



Universidad Autónoma
de Madrid

Biblos-e Archivo
Repositorio Institucional UAM

Repositorio Institucional de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

<https://repositorio.uam.es>

Esta es la **versión de autor** del capítulo de libro publicado en:
This is an **author produced version** of a book chapter published in:

Sánchez Moreno, E. "Imperialism and multipolarity in the Far West: beyond the Lusitanians (237-146 BC)". Warlords. War and Interstate relations in the Ancient Mediterranean 404 BC – AD 14. Eds. T. Naco del Hoyo & F. López Sánchez. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2018. 326-350

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004354050_017

Copyright: © 2018 Koninklijke Brill

El acceso a la versión del editor puede requerir la suscripción del recurso

Access to the published version may require subscription

Imperialism and Multipolarity in the Far West: Beyond the Lusitanians (237-146 BC) *

Eduardo Sánchez Moreno

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Board game: towards a theoretical framework

The Mediterranean expansion of the Roman Republic conformed to a multipolar scenario and a complex interaction displayed within it. In the case of its projection in the Iberian Peninsula, the prevailing view of an unidirectional and organic Roman imperialism against a substantially receiver ‘indigenous world’ is explained in favour of a process defined ultimately by the multilineality and multivocality of actors and agendas, as the progress of the investigation infers.¹

In a horizon like the present one, in which hegemonic powers, city-states, peoples and confederations of varied substrate and different articulation compete, an approach that takes into account the perspective of International Relations (IR) seems to fit, since it is a discipline whose theory is stimulating the analysis of the Hellenistic-Roman expansionism.² The adaptation of the so-called ‘realist theory’ to the ancient Mediterranean, under the premise of a framework of relationships defined by militarism, anarchy and interstate rivalry, owes much to A.M. Eckstein.³ In short, the exegesis is that ‘Rome was responding, as any state does, to the harshly undisciplined nature (i.e. anarchy in its literal sense) of interstate relations, in which a state has to fight to maintain its security against rivals or else cave in to the

* This work has been carried out in the framework of the HAR2011-27782 and HAR2011-25443 investigation projects from the Dirección General de Investigación y Gestión del Plan Nacional de I+D+I, Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad, Gobierno de España. I would like to express my gratitude to Adolfo J. Domínguez Monedero, Toni Naco del Hoyo and Alberto Pérez Rubio for reading the original text and offering feedback.

¹ Renewed readings of the Roman expansion from the paradigm of interaction in García Riaza 2011. About the Roman military offensive in the Iberian Peninsula: Richardson 1986; 2011: 468-478; Roldán & Wulff 2001; Naco 2006; Pina 2006; Cadiou 2008; López Castro 2013; Cadiou & Navarro 2014. General perspectives on Roman imperialism during Middle-Late Republic: Gargola 2006; Richardson 2008: 10-62; Erskine 2010; Morley 2010; Rosenstein 2012; Hoyos 2013a; Clark 2014.

² Schieder & Spindler 2014.

³ Eckstein 2006a.

dominance of a stronger one'.⁴ A variation of the 'realist theory' is constructivism, which relates to T. Mommsen's defensive imperialism and has in R. Burton its principal representative.⁵ From this approach, diplomacy through the particular handling of *amicitia* and not military conquest, would be the core mechanism in the Roman interaction with other states.⁶

From these debates, the impact of Carthaginian and Roman imperialism on the westernmost areas of the Roman Republic domain, that is, Hispania Ulterior, will be discussed on the following pages. This analysis will be conducted by using the personality of the inhabitants of the hinterlands of the southwest of the Iberian Peninsula, i.e. the Lusitanians, and their depiction of political relations and hostilities against the Carthaginians and Romans and their respective allies and neighbours. The time frame of this study moves between the creation of the Carthaginian domination of the Barcids in Iberia (237 BC) and the final defeat of Carthage in the Third Punic War (146 BC): a scenario for competence and succession of hegemonies defined by military interventionism, instability and alignments of varied order. In this scenario and period, the Lusitanians played an important role in geostrategic, political and military terms. Nevertheless, their profile at the crossroads of two imperialisms has been underserved or evaluated marginally in research.

Infra Tagum

The ethnohistorical and spatial specificity of the Lusitanians, before the creation of the province of Hispania Ulterior Lusitania by Augustus, is still a pending issue. The deficiencies and biases in literary sources, recurring in the projection of the Lusitanians under the cliché of barbaric raiders of the borders, the endemic *latrocinium*, are responsible for this.⁷ However, the deficient characterisation of the Lusitanians is also a result of intermittent archaeological research, with very scattered results.

⁴ Hoyos 2013b: 6. Similarly, Fronda 2010: esp.280-287 has set out a multipolar analysis of the Hannibalic War in the south of Italy. Discussions about Mediterranean imperialism from a systematic or international point of view: Doyle 1986: 83-91; Eckstein 2006b; Hoyos 2013a: 6-10; Edwell 2013.

⁵ Burton 2003; 2010; 2011.

⁶ Emphasizing diplomatic potentiality, see Coşkun 2005; 2008; Torregaray & Santos 2005; Eilers 2009; Auliard 2009; Torregaray 2011; Sanz 2013.

⁷ This is an ethnographic category emanated from the Greco-Roman narrative, uncritically fossilised in modern historiography. See below n. 29.

According to the available information, we can relate the Lusitanians of the third and second centuries BC with a predominantly southern geographical space, which was disposed around the lower course of the Guadiana river, the western sector of Sierra Morena, the Alentejo and low Extremadura, without exceeding the line of the Tagus river northward.⁸ This was a culturally and linguistically diverse space, affected by the Atlantic, Indo-European, Phoenician-Punic and Tartessian substrates, and where, during the late Iron Age, a regionalised settlement of incipient urban sprawl emerged. As indicated above, the Lusitanians were of a supra-ethnic category handled by the Greco-Roman narrative as cultural antagonism and military conflict.⁹ Such a generic ethnonym masks a conglomerate of peoples and political communities resulting from a complex process of ethnogenesis that was boosted with the arrival on the scene of the Carthaginians and Romans.¹⁰

These Lusitanians formed agro-based societies governed by urban aristocracies, which strengthened their power over interregional client networks. Like their neighbours (that is, the Celtici – with which they are usually confused with –, Conii, Turduli and Turdetani in the south and east, and Vettones in the north), the Lusitanian peoples were organised around *oppida* that acted as territorial and political centers, which bound a dispersed rural habitat. It was precisely the male population – of an age to carry arms – from the nearby villages to urban centers that nourished the recruitment of civic armies and characterised the Lusitanians from the late third century BC.

A contrasted analysis of the sources reveals the scale and manoeuvrability of troops mobilised by the Lusitanians at the time of the intervention of Carthaginians and Romans in the mainland southwest.¹¹ The *auctoritas* of the commanders in the government of armies,

⁸ Subsequently, Lusitania spreads as an area of Roman expansion to the Tagus-Duero interfluvium: Pérez Vilatela 1990; 2000a: 100-105, 249-255; 2000b; Guerra 2010: 87-92. On the integration of the Lusitanian region into the Hispania Ulterior province: de Francisco 1989: 57-96; Edmondson 1994; Richardson 1996; Gorges & Nogales 2010; Salinas 2012a.

⁹ In this regard, Plácido 2004; 2009. Also, the Celtiberians are ethnographically apprehended as a hostile group to Roman expansion: Ciprés 2012.

¹⁰ Concerning the ethnic configuration of the peninsular southwest and the fragmentation of the settlement between the Guadalquivir and the Tagus rivers in the Iron Age: Alarcão 1992; 2001; Rodríguez Díaz 1995; 2001; García Fernández 2007; 2012; Almagro Gorbea 2009; 2011; Correia Santos 2009; Salinas 2011: 144-149; 2012b.

¹¹ With a renewed vision: Cadiou 2008: 173-177, 193-199, 216-219; see also Quesada 2003; 2006a; 2006b; 2009a: 122-129; Gracia 2003: 201-282; Cadiou 2008: 204-215 to contextualise the Iberian and Celtiberian armies.

made up of units of light infantry and cavalry is also remarkable, the latter certainly being representative of the Lusitanians. Recruited by villages, towns and *oppida*, such armies were able to besiege cities, establish and capture camps, and create front-line combat formations, which were strategies that were combined with the frequent use of ambushes and looting. Conceivably, the Lusitanian contingents from the third and second centuries BC would combine units formed by civilians with militia groups, provided by mercenary chiefs or ‘warlords’. Possessing good political shrewdness, these *hegemones* found a revulsive to their power and prestige in Mediterranean imperialism. In summary, the military characterisation of the Lusitanians has little in common with the image of guerrilla bands consecrated by the positivist and romantic historiography.¹²

These communities maintained political and economic ties between them and neighbouring peoples such as the Vettones, Turduli or Turdetani, and with the Punic cities in the Guadalquivir valley and the Atlantic coast. Thus, there were frequent supra-community actions in the form of *symmachiai*, which acquired a multiethnic character against the Punic and Roman expansionism.¹³ Such intercommunity linkages, with antecedents in secular relations of trading exchange, were legitimated through a ‘kinship diplomacy’ that was a typically Hellenistic discourse of power, also manoeuvred by the Lusitanian elites in response to cultural convergence.¹⁴ These associations were often military in nature, and involved a logistical assistance or collaboration with troops for defense – or expansion – demanded by allied states and hegemonic powers.

