



**HAL**  
open science

# Between tradition and innovation. Place Names and the Geography of Power in Late Republican and Early Imperial Hispania

Sergio España-Chamorro

## ► To cite this version:

Sergio España-Chamorro. Between tradition and innovation. Place Names and the Geography of Power in Late Republican and Early Imperial Hispania. Sven Betjes; Olivier Hekster; Erika Manders. Tradition and Power in the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Workshop of The International Network Impact of Empire (Nijmegen, 18-20 May 2022), 50, BRILL, pp.90-109, 2024, Impact of Empire, 978-90-04-53746-0. 10.1163/9789004537460\_008 . hal-04651333

**HAL Id: hal-04651333**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04651333v1>**

Submitted on 17 Jul 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Between Tradition and Innovation

## *Place Names and the Geography of Power in Late Republican and Early Imperial Hispania*

*Sergio España-Chamorro*

### 1 Introduction: Toponymy, Agency, and its Use in Roman Hispania

It is not feasible to live in a disordered space. That is why psychological mechanisms are created to control it and to insert order into the experienced space.<sup>1</sup> The creation of models to represent and interpret the environment is directly linked to the cultural parameters and socio-economic complexity of a society. All these factors are crucial for building the image of the world both metonymically and metaphorically.<sup>2</sup> Bearing this in mind, the anguish caused by the fear of the unknown leads us to extrapolate parameters of what is already known in order to calm the anxiety caused by uncontrolled environments and situations. Toponymy plays an important role in the mental and cultural creation of a space. Giving it a name means endowing space with characteristics that generate the idea of a hypothetical imagined domain. These mechanisms of translation of associated ideas can be engendered by identifying places that remind one of other lived and experienced places. Naming places was used by ancient societies to associate certain characteristics and particularities retained in the communal memory and enhance their continuity as a society.<sup>3</sup> This is the reason why the world order envisioned first by the Greeks and later by the Romans needed to create axes of symmetry at the extremes of the *oikoumene*, which occasionally led them to confuse the reality of space.<sup>4</sup>

1 A. Hernando, *Arqueología de la identidad* (Barcelona 2002), 49–110; P. Ciprés, ‘Celtiberia: la creación geográfica de un espacio provincial’, *Ktema* 19 (1993), 271–272.

2 D.R. Olson, *El mundo sobre el papel: el impacto de la escritura y la lectura del conocimiento*, (Barcelona 1999).

3 H. Jiménez Vialás, *Carteia y Traducta. Ciudades y territorio en la orilla norte del Estrecho de Gibraltar* (Barcelona 2019), 95. About memory in Rome, see A. Rodríguez Mayorgas, ‘La memoria cultural de Roma: el recuerdo oral de los orígenes’, *Gerión* 25,2, (2007), 105–124, and also from a general vision the main works of P. Connerton, *How societies remember* (Cambridge-New York 1986), and P. Connerton, *How modernity forget* (Cambridge-New York 2009).

4 Of interest here are comparisons between different regions such as Iberia and Hiberia or Ethiopia and India (P. Schneider, *L’Ethiopie et L’Inde. Interférences et confusions aux extrémités*

One of the main signs of the appropriation of space is the naming of places. In colonial processes it can be a very useful weapon of symbolic and ideological domination to promote political and social change. For example, in 1664, the English took over New Amsterdam and renamed it New York after the Duke of York.<sup>5</sup> The town never recovered its former place name. In contrast, on 27th May 1703 Tsar Peter the Great founded a new town on the site of a captured Swedish fortress. Saint Petersburg was named after the apostle Saint Peter and also linked to the Tsar himself. A Russianisation process transformed its name into Petrograd in 1914, which ten years later, following Lenin's death, changed to Leningrad.<sup>6</sup> The city regained its original name (Saint Petersburg) in 1991, on the wishes of the local inhabitants. These two examples reveal significant characteristics of toponyms:

1. The importance of a place name as propaganda
2. The temporal factor of place names as historical landmarks
3. Their fragility during periods of political change

While we should remain wary of the historical distance and the varying contexts, the same characteristics may be found for ancient toponyms. Toponymy reveals the world view of a society with multiple cultural nuances and connotations. It speaks about language, links with other places, the natural environment, juridical categories, political implications, and so on.<sup>7</sup> All this is comprised in a simple name that, in fact, is an abbreviated description of a place. This is part of the established practices of rule for each society. Romans were already aware of the political implications of place names as a strong element of maintaining power structures. Preserving place names ensured a notion of tradition in a smooth transition to a new governmental structure and administration for allies. But it was also used as a punishment for defeated enemies and created tension between local and new Roman power structures.

Renaming a place could be regarded as a rather disruptive act that severed the link between the local population and the territory, destroying personal and historical sensibilities. It meant a change of identity because it destroyed the main reference to the place and its chronological link with the past. This

---

*du Monde Antique* Rome 2004, 222), or between Colchis and Egypt (vid. D. Braun, *Georgia in Antiquity. A History of Colchis and Transcaucasian Iberia 550 BC–AD 562*, (Oxford 1994), 17, in which he shows the similarities between both regions as described by Herodotus).

- 5 H.L. Schoolcraft, 'The Capture of New Amsterdam', *The English Historical Review* 22, no. 88 (1907), 674–693.
- 6 J. David, 'Commemorative Place Names. Their Specificity and Problems', *Names* 59, no. 4 (2011), 214–228.
- 7 S. España-Chamorro, *Unde incipit Baetica. Los límites de la Baetica y su integración territorial (s. I–III)*, (Rome 2021), see especially 233–240.

situation creates even more profound changes in a society when a new language is imposed. In the case of Hispania, the pre-Roman societies had very different languages and the Roman conquest imposed Latin as the new language of power and administration.<sup>8</sup> This also required a transformation of the place name, seeking new etymological links, either by translating it or transforming it tangentially or totally.<sup>9</sup> There were several ways of renaming a toponym: from a simple readaptation to a new language to a complete change leaving no traces of the former name.

Place names have two main practical purposes: identification and orientation. However, the *τόπος- νόμος* is more than that. It is a name: the name of a place, the name of a geographical point. The name is revealing in numerous respects. It refers to its place in the world; the society that inhabits that space; the language that society speaks; the political implications in which the place name was created; the links with other *τόποι*; the orogenic characteristics to which it refers; the legal and juridical category of the town, etc. All of this is fixed in a single name. It is, in short, an abbreviated description of a place.

