

99. See e.g., Elden (2010a), Elden (2010b), Agnew (2010), and Delaney (2005). Agnew (1994) looms large in any current discussion of the concept of territory.

100. Agnew (2010), 782, has called for scholarship on territory to move beyond its traditional focus on the state. Murphy's work on territory and identity (2010) is one such attempt to escape the sovereignty-territory nexus, and to meet the challenge "not simply to identify and analyse emerging spaces of identity and interaction, but to consider the territorial ideologies that accompany different territorial arrangements." A brief discussion of Roman conceptions of territory is found in Elden (2010b), 758, but it is superficial and primarily terminological, i.e., focusing on the development of the word *territorium* and its Romance derivatives.

101. Cf. *Lex Irnitana* § 76.

102. See Alfayé and Marco Simòn (2008), 296, 298, 300. One might fruitfully compare the ethnic and political dynamics of the much better known Latin Festival. The inscription of Lamas de Moledo (*CIL* 2.416) resists certain interpretation, but it seems to refer to multiple groups sacrificing multiple animals to multiple divinities.

103. See Alvarez-Sanchís (2003a) and (2003b), 215–294, esp. 281–287.

104. From near Cebreros, discussed by Alvarez-Sanchís (2003b), 286. Elsewhere in Iberia, it is tempting to see certain rock-cut inscriptions from the rugged hills of southern Callaecia—highly abbreviated and restored only with much guesswork—as markers of the territories belonging to hillforts or other commu-

nities; cf. Rodríguez Colmenero (1993), no. 4. But the meaning of these texts remains uncertain.

105. *RIG* II-1, 15: *Vrabos iiioovt atrebo aganntobo Durneogiapo*; the participial phrase *atrebo aganntobo* seems literally to mean "bordering/bounding fathers," the root *⋆ag-* being related to the Latin *pagus* (from *pango,* "to make fast, fix, establish"); see Lambert (2003), 107.

106. See Johnston (2017).

107. *AE* 1914, 85; found at Bizanet, twelve kilometers west of Narbonne, perhaps in what was the territory of the Atacini, on whom see Chapter 3. This cult of the *Fines* is attested, to my knowledge, in only one other Latin inscription from the western provinces (*CIL* 13.7732), a dedication "to the borders and to the spirit of the place" (*Finibus et Genio Loci*) on the Rhine frontier, near Antunnacum (Andernach).

108. In the corpus of the Latin *Gromatici Veteres* one finds much discussion of boundary stones: the variety of their physical forms, their uses in marking different kinds of boundaries, etc.

109. *CIL* 12.531.

110. Lancienses Oppidani and Igaeditani: *CIL* 2.460; *AE* 1976, 273. Mirobrigenses, Salmanticenses, and Polibenses: *CIL* 2.5033. Bletisamenses, Mirobrigenses, and Salmanticenses: *CIL* 2.859. Mirobrigenses, Valutenses, Bletisamenses: *CIL* 2.858. Mirobrigenses, Valutenses, Salmanticenses: *CIL* 2.857.

111. *AE* 2002, 794; cf. Curchin (2004), 85.

112. Iuliobrigenses: *CIL* 2.2916a–2.2916d; *ERC* 31. Segisamonenses: *CIL* 2.2916e. The *Legio IV Macedonica* was stationed in this region for a little over half a century, between the early principate of Augustus (by 25 BCE) and the first years of the rule of Claudius, when it was transferred to the Rhine frontier. For its activities in Spain, see Morillo Cerdán (2000).

113. *AE* 1982, 578.

114. *CIL* 13.4143.

115. All information about this community is extrapolated from *CIL* 12.594; the name of the ancient central place of the *pagus, Gargarius,* survives in the name of the small chapel near which this stone was discovered in the seventeenth century, Saint-Jean-de-Garguier. For more on the Salluvian confederation, see Chapter 2. On this interesting inscription and the interpretation of the key phrase *qui sunt finibus Arelatensium,* see Gascou (2000), esp. 289.

116. *pace* Drinkwater (1983), 106. For some such exceptions, see Chapter 2.

117. Luggones, Bedunienses, and *cohors IIII Gallorum*: *EA* 140–143. Lacimurgenses and Ucubitani: *AE* 1986, 323. Viennenses and Ceutronae: *CIL* 12.113. Cisimbrium: *AE* 1977, 440. Sacilienses, Eporenses, and Solienses: *CIL* 2.2349.

118. *AE* 1993, 1035a–1035b = *HE* 5.874. See Mayer et al. (1998).

119. The nearest parallel to this inscription seems to be *CIL* 5.7743, found near Genua (Genova) and dated to 110 BCE, which pertains to the settlement of a boundary dispute between the Genuates and Veiturii.

120. The suffix –benda means "height" or "hill," appropriate given the terrain described in the *sententia*. On this debated toponymical element, see, most recently, Prósper (2010).

121. For example, Nicolet (1991), 149ff., in one of the more thought-provoking discussions of cadasters, focuses primarily on their relationship to the imperial bureaucratic system of the *agrimensores* that developed under Caesar and Augustus.

122. On the Lacimurga cadaster, see the thorough study of Sáez Fernández (1990). The artifact was discovered through clandestine excavations and is thus, most unfortunately, of unknown provenance.

123. Hyginus Gromaticus, *Constitutio Limitum* §§ 4–5 gives some information about the centuriation of Augusta Emerita and three of its *praefecturae*, and may refer to a cadastral plan (*aeris inscriptiones*) such as that under discussion here. But, as Sáez Fernández (1990) has shown, the dimensions of the *centuriae* on this cadaster do not seem to match those of the territory of Emerita. See also Ariño and Gurt (1994).

124. On these Pompeians near Ucubi, see *BHisp.* 20; the destruction of Ucubi is mentioned at *BHisp.* 27. For the Caesarian colony, see Caballos Rufino (1978), 283ff.; this author has also herein collected all of the literary and epigraphic references to *Ucubi* or, in its later form, the *Colonia Claritas Iulia Ucubi*, although the boundary stone mentioning the Lacimurgenses had yet to be published when he conducted his study.

125. Two *tesserae hospitales* involving agreements between the *coloni* of Ucubi and neighboring communities of Baetica—Baxo (modern location unknown) and Iptuci (Prado del Rey)—are also known, dated to 34 and 31 CE respectively; see Chapter 2.

126. On the centuriation of Ilici, see González Pérez (1974); cf. Fear (1996), 73–74.

127. *AE* 1952, 44. The titles of Vespasian allow a precise dating to 77 CE.

128. Salviat (1977), Oliver (1966), and Piganiol (1962).

129. The Caenicenses are mentioned by Pliny the Elder in his rather disorganized list of the *oppida Latina* of Gallia Narbonensis (*HN* 3.36), but their exact territory cannot be identified.

130. *CIL* 12.1244a. According to Ptolemy (2.10.7), their central place was Noviomagus (Saint Paul Trois-Châteaux), also known as Augusta Tricastinorum.

131. Salviat (1977), 116, believes—without giving the grounds for his assumption—that it would have been well before 77 CE. Such a *redditio* of confiscated land is otherwise unknown from our extant sources.

132. This promotion is known from an honorific inscription set up at Vasio (Vaison-la-Romaine) for a patroness, who was a priestess of the *colonia Flavia Tricastinorum* (*AE* 1962, 143).

133. For example, members of the corporation of *utricularii* from Ernaginum operating on the lower Rhone between Arausio and Arelate (see *CIL* 12.982).

134. The dating of the entirety of the arch to 26/7 CE, suggested by the surviving inscription of Tiberius, is not wholly unproblematic: see, *inter alia*, Gros (1984) and (1979).

135. See most recently Rosso (2004), whose interpretation owes much to the work of Gros. Amy et al. (1962) remains the standard work on the arch.

136. This motif ultimately goes back to Hellenistic Pergamene art, and was most powerfully deployed in the lesser Attalid dedication on the Athenian acropolis, where the conflict between Pergamum and the Gauls was successively prefigured in the Gigantomachy, Amazonomachy, and Persianomachy.

137. *CIL* 12.3362. See Hirschfeld's discussion of this inscription on p. 346 of that volume, as well as Bats (2007). The place is referred to as *Nemausus Arecomicorum* by Pliny (*HN* 3.37).

138. Ugernum and Ucetia were certainly among the larger and more important settlements around Nemausus. Ugernum is mentioned as lying on the road to Nemausus by Strabo (4.1.3) and appears on the major imperial itineraries, and was still prominent enough in the fifth century to host an assembly of the leading men of the provinces of southern Gaul (Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 7.572ff.).

139. Strabo 4.1.12.

140. For a monumental program that shows a comparable concern with internal "geography" among the Riedones of Aremorica, see Chapter 2.

141. Strabo (4.1.12) reports that in his time the name of the Cavares prevailed generally, and that the Romans were beginning to refer to all of the local peoples (βαρβάροι) along this section of the Rhone by this ethnic designation.

142. Eumenius, *Pro Inst. Sch.* 20.

143. Comparison with the *Tabula Peutingeriana* is potentially instructive, since it fits Eumenius' verbal description of the map of Augustodunum reasonably well. While the surviving copy of this map dates to the medieval period, it is based on an original of the fourth century, which in turn seems to derive from a first century source. It is noteworthy that on this map, the territories of various Gallic *civitates*—Vocontii, Cavares, Volcae Tectosages, Cadurci, Ruteni, Mediomatrici, Bituriges, Veneti, Parisii, Nitiobroges, and Treveri—are labeled. The *orbis depictus* of Augustodunum seems to have similarly represented *situs* and *spatia*.

144. *CIL* 13.2681 = *ILS* 5838. It is usually dated to the third century CE. Dessau cau-

tioned against an identification of the two. The places mentioned in the extant portion of this inscription are Autessiodurum (Auxerre), Odouna (Ouanne), Intaranum (Entrains-sur-Nohain), and Siduos (probably the "Sidoloucum" of the Antonine itinerary, modern Saulieu), all in the northwest vicinity of Augustodunum. The names of two *civitates*—the Lingones and the Leuci—appear on another fragment belonging to the same text that was unknown to Dessau (see *AE* 2006, 34).

145. On the various facets of this process, see especially Rehak (2006).

146. Compare the various approaches to aspects of this question by Zanker (1988), Barrett (1997), Woolf (2000), and Woolf (2003).

147. See Tac., *Ann.* 3.43.

148. Epigraphy attests to the presence of members of the Cadurci (*AE* 2007, 945), Mediomatrici (*CIL* 13.2674), Treveri (*CIL* 13.2669), and Bituriges (*CIL* 13.2673) at Augustodunum.

149. Eumenius, *Pro Inst. Sch.* 21.3. For a fuller treatment of the rhetoric of this passage, see the commentary of Nixon and Rodgers (1994), 171ff.

150. Here I am generally indebted to the thought-provoking approach to the role of the map in modern imperialisms and nationalisms in Anderson (2006), 170–178.

151. Ammianus' Gallic digression (15.9–15.12) is a prime example of the longevity of ethnography as a mode of understanding the "barbarians" of the western provinces; see, most recently, Woolf (2011a) and (2011b), 105ff. Moreover, the emperor Julian in his letters and speeches—to a Greek audience, importantly—represents his own sojourn in Gaul very much through the long-established polarity of Hellene and barbarian; "confirmed" by Julian's autopsy, the Gauls of the mid-fourth century are still very much the rhetorical "Celt" of the ethnographic tradition: cf. *Or.* 2.56 B; *Mis.* 342 A, 350D, 359Bf., 360Bf.; *Ep.* 1.3.

152. On community festivals as civic communion, see Procter (2005), 44–45.

153. The fragments of the Gaulish calendars are collected in Duval and Pinault (1986).

154. Fragments of other bronze calendars have been found in similar votive deposits at Lac d'Antre and Ruisseau d'Heria: see Duval and Pinault (1986).

155. See Zavaroni (2007), 9, for a summary of previous scholarship on the question.

156. See Duval and Pinault (1986), 260ff.; Olmsted (1992), 71.

157. In order, the names of the months are Samonios, Dumannos, Riuros, Anagantio-, Ogronn-, Cutios, Giamonios, Simivisonna-, Equos, Elembiuos, Aedrinis, and Cantlos. For the most convincing interpretation of the meanings of these names and their positions relative to the seasons of the year, see Zavaroni (2007), 13–19.

158. This is the most recent—and most convincing—interpretation of Zavaroni (2007) of the meanings of these words, which differs significantly from the previous hypotheses of Olmsted and others. The average duration of a lunation, or lunar cycle, is 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes.

159. These same notations are found on the fragmentary calendar from Ruisseau d'Heria.

160. For example, the designation *TRINOX*, applied to the 17th day of the month of Samonios, has traditionally been interpreted as *tri-noxtion*, "(a festival lasting) three nights": see *inter alios* Duval and Pinault (1986), 403 and Delamarre (2001), 255. But in Zavaroni's more etymologically sound reading, it refers instead to a shift (**tri-*, "through" + **nou-*, "declination, lowering") in the course of the moon relative to that of the sun.

161. The calendar of Coligny has received only passing treatment in more recent histories of Roman Gaul: cf. Woolf (1998), 96, 230n107.

162. Cf. Olmsted (1992), 71–72; Zavaroni (2007), 9–10.

163. The Roman *fasti anni* are collected in Degrassi (1963).

164. Copies of the Roman calendar are indeed known from Gaul: e.g. *CIL* 13.5955 (from modern Grand, site the famous sanctuary of Apollo Grannus) and *AE* 1904, 25 and *AE* 1978, 506 (both from the *civitas* of the Treveri).

165. For the idea of the "pageant," see Beard (1987).

166. Hor., *Carm.* 4.14.4. On the significance of this passage, cf. Feeney (2007), 185.

167. The fact that a system of astronomical reckoning as sophisticated as that of the Coligny calendar was transmitted for well over two centuries into the Roman period lends credence to the possibility that other kinds of knowledge—local histories or mythologies, for example—were in much wider circulation than the archaeological or literary record alone might suggest; for a contrary view, see Woolf (1996b), 376; Drinkwater (1978).

168. See also Chapter 4.

169. *AE* 1999, 521. It is also sponsored by a magistrate with a pre-Roman title, the *vergobretus*. For more on this inscription, see Chapter 4.

170. For the idea of the festival as cultural text, see Procter (2005), 44–45, citing the work of Frank E. Manning.

171. Greg., *Glor. Confess.* 2.

172. In her early twentieth-century introduction to the region of the Cevennes written for English tourists, Sabine Baring-Gould (1907), 18–19, after mentioning Gregory's account of the festival of the Gabali at the lake of *Helanus* claims that, "The people still reverence the pool, which they call the Father of Hail Storms, and till last century continued to cast offerings into the water. The visible result of the efforts of the good bishop so many centuries ago was no more than the construction of a chapel [of S. Hilarius] now in ruins."

173. Bulliot (1899), 45–126 remains the most extensive discussion of the medieval *foire du descent de Beuvray* and its ancient roots; based on comparative folk traditions, the excavations of the site (especially the uninterrupted succession of ceramics for over a thousand years), and early medieval documents, he saw great continuity over the *longue durée;* cf. Goudineau (1998), 65–66.

174. *CIL* 12.4378.

175. On the celebration of imperial anniversaries and *natales* in the west, see Fishwick (1987), vol. 2, 497ff. Even the smallest of communities could participate, in their own way, in such festivities: for example, in 44 CE, the vicus of the *Marosallenses* of Belgica erected a monumental altar in observation of the *natalis Augusti* (CIL 13.4565).

176. *CIL* 12.4333, ll. 29–34. The extant version of this text seems to be an Antonine copy of an original of the late Augustan age: see Fishwick (1987), vol. 2, 482n44. Behind the act of recopying lies an interesting act of remembering; it is certainly conceivable that the anniversary of the *coniunctio* was still observed in the late second century.

177. On the 10th legion and the Atacini at Narbo, see Pomponius Mela 2.75, and Chapter 3.

178. *CIL* 13.4132.

179. Val. Max. 2.10.8 is the best source for the theatrical component of the *Floralia*.

180. Told by Pompeius Trogus (Just., *Epit.* 43.4). Various dates are given by ancient authors for the institution of the *Floralia* at Rome—242 BCE (Velleius Paterculus 1.14.8), 238 BCE (Plin., *HN* 18.286), 173 BCE (Ov., *Fast.* 329f.)—but in any event, they could not have been imported to Massilia before then, and their presence here is anachronistic. After Comanus's plot fails, the tale concludes on an etiological note: "From that time on, the people of Massilia on festival days close the gates, keep watch, post sentinels on the walls, investigate foreign visitors, exercise caution, and guard the city in peacetime just as if they were at war. And so the practices that were reasonably established there are kept not because of the exigencies of the present, but from the custom of acting with circumspection." We shall return to Trogus' local history in Chapter 3.

181. See Chapter 4.

182. See Cass. Dio 54.32. Livy (*Per.* 139) supplies additional detail, including the name and origin of the first priest: "The peoples of Germania situated on both sides of the Rhine were attacked by Drusus, and the unrest that had arisen in Gaul on account of the census was settled. The altar of the god Caesar was dedicated at the confluence of the Arar (Saone) and the Rhodanus (Rhone), with C. Julius Vercondaridubnus of the Aedui being made the first priest." See also Fishwick (1987), vol. 1, 97–100.

183. MacNeill (1962), 1; 418. The date of the dedication and festival can be established

from a passage in the opening of Suetonius' life of Claudius (2.1), where he says that the future emperor was born on the anniversary of the event in 10 BCE. On the problems of the date of Claudius' birth and the dedication of the altar, see Simpson (1987).

184. On the provincial assembly of the Gauls (*concilium Galliarum*), see also Chapter 2.

185. The inscription first published in Audin et al. (1954) records the representatives of the three provinces elected in 220 CE to the management of the common treasury, who were surely associated at least in part with the administration of the festival. T. Sennius Sollemnis, who was *sacerdos Romae et Augusti* at Lugdunum around that year, enumerates the features of the spectacles that he exhibited in his official capacity, presumably at the annual festival: see *CIL* 13.3162 with Pflaum (1948).

186. *CIL* 3.7106, ll. 11–15; the translation is based on my own emendations and the supplements of Oliver and Palmer (1955).

187. *CIL* 2.6278, ll. 56–58. I have adopted the text and supplements of Oliver and Palmer (1955).

188. Note the almost ethnographic distance created by the emperor in the *Sardianum* through the use of the word "they call" (*appellant*).

189. Perhaps seeking to trade on the favor of Marcus Aurelius that they had recently earned by their loyalty during the revolt of Avidius Cassius, according to the argument of Oliver and Palmer (1955), 326.

190. The word *inhumanitas*, as the antithesis of the Romans' conception of their own "high culture" (*humanitas*) is a very agreeable restoration of the missing text. The structure of the thought makes it certain that a word connoting at least a similar idea was originally to be found in the gap on the stone. There was clearly some form of explicit censure ([*conde*]*mnatur*) of the *trinqui*, and this is followed by an adversative clause introduced by *verum* whose content, a grant of permission based on a kind of cultural relativism (*aliut aput alios*), only makes sense if quite serious, though tempered, reservations about the practice—i.e., *inhumanitas quaedam*—had previously been expressed.

191. Mention of human sacrifice in Gaul inevitably recalls the druids; the *loci classici* are the "wicker men" of Caesar's ethnographic excursus on Gaul (*BG* 6.16), Pliny the Elder's mention of Tiberius' suppression of druidism (*Nat. Hist.* 30.13), and the interdict of Claudius of the druids' *dira immanitas*, usually presumed to be human sacrifice (Suetonius, *Divus Claudius* 25.5 with Pomponius Mela 3.18). But the problem of druidism and the question of its Roman interpreters will be reserved for Chapter 5.

192. e.g., Plut., *Quaest. Rom.* 83, where the Romans decide not to punish the chief men of the Bletonesii for having performed a ritual human sacrifice to their

gods. The date of this episode is difficult to establish, as the only temporal reference is to the famous sacrifice in 216 BCE of two Gauls and two Greeks in the *Forum Boarium* "not many years before"; on this, cf. Plut., *Marc.* 3 and Livy 22.57. These Bletonesii of Plutarch are the people of Bletisa (Bletisamenses) in Lusitania: for this community, see n. 110, and the recently discovered *tessera hospitalis* of 27 CE mentioning the *senatus populusque Bletisamensis* published in Beltrán Ortega et al. (2009).

193. This is also the hypothesis of Oliver and Palmer (1955), 326.

194. This suggestion of Oliver and Palmer was taken up again and defended by Moeller in a brief note: see Moeller (1972).

195. Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 5.1.47.

196. Cf. Drinkwater (1983), 78.

197. Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* 5.1.40.

198. Cf. Cicero's scathing remarks on the customs of the Gauls at *Font.* 31 (delivered in 69 BCE): "For who does not know that to this day they keep that frightful and barbarous custom of sacrificing human beings?" On the rhetorical competitions staged by Caligula at Lugdunum, see Suet., *Calig.* 20.

199. On the civic compromise and the religion of the Roman Empire, cf. Gordon (1990). It is worth noting that T. Sennius Sollemnis (see Chapter 2) as provincial priest, exhibited several pairs of gladiators about a half century after this episode; thus the measures to encourage elites to continue to stand for the priesthood and to take on the burden of spectacles seem to have been effective, though whether the associations with the tradition *trinqui* remained active is impossible to determine with any certainty.

200. Cities and regions in the East employed an almost infinite number of different eras: see e.g., Samuel (1972), 245–249. The most discussed local era in the west is that of Patavium in northern Italy: see most recently Liu (2007), with further bibliography.

201. On the foundation, see Cass. Dio 53.25–53.26, with Canto (1990a).

202. e.g., *AE* 1984, 492. The only other *annus coloniae* system of which I am aware was used at Philippi: *AE* 1932, 21.

203. Knapp (1986: 120), for example, is unaware of the system, and in this regard is followed directly by Feeney (2007: 140). Note also its absence from Hannah (2005) and (2009). The nine inscriptions on which this era appears were all discovered subsequent to the publication of Hübner's volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* on Spain, which may partly account for their having remained in relative obscurity.

204. The only extant *annus coloniae* dates come from this period: *a.c.* 130 (105 CE), *a.c.* 180 (155 CE), *a.c.* 204 (179 CE), *a.c.* 205 (180 CE).

205. *AE* 1916, 72. The complete sense of this votive inscription is unclear. The pe-

culiarity of the formulae of the text may be an indication that it was intended specifically for an audience of "insiders."

206. Strabo, Pliny, and Ptolemy are entirely silent on Turgalium. Hyginus Gromaticus (*Const. Limit.* 5) mentions a *praefectura Turgaliensis* as one of the three *praefecturae* of Emerita. Siculus Flaccus (*De Div. et Assign.* 12–13) defines a *praefectura* in this context as a place from whose territory land is taken for the use of a Roman colony. On the hinterland of Emerita generally, cf. Ariño and Gurt (1994).

207. Noteworthy are a dedication to the *genius* of the community (*CIL* 2.618) and a mention of local magistrates (*CIL* 2.5276).

208. On schismogenesis, see Bateson (1972), and Chapter 4.

209. See Knapp (1986), who gives a general overview of the century of scholarship on this era.

210. Those that were known to Knapp: *CIL* 2.5752 (*e.c.* 316); *CIL* 2.5732 (328); *CIL* 2.2713 (338); *CIL* 2.5683 (363); *EC* 5854 (377); *ERC* 14 (392); *CIL* 2.2918 (400); *CIL* 2.5744 (474); *CIL* 2.5738 (482). Newly published: *AE* 2012, 775 (339); *AE* 1990, 554 (358); *AE* 2001, 1232 (361); *AE* 2001, 559 (364); *AE* 1990, 560 (383); *ERC* 15 (389); *AE* 1990, 561 (432).

211. *CIL* 2.5737, 2.5756.

212. These communities were the Vadinienses, Orgenomesci, Elesigaines, Superatii, Alioniges, and Camarices. In several instances, spouses come from different *gentes*.

213. Knapp has convincingly dismantled the flimsy foundations of previous interpretations: an identity with the Christian Spanish Era that used 38 BCE as its starting point is certainly untenable, and various other suggestions (Hübner's 208 BCE, the date of the Roman decision to remain in Iberia, or Mommsen's 138 BCE, the year of the first major penetration into Cantabria by the Romans) are less than satisfactory, and have very little to recommend them in their own right.

214. Knapp (1986), 125. Apart from the Spanish charters of the Flavian period, the best evidence for this reorganization is Plin., *HN* 3.30 On the problems, syntactic and historical, of this passage, see Richardson (1996), 190ff.

215. For example, as others have observed, there is not a single public inscription from Cantabria; cf. Le Roux and Tranoy (1973), 181. Nor do any private inscriptions mention a Roman magistracy. Thus there is little evidence that new civic statuses became an important part of community or individual identities in the region. Rather, pre-Roman *gentes*, such as those attested in relation to the *aera consularis*, seem to have remained the primary locus of identity, and there is evidence that non-Roman forms of local authority may have predominated: cf. Doviderus son of Amparamus, the "chief of the Cantabri" (*princeps Cantabro-*

rum), honored in *AE* 1997, 875. These patterns of local authority will be further discussed in Chapter 5.

216. And the latest date, *aera consulari* 474, would be 549 CE.

217. The Romans themselves did not reckon time "from the foundation of the city" (*ab urbe condita*) until several centuries after the foundation, when they had established a retrospective chronology with the borrowed instruments of Greek synchronism: cf. Feeney (2007), 20ff.

218. Knapp (1986: 132–135) similarly argues that the era was only implemented long after its imagined starting point, but according to his theory this would have been in the late third or fourth century CE, when it became increasingly important as an expression of a Romanized Cantabrian identity in the face of the barbarian incursions into Spain of the fifth and sixth centuries.

219. Strabo vividly characterizes the peoples of this region as "restive and wild" (3.3.8), and describes the "bandits," perhaps war bands more than just brigands, that had survived Augustus's conquest. It was probably they who fought against the troops of the *legio VI Victrix* around 60 CE: cf. the testimony of a Roman soldier who distinguished himself in these battles, *CIL* 11.395, ll. 8–10. Cantabria remained so remote, in fact, that Christianity did not reach the region until the seventh century CE: see González Echegaray (1966), 216.

220. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 96–97.

221. Cf. Anderson (2006), 6.

222. *CIL* 2.2565.

223. Cf. Brañas (2000), 70–74, who relates these objects to "representacións castrexas de soberanía," local cultural representations of sovereignty.

224. Durkheim (1965), 208.

225. *AE* 1967, 137.

226. Vesunna: *CIL* 13.949, 13.956. Vasio: *CIL* 12.1301; *ILGN* 201–202. For more on Nemausus, see Chapter 3.

227. While this question vexes scholars of pre-Roman or "Celtic" religion, who are anxious to sort the "original forms" from the later degenerations, it need not overly trouble us here. On the meaningful role of invented traditions in processes of communalization, see also Chapters 3 and 4.

228. For these attestations of Bandua, see respectively *AE* 1954, 93; *CIL* 2.2515; *HE* 11.340; *HE* 17.150; *AE* 1977, 430; *AE* 1991, 1039; *HE* 11.713; *AE* 1968, 237; *HE* 2.596; *HE* 11.681; *AE* 2003, 863; *HE* 18.227. Although there has been some debate as to the correct interpretation of these epithets ending in *-co(m)* or *-go/u(m)*, I follow the argument of de Bernardo Stempel (2003) in understanding them as names of peoples in the genitive plural, similar to the previously discussed gentilician communities. For further discussion of the goddess Bandua, see de Hoz Bravo and Fernández Palacios (2002), and Pedrero Sancho (1999).

229. These two attestations of Bandua are *AE* 1974, 408 and *CIL* 2.2498. For a comparable case study of such "strategic localism"—the goddesses called the Matronae on the German frontier—see Woolf (2003b). One of the most remarkable attestations of Bandua is found on the base of an ornate silver *patera* (a shallow bowl for pouring libations), dated to the late second or early third century CE and almost certainly originating from the settlement of Castellum Araocelum (São Cosmado). Here she is represented as a participant in a ritual scene at an open-air sanctuary, wearing a turreted crown and clothed in a flowing garment that drapes over her left arm, holding in her left hand a cornucopia, and in her right extending a *patera* over a pair of burning altars. This clear visual assimilation of this Lusitanian goddess to conventional Hellenistic representations of the city-goddess Tyche, and to those Roman images which had, in turn, been derived therefrom, especially of Fortuna and of the (male) *genius populi Romani* or *genius coloniae*. On this *patera*, see Johnston (2014), 68–69, with further bibliography.

230. On the origins of the worship of the *lares Augusti*, see Fishwick (1987), 84–85.

231. For the cult of the *lares* in and around Conimbriga in particular, see Alarcão et al. (1969).

232. These inscriptions are *AE* 1946, 8 and *HE* 2.779; the name Aquitus, upon which the name of a gentilician community might be formed, is attested as the cognomen of a first-generation Roman citizen ("M. Caelius Aquitus, son of Cormerto") among the Igaeditani, just east of Conimbriga (*AE* 1967, 151).

233. No. 11 from Alarcão and Etienne (1976). The mistakes in the syntax of even this very basic and formulaic Latin indicate that the commissioner of the monument was not a native speaker of Latin.

234. *ILS* 3639; I have followed the reading of Dessau. Attempted emendations of the stone fail to convince.

235. *AE* 1994, 944; *AE* 2004, 781.

236. The most famous example of violent resistance to the imperial cult is the revolt of Boudicca, queen of the Iceni, in response to the building of the temple of the deified Claudius at Camulodunum (Colchester) in Britain; see esp. Tac., *Ann.* 14.31.

237. On this toponym and its etymology, see Dumuys (1902), 236.

238. *AE* 1902, 99.

239. On these divinities, see respectively *ILS* 4669; *AE* 2000, 886–887, 889; and *AE* 2000, 884–885, 890. The cult of eponymous *matres* is attested in Gaulish inscriptions in the pre-Roman period at Glanum (*matrebo glaneikabo*, "to the mother-goddesses of Glanum": *RIG* 1, G-14) and Nemausus (*matrebo namausikabo*, "to the mother-goddesses of Nemausus": *RIG* 1, G-203). For an aedile of the *pagus Baginiensis* at Vasio, see *CIL* 12.1377.

240. *CIL* 12.2973.

241. The three inscriptions known to Dexiva from the site of modern Le Castellar are *CIL* 12.1064 (a monumental dedicatory inscription for *sedilia*, some kind of bench); *AE* 1992, 1170 (a votive altar); and *ILN* 3.221 (a miniature votive axe). The Dexivates are known only from their mention as a people of Narbonensis by Pliny (*HN* 3.34). For a study of this cult with regard to the limitations of the "*polis* religion" model, see Haeussler (2011), 413–415, though his reading of the inscriptions as an index of "Romanitas" is problematic. For the site as a "lieu de mémoire," see Agusta-Boularot, Golosetti, and Isoardi (2010).

242. See Nora (1989), 12.

243. Plin., *HN* 3.31.

244. On this process, cf. Woolf (2000), 116–119.

245. *CIL* 13.2651–13.2653. For an excellent study of *Dea Bibracte*, with special attention to the first traces of her worship and the trajectory of her rediscovery and interpretation in the modern period, see Lejeune (1990).

246. Plin., *HN* 3.18. Analysis of the archaeological evidence for settlement patterns in the Iberian peninsula confirms this trend: in central Spain, for example, of some 376 clearly identified late Iron Age settlements, only 91—less than 25 percent—continued to be occupied into the early imperial period; see Curchin (2004), 79. Responses to the crisis of community were clearly mixed.

2. Others

1. The Celtici were bounded by Lusitani across the river Tagus to the north and heirs of the Tartessians—the Turduli and Turdetani—to the south and east; see Plin., *HN* 3.13.

2. *HE* 4.1057, *HE* 14.439. This inscription was originally included among the fakes (*falsae*) in the second volume of the *CIL* by Hübner (*CIL* 2, *18), but any doubts have been subsequently allayed and anomalies explained, and it should now be regarded as genuine.

3. On Greek sophists as ambassadors to powerful Romans, including the emperor, and the "patriotism" expressed thereby, see Bowersock (1969), 43–58.

4. *CIL* 2.1423. The surviving bronze document, set up publicly at Sabora, is the rescript of the emperor addressed to the town councilors and magistrates, which summarizes their request as well as conveying his decision.

5. Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 1.11.2; his journey to Rome in 467 CE is narrated in some detail in *Ep.* 1.5 and 1.9.

6. Mart., *Spect.* 1.3.1–1.3.2.

7. The official formula (*formula togatorum*) specifies those who possessed Roman citizenship, Latin rights, or were a formal ally bound by certain legal obligations (*socius*), or "those outside peoples who are under the arbitration, legal

authority, military power, or diplomatic arrangements of the Roman people";
on this formula, see Baronowski (1984).

8. *CIL* 2.5041 = *ILS* 15. The word used in the text to characterize "those who had
been living in the tower of Lascuta" is *servi*, which has a wide semantic range,
from chattel slave to servant to dependent. For a full bibliography on this doc-
ument, of which there have been differing interpretations since its discovery in
the nineteenth century, see *ELRH* no. U1 (pp. 191-194).

9. See Burillo Mozota (2006).

10. The best ancient account of the outbreak of this so-called "Second Celtiberian
War" is found in the *Iberica* (*Hisp.* 44–45) of the imperial Greek historian Ap-
pian. But this apologetic version of events is heavily biased toward the Roman
perspective, and takes great pains, here as elsewhere in the narrative of the
conquest of Spain, to place the blame for hostilities squarely with the locals.

11. Gellner (2008), 11–12.

12. Larsen (1968) remains an indispensible work on the *koinon*; on *homonoia* in the
Roman period, see Sheppard (1984–1986).

13. Contrebia Belaisca—which means "communal dwelling place of the Belli"—
seems to have developed into an important center in the course of the early
second century as a result of changes brought about by the Roman presence,
and must have benefited from the decline of Segeda.

14. The exact archaeological context of the four bronze documents from Contre-
bia, none of which were discovered in systematic excavations, is uncertain, but
it is most likely that they all belong to the same context, presumably a kind
of public archive or *tabularium* located on the acropolis, represented by the
remains of a two-story building with a columned portico; on this building, see
Beltrán and Tovar (1982), 22–33.

15. The essential edition and study of the so-called *Tabula Contrebiensis* is that of Rich-
ardson (1983). See also the follow-up study of Birks, Rodger, and Richardson (1984).

16. The Salluienses were the people of Salduba (later supplanted by the colony
of Caesaraugusta); many of their men fought as auxiliary troops (the *turma
Salluitana*) under the elder Cn. Pompeius in the Social War, and were granted
Roman citizenship by him; see *ILS* 8888. The Allavonenses were probably a
subgroup of the Vascones, to be identified with the city that minted coins with
Iberian legends in the second century BCE with the name *ALAVN*; see *CNH* 221.
The Sosinestani are otherwise unknown.

17. This seems to be the best understanding of the legal fiction of the text; see
Richardson (1983), 38.

18. While their offices are translated into Latin, the six men all bear local names,
and their filiations and gentilician memberships ("clans" with names ending

in *–cum*) are specified: the leading magistrate seems to be Lubbus, son of Letondo, of the Urdinoci, who is called *praetor*.

19. Birks et al. (1984), 50.

20. Compare this, for example, to the aforementioned decree of L. Aemilius Paullus concerning the people of Lascuta, where Paullus places himself at the very beginning of the text, and is the subject of all of its main verbs, and where the authority of the Roman *populus* and *senatus* is also invoked.

21. *MLH* IV, 576b. Many of the names are not Celtiberian, and are presumably of individuals of Iberian or Vascon extraction.

22. I have based my understandings of these individual Celtiberian words on the convincing linguistic arguments of Stifter (2001). For a detailed and thorough analysis this document as a whole, see Villar, Díaz, Medrano, and Jordán (2001).

23. This summary is derived primarily on the study of Meid (1994), 7–28, which comes closest to a complete understanding of the sense of the decree; the text, and the Celtiberian language in general, still present a number of fundamental difficulties, most of which will remain insurmountable without further epigraphic discoveries.

24. Stifter (2006) differs in his understanding of the words *kombalko-reś* and *ruzimuz*, the latter of which he does not wish to see as a first person plural verbal form meaning something like "we decree." I would counter his objection (2006: 242) "that the use of a 1st pl. subject at the end of a judicial or legal text that otherwise nowhere seems to use non-3rd person subjects would be quite unexpected and unusual for the genre" by comparing line 15 of the *Tabula Contrebiensis*, where we have just such a case: *iudicamus* is used to end the *sententia*, as if this were a direct quotation of the senate, though there are no other first person verbs in the entire text.

25. *AE* 1993, 1043. The fundamental study is Beltrán Lloris (2006); see now also the new edition of the text by Crawford and Beltrán Lloris (2013). This would seem to be a rare and noteworthy case of a monumental public inscription set up in the western provinces outside of an urban nucleus.

