UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Date: January 8, 2005

I, Daniel K. Osland,
hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of:
Master of Arts

in:
Classics

It is entitled:
Early Roman Cities of Lusitania

This work and its defense approved by:

Chair: C. Brian Rose
Barbara Burrell

Early Roman Cities of Lusitania

A Thesis submitted to the

Division of Research and Advanced Studies
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Classics
of the College of Arts and Sciences

January 29, 2005

by

Daniel K. Osland
B.A., Wheaton College, 2000

M.A. Committee
C. Brian Rose (Chair)
Barbara Burrell

Abstract: Early Roman Cities of Lusitania

Daniel K. Osland

The Roman province of Lusitania stretched across large portions of modern Portugal and Spain. Historically, the political division between these countries has prevented a holistic approach to the study of Roman Lusitania. Moreover, many recent publications relating to Lusitania are collections of smaller studies that focus on specific areas of Lusitania, or geographically limited aspects of the culture and history of the province.

In the last three decades of the 20th century, the archaeological picture of the area of ancient Lusitania has improved significantly. This is due in part to increased activity in the Roman province among Portuguese and Spanish scholars, as well as a growing interest in Lusitania as a western province among the international community. As a result, many of the small villages of Portugal and Spain have seen increased archaeological activity, and the publication of unprecedented numbers of Roman sites has substantially improved the overall picture of Lusitania.

This project represents a synthesis of the available archaeological, historical, and epigraphic evidence from Lusitanian cities during the first century of the Roman Empire.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	3
INTRODUCTION	8
HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES	10
<i>INSCRIPTIONS</i>	10
<i>NUMISMATICS</i>	10
<i>ANCIENT SOURCES</i>	11
<i>MODERN SOURCES</i>	14
CHAPTER 1: LUSITANIA	17
GEOGRAPHY OF LUSITANIA	19
ROMANIZATION OF LUSITANIA.....	26
ECONOMIC STATUS OF LUSITANIA.....	30
LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROVINCE OF LUSITANIA	32
CHAPTER 2: CATALOGUE OF CITIES	36
COLONIES AND MUNICIPALITIES	41
OTHER IMPORTANT CITIES OF LUSITANIA.....	79
TOWNS WHOSE LOCATION OR ROMAN PROVINCE IS UNCERTAIN.....	117
CHAPTER 3: ITINERARIES.....	135
CHAPTER 4: GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	141
WORKS CITED.....	151
ANCIENT SOURCES	151

MODERN SOURCES	153
ILLUSTRATIONS	167
APPENDIX: GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS.....	248
PLINY THE ELDER, NATURALIS HISTORIA.....	248
<i>On Baetica</i>	248
<i>On Lusitania</i>	248
STRABO, GEOGRAPHIA	250
ANTONINE ITINERARY	253
RAVENNA CARTOGRAPHY.....	257
INDEX OF CITIES	262

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The Cities of Lusitania.....	168
Figure 2: Augusta Emerita, city gate on Roman coin.....	169
Figure 3: Augusta Emerita, altar on Roman coin.....	169
Figure 4: Augusta Emerita, tetrastyle temple on Roman coin	170
Figure 5: Colippo, Roman pottery kiln and public buildings	171
Figure 6: Locations of Roman pottery kilns in Portugal	172
Figure 7: Roman garum production centers along the Portuguese coast.....	173
Figure 8: Termini Augustales found in northern Portugal.....	174
Figure 9: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, major Roman finds	175
Figure 10: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, ancient and modern coastline of the Tagus, Roman roads ...	176
Figure 11: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, Roman roads and finds	177
Figure 12: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, plan of the Roman theater	178
Figure 13: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, findspot of Corinthian capitals.....	179
Figure 14: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, Corinthian capital	180
Figure 15: Scallabis, Roman temple and other public structures excavated on the acropolis	180
Figure 16: Metellinum, plan of the Roman theater	181
Figure 17: Modern city of Évora (Roman Ebora), with Roman walls in bold.....	182
Figure 18: Ebora, Roman walls and temple.....	183
Figure 19: Ebora, temple capitals.....	184
Figure 20: Ebora, Roman temple plan.....	185
Figure 21: Ebora, detail of the temple podium.....	186

Figure 22: Major routes of Roman Lusitania	187
Figure 23: Acropolis of modern Alcácer do Sal (Roman Salacia)	188
Figure 24: Salacia, general view of the apsidal cella	189
Figure 25: Salacia, plan of the public structure	190
Figure 26: Salacia, marble hand	190
Figure 27: Important Roman finds in modern Beja (Roman Pax Iulia)	191
Figure 28: Pax Iulia, reconstruction of the Roman road system	192
Figure 29: Pax Iulia, foundations of the Roman temple	193
Figure 30: Pax Iulia, Corinthian capitals	194
Figure 31: Pax Iulia, Roman city gate	194
Figure 32: Seated marble female statue, found near Beja	195
Figure 33: Layout of Mérida (Roman Augusta Emerita), with Roman finds	196
Figure 34: Roman amphitheater at Mérida (Roman Augusta Emerita)	196
Figure 35: Augusta Emerita, aerial view of the Roman theater and amphitheater	197
Figure 36: Augusta Emerita, detail of the stonework on the exterior façade of the amphitheater	197
Figure 37: Augusta Emerita, reconstructed Roman theater	198
Figure 38: Augusta Emerita, view of the Roman circus and its <i>spina</i>	198
Figure 39: Augusta Emerita, “Los Milagros” aqueduct	199
Figure 40: Augusta Emerita, “Templo de Diana”	200
Figure 41: Augusta Emerita, detail of the podium of the “Templo de Diana”	201
Figure 42: Augusta Emerita, hypothetical reconstruction of the Mars temple	202
Figure 43: Rome, Temple of Mars Ultor	202

Figure 44: Augusta Emerita, Chronos-Mithras	203
Figure 45: Location of Balsa, on the southern coast of Lusitania	204
Figure 46: Mirobriga, site plan.....	205
Figure 47: Mirobriga, forum area.....	206
Figure 48: Ammaia, inscription in honor of Nero	207
Figure 49: Ammaia, forum plan	208
Figure 50: Ammaia, probable territorial boundaries	209
Figure 51: Eburobrittium, excavation plan	210
Figure 52: Eburobrittium, reconstructed forum ground plan.....	211
Figure 53: Tomar (Roman Sellium), Roman city perimeter	212
Figure 54: Sellium, partial forum plan.....	213
Figure 55: Sellium, Ionic capital	214
Figure 56: Augustobriga, plan of the larger temple.....	215
Figure 57: Augustobriga larger temple columns.....	216
Figure 58: Augustobriga, larger Roman temple.....	217
Figure 59: Augusta Emerita, restored façade of the ‘Templo de Diana’.....	218
Figure 60: Idanha-A-Velha (Roman <i>Civitas</i> Igaeditanorum), inscription dating to 16 B.C.....	219
Figure 61: <i>Civitas</i> Igaeditanorum, aerial view	220
Figure 62: <i>Civitas</i> Igaeditanorum, city plan.....	221
Figure 63: <i>Civitas</i> Igaeditanorum, temple podium.....	221
Figure 64: <i>Civitas</i> Igaeditanorum, views of the Templar tower and its Roman podium.....	222
Figure 65: Plan of Talavera de la Reina (Roman Caesarobriga), with location of Roman road grid and Roman cemeteries	223

Figure 66: Conimbriga, Augustan forum ground plan	224
Figure 67: Conimbriga, Augustan forum decorative scheme	225
Figure 68: Conimbriga, marble portrait of Augustus	226
Figure 69: Conimbriga, with amphitheater	227
Figure 70: Excavated portions of Conimbriga amphitheater	228
Figure 71: Conimbriga, Flavian forum ground plan.....	229
Figure 72: Conimbriga, Flavian forum ground plan superimposed over Augustan.....	230
Figure 73: Conimbriga, Flavian forum decorative scheme.....	231
Figure 74: Cáparra (Roman Capera), with the location of the amphitheater indicated by an arrow	232
Figure 75: Plan of the Roman remains of Capera	233
Figure 76: Roman remains of Capera, including, at far right, amphitheater	234
Figure 77: Capera, dedication of the Temple of Jupiter	235
Figure 78: Capera, Temple of Jupiter (left); public structure (right).....	235
Figure 79: Coimbra (Roman Aeminium) with Roman roads and structures	236
Figure 80: Aeminium, bust of Vespasian (top) and passageway of the cryptoporticus (bottom)	237
Figure 81: Aeminium, three possible plans of the Roman forum	238
Figure 82: Bobadela, location of excavated structures	239
Figure 83: Bobadela, amphitheater.....	240
Figure 84: Roman road from Aeminium to Cale	241
Figure 85: Talabriga, Roman public structure	242
Figure 86: Lancobriga, <i>tessera hospitalis</i> (ca. 7 A.D.).....	242

Figure 87: Lancobriga, <i>tessera hospitalis</i> (ca. 9 A.D.).....	243
Figure 88: <i>Civitates</i> of the Portuguese portion of Lusitania	244
Figure 89: Locations of inscriptions mentioning the Taporí.....	245
Figure 90: Roman villas of Lusitania (first through fifth century A.D.)	246
Figure 91: Proposed route from Corduba to Cale, via Metellinum and Alcántara	247

Introduction

This project represents a synthesis of the information available on the urban centers of the Roman province of Lusitania.¹ The overall purpose of the study is to identify the most important cities of Lusitania, using evidence provided by historical sources, epigraphic finds, and the archaeological record. According to Roman historical sources, many of the major cities of modern Portugal and Spain had already been established by the end of the third century A.D. However, these sources do not present a clear chronological portrait of the development of many of these cities from indigenous settlements to important components of the Roman administration of the province of Lusitania. While a thorough discussion of this process lies well beyond the bounds of the current project, this study does represent the first synthesis of the historical, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence for the earliest Roman presence at the cities of Lusitania.

A great deal of work has gone into the excavation and re-examination of some of the more prominent sites of Portugal over the last few years, in an attempt to establish a reliable chronology for the architectural remains of Roman occupation at major urban centers.² However, a strict reliance on the archaeological remains has produced only limited success, largely because the public architecture of Lusitania followed closely in the canon set down during the reign of Augustus, resulting in a record that shows little variation across the four centuries of Roman urbanization. Furthermore, while architectural remains by themselves can help locate an important Roman center, they often do little to help us identify the ancient site,

¹ Fig. 1.

² Hauschild 2002; Mierse 1999; Guerra 1995; Alarcão 1990; Tranoy 1990.

particularly when pieces of major architectural monuments have survived.³ Some significant structures might include public structures such as bathing facilities, theaters and circuses, aqueducts and bridges, and occasionally temples and fora. Such projects do not always prove the existence of an important Roman city, but they can indicate a level of wealth and organization that makes their site important to this study.⁴ Because of the limitations of the material remains, a consideration of the historical and epigraphic evidence in conjunction with recent archaeological reports will result in a more thorough analysis of the early Roman cities of Lusitania than could otherwise be achieved.⁵

³ Alarcão 1988a, 15-21; 1990.

⁴ While the central administration was not necessarily directly responsible for such projects, it is reasonable to assume that no major construction was sponsored, either by the government or by private individuals, without a concern for the effect that the job would have on the status of the city and its inhabitants.

⁵ This framework gives us a chronology of roughly 30 B.C. through A.D. 70, although neither date should be regarded as absolutely inflexible.

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOURCES

INSCRIPTIONS

The honorific inscriptions that were often set up at the time of the dedication of public structures like those mentioned above are often the best evidence that we have for the individuals responsible for public works in a particular city, and for the city's status within the Roman administration. Other inscriptions may have been set up to commemorate the political career of individuals, to honor the gods, or to pledge loyalty to or honor the Roman emperor. These inscriptions, and personal funerary inscriptions, often contain place names or other information that may hint at specific locations, but may nonetheless not allow us to identify a site's ancient identity.

NUMISMATICS

Another source that provides direct evidence for Roman involvement in the cities of Lusitania comes from the numismatic record. The Romans minted coins in Hispania as early as the second century B.C., and there is evidence of a Roman mint in operation in Lusitania, at Dipo (near Elvas) as early as the end of that century.⁶

Mints in southern Lusitania were in operation during the conflict with Sertorius in the early first century B.C., at Myrtilis, for example, and in the middle of that century under Pompey or his sons, as seems to be the case at Salacia. However, the important Roman mints all apparently date to the early imperial period, during the official establishment of the province of Lusitania and its various administrative divisions. In this period, coins were minted at Augusta

⁶ Ripollès Alegre and Abascal Pallazòn 2000, 93. Roman mints were in operation at both Ampurias and Saguntum during the third century.

Emerita, Pax Iulia, and Liberalitas Iulia Eboracensis, and these emissions comprise the bulk of our evidence for active Roman mints in Lusitania.⁷ However, it should be noted that Lusitanian cities only account for a small minority of the total number of early Imperial coins found in Hispania.⁸

The coins from Augusta Emerita are by far the most numerous and varied of Lusitania, making up about 98% of the total number of Lusitanian coins found to date.⁹ Interestingly, a number of those dating to Tiberius' rule contain depictions of public monuments. Although none of these monuments can be conclusively identified or located, they include a monumental city gate (possibly that guarded by the Alcazaba of Augusta Emerita), an altar (whether the Ara Providentiae in Rome or a provincial parallel is uncertain), and a tetrastyle temple (figs. 2-4). All of the Roman mints in Hispania seem to have ceased production during the reign of Caligula, including some of the major centers of production such as Acci (near Granada), Augusta Bibilis, Augusta Emerita, Caesaraugusta, Carthago Nova, and Segobriga.¹⁰

ANCIENT SOURCES

The most important historical sources relating to the province of Lusitania are book 4 of Pliny's *Naturalis Historia* (= Pliny *Nat.*), which provides information concerning the important cities and geographical features of the province, and the geographies of Ptolemy and Strabo. Appian's *Iberike* (= App. *Hisp.*) also makes some mention of Lusitania and its cities, although

⁷ In fact, the latest of these are from Augusta Emerita, and date to the reign of Tiberius.

⁸ Ripollès Alegre and Abascal Pallazòn 2000, 31; Lusitania has a total of 137 known issues, which accounts for about 7% of the total known production in Hispania during the period in question.

⁹ Ripollès Alegre and Abascal Pallazòn 2000, 32.

¹⁰ Burnett et al. 1992a, 66.

the wars on which his work focuses took place some time before the official establishment of the Roman province.

Strabo's *Geographia* (= Strabo), probably finished between A.D. 17 and 23, offers some historical and geographical details about Lusitania, but focuses mainly on the urbanized southern reaches of the province.¹¹ This work offers distances between important points along the coast of the western Roman world, but these distances are often unreliable, as they seem to depend in large part on the numbers that were provided to Strabo by the works of Eratosthenes (from the third century B.C.) and other Hellenistic geographers. Strabo's description of the western portions of the Empire is also suspect for the simple reason that he had most likely never been to many of these areas, particularly to Hispania, as he was from Pontus in the eastern reaches of the Empire.

Pomponius Mela's *De Chorographia* (= Pompon.) provides a broad description of the Iberian Peninsula (in Book II), and was probably published sometime around A.D. 40.¹² Since he was from the province of Baetica, he would have had greater familiarity with the western portion of the Empire, but his work is nonetheless not particularly detailed for our purposes. Like Strabo, Mela seems to have been more interested in describing the strange customs and places of the known world rather than in providing an accurate map of the Empire.

Pliny spent some time in Hispania during his political career (as proconsul of Tarraconensis in A.D. 73), and would thus have had a particularly good grasp of the current political situation of Hispania.¹³ His *Naturalis Historia* was apparently completed in 77, but not

¹¹ On Strabo see French 1994, 114-48; Prontera 1999; Trotta 1999.

¹² Uggeri 2000, 50-1.

¹³ On Pliny see Klotz 1906; Detlefsen 1904 and 1909.

published until after his death in 79.¹⁴ The extreme detail of the work, which originally consisted of 37 volumes, is particularly impressive, especially by comparison with the much more modest works of Mela and even Strabo. Pliny's interest in politics, and his loyalty to the Flavian emperors (the work was dedicated to Titus) led him to present political and administrative information about the Roman world in addition to his geographical survey, which follows in the same tradition as that of Strabo.

Pliny's major weakness, however, seems to be that he relied heavily on authors of the first century B.C. In particular, Marcus Agrippa's *Formula Provinciarum*, probably begun in the 40s or 30s B.C. (but not completed until after his lifetime), was an important source for Pliny. This source was particularly useful for Hispania, as Agrippa spent a significant amount of time there, campaigning against the northwestern tribes for Augustus.

Claudius Ptolemaeus lived in Alexandria from ca. A.D. 90 to 170, and would thus have had access to many of the same sources as his predecessors. Ptolemy's *Cosmographia* (= Ptol. *Geog.*) deals more generally with Lusitania than does Pliny, giving calculated coordinates for latitude and longitude, but offering no sense of the cities' relative importance or political position.¹⁵ He does lump Lusitanian cities into broad categories based on their ethnic composition, but this often leads him to include cities within the province of Lusitania that must have actually been located in the neighboring provinces. From this we can deduce that the Romans did not make their provincial divisions in Hispania based on ethnic considerations.

Two final sources, both dating no earlier than the end of the third century A.D., must be mentioned, as they provide detailed lists of cities and towns located along the major trade and transport arteries of Lusitania. The Antonine Itinerary (= *AntIt*), which seems to have been

¹⁴ Uggeri 2000, 51-2.

¹⁵ On Ptolemy see Aujac 1993; Uggeri 2000, 52-3.

finished by the end of the third century A.D., provides distances and stopping points between the important cities of the entire Roman world, and includes a large number of the cities mentioned by both Pliny and Ptolemy. The Ravenna Cosmography (= *Rav*) follows a similar format, but does not provide distances. Interestingly, although these works date to roughly the same period, they often show two alternate names for the same city.¹⁶ Differences in spelling can also make it difficult to determine whether both sources refer to the same place, and both sources contain certain obvious errors.

Unfortunately, even when all these written sources are considered in conjunction, it is extremely difficult to reconstruct a coherent and convincing picture of the province of Lusitania in the first century of the Roman Empire. Moreover, there are still too many holes in our archaeological record to fill in the gaps that the written sources have left us. However, a careful reading of all of the sources can at times prove useful in testing the validity of conclusions drawn from archaeological discoveries. This is particularly true when we consider the epigraphic and numismatic evidence that a number of Lusitanian cities provide.

MODERN SOURCES

Over the last three decades, the archaeological record of the area encompassed by Lusitania has improved significantly, at least on the local level. While there is now a greater abundance of published information on the individual cities of Roman Lusitania, there has yet to be a project that seeks to provide a comprehensive picture of the province. Jorge Alarcão's *Roman Portugal* (= Alarcão 1988a-d) presents nearly all of the Roman period finds in a four-volume gazetteer, but does not offer any information on the Spanish side of the province.

¹⁶ The Ravenna Cartography may have reached its current form in the 7th century, though it seems to describe the situation of the third and fourth century Roman empire.

Moreover, the project's date precludes it from dealing with some of the important finds that have come to light over the last two decades.¹⁷ Despite these drawbacks, *Roman Portugal* remains one of the most important archaeological sources relating to Lusitania.¹⁸

Les villes de Lusitanie Romaine (1990) is the first project to focus on the entire province of Lusitania, although, as a collection of independent papers by different authors, it often provides only a summary of the relevant information.¹⁹ This is a good source for political and organizational concerns, and, despite its date of publication (1990), offers a great deal of current evidence relating to the administration and Romanization of the province of Lusitania.

José d'Encarnação has gathered a major corpus of epigraphic evidence from the southern portion of Portugal and parts of Spain in *Inscrições Romanas do Conventus Pacensis* (1984) (= *IRCP*). *IRCP* is a good, regional, supplement to Hübner's 19th century *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, volume II (1869) (= *CIL* II), which contains the bulk of the inscriptional evidence that pertains to Lusitania. Unfortunately, no comparable work has yet emerged to bring together recent epigraphic data from the other *conventus* of Lusitania.²⁰

Two Portuguese periodicals, *Ficheiro Epigraphico* (= *FE*) and *Conimbriga*, both published by the Universidade de Coimbra, contain a large portion of the recent archaeological publications and current excavation reports from Portuguese authors. *Religiões da Lusitânia* (2002) and *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana* (2000) offer syntheses of current evidence related to the religion, and society and culture, respectively,

¹⁷ Published in 1988.

¹⁸ I have not cross-listed my site discussions with the entries in Alarcão 1988, as Alarcão's entries can be found alphabetically in those volumes, based on the modern name of the site.

¹⁹ Listed in the bibliography under the names of individual authors.

²⁰ The updated supplement to *CIL* II pertaining to Lusitania has yet to be published.

of Roman Lusitania.²¹ However, these two tend to prefer the general over the specific, and so, despite the currency of their research, fail to provide the level of detail that is often found in monographs.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, 1990 saw the introduction of the Lusitanian volumes of the series *Tabula Imperii Romani*, which seeks to offer a detailed description of the Roman remains at sites throughout the Roman world. The four volumes pertinent to Lusitania are, *J-29: Lisboa* (= *TIR, J-29*), *J-29: Porto* (= *TIR, J-29*), *K-29: Valencia* (= *TIR, K-29*), and *K-30: Madrid* (= *TIR, K-30*). These provide information relating to historical sources, epigraphic and numismatic evidence, and the architectural finds from nearly every site in Spain and Portugal. Unfortunately for our purposes, the volume that addresses the northern reaches of Portugal, *TIR, J-30*, contains no entries for the Portuguese cities.

The identification of important Roman cities of Lusitania hinges on these sources—the historical written sources, numismatics, epigraphy, and archaeological remains of the cities themselves, as published in modern sources. As is readily evident from this brief survey of the sources available, Lusitania benefits from a wealth of information that was largely unknown until quite recently.

²¹ Both listed in the bibliography under the names of individual authors.

CHAPTER 1: LUSITANIA

Because the ancient province of Lusitania spread over large portions of modern Portugal and Spain, modern scholars from both countries have taken a renewed interest in the definition of the boundaries and the local political/administrative divisions of Lusitania over the last three decades. Our knowledge of the provincial boundaries during the early Imperial period, and again during the Late Antique period, is relatively substantial. By contrast, our knowledge of the local administrative units, those fundamental building blocks of the Roman organizational scheme, relies almost exclusively on the archaeological remains.²² Jorge de Alarcão's project, *Roman Portugal*, remains the definitive work on this topic to date, despite the fact that his discussions focus entirely on that portion of Lusitania which lay within the modern country of Portugal. It is unfortunate that no project has yet sought to bring together the data available from both Portugal and Spain in order to provide a more complete picture of the province of Lusitania.²³

Our information on this province, even during the first centuries of imperial Rome, benefits from many modern and ancient sources, although they are by no means complete. Pliny the Elder, Claudius Ptolemy, the Antonine Itinerary, and the Ravenna Cosmography provide the most informative descriptions of the province, but as a quick look at any modern geography of the Roman West will demonstrate, they do not always provide a sufficiently clear analysis for our purposes.²⁴ This difficulty is further exacerbated by our sparse knowledge of the

²² Francisco Martín 1996, 36.

²³ Some general works on the province include *Les villes de Lusitanie Romaine*, *Conquista y Romanización de Lusitania*, *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana* and *Plinio-o-Velho e a Lusitânia*, but none of these seeks to define the boundaries and administrative districts of the province or to identify all the major cities of early Lusitania.

²⁴ Other ancient authors who mention different aspects of the province include Pomponius Mela, Strabo and Appian.

archaeological record in many towns and villages of Lusitania. As Alarcão's gazetteer indicates, many sites where Roman remains have been identified since the late 19th century have yet to be excavated or even surveyed.²⁵

Without approaching the province of Lusitania from a balanced historical and archaeological perspective, we will be left either with a two-dimensional, fragmented summary of the province, as informed by the historical sources, or a sketchy skeleton of the province, informed largely by the epigraphic and architectural remains available from the minority of well-published sites. The recent "boom" in Portuguese archaeology, particularly evident in the decade of the 1990s, has brought to light a great deal of information that should enhance any discussion of Lusitania.²⁶ For its part, the Spanish portion of Lusitania presents relatively few problems, as far as the delineation of the major Roman cities and their territories, but some difficulties remain as to the exact line of the boundary between Lusitania and Baetica, particularly when looking at the territories governed by cities like Augusta Emerita and Arucci.

Lusitania's complexity is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that the province spreads to four of the five *Tabula Imperii Romani* that cover the Iberian Peninsula. The fact that *TIR*, K-29 provides no evidence, beyond the location of Conimbriga and Porto, for the Roman concentration in Portugal, highlights another problem that has plagued discussion of the province of Lusitania, that of modern political boundaries. As is the case with this catalogue of epigraphic evidence, and indeed, Alarcão's *Roman Portugal* as well, too much attention has been given to the modern political boundaries in recent scholarship. This lack of cooperation between countries is particularly inappropriate in a case like Lusitania, as it is a rich source of history and

²⁵ 1988a-d.

²⁶ See anything by Faria, Mantas, and Alarcão since 1990.

archaeology for both countries involved, and should serve rather to highlight a common past than to perpetuate political divisions.

GEOGRAPHY OF LUSITANIA

Concerning the geography of Lusitania, and indeed of Iberia as a whole, we should begin with Strabo, book 3:

As I was saying, the first part of Europe is the western, namely, Iberia. Now of Iberia the larger part affords but poor means of livelihood; for most of the inhabited country consists of mountains, forests, and plains whose soil is thin—and even that not uniformly well-watered. And Northern Iberia, in addition to its ruggedness, not only is extremely cold, but lies next to the ocean, and thus has acquired its characteristic of inhospitality and aversion to intercourse with other countries; consequently, it is an exceedingly wretched place to live in. Such, then, is the character of the northern part; but almost the whole of Southern Iberia is fertile, particularly the region outside the Pillars. This will become clear in my detailed description of Iberia... (Strabo, *Geog.* 3.1.2, trans. H.L. Jones).

This brief passage captures a sense of the Roman attitude toward the peninsula during the last two centuries B.C. and the first century A.D., lacking only a mention of the mineral wealth it was known to contain.²⁷

Lusitania's most important geographic features, at least from the perspective of Roman civilization, are the major rivers, the coastal region, and the fertile plains of the southern half of

²⁷ Cf. Pliny *Nat.* 4.115; Strabo 3.2.3 and 3.3.4.

the province. The province's most important cities arose along the coast and on the important rivers and the coast, and the southern regions were particularly well suited for olive and fish-sauce production. As Strabo observes, the Tagus (Tejo) and the Anas (Guadiana) flow from the large central plain of Hispania toward the west, the Anas taking a sharp turn toward the south where it empties into the Straits of Gibraltar.²⁸ Later we also read of the Mundas (Mondêgo), Vacua (Vouga), Durius (Douro), the River Lethe/Limaeas/Belion (Lima) and finally the Baenis/Minus (Minho), which Strabo regards as the greatest of the rivers of Lusitania.²⁹ In addition, three more rivers of Hispania deserve mention, the Baetis (Guadalquivir), Sucro, and Iberus (Ebro), the first flowing west, then south toward Cádiz, and the latter two flowing east into the Mediterranean.³⁰

Richardson has argued at great length, and I believe rightly, to the effect that references to the *provinciae* of Hispania prior to the first century B.C. must be seen as references to a senatorial grant of military authority over a definite piece of land, and not administrative units as is meant in later periods.³¹ This assignment of power was an immediate response to the threat that the Carthaginians, under Hamilcar Barca and later Hannibal, posed to Rome as a result of their activities on the eastern coast of Hispania in the last decades of the second century B.C.

There seems to have been a movement toward better fiscal organization of Hispania as early as 179, when Ti. Sempronius Gracchus established treaties that regulated relations between the Celtiberians and Romans.³² These treaties may also have created a system of taxation, the *stipendium*, whereby funds could be gathered from the provinces—this amount would have been

²⁸ Strabo 3.1.6.

²⁹ Strabo 3.3.4.

³⁰ Strabo 3.4.6 has the Sucro and Iberus flowing southwards, parallel to the Pyrenees.

³¹ Richardson 1996, see especially 41-83.

³² App. *Hisp.* 43.

in addition to the one-twentieth grain tax that was also levied to feed troops in the province.³³

Whether this *stipendium* is the same as the fixed tributary exaction that was in use provinces during Cicero's time, or when Pliny was writing, is more difficult to say.³⁴

Rome's essentially military attention to Hispania was in part a result of the mountainous terrain of the peninsula, and this feature, along with the large number of distinct tribes inhabiting Hispania, made Roman military operations in Hispania extremely hazardous from very early on.³⁵ The mountain tribes, including the Cantabri, Astures, Lusitani and Callaeci, proved to be fierce adversaries for the Roman armies of the second and first centuries B.C., particularly when fighting in their homeland and in guerilla fashion.³⁶ Strabo considers the Lusitani the fiercest of all the tribes of Hispania, as does Appian, because of the difficulties they posed to the Romans under D. Junius Brutus in the mid-second century B.C.³⁷ The large number of triumphs that Roman generals won in Hispania during this period is not surprising, given the number of independent tribes in opposition to Roman involvement on the peninsula.³⁸

All the minor successes of Rome during the second century B.C. were essentially military in nature, and it is not until the first century B.C. that we begin to see the establishment of an administrative scheme and Roman colonies in Hispania. It is true that there were Roman settlements prior to this time, as at Italica in 206 B.C., Corduba in 152 B.C., and possibly Valentia in 143 B.C., but these settlements were apparently an ad hoc means of fulfilling Rome's

³³ Richardson 1996, 71.

³⁴ Cic. *Verr. II* 3.6.12.

³⁵ Strabo 3.3.5 claims that there are some thirty tribes north of the Tagus and south of the northern coast of Hispania.

³⁶ App. *Hisp.*; Strabo 3.3.3.

³⁷ Strabo 3.3.2-3; App. *Hisp.* 63-70; nonetheless, the Cantabri and the Astures were not defeated until the last quarter of the first century B.C.

³⁸ Cf. Richardson 1996, 56-8.

obligation to injured soldiers and retired veterans.³⁹ There is no evidence that any towns, other than these colonies, were established in this earlier period with any legal status within the Roman system, beyond the personal rights due to veterans as Roman or Italian citizens.⁴⁰

In the first century B.C., however, there seems to have been a definite shift in the senate's treatment of Hispania, probably because of growing Roman population there.⁴¹ Prior to this time Rome's main interest in Hispania, at least as attested in the histories of Appian, Livy, Diodorus and Polybius, was largely military and political, consisting of intermittent wars whose main goal seems to have been winning a Roman triumph for the victor.⁴² The Roman consuls and praetors in charge of Hispania rarely accomplished anything of lasting importance, with the possible exceptions of the defeat of Viriathus and his Lusitanian allies, the capture of Numantia, and, in 77 B.C., the defeat of Q. Sertorius.⁴³

Hispania was an increasingly important staging-ground for power struggles between the great men of first century Rome by the first century B.C. Sertorius mounted an insurrection in Hispania, beginning with his consulship in 83 B.C., and it was not until the proconsul Cn. Pompeius arrived on the scene in 77 B.C. that his rebellion was finally extinguished.⁴⁴ C. Julius Caesar also served a term in Hispania Ulterior as the quaestor in 68 B.C., and returned six years later, first as praetor and then as proconsul. Because of these ties, Hispania proved to be particularly important during the civil wars of the mid-first century B.C.⁴⁵

³⁹ On Italica, see App. *Hisp.* 38; on Corduba, see Richardson 1996, 78; on Valentia, see Livy *Epit.* 55.

⁴⁰ Livy *Epon.* 43.2-3 discusses the establishment by the Roman senate of a colony at Carteia for the sons of Roman soldiers and indigenous women in 171 B.C.

⁴¹ Richardson 1996, 87-9.

⁴² Richardson 1996, 56-8.

⁴³ App. *Hisp.* 63-76, 76-98, and 101; Richardson 1996, 54 and 99-100.

⁴⁴ App. *Hisp.* 101; Richardson 1996, 96-100.

⁴⁵ Caesar *B Civ.* 2.17-8; see also *BHisp.* 28-31.

Roman interest in the provinces of Hispania continued to revolve around military affairs up through the time of Augustus, when the emperor and his general, M. Vipsanius Agrippa, finally defeated the Cantabri and Astures of the northwest corner of Hispania in 19 B.C.⁴⁶ When peaceful Roman rule had finally been established throughout Hispania, Augustus was able to set up the efficient system of Roman administration that would form the groundwork for successful rule during the next two centuries.

Augustus' main provincial organization in Hispania took place sometime after Agrippa's wars in the northwestern reaches of the peninsula,⁴⁷ although Dio credits the tripartite division of Hispania (into Tarraconensis, Baetica and Lusitania) to the year 27 B.C., when the senate conceded Tarraconensis and Lusitania to Augustus as imperial provinces.⁴⁸ The subsequent reorganization transferred portions of northern Lusitania into the province of Tarraconensis, probably for military purposes. Both Lusitania and Tarraconensis remained imperial provinces, although by the end of the first century B.C. only Tarraconensis still had permanently assigned active legions within its borders, probably to deal with the difficult tribes of the northwest.

It is clear that by the late first century B.C., Lusitania had been established as an imperial province from a portion of the late republican Hispania Ulterior, with its capital at Augusta Emerita. This city was apparently established in 25 B.C., at the official conclusion of Augustus' campaigns in Hispania, as a colony for the veterans of the wars in the northwest. At the same time as the provincial boundaries were being delineated, the cities of the province were also

⁴⁶ Augustus had already closed the doors of the Janus Temple in Rome, but the task of defeating the recalcitrant tribes of the northwest was left to Agrippa; cf. Cass. Dio 54.5.1-3; Pliny *Nat.* 4.11.2-6.

⁴⁷ Richardson 1996, 135-6.

⁴⁸ Cass. Dio 53.12.7.

being organized into an administrative system composed of three separate *conventus*.⁴⁹ Each of these districts had a capital city: Augusta Emerita served as the capital of the *Conventus Emeritensis*, Scallabis Praesidium Iulia as that of the *Conventus Scallabitanus* and Pax Iulia or Colonia Pax Iulia as the capital of the *Conventus Pacensis*. As will be seen later on, in the discussion of these individual cities, conventual capitals were selected both on the basis of their location and their historical loyalty to Rome. These *capitals* functioned as important centers, and could serve as representatives of the Roman government on financial, administrative and judicial matters, thereby relieving the burden of these duties that was placed on the provincial capital.

Within each of the *conventus* there was a network of smaller territorial units, possibly *civitates*, whose principal function seems to have been the collection of local taxes and the performance of local public works such as road building and maintenance of the administrative infrastructure.⁵⁰ These territories in Lusitania seem to have roughly followed the geographical boundaries of pre-Roman ethnic or tribal divisions, and were often governed by the tribal centers, or *oppida*, that had loosely controlled the territory. Pliny refers to the less important of these cities as *stipendiaria*,⁵¹ indicating that they were required to pay a set amount to assist with provincial administration and military affairs. Other cities with higher status, and probably higher populations and greater financial possibilities, were set up as municipalities with Latin rights, municipalities with Roman rights, and colonies.⁵²

⁴⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; for more information on *conventus* in the Roman world, see Deininger 1965.

⁵⁰ Curchin 1991, 66. Many modern authors use the term *civitas* to refer to both these administrative units and to their capital cities (see Alarcão, for example). For the sake of simplicity, I will use the term only to refer to the area governed by a local administrative center, except in cases where the only known Roman title for a city contains the term *civitas*.

⁵¹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

⁵² See below, under Local Administration, for further discussion of these centers.

Lusitania, as it was defined during the first century B.C., was established on the banks of the Tagus, with the rivers Durius and Anas as its boundaries on the north and south/southeast, respectively. The division between Lusitania and Hispania Citerior/Tarraconensis does not seem to have followed a major geographical feature of the large central plateau (“La Mancha”) of the peninsula, and for this reason the boundary remains somewhat uncertain. Indeed, there is also some question as to whether the southern boundary followed the Anas exactly,⁵³ and it is clear that the northern border could only have followed the Durius as far as Ocelodurum before taking a southeasterly direction.⁵⁴

⁵³ See below on *Civitas Aruccitana*.

⁵⁴ Cf. *Ant.It.* 434; 439; Tranoy 1990, 12 suggests that part of the border of Lusitania extended beyond the Durius.

ROMANIZATION OF LUSITANIA

The issue of “Romanization” is a complicated one, and for that reason can only receive limited treatment here.⁵⁵ My use of the term “Romanization” means the general process by which Roman cultural forms were gradually adopted by non-Roman peoples within the Roman empire. An area can be described as “Romanized” when the archaeological remains show a preponderance of Roman influence. Thus, no claim is made as to the ethnic or cultural identity of people using Roman (or Roman style) goods or following ostensibly Roman traditions. We note only that a change in the material culture of a site has taken place, resulting in a significant increase in the proportion of Roman or Roman-influenced evidence at that site.⁵⁶

Strabo refers to the inhabitants of Hispania Citerior as “togati” (Greek τογᾶτοι),⁵⁷ and we learn from Pliny that the province of Baetica was thoroughly urbanized by the end of the first century B.C., boasting some 175 cities, of which 9 were colonies, 10 municipalities, 27 of the *Ius Latii*, and 120 stipendiary cities.⁵⁸ By contrast, Lusitania had only 45 cities, including 5 colonies, 1 municipality, 3 of the *Ius Latii* and 36 stipendiary cities.⁵⁹ Pliny also attributes 6 “libertate” and 3 “foederate” to the province of Baetica, neither of which is represented among

⁵⁵ For more on the Romanization of Lusitania, see Curchin 2004 and 1991, Gorges and Nogales Basarrate 2001, Keay 2001, Roldán Hervás 2001, Alonso Sánchez and Fernández Corrales 2000, Francisco Martín 1996, Richardson 1996, Trillmich and Zanker 1990, and the volumes *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS*, and *El Proceso Histórico de la Lusitania Oriental en Epoca Prerromana y Romana*.

⁵⁶ For example, the presence of a piece of south-Gaulish *terra sigillata* does not prove that a Roman was present. Rather, as a feature of a distinctly Roman cultural set, the *sigillata* demonstrates that non-Roman and Roman cultures have come into contact.

⁵⁷ Strabo 3.2.15; 3.4.20.

⁵⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 3.7. Pliny uses the term *populi* in his discussions of the towns of the Roman provinces, and although this term does not necessarily have such specific connotations, I take it here to mean something like “towns” or “cities,” given the nature of the lists that are presented.

⁵⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

the urban centers of Lusitania.⁶⁰ The most obvious explanation for this difference is the fact that the Romans were forced into activity along the eastern coast of Spain against the Carthaginians as early as the third century B.C., and were forced to impose themselves on the natives from that time onward, in order to protect their military operations. Cities arose in the support base of both Rome and Carthage during this period. By contrast, the area occupied by the Lusitanians was the scene of a policing action by D. Iunius Brutus in the middle of the second century B.C., the ultimate goal of which seems to have been to prevent the Lusitanians from invading the “pacified” eastern areas of Hispania. It was not until the last third of the first century B.C. that Augustus and his forces were able to pacify the northwestern portion of Hispania Ulterior, and the archaeological and epigraphic evidence point to this period in particular as the beginning of intensive Romanization of Lusitania, especially north of the Tagus.

Since the Romans’ activity in Lusitania was relatively late on the Peninsula, it comes as little surprise that the level of Romanization was not yet equal in Lusitania to that of Baetica and the eastern portion of Tarraconensis.⁶¹ This fact is evident both in the archaeological record, which reveals far more advanced production and distribution mechanisms in Baetica and Tarraconensis, and in the epigraphic evidence, from which we learn of a large number of indigenous local officials at important Lusitanian sites, by contrast with the preponderance of Romans in the administration of Baetican cities.⁶²

This situation changes within a few generations of the official establishment of Roman cities in Lusitania, however. By the middle of the first century A.D. a significant majority of

⁶⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 3.7.

⁶¹ Esteban Ortega 2000, 250.

⁶² Cf. Curchin 2004, 122.

officials at the important cities of Lusitania bear standard Roman names,⁶³ although there are still cases in which magistrates' indigenous parentage is evident.⁶⁴

As may be expected, the southern portion of Lusitania adopted Roman customs and culture more readily than the northern areas,⁶⁵ a result of the very early Mediterranean economic ties evident at cities of the Algarve and southern Alentejo.⁶⁶ However, archaeological evidence from Lusitanian cities indicates that there was a strong tendency to emulate Roman urban ideals by the beginning of the first century A.D., even in the northern reaches of the province.⁶⁷ Julio-Claudian public buildings have been identified at Augustobriga in the northeastern corner of the province, at Conimbriga, Scallabis, and Olisipo in the center, north of the Tagus and at Pax Iulia, Augusta Emerita, Ebora, and Ossonoba south of the Tagus.

One cause for such projects may have been the desire of local aristocrats to gain recognition for their wealth, culture and sophistication. Ultimately, such recognition came in the form of *viritalis* citizenship,⁶⁸ as was probably the case with P. Cornelius Macer from Ammaia,⁶⁹ and in elevation to local and provincial posts. If the ruling elite were successful in significantly improving the character of their city in the eyes of regional or provincial Roman administrators, the entire city could be granted the *ius Latii*, which translated to Latin citizenship for normal citizens and Roman citizenship for the *ordo decurionum*.⁷⁰ This may be the case for cities like

⁶³ Salinas de Frías and Ridríguez Cortés 2000, 23.

⁶⁴ Salinas de Frías and Ridríguez Cortés 2000, 23. The fact remains that the western and northwestern reaches of the Iberian Peninsula were never as heavily involved in Roman and provincial politics as the eastern and southern areas of the Peninsula: cf. Curchin 1991, 79 and 1990a.