An important part of a place name is its chronology. Knowing the date of creation allows us to understand other information linked to the name, such as migrations, conquests, language changes, etc. The conquest of new provincial lands of the Iberian Peninsula resulted in a process in which fresh administrative structures were developed and new towns were founded. However, it was during the Republic and Early Empire that toponymy would be recognized by Rome as a potent expression of power. In this time, we can distinguish at least four different categories concerning town naming in Hispania:

1. Maintenance of the original Latinised pre-Roman toponym was the standard procedure for most of the *civitates peregrinae* and was widely used throughout the whole Empire. This is important to us because it preserved the sociolinguistic information of the original name.
2. Maintenance of the Latinised pre-Roman toponym with the addition of a new part (a *cognomen*). This system was also widely used, especially during the Empire, with the addition of *cognomina* that indicated a juridical promotion in a very specific period of time such as Iulia, Augusta, Claudia, Flavia, Ulpia, Antonina, etc.

8 See the compendium of J. De Hoz, *Historia lingüística de la Península Ibérica en la Antigüedad. I. Prolegómenos y mundo meridional prerromano* (Madrid 2010).

9 Toponymy in pre-Roman Hispania is a well-studied topic. The latest substantial synthesis is J. Untermann et. al., eds., *Die vorrömische einheimische Toponymie des antiken Hispanien. Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum. Band VI* (Wiesbaden 2018).

3. Original Roman names given to a new foundation were also a very common phenomenon. In this category we can point to the commemorative names linked to the town's *deductores*, mainly generals of the Republic or emperors.
4. Replacement of the original name. This was not very common, but we can see several examples on the Iberian Peninsula that appeared in different scenarios and for various reasons.

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the two last categories in order to see the impact of the conquest and the Latinisation of the province of Hispania by alternating tradition and innovation. In this way, place names were an important part of the traditional structures of powers, authority and ideology. However, in a colonial situation and in periods of political changes, these structures were altered and adapted to the new regime. On some occasions, they were just incorporated into the new 'state landscape', but on others they were completely changed as part of a new policy designed to create a new geography of power. This chapter focuses particularly on the creation of commemorative place names that broke with the ancient indigenous structures to create a new structure of empire. They were established in different contexts: military situations commemorating victories and triumphs; re-foundations providing a new juridical category (sometimes as a gift, sometimes as a punishment); a process of administrative changes, etc. In this chapter, the process of (re)naming have been subdivided into three different phases (Republic, transition, and early empire) in order to show its development over time.

A question that still has to be addressed beforehand is who created these place names. Generals (*imperatores*) would have been the main actors in such decisions, but they would also have been approved by the Roman senate. This innovative action is part of the agency process of each individual. They are usually impelled to act by the situation, but the final decision is part of the deliberate choice of each. Individual agency goes together with a progressive development of the individualisation of some social classes of Roman society. It is quite remarkable that this process was not really common during the Republic, especially in the Late Republic, when political competition and private propaganda was developed in many different ways. A. Dreizehnter defined the process of naming a town with a personal name as 'unthinkable', but F. Pina Polo has already remarked that his analysis did not take into account all the cases and evidence and his conclusions failed to provide a general statement.<sup>10</sup> Agency and the development of individualism in the upper

10 A. Dreizehnter, 'Pompeius als Städtegründer', *Chiron* 5 (1975), 234; F. Pina Polo, 'Foundations of Provincial Towns as Memorials of imperatores: the Case of Hispania', in:



FIGURE 6.1 Toponyms mentioned in chapter 6

political and aristocratic classes during the Republic was the origin of this process. However, founding a town not only represented an individual honour and propaganda, but could also be extended to the whole family. That is why, even though the decision may have been taken by a single *imperator*, it must not be understood as a simple individual action, because it was determined by the genealogy and family networks in the political system during the Republic.

## 2 Commemorative Town Names in Roman Hispania

In order for a toponym to be considered a fully functional name, all four of the following criteria must be fulfilled: naming, identification, differentiation, and localisation.<sup>11</sup> As far as commemorative names are concerned, the primary function is naming, while the remaining functions are of secondary importance.

A. Díaz Fernández, ed., *Provinces and Provincial Command in Republican Rome: Genesis, Development and Governance* (Sevilla – Zaragoza 2021), 146.

<sup>11</sup> David 2011, op. cit. (n. 6), 217.

Italica is probably the first exonym used by the Romans on the Iberian Peninsula. According to Appian, this first permanent Roman settlement in southern Iberia was founded by Scipio Africanus and settled with injured soldiers from his legions.<sup>12</sup> Its symbolism lies in the fact that it was the first completely new foundation settled with Italian soldiers, although archaeology has revealed a prior pre-Roman settlement.<sup>13</sup> The name Italica was coined from the name *Italia*.<sup>14</sup> It does not refer to a single important person but even this could be considered to be the first commemorative name.

“Naming is often elevated to a highly important, even sacred status.”<sup>15</sup> The main purpose of this is to create a new reality in which the inhabitants can be identified. With this action, the Romans were making the locals aware of the new power structures. The indigenous population can be aware of the new system with the use of exonyms or a readaptation of the original names.

This naming process, which began in the third century BCE, was a common practice that gained strength in the late Republic as a way of usurping the indigenous landscape and creating a new ‘state landscape’. However, it appears to have been focused on the Iberian Peninsula and was less common in other areas. As J. David points out, this new townscape “must be created as soon as a political change occurs”.<sup>16</sup> In Hispania some early foundations, such as Valentia (138 BCE) or Pollentia (123 BCE), bear the name of Italian archaic divinities.<sup>17</sup> They also have connotations of power: Valentia means courage,

- 
- 12 App., *Iber* 7.38: καὶ αὐτοῖς ὁ Σκιπίων ὀλίγην στρατιάν ὡς ἐπὶ εἰρήνῃ καταλιπών, συνώκισε τοὺς τραυματίας ἐς πόλιν, ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας Ἰταλικὴν ἐκάλεσε: καὶ πατρὶς ἐστὶ Τραϊανοῦ τε καὶ Ἀδριανοῦ τῶν ὕστερον Ῥωμαίοις ἀρξάντων τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχήν. Translation (by Loeb Classical Library): Scipio left them a small force suitable for a peace establishment, and settled his sick and wounded soldiers in a town which he named Italica after Italy, and this was the native place of Trajan and Hadrian, who afterwards became emperors of Rome.
- 13 J.M. Luzón Nogué, *Excavaciones en Itálica: Estratigrafía en el Pajar de Artillo. (Campaña 1970)* (Madrid 1973); O. Rodríguez-Gutiérrez and F.J. García-Fernández, ‘Itálica: la fundación de Publio Cornelio Escipión Africano en el corazón de la Hispania púnica’, in: M. Bendala Galán, ed., *Los Escipiones: Roma conquista Hispania* (Madrid 2016), 223–243; J. Beltrán Torres, ‘Itálica antes de Roma’, in: J. Beltrán y J.L. Escacena, eds., *Itálica. Investigaciones arqueológicas en la Vetus Urbs* (Sevilla 2022) 281–316.
- 14 Rodríguez-Gutiérrez and García-Fernández, 2016, op. cit. (n. 13), 228–9.
- 15 David 2011, op. cit. (n. 6), 217.
- 16 David 2011, op. cit. (n. 6), 217–8: “One more function should be mentioned with regard to the act of naming: the function of mythicization. Political power uses commemorative names in an attempt to usurp the landscape. A new landscape created through names is often described as a ‘state/political landscape’”.
- 17 For Valentia, see Liv., *Per.* 55. For Pollentia, see Str., 3.5.1. Valentia was founded by Decimus Junius Brutus Callaicus (see S. España-Chamorro, “Los esquivos oppida de Brutobriga y