26. Based on the evidence of the itineraries, Belsino was most likely located near modern Mallén, on the river Huecha, a tributary of the Ebro upstream from Caesarugusta. The *pagus Gallorum* was in the vicinity of Gallur, which derives its modern toponym from the ancient name of the *pagus*. Of the Segardinenses and their central place (*Segardino or *Segardinum) little is known; they are closely connected to the *pagus Gallorum* in another inscription (*AE* 2006, 677, a bronze *tessera* found at Gallur), and were probably located somewhere nearby on the right bank of the Ebro. The findspot of the bronze, near Agón, would

probably have been within the territory of Belsino, rather than either of the Caesaraugustan *pagi*.

27. Beltrán Lloris (2006), 188: "Thus . . . the work of the provincial authority would have been limited to registering and shaping the local traditions that the *pagani* agreed to abide by."

28. The document says only that Alpinus "fixed this law as unalterable and ordered it to be valid after he was approached by Lucius Manlius, the magistrate of the *pagi* of the territory of Caesaraugusta." Beltrán Lloris (2006: 191) has suggested that, if we can detect the governor's guiding hand elsewhere in the law, it is perhaps in the prescriptions for the jurisdictional relationships between irrigation community and the *pagi* and the urban centers (§§ 11–13). This is possible, but not necessary.

29. *HE* 13.233, found near Garrovillas de Alconetar. For a brief discussion, see Esteban Ortega and Salas Martín (2003), 62–63.

30. On the *precarium*, see Du Plessis (2015), 316.

31. Apart from this tile, only two instances of *precaria* are known from outside of Italy: a right of way from Berytus (Beirut) in Syria (*AE* 1958, 165), and an altar dedication from Aquincum (*CIL* 3.3626) in the province of Pannonia Inferior (*CIL* 3.3626). For examples from Italy, see *CIL* 5.3472, *CIL* 9.4171, *CIL* 11.3743, *AE* 1989, 146 (roads, paths, rights of way); *CIL* 1.3208a (walls); *CIL* 10.4320, *CIL* 11.5473a (burials); *CIL* 10.5974, *AE* 1975, 197 (religious uses).

32. On legal pluralism in theory and practice within the Roman empire, see Ando (2014), esp. 12–18.

33. *AE* 1984, 495; the document dates to 104 BCE, and was found roughly thirty kilometers west of the findspot of the *precarium* tile.

34. I am indebted here to Ma (2003), who adapted the original concept from Renfrew and Cherry (1986). What Ma argues about the Hellenistic east can be observed, *mutatis mutandis*, in the Roman west as well: "There existed a strong network of self-governing, articulate, ideologically confident poleis, which covered much of the Hellenistic world and was crucial in determining the texture of this world . . . we must recognize the existence, and operation, of a system of autonomous communities, densely inter-connected by a civic culture which sustained and depended on connections" (12).

35. For a study of such lateral, intercommunity interactions in Roman Africa, see McCarty (2016).

36. On *tesserae hospitales* from Spain, see, in general, Curchin (2004), 140–143; Nicols (2011), 422–437; Étienne, Le Roux, and Tranoy (1987), 323–336.

37. *AE* 1967, 239; on this document, see Illarregui (2010) and García y Bellido (1966), alongside Johnston (2014), 69–70, which situates this *tessera* in the context of other household objects that illuminate the workings of social memory in Spain and

Gaul. Amparamus would seem to be the father of Doviderus, who calls himself "chieftain of the Cantabri" in another inscription; on this Doviderus, see Chapter 5.

38. Difficulties presented by the script of the obverse have led to some variant readings, especially in the seventh line: namely *posterosque ita vota omnia ei fecerunt*, or *posterosque ita ut ea omnia ei fuerint*. Based on the word *vota* in the former reading, Marco Simòn (2002) ventured an interpretation of perceived religious aspects of the *hospitium*. But based on my own inspection of the bronze, I favor the latter reading, which also has the benefit of being more intelligible Latin and better conforming to the conventions of the genre.

39. Cf. Ma (2003), 21, who makes a similar argument about the civic culture of Hellenistic *poleis*. A recently discovered fragmentary bronze found at Pino del Oro in the upper Duero valley, toward the southern limit of the territory of the Zoelae, records the renewal of *hospitium* in 27 CE between the senate and people of Bletisa (Ledesma), located about sixty kilometers south of the findspot, and another community whose name is not preserved; see Beltrán Ortega et al. (2009). Another similar renewal of *hospitium* a generation later, in 57 CE, is found in a *tessera* from Pompelo (*CIL* 2.2958), although there, unusually, the community membership of the individual is not made explicit.

40. *CIL* 2.5763, found at Pallantia. See Hernández Guerra (1994), 145. The end of the text presents some difficulties in interpretation, and scholars have long suspected that something is missing. Transacted in 2 BCE, this is the earliest extant *tessera hospitalis* to employ the Roman consular dating formula, and was perhaps among the first to be written in Latin.

41. For example, members of the *gens* self-identify as Vaccaean in inscriptions at the provincial capital at Tarraco (Tarragona), and elsewhere in the peninsula at Baeturia (Maguilla), a town of the Turduli in Baetica; see *CIL* 2.4233 and *CIL* 2.6093, and *CIL* 2–7.898, respectively.

42. *AE* 1980, 588; on the six *oppida* of the Arevaci, see Plin., *HN* 3.27. For discussion of this document, see Gimeno Pasual (1988), 59–61; Haley (1991), 106.

43. *AE* 1999, 922.

44. See Chapter 1.

45. *AE* 1955, 21. Iptuci is about 130 kilometers southwest of Ucubi.

46. *CIL* 2–7.187. The precise location of Baxo is not known, but this *tessera* was found at Cañete de las Torres, thirty kilometers northeast of Ucubi, and forty kilometers east of Corduba. Given the fact that a citizen of Baxo was buried at Corduba (*CIL* 2–7.391), and another had a statue of herself set up a short distance to the south in the Sierra Nevada near Loja (*CIL* 2.2060), we would expect Baxo, like Ucubi, to have been somewhere in the southeastern vicinity of Corduba.

47. Strabo 3.2.15.

48. On these Baetican *hospitium* agreements, and the presumed lack of legal status of these communities, see Fear (1996), 98–101. The men who seem to be the ambassadors of Baxo and Iptuci possessed Roman citizenship, however, which they may have acquired through holding office in their local communities if these possessed the Latin right (*per honorem*); but certainly these towns had not been promoted to the rank of *municipia*.

49. For a mosaic from a colonial-era Iberian-style house at Ilici with a series of Iberian names, see *HE* 5.31; on the archaeology of the town of Ilici generally, see Fernández (1975) and Fear (1996), 73–74 and 91–92. One bronze document related to the centuriation of Ilici survives (*AE* 1999, 960), which gives a list of ten colonists and their places of origin. Fernández (1975: 183) believes that the discontinuity—archaeological and cultural—found on the site after a fire in the late Julio-Claudian period is due to civil strife between the native Ilicitani and the Roman colonists, but this is merely speculation.

50. For the colonization of these places, see Plin., *HN* 3.19 and 3.25, respectively; on Acci and their worship of Neto *maxima religione*, see Macrob., *Sat.* 1.19.5; cf. *CIL* 2.3386, an inscribed votive offering given by a woman at Acci supposedly "at the instigation of the god Neto."

51. *AE* 1952, 49; originally published by D'Ors (1948). The location of this Ugia Martia is uncertain, as there were several places bearing the toponym Ugia in southern Iberia; it may have been nearby in Lusitania, or rather more distant in southern Baetica (at the site of the modern Arroyo de Alocaz); on this question, see Fear (1996), 112–113.

52. The site of Termes (or Termantia, as it is sometimes mistakenly called) appears to have been an important place of settlement since at least the end of the sixth century BCE, even before the Celtic-speaking Arevaci arrived in the fourth century. On the rich archaeology of the site, which has sometimes (rather exaggeratedly) been called "the Spanish Pompeii," see the reports of Argente Oliver et al. (1980–2001).

53. *AE* 1953, 267.

54. Tac., *Ann.* 4.45. Tacitus's description of Piso's activities is imprecise enough to leave some room for speculation as to the exact nature of the financial wrongdoing. To provoke such a reaction by the praetor, these must have been monies intended for the imperial fisc, rather than embezzled from the local treasury.

55. It has gone unnoticed, but nowhere else in all of Tacitus's writings is the word *barbari* used of provincials, and it almost never occurs outside of a military context. Its usage here is thus clearly marked.

56. On the little-known uprising of the 50s, see Cass. Dio 39.54. During the opening stages of the Numantine War, the Termestini resoundingly defeated a Roman army under the command of Q. Pompeius Aulus (141 BCE), and remained in-

dependent even after the fall of Numantia, until the city was captured by T. Didius in 98 BCE, who compelled the inhabitants to abandon the ancient fortifications on the acropolis; see Diod. Sic. 33.16; Livy, *Per.* 54.1; App., *Hisp.* 77, 99. Within a generation, the city took up arms again on the side of Sertorius; see Sall., *Hist.* 2.78.

57. *AE* 2004, 788, dated to 26–7 CE on the basis of the emperor's titles.

58. *CIL* 2.760; the *Tapori* are called *Talori* in this text, which appears to be a mistake of the stonecutter. Because of certain perceived inconsistences in the status of these communities, the authenticity of the inscription has been doubted by some scholars; see e.g., Galsterer (1971), 62–64. But as Hoyos (1978) has shown, these arguments are ultimately unconvincing. Further context on the construction of the bridge, including the name of its architect (C. Julius Lacer, who may have been of local origin, as he had friends among the Igaeditani), is supplied by *CIL* 2.761.

59. Of the peoples who contributed funds to the bridge, Pliny (*HN* 4.118) mentions the Co(i)larni, Interamnienses, Lancienses, Meidubrigenses (who are also called Plumbari), and the Tapori as being among the *civitates stipendariae* of Lusitania, the lowest-rank of tribute-paying subject communities. Pliny was probably using outdated information for this region derived from his Augustan sources, for even these communities had presumably attained the privilege of the *ius Latii* in the Flavian age; see Fear (1996), 138–140. The *civitas Aravorum* is the self-identifier used by the Aravi in *AE* 1954, 87 and *CIL* 2.429. There is no other secure reference to any of these communities as a *municipium*.

60. This fact has not been sufficiently emphasized in previous scholarship: there were a number of peoples of the Vettones who were situated much more proximately, and would have derived decidedly more advantage from the new transportation route than the relatively distant Lusitanian Paesures.

61. Paesures: *AE* 1967, 157; Tapori: see Ramos Ferreira (2004), no. 171; Lancienses: *AE* 1961, 360 (L. Oppidani), *AE* 1977, 357 (L. Oppidani), *AE* 1990, 508 (L. Oppidani); Interamnienses: *AE* 1967, 184; Meidubrigenses: *AE* 1977, 362 (from Fundao, northwest of Idanha-a-Velha).

62. *CIL* 2.460 (between Igaeditani and Lancienses Oppidani); *AE* 1979, 331 (between Arabrigenses and Coilarni).

63. The people of the Turodi are known only from a reference in Ptol., *Geog.* 2.6.39. On the pre-municipal history of Aquae Flaviae, which is poorly understood, and its identification with the city of Aqua Laia mentioned by Ptolemy, see Rodríguez Colmenero (1997), 14ff.

64. *CIL* 2.5616. The Bibali, Coelerni, Equaesi, Limici, and Quarquerni are mentioned by Pliny as belonging to the *conventus* of Bracara Augusta (*HN* 3.28). The Coelerni themselves engaged in independent diplomacy with groups outside

of Callaecia, as well: a *tessera hospitalis* (*AE* 1972, 282) records an agreement between the Coelerni and the prefect of a Celtiberian auxiliary cohort from the town of Nova Augusta, which, though unidentified, must have lain outside of Callaecia, in the country of the Arevaci (see Plin., *HN* 3.27); on the various attempts to locate this city, see Curchin (2004: 210–211).

65. The Trajanic inscription which mentions the completion of the "stone bridge" (*pontem lapideum*) is *CIL* 2.2478, to be dated shortly after 103 CE; in its form and dimensions, it seems to have been intended as a counterpart to the earlier Flavian monument.

66. Several milestones that stood on this road are extant, erected upon its completion by the imperial governor C. Calpetanus Rantius Quirinalis Valerius Festus in the first weeks of the year 80 CE: *CIL* 2.4799 (13 miles from Bracara), *HE* 5.976 (14 miles from Bracara), *CIL* 2.4803 (19 miles from Bracara), *HE* 11.655 (29 miles from Bracara), *HE* 13.826 (31 miles from Bracara), *CIL* 2.4838 (34 miles from Bracara), *CIL* 2.4847 (36 miles from Bracara).

67. It is worth noting that the Callaeci were capable of undertaking collective action: a dedication to C. Caesar, adoptive son of Augustus, was made by *Callaecia* as a whole (CIL 2.2422).

68. An eponymous town of the Caladuni (*Caladunum*) is mentioned as lying on the road from Bracara to Asturica in the Antonine Itinerary (422); cf. Ptol., *Geog.* 2.6.38. Based in part on the evidence of milestones, this was probably located at a place now called *O Pindo*, about three kilometers south of Pedrario, where the Iron Age *castro* of the Caladuni was located; see Rodríguez Colmenero (2004), 124–125. On some of the problems of situating the Caladuni as a *civitas*, see Alarcão (2004). The ancient central place of the Equaesi was almost certainly the "Castro de Lesenho," near São Salvador de Viveiro (about 20 km southwest of O Pindo), while that of the Quarquerni was located at Bande, near Rubiás (about 50 km northwest of O Pindo); see Martins da Fonte (2006).

69. For an anonymous septuagenarian member of the Caladuni who died and was buried at Asturica in the early imperial period, see *AE* 1983, 570; the epitaph of another *Caladunus*, who also specified the hillfort community (*castellum*) to which he belonged, was found at modern Berrocal, about seventy kilometers northwest of Hispalis (*AE* 1991, 1004).

70. It is surely not coincidental that the list of *civitates* on the column at Aquae Flaviae overlaps to a significant extent with those peoples that Pliny had deemed a few years earlier to be the only ones in this region worth mentioning. Several statues of traditional "Galician warriors" have been discovered at the pre-Roman hillforts in the territories of each of these *civitates*; on this genre of statuary, see Chapter 3.

71. The first reference to the Oretani (Ὀρῆτες Ἴβηρες) is found in Polybius (3.33). On the Oretani in antiquity, see López Domech (1996).

72. The description of Castulo quoted is that given by Livy (24.41.7); more details on this marriage between Hannibal and Himilce, the daughter of the ruler of Castulo, are found in the narrative of Diodorus (25.10–25.12). For the coinage, see *CNH* 331–339. For the identification of Iltiraka with Salaria (a *colonia* known from literary and epigraphic sources), see Mozas (2006). For the episode that took place in the winter of 97 BCE, with the troops assigned to the young Q. Sertorius by the praetor T. Didius, see Plut., *Sert.* 3.3–3.5.

73. A dedication to Titus by public decree of the local government, dated to the last months of 76 CE, is known from Baesucci (*CIL* 2.3250), which may have been occasioned by the Flavian grant of the *ius Latii* to the region. Laminium was an important city of the Oretani from an early period, if it is to be identified with the city that minted coins bearing the Iberian legend *Labini*; see Rodríguez Ramos (2006).

74. *CIL* 2.3251–2.3253. Baesucci gets pride of place in the first inscription, Laminium in the second; the third is too fragmentary for much besides the name of the honorand to be discerned. But presumably there would have been four inscriptions originally, with each *municipium* given the leading role in one.

75. Edeba was not promoted alongside the other Oretanian *municipia*, and, in fact, seems still to have lacked municipal status in the age of Hadrian: a weight used in the measurement of some commodity, inscribed with the name of the *res publica* (not *municipium*) of Edeba, was found at Anglesola, east of the ancient city of Ilerda (Lleida), perhaps carried there by a merchant of Edeba (*AE* 2004, 833). Ilugo, on the other hand, seems to be a rare example of a *municipium* in Tarraconensis that owed its promotion to a post-Flavian emperor: the city set up an inscription (*CIL* 2.3239) honoring Hadrian as "founder of the *municipium*"; on this monument and its implications for the spread of legal status, see Zahrnt (1989).

76. A roughly contemporaneous inscription from Baesucci shows that, in one year, all six local priests of the imperial cult (*seviri Augustales*) were freedmen of this family (*CIL* 2.3249).

77. The adjective *Oretanus* is attested epigraphically only twice: in one monument from Oretum itself (*CIL* 2.3221) it seems to have the narrower sense of "citizen of Oretum," rather than of ethnic affiliation; only in an inscription from the city of Aeso (Isona) in the foothills of the Pyrenees, which relates to an *Oretanus* who was hospitably received and educated in the liberal arts there (*CIL* 2.4465), might it be construed as a marker of ethnic identity, although the sense remains ambiguous.

78. Among the neighboring groups from whom the Oretani had historically differentiated themselves were the Bastetani immediately to the southeast, and the Turdetani to the west. Of the Turdetani, cities such as the *municipium Flavium* of Aurgi (Jaen), which lay just across the border of the province of Baetica, only forty kilometers southwest of Vivatia on the road to Corduba (almost three times closer than Laminium), were promoted roughly contemporaneously—if independently—of the *municipia* of the Oretani. The Bastetani followed a markedly different trajectory: their cities –like Asso (Caravaca de la Cruz), Tutudi (Galera), and probably Sicelli (unlocated) and Basti itself (Baza)—seem never to have received municipal status.

79. Monuments in the Punic language were set up at Carthago Nova into the imperial period, and the worship of "Hercules of Gades" (the Punic Melqart) continued. On the city, see Ramallo Asensio (2006).

80. See Plin., *HN* 3.19.

81. *RPC* I.169. On the image program of Juba as it intersects with Carthago Nova, see Teverson (2015), 184–190. For this relationship, see Roller (2003), 118; 153–154. Two issues of coins from late in the principate of Augustus record that Juba's son and future successor, the prince Ptolemy, also performed the role of *duumvir quinquennalis* at Carthago Nova: *RPC* I.172–I.173; ca. 13–14 CE. See Teverson (2015), 229–231.

82. On the east, see Braund (1984), xlvi–xlv; 76; on Juba's participation in these Hellenistic monarchic strategies, see Teverson (2015), 188. The collection of essays in Prag and Quinn (2013) expands our view of Hellenistic world to include the "West," arguing for much greater interconnectivity of cultures, politics, and economies across the Mediterranean in this period than has previously been appreciated.

83. *CIL* 2.3417.

84. See e.g., Hekster (2015), 193–194.

85. It was in battle near Carthago Nova in 211 BCE that the Numidians under Masinissa killed Africanus' father, P. Cornelius Scipio, the previous Roman commander in Spain; see Livy 25.34. For the parley at Gades in 208 between Masinissa and Africanus that led to his defection, see Livy 28.35.

86. Avienus, *Or. Marit.* 263–279.

87. On these excavations, see Benoît (1957).

88. See Livy, *Per.* 61; Appian, *Celt.* F 12. For discussion of these events and their background, see Dyson (1985), 136–154 and Rivet (1988), 39–53.

89. *CIL* 13.1462. See also Chapter 4.

90. For the alliance under Sacrovir, see Tac., *Ann.* 3.45–3.46. Eighty years earlier, Caesar (*BGall.* 1.9) had seen that, in spite of a rivalry for hegemony (cf. *BGall.* 6.12), Aeduan elites like Dumnorix enjoyed significant influence among the

Sequani; although the Sequani and Aedui had been in conflict immediately before Caesar's arrival in Gaul, it was still the Aeduan Diviciacus who represented their interests of the Sequani before Caesar (*BGall.* 1.32–1.33). The participation of the Sequani and Aedui in the uprising of Vindex is extrapolated from Tac., *Hist.* 1.8, 51, 53, and is shown by the fact that the culminating battle of Vindex's rebellion was fought at the Sequanian capital of Vesontio (Besançon), which according to Dio (63.24) had closed its gates to the Roman commander Verginius Rufus; cf. Hainsworth (1962), Wightman (1985), 67.

91. *CIL* 13.5353. On the sanctuary, see Lerat (1998). Public commemoration of members of other *civitates* is exceedingly rare; indeed, Fishwick (2002: 40) notes this monument as an "incongruity" in the pattern of commemoration of provincial priests by their own *civitates*.

92. Auson., *Mos.* 1–4. For the uprising, see Tac., *Hist.* 4.55–4.79; Cass. Dio 66.3.

93. Tac., *Hist.* 5.19. The revolt of the Aedui and Sequani under Julius Sacrovir, and that of the Treveri and Lingones under Julius Classicus, Julius Tutor, and Julius Sabinus, have attracted passing discussion in the scholarship, but these discussions tend to overemphasize the role of supposedly anomalous individual actors (whose names are preserved by our sources), at the expense of understanding patterns of community (inter)action. See Dyson (1971), 265 (who mistakenly identifies Tutor as a Batavian, rather than one of the Treveri); Drinkwater (1983), 28–29 and 46–50; Wightman (1985), 64–65, 68–72, 102–103; Woolf (1998), 20–21. These revolts are, somewhat surprisingly, not discussed by Gambash (2015), the most recent treatment of "provincial resistance."

94. *CIL* 12.1783; cf. *CIL* 12.1903, from Vienna itself. Such refusals were not unheard of; under Claudius, it seems to have happened regularly enough to provoke the emperor's anger (see Suet., *Claud.* 24.1).

95. *CIL* 12.2972. Found at Collias, a short distance southeast of ancient Ucetia.

96. Delamarre (2003), 123. Condate is the site of the modern Rennes.

97. Numismatic evidence from Condate dated to the middle of the first century BCE illuminates the regional connections between the Riedones and other Celtic-speaking peoples during the transitional period surrounding the conquest: issues are known from the nearby Aulerci Eburovices, Carnutes, and Aedui of central Gaul and from the Pictones and Santones of the southwest coast, as well as coins originating as far away as the valley of the Rhone; for a summary of these numismatic finds, see *CAG* 35, 197. The Riedones played a minor role in the resistance to the Roman conquest, and are mentioned only twice by Caesar (*BGall.* 2.34; 7.75); after that, they are only attested in an administrative list of Aremorican *civitates* (Pliny, *HN* 4.107).

98. The three archaeological campaigns that brought these inscriptions to light took place in 1868, 1896, and 1968. The five texts known from the earlier discov-

eries were published in volume thirteen of the *CIL* (nos. 3148–3152), while the last two were published by Bousquet (1969). See also Bousquet (1971).

99. *AE* 1969/70, 405a.

100. *AE* 1969/70, 405b and *CIL* 13.3151, respectively. It is worth noting a potentially significant visual element of the former inscription: in the fourth line of the text, the local theonym *Atepomarus* occupies its own line, prominently aligned at the center of the stone, and decidedly divorced from the Roman Mercury with whom *interpretatio* had joined him. Such aesthetic choices may hint at the potential superficiality of these identifications, and suggest that the god was understood first and foremost as Atepomarus.

101. *CIL* 13.3148–13.3150. Though vexingly fragmentary, one last anonymous inscription (*CIL* 13.3152) is to be included in the overview of the temple-basilica complex of Mars Mullo, since enough of the formulaic text can be read on the stone to determine with certainty that it belongs to the same context as the others, and represents a seventh statue base, and sixth dedication to the divinities of the *pagi*. Too little is preserved of this monument to discern whether it related to one of the otherwise attested *pagi* or to still another.

102. On this sanctuary, see Batt (1988) and (1989), with *CAG* 35, 152–153.

103. See *CAG* 35, 204–207.

104. For an approach to this kind of non-monumental religious visual culture as a window into social memory and local identity, see Johnston (2014).

105. Given some of the difficulties in the dating of the workshop, and of the contexts in which these figurines have been found, I have opted for a broad chronological range. For the excavations of the workshop on Rue Saint-Louis, see Fichet de Clairfontaine and Teil (1988). The best study of these terracotta figurines of '*Vénus à gaine*' is Bémont et al. (1993), 79–82 (for the production sites at Rennes/Rue Saint-Louis and La Chapelle-des-Fougeretz) and 155–159 (for the distribution of findspots throughout Brittany).

106. For a summary of recent scholarship on the subject of these kinds of *basilicae* in Gaul, see Vipard (2009), 978–980. See also Etienne (1987). The most instructive comparandum comes from the site of Bois-l'Abbé in the territory of the Beglic Ambiani, where a basilica-temple complex has been recently excavated. There the *basilica*—explicitly identified by an inscription—measures some 70 x 17 m, and is physically connected to the *fanum* itself: see Dondin-Payre (2006).

107. Cf. Revell (2009), 110ff., though she perhaps does not go far enough in critiquing the viability of "Roman" as a meaningful descriptor of spaces and practices in the provinces.

108. A fruitful point of comparison for this kind of "cartographic" inventory might be the so-called "inscription géographique" from Nemausus, discussed previously.

109. None of these *pagi* can be located with any certainty.

110. On the public cults of the Treveri, see Scheid (1991).

111. Caesar (*BGall.* 6.13) reports that their territory was the heart of Gaul, and that every year the druids gathered at a sacred site of the Carnutes to sit in judgment and settle disputes. The Carnutes are perhaps best known for the massacre of Roman citizens staged in 53 BCE at one of their chief-places, Cenabum, which ushered in the final, general uprising under Vercingetorix (*BGall.* 7.1–7.3).

112. Cf. Lambert (2003), 34. As an adjective meaning "of the Carnutes," *Carnutenus* (or *Carnutinus*) occurs in the self-identification of several individuals in inscriptions: a *civis Carnutenus* is known from Aquae Sulis (Bath) and from Lugdunum (Lyon), and a *Carnutinus ex provincia Lugdunensi* from Bononia (Bologna). See *ILS* 4661; *CIL* 13, 2010; and *CIL* 11, 716. It is also attested—referring to Autricum, a town of the Carnutes—in the late antique writer Sulpicius Severus: 'in Carnutena . . . civitate.' (*Dialogues* 3.2)

113. *BGall.* 8.5.

114. The Bituriges, discussed previously, and the Boii, discussed in the following, are two examples.

115. Adding to the obscurity is, of course, the incompleteness of our evidence for the "program" of the basilica of Mars Mullo and the administrative organization of the *civitas* of the Riedones: there may have existed more than four *pagi*, and there may have been significantly more divinities involved than the three whose names survive.

116. Etienne (1992), 174.

117. For epigraphic attestations of the cult of Mars Mullo in these *civitates*, see, respectively, *AE* 1960, 319b; *CIL* 13.3096; and *CIL* 13.3101.

118. *CIL* 13.1318. This is against the argument for the "Romanization" of local gods made by Van Andringa (2007), who overemphasizes this idea of "rapprochement," and claims that, with the gods of the Riedones, "the composite name . . . should not deceive us . . . The process that took place was decisive, especially once an indigenous divinity adopted a Roman name. There was no fusion or syncretism or simple dressing up—these gods changed both names and identities" (87–88). If Mullo and Vicinnus had both so thoroughly changed identities and "become" Mars, there would be no point in the same euergetist distinctly invoking them both in the same temple-basilica complex; clearly the process was not so decisive.

119. The Olossitani, securely known only from the curse tablets under discussion, seem to have been centered around the modern town of Olot, some fifty kilometers west of Empúries. On this coinage and its interpretation, see Torrent Orri (1957).

120. On the origins of the city, and the resulting idiosyncrasies of the urban to-

pography (e.g., a wall dividing the city into "Iberian" and "Greek" districts), political constitution, and internal dynamics of the community, see Livy 34.9 and Strabo 3.4.8.

121. For a detailed discussion of the archaeological context of the Ballesta necropolis and the comparative magical aspects of the texts, see Wilburn (2012), 219–253 (with extensive bibliography), who supports the view that texts and burials are contemporaneous. On the contrary, Marco Simòn (2010) supports an Augustan date for the burials, which represent a distinct episode to the curse tablets. For our purposes here, it is not necessary to come down in favor of one date in favor of the other, but the evidence for and ramifications of Wilburn's argument must be taken seriously.

122. The authoritative edition of the texts is now that established by Marco Simòn (2010). It is primarily the identities of these officials—especially the *legatus Augusti* T. Aurelius Fulvius—that allow a precise date to be established for the curse tablets. A fourth imperial official named in the tablets, Sempronius Campanus Fidentinus, is otherwise unknown, and the nature of his position is difficult to discern.

123. It was long argued that the imprecator was a member of the Olossitani, but since the Olossitani appear to be targets of the curse, this is insupportable. Marco Simòn (2010), following Fabre et al. (1991), has, more plausibly, suggested that the author of the curse was "a citizen of Emporiae," but given, as we have seen, the complexity of identities within this community, this is not as precise as we might wish. Wilburn (2012) is primarily interested in other aspects of these texts, and gives little attention to the question of identity.

124. Tac., *Hist.* 2.61. One might reasonably draw a comparison between the *electa iuventus* of the Aedui and the paramilitary ephebeia groups of Greek poleis: cf. Prag (2007), who argues for the continued importance, through the institution of the gymnasium, of local militia groups in Roman Sicily.

125. For a different interpretation of this revolt, which suggests the presence of a "druidic" element with which Mariccus cooperated, see Bowersock (1987), 311; the evidence, however, as Wi niewski (2007), 155–156 n. 36 has pointed out, does not support such claims.

126. For the activities of the Boii leading up to their defeat, see *BGall.* 1.5; for the settlement, see *BGall.* 1.28 and 7.9. The exact location of Gorgobina is unknown.

127. *CIL* 13.2656 and *CIL* 13.615 respectively.

128. On peasant memories, see Fentress and Wickham (1992), 92–113; see also Wood (2013).

129. Tac., *Hist.* 4.67. On the possible nature of these *monumenta*, cf. Roymans (2004), 211–220.

130. Much of the backdrop to the revolt of the Allobroges can be glimpsed in Cicero's speech on behalf of Fonteius, and his third speech against Catiline. The revolt of Catugnatus, the plausible context for the expulsion of Italic merchants, is narrated by Cassius Dio (37.47–37.48); Audin (1965: 25) convincingly connects this event with the first settlement of Lugdunum, mentioned later by Dio (46.50).

131. The fragmentary text of the emperor Claudius' speech is preserved on a bronze tablet from Lugdunum: *CIL* 13.1668. On the early imperial history of the city, cf. Damon (2003), 232.

132. On the fire of Lugdunum, see Tac., *Ann.* 16.13.3, with Sen., *Ep.* 91.

133. See Tac., *Hist.* 1.64–1.66. Compare the arguments put into the mouths of the colonists of Lugdunum by Tacitus—in which Vienna, where "everything is foreign and at odds with us," is called the "home of Gallic wars"—with the ethnographic comments of Cic., *Font.* (esp. 31–32).

134. *RIG* 1, G-153.

135. *HE* 13.767; interpretations that would read the final two words of the text, *kontebiaz belaiskaz*, not as the place of origin of Lubos (Contrebia Belaisca, here in the ablative case), but rather as representing a second party, fail to convince.

136. Hester (2008), 10.

137. Scholarship on travel and identity in the early modern and modern periods has exploded in the last two decades: see, for example, the overview in Morgan (2001), 230 of works produced just in the last decade of the 20th century. The relationship between travel and identity remains comparatively neglected in the Roman world, although work on Pausanias (e.g., Alcock et al. [2001]) and foreigners—particularly Jews—at Rome (e.g., Noy [2000]) has begun to address this gap. Purcell's important work (2005) on the diaspora of "Romans in the Roman world" addresses the "cultural weave" of the empire, and the dynamics of Roman imperial power more generally. See also the essays in Adams and Laurence (2012).

138. This is essentially the assessment of Strabo (4.6.11). But cf. Drinkwater (1975), who problematizes the idea of Lugdunum as a "natural capital."

139. Aedui (*CIL* 13.1714, 2014), Arverni (*CIL* 13.1706, 1715), Bituriges (*CIL* 13.1693, 2025a), Cadurci (*CIL* 13.1686, 2001, 2021), Carnutes (*CIL* 13.1672, 2010), Lemovices (*CIL* 13.1698–13.1700), Lingones (*CIL* 13.2035), Nemetes (*AE* 1982, 709), Nervii (*CIL* 13.1702), Parisii (*AE* 1976, 433), Petrucorii (*CIL* 13.1704), Pictavi (*CIL* 13.1697), Remi (*CIL* 13.2008), Santones (*AE* 1959, 78), Segusiavi (*CIL* 13.1701, 1711, 1712, 2013), Senones (*AE* 1992, 1240), Sequani (*CIL* 13.1674–13.1675, 1695, 1991, 2023), Suessiones (*CIL* 13.1690), Treveri (*CIL* 13.2027, 2029, 2032, 2033), Tricasses (*CIL* 13.1691), Turoni (*CIL* 13.1703, 1716), Vangiones (*CIL* 13.2020), Veliocasses (*CIL* 13.1717, 1998, *AE* 1961,

68), Viromandui (*CIL* 1688), Veneti (*CIL* 13.1709), Vocontii (*CIL* 13.1835, 2017; *AE* 1973, 332).

140. If the character of the notice of the appointment of the first *sacerdos* of the *ara* (Livy, *Per.* 139: "C. Julius Vercondaridubnus of the Aedui was made priest") is any sign, *civitas* identity may have been very much bound up in the discourse and dynamics of the provincial priesthood from the very beginning of the institution.

141. *AE* 1982, 709: Victorius Regulus is first a *civis Nemetis*, and then a *negotiator purpurarius*. To take another example (*CIL* 13.2023), one Poppillius, who through his mercantile enterprises dealing in Gallic brushed wool seems to have gained citizenship at Lugdunum, still chose to identify himself primarily as "by birth one of the Sequani."

142. Contrast the primary focus of Ando's work on loyalty in the Roman Empire, "the transformation of [Rome's] empire from an aggregate of ethnic groups into a *communis patria*" (Ando 2000: 19).

143. *CIL* 13.3162c, ll. 5–26.

144. Pflaum (1948) remains the essential work on this inscription. On the date and details of Sollemnis's provincial priesthood, see Fishwick (1976). Sollemnis must have been *sacerdos Romae et Augusti* sometime around 220 CE, two decades before this monument was erected.

145. Christopherson (1968), 353, who is heavily indebted to Larsen (1955), 142. Goudineau (1983), on the other hand, problematizes the idea of a "patrie gauloise" in the Roman era and concludes that "il n'existe pas" (158).

146. Cf. Caesar, *BGall.* 1.30, 2.4, 4.6, 5.2, 5.24, 5.54, 6.3, 6.44, 7.63.

147. One could see the *conventus* called by Augustus in 27 BCE (Livy, *Per.* 134) as an intermediate stage between the conquest period and the establishment of the formal *concilium* connected to the imperial cult in 12 BCE.

148. The loaded adjectives "national" and "federal" so frequently applied to the assembly belie the degree to which modern political structures and concepts contaminate and hinder interpretations of the institution in its ancient context.

149. Christopherson (1968: 351), noting the contrast between the administrative function of the assemblies of the Greek east and the limited official capacity of the *concilium Galliarium*, muses that, "It seems strange . . . that an institution so organized and numbering within its membership the leading men of the provinces could satisfy the political aspirations of these men by having them merely preside in idle dignity over the annual celebrations of the cult." It is an issue that, in dwelling only on the "national" character of the assembly, he never fully rectifies.

150. *CIL* 13.1667a–13.1667c. One "seat" of the Arverni, six of the Bituriges Cubi, and

two of the Tricasses survive, but it is almost certain that, as on the altar of *Roma et Augustus*, the names of all sixty-four *civitates* were originally inscribed.

151. Alabenses (*CIL* 2.4200); Amocenses (*CIL* 2.4233); Aquiflavienses (*CIL* 2.4204); Asturicenses (*CIL* 2.4144); Augustobrigenses (*CIL* 2.4277); Ausetani (*HE* 6.898); Avobrigenses (*CIL* 2.4247; *RIT* 261); Balearicus Palmensis (*CIL* 2.4218); Bracaraugustani (*CIL* 2.4215, 4236, 4237, 4257; *RIT* 378, 905); Brigaecini (*CIL* 2.6094); Calagorritani (*CIL* 2.4245); Cantabri (*CIL* 2.4192, 4233, 4240); Carthaginienses (*CIL* 2.4230); Castulonenses (*CIL* 2.4209); Clunienses (*CIL* 2.4233); Consaburonenses (*CIL* 2.4211); Edetani (*CIL* 2.4251); Ercavicenses (*CIL* 2.4203); Flaviaugustani (*CIL* 2.4196); Gerundenses (*CIL* 2.4229); Grallienses (*CIL* 2.4244); Guiuntani (*CIL* 2.4218); Ilerdenses (*CIL* 2.4269; *RIT* 372, 373); Intercatienses (*CIL* 2.4233, 6093); Karenses (*CIL* 2.4242); Lancienses (*CIL* 2.4223); Osicerdenses (*CIL* 2.4241, 4267); Pompaelonenses (*CIL* 2.4208, 4234, 4246); Saguntini (*CIL* 2.4201, 4214); Segobrigenses (*CIL* 2.4191, 4220, 4222, 4252); Segontini (*CIL* 2.4195); Toletani (*CIL* 2.4164); Uxamenses (*CIL* 2.4306); Vaccaei (*CIL* 2.4233, 6093; *RIT* 317); Vergilienses (*CIL* 2.4207); Vettones (*CIL* 2.4280); Viminacienses (*CIL* 2.6115).