Carthaginians and Lusitanians

Presumably, the participation of Lusitanian groups as allies or mercenaries of Carthage, preceded the outbreak of the Second Punic War. Not surprisingly, the Punic interest in the

¹² Concerning the Lusitanian and Celtici warfare and military organisation, lacking an integral systematisation: Ciprés 1993: 135-136, 147-156, 159-162; Berrocal 1997; Paniego 2013: 23-28.

¹³ Pérez Rubio *et al.* 2013; García Riaza 2013.

¹⁴ Viriathus, *hegemon* of the Lusitanians between 147 and 139 BC, represents the paradigm. If in the analysis of his figure the rhetoric-moralistic and the heroic-romantic connotations, historiographically concocted, are neutralised (Lens 1986; García Moreno 1988a; Guerra & Fábão 1992; Pereira 2009; Iglesias 2010; Aguilera 2015), the result is an acceptable political-military career as a Western model of late-Hellenistic prince. On Viriathus’ rank, power and ideological slant, see: López Melero 1988; Pérez Vilatela 1989a; 2000a: 268-275; Sánchez Moreno 2006; 2010; Salinas 2008; Sánchez Moreno & García Riaza 2012: 1256-1257.

southwest of the Peninsula is evident from the beginning of Barca's eparchy in Iberia (237-206 BC).¹⁵

After landing at Gades, Hamilcar Barca faced the coalition forces of Iberians, Tartessians and Celts (Celtic or Lusitanian, most probably) in the area of the lower Guadalquivir, led by the kinglets Istolacius and Indortes.¹⁶ Under the command of Hasdrubal (228-221 BC) and Hannibal in Iberia (221-218 BC), the control of the Guadalquivir-Guadiana interfluvium, used as a strategic rearguard to supply resources to the Carthaginians, took hold, and this was only possible through the joining of numerous local powers.¹⁷ These assistance networks transformed Lusitania, during the war with Rome, into a place of shelter and provision for the Punics,¹⁸ and a key region for the supply of mercenaries and allied troops.¹⁹ The provision of the latter concerned those communities that, located within the orbit of Carthage, were urged to cooperate militarily, either under threat, or because of the interests of their own ruling elites who were, to greater or lesser extent, influenced by the tradition of contact with the Phoenician-Punic centres of the Atlantic and Mediterranean shores.²⁰ Indeed, the impact of the pre-Barcid Punic presence in the peninsular inland is being valued by research as the first

¹⁵ On the Carthaginian presence in Hispania: Chic 1978; López Castro 1995: 73-97; González Wagner 1999; Domínguez Monedero 2007; Hoyos 2011; García Fernández 2012; Bendala 2013; 2015.

¹⁶ Diodorus 25.10. After the battle 3,000 Hispanics were integrated into the Carthaginian army – this is the first peninsular military contribution to the Barcid army attested in our sources – and another 10,000 ended up being released by Hamilcar.

¹⁷ From this projection of economic and military interests it must be understood (without rejecting other explanatory motives) the campaign that leads Hannibal towards the Duero in 220 BC, and its effect on the Carpetanian, Vettonian (in the Lusitanian outskirts) and Vaccean communities affected by his incursion. See recently on this campaign: Sánchez Moreno 2008; Remedios 2012; Domínguez Monedero 2013; Ruiz Zapatero & Álvarez Sanchís 2013.

¹⁸ In *Lusitania ac propius Oceanum* is where Hasdrubal, Hannibal's brother, protects himself against the progress of the Scipiones after the Ebro's defeat in 217 BC, (Livy 22.20.12). At the time of the Roman capture of New Carthage (209 BC) general Mago Barca and general Hasdrubal Gisco are respectively cantoned in the country of the Conii and the estuary of river Tagus (Polybius 10.7.5; Liv. 26.20.6). And after the Battle of Baecula, is in inner Lusitania where Hasdrubal Gisco tries to reorganise and protect himself in 208 BC (Liv 27.20.8; 28.1.2) and gets reinforcements a year later (Liv 28.2.15; 28.16.3).

¹⁹ The Lusitanians were present in the army that accompanies Hannibal to Italy if we are to believe Livy (21.48.8; 21.57.5). In the Ulterior – beyond the hinterland of Gades – the Carthaginians recruited large troops in the final phase of the war in Iberia, between 208-206 BC (Liv. 28.12.14; 28.23.7). On the Iberian mercenaries in Hannibal's army, see: Quesada 2005; 2009a; 2013; Jiménez 2012.

²⁰ As seen in the case of the southern Lusitanian aristocracies. In this regard: García Moreno 1992: 125-127; Sánchez Moreno & García Riaza 2012: 1251-1254.

episode of a process of ‘Western Hellenization’ – crowned afterwards by Carthaginian and Roman imperialisms – which has its outcome in the ideological and material dynamization of the local political structures.²¹

The interconnection with cities and *reguli* of the southwest mainland was maintained during the period of anarchy that followed the defeat of the Carthaginians in Iberia. The surrender of Gades to Scipio Africanus in 206 BC²² symbolised the transition of Mediterranean hegemonies and thus the activation of resistance fronts to the new dominant power. Therefore, in the uprising of 197-195 BC led by the local *reguli* Culchas – former ally of Scipio – and Luxinius against Roman power, it is feasible to recognise the participation of the Lusitanian and Celtici peoples. In fact, apart from the seventeen strongholds controlled by Culchas and the cities of Carmo, Malaca, Sexi and Bardo, the whole of Baeturia and other unidentified communities that had delayed their decision, joined the revolt.²³ Encouraged by the participation of 10,000 mercenaries at the service of the Turduli, the rebellion continued until 195 BC when the consul M. Porcius Cato was sent to Hispania with the mission of suppressing the upheaval, revived in the province of Citerior.²⁴

In Hispania Ulterior, instability was latent in the following years, since in 194 BC, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica confronted a powerful army of Lusitanians in the vicinity of Ilipa (Alcalá del Río, Seville), *pervastata Ulteriore provincia cum ingenti praeda domum redeuntis*.²⁵ Far from calming down, the hostilities persisted, and therefore around 191-189 BC, L. Aemilius Paullus and P. Junius Brutus opposed the acting Lusitanian groups in

²¹ Domínguez Monedero 2005-2006; 2007; Bendala 2006; 2010; 2013; 2015: 80-140; Barceló 2006; 2012; Ferrer 2011; 2012; Ferrer & Pliego 2010; 2013; Mora & Cruz 2012. For a Mediterranean contextualisation of the ‘Hellenistic West’: Prag & Quinn 2013.

²² Just before Gades’ *deditio*, Scipio authorised to his newly won ally the Prince Numidian Masinissa, up to that point a Carthaginian ally (Liv. 27.5.11-14), to devastate ‘the neighbouring lands’ (Liv. 28.35.13). These areas would correspond to the territories of the last nuclei reluctant to Rome, located in the west of Gades and among those there would be Lusitanian support to the Carthaginian cause (Sánchez Moreno & García Riaza 2012: 1252). On Gades’ surrender and its legal regulation, see: López Castro 1991; 1995: 100-106; Millán 1998: 181-185; Naco 2006: 86-87.

²³ Liv. 33.21.6-9; see also Appian *Hispanica* 39.

²⁴ Liv. 33.43.1-3; 33.44.4-5; 34.8-12; 34.17-19. Regarding Cato campaigns in Turdetania: Chic 1987.

²⁵ Liv. 35.1.5. On the magnitude of the Lusitanian forces the figures provided by Livy are quite telling: 12,000 dead, 540 prisoners, mostly horsemen and 134 military standards captured by the enemy, Liv. 33.1.9-10.

Bastetania and the region of Gades, with different outcomes.²⁶ The atmosphere of these riots in which, with greater or lesser involvement, the Lusitanians participated was, in short, a generalised uprising of anti-Roman outbreaks: focal points which in some cases – Bastetania, Turdetania – had formed a nuclear part of the Barcid eparchy and in others –Turduli and Lusitanian-Celtici areas – formed a certain Punic periphery. In addition, it does not seem coincidental that this is the same spatial correlation in which fifty years later, Viriathus would conduct the war against Rome: the Andalusian coast and especially the Guadalquivir valley and hinterland beyond Sierra Morena and the Guadiana, in other words *infra Tagum*.²⁷

Crossing the straits

Written sources provide loquacious references of the Lusitanian armed incursions in the Guadalquivir valley, the southern Atlantic coast and North Africa during the second century BC.²⁸ Such mobility is recorded in the Greco-Roman narrative under the *topos* of bandit raids, ravaging the fertile territory of novice subjects of the Roman Republic. However, this long-haul cultural simplification in the historiographical (sub)-valuation of the Lusitanians²⁹

²⁶ Liv. 37.46.7-8; 37.57.5-6. Episodes that, as García Moreno (1986) argues, would relate to the legal and territorial reorganisation imposed by Lucius Aemilius Paullus to the Punic-Turdetanian city of Hasta (Mesas de Asta in Jerez de la Frontera, Cádiz) and its subsidiary *Turris Lascutana*, whose inhabitants were released from a certain kind of community servitude by the praetor. On the decree reflected in Lascuta's notorious bronze (*CIL* II 5041), dated precisely 189 BC, see with previous bibliography: Díaz Ariño 2008: 191-194.

²⁷ On the scenario and the dimension of Viriathus' wars: Gundel 1968; García Moreno 1988a; Pérez Vilatela 1989a; 1989b; Pastor 2004: 153-181; 2011; 2014; Rodríguez Martín 2009; Gorges & Rodríguez Martín 2009; Silva 2013: 137-178.

