

## POMPEY'S ORGANIZATION OF TRANSALPINA

CHARLES EBEL

POMPEY'S ORGANIZATION of Transalpina has not received the attention it deserves, although it is only after his settlement there that separate administration of the region is clearly attested.<sup>1</sup> Earlier intimations of Roman control, or influence, tend to fall into one of those informal categories so admirably described by Professor Badian under the general heading of *clientela*.<sup>2</sup>

A major obstacle to the proper recognition of Pompey's role in Transalpina has been the widely held assumption that the province had been rather well organized for a good many years before Pompey's arrival there in 77, and that nothing much needed to be done.<sup>3</sup> That obstacle has been greatly reduced by Badian's vigorous objection to the traditional view that it was Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 122) who first organized the province in about 120.<sup>4</sup> He points out that regular procedures for organizing a province, culminating in the formulation of a *lex provinciae*, were, by then, well established and are well attested elsewhere, but that there is no trace of them in connection with Domitius in Transalpina.

Badian goes on to argue that, for the rest of the second century, Rome's interest in the region was restricted to the protection of lines of communication between Italy and Spain which, for the most part, was entrusted to a few small garrisons stationed at strategic locations along the route. A more important commitment, but for the same limited purpose, was the foundation of the citizen colony of Narbo Martius in 118.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>In general, I have not cited modern works which treat this subject, or aspects of it, only incidentally. The notes reflect those recent works which I found particularly useful. The frequently cited T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York 1951-1952) is regularly abbreviated *MRR*. Three works by E. Badian are cited as follows: *Foreign Clientelae* (264-70 B.C.) (Oxford 1958), *FC*; a collection of articles, *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (New York 1964), *Studies*; "Notes on Provincia Gallia in the late Republic," in *Mélanges Piganiol* (Paris 1966) 901-918, *Notes*.

<sup>2</sup>*FC*.

<sup>3</sup>E.g., T. Rice Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (Oxford 1911) 3-4; H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero* (New York 1959) 41-43; J.-J. Hatt, *Histoire de la Gaule romaine* (Paris 1959) 19-47; A. Piganiol, *La Conquête romaine* (Paris 1967) 379-385.

<sup>4</sup>*FC* 140, 264, 287; *Studies* 88-104; *Notes*. Cf. n. 11.

<sup>5</sup>*Notes* 903-904. Velleius' precise dating of the foundation of Narbo (1.15.5) cannot be lowered on evidence from the so-called "Narbo issue," nor on the basis of Cicero's comments on the career of L. Licinius Crassus (*Brut.* 43.159 ff.), as H. B. Mattingly has proposed: "The Foundation of Narbo Martius," *Hommages Grenier* (Brussels 1958) 1159-1171; "Notes on some Roman Republican Moneyers," *NumChron* 9 (1969) 95-105; "The Numismatic Evidence and the Founding of Narbo Martius," *Revue archéologique*

Not until the Cimbric menace proved these arrangements inadequate did Rome provide for more regular and firmer supervision of the area. Proof of this, in Badian's view, is that we begin to hear of regular governors—though not for a separate Transalpine province. The two Gallic regions, Transalpina and Cisalpina, were normally thrown together under one command forming a *Provincia Gallia*. When circumstances required, however, the Transalpine region could also be attached to Nearer Spain. It was not until the seventies that the two Gauls became separate provinces, only to be united again in the sixties and fifties.

Badian's reconstruction leaves the status of the Gallic province, or provinces, unnecessarily ambiguous and not consistent with his objection to the view that Transalpina was first organized by Domitius. The ambiguity is, or course, no accident. Badian does mean to show that Rome's administration of the two Gauls after 100 was very flexible but that they were normally treated as a unit. Some elaboration and modification of his thesis is warranted.

The Transalpine region should not be treated as an indivisible administrative unit. Here, Badian does not escape from the very trap he exposes. He argues convincingly that, for the Romans, the Alps and the Pyrenees were not the natural frontiers that we have since come to accept as eternal; he then proceeds to treat the region between them (Transalpina) as a unit when he attaches it alternatively to Cisalpina or Nearer Spain.<sup>6</sup> There are good reasons for proposing that, before the seventies, only portions of Transalpina were regularly attached to neighboring provinces, and that the truly formidable boundary between Italy and Spain was the Rhone. It is worth noting in this respect that a consistent pattern of Roman policy in Transalpina had emerged by the end of the second century; it shows a distinctly different approach to the eastern and western halves of the region.

