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INTRODUCTION

In the late summer of 133 BC, after twenty years of conflict with Rome and, finally, a thirteen-month siege, the weary and famished defenders of Numantia, in North-Central Spain, looked out in hatred at the forces of the Roman general, Scipio Africanus, that surrounded them. The Roman army had constructed a wall, complete with impaling spikes, around the town, and starvation had already killed many Numantines and driven others to cannibalism. The men who looked over the walls now had already killed any of their wives and children that had survived this long to spare them further suffering at the hands of the besiegers. Knowing there was nothing left to be done, the last Numantines took one final defiant stand. They took up torches and set their town ablaze, perishing in the choking fumes.¹ Two centuries later in Baetica, the infant Marcus Ulpius Traianus (53-117 AD), who would become Rome’s first provincial-born emperor, drew his first breath in a very different Spain. These Spanish provinces had transformed from remarkably defiant barbarian backwaters that had to be subjugated with force into cultural centers deemed worthy breeding grounds for Rome’s most important citizens.

This happened not only in Spain, but across the empire. Villages became cities with baths, aqueducts, and amphitheaters. Roads carried people and trade goods between the frontiers of the empire and its heart, exposing millions of people to new ideas,

¹ Florus, Epitome of Roman History 34.18.1-17.
objects, and fashions. Worship of the Celtic Sulis and the Punic Ba’al-Hammon were subsumed by the Roman Minerva and Saturn, respectively. Latin became the “lingua Franca” for native speakers of hundreds of Celtic, Germanic, Iberian, Thracian, Italic, Punic, and Libyan languages and dialects. These provincial transformations are common knowledge, as Rome’s imprint on the physical and social landscape, especially of Europe, is still clearly visible in the form of architectural ruins, the multitude of neo-Latin languages currently spoken, and the spread of the late Roman provincial religion, Christianity. The fact that this is unsurprising does not mean it is sufficiently understood, however.

While difficult to deny the fact that societies transformed as they joined the Roman world, there is considerable disagreement, especially among Anglophone historians, about the process and the depth of the metamorphosis that turned the smoking ruins of towns like Numantia into the homelands of illustrious Romans like Trajan. Over the past century, English-language historiography of the indigenous provincial experience has oscillated dramatically. At the heart of the debate is the term “Romanization” and its Romano-centric application as the framework for understanding the provinces. The term was coined at the height of the colonial era, as Europe’s conquest of huge swathes of Asia and Africa was in full swing as a “civilizing mission.” British historians, in particular, envisioned Rome’s imperialism as they understood their own: the conquerors were all-powerful, the indigenous people were uncivilized barbarians, and the resulting transfer of new ideas, values, and practices was both beneficial and ultimately welcomed by the conquered peoples, who were awed by the conquerors and eager to be enfranchised. The collapse of colonial powers in the mid-twentieth century and distaste
for the then-obvious damage done by their hands initiated a wholesale revision of this framework. Beginning in the 1970s, post-colonial interpretations emphasized indigenous agency in the creation of the new provincial culture. Romanization was joined by an archaeology of resistance, emphasizing the aspects of indigenous cultures that endured Romanization unchanged. As post-colonial theory progressed, Romanization ceased to be Roman altogether. From the 1990s, indigenous peoples were reimagined as the primary active party in the cultural shift, Romanizing themselves. This idea has undergirded various explanatory frameworks from the last thirty years, including hybridity, creolization, and globalization, which seek to discard the framework of Romanization, or, the “R-word,” outright.

Both sides of the pendulum swing are untenable in explaining the culture shift as it is visible in the primary sources and in archaeology. The colonial-era version of the story restricts the indigenous role in the Roman world to that of passive recipient. The process of change, in this framework, was a trickle-down process, transmitted from the Roman conquerors to the eagerly accepting (male) elites, and thence to the rest of the population as far as contact allowed. It overemphasizes the homogeneity of the Roman world, privileges elite culture, and downplays indigenous continuities as rusticisms. The postcolonial versions, however, progressively move toward an unrealistic vision of the imperial power dynamic. They acknowledge, validly, that indigenous peoples were not passive in the incorporation process and that the empire was not transformed into a collection of “mini-Romes.” The shift in emphasis, from Rome to the provinces, however, has entailed a dangerous downplay of the nature of conquest, the balance of power, and, thus, Rome’s central role in the cultural formation process of its provinces.
I argue that Rome was actively responsible for imposing profound social changes on its provincial populations that resulted in a shift toward Roman culture in the interest of Roman imperialism. This affected every segment of every conquered population, though the details of individual experiences varied widely. This paper assesses the changes in provincial societies pre- and post-Rome to ascertain Rome’s role in the process and the validity of Romanization as a framework. Chapter one will trace the historiography of Roman provincial culture in depth, exploring the contentious history of Romanization as an explanatory framework and the new frameworks, including elite self-Romanization, creolization, and globalization, that have been called up to replace it. The following two chapters are the primary case studies. Spain, chapter two, represents one of Rome’s earliest conquests outside of Italy and sheds light on Rome’s changing interests over the centuries, and thus, its changing expectations and the impositions it had for the Spanish provinces. Since the conquest and transformation of Spain were so protracted, ongoing from the third century to the first century BC, we have ample time to recognize the impact of Rome’s politics on the local population. Britain, in chapter three, has been the site of much of the contention over Romanization, as it was the homeland and primary research area of many of its earliest theorists. In addition to this legacy as a core site for discussion of Romanization, it provides a useful contrast to Spain, as it was conquered entirely within in the Principate in the first century AD, after Rome had refined and consolidated its methods. In both case studies, the goal is to understand the advent of Rome from the ground up, as an indigenous local from Spain or Britain would have experienced it. As these experiences were extremely diverse, I will break the discussion down along the lines of geography, social status, and gender. The latter has
rarely been addressed in Roman provincial studies but is crucial as it sheds light on the discrepant experiences of half of each population. Chapter four will address three other provinces on three different continents, Africa Proconsularis, Dacia, and Pontus-Bithynia, as “mini-case studies,” focusing on a few aspects of pre- and post-Roman life to illustrate that the changes observed in Spain and Britain were not isolated, but variations on a diverse but consistent pattern.

As “Romanization” is the key term here, we must be clear on what being “Roman” means. *Romanitas*, or “Roman-ness,” included traits like urbanism, the Latin language, widespread literacy, a hierarchical social pyramid, client/patron relationships, patriarchal gender ideologies, monumental architecture, public epigraphy, state-sponsored leisure activities including bathing and games, wearing the toga, worshipping the Roman pantheon with Roman votive rituals, and profound value placed on honor, dominance, military prowess, and discipline. This was not a static culture but was constantly evolving due to advances in technology and influences from the provinces, especially the Greek East. It had at all times, however, a markedly different set of values and practices than those of the unconquered territories. Though the provinces never participated in a fully standardized cultural repertoire, every annexed location became dramatically more like Rome than it had been previously. While not identical to any frozen moment of “pure” *Romanitas*, if such a thing existed, provincial culture was the new lifestyle created by Roman involvement and, though it did not eradicate all local customs, it nevertheless represented a dramatic change that local people likely understood as an overhaul.
Understanding, then, what Roman culture meant in the imperial context, the next question is who was driving the changes. Recent scholarship has emphasized the agency of indigenous peoples in the ways Rome affected their lives and values. Indeed, they were active negotiators at every stage. While focusing on this indigenous agency makes for a gentler, less traumatic conquest story, we must not forget the darker side of the picture. The fact is, the annexation of people groups was an act of conquest and sometimes even genocide. Millions died, were enslaved, dispossessed, raped, and otherwise traumatized in the process of Roman expansion. There was a power dynamic in play in which Rome was the dominant party and commanded disproportionate respect as a result of its political authority and military backing. The Romans did not micromanage every aspect of local life; even if it were possible, they had no need or desire to do so. They did, however, have the means to impose and enforce imperial policy, and this involved extensive social change. It is a traumatic story and will not assuage any post-colonial guilt, but it is, I believe, what happened.
CHAPTER ONE:

THE PEN AND THE \textit{GLADIUS}: MODELS OF ROMANIZATION

1.1 Introduction

The dynamic tension between conquerors and conquered has intrigued historians and archaeologists of the Roman West for over a century. In the late 1800s, as European nations consolidated conquests in Asia and the Scramble for Africa caused Great Britain and France, especially, to become world dominators, the Roman empire provided a model and an apologetic for the spread of European civilization. These studies focused on natives of the empire passively “doing as the Romans do.” Since the 1970s, new theories and models have been proposed in quick succession as the realities of the post-colonial world caused these basic mechanisms of empire to come under question. Rebelling against the shameful memory of Europe’s \textit{mission civilisatrice} and its disruptive consequences, post-colonial Anglophone scholars shifted the focus to the diversity and indigeneity of the “elsewhere,” eventually advocating a rejection of the concept of Romanization or the idea that Rome applied pressure on conquered peoples to change their lifestyles. Against this new orthodoxy, which insists that culture change was native-driven, I argue that post-colonial models of culture change in the Roman empire have wrongly decentered Rome from the process, just as colonial models wrongly stripped
indigenous peoples of agency. A balanced perspective must make sense of both the literary evidence, which shows Rome on an aggressive acculturation mission, and the archaeological evidence, which shows that imperial culture was far from homogenous and that Romanizing meant both more and less than becoming culturally Latin. After an overview of these two data categories, the extant historical theories can be assessed for their explanation of this evidence.

1.2 The Evidence for Romanization

The most direct source of explanatory evidence we have is, of course, source material written by ancient people themselves, describing the culture change as they witnessed it. Unfortunately, this is a one-sided story told by Romans and Romanized Greeks. Few of these writers explicitly referenced the acculturation process. Fewer of these were eyewitnesses. Not one of them was reporting “just the facts.” These accounts may very likely not reflect an accurate appraisal of the complexities of culture negotiation in these newly provincial regions, but the “official story” from Rome’s perspective is clear: Rome entered the barbarian West and made it Roman, human, and civilized. Roman histories are loaded with accounts of Rome’s dealings in the provinces, founding cities, settling disputes, extracting resources, etc. While described as barbarians before being incorporated, this is not the case for post-conquest provincials. The assumption is that they entered a Roman version of civilized life upon direct rule by Rome. The process, unfortunately, normally escapes explicit description. There are three exceptions to this rule, however. Written in different centuries about three different
provinces, they clearly demonstrate the Roman view that Rome explicitly directed cultural change.

The earliest of these comes from Strabo’s first century BC *Geography*. Writing about the Baetica region of Southern Spain, he says that, thanks to favorable geography and Mediterranean connections, all it took to fully convert the population was a Roman administration in the region. He wrote:

> The Turdetanians, however, and particularly those that live about the Baetis, have completely changed over to the Roman mode of life, not even remembering their own language any more. And most of them have become Latins, and they have received Romans as colonists, so that they are not far from being all Romans. And the present jointly-settled cities, Pax Augusta in the Celtic country, Augusta Emerita in the country of the Turdulians, Caesar-Augusta near Celtiberia, and some other settlements, manifest the change to the aforesaid civil modes of life. Moreover, all those Iberians who belong to this class are called "Togati."²

This statement contrasts with the Cantabrians, a Celtic people further north, who were also rendered “peaceable” and “civilized,” but only after three Roman legions were sent in to quell both their barbarity and their independence.³ This is an incidental glimpse into the acculturation process that plays into Strabo’s larger connection between civilization and geography.⁴ The point remains, however. The Romans were an unstoppable cultural force and where they went, they expected *Romanitas* to follow.

A century later, Tacitus gives us perhaps the most famous account of Romanization, combining it with his own typically elegant analysis:

---
² Strabo, *Geography* 3.2.15.
³ Strabo, *Geography* 3.3.8.
[Agricola] likewise provided a liberal education for the sons of the chiefs, and showed such a preference for the natural powers of the Britons over the industry of the Gauls that they who lately disdained the tongue of Rome now coveted its eloquence. Hence, too, a liking sprang up for our style of dress, and the “toga” became fashionable. Step by step they were led to things which dispose to vice, the lounge, the bath, the elegant banquet. All this in their ignorance, they called civilization, when it was but a part of their servitude.\(^5\)

Like Strabo, Tacitus clearly believed that subject peoples living under a Roman administration were easily won over by the perks of participation. He adds to Strabo’s picture, however, by suggesting this to be a manipulation or seduction on the part of the Roman governor. Agricola, in indoctrinating the young and malleable, made sure that the next generation of young elite Britons was fully loyal. He allowed them to believe that they had choices which were in fact made for them. In his picture of Agricola’s dominance and influence over the British elite, though it may have been exaggerated or misunderstood, there could be no mistaking the fact that a Roman administrator was expected to direct his barbarian subjects as their master.

Another interesting ancient angle on Romanization comes from Cassius Dio, a provincial senator from the Greek-speaking East in the early third century. His analysis of the disastrous loss of new territories in Germania in 9 AD traced the problem to administration of Romanization. Like the other sources, he clearly shows that his audience expected the Roman administration to influence cultural change, creating provincial togati in its own image.

The Romans were holding portions of [Germania] […] and soldiers of theirs were wintering there and cities were being founded. The barbarians were adapting themselves to Roman ways, were becoming accustomed to hold markets,

---

\(^5\) Tacitus, *Agricola* 21.
and were meeting in peaceful assemblages. They had not, however, forgotten their ancestral habits, their native manners, their old life of independence, or the power derived from arms. Hence, so long as they were unlearning these customs gradually and by the way, as one may say, under careful watching, they were not disturbed by the change in their manner of life, and were becoming different without knowing it. But when Quinctilius Varus became governor of the province of Germania, and in the discharge of his official duties was administering the affairs of these peoples also, he strove to change them more rapidly. Besides issuing orders to them as if they were actually slaves of the Romans, he exacted money as he would from subject nations. To this they were in no mood to submit, for the leaders longed for their former ascendancy and the masses preferred their accustomed condition to foreign domination.  

His strategy failed, and his legions were ignominiously defeated in the Teutoberg Forest by disgruntled Germanic tribes under Arminius, a native Cherusci who served in the Roman military and Varus’ close companion. This account, like Tacitus and Strabo’s, assumes that Roman presence meant adoption of Roman ways and that the provincial administration was directly responsible for this. They founded the cities and encouraged the markets and assemblies “under careful watching.” He took Tacitus’ picture of indoctrinated young people a step further and portrayed the Roman administration as puppet-masters, carefully manipulating the changes to get what they wanted, which was a peaceful, easily ruled population. While thwarted by mismanagement in this instance, the strategy worked remarkably well, as complete disasters like Teutoberg were uncommon. 

We know that these primary sources are complicated evidence and that their agendas, like those of modern historians, were multi-layered and intentionally reflective

7 As shall be seen in our case study on Hispania, “strategy” on an empire-wide scale is not appropriately described before the end of the Republic, though individual consuls and generals secured provincial manageability in ad hoc ways from the founding of the first provinces.
of their contemporary worlds. However, it would be a mistake to ignore the Roman perspective on their own actions, as the assumptions reflected are more important than the details. They may have been mistaken, as Strabo certainly was when he insisted the Turdetani absorbed *Romanitas* without question. Indeed, there were indigenous revolts in Turdetania as elsewhere in Spain, and, as shall be seen in the following chapter, Iberian identity was not lost overnight. It is significant, however, that Strabo’s assertion is celebratory. If, indeed, Baetica had become just like Rome, that would have been a victory. Tacitus and Dio were even more explicit about this. Not only was Romanization desirable, it was carefully orchestrated. Tacitus’ Agricola groomed the next generation of British elites to be proficient in the repertoire of *Romanitas*. Dio’s Varus was supposed to gradually ease his population into a new “mode of life,” a matter of grave importance, considering the disaster of his failure. From these rare ancient analyses, it is clear that Rome believed its provincial administrations were responsible for influencing and even directly enforcing Roman cultural norms.

These literary sources give us an elite Roman perspective on the cultural changes that the authors believed happened as the empire expanded, but, while their perspective cannot be ignored, it is extremely limited and must be balanced with archaeological findings to give anything close to a full picture of provincial metamorphoses. Though the interpretation of the findings is constantly revised and debated, it is unquestionable that Roman Western Europe was flooded with new goods, given a new language, and organized in new administrative forms as territories came under Rome’s power. The debate chiefly centers on the simultaneous presence of indigenous artifacts in many areas,

---

8 Livy, *History of Rome* 34.17.
calling into question the thoroughness of the transformation. Along with questioning the depth of change, another important question is who instigated it: was it Romano-centric, as the literary sources suggest, or did indigenous people take it upon themselves to Romanize in a more organic way? The selective use of Roman forms in many areas indicates that indigenous people certainly had some choice in the matter of what they adopted. This does not negate the fact that the occasion for these choices was occupation and annexation by Rome, however. Before exploring the ways in which historians have answered these questions, an overview of the evidence that informs them will be useful.

While many of the Roman goods that would have been distributed to and adopted by provincials have long since perished, ceramics are a key way to measure the penetration of Roman culture. Samian ware, also called *terra sigillata*, was a fine, red-slip tableware mass-produced in Southern Gaul and a ubiquitous example of the archaeological footprint of Rome in a community. Its presence in assemblages aids in dating sites and establishing chronologies of other finds, and it is also importantly used as an index of Roman culture. On one hand, its presence demonstrates the availability of the product, indicating that an area was connected to the empire-wide trade network. It also indicates that its owners had disposable income and found it economically advantageous to buy mass-produced, imported tableware as opposed to making it at home or trading for locally crafted products. A study of Samian in Roman Britain, for example, showed a higher percentage of Samian to other pottery types in military centers and

---


10 Willis, “Samian Ware and Society,” 169.
major urban areas compared to small towns and rural areas. However, in rural areas it was commonly found among grave goods, showing it may have been less used but more highly valued in these communities. The nature of the individual pieces also sheds light on associated cultural shifts. Platters and plates were more suited to a Roman culinary tradition, involving a variety of solid foods served together, than the usual porridge or stew that formed the backbone of pre-Roman Northern European diets.

Coinage is also frequently used to measure Romanization, as it is also durable, broadly distributed, and easily datable. In the Western half of the empire, all provinces used officially issued imperial coinages beginning in the first century BC under Augustus. Before this time, and for provinces not yet part of the empire, however, coinage demonstrates negotiation and experimentation with Roman forms. Parts of Gaul and Britain, for example, began issuing coins with Latin inscriptions long before formally annexed as provinces. These reflected familiarity with Roman coins, often including a portrait profile on one side. Some, like the third century BC Greek-modelled Gallo-Belgic A gold stater, with its head of Apollo, and bronze “Remo” coin of first century BC Gaul, depicting Victory on a chariot, were clearly interested in the classical iconography. Others reflect primarily indigenous expression, including the Gaulish “Avavcia” series which was produced in the early years of Roman rule in Gaul. On

---

11 Ibid., 197.
12 Ibid., 189.
17 Ibid., 163.
most there is a mix of symbolism; classical figures appear surrounded by Celtic symbols like wheels, spirals, and swastikas, allowing archaeologists to theorize the meaning these conjunctions had for the identity of the coin distributor. Further, the distribution patterns of coin finds indicate their use. The coinage of Late Iron Age Britain, for example, was not used for purchasing goods, but appears more indicative of a client-patron system, wherein coins issued from an elite patron were generously given to his underlings to cement the relationship.¹⁸

Other inscribed artifacts, from massive funerary monuments to scribbles on potsherds, shed uniquely revealing light on provincial culture. From this epigraphy we confirm that Latin was the language of public display in the West. The individual names on the inscriptions are more telling, as they can reveal the progression of indigenous names, recorded in the Roman nomen + cognomen formula to the use of a Latin nomen with indigenous cognomen onwards to the full Roman tria nomina of an individual with Roman citizenship.¹⁹ The speed or delay in using Latin names differentiates segments of a population. For example, women in some areas of Roman Spain were more conservative in this regard than men of similar status and were more likely to have indigenous names for longer post-conquest.²⁰ This evidence can inspire speculation on women’s choices in representation or parents’ projections of identity on sons vs. daughters. Smaller inscribed finds, like curse tablets, show that Latin literacy may have pervaded the lives of non-elite provincials, as well. These were common in Roman

Britain at various aquatic sanctuaries, like Bath. The preponderance of lower-status items mentioned, including lengths of cloth, gloves, and tools, and the absence of consistent handwriting that would point to a professional scribe indicate that Latin literacy may have extended to lower-status populations. 

Archaeology cannot truly tell us what people thought or intended in their use of these objects, however, as the relationship of people to goods was as complex in the ancient past as it is now. There is no way to know whether Samian dishes were used for food consumption by all their owners or for display. Even if used, it is not a given that serving a Mediterranean-style meal on a Samian platter gave its user any sense of identity with the Roman heartland. A modern example may help illustrate the possibilities. A millennium after Samian dishes marked the spread of Rome, a Coca-Cola product may indicate the broad influence of American trade and culture. However, it does not demonstrate any aspiration on the part of the individual consumer to be an American or even a constant consciousness of the product’s American-ness. Coca-Cola is consumed by millions of people who do not associate it primarily with American culture but who purchase the products for their flavor, availability, price and local fashion. In Trinidad, for example, Coca-Cola arrived with American soldiers taking over military bases from the British colonial administration, but from there it received a local Trinidadian


franchise and became part of the fabric of daily life, no longer an American product but a Trinidadian one. Furthermore, Coca-Cola sells products in Asia that are not available in Europe; there are regional variations to suit local preferences and politics, a phenomenon called the “particularization of the universal.” This example from the modern world does not attempt to prove that ancient people felt the same way about their terra sigillata, but it should caution the assumption that the presence of Roman artifacts indicates enthusiastic participation in Romanitas. Archaeology can tell us what people bought, used, and disposed of, but not their associations or feelings towards it. These must be filled in by guesswork and extrapolation, which are subject to the experiences and worldviews of the people who study them.