²⁸ On the movements of the Lusitanians towards the southern areas of Iberia, traditionally interpreted as bellicose and destabilizing: Chic 1980; Santos 1981; González Román 1981: 37-40; García Moreno 1988b: 91-97; Sayas 1988; Ciprés 1993: 76, 138, 153-155; Salinas 1993: 22-29; López Castro 1995: 153-155; Gozalbes 2005: 153-166; with an alternative approach: Sánchez-Corriendo 1997; Sánchez Moreno 2006; forthcoming; Baray 2015.

²⁹ Starting with the classic codification of the Lusitanians as *latrones*/Λησται (Ciprés 1993: 60-79, 136-141) and the banditry as a way of marginal and unlawful hostility, inherent of populations subversive to the imperialism of Rome (Shaw 1984; Vallejo 1984; Grünwald 2004; Gozalbes 2006; 2007; Cadiou 2008: 180-185; Riess 2011). The topic of the banditry together with the one of the guerrilla struggle as a warlike idiosyncrasy of *homo hispanicus* (Cadiou 2008: 173-203; Quesada 2011) has highly conditioned the historiographical projection of the Lusitanians. See the insightful analysis by Aguilera 2015. For his part, from a socioeconomic perspective the primitivist and tribal characterisation of the Lusitanians is based on the myth of poverty and landlessness: Caro Baroja 1943: 145-153; García y Bellido 1945: 554-560; Sayas 1988; Salinas 1993: 22-29. And yet, it is the ideology built by Hellenistic historiography to legitimise the 'Lusitanian banditry' and justify the benefactor

masks, in reality, an experienced political and military collaborative strategy: the connectivity of the Lusitanians and some of their inland allies with the Turdetani and North African cities located in the orbit of Carthage.³⁰ Therefore, this is how the movements of citizen troops – and not herd-robbers gangs – under the command of prominent Lusitanian leaders should be understood, in the account of the wars of Rome in Iberia by Appian of Alexandria.³¹ A review of this record would be of great interest.

Between 155-154 BC, a Lusitanian *hegemon* under the expressive name of Punicus,³² forced the praetors M. Manilius and L. Calpurnius Piso to flee, after attacking the territory of communities subjected to Rome, and killing six thousand men. Therefore, ‘excited by this, overran the territory as far as the Ocean and, after adding the Vettones to his army, besieged some subjects of the Romans called the Blastophoenicians’.³³ Punicus – who was struck on the head and died – was succeeded by Caesarus, who faced the new praetor of Hispania Ulterior with varying success: although defeated in the first instance, he managed to react by retreating, killing 9000 men, as well as recovering the loot and camp taken by L. Mummius, conquering the Roman camp itself and capturing numerous enemy weapons and banners that ‘the barbarians carried throughout Celtiberia in mockery of the Romans’ (App. *Hisp.* 56). At that time, another Lusitanian *hegemon* named Caucenus, from the north bank of the Tagus,

interventionism of Rome in frontier societies. This is a deeply-rooted reading in modern research, subject of critical review only recently: Sánchez Moreno forthcoming; Baray 2015.

³⁰ Chic 1980: 20-21 understands these connections as Lusitanian mercenary services in Andalusian philo-Punic settlements, rectifying in favour of their role as allies – instead of mercenaries – of the Turdetani: Chic 1987: 24 n.11. Similarly, Ciprés 1993: 153-154 and García Moreno 1992: 125-127, who defends a ‘punización de los grupos lusitanos sudtajanos’ settled in the (pro-Carthaginian) mercenary inheritance of its military elites.

³¹ App. *Hisp.* 56-75 for the Hispania Ulterior conflicts between 156-139 BC. On the works by Appian regarding Iberia see Sancho 1983; Gómez Espelosín 1993a; 1993b; Richardson 2000.

³² Plausibly, an epithet concerning the origin or the political affinity of the character, not a *stricto sensu* anthroponym. On his onomastic affiliation: Solá 1967: 310-311; García Moreno 1986: 205-207; see López Castro & Belmonte 2012 for the survival of the Phoenician-Punic onomastics in Roman times.

³³ App. *Hisp.* 56. Appian says about the Blastophoenicians: ‘Hannibal the Carthaginian is said to have settled some people from Lybia among them, and consequently they are called Blastophoenicians’. On the identity of these North African peoples (also recognisable under the term Libyan-Phoenician), the debate on the location and nature of their settlements and personality of their coinage (*Asido*, *Bailo*, *Oba*, *Lascuta*, *Iptuci*, *Vesci* in Gades’ backshore, *Arsa*, *Turrirecina*, *Balleia* in the Turduli Baeturia; with inscriptions in an ‘aberrant’ Neo-Punic variety of writing), see: García Moreno 1992; Chaves 1990; López Castro 1992; García-Bellido 1993; 1995; 2013; Domínguez Monedero 1995a; 1995b; 2000; Alfaro 1998: 105-115; Ferrer 2000; 2004; Ferrer & Álvarez 2009; Mora Serrano 2011; Mora Serrano & Cruz Andreotti 2012.

confronted the Roman power with his troops, destroying the territory of the Conii under Roman rule, and took over their capital Conistorgis.³⁴ Subsequently, and this is a revealing fact, he proceeded to the coast with a large army, crossed over the straits near the Pillars of Hercules –predictably close to Gades – and once on African soil, sent part of his forces ‘to submit to plunder the rest of Libya’, and the other to put under siege Ocile (probably Zilis/Asilah at the south of Tangier) in the Mauri territory. The praetor Mummius, for his part, followed Caucenus with 9,000 infantry and 500 cavalry, killing up to 15,000 Lusitanians who were looting in Libya, and an unknown number of those besieging Ocile, before ending the siege and obtaining a large booty, which made him earn a triumph when he returned to Rome (App. *Hisp.* 57).

Mummius’s successor in Hispania Ulterior, Gaius Atilius Serranus, increased the pressure on the Lusitanians in 152 BC by attacking the city of Oxtraca, of unknown location. Meanwhile, he threatened the allied neighbouring communities of the Lusitanians, among them some of Vettonian affiliation, demanding the establishment of friendship treaties that would include territorial compensations.³⁵ Taking advantage of the winter withdrawal of the praetor, the Lusitanians rebelled and acted against certain nuclei allies of Rome, causing a harsh retaliation by the new *imperator* in Hispania Ulterior, Servius Sulpicius Galba (App. *Hisp.* 58). It is certainly a significant fact that in the winter of 151 BC, the governor of Hispania Citerior, the consul Lucius Licinius Lucullus, was in Turdetania. The consul, aware of the fact that the Lusitanians were raiding nearby, acted against them, annihilating, firstly, 4,000 men and secondly, 1,500 more casualties. To these numbers, a third group, besieged on a hill, would be added. In the meantime, as had happened two years before with Caucenus, new Lusitanian troops crossed the Strait surrounding Gades and headed to Africa.³⁶

³⁴ App. *Hisp.* 57. The usual reduction of the Conii’s country in the Portuguese region of Algarve has been challenged in favour of the Guadiana’s River medium valley (Alarcão 2001: 335-338; Almagro Gorbea 2008), proposing the identification of Conistorgis with the Castle hill of Medellin (Badajoz), a settlement originated in a Tartessian colonisation from the 7th century BC (Almagro Gorbea 2008; 2011).

³⁵ App. *Hisp.* 58. Military-legal relations between Romans and Lusitanians have been studied extensively by García Riaza 2002: 99-121, 124-128, 149-159; 2012a; 2012b. More specifically, on the redistribution of land to the Lusitanians both as a diplomatic motivation and as Roman propagandistic rhetoric: Sánchez Moreno forthcoming.

³⁶ App. *Hisp.* 59. The coordinated and complementary attack of the two Hispanic governors in 151-150 BC, Galba and Lucullus, ‘devastating the Lusitania on both sides’, enlightens the magnitude of the Lusitanian threat and the fear of its extension towards North Africa.

From what ports were the Lusitanian contingents shipped? What state provided the fleet that moved them to African soil? Under what circumstances and on what basis of relationships was it carried out? The answers seem rather difficult... From Appian's account – unspoken regarding naval logistics – we can infer a circulation on the Atlantic side of the straits, with Gades as a free port on their journey. It may also be stated that other coastal Punic or Turdetanian cities could charter vessels, supplementing the port of Gades. In any case, behind these actions, we may suspect alliance networks that link the Lusitanians with certain communities of the southern mainland³⁷ and the North African Carthaginian area.

Allies versus allies

From the review of the previous set of information, two conclusions can be established, already outlined above. The former is the potentiality of the armies mobilised by the Lusitanians and their allies from the final stages of the Second Punic War. The latter is the aggressive attitude of the Lusitanians towards the legions of praetors and consuls, to the allied centres or to those subjected to Rome in the Punic-Turdetanian and North African areas. Investigating this issue, there is a decisive fact: the movement to Africa by the Lusitanians observed in Appian's account coincide with the years immediately prior to the last war between Rome and Carthage,³⁸ which will definitely terminate the autonomy of the African metropolis in 146 BC.³⁹

Going further, the scenario that coincides in time and appears to be behind the Lusitanian significant military presence in Africa (with *floruit* between 153-150 BC), is the conflict between Carthage and an elderly king of Numidia, Masinissa.⁴⁰ Remember that Masinissa had been an ally of Rome for fifty-five years, when, as a young prince, he negotiated his

³⁷ Was Gades among them, despite the *foedus* that bounded it to Rome at that time? On the political autonomy of Gades in the context of second century BC Roman imperialism: López Castro 1995: 144-159; 2007; Millán 1998: 179-185.