In the area between the Rhone and the Alps, the cornerstone of that policy was Rome's long-standing alliance with Massilia.<sup>7</sup> From the first

*de Narbonnaise* 5 (1972) 1–19. Mattingly's arguments from Cicero's *Brutus* have been refuted by B. Levick: "Cicero, *Brutus* 43.159 ff., and the Foundation of Narbo Martius," *CQ* 21 (1971) 171–179. See also G.V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (Toronto 1973) 95–96, rightly defending the 118 date. The supposed connection between the coins and the foundation of Narbo ought to be abandoned. There is no parallel for the proposed duumvirate of Licinius and Domitius (whose names appear on the coins) leading out of the colony; the usual commission was made up of three men. And the coin type itself (Gallic warrior in a *biga*) seems to allude to a military event, not a colonial foundation. It may honor Domitius' capture of Bituitus and his triumph over the Arverni (*MRR* 1.525 and 526 n. 6).

<sup>6</sup>Notes 905–908; *Studies* 88–97. See also below, n. 45.

<sup>7</sup>N. J. DeWitt, "Massilia and Rome," *TAPA* 71 (1940) 605–615; F. R. Kramer, "Massiliot Diplomacy before the Second Punic War," *AJP* 69 (1948) 1–26; Badian *FC* 47–49.

recorded instance of Roman intervention in the region, down through Pompey's settlement in 71, the only clearly stated Roman dispositions there placed conquered Gauls under Massiliot control. In 154, the consul Q. Opimius, coming to the aid of the Massiliot colonies of Nicaea and Antipolis, defeated the Ligurian Oxybii and Deciatae.<sup>8</sup> The territories of the two tribes were given over to Massilia. Other, apparently less important tribes, were disarmed and required to give hostages to the Massiliots at regular intervals.

In 122, C. Sextius Calvinus (cos. 124), after driving the Gauls back from the coast (east of Massilia), again turned the territory over to Massilia (Strabo 4.1.5). The garrison he stationed at the warm springs which preserved the memory of his visit as Aquae Sextiae was probably small and perhaps not even permanent.<sup>9</sup> Twenty years later (104–102), while awaiting the return of the marauding Cimbri and Teutoni in southern Gaul, C. Marius built a canal at the mouth of the Rhone to supply his troops. He later turned it over to the Massiliots for whom, according to Strabo (4.1.8), it proved to be very profitable.<sup>10</sup> Later, as we shall see, both Pompey and Julius Caesar granted similar favors to the Greek city.

Along the coast between the Rhone and the Pyrenees, the situation was different. Direct Roman control is witnessed on two counts: the building of the Via Domitia and the settlement of Narbo Martius. Both are dated to shortly after 120 and are usually cited in support of Domitius' organization of the province.<sup>11</sup> Both were important actions which, if sudden, should have prompted strong resistance from the local inhabitants. We hear nothing of it. And more remarkably, the sources locate all of the fighting in the few preceding years in the area east of the Rhone (see n. 3). Under the circumstances, we should adopt a theory of earlier encroachment into Transalpine, for strategic reasons, from the Spanish provinces.

<sup>8</sup>Polyb. 33.7–11; Livy *Per.* 47. Not an isolated incident, but to be viewed, as it certainly was from Rome, in conjunction with a serious Lusitanian revolt (App. *Hisp.* 56). See also Strabo 4.6.3.

<sup>9</sup>Our sources (Strabo 4.1.5; Livy *Per.* 61; Pliny *HN* 3.36) are late and reflect later developments. On the foundation of provincial towns and what can be said about them, see P. A. Brunt, *Italian Manpower* (Oxford 1971) 215–220, 570–576.

<sup>10</sup>Badian (*Notes* 909 and elsewhere) unjustly, I think, offers this as proof that Rome had no commercial interests in the area. Marius really had no honorable alternative. The canal had been drawn through Massiliot territory and Massilia was a faithful ally. Cf. E. T. Salmon, *Roman Colonization Under the Republic* (London 1969) 121–123.