1.3 Working with the Evidence: A Historiographical Survey

Though this archaeological evidence was not fully available until later, interpretation of the Roman literature and available physical remains, like epigraphy, solidified into theories of “Romanization” beginning in the late nineteenth century. The term “Romanization” was coined by German scholar Theodor Mommsen. In his broad history of the Roman Empire through the early Principate, Mommsen revolutionized the study of provincial culture in two important ways. He theorized a defensive nature of Roman expansion, meaning that imperialism was necessary to pacify and protect frontiers, and he incorporated epigraphic evidence into traditional study of literary evidence. This enabled him to show, as never before, the unifying influence of the

---

24 Ibid., 253
Roman administration in the far-flung provinces.²⁷ Describing the imperial culture as “Italo-Hellenic,” he explores the “Latinization” and “assimilation” of provincial peoples into the Roman world and the creation of a “national character” for the unified Roman state.²⁸ Decried at the time for its lack of a moral agenda, itself perhaps a contribution to the field, Mommsen’s study of the provinces was notable for the groundwork it laid for the next generation of scholars.²⁹

Arguably the most significant of these for the conceptualization of Romanization was Francis Haverfield. His seminal work, *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, originally published in 1905, as well as his lectures and other writings, are the starting point for virtually all English-language analyses of the topic. Haverfield followed Mommsen’s emphasis on the uniformity of the Romanitas of the empire but moved beyond literary and epigraphic sources to include other forms of archaeological evidence from his extensive work in the excavations at Chester, Silchester, and Hadrian’s Wall.³⁰ Writing during a revival of interest in Edward Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, popular for its relevance as a cautionary tale for the British Empire, Haverfield echoed familiar and encouraging sentiments of the triumph of civilization over barbarity.³¹ “[…] the old view of an age of despotism and decay has been overthrown, and the believer in human nature can now feel confident that, whatever their limitations,
the men of the empire wrought for the betterment and happiness of the world.”

The discourse portrays the native Britons as childlike and backward, following the perspective of the Romans themselves, and the conquerors as both technologically and culturally superior. In his view, the adoption of Roman culture in the provinces was no accident. “Civilized men are always more easily ruled than savages,” he wrote; Roman administrators rewarded conformity and repressed perceived barbarism in order to ensure governability of the provinces.

The only significant English challenge to Haverfield’s position for decades came from R.G. Collingwood in the 1930s. He followed in Haverfield’s Romano-centric footsteps, noting that “[t]ribal aristocracies easily became Romanized in manners and in thought; they were induced to build towns […] in the Roman style.” These units which were “rooted in native tradition but conformable to Roman usage” were a transitional stage “[…]from barbarian freedom to full membership of the Roman commonwealth[…]” In this analysis, clearly informed by Tacitus’ statement, Rome controlled and manipulated a definite progress towards provincial Romanization in Britain, and that this was a positive step in all areas except art, an area wherein “vulgar” imperial influence was a step backward from the refined Celtic tradition.

He tempered Haverfield’s earlier proposition by giving indigenous peoples more credit for the formation of Romano-British society. The upper class, Collingwood explained, became thoroughly Romanized and had no choice in the matter, but Romanization operated on a sliding scale, being very thorough at the elite level and only marginally significant for the
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peasantry. The Celtic elements that remained, like the persistence of local religious cults, he argued, made Romano-British culture distinct from that of Rome proper as it tried and failed to be part of a “universal civilization.”36

Haverfield, and even Collingwood, generally viewed Roman culture as progress, an idea that mapped onto the aggressive imperialism of parts of Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.37 During this period, Britain’s territories stretched around the globe, forming an empire on which “the sun never sets” and which included huge stretches of the world’s land area and population. France likewise ruled extensive territories in Africa and Southeast Asia. In Britain, the study of Classics and classical languages were part of the education of young men seeking desirable civil service postings in provincial administration; thus European empires and the Roman empire became deeply intertwined and contemporary imperialism became the lens through which the ancient past was imagined.38 The “white man’s burden” of the European empires was analogous to the “civilizing” mission of Rome. Colonial administrators saw themselves, wishfully, as bearers of civilization, law and order, true

36 Ibid., 269.
37 This paper discusses the Anglophone treatment of Romanization theory, but it is important to note that other traditions existed as well. Continental scholarship saw this through a lens of nationalism/regionalism, not just imperialism. On the Iberian Peninsula, for example, historians valorized indigenous ingenuity, celebrating local heroes like Viriatus or resistance events, like the siege of Numantia, and viewed the Roman conquest as a tragic interruption of the true Spanish soul, not progress. Modesto Lafuente articulated this retrospective nationalism powerfully as early as the 1850s and it continued to influence late 19th-early 20th century histories, especially after Spain lost Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Phillipines in the 1890s. German archaeologist Adolf Schulten fueled it with archaeological excavations at Numantia and Tartessos in the early 20th century. France, being a 20th century imperial power like Britain, took a middle path, celebrating the civilizing progress of the Roman empire while emphasizing the contributions made to its greatness by the native Gauls, an interpretation fathered by Camille Jullian in the early 20th century. Modesto Lafuente, Historia General de España, Vol. 1, (Madrid, 1850); Adolf Schulten, Numantia. Die Ergebnisse Der Ausgrabungen, 1905-1912, (Munich, 1914); Schulten, Tartessos: ein Beitrag zur ältesten Geschichte des Westens, (Hamburg: Friederichsen, 1922); Camille Jullian, Histoire de la Gaule (Paris: Hachette, 1908).
religion, and just, paternal rule. Their Romans took on the same character and shared the same right of conquest, being the most highly evolved culture in its sphere of influence. Thus, Haverfield and his British contemporaries saw Romanization as intentional, inevitable, and necessary. Rome was, of course, the active party in the transmission of culture. Native togati, recognizing the superiority of Rome’s culture and technology, eagerly accepted the paternalistic bestowal of these blessings and passively allowed their cultures to be displaced by the newcomers.

This view of Rome’s civilizing mission remained largely unchallenged until the mid-twentieth century when the bulk of British and French overseas possessions successfully won their independence. The concerns of the first post-colonial generation of historians were markedly different from their predecessors. The 1970s and 80s saw a radically transformed opinion of imperialism. Edward Said’s Orientalism challenged imperial ideology by unveiling the formation of alterity and its propagation in discourse. The influence of New Archaeology in the 1960s encouraged broader field surveys and focus on non-elite sites. The Annales school and other social history movements took new interest in the experiences of non-elite populations. The Civil Rights movement in the United States and Negritude in Africa challenged colonial racial ideology. Wallerstein’s World Systems analysis in 1974 inspired a blossoming of interest in the economic dynamics of imperialism and consumer choices, displacing
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politics as the primary agent of change.\textsuperscript{43} This even filtered into popular media. The 1977 release of \textit{Star Wars} should not be underestimated for its extreme take on the post-colonial \textit{zeitgeist}; empires, including Rome’s, were not only unable to impose complete or beneficial change, but they could be downright villainous. The moral high ground and agency in cultural change were essentially transferred from the colonists to the indigenous populations.

Works on Romanization during these early post-colonial years of the 1970s-80s saw a new emphasis on indigenous \textit{resistance} to the expanding Roman empire. This “Nativist” school was exemplified by historians like Stephen Dyson, who discussed revolts in the Roman Empire as cultural reassertion and, most famously, by Marcel Bénabou, describing indigenous resistance to Romanization in North Africa.\textsuperscript{44} He discussed resistance at a military, and, more intriguingly, at a cultural level. Indigenous languages like Punic, he argues, remained in use alongside Latin.\textsuperscript{45} The choices of new names, like that of Iddibal Caphada Aemilius of first century Tripolitania, on receiving Roman citizenship likewise showcased African identity that was not overshadowed by Roman naming formulae.\textsuperscript{46} Religion as well, he argued, was a way for local populations to preserve their indigenous beliefs by transferring cult practices of deities like Ba’al Hammon to the Roman Saturn, transforming him into a focus of African identity.\textsuperscript{47} Bénabou posited these as conscious choices made by Africans to keep their own culture alive and well despite the Romanizing attempts of the immigrants. Roman culture was

\textsuperscript{45} Bénabou, \textit{La Résistance Africaine}, 484.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 516.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 373.
thus a “thin veneer” for appearances’ sake, while the heart and soul of the North African provinces remained African. British historians took up the theme as well. Britain, argued Richard Reece, experienced its Celtic revival in the fifth century and quickly de-Romanized because Roman culture had never been more than superficial and merely for political expediency. The “tender Mediterranean plant” of urban culture was so shallow-rooted that, after the challenges of the third century “[…] a few boatloads of unorganized Anglo-Saxons swept it away.”

J. T. Smith also directly questioned the “villa” discoveries from Roman Britain, positing that they were unlike any form of villa known in Italy and that their separate-unit layout was uniquely well suited to Celtic family dynamics, like partible inheritance. Thus, the villa, previously used by Haverfield and Collingwood to demonstrate the thorough Romanitas of the British country elite, was perhaps nothing more than a Celtic carryover with a few Roman decorations.

Though this Nativist reaction successfully began to turn the tide in mainstream scholarship’s tendency to belittle indigenous cultures and strip conquered populations of agency, it did not move past a rigid Roman-Native binary or account for areas of true fusion and mutual sharing. For the Nativist school, a “pure” indigenous body that was itself relatively unchanging existed beneath the toga of Romanitas, also a distinct and monolithic set of practices and ideas that was essential to Rome. The colonial-era archaeologists and historians, focusing on the homogeneity of the Roman-ruled world and oversimplifying pre-Roman cultures, were guilty of the same essentialism.
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the roles were simply reversed. The indigenous people became the active protagonists while the Romans were impotent at best, villainous at worst.

Martin Millett introduced a groundbreaking synthesis of colonial and Nativist ideas in 1990. Even the title of his *The Romanization of Britain* heralded his intentional dialogue with Haverfield. Like the colonial-era school, Millett’s view of Romanization was one of deeply penetrating change that ultimately amounted to progress. Like the Nativist school, the active party in deciding how much to accept were the indigenous peoples. Unlike either, he decentralized Rome from the process, describing Rome as “an essentially *laissez-faire* administration.” The indigenous *togati*, he argued, donned the togas by free choice and Romanized themselves. This was due to many factors, primarily the need to distinguish themselves as elite to their own people, which required a new strategy when Rome’s imposition removed their traditional status-builders of weaponry and warfare, and the need to maintain leadership positions in the Roman administration. Romanization was, for these reasons, “the result of native elite desire to participate in a Roman style of life.”

This was an attractive stance and was further developed by a host of other works. Greg Woolf’s 1998 study of Roman Gaul presented a more nuanced look at the give-and-take between the conquerors and the indigenous populations, but still placed the onus of Romanization on the shoulders of the native elites. C. R. Whittaker and Ramsay MacMullen’s empire-wide studies likewise posited Romanization by “osmosis” or
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imitation of Rome by the elite and of the elite by the non-elite.\textsuperscript{54} Thus in all these studies Romanization was a trickle-down process initiated by indigenous elites recognizing the value, either intrinsic or strategic, of Roman culture and the rest of society following by the desire to emulate the elite. Since the conquering Romans were largely relieved of responsibility for the loss of cultural continuity, this stance may have served to assuage some post-colonial guilt by allowing former imperialists of Western Europe to believe that they, too were not responsible.\textsuperscript{55}

This emulation model explained divergences in material evidence for Romanization by class and geography by explaining the persistence of local culture as a lower-class or rural phenomenon, but this does not account for all that Romanization meant. The proponents of this model downplayed the fear-based motivation that accompanied any appreciation of Roman society as an attractive option. The Romans were famously open-handed with enfranchisement of conquered peoples, and indigenous power structures were often left intact to rule their own civitates, or tribal centers. It is imperative to remember, however, that this privilege was only afforded to people groups and individuals who submitted to Roman rule without resistance. The Eburones of Northern Gaul, for example, were utterly destroyed, according to Caesar, due to resistance in 54 BC.\textsuperscript{56} Iron-Age settlements in this area show massive population disruption during this time, validating Caesar’s sometimes difficult-to-swallow


\textsuperscript{55} Richard Hingley, \textit{Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity, and Empire} (New York: Routledge, 2005), 46.

\textsuperscript{56} Caesar, \textit{The Gallic War} 6.34.8.
posturing.\textsuperscript{57} When the Roman military marched up to a settlement, the population knew that they had two options: surrender and comply or resist and be enslaved. The ballooning of the slave economy in Rome during the rapid expansion of the late Republic meant that this happened very often.\textsuperscript{58} Word of tribes enslaved must have spread as a rumor. This was an effective terror strategy. Even though local elites certainly made choices in how they would express solidarity with Rome, not expressing it would have been suicide. Even in pacified, civilian areas, armed and armored military personnel were present in service of the governor.\textsuperscript{59} The visual impact of these soldiers must not be underestimated. Even if we believe that the literary sources greatly exaggerated the Roman role in culture transmission, the change in lifestyle was not necessarily a free choice, regardless of its place in official policy. Indigenous populations must have had good reason to believe that they would suffer for refusal to speak Latin, worship the imperial pantheon, and follow Roman laws. Daily life decisions, like what kind of pottery to buy at the market, whether to put on a toga or trousers, and whether to drink wine or beer, were likely not micro-managed by the administration, but must still be seen in the context of this very uneven balance of power wherein indigenous lifestyles were second-class.

These works rely on the idea of monolithic indigenous and Roman cultures that existed in relatively pure, while sometimes coexisting, forms in the minds of conquerors and conquered, a viewpoint challenged in 2001 by Jane Webster. Using the term,

\textsuperscript{59} David Mattingly, \textit{An Imperial Possession: Britain in the Roman Empire} (New York: Penguin, 2006), 129.
creolization, to describe the process of blending and fusion, she draws parallels between Roman provincial culture and more modern African colonial populations in the New World. “Creolization,” she explains, “is a linguistic term indicating the blending of two languages into a single dialect. It has come to be used more generally for the processes of multicultural adjustment through which […] African-American and African-Caribbean societies were created.” She argues that the same processes of adjustment should guide us in understanding Roman provincial culture. In doing so, Webster turned the conversation around in two ways. First, she emphasized the hybridity of provincial culture, and, second, she argued that this happened even in non-elite social strata, though it looked different. Religion was her primary case study, with the ubiquitous Gaulish goddess, Epona, exemplifying use of a blended “vocabulary” of cultural practices, beliefs, and objects. Like other pre-Roman Celtic deities, Epona was not anthropomorphized until the Roman conquest. She was represented by the figure of a horse, instead. Roman-era iconography showed Epona as a woman, but unlike Mediterranean deities who were not usually depicted with animals, Epona was constantly flanked by horses in sculptural art. Thus the human female goddess and her animal representations formed a compromise between the Celtic and Roman iconographic traditions. Further, since religion was not exclusive to the upper classes, the rural poor may have had as much to do with this syncretism as the urban elite.

This model, despite its attractive features, does little to clarify the waters of innovation, transmission, and transformation. On a basic level, the comparisons to the
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early modern Americas may not hold up. The Roman provinces were different from the Caribbean situation in many key ways, besides the historical difference. In contrast to the African and European New World populations Webster references, the indigenous peoples of the Roman empire were in their ancestral homelands and adjusting to life under an occupying foreign invasion. The adaption mentality must have been different for people displaced from their environments compared to people who remained in environments that underwent changes. Another key discrepancy is the fact that the African populations in North America were enslaved and were subjected to their masters’ interference in most areas of their lives. Compliant indigenous peoples from Iron-Age Western Europe, in contrast, were subjugated but not enslaved in the same way, despite the analogies drawn by Roman writers. They were allowed to retain many of the basic building blocks of their societies, including family units and local social hierarchy. This was a far more stable situation and community, on the whole, than the experience of a plantation slave in Haiti, and the adaptation mechanisms cannot be assumed to be the same. It would be more appropriate to compare Romanization to instances of cultural fusion between Native American populations and European colonists or to compare African-Caribbean slaves with indigenous people enslaved and displaced by the Romans. Further, however, the Roman conquests did not have the same “white” vs. “black” racial binary that characterized New World creolization. Romans certainly displayed a cultural chauvinism and othering of “barbarians,” but the boundary was purely cultural, not biological; barbarians could become fully enfranchised Romans, producing senators and
even emperors after several generations.\textsuperscript{62} Webster’s Caribbean situation generally separated people groups more rigidly.

Beyond the problematic framing, Webster’s concept allows exploration of crucial ideas left to collect dust by other theorists. In particular, she highlights the cultural negotiations made by the non-elite. Even Collingwood, who recognized coexistence of Roman and Celtic elements as early as the 1930s, saw Roman adoptions being more associated with the elite, leaving rural and lower-class populations responsible for preserving indigenous traditions. Likewise the other models discussed here have conceived of cultural change as a trickle-down process with elite culture as the one that mattered most and the rest of society getting an uneven scattering of crumbs. Webster’s case study is religion, not foreign imports or elite fashion, but an area of life that affected the spectrum of society, showing blended Roman and indigenous choices. Whether this is conclusive evidence of lower-class engagement with Roman culture is debatable, because religious syncretism could have just as easily been an elite-driven phenomenon. In fact, for many cultures in the ancient world, priesthoods and religious leadership were elite roles, from the Druids of Britain and Gaul to the \textit{pontifex maximus} of Rome itself, while the rural poor have long been notably conservative when faced with religious change.\textsuperscript{63} She does raise awareness of the fact that non-elites are a virtual blind-spot for most theorists, however, and sets a precedent for discovering cultural negotiations that certainly occurred in the lower strata of society as well.

\textsuperscript{62} Alejandro Bancalari, “Es Criollización una Alternativa de la Romanización?” \textit{Aevum}, Anno 82, Fasc. 1 (Gennaio-Aprille 2008): 199-205.

\textsuperscript{63} The word “paganus” from which we derive the modern English “pagan” was simply the Latin for “villager” or “peasant,” reflecting their religious holdout as Christianity advanced. See Ramsay MacMullen, \textit{Christianizing the Roman Empire (AD 100-400)} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984), 83.
Recently, there has been a call among Anglophone scholars of the Roman Empire to eschew the concept of “Romanization” altogether. Instead the globalization of the Roman world, not the intentional introduction of a new culture or a conscious “civilizing mission,” determined the shape taken by provincial cultures. “Globalization is not about (American or Roman) power destroying local and authentic cultures; quite the contrary. Globalization theories are about investigating diversity within a single cultural framework […] and about the transformative capacities of intercultural encounters.”

This builds on the World Systems analysis of the 70s, which posits the existence of “core” economic spheres and “periphery” areas to which trade goods flowed. These networks, carrying goods, people, and ideas between core and periphery, existed for centuries in the ancient Mediterranean but reached new heights under the Roman empire. Instead of centering Roman imperial culture on the city of Rome or the Italian heartland, theorists of ancient globalization view the Roman world as the oikumene, or “civilized” world, a place of exchange, not acculturation. Instead of seeing culture as transferred from one closed cultural “container” to another, Macedonia to Rome or Rome to Gaul, for examples, Versluys advocates seeing the entire oikumene as a single container, a place of interaction and creation of new identities, not A to B change. Within the single cultural container created by circulation of objects and people via trade,
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immigration, military occupation, etc., local differences thrived, as each engaged with the wider world differently, a reality encapsulated in the term “glocalization.”69 Terra sigillata united the provinces but took on diverse meanings in local contexts, for example. It was an opportunity for elite display in Camulodunum, Britain, but used by rich and poor Libyans alike in an exclusive funerary context.70 Archaeological sites are therefore not measured against Romanitas but analyzed for unique interactions with the Roman oikumene.71

This perspective helpfully demonstrates how complicated the cultural developments in the Roman world were. Production of identity is a central theme in these investigations and this approach allows a more nuanced image of how this worked. Previous scholarship tended to view “Roman” and “Native” elements in a binary. The question was how much Roman and how much indigenous culture were present in any given context, indexing how thoroughly Romanized a community or individual was. Globalization, on the other hand, especially the concept of “glocalization,” emphasizes negotiation in cultural adaptation and the diverse meaning and symbolism that the same object or practice could have in different communities. Indeed, as we have seen, not only could using a Roman object, like a terra sigillata cup, give its user a sense of belonging to the Roman empire, it could also be part of a unique local tradition that solidified community identity as distinct from other ethnic groups or provinces and also distinct from the “correct” Roman usages that may have defined the administration and military.

71 Ibid., 651.
Thus, participating in imperial culture did not mean Roman identity; it could also be a way to produce a local identity.

This perspective resonates strongly with the early twenty-first century zeitgeist because, like all history, it is a reflection of the world in which it was written. Twenty-first century earth is a truly global society. Rapid intercontinental transportation and the internet make transnational trade, communication, and true interconnectivity bloom. The ancient world was very different, however. Though exchange and sharing happened across the empire, the extent of global awareness likely made minimal impact on the identity of most people. Maps were very rare and incredibly imprecise by modern standards.\(^72\) The average Gaul probably had no idea where Egypt was and could in no way appreciate the “Egyptizing” impact it had on his visual art.\(^73\) Indeed, one Late Roman philosopher reported the refusal of landlocked Syrian peasants to believe the existence of fish.\(^74\) Farmers in Noricum likely had no concept of where their terra sigillata came from or that it unified the empire, just that it was technologically more sophisticated and visually more impressive than their handmade pots. Pannonian devotees would not have known that Epona was a Gaulish goddess, just that she was supposed to aid the fertility of their land. Those alive at the time of provincial conquest certainly would not have seen the legions as an opportunity to globalize the local or localize the global. Instead of interconnectivity and diversity, the new provincials likely saw a foreign enemy. Though the mechanisms of exchange and connection circulated


\(^{74}\) Synesius, *Epistles* 148.
provincial peculiarities, most inhabitants had no way of knowing they were part of such an interconnected world, meaning global culture did not function in the same way as it does today and that this analysis would have had little meaning for the subjects it studies.

