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The foundation of cities bearing the name of their founder was a well-known phenomenon during the Roman Empire. Augustus was especially active in this respect, particularly in Hispania, where a large number of new foundations was scattered throughout its territory, coinciding with the final conquest of the Iberian Peninsula: Caesar Augusta, Emerita Augusta, Lucus Augusti, Bracara Augusta, Pax Iulia, Iuliobriga. Giving the name of its founder to a new town was much more infrequent during the Republic, but some examples are known. In the 60s, Cn. Pompeius Magnus founded Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia, and re-founded Soloi-Pompeiopolis in Cilicia and Magnopolis in the Pontos, in the context of Pompeius’ efforts to be recognised as a new Alexander during his campaigns in the East[[1]](#footnote-2). In Hispania, after Caesar’s assassination the triumvir Lepidus founded Colonia Victrix Iulia Lepida in the Ebro valley in 43 and Caius Norbanus Flaccus founded Colonia Norba Caesarina (today Cáceres in Extremadura) in 34. Both were Roman colonies. All in all, the Republican period, in which competition within the ruling Roman aristocracy was always an important feature of identity of the political system, does not seem to have favoured the practice of giving the names of *imperatores* to new cities, which undeniably represented a honour that put the public spotlight on the founder and his family, not only within contemporary Roman society but also for the future[[2]](#footnote-3).

It is therefore striking that, with the exception of the colony Aquae Sextiae (today Aix-en-Provence) in Transalpine Gaul, established by C. Sextius Calvinus in 122[[3]](#footnote-4), and the aforementioned foundations of Pompeius in the East, Hispania is the only province where we find towns founded by Roman *imperatores*, in the second century and first decades of the first century, whose names were taken from their founders: Gracchuris, possibly Caepiana, Brutobriga, Valeria, Metellinum and Pompelo[[4]](#footnote-5). In most cases we have only meagre information about them beyond the fact that they existed, and sometimes the date of foundation and/or the location are merely conjectural. Even the founder is debatable. Yet they form quite a homogeneous ensemble, sharing similar circumstances of foundation. Analysing these features is the main purpose of this paper, with the ultimate objective of reflecting on the prerogatives of provincial governors.

Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, the father of the tribunes of the plebs, was the governor of Hispania Citerior in 180-178. During his command in the province, Gracchus conquered cities and defeated a coalition of Celtiberians, presumably in the region around the mountain now called Moncayo (Mons Chaunus) in the Ebro valley. According to Livy, thousands of Celtiberians were killed and many cities surrendered[[5]](#footnote-6). Upon his return Gracchus celebrated a splendid triumph, and 40,000 pounds of silver were borne in the procession[[6]](#footnote-7). The government of Gracchus in Hispania Citerior had the novelty of signing treaties with the Celtiberians, in which conditions about the recruitment of auxiliary troops and the payment of war indemnities were included[[7]](#footnote-8). In connection with these treaties, Appian asserts that Gracchus distributed land among local people[[8]](#footnote-9). The *Periochae* of Livy are, however, more specific: after defeating the Celtiberians and accepting their surrender, Gracchus founded a new city (*oppidum*) of name Gracchuris[[9]](#footnote-10). According to Festus, an indigenous town with the name Ilucis previously existed where Gracchuris was founded[[10]](#footnote-11). The town is located on the banks of the river Ebro, at the current Alfaro in La Rioja[[11]](#footnote-12). The ancient name of the town is obviously composed of the *cognomen* of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus in its first part, and perhaps an indigenous suffix that could have meant ‘city’. Gracchuris would therefore be ‘the city of Gracchus’. There is no doubt that Gracchuris was inhabited by local people, in all probability by Celtiberians[[12]](#footnote-13), and it was very likely a *civitas peregrina* until it was promoted to *municipium*, probably by Augustus[[13]](#footnote-14).

Between 154 and 133 Rome was engaged, in Hispania, in a series of wars against Celtiberians and Lusitanians, the latter under the leadership of Viriathus. Once Viriathus was assassinated in 139[[14]](#footnote-15), the Lusitanians kept fighting under the command of Tautalus, but they soon surrendered to the Roman governor, Q. Servilius Caepio. To help us to reconstruct the subsequent events we have only two brief passages of Appian and Diodorus[[15]](#footnote-16). Diodorus does not speak explicitly of a decisive battle between Romans and Lusitanians, but asserts that Caepio terrified the Lusitanians to the point that they were forced to surrender[[16]](#footnote-17). Caepio then imposed the conditions upon them as he pleased, and the agreement included the deliverance of land. Additionally Caepio founded a city (*polis*) for the Lusitanians, but its name is not recorded by Diodorus[[17]](#footnote-18). Appian does not mention a previous military confrontation either, but makes it clear that the Lusitanians capitulated to Caepio in a formal *deditio* and were obliged to surrender all their arms. An agreement between Tautalus and Caepio must have existed, and as a result the Lusitanians, according to Appian, received land to settle[[18]](#footnote-19). Appian, however, does not allude to the foundation of a town for the Lusitanians, and does not specify where or how the defeated were settled.