³⁸ Chic 1980: 21 refers to a 'Lusitanian seafaring tradition' in the 155-147 BC period, which he suspects to be related to the events experienced by Carthage. On the contacts between Hispania and North Africa at this time: Blázquez 1961, see: 37-40; Millán 1998: 179-202; Callegarin 2008.

³⁹ On the so-called Third Punic War, see most recently: Hoyos 2010: 214-219; Le Bohec 2011; Rosenstein 2012: 233-239.

⁴⁰ The preserved narrative is due to Appian (*Libyca* 67-74), inspired on Polybius. On the relationships between Carthage and Numidia in the period 201-149 BC: Hoyos 2010: 211-216; Kunze 2011; Gozalbes 2014: 275-285; see also Amara 2013.

accession to Scipio Africanus in Iberia at the beginning of the surrender of Gades.⁴¹ Decades later, the conflict between Masinissa and Carthage was a military-diplomatic crisis prompted by the expansionism of the Numidian king at the expense of Carthage which, although being silenced internationally after its defeat in the Hannibalic War, was experiencing a strong recovery process. Therefore, the hypothesis is that the Lusitanians would have irrupted into the scenario as auxiliary forces of the Carthaginians, probably together with other pro-Punic peninsular contingents. This would have been carried out through an interconnected and simultaneous confrontation in southern Iberia and North Africa, against the antagonistic front represented by Roman imperialism and, in turn, in Libya, Rome's hegemonic ally Masinissa in those decades.⁴²

The escalation of tension existing in North Africa during the first half of the second century BC reached a dead end in 151 BC when Masinissa's forces attacked the city of Oroscoipa.⁴³ Despite being a settlement under the jurisdiction of Carthage, or precisely because of this, the Carthaginian military response to Masinissa's umpteenth provocation broke the peace terms established by Scipio Africanus in 202 BC, and officially made a *casus belli* to the *nobilitas* in favour of ending with Carthage once and for all.⁴⁴ That the Punic metropolis was in those moments – after a remarkable economic restructuring – a rising state is evidenced by the army, gathered against Masinissa in 151 BC. 25,000 infantry soldiers and 400 horsemen formed this army, joined by 6,000 Numidian deserters and other reinforcements from the country (App. *Lib.* 70-71).⁴⁵ It is true that the participation of Iberian

⁴¹ Liv. 28.16.11-12; 28.35.1-13; 29.29.5; App. *Hisp.* 37; *Lib.* 10; Silius Italicus *Punica* 16.136. Livy has left an accurate biographical excursus on Masinissa and his struggle to become king of the Numidians using his friendship with Rome: Liv. 29.29.5-33.10; 29.12.5-15.14; see Masinissa's praise in Polyb. 36.16.1-10. An assessment of the Numidian king as *exemplum* of *amicitia* in Livy's rhetoric: Levene 2010: 247-260.

⁴² It is remarkable the account of Iberian forces –feasibly Lusitanians under Caucenus' command?– assailing Numidian troops in Libya by 153 BC (App. *Lib.* 68).

⁴³ App. *Lib.* 70. Would it be any link between the events in Oroscoipa and those at the North-African Ocile, which was besieged a year earlier by Caucenus' Lusitanians and liberated by Mummius (App. *Hisp.* 57)?

⁴⁴ App. *Lib.* 69; 79. The surrendering terms imposed after Hannibal's defeat at Zama established that, with regard to foreign policy, 'the Carthaginians would not make wars neither in Africa nor outside Africa without the mandate of Roman people, (that) they would return their goods to Masinissa, and (that) they would pact an alliance with him' (Liv. 30.37.4; see Polyb. 15.18.4-5; App. *Lib.* 54; Cassius Dio, *Fragment* 57.82).

⁴⁵ Another passage (App. *Lib.* 73) notes that the Carthaginians ended up with 58,000 fighters. In the negotiation preceding Rome's declaration of war against Carthage (149 BC), Hasdrubal the Boetharch, commander of the Carthaginians, warns Gulusa, one of the sons of Masinissa, that 'with regard to [Carthage's] foreign allies,

communities in support of Carthage is not explicitly stated, but it is revealing that, coinciding with the time of highest tension between Numidians and Carthaginians, the consul Lucullus, who was exerting *imperium* in Hispania Citerior – was trying unsuccessfully to block the passage to Africa of Lusitanian troops that were embarking from the Turdetanian coasts. This was a preventive action – of retention and punishment – which Lucullus exercised in coordination with his counterpart in the Hispania Ulterior, Galba, whose policy of extermination of Lusitanians reached dramatic heights (App. *Hisp.* 59-60). The motive of the Lusitanian naval traffic seems obvious: the aid to Carthage.

There is another detail to consider regarding the North African boardgame in 151-150 BC, connected to Hispania. This is the presence in Masinissa's camp of a young Scipio Aemilianus (at that time Lucullus' military tribune in Hispania Citerior) with the mission to request of Rome's old ally, a reinforcement of elephants for the war against the Celtiberians.⁴⁶ In fact, the young tribune was entrusted with the arbitrage in the dispute between Masinissa and Carthage (App. *Lib.* 71-72). Nonetheless, the clash was inevitable and the 'war of Masinissa' ended with the defeat of the Carthaginians in Oroscopa, after suffering a painful siege and the loss of almost all their forces (App. *Lib.* 72-73). Somewhat earlier, during the battle in open field that Scipio witnessed from a hill, he had admired these armies, made up of Numidian and Carthaginian troops and their respective allies, which reached the figure of 110,000 fighters.⁴⁷

expectations are excellent' (Polyb. 38.7.8-9). Note the cocky appearance with which Polybius describes the Carthaginian general (Polyb. 38.7-8).

⁴⁶ Two years earlier, in 153 BC, Masinissa had provided M. Fulvius Nobilior with 300 horsemen and 10 elephants in his campaign against Numantia (App. *Hisp.* 46). The presence of Scipio Aemilianus in Numidia coincides with the arrival of Caecilius' Lusitanians at the African coast (App. *Hisp.* 46) and the troubles that one of Masinissa's sons had when being surrounded by Iberian forces (presumably Lusitanians) (App. *Lib.* 68). In the years to come, in their operations in Celtiberia Q. Caecilius Metellus in 143-142 BC (Valerius Maximus 9.3.7) and Scipio Aemilianus in 134-133 BC received Numidian elephants too, with a body of slingers and archers commanded by prince Jugurtha, the grandson of Masinissa (App. *Hisp.* 89). In Hispania Ulterior the Numidian support to Rome was maintained in the crucial phase of Viriathus' war in 141 BC. Servilianus had requested and obtained from Micipsa, son and successor of Masinissa, the amount of 300 riders and 10 elephants used unsuccessfully against Viriathus in his operations in the Turduli Baeturia (App. *Hisp.* 67).

⁴⁷ 'He [Scipio Aemilianus] often said afterwards that he had been present at many contests, but never enjoyed any other so much, for here only had he seen at his ease 110,000 men join battle. He added with an air of solemnity that only two before him had seen such a spectacle: Jupiter from Mount Ida, and Neptune from Samothrace, in the Trojan war' (App. *Lib.* 71). On the battle of Oroscopa see Amara 2013: 160-161.

Returning to Hispania Ulterior, without abandoning the perspective of certainly meaningful international relations,⁴⁸ and referring to the already suggested boardgame, the punishment campaigns that the Lusitanian *hegemones* – Punicus in 155 BC, Caesarus in 154 BC, and Caucenus in 153 BC...– ran over the territories of southern communities, subjected to Rome *maiestas*, acquire full sense at this point. Among these, the Libyan-Phoenician cities of the Cádiz region – as well as those of the Turduli Baeturia?– seemed to align, i.e. if we accept that their original military populations, albeit strongly Punized, would be less of Carthaginian extraction but rather more Libyan-Mauritanian or essentially Numidian.⁴⁹ Therefore, calibrating, in the balance of political interests, the convenience of loyalty to the Numidian kingdom, the circumstantial proximity of some Libyan-Phoenician enclaves to Rome can be inferred. Consequently, it is also understandable, in reverse, the punitive action carried out against certain Libyan-Phoenician centres by the pro-Carthaginian (or rather, anti-Roman) Lusitanian armies (App. *Hisp.* 56). Considering that behaviours are not, as a general rule, unanimous or respond to an ethnic unit action, which is essentially a historiographical simplification:⁵⁰ neither all the Libyan-Phoenician communities would be necessarily committed to the same extent to the Roman-Numidian alliance, nor all the Punic cities of Iberia would take part in favour of Carthage. Precisely, the existence of fluctuations and conjunctions confers to the Lusitanian operations a selective nature.

In conclusion, there is sufficient evidence in our sources to suspect, if not to assume, a double alignment in the multipolar scenario represented by the Circle of the Strait in the mid-second century BC in its double extension, Iberian and African. On the one hand, a Carthaginian state is found under reconstruction, and in its wake, exceeding its territory and immediate hinterland, some of its old mainland allies with whom networks of solidarity and assistance are maintained: from federal centres of Carthaginian affiliation to small subsidiary war powers. The latter would have their own agendas and traditions, beyond the active worldview of the scenario in which they were integrated. In fact, their military categorisation certainly surpasses that of mercenary groups without a political roadmap. The object of this proposal is to understand the inner southwestern Iberian communities, and in particular, the

⁴⁸ But not much estimated by research usually devoted to the paradigms of ‘primitive belligerence’ and ‘barbarian geography’ for Lusitanians (see above, n. 29). An exception is represented by the, in many respects, sharp works by García Moreno (1988a; 1989) and Pérez Vilatela (1989a; 1989b).