152. *CIL* 2.4233.

153. For the administrative structure and the communities of the *conventus Cluniensis*, see Plin., *HN* 3.26: several pre-Roman *gentes* or ethnic groups (Varduli, Turmogidi, Carietes, Vennenses, Pelendones, Arevaci, and—most relevant to the inscription under discussion—the Vaccaei and Cantabri) constituted the Roman *conventus*, each of which were in turn composed of several *populi* or communities.

154. *Emerita:* Aeminienses (*AE* 1962, 65); Aravi (*AE* 1952, 109); Conimbrigenses (*CIL* 2.5264); Ercavicenses (*AE* 2006, 609); Interamnienses (*CIL* 2.509–2.512; *ERAEmerita* 557; *HE* 4.38); Lamenses (*CIL* 2.513); Lancienses Oppidani (*ERAEmerita* 184); Lancienses Transcudani (*CIL* 2.5261); Martienses *antea* Ugienses (*AE* 1952, 49); Salacienses (*CIL* 2.518); Segobrigenses (*ERAEmerita* 192); Tapori (*CIL* 2.519, 520, 521); Termestini (*ERAEmerita* 58); Tuccitani (*CIL* 2.522); Turduli Veteres (*AE* 1998, 709; *CIL* 2.523). *Corduba:* Aquiflavienses (*CIL* 2–7.280); Asidonenses (*CIL* 2.2249, 2–7.388); Astigitani (*CIL* 2.2201); Baxonenses (*CIL* 2–7.391); Iporcenses (*AE* 1971, 183); Malacitani (*AE* 1996, 883); Mellarienses (*AE* 1996, 884; *AE* 1987, 554b); Obulcenses (*CIL* 2.2131); Sabetani (*CIL* 2.2193); Serienses (*ERBeturi* 35a); Uxamenses (*AE* 1915, 12).

155. See generally Étienne (1962) on Burdigala as a long-distance commercial hub. Greeks, Nicomedians, and Syrians are attested in *CIL* 13.619, 625, and 632 respectively.

156. Ambiani (*CIL* 13.607), Andi (13.608), Aquenses (*CIL* 13.609), Aulerci (*CIL* 13.610), Bellovaci (*CIL* 13.611), Bituriges Cubi? (*CIL* 13.614), Bituriges Vivisci (*CIL* 13.613),

Boii (*CIL* 13.615), Coriosolites (*CIL* 13.616), Lemovices (*CIL* 13.622), Mediomatrici (*CIL* 13.623), Menapii (*CIL* 13.624), Parisii (*CIL* 13.626), Remi (*CIL* 13.628), Ruteni (*CIL* 13.629), Sequani (*CIL* 13.631), Treveri (*CIL* 13.633–13.635), Viennenses (*CIL* 13.636–13.637).

157. Haley (1991) traced the movement of individuals within the Iberian peninsula under the Roman Empire, but primarily with an economic focus: cf. esp. pp. 11–27. But his study, heavily reliant upon the epigraphic record, is only possible because hundreds of migrants within Spain chose to perform and record their identities among communities of "others," a phenomenon which is in itself, as I argue, worth investigating. *Bracara Augusta:* Clunia (*AE* 1973, 298); Elaeneobriga (*AE* 1973, 299); Letiobriga (*AE* 1973, 303); Caladuni (*AE* 1983, 570); Arcobriga (*CIL* 2.2419). *Lucus Augusti:* Ieluibriga (*CIL* 2.2584); Coelerni (*AE* 1974, 387); Asturica (*IRPL* 28). *Clunia:* Intercatia (*CIL* 2.2786); Uxama (*CIL* 2.2787).

158. Bracari: *CIL* 2.2639; Seurri Transminienses: *ILAstorga* 49; Castulo: *CIL* 2.2641; Supertamarci: *CIL* 2.2902–2.2903; *AE* 1976, 286; Lemavi: *AE* 1982, 575; Uxama Argaela: CIL 2.5077.

159. *CIL* 2.5672; cf. AE 2001, 1220, from Uxama.

160. On the shift of the city into the plain from the hill of San Juan del Viso, see most recently Azcárraga Cámara and Ruiz Taboada (2012–2013), with extensive bibliography. For the coinage of the pre-Roman city state, which bears the name of the city alongside an ethnic designation that may relate to its ruling clan, see Jordán Cólera (2014).

161. The relevant inscriptions are: Segovia (*AE* 1985, 602); Interamici (*AE* 1985, 601); Segontia (*AE* 1987, 635; *AE* 2003, 971); Clunia (*CIL* 2.5855); Uxama (*AE* 2003, 974); Arcobriga (*AE* 2004, 796).

162. *ERItalica* 144. Seria is the modern Jerez de los Caballeros, about 130 kilometers northwest of Italica.

163. *AE* 1990, 636. Tucci is the modern Martos, only 20 kilometers southwest of Aurgi (Jaen).

164. *CIL* 2.1643.

165. *CIL* 2.2960.

166. *HE* 3.162; cf. Fernández Martínez (2007), 131. It is unclear whether the adjective *Celtiber* was also the *cognomen* of the deceased, in which case the argument would still hold.

167. *AE* 1951, 281. See Mayer and Velaza (1994), who provide a linguistic and metrical analysis, in addition to a brief commentary on the content.

168. *CIL* 13.581, with the supplements of Hirschfeld.

169. Whose worship is attested elsewhere at Burdigala: see *CIL* 13.580.

170. Tiburnus (or Tiburtus) was remembered as either the founder, co-founder, or

son of the founder of the city: cf. the various traditions in Verg., *Aen.* 7.670 and Servius, *ad loc.*; Hor., *Carm.* 1.18.2, 2.6.5; Solinus 2.7–2.8; Plin., *HN* 16.237. There was a sacred grove (*lucus*) dedicated to him at Tibur (see Hor., *Carm.* 1.7.13; Suet., *Vita Hor.* 8; perhaps also Plin., *HN* 16.237 and Stat., *Silv.* 1.3.74).

171. The fifth-century poem of Rutilius Claudius Namatianus *De Reditu Suo* is one literary exception.

172. On foreigners at Rome, see generally Noy (2000). His picture of Rome is, importantly, one of a vibrant and multi-ethnic community, whose foreign inhabitants contributed in a wide variety of ways to the life of the city. The third section (pp. 157–284), which explores community and individual identity at Rome, underlies many of my ideas here.

173. Noy (2000), 160.

174. In his appendix, Noy has compiled a useful list of foreigners attested epigraphically at Rome; the list is, however, incomplete, especially for Gaul. I here offer a fuller list, with the results of my own inquiries. *Gaul:* Aedui (*CIL* 6.11090; *AE* 1984, 121); Ambiani (*CIL* 6.15493; *ICUR*-10, 27032); Boii (*CIL* 6.3308); Convenae (*CIL* 6.2497); Elusates (*AE* 1982, 68); Morini (*CIL* 6.29692); Novem populi (*CIL* 6.32981); Pictones (*ISIS* 21); Remi (*CIL* 6.46); Sequani (*CIL* 6.18423); Treveri (*CIL* 6.1625a, 3912; *ICUR*-2, 55680); Tricasses (*AE* 1953, 56); Tungri (*CIL* 6.33977); Viromandui (*CIL* 6.2821–2); Vocontii (*AE* 2008, 261). *Spain:* Aeminienses (*CIL* 14.4822); Aesonenses (*CIL* 6.27198); Aravi (*CIL* 6.3422); Astures (*CIL* 6.2536); Baesarenses (*AE* 1908, 108); Bilbilitani (*CIL* 6.2728); Calagurritani (*AE* 1921, 83); Cantabri (*CIL* 6.27441); Colliponenses (*CIL* 6.16100); Complutenses (*AE* 1984, 65); Eborenses (*CIL* 6.14234); Ercavicenses (*CIL* 6.41038); Gaditani (*CIL* 6.9013); Iessonenses (*CIL* 6.28624); Iliberritani (*AE* 1992, 152); Ilipenses (*CIL* 6.28151); Ilurenses (*CIL* 6.1410); Lusitani (*CIL* 6.10048); Meidubrigenses (*AE* 1992, 154); Palantini (*CIL* 6.10184); Saetabitani (*CIL* 6.16247); Saguntini (*CIL* 6.28743); Salacenses (*AE* 1992, 154; *CIL* 6.16310); Scallabitani (*CIL* 6.2614); Segisamonenses (*CIL* 6.24162); Segobrigenses (*CIL* 6.31656); Tuccitani (*AE* 1975, 19); Urcitani (*CIL* 6.3654).

175. In this regard I disagree with Noy (2000), 210, who states that, "The implication of the inscriptions is that 'Spanish' identity was fairly important." The ethnic *Hispanus/a* without further qualification or specification of a local identity only securely occurs twice at Rome (*CIL* 6.9597; 13820), which does not seem statistically significant enough to support his claim. I agree, however, that, "Cities and tribes seem to have played a rather more important role in the self-definition of people from Gaul" (211).

176. Roymans (2004) 2–3; cf. also Lund (1996). It should be noted that in rare epitaphs in the empire, broader ethnic identities such as *natione Germanus* or *natione Gallus* are to be found. But these are, as a general rule, set up by others,

especially for non-free persons; for example, by the comrades of deceased gladiators, who, unsurprisingly, seem to have posthumously assigned them a more stereotypical ethnic identity, such as "Gallic," "German," or "Spanish" (see e.g., the series of gladiatorial epitaphs from Corduba, *CIL* 2–7.354; 362; 364). These identities, imposed by others, are to be contrasted with the self-identifications that constitute the primary focus of this section.

177. See *CIL* 6.15493, *ISIS* 21 (from Ostia), and *CIL* 6.16247 respectively.

178. *CIL* 6.46. I have adhered to Dessau's reading of this inscription (*ILS* 4633), and rejected the most recent edition by Terrisse (see *AE* 1992, 76), who seems to have ignored Dessau's convincing defense of the original sixteenth-century transcriptions of the text. It is unknown exactly when or why the original form of the monument was altered.

179. Cf. *CIL* 13.3297; *AE* 1935, 64.

180. See Caes., *BGall.* 6.29 for a description of the forest. Worship of the goddess is attested at other sites in or bordering on the forest: see *CIL* 13.3631 (Arduenna), 7848 (Ardbinna).

181. *CIL* 8.13333.

182. See Shaw (2002), 214; Nielsen (1997), 193–198; Saller (1988).

183. *CIL* 3.14214, at the place later called *Tropaeum Traiani* (Adamclisi). It is to be distinguished from the more famous and much better preserved victory monument of Trajan, the *tropaeum* itself. The opening of the text is mostly lost, and only a very small fragment of the emperor's titulature survives. For the history of the debate on the dating of the monument, to either Domitian or Trajan (which is, for the most part, immaterial to the argument at hand), see Cichorius (1904), Syme (1937), Berciu (1965).

184. Of the peoples of Gaul, soldiers of the Bellovaci, Lexovii, Nervii, Senones, Tungri, and Viromandui are represented on the cenotaph; from Spain, the Lusitani and Vascones.

185. *CIL* 2.3664. The upper part of the stone, which included the name of the deceased, is lost. I have given only the relevant and complete section of the text. That the city is called *res publica Ebusitana* and not *municipium Flavium Ebusitanum* almost certainly dates this inscription to the Julio-Claudian period.

186. At least one of the heirs (*heredes*) and executors of the will named in the text was a Roman citizen (C. Cornelius Servinus), which is a reasonable, if not certain, indication that the deceased was as well. Islanders' identities were complex; individuals represented themselves as "Balearic" (*Balearicus*), as well as asserting their citizenship at Ebusus, Guiu(ntu)m, Iamo, Bocchoris, or Mago (*Guiuntanus, Iamontanus, Bocchoritanus, Magontanus*). See e.g., *CIL* 2.4218, an honorific inscription for a provincial priest of the imperial cult at Tarraco, who identified as *Balearicus*, and as a citizen of both Palma and Guiu(ntu)m, in which he had

held several political offices. On the islands under Roman rule generally, see
Zucca (1998).

3. Local Pasts

1. Tac., *Hist.* 4.68–4.69.

2. See below for a discussion of Julius Calenus of the Aedui. On Tacitus's firsthand
   knowledge of Gaul, see Syme (1953).

3. Tac., *Ann.* 3.60–3.63.

4. Tac., *Ann.* 4.55–4.56.

5. Cf. Jones (2001a) and Price (2005).

6. The quotation is from Woolf (1996b), 361.

7. Brow (1990), 2–3.

8. Brow (1990), 3, heavily influenced by Foucault's ideas (1980) on the relationship
   between power and knowledge.

9. For some recent contributions to the epigraphy of one region of Greece of par-
   ticular importance for interstate interactions, Boeotia, see the collection of es-
   says in Papazarkadas (2014).

10. This was the general observation on the south of Africa made by a British re-
    viewer of the published narrative of Tuckey's 1816 expedition to explore the
    river Zaire; see "Art. III: Narrative of an Expedition to explore the River Zaire,
    usually called the Congo, in South Africa, in 1816, under the Direction of Cap-
    tain J. K. Tuckey, R. N. To which is added, the Journal of Professor Smith, some
    General Observations on the Country and its Inhabitants, and an Appendix,
    containing the Natural History of that Part of the Kingdom of Congo through
    which the Zaire flows." *The British Critic* 10 (1818), 151. One can still find frequent
    echoes of this attitude in scholarship on the western provinces.

11. On the trope of negation, see Spurr (1993), 92–108.

12. Poseidonius's (FGrH 87) ethnography of the Κέλτοι came in book 23 of his *His-
    tory* (written ca. 80 BCE), in the context of the Roman wars of the late second
    century in southern Gaul. That Poseidonius had autopsy of the customs of
    the Gauls can be established from the surviving fragments, especially F 55 (=
    Strabo 4.4.5, on the treatment of defeated enemies, which Poseidonius claimed
    had at first deeply disturbed him, though he eventually became inured to it).
    On the Celtic ethnography of Poseidonius, essential are Tierney (1959) and
    Nash (1976); Nash is very much a corrective of the at times uncritical and un-
    historical "Pan-Poseidonian" approach of Tierney.

13. Diod. Sic. 5.31 (= Poseidonius F 116); Strabo 4.4.4; Timagenes (FGrH 88) F 2 (=
    Amm. Marc. 15.9.8). Caesar was certainly aware of the Poseidonian schema,
    but introduced an innovation into his Gallic ethnography, dividing the Gauls
    instead into "two classes of men of any rank and distinction," the druids (*dru-*

ides) and the equestrians (*equites*), the former of whom seem to absorb the functions of Poseidonius's βάρδοι and ὀυάτεις.

14. Cf. Ael., *VH* 12.23.

15. Cf. Timagenes F 2 (= Amm. Marc. 15.9.8).

16. Poseidonius F 18 (= Ath., *Deipn.* 4.36).

17. App., *Celt*. F 12. Appian, or the excerptor of this passage, has mistaken Bituitus for the king of the Allobroges; he was, as has been stated above, the king of the Arverni, to whom the Allobroges had turned for aid against the Romans.

18. Cf. *Schol. vet. in Iuv.* 8.234. The scholiast's Gaulish etymologies are accurate (see Delamarre 2001: 34 and 77), and thus most likely reflect on some level the social memory of the Allobroges themselves. Timagenes (F 2 = Amm. Marc. 15.9.4) preserves a similar, though more generalizing, local tradition (which he opposes to the accounts of Greek writers), that part of the population of Gaul was indigenous, and part transplanted from elsewhere, from either across the Rhine or across the sea. This discourse of autochthony versus foreignness, inhabiting ancestral versus recently acquired territory, probably of particular significance during the population movements of the late second and early first centuries BCE, can be further seen in the juxtaposition of the names of the Allobroges ("Of another country, foreigners") and the Nitiobroges ("Of their own country, autochthonous, indigenes").

19. Cf. Woolf (1996b), who disagrees with the importance of oral traditions; see esp. 372 and 376, where he argues that the possibility of an independent, oral version of the past must be remote, and that from the sanctions against the *druidae* it follows that "the indigenous, pre-conquest intelligentsia had no direct descendants."

20. See Chapter 1.

21. Cf. generally Drinkwater (1978).

22. For more on the problem of the *druidae*, see Chapter 5.

23. *Contra* Mierse (1999), 299–300.

24. Caes., *BGall.* 6.14.

25. Compare, for example, the picture of late fourth-century BCE Mauryan society in the *Indica* of Megasthenes (FGrH 715 F 19a–b), who claims that the people of India are divided into seven rigid classes. He is perhaps generalizing his impression of the palace economy at the capital of Palimbothra to Indian society writ large, and in doing so betrays several "Hellenizations" (cf. Roller's commentary on this passage in *Brill's New Jacoby*). But his schematic description is not a representation of the Hindu caste system; for a discussion of the history of scholarship on this passage, see Karttunen (1997), 82–87.

26. For more on this role, see Chapter 5.

27. On post-conquest iconography at Numantia, see Marco Simòn (2007).

28. This is the so-called "estilo III ilicitano," dated to around the second century CE; see Tortosa (2004), esp. 74–76 and 177, with further bibliography.

29. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 7.

30. As has been increasingly observed by historians of the modern period: see especially Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), who discuss, for example, the Scottish kilt; cf. also Said (2000), 178. This idea of the "invention of tradition" in the Roman world has recently been revisited by Boschung et al. (2015).

31. Cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 95–96 on modern peasant memories, from whom I have adapted this formulation.

32. Tac., *Ann.* 2.88.

33. Smith's reading of this passage (2006: 429) focuses on the critique of the chauvinism of Greek historians, while entirely eliding the oral poetic memory of the west that occasions Tacitus's comment. On orality and social memory, cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 41–47, esp. 45.

34. Woolf (2011b), 117, differs slightly.

35. Cic., *Arch.* 26, on Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius at Corduba in 74 BCE, who had lent his ears to the praises of the native poets of Corduba, even though they sounded crude (*pingue*) and foreign (*peregrinum*). Both Richardson (1996: 103) and Ramage (1961) interpret this passage as referring to poor and strange-sounding Latin poetry, as opposed to poetry in a local Iberian language. But it is perhaps not so clear-cut; while *pingue*, "coarse, crude," certainly could be a critique of Latin style or pronunciation (cf. Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.267), *peregrinum* is used frequently to refer to foreign languages (Varro, *Ling.* 5.77; Curt. 6.10.23; Quint., *Inst.* 1.5.55; Suet., *Tib.* 71). The verb *sonare* is used elsewhere by Cicero of crude or barely intelligible speech (*Rep.* 3.2.3; *Brut.* 259).

36. *AE* 1969/70, 229. On this inscription, see also Magueijo (1970).

37. Peña (2009), 280–281.

38. On this aspect of Corippus' poetry, cf. Sánchez Medina (2007).

39. Verg., *G.* 2.176. Virgil's is a golden line, while that of the inscription is close, but falls short. On the *laudes Italiae* of *Georgics* 2 (ll. 136–76), see Thomas (1988), 179–190 and Thomas (1982), 36–51. It is worth noting that *omnia tellus* at the end of the penultimate verse of the inscription is also a line-ending clausula found in Virgil: cf. *Ecl.* 4.39.

40. Hernández (2001: 197) further saw in this epitaph a passing resemblance to the final line of Virgil's famous "autoepitafio": *cecini pascua, rura, duces*. The verb and the tricolon of "genres" are perhaps paralleled in the inscription of our *cantor*; the epitaph of Virgil, authentic or invented, did inspire a number of imitators in antiquity: see Pease (1940).

41. A compelling Iberian comparandum in this regard is the *"laudes Celtiberiae"* of Martial, *Ep.* 4.55.

42. Within the Virgilian corpus, the idea of *gentes* existing in some happy (though never unproblematically so) golden age before their conquest by Rome is also explicitly expressed at *Aen.* 11.252–11.253. If the restoration of *paci* in the first line of this inscription is correct, this could have served as a fruitful junction of toponym (*Pax Iulia*) and idea ("peace") for poetic conceptions of a local golden age.

43. On Cornelius Bocchus, see PIR2 C. 1333, and below.

44. For the fragments of Varro Atacinus, see the edition of Hollis (2009: 165–214). Porte (2000) has proposed a reinterpretation of the date and scope of the poem, that they encompassed the entirety of the Gallic wars. Courtney's (1993: 235–236) discussion of Varro's ethnic identity is, while detailed, consciously equivocal and inconclusive. Of particular relevance for this question is a passage of Pomponius Mela's *Chorographia* on southern Gaul, which refers to Narbo as *Atacinorum Decimanorumque colonia* (2.75); based on his naming conventions for the chief places of Gaul, we should understand this to mean a mixed city of a local ethnic group called the Atacini and settlers from the 10th legion *Gemina* (planted there by Caesar in 45 BCE; see Suet., *Tib.* 4.1). The people of the Atacini must have taken their name from the river Atax or Atacos which flows through the country, and whose Gaulish name means "very swift"; this connection perhaps lies somewhere behind the statement of the ancient commentator on Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.46–7 that *Atacinus* comes from the name of the river *Atax* (see Hollis 2009: 166). Varro's secondary cognomen *Atacinus* is probably an ethnic, rather than a sobriquet, and links him with these Atacini. It is likely that in his geographical work he dwelt on the Atacini and the foundation of Narbo, which may in turn have been Mela's source; Courtney has argued that Mela is elsewhere indebted to Varro (cf. Courtney 1993: 247, 252).

45. Mela 2.96; cf. Strabo 3.1.8. On the important and long neglected Phoenician aspects of Mela's work, see Batty (2000).

46. Mela 1.41, with my italics; the meanings of *nos* and *nostrum*, "us" and "ours," in the chorography as a whole are complex, vacillating between "Roman" and "Phoenician."

47. Mela 2.105.

48. Plin., *Ep.* 2.3.

49. *CIL* 2.4967.31.

50. *AE* 1971, 254. It is noteworthy that this statue dates to the third or fourth century CE, the period at which the orators of Gaul were in full bloom; cf. Johnston (2014), 71.

51. *CIL* 13.3654. The verses, incomplete, are those of Lucan 7.1–7.2.

52. For the idea of "further voices" in the *Aeneid*, see Lyne (1987).

53. Woolf (2000), 121.

54. Idealized native Italian farmers of the pre-Jovian age are characterized by Vir-

gil as *indomiti* before their clash with the Trojan bands of Aeneas and Ascanius at *Aen.* 7.519–7.522. On the ambiguities of Turnus, see also Chapter 4.

55. Cf. *Tabulae Vindolandenses* vol. 4, no. 854 (Virgil, *Georgics* 1.125). Also known from Vindolanda is a line of the ninth book of the *Aeneid* (9.473; *Tab. Vind.* vol. 2, no. 118). This line, referring to winged rumor, is in the context of the Trojans looking out from atop their walls and seeing the heads of Euryalus and Nisus impaled on spikes; there is clearly a potentially grim resonance for soldiers stationed on Hadrian's wall. For the diffusion of Virgil in the provinces more generally (as detectable through the *carmina Latina epigraphica*), the standard work is Hoogma (1959).

56. On foundation legends in classical antiquity, the seminal work remains Bickerman (1952). Scholarship on the topic has proliferated in recent years: see especially Gruen (2011a), 223–252, and the various contributions to Gruen (2011b), Derks and Roymans (2009), and Gruen (2005). Scholarship on the west still lags behind that on the east, and has tended to focus almost exclusively on the role of Hercules or the Trojans.

57. For example Hall (2002), 9.

58. *Persai* from Perseus, *Keltai* from Keltos, *Latinoi* from Latinos, etc.

59. Cf. 1 Kings 10.22 (Solomon maintains a fleet of ships from *Taršiš*, i.e., Tartessus). On the archaeology of Tartessus see Blech (2001) and Koch (1984). For the literary sources on Tartessus, see generally Schulten (1950), 55–71.

60. See Hdt. 1.163 for the story of the Phocaeans' relationship with the Tartessian king Arganthonius.

61. Anacreon F 16 Page. Here "to be king of Tartessus" is analogous to possession of the horn of Amalthia, i.e., to be very rich.

62. Cf. Stesichorus, *Geryoneis* F 7 Page. On this poem generally, see Page (1973). Davies (1988) has elucidated the folk-tale motifs that ultimately underlie this story.

63. At Hes., *Theog.* 287–290 and 979–983 Chrysaor is the father of Geryon, who is located with his flocks on the sea-girt island of Erytheia, nebulously situated beyond Ocean.

64. Timagenes (F 2 = Amm. Marc. 15.9.6) refers to Geryon as *tyrannus*, and Hercules is cast as tyrannicide. In Diodorus (4.17–4.18), Geryon is one of three sons of Chrysaor, the wealthy βασιλεύς of Iberia. Each son has under his command an army composed of various barbaric ἔθνη μάχιμα, which upon Hercules' arrival are drawn up together in encampments in the plain. Hercules challenges and defeats each brother in single combat.

65. Just., *Epit.* 44.4.

66. But see the work of Gascó La Calle (1986) and, more cautiously, Bermejo Barrera (1978).

67. Just., *Epit.* 44.4.14. Trogus' representation of Geryon, which may be partly indebted to Timagenes, is also rationalizing (not a three-headed monster, but three brothers living in such concord that they seemed to be of one mind) and sympathetic (he only went to war with Hercules when provoked), perhaps consistent with Trogus' *persona* as *philobarbaros* (cf. e.g., Malaspina 1976).

68. Gascó La Calle (1986), 139–142.

69. On this process, see Wiseman (1995).

70. The identity of the Curetes is an interesting problem, which relates to the Greek perspective. Though unattested epigraphically, these Curetes are probably to be connected with the local toponym *litus Curense* (Plin., *HN* 3.7), which refers to the Iberian coast from the mouth of the Baetis (Guadalquivir) to the tip of Gibraltar. The fact that they bore a similar name to the Κουρῆτες of Greek mythology, who had nurtured Zeus and were conventionally located on Crete, seems to have resulted in secondary contamination: these Greek Κουρῆτες were traditionally credited with the discovery of honey (cf. Diod. Sic. 5.65.1), and this may lie behind the confused ascription of this accomplishment to Gargoris. Also, the location of the Titanomachy in Iberia is unusual, as the Titans are usually associated with Thessaly (cf. Hes., *Theog.* 632–634); but it can perhaps be explained in relation to minor traditions like that found in Thallus (FGrH 256 F 2), that the Titan Ogygos fled to Tartessus. Thus these introductory details about Titans and honey should probably be understood as secondary accretions onto a local core, the result of Greek literary interpretations.

71. The political organization of the Tartessians that is taken for granted in the account of Habis—distributed among *septem urbes*—is significant, in that it differs from the usual Greek and Roman view of a single nucleated center called "Tartessus." In light of the archaeological record, the interpretation of Tartessus as a cultural region composed of multiple settlements, supported by this myth, seems more accurate. Authors of the Roman period variously tried to identify "Tartessus" with a contemporary city, usually either Carteia (e.g., Plin., *HN* 3.7) or Gades (e.g., Sall., *Hist.* 2.5), both of which were, in actuality, originally Phoenician *emporia*.

72. As Justin's authorial interjection about the parallels of Cyrus and Romulus reminds us, the tale of the exposed child who survives, often with the aid of an animal, and ultimately grows up to become king (or queen) is a widespread Mediterranean folk motif, going back at least as far as the Akkadian king Sargon in the third millennium BCE; cf. e.g., Forsythe (2005). Thus the tradition around Habis' variously attempted exposure should most likely be understood in relation to a motif that was "in the air," rather than as demonstrating direct Greek or Roman cultural influence or borrowing.

73. Von Gutschmid (1882), more or less followed by Jacoby, argued that Trogus'

history was essentially a reworking in Latin of Timagenes; this view has since been significantly and justly moderated by e.g., Forni and Angeli Bertinelli (1982). But for book 44, which is clearly secondary to Trogus's main narrative and assembled in a more piecemeal fashion, the question of sources is even more problematic.

74. For the more traditional view of the Carthaginian destruction of Tartessian culture, see Schulten (1950), 72–79; for a more recent view of the Tartessian *Untergang*, see Blech (2001), 347–348.

75. The last mention of the Tartessii as an ethnic group is by Livy in the context of the Roman campaigns against the *gens Tartesiorum* in the Second Punic War (23.26). On the issue of the Tartessian cultural inheritance of the Turdetani/ Turduli, see Blech (2001), 322–323. For ancient perspectives on the affinity between the Turdetani and Turduli, and their position as heirs of the Tartessians, see Strabo 3.1.6 and 3.2.11. The phonetic structure of all three ethnonyms, *Tartessi* and *Turd-etani/Turd-uli,* betrays the same Iberian root *trt/trs* at their core: see the discussion of Schulten (1950), 80–84.

76. Cf. Plin., *HN* 3.13–3.14.

77. This people, whose territory was northern Lusitania, were isolated from the core territory of the Turduli, which was further south between the Anas (Guadiana) and the Baetis (Guadalquivir) rivers; cf. *AE* 1983, 476–477 (*tesserae hospitales* dated to the first decade CE), as well a funerary monument for "Quadratus, son of Mantai, Turdulus Vetus" (*AE* 1975, 513), who died abroad at Caurium.

78. Strabo 3.1.6.

79. See Untermann (1990).

80. Cf. discussion of memory and language in Fentress and Wickham (1992), 44–46.

81. The quotation is from Dench (1997), 43, on origin myths of peoples of the central Apennines. For the relationship between present conceptions of the world and memories of the past, cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 88.

82. Strabo 3.2.15.

83. The exceptionality of Turdetanian culture is related elsewhere by Strabo (3.2.15).

84. An argument for this connection has not, to the best of my knowledge, been made previously.

85. Strabo at one point (4.1.11) calls Lugdunum "a city of the Segusiavi," but elsewhere (4.3.2) states more clearly that "the Romans occupy Lugdunum" and that "this city is situated before the *ethnos* of the Segusiavi." Pliny (*HN* 4.107) draws a distinction between the Segusiavi and the Roman colony in their territory. The capital of the Segusiavi was at Forum Segusiavorum (Feurs), some 50 km to the west.

86. See Cass. Dio 46.50. Audin (1965: 25) interpreted these first settlers as Italian merchants driven out during the Allobroges' uprising in 61 BCE under Catugnatus (cf. Cass. Dio 37.47–37.48). Cicero's correspondence with Plancus during the early months of 43 (*Fam.* 10.1–10.24) contextualizes the praetor's activities in Gaul within the broader political and military concerns of the tumultuous period leading up to the formation of the Second Triumvirate. The epitaph of Plancus (*ILS* 886, from Formiae) also refers to his role in the foundation of Lug(u)dunum.

87. Pelletier (1996), 171. On Fourvière was the intersection of the *cardo* and *decumanus*, the forum, the temple to the imperial cult, and the theater.

88. Desbat (2004), 204–205, who characterizes the site where the colony was planted as "pratiquement vierge."

89. Sen., *Ep.* 91.10.

90. Kallisthenes FGrH 291 F 5 = Ps.-Plutarch, *De Fluviis* 6.1–6.3.

91. Kleitophon FGrH 293 F 3 = Ps.-Plutarch, *De Fluviis* 6.4.

92. On the *De Fluviis* of Pseudo-Plutarch, see most recently Cameron (2004), 127–134.

93. The most useful piece of evidence for dating the two works of this Pseudo-Plutarch—the *De Fluviis* and the so-called *Parallela Minora*—is the fact that many of his bogus citations are parroted by Clement of Alexandria, whose writings can be dated to the end of the second or beginning of the third century CE: for example, the *Italica* of Pythocles of Samos is cited by both Pseudo-Plutarch (*Par. Min.* 14) and Clement (*Strom.* 1.21) for the story of the augur C. Iulius; the *Italica* of Dorotheus is cited by them both (*Par. Min.* 20 and *Prot.* 3.42.7) for the story of C. Marius sacrificing his own daughter during the Cimbrian wars. 200 CE is thus a reasonable *terminus ante quem*, which means that Pseudo-Plutarch may have been a rough contemporary of other Greek sophistic satirists like Lucian.

94. Cf. Delamarre (2001), 76. Caesar, however, does speak of the river's almost imperceptible flow at certain times of the year (*BGall.* 1.12).

95. *AE* 1913, 161. The earliest attestation of the name Sauconna for the river is to be found in Ammianus (15.11.17).

96. This god is alternately conflated with Apollo (*CIL* 13.1318, from the territory of the Bituriges Cubi) or Mercury (*AE* 1969/70, 405b, from Condate, modern Rennes, in the territory of the Riedones).

97. Included as such by Whatmough (1970), 650, 655.

98. See Delamarre (2001), 177–178. The usual Gaulish word for crow is *brannos*; cf. the people of the Brannovices, or the toponym Bran(n)odunum (mod. Brandon).

99. See Déchelette (1904), vol. 2, 270–274.

100. Déchelette (1904), vol. 2, nos. 65 and 66.

101. Déchelette (1904), vol. 2, no. 67.

102. *RIC* vol. 4.1, 47 nos. 23 and 24. The legend reads *GEN(IUS) LUG(DUNI) COS · II.*

103. Only very brief treatments of the myth are to be found in Audin (1965), 76–77, and Wuilleumier (1953), 11. Jullian (1908–1926), vol. 2, 252–253, remains the subtlest reading.

104. Cf. the most basic version of the canonical Roman account in Livy 1.3–1.7.

105. See *AE* 1969/70, 405b, a dedication to *Deus Mercurius Atepomarus* by T. Flavius Postumius, *sacerdos Romae et Aug.* in his native *civitas* of the Riedones. *At-epomaros* means "the very (*at-*) great (*maros*) horseman (**epo-*)," perhaps not entirely dissimilar to the prominent aspect of the Dioscuri as tamers of horses and especially Castor as an equestrian hero. Atepomarus was actually co-opted elsewhere by Pseudo-Plutarch (*Par. Min.* 30) where the author needed a stock Gallic king to pit against the Romans in his etiology of the festival of the *Nonae Caprotinae*; perhaps this suggests the *perceived* importance of Atepomarus to the Gauls on the part of Pseudo-Plutarch. On this story, cf. Bremmer and Horsfall (1987), 83.

106. Cf. Strabo 4.4.6, who cites with skepticism the geographer Artemidorus for the story of the idiosyncratic method of settling of disputes at a place on the ocean called "Two Crows."

107. See ll. 585–586 in the 1953 edition of Dillon. This is one of the texts contained in the twelfth-century manuscript *lebor na hUidre* ("The Book of the Dun Cow") that relates a number of myths from the Ulster Cycle.

108. See Davidson (1988), 91; Ross (1967), 250.

109. On this link between crows and omens in Old Irish literature, see Ross (1967), 249–261, esp. 250–251.

110. Seneca's consolation is referred to at *Ep.* 91.13–91.14.

111. Cf. Drinkwater (1983), 202; Matthews (1975), 348–351.

112. Here I am partly indebted to Krebs (2011) on "Borealism," especially 202–203.

113. Bickerman (1952) remains a salutary counterbalance to current, revisionist views of Greek ethnographic treatments of *origines gentium*, and what follows is heavily influenced by this important article.

114. Bickerman (1952), 70.

115. See Gruen (2011a), 223, for a discussion of Josephus and Diodorus' Egyptian sources.

116. Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, Megasthenes' *Indica*, and Hecataeus of Abdera's *Aegyptiaca* are a few examples among many.

117. See especially Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 1.4–1.5.

118. According to Asclepiades of Myrleia (FGrH 697) F 7 = Strabo 3.4.3.

119. This argument for the distinction between Greek ethnography and Roman

imperialism as they relate to *origines* runs somewhat contrary to the thesis of Woolf (2011), 59–88.

120. The most illuminating recent treatment of Roman ethnographies in context is Dench (2005), 37–92.

121. Caes., *BGall.* 6.18.1 and 5.12.1; Tac., *Germ.* 2–3 and *Agr.* 11; Sall., *Iug.* 17 on the *libri Punici*; cf. Bickerman (1952), 75. I except here Ammianus's Gallic digression in book 15 of his history, since, through his deliberately antiquarian reliance on the ethnography of Timagenes, the historian is, though writing in Latin, very much "playing the Greek."

122. Diod. Sic. 5.21.2. This is precisely the mentality that Lucian satirizes to great effect in the *True History* some two centuries later.

123. Diod. Sic. 4.19. The development of the story must necessarily date to the two decades between 51 BCE and the mid-30s, when Diodorus put the finishing touches on his *Library*. I see no reason that this story should not be purely the invention of Diodorus, although Woolf (2011b: 21) believes that this is "most unlikely," and sees it instead as a tale negotiated on a middle ground between Greek speakers and Gallic locals. But such a fabricated continuum between Hercules and a great Greek (or Roman) conqueror is absolutely typical of Hellenistic ethnography: Megasthenes (FGrH 715 F 11a), for example, says that India had remained unconquered after Hercules's invasion until Alexander. It is, moreover, perfectly consistent with the tenor of Diodorus's work, especially the early books, and if it is not originally his, then we must postulate an otherwise unknown work of Greek history or poetry on the Gallic wars by an author with firsthand knowledge of northern Gaul written, published, and consulted by Diodorus in the span of only a few years. To attribute the Alesia myth to Diodorus's imagination is thus a far more economical interpretation in the absence of any evidence to the contrary. Cf. Sacks (1990), 179; Jourdain-Annequin (1989), 242–246.