Pollentia could mean superiority.<sup>18</sup> The town of Pollentia was founded along with Palma by Quintus Caecilius Metellus following the latter's victory over Balearic pirates.<sup>19</sup> The commemoration of military virtue and victory was central to the foundation of Pollentia and Palma as much as of Valentia. This is strongly reflected in their names. Palma is linked to the *palma triumphalis*, the palm branches that symbolised victory and triumph.

The examples of Pollentia, Valentia, and Palma are part of a wider phenomenon of commemorative place names during the Republic and the early Roman Empire. Along these lines, we can find new foundations that bear the toponymy of personal names of generals in honour of their victories and military campaigns in Hispania (discussed below):

- Gracchuris (179 BCE) – Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus
- Caepio/Caepiana (150 BCE) – Quintus Servilius Caepio
- Brutobriga (ca. 138–133 BCE) – Decimus Junius Brutus Callaicus
- Valeria (93–92 BCE) – Caius Valerius Gracchus
- Metellinum (79 BCE) – Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius
- Pompaelo (75–74 BCE) – Cneus Pompeius Magnus
- Celsa Lepida (44 BCE) – Marcus Aemilius Lepidus
- Norba Caesarina (34 BCE) – Caius Norbanus Flaccus

There are also several *mansiones* or *castra* that follow the same line:

- Semproniana (179 BCE?) – Probably Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus
- Castra Aelia (170 BCE?) – Probably Aelius Patus<sup>20</sup>
- Castra Servilia (140–139 BCE) – Quintus Servilius Caepionis<sup>21</sup>
- Castra Caecilia, Vicus Caecilius and Caeciliana (79–76 BCE) – Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius<sup>22</sup>
- Castra Postumiana<sup>23</sup>

---

Turobriga: una propuesta sobre su ubicación y su relación con las deportaciones célticas”, *Revue des Études Anciennes* 123, no. 1 (2021), 137–170).

18 Liv., 39.7.8 speaks about a statue of the goddess Pollentia; Valentia was a divinity worshiped in Ocrinum (see *CIL* XI, 4082 “ex visu deae Valentiae”, and also Tert., *Apol.* c.24). For a linguistic discussion of those place names, see: M.J. Pena, ‘La tribu Velina en Mallorca y los nombres de Palma y Pollentia’, *Faventia* 26, no. 2 (2004), 70–1.

19 For the place names see Pena 2004, op. cit. (n. 18), 70–1. For the foundation of Palma, see Str., 3.5.1.

20 Mentioned by Liv., *fr.* 1.91.3. It is difficult to trace the origin of this name. F. Pina Polo and J. Pérez Casas, ‘El oppidum Castra Aelia y las campañas de Sertorius en los años 77–76 a.C.’, *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 11 (1998), 245–264 proposed attributing it to Quintus Aelius Paetus as governor of Hispania in 170 BCE. Even though we do not know for sure whether he was governor of this province, it seems feasible to propose him as governor and founder of this military camp.

21 Plin., *NH* 4.117.

22 Castra Caecilia: Plin., *NH* 4.117, Ptol., 2.5.8, *It. Ant.* 433.4.

23 *BHisp.* 8.6.



All these toponyms played a part in the creation of the Iberian provinces and the establishment of this new reality. It is a commemorative topography described as impersonal, cold and onymically sterile, being unrelated to the past and culture of the region.<sup>24</sup> Instead, this new situation is a mythical construction that helps the political power create a new myth and adapt history to suit its ideological interpretation. Commemorative town names express a new form of control and a particular political power. The evolution of these names can be divided into three phases that explain how the phenomenon evolved.

### 3 First Phase: the Conquest of Hispania during the Republic

The first stage of the developing process of commemorative names began with Gracchuris. Inspired by Hellenistic models of naming, such as Philippi, Philippopolis or the multiple Alexandria, several governors named towns after themselves as a form of commemoration and self-representation. It was a social process in which generals developed a special individualisation, but also with the permission of the senate.

Gracchuris was founded on the site of a pre-Roman town. Festus tells us the previous name was Ilurcis. Gracchuris seems to be the first commemorative place name of its type and is also very controversial in linguistic terms. The suffix *-is* undoubtedly expresses a pre-Roman origin.<sup>25</sup> It is difficult to determine whether the linguistic origin of Ilurcis is the Vasconic or Iberian language.<sup>26</sup> However, the name Gracchurris undoubtedly uses the Vasconic toponymic suffix *-urri*, which signifies 'town'. F. Pina Polo rightly points out that this kind of commemorative town was populated by defeated people transferred by order of the founder to the new *civitas peregrina*.<sup>27</sup> He also proposed that the people transferred to Gracchurris were probably Celtiberians. However, this town was in Vasconian territory and F. Villar reminds us that the Iberian stratum of the first toponym was erased.<sup>28</sup> A possible readaptation would be Iligracco or something similar (*ili-* means town in Iberian). The sense of using *-urri* instead of *ili-* probably means that the defeated population transferred there spoke a

24 David 2011, op. cit. (n. 6), 218.

25 Paul. Fest., 97M: *Gracchuris urbs Hiberiae regiones, dicta a Graccho Sempronio, quae antea Ilurcis nominabatur*.

26 See F. Villar Liébana, *Indoeuropeos y no indoeuropeos en la Hispania prerromana* (Salamanca 2000), 259–262, 282–284, 287–289, 314, 383–384, 392, 405; J.L. García Alonso, *La península ibérica en la Geografía de Claudio Ptolomeo* (Vitoria 2003), 124; J.A. Correa Rodríguez, *Toponimia Antigua de Andalucía* (Sevilla 2016), 392–393.

27 Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10), 147 and 153.