Did the town mentioned by Diodorus really exist? Is there any way to know its name and location? It has sometimes been assumed that Caepio had no time to implement the terms of the treaty with Tantalus, and that it was his successor in Hispania Ulterior, D. Iunius Brutus, who did so[[19]](#footnote-20). Accordingly, it has been suggested that the new city may have been Brutobriga (see below)[[20]](#footnote-21). Nevertheless, Silva Reneses has recently argued reasonably, that the city mentioned by Diodorus could be Caepiana[[21]](#footnote-22). Ptolemy alludes to this town (Kaipiana) among the towns that belonged to the Celtici who inhabited Lusitania, and this mention is our only evidence of its existence[[22]](#footnote-23). He includes it after Laccobriga and before Braetoleum, Mirobriga and Arcobriga. According to the geographical coordinates given by Ptolemy, Caepiana could therefore be placed between the rivers Tagus and Sado, not far from the Atlantic coast[[23]](#footnote-24). Its location has, nevertheless, been much discussed[[24]](#footnote-25).

If this hypothesis is correct, we should assume that Q. Servilius Caepio effectively founded a city bearing his name before departing for Rome, as Diodorus asserts[[25]](#footnote-26). Another Q. Servilius Caepio, a son of the consul of 140, was also governor in Hispania Ulterior in 109-107 and achieved a triumph over the Lusitanians[[26]](#footnote-27). In theory he may also have been responsible for the foundation of Caepiana. The only reason that seems to point towards attribution to the father is that Diodorus speaks of a town founded specifically by him, whereas we do not have such evidence for the son. Given the fragmentary nature of the evidence, this fact is significant but obviously cannot be considered definitive[[27]](#footnote-28).

The inhabitants of the new city were therefore Lusitanians, apparently defeated and demobilised troops who had previously fought under the command of Viriathus and then of Tautalus. The foundation must have implemented the terms of the treaty signed by Caepio and Tautalus, which apparently included the grant of land to the Lusitanians, a claim repeatedly formulated by Viriathus in his negotiations with the Roman governors during the previous wars. At the same time, the new town implied a transfer of local people from their original location to the new one[[28]](#footnote-29). A text of Strabo seems to clarify this[[29]](#footnote-30). When describing the region between the rivers Tagus and Anas, Strabo refers to Lusitanians who were transplanted by the Romans from the other side of the Tagus, that is, from the region north of the Tagus. Strabo does not give any hint of the date on which this transfer took place, but it is possible to hypothesize that it may have occurred in 139 at the end of the Lusitanian war, and therefore that Caepio was the promoter of this action[[30]](#footnote-31).

Decimus Iunius Brutus was Caepio’s successor as governor of Hispania Ulterior in 138-136. Once the war against the Lusitanians was over, Brutus brought his army northwards, crossed the Durius and confronted the Callaeci (Appian mentions in particular the Bracari or Bracarenses) for the first time. Brutus’ campaigns were successful, and many peoples and towns surrendered[[31]](#footnote-32). In honour of his victory he celebrated a triumph and received the *cognomen* Callaicus. According to Livy’s *Periochae*, Brutus founded a city of the name Valentia for soldiers who had fought “sub Viriatho”[[32]](#footnote-33). There is now no doubt that Valentia refers to the Latin colony on the Mediterranean coast which today is Valencia. Archaeological remains have shown that the city was founded in the 130s and that its first settlers were in all probability Italic peoples. The sentence in the *Periochae* should therefore be understood in the sense that Brutus granted land to troops who had served in the Roman army against Viriathus, and not to Lusitanians who had fought under the command of Viriathus[[33]](#footnote-34).