⁶⁵ Curchin 1991, 20.

⁶⁶ Francisco Martín 1996, 264; Salinas de Frías and Ridríguez Cortés 2000, 23; Mantas 1990.

⁶⁷ E.g. Aeminium, Capara, Conimbriga, Eburobrittium and *Civitas Igaeditanorum*.

⁶⁸ Salinas de Frías and Ridríguez Cortés 2000, 24.

⁶⁹ *CIL* II, 159.

⁷⁰ Curchin 1991, 66.

Ebora, Myrtilis, and Salacia, described by Pliny as “*oppida veteris Lati*,” although the chronology for the concession of Latin rights to these towns may rather indicate that theirs was a reward for service rendered during the civil wars.⁷¹

⁷¹ Faria 1999, 33, 36 and 42; Mantas 1990a, 174.

ECONOMIC STATUS OF LUSITANIA

As we have discussed in the historical introduction, Rome's initial interest in the provinces of Hispania was a direct result of Carthaginian activities in the area. The area that was later defined as the province of Lusitania was most likely brought into the Punic wars because of the mineral wealth of the area, mentioned by a number of the ancient geographies.⁷² Although the ancients generally highlighted the importance of the alluvial gold available in Lusitania,⁷³ archaeological remains from the most extensively worked mines demonstrate that copper and silver were also highly desired by the Romans, particularly in the southern areas of Lusitania.⁷⁴ Indeed, the wealth of mineral deposits in Lusitania may have been one of the motivating factors in Augustus' reorganization of Hispania, which left most of the major mining centers in the imperial provinces of Lusitania and Tarraconensis.⁷⁵

The establishment of colonies in Lusitania, all in the first century B.C., also indicates that the Romans were aware of the agricultural wealth of this province. It is significant in this respect that the colonies were all established in agriculturally wealthy areas, rather than in the areas where mineral deposits dominate the economy. Of course, the creation of colonies must also be seen as a part of the Roman military program, even in this later period, when it was employed for the purpose of settling the veterans of first century B.C. wars.⁷⁶ Agricultural production in Lusitania must have been particularly centered on wine and olive oil, as is demonstrated by the

⁷² Francisco Martín 1996, 305.

⁷³ References to the *aurifer Tagus* occur in Catullus 29: 18-20, Ovid, Strabo, Pliny, Seneca, Marcial, Juvenal, Lucan and Pomponius Mela.

⁷⁴ At São Domingos, Ruy Gomes and Aljustrel; cf. Francisco Martín 1996, 299-304.

⁷⁵ Francisco Martín 1996, 39; Baetica also had a number of productive mines in the Republican period, but many of these were heavily depleted by the end of the first century B.C.

⁷⁶ Francisco Martín 1996, 110.

large numbers of locally produced amphorae at sites like Collippo and the many Roman villas scattered throughout the province (figs. 5 and 6).⁷⁷

The third economic resource that the Romans exploited heavily from the earliest years of the principate is that of *garum*. *Garum* is a fish preserve sauce that was used throughout all classes of Roman society, both to make condiments and as a spice, among the poor, as a substitute for salt.⁷⁸ A large number of installations related to the production of *garum* have been found along the Portuguese coasts, at Lisbon, Troia, Setúbal, Portimão, Faro, Luz de Tavira, and Castro Marim (fig. 7). Finds from some, particularly those along the southern coast, indicate that the production of *garum* actually predates the arrival of the Romans in the area.⁷⁹

These three, minerals, agriculture, and *garum*, represent the principal economic activities of Roman Lusitania. The province's mineral wealth in particular offers a ready solution to the problem of why the important Roman roads and bridges of Lusitania were first established. The means by which these major endeavors were accomplished is another matter, and this problem is closely tied both to the level of local Romanization and to the economic dependencies of the cities of Lusitania. Rome's control of the Lusitanian mines and the successful extraction of funds from the cities of Lusitania presented another major problem, that of civil order. Without a reliable system of taxation and local administration, the province of Lusitania would cease to be a useful focus of Roman activities.

⁷⁷ Curchin 1991, 130, 144 and 146-8; Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 9-13 and figs. iii-iv.

⁷⁸ Edmondson 1987, 102.

⁷⁹ Francisco Martín 1996, 264.

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROVINCE OF LUSITANIA

The cities of the Roman world were arranged into different groups, based on the nature of their initial Roman occupation, their cooperation with Rome, their economic and military importance, and the power and influence of the Roman citizens settled there. The three levels offered by Pliny are colonial, municipal, and stipendiary, and these represent financial and juridical realities for the inhabitants of the various cities.⁸⁰ Although the titles represent three distinct categories, there also seem to be differences among cities of the same status—in other words, Roman administration of the provinces was fluid enough to allow city charters to be arranged on a case-by-case basis.⁸¹

Citizens of the Roman colonies enjoyed the most rights, and seem to have been least heavily burdened with taxes, in some cases receiving an exemption from the provincial land tax.⁸² Colonies were an essentially military foundation in earlier years, and were often established *ex novo* and arranged on a plan identical to that of Roman military camps.⁸³ There seems to have been a sense that colonies were essentially a small part of Rome away from Rome, a quality that would have been enhanced by the high percentage of Italian-born residents.⁸⁴

Municipalities, on the other hand, were generally indigenous settlements that had been granted privileged status because of their compliance with the Romans or because of a personal connection between a particular Roman leader and the city. While the citizens of a municipality enjoyed higher status and special privileges based on their citizenship claims, they often retained

⁸⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

⁸¹ Francisco Martín 1996, 109.

⁸² Francisco Martín 1996, 109; Vittinghoff 1952, 465-70.

⁸³ This is most obviously the case at Augusta Emerita, although military considerations do not seem to have been a primary concern in the selection of the site.

⁸⁴ Francisco Martín 1996, 111.

administrative control over their own city, essentially paying taxes in exchange for their additional freedoms.⁸⁵ Their rights were greater than those of the stipendiary citizens but at the same time their responsibilities to the provincial and local administration were significantly more burdensome.⁸⁶

After the references in Pliny's account, the epigraphic record is our most informative evidence concerning the status of Roman cities during the first century. Inscriptions from many of the important Roman centers give us direct evidence for the local government structure and for the involvement of local individuals in the provincial and imperial administration. Furthermore, we can learn something of the chronology of Roman involvement in the city from the tribe into which its inhabitants were enrolled. In general, Lusitanians received affiliation with the Sergia tribe, from Caesar and Augustus,⁸⁷ the Galeria tribe, from Caesar and/or Augustus,⁸⁸ the Papiria tribe (only at Augusta Emerita) from Augustus,⁸⁹ and the Quirina tribe, possibly from Claudius onward.⁹⁰ Because Vespasian's extension of Roman rights extended to

⁸⁵ D'Ors 1953, 140-1.

⁸⁶ Francisco Martín 1996, 110.

⁸⁷ Mantas 1993, 486-7 and n. 101; Faria 1999, 43; Alarcão 2002, 42; At Urso, in Baetica, the inhabitants enrolled by Antony entered the Sergia tribe, while later colonists were enrolled in the Galeria tribe by Augustus.

⁸⁸ A. Faria 1999, 33; Mantas 1993, 487 and n. 101.

⁸⁹ *TIR*, J-29, "Augusta Emerita," 33.

⁹⁰ Although most scholars believe that the Flavian emperors, particularly Vespasian, were responsible for the spread of the Quirina tribe throughout Lusitania, there is some evidence that Claudius began to associate himself with the Quirina tribe after his adoption of Nero. Presumably, Claudius and Nero may well have enrolled citizens into this tribe, but there is little evidence to suggest that either was involved in large-scale citizenship grants in Lusitania (see Ross-Taylor 1960, 21 n. 18, 204-5, 281-2).

the entire Iberian Peninsula,⁹¹ we are unlikely to find citizens of Lusitanian cities enrolled in tribes other than these.⁹²

As for the local administration, the general rule is that colonies were governed by a pair of magistrates, the *duoviri*, while municipalities had a magistracy shared by four individuals, the *quattuorviri*, composed of two *duoviri* and two *aediles*.⁹³ In Italy during the Republican period, citizens of towns governed by officials with either of these titles enjoyed “full citizenship.”⁹⁴ Since nearly all of the important cities of Lusitania seem to have received municipal status by the end of the first century A.D.,⁹⁵ and since we have no evidence for colonies other than those mentioned by Pliny, any information related to local administration is most important for chronological reasons, for determining when a particular city received its municipal status. If an individual is described as a *duumvir*, we know he performed this civic function in a town that must have had an official Roman charter, most likely as a *municipium* or *colonia*.

Funerary monuments or the dedicatory inscriptions from public buildings often offer us information on the *cursus honorum* of individuals from the Roman cities of the province, and the latter sometimes provide us with details about structures of which nothing else remains.⁹⁶ It is also through these inscriptions that we learn of the activities of Lusitanians in the broader administration of the Hispanias and of the Roman Empire itself. Lusitanian involvement in the

⁹¹ Or virtually the entire province, if we can accept Pliny’s words at 3.30.

⁹² Caesar’s and Augustus’ enrollment of local citizens into the tribes Galeria and Papiria does not accord well their association with the Fabia and Scaptia tribes (Cf. Ross-Taylor 1960, 221-2). However, neither of the latter tribes is well attested in Lusitania, and there is a strong possibility that in the case of Roman colonies, at least, settlers were already Roman citizens with tribal affiliation (Sergia settled at Scallabis, and Papiria at Augusta Emerita, for example). On the other hand, Galeria tribe is simply too widespread in the province for this to have been the case.

⁹³ Curchin 2004, 58.

⁹⁴ Ross-Taylor 1960, 82.

⁹⁵ Or at least the *Ius Latii*.

⁹⁶ Coins are also occasionally helpful to this end, although only Augusta Emerita in Lusitania issued coins with buildings on them.

provincial and imperial administration raises questions concerning the level of Romanization that had taken place in this distant province by the end of the first century A.D. One would expect the colonies to represent the highest concentration of Roman occupation of any of the communities of Lusitania, with municipalities following close behind, and stipendiary *oppida* and *vici* retaining, to a great extent, their indigenous qualities and customs. However, even in the colonies of Lusitania we see a high incidence of indigenous names, presumably a reflection of an earlier indigenous settlement at the site or emigration to the Roman colonies.⁹⁷

⁹⁷ Cf. Curchin 1990a; Francisco Martín 1996.

CHAPTER 2: CATALOGUE OF CITIES

These cities form the foundation of all that we know about the early province of Lusitania. It is my working assumption that the most important cities of the province were included in the geographical descriptions of Pliny and Ptolemy, though as Pliny himself hints, there may be questions as to whether a particular city fell within the confines of Lusitania or one of the neighboring provinces.⁹⁸ Pliny observes that while there are 36 stipendiary cities of Lusitania, it is only worthwhile to list 19 of them here, leaving out those that were mentioned as tributary towns of Baetica, and possibly others.⁹⁹ The fact that Pliny has mentioned that there are 45 *populi* in the province of Lusitania is an important hint to the situation at that time. Since we are given 30 of them directly in this passage, and another one (if I am correct about Serippo) is listed among the cities of Baetica, we are left with roughly 15 unidentified cities in Lusitania at the end of the first century B.C.

As will be discussed later, it seems likely that portions of the sphere of influence of some of the border cities stretched across the provincial boundaries.¹⁰⁰ Here we may be aided by the inscription on the bridge at Alcántara, which lists the cities that offered assistance during its construction.¹⁰¹ The cities listed are: Igaeditani, Lancienses Oppidani, Talori, Interannienses,

⁹⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

⁹⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Pliny *Nat.* 3.14; Arunci may be identified with the *Civitas* Aruccitana mentioned above (*CIL* II, 963), while Serippo may well be the town of Serpa. Both Arucci and Serpa are mentioned in the *Antonine Itinerary* (426, 6 and 427, 2), but the modern identifications do not make sense of the route described.

¹⁰⁰ This seems to be the case, for example, with the *Civitas* Aruccitana (*CIL* II, 963), which Alarcão has identified as the modern village of Moura in Portugal, but which others have assigned to the southwestern corner of Spain.

¹⁰¹ *CIL* II, 760: MVNICIPIA PROVINCIAE LVSITANIAE STIPE CONLATA QVAE OPVS PONTIS PERFECERVNT IGAEDITANI LANCIENSES OPPIDANI TALORES

Colarni, Lancienses Transcudani, Aravi, Meidubrigenses, Arabrigenses, Banienses, and Paesures. We have already encountered the Lancienses in Pliny, but there was no cognomen attached, which has led to speculation that there was originally only one territory of the Lancienses, and that this was subsequently divided (by the time of Trajan) into the territory of the Transcudani and of the Lancienses.¹⁰² Whatever the reason, we now have an extra city, that of the Lancienses Transcudani, to add to our list of cities of the first century, though if the suggestion above is correct, this city would not have counted among those addressed by Pliny. The Igaeditani do not come up in any of the ancient sources, but epigraphic evidence at the village of Idanha-a-Velha has confirmed the existence of an important Roman *Civitas Igaeditanorum* there, established before 16 B.C.

Pliny mentions the Taporí and there seems to be little reason for denying the equation between this group and the Talóri of the Alcántara inscription.¹⁰³ Two inscriptions found near Teixoso in northeastern Portugal led Alarcão to the conclusion that the city was located here,¹⁰⁴ and promoted to a municipium by the Flavians.¹⁰⁵ The Aravi of are also mentioned on an altar dedicated to Hadrian by the *Civitas Aravorum*.¹⁰⁶ Since this inscription was found in Marialva, that city has been identified as the capital of the *Civitas Aravorum*, and must have been another of the stipendiary cities omitted by Pliny.

The Arabrigenses are mentioned by both the Alcántara inscription and by a *terminus Augustalis* marking the boundary between that group and the Coilarni, at the town of Goujim

INTERAMNIENSES COLARNI LACIENSES TRANSCVDANI ARANI MEIDVBRIGENSES
ARABRICENSES BANIENSES PAESVRES.

¹⁰² Alarcão 1988a, 18.

¹⁰³ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

¹⁰⁴ *CIL* II, 519 and another, unpublished.

¹⁰⁵ Alarcão 1988a, 19.

¹⁰⁶ *CIL* II, 429

(fig. 8).¹⁰⁷ The stone dates to the period of Nerva, which makes it roughly contemporary to Pliny's writings. Pliny uses Paesuri to refer to the Paesures mentioned at Alcántara, and in his account they are located at the extreme northwest of Lusitania, coming right after the Douro and the Turduli Veteres in his north-south listing of the features of the Lusitanian coast.¹⁰⁸ The fact that they contributed to the bridge at Alcántara may imply that they were involved in trade with eastern areas of Hispania.¹⁰⁹

The “Stipendiaria” of Lusitania

Pliny claims that there are 45 *populi* in Lusitania, of which five are colonies, one is a Roman municipality, three benefit from the Latin rights and 36 are stipendiary.¹¹⁰ Of the 36 *populi stipendiarii*, Pliny elects to mention only 19,¹¹¹ having either mentioned others earlier, when discussing the province of Baetica,¹¹² or simply not wishing to belabor the reader with unimportant towns.¹¹³ Because of this decision, there has been a great deal of speculation concerning the identification of the other stipendiary cities, and only Alarcão has been brave enough to offer some suggested identifications.¹¹⁴

A number of the cities that Pliny lists have been conclusively identified, on the basis of the same sorts of information that were used to identify the more important cities of Lusitania—numismatics, toponyms, inscriptions and other historical sources. Some of these cities, despite

¹⁰⁷ Alarcão 1988a, 19.

¹⁰⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Tranoy 1990, 18 and n. 53.

¹¹⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

¹¹¹ It is generally agreed that Pliny's description of the Roman world relied heavily on the *formula provinciarum* of Agrippa, dated to 41 B.C.; cf. Blázquez 1965, 5.

¹¹² Pliny *Nat.* 3.14.

¹¹³ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

¹¹⁴ Alarcão 1990 and 1988a.

their less important administrative role and lower position within the Roman framework, nonetheless achieved noteworthy wealth and status, possibly through their commercial ties. Even those cities that did not by their location or natural advantages achieve success were ultimately granted Roman citizenship and rights by Vespasian in 73 or 74 A.D.,¹¹⁵ a time when a large number of Lusitanian cities were first recognized as Roman municipalities.

In order for us to fully understand the organization of first century Lusitania, it will be important to consider the information available from each of the stipendiary cities and potential stipendiary cities. This is in part because of the important role that these cities would have played as way stations along the imperial roads, as demonstrated above all in the fourth century itineraries. Moreover, by looking at what we do know about the identified stipendiary cities, we can make hypotheses as to where the others must have been located, and in that way deduce a fuller portrait of the province as a whole.

One fundamental aspect of this project is the identification of the waypoints mentioned by the Antonine Itinerary and the Ravenna Cosmography. Even in cases where these small *mansiones* or *stationes* cannot be identified with certainty, the remains of paved roads and the incidence of mile markers along the major routes lend a certain credibility to conclusions drawn through this method. Works that have arisen out of analyses of the routes of a particular region have in some cases led to the identification of important historical cities whose whereabouts would otherwise remain unknown.¹¹⁶ Thus, while I do not propose to reconstruct the entire system of Roman roads in Lusitania, I will in some cases rely on the topographical information

¹¹⁵ Alarcão 1990a, 28.

¹¹⁶ Marnel's identification as Talabriga is a direct result of careful studies of the roads linking Olisipo to Aeminium and finally Cale.

available in discussions of the precise locations of sites that cannot be identified through architectural and epigraphic information.

The cities discussed below have been divided into three categories, based the information available concerning each (see below, at the beginning of each section). The number preceding the Roman name of the site indicates the position of this site on the map in figure 1. A footnote next to the ancient city's name contains published epigraphic evidence relating directly to the city's ancient name, and a footnote next to the modern name of the city has epigraphic evidence found at or in the immediate vicinity of the site. For most of the cities, ancient historical references have been included after the modern name.

COLONIES AND MUNICIPALITIES

The cities in this section were without question the most important Roman centers in the province of Lusitania from as early as the middle of the first century B.C. Moreover, each of these cities was recognized as an important Roman city by the time of Pliny's sources. They are arranged in my catalogue based on the earliest archaeological and historical evidence of significant contacts with Roman civilization.

1. Felicitas Iulia Olisipo¹¹⁷ (Lisboa)¹¹⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6 and 2.5.4; Strabo 3.3.1; Pompon. 3.8; Varro *rust.* 2.1.19; *AntIt* 416-25; *Rav* 307

Romans first took an active interest in the city of Olisipo in the middle of the second century B.C., at which time Strabo claims that D. Iunius Brutus fortified the settlement in order to use it as a base of operations against the Lusitanians.¹¹⁹ Part of the city's importance lay in control of the Tagus, with its gold-bearing sands and access to inland Lusitania.¹²⁰ Olisipo's importance to the Roman cause is reflected by its reception, probably in the mid-first century B.C., of status as a Roman municipality. According to Pliny's account, Olisipo was the only municipality of Roman citizens in the province of Lusitania—municipalities of Latin citizens were more common, offering fewer rights to new citizens (Pliny tells of three such Latin municipalities).

It is generally agreed that Olisipo's municipal status was probably granted sometime before 27 B.C. This theory is upheld by the enrollment of the citizens of Olisipo into the *Galeria*

¹¹⁷ *CIL* II, 176, 185=5217, 186-8, 187, 188=190=4993, 214, 959, 4992=5221, and 5240.

¹¹⁸ *CIL* II, 173-257 and *IRCP* 296.

¹¹⁹ 3.3.1.

¹²⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 4.115.

tribe, which must have taken place sometime after the middle of the first century B.C.¹²¹ Faria has argued convincingly that the accession of Olisipo to municipal status must have taken place between the years 31 and 27 B.C., at which time the colony of Pax Iulia was also established, and the *latium vetus* was granted to the city of Ebora.¹²²

Despite the density of subsequent occupations of Lisbon, a good deal of archaeological evidence remains to shed light on the Roman period in the city (fig. 9).¹²³ The *Baixa*, or downtown area of modern Lisbon, preserves evidence of Roman occupation,¹²⁴ including a massive cryptoporticus, which may have supported a monumental bath complex, public portico, or commercial center.¹²⁵

This latter complex was excavated during the 1770s, the 1850s and finally in the 1960s, providing a good deal of information about the techniques employed in its construction.¹²⁶ Architectural clues strongly suggest that the underground structure, known today as the “conservas de água da Rua da Prata,” underwent at least two major phases of building activity. The first phase, dating to the Julio-Claudian period, exhibits large, regularly dressed stone blocks, and the style of stonework suggests an Augustan date.¹²⁷ It seems possible that the complex was initially constructed to provide access to, and storage of, water from an underground spring. An Augustan date for the initial stage of construction would be interesting

¹²¹ Before this time the citizens would have been inscribed into the Sergia tribe as was the case for example at Scallabis (see Alarcão 2002, 42 and Faria 1999, 43).

¹²² Faria 1995b, 91-5; 1999, 36.

¹²³ Alarcão 1994, 59.

¹²⁴ See Caetano 2001.

¹²⁵ Maciel 1993/4, 149.

¹²⁶ See Maciel 1993/4 and Moita 1977 for complete discussion of the archaeological history of the structure.

¹²⁷ Maciel 1993/4, 148.

in the broader scope of urban renewal during that period, especially with reference to the attention given to the Roman water supply.¹²⁸

The second phase of construction employed *opus caementicium* and introduced vaulting and stucco on the interior walls, perhaps because of an added function that the structure now served.¹²⁹ To this latter phase may belong an inscription dedicating a public project to the *municipium* and entrusting that gift to the protection of Aesclepius.¹³⁰ Maciel has suggested that a comparison may be drawn between this underground spring and its possible public functions and the *Mithraeum* under the Basilica of St. Clement in Rome,¹³¹ but beyond the inscription to Aesclepius, no other evidence in support of this suggestion has yet come to light.

Just a slight distance around the coast from the main settlement of Roman Olisipo, archaeologists have uncovered a series of structures that were clearly associated with the Roman garum industry.¹³² Amaro and Caetano have reconstructed what the shoreline may have been in Roman times, when this garum production complex was in use, indicating that these structures stood on the water's edge in ancient times (fig. 10).¹³³ The chronology of the structures associated with the fish-salting operation spans the period between the second century B.C. and the fifth century A.D.¹³⁴

Four buildings have been conclusively identified as being associated with the production of *garum* on the coast of the Tagus estuary, and another third century A.D. structure seems to

¹²⁸ Maciel 1993/4, 151; Pliny *Nat.* 36.122.

¹²⁹ Maciel 1993/4, 148.

¹³⁰ Maciel 1993/4, 148-9 and *CIL* II, 175.

¹³¹ Maciel 1993/4, 150 n. 9.

¹³² Amaro and Caetano 1993/4.

¹³³ Amaro and Caetano 1993/4, 286.

¹³⁴ Diogo and Trindade 2000, 60. Archaeological remains from the city indicate port activities from as early as the 5th century B.C.; cf. Amaro and Caetano 1993/4, 285.

have served as the baths for the complex.¹³⁵ All of the Roman buildings in this area, including the cryptoporticus discussed above, are oriented along the same lines, and traces of the road grid that serviced this portion of the settlement have been identified (fig. 11).¹³⁶ Earlier buildings were oriented along different axes from the Roman production complex, suggesting that the ancient streambed in the modern Baixa had silted up before the arrival of the Romans on the site.¹³⁷

Much of the evidence uncovered to date indicates that the residential and monumental centers of Felicitas Iulia Olisipo were located on the slope of the hill on which the Castelo de São Jorge stands today. A first century Roman theater stands partially excavated about two-thirds up the hill from the areas discussed above, still below the imposing medieval castle. This theater was first (re-) discovered in the decades following the massive earthquake of 1755, and an excavation report and drawings of the area uncovered were published in 1815 (fig. 12).¹³⁸ An inscription found during the 18th century excavation indicates that the *proscenium* was built (or redecorated) at the time of Nero, around the year 57 A.D.¹³⁹ The theater was reburied not long after its initial excavation, and it was not until the 1960s that new excavation work began at the site, after the 18th and 19th century buildings on the site were purchased by the city of Lisbon. The 20th century excavations have continued up until the present day, but the city's acquisition of properties under which much of the theater now lies continues to lag behind expected

¹³⁵ Amaro and Caetano 1993/4, 286-7.

¹³⁶ Mantas 1990a, 162, 165-6 and fig. 2.

¹³⁷ Amaro and Caetano 1993/4, 288.

¹³⁸ The theater was still visible in the 14th century, but by 1571 had apparently been buried; see Alarcão 1982, 287; Azevedo 1815.

¹³⁹ Alarcão 1988c, 124; *CIL* II, 183. The *proscenium* was dedicated by the "AVGVSTALIS PERPETVVS C HEIVS PRIMVS CATO HEIA...", and both Heius and Heia Primi are also recorded on another inscription from the theater, *CIL* II, 196.

deadlines.¹⁴⁰ For this reason, Alarcão's discussion of the theater is the most recent publication of the structure, and he was forced to rely heavily on the information from the two earlier excavations.¹⁴¹

One study that has brought some certainty to the proposed chronology for the Lisbon theater is Diogo and Sepúlveda's study of the Roman lamps excavated from the theater.¹⁴² This brief report of their analysis of the lamps found in the Roman theater supports the hypothesis, first proposed in 1815, that the theater underwent a significant renovation phase in the time of Nero.¹⁴³ The bulk of the lamps date from the second half of the first century A.D. through the middle of the second century.¹⁴⁴ This agrees with the inscription, but unfortunately does not offer conclusive evidence concerning the structure's initial construction date.

There is little archaeological evidence that might suggest where the Roman forum of Olisipo stood. Some possibilities include the summit of the hill now occupied by the castle,¹⁴⁵ the area surrounding the medieval Sé de Lisboa (where the Moorish mosque seems to have been located)¹⁴⁶ and the Largo da Madalena, located on the west slope of the hill, below the castle.¹⁴⁷ The last site is possibly the most likely, as architectural elements including columns, bases, and capitals were uncovered there, along with several inscriptions.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁰ Alarcão 1982, 288.

¹⁴¹ Alarcão 1982.

¹⁴² Diogo and Sepúlveda 2001.

¹⁴³ Azevedo 1815, 40-43.

¹⁴⁴ Diogo and Sepúlveda 2001, 227.

¹⁴⁵ Where no evidence has yet been uncovered that might support this suggestion, despite excavations of the Moorish and Iron Age remains there.

¹⁴⁶ Excavations within the cloisters of the Sé have revealed Roman and Iron Age occupations, but no monumental architecture; Arruda, Freitas and Sánchez 2000, 30.

¹⁴⁷ Alarcão 1988c, 124; Mantas 1990a, 162-3.

¹⁴⁸ Alarcão 1988c, 124; *CIL* II, 176, 187 and 190.

Just a short distance from the Sé de Lisboa, workers excavated two Corinthian columns, which have recently been analyzed and published by Lúcia Fernandes (figs. 13 and 14).¹⁴⁹ Fernandes concluded, based on stylistic considerations, that both capitals fall into a “degraded” typology influenced by the canon prevalent in the Flavian period.¹⁵⁰ They appear to have been made in the early second century, and quite obviously were intended for the same architectural context, being virtually identical in their dimensions and in the details of their decoration. However, we do not know the identity of the structure from which these capitals came.

Other important finds from Lisbon that date to the Roman period include a small portion of the *spina* of a circus,¹⁵¹ two cemeteries,¹⁵² a bath complex,¹⁵³ and the collection tank for an aqueduct.¹⁵⁴ None of these finds has been conclusively dated to the first century A.D., although one of the cemeteries does contain some first century materials.¹⁵⁵

2. *Myrtilis Iulia* (Mértola)¹⁵⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.116 and 117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.4; Pompon. 3.7; *AntIt* 431; *Rav* 306

Mértola’s importance since ancient times lay in its location near an important mineral deposit, the Minas de São Domingos, otherwise known as Aljustrel. Evidence of Roman activity at these mines includes *terra sigillata*, bronze jewelry, a woven sandal, and a number of mining implements, including a woven basket, pulleys, and water extraction screws.¹⁵⁷ The intensive

¹⁴⁹ Fernandes 2002 and figs. 1 and 3.

¹⁵⁰ Alarcão 2002, 247 and 250-1.

¹⁵¹ Under the Praça do Rossio; Sepúlveda et al. 2002.

¹⁵² Under the Praça da Figueira and the Rua das Canastras; cf. Sepúlveda et al. 2002, 298.

¹⁵³ *TIR*, J-29, “Lisboa.”

¹⁵⁴ Maciel 1993/4, 152.

¹⁵⁵ Fabião 1998, 180, n. 14.

¹⁵⁶ *CIL* II, 15-20, 5178-80; *IRCP* 95-119.

¹⁵⁷ Viana et al. 1956, 11-8.

mining throughout the southern reaches of the Guadiana offer reason enough for Roman interest in the area, but the fact that this was the highest navigable point on the river gave Myrtilis an added importance as the key point of contact between Mediterranean trade and inland Lusitanian production.

Archaeological evidence indicates that there has been a settlement at the site of Mértola since as early as the 8th century B.C. The city developed as an important trading center on the Guadiana River, whose delta opens onto the southern coast of the Iberian Peninsula, linking merchants from the Mediterranean to the mineral wealth of the region dominated first by the kingdom of Tartessos, and then by Turdetania.¹⁵⁸ Roman contacts with Myrtilis may have begun as early as the second Punic War, when Carthaginian armies controlled much of the coast of Hispania.

There is a good deal of debate as to whether the city was given status as *oppidum veteris Latii* by Julius Caesar or Caesar Augustus.¹⁵⁹ The Romans minted coins during the Sertorian War,¹⁶⁰ but we know little about the legal position of the city apart from the few inscriptions that have survived from the Roman period. One of these, *IRCP* 7, does record the fact that citizens of the city were enrolled in the Galeria tribe, indicating at the very latest that either the Latin rights or municipal status was granted to Myrtilis by Augustus.¹⁶¹

Republican coin hoards have been reported in the area of Mértola since the 19th century, indicating a relatively dense Roman occupation of the site compared to other cities of the western reaches of Hispania Citerior at that time. Numerous marble statues have also been

¹⁵⁸ Alves 1956, 52; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.4.

¹⁵⁹ see Mantas 1987, 28; Faria 1999, 35; Galsterer-Kröll 1972, 111, n. 168; Gorges 1990, 95; Ramage 1998, 440, n. 38.

¹⁶⁰ Faria 1999, 35-6; Crawford 1985, 341; contra Burgos 1984 and *TIR*, J-29, "Myrtilis."

¹⁶¹ For more on this topic, see below under "Ebora."

uncovered at the site, and reports exist at least since the 16th century of these statues being taken out of Portugal and put on display.¹⁶² Two, however, have made their way to the National Archaeological Museum in Belém. The first has been identified as a slightly larger than life-size Augustus (2.30 m restored), and cannot be dated more specifically than the early imperial period.¹⁶³ The second statue, on the other hand, offers characteristics that place it within a specific time frame, in the first quarter of the first century A.D. This second statue is a marble portrait that would have stood some 2.70 m when it was first set up. As it is, it stands 2.46 m tall without its feet and (possibly) base. The face has been completely destroyed, and the forearms are also missing, but enough remains of the head to identify a *stephane* and the unmistakable hairstyle of Livia, Augustus' wife.¹⁶⁴

Little architectural evidence remains of the Roman occupation of the city, although occasional reports of marble pillars and worked stones suggest that the town's architectural program was fairly impressive.¹⁶⁵ The excavations undertaken by the team at the Campo Arqueológico de Mértola have uncovered remains of what may have been the forum area, on the hillside north of the castle.¹⁶⁶ A cryptoporticus extends the platform of the hill northward, providing a greater area on which the civic center could be built overlooking the city below. Slightly farther east of the area currently under excavation lies the 13th century mosque, built over an early Christian church. Archaeologists at the site believe that this church, like the basilica being excavated on the western side of the forum platform, was simply an adapted structure of the Roman forum, perhaps a temple.

¹⁶² Alves 1956, 50-1 and 59.

¹⁶³ Garcia y Bellido 1966-7, 280-2.

¹⁶⁴ Garcia y Bellido 1966-7, 282; cf. Rose 1997, 76 and pl. 232.

¹⁶⁵ Alves 1956, 72-5.

¹⁶⁶ *TIR J-29*, "Myrtilis."

3. Scallabis Praesidium Iulium¹⁶⁷ (Santarém)¹⁶⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; Strabo 3.3.1; *AntIt* 420-1; App. *Hisp.* 71.

As Pliny observes, Lusitania begins at the Durus,¹⁶⁹ and the northern *conventus* seems to have extended below the Tagus.¹⁷⁰ Scallabis was the capital of the northern portion of this province, the *Conventus Scallabitanus*, giving it a very important role in the judicial and administrative activities of Lusitania.¹⁷¹ Despite the city's importance to early Roman activities in the province, archaeological and epigraphic evidence for this administrative and judicial capital remain scarce, despite the concentrated efforts of archaeologists in recent years. In fact, it was not until 1999 that the city of Santarém was definitively identified as the Roman city of Scallabis.

Santarém is well positioned on a high promontory over a sharp bend in the Tagus. Just north of the hill occupied by Santarém is a small river valley, and the promontory of the city's castle is protected on the south by a deep ravine, making the site ideal for a fortified settlement. The acropolis has an excellent view of the fertile plains north and east of the city, and the low level of the lands surrounding Santarém on the east in particular make agriculture especially profitable even in warm, dry weather.

Excavations undertaken on the *alcáçova*, the hilltop area encompassed by Santarém's medieval castle, revealed the first evidence of Roman habitation at the site.¹⁷² On the northern side of the acropolis the podium of a Roman temple, dating to the late republican or early

¹⁶⁷ *CIL* II, 35.

¹⁶⁸ *CIL* II, 325, 326=5229, 327-336 and 5026.

¹⁶⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113.

¹⁷⁰ Alarcão 2002, 43-6.

¹⁷¹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

¹⁷² Arruda and Viegas 2002, 73.

imperial period, was uncovered.¹⁷³ The podium measures 15.25 x 15.45 m, and is oriented in such a way that the building would originally have overlooked the northern lower city, which may have served as the port of Scallabis. The excavation revealed that the temple entrance was on the east side of the structure, and remains on the podium indicate that the cella extended all the way to the southern edge of the hill. From this the excavators have tentatively reconstructed a tetrastyle in antis temple, facing eastward and overlooking the main concentration of Roman settlement at the site (fig. 15).¹⁷⁴ Unfortunately, the remains of the temple itself have been virtually obliterated by succeeding occupations at the site.

Arruda and Viegas have postulated that the temple was built sometime between the year 48 B.C., in which Caesar returned to Rome from Hispania, and 27 B.C., when Augustus had finished consolidating his power.¹⁷⁵ This conclusion is based on both the ceramics and other materials that were collected during the excavation, and on a comparative analysis of the temple with others that seem to follow the same general layout.¹⁷⁶ Since the temple's site was cleared of earlier structures in order to level the bedrock for its foundations, the excavators are confident as to the chronology and layout of their findings. Furthermore, no other structures that could be identified as exactly contemporary to the temple, either by their orientation or by their material remains, were discovered in the immediately surrounding area; this suggests that this may have been a sort of *Capitolium* rather than a forum temple of the sort that predominate in Roman Hispania.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷³ Arruda and Viegas 2002.

¹⁷⁴ Arruda and Viegas 2002, 224-225.

¹⁷⁵ Alarcão 2002, 225-6.

¹⁷⁶ Arruda and Viegas 2002, 225.

¹⁷⁷ Alarcão 2002, 39-40.

As for the actual Roman settlement at Santarém, the hilltop of the alcáçova could well have accommodated a fortress of some sort in Roman times, but would not, even at its most extensive area of six hectares, have been sufficient to hold an important Roman colony.¹⁷⁸ Strabo mentions a city called Moron, which was an important military post established by D. Iunius Brutus in 138-6 B.C.¹⁷⁹ Some scholars would identify the fortress of Santarém as the military camp of Moron.¹⁸⁰ However, the presence of a Roman army camp just to the west of Santarém, at Chões de Alpompé, has led to speculation into the relationship of that camp with the Roman city at Santarém.¹⁸¹ It has been argued that this camp was that of Julius Caesar, and was ultimately the reason that Pliny called Scallabis the *Praesidium Iulium*.¹⁸² Surface evidence indicates a Roman presence during the first and second centuries B.C., but the little excavation work that has been done at Chões has been largely inconclusive.¹⁸³

Alarcão has suggested that the double name for the city (Moron and Scallabis) might arise from the existence of a pre-Roman *oppidum* at the site, possibly located to the north of the acropolis on a small tributary of the Tagus.¹⁸⁴ When, in the 30s B.C. the site was given its new status as a colony and later developed into a conventus capital, it was given a Roman name. The new, official name of the site was qualified with the descriptor “Praesidium Iulium” to link it to Caesar’s successes in the Spanish wars, and as a reference to the existence of a cohort stationed nearby, at Chões de Alpompé.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸ Alarcão 2002, 39.

¹⁷⁹ Strabo 3.3.1.

¹⁸⁰ Alarcão 2002, 37-9.

¹⁸¹ *TIR*, J-29, “Scallabis.”

¹⁸² Alarcão 2002, 38; *Pliny Nat.* 4.117.

¹⁸³ Fabião 2002, 150-1.

¹⁸⁴ Alarcão 2002, 37-8.

¹⁸⁵ Alarcão 2002, 38-9.

Because of the role that Scallabis (and possibly a pre-Roman settlement at or near Santarém known as Moron) played in the second and first centuries B.C., the Romans made it a conventus capital and colony.¹⁸⁶ The fact that the site seems to have had a monumental temple on its summit from as early as the middle of the first century B.C. might well have been an added incentive to Scallabis' elevation to colonial status, although the chronology remains somewhat insecure. An inscription found within the city limits demonstrates conclusively that this was the *colonia scallabitana*, and funerary inscriptions from the area immediately surrounding Santarém indicate that its inhabitants were inscribed into the Sergia tribe.¹⁸⁷ This latter detail suggests that the citizens were given Roman tribal affiliation before the year 27 B.C., which seems to be the year in which Augustus began enrolling citizens into the Galeria tribe.¹⁸⁸ This might place the date of Scallabis' colonization within 30s B.C., roughly contemporary to the establishment of the Roman colony at Norba Caesarina, where the citizens were also enrolled in the Sergia tribe.¹⁸⁹

4. **Colonia Metellinensis/Metellinum (Medellín)**¹⁹⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; *AntIt* 416; *Rav* 315

One of the earliest foundations of the entire province of Lusitania, Metellinum was most likely established first as a military camp of Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius in 79 B.C.¹⁹¹ Antonio

¹⁸⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6.

¹⁸⁷ *CIL* II, 35; *CIL* VIII, 3128; Alarcão 2002, 42.

¹⁸⁸ There is also the possibility, suggested above under Local Administration, that the armies of Caesar or Augustus in Lusitania were settled at Scallabis and Norba, already having tribal affiliation with the Sergia tribe. See Faria 1999, 43; Alarcão 2002, 42 mentions another inscription referring to an individual from the Galeria tribe, but argues that this person must have been from another *civitas*.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Alarcão 2002, 42.

¹⁹⁰ Inscriptional evidence from the site contains no reference, to date, to the site's identity in Roman times: *CIL* II, 605-17.

Álvarez Rojas has argued that the original name of the site was “Castra Metellina,” and that the settlement occupied the location of an earlier indigenous population.¹⁹² Whether or not the site was formerly occupied, Metellinum was recognized by Pliny’s sources in the late first century B.C. as a *colonia*.¹⁹³

It has been suggested that Metellinum was granted its colonial status during Augustus’ reign,¹⁹⁴ but this disagrees with Pliny’s description, as his sources on Hispania are probably too early for that interpretation.¹⁹⁵ Even if Pliny’s sources date to the Augustan period, the fact that Augustus established a new colony nearby strongly suggests that Metellinum was established earlier and then replaced by a better-positioned administrative center, that of Augusta Emerita. Furthermore, the citizens of Metellinum seem to have been enrolled in the Sergia tribe, which, as we have already observed, was generally the tribe assigned by Caesar and Antony.¹⁹⁶

Metellinum retained its colonial status even after the establishment of the *ager* of Augusta Emerita, which completely surrounded the territory of this older colony. Unfortunately, the city’s sphere of influence and economic and administrative importance were certainly superseded by the establishment of Augusta Emerita.¹⁹⁷

Medellín has been identified as the ancient colony based both on the modern name of the town and the abundant signs of Roman occupation at the site. Remains visible today include portions of paved road and the long bridge across the Guadiana, which has been rebuilt since

¹⁹¹ Compare Álvarez Rojas 1999, 16-18 to Sayas Abengochea 1993, 218-9, where Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus (142 B.C.) is suggested as another candidate.

¹⁹² Álvarez Rojas 1999, 12, 16-18.

¹⁹³ Francisco Martín 1996, 163 and n. 335; *TIR*, J-30, “Medellín.”

¹⁹⁴ Sáez Fernández and Pérez Paz 1993, 647 and n. 13.

¹⁹⁵ Blázquez 1965, 5.

¹⁹⁶ *TIR*, J-30, “Medellín.”