124. On the archaeology of Alesia, see Bénard (1994), 29–60.

125. Tac., *Germ.* 2. Woolf (2009b: 214), on the other hand, frames his discussion of this passage in terms of general "research questions" shared by both Greek and Roman authors, and sees nothing particularly innovative about the tale of origins told by Tacitus here.

126. Tac., *Germ.* 3.

127. Asclepiades of Myrleia (FGrH 697) T 4 and F 7 = Strabo 3.4.3. Bickerman (1952), 69, regards Asclepiades' deliberate disregard of native traditions as paradigmatic.

128. The text of Strabo is corrupt here, and reads *Opiscella*; but the town of Ocelum is attested in this vicinity in both Ptolemy (*Geog.* 2.5.7) and Pliny (*HN* 4.118);

thus given the geography and the etymology (Ocelum < Ocelas) this reading should almost certainly be restored in Strabo.

129. Asclepiades would almost certainly have been familiar with the periegetic writings of his near contemporaries like Heliodorus, who had produced a work in fifteen books on the Athenian acropolis, and most importantly, Polemon of Ilium, who was called "stele devourer" for his voracious appetite for the study of inscriptions. On the genre, see Bischoff, s.v. Perieget, *RE* 19.

130. Woolf (2009b), 212–213, and Woolf (2011b), 17–31, esp. 24–27, adopting the idea of White (1991). He sees the local Iberian go-betweens as potential "Squantos," who knew "the kinds of answers for which visitors were looking" (2011b: 26). For a study of the guides of Pausanias, see Jones (2001b).

131. Cf. Pérez Vilatela (1995).

132. Ammianus arrived in Gaul in 355, and may have still been there as late as 359, probably crossing paths with the Caesar Julian himself. But he was not in Paris for Julian's acclamation as Augustus in 360, having been sent east with Ursicinus to Amida, where his history makes it clear that he was present for the siege. In any event, he would have had sufficient time to get a sense of Gallic provincial culture.

133. Amm. Marc. 15.9.6. There are interesting similarities here to the passage of Tacitus (*Germ.* 2–3) discussed earlier in this chapter.

134. Scholars since Gardthausen have debated which parts of Ammianus' excursus at the end of book 15 are to be credited to Timagenes, which to other written sources, and which to Ammianus' own observation. The most natural reading of 15.9.6, I would argue, is to interpret it as based upon the *visa* and *audita* of the historian, rather than the *lecta*; cf. Barnes (1998), 95–106, esp. 99. The language of this section seems to mark it off as derived from a different source of authority than what precedes (and follows). On this point, cf. the overview in De Jonge (1953), 47–49.

135. Though Woolf (2011b:109; 1996: 364) is more or less dismissive of this testimony of Ammianus, he does acknowledge elsewhere in passing (2011a: 259) that, in light of recent work on the role Hercules in the construction of ethnic identities in the Rhineland, "the idea that some of these mythological connections were monumentalized locally now seems less fanciful than it once did."

136. See Dench (2005), 62–69.

137. Just., *Epit.* 44.3.2; cf. Plin., *HN* 4.112 on the Heleni. Bickerman (1952), 66 accepts this statement of Trogus.

138. For these spaces in early Roman self-accounts, see Dench (2005), 63.

139. *CIL* 13.3026 (territory of the Parisii); three cranes (*garanus* in Gaulish) are perched upon the bull's back. Julian and his army wintered at Lutetia in 357/8

and 358/9, and tempting though it is to imagine Ammianus among them study-ing this particular monument, it is highly unlikely.

140. For the potential Indo-European resonances of the three-horned bull vis-à-vis Hercules and the "Master of Animals," see Burkert (1979), 86.

141. The same iconographic theme is found with some variation (and without la-bels) on an early imperial votive altar set up by a member of the Mediomatrici at Augusta Treverorum (*CIL* 13.3656, territory of the Treveri).

142. Both forms of these Aquitanian divinities are attested: Andossus (*CIL* 13.26) and Ilunnus (*CIL* 13.27) are found among the Aquitani, but they are conflated with Hercules in the more cosmopolitan context of Narbo (*CIL* 12.4316). Hercules Toli-Andossus (non-Gaulish, meaning obscure) is also known from Aquitania (*CIL* 13.434). On the coinage of the Segusiavi, see Johnston (2014), 67–68.

143. Claudius Marius Victor, *Alethia* 3.204–3.209.

144. On this passage, see Duval (1969).

145. Cic., *Nat. D.* 3.42; Varro, *Sat. Men.* fr. 20 = Servius, *ad Aen.* 8.564.

146. On Melqart, see Bonnet (1988). He was in origin the civic god of Tyre; in fact the name means "god (*mlk*) of the city (*qrt*)."

147. Of the plan of the city of Gades (Phoenician *Gdr*, "wall, fortress"; Greek Γάδειρα), little is known, but its foundation by the Phoenicians, presumably for the purposes of trade with neighboring the Tartessian culture immediately to the west, appears to date to the 8th c. BCE, shortly after that of Carthage. An-cient authors wrongly credited it with greater antiquity, Mela (3.46) placing its foundation in the era of the Trojan War and Velleius (1.2.3) shortly thereafter.

148. Poseidonius (FGrH 87) F 53 = Strabo 3.5.5. The fundamental study of Hercules Gaditanus is García y Bellido (1963), and what follows is heavily indebted to this work.

149. Philostr., *V A* 5.4. Silius (*Pun.* 3.32–3.44) claims that the labors of the Theban Hercules were represented on the doors of the temple of Hercules Gaditanus, though he is our only evidence for this. Silius' authority on this aspect of the sanctuary has usually gone unquestioned: see e.g., García y Bellido (1963), 104–108, who, rather problematically, takes the poet at face value. But epic prece-dents like the doors of the temple of Apollo at Cumae in Virgil (*Aen.* 6.20–6.30) may have motivated authorial invention, or at least poetic license, and the ver-bal parallels make it still more likely that Silius was thinking of this passage. It is certainly possible that aspects of the Greek mythographical tradition may have been incorporated into the sanctuary, but caution is required in recon-structing its architectural decoration from Silius's description.

150. Cf. e.g., Diod. Sic. 5.20.2; Arr., *Anab.* 2.16. Silius (*Pun.* 3.14–3.31) describes the cult rituals in his account of Hannibal's sacrifice and consultation of the or-acle at Gades, a description which may ultimately go back to the observa-

tions of Poseidonius himself; on this, cf. Nicol (1936), 148–149. Appian (*Hisp.* 2) asserts that even still in his own day (the second century CE) the worship of Hercules at Gades was conducted "in Phoenician fashion." Cf. Fear (1996), 234–236.

151. See Pausanias 10.4.6.

152. See García y Bellido (1963), 134–136; Fear (1996), 231.

153. Sall., *Iug.* 18. On this tradition, cf. most recently Gruen (2011a), 274.

154. Mela 3.46.

155. It is worth noting that this association between Melqart and (colonial) foundations seems to have been generally in the air at the time. In a roughly contemporaneous, second-century BCE Phoenician-Greek "dictionary" from the island of Malta, Melqart is glossed as ἀρχηγός, "founder": see Donner and Röllig (1971–1976), 47.

156. *CIL* 2.3409. Hercules Gaditanus may also come to have been seen as an icon of "Baetican" identity: he appears on coins of the emperors Trajan and Hadrian, both of whom were born at Italica, only a short distance north of Gades.

157. Thus Keay (1988: 147) perhaps oversimplifies when he states that, "The cult of Hercules in southern Spain is therefore a continuation of the Phoenician cult of the great god Melkaart."

158. *CNH* p. 127, 6.

159. Lucian, *Heracles* 1. Ogmios is otherwise only attested on two curse tablets found at Brigantium (Bregenz): see Kropp (2008), 2.

160. Lucian's vivid description has long captivated the imaginations of his readers, among whom was the sixteenth-century German artist Albrecht Dürer. See Le Roux (1960).

161. Lucian, *Heracles* 4–6.

162. For a summary of various examples, see the references at Hofeneder (2006), 46n73.

163. Amato (2004). Hofeneder (2006) has since taken up Amato's theory in his study of Favorinus. Only three works of Favorinus survive—two speeches transmitted mistakenly under the name of Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 37 and 64) and one treatise *On Exile* that is preserved on papyrus—though he is known to have been a prolific author.

164. On Polemon's slur, see Isaac (2011), 507–508. For more on Favorinus's "role-playing" of "the Celt," see Chapter 5.

165. Cf. Johnston (2014), 63–67.

166. See Gruen (2011a), 250–252.

167. Parthenius F 52 Lightfoot = Stephanus of Byzantium, *Ethica* s.v. "Nemausos." The fragment is perhaps from his *Heracles*, although Lightfoot does not suggest this.

168. Parth, *Amat. narr.* 30. Lightfoot in her commentary on this episode (1999: 531–535) sees it as "one among many variants on Celtic eponyms, all of which will have been generated in response to the new Greek awareness of the Celtic nation following the explorations of Pytheas of Massilia and then the Celts' own irruption into Greece and Asia Minor at the beginning of the third century BC." Woolf (2011b: 23–24), on the contrary, sees this story as "something new," which, in its interest in the etymology of Celtae, "belongs entirely to the last century BCE." I would incline toward Lightfoot's earlier date for the generation of these kinds of eponymous stories on the Celtae or Galatae, which are detectable already in the fragments of Timaeus (FGrH 566 F 89–90).

169. See e.g., *CIL* 12.3077, 3093.

170. Sauvage (1992: 112–113) favors this dating of the eponym; see also Häussler (2011), 404–411. If the name Nemausus is indeed Gaulish (rather than Ligurian or pre-Celtic), and means something like "sacred enclosure" (the root *nem-* here being the same as in the well-attested word *nemeton*, roughly synonymous with the Greek *temenos*), then it is most logical from a linguistic standpoint to interpret it as in origin a toponym, which was later applied to the god of the spring. See also the previous discussion of eponymous divinities and imaginary communities in Chapter 1.

171. See the publication of this monument in Guillet et al. (1992).

172. Sauvage (1992) gives an overview of this process, with bibliography; see also the broader view of the development of the urban space in Célié et al. (1994). For one such magistrate, see *CIL* 12.3094 (dedication by a *quaestor*).

173. *CIL* 12.3100. It is worth noting that the dedicant of the *horologium* has a Gaulish *nomen gentile*, Utullius.

174. *CIL* 12.3070, 3072. On this coinage, see Christol and Goudineau (1987), 95.

175. The city of Nemausus must have become significantly more important and more connected with Spain and Italy after the conquest of Narbonensis, benefitting from its highly advantageous position on the *via Domitia*.

176. Otherwise, it is first mentioned in Strabo (4.1.12).

177. On Parthenius' sources generally, see the discussion in Lightfoot (1999), 246–256.

178. The most recent edition of this text has been published by Santiago (2003) = *SEG* 53: 1153. It was originally published by Sanmartí and Santiago (1987) = *SEG* 37: 838. The toponym Σαιγάνθηι mentioned in the first and fourth lines of the bronze can be identified with some certainty as an attempt at Hellenizing the Iberian name of Saguntum.

179. Livy 21.7.

180. Polybius, our earliest literary source for the city, calls it Ζάκανθα (3.17), sug-

gesting that the Greek appellation had already been contaminated by this ety-
mology by the second century BCE.

181. On this coinage, see Ripollès (2005), 89 and Ripollès (2002), 478.

182. The career of L. Cornelius Bocchus is known from several inscriptions of south-
ern Lusitania: *CIL* 2.35 and 2479 (from Salacia), 5184 (from Caetobriga, modern
Setubal), and *AE* 1999, 857, a recently discovered public monument from Olisipo
(Lisbon) wherein he is explicitly referred to as *Salaciensis*. He was prominent
among the provincial elite, holding the priesthood of Lusitania in addition to
several local offices in his community; he had also served in Africa as *tribunus
militum* of the *legio III Augusta*.

183. All of the securely attributed fragments of Bocchus come from Pliny the Elder:
16.216; 37.24, 97, 127. Schanz/Hosius (vol. 2, 646–647), following Mommsen, ap-
proximate the title of his work as *De Admirandis Hispaniae*. Besides these four
fragments, Pliny in his introduction lists Bocchus as a source for books 33 and
34 as well; it is likely that the information on metals and mines in Lusitania in
these books (e.g. 33.78, 96, 118; 34.156) is drawn from him.

184. Plin, *HN* 16.216.

185. On the archaeology of Saguntum, see Aranegui Gascó (1992) and (2006). Boc-
chus seems to have also claimed autopsy of Olisipo (cf. Plin., *HN* 37.97, with
the new inscription mentioned previously, n. 182) and the mountains around
Ammaia (Portalegre; cf. Plin., *HN* 37.24), somewhat closer to his native place
than was Saguntum.

186. In Trogus's version (Just., *Epit.* 43.3.4), Massilia's foundation is, more or less
correctly, synchronized with the reigns of the historical sixth-century kings of
Rome.

187. Sallust, in the fragments of the second book of his *Histories* (2.26), anachronis-
tically describes Saguntum as still half-ruined and bearing the scars of Punic
destruction in the first century BCE. But at this period it was a fairly flourishing
commercial hub, and Sallust's depiction must have been composed with an eye
toward rhetorical effect.

188. Sil., *Pun.* 1.273–1.295. On the ethical function of the hero Zacynthus in this epi-
sode, see Vessey (1974: 30). On the function of Saguntine origins more generally
within the first two books of Silius, see Pérez Vilatela (1990). On the ethnic
affiliation between Rome and Saguntum elaborated by Silius, see Schettino
(2006), and Chapter 4.

189. The fundamental work on the historical and geographical sources of Silius Ital-
icus remains Nicol (1936), who concludes that Silius must have made extensive
and direct use of Livy. Lucarini (2004) is one of the most recent additions to the
Quellenforschung on Silius, and he gives a brief overview of the history of schol-

arship on the topic. On this passage, Nicol (1936: 108) states that Silius here gives "two obviously incompatible versions of the founding of the city. One of these is Livian and the other is not, but the non-Livian version cannot be definitely attributed to an annalistic writer, inasmuch as it involves a Hercules legend for which Silius appears to have had a special authority." Later (145), he asserts that, "Silius is unlikely to have been the originator of this episode when he gives the Livian version of the founding of Saguntum as well; in any case, he was not in the habit of inventing mythological tales—he either borrowed his stories or modeled them closely on those of other writers."

190. See Sil., *Pun.* 1.274–1.275 and 2.581–2.583 (where he calls the monument a *tumulus*). To my knowledge, it has not been suggested that Bocchus could have been a source of Silius here, but it is distinctly possible: the source was probably not an annalist, and Bocchus, as we have seen, was interested in the monuments of Saguntum and their relationship to the conquest of Hannibal, and was consulted as a special authority on Spain by Silius's rough contemporary Pliny. Furthermore, Silius's description of the temple of Hercules at Gades (3.17–3.19) echoes Bocchus's description of the ancient temple of Diana at Saguntum; he seems to employed poetic license to transfer the ancient wooden beams (*trabes*) that were not susceptible to decay from one place of memory associated with Hercules to another.

191. See Aranegui Gascó (2006), 65–68.

192. These are series II through VII in the classification of Villaronga (1967), dating from the last quarter of the third century through roughly the end of the second century BCE; see also Ripollès (2002).

193. This is a term used by Gruen (2011a), 224–252, esp. 224–227.

194. See Glatz (2014), 110.

195. On the complex social and political processes at Rome whereby monuments transform events into memories, and victory into power, see Hölscher (2006); on landscape as monument, see Tilley (2004), 217.

196. See Keay (1995) for the importance of these three factors in particular; Woolf (1998), 112–126, is a clear overview of the general trajectory of urbanism in Gaul from the late first century BCE to the early second century CE; Curchin (2004), 69–116, offers a comparable survey of the development of cities and countryside in central Spain. See also Noreña (2011), 10–14, 322–323.

197. Cf. Woolf (1996a).

198. Strabo 3.4.2; Orosius 7.2.6; cf. Fear (1996), 229.

199. On the necropolis of Baelo Claudia, see Jiménez (2010a), esp. 38.

200. Talaiotic sites have received comparatively little systematic archaeological study. The best stratigraphic sequences for continued occupation into the Roman period come from "Casa 2" at Torre d'en Galmés (Pérez Juez et al.

2007) and "La sala hipóstila" at Torralba d'en Salort (Fernández-Miranda et al. 1980).

201. See Fear (1996), 91.

202. For Urcestar at Ilurco, see *CIL* 2.2067. On these *recintos*, see Fear (1996), 253–257.

203. Curchin (2004), 78–79.

204. Keay (2006), 230.

205. As at Augustodunum, for example, on which see Colin, Fichtl, and Buchsenschutz (1995).

206. See Ghey (2007), 27.

207. *CIL* 1.3451.

208. *CIL* 2.6342; on this inscription and the interpretation of the Iberian text, see most recently Rodríguez Ramos (2001), 60–62. On the conventional dating to 40–30 BCE, see Beltrán Lloris (2004), 166.

209. Aranegui Gascó (2006).

210. These two inscriptions are *CIL* 2.3302 and *HE* 5.465, on which see recently Rodríguez Ramos (2010); concerning the coinage featuring the word "Isc(er)" and the name "M. Ful.," cf. Fear (1996), 59-61. It is worth noting that the old Iberian fortification walls of Castulo, "collapsed due to their antiquity" (*muros vetustate collapsos*), were restored in the early Imperial period as well (*CIL* 2.3270). On the history of Castulo, see also Chapter 2.

211. The silversmiths of Alesia attracted the notice even of Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* 34.162). The *civitas* to which Alesia and its *pagus* belonged in the Roman period, the Aedui or the Lingones, is unclear. Ti. Claudius Professus Niger, who constructed the portico to the god Moritasgus, held the full range of political offices in both states, an unusual career (*CIL* 13.2873). On the basis of numismatic evidence, it might be seen to fall more within the orbit of the Lingones in the early period (Bénard 1994: 33); but Buckley (1981: 287n1) argues that it passed into Aeduan control after 69 CE. This "redistricting," perhaps the result of punitive measures against the rebellious Lingones, may explain the double career of Niger.

212. See Bénard (1994), 58. For a votive offering to Ucuetis and Bergusia, see *CIL* 13.11247; portico dedicated to *deus Moritasgus*: *CIL* 13.2873.

213. Ghey (2007), 23–24.

214. *CIL* 13.2880; on this text, see Lambert (2003), 98–101.

215. Stifter (2011), 173.

216. For the imperial deposit at Higuera la Real, see Berrocal-Rangel and Ruíz-Triviño (2003). The most recent excavations at Nertobriga, with bibliography on previous archaeological work at the site, are summarized by Díaz Sanz and Medrano Marqués (2004).

217. On the site, see Alarcão (2001), 315–316; results of the recent excavations, which confirmed the previous hypothesis of a first-century CE abandonment, are presented in Correia Santos and Schattner (2010).

218. See Curado (1984); but see also the inscription set up by the *vicani Ocelonenses* (*AE* 2002, 676), which came to light only recently.

219. See the excellent discussion of Alfayé and Marco Simòn (2008), 293–296 and 300–301, to which my ideas here are much indebted.

220. For a description of these reliefs, see Aranegui Gascó (2006), 68.

221. On Glanum, see Frakes (2012); on the Arucci head, see Fear (1996), 259.

222. From Aquitania, see e.g. *CIL* 13.151; on Lara de los Infantes, see Franz and Greenland (2003), 635–640. On the ancient name and ethnic assignation of the site, see Curchin (2004), 210–211. Cf. Marco Simòn (2007) on these kinds of iconographies and "lost identities."

223. On the necropolis of Pozo Moro, see Alcalá-Zamora (2003), esp. 102–103 for the summary of the Roman phases (V–VI); she concludes that as late as the fourth century CE, the sacredness of the place must have been known and respected by the community.

224. These are the identifications of Éveillard (2003), which is nevertheless a useful study of the pillar; especially fruitful is the comparison with Christian appropriation of these monoliths in the medieval period.

225. On the archaeology of the site, see Brunaux (2000); Brunaux (2009). Despite Brunaux's efforts to connect the battle to the immigration of the Belgae in this period, the details of the circumstances and participants must remain uncertain; cf. the caution of Derks (2002), 545.

226. Woolf (1996b), 361.

227. Mart., *Ep.* 4.55.23. Arenas Esteban (2007) is an interesting attempt to understand the ancient landscape at a site in Celberia from a symbolic perspective through an investigation of tree cult, balancing the extreme positions on "Celtic" tree cult of Aldhouse-Green (2000) and Brunaux (1993).

228. Urso: *CIL* 2–5.1112. Segobriga: Alföldy (1985); Abascal, Almagro Gorbea, and Cebrián (2006). Convenae: *CIL* 13.129, 132, and 175. Santones: *CIL* 13.1112.

229. Suplicius Severus, *Vita Mart.* 13. The sanctuary at Leprosum destroyed by Martin (*Vita Mart.* 14), which Severus characterizes as "very wealthy thanks to anxious credulity in its supernatural power" (almost certainly referring to votive offerings), is reasonably identified with that of Cosusus, the recipient of a bronze statue dedicated by Flavia of the Bituriges Cubi in the early imperial period (*CIL* 13.1353).

230. See Martin of Braga, *De Correctione Rusticorum* ("On the Straightening-Out of the Rustics"), 16. Cf. the attempt of Hilarius to dissuade the Gabali from their lake festival, discussed in Chapter 1.

231. Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 24.23–24.25.

232. This is the so-called "*fonte do ídolo*"; see *CIL* 2.2419–2.2420, with Tranoy (2002).

233. See Deyts (1966).

234. The question of spring sites as pre-conquest cult foci in Gaul is a highly debated one; see Webster (1995), 449–450. The earliest evidence for votive deposits at spring sites across the region is concentrated in the immediate post-conquest period, and scholars tend to read this in one of two ways: either the ritual importance of springs is only a development of the early Roman period, with changing patterns of interacting with the landscape coinciding exactly with developments in material culture that make ritual practices more archaeologically visible; or, there was a tradition of cult practices at spring sites in the pre-Roman period, which, due to their ephemeral nature or the perishable media of votive offerings, have left no discernible trace in the archaeological record. For my part, I find the latter interpretation somewhat more plausible.

235. *CIL* 12.2926. This spring is the point from which the great aqueduct of Nemausus, built in the middle of the first century CE, began (the most iconic stretch of which is the famous Pont du Gard).

236. Among the more recent and sophisticated treatments of rock sanctuaries—with new findings from Peñalba—is Alfayé and Marco Simòn (2008).

237. The Cueva del Puente, near Orduña. The texts are *HE* 8.39–8.43.

238. All of these interpretations have had their proponents among scholars in the last two decades: see the summary of Alfayé (2010), 214–215.

239. I follow the most recent reading of Díaz Ariño (2008), 176.

240. For other examples of the reuse of prehistoric spaces in the Roman period, see García San Juan, Garrido, and Lozano (2007).

241. See, for example, Antonaccio (1994) and Alcock (2002), 132–175, esp. 146–152.

242. Grenier (1944) is the foundational study. But see recently Häussler (2010), esp. 203–211.

243. Nicander of Colophon F 117 Schneider = Tert., *De anim.* 57.

244. This definition owes much to the deliberately open-ended definition of tomb cult given by Alcock (2002), 146.

245. Cf. Strabo 3.3.6.

246. See Ferreira da Silva (1986), 291–294.

247. See Alarcão (2003); cf. Tranoy (1988). For further discussion of these *principes*, see Chapter 5.

248. Respectively *CIL* 2.2462 (cf. *HE* 17.253) and *AE* 1985, 573.

249. *HE* 8.611; cf. Almeida (1974), 28.

250. Ferreira da Silva (1986), 293.

251. *AE* 1983, 548. The reading of the third line of the inscription has provoked some

debate: see most recently Redentor (2009). Based on the best photograph available to me, I would still prefer the original reading: *Artifices/Calubrigens/es e(x) s Albinis/f(aciendum) c(uraverunt)*.

252. Brow (1990), 2.

253. See Ferreira da Silva (1999), 16, 31.

254. On the location of Meidunium—attested as the hometown of a local elite commemorated in a funerary inscription in the valley at nearby Xinzo de Limia (*CIL* 2.2520)—with the Castro de Rubías, near Bande, and the identification of this as the central place of the Quarquerni, see Rodríguez Colmenero (2002), 283; Rodríguez Colmenero (1977), 103.

255. Rodríguez Colmenero (1997), no. 591.

256. *CIL* 13.1571.

257. Buisson (1991), 65, misunderstands this inscription as referring simply to a tomb.

258. See Häussler (2010), 207–211; Roth Congès (2004).

259. By Roth Congès (2000); cf. Häussler (2010), 208.

260. See Lintz et al. (1996), 1–8; Grenier (1944), 224–228.

261. See, for example, Alcock (2002).

262. See Bradley (2002) and (2000); cf. Galliou (1984).

263. See LeCornec (1994).

264. As at the site of Tressé, infamously poorly excavated in the 1930s by Vera Collum: for an attempt at reinterpreting the evidence, see Bradley (2000).

265. Woolf (1996b: 376) is, I think, overly pessimistic concerning the potential contributions of kin group memories to collective traditions.

266. See, for example, Forsythe (2005), 74–77, 296, 340. For a discussion of some of the problems in reconstructing early republican history resulting from this family bias in Roman historiography, see Ridley (1983).

267. Cass. Dio 63.22.12 f.

268. On Philopappos and his monumentalized identity at Athens, see Kleiner (1983).

269. At Rome, however, foreigners' claims to royal ancestry were made to different ends, and conditioned by a very different cultural and social milieu.

270. See Suet. *Ner.* 40 and *Galb.* 9.

271. *BMC,* vol. 1, 49 (p. 301).

272. For the term, see Woolf (1998), 11; but for a problematization of its applicability to other contexts, see Chapter 4. On the character and objectives of the uprising of Vindex, cf. Drinkwater (1983), 40–43.

273. See Tac., *Hist.* 4.55 and 67 and Plut., *Amat.* 770d. Plutarch's story about Sabinus and his wife Epona gives the impression that Sabinus acquired the status of a kind of folk legend after his death. The veracity of Sabinus' genealogical claim

is beside the point, although it is not impossible given Caesar's reputation for sleeping his way through Gaul: cf. Suet., *Iul.* 51.

274. Tac., *Hist.* 4.67.

275. Roymans (2004), 55–65; cf. 235–249 on Hercules.

276. Though he does not specifically mention Sabinus, Woolf (1996b: 376) suggests an interesting comparison between these kinds of traditions and Melanesian "cargo cults," particularly those created around the figure of Captain Cook. If we adopt this reading of Sabinus's Caesarian genealogy, as I argue we should, then we might wonder about the extent to which Sabinus's revolt had a "Roman form" (cf. Woolf 1998: 242n8).

277. Tac., *Hist.* 3.35.

278. *CIL* 13.2805.

279. *CIL* 13.2728.

280. Drinkwater (1978: 821–822) also suggests this interpretation.

281. Caes. *BGall.* 7.39. This Eporedirix may have been the son of an elder Eporedirix, also of the Aedui, mentioned by Caesar at 7.67. If so, this would further strengthen our identification, since Eporedirix ("horse-riding king") would then seem to be a name passed down from one generation to the next.

282. See Caes., *BGall.* 7.76.

283. Caes., *BGall.* 7.88–7.90.

284. Eporedirix was not the only Gallic enemy of Caesar to be remembered genealogically in the early imperial period. The descendents of Lucterius of the Cadurci, the intrepid political ally of Vercingetorix and stubborn thorn in Caesar's side, bore—most unusually—his name as their *nomen gentile*. One of these heirs rose to significant prominence in the first century CE, holding the priesthood of Rome and Augustus at Lugdunum: see *CIL* 13.1541 and *AE* 1955, 212.

285. Tac., *Hist.* 4.55.

286. Tacitus' first reference to Classicus is at *Hist.* 2.14. On Classicus and the Batavian revolt, see generally Heinen (1985), 67–81; Urban (1985). Although he does not discuss the Treveri or Classicus explicitly, the ideas of Roymans (2004: 61–65 and 251–258) on the place of the memory of "kingship" or the *stirps regia* for the identity of the community of the Batavians are an instructive point of comparison.

287. Cf. Tacitus's comment on the citizenship of the Trevir Florus, who had instigated the uprising of 21 CE (*Ann.* 3.40).

288. For the revolt of Indutiomarus, which was continued after his death by his *finitimi* and *propinqui*, see Caes., *BGall.* 5.2–5.4, 6.2–6.8.

289. Outside the text of Tacitus, the *ala Treverorum* is attested epigraphically along the Rhine in the first century CE: see *AE* 1907, 77 and *AE* 1968, 321. On the relationship of the Gallic aristocracy of the first century to these auxiliary cohorts,

cf. Drinkwater (1978), 828–831; on the end of this system of "ethnic units," see Drinkwater (1983), 48.

290. *CIL* 13.1036.

291. See the discussions of Woolf (2000), 126–131, and Maurin (1978), 71–81.

292. *AE* 1959, 78.

293. *CIL* 13.1043.

294. See Allen (1980), 124–125.

295. The presence of Epotsorovidus on the monument of Rufus should cause us question the argument that, in the western provinces, "no local genealogies tied local elites to pre-Roman figures" (Price 2012: 28–29).

296. Cf. Woolf (2000), 130 and Woolf (2005b), 114, who also sees the idea of a local "dynasty" articulated here. But elsewhere Woolf (2005a: 233) suggests that the Julii of the Santones "represented themselves as the very image of The Roman Family," which is somewhat at odds with the dynastic reading.

297. On the involvement of the Santones in the uprising, see Caes., *BGall.* 7.75.

298. On the site, see Castro and Cunliffe (2002).

299. The *elogia* are *CIL* 2.1585–2.1596. On the "mausoleum" and the inscribed urns, see Fortes et al. (2010), esp. 149–158; my reconstruction of the genealogy of the Pompeii differs somewhat from theirs, especially in seeing Igalghis and Ildrons as the earliest members of the family.

300. Just., *Epit.* 43.5.11.

301. Just., *Epit.* praef. 4.

302. This is book thirty-eight, into which Justin inserts the speech in *oratio obliqua* that Trogus had placed into the mouth of Mithridates. That this single "quotation" results in this book being three times longer than an average book of the epitome suggests that Justin has made vast cuts to the original text through both summary and omission of entire episodes. Conservatively, then, Justin has reduced the original history by 66 percent; based on the internal evidence and on comparison with the average book lengths of Livy, who was one of Trogus's models, I suspect the true figure is closer to 90 or 95 percent for an average book.

303. Just., *Epit.* 43.1.

304. Cf. Woolf (2011b), 29–31.

305. Velleius Paterculus, writing under Tiberius, inserted a digression into his Roman history (2.15–2.16) in which he reached back across the generations to his great-great-great-grandfather, Minatius Magius of Aeculanum, who was enfranchised by the Romans for his remarkable loyalty in the Social War, and still further to Minatius's grandfather, Decius Magius, a distinguished leader of the Campanians at the time of the Hannibalic War.

306. *AE* 1972, 235; *AE* 1936, 6.

307. Arrius Badiolus recorded that his dedication to Endovellicus was "as a *relicticium*" (*ad relicticium*) in accordance with the command of the god (*IRCP* 488); the reading of *relicticium* is secure, and the word is nowhere else attested in the literary or epigraphic record. For the previous text, see *IRCP* 499, with d'Encarnação (2008).

308. Thierry (1840), 12–13.

309. Spurr (1993), 98.

4. Roman Pasts

1. At a place called Villette, just outside of Saint-Laurent-du-Pont, and still within the extensive territory belonging to the *Colonia Iulia Augusta Florentia Vienna*. For a brief discussion of the place and its archaeology, see *CAG* 38.1, p. 127. The nearest communities, situated in the hinterland between the two overland routes from Alpis Graia to Vienna and Lugdunum, were Labisco (Les Échelles) and Morginnum (Moirans); for these routes, see the relevant section of the *Tabula Peutingeriana* and Moore (1910), 223.

2. *CIL* 12.2201 (second half of the 2nd c. CE); *CIL* 12.2202 (late 1st or early 2nd c. CE). These discoveries were made between 1867 and 1878. On "Augustan gods," i.e., divinities with the epithet *Augustus*, see Fishwick (1987), vol. 2.1, 446–454.

3. The name Coius is also attested in eastern Narbonensis at Glanum and Genava (Geneve).

4. It is worth noting here that Vienna—unlike its neighbor and rival to the north, Lugdunum—was in origin a settlement of the Allobroges, and never received Roman colonists. It was promoted to the status of a Latin *colonia* first by Caesar, and was subsequently honored by Augustus and Tiberius; see Chapter 2.

5. *CIL* 6.565, found near the sanctuary of Quirinus on the *Mons Quirinalis*.

6. *AE* 1999, 1828; dated from the imperial titulature to 230–235 CE.

7. For the potential origins of Quirinus and his valences as a member of the so-called "Archaic Triad," see Dumézil (1970), 148–175 and 246–272.

8. See e.g., Varro, *Ling.* 5.8 and 5.10.

9. The prominence of this interpretation is clearly detectable in the 50s BCE: see Cic., *Rep.* 2.20. It may go back as early as the 3rd c. BCE and the battle of Sentinum: see Dumézil (1970), 247–252.

10. In 45 BCE. Cass. Dio 43.45.3; cf. Cic., *Att.* 12.45.2. On this letter and the ambiguity of Cicero's reference, see Shackleton Bailey (1966), 338. Generally, on the relationship between Caesar and Romulus-Quirinus, see Burkert (1962) and Weinstock (1971), 169–171 and 175–199.

11. *CIL* 10.809, ll. 10–12. This *elogium* of Romulus found in the forum at Pompeii was almost certainly copied from that in the Forum Augustum (*CIL* 6.40937), which survives only in much more fragmentary form. As we shall discuss below, cop-

ies of these *elogia* have also been found in the western provinces, suggesting that their propagandistic Augustan interpretation of the past was in fairly wide circulation.

12. Dumézil (1970), 247.

13. Plin., *HN* 15.120.

14. *urbs Quirini* is a favorite formulation of Ovid: cf. *Tr.* 1.3.33 and 1.8.37; *Pont.* 1.5.73.

15. See Ben Abdallah (1999); she was unaware of the two dedicatory altars from Narbonensis.

16. Ben Abdallah (1999), 467–468.

17. Tac., *Hist.* 4.58.

18. Woolf (1996), 361. The emphasis is mine.

19. For a fuller treatment of these events, which ultimately led to the formation of the Roman province of Narbonensis, see Rivet (1988), 39–53.

20. Livy, *Per.* 61.

21. The inclusion of the Aedui by Livy (5.34.5) among the Gauls who invaded Italy in the sixth century BCE is anachronistic; his first catalogue of peoples—Bituriges, Arverni, Santones (following the corrected reading of Sigonius from *Senones*), Aedui, Ambarri, Carnutes, Aulerci—is patently influenced by the participation of these very same northern peoples in the recent Gallic wars of Caesar. None of these peoples of late first-century *Gallia Comata* of which the historian places an ancestral branch in Cisalpine Gaul are mentioned as having settled there by any other source. For a detailed discussion of this digression, see Ogilvie (1965), 700–715.

22. On these events, see Caes., *BGall.* 1.31 and 6.12.

23. Cicero refers to his relationship of guest-friendship with Diviciacus, through the mouthpiece of his brother and interlocutor Quintus, at *Div.* 1.90. On this passage, see also, Chapter 5.

24. Cic., *Att.* 1.19.2.

25. Caes., *BGall.* 1.33.

26. See Cic., *Fam.* 7.10.4, where he says that conversation with Trebatius will be worth more than all the Gauls, be they enemies or kinsmen like the Aedui. On this letter and its relationship to Caesar's *commentarii*, see Nice (2003), who detects some influence of the fourth book of the *Bellum Gallicum* on Cicero's joke to Trebatius at 7.10.2 about swimming in the Ocean. For the publication of the *commentarii* at Rome, the discussion of Wiseman (1998) is fundamental.

27. Holleaux (1930), 179, in regard to the people of Lampsacus, who possessed blood-ties with Rome as inhabitants of the Troas.

28. See Jones (1999), *passim* and esp. 93; Erskine (2001); Gruen (2011a), 253–307.

29. See Battistoni (2010), 137–147; cf. Braund (1980), who also argues this point,

although to a somewhat different end. Independently of Braund, Elwyn too (1993: 278–279), following Rankin (1987), has suggested, "that the Aedui claimed descent from Trojans fleeing the devastation of the Trojan war." Jones (1999: 92) is rather more cautious, acknowledging the fact that "no source bases the [kinship] link on myth or history."