<sup>11</sup>For an elaboration of the traditional view on the basis of a milestone from the Via Domitia, see P.-M. Duval, "A-propos du milliaire de Cnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus trouvé dans l'Aude en 1949," *Gallia* 7 (1949) 207–231 and *idem*, "Le Milliaire de Domitius et l'organisation de la Narbonnaise," *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 1 (1968) 3–6. But (as Badian saw) neither the road nor the colony adds up to provincial organization in the normal sense. See also below, n. 20.

Since the late third century, the center of Roman power in Spain was located just south of the Pyrenees<sup>12</sup>—which, as we have seen, were no barrier. Western Transalpina became, in effect, an adjunct of Nearer Spain. The suggestion was made long ago by Mommsen on the basis of the distribution of Iberian coins north of the Pyrenees;<sup>13</sup> recent numismatic studies strengthen it.

The origin and spread of Iberian coinage in the Spanish provinces has been shown to coincide with the arrival and expansion of Roman control there. M. H. Crawford dates the earliest Iberian coinage in Nearer Spain soon after 200, perhaps in 197 when the first regular governors were sent out from Rome; the series ends with the defeat of Sertorius.<sup>14</sup> The correlation should hold as well for Iberian issues from north of the Pyrenees, notably from the region of Narbonne. Unfortunately, they are not precisely dated. G. F. Hill places them between 175 and 71.<sup>15</sup> J. C. M. Richard, reviewing their circulation (rare) in Spain, dates them later, in the first century B.C.<sup>16</sup> More encouraging is the distribution of other coins in Transalpina. By far the most common Gallic coinage in western Transalpina is the so-called *monnaies à la croix*, an abundant series apparently issued from a number of centers by virtually all of the major Gallic tribes of the region.<sup>17</sup> There is disagreement on when the series began. Proponents of a high chronology argue for a late third-early second century date, those favoring a low chronology date all issues to after "the conquest," i.e., 121. There is some hoard evidence (not unchallenged) favoring the high chronology.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>12</sup>See Nicole Dupré, "La Place de la vallée de l'Erbe dans l'Espagne romaine," *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 9 (1973) 133–175.

<sup>13</sup>T. Mommsen (ed. Broughton), *The Provinces of the Roman Empire* (Chicago 1968) 83.

<sup>14</sup>M. H. Crawford, "The Financial Organization of Republican Spain," *NumChron* 9 (1969) 79–93.

<sup>15</sup>*On the Coins of Narbonensis with Iberian Inscriptions* (New York 1930) 7, 36.

<sup>16</sup>"Monnaies gauloises du Cabinet numismatique de Catalogne," *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 8 (1972) 64–67 and "Les Monnayages indigènes de Narbonne et sa région," *Narbonne: archéologie et histoire* (1973) 135–149. Cf. n. 18 below.

<sup>17</sup>A. Soutou, "Remarques sur les monnaies gauloises à la croix," *Ogam* 20 (1968) 101–127 and *idem*, "Répartition géographique des plus anciennes monnaies gauloises à la croix," *Ogam* 21 (1969) 156–169; D. F. Allen, "Monnaies à la croix," *NumChron* 9 (1969) 35–77; J. B. Colbert de Beaulieu, "La Limite septentrionale des monnaies à la croix et la politique de Rome," *RBNum* 117 (1971) 115–131 and *idem*, "Le Signe du denier au droit des monnaies d'argent gauloises dites 'à la croix'," *Acta Numismatica* 2 (1972) 113–119; J. C. M. Richard, "Recherches sur les étalons monétaires en Espagne et en Gaule du Sud antérieurement à l'époque d'Auguste," *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 9 (1973) 81–131.

<sup>18</sup>Soutou and Allen (above, n. 17) propose the late third-early second century date for the earliest issues; Colbert de Beaulieu and Richard suggest the later date. On the hoards from Valera and Drieves (Spain), which contained *monnaies à la croix* and hoards (early second century) Roman coins, see Allen 40 and Richard (above, n. 16) 101–102.

In eastern Transalpina, Massiliot coinage, which circulated widely elsewhere in the western Mediterranean as well, supplied most needs. Massilia adopted a *denarius* standard by the early second century; the Gallic tribes east of the Rhone followed suit after 121.<sup>19</sup>

In brief, the numismatic evidence does support an east-west division of Transalpina, with the western half more closely following the pattern of Nearer Spain. Since the coins are thought to reflect Roman control in Spain, we ought to consider the same probability for Transalpina.