⁴⁹ As suggested by Domínguez Monedero (1995a: 236) throughout the evaluation of Libyan-Phoenician mints. See above n.33.

⁵⁰ On this topic: see Sánchez Moreno 2011.

Lusitanians, as actors in the interstate theatre of western Mediterranean imperialism. Presumably, military contributions could concur between those minor Carthaginian allies, such as bands of Lusitanians and perhaps Turduli, Vettones and Oretani.

On the other hand, the dominion that Rome had established in Hispanic demarcations since the defeat of the Punics in Iberia was located opposite to Carthage. This was an *imperium* that became stronger on a growing (though discontinuous) alignment of subjected states and allied populations, which were remarkable in the Guadalquivir valley and the Baetica coast. This Roman rule was also protected strategically in North Africa by an instrumental ally, the Numidian kingdom of Masinissa, and under his tutelage, a constellation of principalities and vassal tribes that reached the Sahara sands.

And yet, a swan song would eventually become the assistance axis articulated around the Carthaginian metropolis. Since the defeat of Carthage in 146 BC and the consolidation of the Roman domain in Hispania Ulterior after the *bellum Viriathicum* (147-139 BC) would foster the dissolution of a Lusitanian-Carthaginian entente, which began its days *of wine and roses* with Hamilcar Barca's landing at Gades.

Bibliography

- Aguilera, T. (2014) 'L'eroe indomito. Viriato nella mitologia nazionalista spagnola', in J. Bassi & G. Canè (eds.), *Sulle spalle degli antichi. Eredità classica e costruzione delle identità nazionali nel Novecento*, Milano: 165-179.
- Aguilera T. (2015) 'De ladrones, guerrilleros y revolucionarios. El tópico del bandidaje en la Iberia prerromana', en D. Gómez Castro (ed.), *Economía y ejército en el mar corruptor (Anejos de Herakleion, 1)*, Madrid: 113-146.
- Alarcão, J. de (1992) 'Etnografia da fachada atlântica ocidental da Península Ibérica', in M. Almagro Gorbea & G. Ruiz Zapatero (eds.), *Paleoetnología de la Península Ibérica. Complutum 2-3*, Madrid: 339-348.
- Alarcão, J. de (2001) 'Novas perspectivas sobre os lusitanos (e outros mundos)', *Revista portuguesa de arqueologia* 4.2: 293-349.
- Alfaro Asins, C. (1998) 'Las emisiones feno-púnicas', in C. Alfaro Asins *et al.*, *Historia monetaria de Hispania antigua*, Madrid: 50-115.
- Almagro Gorbea, M. (2008) 'Medellín-Conisturgis. Reinterpretación geográfica del Suroeste de Iberia', *Boletim da Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa* 126 (1-12): 84-115.
- Almagro Gorbea, M. (2009) 'Lusitanos y Vettones', in P.J. Sanabria (ed.), *Lusitanos y Vettones. Los pueblos prerromanos en la actual demarcación Beira Baixa-Alto Alentejo-Cáceres*, Cáceres: 15-43.
- Almagro Gorbea, M. (2011) 'La colonización tartésica: toponimia y arqueología', *Palaeohispanica 10. Serta Palaeohispanica in honorem Javier de Hoz* : 187-199.

- Amara, O.A. (2013) *Numides et maures au combat. États et armées en Afrique du Nord jusqu'à l'époque de Juba Ier. (Studi di Storia Antica e di Archeologia, 13; collana diretta da A.M.Corda e A. Mastino. Sandhi)*, Ortacesus.
- Auliard, C. (2009) 'Le jeu diplomatique des romains en Occident lors de la conquête des provinces occidentales', in Y. Le Bohec (coord.), *Rome et les provinces de L'Occident de 197 av. J.-C. à 192 ap. J.-C.*, Nantes : 11-26.
- Baray, L. (2015) 'Le "brigand lusitanien" reconsidéré. Analyse du problème de la terre chez Appien' *Gerión* 33 : 229-260.
- Barceló, P.A. (2006) 'Sobre el inicio de la presencia cartaginesa en Hispania', in J. Martínez Pinna (ed.), *Initia rerum. Sobre el concepto del origen en el mundo antiguo*, Málaga: 105-124.
- Barceló, P.A. (2012) 'Aníbal y la helenización de la guerra en Occidente', in S. Remedios, F. Prados, J. Bermejo (eds.), *Aníbal de Cartago. Historia y mito*, Madrid: 159-175.
- Bendala, M. (2006) 'Expresiones y formas de poder en la Hispania ibérica y púnica en la coyuntura helenística', *Pallas 70. L'hellénisation en la Méditerranée occidentale au temps des guerres puniques (260-180 av. J.-C.)* : 187-206.
- Bendala, M. (2010) 'La retaguardia ibérica de Aníbal', *Mainaké 32.1. Los Púnicos de Iberia: proyectos, revisiones, síntesis*: 437-460.
- Bendala, M. (ed.) (2013) *Fragor Hannibalis: Aníbal en Hispania*, Alcalá de Henares.
- Bendala, M. (2015) *Hijos del rayo. Los Barca y el dominio cartaginés en Hispania*, Madrid.
- Berrocal, L. (1997) 'À propos des peuples, des armes et des sites pendant les guerres lusitaniennes: une vision d'ensemble', in M. Feugère (ed.), *Journal of the Roman Military Equipment Studies 8. L'équipement militaire et l'armement de la République (IVe-Ier s. a. J.-C.)*: 123-136.
- Blázquez, J.M. (1961) 'Las relaciones entre Hispania y el norte de África durante el gobierno bárquida y la conquista romana' *Saitabi* 11: 21-43.
- Burton, P.J. (2003) 'Clientela or Amicitia? Modeling Roman International Behavior in the Middle Republic (264-146 B.C.)' *Klio* 85.2: 333-369.
- Burton, P.J. (2010) 'Culture and Constructivism in International Relations', *The International History Review* 32.1: 89-97.
- Burton, P.J. (2011) *Friendship and empire: Roman diplomacy and imperialism in the middle Republic (353-146 BC)*, Cambridge.
- Cadiou, F. (2008) *Hibera in terra miles. Les armées romaines et la conquête de l'Hispanie sous la République (218-45 av. J.-C.)*, Madrid.
- Cadiou, F. & Navarro, M. (eds.) (2014) *La guerre et ses traces. Conflits et sociétés en Hispanie à l'époque de la conquête romaine (IIIe-Ier s. a.C.)*, Bordeaux.
- Callegarin, L. (2008) 'La côte Mauretanienne et ses relations avec le littoral de la Betique (fin du III^e siècle a.C.-I^{er} siècle P.C.)', *Mainake* 30 : 289-328.
- Caro Baroja, J. (1943) 'Regímenes sociales y económicos de la España prerromana', *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 1: 149-190.
- Chaves, F. (1990) 'Los hallazgos numismáticos y el desarrollo de la Segunda Guerra Púnica en el sur de la Península Ibérica', *Latomus* 49: 613-622.

- Chic, G. (1978) 'La actuación político-militar cartaginesa en la Península Ibérica entre los años 237 y 218 a.C.', *Habis* 9: 233-242.
- Chic, G. (1980) 'Consideraciones sobre las incursiones lusitanas en Andalucía', *Gades* 5: 15-25.
- Chic, G. (1987) 'La campaña de Catón en la Ulterior. El caso de Seguntia', *Gades* 15 : 23-27.
- Ciprés, P. (1993) *Guerra y sociedad en la Hispania indoeuropea. Anejos de Veleia* 3, Vitoria.
- Ciprés, P. (2012) 'Pueblos enfrentados a Roma e identidad: El caso de los celtiberos', in J. Santos Yanguas & G. Cruz Andreotti (eds.), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma antigua: el caso hispano. (Revisiones de Historia Antigua VII. Anejos de Veleia* 12, Vitoria: 235-279.
- Clark, G. (2014) *Triumph in defeat. Military loss and the Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- Correia Santos, M. J. (2009) 'Lusitanos y Vettones en la Beira Interior portuguesa: La cuestión étnica en la encrucijada de la arqueología y los textos clásicos', in P.J. Sanabria (ed.), *Lusitanos y Vetones. Los pueblos prerromanos en la actual demarcación Beira Baixa-Alto Alentejo-Cáceres*, Cáceres: 181-196.
- Coşkun, A. (ed.) (2005) *Roms auswärtige Freunde in der späten Republik und im frühen Prinzipat. (Beihefte zum Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft Band, 19*, Göttingen.
- Coşkun, A. (ed.) (2008) *Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer (2. Jh. v.Chr. – 1. Jh. n. Chr.)*, Frankfurt.
- Díaz Ariño, B. (2008) *Epigrafía latina republicana de Hispania (ELRH). (Instrumenta, 26)*, Barcelona.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (1995a) 'Libios, libiofenicios, blastofenicios: elementos púnicos y africanos en la Iberia Bárquida y sus supervivencias', *Gerion* 13: 221-239.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (1995b) 'De nuevo sobre los 'libiofenicios': un problema histórico y numismático', in M.P. García-Bellido & R.M. Sobral Centeno (eds.), *La moneda hispánica. Ciudad y Teritorio. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 14, Madrid: 111-116.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (2000) 'Monedas e identidad étnico-cultural de las ciudades de la Bética', in M.P. García-Bellido & L. Callegarin (eds.) *Los cartagineses y la monetización del Mediterráneo Occidental. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 22, Madrid: 59-74.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (2005-2006) '¿Cartago en Iberia? Observaciones sobre el papel de la Cartago pre-bárquida en la Península Ibérica, in *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Amigos de la Arqueología*, 44. *Homenaje a D. Vicente Viñas y D^a Rosario Lucas Pellicer*: 181-199.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (2007) 'La presencia cartaginesa hasta la Segunda Guerra Púnica', in E. Sánchez Moreno (ed.), *Protohistoria y Antigüedad de la Península Ibérica. I: Las fuentes y la Iberia colonial*, Madrid: 403-428.
- Domínguez Monedero, A.J. (2013) 'La estrategia militar de Aníbal antes de la marcha a Italia: el ataque a los pueblos de la Meseta castellana', in M. Bendala (ed.), *Fragor Hannibalis: Aníbal en Hispania*, Alcalá de Henares: 285-311.
- Doyle, M.W. (1986) *Empires*, Ithaca & London.
- Eckstein, A.M. (2006a) *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London.
- Eckstein, A.M. (2006b) 'Conceptualizing Roman imperial expansion under the Republic: an introduction', in N. Rosenstein & R. Morstein-Marx (eds.) *A companion to the Roman Republic*, Oxford: 567-589.