30. Diod. Sic. 5.25. For further discussion of this passage, see Braund (1980), 421n7.

31. Cf. e.g., Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.* 1.50; Hdn. 1.11.3. Furthermore, the Latin adjective *consanguineus* used by Caesar (see previous, n. 25) is also frequently deployed in reference to Trojan kinship: for example, between Rome and Segesta (Tac., *Ann.* 4.43), or between Rome and Ilium herself (Suet., *Claud.* 25.3).

32. Timagenes (FGrH 88) F 2 (= Amm. Marc. 15.9.5).

33. See Bateson (1972), 68; Sahlins (2004), 69.

34. This is the cause given in the *De Sententiis* of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus (= Appian, *Celtica* F 21), where the Aedui are supposed to have been persuaded to revolt against Caesar and the Romans by someone called Britores. This version of events is given nowhere else, and similarly this Britores is a personage not otherwise known.

35. Livy, *Per.* 139.

36. Tac., *Ann.* 11.25.

37. Tac., *Ann.* 4.43.

38. Tac., *Ann.* 4.55.

39. On the territory of the Aedui in the third century, see Buckley (1981).

40. These are nos. 5, 8, and 9 in the OCT edition of Mynors. For the context, see Nixon and Rodgers (1994).

41. *Pan. Lat.* 8.21.2.

42. See Nixon and Rodgers (1994), 255–263.

43. *Pan. Lat.* 5.3.2–5.3.3. Nixon and Rodgers (1994: 269n16) also note some of the inconsistencies between this account and that of Caesar.

44. The detail of the shield is only mentioned here, although the exhausted warrior leaning upon his shield is a common image in historiography: cf. e.g., Caes., *BGall.* 2.27, Livy 28.15.5, and Ps.-Quintilian, *Decl. Min.* 3.13.

45. Cf. Caes., *BGall.* 6.12.5.

46. *Pan. Lat.* 5.2.4. With *immanes et barbaras* our speaker has borrowed a favorite collocation of Cicero, which he uses frequently, and of the Gauls in particular at *Font.* 31 and 33

47. Woolf (1996b: 362–363) calls this speech "thoroughly Roman in tone," as other commentators like Galletier (1949: vol. 2, 80) and Nixon and Rodgers (1994: 269n20) have noted previously. Perhaps he is right, insofar as there is no mention of the pre-Roman past, and there is at least the pretense of an internalization of the imperializing ethnographic gaze with the speaker's characteri-

zation of the ancient Gauls as *immanes et barbaras*. But the false dichotomy of "Roman" or "non-Roman" is not a productive lens through which to analyze this speech, especially given its historical and social context. As I argue here, it should rather be read as the product of a local discourse of identity structured by relations with imperial power.

48. *Pan. Lat.* 5.3.1. On this passage, Jones (1999: 124) has suggested that, "by dismissing mythic kinships, the speaker wishes to represent the embassy to the republican senate as something more concrete, a matter of elective affinity rather than a vague and mischievous appeal to forgotten obligations." For my part, I read the contrast not as one between the mythical and the concrete, for I think that the Trojan myth of the Aedui is still a latent meaning here. Rather, I see the contrast as one between the fictive self-ascription of upstart, recently constituted populations of Mamertines and Ilians—both of whom could, in reality, trace their histories as communities no further back in time than the beginning of the third century BCE—and the recognition and authorization of the claims of the genuinely ancient Aedui by Roman power.

49. Against Caesar in 52 BCE, under Julius Sacrovir in 21 CE, and under Vindex in 68 CE.

50. *Pan. Lat.* 5.3.3–5.3.4.

51. Strabo 4.2.3.

52. Plut., *Caes.* 26.8.

53. There is little scholarship on the Trojan kinship of the Arverni. It is, surprisingly, entirely absent from recent work on the spread of myths of Trojan origins like Olshausen and Sonnabend (2006), and only mentioned very briefly by Roymans (2009: 221; 235) and Barlow (1995: 87–88).

54. Luc. 1.427–8.

55. See originally Bateson (1972), 68.

56. This would seem to be the implication of Tac., *Hist.* 4.17.

57. *CIL* 13.1462. This Sex. Orgius Suavis of the Aedui is also known from two other dedications set up to Mercury and Hercules at Cabillonum (Chalon-sur-Saone), which can be reasonably dated based on letter forms to the first century CE: see *CIL* 13.2608–9.

58. Cf. Fentress and Wickham (1992), 88.

59. Roymans (2009), 235.

60. As emphasized by Greg., *Hist. Franc.* 2.11.

61. Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 7.139–7.152. On the battle of Gergovia, see Caes., *BGall.* 7.34–7.53.

62. Verg., *Aen.* 5.114–5.286.

63. Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 2.2.19.

64. Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 2.14.1.

65. In 475 CE.

66. Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 7.7.2.

67. Sidonius was a great admirer of Lucan: elsewhere in his letters he makes reference to Lucan (2.10.6) or quotes his poetry (1.11.7 quoting Luc. 5.322). In his poem addressed to Magnus Felix (*Carm.* 9), he includes an extended meditation on Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (ll. 230–58).

68. For example, in the first book (1.32) he dwells on the destruction of the temple of *Vasso Galate*, almost certainly the temple to *Mercurius Arvernus* on the Puy de Dôme, by the Alamannic king Chrocus in the mid-third century CE. Various chapters of the same book are devoted to the ecclesiastical history of the Arverni in the fourth century: see 1.33; 1.44–1.47.

69. Greg., *Hist. Franc.* 4.30.

70. Barlow (1995: 88) also very briefly mentions this passage as a reminiscence of the Trojan myth of the Arverni.

71. For a summary of bibliography on the presence of later Italian conflicts in Virgil's *Aeneid*, see Goldschmidt (2013), 131n96.

72. For the idea of "reproducing difference" in colonial encounters, see Jiménez (2010b).

73. See Chapter 3.

74. See Villaronga (1967).

75. Livy 21.7.

76. Sil., *Pun.* 1.291–1.293. On Saguntum in Silius, see Vessey (1974), 30; Pérez Vilatela (1990); Schettino (2006).

77. Livy 28.39.

78. See Battistoni (2010), 117–127.

79. Aranegui Gascó (2006: 65–66), for example, emphasizes the agency of Rome and "cultural colonisation" in the redevelopment of city in the early second century BCE, and suggests the presence of large numbers of Italians at Saguntum to account for cultural changes.

80. Such a discussion might plausibly have fallen either in books two and three, which dealt with Italian peoples and places, or in book four, in which Cato narrated the war against Hannibal. On the form and character of the *Origines*, see, most recently, the introduction by Cornell in *FRHist* I.195-218.

81. See Dulière (1979), 246, who situates this instance of the wolf in the larger context of the prominence of the motif as "décor d'armes." Dardenay (2010: 162 and n. 59) presses this connection further, and suggests that the monument may have been "dédié à un personnage ayant réalisé son cursus sous les *signa* de la légion" and that "ces répétitions du motif du bouclier pourraient autoriser à y voir les vestiges d'un monument éventuellement érigé en l'honneur d'un vétéran." If this individual had served with the Romans, it would have been in an auxiliary detachment of cavalry, not the legions; a

good contemporary paradigm is C. Julius Macer, son of Agedilius, of the Santones, who had served as a cavalryman in the Gallic *ala Atectorigiana* under Augustus (see *CIL* 13.1041).

82. Zanker (1988: 297–333), whose survey of Augustan imagery in the western provinces has been very influential on modern scholarship, focuses primarily on public contexts and on the imperial cult. Moreover, his reading is at times reductive in its insistence on the "natural spread" and "spontaneous takeover" of the Augustan cultural program in the west (316).

83. The contemporary "tombeau dorique" from Aesernia (Isernia) on the Via Appia in Campania is the classic artistic comparandum to this tomb in modern scholarship.

84. See Drinkwater (1978) for a discussion of this dynamic among the early Gallic Julii.

85. See especially Trillmich (1996a) and Trillmich (1996b); Edmondson (2006), 260–263. For more recent discussion and bibliography, see Dardenay (2010), 139–140; Jiménez (2010b). For the exceptional quantity of evidence for images of Roman foundation myths from Spain, see generally Dardenay (2011).

86. Dardenay (2010), 139.

87. See e.g., the reconstruction of W. Trillmich, U. Städtler, and T. Nogales Basarrate given by Edmondson (2006: 266).

88. *AE* 1996, 864.

89. *CIL* 10.8348. For further discussion of this inscription and its relationship to that from the Forum of Augustus, see Geiger (2008), 194.

90. For discussion and bibliography, see Dardenay (2010), 92–94 and n. 88. Trillmich (1996b: 185–186) would prefer to interpret the figure as Aeneas. Another copy of this so-called *Romulus tropaeophorus* is known from the colony of Italica, only a short distance southwest of Corduba.

91. For the composition of the *conventus* of Corduba, see Plin., *HN* 3.10.

92. *CIL* 2.2126.

93. Verg. *Aen.* 8.42–8.49. On this passage and the variant traditions, see Fordyce (1977), 208–210.

94. Varro (*Rust.* 2.4.18) mentions that bronze statues of the sow and her piglets were set up in public spaces in his own day, and that the actual body of the sow, preserved in some sort of brine, was occasionally brought out by the state priests. For a discussion of a mid-1st c. BCE relief from Rome of the sow and piglets, see Dardenay (2010), 63–64.

95. This hypothesis, a form of which was originally put forward by Hirschfeld (1870: 1093–1094), has, to the best of my knowledge, not been reiterated since.

96. This is in sharp contrast to Zanker (1988: 332), whose treatment of the iconography of the western provinces places emphasis on the resultant uniformity

of communities and the "unavoidable" simplification that "strengthened the effectiveness of the few visual formulas in which the myth of empire was expressed."

97. *CIL* 2.2156. It is not indisputable (cf. Dulière 1979: 261–262), but I think that *Lupae Romanae* should probably be read as genitive ("a statue of the Roman wolf") rather than dative ("to the Roman wolf"); cf. Edmondson (2006), 275.

98. *CIL* 2.5063.

99. This is generally the interpretation of Dardenay (2010); see esp. 137–152.

100. *CIL* 2.2006.

101. The wolf is easily identified as male by its prominent *membrum virile*. On this coinage, see Trillmich (2003), 628–629.

102. *CIL* 2.4603 (= *IRC* 1.132).

103. Lactantius, *Instit. Div.* 1.20; Arnobius, *Adv. Nationes* 4.3. See Dulière (1979: 254–274), who has surveyed the evidence for the *lupa* as an object of cult at Rome and in the provinces, and found nothing secure save this dedication. In her analysis, she groups this inscription together with the previously discussed statue base from Singili (*CIL* 2.2156); but see the note above (n. 96) on that object.

104. In a somewhat similar vein, Dulière (1979: 261–262) wonders whether this dedication evidences a kind of wish to be "plus catholique que le pape."

105. On cargo cult, see Kilani (1983).

106. Philostr., *V A* 5.8. On the problems of "Damis" as a source, see Bowie (1978).

107. Philostr., *V A* 5.9.

108. *CIL* 2.801; *ILS* 4512a; *AE* 1955, 235; *AE* 1985, 539.

109. Aur. Vict., *Caes.* 39.20.

110. For an introduction to the coinage of Carausius and its historical and numismatic context, see *RIC* 5.2, pp. 426–460.

111. *RIC* 5.2, p. 508 no. 534.

112. Verg. *Ecl.* 4.6. See Bédoyère (1998).

113. *RIC* 5.2, pp. 439–440 and p. 510 nos. 554–558.

114. Verg. *Aen.* 8.36–8.39. The vocative *expectate* has also been connected to another Virgilian passage, the appearance of Hector's ghost (*Aen.* 2.282–2.283); for the potential problems of the context of this passage and its bearing upon the coinage of Carausius, see de la Bédoyère (1998), 84. See also Barlow (1995: 88–89), who wishes to see an intentional parallel in the Virgilian allusion of this coinage between the Tiber and the Rhine, and thus a transplantation of the Trojan foundation myth from Latium to a northern Gallic context, that is, an arrival of Aeneas at the Rhine. I suspect that this presses the allusion too far.

115. Hedlund (2008: 171–173) has argued that the power of the usurpers Carausius and Allectus was based in large part on the local elites of provincial communities, and that "that the formation of important Romano-British communi-

ties was intricately connected to the usurpations of Carausius and Allectus, and moreover is of vital importance for the shaping of the coinages struck for them."

116. See Caetano and Murão (2011).

117. For example, in a well-preserved mosaic of the wolf and twins from a villa near Corduba: see Dardenay (2010), 30 XXII.

118. See Chapter 3.

119. For a brief recent treatment of the evidence for the identity and life of Orosius, see Rohrbacher (2002), 135–137.

120. Oros. 1.18.

121. Oros. 5.1.6–5.1.13.

122. This festival was associated with the twins from the very beginnings of Roman historiography: see Fabius Pictor, *HRR2* F 5b (= Dion. Hal.*, Ant. Rom.* 1.80); cf. Livy 1.5.

123. For descriptions and aetiologies of the festival, see Plut., *Rom.* 21.3–21.8 and Ov., *Fast.* 2.267–2.474. As is especially evident from Ovid (*Fast.* 2.425–2.452), the beating of the women was considered to promote fertility, and to help effect the transition from *nupta* to *mater*.

124. North (2008), 154–155. His is the most salutary recent scholarly treatment of the historical celebration of the Lupercalia, and is particularly interested in Caesar's self-conscious association of himself with the festival in 44 BCE.

125. *HE* 9.237. Zucca (1998), 200.

126. The reading of the stone is either *lupercus* [*in i*]*nsulis Baliaribus* or *lupercus* [*ex i*]*nsulis Baliaribus*, the crux being the preposition upon which the ablative depends.

127. Arguments concerning the spread of the Lupercalia have been made for a century and a half on both sides, and the question has vexed attempts at even defining the festival. Compare, for example, the contrary positions of two nineteenth-century dictionary writers, Smith and Ruggiero. Smith (1875: 718, s.v. Lupercalia), based on an interpretation of the epigraphic evidence, states that "Lupercalia were also celebrated in other towns of Italy and Gaul, for Luperci are mentioned in inscriptions of Velitrae, Praeneste, Nemausus, and other places." Ruggiero (1895: vol. 4, s.v. Luperci), on the other hand, in his reading of these same inscriptions excludes the possibility that inscriptions mentioning *Luperci* from outside of Rome refer to local celebrations. There has been no full treatment of the issue of the Lupercalia in the provinces, but modern scholarly opinion seems to have followed the view of Ruggiero. Cf. e.g., Woolf (2009a), 249: "[Other festivals] depended on certain locations, locations in the City of Rome that is. There could be no provincial *Lupercalia* for there was only one *Lupercal*."

128. *CIL* 8.8340.

129. For priests of local *sacra publica* from the province of Baetica, for example, cf. *CIL* 2.2105 (Urgavo), *CIL* 2.5120 (Carmo), *HE* 11.250 (Igabrum).

130. It is worth drawing attention here to the diversity of the uses and meanings of "Rome" even within the Balearic islands: elsewhere we have seen the potential for constructions of local identity in which there was a marked alienation of "the Roman": see Chapter 2.

131. Caesarea: *CIL* 8.9405–9406; *AE* 1924, 41. Nemausus: *CIL* 12.3183–12.3184.

132. North and McLynn (2008), 177–178; the original argument for the Lupercalia as an initiation rite for young *equites* in the early imperial period was made by Veyne (1960), whose interpretation was primarily based upon the visual evidence.

133. For example, from the Villa Font de Mussa near Benifaio, now housed in the Museo de la Prehistoria in Valencia: see Dardenay (2010), 27 XVI.

134. On this mosaic, see Dunbabin (1999), 110 and n. 28.

135. The mosaic is now housed in the Museu Nacional de Arqueologia de Lisboa. For images, see Neira Jiménez (1998), 909–910.

136. *IRCP* 480. Cf. *HE* 7.1182, *HE* 8.600, *AE* 1998, 696, and Dunbabin (1989), 45.

137. Neira Jiménez (1998), esp. 916–919.

138. *CIL* 2.760. For the bridge in the broader context of second-century monumentality, see Thomas (2007), 202–203. See also Chapter 2.

139. *CIL* 2.761 (= *CLE* 878).

140. Wissowa (1917: 102n1) already summed up the divide in scholarly opinion, which has lasted to the present day, as to how the *divi Romulei* ought to be understood. In recent years, with the notable exception of Petit (1976: 105), scholars have tended to read *divi Romulei* as referring to generic "Roman gods." Against this view, it must be noted that the collocation of *divi* and the living Augustus in the worship of the imperial cult in Spain from the Flavian period on is so widespread—on this see Fishwick (1970)—as to make it almost certain, based on the context of the dedication of this temple, that the *divi* here referred to are in fact the deified emperors, and not some other unnamed gods. The parallel between the first and the seventh lines of the poem sets up a correspondence between *superi et Caesar* and *divi Romulei cum Caesare*, which is not at all problematic for the interpretation of the *divi* as deified emperors, since the emperors were technically reckoned among the *di superi*: cf. e.g., Ov., *Tr.* 4.4.19 and *Pont.* 1.2.119 and 4.9.127 (admittedly *ante mortem* and perhaps somewhat disingenuous), and *Pont.* 4.9.49 (where *Caesares superi* seems to refer to the deified Julius and to living members of the imperial house).

141. Fishwick (1987) is, I think, representative of this traditional view.

142. On its fall, see Livy 21.1–21.16; Polyb. 3.6–3.21; App., *Hisp.* 10–12. The restoration is recounted by Livy 28.39.4–28.39.5.

143. *CIL* 2.3836. The inscription has been variously dated based on letterforms from the late Augustan period to the early second century CE; moreover, some scholars wish to see this—erroneously, I would argue—as a renewal of an original inscription more or less contemporaneous with Scipio himself: see MacMullen (2000), 75 and 82n. Cf. Corell (2002), 106–109, who also believes that this inscription could not be a copy of a late third- or early second-century BCE exemplar; he rightfully notes that there is no evidence for epigraphy at Saguntum from that period.

144. See Livy 28.39.9–28.39.10.

145. *CIL* 1.2927.

146. Livy, *Per.*41.2. This must have been narrated in the opening of book 41, which has been lost. The first mention of Gracchus in the extant portion of this book is at 41.6 where he is received by the senate in the temple of Bellona upon his return to Rome and celebrates his triumph.

147. Wiegels (1982), esp. 220, where he calls this practice *Geschichtsklitterung*, "the smudging of history." Greek historiography of the second and first centuries BCE was prone to exaggeration concerning Gracchus; Poseidonius had mocked Polybius for his ingratiating claims as to the extent of Gracchus's conquests (Strabo 3.4.13). This tradition—perhaps also followed by historians writing in Latin, like Livy—may have given encouragement to the Iliturgitani to take liberties with the past.

148. Livy 28.19; 34.10.

149. App., *Hisp.*. 43.

150. *CIL* 2.1119; for the idea of this text as a second-century invention, see Peña Jurado (2007), 339–340, whose reconstruction and interpretation of the text I follow here.

151. For these *tituli*, see *ILS* 21. Our historical sources for Mummius's dedications in Italy are Strabo 8.6.23; Cic., *Off.* 2.76; Ps.-Frontinus, *Strat.* 4.3.15; Ps.-Aurelius Victor, *De vir. ill.* 60.3.

152. A point also made by Wiegels (1982), 220–221.

153. *AE* 1951, 81. On this text and its context, see Quoniam (1950).

154. Ferchiou (1986: 666), Gascou (1972: 24n6), and Watkins (1983: 321), among others, have argued that the promotion of Thuburnica to an honorary *colonia* should be dated to the Augustan period; it is the consensus that there was no formal Marian *colonia*. At Plin., *HN* 5.29, Thuburnica is listed not among the *coloniae*, but rather the fifteen *oppida civium Romanorum*, which has led some scholars to wonder whether it instead did not receive colonial status until after the time of Pliny's composition. But as Shaw (1981: 453–455) has convincingly argued, the

administrative document from which Pliny drew the information for his African geography (*HN* 5.29-30) should be dated between 46 and 44 BCE, and thus does not at all preclude Thuburnica from being an Augustan *colonia*.

155. *CIL* 14.4338. Cf. Livy 1.33.

156. *CIL* 13.5280. For the archaeology of the place, see *CAG* 25, pp. 185–186.

157. *CIL* 13.5281. See also *CAG* 25, p. 208.

158. Cf. Walter (1978), 57, the only suggestion that I have found in scholarship of the statue base and inscription at Vesontio being related to the program of the Forum of Augustus.

159. Cf. *CIL* 8.12538 from Carthage, a fragmentary monumental inscription which also commemorates a Roman of the republican period; his identity is unknown, but the extant text, celebrating public offices and achievements in war, makes it clear that this is some kind of elogium.

160. On the rather vexed question of Pompeius's inclusion among the *summi viri* of the Forum Augustum, see Geiger (2008), 157–158.

161. On the first two episodes, see Chapter 2; for the *res turbatae* in the early 170s, see *Hist. Aug.*, Marc. 22.10.

162. Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.2; a sentiment echoed by Zanker (1988: 307): "Apart from the nobility in Rome, no one mourned the passing of the Republic."

5. Performances of Identity

1. *CIL* 13.631. That the two brothers bear different *nomina gentilia* is somewhat unusual. On foreigners at Burdigala, see Chapter 2.

2. For the dating of this monument to the Severan period, and the limited bibliography, see *ILA* 7.146.

3. Compare, for example, representations of the Gallic god Sucellus, who is usually shown wearing the *sagum*: see Boucher (1988). On the *sagum*, see Strabo 4.4.3.

4. The classic, evocative illustration is the torque-wearing "Dying Gaul," which can be read alongside the general ethnographic descriptions of Diodorus (5.27.3) and Strabo (4.4.5), and the vivid imagery of Verg., *Aen.* 8.660–1 ("'milky-white necks embraced by gold'"). For torques attracting the "ethnographic gaze" of poets and historians, cf. Polyb. 2.29.8, Tac., *Ann.* 12.36 (the Britons), Prop. 4.10.39–4.10.44 (M. Claudius Marcellus and Viridomarus), and, most famously, the objectification of the nude Gallic opponent of Manlius Torquatus by Claudius Quadrigarius (*FRHist* 24 F6 = Gell., *NA* 9.13.7-19). On the "ethnographic gaze" in general, see Madden (2010), 96–113, who defines it as the "specific way ethnographers have trained their observations on others" (96).

5. Quint., *Inst.* 6.3.79. On this episode, cf. Lamoine (2009), 145.

6. For this ethnographic portrait of the hair and beards of the Gauls, see Diod. Sic. 5.28.1–3. On the stereotypical, clichéd "image" of Gauls at Rome, see Dalby (2000), 83–85. The Gauls' long hair was a defining part of this image (hence *Gallia Comata*); on Romans' impressions of long hair and beards, which were associated with their own hoary past and were thought to liken one to an animal, see e.g., Cic., *Cael.* 33 and *Sest.* 19; Juv. 5.30; Sen., *QNat.* 1.17.7.

7. See Bartman (2011), 230–232 and 38n.

8. For the "ethnic" interpretation of these portraits, see Bartman (2011), 232. On the *civitas* to which this villa was attached in antiquity, see Jullian (1918); it is situated very near the border of Narbonensis and Aquitania, and may possibly have been instead attached to Calagorris (Saint-Martory) and the *civitas* of the Convenae. The statues are now housed in the Musée Saint-Raymond in Toulouse (nos. 30127 and 30162). On the remarkable site, the interpretation of which—especially the question of local versus imperial ownership—has long been debated, see *CAG* 31.1, 212–265; cf. Gros (1991), 165–166.

9. See Franz and Greenland (2003), 643–644. For an interesting approach to the complexities of Baetican sculpture in the early Roman period and the limits of "hybridity" as an interpretive model, see Jiménez (2011).

10. The concept of the "performativity" of identities was pioneered by Judith Butler, primarily in relation to gender and sexual identities. Since her early work, the idea has been subject to interpretation, expansion, and redefinition by herself and others; see Butler (1999), xiv–xv.

11. Cf. Bartman (2011), 244–245 on ethnic portraits as cultural hybrids.

12. For similar arguments about the Greek east, see Van Nijf (2010), 178–179; see also Davies (2000).

13. *CIL* 13.4207; *CIL* 13.4159. Cf. Stüber (2007), 88–90.

14. *CIL* 2.4204. On such calques, cf. Delamarre (2001), 347.

15. *CIL* 12.5127; *CIL* 13.3909.

16. I am much indebted here to the ideas of Hölkeskamp (2011) on the consuls as actors in the Roman "republic of processions," esp. 164–167, who is, in turn, very much influenced by the work of Muir (1981) on Renaissance Venice.

17. Interpreting these continuities as "imagined," that is, as the products of social memory and discourses of "authenticity" and "tradition," allows us to escape, for the most part, the question of pre-Roman "realities" that consumes so much of Continental scholarship on Gaul and especially Spain, whose reconstructions of "indigenous" cultures tend to be methodologically unsound in a number of respects, not least of which is the highly problematic practice of extrapolating the idealized "pre-Roman" realities from the contextualized, negotiated "Roman" constructs.

18. The evidence of Caesar will suffice as a representative sampling. For Gallic *principes*, see *BGall.* 1.16.5; 1.30.1; 1.31.1; 2.5.1; 2.14.3; 4.6.5; 4.11.3; 5.3.5; 5.4.3; 5.6.4; 5.41.1; 5.54.1; 6.11.3; 6.12.4; 7.1.4; 7.4.2; 7.28.6; 7.31.1; 7.32.2; 7.36.3; 7.38.2; 7.38.10; 7.64.8; 7.65.2; 7.88.4. For *principes* in *Hispania*, see *BCiv.* 1.74.5; 2.19.1; 2.20.2. For a selective prosopography, cf. Lamoine (2009), 74–81. See Rodríguez Neila (1998) for a useful approach to the question of the indigenous aristocracies in Spain and their initiative in adapting to the Roman administrative framework, although it is at times problematic in its rather uncritical and overly positivistic reliance on Greek and Roman literary sources.

19. For approaches to this question, see, for late republican Italy, Cébeillac-Gervasoni (1983), and for Africa, Kotula (1965). See also the problematization the definition and role of "elites" in cultural change of Alcock (2001).

20. See Rodríguez Neila (1998), esp. 117–118 on local *principes*. See also the survey of the sense of the term *princeps* in the wider empire by Lamoine (2009), 68–74.

21. Caes., *BCiv.* 3.59.1–3.59.2.

22. Since Harmand (1970: 128), French scholars have misread this passage, understanding the *senatus* into which Roucillus and Aecus were enrolled to be the Roman senate, rather than the local body of the Allobroges: cf. Burnand (1982); Chastagnol (1992), 20; and, most recently, Lamoine (2009), 96. But Syme, in one of his final articles (1986: 4), rightly dismissed this reading, which cannot be supported by either the syntax of the Latin (*domi* must apply to both the *magistratus* and the *senatum*) or by the historical context.

23. Cf. the *magnus comitatus* of these Allobroges at *BCiv.* 3.61. Elsewhere, Caesar exhibits an interest in local Gallic social structures and forms of aristocratic authority that engender these patron-client relationships, such as the *ambacti* (*BGall.* 6.15.2), a class similar, in Roman eyes, to *servi*, and the *soldurii* (*BG* 3.22.2), who swore to share the fate of their leaders even unto death; cf. also his discussion of *patroni* and *clientes* at 7.40.7. On these terms within the late republican vocabulary of ethnography, see Bell (1993), 754–755.

24. In Weberian terms, one might see this as a shift from "traditional authority" to "rational-legal authority."

25. By "municipalization" I mean not only the process whereby communities received a *formal* recognition of legal rights and status, but rather more generally to an earlier "virtual municipalization," in which communities through their own initiative began to adopt Roman-style administrative and juridical structures. Cf. Rodríguez Neila (1998), 133.

26. *CIL* 13.1645.

27. On this inscription, see Lamoine (2009), 84–85 and Dondin-Payre (1999), 186–187, the latter of whom proposes an early date based on "l'intitulé très laconique."

28. On the visual "poetics" of power in a modern French context, cf. Hunt (1984), 19.

29. For the sake of example, however, one imagines that in this transitional-stage political economy, public feasting (and drinking) would have played a significant role in shoring up positions of informal power like the *princeps*; cf. the seminal article of Dietler (1990).

30. I have adapted the idea of "public ritual drama" from Dietler (2001), 81, who uses it in the context of public feasting, although it is good to think with concerning elaborate public funerals as well.

31. Cf. also Hölkeskamp (2011), 164 on the Roman *pompa funebris* as a staging and constitution of community identity and civic ideology. On the funeral as performance, see the end of this chapter.

32. *ERA* 14. Most editors have preferred to emend the text to the nominative *princeps* to agree with Nicer, rather than the genitive *principis* in agreement with his father Clutosus.

33. On the *populi* of the Albiones and the Copori, cf. Plin., *HN* 4.111.

34. *CIL* 2.2585 (= *IRPL* 34).

35. If the restoration of *princeps ex Hisp. Cit.* is indeed correct, it represents a rather ambiguous form of local power. Alarcão (2003: 119–120) has suggested, plausibly although without solid grounds, that this particular *principatus* would not have been a formal chief authority over any one *populus*, but rather a kind of honorific recognition of more informal social status and political influence.

36. See Chapter 3.

37. See Alarcão (2003), who has convincingly argued for the identification of the warrior statues with the type of local elites who represent themselves as *principes* in the epigraphic record; cf. Tranoy (1988).

38. For burial as ritual "scene-making," and the relation between burial, "texts," and time, cf. the work of Halsall (1998) and (2003) on early Merovingian contexts, which provide a fruitful comparandum.

39. *AE* 1997, 875. See the original publication and discussion of Mangas and Martino (1997). Editors have been unable to satisfactorily resolve the words *Deobrigi f*(). The *-brig-* suffix suggests a toponym or a toponymical adjective, although a place called Deobriga is otherwise unattested.

40. The reference is to Hor., *Carm.* 4.14.41. See the discussion of the Cantabri in Chapter 1. For the administrative peculiarities of the region in the wake of the Roman conquest and the political settlements of 29–15 BCE, particularly in relation to the important document of the Bierzo bronze, see Sánchez-Palencia and Mangas (2000).

41. Cf. Mangas and Martino (1997), 333–339.

42. Mangas and Martino (1997: 331–333) have shown good reasons why Doviderus

should not be understood to be *princeps* of *all* of the Cantabri, although they do not delve into the possible reasons why he might have represented himself as such.

43. For this intriguing suggestion concerning the identity of Amparamus on this document from Herrera de Pisuerga, see Illarregui (2010), 25–27. See also Chapter 2.

44. See *AE* 1988, 763, dated to the early third century, in which the office of *ex*(?) *pr*(?) *eorum conviventium* held by a *cives Vadiniensis* has been interpreted as *ex principe* or *exactor principis*; cf. Mangas and Martino (1997), 338.

45. *AE* 1986, 369.

46. Cf. Rodríguez Neila (1998), 132–133; Fear (1996), 246–247.

47. *AE* 1993, 1002; *CIL* 2.5048. On these coins, see *CNH* p. 347, 44 and p. 393, 12.

48. *CIL* 2.3695; cf. Rodríguez Neila (1998), 118; 120; 131.

49. See e.g., Livy 33.46.3 (the election of Hannibal as *praetor* at Carthage, i.e., one of the two *sufetes*).

50. *Sufetes* are known, for example, at Themetra (Sawani al Adhari) and Vina (El Mden) under Hadrian, and at Thibicaae (Bir Magra) under Antoninus Pius; see *AE* 1946, 234; *AE* 1992, 1803; *CIL* 8.765.

51. Caes., *BGall.* 1.16. Cf. 7.32.3, where Caesar speaks further about the breakdown of the system of the *singuli magistratus* among the Aedui, which must be referring to the *vergobretus*.

52. Lund (1996) is the most thoroughgoing critique of Caesar's value as an ethnographer.

53. See Delamarre (2001), 264–265.

54. See *RIG* 4, 226, a coin of the second half of the first century BCE, from the *civitas* of the Lexovii in Aremorica, where one Cisiambos appears as *vercobreto(s)*.

55. For example, Drinkwater (1983: 108) and Woolf (1998: 228) only allude to the *vergobretus* in passing. Even in his work on local careers in the early empire, Drinkwater (1979: 92) gives it but a brief mention, as simply "the Celtic term for *duumvir.*"

56. See, most recently, the cursory survey of Lamoine (2009), 106–116, esp. 106 for these sentiments.

57. For example, *CIL* 13.1038, from the amphitheater at Mediolanum Santonum (Saintes). The second line was originally read by Hirschfeld in the *CIL* as [*Pe*] *tr*[*uc*]*ori*, but this reading was soon (and rightly) called into question. A century later, with the text still uncertain, Maurin and Thauré (1980: 198–199) saw [*v*] *er*[*g*]*obr*[*etus*]. But this is too much of a stretch; the easiest and far most likely reading is as a dedication to the emperor, for which there are thousands of comparanda. Thus: [. . .*i*]*m*[*p*]*er*[*at*]*ori*[. . .]. Cf. also *CIL* 13.1579, where *Dubnoco VE*[. . . has been supplemented by some (see *ILA* 3.26) as *ve*[*rgobreto*. As its find-

spot is within the territory of the Vellavi, it is more likely to be *Ve[llavo]*, or else a patronymic.

58. See, for example, the positivistic approaches of Le Roux (1959) and Lamoine (2006).

59. *AE* 1989, 521. On this inscription, see Bost and Perrier (1990).

60. On the water supply at Augustoritum, cf. Loustaud (1997).

61. For example, at *Aquae Granni*, modern Aachen. On this festival, see Chapter 1.

62. Lamoine (2009: 115), in his analysis of the *vergobretus*, sorts the instances of the magistracy into two similarly overly simplistic and seemingly arbitrary categories: "contexte romain," into which he places this instance, and "contexte de transition."

63. *CIL* 13.1048. cf. Aymard (1948) and Veyne (1966).

64. On this inscription and the career of Marinus in the broader context of the *civitas* of the Santones, cf. Maurin (1978), 147–154.

65. On these associations of Roman citizens in Gaul, see Van Andringa (1998).

66. Lejeune (1968–1970), 139; cf. Maurin (1978), 153.

67. See Chapter 3. Marinus's representation of his genealogy, intentionally including the Gaulish *cognomen* of his father, is very similar to Rufus's.

68. *AE* 1980, 633. On this inscription and its archaeological and cultic context, see the interpretation of Allain et al. (1981).

69. This emphasis on local choice disagrees somewhat with Woolf (1997), 344, which underlies much of Woolf (1998): "If we are to contrast iron age cultural patterning in Gaul with the Roman one that succeeded it, what appears is not the replacement of diversity with uniformity so much as the replacement of a diversity generated by local choice with diversity ordered by imperial power."

70. *CIL* 13.4228.

71. See Delamarre (2001), 113. This term was significant enough through late antiquity to be included in the Merovingian "glossary" of Gaulish words (*De nominibus Gallicis* 10); cf. Dottin (1920), 212 no. 5. See also the brief discussion of this magistracy by Dondin-Payre (1999), 181–184.

72. *arganto-* being cognate with Latin *argentum*. On this magistracy and the coinage associated with it, see Lejeune (1985).

73. *CIL* 13.6776.

74. It is tempting to connect the emergence of the Gallic "league" (*leuga*) as the predominant unit of measurement of distance on milestones in Gaul in the course of the second century—and later officially adopted by Severus in the early third century as the standard for the Three Gauls—with the activities of these kinds of local magistrates. On the *leuga* and its potential cultural connotations, cf. with some circumspection MacMullen (1965), 103.

75. For *magister pagi* at Divodurm, see *CIL* 13.4316; for *magister vici,* see *CIL* 13.4310.

76. For the abundant archaeological material excavated from the workshops, see Hermet (1934).

77. These are respectively Marichal (1988) nos. 2, 4, and 19.

78. On these graffiti, bilingualism at La Graufesenque, and the *cassidannos*, see Adams (2003), 694–697; Marichal (1988), 98. The objections of Dondin-Payre (1999: 182n105) to this interpretation seem to me unconvincing.

79. The element **-cass-* appears frequently in Gaulish onomastics, and has always resisted conclusive definition; see Delamarre (2001), 93–94.

80. At Pompeii, for example, where at times the names of the *duoviri* were used instead of consular dating in the *acta coloniae*: see e.g., *CIL* 4.3340 nos. 138, 141, 145; or in Baetica at Italica, where eponymous *duoviri* are also attested: *CIL* 2.1120.

81. Cf. Delamarre (2001), 156.

82. e.g., Moreau (1958).

83. Bibliography abounds. See, most recently, Lamoine (2009), 356–371, whose rather uncritical inclusion of the *gutuater* "parmi les druides" renders much of his discussion problematic.