1.4 Conclusion

The early generations of provincials who learned to adapt and live under Roman occupation are, of course gone without telling us how or why they made these adaptations. We are left with imperfect evidence to speculate based on our own experiences and contemporary observations of the world, be it a colonial, post-colonial or global context. The literary evidence tells us that Rome saw itself on a very intentional mission to transfer its culture to the provinces of the Empire in order to make them better subjects. Archaeology confirms the presence of Roman material culture, including ceramics, coins, and inscriptions, in various social strata and contexts, indicating that the cultural augmentation was successful to an extent. However, the feelings, identities, and perceptions of these cultural features are subject to interpretation. These interpretations, furthermore, are the direct product of contemporary experience. Theories on the Roman imperial culture shifts, whether termed “Romanization,” “creolization,” “globalization” or something else, have reflected the outlook and concerns of their authors’ eras, doubly obscuring the reality on the ground in the new provinces of the Roman Empire. Colonial scholars easily imagine Rome as a paternal master; post-colonial historians either villainize Rome or simply downplay responsibility, shifting most of the agency to the conquered peoples. The recent experiences of decolonization and the rise of post-colonial
theory have enriched our understanding of indigenous actions and reactions, but in this emphasis, they have displaced Rome from the center of the story. We must remember that the creation of provincial culture was not undertaken on a level playing field. All new provinces knew that Rome had the power of punishment and reward. We must approach this issue with a balanced view that recognizes the agency and unique negotiations that societies and individuals enacted in becoming part of the Roman empire but that this process was not on their own terms. Rome did truly “Romanize” the Empire by bringing new territories into its “cultural container” to the extent convenient and in the service of its own interests, as will be demonstrated by the following case studies.
CHAPTER TWO:

GLORY AND GOLD: THE CREATION OF ROMAN HISPANIA

2.1 Introduction

Hispania, among Rome’s earliest conquests outside of Italy, provided Rome with exotic resources that changed the course of its history. Gold, silver, olives, horses, and slaves, including the famous dancers of Gades, were among the benefits Rome reaped from Spain’s incorporation into the new Empire at the end of the third century BC. For Spain, however, like other conquered regions, incorporation meant not only the loss of political autonomy but an alteration of its cultural trajectory as well. Unlike the changes Roman civilization experienced, the Romanization of Spain was not entirely voluntary. An experiment in empire-building that would be perfected in later provinces, Spain was conquered over a period of approximately 200 years, most of which were marked by significant violence as perpetual wars of conquest slowly engulfed the Iberian Peninsula. Though the progress of Roman culture was not a major concern of the conquerors during the wars of conquest, it proceeded in piecemeal fashion like the territorial conquest even in these early centuries. Examining this process by comparison between the Pre-Roman Iron Age and the early Imperial period, I argue that Romanization here, as elsewhere, was not a homogenous process or the result of a predefined strategy, but at every stage
involved local people making adjustments and adaptations that served Rome’s interest at Rome’s official or unofficial behest, either for production of resources under the Republic or imperial unity under the Principate. Analysis of the social variables of region, social status, and gender pre- and post-conquest demonstrate the depth and breadth of these adaptations.

2.2  *Iberia Before Rome: Geography, Social Organization, and Gender*

To appreciate the dramatic adaptations made under Rome, we must understand the pre-Roman cultural landscape. Iron-Age Iberia\(^1\) was an incredibly diverse region. The ethnic makeup of the territory is debatable and deeply entangled with nationalism in Spanish historiography, but today it is generally agreed that Pre-Roman Iberia was home to diverse cultures. Iberian non-Indo-European language speakers occupied the East and South. Celtic language speakers either migrated in large numbers or diffused Celtic culture into in the central areas, including a blended Celtic/Iberian region known as Celtiberia to the East of the North-Central plateau and a Celtic/Aquitanian (proto-Basque) mixture along the Pyrenees in the Northeast. Other Indo-European Celtic-like cultures characterized the far North and West (Figure 2.1).\(^2\) Understanding the cultural trajectories of these areas at the time of Roman contact will be crucial for understanding how the imposition of Roman authority affected them. Additionally, in examining the impact of Rome along social status and gender lines, we must consider the regional

\(^1\) For the purposes of this paper, “Iberia” will refer to the entire Iberian Peninsula, encompassing modern Spain and Portugal, which will then be called “Spain” or “Hispania” when discussing the Roman period specifically, in keeping with scholarly tradition. The adjective, “Iberian,” however, will be restricted to its more specific meaning, that is, non-Indo-European language speakers of the South and East of the peninsula.

\(^2\) Map from indo-european.eu/tag/vaccae.
diversity within these categories of analysis, as social hierarchy and gender ideology were very different from region to region.

The southernmost of these is the Iberian zone along the Mediterranean coast from modern Catalonia to the Atlantic past the Straits of Gibraltar, including several rich river valleys, including the Guadalquivir and the Ebro. An incredibly rich and fertile region, the Southwest of this zone was home to the semi-mythical kingdom of Tartessos, lauded by Greek scholars and even known to the authors of the Hebrew Old Testament as Tarshish. There is evidence of urbanization and social hierarchization in this area of
Southwest Iberia dating back to the third millennium BC. After 1000 BC, Southern Iberia underwent a period of cultural “Orientalization” due to Eastern Mediterranean presence, not only in trade relationships, but also from Phoenician colonies on the Southwest coast. These included colonies founded by Phoenicians, like Gadir (modern Cadiz) and “Semiticized” Iberian towns like Carmona (near modern Seville). This diffused Eastern cultural features and urban planning techniques, including fortified, walled cities, multi-room dwellings, grid-pattern streets and writing. Southwest Iberian social structures, already showing loose hierarchy entering the Bronze Age, became more extremely stratified and developed a royalty that was linked to the divine, as evidenced by increasingly lavish elite cremation burials surrounded by lower status “client” cremations, in the seventh century BC that included increasingly more objects of religious significance than of warfare. Together with Greek and Hebrew references to “kings” of Tartessos/Tarshish, the picture emerges of a pyramid-shaped, monarchial society common in the Eastern Mediterranean but otherwise unattested in the West during the Bronze Age. Phoenician impact was also felt along the East coast, though they did not find an already-urbanized and stratified culture in this region, but kin-based agricultural societies, semi-sedentary along the coast and urbanizing further inland. Phoenicia was not the only Eastern Mediterranean power to leave an imprint on the
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Iberian zone. Greek city-states also sent colonists to the region. Phocaea, a nearby Greek colony, had an indubitable influence on Tartessian culture to judge from its architecture.\(^8\)

This Orientalizing Period declined in the sixth century BC after the fall of Tyre to Nebuchadnezzar II of Babylon, giving rise to the Turdetanian culture encountered by Rome centuries later. Agriculture again became preeminent in the economy, in place of mining and metallurgy, and the tradition of monumental sacred/royal burials disappeared. While society may have continued to be highly stratified, the top of the pyramid was almost certainly flattened at this time. The new culture retained much of Tartessos, however continuing to use an alphabet and keep written records like their predecessors.\(^9\)

The dominance of Phoenicia in the Western Mediterranean began to wane during these centuries as well, leaving room for her most famous daughter, Carthage, to assert her influence on Southern Spain, founding new colonies along the Eastern and Southern coastlines and bolstering the development of urbanization in these pockets.\(^10\)

While Tartessos developed social hierarchies during the Bronze Age, the Eastern part of the Iberian zone took longer to develop this stratification, though by the late Iron Age this had changed. A significant development in the creation of social stratification in the Iberian lands was heightened exploitation of resources, including mineral wealth, perhaps due to Punic activity in the lead-up to the wars with Rome in the third century BC. The traditional aristocracies became a land-owning class on the eve of the Roman conquest.\(^11\)
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labor force. Destruction levels in areas like Jaen show likely conflict between owners and this increasingly alienated labor force.\textsuperscript{12} A private necropolis near the city of Jaen shows the increasing links between important families and the land they owned or controlled.\textsuperscript{13}

Iberian society was highly patriarchal, though women were clearly of high value. Marriage was monogamous, and women were buried with the same honors and grave richness as men. The chief Iberian deity was a mother-goddess, and, aside from the ban on women in the Punic temple of Hercules in Gades, there does not appear to be any restriction on female participation in cult practice.\textsuperscript{14} Elite Iberian women were valued for their role in perpetuating a noble lineage and for use in pacts and alliances, creating “relations of subordination” as Hasdrubal and Hannibal did when they married Iberian princesses.\textsuperscript{15} This meant that chastity was absolutely imperative. While Iberian women did not engage in warfare of any kind, Appian describes a woman gouging out a soldier’s eyes with her fingers to avoid being raped.\textsuperscript{16} An Iberian woman’s physical appearance was also a source of value and pride for her family. Archaeologists have found tweezers for hair removal, as well as countless ornate pieces of jewelry and decorative accessories.\textsuperscript{17} Women did have some limited economic prestige in this region for their role in weaving, which was a key regional export. Baetic wool was famous and valuable across the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{18} As an aspect of their domestic sphere, women’s weaving activities were responsible for creating the finished product. One wealthy woman in a
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first century BC funerary relief from Albufereta de Alicante was portrayed holding a
distaff, similar to early representations of Roman matrons in Italy.19 Lower class women
are visible in the sources primarily as objects of pleasure. This region of Spain,
particularly Gades, was famous for a particularly suggestive style of dance done with
castanets, perhaps an ancient precursor to Flamenco.20 Women were regularly brought on
board Phoenician and Carthaginian ships to entertain sailors with these dance
performances.21

The central region of the peninsula was settled by Celtic peoples, among Rome’s
most intense antagonists during the wars of conquest. In sharp contrast to the urbanized,
globally connected South, the lifestyle of central Spain was primarily rural and pastoral.22
According to Strabo, most people lived in the “forest” and the impact of cities was
minimal. Enclosed dwellings, the hillforts seen across the Celtic world, were familiar, but
most were only large enough to house one clan.23 Though Polybius referred to these as
poleis, Strabo criticized this designation.24 There were several larger fortified oppida in
the region, most notably Numantia, the “capital” of the Celtiberian Aravaceos, which
likely developed from a single-clan castro, or hillfort, in the third or fourth century BC.25
The purpose of these oppida was to stand out, control, and defend the surrounding area.26
Pastoralism was crucial for the economy of the region, as the landscape did not produce
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the agricultural bounty of the southern river valleys. Sheep and goats were economic and dietary staples, but cattle were also important as a source of prestige for the elite, and cattle-raiding was an important source of conflict, as seen elsewhere in the Celtic world. According to Poseidonius, the region also produced famously fast horses. This pastoral economy was supplemented with cereals, providing the indigenous peoples with bread and beer. This agricultural production was apparently cooperative, with community storage facilities such as the one at Segortia Lanka suggesting a communal distributive model.

There does not appear to have been a monarchy, but groups were headed by a warrior aristocracy, with disparate groups banding together in coalitions as needed under an elected war chief in a system that may be analogous to North American groups like the Iroquois. The rise of oppida in Celtic and Celtiberian areas bolstered the position of the warrior elite, giving them opportunity for public display and conspicuous consumption. This mounted nobility was on the front lines of diplomacy with the incoming Romans. As they were recruited to join the Roman army, they were the first to receive Roman citizenship and to add Roman elements to their cultural repertoire. The Bronze of Ascoli, for example, shows the grant of citizenship to the Turma Salluitana, a Celtiberian cavalry squadron that fought for Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo in the Social War. This Roman involvement led to heightened class awareness and increased social differentiation. As
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their dominance of their compatriots was solidified, however, these “equestrians” became subordinated to Rome through bonds of clientage.\(^{33}\)

Like Iberian Southern Spain, the peninsular center was also markedly patriarchal, though women’s lives in this zone were somewhat different. Elite women in Celtic and Celtiberian Spain were likewise valued for their contribution to their families and communities through reproduction and nobility of lineage, and women of all classes were expected to take responsibility for the domestic sphere, preparing food, weaving cloth, and caring for children. Celtic/Celtiberian women participated with more robust personal agency in the marriage and lineage process than Iberian women, if Strabo’s account is to be believed, however. He noted that these women chose their own husbands without their fathers’ impediment, preferring partners with outstanding military prowess.\(^{34}\) They also took a more active role in warfare, supporting the male troops, fighting in last-stand defenses, and committing suicide to prevent capture.\(^{35}\) A fragment from Sallust’s *Histories* includes an dramatically embellished story about a group of Celtiberian women’s response when their male warriors considered surrender: “The women, unable to dissuade them, separated from their husbands and seized a very secure stronghold near Meoriga. They declared that the men had yielded their country, their child-bearers and their freedom; and so the wives were leaving breast-feeding, childbirth and the other roles of women to their husbands.”\(^{36}\)

The Northern strip of the Iberian peninsula, with its rugged terrain and poor agricultural prospects, especially in the Northwest corner, was described by Strabo as “a
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miserable place to live in.”37 Most of the groups living along the northern coast were Indo-European, unlike the Iberians of the south, and many groups were Celtic or proto-Celtic like the central zone, but the terrain and living conditions made them culturally isolated. These societies were less stable than those further south, as they could not always depend fully on agriculture for sustenance, and inter-community warfare and raiding were an accepted part of life. Even so, individual communities located in and around defensive castros, as the hillforts of the Iberian peninsula are known in Spanish archaeology, were normally self-sufficient. In most areas of the region these lacked a hierarchy of settlements or exploitive relationships between communities, but each exploited its own immediate surroundings for agriculture and raw materials and manufactured its own goods.38 None of these were obviously larger in size or more prestigious in standing.39 Material culture was fairly homogenous, however, indicating communication and exchange, perhaps due to frequent raiding. This makes tribal affiliations difficult to gage. Names like “Callaeci” were geographical areas designated by Rome and imposed on groups with only loose ties to each other, casting their accuracy as self-conscious tribes into serious doubt.40 Roman-era epigraphy shows a transition from designation of individual castro community as place of origin to consideration of civitas as primary unit of belonging.41

37 Strabo, Geography 3.1.2.
41 Ibid., 142.
Lacking hierarchy of settlements, this region also lacked a strong social hierarchy within these settlements. Archaeology in the *castros* of the Las Medulas area, for example, shows an internal organization that reflects the relations of these communities with one another. We see groupings of semi-isolated dwellings within the *castro* walls, all of roughly the same size and with identical features, including living areas, work spaces, and storage.\(^{42}\) Each household was somewhat self-sufficient and there were no palaces. Except for the transitional zones influenced by Celtiberian customs, there is no evidence to suggest an aristocracy or a social elite in Northern Iberia.

Along the northern strip of the peninsula, women exercised considerable agency in their communities beyond reproduction and domesticity. While women in Northern Spain were still responsible for the domestic sphere, they performed considerable work outside it as well. Since raiding was a crucial activity and occupied much of men’s time, the manual labor of daily life fell to women. They performed the small-scale agriculture that could be eked from the difficult terrain, and even some mining activity.\(^ {43}\) Women also served as healers, being traditionally associated with magic and the preservation of passed-down remedies.\(^ {44}\) Female participation in war was not institutionalized, but women in this region did take spontaneous initiative assisting the men of their community in battle, even fighting personally. While they cannot be described as any kind of pure matriarchy, societies in Northern Spain had matrilineal and matrilocal features, with husbands joining the clan of the wife upon marriage in many cases.\(^ {45}\)

\(^{42}\) Sastre, *Formas de Dependencia*, 22.
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The variety of linguistic groups and cultures, progressively less urbanized and hierarchical further from the Mediterranean, meant that the impending clashes with Rome would be experienced very differently from one group to another, and from one person to another even within a regional culture. For some, the conquest was more traumatic and represented more of a lifestyle change than for others. No group was unaffected by it, however, and each adapted in different ways, creating a unique new provincial culture according to Rome’s interests and involvement in each region.

2.3 *Hispania and the Roman Republic: Wars, Treaties, and Incorporation*

Rome’s involvement with these “barbarians” began in the third century BC as rivalry with Carthage escalated. Having already fought one war with the Carthaginians over colonies in Sicily, Spain became the battleground for the Second Punic War, 218-201 BC. The famed Carthaginian general, Hannibal, in shoring up resources and support in Iberia, attacked the Roman ally city of Saguntum. It is unclear what Rome’s exact relationship with Saguntum was or when it began, but it is significant that Rome sent no aid to the city while it was under attack. Only once Carthage had conquered did Rome respond by declaring war. This dubious timing indicated that Rome was probably waiting for an excuse to go on the offensive.\(^{46}\) It is important to note here that this initial foray into the peninsula was not a territorial grab, but a step in the direction of war against Hannibal. Indeed, before the end of the Second Punic War, Rome showed no interest in Spain beyond its role as a battleground.\(^{47}\) Rome came to know the riches of Iberia only

---


after taking control of the Carthaginian strongholds of Carthago Nova, Baecula, and Ilipa on the east coast. At this point it became imperative to keep them for Rome’s enrichment and to prevent them from falling back into Hannibal’s hands.⁴⁸ Carthago Nova, for example, was home to the famous Baebulo mine, which, according to Roman opinion, had enriched Carthage with 300 *drachmai* of silver every day.⁴⁹

The conquest of the remainder of Spain took over 200 years, and the goals and results varied considerably in both space and time. Just because there was no unifying strategy to the process does not mean that, at any point, the new Roman rulers did not have interests to fight for in the new province. In rich Turdetania, these interests were material and centered on exploiting resources like silver and olive oil that were increasingly indispensable to Roman life. Other conquests, like much of the central zone, were defensive, to pacify hostile neighbors and neutralize threats, turning them into stable and reliable buffers against the unconquered peoples to the North. In all regions, many conquests were made for the prestige of conquering generals in an age when celebrating a triumph in Rome was crucial for political success.⁵⁰ These conquests could be sealed with treaties or could be won by violence. Victories were not always clear-cut or permanent either. The pacified Turdetani, for example, rebelled again during Cato’s consulate in the mid-second century BC, likely in response to his harsh terms.⁵¹ Rome could transgress agreements, too, however, as happened under Galba in the Lusitanian wars. His massacre of Lusitani after making peace in 151 BC started a brutal decade of warfare which saw
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the rise and fall of Viriathus, one of Iberia’s most charismatic indigenous leaders.\textsuperscript{52} The mid-second century also saw protracted warfare with the Celtiberians in the peninsular center. The yearlong siege of the fortified oppida at Numantia after another broken peace treaty in 133 BC exemplifies the extreme lengths to which both defenders and conquerors could go.\textsuperscript{53} Not all diplomatic efforts ended in violence, however. Some cities, like Gades in 206 BC, were given special status as trading partners and were allowed to remain semi-independent.\textsuperscript{54} These ally cities gained both protection and prestige from the relationship with Rome which placed them in a stronger position in relation to their neighbors.\textsuperscript{55} The Saguntines, for example, praised Scipio for defeating their old enemies: “And lastly the Turdetani, such deadly enemies to us that had their strength remained unimpaired Saguntum must have fallen, even they have been brought so low by his arms that they are no longer to be feared by us […]”.\textsuperscript{56}

This alternating progression of clemency and violence continued throughout the 200-odd year ordeal of Iberian pacification. Until the very late stages, there was little rhyme or reason, certainly no “grand strategy,” to the imperial experiment. The Senate was rarely involved in decisions of policy or strategy, beyond appointing consuls and punishing them if they egregiously transgressed norms, as they did for Pompeius and his disastrous breach of faith that led to the siege of Numantia.\textsuperscript{57} In most cases generals in Iberia made decisions regarding relations with indigenous peoples without waiting for senatorial approval. For example, the Bronze of Alcantara records the decision of Lucius
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Caesius in accepting the surrender of the Seano, a people group of Southern Lusitania, restoring to them their hostages and horses and allowing both the physical town and its laws to remain in use at the will of the Roman people.\textsuperscript{58} Though Caesius did make the decision \textit{in consilio}, the Senate is not mentioned. It appears to have been an ad hoc decision on the spot. Indeed, disgruntled indigenous leaders appealed to the Senate on the basis of treaties and terms given to them by individual generals, as the Avaceos did in 152 BC, pleading the Senate to uphold the terms of a treaty made with them by S. Gracchus.\textsuperscript{59} This and other treaties by Gracchus were staunchly upheld by their communities, becoming effective “constitutions of Celtiberia.”\textsuperscript{60} They were viewed as fully valid and solemnized regardless of Senatorial involvement.\textsuperscript{61} This represented a “strategy” only in its very broadest sense, making Iberia less hostile to Rome and more exploitable. Neither the pacification nor the exploitation was systematic, but were flexible and pragmatic, a response to the needs of the given situation and often made on the spot by commanders, not the Senate. Even the fortifications used in new areas show this willingness to adapt. For years archaeologists mistook several Roman military forts, like Lomba do Canho in Lusitania, for indigenous sites due to their use of native materials and building techniques in stone and adobe, without the characteristic Roman mortar and roof tiles.\textsuperscript{62}

Until the first century BC, contact between Romans and indigenous peoples in most of Spain was military. Celtiberia alone took over 100 years to pacify, with several
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rebellions of “pacified” peoples keeping administration highly unstable. Hispania was divided into two provinces Hispania Citerior, or “Nearer Spain,” and Hispania Ulterior, or “Further Spain,” each governed by a consul or praetor who commanded the military campaigns of his province. Some, like Cato the Elder, consul and governor of Citerior in 195 BC, were ambitious and aggressive, conquering neighboring peoples, expanding frontiers, and consolidating resources.\textsuperscript{63} While several \textit{colonia}, or Roman towns inhabited by mostly Italian Roman citizens, were founded in the second-third centuries, these were scarce, and few non-military Italians immigrated to facilitate a transition to Roman culture. Though all the Roman areas of Hispania felt the impact of the monetarization of the economy as a necessity to do business with the Roman solders, even this was not strictly regulated. In the South, for example, the Iberian peoples minted coins, but continued to use their own languages on the legends.\textsuperscript{64}

\section*{2.4 The Creation of a Hispano-Roman Society}

This changed significantly in the first century BC with the rise of Julius Caesar and the Civil Wars, beginning a consolidation process that came to fullness under Augustus. Before the first century BC, there were fewer than 30,000 Italians in Iberia.\textsuperscript{65} After the Civil Wars of the mid-first century, Caesar alone settled 80,000 veterans in the provinces of Hispania, a number further increased by Augustus.\textsuperscript{66} This period also saw Iberia take on a more “Roman” appearance, with the emergence of baths, theaters, and
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villas, which were rare before the first century AD. Latin-only inscriptions took the place of bilingual ones. Iberian mints ceased production one by one under the Julio-Claudians, with no Iberian coinage attested after Claudius. In its place the province circulated imperial coins. These were also undergoing changes since Augustus/Octavian’s victory at the Battle of Actium. Relatively rare before 31 BC, post-Actium coinage consistently depicted the ruler’s portrait, now the emperor. This may signal an effort by the newly-monarchial regime to legitimize its power. Augustus’ portrait on coinage distributed throughout his entire empire symbolized the unification of the provinces under his overall authority. While Rome’s authority on its individual provinces was not likely doubted by their inhabitants, the intentional settlement of Italian colonists to diffuse Roman culture, the energetic foundation of official Roman cities, and the re-creation of Roman aesthetics in architecture and art in these cities makes clear that cultural consolidation and unification under Rome demonstrate a new level of concern and involvement in the first century BC.