- Edmondson, J. (1994): 'Roman power and the emergence of provincial administration in Lusitania during the Republic', in E. Hermon (ed.), *Pouvoir et Imperium (IIIe av. J.-C.-Ier ap. J.-C.)*, Napoli: 163-211.
- Edwell, P. (2013) 'Definitions of Roman Imperialism, in D. Hoyos (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*, Leiden & Boston: 39-52.
- Eilers, C. (ed.) (2009) *Diplomats and diplomacy in the Roman world. (Mnemosyne Suppl. 304)*, Leiden.
- Erskine, A. (2010) *Roman imperialism*, Edimburgh.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. (2000) 'Nam sunt feroces hoc libyphoenices loco: ¿libiofenicios en Iberia?', *Spal* 9: 421-433.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. (2004) 'Substratos fenicios y adstratos púnicos: los bástulos entre el Guadiana y el Guadalquivir', in J. Fernández Jurado, C. García Sanz & P. Rufete (eds.), *Huelva Arqueológica, 19-20. Actas del III Congreso Español de Antiguo Oriente Próximo (Huelva 2003)*: 281-298.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. (2011) 'Rasgos ideológicos helenísticos en la política ibérica de los Barca', in J.M. Cortés, E. Muñiz, & R. Gordillo (eds.), *Grecia ante los imperios. V Reunión de historiadores del mundo griego*, Sevilla: 305-316.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. (2012) 'El sustrato púnico en las urbes meridionales: persistencias culturales e identidades cívicas', in J. Santos, & G. Cruz Andreotti (eds.), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma antigua: el caso hispano. (Revisiones de Historia Antigua VII. Anejos de Veleia 12)*, Vitoria: 665-689.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. & Álvarez Martí-Aguilar, M. (2009) 'Comunidad cívica e identidad en la Iberia púnica', in F. Wulff & M. Álvarez Martí-Aguilar (eds.), *Identidades, culturas y territorios en la Andalucía prerromana*, Málaga: 205-235.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. & Pliego, R. (2010) '...Auxilium consanguineis karthaginiensis misere: un nuevo marco interpretativo de las relaciones entre Cartago y las comunidades púnicas de Iberia', in *Mainaké, 32.2. Los Púnicos de Iberia: proyectos, revisiones, síntesis*: 525-557.
- Ferrer Albelda, E. & Pliego, R. (2013) 'Cartago e Iberia antes de los Barca', in M. Bendala (ed.), *Fragor Hannibalis: Anibal en Hispania*, Alcalá de Henares: 107-133.
- Francisco Martín, J. de (1989) *Conquista y romanización de Lusitania*, Salamanca (2nd ed.1996).
- Fronza, P. (2010) *Between Rome and Carthage: Southern Italy during the Second Punic War*, Cambridge.
- García Fernández, F.J. (2007) 'Etnología y etnias de la Turdetania en época prerromana', *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid* 33: 117-143.
- García Fernández, F.J. (2012) 'Cartago a las puertas: Turdetania en los albores de la Segunda Guerra Púnica', in S. Remedios, F. Prados & J. Bermejo (eds.), *Aníbal de Cartago. Historia y mito*, Madrid: 379-428.
- García Moreno, L.A. (1986) 'Sobre el decreto de Paulo Emilio y la Turris Iascutana (CIL II, 2. 614)' in *Epigrafía hispánica de época romano-republicana*, Zaragoza: 195-218.
- García Moreno, L.A. (1988a) 'Infancia, juventud y primeras aventuras de Viriato, caudillo lusitano', in *Actas I Congreso Peninsular de Historia Antigua (Santiago, 1986)*, 2, Santiago de Compostela: 373-382.
- García Moreno, L.A. (1988b) 'Hispaniae Tumultus. Rebelión y violencia indígena en la España romana de época republicana', *Polis* 1: 81-107.
- García Moreno, L.A. (1989) 'La Hispania anterior a nuestra Era: verdad, ficción y prejuicio en la Historiografía antigua y moderna', in *Actas del VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos*, 3, Madrid: 17-43.
- García Moreno, L.A. (1992) 'Ciudades béticas de estirpe púnica. (Un ensayo postmarxista)', *Dialoghi di Archeologia* 10: 119-127.

- García Riaza, E. (2002) *Celtíberos y lusitanos frente a Roma: diplomacia y derecho de guerra*. (Anejos de Veleia 18), Vitoria.
- García Riaza, E. (ed.) (2011) *De fronteras a provincias. Interacción e integración en Occidente (ss.III-I a.C.)*, Palma de Mallorca.
- García Riaza, E. (2012a): 'Sobre los mecanismos de integración de los vencidos en el Occidente romano-republicano. Algunas observaciones', in F. Marco, F. Pina & J. Remesal (eds.), *Vae victis! Perdedores en el mundo antiguo*. (Instrumenta, 40), Barcelona: 161-175.
- García Riaza, E. (2012b) 'Territorios indígenas y derecho de guerra romano en Hispania', in J. Santos & G. Cruz Andreotti (eds.), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma antigua: el caso hispano. (Revisiones de Historia Antigua VII. Anejos de Veleia 12*, Vitoria: 207-233.
- García Riaza, E. (2013) 'Alianzas regionales e identidad supralocal en Occidente durante la etapa de expansión romana (ss.III-I a.C.)', in S. Lefebvre (ed.), *Identités et dynamiques provinciales du IIe siècle avant notre ère à l'époque julio-claudienne*, Dijon: 13-25.
- García y Bellido A. (1945) 'Bandas y guerrillas en las luchas con Roma', *Hispania* 21: 547-604.
- García-Bellido, M.P. (1993) 'Las cecas libiofenicias', in B. Costa & J.H. Fernández Gómez (eds.), *Numismática hispano-púnica. Estado actual de la investigación. VII Jornadas de Arqueología fenicio-púnica (Eivissa, 1992)*, Ibiza: 97-146.
- García-Bellido, M.P. (1995) 'Célticos y púnicos en la Beturia según sus documentos monetales', in *Celtas y Túrdules: la Beturia. Cuadernos Emeritenses 9*, Mérida: 255-291.
- García-Bellido, M.P. (2013) '¿Clerujías cartaginesas en Hispania? El caso de Lascuta', *Palaeohispanica* 13 (Acta Paleohispánica XI): 301-322.
- Gargola, D.J. (2006) 'Mediterranean Empire (264-134)', in N. Rosenstein & R. Morstein-Marx (eds.), *A companion to the Roman Republic*, Oxford: 147-166.
- Gómez Espelosín, F.J. (1993a) *Apiano: Sobre Iberia y Aníbal*, Madrid.
- Gómez Espelosín, F.J. (1993b) 'Appian's Iberiké. Aims and attitudes of a Greek historian of Rome', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II. 34.1: 403-427.
- González Román, C. (1981) *Imperialismo y romanización en la Provincia Hispania Ulterior*, Granada.
- González Wagner, C. (1999) 'Los Bárquidas y la conquista de la Península Ibérica', *Gerión* 17: 263-294.
- Gorges, J.-G. & Nogales, T. (eds.) (2010) *Naissance de la Lusitanie romaine (Ier av.-Ier ap. J. C.). VII Table ronde internationale sur la Lusitanie romaine*. (Toulouse, 8-9 novembre 2007), Toulouse.
- Gorges, J.-G. & Rodríguez Martín, F.G. (2009) 'Les guerres lusitaniennes entre mythe, histoire et réalité: réflexions autour du complexe militaire romain du 'Pedrosillo' (Casas de Reina, Badajoz, Espagne)', in J.-G. Gorges et al. (eds.), *Lusitânia Romana. Entre o Mito e a Realidade. (Actas de la VI Mesa-Redonda sobre Lusitânia Romana, Cascais 2004)*, Cascais: 349-384.
- Gozalbes, E. (2005) 'Mito y realidad del bandolerismo hispano en la Antigüedad (siglos II a.C.-I d.C.)', in *Actas de las VIII Jornadas sobre el bandolerismo en Andalucía*, Lucena: 117-173.
- Gozalbes, E. (2006) 'Algunos modelos de interpretación del bandolerismo hispano en la Antigüedad', in S. Castillo & P. Oliver (eds.), *Las figuras del desorden. Heterodoxos, proscritos y marginados*, (Siglo XXI. Asociación de Historia Social). [CD-Rom text]. Madrid.