84. The relevant passages of Caesar and Hirtius are *BGall.* 7.3.1, where the name is *Cotuato*, and *BGall.* 8.38.2–8.38.5, where there is some manuscript confusion between *Gutuatrum* and *Gutruatum*. See the recent, fierce, and ideologically loaded debate between Le Bohec (2001 and 2005), who wishes to see this personal name as instead the common noun *gutuater*, which would then lend a "druidic" inspiration to the revolt, and Goudineau (1990: 158; and 2003), whose polemical response, and broader critique of certain ideological tendencies of French scholarship concerning the druids, is a salutary moderation. Lamoine (2009: 358) somewhat disingenuously misrepresents the current state of the question when he claims that the identity of the leader of the revolt and the *gutuater* "n'est plus à démontrer." In fact, as Goudineau (2003) has demonstrated, the theory is well over a century old, and was in origin the product of the agenda of a very particular right-wing political milieu.

85. *CIL* 13.1577 (= *ILA* 3.25). For the restoration of the position of *adlector ferrariarum*, cf. CIL 13.1576.

86. Of course, if the *gutuater* is to be seen as the classic "druid," then the business of overseeing the collection of taxes from local mining operations would seem to have been an incongruously mundane occupation for someone who normally concerned himself with pondering the mysteries of the universe in seclusion. Perhaps this is the so-called "phase de banalisation" to which Lamoine (2009: 362) refers.

87. *CIL* 13.11225–13.11226; for the dating of these two dedications to the second half of the second century CE, see Lamoine (2009), 360. On the Gaulish inscription ("cartouche d'Autun"), see *RIG* II 128–134.

88. *CIL* 13.2585. Matisco is mentioned as an agglomeration of the Aedui by Caesar (*BGall.* 7.90).

89. The recent interpretation by Lamoine (2009: 362–369) of the position of *gutuater* as exercised by Gallus, which would connect it to the maintenance of order and the repression of the revolt of Mariccus in 70 CE, while imaginative, is entirely speculative and founded on a number of demonstrably false assumptions, and is thus ultimately untenable.

90. The lacuna in the text after the *flamen Augustalis* is most unfortunate, but it would seem that the word preceding *dei Moltini* (*p*[. . .]*ogen*[. . .]) must have been the title of some sort of priesthood. Given that no suitable Latin words appear possible, it may have been another Gaulish title.

91. The "regular" *salii*: *CIL* 2.3853; 3854; 3859. The *magistri saliorum*: *CIL* 2.3864; 3865; 6055; *AE* 1957, 314.

92. In *Latium vetus* at Lavinium, Tusculum, Tibur, Aricia, and, of course, Rome; in *Latium adiectum* at Anagnia.

93. Hirschfeld (1870: 1113–1114) suggested that the Salii were transferred from the Latin city of Ardea when colonists were sent out to Saguntum, but this emigration is, as we have seen, purely a fiction; Alföldy (1984: 216–217) argued that they might have developed out of an indigenous ritual. Since Alföldy, the Salii of Saguntum have received only an occasional mentions by scholars of Roman Spain: e.g., Mackie (1983), 63; Curchin (1990), 44–45; MacMullen (2000), 75–76 and n. 83; Aranegui Gascó (2006), 72–73.

94. The institution of the Salii was associated with Numa by the late republic, and it is in accounts of his reign that the best descriptions of the rituals are to be found: see e.g. Livy 1.20; Dion. Hal. 2.70–2.71; Plut., *Num.* 13.

95. On this point, see Quint., *Inst.* 1.6.40. L. Aelius Stilo, the first of the great Roman scholars, already in the late second century BCE attempted an interpretation of the *carmen*: see Varro, *Ling.* 7.2.

96. *CIL* 2.3853.

97. Compare the recreation of the *agon Drepanitanus* among the Arverni discussed in the previous chapter. A comparandum from modern imperial interactions might be the adoption and reinterpretation of British sport by colonized groups in India and the Caribbean, sport being a kind of performative cultural ritual of the dominant power; on this see, for example, Huggins (2004), 219–247.

98. Woolf (1997), 343.

99. Cf. the influential study of the Scythian "mirror" of Herodotus by Hartog (1988).

100. Frankfurter (2000), 174, specifically in relation to the priests of Roman Egypt; cf. Frankfurter (1998), 225–226.

101. Frankfurter (1998), 225.

102. Scholarship abounds on the druids, as does more popular writing variously tinged by the manifold neo-pagan and New Age "revivalism" movements, particularly in Britain and France, that have appropriated druidism for a wide range of purposes and agendas since the eighteenth century; indeed sometimes the line between the two—scholarly and popular—is rather blurred. For the perspectives of French scholars, see the attempted synthesis of Bachelier (1959), and revised survey of Guyonvarc'h and Le Roux (1986). For various British assessments, see the surveys of the medievalist Chadwick (1966) and the English prehistorian Piggott (1968); Aldhouse-Green (1997) represents a popularizing, New Age attempt by a scholar to recover the "truth" of the ancient druids, while Webster (1997 and 1999), from the viewpoint of post-colonialism, offers a sympathetic if specious interpretation of druidic resistance to Roman power and Roman culture. Somewhat external to these national discourses are the recent critical articles of Wiśniewski (2007) and (2009), to the arguments of which we shall return.

103. See Diog. Laert., *Vit. Phil.* 1.1. Based on Diogenes' reference, Sotion seems to have argued that φιλοσοφία may have arisen first among the barbarians, adducing the druids—in addition to the Persian *magoi*, the Chaldeans, and the Indian gymnosophists—as evidence to support such a theory. This grouping of barbarian philosophers, sometimes with the addition of Egyptian priests, became a canonical list in Greek imperial literature: cf. e.g., Dio Chrys., *Or.* 49.7–49.8; Clement, *Strom.* 1.71.

104. Cicero, *Div.* 1.90. Cf. Strabo 4.4.4, almost certainly dependent upon Poseidonius. For the context of Diviciacus' visit to Rome, see Chapter 4.

105. On this episode, cf. Momigliano (1975), 70, who somewhat implausibly suggests that Diviciacus may have actually read Poseidonius.

106. For a summary of this view, see Wiśniewski (2009), 310.

107. See Johnston (2017); cf. Schadee (2008), 175–178; Krebs (2011), 204.

108. Caes., *BGall.* 6.21.1.

109. Indeed in Caesar's narrative, Diviciacus is a *princeps*, and without Cicero's testimony, one would never surmise that—at least in certain contexts with certain audiences—he was able to represent himself as a druid.

110. Mela 3.18–3.19.

111. Plin., *HN* 29.52–29.54.

112. Plin., *HN* 3.31.

113. See Syme (1958), 619–624.

114. One wonders, with circumspection, whether it was, in fact, ultimately a "mis-

reading" by Claudius of such performances—a misperception of the insidious contamination of even Roman institutions at Rome by "druidism" like this Vocontian's "wind egg"—that in part motivated his ban, since it seems so unlikely that he would have had any evidence of actual druidic practices in contemporary Gaul, let alone to the extent that he would have feared their potentially destabilizing impact. The ban would, rather ironically, have amounted to a real crackdown on "fake" druidism; if this interpretation were correct, it would cut one of the major "Gordian knots" of scholarship on the druids under Roman rule.

115. Tac., *Hist.* 4.54.

116. For varying interpretations of this passage, see Webster (1999), 14–16, who uses it as proof of druidic resistance and antipathy to Rome; Zecchini (1984) too reads it as evidence for contemporary druidic views. Drinkwater (1983), 39 and 46, on the other hand, sees the passage as either a literary fiction of Tacitus, or a report of Italian rumors, playing on the old *metus Gallicus*, rather than reflective of the Gauls' own rhetoric. But Syme (1953), 32n11, though he doubts the continued existence of the druids of Caesar's day, forcefully defends the historicity of Tacitus' testimony, and he later reaffirmed his position (1958: 458n6), stating, with characteristically dismissive laconicism that "Some scholars ignore, and others deny, the testimony of a Roman consular." Wiśniewski (2007), 151–152 summarizes other scholarly positions, and himself inclines toward the interpretation of Drinkwater, since, he argues, "it is highly improbable that in the 1st century AD the Druids in Transalpine Gaul would have remembered that more than four hundred years earlier their distant relatives had captured Rome, at least if we do not assume that Druids frequented Roman schools and read Livy."

117. For a detailed analysis of this phenomenon of the reappearance of the druids in fourth century Latin literature, see Wiśniewski (2009).

118. See, again, Amm. Marc. 15.9.4. On this point, cf. Wiśniewski (2009), 312.

119. Auson., *Prof. Burd.* 4.7–4.9.

120. Auson., *Prof. Burd.* 10.22–10.30.

121. On these lines and the druidic claims of Patera, see Green (1991), 336.

122. Contrary to the assertions of previous scholars, especially Webster (1999) and Bachelier (1959), Wiśniewski (2009) has rightly argued that in late antiquity there was no true druidic revivalist movement in practice, and that, while elements of traditional pagan religion certainly remained, the adherents to these cults did not call themselves "druids."

123. On Protadius' origins and career, see *PLRE* vol. 1, 751–752.

124. Symm., *Ep.* 4.18; cf. also *Ep.* 4.36. On these letters and their context, see Wight-

man (1975) and Cameron (2010) 523–524, who sees in them a vein of local "patriotism."

125. On the problem of "the Celts," see James (1999).

126. Philostr., *V S* 1.8.

127. Gell., *NA* 9.13.5–9.13.6. Here the piercing ethnographic gaze of Quadrigarius is turned into a kind of "autoethnographic gaze." This prefatory material to the very famous passage is often neglected by scholars, who are primarily interested in the "fragment" of Quadrigarius itself and seldom realize that it is introduced through Favorinus's act of reading and commentary.

128. Favorinus, *Corinthian Oration* 25–7 (= Dio Chrys., *Or. 37*).

129. For an excellent situation of this speech in its Corinthian context, see König (2001). See also Whitmarsh (2001), 119–121, for a discussion of *paideia* and strategies of "self-making" in this speech, although his emphasis here is on Favorinus's general "non-Greekness" (i.e., Romanness), rather than his identification as a "Celt." Cf. *inter alios* Romeo (2002), 32–33; Isaac (2011), 507–508.

130. On the Panhellenion and Greek identity in the Hadrianic era, see generally Romeo (2002).

131. See Isaac (2011), 508 for the reference.

132. Favorinus, *De Ex.* 10.1–10.2. Cf. Whitmarsh (2001), 167–178, esp. 173.

133. Fear (1991), to whom what follows is greatly indebted, is a useful brief survey of the evidence for the dancing girls, although his conclusions are more or less limited to the suggestion that the "Gaditanae" represent part of Gades' Phoenician heritage. Even with the emergence of dance theory and performance theory since Fear's article, little has been written on the Gaditanae. What work there is focuses almost exclusively on the use of these dancing girls by Romans, either as playthings or as a literary trope in constructions of Roman identity: see e.g., Naerebout (2009), 156–157 and Dalby (2000), 107.

134. Poseidonius (FGrH 87) F 28 (= Strabo 2.3.4). The question of the social or legal status of the Gaditanae is important, but not entirely clear: in addition to this passage, they are variously referred to as *mancipia* and *ancillae*. On this point, cf. Fear (1991), 75.

135. See the scholiast on Juvenal 11.162, for example. The dancing Syrian *Ambubaiae* were also well known; cf. Naerebout (2009), 157.

136. This is when references to the Gaditanae, their dance, and the licentious reputation of Gades abound: Juv. 11.162–11.174; Mart., *Ep.* 1.41, 1.61, 3.63, 5.78, 6.71, 11.16, 14.203; Stat., *Silv.* 1.6.71; Plin,, *Ep.* 1.15.3; *Corpus Priapeum* 19, 27, 40.

137. For this idea of "manufacturing exoticism" as regards tango in the twentieth century, see Savigliano (1995), 83–95.

138. See generally Connerton (1989).

139. Shapiro (2008), x.

140. This description represents an amalgamation made from the following poems, all of which are roughly contemporaneous: Juv., *Sat.* 11; Mart., *Ep.* 3.63, 5.78, 6.71, 11.16, 14.203; Stat., *Silv.* 1.6; *Corpus Priapeum* 19.

141. Cf. Fear (1991), 76. The comparison to belly dance is apt on the level of discourse as well, since, like Roman perceptions and descriptions of the dance of the Gaditanae, western ways of talking about belly dance are inextricable from ways of representing and dominating the "East" (that is to say, "Orientalizing").

142. Nash (2000), 660.

143. Fear (1991: 77) has drawn attention to *CIL* 5.6134, a verse epitaph set up at Milan for one "Lesbia, whom the most beautiful land [of] Tarsis bore", who he suggests may, if Tarsis is understood as a reference to Tartessus and Tartessus in turn as a metonymy for Gades, have been a Gaditana.

144. Mart., *Ep.* 6.71. The same Telethusa also makes an appearance in *Ep.* 8.51.

145. *Corpus Priapeum* 19; 40. Cf. Fear (1991), 77, who cautiously suggests that Telethusa was not merely a type, but was an actual individual.

146. For a survey of this ancient idea, see Romm (1992).

147. On the Morini, see Verg., *Aen.* 8.727; on Olisipo's geographical position, see Plin., *HN* 4.113; on the west wind at Olisipo, capable of impregnating mares with the swiftest foals, see Plin., *HN* 8.166.

148. See Isid., *Etym.* 15.1.70; Solinus 23.5–23.6; cf. Mela 3.6, who calls the city *Ulisippo*, the misnomer betraying the influence of the myth.

149. For this story, see Plin., *HN* 9.9.

150. I am indebted here to Habinek (1998), 103–121, although our differences as to the degree to which Latin literature "continued its support of aristocratic hegemony" in the imperial provinces will be apparent.

151. See Habinek (1998), 121.

152. Whitmarsh (2001), 2.

153. Freudenburg (2010), 272, which has influenced much of what follows. On the poetic persona of Martial in Rome, see Fitzgerald (2007), 7–13.

154. On this point, see Dench (2005), 333.

155. The most egregious instance of this is Schulten (1913), 462–463; cf. Howell (1980), 213. Sullivan's comments (1991: 172) on Martial's ethnic identity are, at best, reductionist. From "the fusion of the two races" and "the borrowings of each bellicose culture from the other" that he (incorrectly) sees as the ethnogenesis of the Celtiberians, he traces one genetic "inheritance" of Martial to the Iberians (hirsuteness), and one cultural "proclivity" to the Celts (pederasty).

156. Rimell (2008), 203; 182. The fifth chapter of her book is a particularly relevant

and stimulating treatment of Martial and "the space of epigram", especially interesting for books 1, 10, and 12, which will be discussed in what follows. While I am persuaded by much of her analysis of the "magnifying/miniaturising project" of epigram, and agree with her conclusion that Martial's work "reaches out to an audience of displaced people… in search of ways to express new identities in a changed globe" (206), our approaches and points of emphasis regarding the poet's abiding concerns are somewhat different.

157. Mart., *Ep.* 1.49.1–1.49.18. In line 4, I have adopted the reading convincingly proposed by Musso (2004). The best commentary in English on this poem is Howell (1980), 212–227. Licinianus is also addressed in *Ep.* 1.61, again as a *Bilbilitanus*. Rimell (2008: 205), focusing on the second half of this pastoral idyll, which I have not discussed here, and the image of the hare, sees its promise of nostalgic escapism as "tainted beyond redemption" by the poems by which it is framed in the book, and with which it has some intertextual relationship (e.g., Hor., *Epod.* 2). But especially in light of the first half of the poem, and the poet's explicit emphasis in the second half on the absence from this idealized landscape of the powerful symbols of Roman cosmopolitanism (*lunata pellis*, *toga*, *olidae vestes murice*, *horridus Liburnus*, *querulus cliens*), I find this pessimistic interpretation less convincing on the whole.

158. *Ep.* 10.78. On Martial and Catullus, see Swann (1994), esp. 10–81, and Fitzgerald (2007), 167–186, although neither of them foregrounds the issue of local versus Roman identities in Martial's reception of his Republican predecessor.

159. The parallels between Martial and the protagonist of Thomas Wolfe's *You Can't Go Home Again*, who writes a successful novel about his own hometown of Libya Hill, are instructive.

160. *Ep.* 10.103. On Martial's return to Spain, see Howell (1998).

161. Cf. Rimell (2008), 79-80.

162. *Ep.* 10.96.1–10.96.2; cf. 10.37, addressed to his countryman Maternus.

163. On the toga at Bilbilis, see *Ep.* 12.18.17; cf. 1.49.31. I count seventy-eight references to the toga in Martial's epigrams, more than any other Latin author except Cicero (far more of whose writings are preserved). On the toga as metonymy for "Romanness" more generally, see Dench (2005), 103; 138; 155; 303.

164. *Ep.* 10.65.1–10.65.9.

165. *Ep.* 12.2.1–12.2.6.

166. *Ep.* 12. praef. Rimell (2008: 192) sees this preface to the final book as part of a "culminating epigrammatic schizophrenia about identity and geography".

167. See Vell. Pat. 2.51 (on Cornelius Balbus, a native of Gades and thus a *Hispanus*, not a *Hispaniensis*).

168. On the life and career of Ausonius in the context of the Gallic aristocracy and imperial court of the fourth century, see the foundational study of Matthews

(1975), 56–87; see also Booth (1982); Van Dam (1992), esp. 303–311; Sivan (1993). On the "pagan' literary revival of the mid-fourth century in Gaul with which Ausonius' works intersect, see Cameron (2011), 399–420. For a study of the transformation of Latin poetics in this period—especially the privileging of the reader's active involvement in shaping meaning— see Pelttari (2014), who treats the works of Ausonius extensively.

169. Auson., *Ordo nob.. urb.* 166–168.

170. Cic., *Leg.* 2.5. On Ausonius and Cicero, cf. Miles (2003), 123–125.

171. Auson., *Mos.* 438–443.

172. Although, as with most of his contemporaries, there is some slippage in the works of Ausonius between the names of *civitas*-capitals and the *civitas* itself, reflecting what must have become the vernacular usage, Ausonius does maintain a distinction between place and people: the capital of the Vasates is called by its old name, *Cossio Vasatum* and not simply *Vasates* (*Parent.* 24.8; cf. Sid. Apoll., *Ep.* 2.1).

173. *Praef.* 1–8.

174. *De Hered.* 1–3; *Epiced. in Pat.* 3–6.

175. See *Parent.* 4.3–4.14; cf. *Prof. Burd.* 16 (Ausonius' maternal uncle, Aemilius Magnus Arborius).

176. Especially by Le Bohec (1991: 41–4), which is the most recent reexamination of the cases for and against the "inscription theory"; somewhat surprisingly, he argues that this document was never inscribed.

177. *CIL* 13.5708 (ll. 1.1–1.4, 7–12; 18–19; 2.22–2.27).

178. This is the assertion of Woolf (1998), 167.

179. See Chapter 3. For variations of this argument, see Le Bohec (1991), 46–47; Buisson (1991); cf. Hatt (1986), 69–70.

180. On the heroic and cultic significance of the statue (possibly, though not certainly equestrian), see again Le Bohec (1991), 47, with Benoît (1954), 12, 84, 97.

181. It is worth comparing the roughly contemporary disdain of Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.2.3–4.2.4) for Regulus' strange and excessive display of grief around the funeral pyre of his son, where Regulus slaughtered his son's ponies, dogs, and pet birds.

182. For the Romans, on the other hand, hunting was not traditionally a very popular pursuit. See Woolf (1998), 165–166; Ferdière (1988), vol 2, 163–181.

183. Caes., *BGall.* 6.19.

184. Mela 3.19.

185. Diod. Sic. 5.28.6.

186. Le Bohec (1991: 52–53) only mentions the passages of Caesar and Mela as a comparandum, without elaborating on the potential significance.

187. Though we went into detail for only one case study, assemblages of grave goods

from elsewhere in the early imperial west demonstrate the dramatic extent to which the performance of funerary rites reflected the self-conscious choices of family groups to align themselves with particular memories and particular identities. An excellent example comes from the necropolis of the old Punic city of Baelo Claudia, in southern Iberia, on which see Jiménez (2010a).

Conclusion

1. For this episode and the Greek and Roman interpretations of the river, see Strabo 3.3.4–3.3.5; App., *Hisp.* 72; Flor., *Epit.* 1.33; Livy, *Per.* 55; Plut., *Quaest. Rom.* 34; Sil., *Pun.* 1.235–1.236 and 16.476–16.477; Mela 3.10; Plin., *HN* 4.112. Our ancient sources do not elaborate on the methods by which the Roman ultimately persuaded his troops to follow him into the unknown; but in the dramatic re-enactment of the event in the modern Festa do Esquecemento ("Festival of Forgetfulness") at the town of Xinzo de Limia, "Brutus" calls each of his men by name, demonstrating that he remembers his country and his people.

2. They are mentioned only as a bare name in the catalog of Pliny (*HN* 3.28, with an apology for the tedium of listing strange and unimportant peoples) and the geography of Ptolemy (*Geog.* 2.6.43).

3. *ILS* 5162; *CIL* 2.4215.

4. See, respectively, Rodríguez Colmenero (1997), no. 326; *CIL* 2.5353; *HE* 12.645; Rodríguez Colmenero (1997), no. 375. On Talabriga, famous as a site of resistance to Rome during the campaigns of Brutus, see App., *Hisp.* 73.

5. Schmitz (1847), 458.

6. Spurr (1993), 61–75 examines this kind of rhetoric of classification, "by which Western writing generates an ideologically charged meaning from its perceptions of non-Western cultures," in the history of science, the language of colonial administration, and the postcolonial ideology of "modernization."

7. For a critical study of Haverfield's work in the context of early twentieth-century British imperialism, see Hingley (2000), esp. 111–129.

8. Haverfield (1915), 13.

9. On the colonial rhetoric of naturalization, see Spurr (1993), 156–169.

10. Price (2012), 28–29, citing Woolf (1996b), whose work on the provinces has been very influential in the last twenty years, including on Price himself. In this context, it is worth comparing Woolf's study of the process of Romanization in the eastern Mediterranean ("Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity, and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East," 1994) with his important monograph on that process in the west (*Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, 1998). The partial overlap in titles is significant, and neatly captures the perceived dichotomy between the two halves of the Mediterranean world: in Greece, which was already "civilized," it was possi-

ble strategically and contextually to "become Roman" while remaining, for all intents and purposes, unchanged in one's sense of self, while in Gaul, it is assumed that "becoming Roman" supplanted all other identities, memories, cultural practices, and meanings through the introduction of "civilization."

11. For example, Woolf (1996b), 361: "No local coinages preserved images of founders, festivals and monuments did not celebrate historical events and no local histories or vernacular literatures were created."

12. For example, we might draw much the same conclusion from our study of the west that Van Nijf did from the remote Pisidian town of Termessus in southwestern Anatolia [(2010), 186]: "It is striking that throughout the Mediterranean 'global' and local themes were more often mixed to produce a new blend of a provincial Roman society."

13. On the ethnographic imagination of the poem, see Dougherty (2001); on insubstantialization as part of the aesthetics of colonial rhetoric, see Spurr (1993), 141–155.

14. For another recent corrective in this vein, see Jiménez (2015).

15. Livy 1.7.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

✑

Abascal, J. M. (1996) "Derecho latino y municipalización en Levante y Cataluña." In *Teoría y práctica del ordenamiento municipal en Hispania*, edited by E. Ortiz de Urbina and J. Santos, 255–284. Vitoria-Gasteiz.

Abascal, J. M., M. Almagro Gorbea, and R. Cebrián. (2006) "Segobriga: *caput Celtiberiae* and Latin *municipium*." In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, edited by L. Abad Casal, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo Asensio, 184–196. Portsmouth, RI.

Adams, C., and R. Laurence. (eds.) (2012) *Travel and Geography in the Roman Empire*. London.

Adams, J. N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge.

Agnew, J. (1994) "The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory." *Review of International Political Economy* 1: 53–80.

———. (2010) "Still Trapped in Territory?" *Geopolitics* 15 (4): 779–784.

Agusta-Boularot, S., R. Golosetti, and D. Isoardi. (2010) "La Déesse Dexiva du Castellar (Cadenet, Vaucluse): Confrontation des témoignages épigraphiques et des données archéologiques à l'occasiondes premières fouilles." *RAN* 43: 109–126.

Alarcão, J. (2001) "Novas perspectivas sobre os Lusitanos (e outros mundos)." *Revista portuguesa de Arqueología* 4.2: 293–350.

———. (2003) "As estátuas de guerreiros galaicos como representações de príncipes no contexto da organização político-administrativa do Noroeste pré-flaviano." *MM* 44: 116–126.

———. (2004) "Sobre Caladunum e a via de Bracara Augusta a Aquae Flaviae." In *Au Jardin des Hespérides*, edited by C. Auliard and L. Bodiou, 437–456. Rennes.

Alarcão, J., and R. Étienne. (eds.) (1976) *Fouilles de Conimbriga II*. Paris.

Alarcão, J., R. Étienne, and G. Fabre. (1969) "Le culte des Lares à Conimbriga." *CRAI* 113: 213–236.

Alcalá-Zamora, L. (2003) *La Necropólis Ibérica de Pozo Moro.* Madrid.

Alcock, S. (1993) *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece.* Cambridge.

———. (2001) "Vulgar Romanization and the Dominance of Elites." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by S. Keay and N. Terrenato, 227–230. Oxford.

———. (2002) *Archaeologies of the Greek Past.* Cambridge.

Alcock, S., J. Cherry, and J. Elsner. (eds.) (2001) *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece.* Oxford.

Aldhouse-Green, M. J. (1997) *The World of the Druids.* New York.

———. (2000) *Seeing the Wood for the Trees: The Symbolism of Trees and Wood in Ancient Gaul and Britain.* Aberystwyth.

———. (2001) *Dying for the Gods: Human Sacrifice in Iron Age and Roman Europe.* Stroud.

———. (2003) "Alternative Iconographies: Metaphors of Resistance in Romano-British Cult-Imagery." In *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum: neue Funde und Forschungen*, edited by P. Noelke, F. Naumann-Steckner, and B. Schneider, 39–48. Mainz.

Alfayé, S. (2010) "Hacia el lugar de los dioses: aproximación a la peregrinación religiosa en la Hispania indoeuropea." In *Viajeros, Peregrinos y Aventureros en el Mundo Antiguo*, edited by F. Marco Simòn, F. Pina Polo, and J. Remesal Rodríguez, 177–218. Barcelona.

Alfayé, S., and F. Marco Simòn. (2008) "Religion, Language and Identity in Hispania: Celtiberian and Lusitanian Rock Inscriptions." In *Romanisation et épigraphie: Etudes interdisciplinaires sur l'acculturation et l'identité dans l'Empire romain*, edited by R. Häussler, 281–306. Montagnac.

Alföldy, G. (1984) "Drei städtische Eliten im römischen Hispanien." *Gerión* 2: 193–238.

———. (1985) "Epigraphica hispanica 6: Das Diana-Heiligtum von Segobriga." *ZPE* 58: 139–159.

Allain, J., L. Fleuriot, and L. Chaix. (1981) "Le vergobret des Bituriges à Argentomagus: essai d'interprétation d'une fosse cultuelle." *RAE* 32: 11–32.

Allen, D. F. (1980) *The Coins of the Ancient Celts.* Edinburgh.

Almeida, C. A. F. (1974) *Escavações no Monte Mozinho.* Penafiel.

Alvarez-Sanchís, J. (2003a) *Los señores del ganado: Arqueología de los pueblos prerromanos en el occidente de Iberia.* Madrid.

———. (2003b) *Los Vettones.* Madrid.

Amato, E. (2004) "Luciano e l'anonimo filosofo celta di *Hercules* 4: proposta di identificazione." *Symbolae Osloenses* 79: 128–149.

Amy, R., P.-M. Duval, J. Formigé, J.-J. Hatt, C. Picard, G.-Ch. Picard, and A. Piganiol. (1962) *L'Arc d'Orange*: XVᵉ supplement à *Gallia*. Paris.

Anderson, B. (2006) *Imagined Communities*. Revised edition. New York.

Ando, C. (2000) *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley.

———. (2014) "Pluralism and Empire, from Rome to Robert Cover." *Critical Analysis of Law* 1: 1–22.

Antonaccio, C. M. (1994) "Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece." *AJA* 98: 389–410.

Aranegui Gascó, C. (1992) "Evolución del área cívica saguntina." *JRA* 5: 56–68.

———. (2006) "From Arse to Saguntum." In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, edited by L. Abad Casal, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo Asensio, 63–74. Portsmouth, RI.

———. (2013) "Valentia (Valencia)." In *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History, edited* by R. S. Bagnall, K. Brodersen, C. B. Champion, A. Erskine, and S. R. Huebner, 6936. Oxford.

Arenas Esteban, J. A. (2007) "Ancient Tree Cults in Central Spain: The Case of La Dehesa at Olmeda de Cobeta." In *Continuity and Innovation in Religion in the Roman West*, edited by R. Haeussler and A. C. King, 189–200. Portsmouth.

Argente Oliver, J. L. (1980–2001) *Tiermes I–V*. Madrid.

Ariño, E., and J. M. Gurt. (1994) "Catastros Romanos en el entorno de *Augusta Emerita*. Fuentes literarias y documentacíon arqueológica." In *Les Campagnes de Lusitanie romaine: occupation du sol et habitats*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and M. Salinas de Frías, 45–66. Madrid.

Audin, A. (1965) *Lyon, miroir de Rome dans les Gaules*. Paris.

Audin, A., J. Guey, and P. Wuilleumier. (1954) "Inscriptions latines découvertes à Lyon dans la Pont de la Guillotière." *REA* 56: 297–335.

Aymard, A. (1948) "*Flamen primus.*" *REA* 50: 414–417.

Azcárraga Cámara, S., and A. Ruiz Taboada. (2012–2013) "Los Orígenes de Complutum: el descubrimiento de la planta de la ciudad romana de San Juan del Viso (Villalbilla, Madrid)." *Anales de Arqueología Cordobesa* 23 (4): 95–116.

Bachelier, E. (1959) "Les Druides en Gaule romaine: I: Les Druides avant la conquête; II: Les Druides après la conquête; III: Le druidisme au IVe siècle." *Ogam* 11: 46–55; 173–184; 295–304.

Baring-Gould, S. (1907) *A Book of the Cevennes*. London.

Barlow, J. (1995) "Gregory of Tours and the Myth of the Trojan Origins of the Franks." *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 29: 86–95.

Barnes, T. D. (1998) *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality*. Ithaca.

Baronowski, D. W. (1984) "The '*Formula Togatorum.*'" *Historia* 33 (2): 248–252.

Barrett, J. C. (1993) "Chronologies of Remembrance: The Interpretation of Some Roman Inscriptions." *World Archaeology* 25 (2): 236–247.

———. (1997) "Romanization: A Critical Comment." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. J. Mattingly, 51–65. Portsmouth.

Bartman, E. (2011) "Ethnicity in Roman Portraiture." In *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by E. Gruen, 222–254. Los Angeles.

Bateson, G. (1972) *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. Chicago.

Bats, M. (2007) "Droit latin, adtributio et contributio/sunteleia: Strabon, Pline, Nîmes et les Volques Arécomiques." *MEFRA* 119: 51–62.

Batt, M. (1988) "Mordelles, Sermon, ensemble gaulois et gallo-romain." *Bulletin d'information archéologique de la circonscription des Antiquités de Bretagne* 1: 47–48.

———. (1989) "Mordelles, Sermon, ensemble gaulois et gallo-romain." *Bulletin d'information archéologique de la circonscription des Antiquités de Bretagne* 2: 38–39.

Battistoni, F. (2010) *Parenti dei Romani: mito troiano e diplomazia*. Bari.

Batty, R. (2000) "Mela's Phoenician Geography." *JRS* 90: 70–94.

Beard, M. (1987) "A Complex of Times: No More Sheep on Romulus' Birthday." *PCPhS* 33: 1–15.

Bédoyère, G. de la. (1998) "Carausius and the Marks RSR and INPCDA." *Numismatic Chronicle* 158: 79–88.

Bell, B. M. (1993) "The Contribution of Julius Caesar to the Vocabulary of Ethnography." *Akroterion* 38: 104–112.

Beltrán Fortes, J., J. Maier Allende, J. Miranda Valdés, J. A. Morena López, and P. Rodríguez Oliva. (2010) *El Mausoleo de los Pompeyos de Torreparedones (Baena, Córdoba): análisis historiográfico y arqueológico*. Córdoba.

Beltrán Lloris, F. (2004) "Libertos y cultura epigráfica en la Hispania republicana." In *Vivir en tierra extraña: emigración e integración cultural en el mundo antiguo*, edited by F. Marco Simòn and J. Remesal Rodríguez, 151–176. Barcelona.

———. (2006) "An Irrigation Decree from Roman Spain: The *Lex Rivi Hiberiensis*." *JRS* 96: 147–197.

Beltrán Ortega, A., I. Sastre Prats, and F. J. Sánchez-Palencia Ramos. (2009) "Nuevo pacto de hospitalidad procedente de Pino del Oro (Zamora)." *ZPE* 168: 287–292.

Beltrán, A., and A. Tovar. (1982) *Contrebia Belaisca I: el bronce con alfabeto 'iberico' de Botorrita*. Zaragoza.

Bémont, C., M. Jeanlin, and C. Lahanier. (1993) *Les Figurines en terre cuite gallo-romaines*. Paris.

Ben Abdallah, Z. (1999) "*Quirinus, deus pater*: Une résurgence de la religion romaine archaïque en province proconsulaire d'Afrique sous l'Empereur Sévère Alexandre." *CRAI* 143: 457–468.

Bénard, J. (1994) *Les agglomérations antiques de Côte-d'Or*. Paris.

Benoît, F. (1954) *L'héroïsation équestre*. Aix-en-Provence.

———. (1957) *Entrement, capitale celto-ligure des Salyens de Provence*. Aix-en-Provence.

Berciu, I. (1965) "Cornelius Fuscus et le cénotaphe d'Adamclissi." *Apulum* 5: 259–270.

Bermejo Barrera, J. C. (1978) "La función real en la mitologia tartesica: Gargoris, Habis, y Aristeo." *Habis* 9: 215–232.

Berrocal-Rangel, L., and C. Ruíz-Triviño. (2003) *El depósito alto-imperial del Castrejón de Capote (Higuera la Real, Badajoz)*. Mérida.

Bickerman, E. J. (1952) "Origines Gentium." *CP* 47 (2): 65–81.

Birks, P., A. Rodger, and J. S. Richardson. (1984) "Further Aspects of the *Tabula Contrebiensis*." *JRS* 74: 45–73.

Blagg, T., and M. Millett. (eds.) (1990) *The Early Roman Empire in the West*. Oxford.

Blázquez, J. M. (1989) *Nuevos estudios sobre la romanización*. Madrid.

Blech, M. (2001) "Tartessos." In *Hispania Antiqua. vol. 1: Denkmäler der Frühzeit*, edited by M. Blech, M. Koch, and M. Kunst, 305–348. Mainz.

Bonfante, G., and L. Bonfante. (2002) *The Etruscan Language: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Manchester.

Bonnet, C. (1988) *Melqart: cultes et mythes de l'Héraclès tyrien en Méditerranée*. Leuven.

Booth, A. D. (1982) "The Academic Career of Ausonius." *Phoenix* 36: 329–342.

Boschung, D., A. W. Busch, and M. J. Versluys. (eds.) (2015) *Reinventing 'The Invention of Tradition'? Indigenous Pasts and the Roman Present*. Paderborn.

Bost, J.-P., and G. Fabre. (1988) "Aux origines de la province de Novempopulanie: nouvel examen de l'inscription d'Hasparren." *Aquitania* 6: 167–178.

Bost, J.-P., and J. Perrier. (1990) "Un vergobret à Limoges sous le Haut Empire romain." *Trav. Arch. Limousine* 10: 27–32.

Boucher, S. (1988) "L'image et fonctions du dieu Sucellus." *Caesarodunum* 23: 77–85.

Bousquet, J. (1969) "Nouvelles inscriptions de Rennes." *Annales de Bretagne* 76: 275–279.

———. (1971) "Inscriptions de Rennes." *Gallia* 29: 109–122.

Bowersock, G. (1969) *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

———. (1987) "Mechanisms of Subversion in the Roman Provinces." In *Opposition et résistances à l'empire d'Auguste à Trajan* (Entretiens Fondation Hardt 33), edited by K. A. Raaflaub, 291–320. Genève.

Bowie, E. (1978) "Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality." *ANRW* 2.16.2: 1652–1699.

Bradley, R. (2000) "Vera Collum and the Excavation of a 'Roman' Megalithic Tomb." *Antiquity* 74: 39–43.

———. (2002) *The Past in Prehistoric Societies*. London.

Brañas, R. (2000) *Deuses, heroes e lugares sagrados na cultura castrexa*. Santiago de Compostela.

Braund, D. C. (1980) "The Aedui, Troy, and the *Apocolocyntosis*." *CQ* 30 (2): 420–425.