However, we certainly know of the existence of a town in Hispania called Brutobriga, that is, the ‘city of Brutus’. The name clearly must refer to a Brutus who at some point held command in Hispania. A P. Iunius Brutus was governor in Hispania Ulterior in 189 after the praetor to whom the command belonged died[[34]](#footnote-35), but it seems impossible that Brutobriga was founded at such an early date, since the region where the town was probably situated (see below) was not yet under Roman control. Actually, the territory beyond the Anas was almost utterly unknown at that time. The other Brutus we know as governor in Hispania Ulterior is Decimus Iunius Brutus, who appears as the most probable founder of Brutobriga. The problem is that we barely know anything about Brutobriga other than its name. The only source that mentions it is Stephanus of Byzantium, an author of the sixth century AD, who actually speaks of a city of the name Broutobría (griego), presumably Brutobriga. It is generally assumed that this town is the same one that minted a unique issue of coins which have been dated to the second half of the second century, although they were probably coined later in the first century BC.[[35]](#footnote-36). The exact location of this town is unknown. It has recently been proposed that it could have been situated in the neighbourhood of Villanueva de la Serena, immediately south of the river Anas, where a number of coins bearing the legend Brutobriga have been found. In any case, the suffix –briga suggests that the inhabitants of the town may have been of Celtic rather than Lusitanian origin[[36]](#footnote-37). Could Brutus Callaicus have founded Brutobriga in southwest Hispania, with the Callaeci defeated during his campaigns beyond the river Durius? Are we in the presence of another transplant of indigenous people to a relatively distant location following their military defeat? The reverse of the coins issued in Brutobriga depicts a ship with a fish below it, which has sometimes been identified with a tuna, though this is not certain. Does this iconography indicate that Brutobriga was on the coast of the Iberian Peninsula? Or was it intended to recall the maritime origin of the first Callaeci settlers?



Some quiet years followed the Roman victory over Lusitanians and Celtiberians, once Scipio Aemilianus had subdued Numantia in 133. As a matter of fact, at that point Rome nearly doubled the territory under her control in the Iberian Peninsula. A commission of ten senators went to Hispania shortly after the capitulation of Numantia in order to organise the government and economic exploitation of the recently acquired regions[[37]](#footnote-38). The Roman senate probably thought it had pacified Hispania definitively, but the precarious peace lasted not even two decades. From 114 onwards we hear of wars once more against Celtiberians and Lusitanians, to the point that we have a concentration of *imperatores* who triumphed over Celtiberians or Lusitanians in the last years of the second century and first decade of the first century[[38]](#footnote-39).

The last Celtiberian revolt was crushed by C. Valerius Flaccus, who very probably came to Hispania Citerior as consul in 93 and remained in the province as a promagistrate in the following years. He celebrated a triumph over Hispania and Gaul in 81[[39]](#footnote-40). According to Appian, Flaccus killed 20,000 Celtiberians during the repression of the revolt[[40]](#footnote-41). The number is in all probability an exaggeration, but Appian’s account probably reflects the importance of the military confrontation. At any rate, there is no doubt that Flaccus reached a decisive victory over the Celtiberians, of whom we hear no other reports of rebellion in the following years. Flaccus was active in the 80s in Hispania Citerior, particularly in the Ebro valley. He must have been the governor who recruited auxiliary troops to fight in Italy under Roman command against the Italian rebels during the *Bellum Sociale*, as the so-called bronze of Ascoli shows[[41]](#footnote-42). As governor of Hispania Citerior, he certainly sanctioned in 87 the verdict enacted in a lawsuit among local communities of the central Ebro valley that is recorded in the *tabula Contrebiensis*, in which Flaccus expressly appears as *imperator*: “iudicium addeixit C(aius) Valerius C(ai) f(ilius) Flaccus imperator”[[42]](#footnote-43).

In this context it seems plausible to attribute to Valerius Flaccus the foundation of Valeria (today Valera de Arriba), a town situated in southern Celtiberia, in the modern province of Cuenca, not far from other ancient towns including Ercavica and Segobriga[[43]](#footnote-44). Pliny mentions Valeria as *oppidum veteris Latii*, and Ptolemy includes it among the Celtiberian cities[[44]](#footnote-45). Espinosa has recently proposed that Valeria could initially have been a Latin colony that later became a Latin *municipium* under Augustus[[45]](#footnote-46). However, it seems more plausible to assume that Valeria was founded as a *civitas peregrina*, and very likely reached the status of *municipium* only in the Augustan age. The inhabitants of the new town may have been some of the Celtiberians who had recently been defeated by Flaccus. As in the previous cases already analysed, they would have been transferred from their original location to the new one by order of the Roman governor[[46]](#footnote-47).