28 Villar Liébana, 2000, op. cit. (n. 26), 194–5.

Vasconic and not an Iberian (or Celtiberian) language. Another possibility is that both populations were resettled in this Vasconic area after the war, as punishment in the case of the Celtiberians (as defeated enemies) and as reward for the Vascones (as allies). In his *Periochae*, Livy tells us that Gracchuris was founded as a symbol of victory after the war and as a monument to his triumph.<sup>29</sup> Its naming set in motion the process of commemoration by creating town names. Generals adapted their personal names, sometimes with palaeo-Hispanic suffixes and prefixes to demonstrate to the local population that settlements were not merely ephemeral, but actual towns. The use of palaeo-Hispanic suffixes and prefixes was also a means of reappropriating the language, the place and the indigenous culture.

Caepio has been associated with Quintus Servilius Caepius.<sup>30</sup> There is neither epigraphic evidence nor any classical sources that tell us where it was. It has been linked to the Caepiana mentioned by Ptolemy that was located between the Rivers Tagus and Sado, not far from the ocean, although there is no consistent proof of its location.<sup>31</sup> Ptolemy described the town in the list of *Celtici* living in Lusitania, although its name is not Celtic, but Latin.<sup>32</sup> In Latin a personal name and the suffix *-ana(s)* refers to possession and there is another example with Calpurniana. For Caepio, however, there is no reason to believe that Caepius had possessions in Lusitania at this early time. L. Silva Reneses, following F. Cadiou, rejected A. Schulten's theory of a military origin like *Castra Caepiana*, because such *castra* as a rule took the general's *nomen* rather than his *cognomen*.<sup>33</sup> Possibly, Caepio/Caepiana was a Latin foundation of a settlement in the Celti territory in Lusitania, which may have been linked to another process of deportation of defeated populations.<sup>34</sup>

29 Liv., *Per.* 40.50.

30 App., *Hisp.* 75, Diod., *Sic.* 33.1.4.

31 Ptol., 2.5.5; with L. Silva Reneses, 'Embajadas, rendiciones y tratados: los traslados de ligures apuanos y lusitanos (s. II a. C.); *Ktèma* 41 (2016), 196; A. Guerra, 'Caepiana: uma reavaliação crítica do problema da sua localização e enquadramento histórico', *Revista Portuguesa do Arqueologia* 7 (2004), 217–235 proposed to place it in Chibanes (PT).

32 García Alonso 2003, op. cit. (n. 26), 46, 96, 444.

33 A. Schulten, 'Las guerras de 154–72 a. C.', in: *Fontes Hispaniae antiquae* vol. 4 (Barcelona 1937) Barcelona, 123; F. Cadiou, *Hibera in terra miles: les armées romaines et la conquête de l'Hispanie sous la République (218–45 av. J.-C.)* (Madrid 2008), 284–286.

34 R. Knapp, *Aspects of the Roman Experience in Iberia, 206–100 B.C.* (Valladolid 1977), 148; F. Pina Polo, 'Deportaciones como castigo e instrumento de colonización durante la República romana: el caso de Hispania', in: J. Remesal Rodríguez et al., eds., *Vivir en tierra extraña: emigración e integración cultural en el mundo antiguo: actas de la reunión realizada en Zaragoza los días 2 y 3 de junio de 2003* (Barcelona 2004), 230; F. Pina Polo, 'Deportación of indigenous population as a strategy for Roman dominion in Hispania', in: *Línes XX. XX*

According to Appian and Diodorus, the town of Brutobriga was founded by Brutus to settle the remnants of the defeated troops of Viriathus and Tautamus at the end of the Lusitanian Wars.<sup>35</sup> The message of its foundation was one of conquest and one of tolerance: its commemorative name reminded the new inhabitants of the general who had defeated them; the bestowal of lands expressed *clementia*. Again, the indigenous suffix *-briga* was taken from the Celtic or Celtiberian language and is an indication of a *civitas peregrina*. Much like Gracchuris, it may also have been a nod to the pre-Roman origin of the population. We do not know the exact location of the town.<sup>36</sup>

Valeria was founded after Flaccus' victory and suppression of the Celtiberian revolt.<sup>37</sup> Archaeology has revealed that a Celtiberian settlement was there before 90 BCE and there is proof that this *oppidum* would have borne an indigenous name.<sup>38</sup> Some researchers have associated it with Althaea, the capital of the Olcades (a Celtiberian people), yet definitive evidence is lacking.<sup>39</sup> Nevertheless, we are probably witnessing a replacement of the previous name with a commemorative Latin toponym, again after a victory over the Celtiberians. In this case the name is purely Latin, without any palaeo-Hispanic addition.

Metellinum is another case of an indigenous settlement obliterated by a new Roman town with a Latin name. Archaeology and numismatics have revealed that Conisturgis was the ancient name of the oppidum where Metellus founded Metellinum, the suffix *-urgis* definitely pointing to a Turdetanian origin.<sup>40</sup> Metellinum and the other military *castra* were founded as a line of defence against attacks during the Lusitanian war, but only Metellinum became a town. The refoundation deliberately used the Latin form without an indigenous suffix (e.g. Metellinurgis) as in the case of Valeria.

---

*Congreso Internacional de Estudios sobre la Frontera Romana I* (Madrid 2009), 282; Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10), 152.

35 App., *Iber.* 44 = *Hist. Rom.* VI, Diod., 33.1.4. Also see Steph. Byz., *Ethnika*, B187.1.

36 My proposal in *España-Chamorro* 2021, op. cit. (n. 17), 137–170.

37 Plin., *NH* 3.25. Knapp 1977, op. cit. (n. 34), 20, proposed that Flaccus could have become the patron of Valeria and that this is why the inhabitants named the town after him. Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10), 160 disagrees: "Is it realistic to assume that the local people who had been defeated and transplanted to another place were willing to honour the man who had crushed them? Is it not more plausible to think that the triumphator wished to enhance his glory and renown by linking his victory to a city bearing his name?"

38 E. Gozalbes Cravioto, 'Una introducción: entre Valeria y Valeria', in: E. Gozalbes Cravioto, ed., *La ciudad romana de Valeria (Cuenca)* (Cuenca 2009), 13–36.

39 G. Carrasco Serrano, *Los pueblos prerromanos en Castilla-La Mancha* (Cuenca 2007), 96.

40 M. Almagro Gorbea, 'Medellín-Conisturgis. Reinterpretación geográfica del Suroeste de Iberia', *Boletim da Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa* 126 (2008), 84–115; See Villar Liébana, 2000, op. cit. (n. 26), 259–262, 282–284, 287–289, 314, 383–384, 392, 405; García Alonso 2003, op. cit. (n. 26), 124; Correa Rodríguez 2016, op. cit. (n. 26), 392–393.