This cultural conquest, like physical conquest, was slow, un-methodical, and piecemeal under the Republic, with an appearance of greater urgency and organization under the Julio-Claudian dynasty. It is visible from the beginning of Roman presence in Iberia, however. Roman consuls founded cities and changed local settlement patterns, radically altering the lives of rural people. They made treaties and conducted administration with indigenous people in Latin. Latin names appeared on tombstones.
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Greco-Roman gods shared worship with indigenous deities. Some of this was ostensibly voluntary, as those with purchasing power could choose whether or not to buy imported goods and show off togate Roman fashion. However, many changes were certainly not optional. Latin fluency was necessary for communicating with Roman administrators, for example. Refusal to learn it would mean certain marginalization. The rural poor whose ancestral land was repurposed or who were relocated to populate new villages certainly could do little but comply. This is not to argue that indigenous Iberians had no agency in the face of Rome’s bulldozer might, however. They were active players at every stage. Their experience of provincial Roman life varied significantly by location, social status, and gender, and their various adaptations created a rich provincial culture that was colored by Rome at every level while remaining dynamic and unique.

While the Southwest had an ancient urban tradition, most of the peninsula was fundamentally altered by the shift towards urbanization. The Roman confluence of the concept of civic life with civilization is clear in the etymology. Following the Greeks, for whom the polis was the foundation of civilization, Roman thinkers drew a sharp line between civilized life and barbarity. Cicero theorized that the city entailed the absence of bellicosity, the satisfaction of communal life, and the practice of philanthropy. They emphasized the barbarity of Northern barbarians, like those of Northern Iberia, by their antagonism to urban life. Not only did they not live in cities, but they sacrificed to Ares, a pre-polis deity and destroyer of cities, and preferred making war to living peacefully as city-dwellers would. To Rome, they were the antithesis of civilized. Hoping to
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demonstrate the benefits of city life and encourage participation in specialization, trade, and civic-focused culture, Rome founded and populated cities at every stage of conquest, beginning with Tarraco at the outset of the Second Punic War in 218 BC, and in every region, including important centers like Asturica Augusta in far North.

These cities had various purposes and forms, impacting the local populations in significantly different ways. The most prestigious cities were the *coloniae*.

These were created for Italian immigrants, mostly veterans. Living in a *colonia* entailed Roman citizenship. These newcomers brought their home culture with them, and this is reflected in material culture remains like pottery, Roman features like baths, and building styles and decorations. There were few of these in Spain until the Julio-Claudian era. Even important cities like Tarraco, the first Roman city and subsequently the capital of Hispania Citerior, lacked *colonia* status until granted by Caesar.

One of the earliest *coloniae*, Carteia, was an exception to the rule. Instead of being created by and for immigrants, the city, originally a Phoenician trading post, was given official status in response to demands from the descendants of Roman men and indigenous women who bemoaned their lack of citizenship or rights despite having Italian descent. Rome elevated Carteia to a *colonia*, extending citizenship to its inhabitants.

In the late first century, however, Caesar and Augustus created at least twenty-three new *coloniae* between them and elevated seventy-seven indigenous cities to an intermediate form of town, the *municipium*.
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were given official status by Rome. Some, like Asturia Augusta, were centers of military or mining activity in the interim. Along with the mass creation and promotion of official Roman cities during this period, this is when we see cities becoming not just centers of administration, but Roman culture. Tarraco, for example, although founded in the third century, did not have a forum or theater until after its promotion to *colonia* by Caesar in the first century BC.77

Rural settlement and agriculture were also transformed under the Romans, having a dramatic impact on country-dwellers. Agricultural intensification and specialization was a key interest here. The Baetica region became a crucial exporter of olive oil, for example, an empire-wide necessity, thanks to Rome. Amphorae of Spanish olive oil have been found as far abroad as Vindolanda, a fort near Hadrian’s Wall in Northern Britain.78 Further evidence for this supply and demand comes from the city of Rome itself. Excavations at Monte Testaccio, a 580,000 cubic meter rubbish pile made entirely of ancient pottery fragments, have shown over 85% of its contents to be Baetican olive oil amphorae.79 Mineral exploitation also had a significant impact and shows how the countryside was reorganized to meet Roman demands. In Southeast Spain, the area around the important Punic mines at Carthago Nova, the pre-Roman norm was for small rural settlements, whose purpose was agricultural, to depend on a larger highland settlement or hillfort.80 The numbers of these small settlements surged under Rome but also changed in important ways. The highland nucleus towns, like Coimbra, were

77 Ibid., 88
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abandoned, and their function shifted to new settlements in lowland areas. Highly lucrative mines brought Italian immigrants and their aesthetic preferences to these towns, giving their appearance and character a distinctly Roman feel.\textsuperscript{81} While still important agricultural producers, the focus in this area shifted to specialized exploitation of mineral resources. Only one known small settlement in the Southeast, La Fuente de la Teja, was known to have served this function before Rome.\textsuperscript{82}

Like urbanization, language was another broad cultural building block that affected both men and women, elites and non-elites across the peninsula, though with significant variation. As expected, Latin did not become the dominant language in Spain overnight. Its introduction was gradual. Early generations after conquest in any part of the peninsula would have been bilingual; Latin as the sole fluent language happened later in development.\textsuperscript{83} Epigraphy is the best way to gage this Latinization, though it is far from complete, as it gives little information on non-elites. An extraordinary funerary stele for a woman named Cornelia Sirasteiun in Alcañiz exemplifies this transition. As is common in Hispano-Roman inscriptions, Cornelia’s name follows the Roman \textit{nomen} + \textit{cognomen} naming formula. Cornelia, her \textit{nomen}, is obviously Latin, but the cognomen is certainly not, and has been demonstrated to be an indigenous Iberian name.\textsuperscript{84} This mix of indigenous and Roman naming traditions within a Roman formula is evident across Iberia, pointing to the complexity of culture shifts. After Augustus inscriptions were Latin only.\textsuperscript{85} Cornelia’s stele is extraordinary, however, because of her Latin funerary
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poem, a typically Roman *carmen* expressing joy in being reunited with her husband, who preceded her in death.\(^{86}\) Though she, or the family member who commissioned the tombstone, was clearly interested in projecting an affinity with both the Latin language and Roman traditions, she still wore an Iberian *cognomen* proudly with no attempts to Latinize it.

Along with spoken fluency in the Latin language, literacy further transformed the Iberian Peninsula. In the coastal South and Southeast, the Iberian zone long in contact with Phoenicia, Greece, and Carthage, literacy was not new. The Iberian language had its own writing system which can be seen on coinage and some rare inscriptions. This script was even adopted in Celtiberian central Spain for use on coinage in the second century BC; it was poorly suited to Celtic languages, however, and its restricted use may indicate that few were been able to read it.\(^{87}\) Latin appears in some cases from the very moment of conquest, as in the Bronze of Alcantara, indicating that there were indigenous people among the population, perhaps auxiliary soldiers or traders, who could read it, though its prevalence is most visible though the increased urbanization of the imperial period.\(^{88}\) Certainly elites would have had motivation to learn it quickly in order to hold positions of high favor and authority in the new administration. It was not restricted to elites, nor to urban administrative centers, however, as Rome certainly needed to keep tabs on agricultural production of valuable exports like olive oil in the countryside as well. If literacy were an urban phenomenon, we would expect higher quality Latin, with fewer errors, in these urban settings than in rural areas with lower concentration of elites and
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native Latin speakers where lower professional standards would perhaps be tolerated. In Spain, however, this was not the case. Rural inscriptions show only marginally higher error rates. Ironically, the numbers on the tombstones give us clues as significant as the words. In giving the age of the deceased, it is normal to see a phenomenon known as “age-rounding” among less-educated internments, including women. Since these people were less likely to know their actual year of birth, their ages were often reported as approximate numbers divisible by 5. In the Iberian peninsula this varied significantly from community to community, but overall we see fewer instances of age rounding than frontier provinces, like those along the Rhine and Danube, but more than in Italy or North Africa. This indicates that a moderate level of education and literacy were diffused throughout society, sufficient at least to keep the provincial economy and bureaucracy running smoothly.

Latin epigraphy also aids our understanding of Hispano-Roman religion through the practice of devotional inscriptions. We see a pervasive mixture of indigenous and Roman tradition across the peninsula, though the nature of the mixture varies from region to region. Overall, it is unsurprising that inscriptions to most Roman deities were concentrated in urban areas, presumably where most Italian colonists settled and set the tone. Interestingly, however, there were several notable exceptions to this rule. The most dramatic exception was Jupiter, chief of the Roman pantheon. His worship was not restricted to the most cosmopolitan areas but included shrines even in rugged rural regions with no colonists. This could not be the result of free choice or emulation, then,
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as there would be few models to follow. It seems that Rome instructed or encouraged at least a baseline adoption of the Roman pantheon. Other classical deities were similarly widespread in indigenous and rural contexts. After Jupiter, the Nymphs, followed by the Lares, were widely attested in inscriptions, even more prolifically in the less-Romanized Northwest than elsewhere.\(^91\) Indigenous deities were still worshipped alongside the classical pantheon in this area, of course. For the Romans, physical conquest of an area implied the capitulation of that local pantheon to Rome, becoming “Roman” deities.\(^92\) Their veneration was even officially conducted by Romans. A Latin inscription was found near Astorga dedicated to the Celtic god Vagus Donnaegus on behalf of the res publica of Asturica Augusta by magistrates Gaius Pacatus and Flavius Proculus.\(^93\) The manner of worship, with its civic focus and votive inscription, however, were an unquestionable Roman addition to the traditional veneration of the god. These formerly incorporeal deities were honored with Latin devotional inscriptions and represented visually in human form in Spain as elsewhere. Often they shared an epithet with a classical deity. Apollo Grannus and Mars Sagatus worshipped in Astorga are examples of this interpretatio of deities.\(^94\) This practice was foundational to imperial Roman religion, as the interpretatio of the Greek Olympian gods gave Rome its mythology. Caesar’s Gallic Wars, in which he insisted that Mercury was the chief deity of the unconquered Gauls, followed by Apollo, Jupiter, Mars and Minerva, shows a clear precedent for
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Roman initiative in the assignment of counterparts.\textsuperscript{95} This and the transformation of traditional worship to Roman votive practice indicates that Rome imposed Roman identities on local deities, rather than the indigenous people taking this step for themselves.

This religious sphere became an important avenue of power for elite Hispano-Roman women. While not allowed any formal political power, the office of priestess, whether \textit{sacerdos} or \textit{flaminica}, gave wealthy women community recognition and authority. These priestesses were usually associated with the imperial cult, presiding as caretakers of the cults of deceased empresses.\textsuperscript{96} In major urban centers, the mystery cult of Isis also gave Hispano-Roman women the mix of liberty, sensuality, and asceticism afforded to women in Rome. Interestingly, Hispano-Roman women appear more religiously conservative than their Roman counterparts, as popular Roman mystery cults like Dionysus and Mithras were largely the purview of men in Hispania. The cult of Isis was the notable exception.\textsuperscript{97}

Another avenue for upper-class female agency came through urban munificence. Iunia Rustica, a Hispano-Roman woman from first century AD Cartima in Southern Spain near Málaga provides an interesting example. An inscription from her town describes her as a “\textit{sacerdos} for life,” making her the first Cartima woman to be given a priesthood in perpetuity, and describes the massive urban restoration projects she undertook, including reparation of old porticoes, donation of land and buildings for public use, and construction of a bath complex and a forum, both dedicated to Roman

\textsuperscript{95} Caesar, \textit{The Gallic War} 6.17.
\textsuperscript{96} Gallego Franco, \textit{Femina Dignissima}, 117.
\textsuperscript{97} Ibid., 125-6.
Urban munificence was common in the Roman West as a way for elites to visibly enhance prestige and bolster support from their communities. Women across the empire with sufficient means could be city patronesses, too, though only the very highest-status women participated. This contrasts with male patronage, which could be drawn from broader ranks of society, including wealthy freedmen. Iunia was exceptional in this scheme, however, for the scale of her donations. She was the only known woman to donate the annual tax on behalf of the town. Her husband is mentioned only briefly as the recipient of a statue she dedicated, indicating that the resources, including land, that she distributed were her own inheritance, not contingent upon her marriage.

Economic independence among women is attested in other areas as well, demonstrating some Hispano-Roman women’s ability to take Rome’s legal and economic systems, however patriarchal its ideology, and use it to their advantage. Rome may have even allowed this in order to both demonstrate its magnanimity and keep revenue options as open as possible. One woman who evidently owned land in her own name, Valeria Faventina, successfully brought suit to the provincial governor of Hispania Tarraconensis in 193 AD regarding rivals impinging on her property near Tarraco. In Baetica, amphorae inscriptions indicate female ownership of either the estates producing olive oil or the workshops for making the ceramic containers. Elsewhere in Hispania, women’s names were inscribed on sigillata hispanica for workshops they apparently owned.
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This ownership, management, and distribution of her own property stands in stark contrast with Rome’s official position on women’s independence. Never in Roman history was a woman officially *sui iuri*, or an independent person. Rather, she was required to be under the care, or *tutela*, of a male guardian at all times. Various municipal laws, including the *Salpensana, Malacitana, Ursonense*, and *Iritana*, clarified the provisions to be made for ensuring the tutelage of women whose fathers, husbands, and brothers were deceased.¹⁰⁴ Women like Iunia and Valeria, however, indicate that this official Roman position did not necessarily reflect reality in the provinces.

Lower-class women did not always adhere to the Greco-Roman ideal of female domesticity, either, however. In Hispania, free women worked in a wide variety of industries and professions. In the North, they continued to perform traditional agricultural labor through the first century AD, though Augustan reforms and intensification of agricultural exploitation gradually replaced them with physically stronger men. The Roman administration and loss of traditional raiding lifestyles combined to make the traditional arrangement unnecessary. In Conimbriga, Lusitania, loom weights have been discovered with women’s names inscribed on them, many obviously indigenous, like Bolosea and Pusinica.¹⁰⁵ These were likely employees, women weaving for a living in a workshop. The same town also produced an interesting inscription reading “Iulia c(entum) (lateres),” or “Julia 100 bricks.”¹⁰⁶ We do not know whether Julia was the maker, seller, or recipient of the bricks in question, but she was apparently a woman involved with the brickmaking industry in some way. While limiting women’s roles in

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 111.
¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 104.
ideology, Rome’s property laws, tradition of munificence, and market economy gave some women expanded opportunities, while removing others from their traditional agricultural occupation. All lived in a very different world from their grandmothers and worked within the new system to either eke out a living or become community superstars.

Rome brought other socio-economic changes in addition to professional or proprietary roles for women. An entire economy of slave labor emerged for both men and women. Just as elsewhere in the empire, slaves performed manual labor, including agriculture and mining, unskilled labor for public service, like operating the thermal baths, and highly skilled professional work, like medicine, education, business administration, and hairdressing. The creation of a slave economy was a tremendous change from the pre-Roman order in Iberia. There were certainly slaves in Iberia before the Romans came, usually in the form of war prisoners, but they were not foundational to the local economies and their numbers were far lower.107 More common in pre-Roman Iberia was the practice of community dependency, wherein one community in possession of its own land was bound to another in what was close to a client-patron relationship. The decree of Lucius Aemilius Paulus in 189 BC shows Roman interference in this system. He declared free the servei of the town of Hasta from servitude to the town of Lascutana and allowed them to continue possessing the land and city they had.108 This was an un-Roman form of dependency, as servei status would not entail landownership in the Roman mind. The more familiar version of slavery in the Roman world was introduced after the conquest, especially given their pressing need for large forces of

107 Salinas de Frías, Celtiberia, 169.
manual labor for the Spanish mines.\footnote{Ibid., 204.} Doubtless the indigenous inhabitants of some conquered areas formed a large part of this force, though supplemented by prisoners and undesirable slaves from Rome’s own slave markets.

In addition to creating a slave-based economy in the Iberian peninsula, Rome transformed the social class system at virtually every level. This was the least impactful in the already-urbanized South, but an important shift elsewhere. As previously noted, the peoples in central and northern Iberia did not usually live in large towns, but in smaller, but self-sustaining, agricultural communities. In the Celtiberian center, there was certainly social differentiation within the groups, with prestige likely based on success in warfare or in belonging to a martially-successful lineage, but agriculture was largely communal, as evidenced by a warehouse of community tools in Langa de Duero.\footnote{Salinas de Frías, Celtiberia, 164.} Roman presence in the peninsula brought new norms of private ownership, and, with it, personal wealth.\footnote{Julio Mangas Manjarrés, “Servidumbre Comunitaria en la Bética Prerromana,” Memorias de Historia Antigua 1 (1977): 158.} The new elite class carried purchasing power, demonstrated by luxury imported goods, instead of weapons as a marker of prestige, and, perhaps more importantly, the power of munificence as we have seen in the case of Iunia Rustica, a Roman tradition thoroughly owned by Roman Spain. Showing off details of their lavish generosity was crucial for provincial elites and for this reason we know the exact amounts of many of these gifts from their inscribed dedications. A Baetican procurator, for example, specified remittance of a 10,000,000 sesterce debt in addition to various costly construction and maintenance projects.\footnote{Leonard Curchin, “Personal Wealth in Roman Spain,” Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte 32, no. 2 (1983): 230.}
2.5 Conclusion

The Romanization of Spain, then, was a process that was as flexible and pragmatic as Roman imperial policy and as varied as indigenous culture and society on the Iberian peninsula. There was no single way to be Hispano-Roman. For Iunia Rustica, a wealthy woman in Southern Spain, being Romanized meant having significant wealth in land enriched by exports to imperial markets. Her society was already stratified and patriarchal hundreds of years before her birth, so she likely experienced more freedom thanks to the Roman customs of proprietorship and munificence than she would have in an Iberian town. Her ability to fund public works, which included Roman cultural features like the bath, clearly benefitted the Roman administration, too, and aided normalizing romanitas. Others, like the castro inhabitants of Astorga, found themselves living very different lives from their ancestors as they adjusted to life in new Roman cities and work in the gold mines, facing impositions in even their most sacred spaces as their groves became sanctuaries for Roman gods. For the mothers of the new citizens of Carteia, it meant creating a blended culture within their own bodies. All of these people experienced changes imposed upon their land, economically, linguistically, and spiritually, that were part of being included in the Roman Empire. This does not mean they all became Roman in a way that they would become part of their identities or that an Italian Roman would recognize, but they all either had lifestyle choices made for them by Rome or they lived within the legacy of such choices.
CHAPTER THREE:

CIVILIZATION AND SERVITUDE: THE ROMANIZATION OF OCCUPIED BRITAIN

3.1 Introduction

"Idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur cum pars servitutis esset."¹ The Roman historian Tacitus, in a passage discussed in Chapter One, makes this loaded statement about the nature of conquest and Roman imperialism. After the governor’s administration indoctrinated its young elites in a Latin education, the people of Britain began to wear togas and enjoy city life. These “perks” were all part of the administration’s control mechanism and amounted to a form of servitude. While Tacitus’ account was elegantly hyperbolic and meant to besmirch the decadence of Flavian Rome and its corrupting influence, his basic assumption that the spread of Roman culture was linked to Roman dominance should be taken seriously. In Britain, as seen in Spain, Rome’s involvement and impositions spanned every social division. It is clear that these transformations were not as thorough or enduring in Britain as those in Spain and there was considerable hybridity and innovation here as elsewhere. With that qualification, I

¹ “All this in their ignorance they called civilization, when it was but a part of their servitude.” Tacitus, Agricola 21.
argue that indigenous Britons experienced the Roman occupation as a dramatic change from the Iron Age status quo and that the most significant and widespread of these changes were the direct result of Roman rule. It was experienced broadly across society, and in different ways, positively and negatively, depending on many social variables, but, due to imperial interests more than local choices, it was experienced by all groups in some way. This chapter will examine the Roman impact with a focus on region, social status, and gender as variables in this analysis in order to take as much of the population into account as possible. Unlike Spain, which was conquered over hundreds of years, Britain was consolidated within a few decades in the mid-late first century AD. This gives a period of dramatic and immediate changes within the first several generations post-conquest. This analysis will examine Iron Age society in Britain, the conquest, and the first century of Britannia’s life as a province in order to assess these changes.