Hispania again lived through a long war during the 70s, when Sertorius rebelled against the Sullan regime. Until his assassination in 72, Sertorius fought for years against the troops sent by the senate, with the support of indigenous people, especially Celtiberians and Lusitanians, who once more confronted Roman dominion, along with exiles who came from Italy to join the Sertorian troops after the failure of the consul M. Aemilius Lepidus in 78-77. Two *imperatores* were the main opponents of Sertorius: Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius in Hispania Ulterior and Cn. Pompeius Magnus in Hispania Citerior. As a result, two cities bearing the names of the two generals were founded: Metellinum (today Medellín in the province of Badajoz, Extremadura) in Hispania Ulterior, and Pompelo (today Pamplona in Navarre) in Hispania Citerior. The foundation of both cities must be understood in the context of the final victory achieved by Metellus and Pompeius, not only against Sertorius but also against local peoples who in all probability made up their population.

Metellinum at some point became a Roman colony according to Pliny[[47]](#footnote-48). Ptolemy refers to it as Caecilia Metellina, which confirms its relationship to Caecilius Metellus[[48]](#footnote-49). No source, however, speaks about the origin of Metellinum. It has been supposed that Metellus could have built a camp during the war against Sertorius which had later become a town[[49]](#footnote-50). Given that the war lasted some years, it is probable that Metellus built some long-lasting camps, as we know happened with Castra Caecilia, situated some 90km from Metellinum, if its identification with Cáceres el Viejo is correct[[50]](#footnote-51). Nevertheless, nothing confirms that Metellinum was originally a military camp. On the contrary, it may have been founded *ex novo* as a city at the end of the hostilities. It is clear that Metellinum was a *civitas peregrina* at the beginning of its existence, which supports the idea that it was inhabited by indigenous people.

A text of Strabo allows us to assume that it was very likely that Pompeius Magnus founded Pompelo. When Strabo speaks of the Vascones, he asserts that in their territory was situated a city called Pompelo, “or, as one might say, Pompeiopolis”[[51]](#footnote-52). Strabo’s text implies that Pompelo and Pompeiopolis were synonymous, and that both meant “the city of Pompeius”. Consequently, it has been suggested that the first part of the word Pompelo alludes to Pompeius, whereas the indigenous suffix –ilun would mean “city”. Pompelo was probably founded at the end of the Sertorian war, around 72-71, when Pompeius developed a politics of reward and punishment towards the local peoples who had taken part in the conflict[[52]](#footnote-53). According to Pliny, Pompelo was a *civitas stipendiaria[[53]](#footnote-54)*.

So far we have the list of known Hispanian towns that bear the names of Roman *imperatores* in pre-Caesarian times; now a comparative analysis should be made. In the case of Gracchuris and Pompelo the foundations are expressly attributed to Gracchus and to Pompeius; in the other cases the relationship of the towns to Caepio, Brutus, Valerius Flaccus and Metellus is not directly attested, although each seems feasible. For some of the cities, such as Caepiana and Brutobriga, we barely have more information than their mere existence, and we do not even know their locations. All in all, some similarities emerge if we make a comparison of the historical contexts in which these towns were founded. In any case, it must be borne in mind on one hand that there were obviously other Roman foundations in the Iberian Peninsula in the same period that did not receive the name of an *imperator*: Italica, Tarraco, Corduba and Carteia. On the other it must be remembered that the *imperatores* who founded towns bearing their names were a very small portion of the Roman generals who achieved military success in Hispania during the conquest.

One fact draws attention straight away: all the new towns followed Roman military victories over local peoples, or, more precisely, followed the surrender (*deditio*) of local peoples[[54]](#footnote-55). The *imperatores* who founded towns with their names, Gracchus, Brutus, Valerius Flaccus, Metellus and Pompeius, received triumphs when they were back in Rome, which makes it clear that they achieved significant victories[[55]](#footnote-56). Metellus and Pompeius certainly had not only defeated local peoples but also the Romans and Italians under the command of Sertorius. However, when at the end of the war Pompeius erected *tropaea* in the Pyrenees[[56]](#footnote-57), he included an inscription in which he stated that he had forced the submission (*in dicionem redacta*) of 876 towns (*oppida*) from the Alps to the boundaries between Hispania Citerior and Ulterior[[57]](#footnote-58). Pompeius therefore emphasised his victory over indigenous peoples. The only exception is Caepio, who did not obtain the triumph because of the way in which he had conducted the war.