¹⁹⁷ Francisco Martín 1996, 163; Norba Caesarina also seems to have suffered some loss of importance after the new colony was planted at Augusta Emerita.

ancient times but nonetheless seems to represent a Roman original from the Julio-Claudian period.¹⁹⁸ A survey of Medellín, focusing particularly on the area of the castle located just north of the modern town, has revealed Republican period ceramics, supporting the idea that Roman involvement in the site began quite early.¹⁹⁹ The fact that the Roman evidence was found on the surface of a site whose earliest remains date as far back as the ninth century B.C. also agrees with Álvarez Rojas' hypothesis that Metellinum was established on the site of an earlier settlement.²⁰⁰

The most comprehensive archaeological campaigns to date have focused on the hillside just below the medieval castle, in the area of the Roman theater (fig. 16).²⁰¹ Because our historical references indicate that Metellinum was a very important Roman city at the end of the first century B.C., it is not surprising that this site has one of the three confirmed theaters of Lusitania. Although the theater was a monumental construction, it should also be observed that the builders took special care to limit the materials necessary for its completion, a feat made possible by the excellent topographical situation of the theater.²⁰²

It was only after the excavation had removed occupation layers, dating from the 16th down through the 8th century, that archaeologists began to encounter remains of the theater's *proscenium* and *aditus maximi*. These features, along with sections of the semicircular exterior wall and the *crypta*, are all that have been excavated of the theater. Although the general plan of the theater has been reconstructed through excavation work, very little is left of the superstructure. This renders conclusions about the theater's final form somewhat tenuous,

¹⁹⁸ *TIR*, J-30, "Medellín."

¹⁹⁹ Hera 1982, 317.

²⁰⁰ Hera 1982, 318.

²⁰¹ Hera 1982, 322.

²⁰² Hera 1982, 318.

although architectural elements found both in the excavation and by chance in some of the more recent structures of Medellín (including the nearby castle and three local churches) may give some indication of its decorative scheme.²⁰³

The theater was built facing S-SE, apparently ignoring the rules set down by Vitruvius concerning the orientation of Roman theaters, which should be built in such a way as to avoid the dangers of direct sunlight.²⁰⁴ The theater's unfavorable situation may be due to the topography of the hillside, whose contours seem to have made construction of the *cavea* much easier. The theater was built into the hillside, and the excavation revealed only one vault supporting the upper seating sections. It could also be argued that if the *scaenae frons* were sufficiently tall, sunlight would only have offended the people sitting in the uppermost rows.²⁰⁵

Painted stucco preserved on the *scaenae frons*, as well as on two column drums, give some idea of the painted decoration of the theater. The excavations have not revealed enough of the decoration to give us a clear picture of the motif depicted, but the fact that the base "yellowing" tone on here is identical to that on the column drums suggests that this was the theater's dominant color. A single Doric capital found in the same stratigraphic context as the remains of the *scaenae frons* may indicate that the *columnatio* followed the Doric order, but not enough information has been uncovered to guarantee that this was the case.

The archaeologists have dated the theater to the last quarter of the first century B.C., which would make it roughly contemporary to the theater of Augusta Emerita, to which a number of other similarities have also been suggested. For example, the traces of stucco

²⁰³ Hera 1982, 318-9.

²⁰⁴ *De arch.* 5.3.2, *Etiamque providendum est, nene impetus habeat a meridie.*

²⁰⁵ Given the intense heat of this region today, it is difficult to imagine attending a theater before nightfall, although daytime bullfights continue to be fought with a large portion of the audience fully exposed to the sun.

paintings at Medellín are very similar to those that are preserved in Mérida. Furthermore, the construction methods and materials employed, in the words of the excavator, “son tan similares...que se diría fueron realizados por los mismos constructores.”²⁰⁶ The size of the bricks and the granite blocks used in the two theaters are also strikingly similar, the granite so much so that it may have been quarried from the same place as that used in Mérida.

Colonia Metellinensis seems to have derived its greatest importance from its location on some of the main routes of travel through southern Lusitania. It was an important station on the road between Augusta Emerita and Corduba,²⁰⁷ and as Álvarez Rojas has recently shown, it was also an influential hub of travel between Corduba and the port of Cale (modern Porto), through a major gold and tin mining region.²⁰⁸ There is also a possibility that a secondary route from Augusta Emerita to Caesaraugusta would have passed through this city, though no reference is made to this line of travel in the Antonine Itinerary or the Ravenna Cosmography.

5. Liberalitas Iulia Eborā (Évora)²⁰⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; Strabo 3.1.9; Pompon. 3.4; *AntIt* 418 and 426; *Rav* 307

Eborā Liberalitas Iulia was certainly a pre-Roman Celtic settlement, as is clear from the town's indigenous name Eborā,²¹⁰ a name which occurs several other times in the western areas of the Iberian Peninsula.²¹¹ The Lusitanian city of Eborā appears in a number of ancient sources, but only the later itineraries offer us any good information concerning the site's location. As far

²⁰⁶ Hera 1982, 324.

²⁰⁷ *AntIt* 415.

²⁰⁸ Álvarez Rojas 1999b 28-31.

²⁰⁹ *CIL* II, 108-13, 116-21, 122=5189, 123-6, 339, 504, 5187, 5199; *IRCP* 373-409.

²¹⁰ Inscriptions indicate a high number of Romanized indigenes by the early imperial period; cf. Mantas 1998, 43; this trend is more common in other cities of the province during the first half of the first century A.D.

²¹¹ García y Bellido “Recinto” 1-2.

as the modern identification, we are fortunate that the ancient name of the city has passed down virtually unchanged. More importantly, from the archaeologist's point of view, a large Roman temple still stands in the center of the modern city of Évora.

Ebora minted coins by the permission of Caesar Augustus sometime after 27 B.C.,²¹² perhaps in commemoration of Augustus' acceptance of the title "pontifex maximus," or of the city's reception of municipal status.²¹³ Unfortunately, the exact chronology of the city's reception of a municipal charter remains somewhat uncertain, partly because Augustus and Caesar both enrolled new citizens into the Galeria tribe. Faria has argued that the city received the *ius Latii* at or around the time that Octavian received the title Augustus.²¹⁴ It could not have been until after the year 13 B.C. that Ebora received its municipal status, he argues, because Pliny's sources do not recognize the city as a municipium.²¹⁵

Epigraphic information from Évora indicates very clearly that the citizens of the city were inscribed in the Galeria tribe. While it has been argued that citizens could have been enrolled in a Roman tribe based on the concession of the *ius Latii*, and hence prior to the city's municipalization, evidence from Évora has shown that this leap of reasoning is not necessary.²¹⁶ Aside from the inscription mentioning the *munic. Eborensis*,²¹⁷ the fact that Augustus minted coins referring to the city's municipal status effectively proves that Ebora was a municipium

²¹² PERMISSV AVGVSTI.

²¹³ Faria 1999, 33; Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès 1992, 74; Augustus accepted the title of pontifex maximus in 12 B.C.

²¹⁴ Faria 1999, 33; Octavian took the title of Augustus in 27 B.C.

²¹⁵ Faria 1999, 33. There does not seem to have been a distinction between different types of municipium until the time of the Flavians, which makes it highly unlikely that the *oppida veteris Latii* that Pliny mentions in Lusitania (*Nat.* 4.117) were Latin municipalities under Augustus.

²¹⁶ Faria 1999, 36; cf. Le Roux 1996, 242.

²¹⁷ *CIL* II, 114.

before 14 A.D. at the very latest.²¹⁸ If the coins bearing the legend PERMISSV AVGVSTI were issued in Ebora at the same time as those bearing the same legend were issued in Augusta Emerita (see under Augusta Emerita below), then we have evidence from Ebora of a municipal charter dating no later than the 20s B.C.²¹⁹

Remains of Roman occupation of the city are not limited to the inscriptions and historical references mentioned above. The fourth century fortification walls are still preserved in long stretches, and excavations outside the circuit of these walls has revealed that the Roman town extended well beyond in previous centuries.²²⁰ Only one of the Roman gates has been preserved in the massive fortification walls,²²¹ but enough of the Roman city plan can be seen in the modern city's layout to give us a reasonable certainty as to the location of the *cardo* and the *decumanus*. The *cardo* must have followed the line of the Rua Soares Lusitano in a north-south direction, while the *decumanus* seems to line up with the Rua do 5 d'Outubro (fig. 17).²²²

To the northeast of where these two main axes crossed stands the Roman temple of Évora, much of which is still standing today. Because of its location, it seems quite likely that this was the forum temple, standing at the center of the city and as the focus of a forum that probably covered much of the area now housing the municipal museum.

The temple of Évora was later used as a fortress and a market, but since 1870 has stood as seen today, with 14 columns still in position (fig. 18).²²³ The fluted granite columns are topped with marble Corinthian capitals from nearby quarries, and as far as I know, these capitals

²¹⁸ Faria 1999, 33; Faria also observes that the counter stamp "D.D." placed on coins minted at Ebora during the first half of the first century A.D. confirms the impossibility of a Flavian municipal charter.

²¹⁹ *TIR*, J-29 "Augusta Emerita," 37.

²²⁰ Garcia y Bellido 1971.

²²¹ Garcia y Bellido 1971, 8-9.

²²² Garcia y Bellido 1971, fig. 3.

²²³ Alarcão 1988d, 159.

have yet to be comprehensively analyzed (fig. 19).²²⁴ Theodor Hauschild argues that certain decorative elements of the capitals recall similar finds at the Maison Carrée in Nîmes, at the Forum Augustum in Rome, and the so-called Marble Forum in Mérida.²²⁵ The location of the frieze blocks directly over the columns is unattested elsewhere in Hispania, and the precise construction method applied in the architrave and frieze occurs in a cult structure only at the temple of Castor in the forum at Rome.²²⁶ As that building dates from the time of Claudius, it may be the case that the temple at Évora was built at roughly the same time, in the first half of the first century A.D.

Despite the relatively good preservation of the temple, some uncertainty remains as to the exact layout of the building (fig. 20).²²⁷ It was a large temple for Lusitania, measuring about 25.50 x 15.20 m. The temple podium (fig. 21), constructed of large stone blocks encasing *opus incertum*, stands roughly 3.5 m above the level of its surroundings, and a single staircase provided access from the south (fig. 20).²²⁸ At a later date, this staircase was replaced with two lateral ascents, allowing for the construction of a pilastered block wall cutting across the front of the temple. While the function of this wall remains uncertain, it seems that here, as in Mérida, the wall may have been a part of the decorative scheme of the city forum, of which this temple was the dominant structure.²²⁹ Other fragmentary remains of the forum have been found in soundings, and a portion of marble-flagged courtyard is preserved inside the city museum mentioned above. The temple was surrounded on the west, north, and east by a reflecting pool

²²⁴ Mierse 1999, pl. 27.

²²⁵ Hauschild 2002, 218.

²²⁶ Hauschild 2002, 218.

²²⁷ Garcia y Bellido 1971, fig. 1.

²²⁸ Mierse 1999, pl. 15; Alarcão 1988a, 111.

²²⁹ Hauschild 2002, 218.

some five meters across, and finds from this area suggest that the pool was most likely finished in the middle of the first century A.D.²³⁰

Aside from the architectural elements mentioned, nothing remains to give any sense of the decorative program of the temple proper. The temple was peripteral, with six columns along the front and rear, and nine or, more likely, ten along each side. Some traces of plaster are still visible on portions of the walls and the granite columns, indicating that the whole thing may have been plastered and painted in ancient times.²³¹ We have no information for the cella due to the renovations done over the centuries, but Garcia y Bellido has suggested that it was a single chamber of roughly 8 (E-W) x 10 m (N-S).²³²

The large number of inscriptions relating to the imperial cult at Évora may be sufficient evidence to confirm the nature of this temple.²³³ However, a single piece of Doric frieze preserved in the local museum may attest to the existence of another temple in Évora, though no other evidence related to that structure is yet known.²³⁴ Alarcão has suggested that the curve of the Rua de São Maços resembles the curve of a theater's *cavea*, but only an archaeological intervention at the site could prove or disprove that identification.²³⁵

²³⁰ Hauschild 2002, 218-9.

²³¹ It is difficult to say whether this plaster is ancient or more recent, given the building's various functions throughout the middle ages.

²³² Mierse 1999, 106-8.

²³³ Étienne 1990, 29.

²³⁴ Alarcão 1988d, 160.

²³⁵ Alarcão 1988a, 112.

6. Norba Caesarina²³⁶ (Cáceres)²³⁷ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; *AntIt* 433,2; *Rav* 319,13

Most scholars agree that the city of Norba Caesarina was most likely established by C. Norbanus Flaccus, proconsul of the Hispanias from 36 to 34 B.C.²³⁸ Although there is generally a consensus as to the general location of the site, somewhere in the region surrounding Cáceres, scholars have identified a number of different possibilities throughout the last two centuries. Epigraphic information concerning the *colonia Norbensis Caesarina cognomine* has been found at sites across the Roman world, including Argentorate (Strasbourg), Rome, Carthage, and Capera (Cáparra).²³⁹ However, such finds do little beyond confirming the existence of a city called Norba and emphasizing the fact that many citizens of this colony were very active militarily.²⁴⁰

Pliny's reference to this Roman colony confirms, in a sense, what we know from epigraphic information concerning the existence of the site. The concentration of epigraphic finds related to Colonia Norba Casearina in Hispania, and specifically within Lusitania, confirms that the city was located in that province. However, Pliny also confuses the matter somewhat, with his statement that, *contributa sunt in eam Castra Servilia, Castra Caecilia*....²⁴¹ Ptolemy also mentions the city of "Norba Kaisareia",²⁴² but beyond these two historical references, none of the other literary sources mentions the site. Castra Caecilia,²⁴³ on the other hand, also comes

²³⁶ *CIL* II, 508, 694-5 and 711-13; see Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 119-35 for complete epigraphic references.

²³⁷ *CIL* II, 692-757, 813-4, 944 and 5298-304.

²³⁸ Esteban Ortega 2000, 250-1 and n. 4.

²³⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 24-34.

²⁴⁰ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 24-6.

²⁴¹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117.

²⁴² Ptolemy *Geog.* 2.5.6.

²⁴³ *CIL* II, 4994 mentions "Castrensis."

up on the Antonine Itinerary²⁴⁴ and in the Ravenna Cosmography,²⁴⁵ in the latter case as simply “Castris,” which suggests that the *cognomen* had dropped out of common use by the early fourth century.²⁴⁶

Early scholarship on this matter generally relied on the similarity between Cáceres and Castra Caecilia, and the conclusion that Cáceres was that ancient tributary *castrum* needed little further confirmation. The discovery of an inscription within the “Ciudad Monumental” of Cáceres in the 18th century bearing the legend COL. NORB. CAESARIN. strongly argued for the identification of that portion of modern Cáceres with the ancient colony mentioned by Pliny.²⁴⁷ Unfortunately, the inscription was lost soon after its publication, which led scholars to the conclusion that it was probably a forgery.²⁴⁸ This argument has largely been discredited in the last few years, since there is simply no reason to suspect the inscription, except that it seems to disagree with the commonly held view that Cáceres corresponds to Castra Caecilia.

In the 1920s, Adolf Schülten excavated what came to be identified as a Roman army camp just north of Cáceres. Schülten believed this to be the Castra Caecilia that Pliny called a tributary of Norba Caesarina.²⁴⁹ However, no evidence dating from the imperial period was ever recovered during the course of the excavations at Cáceres el Viejo. Moreover, the remains from the site are of a strictly military nature, or of that sort of residential material that would naturally be expected at a permanent army camp.²⁵⁰ All this makes it highly unlikely that the site was occupied in the fourth century and remained important enough as a station to receive mention on

²⁴⁴ *AntIt* 433,2.

²⁴⁵ *Rav* 319,14.

²⁴⁶ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 39.

²⁴⁷ *CIL* II, 694; Boxoyo 1952, 154.

²⁴⁸ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 14.

²⁴⁹ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 59.

²⁵⁰ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 17.

both the Antonine Itinerary and the Ravenna Cosmography. In fact, as has been argued recently, the mileage given between Augusta Emerita and Castris Caecili (the *Ravenna Cosmography* calls it Castris) is too short for the actual distance measured along the *Via Lata* between Mérida and Cáceres el Viejo, by about two kilometers.²⁵¹

Assuming our knowledge of this route is sufficiently accurate, we must be correct in arguing that the fourth century references to Castris/Castris Caecili refer precisely to the historical center that is preserved in modern Cáceres. Pliny's reference to *Castra Caecilia*, on the other hand, probably does refer to the camp, which must have been established by Q. Caecilius Metellus around the same time as Metellinum. However, we have almost no Roman remains from the city of Cáceres, largely because the dense population and the importance of the historical precincts have prevented serious excavations there.²⁵²

It is generally agreed that the location of Cáceres is remarkable both for its defensive advantages and for its proximity to the Rivera del Marco, virtually the only source of water in the region. There is some evidence that a pre-Roman settlement occupied the site of Cáceres,²⁵³ but very little is known about the people (probably Lusitanians, given the region) who settled here. It is possible that this settlement was destroyed or deserted during the retreat of Viriatus in the mid-second century B.C., which would have allowed the Roman general Quintus Servilius Scipio to use the site for his own encampment.²⁵⁴ This camp became known as *Castra Servilia*, whose population was later joined to that of the first century B.C. camp at *Castra Caecilia* in the establishment of the *Colonia Norba Caesarina*.²⁵⁵

²⁵¹ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 18-9; Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 38-42.

²⁵² See Álvarez Rojas 1999, 11-2.

²⁵³ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 12.

²⁵⁴ Appian *Rom* IV.70.

²⁵⁵ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 13-15, 21; Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 35.

Unfortunately, this explanation only takes us as far as the last third of the first century B.C., the date at which Norba is generally agreed to have received its colonial mandate.²⁵⁶ Somehow, the name of the city had reverted to that of one of its *civitates contributa*, *Castra Caecilia*, by the fourth century. In order to explain this change, scholars are forced to reconstruct a third century destruction of the city, and then a subsequent re-occupation of the site by residents of *Castra Caecilia*,²⁵⁷ who would naturally have preferred the site because of its superior location.²⁵⁸

The archaeological remains offered by the site of Cáceres el Viejo have already been mentioned, but some room must be made for a discussion of the nature of the site before moving on to the city of Cáceres proper. First, Cáceres el Viejo (or *Castra Caecilia*) was laid out in an almost perfect rectangle. Schülten's excavations revealed a great deal about the site in the first decades of the 20th century, including the general layout of the camp and some of its important monumental remains. These include the forum area, which was dominated by a temple at the southern end, and surrounded on the other three sides by *tabernae*.²⁵⁹ Small finds from the site confirm that it was occupied most heavily during the beginning of the first century B.C.,²⁶⁰ but there is virtually no evidence to indicate that the site still had residents through the imperial period.²⁶¹

As for the actual city of Cáceres, the layout of the Ciudad Monumental seems to follow the general plan of a Roman camp typical of colonies. There may have been a forum located at

²⁵⁶ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 61-4.

²⁵⁷ See Roldán Hervás 1971, 81-2; Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 47-50.

²⁵⁸ Which raises the question, "why did the unknown danger not destroy *Castra Caecilia*, which was not as well positioned for defense as Norba?"

²⁵⁹ *TIR*, J-29, "Castra Caecilia."

²⁶⁰ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 59-60; Álvarez Rojas 1999, 16-8.

²⁶¹ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 17.

the intersection of the two main roads, and the course of the Roman walls seems to be preserved by the medieval walls standing today. Aside from the inscriptions already mentioned above, another single piece of epigraphic evidence is relevant to the identification of Cáceres as Colonia Norba Caesarina. An inscription excavated from the wall of the monumental center of Cáceres in 1931 reads *L. Cornelio/Balbo Imp/C. Norb. Caesa/Patrono*, leaving little doubt as to the title of this city at the time of L. Cornelius Balbus.²⁶² Scholars have determined, through other sources, the exact date of this individual's receipt of the title of *imperator*, 19 B.C.²⁶³

Taken as a whole, the region of Cáceres holds a great deal of information for the scholar interested in the Roman period. However, there is virtually no architectural evidence available today, particularly in relation to the early imperial period. The few excavations that have taken place in the monumental center of Cáceres have only uncovered the remains of a villa and some funerary remains. As I have already observed, Schülten's excavations at Cáceres el Viejo revealed the remains of a Republican period encampment, which, aside from the insight it offers concerning the location of Norba and Castra Caecilia, is of little interest to the present study. The identification of Castra Servilia, mentioned only by Pliny, offers another set of problems, but in the end is only relevant to this study in that it might shed light on the colony of Norba. Until the urban cores of the three Roman sites surrounding Cáceres have been identified, little more can be said about these places or their interactions with each other and with the province of Lusitania aside from the historical accounts.

²⁶² Floriano 1931, 9ff; for more on this important individual, see *PIR*² C 1331.

²⁶³ Salas Martín and Esteban Ortega 1994, 23.

7. Imperatoria Salacia (Alcácer do Sal)²⁶⁴ Pliny *Nat.* 4.116 and 118; 8.191; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.2; Pompon. 3.8; *AntIt* 417, 418 and 426; *Rav* 306

Pliny indicates that the city of Salacia was surnamed Urbs Imperatoria, an identification which agrees with the numismatic record of Alcácer do Sal.²⁶⁵ The Roman city of Salacia was established on the site of an indigenous settlement that was already active in trade with the Mediterranean world (fig. 22).²⁶⁶ Remains from Alcácer do Sal date as far back as the seventh century B.C., which is the date of the earliest Phoenician pottery discovered there thus far.²⁶⁷ It is not surprising that Strabo also mentions Salacia as an important port city in his description of the coast of Lusitania.²⁶⁸

The toponym “Salacia” seems to derive from the goddess Amphitrite, who shared dominion over the sea with Neptune, with whom Pompey had strong ties.²⁶⁹ The pre-Roman name of the city may have been Ketonion or something similar, an identification based on fourth century B.C. bronze coins from the site.²⁷⁰ Other bronze coins of the second century B.C. give a name in an unknown script, so for the present the original name of the site remains uncertain.²⁷¹

A series of coins was issued in the year 45/4 B.C., most likely by the Pompeians, displays the legends *IMP(eratoria) Sal(acia)* and *IMP(eratoria) SALAC(ia)*.²⁷² It is impossible to discover from the information that we have at this point whether the city was given an official administrative status at this time or was simply recognized as a city friendly to the cause of the

²⁶⁴ *CIL* II, 32-39, 518, 5182-3; *IRCP* 182-206.

²⁶⁵ Pliny *Nat.* 4.116; Faria 1999, 41.

²⁶⁶ Mantas 1990a, fig. 1.

²⁶⁷ Mantas 1990a, 174.

²⁶⁸ Strabo 3.3.1.

²⁶⁹ Faria 1999, 42.

²⁷⁰ *TIR* J-29, “Salacia”; Mantas 1990a, 174.

²⁷¹ *TIR* J-29, “Salacia.”

²⁷² Mantas 1990a, 174; Faria 1999, 42.

Pompeians. What little evidence we do have suggests that Salacia was given Latin rights and its citizens inscribed into the Galeria tribe between 27 and 12 B.C.²⁷³ We know that the city later achieved municipal status because of a first century inscription referring to the *praefectura Caesarum* of L. Cornelius L. f. Bocchus.²⁷⁴ The fact that Pliny mentions this as an *oppidum veteris Lati* may already be a hint at Salacia's early municipal status, although we lack further confirmation of its status at this time.

Archaeological evidence of the Roman public building program is relatively scarce today, as the nucleus of the modern city sits atop the same site as that occupied by the Roman and pre-Roman settlements. However, an excavation in the area of the Igreja de Santa Maria do Castelo has uncovered a structure that was most likely integrated into the Roman forum of Salacia (fig. 23).²⁷⁵ Both the floor and the walls of this structure were decorated with large marble slabs, but very little of the stone was preserved in place.²⁷⁶ Although the building was only partially excavated—the western side is unexcavated—enough has come to light to provide the dimensions and general plan of the building (figs. 24 and 25).²⁷⁷ The main entrance is on the eastern side of the structure, which measures 7.75 x 11.90 m. On the western end of the building, opposite the front doorway, there is a slight divergence from the rectangular plan—an apse.²⁷⁸ Because this end has not been fully excavated, there remains some hope that items uncovered in the apse itself will provide information related to the building's identity and chronology. For now, the building has been tentatively labeled either a basilica or a curia.

²⁷³ *FE* 4, #13; Faria 1999, 42.

²⁷⁴ *IRCP* 189.

²⁷⁵ J. Faria 1998, fig. 3.

²⁷⁶ J. Faria 1998, 188-9.

²⁷⁷ J. Faria 1998, pl. 3.

²⁷⁸ J. Faria 1998, 189.

A number of other important archaeological pieces have also been found in the area immediately adjacent to the excavation site. The Igreja de Santa Maria do Castelo has several apparently Roman columns on its exterior façade, and in a small garden plot near the “forum” excavation, two marble statues depicting togate men have been uncovered in recent years.²⁷⁹ Nothing has yet been said about their potential relationship to two marble fragments found in structures built over the apsidal chamber, but the existence of togate marble statues in this location strongly suggests a Roman public presence here (fig. 26).²⁸⁰ Nearly all the small finds from the context of the apsidal structure suggest a first century date for the archaeological complex.²⁸¹ A last bit of statuary from Imperatoria Salacia is the bust of a male found in the wall of the Igreja de São Vicente in 1896. A. Garcia y Bellido believes that the portrait represents Claudius, though it is very severely damaged.²⁸²

Remains of a Roman aqueduct are still standing today, at an elevation that would permit it to water both the upper and lower parts of the ancient city.²⁸³ There are also a number of Roman villas in the immediate vicinity of Alcácer do Sal, one of which presents two columns carved elaborately in the form of acanthus leaves and lotus flowers.²⁸⁴

There is a great deal of epigraphic information from Alcácer do Sal, even by comparison with other sites known to have been important during the early imperial period, indicating a particularly high level of municipal activity. These inscriptions reveal that men from Imperatoria Salacia served as provincial flamen of Augustus, duumvir, aedile, and flamen of the deified

²⁷⁹ Mantas 1990a, 175.

²⁸⁰ J. Faria 1998, pls. 1 and 2; the pre-Roman inhabitants were unlikely to use marble in their statuary, and would certainly not have represented togate individuals before the arrival of the Romans.

²⁸¹ J. Faria 1998, 188.

²⁸² Garcia y Bellido 1966-7, 282 and 288.

²⁸³ Faria and Ferreira 1986, 46.

²⁸⁴ Faria and Ferreira 1986, 48-9 and pls. 6 and 7.

emperors.²⁸⁵ This evidence suggests that the city would have had a significant monumental center by the end of the first century, with a forum and a temple of the imperial cult. In addition, there is an inscriptional reference to a monument, dedicated by L. Cornelius Bocchus,²⁸⁶ which has yet to be discovered.

8. Pax Iulia (Beja)²⁸⁷ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.4; Strabo 3.2.15; *AntIt* 425, 427 and 431; *Rav* 306

The modern city of Beja, referred to in ancient sources as Colonia Pacensis, Pax Iulia, and Pax Augusta, was the capital of the conventus that encompassed the southern half of modern Portugal. Until quite recently, it was believed that the Roman colony was set up at a previously unoccupied site. However, in the last few years archaeological interventions have brought to light new information, including Iron Age ceramics in the area of Beja's medieval castle, which strongly suggests a pre-Roman presence in Beja.²⁸⁸ Whatever the date of the initial settlement at the site, it seems clear that the Roman colony was established either by Julius Caesar or Octavian, sometime before 27 B.C.²⁸⁹ A great deal of debate has surrounded the attempt to attribute the *deductio* of Pax Iulia to either Caesar or Augustus,²⁹⁰ but I am convinced that the debate has been settled, and with finality, by Faria.²⁹¹ In his 1999 article, he argues compellingly

²⁸⁵ Mantas 1990a, 175.

²⁸⁶ *IRCP*, 189.

²⁸⁷ *CIL* II, 45, 46=5185, 47-58, 59=5186, 60-2, 64-8, 70-8, 80-4, 86-92, 94-107, 516-7, 5185-8; *IRCP* 229-372.

²⁸⁸ Lopes 1996, 65; Mantas 1996b, 47; 1998, 41.

²⁸⁹ See Lopes 1996 and Mantas 1996b for full analyses of the information.

²⁹⁰ Francisco Martín 1996, 163; the identification of an individual from Pax Iulia ("Pacensis") on an inscription (*CIL* II, 516) found in Augusta Emerita as a member of the Galeria tribe ("GAL") may indicate that the citizens of Pax Iulia were enrolled by either Caesar or Augustus.

²⁹¹ Faria 1999, 38-41.

that all of the evidence available points to an Augustan foundation between the years 31 and 27 B.C., most likely as a part of the post-Actium celebrations.²⁹²

Surviving architectural evidence suggests that a significant urban improvement campaign was undertaken in the early years of the first century A.D. (fig. 27).²⁹³ Excavations in the 1930s revealed the city forum, located within the confines of the modern Praça da República at the high point of the city (fig. 28).²⁹⁴ Inside the forum, Abel Viana unearthed the remains of the forum temple, which was discovered to be slightly larger than that of Évora, measuring 29 x 16.5 m (fig. 29).²⁹⁵ Unfortunately, the podium and a number of Corinthian capitals are all that remained of the temple at the time of its discovery. The foundations of the temple indicate that it was most likely of the prostyle variety—there is no evidence of interior cella walls like those found at Évora.

A number of composite and Corinthian capitals, along with a group of bull heads believed to be arch keystones, provide further evidence for a significant amount of monumental architecture in Beja by the second half of the first century (fig. 30).²⁹⁶ Whether this was a part of the urbanization project of Augustus, upon the city's elevation to conventus capital, or was simply a Flavian undertaking, has not yet been determined. A study of the capitals from Beja indicates that these architectural elements could date to the late first century B.C. through the first century A.D., leaving this discussion wide open for future studies.²⁹⁷

²⁹² Faria 1999, 38-9; see Strabo 3.2.5.

²⁹³ Ribeiro 1999, fig. 14.

²⁹⁴ Mantas 1996a, fig. 2.

²⁹⁵ Mantas 1996a, 17; Viana 1947; Alarcão 1990b, fig. 3.

²⁹⁶ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2 and fig. 4; Mantas 1996a, 18; see also Ribeiro 1999.

²⁹⁷ The fact that this was both a colony and a conventus capital argues, in my opinion, for an earlier, rather than a later date.

The circuit of city walls dating, most likely, to the time of the foundation of the colony, preserves at least one of the first century gateways (known as the Porta de Évora).²⁹⁸ This gateway contains yet another of the bull head figures referred to above, and in the late 19th century a late first century B.C. inscription that commemorated the construction of the walls and towers was uncovered (fig. 31).²⁹⁹

Recent studies have provided initial evidence that the city also had both a theater (as suggested by an epigraphic reference to an *exodiarus*) and an amphitheater. According to Mantas, the theater was built within the Augustan circuit walls, and its diameter measured some 90 meters across the *cavea*.³⁰⁰ This would place the theater of Pax Iulia within the same size range as that uncovered at Augusta Emerita, but further comparisons will only be possible following successful excavation work in Beja.³⁰¹

Traces of the amphitheater of Pax Iulia may have been discovered to the northwest of the walled city, in the vicinity of the modern bull ring.³⁰² Vestiges of the structure are still visible today, but structure's identification as an amphitheater was only possible through the use of aerial photographs.³⁰³ Archaeological interventions are expected at the sites of the purported amphitheater and theater within the next few years, in order to confirm the identification of those structures.

Two pieces of marble sculpture have also been found in the immediate area of Beja. One is the head of a male figure, originally identified as Caesar.³⁰⁴ While this identification remains

²⁹⁸ Mantas 1996a, 12.

²⁹⁹ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 7; *FE* # 29, 131.

³⁰⁰ Mantas 1996a, 17.

³⁰¹ Mantas 1996a, 17, n. 70.

³⁰² Lopes 1996, 65.

³⁰³ Mantas 1996b, 54, n. 82.

³⁰⁴ Mantas 1996b, 51.

uncertain, the suggested late Republican/early Imperial chronology has met with general acceptance.³⁰⁵ The other sculpture is a life-size seated female figure possibly identified as Pax and dating to the Augustan period (fig. 32).³⁰⁶

Pax Iulia was also responsible for a brief series of silver coins under Augustus, possibly dating as early as 19 B.C., but due to the bad preservation of the coins known, little can be said about the city based on these emissions.³⁰⁷ Colonia Pacensis also minted *asses*, possibly between the years 31 and 27 B.C., in celebration of the city's *deductio*, following the victory at Actium.³⁰⁸

As is readily evident from my discussion of this very important Roman city, a great deal of information about the nature of the urban development and monuments of this site remains buried beneath modern structures. In a sense, Beja is typical of the state of archaeology in Portugal, particularly regarding the Roman period: the Roman occupational strategy and its subsequent administrative design were ultimately so successful that a significant majority of important Roman sites form the urban core of modern Portugal.

9. Augusta Emerita³⁰⁹ (Mérida)³¹⁰ Pliny *Nat.* 4.116 and 117; 9.141; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6 and 8.4.3; Strabo 3.2.15 and 3.4.20; *AntIt* 414-6, 418, 431-3, 438 and 444; *Rav* 314-6, 319, 416 and 418-20; Pompon. 2.88

Archaeological and historical sources confirm that Augustus established the city of Augusta Emerita in about 25 B.C., through his legate P. Carisius, as a settlement for legionaries

³⁰⁵ Souza 1990, 12.

³⁰⁶ Souza 1990, 11; Mantas 1996a, fig. 3.

³⁰⁷ Sutherland 1992, 74.

³⁰⁸ Faria 1995b, 150-1.

³⁰⁹ *CIL* II, 32, 371, 467, 484, 492, 494, 505-8, 823-4, 956, 1056, 5212, 5270 and 5458.

³¹⁰ *CIL* II, 462-604.

from the legions V. Alaudae and X Gemina.³¹¹ Silver coins minted in the first years after the establishment of the city bear the legend “PERMISSV AVGVSTI,”³¹² and contain the names of Augustus and Carisius.³¹³ There do not seem to have been monetary emissions from Emerita between the time of Tiberius and the Visigothic period, despite the city’s central economic and administrative position in Lusitania throughout the first four centuries of our era.³¹⁴

As a *colonia*, Augusta Emerita’s layout reflects the general plan of military camps of the Republican period, with a *cardo* and a *decumanus* roughly quartering the city (fig. 33).³¹⁵ Excavations have revealed that most of the city followed a strict grid pattern, a fact that may indicate that Augusta Emerita was a foundation *ex novo*. This hypothesis is supported by the site’s relatively poor defensive position, although finds predating Roman occupation have been reported.³¹⁶ The reason for the decision to establish a colony at this site was most likely based on the location’s excellent agricultural surroundings, as well as its central position with respect to the new province of Lusitania, of which this was the capital. Augusta Emerita also lay on the major axes of trade and travel between the western reaches of Hispania and the important cities of Baetica and Tarraconensis.³¹⁷

The imposing monumental program of Emerita was inspired by the high concentration of Roman citizens settled there and the imperial desire to present an impressive image of Rome to

³¹¹ Cass. Dio 53.26.1; Isid. *Etym.* 15,1,69.

³¹² The legend also visible on coins minted at Ebora most likely during the same period.

³¹³ *TIR*, J-29 “Augusta Emerita,” 37.

³¹⁴ *TIR*, J-29 “Augusta Emerita,” 37.

³¹⁵ Hyginus Grom. 1.170-1; Ramos Sanchez 1992.

³¹⁶ The fact that much of the city’s water was provided by extensive aqueducts further emphasizes the city’s poor defensive situation; see *TIR*, J-29 “Augusta Emerita,” where the presence of some pre-Roman finds is admitted.

³¹⁷ Cf. Roldán Hervás 1971; *AntIt; Rav.*

the newly pacified inhabitants of Lusitania.³¹⁸ Augustus' most trusted general and right-hand man, Marcus Agrippa, was personally involved in the construction of the theater of Augusta Emerita, and other structures dating to the early imperial period include the amphitheater, the so-called "Temple of Diana," the massive aqueducts, a mile-long bridge, a circus, and extensive city walls.³¹⁹

The Augustan period amphitheater (fig. 34) and theater were built right next to each other (fig. 35), and exploit their position at the side of a hill so harmoniously that there can be no doubt that they formed part of a single comprehensive design.³²⁰ Both of these monuments were excavated in the early 20th century, at which time inscriptions offering secure dates based on the activities of Augustus and Agrippa appeared. The inscriptions from the theater revealed that the initial project was completed around the year 16 B.C.,³²¹ although there was most likely a significant renovation and beautification of the *scaenae frons* during Trajan's time.³²² The amphitheater was completed slightly later, probably in the year 8 B.C.³²³

As I have said, both the amphitheater and theater used the hillside to the southeast to reduce the amount of superstructure necessary for the seating of spectators. Where such superstructure was necessary, however, the builders used large, cut blocks of granite for the façade, with cemented fill between the facing walls (fig. 36).³²⁴ The theater's *scaenae frons* was completely and elaborately decorated with several different types of marble early in the second

³¹⁸ In fact, portions of Lusitania, which included Gallaecia and Asturia until roughly 13 B.C., were not completely pacified at the time of Emerita's foundation.

³¹⁹ *CIL* II, 474.; Ramos Sanchez 1992, 13.

³²⁰ Ramos Sanchez 1992, 9.

³²¹ Mélida 1925, 85; Ramos Sanchez 1992, 11.

³²² Ramos Sanchez 1992, 12; Saénz de Buruaga 1982, 307-10; *CIL* II, 478.

³²³ Mélida 1925, 93.

³²⁴ Ramos Sanchez 1992, 14.

century, as it has been reconstructed today, but there is little evidence as to the decorative scheme during the earlier period (fig. 37).³²⁵

Some distance outside the walls of Augusta Emerita stands what is left of the Roman circus, which measured about 435 x 115 m (fig. 38).³²⁶ This structure seems to have been built in much the same fashion as both the theater and amphitheater, taking advantage of a small hill on one side to reduce the amount of work required to build the *cavea* on that side. What little remains of the spina and superstructure of the circus itself indicates that large granite blocks were employed throughout the circus.³²⁷ A group of 12 starting gates was built at the western end of the circus, and this complex seems to have been the first portion of the circus' superstructure that was completed. Evidence from the *cavea* suggests a slightly later date for its construction, and in general, the evidence from other excavated sections of the circus strongly suggests a first century completion of the earliest circus.³²⁸ An inscription dating to the fourth century indicates that a renovation took place at that time, and it is most likely that the remains of the spina that are visible today date to this later period.³²⁹

The massive bridge of Augusta Emerita, most likely built in the Augustan period,³³⁰ stretches nearly 800 m across the Guadiana, leading from Augusta Emerita in the direction of Hispalis (Sevilla).³³¹ A stone tower, the Alcazaba, defended the bridge at its exit from the city, and was incorporated into the earliest city walls, only portions of which are still visible.³³² Another, less impressive bridge leaves Augusta Emerita on the northern side, in the direction of

³²⁵ Ramos Sanchez 1992, 10-1.

³²⁶ Ramos Sanchez 1992, 16.

³²⁷ Mélida 1925, 96-7.

³²⁸ Sánchez-Palencia et al. 2001, 86-9.

³²⁹ Mélida 1925, 97; Sánchez-Palencia et al. 2001, 91.

³³⁰ Mélida 1925, 24.

³³¹ Mélida 1925, 23.

³³² Ramos Sanchez 1992, 22 and 40.

Castra Caecilia, following the line of the aqueduct known today as “Los Milagros.” This aqueduct was about 5 km long, and is still very well preserved in places (fig. 39).³³³ Two other aqueducts are also known from the site, although neither is as well preserved as Los Milagros. Little evidence exists that might suggest a specific date for the construction of the water supplies, but their careful construction and the fact that these were very important sources of potable water for the city may indicate a very early date. Both these aqueducts, the walls and the bridge across the Guadiana were fundamental to maintaining a settlement at Augusta Emerita, and they must date, at least in their earliest forms, to the period of the colony’s original foundation (fig. 40).³³⁴

Mélida suggests that there were at least five Roman temples in the city of Augusta Emerita, of which only one is preserved to any extent, the “Templo de Diana.”³³⁵ The granite block podium of this temple measures 21.90 x 42.75 m, and stands about 3 m high (fig. 41).³³⁶ Columns preserved in place demonstrate that this temple had 6 frontal columns and 9 along the sides, with a slightly wider intercolumniation between the center pair at the front, to provide access to the *cella*.³³⁷ The fluted granite columns were topped with Corinthian capitals, also in granite, and the whole structure seems to have been plastered and then painted.³³⁸

The Diana temple was probably not the earliest temple in Augusta Emerita, having been built sometime at the end of the first century B.C. and subsequently renovated in the following century.³³⁹ Rather, the remains of a temple podium still visible in the early 19th century, near the axis of the *cardo maximus*, probably held the first temple at the site, in the provincial forum. An

³³³ Mélida 1925, 31; Ramos Sanchez 1992, 35.

³³⁴ Mierse 1999, 64 and n. 30.

³³⁵ Mélida 1925, 68; Mierse 1999, fig. 37.

³³⁶ Mierse 1999, 99; Mélida (1925, 68) gives measurements of 21.50 x 15.60 m; Mierse 1999, pl. 13.

³³⁷ Mélida 1925, 68.

³³⁸ Mierse 1999, 71.

³³⁹ Mierse 1999, 75.

inscription found at the small chapel of Santa Eulalia, in honor of Mars, may well have come from this structure, whose layout is reported to have been strikingly similar to that of the Mars Ultor temple in Rome (figs. 42 and 43).³⁴⁰ The slightly later Diana temple was incorporated into a municipal forum, which was richly decorated in a fashion reminiscent of the Forum Augustum in Rome.³⁴¹ This later complex was located at the crossing of the *cardo* and the *decumanus*, and both because of its ornate decoration and its central position it is unlikely that it did not form a part of the initial plan for the city. Mierse has argued that the architects of Augusta Emerita must have begun their work with the intention of building two fora, a provincial forum and a municipal forum, in the last quarter of the first century B.C.³⁴² A very elaborate city plan should not be surprising for so important a city, especially one that was established on virtually untouched soil and intended to serve as the capital of a new imperial province.