3.2 Iron-Age British Society: Geography, Social Organization, and Gender

Before examining the diversity of Romanizations in Britain, it must be stressed that, like the Roman empire, Celtic British people were neither static nor monolithic. Britain had innovative and sophisticated civilizations dating to the Neolithic period, including the third millennium BC creators of the Skara Brae settlement and Stonehenge.² Britain’s rich agricultural possibilities were exploited as agriculture developed in the Bronze Age and influence, including some degree of migration, brought in Celtic language and culture from continental Europe. The La Tène tradition, whose

finds are characterized by exquisitely decorated metalwork, began appearing in the British Isles around the fourth century BC.³

Unlike the situation in Spain, which was much larger and more culturally diverse, people across Britain shared a similar language and artistic sensibilities; however, varying settlement types and social structures point to diversity and localized mentalities within the overarching Celtic package, a reality that would impact the later incorporation by Rome. Much of the South and West was typified by hillforts, prominent settlements enclosed by defensive palisades, earthworks, and ditches.⁴ Known to archaeology for centuries, these were long regarded as the typical British settlement, but new technology like aerial photography has unveiled a ghostly landscape of Iron-Age villages, homesteads, and fields.⁵ The northern and eastern reaches of Britain did not ascribe to hillfort life, but were populated with clusters of enclosed homesteads and shifting unenclosed villages, respectively.⁶ These divergent adaptations to basic sustenance and defense needs undoubtedly point to others. A hillfort-based lifestyle was certainly different from a more dispersed population structure like the scattered homesteads of Northern Britain, as hillforts allowed for broader cooperation and communal economies. This could also have effects on notions like kinship, lineage and marriage. For hillfort societies, warfare must have been a central feature to judge from the defensive nature of the fortresses. The unenclosed villages of East Anglia, however, point to a different reality. This may have impacted religion, with more warlike groups favoring warrior
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deities. The desire of warriors to advertise prowess and prestige likely impacted personal
display and adornment choices, as well. Thus, under the relative homogeneity of
language and culture, there was significant room for “othering” inhabitants from one end
of the island to the other.

From Roman-era literary sources, we know that closely related groups within this
diverse population grouped themselves into discreet units, usually described as “tribes.”
These were not rigid polities during most of the Iron Age, however. The names of several
peoples were given by Caesar in The Gallic War, but in the writings of Tacitus and
Ptolemy in the second century, we have an almost new set of names. The Trinovantes
are the only group to be mentioned by the same name before and after the conquest. The
later Iceni are usually considered to be the same as or descendants of Caesar’s
Cenimagni, but the remaining names bear no resemblance to each other at all. While it is
certainly possible that Caesar and his translators miscommunicated, confusing a group
name for a leader’s name, a description, or a subgroup, the decentralized settlement
patterns in most of Britain suggests a fluid political identity. Most Britons probably
identified locally at the village or family level, not primarily as a tribe, and certainly not
with pretensions to statehood. Villages likely banded together in different arrangements
based on need over time, either to pool resources or defend themselves against other
groups in competitions for these resources.

7 Caesar, The Gallic War 5.21; Tacitus, Annals; Ptolemy, Geography 2.2.
8 John Collis, “The Polities of Gaul, Britain, and Ireland in the Late Iron Age,” in The Later Iron Age in
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Due to this localism and lack of consistent political structures, power and individual status were probably not as cleanly delineated in most communities across Britain’s Iron Age as they were in the Mediterranean world during this time. The houses excavated in most hillforts are roughly the same modest size. There are no known “chief’s houses” or palaces of any kind before the Late Iron Age, around 150 BC.\(^\text{10}\) Yorkshire, in Northern Britain, was something of an exception, at least for a brief period. In this region mid-Iron Age cemeteries, complete with lavish chariot burials, indicate the existence of an elite class.\(^\text{11}\) The rest of Britain, however, including Yorkshire after the fourth century BC, lacks evidence for status differentiation among the dead. Excarnation or exposure was common throughout the south, with occasional simple inhumations containing swords or mirrors.\(^\text{12}\) This does not mean that Iron Age British societies were completely egalitarian; there could be markers of prestige, like lineage or skill in warfare, that do not survive in the archaeological record. Hierarchy was not produced in terms of personal wealth or possessions, however, and was not based on land ownership. It can also be generalized that, though there were different kinds of societies and different kinds of power and expressions of it, Iron Age Britain as a whole was not characterized by a pyramid-shaped social scheme with a small elite ruling class at the apex.

This remained the case in most of Britain until the arrival of Rome, but in the Southeast the situation began to change in the late second century BC, the threshold of the Late Iron Age. Social hierarchies intensified as luxury goods, including wine and


\(^{12}\) Cunliffe, *Iron Age Communities in Britain*, 552-9.
wheel-thrown pottery, arrived from the continent, especially after Rome’s annexation of southern Gaul. Creighton emphasizes the importance of another import: gold. Though Britain did develop a gold mine at Dolaucothi in Wales during the Roman period, there is very little gold in the archaeological record in Britain until the late second century BC.

At this point, he argues, gold coins and gold torcs went hand in hand in establishing patron-client relationships within and among the tribes, a new feature for Iron-Age society and one that formed part of the Mediterranean cultural package that was radiating north and west via Roman expansion. Torcs were a wearable status marker, while coins loosely modelled on Rome, stamped with the chief’s face and other symbols of authority, like horses and various spiritual designs, were distributable, solidifying personal relations of power in the clientage network.

Even as Late Iron Age society developed elite social strata in at least one pocket of Britain, there was still no identifiable institution of monarchy in any region until the arrival of Caesar. It was, Hill says, a society with leaders, but not rulers.

Gender roles, likewise, were not rigidly hierarchical in Iron Age Britain. While we know several elite pre-Roman British rulers by name from coinage, the first verifiably female power-players come from the writings of Tacitus: Cartimandua, ruler of the Brigantes, and Boudica, queen-consort-turned-rebel-ringleader of the Iceni.
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they are post-conquest figures, these literary accounts fit well within archaeology for older periods. Cartimandua is an intriguing example of female political power. Tacitus called her regina, a title of absolute monarchy not used for Boudica. Much of her story involves keeping the peace with Rome, even handing over the refuge-seeking rebel leader Caratacus, a move that, along with purported adultery with her husband’s armor-bearer, earned her a Malinche-like reputation for betrayal through the following millennia.\textsuperscript{19} Around this time, far away to the southeast, Prasutagus made a doomed attempt to leave at least part of the Iceni kingdom to his two daughters on his untimely death, a decision his people famously defended.\textsuperscript{20} This does not necessarily point to a totally egalitarian society; Prasutagus apparently had no sons to inherit, and we cannot know whether Cartimandua had brothers. These royal women may have been second choice for positions of power, but once chosen, their people seem to have fully backed them. Prasutagus’ daughters were famously supported by their mother, Boudica, who further shows us the kind of military leadership that was possible for women in this society. Tacitus indicated that she was elected by a coalition of tribes to lead the war against Rome, one in which she had a personal stake due to the impending annexation of Iceni territory. He placed her squarely in the action and stated that the British “admit no distinction of sex” in choosing their leaders.\textsuperscript{21} This may have been an intentionally outrageous statement to thoroughly barbarize the Britons or a misunderstanding of

\textsuperscript{19} La Malinche, Malintzin, or Doña Marina was Hernando Cortez’ indigenous interpreter/concubine who greatly facilitated the Spanish conquest of the Aztec empire; Tacitus, \textit{Histories} 3.45.

\textsuperscript{20} Tacitus, \textit{Annals} 14.31.
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extraordinary circumstances, but he mentioned women present in other battles as well. The druid defense of Mona was apparently aided by daring, torch-wielding women “like Furies” on the front lines.\textsuperscript{22} In describing the final battle of the Boudican revolt, Tacitus’ Suetonius Paulinus encouraged his troops by noting that “there are more women than warriors” among the British ranks.\textsuperscript{23}

Archaeology of skeletal remains confirms Tacitus’ assertion of British women’s power and independence compared to the Classical Mediterranean, though centuries of poor documentation and incomplete understanding of Iron Age gender roles obscure many findings.\textsuperscript{24} Even with modern archaeological precision, sexing skeletons requires judgement calls when the individual falls between the male-female measurement extremes for the pelvis, skull, and limb bones. As a result, many individuals have been sexed by their grave goods when present, a leap that requires assumptions about ancient gender ideology. This circular logic is problematic when the grave goods do not align with the skeletal measurements. For example, a gracile young adult buried with a sword in Yorkshire was interestingly described as “possibly female” in regard to bones, “but not according to the grave goods.”\textsuperscript{25} An extraordinary recent find from Cornwall further complicates analysis: an unsexed individual in a cist grave with both a mirror and a sword.\textsuperscript{26} Despite the difficulties, there is enough reliable evidence to indicate that
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Boudica and Cartimandua were not unique. In Yorkshire, where inhumation burial was practiced and society was briefly more stratified than elsewhere, women are well represented in high-status burials. In a group of three barrows in Wetwang Slack, the earliest and central burial is that of a young woman, flanked by smaller burials of men. All three were buried on dismantled two-wheeled chariots. Though restricted to this area of the Northeast in Britain, vehicle burials were known across Celtic Europe, with the wagon or chariot representing the prestige of the individual. Boudica and the women mentioned by Tacitus were also not the only British women to pick up weapons in the Iron Age even if the dubious sword burials were truly all male. Nearly twenty percent of Late Iron Age female skeletons in Dorset had injuries consistent with combat, and a young woman buried at Maiden Castle had 117 slingstones among her grave goods.

Into this group of related societies, which were locally-focused, only loosely hierarchical, and not rigidly misogynist, Rome entered in 55 BC. Caesar’s expedition, articulated for maximum effect in *The Gallic War*, was immediately met with resistance from Southeast British tribes. Unprepared to make a protracted campaign of conquest, he withdrew after extracting hostages and tribute. Creighton has raised the possibility that the hostages taken by Caesar included the young sons of important dynasties, which, having been raised to manhood in Rome with the education and cultural literacy that would have been a given, returned to Britain as the new generation of tribal rulers. After this time, territorial consolidation, beyond the client network or kinship alliances, became a new, and very Roman, articulation of power. Tasciovanus, for example,
established a dynasty ruling a large and expanding swathe of the Southeast. He may have aspired to empire. His son, Cunobelin, Shakespeare’s Cymbeline, who may have been among Caesar’s hostages, was later lauded as “King of the Britons” by Suetonius. Though Rome was out of sight for nearly 100 years, it was clearly not out of mind.

3.3 Resistance is Futile: Rome Comes Back to Stay

When Claudius’ legions arrived to stay in 43 AD, the legendary might of Rome became real even for Britons without continental connections. At least three groups, the Atrebates, the Iceni, and the Brigantes (see Figure 3.1), were allowed to keep their indigenous leaders in positions of client kingship like others recorded across the empire. The Roman government in Britain apparently gave these rulers significant support. One, Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus, was certainly made a Roman citizen. We have no such evidence of this for Prasutagus or Cartimandua, but the latter would have been excluded due to her gender. Tacitus implies extensive Roman involvement in Cartimandua’s government, however. She handed over Caratacus to them, presumably in a demonstration of loyalty. When her husband, Venutius, led a rebellion, Rome stepped in to rescue her before crushing the insurgents. Rome disarmed the Iceni in 47 AD, according to Tacitus, provoking a rebellion. Prasutagus was still ruling semi-
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independently until he died in 60 or 61 AD, indicating impressive trustworthiness. Coinage usually attributed to Prasutagus intriguingly depicts the king as a clean-shaven Roman but with a torc over his head, an indication of the tension he, and perhaps the other client rulers, felt as they tried to bridge the gap and maintain peace and stability for their people.
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For the rest of the indigenous rulers, however, tension was not an option. The velvet glove was worn by an iron fist. Rome quickly consolidated power in the Southeast and established military control, moving on to subdue the northern and western tribes within the next four decades. The conquest of Britain, like Rome’s expansion elsewhere, was a violent and disruptive process, a fact that is too often downplayed in emphasizing the diplomatic civil relations that developed later.\(^{39}\) An estimated 100,000 – 250,000 Britons out of a population of around two million likely lost their lives by the time the Brigantes in the North were conquered in the 80s AD.\(^{40}\) This high figure does not even account for other kinds of trauma; countless people were certainly injured, dispossessed, enslaved, raped, widowed, and orphaned. Most of these are now anonymous, but Caratacus, son of Cunobelin, is a high-status example of this upheaval. After leading resistance to the initial Roman foothold in 43, he ended up on the run, eventually running afoul of Cartimandua, leading to capture, trial, and exile in Rome.\(^{41}\) Other high-status individuals likely also had to choose between surrender, exile, and death. Communities who resisted were vulnerable to be captured en masse and sent to Rome’s slave markets. Cicero anticipated this ubiquitous aspect of conquest upon hearing of Caesar’s expedition, writing to a friend: “[…] there isn’t a pennyweight of silver in that island, nor any hope of booty except from slaves.”\(^{42}\) Those who remained alive and on the island saw Rome set up forts and civilian towns in their territories (see figure 2). Camulodunum, an ancient ritual center-turned-capital for the Trinovantes, for
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example, became the first known *colonia*, or city for Roman citizens, in Britain.\(^\text{43}\) Tacitus states that its purpose was “a defense against the rebels, and as a means of imbuing the allies with respect for our laws.”\(^\text{44}\) Besides housing Roman veterans, it also boasted a temple to the deified Claudius, a project that demanded the service and resources of the formerly powerful local elites.\(^\text{45}\) By implication, this was also an example of religious intervention that would have affected countless others.

The military was, then, the “Rome” most Britons first encountered. Visually distinctive troops, in their red tunics, armor, and helmets, were the only segment of the population allowed to carry weapons. They were a constant reminder of the power balance in the new province. The culture they brought with them, though cosmopolitan in its inclusion of other provincials in auxiliary ranks, was certainly “Roman” to the Britons. Even if a few royal British hostages spent time in the city of Rome, this was a very few people. To almost all the population of Britain, the incoming military *was* Rome. An observant Roman may have been able to appreciate the hybridizations and creolizations made to the empire as it expanded, but to British people experiencing the overhaul of their homeland, such subtleties would certainly be lost. The legions were an invasion force and brought with them a new and alien set of practices and values. As Britons who assimilated and curried favor, like Cogidubnus, were rewarded and empowered and those who resisted, like the Iceni, were mown down, the choices and their consequences were plainly apparent. If the choice was between social (or actual) death and enfranchisement, can we say that it was really a choice?

---
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3.4  *The Creation of Romano-British Society*

With this in mind, the archaeology of the first several generations of Roman Britain can be examined to assess how imperial occupation affected British culture on the social axes discussed for the Iron Age and for Spain. This will primarily span the years from 43-100 AD, but some evidence from later periods will be discussed for areas where archaeology is sparse. For these instances, it will serve to illustrate the first century trajectories made evident by the second century realities. A sampling of cultural features, similar but not identical to those examined for Spain, will be explored here. Thanks to the Treasure Act and Portable Antiquities Scheme, which catalogue the finds of England’s and Wales’ many amateur archaeologists and metal detectorists, there is a wealth of professionally analyzed small finds from Roman Britain compared to Spain. The epigraphic evidence for Britain is much poorer, however. Thus, though we will draw similar conclusions for the two provinces, the available evidence is notably different.

The military presence and the new civilian administration radically overhauled the landscape and subsumed regional differences into a new overarching geographical binary: civilian vs. military. Roman soldiers were highly visible in all areas of Britain, as they often served administrative roles in civilian areas, but they would have dominated culture and economy in the military zone.\(^{46}\) This shifting region was peppered with forts of various sizes, built and abandoned according to need. The areas around these were under direct military supervision, meaning they were taxed, policed, and regulated by the nearby forts with little opportunity for tribes to establish civil self-government as happened in stable areas of the Southeast.\(^ {47}\) Villages and farms around the forts were
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pulled into the orbit of the military economy and found themselves working to meet the supply needs of the garrisoned soldiers. *Canabae* and *vici*, types of small settlement, sprung up to offer markets, taverns, brothels, and other services to the local regiment. The garbage pit of the fortress at Vindolanda, an outpost in the North garrisoned before Hadrian’s Wall was erected, contains well-preserved ink-on-wood tablets discussing this economic activity. While also confirming long-distance trade between the frontier and the heart of the empire, local barley, *bracis* (a British grain), and corvee transport labor are mentioned in several of these, underlining the impact the fortress had on the surrounding peasantry. 48 Very little coinage has been found in Northern Britain, though it has been found across Hadrian’s wall in what is now Scotland, suggesting that while goods were purchased from free indigenous people, in Roman-controlled areas the supply requisitions from the surrounding rural population were a form of taxation. 49

The forts were, of course, occupied by soldiers. In the first century, these were comprised largely of Italian legionaries and provincial auxiliaries, and these must have been the primary agents of Romanization in the military zones. This likelihood has been extensively discussed for Spain, but rarely mentioned for Britain. We know that the men who served in the forts brought some form of Romanized culture with them. We know that they spoke Latin, 50 they used Samian pottery, 51 they ate fish sauce, 52 they bathed in
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indoor bath complexes,\textsuperscript{53} and they worshipped Roman deities.\textsuperscript{54} One of the Vindolanda tablets remarkably contains a line from Virgil’s \textit{The Aeneid}, reminding us that people with a Roman literary education were present on the northern frontier.\textsuperscript{55} Their impact on local communities was intense, but not the same from place to place. In the western reaches of the military zone, the area that is now Wales, we have evidence that the military presence led to a major change in the local economy that did not occur in the North: the use of money. Western British people did not produce their own coinage during the Iron Age and only thirty-five Iron Age coins from Eastern neighbors have been uncovered in Wales.\textsuperscript{56} Nearly 1,200 Roman coins have been found dating before the end of the first century AD, however, and all but a handful of these were discovered at military sites and the small settlements that served them.\textsuperscript{57} Over the following century, the pattern shifted and the ratio of Antonine coin finds between non-military settlements and forts evened out, indicating that the cultural and economic changes that were introduced with the soldiers rippled out and impacted Western British society far beyond.

The southeast half of the province was under civilian administration within a decade of the Boudican revolt, with cities as the centers of control rather than forts. It is in this area, once Rome was satisfied that the local population sufficiently accepted Roman dominance, that local people were recruited to participate in provincial administration. With bloody conflicts in recent memory and the military still a visible presence, however, they had few real choices in doing so. Adaptation to urban life was

\textsuperscript{54} Georgia Irby, \textit{Military Religion in Roman Britain} (Leiden: Brill, 1999).
\textsuperscript{55} Bowman, \textit{Life and Letters on the Roman Frontier}, 18.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 48.
one crucial requirement. There were two main types of larger civilian urban centers in
Roman Britain. *Colonia* were ruled by Roman citizens and subject to Roman law,
housing retired veterans and Roman administrative personnel and flanked by non-citizen
indigenous settlements.\(^{58}\) The other main type of city in Britain was the *civitas* center, or
tribal capital. These were ruled by an indigenous oligarchy with some ability to maintain
and enforce their own laws.\(^ {59}\) There were only about a dozen of these in Roman Britain, a
low number compared to other provinces, and “promotions” to *municipium*, an
intermediate town type with only one example, Verulamium (St. Albans), in Britain, or
*colonia* status were also below average.\(^ {60}\) Britain had a total of four or five *coloniae*:
Camulodunum (Colchester), Glevum (Gloucester), Lindum (Lincoln), Eboracum (York),
and possibly Londinium (London) during its 400 year occupation. In Gaul, by contrast,
eleven known *coloniae* were established by Caesar and Augustus alone, with more
founded by successive emperors.\(^ {61}\) Cities were distributed thinly in Britain, with only a
few in military zones and most in civilian areas, so the level and nature of supervision
varied widely.

Millett argues against Roman involvement in the Romanizing of these towns,
which could include any combination of a forum, temple, baths, amphitheater or theater,
insisting that they were the result of native elite emulation.\(^ {62}\) This view contains the
crucial element of recognizing indigenous sophistication and agency. As discussed, many
were manipulating continental forms long before being told to. It does, perhaps,

\(^{59}\) Ibid., 261.
\(^{60}\) Ibid., 263.
undervalue the impact of the military and the trauma of conquest, however, and assumes that Roman infrastructure was a sign of enthusiasm. This cannot be assumed to have been the case. The Iceni civitas capital, Venta Icenorum, for example, shows few large Roman structures, either due to post-revolt poverty or to continued rejection of them after the struggle to maintain autonomy, but it did have streets laid out on a grid, at least two Romano-British temples, a forum, and possibly a small bath complex. From this example, it appears likely that there was a minimum threshold of romanitas that was required and perhaps even implemented by the Roman administration in order to achieve civitas capital status. This is a pared-down romanitas that betrays no sign of enthusiasm. Given the known anti-Roman stance of the Iceni, however, we must be impressed with the presence of these features, however meager, among this population. It was not their first choice, and this one was likely made for them.

Outside these cities, we find the bulk of the population also caught in the cultural tension. Small towns and rural agricultural settlements housed at least 80% of the population and they were tasked with producing for markets in the forts or the cities, depending on their location, a new economic feature begun by Rome. There is a wide variety of evidence for adoption of Roman material culture in these locations. In the Southeast, with its short period of military administration and emerging hierarchy from the Iron Age, there was steady intensification in the scale of agricultural production in the early Roman period, necessitating large structures for storage and processing for transport.

---

to urban markets. These are called “villas,” though they were not strictly classical Mediterranean residences. Some did have tessellated pavements, hypocausts, small baths, and mosaics, but typically restricted to the front “reception” area of the building until later in the Roman period. By contrast, in Western Britain, which had a much longer direct military rule and a less stratified society previously, these large structures are absent and material culture is strikingly indigenous. A study of three Roman-era cemeteries in the environs of modern Gloucester, on the Welsh marches, shows a notably lower level of carbon isotope-enriched foods, particularly seafood, a Roman luxury, in rural locations compared to urban. People living in Western Britain had other interfaces with Rome, however. Salt production was crucial to the economy of the area, and this industry was under direct Roman oversight, either by the military until the late second century or by civilian contractors afterward. It is possible that the more intense and direct level of economic intervention by Rome in this area may have inspired resentment and rejection of material culture. In settings like this, negative interaction with Romanitas could also be a powerful force, perhaps inspiring unanticipated cultural changes with increased conservatism and isolation.