Pompaelo was founded by Pompey the Great after the Sertorian Wars as a way of reinforcing the power of the *optimates*.<sup>41</sup> The town was important as a mid-point between the Ebro Valley and Aquitania.<sup>42</sup> There is no information in the literary sources about a previous name or any archaeological proof of a pre-Pompeian settlement on the site. However, it is considered the most important town of the Vascones.<sup>43</sup> The linguistic interpretation is not conclusive. As a Latin name it appears unnatural, and it can be hypothesised that the final part of the word (*-elo*) derives from *-ili*, an ancient form of the Vasconic suffix *-iri/-uri* (= town).<sup>44</sup> This town was part of a major project in the Pyrenees, together with Gerunda (Girona, Spain) and Lugdunum Convenarum (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, France) in Aquitania. However, Pompaelo was the only town that took the name of the *deductor*. This could mean that it was the most important element in the Pompeian plan, a new foundation, which is why he decided to give it his own name. The town also symbolised control of the Pyrenees, for which Pompey also built a trophy monument on the summit of the mountain.<sup>45</sup> It is no coincidence that, at the beginning of the Empire, Augustus reappropriated the symbolic control of the mountains and built his own trophy monument at Lugdunum Convenarum.<sup>46</sup>

For all of the towns mentioned so far, F. Pina Polo has demonstrated they were founded after a victory over a people and that all of them were partly settled with *populi* deported from other places:<sup>47</sup>

- 
- 41 Str., 3.4.10. appears to state this, calling the city Pompeiopolis instead. Most authors, except A.M. Canto, 'La tierra del toro. Ensayo de identificación de ciudades vasconas', *Archivo Español de Arqueología* 70 (1997), 31–70, agree with this interpretation. About the name, see Plut., *Sert.* 21.8.
- 42 F. Beltrán Lloris and F. Pina Polo, 'Roma y los Pirineos: la formación de una frontera', *Chiron* 24 (1994), 103–133.
- 43 Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10), 157 based on Str., 3.4.10.
- 44 García Alonso 2003, op. cit. (n. 26), 288.
- 45 Beltrán Lloris and Pina Polo 1994, op. cit. (n. 42), 113–5; J. Arce, 'Los trofeos de Pompeyo «In Pyrenaei Iugis»', *Archivo Español De Arqueología* 67 (1994), 261–268.
- 46 J.-L. Schenck-David, 'Le trophée de Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: nouvelles hypothèses sur son agencement et sa place dans la ville antique', *Mémoires de marbre et d'airain, monuments et monnaies antiques* (Perpignan 2004), 41–50. See also E.S. Ramage, 'Augustus' Propaganda in Gaul', *Klio* 79, no. 1 (1997) 117–60. For Roman symbolic expressions of control in the landscape in the age of Augustus, also see Betjes in this volume.
- 47 Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10). Although based on data from this work (amongst others), the table is my own.

Town	Origin	Deported populi
Gracchuris	Iberians (?)	Celtiberians/Vascones (?)
Caepio	Celts (?)	Lusitani (?)
Brutobriga	Celts or Celtiberians	Lusitani/Callaeci (?)
Valeria	Celtiberians	Celtiberians
Metellinum	Turdetani	Lusitani (?)
Pompaelo	Vascones	Vettones/Celtiberians (?)

In fact, commemorative names were a way of punishing the deported inhabitants by depriving them of an indigenous identity linked to their landscape and language. With the destruction of the indigenous communities' political memory, they were no longer inhabitants of Ilurcis, Conisturgis or other towns, but of a restructured society belonging to the Roman Republic. Gracchuris, Caepio, and Brutobriga were the first, almost anecdotic, commemorative foundations, together with other towns founded to mark a victory but with other kinds of place names such as Valentia, Palma and Pollentia. During the first century BCE, the number of commemorative foundations increased significantly. It is very difficult to determine why some generals used palaeo-Hispanic suffixes and prefixes, while others did not. Perhaps it was a personal choice of each general, as part of his human agency. But it is also linked to the ultimate purpose of the political programme, which envisioned the future plan for the region. It probably had to do with the creation of a link between the indigenous populations that lived in the towns or the erasure of their ethnic past.

Regarding *castra*, these would receive commemorative names from the mid-second century BCE onwards. These were not commemorative towns as such, but a sort of commemorative military camp taking the name of an important general. The difference is that most of these *castra* had a short life, which does not allow for a real propaganda plan with these place names. For example, we have several examples in the Iberian peninsula such as Castra Caecilia, Castra Aelia, Castra Servilia and Castra Postumiana.<sup>48</sup>

48 Following Pina Polo 2021, op. cit. (n. 10), 146 n. 4, Castra Caecilia (Plin., *NH* 4.117, Ptol., 2.5.8, *It. Ant.* 433.4); Castra Aelia (Liv., *fr.* 91.3); Castra Servilia (Plin., *NH* 4.117); and Castra Postumiana (*BHisp.* 8).

#### 4 Second Phase: Preparing for the Empire?

A new model of commemorative names arose during the Late Republic. This is first of all attested by the case of Celsa Lepida. This was a very important Iberian town called *Kelse* that had ensured Pompey's dominance of the valley during the civil wars. Lepidus, twice governor of Hispania Citerior (48–47 BCE and 44–42 BCE), already knew the topography of this region. That is why he founded a colony here to punish the inhabitants for their support of Pompey. It was given the name of *colonia Iulia Victrix Lepida*, which erased the indigenous name. This is another example of a commemorative name for a town founded after a war (probably in 48–47 BCE when Caesar was still alive and some months after the Battle of Ilerda, during the civil wars). Here we can observe a different procedure: the indigenous name was erased, but the commemorative names were added as *cognomina*. It was also the first town in Hispania to bear *cognomina* of two different people. In fact, the *deductor* was Lepidus, who gave his name as the main name of the town while the *cognomina* *Victrix* and *Iulia* referred to the Battle of Ilerda and Caesar respectively.<sup>49</sup> When Lepidus lost his triumphal powers in 36 BCE, the indigenous name was recovered and it became the *colonia Iulia Victrix Celsa*. These particularities would have been related to a specific moment of political change, the new Roman administrative policy on the Iberian Peninsula and the town's juridical category as a Roman colony of veterans.

Then there is Norba Caesarina, founded in 33 BCE by Norbanus Flaccus as a commemoration of his triumph *ex Hispaniae* in 34 BCE.<sup>50</sup> Archaeology has not provided any proof of a pre-Roman settlement at this place and the name does not reveal any aspect of a previous origin.<sup>51</sup> It may therefore be assumed that this Roman colony was founded *ex novo*. The use of Caesarina is peculiar because other *coloniae* or *municipia* founded by Caesar or Augustus frequently bore the *cognomen* *Iulia* with the single exception of Asido Caesarina, in Baetica. This has been understood as a previously unfinished project of Caesar

49 M.P. García-Bellido, 'La historia de la colonia Lepida-Celsa según sus documentos numismáticos: su ceca imperial', *Archivo Español De Arqueología* 76 (187–188) (2013), 275–6. Plin., *NH* 3.24, quotes the people of Celsa as a Roman colony.