- Gozalbes, E. (2007) 'Las formas de bandolerismo en el Occidente romano (siglos I al III). Algunas lecturas al respecto', in G. Bravo (ed.), *Formas y usos de la violencia en el mundo romano*, Madrid: 307-320.
- Gozalbes, E. (2014) 'Roma y los africanos. Imperialismo y relaciones de poder con las poblaciones norteafricanas (siglos II-I a. C.)', in G. Bravo & R. González Salinero (eds.), *Conquistadores y conquistados: relaciones de dominio en el mundo romano*, Madrid: 271-290.
- Gracia, F. (2003) *La guerra en la Protohistoria. Héroes, nobles, mercenarios y campesinos*, Barcelona.
- Grünewald, T. (2004) *Bandits in the Roman Empire. Myth and Reality*, London & New York.
- Guerra, A. (2010) 'A propósito dos conceitos de 'lusitano' e 'Lusitania'', *Palaeohispanica 10. Serta Palaeohispanica in honorem Javier de Hoz*: 81-98.
- Guerra, A. & Fabião, C. (1992) 'Viriato: genealogia de um mito', *Penélope, fazer e desfazer a História* 8: 9-23.
- Gundel, H.G. (1968) 'Viriato, lusitano, caudillo en las luchas contra los romanos, 147-139 a.C.' *Caesaraugusta* 31-32: 175-198.
- Hoyos, B.D. (2010) *The Carthaginians*, London & New York.
- Hoyos, B.D. (2011) 'Carthage in Africa and Spain, 241-218', in B.D. Hoyos (ed.), *A companion to the Punic Wars*, Oxford: 204-222.
- Hoyos, B.D. (ed.) (2013a) *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*, Leiden & Boston.
- Hoyos, B.D. (2013b) 'Introduction', in B. D. Hoyos (ed.) *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*, Leiden & Boston: 1-20.
- Iglesias, J.C. (2010) 'Viriato como líder militar en la historiografía griega', in J. Cortés & J.V. Méndez (eds.), *Dic mihi, musa, virum: homenaje al profesor Antonio López Eire*, Salamanca: 337-344.
- Kunze, C. (2011) 'Carthage and Numidia, 201-149', in B.D. Hoyos (ed.), *A companion to the Punic Wars*, Oxford: 395-411.
- Le Bohec, Y. (2011) 'The 'Third Punic War': the siege of Carthage (148-146 BC)', in B. D. Hoyos (ed.), *A companion to the Punic Wars*, Oxford: 430-445.
- Lens, J. (1986) 'Viriato, héroe y rey cínico', *Estudios de Filología Griega* 2: 253-272.
- López Castro, J.L. (1991) 'El *foedus* de Gadir del 206 a. C: una revisión', *Florentia Ilberritana* 2: 269-280.
- López Castro, J.L. (1992) 'Los libiofenicios: una colonización agrícola cartaginesa en el Sur de la Península Ibérica', *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 20: 47-65.
- López Castro, J.L. (1995) *Hispania poena. Los fenicios en la Hispania romana (206 a.C.-96 d.C.)*, Barcelona.
- López Castro, J.L. (2007) 'The western Phoenicians under the Roman Republic: integration and persistence', in P. Van Dommelen & N. Terrenato (eds.), *Articulating local cultures. Power and identity under the expanding Roman Republic*, Portsmouth, Rhode Island: 103-125.
- López Castro, J.L. (2013) 'The Spains, 205-72 BC', in B.D. Hoyos (ed.), *A Companion to Roman Imperialism*, Leiden & Boston: 67-78.
- López Castro, J.L. & Belmonte, J.A. (2012) 'Pervivencias de la antroponimia fenicia en época romana en la Península Ibérica', in B. Mora & G. Cruz Andreotti (eds.), *La etapa neopúnica en Hispania y el Mediterráneo centro-occidental. Identidades compartidas*, Sevilla: 141-164.
- López Melero, R. (1988) 'Viriatu Hispaniae Romulus', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Ser.2: Historia Antigua*, 1: 247-261.
- Millán, J. (1998) *Gades y las navegaciones oceánicas en la Antigüedad (1000 a.C.-500 d.C.)*, Ecija (Sevilla).

- Mora, B. (2011) 'Coins, cities and territories. The imaginary Far West and South Iberian and North African Punic coins', in A. Dowler & E.R. Galvin (eds.), *Money, Trade and Trade Routes in Pre-Islamic North Africa* (British Museum Research Publication, 176), London: 21-32.
- Mora, B. & Cruz Andreotti, G. (2012) 'Ethnic, cultural and civic identities in Ancient coinage of the South of the Iberian Peninsula', in F. López Sánchez (ed.), *The City and the Coin in the Ancient and Early Medieval Worlds*, BAR Int.Ser. 2402, Oxford: 1-16.
- Mora, B. & Cruz Andreotti, G. (eds.) (2012) *La etapa neopúnica en Hispania y el Mediterráneo centro-occidental. Identidades compartidas*, Sevilla.
- Morley, N. (2010) *The Roman Empire. Roots of Imperialism*, London & New York.
- Ñaco del Hoyo, T. (2006) 'Una historia de la primera fase de la intervención romana en Hispania (218-133 a.C.)', in T. Ñaco & I. Arrayás (eds.), *War and territory in the Roman World. British Archaeological Reports, Int.Ser. 1530*, Oxford: 81-102.
- Paniego, P. (2013) 'La guerra en la Beturia céltica: del siglo V a. C. a la muerte de Viriato', *Revista Historia Autónoma* 2: 13-28.
- Pastor, M. (2004) *Viriato. El héroe hispano que luchó por la libertad de su pueblo*, Madrid.
- Pastor, M. (2011) 'Viriato y las ciudades de la Bética', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Serie II: Historia Antigua* 24: 405-436.
- Pastor, M. (2014) 'Viriato y la conquista del territorio lusitano', in G. Bravo & R. González Salinero (eds.), *Conquistadores y conquistados: relaciones de dominio en el mundo romano*, Madrid: 105-136.
- Pereira, M.H. da R. (2009) 'Entre a história e a lenda: a figura de Viriato', in J.-G. Gorges & J. d'Encarnação (eds.), *Lusitânia Romana. Entre o Mito e a Realidade*, Cascais: 11-23.
- Pérez Rubio, A., Sánchez Moreno, E., Per Gimeno, L., Martínez Morcillo, J.A. & García Riaza, E. (2013) 'Symmachiai celtibéricas (220-133 a.C.): coaliciones militares en el horizonte del imperialismo mediterráneo', *Palaeohispanica* 13 (*Acta Palaeohispanica*, IX): 675-697.
- Pérez Vilatela, L. (1989a) 'Notas sobre la jefatura de Viriato en relación con la Ulterior', *Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina. Homenaje a D. Fletcher Valls* 19: 191-204.
- Pérez Vilatela, L. (1989b) 'Procedencia geográfica de los lusitanos de las guerras del s.II a.C. en los autores clásicos (154-139 a.C.)', in *Actas VII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos (Madrid, 20-24 de abril de 1987)*, vol. 3, Madrid: 257-262.
- Pérez Vilatela, L. (1990) 'Identificación de Lusitania (155-100 a.C.)', en J. Sanchís Llopis (ed.), *Homenatge a José Esteve Forriol*, Valencia: 133-140.
- Pérez Vilatela, L. (2000a) *La Lusitania. Etnología e Historia*. Bibliotheca Archaeologica Hispana 5, Madrid.
- Pérez Vilatela, L. (2000b) 'De la Lusitania independiente a la creación de la provincia', in J.-G. Gorges & T. Nogales (eds.), *Sociedad y cultura en Lusitania romana. IV Mesa Redonda Internacional (2-6 Marzo de 2001)*, Mérida: 73-84.
- Pina Polo, F. (2006) 'El imperialismo romano en la primera mitad del siglo II a.C.', in F. Burillo (ed.), *Segeda y su contexto histórico. Entre Catón y Nobilior (195 al 153 a. C). Homenaje a Antonio Beltrán Martínez*, Zaragoza: 27-33.
- Plácido, D. (2004) 'La configuración étnica del occidente peninsular en la perspectiva de los escritores grecorromanos', *Studia Historica. Historia Antigua* 22: 15-42.