In the cities, however, for the local elites to survive in the new order, fluency in Latin and Roman culture was demanded, not only to set themselves apart as a ruling class as Millett suggested, but also to function within the Roman government. Some imperial ideas about status and hierarchy were manipulated by powerful individuals in their state-

---
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building endeavors from the first century BC, but even more Roman practices became standard elite curricula after Claudius. Literacy was requisite for administration and, thus, daily life for elite rulers of *civitas* towns. Eckardt has pointed out the distribution patterns of writing paraphernalia as an example of this. In the late first century AD, decorative copper-alloy, enameled, and ceramic inkwells were included in high-status indigenous burials in the South, while urban and military personnel preferred the more utilitarian Samian ware. \(^{70}\) Similarly, indigenous distribution applies to copper spatula handles, used for waxing writing tablets, shaped like a bust of the Roman goddess, Minerva. With very few exceptions, the decorative versions were found outside of military sites and large urban areas. \(^{71}\) The handles associated with soldiers and colonists were simple, utilitarian iron. This may point to an ongoing identity crisis, with indigenous elites seeking to show off their literacy.

Eventually literacy became more widespread. Curse tablets from Bath, an ancient worship center of the goddess, Sulis, and other ritual deposit sites detail the theft of mundane objects, not status items, hinting at middling status for their creators. \(^{72}\) While it is certainly possible that not every person who deposited a tablet was literate, the wide variety of handwriting appears to preclude the use of professional scribes. \(^{73}\) Bath was not associated with a *colonia* or military center, implying an indigenous origin for at least many of these depositors, which are well-represented by both genders. The tablets also reveal the widespread but gradual adoption of Latin names by the local populace. As in


\(^{71}\) Ibid., 193.


\(^{73}\) Eckardt, *Objects and Identities*, 180.
Spain, Romano-British names followed a transition from a Celtic single name, to Latin _nomen + cognomen_, to full _tria nomina_ with successive generations. Uniquely, however, Britons did not often retain Celtic elements when adopting a Roman-formula name.\(^74\) Even in the second-fourth centuries, the Latin names they chose often bore similarity to Celtic names. Some, like Seneca, often beginning with Sen- or Bel- which were common in Celtic names, or were Latin translations of Celtic names, like Victoria for Boudica or Candidius for Vindiorix.\(^75\) Bath’s devotees were largely non-elite, civilian, and rural, yet they wrote in Latin and adopted a Mediterranean practice in the use of curse tablets, showing the deep impact of Rome across regional, status and gender lines.

The deposition of these Greco-Roman tablets in ancient indigenous ritual sites like Bath points to the impositions of Rome into the religious life of Britain. This was a complex process that involved changes in both the deities worshipped and their devotional practices. It is no surprise that Celtic gods were worshipped throughout the Roman period as they were in Spain. Soldiers and other immigrants seemingly took no issue worshipping these local gods, glad of protection from any quarter. The British warrior god, Cocidius, for example, was widely venerated by all ranks of the Roman military serving along Hadrian’s Wall.\(^76\) The British deities were anthropomorphized, worshipped in temples, and honored with devotional inscriptions just as their Spanish counterparts were, all important augmentations to devotional practices at the time of the conquest. With Rome came the rest of the Roman pantheon. The Roman attempt to integrate them into local devotional life is evident here, too, in the practice of

\(^74\) The client king Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus was a rare exception. Mullen, “Linguistic Evidence for ‘Romanization,’” 42.

\(^75\) Ibid., 53.

\(^76\) Irby, _Military Religion_, 114.
interpretatio. The most famous British example is also from Bath: Sulis Minerva. This interpretatio was more than a renaming; the goddess was worshipped in a manner that reflects Roman imposition on local traditions. Bath, long the watery sanctuary of Sulis, became the focal point of the cult, which retained the healing aspects of the British goddess. However, in addition to gaining a Roman alterego, Sulis was visually personified as Minerva herself in iconography. Her cult statue is classical in style and depicts the Roman Minerva’s typical accoutrements: a helmet, an owl, and winged Victories.\(^77\) Another Roman religious import, which the Roman Tacitus insisted was both mandatory and deeply unpopular to the local people in the beginning was the imperial cult. He dramatically described the temple of the Divine Claudius at Camulodunum as “a citadel of perpetual tyranny” for the Trinovante people.\(^78\) Though there is only sparse evidence for worship of deified deceased emperors after Claudius, the imperial cult continued as homage to the numen, or divine spirit, of living emperors.\(^79\)

These impositions were certainly dramatic at first, whether or not a familiar name graced the statue of a Roman goddess, but the greatest alteration to local tradition was the eradication of the Druids, the poorly understood priests or shamans of Britain and Gaul. While demonstrably willing to indulge the presence of Celtic deities in official devotional practice, Rome outlawed Druidry at least three times.\(^80\) The exact nature of Druids’ place in society is not clear. They are consistently associated with the ruling elite as it developed in the late Iron Age, but pre-conquest accounts described them as philosophers

\(^77\) Ibid., 168.
\(^78\) Ibid., 14.31.
\(^79\) Ibid., Military Religion, 28-29.
\(^80\) Under Augustus and again later under Claudius: Suetonius, Claudius 25.5; under Tiberius: Pliny, Natural History 30.13.
and only later ones emphasize magical inclinations and priestly functions.\textsuperscript{81} They may have been a shaman-like order, practicing healing and sympathetic magic. Whatever their role in society, Rome found them both distasteful, at least partially owing to purported practice of human sacrifice, and dangerous, as they were associated with anti-Roman activity,\textsuperscript{82} most notably the defense of Mona.\textsuperscript{83} This was not an area of Roman-directed cultural fusion or blending, but rather the abrupt end, mandated by Rome, of a popular practice. The curse tablets and other rituals performed for the Romano-Celtic gods may have come to fill this role of negotiation with the supernatural eventually, but it did not happen right away. Most of the tablets at Bath date to the second century and later. Several generations likely lived and died without the comfort of a traditional mediator.

Literacy and Latin, including personal names, were not the only modes of self-fashioning utilized by Britons across social status and gender lines to negotiate their new places in the empire. Clothing and personal adornment are also an example of this. We have no reliable eyewitness accounts of Iron Age clothing, but brooches are consistently found in grave contexts, implying an outfit consisting of layers of draped clothing pinned in conspicuous and decorative ways.\textsuperscript{84} While we have no archaeological proof to confirm Tacitus’ assertion that the toga became standard dress, brooches do decline in the Roman period for many regions. Instead of the complicated multi-pinned Iron Age garments, mortuary reliefs show that the Gallic coat, a loose, long-sleeved tunic-like garment worn by men and women, became standard dress.\textsuperscript{85} While togas may have been worn for

\textsuperscript{81} Jane Webster, “The End of the World: Druidic and Other Revitalization Movements in Post-Conquest Gaul and Britain,” \textit{Britannia} vol. 30 (1999), 4-11.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 14-15.
\textsuperscript{83} Tacitus, \textit{Annals} 14.29-30.
ceremonial occasions, the Gallic coat was everyday wear at all levels of society in much of Britain. Common across the northern provinces, the Gallic coat is an instance of the cultural amalgamation inherent in the expanding Roman empire. Though it had no place in Classical Rome, it became part of “Roman fashion” as part of the imperial package. Interestingly, brooches remained widely used in Western Britain in the rural hinterlands of Wroxeter, a site of intense garrisoning that only transitioned from military to civilian rule in the second century, pointing to diversity in preferences and motivations for adopting or resisting imperial fashion. Body art, including tattooing and woad painting, was a famously Celtic practice, regarded with disdain by Roman writers and may have served a similar conservative function for some Britons. In an analysis of small vessels often called “Roman cosmetics grinders” due to an inclusion in a 100 AD Roman cosmetic set, Carr points to the Celtic origin of the design and its restriction to Britain, suggesting that their actual original use was the application of woad designs onto the skin, only later being adapted for women’s make-up. This could have been used in the early post-conquest decades as a show of solidarity with fellow Britons and resistance, either public or private, as it may have been covered by clothing, to Roman conventions.

The diets and food preferences of Britons also underwent a shift due to Roman contact. This, like other new material culture changes varied by location and social position. In the first century BC, a variety of new forms of pottery vessels became popular among the emerging imperially-minded elites of the Southeast. These were made

for a particular purpose, serving and storing Mediterranean foods and beverages, and were undoubtedly used for these in Britain as well. The popularity of the platter in the Southeast indicates not only new foods but new cooking methods like frying and steaming. Instead of stewing and serving a sauce-based meal in a large bowl, platters allowed for maximum display potential, but also necessitated more labor-intensive cooking methods compared to stewing, as the meal was composed of various small dishes cooked separately instead of boiled together in a single pot.\(^9\) This innovation appealed to people in the Southeast, but was not taken up as eagerly by all Britons. Further to the West, in the port area of Hengistbury Head, an important trading post, locals adopted wine-drinking, evidenced by wine cups and amphorae, but not platters, nor presumably the specialized food eaten on them.\(^9\) In rural Gloucester, though there is little evidence of amphorae or other specialized Mediterranean pottery, poultry bones, rarely eaten in Iron Age Britain, and oyster shells at an inland farm show diet diversification affecting even these areas on the fringes of Roman society.\(^9\) While this increased variety was able to penetrate rural areas, it was much more noteworthy in urban settings. A forensic survey of children buried from the first-fifth centuries AD shows significantly higher rates of dental cavities for urban children in Roman Britain, compared to those growing up in rural areas, as much as four times higher for those over age ten.\(^9\) This is likely the result of a diet higher in refined carbohydrates and sugars, consistent with Roman preferences for white bread, honey, and fruit syrups, than their rural counterparts.

\(^9\) Cool, *Eating and Drinking*, 165.
\(^9\) Ibid., 169.
\(^9\) Ibid., 191.
\(^9\) Anna Rohnbogner and Mary Lewis, “Dental Caries as a Measure of Diet, Health, and Difference in Non-adults from Urban and Rural Roman Britain,” *Dental Anthropology* 29 (2016), 14.
New foods meant more labor intensive and specialized cooking methods than the traditional stew or porridge, leading to more of a division of labor between men and women, who became more bound to the domestic sphere. Under Roman rule, women lost whatever political power or military presence they had in the Iron Age. After Cartimandua, Britain would not see another woman ruling in her own right for 1,500 years. The military also became an exclusively male space in Roman Britain. There were no further Roman mentions or archaeological discoveries indicating female participation in warfare after the momentous 61 AD, which saw women on the front lines in Boudica’s revolt and in the Druid uprising on the island of Mona. Women may have also lost prestige in their own families and communities as a result of the shift to Mediterranean culture. The previously cited study from Gloucestershire cemeteries shows a difference in the diets of men and women in urban Glevum throughout the first through fifth centuries. Carbon isotope-rich foods were consumed far more frequently by men. An important source of this was seafood, rarely consumed by these inland Britons prior to Rome, but an important luxury foodstuff for Romans. This exotic and special diet augmentation was largely restricted to men in this region. From tombstone depictions, it is clear that by the second century at the latest wealthy women were expected to fulfill Roman ideals of womanhood. In contrast to the high-status female burials of the Iron Age, which, as much as we understand them, focus on the individual’s status or merit, Romano-British tombstones often emphasize women’s places within their families. Julia Velva, for example, is pictured reclining on a couch, surrounded by her children and servants. Others picture women alone, but still emphasize domesticity. The fort of Arbeia on the
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Tyne in Northern Britain contained the tombstone of a British Catuvellauni woman
named Regina, the freedwoman/wife of a Syrian merchant. She was depicted in sculpture
sitting and holding skeins of wool, reminiscent of the Mediterranean portrayal of matrons
and textile-working.\textsuperscript{96}

The forts and military garrisons were home to women, though strictly non-
combatant. This included the legal wives of officers, like Sulpicia Claudia, whose
birthday party invitation to her friend, Lepidina, gives a timeless human face to
Vindolanda around 100 AD,\textsuperscript{97} unofficial concubines of common soldiers, and, most
likely, camp prostitutes.\textsuperscript{98} Not all of these women were literate or nameable like Sulpicia
and Lepidina, but their anonymous presence is attested by various sizes of women’s and
children’s shoes found inside one of Vindolanda’s barracks blocks.\textsuperscript{99} Considering the
connections and supply relationships discussed previously for the military zone, it stands
to reason that native British women were among these concubines and prostitutes. Being
female within this military zone, then, entailed heightened vulnerability, but it may also
have been viewed as an opportunity for some. Like modern women across the world,
liaisons with foreign soldiers may have been a chance for economic stability, protection,
escape, or adventure. Indeed, a woman named Lollia Bodicca, presumed to be British due
to her name’s similarity to the Iceni queen Boudica, commemorated her centurion
husband in Algeria in the late second century, showing just how far such relationships
could take British women who had to learn a new language and set of behaviors to join
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the wider world. Many more undoubtedly stayed in Britain and, like the mothers of Spain’s Carteians and countless others across the empire, became the matrons of blended Romano-British families.

3.5 Conclusion

This hypothetical multi-ethnic family is an apt metaphor for Romanization as we have seen it in action in both Britain and Spain. It was a meeting of cultures and its children were the product of both. However, unlike egalitarian modern relationships, this marriage operated under Roman gender norms, with the husband in control. We must not lose sight of the countless Roman artworks depicting conquest as rape. The provinces, as the metaphorical feminine partners, were no doormats, certainly. Britain and Spain may have made the most of the situation, exercised agency, and kept their indigenous identity alive in many areas, but that must not downplay the impositions of Rome. The Roman Empire was a daily reality to all the people and groups of people discussed here, and this had varied implications for them. In Britain, we have seen that this involved taking new names and adopting new clothing to finding new ways to use traditional body paint in resistance. Few would have been indifferent, however. The year 43 AD and the subsequent years of conquest and resistance were a watershed of cultural change for Britain, and this was directly tied to Rome itself. The “civilization” they cultivated on the island was, indeed, part of provincial servitude to Rome’s imperial interests.

---
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CHAPTER FOUR:

VARIATIONS ON A THEME: CONSIDERING THE CASES OF AFRICA

PROCONSULARIS, DACIA, AND PONTUS-BITHYNIA

4.1 Introduction

Hispania and Britannia were obviously not the only two provinces to undergo cultural transformation in the interest of Roman occupation. This was a broad phenomenon affecting every territory, people group, social strata, and gender that experienced the aftermath of conquest though the particular adaptations made in each case varied tremendously. To give further depth, this final chapter will examine three additional case studies, highlighting a few of the unique elements of Romanization in each to demonstrate the consistency of Rome’s cultural interference in the empire. In each of these three provinces, I argue, Rome took intentional steps to make the populace more Roman in the interest of exploitation and/or control. Two of these, Africa Proconsularis and Dacia, belong to the Western, Latin-speaking empire, filling out the picture of Rome’s cultural imperialism in the West. In Africa, like Spain, society and settlement patterns were reorganized to maximize economic potential, and Rome’s subsequent impositions in traditional religion and language further suggest that this was even more deeply unpopular than elsewhere, considering the tenacity of pre-Roman
forms in the region. Dacia, whose wars of conquest likely stripped the new province of its local elite, demonstrates how rapidly and thoroughly cultural transformation could progress in an area unimpeded by the need to wear a velvet glove and negotiate with local aristocracy. It is Romanization in its most raw form and makes the latent default policy of total overhaul, notable here in urbanization, religion and language, very clear. Pontus et Bithynia provides a sample of the Greek-speaking East. Cultural intervention took very different forms here because of ancient traditions of urbanization and a legacy of cultural sharing with Rome that had included a significant outpouring of aesthetic and religious influence to Rome long before Roman direct rule. Romanization in the East was less about dramatic and visible culture shifts than the West, but still involved adaptations to local life that bolstered Roman control as can be seen in local politics, civic life, and language, with proof of distaste for the changes visible in the backward-looking literary *renaissance* of the Second Sophistic.

### 4.2 Africa Proconsularis

The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis, encompassing much of modern Tunisia as well as parts of Algeria and Libya, is a special case in the overall study of Romanization as a framework, as it provided the initial challenge to the colonial *status quo* that made Romanization a topic of contention and debate in the postcolonial 20th century. Marcel Bénabou, discussed in a previous chapter, and other historians and archaeologists studying Roman Africa argued that pervasive and persistent pre-Roman forms in African culture constituted a form of resistance to Rome and stressed indigenous continuity rather than Roman overhaul, which remained, at most, a thin veneer. The
endurance of indigenous forms centuries after the Roman conquest is significant here and points to the intentional and non-negotiable cultural Romano-centrism of the empire. *Romanitas* was widespread and highly visible, while preference for Punic forms is clear centuries after conquest. North Africans notably retained pre-Roman culture in areas like religion, language, and material culture while also enduring their integration into Roman norms. The continuities indicate a preference for tradition, making the imposed nature of the Roman forms exceptionally clear. The strength of pre-Roman traditions is not surprising considering North Africa’s background under another empire that was both dominant and unifying: Phoenicia.

Beginning in the ninth century BC, Phoenicians colonized and transformed the North African coastlines.¹ Though their first foothold in the region was the trade town of Utica, founded perhaps as early as the 11th century according to Pliny, staying power came from the refugee settlement of Carthage.² According to legend, Elissa, the sister of Pygmalion, king of Tyre, was forced into exile with a company of followers, eventually establishing the city of Kart-Hadasht, or Carthage, near Utica. She was better known to us by her Libyan epithet, *Deido*, meaning “wanderer,” becoming Virgil’s infamous

---


queen, Dido. These Phoenicians annexed extensive fertile land in North Africa, at first paying tribute to their Libyan neighbors in exchange for the land use. Though many Libyan toponyms and personal names remained in use, Punic culture spread broadly and deeply. Tipasa, a small excavated town in the Mauretanian kingdom, shows Punic grave shapes and the use of Punic pottery, though it was neither a colony nor a trading center. Punic religion gave new names, Ba’al Hammon and Tanit, to the African versions of its most important deities, but continued Semitic practices, most visibly the child sacrifices routinely denounced in the Near East by Old Testament prophets. “Tophets,” so called from the Hebrew term for sacrificial locations in these writings, have been uncovered in several Punic cities, with the largest in Carthage itself. Consisting of incinerated infant or toddler bones in special urns, occasionally substituting a lamb or kid goat, they were accompanied by votive epigraphy on stelae. These and other votive monuments were recorded in Punic, which became the common language of the Phoenician world, which in addition to widespread use also enjoyed a literary tradition, as indicated by Pliny’s mention of Hannibal’s library.

After the fall of the Phoenician mother city of Tyre in the sixth century BC, Carthage fully stepped into inheritance of the Phoenician legacy and became a power in
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its own right, setting the stage for conflict with Rome in the following centuries.\textsuperscript{8} As Rome began the long process of expanding from a prosperous city-state to an empire, Carthage was the dominant power in the Western Mediterranean. Polybius recounts treaties forbidding Roman trade with the island of Sardinia and the coast of Africa, indicating the firm sense of Punic ownership over these lands.\textsuperscript{9} As Rome came to view itself as a power, Carthage became a rival. After gaining lands in the first two Punic Wars in the third century BC, the excuse to finally destroy the city and its grip on North Africa came in 146 BC. Carthage violated a treaty with Rome’s ally Massinissa, excusing intervention as a “just war.”\textsuperscript{10} Carthage and its ally cities were destroyed, but the seven North African cities that sided with Rome kept their lands and lives.\textsuperscript{11} The destruction of Carthage became a byword for obliteration for centuries of Roman historians, including Polybius, Appian, Sallust, and Florus, and rhetoricians like Cicero.\textsuperscript{12} This was the kind of event that usefully ensured compliance from would-be resistance.

While benefitting from the dense urbanism and administrative organization left in place by the defeated Carthaginians, Rome transformed Africa Proconsularis into one of its wealthiest and most productive provinces. As in Spain, focused and systematic intervention intensified in the late first century BC as Caesar and later Augustus set about remaking the Roman world into a true empire that included cultural expectations to
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consolidate economic and territorial dominance. In this period, land ownership and use were transformed on the Roman model of specialization. Many areas, including the Segermes Valley (located East of Thuburbo in shift Figure 4.1), for example, became high-producing sources of olive oil. Mills, counterweights, and press beds were found throughout, even on multi-crop farms. The Kasserine area (see Sbeitla in Figure 4.1) produced twenty settlements in just 3.5 square km ranging from villas to nucleated towns, though all had primarily agricultural function. One of these, at Ksar el-Guellal contained twenty olive presses in just fifty-three hectares, showing the importance of this crop for the province. This intensified production was a Roman innovation. In the Segermes Valley, only two Punic sites were reused; new settlements sprang up in lowland areas more suitable for olive cultivation, as well as production of
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other valuable crops like cereals.\textsuperscript{17} This, of course, created unwelcome disruptions in local land ownership. This insecurity in the face of centurial administration, taxation, and the encroachment of private Roman estates that broke up pastureland for crop cultivation spurred Tacfarinas’ Revolt in 15 AD, a local rebellion that took nine years to be subdued.\textsuperscript{18} Others benefitted from these changes. An evocative third century inscription from Mactar demonstrates the new social mobility that, while exceptional, was possible in some version for a few within the Roman bureaucracy, especially since ancestral land claims lost priority to economic productivity. “\textit{Paupere progenitus lare sum parvoq(ue) parente cuius nec census neque domus fuerat},” records an African man, whose name unfortunately did not survive, who through years of hard work advanced from field hand, to field leader, to conscription counselor, to decurion, and finally, “[...] \textit{de rusticulo censor et ipse fui}.”\textsuperscript{19}

Cultural changes followed the administrative overhaul. In the interest of unifying the provinces under his new sole authority, as many as 50,000 colonists were settled in North Africa under Augustus, infiltrating local society with a new language and new practices.\textsuperscript{20} Latin was known on only five inscriptions dating earlier than 46 BC, but came to dominate epigraphy from the Augustan era onward. Following the fall of Carthage, the Punic script shifted to a more cursive version known now as Neo-Punic.\textsuperscript{21} This was frequently used alongside Latin and occasionally Greek in bi- and tri-lingual inscriptions. Beyond the exclusively votive use of Old Punic in epigraphy, Neo-Punic

\textsuperscript{18} Fentress, “Romanizing the Berbers,” 28.
\textsuperscript{19} “I was born into a poor dwelling and to a poor father who had no property or household [...] from a country boy, I became a censor.” CIL 8.11824
\textsuperscript{21} Karel Jongeling and Robert Kerr, \textit{Late Punic Epigraphy: An Introduction to the Study of Neo-Punic and Latino-Punic Inscriptions} (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 1-2.
followed the Latin tradition of versatile monumental epigraphy in the Augustan age.22
Lengthy building dedications and records of euergetism are attested in the major excavated cities. A remarkably long and complete bilingual text dedicating the market at Lepcis Magna in 8 BC is enlightening for the process of Latinization of North Africa. The Neo-Punic completely translates the Latin, but Latin is the visually dominant language, as is true for other bilingual monuments from this period.23 Many local elite names are recorded in the dedication, all of them proudly Punic, including Hannibal, Muttun, Himilco, Abdemelquart.24 Only one individual, Hannibal Tapapius Rufus, used the *tria nomina* though he obviously adhering to Punic traditions, just in a Latin formula and with the addition of the *cognomen* “Rufus.”25 Later inscriptions continued the use of Punic through the first century AD but transliterated the spoken pronunciation into the Latin script.26 By the second century, Latin had completely eclipsed Punic as the language of public display. Various other sources point to the survival of Punic, however. These include the writings of St. Augustine, himself a North African with knowledge of spoken Punic, perhaps through his mother, Monnica, whose name was African.27 Trilingual catacombs inscriptions from Sirte further show that it was still in living use at least through the fifth century AD.28 Despite this remarkable private-sphere continuity of Punic, however, Latin became the sole public and literary language in the second century

23 Ibid., 305.
AD. Punic survival implied local preference or conservatism, perhaps due to its Latin-like role as a regional unifier in the Carthaginian period. Latin’s eclipse of this language was, then, an imposition in the interest of similar unity with the rest of the Roman world and it seems unlikely that people still giving their children Punic names in the fifth century would eagerly concede its pride of place.