In this connection, Polybius' reference (3.39.7-8) to a road, marked with milestones, from Emporiae to the Rhone might well predate the Via Domitia. Biographical and textual considerations do suggest an earlier date.<sup>20</sup>

If this view of Transalpina is essentially correct, Badian's Provincia Gallia would have extended only to the Rhone. The known "governors" in Transalpina before M. Fonteius in 74 fit into this pattern very well. The evidence for any one of them is woefully thin and it is only a composite view that begins to emerge. They can hardly be styled regular governors of a Transalpine province.

The Roman commanders sent to Gaul to oppose the German invaders (109-102) were emergency appointments, even more clearly than those of 125-121 sent to defend Massilia, and Badian rightly resists crediting them with any serious organizing activities. Some political adjustments in Transalpina were, no doubt, necessary after Marius' decisive victories at Aquae Sextiae and (with Q. Lutatius Catulus) Vercellae. But, as the sources make very clear, Rome's primary concern at the time was the defense of Italy and only later, perhaps, as Badian suggests, safe passage between Italy and Spain. That Roman garrisons were established, or

<sup>19</sup>The first comprehensive study of Massiliot coinage, by H. Rolland, is expected to be published shortly. See, however, the recent survey with bibliographical references by J. B. Colbert de Beaulieu and J. C. M. Richard, "La Numismatique de la Gaule et la numismatique de la Narbonnaise," *Hommage à F. Benoit* 3 (Bordighera 1972) 90-100, especially 95-97 on Massilia and the Gauls east of the Rhone.

<sup>20</sup>This passage has been challenged by some editors because of its apparent lateness on the assumption that there was no marked road in the region before the Via Domitia. For a recent discussion, with references to the modern authorities, see F. W. Walbank, *Polybius* (Berkeley 1972) 12-13. Walbank cites the reference to the milestones as the latest date mentioned in the *Histories* and allows that it may be from Polybius' own hand. By conservative estimate, Polybius would have been at least eighty when he wrote it (Walbank 11, n. 53). The next latest reference (31.28.13) is an apparent allusion to the death of Scipio Aemilianus in 129 (Walbank 19). It is, of course, possible that the reference to the milestones was inserted by a later editor, but it is a strangely obscure piece of information to be given such treatment. It seems more reasonable to assume, as Mommsen suggested (*CIL* 5.885), that the reference is to work done in the 130's. It is a descriptive detail that sounds first-hand. Polybius may have seen the milestones himself, or heard of them, while writing his now lost history of the Numantine War (Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.2).

maintained, at various sites in the region is probable but undocumented.<sup>21</sup> If we look now at the meagre record of attested governors in Transalpina after 100, we can hardly postulate (as Badian does) any significant change in Roman policy there before the time of Pompey.

The first candidate is L. Licinius Crassus (cos. 95), who governed Gallia after his consulate, for how long, we do not know. Badian's suggestion that he had both "provinces" on the basis of "his known interest in Transalpina and the spread of his *nomen* there" (Broughton, *MRR* 2.13, proposes Cisalpina) is not convincing.<sup>22</sup> In any case, we need not assume that he had the whole of Transalpina.

The first governor actually found in Transalpina is C. Coelius Caldus (cos. 94), who was there in 90 putting down a revolt of the Salluvii.<sup>23</sup> This is east of the Rhone. No other information on Coelius' appearance in Transalpina has survived. The presence of his brother in Cisalpina in 87, perhaps serving as his legate, suggests to Badian that his command extended to both Gauls at that time.<sup>24</sup> Again, we should perhaps include only the eastern half of Transalpina in Coelius' command.

Only slightly more is known about the command of C. Valerius Flaccus (cos. 93). He went to Nearer Spain after his consulate, where he campaigned successfully against the Celtiberians, in 83, and perhaps as early as 85 he was in Transalpina; in 81 he celebrated a triumph *ex Celtiberia et Gallia*.<sup>25</sup> On the basis of this essential information, Badian proposes that Transalpina had been attached to Nearer Spain by 85 and Cisalpina to Italy. Why not assume that the western half of Transalpina was part of Flaccus' command from the beginning? It simply explains his presence in Transalpina and fits his triumph perfectly.