———. (1984) *Rome and the Friendly King: The Character of Client Kingship*. London.

Brow, J. (1990) "Notes on Community, Hegemony, and the Past." *Anthropological Quarterly* 63 (1): 1–6.

Brubaker, R., and F. Cooper. (2000) "Beyond Identity." *Theory and Society* 29: 1–47.

Brunaux, J. L. (1993) "Les bois sacrés des Celtes et des Germains." In *Les bois sacrés* (Coll. Centre Jean Bérard 10), 57–65. Naples.

———. (2000) "Ribemont-sur-Ancre (Somme): du trophée celtique au lieu de culte public gallo-romain." In *Archéologie des sanctuaires en Gaule romaine*, edited by W. Van Andringa, 133–156. Saint-Etienne.

———. (ed.) (2009) *Les Temples du Sanctuaire Gallo-Romain de Ribement-sur-Ancre, Somme*. Saint-Germain-en-Laye.

Buckley, B. (1981) "The Aeduan Area in the Third Century." In *The Roman West in the Third Century,* edited by A. King and M. Henig, 287–315. Oxford.

Buisson, A. (1991) "Le tombeau du Lingon: étude du cadre architectural et archéologique." In *Le Testament du Lingon*, edited by Y. Le Bohec, 63–72. Lyon.

Bulliot, J. G. (1899) *Fouilles de Mont Beuvray (ancienne Bibracte) de 1867 à 1895*. Vol. 2. Autun.

Burillo Mozota, F. (2006) "Segeda and Rome: The Historical Development of a Celtiberian City-State." In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, edited by L. Abad Casal, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo Asensio, 159–171. Portsmouth, RI.

———. (2007) *Los Celtiberos: etnias y estados*. 2nd ed. Barcelona.

Burkert, W. (1962) "Caesar und Romulus-Quirinus." *Historia* 11: 356–376.

———. (1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley.

Burnand, Y. (1982) *"Senatores Romani ex provinciis Gallia . . . orti."* EOS 2: 387–437.

Butler, J. (1999) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York.

Caballos Rufino, A. (1978) "Colonia Claritas Iulia Ucubi." *Habis* 9: 273–292.

Caetano, M. T., and C. Murão. (2011) "A 'Portrait' of Book XII of the *Aeneid*: The Mosaic from the 'House of the Medusa' (Alter do Chão, Portugal)." In *Mosaics of Turkey and Parallel Developments in the Rest of the Ancient and Medieval World: Questions of Iconography, Style, and Technique from the Beginnings of Mosaic until the Late Byzantine Era* (11th International Colloquium on Ancient Mosaics), edited by M. Sahin, 205–223. Istanbul.

Cameron, A. (2004) *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford.

———. (2011) *The Last Pagans of Rome*. Oxford.

Canto, A. (1990a) "Las tres fundaciones de Augusta Emerita." In *Stadtbild und Ideologie: Die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit*, edited by W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, 289–297. München.

———. (1990b) "La tabula Lougeiorum: un documento a debate." *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología Universidad Autónoma de Madrid* 17: 267–275.

Carey, S. (2003) *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History*. Oxford.

Casey, E. S. (1997) *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley.

Cassibry, K. (2016) "Coins before Conquest in Celtic France: An Art Lost to Empire." In *Beyond Boundaries: Connecting Visual Cultures in the Provinces of Ancient Rome*, edited by S. Alcock, M. Egri, and J. F. D. Frakes, 137–155. Los Angeles.

Castro, M. C. F., and B. Cunliffe. (2002) *El Yacimiento y el Santuario de Torreparedones: un lugar arqueológico preferente en la campiña de Córdoba*. Oxford.

Castro García, L., and R. Blanco Ordás. (1975) "El Castro de Tariego de Cerrato (Palencia)." *Publicaciones de la Institución Tello Téllez de Meneses* 35: 55–138.

Cébeillac-Gervasoni, M. (1983) "Le notable local dans l'épigraphie et les sources littéraires latines: problèmes et équivoques." In *Les 'Bourgeoisies' municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.-C*, edited by M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, 51–58. Paris.

Célié, M., P. Garmy, and M. Monteil. (1994) "Enceintes et développement urbain: Nîmes antique des origines au Ier s. ap. J.-C." *JRA* 7: 383–396.

Chadwick, N. K. (1966) *The Druids*. Cardiff.

Chastagnol, A. (1980) "L'organisation du culte impérial dans la cité à la lumière des inscriptions de Rennes." In *La civilisation des Riedones*, edited by A.-M. Rouanet-Liesenfelt, 187–199. Rennes.

———. (1992) *Le Sénat romain à l'époque impériale*. Paris.

Christol, M., and C. Goudineau. (1987) "Nîmes et les Volques Arécomiques au Ier siècle avant J.-C." *Gallia* 45: 87–103.

Christol, M., J.-L. Fiches, Y. Gasco, and A. Michelozzi. (2005) "Une nouvelle dédicace de T(itus) Carisius, *praetor Volcarum*, près de *Ugernum* (Beaucaire, Gard)." *RAN* 38: 409–423.

Christopherson, A. J. (1968) "The Provincial Assembly of the Three Gauls in the Julio-Claudian Period." *Historia* 17: 351–366.

Cichorius, C. (1904) *Die romischen Denkmäler in der Dobrudscha*. Berlin.

Clarke, G. W. (1965) "The Treveri and the Tribute in Tacitus." *Historia* 14: 335–341.

Colin, A., S. Fichtl, and O. Buchsenschutz. (1995) "Die ideologische Bedeutung der Architektur der Oppida nach Eroberung Galliens." In *Integration in the Early Roman West: The Role of Culture and Ideology*, edited by J. Metzler, M. Millet, N. Roymans, and J. Slofstra, 159–167. Luxembourg.

Connerton, P. (1989) *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge.

Corbier, M. (2006) *Donner à voir, donner à lire: mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne*. Paris.

Corell, J. (2002) I*nscripcions romanes del País Valencià: Saguntum i el seu territory*. València.

Correia Santos, M. J., and T. G. Schattner. (2010) "O Santuário do Cabeço das Fráguas através da arqueologia." *Iberografias* 6: 89–108.

Cortijo, M. L. (1991) "El *pagus* en la administración territorial romana: Los pagi de la Bética." *Florentia Iliberritana* 2: 99–116.

Courtney, E. (1993) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets: Edited with Commentary*. Oxford.

Crawford, M. H., and F. Beltrán Lloris. (2013) "The *Lex Rivi Hiberiensis*." *JRS* 103: 233.

Crumley, C. L. (1995) "Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies." In *Heterarchy and the Analysis of Complex Societies*, edited by R. M. Ehrenreich, C. L. Crumley, and J. E. Levy, 1–5. Washington.

Curado, F. P. (1984) "Aras a Laepus procedentes de Pousafoles, Sabugal." *Ficheiro Epigráfico* 7: 8–12.

Curchin, L. (1985) "*Vici* and *pagi* in Roman Spain." *REA* 87: 327–343.

———. (1990) *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto.

———. (2004) *The Romanization of Central Spain: Complexity, Diversity, and Change in a Provincial Hinterland*. London.

Dalby, A. (2000) *Empire of Pleasures: Luxury and Indulgence in the Roman World*. London.

Damon, C. (2003) *Tacitus: Histories Book I*. Cambridge.

Dardenay, A. (2010) *Les mythes fondateurs de Rome: images et politique dans l'occident romain*. Paris.

———. (2011) "La diffusion iconographique des mythes fondateurs de Rome dans l'Occident romain: spécificités hispaniques." In *Roma generadora de identidades: la experiencia hispana*, edited by A. Caballos Rufino and S. Lefebvre, 79–96. Madrid.

Dark, K. R. (1993) "Roman-Period Activity at Prehistoric Ritual Monuments in Britain and in the Armorican Peninsula." In *Theoretical Roman Archaeology: First Conference Proceedings*, edited by E. Scott, 133–146. Avebury.

Davidson, H. R. E. (1988) *Myths and Symbols in Pagan Europe: Early Scandinavian and Celtic Religions*. Manchester.

Davies, A. M. (2000) "Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity." In *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, edited by E. Matthews and S. Hornblower, 15–40. Oxford.

Davies, M. (1988) "Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* and Its Folk-Tale Origins." *CQ* 38 (2): 277–290.

Déchelette, J. (1904) *Les vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule romaine (Narbonnaise, Aquitaine et Lyonnaise)*. 2 vols. Paris.

Degrassi, A. (1963) *Inscriptiones Italiae*. Vol. 13, *Fasti et Elogia*. Fasc. 2, *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani*. Rome.

Delamarre, X. (2001) *Dictionnaire de la langue Gauloise*. Paris.

Delaney, D. (2005) *Territory: A Short Introduction*. Oxford.

Dench, E. (1995) *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines*. Oxford.

———. (1997) "Sacred Springs to the Social War: Myths of Origins and Questions

of Identity in the Central Apennines." In *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy*, edited by T. Cornell and K. Lomas, 43–51. London.

———. (2005) *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford.

Derks, T. (1998) *Gods, Temples, and Ritual Practices: The Transformation of Religious Ideas and Values in Roman Gaul*. Amsterdam.

———. (2002) "Roman Imperialism and the Sanctuaries of Roman Gaul," *JRA* 15: 541–545.

Derks, T., and N. Roymans. (eds.) (2009) *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: The Role of Power and Tradition*. Amsterdam.

Desbat, A. (2004) "Nouvelles données sur les origines de Lyon et sur les premiers temps de la colonie de Lugdunum." In *Simulacra Romae: Roma y las capitales provinciales del Occidente Europeo*, edited by J. Ruiz de Arbulo, 201–221. El Médol.

Deyts, S. (1966) *Ex-voto de bois, de pierre et de bronze du sanctuaire des sources de la Seine, art celte et gallo-romain*. Dijon.

Díaz Ariño, B. (2008) *Epigrafía latina republicana de Hispania*. Barcelona.

Díaz Sanz, M. A., and M. M. Medrano Marqués. (1993) "Primer avance sobre el gran bronce celtiberico de *Contrebia Belaisca* (Botorrita, Zaragoza)," *AEA* 66: 243–248.

———. (2004) "Nertobriga: últimas investigaciones." *Salduie* 4: 437–462.

Dietler, M. (1990) "Driven by Drink: The Role of Drinking in the Political Economy and the Case of Early Iron Age France." *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 9: 352–406.

———. (2001) "Theorizing the Feast: Rituals of Consumption, Commensal Politics, and Power in African Contexts." In *Feasts: Archaeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*, edited by M. Dietler and B. Hayden, 65–114. Washington, DC.

Dignas, B., and R. R. R. Smith. (eds.) (2012) *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*. Oxford.

Dirlik, A. (1998) *What Is in a Rim? Critical Perspectives on the Pacific Region Idea*. 2nd ed. Lanham, MD.

Dondin-Payre, M. (1999) "Magistratures et administration municipale dans les Trois Gaules." In *Cités, Municipes, Colonies: Les processus de municipilisation en Gaule et en Germanie sous le Haut Empire romain*, edited by M. Dondin-Payre and M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, 127–230. Paris.

———. (2004) Review of M. Tarpin, Vici *et* pagi *dans l'Occident romain. L'antiquité classique* 73: 545–547.

———. (2006) "Sanctuaires publics et territoires civiques: réflexions à partir de l'exemple du Bois l'Abbé (cité des Ambiens)." In *Sanctuaires, pratiques culturelles et territoires civiques dans l'Occident romain*, edited by M. Dondin-Payre and M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, 135–158. Brussels.

Donner, H., and W. Röllig. (1971–6) *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 3rd ed. 3 vols. Wiesbaden.

D'Ors, A. (1948) "Una neuva table emeritense de *hospitium publicum*." *Emerita* 16: 46–74.

Dottin, G. (1920) La langue gauloise. Paris.

Dougherty, C. (2001) *The Raft of Odysseus: The Ethnographic Imagination of Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.

Drinkwater, J. (1975) "Lugdunum: 'Natural Capital' of Gaul?" *Britannia* 6: 133–140.

———. (1978) "The Rise and Fall of the Gallic Iulii: Aspects of the Development of the Aristocracy of the Three Gauls Under the Early Empire." *Latomus* 37: 817–850.

———. (1979) "A Note on Local Careers in the Three Gauls Under the Early Empire." *Britannia* 10: 89–100.

———. (1983) *Roman Gaul: The Three Provinces,* 58 BC–AD 260. London.

———. (1992) "The Bacaudae of Fifth-Century Gaul." In *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?* edited by J. Drinkwater and H. Elton, 208–217. Cambridge.

Dulière, C. (1979) *Lupa Romana: recherches d'iconographie et essai d'interprétation*. Bruxelles.

Dumézil, G. (1970) *Archaic Roman Religion*. Trans. P. Krapp. Baltimore.

Dumuys, L. (1902) "Une inscription romaine découverte à Orléans." *Bulletin Monumental* 66: 232–236.

Dunbabin, K. M. D. (1989) "*Baiarum Grata Voluptas*: Pleasures and Dangers of the Baths." *PBSR* 57: 6–46.

———. (1999) *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*. Cambridge.

Duncan-Jones, R. (1982) *The Economy of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.

Durkheim, E. (1965) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. New York.

Duval, P.-M. (1969) "Un texte du Vᵉ siècle relatif au sanctuaire apollinien des Leuci." In Volume 2 of *Hommage à Marcel Renard*, edited by J. Bibauw, 256–261. Brussels.

Duval, P.-M., and G. Pinault. (1986) *Recueil des inscriptions Gauloises, vol. 3: Les calendriers*. XLVᵉ supplement à *Gallia*. Paris.

Du Plessis, P. (2015) *Borkowski's Textbook on Roman Law*. Oxford.

Dyson, S. L. (1985) *The Creation of the Roman Frontier*. Princeton.

Edmondson, J. (2006) "Cities and Urban Life in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire, 30 BCE–250 CE." In *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, edited by D. S. Potter, 250–280. Oxford.

Eich, P. (2012) "Centre and Periphery: Administrative Communication in Roman Imperial Times." In *Rome, a City and Its Empire in Perspective*, edited by S. Benoist, 85–108. Leiden.

Elden, S. (2010a) "Land, Terrain, Territory." *Progress in Human Geography* 34 (6): 799–817.

———. (2010b) "Thinking Territory Historically." *Geopolitics* 15 (4): 757–761.

Elwyn, S. (1993) "Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy." *TAPA* 123: 261–286.

d'Encarnação, J. (2008) "Dédicants et *cultores*: quelques aspects . . . dans la Lusitanie romaine. Le cas d'Endovellicus," in A. Sartori (ed.) *Dedicanti e cultores nelle religioni celtiche* (*Quaderni di Acme* 104). Milan: 61–71.

Erskine, A. (2001) *Troy between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power.* Oxford.

Esteban Ortega, J., and J. Salas Martín. (2003) *Epigrafía romana y cristiana del Museo de Cáceres* (Memorias 3). Cáceres.

Étienne, R. (1962) *Bordeaux antique.* Bordeaux.

———. (1987) "A propos de quelques basiliques de Gaule et de Péninsule ibérique." In *Atti del Convegno Studi Lunensi e prospettive sull'Occidente romano, Lerici settembre 1985.* Lerici: 37–52.

———. (1992) "Culte de la ciuitas, culte des pagi dans les Trois Gaules." In *Religio deorum: Actas del coloquio internacional de Epigrafía "Culto y Sociedad en Occidente,"* edited by M. Mayer, 171–176. Barcelona.

Étienne, R., P. Le Roux, and A. Tranoy. (1987) "La tessera hospitalis, instrument de sociabilité et de romanisation dans la péninsule ibérique." In *Sociabilité, pouvoirs et société: actes du colloque de Rouen 24/26 novembre 1983,* edited by F. Thelamon, 323–336. Rouen.

Éveillard, J. (2003) "Un monument sculpté gallo-romain atypique: la stèle de Kervadol en Plobannalec (Finistère)." In *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum: neue Funde und Forschungen,* edited by P. Noelke, F. Naumann-Steckner, and B. Schneider, 115–126. Mainz.

Fabre, G., M. Mayer, and I. Rodà. (eds.) (1991) *Inscriptions romaines de Catalogne.* vol. 3. Paris.

Falileyev, A. (ed.) (2010) *Dictionary of Continental Celtic Place-Names: A Celtic Companion to the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World.* In collaboration with Ashwin E. Gohil and Naomi Ward. Aberystwyth.

Fear, A. T. (1991) "The Dancing Girls of Cadiz." *Greece and Rome* 38: 75–79.

———. (1996) *Rome and Baetica: Urbanization in Southern Spain c.* 50 BC–AD 150. Oxford.

Feeney, D. (2007) *Caesar's Calendar.* Berkeley.

Fentress, J., and C. Wickham. (1992) *Social Memory.* Oxford.

Ferchiou, N. (1986) "Le mausolée anonyme de Thuburnica." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome* 98: 665–705.

Ferdière, A. (1988) *Les campagnes en Gaule romaine.* 2 vols. Paris.

———. (2004) "Indigènes et 'romanisés' à travers la tombe privilégiée en Gaule," *Latomus* 63: 35–57.

Fernández, R. R. (1975) *La ciudad romana de Ilici.* Alicante.

Fernández Martínez, C. (2007) *Carmina latina epigraphica de Bética romana.* Sevilla.

Fernández-Miranda, M., P. Bueno, F. Piñón, and A. Rodero. (1980) "Torralba d'en Salort (Alayor, Menorca): La Sala Hipóstila." *Noticiario Arqueológico Hispánico* 10: 137–182.

Ferreira da Silva, A. C. (1986) *A Cultura castreja no Noroeste de Portugal.* Paços de Ferreira.

———. (1999) *A Citânia de Sanfins.* Paços de Ferreira.

Finley, M. (1985) *Ancient History: Evidence and Models.* London.

Fishwick, D. (1970) "Flamen Augustorum." *HSCP* 74: 299–312.

———. (1976) "The Provincial Priesthood of Titus Sennius Sollemnis." *Historia* 25: 124–129.

———. (1987) *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West.* Leiden.

Fitzgerald, W. (2007) *Martial: The World of the Epigram.* Chicago.

Fordyce, C. J. (1977) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Libri VII–VIII.* Oxford.

Forni, G., and M. G. Angeli Bertinelli. (1982) "Pompeo Trogo come fonte di storia." *ANRW* II 30 (2): 1298–1362.

Forsythe, G. (2005) *A Critical History of Early Rome.* Berkeley.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge.* New York.

———. (2004) *Sécurité, territoire, population: cours au Collège de France (1977–1978).* Paris.

Frakes, J. F. D. (2012) "An Architecture of Human Heads: Gallic Responses to Roman Power." In *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde: Tall Order: Writing the Social History of the Ancient World: Essays in Honor of William V. Harris*, edited by J. Aubert and Z. Várhelyi, 161–183. Munich.

Frankfurter, D. (1998) *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance.* Princeton.

———. (2000) "The Consequences of Hellenism in Late Antique Egypt: Religious Worlds and Actors." *ARG* 2: 162–194.

Franz, A., and F. A. Greenland. (2003) "Omnes Hispaniae: Cultural Identities and Hispano-Roman Sculpture in Baetica and Tarraconensis." In *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum: neue Funde und Forschungen*, edited by P. Noelke, F. Naumann-Steckner, and B. Schneider, 635–646. Mainz.

Freudenburg, K. (2010) "*Horatius Anceps*: Persona and Self-Revelation in Satire and Song." In *A Companion to Horace*, edited by G. Davis, 271–290. Oxford.

Galletier, E. (1949) *Panégyriques latin.* 3 vols. Paris.

Galliou, P. (1984) *L'Armorique romaine.* Braspars.

Galsterer, H. (1971) *Untersuchungen zum römischen Städtewesen auf der iberischen Halbinsel Suppe: Madrider Mitteilungen*. Berlin.

———. (1986) "Roman Law in the Provinces: Some Problems of Transmission." In *L'impero romano e le strutture economiche e sociali delle province*, edited by M. Crawford, 13–27. Como.

———. (1988) "Municipium Flavium Irnitanum: A Latin Town in Spain." *JRS* 78: 78–90.

Gambash, G. (2015). *Rome and Provincial Resistance*. London.

García San Juan, L., P. Garrido, and F. Lozano. (2007) "Las piedras de la memoria (II): el uso en época romana de espacios y monumentos sagrados prehistóricos del sur de la Península Ibérica." *Complutum* 18: 109–130.

García y Bellido, A. (1963) "Hercules Gaditanus." *AEA* 36: 70–153.

———. (1966) "Tessera Hospitalis del año 14 de la era hallada en Herrera de Pisuerga." *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 159: 149–167.

———. (1972) "Valencia, colonia romana." *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 169: 247–261.

Gascó La Calle, F. (1986) "Gargoris y Habis: la leyenda de los orígenes de Tartesos." *Revista de estudios andaluces* 7: 127–146.

Gascou, J. (1972) *La politique municipale de l'empire romain en Afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime Sévère*. Roma.

———. (2000) "L'inscription de Saint-Jean-de-Garguier en l'honneur du sévir augustal Q. Cornelius Zosimus." *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome* 112: 279–295.

Geiger, S. (2008) *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Leiden.

Gellner, E. (2008) *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca.

Ghey, E. (2007) "Empty Spaces or Meaningful Places? A Broader Perspective on Continuity." In *Continuity and Innovation in Religion in the Roman West*, edited by R. Haeussler and A. C. King, 103–116. Portsmouth, RI.

Gilly, W. S. (1844) *Vigilantius and His Times*. London.

Gimeno Pascual, H. (1988) *Artesanos y técnicos en la epigrafía de Hispania*. Barcelona.

Glatz, C. (2014) "Monuments and Landscape: Exploring Issues of Place, Distance, and Scale in Early Political Contest." In *Approaching Monumentality in Archaeology*, edited by J. F. Osbourne, 109–134. Albany.

Goldschmidt, N. (2013) *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford.

González Echegaray, J. (1966) *Los Cántabros*. Madrid.

González Pérez, V. (1974) "La centuriation de Ilici." In *Estudios sobre centuriaciones romanas en España*, edited by A. López Gómez, 101–113. Madrid.

González, J., and M. Crawford. (1986) "The *Lex Irnitana*: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law." *JRS* 76: 147–243.

Gordon, R. (1990) "Religion in the Roman Empire: The Civic Compromise and Its

Limits." In *Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*, edited by M. Beard and J. North, 235–255. London.

Goudineau, C. (1983) "La notion de patrie Gauloise durant le Haut-empire." In *La Patrie Gauloise d'Agrippa au VIᵉ⁽ⁱᵉᵐᵉ⁾ s. (Actes du Colloque de Lyon 1981)*, 149–160. Lyon.

———. (1990) *César et la Gaule*. Paris.

———. (1998) *Regard sur la Gaule*. Paris.

———. (2003) "Le *Gutuater* gaulois." *Gallia* 60: 383–387.

Goudineau, C., L. Fauduet, and G. Coulon. (eds.) (1994) *Les sanctuaires de tradition indigène en Gaule romaine*. Paris.

Green, R. P. H. (1991) *The Works of Ausonius*. Oxford.

Grenier, A. (1944) "Sanctuaires gallo-romains et tombe du héros." *CRAI*: 221–228.

Gros, P. (1979) "Pour une chronologie des arcs de triomphe de Gaule narbonnaise." *Gallia* 37: 55–83.

———. (1981) "Notes sur deux reliefs des 'Antiques' de Glanum: le problème de la romanisation." *RAN* 14: 159–172.

———. (1984) "Une hypothèse sur l'arc d'Orange." *Gallia* 44: 191–201.

———. (1991) *La France gallo-romaine*. Paris.

———. (2001) *L'architecture romaine*. Vol. 2. Paris.

Gruen, E. (2011a) *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton.

———. (ed.) (2011b) *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Los Angeles.

Guillet, E., V. Lelièvre, J.-L. Paillet, M. Piskorz, A. Recolin, and F. Souq. (1992) "Un monument à portique tardo-hellénistique près de la source de la Fontaine à Nîmes (Gard)." *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale* 15: 57–89.

Gutschmid, A. von (1882) "Trogus und Timagenes." *RhM* 37: 548–555.

Guyonvarc'h, C.-J., and F. Le Roux. (1986) *Les druides*. 4th ed. Rennes.

Habinek, T. N. (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.

Hainsworth, J. B. (1962) "Verginius and Vindex." *Historia* 11: 86–96.

Haley, E. W. (1991) *Migration and Economy in Roman Imperial Spain*. Barcelona.

Hall, J. (2002) *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.

Hallsall, G. (1998) "Burial, Ritual, and Merovingian Society." In *The Community, the Family, and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, edited by J. Hill and M. Swan, 325–338. Turnhout.

———. (2003) "Burial Writes: Graves, Texts, and Time in Early Merovingian Northern Gaul." In *Erinnerungskultur im Bestattungsritual*, edited by J. Jarnut and M. Wemhoff, 61–74. Munich.

Hannah, R. (2005) *Greek and Roman Calendars: Constructions of Time in the Classical World*. London.

———. (2009) *Time in Antiquity*. London.

Harley, J. B., and D. Woodward. (1987) *The History of Cartography: Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean*. Vol. 1. Chicago: 220–225.

Harmand, J. (1970) *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'Antiquité classique*. Paris.

Hartog, F. (1988) *The Mirror of Herodotus: The Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*. Berkeley.

Hatt, J.-J. (1986) *La tombe gallo-romaine*. 2nd ed. Paris.

Häussler, R. (2010) "From Tomb to Temple: On the Rôle of Hero Cults in Local Religions in Gaul and Britain in the Iron Age and the Roman Period." In *Celtic Religion across Space and Time*, edited by J. Alberto Arenas-Esteban, 200–227. Toledo.

———. (2011) "Beyond 'Polis Religion' and *Sacerdotes Publici* in Southern Gaul." In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, edited by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 391–428. Stuttgart.

Haverfield, F. (1915) *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. Oxford.

Hedlund, R. (2008) *". . . Achieved Nothing Worthy of Memory." Coinage and Authority in the Roman Empire c. AD 260–295*. Studia Numismatica Upsalensia 5. Uppsala.

Heinen, H. (1985) *Trier und das Trevererland in römischer Zeit*. Trier.

Hekster, O. (2015) *Emperors and Ancestors: Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition*. Oxford.

Hermet, F. (1934) *La Graufesenque (Condatomago)*. 2 vols. Paris.

Hernández Guerra, L. (1994) *Inscripciones romanas de la provincia de Palencia*. Valladolid.

Hernández, R. (2001) *Poesia latina sepulcral de la Hispania romana: estudio de los tópicos y sus formulaciones*. Valencia.

Hester, N. (2008) *Literature and Identity in Italian Baroque Travel Writing*. Aldershot, UK.

Hiernard, J. (1997) "Bituriges du Bordelais et Bituriges du Berry: l'apport de la numismatique," *Revue Archéologique de Bordeaux* 88: 61–65.

Hingley, R. (2000) *Roman Officers and English Gentlemen: The Imperial Origins of Roman Archaeology*. London.

Hirschfeld, O. (1870) "Review of Hübner." *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae: Göttingische gelehrten Anzeigen* 28: 1081–1120.

Hobsbawm, E., and T. Ranger. (eds.) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge.

Hofeneder, A. (2006) "Favorinus von Arleate und die keltische Religion." *Keltische Forschungen* 1: 29–58.

Hölkeskamp, K. J. (2006) "History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic." In *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, 478–495. Oxford.

———. (2011) "The Roman Republic as a Theater of Power: The Consuls as Lead-

ing Actors." In *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*, edited by H. Beck, A. Duplá, M. Jehne, and F. Pina Polo, 161–181. Cambridge.

Holleaux, M. (1930) "Rome and Macedon: The Romans against Philip." *CAH* 8: 138–198.

Hollis, A. S. (2009) *Fragments of Roman Poetry: c. 60 BC–AD 20*. Oxford.

Hölscher, T. (2006) "The Transformation of Victory into Power: From Event to Structure." In *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, edited by S. Dilon and K. Welch, 27–48. Cambridge.

Hoogma, R. P. (1959) *Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina latina epigraphica: eine Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrisch-technischen Grundsätze der Entlehnung*. Amsterdam.

Howell, P. (1980) *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.

———. (1998) "Martial's Return to Spain." In *Toto notus in orbe: Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation*, edited by F. Grewing, 173–186. Stuttgart.

———. (2009) *Martial*. London.

Hoyos, B. (1978) "In Defense of C.I.L. 2.760." *Athenaeum* 56: 390–395.

de Hoz Bravo, J., and F. Fernández Palacios. (2002) "Band-." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur saxa*, edited by L. Raposo, 45–52. Lisboa.

Huggins, M. (2004) *The Victorians and Sport*. London.

Hunt, L. (1984) *Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution*. Berkeley.

Illarregui, E. (2010) "*Tessera Hospitalis* de Herrera de Pisuerga (Palencia–España)." *Revista Internacional d'Humanitats* 20: 15–28.

Isaac, B. (2011) "Attitudes toward Provincial Intellectuals in the Roman Empire." In *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by E. Gruen, 491–518. Los Angeles.

Izquierdo Peraile, I. (1996) "Les piliers-stèles ibériques: un type de monument funéraire aristocratique." *MCV* 32: 35–70.

James, S. (1999) *The Atlantic Celts: Ancient People or Modern Invention?* London.

Jiménez, A. (2010a) "Roman Settlements/Punic Ancestors: Some Examples from the Necropoleis of Southern Iberia." *Bolletino di Archaeologia on line* 1, vol. spec. A/A7/4: 25–43.

———. (2010b) "Reproducing Difference: Mimesis and Colonialism in Roman Hispania." In *Material Connections: Mobility, Materiality and Mediterranean Identities*, edited by B. Knapp and P. van Dommelen, 38–63. London.

———. (2011) "Pure Hybridism: Late Iron Age Sculpture in Southern Iberia." *World Archaeology* 43: 102–123.

———. (2015) "The Western Empire and the 'People without History': A Case Study from Southern Iberia." In *Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire*, edited by K. Galinsky and K. Lapatin, 170–190. Los Angeles.

Johnston, A. C. (2014) "Household Objects and Social Memories in Roman Spain

and Gaul." In *Roman in the Provinces: Art on the Periphery of Empire*, edited by L. R. Brody and G. L. Hoffman, 63–76. Chestnut Hill, MA.

———. (2017) "*Nostri* and the Other(s)." In *The Cambridge Companion to Caesar*, edited by L. Grillo and C. B. Krebs. Cambridge.

Jones, C. P. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA.

———. (2001a) "Memories of the Roman Republic in the Greek East." In *The Greek East in the Roman Context*, edited by O. Salomies, 11–18. Helsinki.

———. (2001b) "Pausanias and His Guides." In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, edited by S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner 33–39. Oxford.

Jonge, P. de. (1953) *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XV*, 6–13. Groningen.

Jordán Cólera, C. (2004) *Celtibérico*. Zaragoza.

Jourdain-Annequin, C. (1989) *Héraclès aux portes du soir: mythe et histoire*. Paris.

Jullian, C. (1908–1926) *Histoire de la Gaule*. 8 vols. Paris.

———. (1918) "Sur la cité à laquelle appartenait la villa de Chiragon." *REA* 20: 247–248.

Karttunen, K. (1997) *India and the Hellenistic World*. Helsinki.

Keay, S. (1988) *Roman Spain*. London.

———. (1995) "Innovation and Adaptation: The Contribution of Rome to Urbanism in Iberia." *PBA* 86: 291–337.

———. (2006) "The Early Roman Towns of Tarraconensis: A Discussion." In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, edited by L. Abad Casal, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo Asensio, 223–237. Portsmouth, RI.

Keay, S., and N. Terrenato. (eds.) (2001) *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*. Oxford.

Keay, S., J. Creighton, and J. Remesal Rodríguez. (2000) *Celti (Peñaflor): The Archaeology of a Hispano-Roman Town in Baetica*. Oxford.

Kilani, M. (1983) *Les cultes du cargo mélanésiens: mythe et rationalité en anthropologie*. Lausanne.

Kleiner, D. E. E. (1983) *The monument of Philopappos in Athens*. Rome.

Knapp, R. (1986) "Cantabria and the *era consularis*," *Epigraphica* 48: 115–146.

Koch, M. (1984) *Tarschisch und Hispanien: historisch-geographische und namenkundliche Untersuchungen zur Phönikischen Kolonisation der Iberischen Halbinsel*. Berlin.

König, J. (2001) "Favorinus' Corinthian Oration and Its Corinthian Context." *PCPhS* 47: 141–171.

Konrad, C. F. (1978) "Afranius imperator." *Hisp. Ant.* 8: 67–76.

Kotula, T. (1965) "Les *principes gentis* et les *principes civitatis* en Afrique romaine." *Eos* 55: 347–365.

Krebs, C. B. (2006) "'Imaginary Geography' in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*." *AJP* 127: 111–136.

———. (2011) "Borealism: Caesar, Seneca, Tacitus, and the Roman Discourse about the Germanic North." In *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by E. Gruen, 202–221. Los Angeles.

Kropp, A. (2008) *Defixiones: Ein aktuelles Corpus lateinischer Fluchtafeln*. Speyer.

Lambert, P. (2003) *La langue gauloise: description linguistique, commentaire d'inscriptions choisies*. 3rd ed. Paris.

Lamoine, L. (2006) "La pratique du vergobret: le témoignage de César confronté aux inscriptions." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 17: 81–104.

———. (2009) *Le pouvoir local en Gaule romaine*. Clermont-Ferrand.

Larsen, J. A. O. (1955) *Representative Government in Greek and Roman History*. Berkeley.

———. (1968) *Greek Federal States: Their Institutions and History*. Berkeley.

Lavan, M. (2013) *Slaves to Rome: Paradigms of Empire in Roman Culture*. Cambridge.

Le Bohec, Y. (ed.) (1991) *Le Testament du Lingon*. Lyon.

———. (2001) "*Gutuater*: nom propre ou nom commun?" *Gallia* 58: 363–367.

———. (2005) "Le clergé celtique et la guerre des Gaules: Historiographie et politique." *Latomus* 64: 871–881.

LeCornec, J. (1994) *Le Petit-Mont, Arzon (Morbihan)*. Rennes.

Lejeune, M. (1968–1970) "La Prêture en Narbonnaise et l'Inscription Gauloise de Vitrolles." *Études Classiques* 3: 131–139.

———. (1985) "Sur les légendes monétaires des Gaulois Lixoviens." *Latomus* 44: 271–280.

———. (1990) "Les premiers pas de la déesse Bibracte." *Journal des Savants* 1–2: 69–96.

Lerat, L. (1998) *Les Villards d'Héria, Jura*. Besançon.

Le Roux, F. (1959) "A propos du *vergobretus* gaulois: La Regia potestas en Irlande et en Gaule." *Ogam* 11: 66–80.

———. (1960) "Le Dieu celtique aux liens: de l'Ogmios de Lucien à l'Ogmios de Dürer." *Ogam* 12: 209–234.

Le Roux, P., and A. Tranoy. (1973) "Rome et les indigènes dans le Nord-Ouest de la Péninsula Ibèrique: Problèmes d'épigraphie et d'histoire." *Mélanges Casa Velàsquez* 9: 177–232.

Lewis, C. (2000) "Gallic Identity and the Gallic *Civitas* from Caesar to Gregory of Tours." In *Ethnicity and Culture in Late Antiquity*, edited by S. Mitchell and G. Greatrex, 69–81. Swansea.

Lightfoot, J. L. (1999) *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικά Παθήματα*. Oxford.

Lintz, G. and I. Sautereau. (1996) *Sanctuaires et habitat antiques de la montagne limousine: les Cars, Corrèze*. Limoges.

Liu, J. (2007) "The Era of Patavium Again." *ZPE* 162: 281–289.

López Domech, R. (1996) *La región Oretana: estructuras indígenas y organización romana en la alta Andalucía.* Murcia.

Loustaud, J.-P. (1997) "L'alimentation en eau de la ville d'Augustoritum-Limoges." *Caesarodunum* 31: 289–290.

Lowi, T. J. (1992) "The State in Political Science: How We Become What We Study." *American Political Science Review* 86: 1–7.

Lucarini, C. M. (2004) "Le fonti storiche di Silio Italico." *Athenaeum* 92 (1): 103–126.

Luján, E. M. (2011) "*Briga* and *Castellum* in North-Western Hispania." In *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street: Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz,* edited by E. R. Luján and J. L. García Alonso, 225–242. Innsbruck.

Lund, A. A. (1996) "Caesar als Ethnograph." *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 39 (2): 12–23.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1987) *Further Voices in Virgil's Aeneid.* Oxford.

Ma, J. (2003) "Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age." *Past and Present* 180: 7–38.

Mackie, N. (1983) *Local Administration in Roman Spain A.D.* 14–212. Oxford.

MacMullen, R. (1965) "The Celtic Renaissance." *Historia* 14: 93–104.

———. (2000) *Romanization in the Time of Augustus.* New Haven.