A similarly uneasy dominance occurred in the Romanization of African religion. Rome rebranded the two principal Punic deities, Ba’al Hammon and Tanit, as Saturn and Dea Caelestis but their cult, for all its expected Roman visual conformity, betrayed its Punic origins at every turn. Saturn was widely known outside of Africa, but this province was unique in the dominance of his cult, which outstripped even Jupiter. He was worshipped as a cosmic god, whose cult seems to have been confused with the normally dominant Jupiter in actual practice; an inscription from the city of Constantine names him “Iovi Saturno Augusto,” a clear amalgamation of the two gods, Jove (Jupiter) and Saturn.29 His worship, together with Caelestis, further makes his Punic nature clear. Saturn was not normally worshipped with a consort, while the divine couple, Ba’al Hammon and Tanit, was at the heart of Punic worship. Rome ended public sacrifice of children, as its famous religious toleration drew firm limits at human sacrifice. The practice continued in secret, however, with substitution of young animals for babies becoming more common. A stela from second or third century Nicivibus, modern N’Gaous, Algeria, records the dedication of an agnum pro vika(rio), or a surrogate lamb, by a pair of devotees named Felix and Diodora.30 Here, as with language, we see that
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29 Lancel, Carthage, 436.
African tradition continued, but was made to submit to Roman interests. Given the tenacity of Punic worship within these adaptations, the submission was unlikely voluntary.

This does not mean that tradition was necessarily a means of resistance nor that Roman culture did not take a firm hold, as Bénabou suggested, however. Aspects of African material culture demonstrate new Roman forms and ideas integrated deeply into local culture although the instigation was clearly Roman. Examination of ceramics, for example, reveals the mass importation of Italian terra sigillata in the Augustan age, perhaps at first a response to demand from the tens of thousands of new colonists who settled in Africa Proconsularis during these years. After this, however, local production took over, showing a sharp drop in non-African imports after about 60 AD.\(^{31}\) This local version, called African Red Slip Ware, became the most popular fineware ceramic in Africa and was exported across the wider Roman world. Baths, another ubiquitous Roman legacy, were also adopted by African locals. Bathhouses dating to the first century AD have even been excavated even in rural areas of the Segermes Valley far from reliable water sources.\(^{32}\) It is possible that the tradition was adapted in these areas to seasonal use, operating only when the wadis were flowing, instead of year-round. In any event, the use of large amounts of water for a traditional Roman bath in a semi-desert land involved considerable effort, indicating the importance of the new ritual to even the rural population. The construction of these bathhouses, as well as other buildings, does show local preferences at play, however. Instead of the typical Roman brickwork, most


rural African buildings continued to use stone and mortared rubble, except in the heated areas of bathhouses. Whether due to practical reasons, like cost, or preference, these and other Roman institutions of much of Africa Proconsularis retained a distinctly African character.

Africa Proconsularis, was, then, an appropriate “ground zero” for the challenge to the colonial-era vision of Romanization but also serves now to challenge the trend to downplay Rome’s cultural imperialism. Rome made a significant impact on the social and physical landscape of Africa. Latin edged Punic out of the public sphere, traditional religious practices were outlawed, deities were renamed, and baths appeared in the desert. While material culture was adopted and adapted extensively in this province, the endurance of the Punic language, even when relegated to the private sphere, and religious practices, even when banned by Rome, indicates an uneasiness with Romanitas. While some, like the Mactar harvester, certainly benefitted, these were clearly not welcome changes for all. They were uniquely adapted to satisfy the need for continuity within the provincial identity, but, particularly given the importance of Punic, even in monumental display, for centuries after conquest and the unique worship of Saturn and Caelestis, it is difficult not to appreciate a degree of unwillingness to conform completely and hence the perceived imposition of Roman cultural forms that accompanied the administrative impositions. Rome achieved what it needed, a profitable agricultural region with a public culture that communicated seamlessly with the rest of the empire. This rendered the

province non-offensive, exploitable, and easily ruled, but only after reorganizing the physical, economic, and social landscape.

4.3 **Dacia**

Dacia, among Rome’s last provinces and under Roman authority for less than two centuries from 106 to 275 AD, presents us with an extreme example of Roman involvement in cultural change that diverges from what we have seen in other provinces. Romanization here was a blitzkrieg to all appearances. Instead of a process of gradual transformation and incorporation into provincial culture over several generations, Daco-Roman culture erupted *ex nihilo* from the ruins of the conquest. A unique circumstance is likely the cause, namely the absence of an indigenous local elite. These were normally coopted into provincial administration roles, as we have seen in Spain and Britain, and, from events like the Boudican revolt, Rome learned how far it could push them to adapt and still maintain efficiency. In Dacia, there was no need to play nice and introduce changes gradually. The void was filled with colonists from across the Roman world, especially the West, who already spoke Latin and participated in imperial culture. Without the gradual process of integration, we get to jump ahead in Dacia and see Rome’s idea of a model population, one they chose themselves. Their Dacian model was likely the goal for all provinces, demonstrating that the process was slower and messier elsewhere due to the mitigating presence of indigenous elites. An examination of the pre-Roman background of the province and of the wars of conquest provides an explanation for how this anomalous set of circumstances came about. The impact of the colonists on
this landscape will be assessed in terms of population centers, epigraphic insights into
language and religion, and, finally, indigenous material culture.

Before Trajan’s colonists laid down roots in Dacia, the land was inhabited by
Thracian-speaking peoples known as Daci or Getae to ancient writers.34 These people
were influenced by the spread of La Tène Celtic culture from Central Europe in the
second and third centuries BC, from whence wheel-made pottery, coinage, and
consolidated political authority entered Dacian life. There were hillforts of various
importance and size, each with an affiliated settlement whose size and complexity
corresponded to that of the fort, surrounded by small holdings that in some places
clustered into villages of various sizes.35 The hillforts and the more nucleated villages
marked areas of particular political importance or rich resources, like iron ore.36 The
absence of a tribal aristocratic organization like the civitates of other Iron Age European
societies is notable, however. Ptolemy provides a list of Dacian poleis during the time of
the province; unlike other Roman provinces, the names of the Dacian urban centers were
unrelated to ethnic names, deriving from the names of local places or rivers instead.37
Diaconescu posits that the lack of tribally-based civitates in Dacia was due to the
historically centralized nature of the region. In the first century BC, a powerful leader,
Burebista, emerged to unite the various Dacian and Getic tribes which expanded to

34 Ioana Oltean, *Dacia: Landscape, Colonisation, and Romanisation*, (New York: Routledge, 2007), 44; late Roman writers like Jordanes confusingly associate the Getae with the Goths of the late empire, though no relation has been proven. The two terms were used interchangeably by Latin poets, including Virgil, Horace, and Juvenal. The Greco-Roman geographer, Strabo, described them as regionally differentiated peoples but speaking the same language. *Geography*, 7.3.12-13.
35 Oltean, *Dacia*, 90-91.
threaten the Greek colonies on the Black Sea and even become involved with Pompey in Rome’s civil wars. This Dacian kingdom was a centralized state which replaced ethnic or tribal rulers with royally appointed nobles. It was reborn in the late first century AD under Decebalus, again ruling over a united and centralized Dacian territory from his capital, Regia Sarmizegetusa, in the Carpathians. Dacian rulers further consolidated power through a politically powerful, semi-divine priesthood. According to Herodotus’ interesting, though exoticizing, account, Zalmoxis, a former slave of the Ionian Greek philosopher, Pythagoras, charmed his way into elite Dacian circles as a sophisticated counsellor and was later revered as the chief god.38 Among the teachings of Zalmoxis that others, including Strabo, recorded was the immortality of noble believers in the afterlife, providing an attractive incentive for the king’s loyal aristocrats and, the Romans supposed, made the Dacian military particularly formidable, as they had no fear of death.39

Though interaction with Rome began prior to Burebista’s expansionist ambitions, as evidenced by copious Roman coins beginning around 145 BC, Rome showed little motivation to become directly involved without a perceived threat emanating from the Dacian kingdom.40 This finally happened during the reign of Domitian as Decebalus tested his strength on the fragile Roman frontier. Cassius Dio, casting Decebalus as a “shrewd” and “expert” warrior and negotiator, related that the Dacian king managed to negotiate a shameful Roman surrender and exact tribute from Domitian, who was so

38 Herodotus, Histories 4.95.
39 Strabo, Geography 7.3.5; Oltean, Dacia, 107.
humiliated he attempted to salvage Roman honor by staging the truce as a Roman triumph, complete with processions (of his own riches) and victory games.\textsuperscript{41} At the turn of the second century AD, Trajan campaigned to restore tarnished Roman honor and turn the tables on Decebalus. After the second of two wars against the Dacians, Decebalus conceded defeat and committed suicide, leaving Trajan to establish provincial rule, exploit Dacia’s considerable riches, and found Roman cities.\textsuperscript{42} Though mentioned by late Roman writers Jordanes and Cassiodorus, the chronologically closest source for these events are the writings of Cassius Dio in the early third century and the vivid visual depiction on Trajan’s Column in Rome, both shamelessly valorizing Trajan. The reliefs on Trajan’s Column, significantly, show an incredibly violent conquest, with masses of Dacians killed or carried off as slaves. This is a reminder that enfranchisement and even survival were the prerogative only of those who surrendered and allied with Rome willingly. Those who resisted or demonstrated “arrogance” towards Rome, as Decebalus’ Dacia did, paid the price with life and liberty, providing fresh fodder for Rome’s hungry slave markets and cautionary tales for others who may consider resistance as an option.

Archaeology confirms that the defeat was both decisive and violent, an overhaul that extended into the new culture as well. This is particularly evident in examination of the dramatic changes in settlement following the war. Pre-Roman Dacian sites, like Costeşti, Fețele Albe, and the ritual center at Grădiștea Muncelului, show clear evidence of burning at the time of the conquest.\textsuperscript{43} Few Daco-Roman cities show signs of occupation prior to the conquest and there is evidence for numerous abandoned Dacian

\textsuperscript{41} Cassius Dio, \textit{Histories} 67.6.1-3, 67.7.1-4
\textsuperscript{42} Cassius Dio, \textit{Histories} 68.6-14.
\textsuperscript{43} Lockyear, “The Late Iron Age Background,” 50.
sites, leading archaeologists to believe that populations were either destroyed or relocated to new, Roman-built settlements. Even settlements with Dacian names, like Apulum and Sarmizegetusa (see Figure 4.2), were built by the Romans miles away from the original indigenous citadels. The appearance of the cities themselves is typically provincial-Roman. Timber structures were quickly erected to make forts. Civilian vicus attached to the forts, exemplified by Porolissum, eventually grew and shifted the center
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45 Map from en.wikipedia.org/Roman_Dacia.
of gravity from a military to a civilian establishment.47 Sarmizegetusa’s civilian vicus grew quickly to include an amphitheater, gladiator training center, and bath complex, being the first part of town to be converted to stone buildings.48 This stonework was done in the typical Roman style seen across the provinces.49 Nothing notably Dacian in the architecture stands out. The same trends are evident in the excavated remains of Dacia’s eleven known colonia and municipia sites.50

The ethnic population and culture of these new Daco-Roman settlements is a contentious issue and is critical for understanding the Roman role in the transformation of Dacia. Late Roman historians, including generally reliable epitomist Eutropius, believed that the ethnic Dacians were obliterated and that Trajan “[…] brought from the whole Roman world countless masses of people to live in the fields and in the cities […]” to replace them.51 On one hand, archaeology from the civic and religious spheres supports contention that most, if not all, of the people in the Roman cities of the new province were colonists from around the Roman empire. Along with the lack of civitas centers of indigenous administration, the absence of indigenous Dacians in any positions of local authority is striking in this province. The decurion positions and other minor magistracies that would be filled by the local elite elsewhere were instead occupied by veterans of the Roman army.52 The province boasts an exceptional corpus of over 3000 personal

49 Ibid., 27-32.
50 Juan Ramón Carbó García, “‘Dacia Capta’: Particularidades de un Proceso de Conquista y Romanización,” Habis, 41(2010), 283.
51 Eutropius Abridgement of Roman History 8.6.2.
inscriptions with an exceptional lack of individuals with Dacian names. Less than 3% of the thousands of inscribed names in the province were of Thracian-language origin, and many, if not most, of these may have been colonists from other Thracian-speaking provinces, like Upper and Lower Moesia.\textsuperscript{53} Greek and Eastern names are also a minority here, despite proximity to Greece and Anatolia. The vast majority, around 75%, are Latin-Italic and virtually all of the entire corpus are recorded in Latin-language inscriptions, not Greek.\textsuperscript{54} Therefore, despite its geographical position on the Eastern frontiers of Europe, Dacia was a culturally Latin province with no marked transition from indigenous to Roman. This is undoubtedly due to its large numbers of Latin-speaking Western colonists. As Ruscu has suggested, Dacia’s shaky ground as a frontier province and as an area rich in natural resources prompted settlement of an ideal population that would be loyal, trustworthy, and easily governed. Significantly, Rome’s ideal citizens were Latin-speaking, Romanized colonists from the West.\textsuperscript{55}

Daco-Roman religion follows the same pattern. Instead of the mix of local and imperial deities, interpretatio, or syncretism of the two, we see the gamut of Roman provincial religion with no appreciable local input. At Apulum alone, there are numerous inscriptions to Rome’s Capitoline Triad (Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva) and the whole of the classical Roman pantheon. Some have special popularity in this province, particularly Diana, ascribed here with the epithet Mellifica.\textsuperscript{56} She was uniquely paired with Jupiter in several Dacian inscriptions, a combination rarely seen elsewhere, reflecting variations

\textsuperscript{53} Ruscu, “The Supposed Extermination of the Dacians,” 78, 84.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., footnote 84
\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 84
\textsuperscript{56} Byros, “Reconstructing Identities in Roman Dacia,”
within a very Roman framework. Gods associated with healing, particularly Aesculapius and Hygeia, were also notably favored here. A wide range of Eastern deities are attested from inscriptions. Of these, Mithras was especially popular, as evidenced from the numerous Mithraea discovered, as was the syncretized Jupiter Dolichenus, a Syrian combination. The Egyptian Isis and Serapis had Dacian cults, and gods from even the Western Celtic fringes of the empire, including the Gaulish Epona and the British Camulos were honored with devotional inscriptions. What is missing is Dacian. Only one inscription to a Dacian deity, Zalmoxis, is archaeologically attested amid thousands of imported cult figures. This stands in sharp contrast to even the most militarized zones of other provinces. There are fifty known religious sanctuary sites from Iron Age Dacia, all of which saw their activities curtailed immediately after the conquest. The reason for this must be taken alongside the civic absence of local elites in the record. We know from Strabo’s accounts that Zalmoxis’ divine priesthood was associated with aristocracy, as was also the case for the Druids of Gaul and Britain, who were exterminated by Rome even though other aspects of religion endured longer. The Dacian nobility may have been targeted by Rome because of its threatening religious/political power, feared, like the Druids, to be a focal point of resistance. Alternately, Trajan’s Column’s depicts mass annihilation of native Dacians and the suicide of Decebalus. With religious views that emphasize the afterlife and immortality, the warrior elite may have fought to the death and found it, either in last-ditch battle
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59 Ibid., 86.  
60 Byros, 67.  
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62 Ruscu, “The Supposed Extermination of the Dacians,” 81; Strabo *Geography* 7.3.5.
efforts or, following the king’s example, through suicide to avoid capture and enslavement. In their place were Rome’s handpicked model citizens, Romanized colonists from across the empire, veterans of the wars that decimated the local population.63

Despite this apparent absence of Dacian aristocracy in the Roman period, it is striking that indigenous pottery continued in use, even in the new cities, long after the conquest, indicating that there was no complete Dacian genocide or deportation, though vast numbers from all social strata, and perhaps all of the nobility, were certainly killed or enslaved.64 Roman provincial wheel-thrown pottery almost completely eclipsed indigenous wheel-thrown wares across all settlement types.65 Much of it was made in Dacian workshops, not imported, and some of these production centers, like Slimnic and Locusteni, produced Roman and indigenous pots side by side.66 The vast majority of indigenous Dacian pots visible in the archaeological record for this period were hand-built pots of various shapes, complementing the cheap, durable Roman wheel-thrown vessels, likely for their irreplaceability in indigenous cooking or serving traditions. This evidence of a cultural transition phase in low-status material culture indicates that Dacian society was not completely dismembered, but more likely decapitated. These Dacians that remained were not the ones with sufficient wealth to afford monumental epigraphy or influence to put a Dacian spin on the architecture of their new towns. Thanks to the preeminence of Roman colonists in the new province, they experienced rapid and

63 Diaconescu, “The Towns of Roman Dacia,”123.
64 Ibid., 125.
66 Ibid., 35.
thorough overhaul. Their town populations were relocated, their language marginalized, and their religious practices ended.

In this extreme example of Romanization, Dacia is therefore as instructive for the Romanization of other provinces as it is on its own face value. Here we see how intense and thorough the introduction of Roman culture could be in a province without local elites and administrators to negotiate and mitigate the changes. So thorough was the transformation that modern Romania speaks a Latin-descended language to this day though the province was only briefly under Roman authority and has been surrounded by Slavic-speaking peoples for the better part of a millennium. This stands in stark contrast to Western Britain, modern Wales, the region of Roman Britain not occupied in Late Antiquity by Germanic peoples. It bore an intense military presence for almost 400 years, yet when the legions departed, so did most traces of Romanitas from the landscape, culture, and language. The key difference in Dacia was that, while British tribal structure was left intact, with local elites able to mitigate social disruption to some degree, in Dacia their administrative function was replaced by already-Romanized colonists from other Western provinces. This gave the new province a Roman makeover that was both immediate and thorough. The fact that this did not happen in other locations highlights the normal importance of indigenous leadership in softening the blow of Roman domination more than their role in inviting in Romanitas as Millet and others have suggested.67 As great as the changes were in Spain, Britain, and Africa, they experienced a more transitional and gradual Romanization that did not see local peculiarities eradicated completely. Enfranchising indigenous elites was worth the trouble for Rome in
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67 See Chapter One above.
these areas because it required less Roman manpower if the elites were adaptable and compliant, as they were able to carry out administrative functions. However, this meant that changes must be made “[…] gradually and by the way, as one may say, under careful watching […],” as Cassius Dio pointed out, at the risk of costly rebellions like that of Arminius in Germany. In Dacia we see Rome able to bypass this step and see what the ultimate goal for every provincial population was: Latin-speaking, Jove-worshipping, city-dwelling, in a word, Romanized.

4.4 Pontus et Bithynia

Roman cultural influence in the Eastern half of the empire was distinctly different from the West in many ways. Anatolia, the Middle East, Egypt, and the Southern Balkan Peninsula had extensive Greek influence, thanks to a millennium of colonization and, most significantly, Alexander’s ambition in the fourth century BC. This Greek cultural expansion was formative for Rome’s own cultural development, providing many of the artistic, religious, and material-culture origins of what became “Graeco-Roman.” On its face, the appearance of culture change in the Eastern provinces was less dramatic than in the West. Urban life, literacy, civic religion, trade, Roman-like social hierarchies, the classical pantheon, and similar material culture were already firmly established in the urban regions of the East. That does not mean that the East did not make compulsory adaptations as it was claimed by the empire, however. The province of Pontus-Bithynia, which stretched along the Black Sea coast of Anatolia, modern Turkey, is a useful case study of this different version of Romanization. Source material on its subjugation and
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administration is unusually abundant, thanks to histories of the bloody first century BC war with Pontus’ Mithridates VI, the prolific letters of second century governor, Pliny the Younger, to Trajan, and the transcribed speeches of the Bithynian orator Dio Chrysostomos. Further, due to the Greek world’s rich literary legacy, we can see Romanization from a different angle here than possible in the West: the perspective of the conquered people. This mini-case study will privilege these precious literary insights over archaeology in order to broaden our view of what Romanization meant to those it affected. This examination of this province shows that, though Romanization was less visibly dramatic here than in the Western provinces, the Greek East did not experience Rome unchanged. As in the West, Rome did what was necessary to make Pontus-Bithynia governable and exploitable. In this province it can particularly be seen in aspects of politics, civic life, language, and cultural push-back in the form of literary conservatism.