As the capital of the province of Lusitania, known in ancient times for its impressive mineral wealth, Augusta Emerita's architectural program had to reflect the city's wealth and the grandeur of Rome. Remains of the municipal forum have led to its being labeled the "Marble Forum," and the sculptural program of this complex reveals influences from as far away as Tarraco and Rome itself.³⁴³ For its part, Emerita may also have exerted influence over the civic architecture of other cities within its province. This is particularly evident when we compare the earliest temples of Augustobriga, Eborac, and Pax Iulia to the "Diana Temple" of Augusta Emerita,³⁴⁴ although questions remain as to the relative chronology of these structures.³⁴⁵

³⁴⁰ Mierse 1999, 67-8, 76-7 and figs. 27 and 28.

³⁴¹ Mierse 1999, 69 and 73.

³⁴² Mierse 1999, 74 and 77.

³⁴³ Mar 1997, 145-6; Ensoli 1997, 162-4.

³⁴⁴ Hauschild 2002, 216-9.

³⁴⁵ Mierse 1999, 99 and n. 160-1; 102 and n. 167; Hauschild 2002.

Remains of temples other than the two mentioned above are far less informative, although it is not unlikely that a city of Emerita's importance would have had numerous temples in Roman times. One inscription in honor of *CONCORDIAE/AVGVSTI* is all that is left of Mérida's "imperial cult temple",³⁴⁶ and some architectural and sculptural remains pertaining to the temple(s) of Serapis and Mithras have been excavated on the southern tip of Augusta Emerita (fig. 44).³⁴⁷

Aside from the extensive architectural remains preserved under the modern city of Mérida, a great deal of other evidence concerning Augusta Emerita remains preserved in the epigraphic record of this and other cities. We know from the inscriptions that the citizens of Augusta Emerita were enrolled in the Papiria tribe.³⁴⁸ The widespread locations of these inscriptions, along with historical references, give us some idea of the extent of Emerita's territorial boundaries. However, since the colony was planted to provide lands for the veterans of the Roman legions, most of the earliest settlers were already Roman citizens, and as such had already been enrolled in tribes other than the Papiria.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁶ Mérida 1925, 70.

³⁴⁷ Mérida 1925, 72; Ramos Sanchez 1992, 49-51.

³⁴⁸ *CIL* II, 559=5259, 560, 571-2 and 719.

³⁴⁹ *CIL* II, 488-91, 494 and 5266.

OTHER IMPORTANT CITIES OF LUSITANIA

The cities in this section are arranged based on their location, beginning with the most southwesterly. Identifiable cities included in Pliny's and Ptolemy's lists of Lusitanian cities, and those whose archaeological and epigraphic evidence suggest a Roman presence during the first half of the first century A.D., even without historical references, have been included here.

10. Ossonoba³⁵⁰ (Faro) Pliny *Nat.* 4.116; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.2; *AntIt* 418 and 426; *Rav.* 306

Mediterranean activities at the site occupied by Ossonoba may date as far back as the eighth century B.C., but the only pre-Roman evidence at the site is a single piece of Punic pottery.³⁵¹ Along with Balsa (see above), Ossonoba controlled trade along the southern coast of Lusitania in the Roman period, and was an important center for the production of garum.³⁵² Roman occupation of the city reaches back as far as the second century B.C., but the best archaeological evidence of Roman occupation dates from the late first century B.C. and later.

Although little enough architectural evidence remains from the Roman period, numerous inscriptions confirm the identification of Faro as Ossonoba,³⁵³ and one of these inscriptions also gives the tribe of Ossonoba as Galeria.³⁵⁴ We also know from the epigraphic evidence of the existence of an *ordo decurionum* and of numerous *duumviri*, but the inscriptions do not provide enough evidence to offer a possible date for the creation of a *municipium* of Ossonoba. The fact that citizens were enrolled into the Galeria tribe suggests strongly that the city gained its municipal status in the last third of the first century B.C. Moreover, Pliny's description of

³⁵⁰ *CIL* II, 1-11, 5135-60; *IRCP* 1-36.

³⁵¹ Mantas 1990a, 183.

³⁵² Mantas 1990a, 185 and 190.

³⁵³ E.g. *CIL* II, 1; *IRCP* 3 and 4.

³⁵⁴ *IRCP* 7.

Lusitania shows that Ossonoba must not have been a *municipium* by the time his sources were compiled, and this fact makes it far more likely that Ossonoba's elevation to municipality took place under Augustus rather than Caesar.³⁵⁵

An excavation in the 1940s uncovered the podium of a Roman temple in the Largo da Sé, but conditions at the time did not allow for a complete excavation of the finds.³⁵⁶ The evidence that did come to light suggests that the temple was a forum temple, and that the forum and temple extend under the Sé.³⁵⁷ Unfortunately, the excavation did not reveal any evidence about the chronology of this complex, leaving questions about the relationship of the forum and its temple to the city's accession to municipality unanswered.

Even though the city of Ossonoba is at no point higher than 8 m above sea level, continuous occupations and the geological changes due to the silting up of low-lying surroundings have not obscured the general layout of the Roman city. Ossonoba seems to have occupied a relatively small portion of the modern city of Faro, probably just the area circumscribed by the Moslem walls standing today.³⁵⁸ As we mentioned above, the forum most likely stood in the Largo da Sé, which would have marked the geographic center of the city as well as the crossroads of the *cardo* and *decumanus*, represented today by the Rua do Castelo and the Rua do Repouso.³⁵⁹

³⁵⁵ It seems particularly unlikely that Caesar would have granted municipal status to a city that was still within the southern reaches of Lusitania, which were largely sympathetic to Pompey and his family until after Actium.

³⁵⁶ Alarcão 1988d, 209.

³⁵⁷ Alarcão 1988d, 209.

³⁵⁸ Mantas 1990a, 185.

³⁵⁹ Mantas 1990a, 185.

11. Balsa³⁶⁰ (Luz de Tavira) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.2; *AntIt* 426; *Rav.* 306.10³⁶¹

Archaeologists have been interested in the extensive ruins visible at Luz de Tavira since the 19th century, at which time the first publications concerning Roman finds there first emerged (fig. 45).³⁶² Despite the wide array of incidental finds and nearly two centuries of interest in the site, there has still never been an intensive excavation of Balsa.³⁶³ This has become a serious problem in recent years, as disturbances of the site now threaten to obscure much of the information that it may have offered at one time.

Balsa seems to have minted *asses*, *semis* and *quadrantes* in the mid-first century B.C., depicting a tree on a ship.³⁶⁴ However, it is by means of a second century A.D. inscription that we know Balsa's location and reception of municipal status under the Flavians.³⁶⁵ Most of the datable Roman evidence relating to Balsa is from the second century A.D., a fact which suggests that the city did not experience a high level of urbanization until the second century.³⁶⁶

Architectural remains from Balsa, though numerous, have not been sufficiently studied to give any idea of the urban plan of the site. Two inscriptions dating to the second century refer to the construction of the circus *spina*,³⁶⁷ but there are remains that may indicate a bath complex as well.³⁶⁸ The archaeological record of the site contains references to numerous architectural elements, particularly marble columns, architrave blocks, aqueducts, polished marbles, and

³⁶⁰ *CIL* II, 13-14, 5161-5177; *IRCP* 73-90.

³⁶¹ See *IRCP* 6, 73-94, 294, 660.

³⁶² Mantas 1990a, 192 and fig. 1.

³⁶³ Viana 1952, 62; Mantas 1990a, 192.

³⁶⁴ Mantas 1990a, 192 and n. 198.

³⁶⁵ *CIL* II, 4990; Mantas 1990a, 192-3.

³⁶⁶ Mantas 1990a, 193.

³⁶⁷ *CIL* II, 5165 and 5166.

³⁶⁸ Mantas 1990a, 199.

capitals, but these pieces exist only as historical references for now.³⁶⁹ Until further excavations are held at the site, the wealth of archaeological information contained in the lands of Luz de Tavira will remain something of a mystery to modern scholarship.³⁷⁰

12. Mirobriga Celtici (Santiago do Cacém³⁷¹) Pliny *Nat.* 4.116 and 118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5;

AntIt 444

Pliny mentions two Lusitanian cities that may be equivalent to the modern site of Miróbriga, near Santiago do Cacém. The first reference is to a coastal city of Merobrica in his list of *oppida memorabilia*.³⁷² It seems likely that a later reference to the city of the *Mirobricenses qui Celtici cognomantur*³⁷³ describes the same city. There is, however, another city known as Mirobriga within the limits of Lusitania, as indicated by several inscriptions found in Ciudad Rodrigo.³⁷⁴ Since this city is nowhere near the coast of Lusitania, and since it lies well north and east of the area inhabited by the Celtici, this is most likely not the Mirobriga that Pliny mentions.³⁷⁵ For our purposes, the city of Mirobriga Celtici, identified as a coastal town of

³⁶⁹ Viana 1952, 264-5, 273.

³⁷⁰ Prof. Catarina Viegas (Universidade de Lisboa) is currently conducting research on the ceramics that have been collected in excavations at the site of Tavira. Based on her ongoing work, there seems to have been a Roman presence at the site at least by the Augustan period.

³⁷¹ *CIL* II, 21-31; *IRCP* 144-60, 171.

³⁷² Pliny *Nat.* 4.116.

³⁷³ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

³⁷⁴ *CIL* II, 859; *ILER* 1782 and 1783.

³⁷⁵ *TIR K-29*, “Mirobriga;” Hübner (1869, 802) suggests that Pliny’s *Medubrigenses qui Plumbarii* (Pliny *Nat.* 4.118) should be equated with Ptolemy’s *Meribriga* (2.5.5).

Lusitania, must correspond with that mentioned by Pliny at 4.116.³⁷⁶ The archaeological remains of Miróbriga, near Santiago do Cacém, confirm municipal status from the Flavian period.³⁷⁷

Excavations at the site uncovered a number of important buildings, including a monumental bath complex, a circus, two temples, and a forum (fig. 46).³⁷⁸ The temples were incorporated into the forum, which was built on the highest point of the city, known today as the Castelo Velho.³⁷⁹ A large marble-paved courtyard was dominated by the larger of the two temples, whose dedication is unknown, although an inscription to Aesclepius may indicate the presence of a cult to that healer.³⁸⁰ The fact that this temple is clearly on the same axis as the monumental courtyard, with its portico on three sides, strongly suggests that it was the forum temple, as is clearly the case at Conimbriga and possibly at Eburobrittium (fig. 47).³⁸¹ Since the structures on the north and south sides of the courtyard are poorly preserved, it is impossible to say whether they represent *tabernae* or are other structures associated with the forum complex.

The other temple may have been dedicated to Venus, to whom an inscription found at the site refers, although some questions were raised in the 1980s excavations about conclusions drawn from earlier work at the site.³⁸² This structure's form is similar to that of a Christian basilica, according to Slane, which suggests that it might have originally functioned as the basilica or (perhaps less likely) the curia of the Mirobriga forum.³⁸³ Its position slightly outside the immediate area of the forum could be easily explained by the difficult terrain evident on the

³⁷⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

³⁷⁷ *IRCP* 150—MUNICIPIUM FLAVIUM MIROBRIGENSIS; Mierse 1999, 220; Alarcão 1990a, 23; 1988a, 28.

³⁷⁸ Biers 1988, fig. 12.

³⁷⁹ Slane 1988, 15.

³⁸⁰ Mierse 1999, 220 and 224; Slane 1988, 15 and n. 24-6.

³⁸¹ Mierse 1999, fig. 64.

³⁸² Slane 1988, 15.

³⁸³ Slane 1988, 15.

complex's eastern and southern sides. In the event that the structure is a temple, there is the further possibility of another temple on the southern side of the marble-paved courtyard, which might in turn hint at the presence of a cult to the Capitoline triad.

The initial excavators at the Castelo Velho of Miróbriga believed that the temples were built in the fourth century as part of a complex dedicated to Aesclepius.³⁸⁴ Work done in the 1980s has brought to light evidence for the forum that suggests an initial construction phase dating to Claudius or Nero, with a second phase in the Flavian period, possibly related to the concession of municipal status at that time.³⁸⁵

The bath complex was also built in two major phases, corresponding to the earlier East Baths and the later West Baths.³⁸⁶ It seems most likely that the construction project involving the bath complex at Mirobriga actually spanned the whole second century A.D., possibly having begun at the end of the first century.³⁸⁷ The elaborate nature of these baths, along with the continuing renovations to the complex, indicates a strong Roman influence at the site, and a relatively wealthy population. However, the excavators have yet to uncover any residential areas of Mirobriga, despite several phases of excavation and survey work over the last half century. Mirobriga's circus was a very simple structure by comparison to others in Hispania, particularly that at Augusta Emerita. Despite its apparent modesty, the circus was nonetheless an important enough structure to warrant a stone circuit wall and spina, and its length was comparable to other circuses in Hispania.³⁸⁸ Foundations on the southern end of the circus also suggest strongly that

³⁸⁴ Cf. Mierse 1999, 220, n. 41 with reference to Almeida 1964, 71.

³⁸⁵ Mierse 1999, 222-3 and n. 44.

³⁸⁶ Biers and Biers 1988, 108.

³⁸⁷ Biers and Biers 1988, 109-12.

³⁸⁸ Leonard and Slane 1988, 38 and 40.

there was a monumental entrance on that end, farthest from the city of Mirobriga.³⁸⁹ Very little evidence has been found that might offer a secure date for the initial construction phase of the circus, although a few remains may point to the late first century A.D., with an important renovation during the third century.³⁹⁰ Given the circus' distance from the town (ca. 700 m) and monumental entrance on the southern (farther) end, the excavators have raised the suggestion that this circus was a training track rather than a show track.³⁹¹ If this hypothesis is accurate, it may imply that Mirobriga was an important training center and point of departure for Lusitanian horses. This possibility is particularly interesting in light of Pliny's acknowledgement of the excellence of Lusitanian horses and the existence of at least one Alentejan villa, the Torre de Palma, whose remains suggest that it may have been involved in horse breeding activities.³⁹²

13. Caetobriga (Setúbal)³⁹³ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.2; *AntIt* 417; *Rav.* 306

Although this was not a major city during the early imperial period, Caetobriga was an important *mansio* on the route between Olisipo and Augusta Emerita.³⁹⁴ The earliest finds from the site are Phoenician, a fact that is not surprising given Caetobriga's location at the mouth of the Sado, which communicates with Alcácer do Sal.³⁹⁵ Roman remains from Caetobriga date as early as the first century A.D., and include abundant amphorae and structures related to the production of garum.³⁹⁶

³⁸⁹ Leonard and Slane 1988, 41.

³⁹⁰ Leonard and Slane 1988, 43.

³⁹¹ Leonard and Slane 1988, 43.

³⁹² Pliny *Nat.* 4.116; Gorges 1979, 29, 156, 465-6.

³⁹³ *CIL* II, 40-4 and 5184; *IRCP* 207-28.

³⁹⁴ *AntIt* 417.

³⁹⁵ Mantas 1990a, 174.

³⁹⁶ *TIR*, J-29, "Caetobriga."

14. Ammaia³⁹⁷ (São Salvador de Aramenha/Marvão)³⁹⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 37.24; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

Pliny does not list Ammaia as one of the stipendiary cities of Lusitania in book 4. However, Ptolemy's list of Lusitanian cities contains a reference to Ammaia, and an inscription dating to the middle of the first century A.D. from São Salvador de Aramenha calls the city the "*civitas Ammaiensis*" (fig. 48).³⁹⁹ It seems to be the case that when this inscription was set up, in 44 or 45 A.D., the *civitas* had not yet received an official Roman status beyond its position as a tribal center for the Ammaienses. However, the presence of a man who acted as *duumvir* and *quaestor* on another inscription found at Ammaia, dating to Nero's time, provides some evidence concerning the date of Ammaia's municipal charter.⁴⁰⁰ The individual who carried out these charges, P. Cornelius Q. Macer, may have been given viritane citizenship by Claudius. However, it is unlikely that a mere *civitas* would have required individuals in these official posts.⁴⁰¹ For this reason, Étienne, following Galsterer, believes that Ammaia was given municipal status between the time of Claudius and the Flavian period.⁴⁰² Given the apparent date of the *duumvir* and *quaestor* inscription, this would have had to take place more specifically, between the reign of Claudius and the death of Nero.⁴⁰³

Excavations at Ammaia in recent years have revealed a great deal about the Roman occupation of the site. Ammaia was initially an indigenous settlement, but seems to have undergone extensive re-organizations in the early first century A.D. and in the second century. A

³⁹⁷ *CIL* II, 158, 501 and 809.

³⁹⁸ *CIL* II, 158-67; *IRCP* 604-636.

³⁹⁹ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6.; *IRCP* 615; Mantas 2000, fig. 1.

⁴⁰⁰ Alarcão 1990a, 23. See above under "Local Administration..."

⁴⁰¹ But see D'Encarnação 1984, 748.

⁴⁰² Étienne 1990, 220 after Galsterer 1971, 68-9.

⁴⁰³ There is evidence that members of the Quirina tribe were present within the area of Ammaia during the Roman period, but whether these came bringing their citizenship from other locations (as Macer seems to have done in the above example) or were enrolled in the Quirina tribe in Ammaia is unknown. *IRCP* 618 = *CIL* II, 159; Le Roux 1990, 44; Alarcão 1990a, 23, 30.

monumental gateway to the city was set up during the first century, and was incorporated into the rectangular defensive circuit that the Romans built around the city.⁴⁰⁴ The Roman forum at Ammaia was one of the largest in Lusitania, measuring 66 x 99 m, and had a central temple whose podium remains measure 9 x 17 m, not counting the frontal staircase. Although very little remains of the superstructure of the forum, it seems to have consisted of a marble-paved courtyard surrounded by a portico (fig. 49).⁴⁰⁵

A high concentration of Roman villas in the areas immediately surrounding São Salvador de Aramenha suggests that the Roman city at this site may have benefited from the excellent agricultural conditions of the northern section of the *Conventus Pacensis* (fig. 50).⁴⁰⁶ Our lack of information that dates to the first century A.D. or earlier makes it difficult to understand the exact nature of Roman occupation of Ammaia during the early imperial period.

15. Eburobrittium (Óbidos) Pliny *Nat.* 4.113

The city of Eburobrittium was long unknown, due to the absence of evidence of Roman occupation in the areas north and west of Olisipo. Two inscriptions from Amoreira, just north of Óbidos, mention a duumvir and the quattuorviri of what may be “Flavia Eburobrittium”.⁴⁰⁷ The latter of these two seems to show that the city was elevated to municipal status under the Flavians, and as a result, the citizens would have been inscribed in the Quirina tribe.⁴⁰⁸

In 1994, the remains of the Roman city of Eburobrittium were first discovered. The subsequent excavation revealed the remains of Eburobrittium’s civic center, including a large

⁴⁰⁴ Mantas 2000, 413-4.

⁴⁰⁵ Mantas 2000, 414 and fig. 5.

⁴⁰⁶ Gorges 1990, 99; Mantas 2000, fig. 2.

⁴⁰⁷ Alarcão 1990a, 25.

⁴⁰⁸ Moreira 2002, 27.

portion of the forum complex and the public baths (fig. 51).⁴⁰⁹ Only these public areas of the site have been excavated thus far, due to the presence of a modern freeway exchange ramp over its eastern side. Traces of the eastern precinct wall of the forum complex have been found east of the freeway ramp, allowing the archaeologists to determine the complex's full extent (fig. 52).⁴¹⁰

Remains under the foundations of the forum indicate that the first phase was built during the last decade before Christ.⁴¹¹ A second building phase took place during the last decades of the first century A.D., probably at the time of the Flavian concession of municipal status.⁴¹² Evidence from the baths also suggests an initial construction during the first century A.D., although third century materials found in the complex may indicate that the baths underwent a renovation at that time.⁴¹³

The territory governed by Eburobrittium extended as far south as the Ribeira de Alcabrichel, where it met with that of Olisipo. On the east, the territory of the colony of Scallabis bordered that of Eburobrittium at the Serra dos Candeeiros and the Serra de Montejunto. The northern boundary of Eburobrittium's territory followed the latitude of Nazaré and Alcobaça, where the territory of Collippo began.⁴¹⁴

⁴⁰⁹ Moreira 2002, 30, 88-130 and fig. 63.

⁴¹⁰ Moreira 2002, 133 and fig. 191.

⁴¹¹ Moreira 2002, 159.

⁴¹² Moreira 2002, 159-60.

⁴¹³ Moreira 2002, 130.

⁴¹⁴ Moreira 2002, 35-7 and fig. 6.

16. Sellium⁴¹⁵ (Tomar)⁴¹⁶ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6, *AntIt* 421

Despite Pliny's failure to mention the city, Sellium was an important station on the route between Olisipo and Bracara, in the north central region of Lusitania.⁴¹⁷ The Antonine Itinerary places Sellium thirty-two miles north of Scallabis and thirty-four south of Conimbriga, which agrees with the archaeological information found in the area of modern Tomar.⁴¹⁸

Recent excavations at Tomar have brought further confirmation of the site's importance in the early years of the Roman Empire (fig. 53).⁴¹⁹ The Roman forum in the center of the city was most likely begun during Augustus' reign, but the chronological evidence suggests a Tiberian date for the completion of the complex.⁴²⁰ Only a portion of the forum has been published so far, but there is enough information to provide a reconstructed plan of the southern half of the complex (fig. 54).⁴²¹ The southernmost section of the forum housed the basilica and the curia, the latter of which was appended to the western end of the basilica. On the northern side of the basilica a portico provided access to the forum courtyard, and each of the columns of this portico seems to have had a commemorative statue, two bases of which are still preserved, set up in front of it.⁴²² The only decorative pieces of the basilica found to date are an Ionic capital, a few column bases and a piece of cornice entablature, from which the basilica's height is projected at 11.87 m (fig. 55).⁴²³

⁴¹⁵ *CIL* II, 73, 179=4959, 331-6, 2562, 4960=6198 and 5026.

⁴¹⁶ *CIL* II, 332-6.

⁴¹⁷ Batata et al. 1993, 513;

⁴¹⁸ Alarcão 1990a, 26.

⁴¹⁹ Ponte 1985, pl. 1.

⁴²⁰ Batata et al. 1993, 514-5, 545.

⁴²¹ Alarcão 1990a, fig. 6.

⁴²² Ponte 1993, 450.

⁴²³ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 7; Ponte 1993, 450 and figs. 4-6.

Although no secure architectural evidence for a temple has been found, there was most likely a forum temple located in the northern portion of the forum, and there were also monuments (perhaps temples or other structures) dedicated to the *GENIO MUNICIPII* or the imperial cult, both attested by the epigraphic record.⁴²⁴ A large square tower in front of the Igreja de Santa Maria dos Olivais may stand on the foundations of a Roman temple or some other important Roman structure, as suggested by the large stone masonry and the building's orientation along the same axis as other civic structures of Sellium.⁴²⁵

A number of Roman *insulae* have been excavated in the area immediately surrounding the forum of Sellium. Evidence found in these structures indicates a Roman presence from the early years of the principate, but the bulk of finds date to the first century A.D.⁴²⁶ The vast majority of household wares seem to have been imported from Italy (the *terra sigillata*), Augusta Emerita, Bracara Augusta and Baetica ("paredes finas").⁴²⁷ Ceramic construction materials, however, were for the most part manufactured in Sellium, and figure very prominently in the civic constructions of the Roman city.⁴²⁸

The fact that the forum, *insulae*, drainage system and major roads of Sellium were arranged on an orthogonal grid suggests that this may have been a foundation *ex nihilo*,⁴²⁹ although there is some evidence of a pre-Roman presence in Tomar, the nature of which is not yet understood.⁴³⁰ Sellium does not seem to have benefited from protective walls at any time

⁴²⁴ Ponte 1993, 448.

⁴²⁵ Ponte 1993, 448-9.

⁴²⁶ Ponte 1993, 451-2.

⁴²⁷ Ponte 1993, 451.

⁴²⁸ Used, for example, in the courtyard of the forum, throughout the city's drainage and sewage system and even on residential structures throughout the city.

⁴²⁹ Batata et al. 1993, 514.

⁴³⁰ Ponte 1993, 447.

during the Roman occupation, but the presence of several defensive towers in the immediate vicinity of the town may point to a general military presence in the area.⁴³¹

There are extensive Roman remains in the sub-urban areas around Sellium, including dozens of *villae* and *vici*,⁴³² and these have provided much of the epigraphic information on the Roman city.⁴³³ Sellium's central location within the Conventus Scallabitanus allows us to see it within the context of the other important cities around it, including Collippo, Scallabis, and Conimbriga.

17. Augustobriga⁴³⁴ (Talavera la Vieja)⁴³⁵ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7; *AntIt* 438 and/or 442; *Rav* 311.2 and 312.12

Augustobriga has long been known as the town of Talavera la Vieja, now submerged under the reservoir of Valdecañas on the Tagus. The city is mentioned by both the Antonine Itinerary and the Ravenna Cosmography as a *mansio* on the route from Emerita to Caesarobriga, indicating that the city continued to act as an important station and urban center through the imperial period.

Roman structures were visible at Talavera la Vieja throughout the town's history, and studies dealing with the Roman temple there date as early as the 18th century.⁴³⁶ In fact, before the emergency excavations of the early 1960s, two temples were already fairly well known. Mérida's descriptions were the most comprehensive until García y Bellido's excavations in the 1960s, but contain some conclusions that have since needed revision.

⁴³¹ Ponte 1993, 449.

⁴³² Batata et al. 1993, 520-1 and pl. 1.

⁴³³ Batata et al. 1993, 537-42.

⁴³⁴ *CIL* II, 941 and 5346.

⁴³⁵ *CIL* II, 926-37, 938=5343, 939-46, 947=5344 and 5345-51.

⁴³⁶ García y Bellido 1962, 235; Fernández Corrales 1988, 37.

The smaller of the temples, possibly dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, measures 8.85 x 23.31 m, and stands on a podium 2.35 m high, built of squared granite blocks.⁴³⁷ The length of the structure without its front staircase is actually 17.96 m, which calculates to roughly twice its breadth, close to the standard dimensions for Roman temples in Lusitania. Given the dedication of the temple, and its close proximity to another larger temple, Garcia y Bellido believed that there must be a third temple, completing a complex in honor of the Capitoline Triad.⁴³⁸ However, his excavations did not uncover any evidence of this third temple.

Mélida initially identified the larger of the Augustobriga temples as a *curia*, believing that the monumental complex represented a forum.⁴³⁹ Four granite columns line the front of the building, and two columns stand behind these four on the exterior (fig. 56).⁴⁴⁰ The central intercolumniation is wider than the external ones, providing a wider access to the cella, whose walls were partially reconstructed in the 19th century.⁴⁴¹ Traces of stucco remain on the granite columns, and the capitals were apparently decorated with stucco as well, though their final form cannot be adduced from the bare granite capitals that survive (fig. 57).⁴⁴² The presence of a single granite arch over the central columns implies an imported (possibly Eastern) means of allowing more light into the cella of the temple (figs. 58 and 59).⁴⁴³

Despite the obvious presence of a Roman monumental program on the site, it was not until the late 19th century that an inscription containing the Roman name for Augustobriga was

⁴³⁷ Mélida 1925, 73; cf. *CIL* II, 926.

⁴³⁸ Garcia y Bellido 1962, 235.

⁴³⁹ Mélida 1925, 101; Garcia y Bellido 1962, pl. 164.

⁴⁴⁰ Mierse 1999, pl. 12.

⁴⁴¹ Mélida 1925, 101-2.

⁴⁴² Mierse 1999, 109-10 and pl. 25.

⁴⁴³ Mélida 1925, 102; Mierse 1999, pls. 12 and 43. Compare the remains of the Augustobriga temple in fig. 58 to fig. 59, a temple in Augusta Emerita with a similar arch over the central intercolumniation.

published.⁴⁴⁴ The inscription reads *C. IVLIVS C. F. GL. / SENATVI. POPV / AVGVSTOBR / HOSPE. D / DAT*, and seems a clear indication that the city had a Roman constitution at least by the first century. The city was most likely a municipium at this time, although this particular inscription does not make the city's status clear.

A late Roman wall still stood, though in a bad state, in the 1960s, but little more can be said of the urban plan, as the village of Talavera la Vieja covered much of the Roman city.⁴⁴⁵ The two temples that have been rescued from the flooding of the Tagus indicate that in Roman times this was a flourishing center, despite the lack of further architectural evidence for Roman activity there. There may have been a pre-Roman settlement on the site, as Roman finds were mixed in with earlier and much later materials.⁴⁴⁶

18. Collippo⁴⁴⁷ (São Sebastião do Freixo) Pliny *Nat.* 4.113; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.2

Although there has historically been a tendency to locate Collippo in the modern town of Leiria,⁴⁴⁸ no evidence supporting this traditional identification has yet been discovered in that city. An inscription in the castle wall of Leiria bearing the name “Collippo” cannot be accepted as confirmation of that city's Roman heritage, as no other archaeological remains dating to the Roman period have yet been found within Leiria.⁴⁴⁹ São Sebastião do Freixo, on the other hand,

⁴⁴⁴ Garcia y Bellido 1962, 237; *CIL* II 5346.

⁴⁴⁵ Garcia y Bellido 1962, 237.

⁴⁴⁶ *TIR*, J-29, “Augustobriga.”

⁴⁴⁷ *CIL* II, 337-64 and 5232-8; Hübner notes that the three bearing the purported Roman name of S. Sebastião do Freixo are suspect—339, 340, 353.

⁴⁴⁸ Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 1-2.

⁴⁴⁹ Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 2.

has produced numerous inscriptions relating to the city of Collippo, as well as a substantial body of Roman artifacts, including sculpture, architecture, ceramics, coins, and building materials.⁴⁵⁰

Excavations at São Sebastião do Freixo have revealed the remains of two well-built walls, possibly incorporated into the civic architectural scheme.⁴⁵¹ Very near one of these walls, the excavators uncovered a monumental marble statue of a togate figure, possibly giving indication of the civic nature of the area under excavation.⁴⁵² The statues date to the first century A.D., and are similar in their workmanship and style to others found at Mérida.⁴⁵³

Based on the architectural and epigraphic remains from São Sebastião do Freixo, there is little room to doubt the conclusion that this is the site of ancient Collippo. Further excavation of the site will no doubt clarify the nature of the structures discovered in the 1960s, but for the present we must be content with the little that we know about the Roman oppidum of Collippo.

19. *Civitas Igaeditanorum*⁴⁵⁴ (Idanha-a-Velha)⁴⁵⁵

Idanha was chosen as the capital of the Igaeditani during the reign of Augustus, probably between 4 and 6 AD, as suggested by two *termini augustales* found on the edges of the *civitas*.⁴⁵⁶ The earliest epigraphic information from the province of Lusitania comes from Idanha-a-Velha, in the form of a dedicatory inscription set up in the year 16 B.C. (fig. 60).⁴⁵⁷ It seems to have

⁴⁵⁰ Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 4-7.

⁴⁵¹ Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 11-2.

⁴⁵² Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, 12.

⁴⁵³ Sanches 1969, 13-15.

⁴⁵⁴ *CIL* II, 435, 459, 460, 760-1, 987.

⁴⁵⁵ *CIL* II, 435-60.

⁴⁵⁶ Mantas 1988, 415-20.

⁴⁵⁷ Almeida 1956, fig. 105.

been raised to a municipium during the Flavian period, judging from numerous epigraphic references to citizens as members of the Quirina tribe.⁴⁵⁸

During the late 20th century, excavations at Idanha-a-Velha revealed a vast number of Roman architectural elements reused in the later habitation of the town, as well as hundreds of votive inscriptions containing references to the temples of Mars, Venus, and Juno.⁴⁵⁹

Excavations of the Roman center of Idanha-a-Velha revealed a great deal of architectural evidence, but unfortunately failed to produce anything that offers a secure date for the structures involved (figs. 61 and 62).⁴⁶⁰

The most important structure uncovered is a podium on which the later Templar tower was constructed (figs. 63 and 64).⁴⁶¹ However, the identity of the deity worshipped here remains something of a mystery, despite the abundant epigraphic remains from the site. Mantas has most recently argued that the temple was built in honor of Jupiter, but no inscription has yet been found to that effect.⁴⁶² Of particular relevance to discussions concerning the nature of the temple is the fact that the temple seems to be located at the highest point in the town, on a large flat area that almost without a doubt housed the Roman forum.⁴⁶³

Hauschild has suggested that the temple was prostyle with four columns, and a wall of cut stones surrounding the podium at a distance of roughly six meters may represent the temple's portico.⁴⁶⁴ Excavations in Idanha have largely focused on the area west of this temple podium, however, specifically in the region of the late antique Christian See and baptistery. The See has

⁴⁵⁸ Almeida 1956, 155, 188-9, 197-8, 200, 229, 252.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. Almeida 1956; Mantas 2002, 231-3.

⁴⁶⁰ Mantas 2002, 233; Almeida 1956, figs. 5 and 30.

⁴⁶¹ Almeida 1956 and Hauschild 2002, 233; Alarcão 1990b, pl. 7; Almeida 1956, figs. 49-52.

⁴⁶² Mantas 2002, 233.

⁴⁶³ Mantas 2002, 232-3.

⁴⁶⁴ Hauschild 2002, 220.

undergone numerous reconstructions since the sixth century, and consequently contains architectural elements certainly borrowed from earlier monumental structures.

Virtually no work has been done at this site since the death of Fernando de Almeida in 1979, as the focus of the IPPAR has shifted to the inscriptional treasures that his work brought to light, rather than the architecture of the Roman city. Fortunately for the archaeologists, at least two of the temples that must have stood in Roman Idanha were dedicated by the same individual, a wealthy man by the name of C. Cantius Modestinus.⁴⁶⁵ His name appears in five dedicatory inscriptions for temples,⁴⁶⁶ but none of the temples has yet been identified with certainty.

The foundations of the temple described above may be from one of the Modestinus temples at Idanha, which, based on analyses of the lettering and size of the inscription, Mantas has suggested was dedicated to Venus.⁴⁶⁷ However, he has since argued, based on a comparison with the small temple dedicated by C. Iulius Lacer at the Alcántara bridge, that the Modestinus temples must have been smaller than the podium described above would allow. Consequently, he believes that the temples dedicated by Modestinus in Idanha were small structures located on either side of the main forum entrance.⁴⁶⁸ The foundations of one such structure are visible today, though no work has been done to excavate this, nor is anything visible across the forum area as a possible parallel.⁴⁶⁹

Idanha is in need of a major archaeological undertaking, and only after such a project has cleared away some of the more basic difficulties of this site will it be possible to understand more about the religious edifices of the first century A.D.

⁴⁶⁵ Mantas 2002.

⁴⁶⁶ Mantas 2002, 231.

⁴⁶⁷ Mantas 1988, 427-30.

⁴⁶⁸ Mantas 2002, 233.

⁴⁶⁹ Hauschild 2002, 220.

20. Caurium⁴⁷⁰ (Coria)⁴⁷¹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

The modern town of Coria boasts a very large corpus of Roman inscriptions. A number of these inscriptions were reused in the late Roman walls of the site, demonstrating that many date to before the fourth century A.D.⁴⁷² There are also remains of the originally Roman aqueduct, which has been rebuilt in modern times.⁴⁷³ A number of marble statues and fragments also survive, preserved, like many of the inscriptions, in the late Roman walls and medieval buildings of Coria.⁴⁷⁴

Caurium was apparently built over a pre-Roman fortified settlement that depended on the nearby Alagon River for its southern defense.⁴⁷⁵ However, epigraphic evidence demonstrates a high number of Romanized individuals, from Caurium itself⁴⁷⁶ and from the Lusitanian cities of Arabriga⁴⁷⁷ and Arcobriga,⁴⁷⁸ showing that Roman interest in Caurium was intense from very early on. The practice of naming the origin of the deceased is normally reserved for those who are buried outside the limits of their home territory, so the discovery of funerary inscriptions bearing references to Caurienses may be suspicious. However, nearly all of the inscriptions from the site of Caurium were found in later archaeological contexts, leaving conclusions based on their find spot somewhat dubious.

⁴⁷⁰ *CIL* II, 766-70, 802.

⁴⁷¹ *CIL* 763-803 and 5307-11.

⁴⁷² *TIR* J-29, "Caurium."

⁴⁷³ Mélida 1924a, 106.

⁴⁷⁴ Mélida 1924a, 106.

⁴⁷⁵ Fernández Corrales 1988, 36.

⁴⁷⁶ *CIL* II, 766-9 and 802.

⁴⁷⁷ Mélida 1924a, 110 no. 301; cf. Aarabriga.

⁴⁷⁸ *CIL* II, 765; cf. Axabricsenses.

None of the inscriptions published to date refer to civic officials or the status of the city in Roman times.⁴⁷⁹ The fact that Pliny refers to it as a stipendiary city proves that it had been absorbed into the Roman taxation scheme by the end of the first century B.C., but there is some question as to whether or not it received municipal status before the time of Vespasian.⁴⁸⁰ The magnificence of the late Roman walls of Coria betrays the city's importance in later times, but their size contrasts starkly with the relatively tiny inhabited precinct of roughly 6.5 hectares.⁴⁸¹ It is highly probable that most of the ancient city lies under the modern town of Coria, and as a result we must await further archaeological work within the walled city, and particularly in the area of the castle, in order to better understand the city's early Roman development.

21. Caesarobriga⁴⁸² (Talavera de la Reina)⁴⁸³ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Caesarobriga was a pre-Roman settlement, a fact attested by the suffix –briga, which generally denotes a Celtic origin.⁴⁸⁴ Pliny's account indicates that the city had not yet risen to the status of municipium at the time of Augustus' provincial reorganization,⁴⁸⁵ although there was already a stipendiary *oppidum* there by that time.⁴⁸⁶ The fact that the city is not mentioned on the Antonine Itinerary route from Emerita to Caesaraugusta⁴⁸⁷ has been explained as mistake

⁴⁷⁹ Hübner 1869, 96; Mélida 1924a, 106-14.

⁴⁸⁰ Hübner 1869, 96.

⁴⁸¹ Fernández Corrales 1988, 36.

⁴⁸² *CIL* II, 895-8, 5033 and 5320.

⁴⁸³ *CIL* II, 893-925 and 5315-42.

⁴⁸⁴ Fuentes 1993, 568-9.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. Blázquez 1965, 5 on the dates of Pliny's source.

⁴⁸⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.117-8.

⁴⁸⁷ *AntIt* 438.

of transmission, the author of that work having skipped over Caesarobriga by the trick of the eyes caused by the city immediately preceding it on the list, Augustobriga.⁴⁸⁸

Caesarobriga was certainly an important station on the route from Augusta Emerita to Toletum, if for no other reason than its proximity to the Tagus. However, it does not seem to have achieved municipal status by its own merits or ties to powerful individuals. Rather, it rose to municipal status during the reign of the Flavian emperors, who inscribed new citizens into the Quirina tribes, a fact attested by *CIL* II, 896.⁴⁸⁹ Assigning a particular date within that period is impossible at this point, but Vespasian seems a likely candidate, having extended Latin citizenship to the whole of Hispania in 73 or 74 A.D.⁴⁹⁰

A significant number of inscriptions have survived the transformations that Caesarobriga underwent to become the modern city of Talavera de la Reina. Some of these inscriptions present an image of the flourishing municipal life in Caesarobriga: for example, we know something of the *cursus honorum* of one Annius Placidus, who held the post of duumvir, aedile and quaestor.⁴⁹¹ However, despite the extensive epigraphic corpus of Caesarobriga, we know virtually nothing of the Roman city's architecture.

The massive city walls visible today probably follow the lines of the earlier Roman walls, and traces of the Roman orthogonal plan for the city are preserved in the modern street system (fig. 65).⁴⁹² A pottery workshop containing *terra sigillata* from the first century A.D. provides the best archaeological evidence for a Roman presence at Talavera de la Reina, although a wall of carefully worked ashlar that is still standing in the Plaza Padre Juan de Mariana might hold

⁴⁸⁸ Rubio Fuentes 1993, 570-1; Callejo 1968.

⁴⁸⁹ Rubio Fuentes 1993, 572.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. Pliny *Nat.* 3.30; *rei publicae Latium tribuit*; Rubio Fuentes 1993, 572-4.

⁴⁹¹ *CIL* II, 896.

⁴⁹² Mangas Manjarres and Carrobes Santos 1993, 109-10, 113.

clues about Julio-Claudian architecture in the city.⁴⁹³ The foundations of a bridge crossing the nearby Alberche River may also be of early imperial date, but only an excavation will confirm or disprove this possibility.

22. Conimbriga⁴⁹⁴ (Condeixa-a-Velha)⁴⁹⁵ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113; *AntIt* 421

The Iron Age settlement of Conimbriga, located some 24 km east of the Atlantic coast and 15 km south of the modern city of Coimbra (Roman Aeminium), was chosen as the site for extensive building campaigns during the reign of Augustus. Despite its monumental architecture (forum and temple, bath complex, aqueduct, defensive wall), Conimbriga remained a mere oppidum in the Augustan administrative scheme of Lusitania, being elevated to a municipium under the Flavian emperors, possibly as early as the 70s A.D.⁴⁹⁶

Conimbriga had contacts with the Romans as far back as the early second century BC, but does not seem to have received any concentrated interest from outside until the end of the first century B.C. The existence of an Augustan forum at this site raises questions concerning the involvement of the local elite in the decision to undertake monumental projects in provincial cities—offering to provide the funds to construct an imperial forum and a temple might attract attention from the Romans and lead to the elevation of an otherwise unimportant city.