MacNeill, M. (1962) *The Festival of Lughnasa: A Study of the Survival of the Celtic Festival of the Beginning of the Harvest.* London.

Madden, R. (2010) *Being Ethnographic: A Guide to the Theory and Practice of Ethnography.* London.

Magueijo, C. (1970) "Una inscrição métrica do Museu Nacional de Arqueologia e Etnologia (inventario E 6354)." *O Arqueologo Portugués* 3 (4): 115–123.

Malaspina, E. (1976) "Uno storico filobarbaro: Pompeio Trogo." *Romanobarbarica* 1: 134–157.

Mangas, J., and D. Martino. (1997) "*Princeps Cantabrorum* en una nueva inscripcíon." *Gerión* 15: 321–339.

Mann, J. C. (1960) "*Civitas*: Another Myth." *Antiquity* 34: 222–223.

———. (1961) "*Civitas*: A Further Comment." *Antiquity* 35: 142–143.

Marco Simòn, F. (2002) "Vota Omnia Finibus, la tessera de Herrera de Pisuerga y la ritualización de los pactos en la Hispania Indoeuropea." *Paleohispánica* 2: 169–188.

———. (2007) "A Lost Identity: Celtiberian Iconography after the Roman Conquest." In *Continuity and Innovation in Religion in the Roman West,* edited by R. Häussler and A. C. King, 103–116. Portsmouth.

———. (2010) "Execrating the Roman Power: Three *defixiones* from Emporiae (Ampurias)." In *Magical Practice in the Latin West,* edited by R. L. Gordon and F. Marco Simòn, 399–423. Leiden.

Marichal, R. (1988) *Les graffites de La Graufesenque.* Paris.

Martins da Fonte, J. M. (2006) "O 'Padrão dos Povos' de *Aquae Flaviae*." *Al-Madan* 14: 55–61.

Matthews, J. (1975) *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425*. Oxford.

Mattingly, D. (ed.) (1997) *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experiences in the Roman Empire*. Portsmouth, RI.

———. (2014) "Identities in the Roman World: Discrepancy, Heterogeneity, Hybridity, and Plurality." In *Roman in the Provinces: Art on the Periphery of Empire*, edited by L. R. Brody and G. L. Hoffman, 35–59. Chestnut Hill, MA.

Maurin, L. (1978) *Saintes antique: des origines à la fin du VIe siècle après Jésus-Christ*. Saintes.

Maurin, L., and M. Thauré. (1980) "Inscriptions révisées ou nouvelles du Musée archéologique de Saintes (Charente-Maritime)." *Gallia* 38: 197–213.

May, R. (1996) *Lugdunum Convenarum: Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges*. Lyon.

Mayer, M., R. García, and J. A. Abásolo. (1998) "El Bronce de Fuentes de Ropel (Zamora)." *Boletín del Seminario de Arte y Arqueología* 64: 161–174.

Mayer, M., and J. Velaza Frías. (1994) "El *carmen epigraphicum* de Arellano (Navarra): Algunas precisiones de lectura, interpretación y cronología." *Principe de Viana* 203: 515–526.

McCarty, M. (2016) "Gods, Masks, and *Monstra*: Situational Syncretisms in Roman Africa." In *Beyond Boundaries: Connecting Visual Cultures in the Provinces of Ancient Rome*, edited by S. Alcock, M. Egri, and J. F. D. Frakes, 266–280. Los Angeles.

McKitterick, R. (2004) *History and Memory in the Carolingian World*. Cambridge.

Meid, W. (1980) *Gallisch oder Lateinisch? soziolinguistische und andere Bemerkungen zu populären gallo-lateinischen Inschriften*. Innsbruck.

———. (1992) *Gaulish Inscriptions: Their Interpretation in the Light of Archaeological Evidence and Their Value as a Source of Linguistic and Sociological Information*. Budapest.

———. (1994) *Celtiberian Inscriptions*. Budapest.

———. (1996) *Heilpflanzen und Heilsprüche: Zeugnisse gallischer Sprache bei Marcellus von Bordeaux*. Innsbruck.

Meiggs, R. (1973) *Roman Ostia*. Oxford.

Mierse, W. E. (1999) *Temples and Towns in Roman Iberia: The Social and Architectural Dynamics of Sanctuary Designs, from the Third Century B.C. to the Third Century A.D.* Berkeley.

Miles, R. (2003) "Rivalling Rome: Carthage." In *Rome the Cosmopolis*, edited by C. Edwards and G. Woolf, 123–146. Cambridge.

Millar, F. (1977) *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London.

Miller, B. K. (2015) "The Southern Xiongnu in Northern China: Navigating and Negotiating the Middle Ground." In *Complexity of Interaction along the Eurasion Steppe Zone in the First Milennium CE*, edited by J. Bemmann and M. Schmauder, 127–198. Bonn.

Moeller, W. O. (1972) "The Trinci/Trinqui and the Martyrs of Lyons." *Historia* 21: 127.

Momigliano, A. (1975) *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization.* Cambridge.

Mommsen, T. (1854–85) *Römische Geschicthe.* 5 vols. Berlin.

Moore, F. G. (1910) *The Histories of Tacitus: Books I and II.* New York.

Moreau, J. (1958) "*Eubages* et *uates* gaulois." *Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France*: 180–190.

Morgan, M. (2001) *National Identities and Travel in Victorian Britain.* New York.

Morillo Cerdán, A. (2000) "La legio IIII Macedonica en la península Ibérica: El campamento de Herrera de Pisuerga (Palencia)." In *Les légions de Rome sous le Haut-Empire,* edited by Y. Le Bohec, 609–624. Lyon.

Mozas, S. (2006) "Consideraciones sobre las emisiones de Iltiraka: procedencia y tipología." *Actas del XII Congreso Nacional de Numismática (Madrid, 25–27 de octubre de 2004).* Madrid: 269–286.

Muir, E. (1981) *Civic Ritual in Renaissance Venice.* Princeton.

Murphy, A. B. (2010) "Identity and Territory." *Geopolitics* 15 (4): 769–772.

Musso, O. (2004) "'Bilbilis equis nobilis, sed nobilior aquis': A proposito di Marziale I 49, 4." In *Hominem pagina nostra sapit: Marcial, 1900 años después,* edited by J. J. Iso Echegoyen and A. Encuentra Ortega, 151–155. Zaragoza.

Naerebout, F. G. (2009) "*Das Reich tanzt . . .* Dance in the Roman Empire and Its Discontents." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire,* edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 143–158. Leiden.

Nash, C. (2000) "Performativity in Practice: Some Recent Work in Cultural Geography." *Progress in Human Geography* 24: 653–664.

Nash, D. (1976) "Reconstructing Poseidonios' Celtic Ethnography: Some Considerations." *Britannia* 7: 111–126.

Neira Jiménez, M. L. (1998) "Reminiscencias de las *Lupercalia* en el agro lusitano: A propósito de un mosaico de la *villa* de Santa Vitória do Ameixial." In *L'Africa Romana: Atti del XII convegno di studio Olbia, 12–15 dicembre 1996,* edited by Khanoussi, M., Ruggeri, P., and Vismara, C., 907–920. Sassari.

Nice, A. (2003) "C. Trebatius Testa and the British Charioteers: The Relationship of Cic. *ad Fam.* 7.10.2 to Caes. *BG* 4.25 and 33." *Acta Classica* 46: 71–96.

Nicol, J. (1936) *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus.* Oxford.

Nicolet, C. (1991) *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire.* Ann Arbor.

Nicols, J. (2011) "Hospitality among the Romans." In *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World,* edited by M. Peachin, 422–437. Oxford.

Nielsen, H. S. (1997) "Interpreting Epithets in Roman Epitaphs." In *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space,* edited by B. Rawson and P. Weaver, 169–204. Oxford.

Nixon, C. E. V. (1990) "The Use of the Past by the Gallic Panegyrists." In *Reading the Past in Late Antiquity*, edited by G. W. Clarke, B. Croke, A. Emmett Nobbs, and R. Mortley, 1–36. Canberra.

Nixon, C. E. V., and B. S. Rodgers. (1994) *In Praise of Later Emperors: The Panegyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary.* Berkeley.

Nora, P. (1984–1992) *Les Lieux de mémoire* (3 vol.). Paris.

———. (1989) "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," *Representations* 26: 7–25.

Noreña, C. (2011) *Imperial Ideals in the Roman West: Representation, Circulation, Power.* Cambridge.

North, J. A. (2008) "Caesar at the Lupercalia." *JRA* 98: 144–160.

North, J. A., and N. McLynn. (2008) "Postscript to the Lupercalia: From Caesar to Andromachus." *JRA* 98: 176–181.

Noy, D. (2000) *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers.* London.

Ogilvie, R. M. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5.* Oxford.

Oliver, J. H. (1966) "North, South, East, and West at Arausio and Elsewhere." In *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoires offerts à André Piganiol*, edited by R. Chevalier, 1075–1079. Vol. 2. Paris.

Oliver, J. H., and R. E. A. Palmer. (1955) "Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate." *Hesperia* 24 (4): 320–349.

Olmsted, G. (1992) *The Gaulish Calendar: A Reconstruction from the Bronze Fragments from Coligny, with an Analysis of Its Function as a Highly Accurate Lunar-Solar Predictor, as Well as an Explanation of its Terminology and Development.* Bonn.

———. (2001) *A Definitive Reconstructed Text of the Coligny Calendar.* Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph no. 39. Washington, DC.

Olshausen, E., and H. Sonnabend. (eds.) (2006) *"Troianer sind wir gewesen." Migrationen in der antiken Welt.* Stuttgart.

Page, D. L. (1973) "Stesichorus: The *Geryoneis*." *JHS* 93: 138–154.

Papazarkadas, N. (ed.) (2014) *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia: New Finds, New Prospects. Brill Studies in Greek and Roman Epigraphy, 4.* Leiden.

Pease, A. S. (1940) "*Mantua me genuit.*" *CP* 35: 180–182.

Pedrero Sancho, R. (1999) "Aproximación lingüística al teónimo lusitano-gallego Bandue/Bandi." In *Pueblos, lenguas y escrituras de la Hispania prerromana*, edited by F. Villar and F. Beltrán, 535–543. Salamanca.

Pelletier, A. (1996) "Pour une nouvelle histoire des origines de Lugdunum." *Caesarodunum* 30: 167–178.

Pelttari, A. (2014) *The Space that Remains: Reading of Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity.* Ithaca.

Peña, María José. (2009) "*Sidera Mundivaga*: Un *carmen epigraphicum* de *Pax Iulia*

(Beja, Portugal)." In *Espacios, usos y formas de la epigrafía Hispana en épocas Antigua y Tardoantigua*, 273–284. Mérida.

Peña Jurado, A. (2007) "Reflejos del Forum Augustum en Itálica." In *Culto imperial: política y poder*, edited by T. Nogales and J. González, 323–345. . Roma:.

Pérez Juez, A., J. Wiseman, P. Goldberg, J. Hansen, K. Mullen, M. Ostovich, C. Payne, S. Gornés, D. Cabanes, I. Euba, J. V. Morales, J. Morín, and F. J. López Fraile. (2007) "El uso del espacio doméstico de una estructura del Talayótica final: Excavación de la Casa 2 del yacimiento de Torre d'en Galmès, Alayor 2003–2006." In *L'arqueologia a Menorca: eina per al coneixement del Passat*, 53–73. Menorca.

Pérez Vilatela, L. (1990) "El origen del Sagunto in Silio Italico." *Arse Sagunto* 25: 23–40.

———. (1995) "Los *nostoi* en Iberia, según la escuela de Pérgamo." *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 5: 321–344.

Petit, P. (1976) *Pax Romana*. Berkeley.

Pflaum, H.-G. (1948) *Le Marbre de Thorigny*. Paris.

Picard, G.-C. (1970) "Les *Conciliabula* de la Gaule." *Bulletin de la Societé Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 62: 66–69.

Piganiol, A. (1962) *Les documents cadastraux de la colonie romaine d'Orange*. Paris.

Piggott, S. (1968) *The Druids*. London.

Porte, D. (2000) "En marge de la guerre des Gaules: le "Bellum Sequanicum" de Varron d'Atax." *Latomus* 59: 276–288.

Prag, J. (2007) "*Auxilia* and *Gymnasia*: A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism." *JRS* 97: 68–100.

Prag, J., and J. Quinn. (eds.) (2013) *The Hellenistic West: Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*. Cambridge.

Price, S. (2005) "Local Mythologies in the Greek East." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by C. J. Howgego, V. Heuchert, and A. Burnett, 115–124. Oxford.

———. (2012) "Memory and Ancient Greece." In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, edited by B. Dignas and R. R. R. Smith, 15–36. Oxford.

Procter, D. E. (2005) *Civic Communion: The Rhetoric of Community Building*. Oxford.

Prósper, B. M. (2010) "Toponimia celta en la inscripción de Fuentes de Ropel: *Seguisona* y sus correlatos europeos." In *Dic mihi, Musa, virum: homenaje al profesor Antonio López Eire*, edited by F. Cortés Gabaudan and J. V. Méndez Dosuna, 533–540. Salamanca.

Purcell, N. (2005) "Romans in the Roman World." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 85–105. Cambridge.

Quoniam, P. (1950) "À propos d'une inscription de Thuburnica (Tunisie), Marius et la romanisation de l'Afrique." *CRAI* 94: 332–336.

Ramage, E. S. (1961) "Cicero on Extra-Roman Speech." *TAPA* 92: 481–494.

Ramallo Asensio, S. (2006) "Carthago Nova: *urbs opulentissima omnium in Hispania.*" In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Tarraconensis*, edited by L. Abad Casal, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo Asensio, 91–104. Portsmouth, RI.

Ramos Ferreira, A. P. (2004) *Epigrafia funerária romana da Beira Interior: Inovação ou continuidade?* Lisbon.

Rankin, H. D. (1987) *Celts and the Classical World*. London.

Redentor, A. (2009) "Sobre o significado dos guerreiros Lusitano-Galaicos: o contributo da epigrafia." *Palaeohispanica* 9: 227–246.

Rehak, P. (2006) *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*. Madison.

Renfrew, C., and J. Cherry. (eds.) (1986) *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*. Cambridge.

Revell, L. (2009) *Roman Imperialism and Local Identities*. Cambridge.

Ribera, A. (2006) "The Roman Foundation of Valencia and the Town in the 2nd–1st c. BC." In *Early Roman Towns in Hispania Taraconensis*, edited by L. Abad, S. Keay, and S. Ramallo, 75–89. Portsmouth, RI.

Richardson, J. (1983) "The *Tabula Contrebiensis*: Roman Law in Spain in the Early First Century B.C.," *JRS* 73: 33–41.

———. (1996) *The Romans in Spain*. Oxford.

———. (2008) *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire from the Third Century BC to the Second Century AD*. Cambridge.

Ridley, R. T. (1983) "*Falsi Triumphi, Plures Consulatus.*" *Latomus* 42: 372–382.

Riggsby, A. M. (2006) *Caesar in Gaul and Rome: War in Words*. Austin.

Rimell, V. (2008) *Martial's Rome: Empire and the Ideology of Epigram*. Cambridge.

Ripollès, P. (2002) *Arse-Saguntum: historia monetaria de la ciudad y su territorio*. Sagunto.

———. (2005) "Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces: Spain." In *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, edited by C. J. Howgego, V. Heuchert, and A. Burnett, 79–94. Oxford.

Rivet, A. L. F. (1988) *Gallia Narbonensis: With a Chapter on Alpes Maritimae: Southern France in Roman Times*. London.

Roberts, M. (1992) "Barbarians in Gaul: The Response of the Poets." In *Fifth-century Gaul: a crisis of identity?* Edited by J. Drinkwater and H. Elton, 97–106. Cambridge.

Rodríguez Colmenero, A. (1993) *Corpus-catálogo de inscripciones rupestres de época romana del cuadrante noroeste de la península ibérica*. Coruña.

———. (1997) *Aquae Flaviae I: Fontes epigráficas da Gallaecia meridional interior*. Chaves.

———. (2002) "Epígrafes latinos sobre guerreros galaicos: una clave esencial para la interpretación de la estatuaria bélica del Noroeste Ibérico." In *Homenaje a José García Oro*, edited by M. Romaní Martínez, M. Romaní, and M. A. Novoa Gómez, 267–285. Santiago de Compostela.

———. (2004) *Miliarios e outras inscricións viarias romanas do Noroeste hispánico (conventos bracarense, lucense, e asturicense)*. Santiago de Compostela.

Rodríguez Neila, J. F. (1998) "*Hispani principes*. Algunas reflexiones sobre los grupos dirigentes de la Hispania prerromana." *Cuadernos de Arqueología de la Universidad de Navarra* 6: 99–137.

Rodríguez Ramos, J. (2001) "El término (t)eban(en) en la lengua íbera: 'coeravit' vs. 'filius'." *Arse* 35: 59–86.

———. (2006) "Sobre la identificación de la ceca ibérica de Lamini(um)." *Acta Numismática* 36: 55–61.

———. (2010) "La inscripción *CILA* III, 1 N° 216 y la romanización onomástica y la pervivencia de elementos indígenas en la Cástulo romana." *Veleia* 27: 123-133.

Rohrbacher, D. (2002) *The Historians of Late Antiquity*. London.

Roller, D. W. (2003) *The World of Juba II and Kleopatra Selene: Royal Scholarship on Rome's African Frontier*. New York.

Romeo, I. (2002) "The Panhellenion and Ethnic Identity in Hadrianic Greece." *CP* 97: 21–40.

Romm, J. S. (1992) *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton.

Ross, A. (1967) *Pagan Celtic Britain: studies in iconography and tradition*. London.

Rosso, E. (2004) "Le 'Relief Historique': Rome et la Gaule," *RA* 2004 N.S. 1: 163–168.

Roth Congès, A. (2000) *Glanum. De l'oppidum salyen à la cité romaine*. Paris.

———. (2004) "Le contexte archéologique de la statuaire de *Glanon* (Saint-Rémy-de-Provence, Bouches-du-Rhône)." *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale* 27: 23–43.

Rousselle, A. (1976) "Du sanctuaire au thaumaturge: la guérison en Gaule au IVe siècle." *Annales* 31: 1085–1107.

Rowlands, M. (1993) "The role of memory in the transmission of culture," *World Archaeology* 25.2: 141–151.

Roymans, N. (2004) *Ethnic Identity and Imperial Power: The Batavians in the Early-Roman Empire*. Amsterdam.

———. (2009) "Hercules and the construction of a Batavian identity in the context of the Roman empire." In *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: the role of power and tradition*, edited by T. Derk and N. Roymans, 219–238. Amsterdam.

Rüger, C. B. (1972) "Gallisch-germanische Kurien." *Epigraphische Studien* 9: 251–260.

Sacks, K. S. (1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the first century*. Princeton.

Sáez Fernández, P. (1990) "Estudio sobre una inscripción catastral colindante con Lacimurga." *Habis* 21: 205–227.

Sahlins, M. (2004) *Apologies to Thucydides*. Chicago.

Said, E. (2000) "Invention, Memory, and Place." *Critical Inquiry* 26.2: 175–192.

Saller, R. P. (1988) "*Pietas*, Obligation, and Authority in the Roman Family." In *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by P. Kneissl and V. Losemann, 393–410. Darmstadt.

Salviat, F. (1977) "Orientation, extension, et chronologie des plans cadastraux d'Orange." *Revue Archéologique de Narbonnaise* 10: 107–118.

Samuel, A. E. (1972) *Greek and Roman chronology: calendars and years in classical antiquity*. München.

Sánchez-Palencia, F.-J., and J. Mangas. (eds.) (2000) *El Edicto del Bierzo. Augusto y el Noroeste de Hispania*. Ponferrada.

Sanmartí, E., and R. A. Santiago. (1987) "Une lettre grecque sur plomb trouvée à Emporion." *ZPE* 68: 119–127.

Santiago, R. A. (2003) "Las láminas de Ampurias y Pech Maho revisitadas." *ZPE* 144: 167–172.

Santos Yanguas, J. (1984) *Comunidades indígenas y administración romana en el Noroeste hispánico*. Vitoria.

———. (1999) "Gentes y cognationes. ¿Dos formas distintas de organización social indígena entre los Cántabros?" in *I Encuentro de Historia de Cantabria*. 2 vols. Santander: 271–290.

Sauron, G. (2004) "Réflexions sur le décor du front de scène du théâtre d'Orange," *RA* 2004 N.S. 1: 150–156.

Sauvage, L. (1992) "Le sanctuaire protohistorique de la Fontaine à Nîmes à la lumière des découvertes récentes." *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale* 15: 112–116.

Savigliano, M. (1995) *Tango and the political economy of passion*. Boulder, CO.

Schaad, D., and M. Vidal. (1992) "Origines et développement urbain des cités de Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, d'Auch et d'Eauze." In *Villes et agglomérations urbaines antiques du Sud-Ouest de la Gaule: histoire et archéologie*, edited by L. Maurin, 211–221. Paris.

Schadee, H. (2008) "Caesar's construction of northern Europe: inquiry, contact, and corruption in *De Bello Gallico*." *CQ* 58: 158–180.

Scheid, J. (1991) "Sanctuaires et territoire dans la colonia Augusta Trevirorum." In *Les sanctuaires celtiques et leurs rapports avec le monde Méditerranéen*, edited by J.-L. Brunaux, 42–57. Paris.

Schettino, M. T. (2006) "Sagunto e lo scoppio della guerra in Silio Italico." *Aevum Antiquum* 6: 53–63.

Schmitz, L. (1847) *A History of Rome: from the earliest times to the death of Commodus, A.D. 192*. Andover.

Schulten, A. (1913) "Martials spanische Gedichte." *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik* 31: 462–475.

———. (1950) *Tartessos: Ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens*. Hamburg.

Scott, J. C. (1998) *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (1966) *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 5. Cambridge.

Shapiro, S. B. (2008) *Dance in a World of Change: reflections on globalization and cultural difference*. Champaign, IL.

Shaw, B. D. (1981) "The Elder Pliny's African Geography." *Historia* 30: 424–471.

———. (2002) "'With whom I lived': Measuring Roman marriage." *Ancient Society* 32: 195–242.

Shelach, G. (2014) "Collapse or Transformation? Anthropological and Archaeological Perspectives on the Fall of Qin." In *Birth of an Empire: The State of Qin Revisited*, edited by Y. Pines, G. Shelach, L. von Falkenhausen, and R. D. S. Yates, 113–138. Berkeley.

Sheppard, A. R. R. (1984–1986) "Homonoia in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire." *Ancient Society* 15–17; 229–252.

Simpson, C. (1987) "The birth of Claudius and the date of dedication of the altar 'Romae et Augusto' at Lugdunum." *Latomus* 46: 586–592.

Sivan, H. (1993) *Ausonius of Bordeaux: genesis of a Gallic aristocracy*. London.

Smith, R. (2006) "The Construction of the Past in the Roman Empire." In *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, edited by D. S. Potter, 411–438. Oxford.

Snyder, W. (1940) "Public Anniversaries in the Roman Empire." Yale Classical Studies 7: 223–317.

Somers, M. (1994) "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach." *Theory and Society* 23: 605–649.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2011) *Athenian myths and festivals: Aglauros, Erechtheus, Plynteria, Panathenaia, Dionysia*. Oxford.

Spurr, D. (1993) *The Rhetoric of Empire. Colonial discourse in journalism, travel writing, and imperial administration*. Durham, NC.

Stifter, D. (2001) "Neues vom Keltiberischen: Notizen zu Botorrita IV." *Die Sprache (Sonderheft): Chronicalia Indoeuropaea* 38/3: 89–110.

———. (2006) "Contributions to Celtiberian Etymology II." *Palaeohispanica* 6: 237–245.

———. (2011) "The textual arrangement of Alise-Sainte-Reine [L-13]." *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 58: 165–182.

Stüber, K. (2007) "Effects of Language Contact on Gaulish Personal Names." In *The Celtic Languages in Contact*, edited by H. L. C. Tristram, 81–92. Potsdam.

Sullivan, J. P. (1991) *Martial, the unexpected classic: a literary and historical study*. Cambridge.

Swann, B. W. (1994) *Martial's Catullus: The Reception of an Epigrammatic Rival*. New York.

Syme, R. (1937) "The Colony of Cornelius Fuscus: An Episode in the Bellum Neronis." *AJP* 58: 7–18.

———. (1953) "Tacitus on Gaul." *Latomus* 12: 25–37.

———. (1958) *Tacitus*. Oxford.

———. (1986) "More Narbonensian senators." *ZPE* 65: 1–24.

Teverson, R. (2015) *Augustan Kings: The Art and Architecture of Herod the Great of Judaea and Juba II of Mauretania*. PhD Dissertation, Yale University.

Thevenot, E. (1968) *Divinités et sanctuaires de la Gaule*. Paris.

Thomas, E. (2007) *Monumentality and the Roman Empire: Architecture in the Antonine Age*. Oxford.

Thomas, R. F. (1982) *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry. The Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge.

———. (1988) *Virgil. Georgics*. Cambridge.

Thomas, Y. (1990) "L'institution de l'origine. *Sacra principiorum populi Romani*." In *Tracés de fondation*, edited by M. Détienne, 143–170. Paris.

Tierney, J. J. (1959) "The Celtic Ethnography of Posidonius." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 60: 189–275.

Tilley, C. (2004) *The materiality of stone. Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*. Oxford.

Torrent Orri, R. (1957) *Los castellani y el poblado ibérico y romano de Olot*. Olot.

Tortosa, T. (2004) *El Yacimiento de Alcudia (Elche, Alicante): pasado y presente de un enclave ibérico*. Madrid.

Tranoy, A. (1988) "Du heros au chef. L'image guerrier dans les sociétés indigènes du nord-ouest de la péninsule ibérique (IIe s. avant J.-C.-Ier s. après J.-C.)." *Caesarodunum* 23: 219–227.

———. (2002) "A 'Fonte do Ídolo.'" In *Religiôes da Lusitânia. Loquuntur saxa*, edited by L. Raposo, 11–16. Lisbon.

Trillmich, W. (1996a) "Reflejos del programma estatuario del Forum Augustum en Mérida." In *II Reunión sobre escultura romana en Hispania*, 95–108. Tarragona.

———. (1996b) "Los tres foros de Augusta Emerita y el caso de Corduba." In *Colonia Patricia Corduba: una reflexión arqueológica*, edited by P. León, 175–195. Córdoba.

———. (2003) "Überfremdung einheimischer Thematik durch römisch-imperiale Ikonographie in der Münzprägung hispanischer Städte." In *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum: neue Funde und Forschungen*, edited by P. Noelke, F. Naumann-Steckner, and B. Schneider, 619–633. Mainz.

Urban, R. (1982) "'Gallisches Bewußtsein' und 'Romkritik' bei P. Trogus." *ANRW* II 30.2: 1424–1443.

———. (1985) Der *"Bataveraufstand" und die Erhebung des Iulius Classicus*. Trier.

Vallat, D. (2008) *Onomastique, culture, et société dans les Epigrammes de Martial*. Brussels.

Van Andringa, W. (1998) "Observations sur les associations de citoyens romains dans les trois Gaules." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 9:165–175.

———. (2007) "Religions and the Integration of Cities in the Empire in the Second Century AD: The Creation of a Common Religious Language." In *A Companion to Roman Religion*, edited by J. Rüpke (ed.), 83–95. Oxford.

Van Dam, R. (1992) *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Berkeley.

Van Nijf, O. (2010) "Being Termessian: Local Knowledge and Identity Politics in a Pisidian City." In *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, edited by T. Whitmarsh, 163–188. Oxford.

Velaza Frias, J. (1989) "Aportaciones a la interpretacion del bronce de Montealegre (Valladolid)." *Faventia* 11.2: 105–120.

Vessey, D. (1974) "Silius Italicus on the Fall of Saguntum." *CP* 69.1: 28–36.

Veyne, P. (1960) "Iconographie de la *transvectio equitum* et des Lupercales." *REA* 62: 100–112.

———. (1966) "Augustal de l'an I: Primier pontarque." *BCH* 90: 144–155.

Villar, F., M. A. Díaz, M. M. Medrano, and C. Jordán. (2001) *El IV Bronce de Botorrita (Contrebia Belaisca). Arqueología y Lingüística*. Salamanca.

Villaronga, L. (1967) *Las monedas de Arse-Saguntum*. Barcelona.

Vipard, P. (2009) "À propos de la dédicace de la basilique du sanctuaire du *pagus Catuslouius* par P. Magnius Belliger à Bois-l'Abbé (Eu, Seine-Maritime, France)," *Latomus* 68: 972–980.

Walckenaer, C.-A. (1862) *Géographie ancienne historique et comparée des Gaules cisalpine et transalpine*. Paris.

Walker, S. (1981) "The Third Century in the Lyon Region." In *The Roman West in the Third Century*, edited by A. King and M. Henig, 317–342. Oxford.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2008) *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.

Walter, H. (1978) *La Franche-Comté romaine*. Wettolsheim.

Watkins, T. H. (1983) "*Coloniae* and *Ius Italicum* in the Early Empire." *CJ* 78: 319–336.

Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and society*. 2 vols. Berkeley.

Webster, J. (1995) "Sanctuaries and Sacred Places." In *The Celtic World*, edited by M. Green, 445–464. New York.

———. (1996) "Roman Imperialism and the 'Post Imperial Age.'" In *Roman Imperialism: Post-Colonial Perspectives*, edited by J. Webster and N. Cooper, 1–17. Leicester.

———. (1997) "A Negotiated Syncretism: Readings on the Development of Romano-Celtic Religion." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Mattingly, 165–184. Portsmouth, RI.

———. (1999) "At the End of the World: Druidic and Other Revitalization Movements in Post-Conquest Gaul and Britain." *Britannia* 30: 1–20.

———. (2001) "Creolizing the Roman provinces." *AJA* 105: 209–225.

Weinstock, S. (1971) *Divus Julius*. Oxford.

Whatmough, J. (1970) *The dialects of ancient Gaul: prolegomena and records of the dialects*. Cambridge, MA.

White, R. (1991) *The Middle Ground. Indians, empires, and republics in the Great Lakes region,* 1650–1815. Cambridge.

Whitmarsh, T. (2001) *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford.

———. (2010) "Thinking Local." In *Local Knowledge and Microidentities in the Imperial Greek World*, edited by T. Whitmarsh, 1–16. Oxford.

Whittaker, C. R. (1997) "Imperialism and Culture: The Roman initiative." In *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism: Power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Mattingly, 143–163. Portsmouth, RI.

Wiegels, R. (1982) "Iliturgi und der *deductor* Ti. Sempronius Gracchus." *Madrider Mitteilungen* 23: 152–211.

Wightman, E. M (1971) *Roman Trier and the Treveri*. New York.

———. (1975) *"Priscae Gallorum memoriae*: Some comments on sources for a history of Gaul." In *The Ancient Historian and His Materials. Essays in honour of C. E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday*, edited by B. M. Levick, 93–107. Farnborough.

———. (1985) *Gallia Belgica*. Berkeley.

Wilburn, A. (2012) *Materia Magica: The Archaeology of Magic in Roman Egypt, Cyprus, and Spain*.

Williams, J. H. C. (2001) *Beyond the Rubicon: Romans and Gauls in Republican Italy*. Oxford.

Wiseman, T. P. (1974) "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome." *Greece & Rome* 21: 153–164.

———. (1995) *Remus: A Roman myth*. Cambridge.

———. (1998) "The Publication of *De Bello Gallico*." In *Julius Caesar as Artful Reporter*, edited by K. Welch and A. Powell, 1–9. London.

Wiśniewski, R. (2007) "Deep Woods and Vain Oracles: Druids, Pomponius Mela, and Tacitus." *Palamedes* 2: 143–156.

———. (2009) "'Si fama non fallit fidem': les druides dans la littérature latine de l'Antiquité tardive." *Antiquité Tardive* 17: 307–315.

Wissowa, G. (1917) "Das Prooemium von Virgils Georgica." *Hermes* 52: 92–104.

Wood, A. (2013) *The Memory of the People. Custom and popular senses of the past in early modern England*. Cambridge.

Woolf, G. (1990) "World systems analysis and the Roman empire." *JRA* 3: 44–58.

———. (1993) "European Social Evolution and Roman Imperialism." In *Frontières*

d'Empire. Nature et signification des frontières romaines, edited by P. Brun, S. E. van der Leeuw, and C. R. Whittaker, 13–20. Nemours.

———. (1994) "Becoming Roman, Staying Greek: Culture, Identity, and the Civilizing Process in the Roman East." *PCPS* 40: 116-143.

———. (1996a) "Monumental writing and the expansion of Roman society in the early Empire," *JRS* 86: 22–39.

———. (1996b) "The Uses of Forgetfulness in Roman Gaul." In *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein*, edited by H.-J. Gehrke and A. Moller, 361–381. Tübingen.

———. (1997) "Beyond Romans and Natives," in *World Archaeology* 28.3: 339–350.

———. (1998) *Becoming Roman*. Cambridge.

———. (2000) "Urbanization and Its Discontents in Early Roman Gaul." In *Romanization and the City: Creation, Transformations, and Failures*, edited by E. Fentress, 115–131. Portsmouth.

———. (2003a) "Seeing Apollo in Roman Gaul and Germany." In *Roman Imperialism and Provincial Art*, edited by S. Scott and J. Webster, 139–153. Cambridge.

———. (2003b) "Local Cult in Imperial Context: The *Matronae* Revisited." In *Romanisation und Resistenz in Plastik, Architektur und Inschriften der Provinzen des Imperium Romanum: neue Funde und Forschungen*, edited by P. Noelke, F. Naumann-Steckner, and B. Schneider, 137–138. Mainz.

———. (2005a) "Family History in the Roman North-West." In *The Roman Family in the Empire: Rome, Italy, and Beyond*, edited by M. George, 231–254. Oxford.

———. (2005b) "Provincial Perspectives." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*, edited by K. Galinsky, 106–129. Cambridge.

———. (2009a) "Found in Translation: The Religion of the Roman Diaspora." In *Ritual Dynamics and Religious Change in the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the Eighth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire*, edited by O. Hekster, S. Schmidt-Hofner, and C. Witschel, 239–252. Leiden.

———. (2009b) "Cruptorix and His Kind: Talking Ethnicity on the Middle Ground." In *Ethnic Constructs in Antiquity: the role of power and tradition*, edited by T. Derk and N. Roymans, 209–217. Amsterdam.

———. (2011a) "Saving the Barbarian." In *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by E. Gruen, 255–271. Los Angeles.

———. (2011b) *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West*. Oxford.

Wuilleumier, P. (1953) *Lyon, Métropole des Gaules*. Paris.

Young, B. K. (2001) "Autun and the Civitas Aeduorum: Maintaining and Transforming a Regional Identity in Late Antiquity." In *Urban Centers and Rural Contexts in Late Antiquity*, edited by T. Burns and J. Eadie, 25–46. East Lansing.

———. (2001) "Sacred Topography: The Impact of the Funerary Basilica in Late An-

tique Gaul." In *Society and Culture in Late Antique Gaul: Revisiting the Sources*, edited by R. W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer, 169–185. Burlington, VT.

Zahrnt, M. (1989) "Ein hadrianisches Municipium in der Hispania Tarraconensis?" *ZPE* 79: 173–176.

Zanker, P. (1988) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor.

Zavaroni, A. (2007) *On the structure and terminology of the Gaulish calendar*. Oxford.

Zecchini, G. (1984) "La profezia dei druidi sull'incendio del Campidoglio nel 69 d.C." In *I santuari e la guerra nel mondo classico*, edited by M. Sordi, 121–131. Milano.

Zucca, R. (1998) *Insulae Baliares. Le isole Baleari sotto il dominio romano*. Rome.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

✧

have shepherded me through the process of bringing this work to publication, and have been liberal with their advocacy, their patience, and their guidance. The thorough, learned, and insightful comments of the two anonymous readers of the manuscript greatly improved the book.

To paraphrase the Celtiberian poet Martial, that which is given to friends exists beyond the grasp of cruel chance, and only those things that we entrust to them will we enjoy always. So I give this work to those whom I have had the great privilege to call friends, especially Bob Abel, Rhett Adams, Anna Bonnell-Freidin, Casey Chalk, Robert Cioffi, Henry Cowles, Lauren Curtis, Jason Filip, Jon Filip, Pat Flannery, David Fox, Janling Fu, Stephanie Groman, Paul Kosmin, Eli Lippard, Duncan MacRae, Jesine O'Gara, Christopher Swenson, Anthony Tardi, Mike Thorpe, Teresa Wu, Lesley Yadon, and last but not least, all of my colleagues on the Gabii Project.

Regarding those to whom I am most deeply indebted, my family, I shall be briefest, trusting that they know that I have no words that could suffice. My parents, Clayton and Linda, have always encouraged me to discover and to pursue my passions, and have supported my studies unconditionally. My sister, Sarah, was my first teacher and my first friend, and she remains the best of both. My wife, Jen, is my solace, my joy, and my illumination. Quinn, *Avis minor*, is the best part of every day.

INDEX