50 Old theories suggested that the name came originally from the veterans (the colony of Norba, in Italy), but there is no proof of this. See the historical discussion in A. García y Bellido, 'Del carácter militar activo de las colonias romanas de la Lusitania y regiones inmediatas', *Trabalhos De Antropologia E Etnologia* 17 (1959), 299–304.

51 It has only been supposed a *contributio* with castra Caecilia and castra Servilia (following Plin., *NH* 4.17).

that was materialised by Augustus.<sup>52</sup> The name Norba is on the same line as Celsa: the *nomen* was taken from the *deductor* but the *cognomen* referred to Caesar. In this case, no palaeo-Hispanic element can be identified in the name. Norba and Celsa began a new process in the use of commemorative names. This can be considered as a period of transition for this model in which the *deductor* was included in the name together with other cognomina. There is not only the name of the emperor who founded the town, but also Roman generals acting in the name of the great men of the Late Republic, in fact Julius Caesar, added a cognomen referring to him. The agency of this act was still present in the naming action, but the subordination to the *triumviri* motivated the addition of the *cognomen*.

Under Caesar, and later Augustus, the use of personal names changed drastically due to the political evolution of the Iberian Peninsula.<sup>53</sup> The beginning of a new model of administration with radical changes in the provincial structures and the juridical categories of towns led to various scenarios regarding toponymy.<sup>54</sup> For example, the pattern that we saw for Gracchurris or Brutobriga also appeared for some Caesarean or Augustan *civitates peregrinae*, e.g. Augustobriga, Caesarobriga or Iuliobriga. Again, these commemorative toponyms have the indigenous suffix *-briga*. In a previous article I have proposed that Augustobriga and Caesarobriga renamed former towns, such as the already known Brutobriga and Turobriga, which would have continued the process of erasing and replacing the former names.<sup>55</sup>

The general plan for the juridical promotion of towns began with Caesar and continued under Augustus.<sup>56</sup> When the towns were founded or re-founded as Roman colonies during this period, they did not use this system of personal names as the main name, but they added a particular *cognomen*. This was also a commemorative act not only of a military triumph in some cases, but also as a mark of their promotion. This is perfectly visible in the names of *coloniae* and *municipia* bearing the *cognomina* Iulia or Augusta. We can only note two specific cases in which the part of the name was not a simple *cognomen*, but the main *nomen*:

52 This theory, already proposed by García y Bellido 1959, op. cit. (n. 50), was later revisited, but no other conclusions were reached.

53 E.S. Ramage, 'Augustus' propaganda in Spain', *Klio* 80 (1998), 434–490, 440.

54 España-Chamorro 2021, op. cit. (n. 7).

55 España-Chamorro 2021, op. cit. (n. 17), 137–170.

56 Ramage 1998, op. cit. (n. 53), 440; González and J.C. Saquete, eds., *Colonias de César y Augusto en la Andalucía romana* (Rome 2011).

- Caesaraugusta did not reuse any aspect of its indigenous name Salduvie, which has been recorded by Pliny.<sup>57</sup> The change occurred when Augustus decided to establish this colony and to give it his name.<sup>58</sup> P. Le Roux has recently pointed out that the original name should be used instead of Caesarea Augusta.<sup>59</sup>
- It is unclear if a previous settlement underlay Augusta Emerita, yet we know that the colony took over some parts of the territories of Dipo and Metellinum.<sup>60</sup> Emerita was a foundation that commemorated the victory in the Cantabrian Wars at some time between 16 and 13 BCE, at the time of Augustus' third journey to the Iberian Peninsula, reminding us of similar commemorative place names of the Republic.<sup>61</sup> P. Le Roux also indicated that, in the absence of a local name such as Ammaedara or Auenticum, Emerita became the main name, like Caesaraugusta.<sup>62</sup>

After Caesar and Augustus we can find very few cases of toponyms related to emperors on the Iberian Peninsula. Even though they are outside the period studied in this paper, it is worth mentioning them briefly. From the time of Claudius we have the cases of Baelo Claudia and Claudionerium, from that of Galba the promotion of Clunia to *colonia* Sulpicia, some towns in the north, such as Flaviobriga and Flavionavia under the Flavian dynasty, and finally, under Hadrian we have *colonia* Iulia Aelia Italica.

- 
- 57 Plin., *NH* 3.24. There is little evidence of the pre-Roman settlement (M. Beltrán Lloris, 'Topografía y evolución urbana', in: F. Beltrán Lloris, ed., *Zaragoza. Colonia Caesar Augusta, Ciudades romanas de Hispania. Las capitales provinciales* (Rome 2007), 29–31.). This has allowed P. Le Roux, 'Colonia Caesaraugusta (CCA). Construire un nom', *PRO MERITO LABORVM. Miscellanea epigrafica per Gianfranco Paci* (Tivoli 2021), 341–56, to affirm that there is no evidence of the pre-Roman town on the same site as Caesaraugusta. Regarding the evolution from one to the other, see F. Pina Polo, 'De la ciudad indígena Salduie-Salduvia a la colonia romana Caesar Augusta', *Gerión* 35 (2017), 541–550.
- 58 F. Beltrán Lloris, 'Caesar Augusta, ciudad de Augusto', *Caesaraugusta* 69 (1992), 31–44.
- 59 Le Roux 2021 op. cit. (n. 57), 341–56.
- 60 M. Almagro-Gorbea et al., 'Dipo: ciudad "tartésico-turdetana" en el valle del Guadiana', *Conimbriga* 48 (2009), 17; F.G. Rodríguez Martín, 'Reflexiones en torno a la elección del solar de Augusta Emerita: Diacronía en la vertebración del territorio', in: J.G. Gorges and T. Nogales Basarre, eds., *Origen de la Lusitania Romana (s. I a.C.–Id.C.): VII Mesa Redonda Internacional sobre la Lusitania Romana* (Mérida 2010), 128 ff.
- 61 This theory has been widely accepted by most scholars. It was proposed by P. Le Roux, *L'armée romaine et l'organisation des provinces ibériques d'Auguste à l'invasion de 409* (Paris 1982), 54–57, 75 n. 316. See also J.M. Abascal Palazón, 'Los tres viajes de Augusto a Hispania y su relación con la promoción jurídica de ciudades', *Iberia* 9 (2006), 63–78.
- 62 P. Le Roux, 'Colonia Emerita', *Anas* 25–26 (2012–2013), 297–304.