The Augustan forum, measuring about 50 x 50 m and oriented roughly N-S, was built on the limestone bedrock to the immediate south of the native Lusitanian settlement at Conimbriga

⁴⁹³ *TIR*, J-30, “Caesarobriga.”

⁴⁹⁴ *CIL* II, 379, 391, 432, 5264 and 5866.

⁴⁹⁵ *CIL* 365-95 and 5239-44.

⁴⁹⁶ Étienne et al. 1976, 29 “Flavia Conimbriga” and 91 “Quirina.” The late elevation to *municipium* may be due, at least in part, to the better situation of the nearby city of Aeminium, modern Coimbra.

(fig. 66).⁴⁹⁷ Remains indicate that the site had to be cleared for the imperial forum, but despite this destruction, the earlier settlement continued to flourish throughout the Roman period.⁴⁹⁸ In fact, an entrance into the public precinct from the north side of town was included in the Augustan forum, indicating, at least in theory, an ongoing desire to include the native settlement in the religious and civic activities of the city.

All that remains of the Augustan forum complex are the foundations, pillar bases and a few pieces of decorative stonework, but from these it seems possible to reconstruct a reasonably accurate description of the public area (fig. 67).⁴⁹⁹ The main entrance to the forum would have been on the south side of the large, central courtyard. This paved area was surrounded on the south and west sides by a portico 3.5 m deep, and on the west side this portico shaded the entrances to nine tabernae of irregular but roughly equal sizes.

On the eastern side of the courtyard stands a building that has been identified as housing the basilica and curia.⁵⁰⁰ The southern room of this building, the basilica, measures on its eastern and western sides, and 13.65 m on the remaining sides. It is provided with an entrance on the eastern side and two on the western, one opening onto the courtyard and the other providing access to the southern portico of the forum.

Along the N-S axis of the basilica run two rows of six pillars each, effectively dividing the basilica into three naves, and nearly four meters from the northern wall there is evidence for a wall separating off a smaller room from the main basilica. While none of the columns of the two colonnades remains, the Flavian building phase has preserved the foundations of the eastern

⁴⁹⁷ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 27 and pl. iv.

⁴⁹⁸ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 28.

⁴⁹⁹ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 32-3 and pls. xi, xiii, xvi, lxx and lxviii.

⁵⁰⁰ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 35-7; the presence of a curia should not be surprising in a mere stipendiary city—the *decuriones* would have been necessary in any stipendiary city for the local administration and for financing public works (Cf. Curchin 1991, 66-8).

colonnade. Each column rested on cut stone foundations of 2 x 2 m, which gives good support to the excavators' suggestion that this basilica had a central gallery flanked by two naves.⁵⁰¹

To the immediate north of the basilica, and in fact sharing its northern wall, sits the small chamber (5.44 x 13.65 m) that has been identified as the curia. The excavators recognize that the size of this curia would place it among the smallest known, but it is by no means unique in Roman architecture.⁵⁰² No entrance to this chamber was identified during the excavations, but this is most likely due to later renovations of the forum precinct.

The northern side of the forum portico was most likely dominated by the forum temple, which, due to the slope of the limestone bedrock at this point, was built atop a cryptoporticus in the shape of a T. This cryptoporticus is all that remains of the temple proper, so again we are forced to look to the excavated foundations in order to present a reconstruction. It is believed that the temple would have stood on the base of the T, extending northward from the forum courtyard. A reinforced portion of the cryptoporticus foundation at the center of the north wall has led to the suggestion that a monumental cult statue would have stood in the cella of the temple above.⁵⁰³ The discovery of a massive marble head of Augustus (fig. 68) makes him a plausible suggestion for the identity of this statue, but that identification might have a substantial effect on the chronology proposed for the complex.⁵⁰⁴

Based on several fragments found in fill related to the Flavian expansion of the forum, the archaeologists have proposed a pseudo-peripteral temple, with a portico along the line of the pillars of the cryptoporticus underneath. The decorative scheme cannot be reconstructed with certainty, as only a socle base, a column drum, and a possible piece of cornice stone and two

⁵⁰¹ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 36.

⁵⁰² Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 37; cf. also Balty 1991, 372-5.

⁵⁰³ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 33.

⁵⁰⁴ Étienne et al. 1976, 237-8.

Tuscan column bases can be attributed to the Augustan period temple. However, basing their reconstruction on these finds and on Vitruvius' description of the basilica at Fano, the excavators have provided drawings of what the temple may have looked like.⁵⁰⁵ Leaving aside the cryptoporticus, which is easily explained by the difficult terrain, the reconstruction compares to imperial forum temples at a number of sites from the Augustan period (Sabratha, Roselle, Lucus Feroniae, Ortona, Sepino, Iuvanum).⁵⁰⁶

Other public works projects at Conimbriga dating to the Augustan period include a public bath complex, an aqueduct system and an extensive city wall. The city amphitheater has not been excavated, as for the most part it lies outside the 3rd/4th century defensive wall, under the modern village of Condeixa-a-Velha (figs. 69 and 70).⁵⁰⁷ Given the relatively understated architectural campaign of Augustan Conimbriga, it seems unlikely that any further monumental or civic architecture will be found on the still unexcavated regions of the hill occupied by Conimbriga. The nearby city of Aeminium may well have received more of Rome's attention in these early days, as this site is far better suited both for sea trade and for defensive purposes.

In the later first century, Conimbriga experienced a major renovation, particularly in the urban core of the city. At this time, or slightly before, the city was raised to the status of a municipium, and given the name Flavia Conimbriga.⁵⁰⁸ The Augustan forum was completely dismantled to make way for a much larger public center. The podium of the new temple was significantly larger than that of its Augustan predecessor, measuring ca. 19 x 12 m. A significant theme in the Flavian renovations, as well as those projects undertaken during Trajan's rule, is the desire to preserve the Augustan ideals of the city's monuments. Thus, while earlier structures

⁵⁰⁵ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 33 and n. 22; Vitr. *De arch.* 5.1.6-8.

⁵⁰⁶ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 34.

⁵⁰⁷ Correia 1994, figs. 3 and 4.

⁵⁰⁸ Alarcão 1990a, 26.

were often removed in their entirety, later projects still respected the orientation and the location of Augustan Conimbriga's monuments.

As I mentioned above, the Flavian temple was larger than the Augustan, and this is also the case with the Flavian forum. However, the Flavian forum is roughly the same size as the Augustan, measuring ca. 23.6 x 36.8 m. Portions of the forum were still paved when first uncovered, but the forum complex seems to have been heavily damaged by the Suevian invasions of the fourth century.⁵⁰⁹

Both the upper and lower levels of the forum complex were surrounded by a portico, the upper portico having been built, along with the temple, on a large cryptoporticus (fig. 71).⁵¹⁰ The forum was set off from the portico that surrounded it on three sides by three steps. Inside the forum, the excavators discovered 23 altar bases, many of which are inscribed and give some reference to the cultic function of the forum area.⁵¹¹

As for the portico itself, it followed the outer walls of the original forum complex on the south and west (fig. 72).⁵¹² On the east side, however, the new precinct wall was built through the center of the Augustan basilica, and the pillars of the portico were placed on roughly the same axis as the western supports of the basilica had used. The portico measured 5.7 m deep on the east and west, and 4.8 m on the south.

The upper portico, which surrounded the temple platform on three sides, measured some 7 meters deep, and was built over a cryptoporticus, as mentioned above. The means of communication between this upper portico and the unpaved area surrounding the temple is uncertain. Matching staircases have been found linking the lower portico to the temple platform,

⁵⁰⁹ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 100.

⁵¹⁰ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. v.

⁵¹¹ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 100-1.

⁵¹² Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. vi.

and presumably from the slightly higher level served by these stairs (possibly built on the Augustan portico discussed above) one could reach the temple.

A single large staircase, whose weight was supported by huge pillars extending into the Augustan cryptoporticus below, led to the temple itself. Since nothing but the podium of the temple was found in place, the exact decorative scheme of the temple is difficult to interpret. However, we do know that it consisted of two separate chambers, or possibly a pronaos and cella. The lower courses of the podium seem to be in part borrowed from the Augustan structure that stood on this spot, though the Flavian building is significantly larger than its predecessor.

While we do not understand the exact decorative scheme, the archaeologists believe that they have discovered enough architectural elements to have an idea of the overall picture offered by the Flavian forum (fig. 73).⁵¹³ It seems that the temple stood some 4.5 m above its surroundings (including podium and stylobate), with four frontal columns, as attested as well at Carthago Nova.⁵¹⁴ It seems that Corinthian columns, measuring some 7 m high and 0.8 m in diameter were used. A single architrave block has also been found, though virtually nothing else remains of the entablature. An estimate of the temple's height places it at 13.3 m, or nearly 18 m from the lower level of the portico.

The pronaos has two further columns, one on each side, and this theme seems to continue onto the cella, with five engaged columns along either side. Thus, we have a pseudoperipteral temple, tetrastyle in antis, decorated with Corinthian columns. "Trajan's Baths" comprise another complex, possibly begun by the Flavians, built over a pre-existing Augustan period structure. The early second century version is much larger and more elaborate, but as in the case

⁵¹³ Alarcão and Étienne 1977, 92, 96-7 and pls. xii, viii, xiv and xviii.

⁵¹⁴ Étienne 1958, 221-2.

of the Flavian forum, is built on axis with the Augustan plan and seems to fall in line with the early first century city plan.

23. Capera⁵¹⁵ (Cáparra/Guijo de Granadilla)⁵¹⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6⁵¹⁷; *AntIt* 433; *Rav.* 319

Mélida first discussed the site's most original feature, a quadrifrons arch, in 1925, but earlier authors had already recognized the Roman site and its interesting monument (fig. 74).⁵¹⁸ Remains of the arch standing today preserve the overall design of the monument, which measured 8.59 x 7.35 m at its base, and stands today at around 9 m in height.⁵¹⁹ The entire monument was built of squared granite blocks, but may also have been decorated with marble sculptures, two of which were found in close proximity. The arch stood on the main road through the site during Roman times (the N-S axis), but it was not until the mid-20th century that archaeologists realized the full importance of the monument's position, at the entrance to the city's forum.⁵²⁰

The first excavations at Cáparra took place in 1929 and 1930, but their results were not published until 1944.⁵²¹ It was discovered, as a result of these excavations, that the Roman city of Caparra covered between 14 and 16 hectares, and the city was laid out in an orthogonal grid pattern.⁵²² The entire site was surrounded by walls in a roughly pentagonal circuit during the

⁵¹⁵ *CIL* II, 806, 810, 812-3 and 815-7.

⁵¹⁶ *CIL* 804-56.

⁵¹⁷ Perhaps also "Capasa" as at Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7.

⁵¹⁸ See Blázquez 1965, 7-9; Martín de Cáceres 2000, pl. 1.

⁵¹⁹ Mélida 1925, 129.

⁵²⁰ Nünnerich-Asmus 1996, 23.

⁵²¹ Blázquez 1965, 9; Floriano 1944.

⁵²² Blázquez 1965, 11.

third or fourth century A.D.,⁵²³ indicating that the site retained its early importance down through the late empire (figs. 75 and 76).⁵²⁴ There are no remains of earlier walls around the site, which suggests that if there was a defensive perimeter set up in the early imperial period, it must have followed the same circuit as the later walls that are still standing.

Floriano excavated the temple dedicated to Jupiter Optimus Maximus and found inside that structure a statue base bearing a dedicatory inscription to Jupiter (fig. 77).⁵²⁵ Because of the location of the temple, slightly out of line with the quadrifrons arch, Floriano and Blázquez both believed that this temple was part of a complex dedicated to the Capitoline triad (fig. 78).⁵²⁶ However, neither Floriano's excavations nor those undertaken in the 1960s revealed a plan or any solid evidence confirming the existence of the other two temples. The Jupiter temple, as interpreted by Blázquez, seems to date to the early second century A.D., a date that seems to agree with the evidence taken from the foundations of the monumental arch set up at the entrance to the forum of Cáparra.⁵²⁷

The forum or monumental plaza of the Capitoline complex of Cáparra had a monumental entrance on its southeastern side. This entrance had three gates, and the middle gate lines up perfectly with the quadrifrons arch, which was probably set up sometime after this entrance was finished.⁵²⁸ All of the major structures excavated thus far in the center of the site line up on the same axis,⁵²⁹ indicating a clear interest in urban planning at least by the Flavian period at this

⁵²³ Floriano 1944, fig. 1.

⁵²⁴ Fernández Corrales 1988, 33; Martín de Cáceres 2000, fig. 2.

⁵²⁵ Floriano 1944, 288 and fig. 19.

⁵²⁶ Blázquez 1965, 14; Floriano 1944, fig. 2.

⁵²⁷ Blázquez 1965, 14-6, 54-5.

⁵²⁸ Blázquez 1965, 26, 30.

⁵²⁹ See Blázquez 1965, figs. 7 and 8.

site. This focus of monumental activity may have been a result of the renovation of the Via Lata linking Augusta Emerita with Asturica Augusta.⁵³⁰

Because of the inscriptions found at the site, there is a high degree of certainty regarding the elevation to municipal status in the first century A.D., most likely as a result of the Flavians' reforms.⁵³¹ Since the major architectural monuments at the site seem to date to roughly the same period as the establishment of a municipality at Cáparra, the building campaign may have been a reaction to the newly acquired status of the city. In any case, Capera was an important station on the road between the two administrative centers at Augusta Emerita and Asturica Augusta by the end of the first century or the beginning of the second.

24. Aeminium⁵³² (Coimbra) Pliny *Nat.* 4.113 and 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; *AntIt* 421

The identification of Aeminium with the modern city of Coimbra was not conclusively established until the year 1888. At that time, an inscription dating to the early years of Constantine's rule was uncovered in Coimbra, bearing the words *[CIV]ITAS AEMINIENS[IS]*.⁵³³ Apparently, the name of Conimbriga, a Roman city about 15km south of Coimbra, had been transferred to Aeminium in the form of "Colimbria" in the sixth century A.D., when the Christian bishopric moved from Conimbriga to Aeminium.⁵³⁴ The importance of the site is readily apparent both in terms of the Roman road between Olisipo and Bracara Augusta, which

⁵³⁰ Blázquez 1965, 30-1.

⁵³¹ *CIL* II, 810 and 813; Blázquez 1965, 6; *TIR K-29*, "Capera."

⁵³² *CIL* II, 395, 500, 695, 815, 5239, 2559=5639.

⁵³³ *CIL* II, 5239.

⁵³⁴ Alarcão 1984, 118.

crossed the *Munda* at this point,⁵³⁵ and in terms of maritime connections with the inland areas of Lusitania.

Roman remains from the city are scarce, though reports from the 15th and 16th centuries include references to a number of monuments purportedly of Roman origin (fig. 79).⁵³⁶ Aside from numerous inscriptions, the best evidence for Roman activity in Coimbra is the cryptoporticus.⁵³⁷ This massive structure now supports the Museu Machado de Castro, and was formerly occupied by the Episcopal palace of Coimbra.⁵³⁸ Excavations within the cryptoporticus have uncovered several marble busts and eventually the overall plan of this structure (fig. 80).⁵³⁹

The busts are relevant to the Roman city because all four of them seem to relate directly to the imperial family of the first and second centuries: they have been identified as Livia, Agrippina I (“Maior”), Vespasian, and Trajan.⁵⁴⁰ The cryptoporticus was built to level the hillside and provide space for a monumental Roman structure, most likely the forum of Aeminium.⁵⁴¹ Because the fill excavated from the cryptoporticus most likely represents the 16th century process of consolidating the hillside to prepare for the construction of the Episcopal palace,⁵⁴² the archaeologists involved in this project believe that the portrait busts may have come from the Roman complex that formerly occupied the platform.⁵⁴³

⁵³⁵ Mantas 1992, 493-4.

⁵³⁶ Mantas 1992, 498-504 and fig. 3.

⁵³⁷ Lucas 1989, 172.

⁵³⁸ Alarcão 1984, 119.

⁵³⁹ Carvalho 1998, plts. 7 and 8.

⁵⁴⁰ Mantas 1992, 505; Carvalho 1998, 180-1.

⁵⁴¹ Carvalho 1998.

⁵⁴² Alarcão 1984, 119.

⁵⁴³ Carvalho 1998, 180; Mantas 1992, 505-6; Alarcão 1984, 119.

Pedro Carvalho has proposed an early- to mid-first century A.D. chronology for the hilltop forum complex that would have dominated the skyline of Roman Aeminium (fig. 81).⁵⁴⁴ However, the fact that the city already figured into the Roman administrative scheme in Augustus' time indicates that the city may have already had public buildings by the middle of the first century A.D.⁵⁴⁵ The attribution of municipal status to the city of Aeminium has yet to be conclusively dated.⁵⁴⁶ Little evidence exists to support claims of Augustan, Julio-Claudian or even Flavian chronologies, although the latest of these may be most likely given the elevated number of cities granted municipal status in that period, particularly during the reign of Vespasian.⁵⁴⁷ This chronological hypothesis fits well with the fact that the only epigraphic information available mentions the Quirina tribe, into which the Flavian emperors inscribed new citizens in Lusitania,⁵⁴⁸ though it should not be considered a conclusive solution.

25. Bobadela⁵⁴⁹ (Roman name unknown: possibly Elbocoris?)

The identification of Bobadela with the Roman city of the Elbocoris came about by a process of elimination—since no evidence for the city mentioned by Pliny has yet been uncovered, and since Bobadela was an important Roman city, there is a strong possibility that the two are the same. Mantas has argued quite recently that Bobadela should be identified as the capital of the Interamnienses, being virtually surrounded by the rivers Mondego and Alva.⁵⁵⁰ The fact that the temple of the city may have been dedicated to Neptune further supports the

⁵⁴⁴ Carvalho 1998, 181 and fig. 16.

⁵⁴⁵ Carvalho 1998, 182; Mantas 1992, 491.

⁵⁴⁶ Cf. Carvalho 1998, 182; Faria 1999, 30.

⁵⁴⁷ Faria 1999, 39.

⁵⁴⁸ *CIL* II, 395; Alarcão 1990a, 27; *contra* Carvalho 1998, 182.

⁵⁴⁹ *CIL* 396-402 and 5245.

⁵⁵⁰ Mantas 2002, 233 and n. 2.

relationship between Bobadela and the local rivers.⁵⁵¹ Unfortunately, Pliny's list of stipendiary cities gives no indication of the position of the cities, and as a result, many of the cities could be almost anywhere within the province of Lusitania. Even the Alcántara inscription does not help in this situation, because the cities seem to be listed generally from east to west, and both Viseu and Bobadela are located at roughly the same longitude.

An inscription found at Bobadela in the 18th century confirmed suspicions that there was once an important Roman city at the site.⁵⁵² References to Roman remains are documented from the middle of the 19th century, and some of the finds mentioned include two aqueducts, columns and capitals, a colossal marble head, numerous inscriptions and two arches.⁵⁵³ All that exists today of any of these finds are the marble head of an emperor (?), some inscriptions and the arch of what may have been the forum, standing in the square in front of the Igreja Matriz.⁵⁵⁴ However, in the 1980s a series of excavations brought to light some of the precinct walls of the forum of Bobadela and an amphitheater. These two architectural finds offered further confirmation of the city's importance in the Roman period, and in conjunction with the (now lost) inscription mentioned above, point to a high level of Roman involvement at the site in the first century A.D.⁵⁵⁵

The amphitheater and the area identified as the forum were lined up on the same axis, indicating that they were perhaps built at the same time, although the chronology of the forum remains unclear (figs. 82 and 83).⁵⁵⁶ The documentation of inscriptions bearing dedications to

⁵⁵¹ *CIL* II, 398; Mantas 2002, n. 2.

⁵⁵² *CIL* II, 397.

⁵⁵³ Frade and Portas 1994, 349.

⁵⁵⁴ Frade and Portas 1994, 350; Maia do Amaral 1982, 103-4.

⁵⁵⁵ Frade and Portas 1994, 355.

⁵⁵⁶ Frade and Portas 1994, figs. 1 and 2.

*VIC[TORIAE] AET[ERNAE]*⁵⁵⁷ and the *GENIO MVNICIPĬ*⁵⁵⁸ suggests that in addition to these two important monuments the city also enjoyed municipal status.⁵⁵⁹

26. Talabriga (Cabeço do Vouga/Marnel) Pliny *Nat.* 4.113; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; *AntIt* 421; App. *Hisp.* 73; (*Rav* 307 “Terebrica” ?)

The earliest reference to this site comes from Appian’s *Iberian Wars*, in which Sextus (Decimus) Iunius Brutus restores Roman control over Talabriga during the wars with the Lusitanians under Viriathus.⁵⁶⁰ These events took place in the early 130s B.C., and it is not until the appearance of Pliny’s histories that Talabriga reappears in the ancient sources.⁵⁶¹ There are no inscriptional references to Talabriga, but Pliny’s description of the geography of the northwestern coast of Lusitania places the city securely at the mouth of the Vouga, in the area of modern Aveiro.

Based on Pliny’s account, it seems likely that the Turduli Veteres were located on the Atlantic coast of Lusitania, immediately south of the Douro. Their capital was probably at Lancobriga/Longobriga, which may have been at Fiães or Monte de Santa Maria.⁵⁶² A terminus augustalis found at Ul, some 18 km south of Fiães, marks the boundary between the Turduli Veteres and their southern neighbors, whose capital was at Talabriga (fig. 8).⁵⁶³ According to

⁵⁵⁷ *CIL* II, 5245; Amaral 1982, 104-6 and fig. 2.

⁵⁵⁸ *CIL* II, 401; Alarcão 1990a, 27.

⁵⁵⁹ A third inscription may be added to these, referring to *VICTORIAE TEMPLVM* (*CIL* II, 402), and like *CIL* II, 401 offering the information *C CANTINVS MODESTINVS EXPATRIMONIO SVO*—these imply that the city had at least one temple, that of Victory.

⁵⁶⁰ App. *Hisp.* 73.

⁵⁶¹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113.

⁵⁶² Lopes 2000, 246; Alarcão 1990a, 27.

⁵⁶³ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2.

Pliny, the area between the Vouga and the land of the Turduli Veteres was occupied by the Paesuri, whose name also appears as “Paesures” on *CIL* II, 760.

I believe that the Paesuri must therefore have had their capital at Talabriga, near modern Marnel, on the Vouga (fig. 84).⁵⁶⁴ This conclusion, although based on the clear indications of Pliny’s account, nevertheless is not shared by most of the individuals involved in this study. The most common identification of the territory of the Paesuri is in the area of Cárquere, to the east of the Turduli Veteres, in agreement with Alarcão’s identification.⁵⁶⁵ This location is offered based on the assumption that in order to be involved in the construction of the Alcántara bridge, the municipium of the Paesuri must have benefited directly from that project. The Paesuri must therefore have lived along the route from the Alcántara bridge through Lusitania, to Cale.⁵⁶⁶ For now the location of the Paesuri remains open to debate. I am, however, far more comfortable taking Pliny’s account at face value and trying to fit the archaeological evidence into that framework, rather than attempting to use the uninformative Alcántara inscription to revise Pliny’s geographical description.

Excavations at Marnel in the 1940s and again in the 1990s uncovered habitation layers dating as far back as the Bronze Age.⁵⁶⁷ The Roman occupation brought significant changes, both in the small finds and in the architectural forms used. A large rectangular structure from the Roman period is the most dominant feature of the site, but its function remains something of a mystery (fig. 85).⁵⁶⁸ It seems most likely that this building’s primary purpose was

⁵⁶⁴ Lopes 2000, 246 and fig. 12.

⁵⁶⁵ Alarcão 1990a, 30; 1988a, 24-5; Tranoy 1990, 18.

⁵⁶⁶ Tranoy 1990, 18.

⁵⁶⁷ Silva 2001.

⁵⁶⁸ Silva 2001, 6.

defensive/military.⁵⁶⁹ The chronology of the Roman remains of Marnel poses a real difficulty, as excavations have not uncovered anything that suggests a particular Roman period.

27. *Civitas Aravorum*⁵⁷⁰ (Marialva)⁵⁷¹

The earliest inscription identifying Marialva as the *Civitas Aravorum* dates to Hadrian's rule.⁵⁷² However, the first epigraphic reference to the *Civitas Aravorum* comes from the Alcántara inscription.⁵⁷³ This inscription reveals that the *Civitas Aravorum* had municipal status by the early second century A.D., but we have no earlier evidence to tell us about the city's status in the first century.

The recent discovery of a Roman period temple in Marialva has confirmed what we already knew from the epigraphic evidence, that this was the site of an important Roman *oppidum*.⁵⁷⁴ Although no detailed information concerning the temple and its excavation has yet been published, the eventual publication of these materials will contribute significantly to our knowledge of the *Civitas Aravorum*. If the city was already an important Roman center by the first century, overlooked by Pliny because of its relative insignificance, the temple and its surroundings should provide material confirmation of that fact.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁶⁹ Silva 2001, 9.

⁵⁷⁰ *CIL* II, 429, 502, 760, 1017 and 3183.

⁵⁷¹ *CIL* II, 428-434.

⁵⁷² *CIL* II, 429.

⁵⁷³ *CIL* II, 760, which was set up by Trajan on the monumental bridge over the Tagus.

⁵⁷⁴ Caldas 2003, 3.

⁵⁷⁵ See *Pliny Nat.* 4.118: "quos nominare non pigeat..."

28. *Civitas Cobelcorum*⁵⁷⁶ (Torre de Almofala)

Although there are no historical references to an important Roman city at this site, recent excavations at the Torre de Almofala have proven conclusively that this was the site of the main urban center of the *Civitas Cobelcorum*.⁵⁷⁷ Excavations initially focused on the tower (torre) itself, which preserves a large portion of a Roman temple, including the podium and the corner masonry of the superstructure. The temple podium measures 8.15 x 16.30 m, and the temple itself would therefore have stood at about 12.20 m.⁵⁷⁸ Large cut stones make up the exterior of the podium, while the interior was filled with cemented stone fill. The walls of the structure seem to have been preserved, in large part because the tower was reused at various times throughout its history.

The first seasons of excavations at the site revealed little beyond the fact that the temple was most likely built in the first century A.D. However, later seasons have provided important evidence concerning the nature and chronology of the site. The area surrounding the temple was occupied by a large courtyard, which was bounded on the east (the side facing the temple's main entrance) by a portico. Soundings on the southern side of this courtyard revealed other structures on the same axis as both the temple and the eastern buildings, suggesting that the whole complex may have been a single forum complex, built no later than the middle of the first century B.C.⁵⁷⁹

An altar dedicated to Jupiter Optumus Maxumus by the *Civitas Cobelcorum* is the only conclusive proof of the identification of this site in Roman times. No pre-Roman evidence has yet been found at the site, so the fact that the altar seems to date to the very early first century A.D. suggests that this city was a new foundation, in line with the Augustan reorganization in the

⁵⁷⁶ *CIL* II, 433; *FE* 11, #46.

⁵⁷⁷ Frade and Caetano 2002, 229.

⁵⁷⁸ Frade and Caetano 2002, 227.

⁵⁷⁹ Frade and Caetano 2002, 229.

last decades of the first century B.C.⁵⁸⁰ Since the excavations at Almofala have focused exclusively on the tower and its surrounding areas, nothing else is known about the *Civitas* Cobelcorum.

⁵⁸⁰ Frade and Caetano 2002, 227, 229.

TOWNS WHOSE LOCATION OR ROMAN PROVINCE IS UNCERTAIN

Many of these towns are mentioned in the historical sources, but archaeological information has yet to provide confirmation of their location. In other cases, the location of the Roman center is known, but it is uncertain whether the town was located in the province of Lusitania. The entries are arranged alphabetically in this section.

29. Arabriga⁵⁸¹ (Axabricsenses—Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; **Ierabriga**—*AntIt* 421; **Terebrica**—*Rav* 307; **Peribrigam**—*Rav* 306: Near **Lamego**⁵⁸²) Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

The *civitas* of the Arabrigenses must have been located in the area just south of the Douro in central Portugal, east of the modern town of Lamego.⁵⁸³ This identification is based on the presence of a terminus augustalis at the village of Armamar, dividing the territories of the Arabrigenses (to the east) and the Coilarni (fig. 8).⁵⁸⁴ There is a possibility that the capital of this territory was at Ranhados or even Meda, which are generally considered candidates for the capital of the Medubricsenses.⁵⁸⁵ It is more likely, however, that the capital of the Arabrigenses was located somewhere in the area northwest of Ranhados, where concentrated Roman ruins have been found to date.

⁵⁸¹ *CIL* II, 760 and 967; Mélida 1924a, 110 no. 301.

⁵⁸² *CIL* II, 5248-57.

⁵⁸³ Alarcão 1988a, 22.

⁵⁸⁴ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2; Alarcão 1990a, 30.

⁵⁸⁵ Hübner 1869, 802; cf. Alarcão 1990a, 30; Tranoy 1990, 17.

30. Aranditani/Arandis (Garvão⁵⁸⁶ or Ourique⁵⁸⁷?) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5; *AntIt* 426; *Rav* 306.13

There is no indication of this city's location beyond the historical references. Alarcão has suggested that it was in the region of Ourique or Garvão,⁵⁸⁸ but because of the lack of archaeological information we must conclude, as he did, that the location of Arandis is unknown.⁵⁸⁹

31. Aritium Vetus⁵⁹⁰ (Alvega)⁵⁹¹ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6; *AntIt* 418 and *Rav.* 316 give "Aritio Praetorio"

This town seems to lie very near the Roman city of Aritium Vetus, attested by the bronze plaque *IRCP* 647 = *CIL* II, 172. The information contained on this text indicates that there was an *oppidum* on the site by the year 37 A.D., at which time the citizens of the town swore an oath of loyalty to Gaius Caesar Germanicus (Caligula).⁵⁹² Although the text does not make clear the juridical status of the city (it is referred to as "ARITIENSE OPPIDO VETERI"), the inscription does indicate that Aritium had some sort of official city organization. Furthermore, the town was sufficiently enmeshed in the Roman world that it could swear allegiance to the new emperor within a short time of his rise to power.⁵⁹³

⁵⁸⁶ *IRCP* 122, 132 and 141.

⁵⁸⁷ *IRCP* 124.

⁵⁸⁸ Alarcão 1988a, 29; 1990, 23.

⁵⁸⁹ Alarcão 1988a, 29.

⁵⁹⁰ *CIL* II, 172

⁵⁹¹ *IRCP* pp. 695-706; *IRCP* 637-47.

⁵⁹² Alarcão 1990a, 24.

⁵⁹³ About two months after, if we can believe the date on the inscription—"IDVS MAI...CN ACERRONIO PROCVLO C PETRONIO PONTIO NIGRINO COS...".

Aside from the epigraphic remains found in the areas surrounding Alvega, the archaeological record has nothing to offer, aside from the few chance finds mentioned by Alarcão.⁵⁹⁴ These remains include the supports for a bridge that crossed the Tagus nearby, a possible dam to supply water to the town, plumbing pipes and mosaics. No excavation has yet been undertaken in Alvega or the Casal da Várzea, both of which have offered small finds in recent years.

TIR J-29 lists three different cities called “Aritium,” making the identification of Ptolemy’s Aritium difficult. However, the references in all three historical sources could conceivably be reconciled to the site of Alvega, given the unreliability of distances transmitted in the Antonine Itinerary.

32. Axabricsenses? Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; perhaps also **Arcobriga**— Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5

Location unknown.

33. Banienses⁵⁹⁵

Although none of the ancient authors mentions the *Civitas Baniensis*, their presence on the Alcántara inscription proves that their city was a *municipium* by the early second century A.D. Their exact location is something of a mystery, despite the discovery of a reference to *Iovi Optimo Maximo civitati Baniensium* just north of the Douro, on the eastern side of Portugal.⁵⁹⁶ It is at least possible that the *Civitas Baniensis* was located to the north of the Douro, even though

⁵⁹⁴ Alarcão 1988d, 146-7.

⁵⁹⁵ *CIL* II, 760 and 2399.

⁵⁹⁶ *CIL* II, 2399; Alarcão 1990a, 30.

Pliny gives that river as the northern boundary of the province of Lusitania.⁵⁹⁷ There is also the possibility that the *Civitas Baniensis* was actually located within the boundaries of Gallaecia, but for the sake of simplicity was grouped with the other Lusitanian *municipia* on *CIL* II, 760. The final option available to us is that the Banienses lived within the traditional boundaries of Lusitania, south of the Douro, but had close ties to a religious center outside their territory.⁵⁹⁸ Virtually no archaeological evidence exists in the area that Alarcão has proposed as the *civitas Baniensis*, making conclusions about the nature of Roman occupation of the area tenuous at best.⁵⁹⁹

34. **Cibilitani** (*see Silves*) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Location unknown.

35. ***Civitas Aruccitana***⁶⁰⁰ (**Aroche**)⁶⁰¹ Pliny *Nat.* 3.14 and 4.117; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.4.11; *AntIt* 427; *Rav.* 317

There is some debate as to whether this city was within the limits of Lusitania or Baetica, despite the fact that both Pliny and Ptolemy place it securely within the province of Baetica. Part of the problem for modern scholars lies in the treatment of Arucci in the itineraries, and in the city's relationship to Serpa, which is commonly placed within the boundaries of Lusitania.⁶⁰² Although Pliny separates Lusitania from Baetica at the Anas, there does not seem to be any reason that this border applies only to the southernmost reaches of that river, and that Lusitania

⁵⁹⁷ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113.

⁵⁹⁸ Cf. Tranoy 1990, 18-9.

⁵⁹⁹ Alarcão 1990a, 30 and 31, fig. 1.

⁶⁰⁰ *CIL* II, 963.

⁶⁰¹ *CIL* II, 964-67.

⁶⁰² Sillières 1990, 83-4; Alarcão et al. 1990, 324-5.

actually extended across the river, roughly following the modern boundary between Spain and Portugal.⁶⁰³ The fact that the only inscription naming this city was found near Moura, well to the west of this proposed boundary, further complicates the situation.⁶⁰⁴

The traditional identification of Arucci the Spanish town of Aroche, whose name seems to preserve the Roman title. However, a number of inscriptions found at and around Aroche record individuals as “Turobrigenses,” which has led to the proposition of a city entitled “Arucci Turobriga” at Aroche.⁶⁰⁵ Aroche and its surroundings preserve strong evidence of Roman occupation, and the city itself holds remains of the Roman amphitheater and numerous architectural elements.⁶⁰⁶

A straightforward reading of the *Antonine Itinerary* (426-7) leaves us nowhere, as the circuit described contains numerous measurements that simply do not agree with what we know about sites in southwestern Lusitania. The *Ravenna Cosmography* lists the three crucial towns, Arucci (Aruci), Fines and Serpa (Seria) in a sequence that indicates that Arucci would have lain farthest east, with Fines (possibly) representing the border between civitates, conventus or provinces. However, this route is supposed to be within the range of the “civitatem Hispalis,” modern Sevilla, well east of the boundary between Lusitania and Baetica.

At present, there seems to be little reason to doubt the ancient authors’ assignment of Arucci (modern Aroche) to Baetica. Whether Fines represents a border town or the border itself must remain a mystery, but it seems a straightforward indication that Serpa lay across a border, perhaps The Border, from Arucci, and consequently within Lusitania.

⁶⁰³ Sillières 1990, 83.

⁶⁰⁴ *CIL* II, 963.

⁶⁰⁵ *TIR J-29*, “Aroche.”

⁶⁰⁶ *TIR J-29*, “Aroche.”

36. Colarnum⁶⁰⁷ (Cárquere?) Pliny *Nat.* 3.28, 4.116, and 118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

The Roman city of Colarnum has yet to be identified. Alarcão places it somewhere in the neighborhood of Colos, Cola and Torre Vã, in southern Portugal.⁶⁰⁸ There is, however, a terminus augustalis marking the boundary between the Arabrigenses and the Coilarni, near the northern city of Lamego (fig. 8).⁶⁰⁹ Whether the Coilarni of this inscription and the Colarni mentioned by Pliny are the same people may be difficult to determine, but the existence of alternate names for the peoples of Lusitania is attested elsewhere, as in the case of the Medubricenses,⁶¹⁰ the Mirobricenses,⁶¹¹ and the Taporí.⁶¹² The fact that Ptolemy lists the city of Colarnum among the cities of the Lusitani rather than the Celtici may be another argument in support of the northern location of that city.⁶¹³ A single inscription referring to the Colarni has been discovered near Sabugal, naming an individual from the town of Balatucelum.⁶¹⁴ As this inscription is from the area of the Lancienses, it does not give us a better idea of where the Colarni were located. Pliny also mentions a group called the “Coelerni” in the Conventus of Bracara Augusta,⁶¹⁵ north of the Durius, although we are again left with conflicting names for what may be the same group of people.⁶¹⁶

⁶⁰⁷ *CIL* II, 760 gives “Colarni;” *FE* 7, #29b “Cularni”; *CIL* II, 2477, *IRL* 29 and *AE* 1972, 382 all give “Colerni.”

⁶⁰⁸ Alarcão 1988a, 29.

⁶⁰⁹ Alarcão 1988a, 19; Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2.

⁶¹⁰ *CIL* II, 760 gives “Meidubrigenses.”

⁶¹¹ *IRCP* 150 reads “Mirobrigensis.”

⁶¹² *CIL* II, 760 may refer to them as the “Talores”; cf. Alarcão 1988a, 19.

⁶¹³ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6.

⁶¹⁴ *FE* 7, #29b.

⁶¹⁵ Pliny *Nat.* 3.28.

⁶¹⁶ Ptolemy (*Geog.* 2.5.2) also mentions the group, *Κοιλερινων* and *Κοελιοβριγα*.

37. **Concordia**⁶¹⁷ (*Coruche?*) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

This city remains unknown today, though Alarcão has suggested the site of Alter do Chão.⁶¹⁸ His hypothesis that the site was once known as Concordia Iulia Abelterium admittedly has no epigraphic support, and thus cannot be considered a reasonable explanation for the discrepancy between the attested names of Abelterium⁶¹⁹ (at Alter do Chão) and Concordia (in Pliny and Ptolemy).⁶²⁰ There is also the possibility that the city was located at modern Castelo Branco, although we are again without any epigraphic support for this identification.⁶²¹ A final possibility, based on the absence of another urban center to which the territory could have been attached, is the Sorraia river valley.⁶²² This area has abundant Roman remains, but archaeologists have yet to identify an urban conglomeration at towns in the area (e.g. Mora or Coruche).⁶²³

38. **Elbocoris** (*see Bobadela*) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.6

Location unknown.

39. **Interamnienses**⁶²⁴ (*see Viseu and Bobadela*) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Location unknown.

⁶¹⁷ *IRCP* 415 and 429.

⁶¹⁸ Alarcão 1988a, 29.

⁶¹⁹ *IRCP* 578 and 595a.

⁶²⁰ See Faria 1989, 64-5.

⁶²¹ Alarcão 1990a, 24-5.

⁶²² Alarcão 1990a, 24.

⁶²³ Alarcão 1988a, 29.

⁶²⁴ *CIL* II, 509-11, 760 and 826.

40. **Lacimurga**⁶²⁵ Pliny 3.14; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7

Pliny places this city within the province of Baetica, describing it as “Lacimurgae Constantia Iulia,” but it is listed in Ptolemy’s Lusitanian cities. This discrepancy has often been explained by the reasoning that the city was initially assigned to the province of Baetica, and then during the Flavian re-organization was assigned to the province of Lusitania.⁶²⁶ The discovery of an inscription dedicated to the Genius Lacimurgae about 12 km north of the Guadiana has long been considered conclusive evidence for the location of the Roman city, although no urban remains are known from that area.⁶²⁷ It is possible that the city of Lacimurga received its municipal status under Octavian, possibly at the same time that the colony of Metellinum was given its municipal status.⁶²⁸

The chronology proposed for the organization of the city of Lacimurga is based on an inscription that preserves the centuriation of that city’s territory.⁶²⁹ Because of the proximity of the two colonies at Augusta Emerita and Metellinum in Lusitani and Ucubi in Baetica, a connection between the centuriation of Lacimurga and the establishment of these colonies has also been proposed.⁶³⁰ However, evidence concerning the city of Lacimurga and its territory, as well as its relationship to the provincial organization of central Hispania, remains spotty, and conclusions drawn from what we know at present should not be considered definitive.

⁶²⁵ *CIL* II, 5068=5550

⁶²⁶ Alarcão et al. 1990, 327, 323, n. 20.

⁶²⁷ Sáez Fernández and Pérez Paz 1993, 647.

⁶²⁸ Sáez Fernández and Pérez Paz 1993, 647, 651-2.

⁶²⁹ Sáez Fernández and Pérez Paz 1993, 644.

⁶³⁰ Sáez Fernández and Pérez Paz 1993, 648, 653. If the area surrounding Lacimurga was in fact centuriated, this would suggest that the settlement and its territory fell entirely within the ambit of a nearby Roman colony.

41. Lancienses Oppidani⁶³¹/Lancienses⁶³² Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7

Location unknown (see **Lancienses Transcudani**).

42. Lancienses Transcudani⁶³³/Lancienses Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7

Neither the capital of the Lancienses Oppidani nor that of the Lancienses Transcudani has yet been discovered. Pliny's reference makes it clear that at least one of these groups already had a stipendiary city by his time, and the presence of both on the Alcántara inscription proves that they had both received municipal status by the early second century. The presence of an Augustan terminus mentioning the Lancienses just northwest of Idanha-a-Velha points to their general location, but beyond this one marker the epigraphic evidence does little to improve our knowledge of the capitals of the Lancienses (fig. 8).⁶³⁴ The archaeological record in the region north and east of Idanha-a-Velha leaves much to be desired—there are Roman remains throughout the area, but none of the sites has been excavated in Spain or Portugal. Possibilities for the capital Lancienses Transcudani include Guarda and Sabugal,⁶³⁵ and for that of the Lancienses Oppidani the options spread as far north as Ciudad Rodrigo, whose Roman identification as Mirobriga we have put into question above.