- Plácido, D. (2009) 'Los pueblos prerromanos y sus observadores', in I. Sastre (ed.), *Arqueología espacial: Identidades. Homenaje a M^a. Dolores Fernández-Posse*. (Arqueología Espacial, 27. Seminario de Arqueología y Etnología Turolense), Teruel: 47-62.
- Prag, J. & Quinn, J. (eds.) (2013) *The Hellenistic West. Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*, Cambridge.
- Quesada, F. (2003) 'La guerra en las comunidades ibéricas (c.237-c.195 a.C): un modelo interpretativo', in A. Morillo, F. Cadiou & D. Hourcade (eds.), *Defensa y territorio en Hispania de los Escipiones a Augusto. Espacios urbanos y rurales, municipales y provinciales*, Madrid: 101-156.
- Quesada, F. (2005) 'De guerreros a soldados: el ejército de Aníbal como un ejército cartaginés atípico', in B. Costa & J.H. Fernández (eds.): *Guerra y ejército en el mundo fenicio-púnico*, Ibiza: 129-167.
- Quesada, F. (2006a) 'Los celtíberos y la guerra: tácticas, cuerpos, efectivos y bajas. Un análisis a partir de la campaña del 153 a.C., in F. Burillo (ed.), *Segeda y su contexto histórico. Entre Catón y Nobilior (195 al 153 a. C). Homenaje a Antonio Beltrán Martínez*, Zaragoza: 149-167.
- Quesada, F. (2006b) 'Not so different: individual fighting techniques and battle tactics of Roman and Iberians armies within the framework of warfare in the Hellenistic age', in *Pallas 70. L'hellénisation en la Méditerranée occidentale au temps des guerres puniques (260-180 av. J.-C.)*: 245-263.
- Quesada, F. (2009a) 'La guerra en la Cultura Ibérica', in M. Almagro Gorbea (ed.), *Historia militar de España. I. Prehistoria y Antigüedad*, Madrid: 111-130.
- Quesada, F. (2009b) 'Los mercenarios hispanos', in *ibid* :165-173.
- Quesada, F. (2011) 'Guerrilleros in Hispania? The myth of Iberian guerrillas against Rome', *Ancient Warfare* 5.2: 46-52.
- Quesada, F. (2013) 'Aníbal, *strategos* carismático, y los ejércitos de Cartago', in M. Bendala (ed.), *Fragor Hannibalis: Aníbal en Hispania*, Alcalá de Henares: 255-283.
- Remedios, S. (2012) 'La campaña contra los vacceos', in S. Remedios, F. Prados & J. Bermejo (eds.), *Aníbal de Cartago. Historia y mito*, Madrid: 203-225.
- Richardson, J.S. (1986) *Hispaniae. Spain and the development of Roman imperialism, 218-82 BC*, Cambridge.
- Richardson, J.S. (1996) 'Conquest and colonies in Lusitania in the Late Republic and early Empire', in E. Ortiz & J. Santos (eds.), *Teoría y práctica del ordenamiento municipal en Hispania. Revisiones de Historia Antigua 2*, Vitoria: 53-61.
- Richardson, J.S. (2000) *Appian. Wars of the Roman in Iberia. With an introduction, translation and commentary*, Warminster.
- Richardson, J.S. (2008) *The language of Empire. Rome and the idea of empire from the third century BC to the second century AD*, Cambridge.
- Richardson, J.S. (2011) 'Spain, Africa and Rome after Carthage', in B.D. Hoyos (ed.), *A companion to the Punic Wars*, Oxford: 467-482.
- Riess, W. (2011) 'The Roman Bandit (*latro*) as Criminal and Outsider', in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*, Oxford & New York: 693-714.
- Rodríguez Díaz, A. (1995) 'Territorio y etnias prerromanas en el Guadiana Medio: aproximación arqueológica a la Beturia Túrdula', in *Celtas y Túrdulos: la Beturia*, Mérida: 205-253.
- Rodríguez Díaz, A. & Enríquez, J.J. (2001) *Extremadura tartésica. Arqueología de un proceso periférico*, Barcelona.

- Rodríguez Martín, G. (2009) 'Las guerras lusitanas', in M. Almagro Gorbea (ed.), *Historia militar de España. I. Prehistoria y Antigüedad*, Madrid: 224-234.
- Roldán, J.M. & Wulff, F. (2001) *Citerior y Ulterior. Las provincias romanas de Hispania en la era republicana*, Madrid.
- Rosenstein, N. (2012) *Rome and the Mediterranean 290 to 146 BC. The imperial Republic*, Edinburgh.
- Ruiz Zapatero, G. & Álvarez Sanchís, J.R. (2013) 'Vacceos, vettones y carpetanos ante el ataque de Aníbal', in M. Bendala (ed.) *Fragor Hannibalis: Aníbal en Hispania*, Alcalá de Henares: 335-355.
- Salinas, M. (1993) 'Problemática social y económica del mundo indígena lusitano', in *El proceso histórico de la Lusitania oriental en época prerromana y romana. Cuadernos Emeritenses 7*, Mérida: 9-36.
- Salinas, M. (2008) 'La jefatura de Viriato y las sociedades del occidente de la Península Ibérica', *Palaeohispanica* 8: 89-120.
- Salinas, M. (2011) 'Las fuentes clásicas y el poblamiento prerromano del occidente peninsular. Problemas de etnicidad y cultura', in G. Ruiz Zapatero & J. Álvarez Sanchís (eds.), *Castros y verracos. Las gentes de la Edad del Hierro en el Occidente de Iberia*, Avila: 129-158.
- Salinas, M. (2012a) 'La provincia Ulterior entre Décimo Bruto y Augusto', in J.M. Abascal *et al.* (eds.): *Estudios de Historia Antigua en Homenaje al Prof. Manuel Abilio Rabanal*, León: 105-121.
- Salinas, M. (2012b) 'Los lusitanos y los problemas de definición étnica en el Occidente peninsular', in J. Santos & G. Cruz Andreotti (eds.), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma antigua: el caso hispano. (Revisiones de Historia Antigua VII. Anejos de Veleia 12*, Vitoria: 335-357.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. (2006) 'Ex pastore latro, ex latrone dux... Medioambiente, guerra y poder en el Occidente de Iberia', in T. Naco del Hoyo & I. Arrayás (eds.), *War and territory in the Roman World BAR S1530*, Oxford: 55-79.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. (2008) 'De Aníbal a César: la expedición cartaginesa de Salamanca y los vetones', in J.R. Álvarez Sanchís (ed.), *Arqueología vettona. La Meseta occidental en la Edad del Hierro. Zona Arqueológica, 12*, Alcalá de Henares: 381-393.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. (2010) 'Viriatius, dux of the Lusitani [var. Viriathus]', in A. Coşkun (ed.), *Amici Populi Romani. Prosopographie der auswärtigen Freunde Roms / Prosopography of the Foreign Friends of Rome. APR 03 (22/04/2010)*. Waterloo Institute for Hellenistic Studies, Waterloo: 259-261.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. (2011) 'De la resistencia a la negociación: acerca de las actitudes y capacidades de las comunidades hispanas frente al imperialismo romano', in E. García Riaza (ed.), *De fronteras a provincias. Interacción e integración en Occidente (ss.III-I a.C.)*, Palma de Mallorca: 97-103.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. (forthcoming) '¿Truco o trato? El reparto de tierras a los lusitanos, un opaco en la expansión romana en el Far West, *Veleia (Monográfico: Gestionar el fracaso, algunas sombras en la diplomacia romana)*, Vitoria.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. & García Riaza, E. (2012) 'La interacción púnica en Iberia como precedente de la expansión romana: el caso de Lusitania', in M.B. Cocco, A. Gavini & A. Ibba (eds.), *L'Africa romana. Trasformazione dei paesaggi del potere nell'Africa settentrionale fino alla fine del mondo antico. (Atti del XIX Convegno di Studio; Sassari, 16-19 dicembre 2010)*, vol. 2, Roma: 1249-1259.
- Sánchez-Corriendo, J. (1997) '¿Bandidos lusitanos o pastores trashumantes? Apuntes para el estudio de la trashumancia en Hispania', *Hispania Antiqua* 21: 69-92.

- Sancho Royo, A. (1983) 'Consideraciones en torno al testimonio de Apiano y Diodoro como fuente para las guerras Celtíbero-Lusitanas', in *Actas del VI Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos. Unidad y Pluralidad en el mundo antiguo*, vol. 2, Madrid: 23-40.
- Santos, N. (1981) 'Las incursiones de lusitanos en Hispania Ulterior durante el s. II antes de nuestra era', *Bracara Augusta* 35: 355-366.
- Sanz, A.-M. (2013) *La République romaine et ses alliances militaires: pratiques et représentations de la 'societas' de l'époque du 'foedus Cassianum' à la fin de la Seconde Guerre Punique* (Doctorat de l'Université. Histoire romaine, École Doctorale D'Histoire. Université Paris I, Panthéon Sorbonne). Paris.
- Sayas, J.J. (1988) 'El bandolerismo lusitano y la falta de tierras', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Historia Moderna. Homenaje al profesor A. de Bethéncourt y Massieu*, Madrid: 701-714.
- Schieder, S. & Spindler, M. (2014) *Theories of international relations*, London & New York.
- Shaw, B.D. (1984) 'Bandits in the Roman empire', *Past & Present* 105: 3-52.
- Silva, L. (2013) *Viriathus and the Lusitanian resistance to Rome, 155-139 BC*, Barnsley.
- Solá, J.M. (1967) 'Ensayo de antroponimia feno-púnica de la Hispania antigua', *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 42: 305-322.
- Torregaray, E. (2011) 'En torno a la diplomacia como una forma de interacción en el Occidente romano: un estado de la cuestión', in E. García Riaza (ed.), *De fronteras a provincias. Interacción e integración en Occidente (ss.III-I a.C.)*, Palma de Mallorca: 13-30.
- Torregaray, E. & Santos, J. (eds.) (2005) *Diplomacia y autorrepresentación en la Roma antigua*, Vitoria.
- Vallejo Girvés, M. (1994) 'El recurso de Roma al bandidaje hispano', *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma. Serie 2: Historia Antigua* 7: 165-173.