The decision to found a city, therefore, was taken by victorious Roman *imperatores* in command of territories as promagistrates, presumably before leaving their provinces to return to Rome. This implies that the governors had the autonomy to make such a resolution. The preserved sources do not specify whether the Roman senate sanctioned the foundations *a posteriori*, but it seems reasonable that the senators had to do it, either explicitly or implicitly. When speaking about Gracchuris, Richardson considered it “improbable that the senate would have given its sanction to a town whose name so explicitly enhanced the prestige of its founder”, in this way suggesting that Gracchus had acted illegally[[58]](#footnote-59). It is certainly striking that at such an early date, in the context of fierce competition within the Roman aristocracy in the first decades of the second century[[59]](#footnote-60), a member of a prominent family was allowed to give his name to a provincial town, something unknown until that moment[[60]](#footnote-61), but it appears very unlikely that Gracchus, and later on the other *imperatores*, acted against the will of the senate. In fact, as discussed above, with the exception of Caepio, all of them were granted triumphs by the senate, which meant a political recognition of their victories, but also of their behaviour in their provinces. A formal or implicit approval of the dispositions taken by the *imperatores* in their provinces consequently appears to have been necessary.

The *imperatores* therefore seem to have decided for themselves the place where the new towns would be established, and who their inhabitants would be. The statute of each new foundation must, in all probability, have been that of a *civitas peregrina*, presumably as *civitas stipendiaria[[61]](#footnote-62)*. The site clearly had to be *sub imperio populi Romani*, that is, presumably *ager publicus[[62]](#footnote-63)*, and as a consequence the Roman authority in the province was entitled to distribute land in the name of the Roman state. Even if the new towns were founded on top of pre-existing indigenous villages, as seems to be the case of Gracchuris and perhaps other towns too[[63]](#footnote-64), the foundation implied the settlement of a new population and the distribution of land, as was usual for the procedure of colonisation. The population of the new city was made up of indigenous people, who, since they had surrendered to a Roman *imperator* – and consequently to Rome –, were at the mercy of his decisions. These defeated people were apparently transferred by order of the founder to their new settlement, following their *deditio*. The sources underline the socialising component of Gracchus’ and Caepio’s initiatives towards Celtiberians and Lusitanians respectively, in order to emphasise Roman generosity. The indigenous certainly received land and a place to live, perhaps as a result of a treaty signed by victors and losers, as is suggested in the case of Gracchus and Caepio, but in doing this they were obliged to abandon their homeland and live elsewhere. As usual in forced displacements of defeated people carried out by Rome in the Republican period, the procedure had the double goal of punishing people who had confronted Rome, by uprooting them from their homes, and, at the same time, socialising them by way of an agrarian colonisation in a new environment far from their original habitat[[64]](#footnote-65).

How far they were transplanted is debatable, and it depended on the circumstances. The inhabitants of Gracchuris were probably Celtiberians who originally lived not far from the new town, in the region where Gracchus had previously operated and achieved his victories. Caepiana seems to have been south of the Tagus in an area where apparently a Celtic population lived, according to the names of its neighbouring towns. If, according to Diodorus, the inhabitants of Caepiana were Lusitanians, they may have been transferred from their original Lusitanian habitat to a Celtic region. We are not certain where Brutobriga was situated, but, if as I have suggested above, its inhabitants were perhaps Callaeci, they would have been transplanted far to the south of their homeland. Valerius Flaccus apparently operated in the Ebro valley in particular, and achieved the surrender of the Celtiberians after an important defeat. Celtiberians therefore probably formed the population of Valeria, a town on the southern frontier of Celtiberia. A transfer is again very likely. Metellus fought in Hispania Ulterior against Sertorius, whose army there was composed of Lusitanians, in particular. Once Sertorius was defeated, it seems most likely that Lusitanians may indeed have been the inhabitants of Metellinum, a city probably situated on the margins of the territory that the Romans called Lusitania.

Pompelo represents, perhaps, a different problem. As Strabo states, Pompelo was situated in the territory of the Vascones[[65]](#footnote-66), and is usually considered the most important city of this people. It is therefore assumed as a logical consequence that its residents were Vascones. Moreover, it has been argued that, since we never hear of a military confrontation between Romans and Vascones in the preserved sources, there possibly existed an early peace agreement between them which converted the Vascones into allies of Rome, and would have implied an enlargement of their territory, to the detriment of neighbouring peoples[[66]](#footnote-67). There is, however, no ancient source that points to this supposed alliance, and the argument *ex silentio* is too weak to conclude that the Vascones never fought against Rome, given that the evidence of the conquest is extraordinarily fragmentary. Furthermore, there is no reason to presume that the Vascones gave the name of Pompeius to their main city as an act of collective *clientela[[67]](#footnote-68)*, a hypothesis that is based merely on the assumption of a previous supposed alliance, so giving room to a circular argument. It is part of this circularity to guess that the Vascones were allies of Pompeius in the Sertorian war, and that Pompeius founded Pompelo as a sort of prize or tribute to his loyal allies.