<sup>21</sup>Badian (*Notes* 903-904) proposes garrisons at Narbo, Tolosa, Forum Domitii, Aquae Sextiae, and probably other sites. The colony of Narbo itself might be counted a garrison, but no special detachment of troops is recorded there. Forum Domitii is known only from late itineraries and may well be a later development (cf. Brunt [above, n. 9] 570, 715). The garrison attested at Tolosa in 106 is surely to be viewed in the context of the Cimbric menace. We may doubt that it survived the disasters of 105 or that it was replaced after Marius' victory in 102 when the danger was removed. On Aquae Sextiae, see n. 9 above.

<sup>22</sup>*Notes* 907; *Studies* 92 and n. 146. His "known interest" is, of course, in the foundation of Narbo Martius.

<sup>23</sup>Livy *Per.* 73, where Badian (*Studies* 90-92) has established the reading Coelius in place of Caelius.

<sup>24</sup>*Studies* 92-97.

<sup>25</sup>Flaccus was sent to Spain in, or soon after, his consulship (*MRR* 2.14). He issued money from Massilia in the late 80's: A. Alföldi, "Les Deniers de C. Valerius Flaccus frappés à Marseille et les dernières émissions de drachmes massaliotes," *RevNum* 11 (1969) 55-61. He was certainly in Transalpina in 83 where Cicero (*Quinct.* 24, 28) refers to him as "Imperator," the same title which appears on his coins. His nephew took refuge in Massilia in 85 (Cic. *Flac.* 63 and 100). His triumph was *ex Celtiberia et Gallia* (Gran. Licin. 39B).

In any case, we may safely observe that Transalpina experienced some unrest during the first two decades of the first century. The situation there deteriorated badly in conjunction with the success of Sertorius in Spain. Appointed to a Spanish command by the anti-Sullan government of 83, he was driven out by C. Annii in 81 but returned in 80 to defeat and dominate a series of Sullan commanders sent against him for the next several years.<sup>26</sup> They operated in Gaul as well as Spain as the flow of the war dictated.<sup>27</sup> The Sullan restriction on governors to stay within provincial boundaries clearly did not apply. The overriding *provincia* of each was the war against Sertorius. It is therefore misleading, if not absolutely wrong, to style them governors of particular provinces.

Revolution in Transalpina set the stage for the separate organization of the province which we see documented for the first time in M. Fonteius' governorship in 74–72. But who was responsible for the new arrangement? Badian, eschewing discussion of the matter, suggests that it was Sulla.<sup>28</sup> But it seems very doubtful that Sulla would have made new arrangements for areas that were still badly out of control at the time of his death. The command of M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 78), moreover, shows that nothing had changed.<sup>29</sup>

Preparing to support his political program with force if necessary, Lepidus secured a Gallic command. Appian (*BCiv.* 1.107) mentions Transalpina but we find his legate, M. Junius Brutus, in Cisalpina with an army when fighting breaks out. Badian, of course, concludes that Lepidus took both Gauls. (In that case, one wonders about the significance of a Sullan settlement there.) P. Brunt suggests that Lepidus might have been replacing C. Cosconius in Cisalpina and Illyricum.<sup>30</sup> But the Cisalpina for Cosconius (who campaigned in Illyricum) is unattested and the proposal fails to account for Appian's reference to Transalpina. It seems more reasonable to see Lepidus' province as the same Cisalpine-western Transalpine command of the pre-Sullan era. Lepidus' forces were rather quickly

<sup>26</sup>On Sertorius' career, see A. Schulten, *Sertorius* (Leipzig 1926). Sent against him after Annii were C. or M. Aurelius Cotta, defeated at sea in 80, L. Fufidius, defeated in Farther Spain the same year, M. Domitius Calvinus, defeated in Nearer Spain in 79 while Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius was being hard pressed in the Farther province (sources *MRR sub annis*). If L. Manlius was indeed assigned Transalpina in 78 (Badian, *Notes* 910: "the first governor"), it was surely as a military province aiming at Sertorius. Brunt (above, n. 9) 464 assigns Manlius three legions. The inadequate sources (Caesar *BG* 3.20; *Livy Per.* 90; *Plut. Sert.* 12; *Oros.* 5.23.4) report his fighting in Spain and Aquitania.