⁶³¹ *CIL* II, 460 and 760; *ILER* 5355, 5356 and 5512.

⁶³² *FE* 28, #126. "Galeria?"

⁶³³ *CIL* II, 760 and 5260.

⁶³⁴ Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2.

⁶³⁵ Alarcão 1988a, 20-2.

43. Lancobriga⁶³⁶ (Fiães or Monte de Santa Maria)—Capital of the **Turduli Veteres**⁶³⁷;

Pliny *Nat.* 4.113; *AntIt* 421⁶³⁸; *Rav.* 307

Pliny clearly locates this group at the mouth of the Douro, presumably just south of the Portus Cale (see fig. 84).⁶³⁹ Since Pomponius Mela and Strabo also observe that the Turduli occupied the coastal region between the Douro and Vouga, there has never been any reason to locate the Turduli Veteres elsewhere.⁶⁴⁰ The discovery of two *tesserae hospitales* at the Castro da Senhora da Saúde in 1983 provided archaeological confirmation of the Turduli Veteres' location on the southern side of the Douro, near the Atlantic coast (figs. 86 and 87).⁶⁴¹ Moreover, the identification of an individual from this *civitas* as a member of the Galeria tribe, along with the inscriptions' dates of 7 and 9 A.D., may indicate that citizens of this territory had already been given Latin rights in Augustus' time.⁶⁴² Their capital, which seems to have been called Lancobriga (or Langobriga)⁶⁴³ has yet to be conclusively located, although the important finds at Monte de Santa Maria are strong evidence of an important Roman center at this location.⁶⁴⁴

⁶³⁶ *CIL* II, 5564 ?

⁶³⁷ *CIL* II, 523 mentions a "Turdula" living in Augusta Emerita.

⁶³⁸ The *Antonine Itinerary* presumably refers to Lancobriga as "Langobriga."

⁶³⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.113.

⁶⁴⁰ Mela 3.8; Strabo 3.3.5.

⁶⁴¹ Silva 1983; 1984 figs. 2 and 3.

⁶⁴² Alarcão 1988a, 24; it is also possible that the individual responsible for these *tesserae* received *virum* citizenship under Augustus.

⁶⁴³ Alarcão 1990a, 27.

⁶⁴⁴ Da Silva 1984, 46-8; 1983.

44. **Medubrica Plumbarii**⁶⁴⁵ (*Meda? Ranhados?*)⁶⁴⁶ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Although the capital of the Medubricenses has not yet been identified with certainty, it seems clear from the presence of these people on the Alcántara inscription that the *civitas* was located in the northwestern portion of Lusitania. Hübner⁶⁴⁷ suggested that Ptolemy's reference to a *Merobrica*⁶⁴⁸ should be compared to Pliny's *Medubrigenses qui Plumbarii*,⁶⁴⁹ which makes some sense if Müller's assertion that the coordinates given for Laccobriga⁶⁵⁰ can be exchanged with those given for Merobrica.⁶⁵¹ A look at Alarcão's map of the *civitates* of Lusitania will show that one of the major difficulties in determining the *civitas* capitals of northern Lusitania is caused by the presence of a forbidding mountain range, the Serra da Estrela (fig. 88).⁶⁵² It is also clear from his map that, either the *civitates* of the northern border of Lusitania were significantly smaller than those of the rest of Lusitania, or the boundaries of those *civitates* have yet to be determined with any certainty.⁶⁵³ The possibility that Medubrica could be identified with Merobrica offers a tantalizing solution to the problem of territorial space that currently characterizes the *civitates* of northern Lusitania. However, no external evidence has yet been found that would offer support to the textual emendations proposed by Hübner and Müller.

A likely capital at Meda may preserve the Roman name of the Medubricenses, but other suggestions in the same area include Castro de Ranhados and Castro de S. Jurjo.⁶⁵⁴ Since none of these sites has yet been excavated, and incidental finds from them indicate nothing more

⁶⁴⁵ See Hübner 1869, 802.

⁶⁴⁶ *CIL* II, 760: Meidubrigenses

⁶⁴⁷ Hübner 1869, 802.

⁶⁴⁸ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5.

⁶⁴⁹ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

⁶⁵⁰ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5.

⁶⁵¹ Müller 1883, 134.

⁶⁵² Alarcão 1990a, fig. 1.

⁶⁵³ As Alarcão is ready enough to admit: cf. 1990a, 29-30; 1988a, 18-24.

⁶⁵⁴ Alarcão 1990a, 30; 1988a, 22.

concrete than some Roman presence, none of them recommends itself more highly than the others. Fortunately, the entire area covered by the proposed sites is small enough that the extent of the *civitas* is relatively secure. Moreover, the discovery of remains of a forum at Marialva to the immediate south, along with inscriptions mentioning the *Civitas Aravorum*,⁶⁵⁵ indicates that another *civitas* shared the space between the Rio Côa and the Rio Torto, south of the Douro.

45. Meribriga/Mirobriga⁶⁵⁶ (Ciudad Rodrigo⁶⁵⁷ or Yecla de Yeltes⁶⁵⁸) Pliny *Nat.*

4.116(?); Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.5

There seems to have been an important city of Mirobriga in the north central region of Lusitania, although the exact location of that city remains something of a mystery, in large part because many of the inscriptions from the area surrounding Ciudad Rodrigo have been gathered in that modern city without concern for their original location. Because of its long history as an important center, Ciudad Rodrigo is generally considered the prime candidate for Mirobriga,⁶⁵⁹ although recently it has been argued that Yecla de Yeltes, northeast of Ciudad Rodrigo, is a more likely site for ancient Mirobriga “Vettonum.”⁶⁶⁰ Finds from this town suggest that it has been inhabited since the fifth century B.C., and the imposing defensive wall around the modern site indicates the town’s importance in later periods. Roman evidence from Yecla de Yeltes dates as early as the early imperial period, and a number of Roman period cemeteries have provided evidence of Roman occupation of the site through the late antique period.⁶⁶¹

⁶⁵⁵ *CIL* II, 429; Alarcão 1988a, 22; Caldas 2003, 3.

⁶⁵⁶ *CIL* II, 857-9 and 5033.

⁶⁵⁷ *CIL* II, 857-69; but see Hübner 1869, 802.

⁶⁵⁸ *CIL* II, 857-9 and 863.

⁶⁵⁹ *TIR* K-29, “Mirobriga.”

⁶⁶⁰ Hernández Guerra and Jiménez de Furundarena 2001, 258; Salinas de Frías 1990, 263.

⁶⁶¹ Hernández Guerra and Jiménez de Furundarena 2001, 258.

Remains at Ciudad Rodrigo date as early as the first century A.D., but no significant excavation has yet focused on the Roman remains of the city. Yecla de Yeltes has abundant Roman remains and is only sparsely occupied today; nonetheless, it has not been excavated yet, and so our archaeological evidence concerning the location of Mirobriga remains virtually nonexistent.

46. Ocelum (Zamora)⁶⁶² Pliny *Nat.* 4.118; Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7; *AntIt* 434 and 439; *Rav.* 319 (Strabo 3.4.3?)⁶⁶³

There is some discussion as to whether Ocelum, or Ocelo Duri, fell within the boundaries of Lusitania or Gallaecia/Hispania Tarraconensis.⁶⁶⁴ In fact, references to a native deity “Ocelum” or something similar are quite common in the northern reaches of Lusitania.⁶⁶⁵ Moreover, as the Douro (Latin Durius) stretches across much of the northern portion of Hispania, adjectives linking cities to that river are generally not very helpful when it comes to determining exact locations.

The modern city of Zamora has long been identified as the site of ancient Ocelum Duri or Ocelodurum, of which *civitas* Pliny’s Ocelensis may have been natives.⁶⁶⁶ Hübner catalogued the city’s inscriptions in the Conventus Asturum of Gallaecia.⁶⁶⁷ However, Ocelum’s location on the crossroads of two of Hispania’s most important roads—one connecting Bracara Augusta to Caesaraugusta and the other connecting Asturica Augusta to Augusta Emerita—suggests a

⁶⁶² *CIL* II, 2628.

⁶⁶³ Cf. Müller 1883, 141.

⁶⁶⁴ Roldán Hervás 1971, 99-100.

⁶⁶⁵ Vaz 1993, 508-9.

⁶⁶⁶ Roldán Hervás (1971, 100) believes that there were two cities named Ocelum; one mentioned by Pliny, was a city of the Vettones, while the other, mentioned by Ptolemy, was a Vaccaean city.

⁶⁶⁷ Hübner 1869, 362, 364-5.

level of importance for the city in Roman times. The fact that Pliny and Ptolemy both mention Ocelum as a Lusitanian city is further confirmation that it was an important city of Lusitania at least until the end of the first century A.D. Ptolemy's other Ocelum, located in Tarraconensis,⁶⁶⁸ comes as no surprise. As Müller observes, the toponym "Ocelum" occurs often in areas of Celtic influence, including Gaul, the Cottian Alps and in Britain.⁶⁶⁹

Archaeological remains from the Roman period are scarce, and no excavation has yet taken place within the city limits, as far as I know. The epigraphic record from the site is virtually non-existent, which may be a hint to the fact that the Roman center was not particularly important, despite its excellent location.

47. Salmantica⁶⁷⁰ (Salamanca)⁶⁷¹ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.5.7; Polyb. 3.13; *AntIt* 434; *Rav.* 319.7

Pliny does not mention Salmantica as one of the stipendiary cities of Lusitania, but Polybius includes a city by that name in his narration of Hannibal's campaign against the Vaccaeans in 220 B.C. Archaeological evidence confirms the existence of a pre-Roman settlement at the site of modern Salamanca, but almost nothing of the Roman city has yet been excavated.⁶⁷² Roman inscriptions from Salamanca and the surrounding areas do little to improve our knowledge of the status of the site in Roman times, although we do know from three boundary markers that the town had some importance in Augustus' time.⁶⁷³

⁶⁶⁸ Ptol. *Geog.* 2.6.22.

⁶⁶⁹ Müller 1883, 141.

⁶⁷⁰ *CIL* II, 438, 857-9 and 870.

⁶⁷¹ *CIL* II, 870-92 and 5312-4.

⁶⁷² Salinas de Frías 1990, 260.

⁶⁷³ *CIL* II, 857-9.

Traces of the imperial Roman wall may be preserved in the actual city walls, which were rebuilt and restored in both the Visigothic and Moslem periods.⁶⁷⁴ Little more is known of the Roman city of Salmantica, although Roldán Hervás has attempted to reconstruct its layout.⁶⁷⁵

48. Silves (Cibilis?)

This Portuguese city may now occupy the site known in Roman times as Cilpes, Cilipis or Cilibis, referred to by Pliny at Pliny *Nat.* 4.118. Roman lead coins dating to 47-44 B.C. and bearing the legend “Cilpe” or “Cilpes” were probably issued by the city of Cilpes/Cilipis,⁶⁷⁶ now known as Silves, where the only examples were found. Archaeological remains from the city of Silves and its surroundings indicate an indigenous presence from as far back as the 4th century B.C.⁶⁷⁷ Unfortunately, Roman evidence from the city remains scarce, as the excavations in progress focus principally on the Moorish occupation of the site.

49. Taporí/Talorí⁶⁷⁸ (Castelo Branco⁶⁷⁹?) Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Aside from Pliny’s reference and a few inscriptional references, nothing is known about the city of the Taporí. Alarcão has proposed that they may be the same people as the Talorí mentioned on the Alcántara inscription,⁶⁸⁰ but if this is the case then the three inscriptions mentioning Taporí and Taporó cannot have come from the area governed by that capital.⁶⁸¹ In a

⁶⁷⁴ *TIR*, K-30, “Salmantica,” 196.

⁶⁷⁵ Roldán Hervás 1971, 95-8.

⁶⁷⁶ Alarcão 1990a, 22 and n. 3; *TIR* J-29, “Cilpe” and “Cibilitani.”

⁶⁷⁷ Alarcão 1990a, 22.

⁶⁷⁸ *CIL* II, 760, 736; *CIL* II, 408, 453, 519-21, 950; *FE* 14, #62.

⁶⁷⁹ *IRCP* 417, 636, and 424 = *CIL* II, 6263.

⁶⁸⁰ Alarcão 1988a, 19.

⁶⁸¹ Alarcão 1990a, 29.

later publication, Alarcão proposed that the capital was actually at Castelo Branco, which would place it significantly farther south than his initial proposal of Teixoso.⁶⁸²

The identification of Castelo Branco as the capital of the Taporí/Talorí is supported by the surveys that have been conducted in the area south of the city.⁶⁸³ Finds from these surveys include building materials (brick, cut stone and roof tiles), column drums and capitals, terra sigillata in abundance and Roman period cooking wares.⁶⁸⁴ However, of the inscriptions relating to the Taporí, Ferreira describes 24, none of which comes from the area immediately surrounding Castelo Branco (fig. 89).⁶⁸⁵ Contrary to what this might suggest, the presence of people from the *civitas Taporí* in other *civitates* indicates a strong Roman cultural influence within the *civitas Taporí*.⁶⁸⁶ These are all funerary inscriptions, and the fact that the deceased's place of origin is stated demonstrates that the inscription was put up outside the area of that *civitas*.⁶⁸⁷ Despite the strong evidence pointing to a Roman settlement in the immediate area of Castelo Branco, no conclusion can yet be drawn concerning the identity of that city. Perhaps an excavation of one of the areas of Roman occupation revealed by the surveys will provide the information necessary to confirm the site's Roman name. Nonetheless, the identification of Castelo Branco as the capital of the *Civitas Taporí* may be the most likely proposition to date.

⁶⁸² The identification of some municipium at Teixoso is attested by *CIL* II, 519, which identifies the Quirina tribe. Another inscription, now lost, mentions a *duumvir primus* in the area of Teixoso; cf. Alarcão 1988a, 19.

⁶⁸³ Ferreira 2000, 162.

⁶⁸⁴ Ferreira 2000, 161-2.

⁶⁸⁵ Ferreira 2000, 167-86.

⁶⁸⁶ Cf. Ferreira 2000, inscriptions 1-6.

⁶⁸⁷ Ferreira 2000, 167-8.

50. Turduli qui Bardili⁶⁸⁸ Pliny *Nat.* 4.118

Alarcão has tried to place the Turduli mentioned by Pliny at Pliny *Nat.* 4.118 near the mouth of the Tagus, based on the assertion that that river represented one of the routes that the Turduli used to reach the western coast.⁶⁸⁹ Pliny's description of Lusitania at *Nat.* 4.113, however, makes it clear that at least some of the Turduli lived on the western coast of Lusitania near the mouth of the Douro. It does not seem that there is any reliable evidence against the identification of the Turduli Bardili as another name for the Turduli Veteres. This solution would facilitate discussion of the Lusitanian Turduli, but thus far there is no epigraphic or archaeological evidence in its support.

51. Turduli Veteres (See Lancobriga)

52. Viseu⁶⁹⁰

Although there has yet to be a thorough excavation of any of the monumental center of Viseu, it is generally agreed that it was the capital of an important *civitas* located on the important trade artery linking Cale with Corduba.⁶⁹¹ The close proximity of a republican period army camp, the "Cava de Viriato," to Viseu reveals an early Roman presence in the region. Within Viseu itself, no remains have yet been found that might suggest a pre-Roman settlement.⁶⁹²

⁶⁸⁸ *CIL* II, 523 mentions a "Turdula."

⁶⁸⁹ Alarcão 1990a, 25.

⁶⁹⁰ *CIL* II, 403-427 and 5246-7.

⁶⁹¹ Vaz 1993, 502-3; Rojas 1999, 28-31.

⁶⁹² Vaz 1993, 503; whether this is merely an accident of the random nature of archaeological research or evidence of the absence of pre-Roman evidence remains problematic.

The best evidence known thus far concerning the Roman occupation of Viseu are the milestones, which date as early as the time of Caligula,⁶⁹³ and a boundary marker that separated the *civitas* governed by Viseu from that governed by Bobadela to the south, Aeminium to the southwest or Talabriga to the west.⁶⁹⁴ The identification of Viseu as the capital of the Interamnienses relies on that boundary marker's inscription (...*ieses*) and on the fact that most of the other capitals of the Lusitanian northwest have been located with some certainty. If the Interamnienses' name derives literally from their position "between the rivers," then Viseu is the most likely candidate for their capital, sitting between the Vouga (Vacua) to the north and the Mondego (Munda) to the south.

Abundant finds from the Roman period in the villages surrounding Viseu emphasize the fact that the area enjoyed a high level of Roman interest by the first century A.D.⁶⁹⁵ The presence of over a dozen Roman villas within five kilometers of Viseu suggests that the area was quite productive agriculturally, and that the *civitas* capital was well positioned to capitalize on the important trade routes of Lusitania. Numerous votive inscriptions and altars also point to the existence of a regional aquatic cult, focused on the abundant mineral springs surrounding Viseu.⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹³ Alarcão 1988a, 20; 1990, 27; Tranoy 1990, 14.

⁶⁹⁴ This uncertainty is based on the fact that the marker was found southwest of Viseu.

⁶⁹⁵ Vaz 1993, 501-2, 505.

⁶⁹⁶ Vaz 1993, 508-9.

CHAPTER 3: ITINERARIES

One of the most important, and most reliable, means of identifying cities mentioned in the ancient sources is through careful analysis of the ancient routes that were in use. These routes were often marked by numerous milestones, and in the case of more important roads, were carefully paved with large stones to facilitate rapid travel between cities. Because of the Roman preference for the best, fastest, and often most direct route between main stopping points, the road systems of modern Spain and Portugal depend to a great extent on the old ways. In some cases, this can make the identification of important way stations relatively simple, as modern towns bear the ancient names and are at the appropriate distances from each other to match the ancient itineraries.

Unfortunately, changes to the topography of Lusitania have also contributed to significant changes in the major routes of travel over the last two millennia. The silting up of rivers is particularly noteworthy on the western coast of Portugal, as this phenomenon has forced the construction of new bridges at narrower points upstream to ensure safe passage, particularly during times of heavy rains. Another factor that has altered the topography of Lusitania, especially in the last century, is the construction of numerous dams across the important rivers that stretch across much of Spain and Portugal. The reservoirs that have resulted from such projects have in some cases flooded important Roman settlements, and in other cases have hidden the remains of bridges and stone-flagged roads that are often indicative of Roman routes. Despite these difficulties, it remains a relatively simple task to connect the important cities of Lusitania by the most logical routes of ancient times.

Rome's most effective means of cultural and administrative expansion were the development of the cities and the infrastructure of roads that made that development possible and

profitable. This allowed for the speedy collection and redistribution of the wealth produced in the provinces, and dramatically reduced the amount of time separating small cities from the important centers of trade and Roman culture. New cities could be established at strategic points along important roadways, both to control the crossroads of such thoroughfares and to capitalize on the heavy traffic that such locations represented. This seems to have been the case with Augusta Emerita, whose advantages are most obviously linked to the major routes of travel between the east and west and between the northern and southern cities of Lusitania, rather than an easily defended position.⁶⁹⁷

The main trade arteries of Hispania Ulterior probably followed well-established routes of the pre-Roman inhabitants, as being the most convenient for travel and linking the important centers of human settlement from earliest times. Lusitania's main roads were that linking Olisipo to Augusta Emerita and eventually to Corduba, another linking Olisipo to Bracara Augusta, one linking Augusta Emerita to Asturica Augusta and one linking Cale to Corduba, via the bridge at Alcántara and Metellinum (fig. 90).⁶⁹⁸

Mantas' study of the Roman roadways of Lisbon resulted in the discovery of roads arranged on a roughly orthogonal plan, running parallel to the ancient coastlines (fig. 6).⁶⁹⁹ Two main arteries seem to leave the city of Olisipo, one on the eastern side, following the course of the Tagus, and the other passing out through the northern end of town. The latter of these must be the beginning of the road to Bracara Augusta, route 421 in the Antonine Itinerary. This road

⁶⁹⁷ The vast amounts of arable land must have further recommended the establishment of a colony on this site, although its position on the Anas was only favorable for regional trade, as waterfalls downstream prevented access to the Mediterranean via the river.

⁶⁹⁸ Cf. Roldán Hervás 1971; Rojas 1999; Gorges 1990, fig. 3.

⁶⁹⁹ Mantas 1990a, fig. 2.

passed north through Ierabriga, which has been tentatively identified as Alenquer.⁷⁰⁰ From here, the road continued along the Tagus, eventually arriving at the conventual capital of Scallabis.

The Antonine Itinerary makes it clear that Scallabis was an important hub of travel in the third century A.D.,⁷⁰¹ probably not least because it was one of the last easily navigable points of the Tagus. Roads from Olisipo in the direction of Bracara Augusta and toward Augusta Emerita passed through this site. The first continued onward to Sellium (Tomar), while the other passed through a number of unidentified sites (Tabucci, Fraxinum, Montobrica, Ad Septem Aras—Campo Maior? and Plagiaria—possibly Badajoz?) before arriving at Augusta Emerita.

After passing through Sellium, the route to Bracara Augusta continued through Conimbriga to Aeminium (Coimbra). It seems this route met up with another northward route from Olisipo via Eburobrittium (near Óbidos) and Collippo (São Sebastião do Freixo) at either Conimbriga or Coimbra. From there, the route continued northward, passing through Talabriga (Marnel) and Longobriga (Monte de Santa Maria, Pedroso) before passing out of Lusitania into the city of Cale (Porto) in Gallaecia.

The standard route between Olisipo and Augusta Emerita seems to have been that which passed through the unidentified *mansio* of Aquabona (Coína-a-Velha?) to Caetobriga (Setúbal and Tróia). From Caetobriga the Itinerary gives an indirect route to Salacia (Alcácer do Sal) through two more unknown *mansiones* (Caeciliana and Malateca), before returning northward to Eborā (Évora). The sites between Augusta Emerita and Eborā (Ad Atrum flumen, Dipone and Evandriana) have yet to be identified, although some have suggested an equation between Dipone and Elvas, where coins bearing the legend “DIPO” have been found.⁷⁰²

⁷⁰⁰ Alarcão 1988c, 118.

⁷⁰¹ *AntIt* 419-20 and 421.

⁷⁰² Ripollès Alegre and Abascal Palazón 2000, 93.

The other route from Olisipo to Augusta Emerita seems to have been the most direct, although the mileages given are particularly problematic in this passage.⁷⁰³ The first *mansio* is that of Aritium Praetorium, which cannot be equated with Aritium Vetus, located some distance north of this route, on the Tagus. Perhaps Aritium Praetorium might be found at Coruche or Mora, where some Roman presence is attested by chance finds. However, the distance given between Olisipo and Aritium Praetorium (38 miles) makes Coruche the more likely candidate. This in turn makes it impossible that Abelterium (Alter do Chão) be located where that site has been excavated, since the distance given is 28 miles and the actual distance between Coruche and Alter do Chão is more like 60 miles in a straight line.

The next *mansio* after Abelterium is Matusaro, which might be at modern Arronches. If Ad Septem Aras can be considered a small rural sanctuary,⁷⁰⁴ then it might have been anywhere in the area between Arronches and Bótoa, which most likely represents Roman Budua.⁷⁰⁵ Plagiaria may correspond to modern Badajoz, as the distance between Badajoz and Mérida is almost exactly 30 miles, as given in the itinerary. However, Badajoz is no more than 15 miles from Bótoa, whose given distance is 20 miles.

The road system in the southern portion of Lusitania seems substantially easier to reconstruct, given the high number of identified sites along the roads described.⁷⁰⁶ Beginning with Balsa (Luz de Tavira) the road passes through Ossonoba (Faro), Arandis (at Garvão or Ourique), Salacia (Alcácer do Sal), Eborā (Évora), Serpa (modern Serpa?), Fines (probably the

⁷⁰³ *AntIt* 418-9.

⁷⁰⁴ Fernández Corrales (1988, 162) places it at Campo Maior.

⁷⁰⁵ The distance between Matusaro and Ad Septem Aras is 60 miles, far too great a distance, given that Augusta Emerita is still another 50 miles east here on the itinerary.

⁷⁰⁶ *AntIt* 426-7 and 431; there are still problems, however, as a portion of the itinerary seems to be missing between 427 and 431, and sites like Serpa and Arucci may not be represented by the same name today.

border between Lusitania and Baetica, at the Guadiana?), Arucci (Aroche?) and finally Pax Iulia (Beja).

Some of the distances given in the itinerary do not add up, especially in the latter part of this route. The modern town of Serpa is much farther from Évora than 13 miles (ca. 60 miles), and the border between Baetica and Lusitania is generally agreed to pass well to the east of the Guadiana in the area between Mértola and Évora. The ancient sources seem to have treated the Guadiana (Anas) as the border between the provinces, and if we accept this information, then Monte do Trigo could represent ancient Serpa, the Guadiana the border, and Moura to ancient Arucci. This would remove some of the complexity of the route described in the itinerary, which would have to double back on itself and take very indirect routes to agree with current understandings. A final stretch of the southern route connected Esuri in Baetica, at the mouth of the Anas, to Myrtilis (Mértola) and Pax Iulia (Beja), generally following the course of the Anas.

The Itinerary is less helpful in the eastern areas of Lusitania, as there seem to have been fewer settlements in that area, and they were generally more spread out. One major route between Augusta Emerita and Caesaraugusta has been comprehensively researched by Roldán Hervás,⁷⁰⁷ namely, the Camino de la Plata or *Via Lata*. This is the road comprising sections 433-4 and 439 of the Antonine Itinerary. The route begins at Augusta Emerita, traveling north through Ad Sorores (Casas de Don Antonio) to Castra Caecilia (northeast of Cáceres). Turmulos (Alconétar or Magdalena?) is the next *mansio* of the route, followed by Rusticana (in the hills of las Brujas), Capara (Cáparra), Caelionicco, Ad Lippos and Sentice (all unidentified), and finally Salmantica (Salamanca). The next town on the list is Sabaria, which may well have stood on the border in ancient times, as it seems to be located on the provincial boundary between Salamanca

⁷⁰⁷ Roldán Hervás 1971.

and Zamora today.⁷⁰⁸ If it was on the border, then Ocelum was not within the boundaries of Lusitania, indicating that either Pliny misplaced the Ocelenses⁷⁰⁹ or Roldán Hervás is right, and there were two different towns of Ocelum within or very near the border of Lusitania.⁷¹⁰ At any rate, the rest of this route passes outside the boundaries of Lusitania, and so we return to the routes of the province.

A secondary route from Augusta Emerita to Caesaraugusta travels northeast from Emerita.⁷¹¹ This road passed through Lacipea (Miajadas⁷¹²) and Leuciana (probably Puerto de Santa Cruz) before arriving at Augustobriga (Talavera la Vieja).⁷¹³ From Augustobriga the road must have passed through the border town of Caesarobriga (Talavera de la Reina) on its way to Toletum (Toledo), despite the itinerary's omission of that city.⁷¹⁴

The southern route connecting Augusta Emerita to Corduba is listed at *AntIt* 415-6, and most likely mentions only one other Lusitanian city, that of Metellinum. However, there are traces of a road that connected the colony of Metellinum to that of Norba Caesarina, a route most likely developed in the days before the establishment of Augusta Emerita. A continuation of this road passes across the monumental bridge at Alcántara and eventually ends up at Cale in Gallaecia, traversing much of northwestern Lusitania (fig. 91).⁷¹⁵

The westward section of this road appears to have passed through *Civitas* Igaeditanorum (Idanha-a-Velha), northward to the vicus of Centum Cellas (near Belmonte) through Viseu

⁷⁰⁸ Roldán Hervás 1971, 99.

⁷⁰⁹ At Pliny *Nat.* 4.118.

⁷¹⁰ Roldán Hervás 1971, 99-100.

⁷¹¹ *AntIt* 438.

⁷¹² Fernández Corrales 1988, 164.

⁷¹³ The distance given between these last two cities is 12 miles, while the actual distance is closer to 45 miles in a straight line.

⁷¹⁴ Cf. Fernández Miranda et al. 1990.

⁷¹⁵ Álvarez Rojas 1999, 27-30 and fig. 3.

(possibly either Interamnienses or Elbocoris) and finally to Talabriga (Marnel), near the mouth of the Vacua. From here, the road continued northward with the other routes from Olisipo to Cale already mentioned above.

There seem to have been several secondary branches of this northwestern route. One of these continued directly northward from Centum Cellas, to the *Civitas* Aravorum (Marialva) and possibly Meidubriga (Ranhados?) before passing across the Durus into the territory of the Banienses and finally Gallaecia. Two other branches split off from the route between Centum Cellas and Viseu near Gouveia. The first went south and west, to Bobadela (possibly Interamnienses or Elbocoris) and eventually met up with the Olisipo-Bracara route at Aeminium. The other went directly north to Lamego (Arabriga?), then west to Cárquere (Colarnum), before crossing the Durus into Gallaecia.

The roads described by the Antonine Itinerary are in large part also attested by the milestones and sections of pavement that have survived. Even in the case of roads that are not mentioned by the Itinerary, we have sufficient archaeological evidence to reconstruct their general routes, as in the case of the Cordoba-Metellinum-Alcántara-Cale road. We are even able to postulate roads whose existence is otherwise unknown by connecting important sites to the logical routes and neighbors, as it is necessary that cities whose importance is evident in their architectural remains must have had access to the other cities of their region.

CHAPTER 4: GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The Roman province of Lusitania probably never reached the level of urbanization and financial significance that its neighbors, Baetica and Tarraconensis, achieved. This was due to a number of factors, including the difficult terrain and hostile tribes of the northwest, the relatively

late arrival of the Romans in the area, especially the north, and the province's distance from the Mediterranean basin. Despite these disadvantages, however, the area that later became Lusitania occupied an important position in Roman politics even in the middle of the first century B.C., when the Sertorian and Civil wars were fought on its soil.

Roman occupation of Lusitania dates only slightly later than the official establishment of the eastern and southern reaches of Hispania—Italica (206 B.C.) and Corduba (152 B.C.) were founded just before the campaigns of D. Junius Brutus, which seem to have resulted in the fortification of at least two cities friendly to the Roman cause, Felicitas Iulia Olisipo and Talabriga. Roman ties to the areas that became Tarraconensis and Baetica, however, were much stronger than those to Lusitanian lands, especially during the late Republican and early Imperial periods. This was particularly due to the early Roman involvement in those areas, via land and coastal routes, and the higher level of economic development that had taken place before the initial arrival of the Romans, as a result of trade ties with other Mediterranean cultures.

In general, the northern regions of Lusitania did not experience the same level of urbanization as the southern. Since the southern part of the province had historical ties to the Mediterranean world reaching back several centuries, it seems entirely possible that the urbanizing process first began as a result of these contacts. Because the Romans and Carthaginians did not arrive in northwestern Hispania until centuries later, this region was still characterized by the traditional settlement pattern of small hill-forts.

Despite the late arrival of the Romans in these regions, their impact can still be seen in the remains from northern settlements. At Talabriga, Aravi, *Civitas Colarnum*, and Bobadela the urban structure was apparently reconfigured upon the arrival of the Romans. Even so, the cities of northern Lusitania were never of the size and importance (economic and political) that

characterized the southern and central settlements of the province. This fact may be illustrative of the northern tendency toward numerous, small settlements, but it may also be a reflection of the economic situation of northern Lusitania.

Roman economic activities seem to have been particularly concentrated in the south, where mining, agriculture, and maritime activities were especially lucrative. Mineral interests also seem to have driven Roman involvement in the northern areas of Lusitania, where the rivers were reported by ancient authors to have run with gold. At this point, however, we do not have evidence of intensive mining activities in northern Lusitania that could be compared with the major works that operated around Myrtilis and Pax Iulia in southern Lusitania.

Rome's interest in the province of Lusitania, and in the whole of Hispania, seems to have shifted between the Late Republican period and the first century A.D., from the early focus on economic and military exploitation to a clear desire to incorporate the peninsula into the administrative scheme of the Roman Empire. This trend is visible both in the increased building activity at Lusitanian cities and in the improved infrastructure of roads and bridges that connected the cities of the province.

Indigenous response to the Roman invasion is also visible throughout the province, most conspicuously in the funerary inscriptions. During the Republican period, inscriptions reveal a significant majority of indigenous names, but by the late first century A.D., this majority has been almost completely replaced by Romanized *indigenes* and individuals whose names are fully Roman.⁷¹⁶

The Roman settlement pattern in Lusitania was not as intrusive on the natives as one might expect in an area of continuing hostilities—even colonies were rarely, if ever, established

⁷¹⁶ Cf. Curchin 1991, 78-9; 1990b, 267-8.

outside the indigenous settlement patterns.⁷¹⁷ The evidence from archaeological and historical sources argues strongly for a Roman policy of reoccupation of indigenous settlements, rather than a drive to build up a new urban network in the province. For this reason it seems likely that most, if not all, of the important Roman cities in Lusitania were already in place by time of Augustus' reorganization at the end of the first century B.C. Pliny's description of the province, most likely based on sources dating from the time of that reorganization, captures a snapshot of that reality. The forty-five cities that Pliny acknowledges seem to have made up the bulk of the Roman presence in Lusitania during the first century A.D. as well, as we have no information suggesting the establishment or unprecedented growth in importance of any Roman cities after the beginning of our era.

Despite the apparent inclination to occupy existing settlements, Roman cultural influence led to the introduction of a number of architectural and urban reforms to the cities of Lusitania. The most effective of these is the imposition of the orthogonal street plan that was apparently based on the organizational pattern of Roman army camps. As I have noted, the Romans do not seem to have established many, if any, cities on completely new sites. It is also true, however, that many of the cities that the Romans did re-occupy were subsequently organized according to a strict grid pattern, which would have called for a complete rebuilding of the urban centers.⁷¹⁸

This imposition of a grid pattern in turn paved the way for the introduction of large-scale public structures, also on the traditional Roman plan. Most important among these, both in terms of urban planning and in terms of the Roman cultural transformation, are fora and temples. Archaeological remains throughout Lusitania reveal that Roman temples were most often built as

⁷¹⁷ Curchin 1991, 103-4; Augusta Emerita may be the lone exception to this general rule, although some pre-Roman materials have been found in excavations at the site.

⁷¹⁸ This seems to have been the case at Ebora, Pax Iulia, and Augusta Emerita, for example.

the focal point of a forum complex. Overall, the civic architecture of Lusitania follows the basic patterns of Roman buildings throughout the western provinces, often (at Conimbriga, Mérida, Évora, *Civitas* Cobelcorum, and Ammaia, for example) adhering strictly to the Vitruvian models in their proportions and general plan.

The restructuring of indigenous settlements also made way for other public structures that were important to the maintenance of the Roman urban ideal. These include theaters, as at Augusta Emerita, Metellinum, and Felicitas Iulia Olisipo; amphitheaters, as at Augusta Emerita, Bobadela, Conimbriga, and possibly Pax Iulia; circuses, as at Augusta Emerita, Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, Mirobriga and Balsa; and aqueducts, as at Augusta Emerita, Conimbriga, Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, and Salacia. As is evident from this list, the major architectural undertakings are largely confined to the most important centers of the province, including colonies, municipalities, and the provincial and conventus capitals. On the other hand, some of the most important cities of Lusitania, such as Norba Caesarina and Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, have thus far failed to offer evidence of *fora* or temples. However, this is not to say that such features were absent from the cities of Lusitania. The absence of such structures in important cities illustrates the fact that our knowledge of many of the Roman cities of Lusitania leaves much to be desired.

In general, the major architectural monuments of Lusitania seem to be most heavily concentrated in the center of the province, around the capital at Augusta Emerita and the Roman colonies of Pax Iulia, Norba Caesarina, and Scallabis. However, the presence of impressive civic architecture in cities like Eburobrittium, Ossonoba, and Conimbriga, and important religious centers as far north as *Civitas* Cobelcorum, indicate that this pattern reflects economic and social realities rather than the level of direct Roman involvement (particularly administrative) in certain areas.

Monumental Roman temples in Lusitania date as far back as the late Republican period, as is the case for example at Scallabis.⁷¹⁹ The most impressive religious structures in the province all date to the Augustan consolidation of the province—at Augusta Emerita, Ebora, and Augustobriga. These structures, along with the Roman temple at Barcino, in Tarraconensis, all seem to have their roots in the Republican peripteral tradition. Moreover, the deep porches of Augusta Emerita and Ebora seem to derive from the model of the temples of Venus Genetrix and Mars Ultor in Rome, both of which were rebuilt under Augustus.⁷²⁰ By comparison with the rest of the Roman Empire, Lusitania's major cities were already cosmopolitan centers by the early first century A.D., apparently as a direct result of Augustus' propaganda campaign. The influence of Augustus' visual campaign is best evident in the Lusitanian capital, whose architectural and decorative remains draw ready comparison to the Mars Ultor temple and the Forum Augustum, both in Rome.

Although there were already important civic structures throughout Lusitania by the beginning of the first century A.D., the area seems to have undergone a second significant transformation during the latter part of the first century, under the Flavian emperors. The chronological details of this transformation have yet to be worked out with certainty, but Conimbriga, for example, provides strong evidence for the Flavian tendency to amplify and mimic earlier Augustan structures. Eburobrittium, and possibly Augusta Emerita, seem to have experienced this same revitalization during the Flavian period. Mirobriga Celtici also reached its *floruit* under the Flavians, and it was not until this time that the Romans seem to have taken an active interest in the indigenous settlement.

⁷¹⁹ Arruda and Viegas 2002, 226.

⁷²⁰ Mierse 1999, 105-6.

The advantages (economic, social, and political) available to individuals who adapted themselves to the new administrative and urban realities introduced by the Romans ultimately facilitated a widespread urbanizing movement during the first century A.D. Because native religious practices were very often linked to rural, undeveloped sanctuaries, this process helps to explain the virtual absence of any native cult centers or indigenous architectural elements in any of the heavily Romanized areas of the province. Any such centers would have rapidly gone out of use as the old religious forms were gradually absorbed into the Roman scheme. In fact, the only native cults whose survival into the Roman period has been confirmed through archaeological remains are those of Endovellicus, Ataecina, and possibly Band[].⁷²¹ The last of these is most likely simply a generic term for “god,” and occurs only with local qualifiers, generally in the northern or central regions of Lusitania.⁷²²

Both the cult of Ataecina and Endovellicus occur in the central portion of Lusitania, within the area of influence of Augusta Emerita and Ebora, respectively. These cults represent an anomaly both because of their location within the provincial framework and because of their apparently fluid adaptation to Roman religious sensibilities. Neither was far enough from the provincial capital to make it invisible to the administration, nor were these deities easily identified with others of the Roman pantheon, which makes it the more surprising that the cults flourished well into the Imperial period.

The cults differed from each other, however, in that there was a definite sanctuary of Endovellicus, located along one of the major routes eastward from Ebora to Augusta Emerita,

⁷²¹ Abascal Palazón 2002; Ribeiro 2002b, 379-80; Hoz Bravo and Fernández Palacios 2002.

⁷²² Hoz Bravo and Fernández Palacios 2002, 45; other cults may have been syncretized into the Roman religious scheme, but it seems far more likely that the indigenous beliefs would have undergone changes to bring them closer to the newly introduced Roman ones than vice versa. Even the indigenous cults that retained their pre-Roman forms underwent a gradual “Romanization,” as evidenced by the use of the Latin language and script on inscriptions.

while the cult of Ataecina was not limited to a specific sanctuary or territory.⁷²³ There is some evidence of other rural sanctuaries and divinities in Lusitania during the Roman occupation, but none of these seems to have had any significance beyond the local level, and nearly all of them fall into the category of Roman *numina*.

As for religious activities within the urban centers, virtually all of the evidence points to a large-scale imposition of Roman cults and imagery, at the expense of apparently all of the indigenous forms that were in place prior to the arrival of the Romans. Mierse observes that, “there is no evidence on the Peninsula of any Roman accommodation to native sensibilities....”⁷²⁴ This seems particularly true of the Romans’ approach to religion—Roman temples and sanctuaries in Lusitania were apparently built with no regard whatsoever for local traditions and forms. We have no evidence of any urban cult that does not fall clearly within the tradition of Roman forms seen in other areas of the western Empire. Again, this may be a result of the incompleteness of our archaeological record, or of the fluid transformation of local urban cults into forms more readily expressed in the Roman fashion, linguistically, artistically, and architecturally. It seems unlikely, however, given the total absence of indigenous forms in the surviving architectural remains, that any such form could have figured prominently into the religious ideology of the first century Roman province.

The imperial cult is another obvious expression of Roman religious ideology during the first century. The earliest official expression of this cult in Hispania seems to have been authorized in 15 A.D., when Tiberius granted an embassy from Tarraco permission to build a temple to the Deified Augustus.⁷²⁵ Robert Étienne has reconstructed a sort of hierarchy of the

⁷²³ Ribeiro 2002a, 80.

⁷²⁴ Mierse 1999, 92.

⁷²⁵ Mierse 1999, 132.

cultic involvement of Lusitanian cities, based primarily on epigraphic and, to a lesser extent architectural, information. From his research we find that the imperial cult seems to have had the strongest following in the colonies and municipalities of Lusitania. However, the cult, broadly defined through architectural and epigraphic remains, was present at a number of other cities in the province, mostly concentrated in the southern and central areas.⁷²⁶

Later in the first century, cities like Aeminium, *Civitas Aravorum*, and Conimbriga all show signs of an active imperial cult, and in the second century there are examples as well at Mirobriga Vettonum (?) and Capera. Since these areas were still relative outsiders with respect to the provincial organization, it comes as no surprise that they do not offer evidence for the official Roman imperial cult in the first half of the first century A.D.