This region of Anatolia was long accustomed to living under the power of foreign empires, but the culture was not fully homogenous. Though ruled as a single administrative unit by the Romans, Pontus and Bithynia were separate kingdoms for much of their duration, though there was considerable overlap in their political histories. The area was part of the Hittite empire during the Bronze age and experienced kaleidoscopic cultural change through migrations and conquests thereafter. According to Herodotus, the Iron-Age Bithyni were a Thracian people who crossed the Bosporus to set up an Asiatic Thracian territory in Anatolia. They were then incorporated into the Greek-like kingdom of Lydia by the expansionist king, Croesus.69 It later fell under Persian rule
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69 Herodotus, *Histories* 1.28. Herodotus makes frequent comparisons between Lydian and Greek culture, showing considerable affinity between the two peoples.
in the mid-sixth century as the satrapy of Phrygia. The area that would later be known as Pontus shared a similar fate.⁷⁰ Persian hegemony did not extent to the sea coasts, however, as they were fringed by Greek colonies, creating both a cultural division and a source of political tension enduring centuries of Greek-Persian warfare and the establishment of the Delian League in 477 BC which included parts of Bithynia.⁷¹ Unlike Bithynia, Pontus’ territory was not ethnically defined, but was carved from parts of Cappadocia and Paphlagonia captured by the Mysian Mithridates II, related either by birth or marriage to the Persian royal house, in the third century BC.⁷² The Achaemenid Persians were defeated in Anatolia by Alexander in the 330s BC, beginning a new period of Greek political, linguistic, and cultural ascendancy. The Hellenistic generals and rulers established and expanded numerous cities, including Nicaea and Nicomedia, and introduced the Greek language, culture, and religion.⁷³

When central power in the region disintegrated due to instability within the Seleucid family appointed by Alexander, Pontus and Bithynia emerged as independent kingdoms, but with distinctly Hellenistic institutions.⁷⁴ In the first century BC, however, the region’s eclectic past was still notable in the cultural landscape. Traces of the region’s Thracian past are rare but not unheard-of. In the region around Nicaea, in Bithynia, for example, four Roman-era tombstones are known to have Thracian names, all of which

⁷⁰ Strabo, Geography 12.2.4.
⁷³ Harris, “Bithynia,” 861.
come from lower and middle-class families.\textsuperscript{75} The kingdom of Pontus, in particular, proudly retained its Persian legacy despite the basically Hellenistic structure of government. Mithridates VI notably styled himself in Greek as \( \text{βασιλεύς βασιλέων} \)\textsuperscript{76} an explicit reference to the Persian imperial title.\textsuperscript{77} On his coinage, however, he appears as a fully Hellenistic ruler, modeled on Alexander.\textsuperscript{78} Rome became a power-player in the region in response to Mithridates VI’s ambitious bid to take over all of Anatolia in the 80s BC. The result was a series of conflicts called the Mithridatic Wars between the 80s and 60s BC, pitting Rome and its allies, including Bithynia, against Mithridates. Nicomedes IV of Bithynia bequeathed his kingdom to Rome upon his death, prompting Mithridates’ interference and Pompey’s decisive counter-attack, which ended the Third Mithridatic war, precipitated Mithridates’ death, and brought all of Anatolia under Roman control by 63 BC.\textsuperscript{79} From that time, the two kingdoms were ruled together as a senatorial province, first as “Bithynia,” then, from the reign of Nero as Pontus et Bithynia, and later as Bithynia et Pontus (see Figure 5).\textsuperscript{80}

Pompey, under whose charge the kingdoms fell, consolidated power and began the process of aligning the new province to serve Roman interests. Though the region had


\textsuperscript{76} Basileus basileon, or, “king of kings,” corresponding to the Persian Shahanshah.

\textsuperscript{77} Brian McGing, “Mithridates VI Eupator: Victim or Aggressor,” in Mithridates VI and the Pontic Kingdom, edited by J. M. Højte (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2009), 203.

\textsuperscript{78} Jakob Munk Højte, “Portraits and Statues of Mithridates VI,” in Mithridates VI, J. Højte, ed., 149.

\textsuperscript{79} Ferit Baz, “Considerations for the Administration of the Province of Pontus et Bithynia During the Imperial Period,” Cedrus 1 (2013): 262-3.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 262-3.
an urban tradition, there were extensive hinterlands and rural areas that were well outside the political and cultural orbit of the Persian and Greek-established cities, which were primarily located near the coast. Pompey took control of the interior areas and founded new cities (see Figure 4.3).\(^8\) Additionally, he redistributed the hinterlands, resulting in assignment of all rural land to an urban center as a taxable unit.\(^9\) He further rewrote urban life, by making adjustments to the Hellenistic political structure. Prior to Roman involvement, these cities had typically Greek three-branch government. The archon (ἀρχόν), or leader, of which there could be several at a time, held an annual elected magistracy and could serve successive terms.\(^10\) The boule (βουλή), or city council, was also a body of elected officials, responsible for drafting much of the legislation that affected the running of the city. The ekklesia (ἐκκλησία), or popular assembly, was the voting bloc of citizens, which were divided into phyle (φυλή), each entitled to elect the

\(^9\) Bekker-Nielsen, Urban Life and Local Politics, 110
\(^10\) Ibid., 73-4.
same number of seats to the boule. Under Pompey, Roman citizenship became requisite for holding a magistracy position and for membership in the equestrian class. The boule was reimagined to function like the Roman senate. Dion Chrysostomos, with an elitist nod to Rome, notes that these should be from the “soundest and most intelligent” group of citizens, a divergence from the more democratic legacy of Greek rule. Ex-magistrates, appointed by Rome, were entitled to a seat on the boule, regardless of electoral decision. A minimum age requirement of thirty was established, and financial criteria, verified by the census officials, like in Rome, limited the field of candidates and gave the Roman administration more control. This assembly newly leveraged significantly greater power in relation to the ekklesia, and it effectively stripped control from the phyle, whose votes were far less important with the new limitations. Though not eradicating the Greek system, then, Rome enforced adaptations aligned Hellenistic politics with what Rome believed was the best way to run a city and to give Roman more political control.

These adjustments to established institutions extended far into city life, notably in two of the Hellenistic world’s most important civic foci: the gymnasium and the festival. In Hellenistic cities, including those of Pontus et Bithynia, gymnasia were pre-eminent cultural institutions. They provided a social gathering place for leisure and recreation. Though the primary purpose was physical training and exercise, they were also school venues for children and youth, making the local gymnasium an integral part of a Greek
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man’s social identity for his lifetime. Under Augustus’ rule this institution was intentionally shifted to solidify connections with the rest of the Roman world: the gymnasia became baths. Festivals were another Hellenistic social glue that was critical for community identity and was used, with key adjustments, to support Roman rule. These “agonistic” events, which included both artistic (theater, music, poetry) and athletic contests, provided inter-city rivalry that transformed winners into local heroes. The Romans capitalized on these events and modified them as a vehicle for legitimizing Rome’s authority. New festivals were founded; old ones were upgraded and expanded to include competitors from further afield in the empire. The imperial cult was notably pervasive. In the Greek Demostheneia, for example, which began on Augustus’ birthday, the organizer wore a crown bearing the emperor’s image and sacrificed publicly in his veneration. In this way, Rome exercised the same tendency seen in the West to use culture to normalize Roman authority and imperial participation.

While it is common knowledge that Greek remained the official language of daily life for the majority of the East, the impact of Latin should not be completely discounted. It is visible in the written record in several ways. Epigraphy, for example, reveals changing naming practices in response to Roman rule and extensions of citizenship. The tria nomina became common in the epigraphic record, particularly during the imperial period, to the extent that it is often difficult to tell whether the individuals who adhered to
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this Latin practice were Italian immigrants or citizens of Pontic-Bithynian origin. As in other provinces, local (Greek) names were sometimes used as the cognomen, such as for Gaius Iulius Demosthenes, providing a way to preserve a Greek personal identity, or were retained as unofficial “nicknames,” as was the case for Quintus Valerius Rufus, who was called Philippus. The picture is complicated by another Latin naming practice peculiar to Pontus et Bithynia. In the Latin-speaking world, the *tria nomina* was normally reserved for males alone. Latin women typically bore only two names. In this province, however, Pontic-Bithynian women with *tria nomina*, like Flavia Domitia Artemonis, were common in public epigraphy. Given the previously discussed Roman intervention in Pontic-Bithynian political life and the new Roman control of participation in the *boule*, this overboard and exaggerated use of Roman naming conventions seems calculated to impress the administration with how well an aspiring candidate could play the Roman game. Cultural changes, then, may reflect the reality that Roman control was a source of anxiety for those who had to perform *Romanitas* in order to maintain standing within their societies, rather than a free undertaking.

Though participating in the Roman administration required adoption of a Latinized public persona, the Greek language was staunchly upheld, reaching even greater heights of local loyalty in response to these pressures from Rome. As Swain has pointed out, across the Hellenistic world, Greeks, though very open to new ideas and technology from other cultures, such as the alphabet adapted from the Phoenicians, were protective and exclusive in regards to their language, which was an absolutely essential
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element of their identity. Even those with Roman citizenship and Latin names, like L. Cornelius Rufus from Sinope in Pontus, used Greek as the language of their epigraphy, for example. This linguistic protectionism reached new heights among Greek-speaking intellectuals in response to Roman influence in the Greek world. Under the Greek empire, the individual dialects of the Greek city-states became enmeshed into a common version of Greek called koine. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a Greek-speaking rhetorician from the neighboring province of Asia, began a movement while working in Rome in the late first century BC to return to the Greek classics and reject the corrupting influences of Latin, particularly its infiltration of koine. He preferred an “Atticized” Greek literary language, modelled on the language of pre-conquest Attica, the peninsula home to the city of Athens and Greece’s most famous philosophers, poets, and other literary minds. Dionysius and the other purists that followed him likely spoke excellent Latin, as they lived and worked among the elite of Rome itself, but they rejected its impingement on their own treasured cultural heritage.

The linguistic purism and Atticization of Greek filtered into the subject matter of Greek literature from the early imperial period as well, creating the first-third century cultural movement known as the Second Sophistic. Just as Greek literary language looked back to the Classical past, the literary works also belie an obsession with the pre-Roman world. The Bithynian Dio Chrysostom, an orator from Prusa, specifically calls out classical examples in his orations because he wanted his audience to have “a
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character that is Hellenic."\(^{99}\) Declamation of historical figures became a common exercise in rhetoric, as exemplified by Valerius Apsines, arguing a campaign against Xerxes’ Greek allies, and Hermogenes imaginative conflict between Demosthenes and Philip of Macedon.\(^{100}\) Novels were likewise backward-looking. Many were set in historical Greek worlds, like *Metiochus and Parthenope* and Chariton’s *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.\(^{101}\) Many others, including *Daphnis and Chloe*, have no historical setting, but there is a conspicuous absence of Roman presence. The cruelty of suffering under a foreign ruler, however, using Persia as a coded stand-in in many novels, is a common theme.\(^{102}\) This palpable discontent with provincial status and level of resentment points to a local mindset that viewed Rome as an oppressive, controlling, and corrupting power. Even in the East, the administration hardly comes across as *laissez-faire* despite the less drastic nature of interference.

While Pontus-Bithynians did not experience Roman cultural overhaul in the same way as the provincials we have discussed in the West, they were, likewise, obligated to make changes in order to thrive under Roman rule. Many of these, particularly surrounding social administration and urban organization, were directly imposed by Rome. Others, like the names chosen for their children, were the result of anxieties about these impositions. They were not extreme measures and some were likely easy to swallow since they worked within existing traditions, but they were required changes, nonetheless, and the cumulative effect of these adjustments certainly led to resentment.
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among the literary elite. Their refinement of local tradition and reverence for indigenous history due to the pressures of imperial rule may have happened in other locations as well but the evidence did not survive. The highly literary nature of Hellenistic society gives a unique window into this phenomenon that is largely invisible in the West. Rome, in imposing political, social, and cultural changes, became the oppressive “other,” a point of comparison and differentiation for Hellenized Anatolians. This spurred an intensified interest in the Greek past and pride in Greek heritage, which flowered in a literary renaissance that was inseparably attached to subjugation by Rome.

4.5 Conclusion

In these three “mini-case studies” we see further examples of the broad theme of Romano-centric cultural onboarding of the empire’s provinces. Each of these provinces began with a violent war that terrified surrounding populations and put Rome in an unquestionable position of dominance. The new rulers then set about consolidating and unifying, using their leverage as conquerors to make whatever changes they deemed necessary to ensure Rome’s imperial interests were achieved. In Africa Proconsularis, living under the shadow of the Third Punic War against Carthage, settlements and agricultural traditions were reorganized and specialized to meet the demands of the empire’s hungry markets, Latin usurped Punic’s ancient public dominance, Punic religious practice was made acceptable to Roman sensibilities, and Roman cultural innovations like mass-produced ceramics and bathing practices. Dacia shows an even more intense incursion, as most of the provincial elite appear to have been eliminated in Trajan’s war. Their replacement with colonists is evident in the immediate uptake of
Roman urban life, Latin, and Roman religion, showing that keeping order in a dangerous frontier region necessitated conformity to Rome’s ideal provincial population, a culturally Roman one. Even in Pontus-Bithynia, where many of these impositions were less drastic, we see Rome making adjustments to local civic and political traditions in the interest of control and unity. Though seemingly small, they were enough to create anxiety for those struggling to participate and conservative resentment among the literary intelligentsia. In all three of these locations, like the provinces more fully explored earlier, we see Rome taking clear steps to make its provinces more Roman. The successive administrations were flexible and pragmatic about this; indeed, these five provinces show that imperial needs were different across the Roman world as were the impositions made and responses to them.
CONCLUSION

For 200 years, from the late first century BC to the late second century AD, the consolidated areas of the Roman world experienced a period of stability and peace known as *Pax Romana*. The communication, trade, unity, and loyalty made possible by the culture changes we have discussed facilitated the dramatic transition from violent frontier conquests, like Numantia, to the consolidated hegemony of the Roman Peace. What was a forced and foreign imposition for the early generations became the new status quo as Roman culture was normalized over time. It must be stressed that the Roman Empire, even under the *Pax Romana*, never became a fully homogenized entity. In each province, locals and Romans created new cultures that were uniquely Romano-British, Hispano-Roman, Daco-Roman, etc. New Roman forms were expressed in uniquely local idioms. In the Tunisian desert, baths were built with a traditional African appearance, for example. In Southern Britain, Minerva was worshipped with water-based rituals formerly devoted to Sulis. In Spain, women owned extensive wealth in their own names and defended it in courts of Roman law. *Romanitas* did not whitewash the pre-conquest realities or preferences in most of these situations. It did successfully bind the provinces together into a cohesive empire with a common language and the ability to read it, transferable religious practices and assumptions, and familiar modes of self-expression through imported goods, fashions, and epigraphic traditions.
These commonalities within the diverse Roman world indicate that Rome had baseline social and cultural goals for its provinces and that it guided the transition to them in the interests of managing the empire. One feature of Romanization that can be seen across the Roman world was a reorganization of land, settlement, and economy. In areas where urbanization had not taken root prior to the coming of Rome, which included much of Spain and Britain, Rome immediately began founding cities. Besides providing a familiar life for Italian colonists, cities like Tarraco and Camulodunum established a model of Rome’s version of civilized life, including dietary preferences, fashion, and use of imported goods, which local people were encouraged to emulate. Another benefit to Rome was the fact that these cities were market centers, encouraging the growth of a new economy that allowed specialization and the export of surplus or specialty crops, like olive oil in Southern Spain and North Africa, and other resources, like Western Britain’s salt and Dacia’s gold. Even in areas that already had an urban tradition, including Africa Proconsularis and Pontus-Bithynia, the hinterlands were reorganized, agricultural settlements relocated, and land property was redistributed. Dacia provided an even more extreme example, with an almost entirely new set of urban sites in use shortly after the conquest. All this was done to facilitate taxation and production for the Roman trade economy.

Within the society created by these new structural and economic changes, there were common cultural impositions as well. The spread of literacy and the Latin language was notably pervasive across provincial, regional, socio-economic, and gender lines. Spain’s rich epigraphic tradition demonstrates the gradual adoption of Latin visible in changing name choices. Britain’s curse tablets show Latin and literacy even among
lower-status rural people. Dacia’s lack of a visible transitional linguistic phase indicates how immediately Latin-speaking outsiders took over the life of the province. Africa and Pontus-Bithynia, each part of a former empire and a literary tradition prior to Rome, were more conservative, but show the pressures of Latinization, nevertheless. In Africa, Latin took over Punic’s pride of place in public display and official communication despite the latter’s endurance in the private sphere. Even in Greek-speaking Pontus-Bithynia, where Greek remained the language of public and private daily life, epigraphy shows some pressure on provincials to adopt a Latin public persona by adopting Latin names and naming formulae.

Religion was another key area in which Rome consistently interfered. *Interpretatio*, a practice as old as Rome’s first encounters with the Greek world, was transferred to the West as Rome assigned local deities new names, new attributes, and new rituals. Sulis became Minerva, Tanit became Caelestis, and Sagatus became Mars. The worship of these deities was transformed as well, as they were enshrined in classical human forms and worshipped in temples and sanctuaries complete with Latin votive epigraphy. In the Greek world, which had profoundly influenced Rome’s own religious development, innovations like the imperial cult were harnessed as propaganda in Bithynia’s festivals to bolster the visibility and perceived authority of the emperor. These represented important changes for local people and were certainly seen as interference by the first generations. Other changes were even more drastic, however. Punic child sacrifices were driven underground, and Britain’s Druids became dangerous outlaws. It is even possible that connection to Dacia’s feared cult of Zalmoxis ensured the destruction of the province’s local aristocracy. These were clearly not local choices. If the Punic rites
were important enough in African society to continue illicitly, it is unthinkable that they chose to outlaw them. Local societies similarly would have felt no need to give their gods new names and new faces or to include worship of a conquering emperor in a local festival if not directed or encouraged to do so by the feared new rulers.

Other cultural features that were crucial to Rome’s way of life are apparent across the empire in the cases we have studied, indicating the cultural baseline for their vision of the provinces went even beyond social structure, language, and religion. Mass produced ceramics, either from *terra sigillata* production hot spots in Southern Gaul and North Africa or from local imitators, demonstrate connections to Mediterranean trade networks and a new preference for the Mediterranean foods served on them. Public bathing became an important feature of cultures from the Greek East, where it coopted the existing gymnasium tradition, to Britain, where it was adopted even by the disgraced descendants of Boudica’s Iceni, to North Africa, where baths emerged in the least practical place imaginable: the Tunisian desert. Memorial epigraphy, using Roman formulae and poetic stylings like Cornelia Sirasteiun’s *carmen* in Eastern Spain, is also a feature of provinces across the empire, demonstrating both a growing preference for Latin names as well as adoption of a new burial tradition. Cities across the Roman world boasted *fora*, temples, markets, circuses, aqueducts, and amphitheaters and were connected by roads. Even a frontier province like Dacia had its own gladiator training school. Without Roman interference, some of these traditions may have caught on selectively over time, but the empire-wide consistency of these baseline features precludes the possibility that this was preference-based. Furthermore, they were adopted immediately in areas conquered during the Principate, and immediately after the ascension of Caesar for earlier
annexations. This cannot be coincidence. Having a culturally cohesive and governable empire was clearly a priority for imperial Rome and not something to leave to chance or local whims.

Each of the provinces we have studied was baptized into Pax Romana with blood and terror, making the power dynamic and the local “choices” clear from the beginning. The Dacians, the Carthaginians, the Iceni, the Numantines, the followers of Mithridates, and countless others found out the hard way that resisting Rome was a high-stakes gamble. Working within the system, however, was an option that provided safety and even new opportunities for some, especially once the resentment of the early generations gave way to the new status quo. Provincials like the Mactar harvester-turned-censor in Africa Proconsularis and the female workshop owners in Spain certainly found that the Roman world could be a land of opportunity. Participation created social mobility and economic opportunities, connecting the provinces into a new web of goods, ideas, and stability, and avoided the total loss of autonomy inherent in captivity and slavery in Rome, or worse, death. The cost of these perks was, of course, submission. Rome welcomed indigenous people from across Europe, the Middle East, and North Africa into its fold, but only the ostensibly cooperative ones. As we have seen, cooperation meant that these people groups and individuals were required to adapt to accommodate the Roman occupation and to serve Rome’s imperial interests. While negotiations and constrained choices were made everywhere, giving each province a unique personality, we have seen that key augmentations in areas like social organization, language, religion, and lifestyle clearly had their origins in Rome and were imposed in one form or another across the Roman world. The provincial cities of the empire never became “mini-
Romes,” but, city and country, rich and poor, male and female, occupied provinces took massive steps in the direction of Romanitas. The power dynamic in these territories, which each had its own Numantia, meant that none of these steps was wholly voluntary, as Rome had too much at stake, in the interest of economic gain and of loyalty and governability to be a truly laissez-faire ruler.

The changes we have seen amount to Romanization. The term carries an unfortunate load of incorrect colonial assumptions, but its basic premise of Rome making the provinces more Roman need not be cloaked in post-colonial apologies. The first generations of provincials would not likely recognize themselves in Millett’s free choice scenario or the idea that cultural change was simply a result of globalization and exposure any more than they would have agreed with Haverfield’s depiction of Rome as a paternalistic power. Both the term and the process must be understood for what they were. Rome instigated important, broad, and deep changes in local societies that served its various needs for imperial expansion and control. These changes were not all voluntary, though local cultures did influence the appearance and flavor of the new order and some certainly benefitted from it. They were likely viewed as an imposition or an interference by the majority at first, but one that had to be accepted due to the long shadow cast by the smoke of failed resistance events like Numantia. Unlike Haverfield, we must view the acceptance of Romanitas as a pragmatic survival strategy. Unlike post-colonial analyses, however, we must bring Rome back into a central position of control and management regarding culture change. As Cassius Dio noted, the conquered populations adjusted themselves to Roman ways and gradually became different,
knowing it or not, all under the “careful watching” of Rome itself. This cannot be anything other than Romanization.
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