## 5 Third Phase: Replacing Names with No Commemoration

### 5.1 *Citerior*

There are also several ‘strange’ cases of name coexistence that cannot be connected to commemorative names. We have evidence from literary sources, coins and inscriptions from other towns that allows us to see a twin name for these places. This particularity appears to be concentrated in Hispania Citerior, with most of the cases in the north-eastern part of the province:

- Arse = Saguntum
- Cesse = Tarraco
- Untikesken = Emporiae
- Hibera Ilercavonia = Dertosa
- Beibum = Salacia
- Bolskan = Osca
- Paemeiobirga = Interamnium Flavium

Why did all these towns change such an important element of identity as the main name? In the case of Arse(sken)/Saguntum, it appears to have been a dual name as both are documented in sources from the fifth–fourth century BCE.<sup>63</sup> The first toponym is reflected in the palaeo-Hispanic script on the coin legends from the fourth to the first centuries BCE and Ptolemy appears to be the only classical author who cites it as “Ἀρσι”.<sup>64</sup> The form Saguntum is mentioned on the famous lead from Ampurias dated to the fifth century BCE as Σαιργάνθη, which may be the first indication of such a name.<sup>65</sup> Mentions in a similar form are not found until the second century BCE, when variations of Saguntum appear in other epigraphic and literary sources (from Polybius onwards).<sup>66</sup> Arse was linked with the town and Saguntum with the port, which was better known on the trade networks. The predominance and perpetuation of Saguntum was probably motivated by the Romanophile part of the population and the fact that this name was better known than that of Arse.<sup>67</sup>

63 See the recent approach by M.J. Estarán Tolosa, ‘Arse-Saguntum, la ciudad de los dos nombres’, *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 27, no. 1 (2021), 109–132.

64 Ptol., 2.6.62.

65 R.A. Santiago, ‘En torno a los nombres antiguos de Sagunto’, *Saguntum* 23 (1990), 123–140; R.A. Santiago, ‘Enigmas en torno a Saguntum y Roda’, *Faventia* 16/2 (1994), 51–64; M.P. De Hoz, *Inscripciones griegas de España y Portugal* (Madrid 2014), 129.

66 Such as Ζάκανθα, Ζάκυνθος, Σάγουντον, Σάγουντον. See all the sources in Estarán Tolosa 2021, op. cit. (n. 63).

67 Estarán Tolosa 2021, op. cit. (n. 63), 126–7.

The same seems to be true of the names Cesse/Tarraco. Both are documented in Livy and on the coins dated before 211 BCE.<sup>68</sup> Pliny defined Tarraco as *Scipionum opus* and its non-Latin name reveals an indigenous origin confirmed by archaeology. The name Cesse disappeared at the end of the Republic.<sup>69</sup> Again, we are dealing with the problem of a double indigenous name that has been linked to a *dipolis*. Maybe, this was a similar case as Saguntum: the name Tarraco turned out to be more famous and popular than Cesse, thus leading to the latter's disappearance.

Coinage allows us to see the twin name of Emporiae and Untikesken. The latter has been identified with the indigenous Indigetan town Indika.<sup>70</sup> This ethnic name has an Iberian origin and appeared between the first half of the second century BCE until the time of Augustus.<sup>71</sup> This double name seems to have been the differentiation of a *dipolis* like Tarraco and disappeared with the foundation of the Roman colony.

In all these double name processes, we can see that this affects to two different groups of pre-Roman names on coins: those with a town name (Cesse and Salduie) and those with an ethnic name (Untikesken and Arsesken).<sup>72</sup>

The importance of these three towns in Iberian times due to their geographical situation is undeniable. They actively helped the Romans in their conquest, which makes it unlikely that the name was changed as a form of punishment. There are doubts and hypotheses about the acquisition of their new toponyms that have alluded to different reasons. They include the creation of *dipoleis* with different legal statuses (one Iberian, one Roman), a name change linked to a legal promotion, or an unchangeable use of both names as the official toponymy. This contrasts with an apparent absence of toponymic changes in Italy, but corresponds to similar processes in Gaul and Africa.<sup>73</sup>

68 Cesse/Cissa/Kissa: Liv., 21.60. Tarrakon/Tarraco: Liv., 22.22, 26.5. L. Villaronga, 'Uso de la ceca de Emporion por los romanos para cubrir sus necesidades financieras en la Península Ibérica durante la Segunda Guerra Púnica', *Studi per Laura Breglia, Suppl. Bolletino di Numismatica* 4 (1984), 209–214; J. Ruiz de Arbulo, 'Kesse/Tarrákon/Tarraco. En torno a los orígenes de una ciudad portuaria', in: L. Mercuri et al., eds., *Implantations humaines en milieu littoral méditerranéen: facteurs d'installation et processus d'appropriation de l'espace* (Antibes 2014), 166.

69 Plin., *NH* 3.21. Also see «Tarraco» (s.v.), in: M.P. García-Bellido and C. Blázquez Cerrato, *Diccionario de las cecas y pueblos hispánicos (DCyPH)* (Madrid 2001, vol. 2), 361–2.

70 Steph. Byz., 146.

71 «U.n.ti.ke.s.ke.n» (s.v.), *DCyPH*, 387.

72 P.P. Ripollès, 'Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces: Spain', in: C. Howgego et al., eds., *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces* (Oxford 2005), 82.

73 Liv., 23.26–28; Ramage 1997, op. cit. (n. 46); E.S. Ramage, 'Augustus' propaganda in Africa', *Klio* 82, no. 1 (2000), 171–207.

There are other difficult cases with double names in Hispania Citerior. Hibera is also known as *municipium* Hibera Iulia Ilercavonia judging by the coins from the end of the Augustan period.<sup>74</sup> However, the coins from the Tiberian era added the third *nomen* Dertosa, which also appears in our literary sources and inscriptions.<sup>75</sup> Hibera, Ilercavonia, and Dertosa are each palaeo-Hispanic names, which makes it difficult to make sense of this. One solution that has been proposed is the theory of a twin town (*dipolis*) on each bank of the river, although there is no archaeological proof of this.<sup>76</sup> Another hypothesis is a transferred population that brought with them the name of their place of origin, as in the case of Arucci-Turobriga.

More obscure is the case of Salacia Imperatoria.<sup>77</sup> In the first bilingual coin emissions, it appears to express the indigenous place name Bevibum, but the complexity of its reading (in an unknown script and language) has led to different name proposals (+betovibon, +cantnipo, ++vibum(n) and the most accepted +bevibum).<sup>78</sup> The circumstances concerning the abrupt change and origin of this toponym are entirely unknown to us.