With the imperial cult, we are again faced with evidence for a greater receptiveness to the introduction of new Roman institutions in the southern areas of Lusitania. Étienne has argued that the Iberians may have been more receptive to the imperial cult because it resonated with an indigenous pre-Roman ruler cult that was especially concentrated in the southern areas of Hispania.⁷²⁷ If this model is correct, then it offers yet another reason for the apparent ease with which Roman culture was imposed on much of southern Lusitania.

However, as discussed above, the northern cities of Lusitania also experienced strong contacts with Roman cultural and social forms, especially as a result of the Flavian grant of Latin rights to many of the cities. Thus, by the end of the first century A.D., the strong contrast that is visible between the late Republican period cities of the north and south no longer characterizes the picture of the province of Lusitania. This fact is perhaps best illustrated by the large numbers of Roman villas found in northern and north-central regions of Lusitania, most of which date no

⁷²⁶ Étienne 1990, 216-8, 229.

⁷²⁷ Étienne 1958, 50-1, 77.

earlier than the end of the first century A.D. (fig. 90). While the Roman occupation of the province was still, to a great extent, concentrated in the major cities of southern and central Lusitania, the first century A.D. seems to have brought an end to much of the cultural disparity that is evident in earlier periods.

We have provided a tentative location for the majority of Pliny's cities, and even in cases where the exact site of a Roman city remains uncertain, we have narrowed the number of possible solutions. The archaeological record of the important cities of first century Lusitania has been carefully presented, and both epigraphic and historical evidence have been provided, when possible. None of this is to suggest, however, that our knowledge of either the archaeological or historical record of Lusitania is complete. A number of important Roman cities have yet to be excavated, and even cities whose public architecture is known contain a great deal of information about the industrial and residential life of the ancient site.

Hopefully, this study has provided a new piece of the foundation that will eventually support a comprehensive understanding of the Roman province of Lusitania. Detailed analyses of the Roman roads of Lusitania will bring to light ties between cities and provide new evidence as to the location of as yet undiscovered Roman cities. Lusitania is also in need of a study focusing on the relationship of later ecclesiastical boundaries to the divisions between Roman *civitates*. The historical sources dating from the fourth century to the beginning of the Moorish invasions will undoubtedly offer important information concerning the identity of late antique sites, many of which will reflect aspects of the early Roman occupation of Lusitania.

WORKS CITED

ANCIENT SOURCES

Antonine Itinerary. 1990. *Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense*, edited by O. Cuntz. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Appian, *Iberike*. 2000. *Wars of the Romans in Iberia*, edited and translated by J.S. Richardson. Warminster.

Bellum Hispaniense. 1955. *Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*, translated by A.G. Way. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Caesar, *de Bello Civile*. 1925. *The Commentaries of G. Julius Caesar on the Civil War*, edited by C.E. Moberly. Oxford.

Cassius Dio. 1914-1927. *Dio's Roman History*, translated by Earnest Cary, on the basis of the version of H.B. Foster. New York: MacMillan Co.

Cicero, *In Verrem II*. 1917. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes III: Divinatio in Q. Caecilium. In Verrem*, edited by W. Peterson. Oxford.

Hyginus Gromaticus, *Agrimensorum*. 2000. *Hygin, l'ouvre gromaticque*, translated by O. Behrends, M. Clavel-Lévêque, D. Conso, A. Gonzáles, J.-Y. Guillaumin, and St. Ratti. Brussels: CNRS.

Isidore, *Etymologiae*. 1911. *Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Etymologiarvm sive Originvm libri XX*, edited by W.M. Lindsay. Oxford.

Livy, *Epitomes*. 1906. *The History of Rome, by Titus Livius*, Vol. 4. *Books Thirty-seven to the End, with the Epitomes and Fragments of the Lost Books*, translated by W.A. M'Devitte. 1906. London: Bell.

-----, *Ab urbe condita*. 1899. *Titi Livi ab urbe condita libri*, edited by W. Weissenborn. Leipzig: Teubner.

Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*. 1927. *C. Plinius Secundus*, edited by F. Semi. Pisa: Giardini.

Pomponius Mela, *de Chorographia*. 1967. Edited by C. Frick. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Ptolemy, *Geographia*. 1883. *Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia*, edited by K. Müller. Paris: Alfredo Firmin Didot.

Ravenna Cosmography. 1990. *Ravennatis Anonymi Cosmographia et Guidonis Geographica*, edited by J. Schnetz. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Strabo, *Geographia*. 1923. *The Geography of Strabo*, translated by H.L. Jones. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons.

MODERN SOURCES

Abascal Palazón, J.M. 2002. "Ataecina." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 53-60. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Alarcão, J. 2002. "Scallabis e o seu Território." In *De Scallabis a Santarém*, 37-46. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

----- 2000. "Os nomes de algumas povoações romanas da parte portuguesa da Lusitânia." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 165-72. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

----- 1994. "Lisboa romana e visigótica." In *Lisboa Subterrânea*, 58-63. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

----- 1990a. "Identificação das Cidades da Lusitânia Portuguesa e dos seus Territórios." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 21-34. Paris: Éditions du Centre Nacional de la Recherche Scientifique.

----- 1990b. "A urbanização de Portugal nas épocas de César e de Augusto." In *Stadtbild und Ideologie: die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium in Madrid vom 19. bis 23. Oktober 1987*, edited by W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, 43-57. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

----- 1988a-d. *Roman Portugal, vols. 1 and 2i-2iii*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips Ltd.

----- 1984. "Criptopórtico Romano de Coimbra," *Arqueologia* 9, 118-120.

----- 1982. "O teatro romano de Lisboa." In *Actas del Simposio el Teatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 13 – 15 de Noviembre de 1980)*, 287-302. Badajoz: Institución Cultural Pedro de Valencia.

----- 1975. *Fouilles de Conimbriga. Volume V. La Céramique Commune Locale et Régionale*. Paris. E. de Boccard.

Alarcão, J., J.-G. Gorges, V. Mantas, M. Salinas de Frías, P. Sillières and A. Tranoy. 1990. "Appendice: Propositions pour un nouveau tracé des limites anciennes de la Lusitanie romaine." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 319-29. Paris: Éditions du Centre Nacional de la Recherche Scientifique.

Alarcão, J., R. Étienne, A.M. Alarcão and S. da Ponte. 1979. *Fouilles de Conimbriga. Volume VII. Trouvailles Diverses—Conclusions Générales*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Alarcão, J. and R. Étienne. 1977. *Fouilles de Conimbriga*. Volume Ia-b. *L'Architecture*. Paris. E. de Boccard.

Alarcão, J., M. Delgado, F. Mayet, A.M. Alarcão and S. da Ponte. 1976. *Fouilles de Conimbriga*. Volume VI. *Céramiques Diverses et Verres*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Almeida, D.F. de. 1956. *Egitânia: História e Arqueologia*. Lisbon: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa.

Alonso Sánchez, Á. and J.M. Fernández Corrales. 2000. "El proceso de romanización de la Lusitania oriental: la creación de asentamientos militares." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 85-100. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Álvarez Rojas, A. 1999. *Tres estudios de Historia de Cáceres: la colonia Norba y los Campamentos de Servilio y Metelo, La calzada Romana del Puente de Alcántara, El término Municipal de Cáceres en el siglo XIII*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura.

Alves, L.F.D. 1956. "Problema da Localização de Myrtilis." In *Arquivo de Beja*, vol. 13, 47-77.

Amaro, C. and M.T. Caetano. 1993/4. "Breve Nota Sobre o Complexo Romano da Rua Augusta (Lisboa)," *Conimbriga*, vol. 32/3, 283-94.

Arce, J., S. Ensolli and E. La Rocca, eds. 1997. *Hispania Romana*. Rome: Electa.

Armani, S. "A propos d'une inscription d'Evora: l'expression de l'état civil in Lusitanie." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 269-80. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Arruda, A.M. and C. Viegas. 2002. "A Alcáçova." In *De Scallabis a Santarém*, 73-81. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

-----, 1999. "The Roman Temple of Scallabis." In *Journal of Iberian Archaeology*, vol. 1, 185-224.

Arruda, A.M., V.T. de Freitas and J.I.V. Sánchez. 2000. "As cerâmicas cinzentas da Sé de Lisboa," *Revista Portuguesa da Arqueologia*, vol. 3, no. 2, 25-59.

Aujac, G. 1993. *Claude Ptolémée, astronome, astrologue, géographe*. Paris: Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques.

Azevedo, L.A. de. 1815. *Dissertação critico-filologico-historica sobre o verdadeiro anno, manifestas causas, e attendiveis circunstancias da erecção do Tablado e Orquestra do antigo Theatro Romano, descoberto na excavação da Rua de São Mamede perto do Castelo desta Cidade, com a intelligencia da sua Inscrição em honra de Nero, e noticia instructiva d'outras*

Memorias alli mesmo achadas, e atégora apparecidas. Lisbon: Nova impressão da viuva Neves e filhos.

Balty, J.-C. 1991. *Curia ordinis. Recherches d'architecture et d'urbanisme antiques sur les curies provinciales du monde romain*. Brussels.

Batata, C., J.P. Bernardes, L. Fernandes, O. de Matos and S. da Ponte. 1993. "Sellium na história antiga peninsular." In *Actas do II Congresso Peninsular de História Antiga (Coimbra, 18 a 20 de Outubro de 1990)*, 511-50. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Clássicos: Instituto de Arqueologia.

Bernardes, J.P. 2000. "Romanização e Sociedade Rural na Civitas de Collippo." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 421-38. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Biers, W.R., ed. 1988. *Mirobriga: Investigations at an Iron Age and Roman Site in Southern Portugal by the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1981-1986 (BAR International Series 451)*. Oxford: BAR.

Biers, W.R. and J.C. Biers. 1988. "The Baths." In *Mirobriga: Investigations at an Iron Age and Roman Site in Southern Portugal by the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1981-1986 (BAR International Series 451)*, edited by W.R. Biers, 48-125. Oxford: BAR.

Blázquez, J.M. 1996. *España Romana*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, S.A.

----- 1968. "Caparra III," *Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* 67.

----- 1966. "Caparra II," *Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* 54.

----- 1965. "Caparra," *Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* 34.

Blázquez, J.M. and J. Aimar, eds. 1996. *La romanización en occidente*. Madrid: Actas Editorial.

Boxoyo, S.B. 1952. *Noticias históricas de la muy noble y leal villa de Cáceres*. Cáceres.

Brandão, D. de P. 1972. "Epigrafia romana coliponense," *Conimbriga*, vol. 12, 40-3.

Burgos, F.A. 1984. *Catalogo General De La Moneda Hispanica, desde sus origines hasta el siglo V*. Madrid: J. Vico.

Burnett, A., M. Amandry and P.P. Ripollès Alegre. 1992a-b. *Roman Provincial Coinage, volume I, parts 1(a) and 2(b): From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius (44 B.C. – 69 A.D.)*. London: British Museum Press.

Caetano, M.T. 2001. "Mosaicos Romanos de Lisboa: I – A 'Baixa Pombalina,'" *Conimbriga*, vol. 40, 65-82.

Caldas, A., ed. 2003. *Eciência Magazine*, no. 6.

Callejo, C. 1968. *El Miliario Extravagante* no. 14.

Carlos Saquete, J. "Privilegio y sociedad en Augusta Emerita: la cuestión del Ius Italicum y la Immunitas." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 379-90. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Carvalho, P.C. 1998. *O Forum de Aeminium*. Instituto Português de Museus.

Castillo, C., F.J. Navarro and R. Martínez, eds. 2001. *De Augusto a Trajano: un siglo en la historia de Hispania*. Pamplona: EUNSA.

Centeno, R.M.S. 1984. *História de Portugal*, vol. 1. Lisbon: Alfa.

Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. 1990. *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Consellería de Cultura, Dirección Xeral de Patrimonio Histórico e Documental. 1993. *Actas del XXII Congreso Nacional de Arqueología*. 2 vols. Vigo: Xunta de Galicia, Consellería de Cultura, Dirección Xeral de Patrimonio Histórico e Documental.

Correia, V.H. 1994. "O anfiteatro de conímbriga, nota preliminar." In *Coloquio Internacional el Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 26-28 de Noviembre 1992)*, edited by J.M. Álvarez Martínez and J.J. Enríquez Navascués, 327-43. Mérida: Junta de Extremadura.

Crawford, M.H. 1985. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.

Curchin, L. 2004. *The Romanization of Central Spain*. London and New York: Routledge.

----- 1991. *Roman Spain: Conquest and Assimilation*. London and New York: Routledge.

----- 1990a. *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

----- 1990b. "Élite urbaine, elite rurale en Lusitanie." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 265-76. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Deininger, J. 1965. *Die Provinziallandtage der roemischen Kaiserzeit. von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Munich: Beck.

Delgado, M., F. Mayet and A.M. Alarcão. 1975. *Fouilles de Conimbriga*. Volume IV. *Les Sigillées*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

D'Encarnação, J. 1984. *Inscrições Romanas do Conventus Pacensis*. 2 Vols. Coimbra: Instituto de Arqueologia da Faculdade de Letras.

Detlefsen, D. 1909. *Die Anordnung der geographischen Bücher des Plinius und ihre Quellen*. Berlin: Wiedmann.

-----, 1904. *Die geographischen Bücher (II, 242--VI Schlufs) der Naturalis Historia des C. Plinius Secundus*. Berlin: Wiedmann.

Diogo, A.M.D. and E. Sepúlveda. 2001. "Um estudo sobre as lucernas encontradas nas escavações de 1966/7 do teatro romano de Lisboa," *Conimbriga*, vol. 40, 225-35.

Diogo, A.M.D. and L. Trindade. 2000. "Vestígios de uma unidade de transformação do pescado descobertos na Rua dos Fanqueiros, em Lisboa," *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia*, vol. 3, no. 1. 37-176.

D'Ors, A. 1953. *Epigrafía Jurídica de la España Romana*. Madrid.

Edmondson, J.C. 1987. *Two Industries in Roman Lusitania. Mining and Garum Production*. Oxford: BAR.

Ensoli, S. 1997. "Clípeos figurativos de los Foros de edad imperial en Roma y en las provincias occidentales. De signo apotropaico a símbolo de la divinización imperial." In *Hispania Romana*, edited by J. Arce, S. Ensoli and E. La Rocca, 161-9. Rome: Electa.

Esteban Ortega, J. 2000. "El proceso de romanización en Lusitania a través de la Epigrafía." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 249-68. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Étienne, R. 1990. "Le Culte Impérial, vecteur de la hiérarchisation urbaine." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 217-32. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

-----, 1958. *Le culte impérial dans la Péninsule Ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (BEFAR 191), Paris: E. de Boccard.

Étienne, R., G. Fabre, P. Lévêque and M. Lévêque. 1976. *Fouilles de Conimbriga*. Volume II. *Épigraphie et Sculpture*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Fabião, C. 2002. "Chões de Alpompe." In *De Scallabis a Santarém*, 149-52. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

----- 1998. "O Vinho na Lusitânia: reflexões em torno de um problema arqueológico," *Revista Portuguesa da Arqueologia*, vol. 1, no. 1, 169-98.

Faria, A.M.de. 1999. "Colonização e municipalização nas províncias hispano-romanas: reanálise de alguns casos polémicos," *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia*, vol. 2, no. 2. 29-50.

----- 1995a. "Moedas da época romana cunhadas em territorio actualmente português." In *La moneda hispánica: ciudad y territorio. Actas del I Encuentro Peninsular de Numismática Antigua (Madrid, Noviembre 1994)*, edited by M. García y Bellido and R. Centeno, 143-53. Madrid: J. Vico.

----- 1995b. "Plínio-o-Velho e os estatutos das cidades privilegiadas hispano-romanas localizadas no actual territorio português," *Vipasca*, vol. 4, 89-99.

----- 1989. "Sobre a presença romana no actual território português. Apostilas ao recente livro do Prof. Jorge de Alarcão," *Conimbriga*, vol. 28, 53-69.

Faria, J. 1998. "Forum de Salacia Imperatoria," *Conimbriga*, vol. 37, 185-99.

Faria, J. and M. Ferreira. 1986. "Estações inéditas da época romana do concelho de Alcácer do Sal," *Conimbriga*, vol. 25, 41-51.

Fernandes, L. 2002. "Sobre dois capitéis de Lisboa." In *Conimbriga*, vol. 41, 237-56.

Fernández Corrales, J.M. 1988. *El asentamiento romano en Extremadura y su análisis espacial*. Cáceres.

Fernández Miranda, M, J.M. Manjarrés, J. Pereira and D. Plácido Suárez. 1990. "Alio itinere ab Emerita Caesaraugusta: La vía romana entre Talavera de la Reina y Toledo y la implantación humana en el Valle Medio del río Tajo." In *Simposio sobre la red viaria en la Hispania romana*, 155-63. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.

Ferreira, A.P. 2000. "Sobre a dispersão dos Taporí," *Conimbriga*, vol. 39, 153-89.

Ficheiro Epigráfico. Suplemento de *Conimbriga*, edited by J. D'Encarnação.

Floriano, A.C. 1944. "Excavaciones en la antigua Cappara (Caparra, Cáceres)," *ArchEspArq*, vol. 56, 270ff.

----- 1931. *La cuestión crítica de la fundación y del nombre de Cáceres*. Cáceres.

Frade, H. and J.C. Caetano. 2002. "Os Cultos na Civitas Cobelcorum." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 227-30. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Frade, H. and C. Portas. 1994. "A arquitectura do anfiteatro romano de Bobadela." In *Coloquio Internacional el Anfiteatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 26-28 de Noviembre 1992)*, edited by J.M. Álvarez Martínez and J.J. Enríquez Navascués, 349-68. Mérida: Junta de Extremadura.

Francisco Martín, J.de. 1996. *Conquista y Romanización de Lusitania*, 2nd ed. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

French, R. 1994. *Ancient Natural History*. London: Routledge.

Galsterer, H. 1971. *Untersuchungen zum römischen Städtewesen auf der iberischen Halbinsel (MF 8)*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

Galsterer-Kröll, B. 1972. "Untersuchungen zu den römischen Beinamen der Städte des Imperium Romanum," *EpSt* 9, 44-145.

García y Bellido, A. 1971. "El recinto mural romano de Eborac Liberalitas Iulia." In *Conimbriga*, vol. 10, 85-92.

----- 1966-7. "Retratos Romanos Imperiales de Portugal," *Arquivo de Beja* vol. 13/4, 280-91.

----- 1962. "Excavaciones en Augustobriga (Talavera la Vieja, Cáceres)," *NAHisp* 5 (1956-61), 235-37.

----- 1959. "Las colonias romanas de Hispania," *Anuario de Historia del Derecho Español*, vol. 29, 447-552.

Gorges, J.-G. 1990. "Villes et villas de Lusitanie." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 91-114. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

----- 1979. *Les villas hispano-romaines: inventaire et problématique archéologiques*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Gorges, J.-G. and T. Nogales Basarrate, eds. 2000. *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Groag, E. and A. Stein. 1936. *Prosopographia imperii romani, pars 2 (PIR²)*. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Haba Quirós, S. 1998. *Medellín romano: La colonia medellinensis y su territorio*. Badajoz.

Hauschild, T. 2002. "Templos Romanos na Província da Lusitânia." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 215-22. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Hera, M. del A. 1982. "El teatro romano de Medellín." In *Actas del Simposio el Teatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 13 – 15 de Noviembre de 1980)*, 317-36. Badajoz: Institución Cultural Pedro de Valencia.

Hernández Guerra, L. and A. Jiménez de Furundarena. 2001. "Nueva propuesta de distribución territorial en la provincia de Salamanca." In *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia Antigua: La Península Ibérica hace 2000 años*, 255-62. Valladolid: Centro Buendía, Universidad de Valladolid.

Hernández Guerra, L., L. Sagredo San Eustaquio, J.M. Solana Sáinz, eds. 2001. *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia Antigua: La Península Ibérica hace 2000 años*. Valladolid: Centro Buendía, Universidad de Valladolid.

Hidalgo, M.J., D. Pérez and M.J.R. Gervás, eds. 1998. "Romanización" y "Reconquista" en la *Península Ibérica: nuevas perspectivas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Hoz Bravo, J. and F. Fernández Palacios. 2002. "Band-." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 45-52. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Hübner, A. 1869. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, Volume 2: Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae*. Berlin: G. Reimer.

Institución Cultural Pedro de Valencia. 1982. *Actas del Simposio el Teatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 13 – 15 de Noviembre de 1980)*. Badajoz: Institución Cultural Pedro de Valencia.

Institución Fernando el Católico. 1990. *Simposio sobre la red viaria en la Hispania romana*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.

Instituto de Arqueologia. 1993. *Actas do II Congresso Peninsular de História Antiga (Coimbra, 18 – 20 de Outubro de 1990)*. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Clássicos: Instituto de Arqueologia.

Instituto de Patrimonio Histórico. 1997. *Actas del XXIV Congreso Nacional de Arqueología. Vol. 4. Romanización y desarrollo urbano en la Hispania republicana*. Cartagena: Instituto de Patrimonio Histórico.

Keay, S. 2001. "Romanization and the Hispaniae." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by S. Keay and N. Terrenato, 117-44. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Keay, S. and N. Terrenato, eds. 2001. *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Klotz, A. 1906. *Quaestiones Plinianae geographicae*. Berlin: Wiedmann.

Le Roux, P. 1996. "Droit latin et municipalisation en Lusitanie sous l'Empire." In *Teoría y práctica del ordenamiento municipal en Hispania. Actas del Symposium de Vitoria-Gasteiz (22-24 de Noviembre de 1993)*, edited by E.O. de Urbina and J. Santos, 239-53. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco.

----- 1990. "Les Villes de Statut Municipal." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie Romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 35-50. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Leonard, A. Jr. and K. W. Slane. 1988. "The Excavations in the Circus." In *Mirobriga: Investigations at an Iron Age and Roman Site in Southern Portugal by the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1981-1986 (BAR International Series 451)*, edited by W.R. Biers, 31-47. Oxford: BAR.

Lopes, L.S. 2000. "A estrada Emínio-Talábriga-Cale: *Relações com a geografia e o povoamento de Entre Douro e Mondego*." In *Conimbriga*, vol. 39, 191-258.

Lopes, M.da C. 1996. "O Território de Pax Iulia: limites e caracterização," *Arquivo de Beja*, vols. II/III, série III. Beja. 63-74.

Lucas, M.M. 1989. "A Gens Cadia em Aeminium," *Conimbriga*, vol. 28, 169-203.

Maciel, M.J. 1993/4. "As 'conservas de água' da Rua da Prata," *Conimbriga*, vol. 32/3, 145-56.

Maia do Amaral, A.E. 1982. "Sobre três inscrições perdidas da Bobadela," *Conimbriga*, vol. 21, 101-26.

Mangas Manjarres, J. and J. Carrobles Santos. 1992. "La Ciudad de Talavera de la Reina en Epoca Romana." In *Actas de las Primeras Jornadas de Arqueologia de Talavera de la Reina y sus Tierras*, 95-114. Toledo.

Mantas, V.G. 2002. "*C. Cantinus Modestinus* e seus templos." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 231-4. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

----- 2000. "A sociedade luso-romana do município de Ammaia." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 391-420. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

----- 1998. "Colonização e Aculteração no Alentejo," *Arquivo de Beja*, vols. VII/VIII, série III. Beja. 33-61.

----- 1996a. "Teledetecção, cidade e territorio: Pax Iulia," *Arquivo de Beja*, vol. I, série III. Beja. 5-30.

----- 1996b. "Em Torno do Problema da Fundação e Estatuto de Pax Iulia," *Arquivo de Beja*, vols. II/III, série III. Beja. 41-62.

- 1993. "As Fundações Coloniais no Território Português." In *Actas do II Congresso Peninsular de História Antiga (Coimbra, 18 – 20 de Outubro de 1990)*, 467-500. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Clássicos: Instituto de Arqueologia.
- 1992. "Notas Sobre a Estrutura Urbana de Aeminium," *Biblos* vol. 68, 487-513.
- 1990a. "As cidades marítimas da Lusitânia." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 149-206. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- 1990b. "A rede viaria do convento escalabitano." In *Simposio sobre la red viaria en la Hispania romana*, 219-39. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- 1988. "Orarium donavit Igaeditanis: epigrafia e funções urbanas numa capital regional lusitana." In *Actas del I Congreso Peninsular de Historia Antigua*, vol. 2, 415-39. Santiago de Compostela: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- 1987. "As primitivas formas de povoamento urbano em Portugal," *Povos e Culturas* 2, 13-55.
- Mar, R. 1997. "El urbanismo romano en la península ibérica." In *Hispania Romana*, edited by J. Arce, S. Ensolli and E. La Rocca, 142-8. Rome: Electa.
- Martín de Cáceres, E.C. 2000. "Capara, municipio romano." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 155-64. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.
- Martín de Cáceres, E.C., J.M. Fernandez Corrales and G.H.G. de la Santa. 1990. "Ciudades, Territorios y Vías de Comunicación en la Lusitania Meridional Española." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 51-72. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Mélida, J.R. 1925. *Monumentos Romanos de España*. Madrid.
- Mendes, N.M. "Cultura e Sociedade: conceito e prática da romanização na Lusitânia." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 439-44. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.
- Menéndez-Pidal Alvarez, J. 1976. "Algunas notas sobre la restauración y atención prestadas a los monumentos emeritenses." *AE*, 199-216.
- Mierse, W.E. 1999. *Temples and Towns of Roman Iberia*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Moita, I. 1977. *As Termas Romanas da Rua da Prata*. Lisbon.

Moreira, J.B. 2002. *Cidade romana de Eburobrittium: Óbidos*. Porto: Mimesis.

Müller, K., ed. 1883. *Claudii Ptolemaei Geographia, Volume I*, Paris: Editore Alfredo Firmin Didot.

Museo Nacional de Arte Romano. 1993. *El Proceso Histórico de la Lusitania Oriental en Epoca Prerromana y Romana*. Mérida: Museo Nacional de Arte Romano.

Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. 2002. *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

----- 1994. *Lisboa Subterrânea*. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Nünnerich-Asmus, A. 1996. *El arco cuadrifronte de Cáparra (Cáceres). Un estudio sobre la arquitectura flavia en la Península Ibérica*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Oleiro, J.M.B. and J. de Alarcão. 1969. "Escavações em S. Sebastião do Freixo," *Conimbriga*, vol. 8, 1-12.

Pereira, I., J.-P. Bost and J. Hiernard. 1974. *Fouilles de Conimbriga. Volume III. Les Monnaies*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Pérez Vilatela, L. 2000. "De la Lusitania independiente a la creación de la provincia." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 73-84. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Ponte, S.da. 1993. "Achegas sobre a estrutura urbana de Sellium (Tomar)." In *Actas del XXII Congreso nacional de arqueologia*, vol. 2, 447-9. Vigo: Xunta de Galicia, Consellería de Cultura, Dirección Xeral de Patrimonio Histórico e Documental.

----- 1986. "Paço do Infante", "Rua Carlos Campeão" and "Rua Ângela Tamagnini." In *Informação arqueológica*, vol. 6, 74-77.

Prontera, F. 1999. "Notas sobre Iberia en la geografía de Estrabón." In *Estrabón e Iberia: nuevas perspectivas de estudio*, edited by G. Cruz Andreotti, 17-30. Universidad de Málaga.

Ramage, E.S. 1998. "Augustus' propaganda in Spain," *Klio* 80: 2, 434-90.

Ramos Sanchez, F. 1992. *Merida: A Brief Guide to its Monuments*, translated by J. Stoelting de López. Mérida.

Ribeiro, J.C. 2002a. "Endovellicus." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 79-90. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

-----, 2002b. "Endovellicus." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 379-80. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Ribeiro, M.A.B.S. 1999. *Capitéis Romanos de Beja*. Beja: Câmara Municipal de Beja.

Richardson, J.S. 1996. *The Romans in Spain*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Ripollès Alegre, P.P. and Abascal Palazón, J.M. 2000. *Monedas hispánicas*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia, Gabinete de Antigüedades.

Roldán Hervás, J.M. 1971. *Iter ab Emerita Asturicam: el Camino de la Plata*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Roldán Hervás, J.M. and F. Wulff Alonso. 2001. *Citerior y Ulterior: las provincias romanas de hispania en la era republicana*. Madrid: Ediciones Istmo.

Rose, C.B. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ross-Taylor, L. 1960. *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic* (Volume XX of Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome). Rome: American Academy in Rome.

Rubio Fuentes, M.J. 1993. "Caesarobriga, ciudad romana de la Lusitania." In *Actas do II Congresso Peninsular de História Antiga (Coimbra, 18 a 20 de Outubro de 1990)*, 567-80. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Clássicos: Instituto de Arqueologia.

Sáenz de Buruaga, J.A. 1982. "Observaciones sobre el teatro romano de Mérida." In *Actas del Simposio el Teatro en la Hispania Romana (Mérida, 13 – 15 de Noviembre de 1980)*, 303-16. Badajoz: Institución Cultural Pedro de Valencia.

Sáez Fernández, P. and A. Pérez Paz. 1993. "Noticia sobre una inscripción catastral de la zona de Lacimurga." In *Actas do II Congresso Peninsular de História Antiga (Coimbra, 18 – 20 de Outubro de 1990)*, 643-54. Coimbra: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Estudos Clássicos: Instituto de Arqueologia.

Salas Martín, J. and J. Esteban Ortega. 1994. *La Colonia Norba Caesarina y la Gens Norbana en Hispania*. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura.

Salinas de Frías, M. 2001. *Los vettones. Indigenismo y romanización en el occidente de la Meseta*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

Salinas de Frías, M. and J. Rodríguez Cortés. 2000. "Substrato y romanización de las oligarquías locales de la provincia romana de Lusitania." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y*

Cultura en Lusitania Romana, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 17-34. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Sanches, M. 1969. "Statue Romaine trouvée à S. Sebastião do Freixo (Commune de Batalha)," *Conimbriga*, vol. 8, 13-5.

Sánchez-Palencia, F.J., A. Montalvo and E. Gijón. 2001. "El circo romano de *Augusta Emerita*." In *El Circo en Hispania Romana*, 75-95. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura.

Sánchez-Palencia, F.J. and M. Ruiz del Árbol. 2000. "Estructuras agrarias y explotación minera en Lusitania nororiental: la Zona Arqueológica de Las Cavenes (El Cabaco, Salamanca)." In *IV Mesa Redonda Internacional: Sociedad y Cultura en Lusitania Romana*, edited by J.-G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarrate, 343-60. Mérida: Editora regional de Extremadura.

Sayas Abengochea, J.J. 1993. "Algunas consideraciones sobre cuestiones relacionadas con la conquista y romanización de las tierras extremeñas." In *El Proceso Histórico de la Lusitania Oriental en Epoca Prerromana y Romana*, 189-233. Mérida: Museo Nacional de Arte Romano.

Sepúlveda, E., A. Vale, V. Sousa, V. Santos and N. Guerreiro. 2002. "A cronologia do circo de Olisipo: a Terra Sigillata," *Revista Portuguesa da Arqueologia*, vol. 5, no. 2, 245-275.

Sillières, P. 1990. "Voies Romaines et Limites de Provinces et de Cités en Lusitanie." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 73-88. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Silva, A.C.F. da. 2001. *Estação arqueologica do Cabeço do Vouga: um olhar sobre o passado feito presente*. Câmara Municipal de Agueda.

----- 1984. "Aspectos da proto-história e romanização no concelho de Vila Nova de Gaia e problemática do seu povoamento," *Gaya* II, 39-58.

----- 1983. "As tesserae hospitales do castro da Senhora da Saúde ou Monte Murado, Pedroso," *Gaya* I, 9-26.

Silva, A.C.F. da, A.B. Lopes and M.J.F. Lobato. 1984. "O forno cerâmico romano de Canelas (Vila Nova de Gaia)," *Gaya* II, 59-61.

Slane, K.W. 1988. "The Survey." In *Mirobriga: Investigations at an Iron Age and Roman Site in Southern Portugal by the University of Missouri-Columbia, 1981-1986 (BAR International Series 451)*, edited by W.R. Biers, 7-30. Oxford: BAR.

Soria Sánchez, V. 1997. "Inscripciones y noticias arqueológicas de Extremadura." In *Actas del XXIV Congreso Nacional de Arqueología*. Vol 4: *Romanización y desarrollo urbano en la Hispania republicana*, 791-8. Cartagena: Instituto de Patrimonio Histórico.

Souza, V. de. 1990. *Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani. Portugal*. Coimbra.

Tabula Imperii Romani: TIR. 2001. Hoja K-29: Valencia. Corduba-Hispalis-Carthago Nova-Astigi.

----- 1995. Hoja J-29: Lisboa. Emerita-Scallabis-Pax Iulia-Gades.

----- 1993. Hoja K-30: Madrid. Caesaraugusta-Clunia.

----- 1991. Hoja J-30: Porto. Conimbriga-Bracara-Lucus-Asturica.

Tranoy, A. 1990. "L'Organisation Urbaine dans le *Conventus Scallabitanus*." In *Les Villes de Lusitanie romaine: hierarchies et territoires. Table ronde internationale du CNRS (Talence, le 8-9 décembre 1988)*, 11-20. Paris: Éditions du Centre Nacional de la Recherche Scientifique.

Trillmich, W., and P. Zanker, eds. 1990. *Stadtbild und Ideologie: die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit: Kolloquium in Madrid vom 19. bis 23. Oktober 1987*. Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Trotta, F. 1999. "Estrabón, el libro III y la tradición geográfica." In *Estrabón e Iberia: nuevas perspectivas de estudio*, edited by G. Cruz Andreotti, 81-100. Universidad de Málaga.

Uggeri, G. 2000. "Le fonti scritte di età classica." In *La topografia antica*, edited by P. Dall'Aglia, 45-62. Bologna: CLUEB.

Universidad de Zaragoza, Seminario de Arqueología. 1983. *Actas del XVI Congreso Nacional de Arqueología*. 1983. Zaragoza: Universidad de Zaragoza.

Untermann, J. 2002. "A epigrafia em Língua Lusitana e a sua Vertente Religiosa." In *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur Saxa*, 67-70. Lisbon: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia.

Viana, A. 1952. "Balsa y la Necropolis Romana de as Pedras d'el Rei," *ArchEspArq* 25, 261-285.

----- 1947. "Restos de um templo romano em Beja," *Arquivo de Beja*, vol. IV, série I. Beja. 77-88.

Viana, A., O. da V. Ferreira and R. F. de Andrade. 1956. "Exploração das Minas de Aljustrel, pelos Romanos," *Arquivo de Beja*, vol. XIII, 3-20.

Vittinghoff, F. 1952. "Röm Stradtrechtsformen." In *Zsav* 69, 465-70.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure 2: Augusta Emerita, city gate on Roman coin
(from Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès Alegre 1992b, pl. 3)

Figure 3: Augusta Emerita, altar on Roman coin
(from Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès Alegre 1992b, pl. 3)

Figure 4: Augusta Emerita, tetrastyle temple on Roman coin
(from Burnett, Amandry and Ripollès Alegre 1992b, pl. 4)

Figure 5: Collippo, Roman pottery kiln and public buildings
(from Oleiro and Alarcão 1969, fig. iv)

Figure 6: Locations of Roman pottery kilns in Portugal
(from Silva et al. 1984, after Centeno 1984, 190)

Figure 7: Roman garum production centers along the Portuguese coast
(from Edmondson 1987, fig. 1)

Figure 8: Termini Augustales found in northern Portugal
 (from Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2)

Distribuição dos vestígios romanos em Lisboa

- (A) Monumento da rua da Prata
- (B) Necrópole da Praça da Figueira
- (C) Fonte
- (D) Fonte
- (E) Teatro
- (F) Basilica
- (G) Termas dos Cássios
- (H) Lápide em honra do imperador Augusto
- (I) Arco do Triunfo
- Fábricas de salga de peixe

Figure 9: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, major Roman finds
(from Alarcão 1994)

FIG. 1 – Localização de estruturas arqueológicas na Baixa Pombalina junto à antiga margem do rio Tejo

Figure 10: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, ancient and modern coastline of the Tagus, Roman roads (from Amaro and Caetano 1993/4, fig. 1)

Fig. 2.- Esquema urbanístico de *Olisipo* (Lisboa) sobre una planta do séc. XVII. 1. Ruínas da Rua da Prata ; 2. Termas dos Cássios ; 3. Catedral ; 4. Vestígios da zona da Madalena ; 5. Localização da Porta do Ferro ; 6. Miliário da Casa dos Bicos ; I. Praça da Figueira ; II. Ribeira Velha ; III. Cruz da Pedra ; A. Rua Augusta ; B. Casa dos Bicos.

Figure 11: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, Roman roads and finds
(from Mantas 1990a, fig. 2)

Figure 12: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, plan of the Roman theater
(From Alarcão 1982, after Azevedo 1815)

Figure 13: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, findspot of Corinthian capitals
(from Fernandes 2002, fig. 1)

Figure 14: Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, Corinthian capital
(from Fernandes 2002, fig. 3)

Figure 15: Scallabis, Roman temple and other public structures excavated on the acropolis
(from Arruda and Viegas 2002, fig. 1)

Figure 16: Metellinum, plan of the Roman theater
(from Hera 1982, 322)

Figure 18: Ebora, Roman walls and temple
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 40 after Garcia y Bellido 1971, fig. 3)

Figure 19: Ebora, temple capitals
(from Mierse 1999, pl. 27)

Figure 20: Ebora, Roman temple plan
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 42, after Garcia y Bellido 1971, fig. 1)

Figure 21: Ebora, detail of the temple podium
(from Mierse 1999, pl. 15)

Figure 22: Major routes of Roman Lusitania
(from Mantas 1990a, fig. 1)

Figure 23: Acropolis of modern Alcácer do Sal (Roman Salacia)
(from J. Faria 1998, fig. 3)

Figure 24: Salacia, general view of the apsidal cella
(from J. Faria 1998, pl. 3)

Vestígios Arqueológicos Romanos em Beja

14 - Localização dos achados arqueológicos romanos em Beja

(Planta actual dos Serviços Urbanísticos da Câmara Municipal de Beja)

Figure 27: Important Roman finds in modern Beja (Roman Pax Iulia)
(from Ribeiro 1999, fig. 14)

Fig. 2

Figure 28: Pax Iulia, reconstruction of the Roman road system
(from Mantas 1996a, fig. 2)

Abb. 3. Pax Iulia, planta do templo (1:500).

Figure 29: Pax Iulia, foundations of the Roman temple
(from Alarcão 1990b, fig. 3)

Figure 30: Pax Iulia, Corinthian capitals
(from Alarcão 1990b, fig. 4)

Figure 31: Pax Iulia, Roman city gate
(from Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2)

Fig. 3

Figure 32: Seated marble female statue, found near Beja
(from Mantas 1996a, fig. 3)

Figure 33: Layout of Mérida (Roman Augusta Emerita), with Roman finds (from Ramos Sanchez 1992)

Figure 34: Roman amphitheater at Mérida (Roman Augusta Emerita) (from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 13)

Figure 35: Augusta Emerita, aerial view of the Roman theater and amphitheater
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 9)

Figure 36: Augusta Emerita, detail of the stonework on the exterior façade of the amphitheater
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, fig. 14)

Figure 37: Augusta Emerita, reconstructed Roman theater
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 10-11)

Figure 38: Augusta Emerita, view of the Roman circus and its *spina*
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 16)

Figure 39: Augusta Emerita, “Los Milagros” aqueduct
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 35)

Figure 40: Augusta Emerita, “Templo de Diana”
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 37)

Figure 41: Augusta Emerita, detail of the podium of the “Templo de Diana”
(from Mierse 1999, pl. 13)

Figure 42: Augusta Emerita, hypothetical reconstruction of the Mars temple
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 27)

Figure 43: Rome, Temple of Mars Ultor
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 28)

Figure 44: Augusta Emerita, Chronos-Mithras
(from Ramos Sanchez 1992, 51)

Figure 45: Location of Balsa, on the southern coast of Lusitania
(from Mantas 1990a, fig. 1)

Fig. 12 Plan of the site, showing 1983 survey grids (scale 1:1500 approx.)

Figure 46: Mirobriga, site plan
(from Biers 1988, fig. 12)

Figure 47: Mirobriga, forum area
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 64)

Figure 48: Ammaia, inscription in honor of Nero
(from Mantas 2000, fig. 1)

Fig. 5. Planta do forum de *Ammaia*.

Figure 49: Ammaia, forum plan
(from Mantas 2000, fig. 5)

Figure 50: Ammaia, probable territorial boundaries
(from Mantas 2000, fig. 2)

fig. 63

Figure 51: Eburobrittium, excavation plan
(from Moreira 2002, fig. 63)

Figure 52: Eboracritium, reconstructed forum ground plan
(from Moreira 2002, fig. 191)

Figure 53: Tomar (Roman Sellium), Roman city perimeter
(from Ponte 1986, pl. 1)

Abb. 5. Pax Iulia, restituição da posição possível do capitel de três frentes (1:500).

Abb. 6. Sellium, planta da basílica do forum (1:500).

Figure 54: Sellium, partial forum plan
(from Alarcão 1990b, figs. 5 and 6)

Figure 55: Sellium, Ionic capital
(from Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2)

Figure 56: Augustobriga, plan of the larger temple
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 39, after Garcia y Bellido 1962, pl. 164)

Figure 57: Augustobriga larger temple columns
(from Mierse 1999, pl. 25)

Figure 58: Augustobriga, larger Roman temple
(from Mierse 1999, pl. 12)

Figure 59: Augusta Emerita, restored façade of the ‘Templo de Diana’
according to Menéndez-Pidal Alvarez (after Menéndez-Pidal Alvarez 1976, fig. 6)
(from Mierse 1999, fig. 43)

FIG. 105

Figure 60: Idanha-A-Velha (Roman *Civitas* Igaeditanorum), inscription dating to 16 B.C.
 (from Almeida 1956, fig. 105.)