Taking into account the general context of the long conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, which developed over the course of two centuries, it is reasonable to assume that the Vascones were not an exception and that, at some point, they opposed the Roman expansion, were defeated and their territory was from that point *sub imperio populi Romani*. The possibility should not be dismissed that the Vascones fought on the side of Sertorius against Pompeius[[68]](#footnote-69), and therefore on the side of the losers in the Sertorian war, and that this was why Pompeius as victor decided to found a town in their territory. At any rate, if we take for granted that the new city was created over *ager publicus*, as in the case of the other towns, this would demonstrate that the territory of the Vascones was already in the hands of Rome when Pompeius made his decision.

Given that Pompelo was placed in what the ancient sources define as the territory of the Vascones, it would seem reasonable to take for granted that most of its inhabitants were certainly Vascones. However, the possibility should not be dismissed that all or at least part of the population was transferred by Pompeius from other regions of Hispania. As a matter of fact, we know that Pompeius, once the war was finished, deported Vettones, Arevaci and Celtiberians with whom he founded Lugdunum (Convenarum) north of the Pyrenees[[69]](#footnote-70). Some of these defeated indigenous people who were transplanted from their homeland could have formed part of the new population of Pompelo[[70]](#footnote-71).

Two further questions arise: first, why were these towns, bearing the names of *imperatores*, founded so profusely in Hispania, and in a much earlier period than other towns were established in other areas of the empire during the last decades of the Republic and during the Principate? Second, why did some victorious *imperatores* take the decision of founding towns bearing their own names, while the majority of them apparently did not? The fact is probably related to the peculiarities of the endless conquest of Hispania, which for the Romans meant the retaking, again and again, of areas they already considered to be under their dominion, in particular those of the Celtiberians and Lusitanians, whereas the conquest in other regions was much faster. Emulation may also have played a role when a triumphant *imperator* wanted to imitate what others had done before him in the same territory, and in this case Gracchus should be seen as an innovator. As far as we know, he was the first to give his name to a provincial town[[71]](#footnote-72). After his command in Hispania Citerior, Gracchus was consul and proconsul in Sardinia in 177-175. He defeated local peoples, conquered the island and celebrated a triumph. However, according to the evidence, he did not found a town with his name as he had in Hispania. At any rate, the evidence does not provide a clear and definitive answer for these two questions, on which, perhaps, something more can be said in the future.

One decisive aspect to consider is who gave the name of Roman *imperatores* to the new towns: their population or the *imperatores* themselves? It has been argued, for instance in the case of Pompelo, as we have seen, that the inhabitants could have wanted to honour their founders by naming the cities after them, and that the founders would have become their patrons[[72]](#footnote-73). However, this idea arises from the long-accepted thesis that client-patron relationships among provincials and leading Roman families were extraordinarily expanded and constituted the basis for Roman dominion in the provinces, a thesis that should be reconsidered[[73]](#footnote-74). 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?

The most likely response to the question formulated above is, therefore, that the *imperatores* imposed their names on the inhabitants of the new towns. As a matter of fact, Livy’s *Periochae* indirectly provides the answer when talking of the foundation of Gracchuris: Gracchus founded the town “as a memorial of his achievements” (*monimentum operum suorum*). On one side, the new towns signalised the dominion of Rome over the indigenous peoples. They were living records of the Roman conquest associated with the *imperatores* who had acted as tools of the empire. In turn, for local peoples the towns were symbols and reminders of their defeat and subjugation. On the other side, Gracchuris, Caepiona, Brutobriga, Valeria, Metellinum and Pompelo (as Aquae Sextiae and later Pompeiopolis and Magnopolis) were memorials in stone, but also immaterial, of the glory and fame of their promoters, whose names, associated with their triumphs, were thus preserved forever, in nothing less than a provincial city founded in the territory where they had triumphed. In a sense, the attribution of a territorial or ethnic surname to a triumphator, for instance Callaicus, and the foundation by him of a city, Brutobriga, which bore his name, were two sides of the same coin: the glorification of the victor. These memorial-cities were, therefore, primarily a powerful means of self-representation for their founders, in front of their contemporaries and before history.
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