In the case of Paemeiobriga, the name appears to mean “between the rivers”, which is why it has been connected to Interamnium Flavium, which is a literal translation of its name. No sources refer to this change and it appears to be the only literal translation of a place name from a palaeo-Hispanic language into Latin.<sup>79</sup> Unfortunately, we have no evidence on the causes or purposes.<sup>80</sup>

## 5.2 *Ulterior*

The most exceptional case is that of Corduba: the capital of the province of Hispania Ulterior during the Republic, and the capital of Baetica after the subdivision. Its placename with the suffix in *-uba*, as well as the archaeological

74 *RPC* i, 205–6.

75 Literary sources: Plin., *NH* 3.23, Str., 3.4.6, Mela, 2.90, *It. Ant.* 304.2, 342.9. Epigraphy: *CIL* II, 4062.

76 J. Diloli, ‘Hibera Iulia Ilercavonia-Dertosa: l’assentament ibèric i la implantació de la ciutat romana’, *Butlletí Arqueològic, època V*, 18 (1996), 60–61; R. Járrega Domínguez, ‘Tarraco Scipionum Opus. ¿Escipión Emiliano fundador de Tarraco?’, *Butlletí Arqueològic* 26 (2004), 26.

77 Plin., *NH* 4.116.

78 «Salacia» (s.v.), *DCyPH*, 333.

79 We can see another example of a literal translation from Punic to Latin: Qart Hadasht = Carthago Nova. Le Roux 2021, op. cit. (n. 57), 347 n. 20.

80 This place name identified in the area that the *tessera Paemeiobrigensis* (*HEp* 7, 1997, 378 = *HEp* 2013, 285) was found (see the edition of Ptolemy by K. Müller 1883–1900 and also A. Schulten, ‘Interamnia Flavia’, *RE* IX, 1603) due to the description of the Antonine Itinerary (429.3; 431.2).

evidence at the site of Colina de los Quemados, confirms a Turdetanian origin.<sup>81</sup> Corduba was one of the most important of Pompey's towns during the civil war. It was re-founded as *colonia* Patricia probably with Marcellus expunging the pre-Roman name at the beginning of the Empire, as we can see on its Augustan-period coins.<sup>82</sup> Again, it seems to be another commemorative name celebrating a victory after the Civil War. However, we have to consider the actual impact of this name change. We have some documents, such as a bronze tablet (*tabula hospitii*) from Cañete de las Torres dated to 34 CE that quotes a *collegium Patriciensium Cordubensium*, and an inscription from Narbo of the first century CE that refers to a *mercator [Cor]dubensis*, that speak of Corduba and not (only) Patricia.<sup>83</sup>

We can also see a diverse use of toponymy on the coinage and epigraphy of the towns of Hispania Ulterior. The colonies of Urso and Ucubi, as well as Hispalis and Astigi, were re-founded as Roman colonies under Caesar or Augustus and *nomina* or *cognomina* were added to all of them.<sup>84</sup>

One of the most exceptional cases on the Iberian Peninsula can also be seen in the south. A *tabula aenea* tells us that an unknown town (probably in Baetica) changed its name voluntarily: *Martienses qui antea Ugienses* ("the town of Martia, which was formerly known as Ugia").<sup>85</sup> This *hapax* shows the re-territorialisation process by which a town, whose original name is clearly Turdetanian, decides to change it, and therefore its historical identity, in favour of a Latin name possibly linked to the god Mars. The reasons for this change are unknown, although it has been linked to a promotion in its legal status.<sup>86</sup>

81 Correa Rodríguez 2016, op. cit. (n. 26), 285–287; J.M. Luzón Nogué and D. Ruiz Mata, *Las raíces de Córdoba. Estratigrafía de la Colina de los Quemados* (Córdoba 1973).

82 *RPC* i 127–131; A. Canto 'Algo más sobre Marcelo, Corduba y las Colonias Romanas del año 45 a.C.', *Gerión* 15 (1997), 253–282.

83 *Tabula hospitii CIL* II<sup>2</sup> 7,187; Inscription from Narbo, *AE* 1916,41.

84 This was also studied by Ramage 1998, op. cit. (n. 53), 444–5. He proposed that: "By combining the Julian, Caesarian, and Augustan names with native places and tribes the emperor was in a sense promoting and perhaps even announcing an alliance between Roman and Spaniard rather than complete defeat for the natives at the hands of a foreign invader".

85 *ERAE* 94 = *AE* 1952, 49 = *HAE* 546 = *EJER* 18.

86 B. Díaz Ariño, 'Pactos entre ciudades, un rasgo peculiar del Hospitium hispánico', in: F. Beltrán Lloris, ed., *Antiqua iuniora: en torno al Mediterráneo en la antigüedad* (Zaragoza 2004), 101–102.

## 6 Conclusions

A place name is undoubtedly a process of self-identity. As a general rule, names evoke the characteristics referring to that place. This chapter has focussed on renaming places as part of the Roman re-territorialisation of the Iberian Peninsula. The phenomenon of renaming meant to 're-construct' a town, 're-adapting' it to the new situation and 're-orienting' it to new purposes. The de-territorialisation and re-territorialisation processes favour this break with such a long-lasting element of the landscape as toponyms were. Renaming processes can be considered as creating a frontier between a selected past and a desired future by destroying referential self-identification of the indigenous community who lived in that town. We can affirm that toponymy was a very powerful ideological weapon for de-territorialising the population of the Iberian Peninsula during the conquest which led to the destruction of the indigenous communities' political memory and traditional structures and created a new topography of power.

The agents of these names were the *imperatores* with the approval of the Roman senate. However, as I said in the introduction, a real agency of these actions must be rethought. Even if these was an action from an individual, in fact, these actions were part of a political process that included Roman aristocratic families in the competition for ruling.

We have seen that these renaming processes were influenced in some cases by a pre-existing indigenous terminology and its adaptation to Latin. In other cases, a name was completely expunged as a new one was created for political purposes. All these changes definitely had an impact on the historical and cultural identity of these pre-Roman societies and, in most cases, on the reformulation of traditional power structures.

## Acknowledgements

This research is based on my postdoctoral project Marie Skłodowska-Curie Individual Fellowship (*IMPACTVM. Mapping the impact of the Augustan colonies on the Early Roman Empire*, Grant Agreement n° 101025799) at the Sapienza Università di Roma. I have received financial support from my previous postdoctoral project at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (*RomAFRICA II – Programa de Atracción de Talento (2020-T2/HUM-19810)*). This research is also included in the Grupo de investigación 'Arqueología Africana' (UCM-971713).