Figure 61: *Civitas Igaeditanorum*, aerial view
(from Almeida 1956, fig. 30)

Figure 62: *Civitas Igaeditanorum*, city plan
(from Almeida 1956, fig. 5)

Figure 63: *Civitas Igaeditanorum*, temple podium
(from Alarcão 1990b, pl. 2)

FIG. 49

FIG. 50

FIG. 51

FIG. 52

CASTELO.

Figure 64: *Civitas Igaeditanorum*, views of the Templar tower and its Roman podium
(from Almeida 1956, figs. 49-52)

Plano de Talavera de la Reina con hipótesis de pervivencias del trazado de época romana. 1) Necrópolis de la Puerta de Mérida-San Clemente. 2) Necrópolis del Arco de San Pedro-Plaza del Rey. 3) Necrópolis de la Puerta de la Alcazaba-Ronda del Cañillo.

113

Figure 65: Plan of Talavera de la Reina (Roman Caesarobriga), with location of Roman road grid and Roman cemeteries
(from Mangas Manjarres and Carroble Santos 1993, 113)

Figure 66: Conimbriga, Augustan forum ground plan
(from Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. 4)

Figure 67: Conimbriga, Augustan forum decorative scheme
(from Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. 13)

Figure 68: Conimbriga, marble portrait of Augustus
(from Étienne et al. 1976, pl. 35)

Figure 69: Conimbriga, with amphitheater
(from Correia 1994, fig. 3)

Figure 70: Excavated portions of Conimbriga amphitheater
(from Correia 1994, fig. 4)

Figure 71: Conimbriga, Flavian forum ground plan
(from Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. 5)

Figure 72: Conimbriga, Flavian forum ground plan superimposed over Augustan (from Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. 6)

Figure 73: Conimbriga, Flavian forum decorative scheme
(from Alarcão and Étienne 1977, pl. 14)

Figure 74: Cáparra (Roman Capera), with the location of the amphitheater indicated by an arrow (from Martín de Cáceres 2000, pl. 1)

Figure 75: Plan of the Roman remains of Capera
(from Floriano 1944, fig. 1)

Figure 76: Roman remains of Capera, including, at far right, amphitheater (from Martín de Cáceres 2000, fig. 2)

Figure 77: Capera, dedication of the Temple of Jupiter
(from Floriano 1944, fig. 19)

Figure 78: Capera, Temple of Jupiter (left); public structure (right)
(from Floriano 1944, fig. 2)

Figure 79: Coimbra (Roman Aeminium) with Roman roads and structures
(from Mantas 1992, fig. 3)

Fot. 7 - Vespasiano

Fot. 8

Figure 80: Aeminium, bust of Vespasian (top) and passageway of the cryptoporticus (bottom)
(from Carvalho 1998, plts. 7 and 8)

Planta 16 – Traçados arquitectónicos hipotéticos do “forum” de Aeminium

Figure 81: Aeminium, three possible plans of the Roman forum
(from Carvalho 1998, fig. 16)

Est. 1. Localização das várias estruturas romanas já identificadas em Bobadela.

Figure 82: Bobadela, location of excavated structures
(from Frade and Portas 1994, fig. 1)

Est. 2. Estruturas do anfiteatro, com a localização dos cortes estratigráficos apresentados nas Estampas 3 a 10.

Figure 83: Bobadela, amphitheater
(from Frade and Portas 1994, fig. 2)

FIGURA 12

Figure 84: Roman road from Aeminium to Cale
(from Lopes 2000, fig. 12)

Figure 85: Talabriga, Roman public structure
(from Silva 2001, fig. 10)

Figure 86: Lancobriga, *tessera hospitalis* (ca. 7 A.D.)
(from Silva 1984, fig. 2)

Figure 87: Lancobriga, *tessera hospitalis* (ca. 9 A.D.)
(from Silva 1984, fig. 3)

Figure 88: *Civitates* of the Portuguese portion of Lusitania
(from Alarcão 1990a, fig. 1)

Figure 89: Locations of inscriptions mentioning the Tabori
(from Ferreira 2000)

Figure 90: Roman villas of Lusitania (first through fifth century A.D.)
(from Gorges 1990, fig. 3)

Figura 3: El eje de la calzada Córdoba-Oporto.

Figure 91: Proposed route from Corduba to Cale, via Metellinum and Alcántara
(from Álvarez Rojas 1999, fig. 3)

Appendix: Greek and Latin texts

PLINY THE ELDER, NATURALIS HISTORIA

On Baetica

III. 7 Baetica a flumine eam mediam secante cognominanta cunctas provinciarum divite cultu et quodam fertili ac peculiari nitore praecedat, iuridici conventus ei IV, Gaditanus Cordubensis Astigitanus Hispalensis. oppida omnia numero CLXXV, in iis coloniae IX, municipia c. R. X, Latio antiquitus donata XXVII, libertate VI, foedere III, stipendiaria CXX. ex his digna memoratu aut Latino sermone dictu facilia, a flumine Ana, litore oceani, oppidum Ossonoba, Aestuaria cognominatum, inter confluentes Luxiam et Urium, Hareni montes, Baetis fluvius, litus Cursense inflexo sinu, cuius ex adverso Gadis inter insulas dicendae, promunturium Iunonis, portus Vaesippo, oppidum Baelo, Mellaria, fretum ex Atlantico mari, Carteia Tartesos a Graecis dicta, mons Calpe. dein litore interno oppidum Barbesula cum fluvio, item Salduba, oppidum Suel, Malaca cum fluvio, foederatorum.

III. 8 dein Maenuba cum fluvio, Sexi cognomine Firmum Iulium, Sel, Abdara, Murgi, Baeticae finis. oram eam in universum originis Poenorum existimavit M. Agrippa; ab Ana autem Atlantico oceano obversa Bastulorum Turdulorumque est. in universam Hispaniam M. Varro pervenisse Hiberos et Persas et Phoenicas Celtasque et Poenos tradit; lusum enim Liberi patris aut lyssam cum eo bacchantium nomen dedisse Lusitaniae, et Pana praefectum eius universae. at quae de Hercule ac Pyrene vel Saturno traduntur fabulosa in primis arbitror.

III. 13 Quae autem regio a Baete ad fluvium Anam tendit extra praedicta Baeturia appellatur in duas divisa partes totidemque gentes, Celticos qui Lusitaniam attingunt, Hispalensis conventus, Turdulos qui Lusitaniam et Tarraconensem accolunt, iura Cordubam petunt. Celticos a Celtiberis ex Lusitania advenisse manifestum est sacris, lingua, oppidorum vocabulis quae cognominibus in Baetica distinguuntur:

III. 14 Seriae adicitur Fama Iulia, Nertobrigae Concordia Iulia, Segidae Restituta Iulia, Contributa Iulia Ugultuniae (cum qua et Curiga nunc est), Lacimurgae Constantia Iulia, Steresibus Fortunales et Callensibus Aeneanici, praeter haec in Celtica Acinipo, Arunda, Arunci, Turobriga, Lastigi, Salpesa, Saepone, Serippo.

On Lusitania

IV. 113 A Durio Lusitania incipit: Turduli veteres, Paesuri, flumen Vagia, oppidum Talabrica, oppidum et flumen Aeminium, oppida Coniumbrica, Collippo, Eburobrittium. excurrit deinde in altum vasto cornu promunturium, quod aliqui Artabrum appellavere, alii Magnum, multi Olisipponense ab oppido, terras, maria, caelum discriminans. illoo finitur Hispaniae latus et a circuitu eius incipit frons.

IV. 114 Septentrio hinc oceanusque Gallicus, occasus illinc et oceanus Atlanticus. promunturi excursus LX prodidere, alii XC, ad Pyrenaeum inde non pauci XIII, et ibi gentem Artabrum, quae numquam fuit, manifesto errore: Arrotrebas enim, quos ante Celticum diximus promunturium, hoc in loco posuere litteris permutatis.

IV. 115 Erratum et in omnibus inclusis. ab Minio, quem supra diximus, CC (ut auctor est Varro) abest Aeminius, quem alibi quidam intellegunt et Limaeam vocant, Oblivionis antiquae dictus multumque fabulosus. ab Durio Tagus CC interveniente Munda; Tagus auriferis harenis celebratur. ab eo CLX promunturium Sacrum e media prope Hispaniae fronte prosilit. XIV inde ad pyrenaeum medium colligi Varro tradit, ad Anam vero, quo Lusitaniam a Baetica discevimus, CXXVI, a Gadibus CII additis.

IV. 116 Gentes Celtici, Turduli et circa Tagum Vettones; ab Ana ad Sacrum Lusitani. oppida a Tago memorabilia in ora Olisippo equarum e favonio vento conceptu nobile, Salacia cognominata Urbs Imperatoria, Merobrica, promunturium Sacrum et alterum Cuneus, oppida Ossonoba, Balsa, Myrtilis.

IV. 117 Universa provincia dividitur in conventus très, Emeritensem, Pacensem, Scallabitanum, tota populorum XLV, in quibus coloniae sunt quinque, municipium civium Romanorum, Lati antiqui III, stipendiaria XXXVI. coloniae Augusta Emerita Anaë fluvio adposita, Metellinensis, Pacensis, Norbensis Caesarina cognomine (contributa sunt in eam Castra Servilia, Castra Caecilia); quinta est Scallabis quae Praesidium Iulium vocatur. municipium civium Romanorum Olisippo Felicitas Iulia cognominatum. oppida veteris Lati Ebora, quod idem Liberalitas Iulia, et Myrtilis ac Salacia, quae diximus. stipendiariarum quos nominare non pigeat, praeter iam dictos in Baetica cognominibus, Augustobrigenses, Aeminienses, Aranditani, Axabrigenses, Balsenses, Caesarobrigenses, Caperenses, Caurienses, Colarni, Lancienses, Mirobrigenses qui Celtici cognominantur, Medubrigenses qui Plumbari, Ocelenses, Turduli qui Bardili et Tappori.

STRABO, GEOGRAPHIA

Cited excerpts from Στραβωνος Γεωγραφικων, *The Geography of Strabo, with an English translation by H. L. Jones, vol. 2.* London and New York: 1923.

3.1.2 Πρῶτον δὲ μέρος αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τὸ ἐσπέριον, ὡς ἔφαμεν, ἡ Ἰβηρία. ταύτης δὴ τὸ μὲν πλέον οἰκεῖται φαύλως· ὄρη γὰρ καὶ δρυμοὺς καὶ πεδία λεπτήν ἔχοντα γῆν, οὐδὲ ταύτην ὁμαλῶς εὐνδρον, οἰκοῦσι τὴν πολλήν· ἡ δὲ πρόσβορρος ψυχρά τέ ἐστι τελέως πρὸς τῇ τραχύτητι καὶ παρωκεανῖτις, προσειληφυῖα τὸ ἄμικτον κἀνεπίπλεκτον τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὥσθ' ὑπερβάλλει τῇ μοχθηρίᾳ τῆς οἰκήσεως. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τὰ μέρη τοιαῦτα, ἡ δὲ νότιος πᾶσα εὐδαίμων σχεδόν τι, καὶ διαφερόντως ἡ ἔξω Στηλῶν· ἐστὶ δὲ δῆλον ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα, ὑπογράψασιν ἡμῖν πρότερον τό τε σχῆμα καὶ τὸ μέγεθος.

3.1.6 ... φέρεται δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσίων μερῶν ἑκάτερος· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐπ' εὐθείας εἰς τὴν ἐσπέραν ἐκδίδωσι πολὺ μείζων ὢν θατέρου, ὁ δ' Ἄναξ πρὸς νότον ἐπιστρέφει, τὴν μεσοποταμίαν ἀφορίζων, ἣν Κελτικοὶ νέμονται τὸ πλέον, καὶ τῶν Λυσιτανῶν τινες ἐκ τῆς περαίας τοῦ Τάγου μετοικισθέντες ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων...

3.1.9 ... ὁ τοῦ Βαίτιος ἀνάπλους ἐστὶ καὶ πόλις Ἐβοῦρα ...

3.2.3 ἔχει δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἄναξ ἀνάπλους, οὔτε δὲ τηλικούτοις, σκάφεσιν, οὔτ' ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον. ὑπέρκειται δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ μεταλλείας ἔχοντα ὄρη, καθήκει δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν Τάγον.

3.2.5 Καταμαθόντες δ' οὖν τὴν φύσιν τῶν τόπων οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὰς ἀναχύσεις ὁμοίως ὑπουργεῖν τοῖς ποταμοῖς δυναμένας πόλεις ἔκτισαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἄλλας κατοικίας, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ποταμῶν. τούτων δ' ἐστὶν ἡ τε Ἄστα καὶ Νάβρισσα καὶ Ὀνοβα καὶ Ὀσσόνοβα καὶ Μαίνοβα καὶ ἄλλαι πλείους.

3.2.15 Τῇ δὲ τῆς χώρας εὐδαιμονία καὶ τὸ ἥμερον καὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν συνηκολούθησε τοῖς Τουρδητανοῖς· καὶ τοῖς Κελτικοῖς δὲ διὰ τὴν γειτνίασιν, ὡς εἶρηκε Πολύβιος, ἡ διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνοις μὲν ἦπτον· τὰ πολλὰ γὰρ κωμηδὸν ζῶσιν. οἱ μέντοι Τουρδητανοί, καὶ μάλιστα οἱ περὶ τὸν Βαῖτιον, τελέως εἰς τὸν Ῥωμαίων μεταβέβλημνται τρόπον, οὐδὲ τῆς διαλέκτου τῆς σφετέρας ἔτι μεμνημένοι. Λατῖνοί τε οἱ πλείστοι γεγόνاسι, καὶ ἐποίκους εἰλήφασι Ῥωμαίους, ὥστε μικρὸν ἀπέχουσι τοῦ πάντες εἶναι Ῥωμαῖοι. αἱ τε νῦν συνωκισμέναι πόλεις, ἡ τε ἐν τοῖς Κελτικοῖς Παξουγούστα καὶ ἡ ἐν τοῖς Τουρδούλοις Αὐγούστα Ἡμερίτα καὶ ἡ περὶ τοῦς Κελτίβηρας Καισαρουγούστα καὶ ἄλλαι ἔνιαι κατοικίαι τὴν μεταβολὴν τῶν λεχθειῶν πολιτειῶν ἐμφανίζουσι. καὶ δὴ τῶν Ἰβήρων ὅσοι ταύτης εἰσὶ τῆς ιδέας τογαῖτοι λέγονται· ἐν δὲ τούτοις εἰσὶ καὶ οἱ Κελτίβηρες οἱ πάντων νομισθέντες ποτὲ θηριωδέστατοι.

3.3.1 Ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἱεροῦ πάλιν ἀκρωτηρίου τὴν ἀρχὴν λαμβάνουσιν ἐπὶ θάτερον μέρος τῆς παραλίας, τὸ πρὸς τὸν Τάγον, κόλπος ἐστίν· ἔπειτα ἄκρα τὸ βαρβάριον ἀκαὶ αἱ τοῦ Ταάγου ἐκβολαὶ πλησίον, ἐφ' ἃς εὐθυπλοῖα στάδιοι εἰσὶ δέκα· ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ ἀναχύσεις, ὧν μία ἐπὶ πλείους ἢ τετρακοσίους σταδίους ἀπὸ τοῦ λεχθέντος πύργου, καθ' ἣν ὑδρεύονται ἐπὶ Σαλάκειαν. ὁ δὲ Τάγος καὶ τὸ πλάτος ἔχει τοῦ στόματος εἴκοσὶ πού σταδίων καὶ τὸ βάθος μέγα, ὥστε μυριαγωγοῖς ἀναπλεῖσθαι. δύο δ' ἀναχύσεις ἐν τοῖς ὑπερκείμενοις ποιεῖται πεδίοις, ὅταν αἱ πλημῆαι γίνωνται, ὥστε πελαγίζειν μὲν ἐπὶ ἑκατὸν καὶ πεντήκοντα σταδίους καὶ ποιεῖν πλωτὸν τὸ πεδίον, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐπάνω ἀναχύσει καὶ νῆσον ἀπολαμβάνειν ὅσον τριάκοντα σταδίων τὸ μῆκος, πλάτος δὲ μικρὸν ἀπολείπον τοῦ μήκους, εὐαλσὲς καὶ εὐαμπελον. κεῖται δ' ἡ νῆσος κατὰ Μόρωναν πόλιν εὖ κειμένην ἐν ὄρει τοῦ ποταμοῦ πλησίον, ἀφεστῶσαν τῆς θαλάττης ὅσον πεντακοσίους σταδίους, ἔχουσιν δὲ καὶ χώραν ἀγαθὴν τὴν περίξ καὶ τοὺς ἀνάπλους εὐπετεῖς μέχρι μὲν πολλοῦ καὶ μεγάλους σκάφει, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τοῖς ποταμίοις· καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸν Μόρωναν δ' ἔτι μακρότερος ἀνάπλους ἐστὶ· ταύτη δὲ τῇ πόλει Βροῦτος ὁ Καλλαϊκὸς προσαγορευθεὶς ὁρμητηρίῳ χρώμενος ἐπολέμησε πρὸς τοὺς Λυσιτανούς καὶ κατέστρεψε τούτους. τοῖς δὲ τοῦ ποταμοῦ κλείθοις ἐπετείχισε τὴν Ὀλυσιπῶνα, ἣν ἔχοι τοὺς ἀνάπλους ἐλευθέρους καὶ τὰς ἀνακομιδὰς τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, ὥστε καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Τάγον πόλεων αὗται κράτισται. πολὺ ἰχθυς δ' ὁ ποταμὸς καὶ ὀστρέων πλήρης. ῥεῖ δ' ἔχων τὰς ἀρχὰς ἐκ Κελιτιβήρων διὰ Οὐεττώνων καὶ Καρπητανῶν καὶ Λυσιτανῶν ἐπὶ δύοσιν ἰσημερινήν, μέχρι ποσοῦ παράλληλος ὧν τῷ τε Ἄνα καὶ τῷ Βαίτι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀφιστάμενος ἐκείνων, ἀποκλινόντων πρὸς τὴν νότιον παραλίαν.

3.3.2 Οἱ δὲ ὑπερκείμενοι τῶν λεχθέντων ὁρῶν Ὡρητανοὶ μὲν εἰσι νοτιώτατοι καὶ μέχρι τῆς παραλίας διήκοντες ἐκ μέρους τῆς ἐντὸς Στηλῶν. Καρπητανοὶ δὲ μετὰ τούτους πρὸς ἄρκτους, εἴτα Οὐέττωνες καὶ Οὐακκαῖοι, δι' ὧν ὁ Δούριος ῥεῖ, κατ' Ἀκούτειαν πόλιν τῶν Οὐακκαίων ἔχων διάβασιν. Καλλαϊκοὶ δ' ὕστατοι, τῆς ὀρεινῆς ἐπέχοντες πολλήν· διὸ καὶ δυσμαχώτατοι ὄντες τῷ τε καταπολεμήσαντι τοὺς Λυσιτανούς αὐτοὶ παρέσχον τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν, καὶ δυνῆν ἤδη τοὺς πλείστους τῶν Λυσιτανῶν Καλλαϊκοὺς καλεῖσθαι παρεσκεύασαν. τῆς μὲν οὖν Ὡρητανίας κρατιστεύουσά ἐστι πόλις Κασταλῶν, καὶ Ὡρία.

3.3.3 Τοῦ δὲ Ταάγου τὰ πρὸς ἄρκτον ἢ Λυσιτανία ἐστὶ μέγιστον τῶν Ἰβηρικῶν ἔθνων καὶ πλείστοις χρόνοις ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων πολεμηθέν.

3.3.4 Ἡ δ' οὖν χώρα, περὶ ἧς λέγομεν, εὐδαίμων τέ ἐστι καὶ διαρρεῖται ποταμοῖς μεγάλοις τε καὶ μικροῖς, ἃ πασιν ἐκ τῶν ἐσθινῶν μερῶν, παραλλήλοις τῷ Ταγῷ· ἔχουσι δὲ καὶ ἀνάπλους οἱ πλείους καὶ ψῆγμα τοῦ χρυσοῦ πλεῖστον.

3.3.5 ...ἔθνη μὲν οὖν περὶ τριάκοντα τὴν χώραν νέμεται τὴν μεταξὺ Ταάγου καὶ τῶν Ἀρτάβρω...

3.3.3 ...ἐνταυθῦθα δὲ καὶ Ὡψικέλλαν πόλιν Ὀκέλα κτίσμα λέγουσι τοῦ μετὰ Ἀντήνορος καὶ τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ διαβάντος εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν.

3.4.20 ...ἐπισκοπεῖ δὲ ὁ τρίτος τὴν μεσόγαιαν, συνέχει δὲ τὰ τῶν τογάτων ἤδη λεγομένων ὡς ἂν εἰρηνικῶν καὶ εἰς τὸ ἥμερον καὶ τὸν Ἰταλικὸν τύπον μετακειμένων ἐντῇ τηβεννικῇ ἐσθῆτι. οὗτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ Κελτίβηρες καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ἰβηρος πλησίον ἐκατέρωθεν οἰκοῦντες μέχρι τῶν πρὸς θαλάττη μερῶν.

ANTONINE ITINERARY

414,	1 Item ab Hispali Emeritam	m.p. CLXII, sic:
	2 Carmone	m.p. XXII
	3 Obucula	m.p. XX
	4 Astigi	m.p. XV
	5 Celti	m.p. XXXVII
415,	1 Regiana	m.p. XLIII
	2 Emerita	m.p. XXIII.
416,	3 Item a Corduba Emeritam	m.p. CXLIII, sic:
	4 Mellaria	m.p. LII
	1 Artigi	m.p. XXXVI
	2 Metellinum	m.p. XXXII
	3 Emerita	m.p. XXIII.
417,	4 Item ab Olisipone Emeritam	m.p. CLXI, sic:
	5 Aquabona	m.p. XII
	1 Catobriga	m.p. XII
	2 Caeciliana	m.p. VIII
	3 Malateca	m.p. XXVI
418,	4 Salacia	m.p. XII
	1 Ebora	m.p. XLIII
	2 Ad Atrum flumen	m.p. VIII
	3 Dipone	m.p. XII
	4 Evandriana	m.p. XVII
	5 Emerita	m.p. VIII.
	6 A Salacia Ossonoba	m.p. XVI.
419,	7 Alio itinere ab Olisippone Emeritam	m.p. CLIII, sic:
	8 Aritio Praetorio	m.p. XXXVIII
	1 Abelterio	m.p. XXVIII
	2 Matusaro	m.p. XXIII
	3 Ad Septem Aras	m.p. LX +?
	4 Budua	m.p. XII
	5 Plagiaria	m.p. VIII
	6 Emerita	m.p. XXX.
420,	7 Item alio itinere ab Olisippone	
	8. Emeritam	m.p. CCXX, sic:
	9 Ierabrica	m.p. XXX
	1 Scallabin	m.p. XXXII
	2 Tabucci	m.p. XXXII
	3 Fraxinum	m.p. XXXII

	4 Montobrica	m.p. XXX
	5 Ad Septem Aras	m.p. XIII
	6 Plagiaria	m.p. XX
	7 Emerita	m.p. XXX.
	8 Item ab Olisipone Bracaram Augus-	
	9 tam	m.p. CCXLIII, sic:
421,	1 Ierabriga	m.p. XXX
	2 Scallabin	m.p. XXXII
	3 Sellium	m.p. XXXII
	4 Conembriga	m.p. XXXIII
	5 Aeminio	m.p. X
	6 Talabrica	m.p. XL
	7 Langobriga	m.p. XVIII
	8 Calem	m.p. XIII
422,	1 Bragara	m.p. XXXV.
	2 Item a Bracara Asturicam	m.p. CCXLVII:
	3 Salacia	m.p. XX
	4 Praesidio	m.p. XXVI
	5 Caladuno	m.p. XVI
	6 Ad Aquas	m.p. XVIII
	7 Pinetum	m.p. XX
	8 Roboretum	m.p. XXXVI
423,	1 Compleutica	m.p. XXVIII
	2 Veniatia	m.p. XV
	3 Petavonium	m.p. XXVIII
	4 Argentiolum	m.p. XV
	5 Asturica	m.p. XXIII.
<hr/>		
425,	6 Item de Esuri Pace Iulia	m.p. CCLXVII, sic:
426,	1 Balsa	m.p. XXIII
	2 Ossonoba	m.p. XVI
	3 Aranni	m.p. LX
	4 Salacia	m.p. XXXV
	5 Eboram	m.p. XLIII
	6 Serpa	m.p. XIII
427,	1 Fines	m.p. XX
	2 Arucci	m.p. XXV
	3 Pace Iulia	m.p. XXX
<hr/>		

431,	4 Item ab Esuri per compendium Pace	m.p. LXXVI:
	5 Iulia	m.p. XL
	6 Myrtili	m.p. XXXVI.
	7 Pace Iulia	
	8 Item ab ostio fluminis Anae Emeri-	
	9 tam usque	m.p. CCCXIII:
	10 Praesidio	m.p. XXIII
	11 Ad Rubras	m.p. XXVIII
	12 Onoba	m.p. XXVIII
432,	1 Ilipla	m.p. XXX
	2 Tucci	m.p. XXII
	3 Italica	m.p. XVIII
	4 Monte Mariorum	m.p. XLVI
	5 Curica	m.p. XLVIII
	6 Contributa	m.p. XXIII
	7 Perceiana	m.p. XX
	8 Emerita	m.p. XXIII.
433,	1 Item ab Emerita Caesaraugus-	
	2 ta	m.p. DCXXXII:
	3 Ad Sorores	m.p. XXVI
	4 Castris Caecili	m.p. XX
	5 Turmulos	m.p. XX
	6 Rusticiana	m.p. XXII
	7 Capara	m.p. XXII
434,	1 Caelionicco	m.p. XXII
	2 Ad Lippos	m.p. XII
	3 Sentice	m.p. XV
	4 Salmatice	m.p. XXIII
	5 Sibarim	m.p. XXI
	6 Ocelo Duri	m.p. XXI
	7 Albocela	m.p. XXII
435,	1 Amallobriga	m.p. XXVII
	2 Septimanca	m.p. XXIII
	3 Nivaria	m.p. XXII
	4 Cauca	m.p. XXII
	5 Segovia	m.p. XXVIII
	6 Miaccum	m.p. XXIII
436,	1 Titulciam	m.p. XXIII
	2 Conplutum	m.p. XXX
	3 Arriaca	m.p. XXII
	4 Caesada	m.p. XXIII
	5 Segontia	m.p. XXIII
437,	1 Arcobriga	m.p. XXIII
	2 Aquae Bilbitanorum	m.p. XVI

	3 Bibili	m.p. XXIII
	4 Nertorbriga	m.p. XXI
	5 Secontia	m.p. XIII
438,	1 Caesaraugusta	m.p. XVI.
	2 Alio itinere ab Emerita Caesarea Au-	
	3 gusta	m.p. CCCXLVIII, sic:
	4 Lacipea	m.p. XX
	5 Leuciana	m.p. XXIII
	6 Augustobriga	m.p. XII
	7 Toletum	m.p. LV
	8 Titulciam	m.p. XXIII
	9 Conplutum	m.p. XXX
	10 Arriaca	m.p. XXII
	11 Caesada	m.p. XXIII
	12 Segontia	m.p. XXIII
	13 Arcobriga	m.p. XXIII
	14 Aquae Bilbitanorum	m.p. XVI
439,	1 Bilbili	m.p. XXIII
	2 Nertobriga	m.p. XXI
	3 Segontia	m.p. XIII
	4 Caesaraugusta	m.p. XVI.
	5 Item ab Asturica Caesaraugus-	
	6 tam	m.p. CCCCXCVII
	7 Bedunia	m.p. XX
	8 Briceco	m.p. XX
	9 Vico Aquario	m.p. XXXII
	10 Ocelo Duri	m.p. XVI
	11 Titulciam mansionibus supra scrip-	
	12 tis	m.p. CXCI
	13 Caesaraugusta mansionibus supra	
	14 scriptis	m.p. CCXV.
	15 Item ab Asturica per Cantabria Caesarau-	
	16 gusta	m.p. CCCI:
440,	1 Brigeco	m.p. XL
	2 Intercatia	m.p. XX
	3 Tela	m.p. XXII
	4 Pintiam	m.p. XXIII
	5 Rauda	
441,	1 Cluniam	m.p. XXVI
	2 Vasamam	m.p. XXIII
442,	1 Voluce	m.p. XXV
	2 Numantia	m.p. XXV
	3 Augustobriga	m.p. XXIII

4 Turiassone

m.p. XVII

RAVENNA CARTOGRAPHY

304 (43) Item super fretum Septem sunt civitates, id est

- 1 Bepsipon
- 2 Merifabion
- 3 Caditana
- Portum
- 5 Asta
- 6 Serpa
- 7 Pace Iulia
- 8 Mirtilin
- 9 Besurin
- 10 Balsa
- 11 Stacio sacra
- 12 Ossonoba
- 13 Arani
- 14 Salatia
- 15 Ebora
- 16 Malabiste
- 17 Celiana
- 18 Cetobriga
- 19 Abona

305 1 Olisipona
 2 Terebrica
 3 Langobrica
 4 Ceno opido
 5 Calo
 6 Augusta Bracaria

313 (44) Iterum quomodo in media provincia ipsius patrie Spanie dicitur civitas

- 7 Complutum, cuius affinalis est civitas quae dicitur
- 9 Titultiam, item civitas
- 10 Toleton
- 11 Lebura
- 12 Augustabria
- 13 Lomundo
- 14 Turcalion
- 15 Rodacis
- 16 Lacipea.

314 Item in spatiosa terra ipsius patrie Spanie est civitas que dicitur

5 Augusta Merita, cuius proxima est civitas que dicitur

7 Evandria. iterum

8 Bipone

9 Aturnea

Item iuxta super scriptam civitatem Augustam Meritam est civitas que dicitur

13 Pergelena

14 Contributa

15 Lacunis

16 Curica

17 Hilipa

18 Italica

315 Item non longe a praefata civitate Augusta Merita est civitas que dicitur

1 Regina

2 Celtum

3 Astigin

4 Obucula

5 Carmone

Item iuxta super scriptam civitatem Augusta Meritam dicitur civitas

8 Metelinon

9 Artibon

10 Mellaria

11 Corduba

12 Noclensis

13 Nobiam

14 Catulune.

Item iuxta super scriptam Corduba est civitas que dicitur

17 Uria

18 Ipagio

19 Sabe Gemella

316 1 Antigaria.

Item iuxta praedictam civitatem Augustam Meritam est civitas que dicitur

4 Plagearia

5 Massusaria

6 Abelterion

7 Aretio. pretorion

8 Perbrigam.

(45) Iterum in ipsa Spania est civitas que dicitur

11 Hispalis, cuius iuxta est civitas que dicitur

13 Balsilippa

- 14 Cirsone
- 15 Olipium
- 16 Osipon
- 17 Urgapa
- 18 Antigaria
- 19 Rataspen.

317 Iterum iuxta praefatam civitatem Hispalis est civitas quae dicitur

- 3 Oripion
- 4 Ugium
- 5 Cappa
- 6 Saudone
- 7 Burdoga
- 8 Saguntia
- 9 Assidone

Iterum iuxta praenominatam civitatem Hispalis dicitur civitas

- 12 Tema
- 13 Tusci
- 14 Hilpula
- 15 Onoba
- 16 Urion
- 17 Aruci
- 18 Fines
- 19 Seria.

318 Item iuxta superius nominatam civitatem Ossaron, que ponitur non longe ab oceano, est civitas quae dicitur

- 4 Alantune
- 5 Alba
- 6 Seustatio
- 7 Belegia
- 8 Sobobrica
- 9 Antequia
- 10 Birobesca
- 11 Tonobrica
- 12 Segisamone
- 13 Pistoraca
- 14 Ambinon
- 15 Lacobrica
- 16 Bimmatium
- 17 Gela
- 18 Antia
- 19 Comeniaca

319 1 Brigicon
2 Pretorion

- 3 Vico aquarum
 - 4 Ocelodorum
 - 5 Comeniaca
 - 6 Sebarium
 - 7 Salmantica
 - 8 Sentice
 - 9 Appos
 - 10 Coloricum
 - 11 Caparra
 - 12 Bustiana
 - 13 Turmulum
 - 14 Castris
 - 15 Sorores, que confinatur cum super scripta civitate Augusta Merita.
- Item in ipsa Spania iuxta civitatem quam praediximus Augustam Braccaria dicitur civitas
- 320
- 1 Salaniana
 - 2 Aquis Ocerensis
 - 3 Aquis Cercenis
 - 4 Gemina
 - 6 Presidium
 - 7 Nemetobrica
 - 8 Foro Gigurnion
 - 9 Ginistaria
 - 10 Bergidon
 - 11 Amnion
 - 12 Asturica
 - 13 Balsata
 - 14 Interamnum
 - 15 Memoriana
 - 16 Luco Astorum
 - 17 Passicin
 - 18 Amneni
- 321
- 1 Lugisonis
 - 2 Ponte Abei
 - 3 Lugo Augusti
 - 4 Ponte Nartie
 - 5 Brevis
 - 6 Assegonion
 - 7 Iria
 - 8 Aquis Celenis.
- Currunt autem per ipsam Spaniam diversa flumina, inter ceter que dicuntur id est
- 12 Iberus
 - 13 Medulla
 - 14 Tagus
 - 15 Betis
 - 16 Samus
 - 17 Bibesia

18 Clerum
19 Nabum
20 Hade
21 Minua.

Index of Cities

A

Abelterium, 123, 138
Aeminium, 28, 39, 100, 103, 108, 109, 110, 134, 137, 141, 149, 156, 161, 162, 236, 237, 238, 241, 248
Alcácer
 (Imperatoria Salacia), 66, 68, 85, 137, 138, 158, 188
Alcácer do Sal
 (Imperatoria Salacia), 66, 68, 85, 137, 138, 158, 188
Almofala
 (Civitas Cobelcorum), 115, 116
Alter do Chão
 (Abelterium), 123, 138
Ammaia, 28, 86, 87, 145, 161, 207, 208, 209
Arabriga, 97, 117, 141
Arandis, 118, 138
Aritium Praetorium, 138
Aritium Vetus, 118, 138
Aroche
 (Civitas Aruccitana), 120, 121, 139
Augusta Emerita, 11, 18, 23, 28, 32, 33, 34, 53, 55, 58, 63, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 84, 85, 90, 92, 99, 108, 124, 126, 129, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 144, 145, 146, 147, 156, 164, 169, 170, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 218, 249
Augustobriga, 28, 77, 91, 92, 93, 99, 140, 146, 159, 215, 216, 217, 255
 Axabricsenses, 97, 117, 119, 249

B

Balsa, 79, 81, 138, 145, 166, 204, 249, 253, 256
Banienses, 37, 119, 120, 141
Beja
 (Pax Iulia), 69, 70, 71, 72, 139, 154, 159, 161, 163, 166, 191, 195
Bobadela
 (Elbocoris?), 110, 111, 123, 134, 141, 142, 145, 158, 161, 239, 240
Bracara Augusta, 90, 108, 122, 129, 136, 137

C

Cáceres
 (Norba Caesarina), 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 106, 107, 139, 154, 155, 158, 159, 162, 163, 164, 232, 234
Caesarobriga, 91, 98, 99, 100, 140, 164, 223
Caetobriga, 85, 137
Cáparra
 (Capera), 61, 106, 107, 108, 139, 163, 232
Capera, 61, 106, 108, 149, 232, 233, 234, 235

Cárquere

(Colarnum?), 113, 122, 141

Castelo Branco

(Taporí/Talori), 123, 131, 132

Castra Caecilia

(Norba Caesarina?), 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 76, 139, 249

Castra Servilia

(Norba Caesarina?), 61, 63, 65, 249

Caurium

97

Cibilitani

120, 131

Ciudad Rodrigo

Meribriga/Mirobriga?, 82, 125, 128, 129

Civitas Aravorum

37, 114, 128, 141, 149

Civitas Aruccitana

25, 36, 120

Civitas Cobelcorum

115, 145, 158

Civitas Igaeditanorum

28, 37, 94, 140

Coimbra

(Aeminium), 15, 100, 108, 109, 137, 153, 155, 157, 160, 161, 164, 165, 236

Colarnum

122, 141, 142

Collippo

31, 88, 91, 93, 94, 137, 155, 171, 248

Colonia Metellinensis

(Metellinum), 52, 56

Concordia

123, 248

Condeixa-a-Velha

(Conimbriga), 100, 103

Conimbriga

15, 18, 28, 83, 89, 91, 100, 103, 108, 137, 145, 146, 149, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 164, 166, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231

Corduba

21, 22, 56, 133, 136, 140, 142, 165, 247, 252, 257

Coria

(Caurium), 97, 98

E

Ebora

(Liberalitas Iulia Ebora), 28, 29, 42, 47, 56, 57, 58, 73, 77, 137, 138, 144, 146, 147, 159, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 249, 252, 256

Eburobrittium

28, 83, 87, 88, 137, 145, 146, 162, 210, 211, 248

Elbocoris

110, 123, 141

Emerita

(Augusta Emerita), 11, 24, 53, 56, 58, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 91, 98, 136, 137, 139, 140, 145, 146, 158, 164, 165, 252, 253, 254, 255

Évora

(Liberalitas Iulia Ebora), 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 70, 71, 137, 138, 139, 145, 182

F

Faro

(Ossonoba), 31, 79, 80, 138

Felicitas Iulia Olisipo, 41, 44, 142, 145, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180

H

Hispalis, 75, 121, 165, 257, 258

I

Idanha

(Civitas Igaeditanorum), 37, 94, 95, 96, 125, 140, 219

Ierabriga, 117, 137, 253**Imperatoria Salacia**, 66, 68**Interamnienses**, 110, 123, 134, 141

L

Lacimurga, 124, 164**Lancienses Oppidani**, 36, 125**Lancienses Transcudani**, 37, 125**Lancobriga**, 112, 126, 133, 242, 243**Liberalitas Iulia Eborae**, 11, 56**Lisboa**

(Felicitas Iulia Olisipo), 16, 41, 45, 46, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 163, 165

Lisbon

(Felicitas Iulia Olisipo), 31, 42, 44, 45, 46, 136, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 166

M

Marialva

(Civitas Aravorum), 37, 114, 128, 141

Marnel

(Talabriga), 39, 112, 113, 114, 137, 141

Medellín

(Metellinum), 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 159

Medubrica Plumbarii, 127**Mérida**

(Augusta Emerita), 56, 59, 63, 72, 78, 94, 138, 145, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 196

Mértola

(Myrtilis Iulia), 46, 47, 48, 139

Metellinum, 52, 53, 54, 63, 124, 136, 140, 141, 145, 181, 247, 252**Miróbriga**

Mirobriga Celtici, 82, 83, 84

Mirobriga Celtici, 82, 146**Myrtilis**

(Myrtilis Iulia), 10, 29, 46, 47, 48, 139, 143, 154, 249

N

Norba Caesarina, 52, 53, 61, 62, 63, 65, 140, 145, 164

O

Óbidos

(Eburobrittium), 87, 137, 162

Ocelum, 129, 140**Olisipo**

(Felicitas Iulia Olisipo), 28, 39, 41, 42, 43, 45, 85, 87, 88, 89, 108, 136, 137, 138, 141, 145, 165

Ossoinoba, 28, 79, 80, 138, 145, 248, 249, 252, 253, 256

P

Pax Iulia, 11, 24, 28, 42, 69, 71, 72, 77, 139, 143, 144, 145, 161, 165, 191, 192, 193, 194

S

Salacia

(Imperatoria Salacia), 10, 29, 66, 67, 137, 138, 145, 158, 188, 189, 190, 249, 252, 253

Salamanca

(Salmantica), 130, 139, 159, 160, 164, 165

Salmantica, 130, 131, 139, 259**Santarém**

(Scallabis Praesidium Iulium), 49, 51, 52, 153, 154, 157

Santiago do Cacém

(Mirobriga Celtici), 82, 83

São Sebastião do Freixo

(Collippo), 93, 94, 137

Scallabis

(Scallabis Praesidium Iulium), 24, 28, 34, 42, 49, 50, 51, 52, 88, 89, 91, 137, 145, 146, 153, 154, 157, 165, 180, 249

Scallabis Praesidium Iulium, 49**Sellium**, 89, 90, 91, 137, 155, 163, 212, 213, 214, 253**Setúbal**

(Caetobriga), 31, 85, 137

Silves

(Cibilis?), 120, 131

T

Talabriga, 39, 112, 113, 134, 137, 141, 142, 242**Talavera de la Reina**

(Caesarobriga), 98, 99, 140, 158, 161, 223

Talavera la Vieja

(Augustobriga), 91, 93, 140, 159

Talori, 36, 37, 131, 132**Tapori**, 37, 122, 131, 132, 158, 245, 249**Tavira**

(Balsa), 31, 81, 82, 138

Tomar

(Sellium), 89, 90, 137, 163, 212

Turduli qui Bardili, 133, 249**Turduli Veteres**

(Lancobriga), 38, 112, 113, 126, 133

U**Urbs Imperatoria**

(Imperatoria Salacia), 66, 249

V

Viseu, 111, 123, 133, 134, 140, 141

Y**Yecla de Yeltes**

(Meribriga/Mirobriga?), 128, 129

Z**Zamora**

(Ocelum), 129, 140