<sup>27</sup>For a brief survey of the flow of the war, see T. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic* 1 (Oxford 1923) 379–384; on the forces involved, see Brunt (above, n. 9) 470–472.

<sup>28</sup>*Notes* 909–910, but he points out (913) that Sulla did not give the province a *lex*.

<sup>29</sup>Cf. Badian, *Notes* 910–911 and *FC* 275–277; Brunt (above, n. 9) 287, 465; E. Gabba, *Appiani Bellorum Civilium Liber Primus* (Florence 1958) 293–296.

<sup>30</sup>Brunt (above, n. 9) 465.

dispersed, though M. Perperna managed to bring a large portion of them to the support of Sertorius in Spain.

Late in the summer of 77, the Senate, with considerable misgiving, authorized the young Pompey to restore the situation in the West. The root of the problem was, of course, Sertorius in Spain. The Senate recognized it and our sources reflect it. The Transalpine Gauls, as we have noted, were also involved, blocking the road to Spain. But without effective leadership, and threatened on the flank from Narbo and Massilia, they had no chance of halting Pompey's advance.<sup>31</sup> After fighting his way through the region late in 77, Pompey spent the winter near the Pyrenees.<sup>32</sup>

Details of the fighting in Gaul are not recorded. Cicero says that the Gauls suffered heavily for resisting, and he lists the Transalpine War among Pompey's great victories (*Leg. Man.* 28 and 30). Later, in a famous letter to the Senate, Pompey could claim that he had "recaptured Gaul" (*Sall. H.* 2.98M). There is no reason to doubt it; at least no one disputed it, which meant, *more maiorum*, that he would supervise a new settlement.

Pompey had both the inclination and the opportunity for the task, and both points are worth making. He was a determined organizer throughout his career and, it seems, not given to following established forms. He first revealed a taste for organization in Sicily and Africa, after he had recovered these provinces for Sulla. Later he was to organize the East on his own authority, where his settlement eventually became law after Caesar, as consul, saw to its ratification.

The successful conclusion of the Sertorian War was critically important to Pompey's future. He had no standing in Rome except at the head of a victorious army. It was the first campaign in which he was not acting merely as an agent of Sulla. It was also his first venture as "The Great" Pompey, the first test of his right to bear the title of the most famous organizer of them all. It can hardly be doubted that he took full advantage of the opportunity afforded by his hard-won victory when it finally came.

Pompey, of course, had ample time to work out a detailed settlement for Transalpine Gaul. It took him five years to bring the Sertorian War to an end. During that time, Transalpine Gaul served as a staging area for the major fighting that was going on in Spain. Pompey and Metellus each spent at least one winter north of the Pyrenees during the war.<sup>33</sup> And the fact that M. Fonteius was assigned administrative responsibilities in Trans-

<sup>31</sup>*MRR* 2.90; Rice Holmes (above, n. 27) 143-145.

<sup>32</sup>*MRR* 2.90.

<sup>33</sup>*MRR* 2.104 places Metellus in Gaul the winter of 75/4 and Pompey the winter of 74/3; this is in addition to Pompey's earlier stay the winter of 77/6.



alpina for some three years, while the fighting was still going on, does not preclude, or diminish, Pompey's role as organizer. It is perhaps no coincidence that Fonteius was sent to Transalpina at about the same time that the Senate was responding to Pompey's demand for more support.<sup>34</sup> Two new legions were dispatched to Spain in 74 and Fonteius may have delivered them. But Pompey's letter stressed the need for money and supplies even more than for men, and that is what Fonteius set about providing from Transalpina.

We are fortunate in having Cicero's account, if biased, of Fonteius' service in Transalpina. A reasonable list of his activities is easily extracted from the rhetoric: Fonteius directed military operations against at least some Gauls, the Vocontii being specifically mentioned; he confiscated lands and cleared them by force; he requisitioned supplies of all kinds and money as well; he called up cavalry for service in other wars; he ordered the refurbishing of the Via Domitia. He rigidly controlled the circulation of money and provided winter quarters for a large Roman army.<sup>35</sup> In doing all this, he seems to have been careful to avoid offending Roman citizens and non-Gallic allies in the province. On the other hand, virtually every important Gallic tribe sent witnesses against Fonteius at his trial. On the whole, the description of Transalpina which Cicero presents is not one of an organized province, but rather one in the process of being organized.

Pompey was still in Transalpina in 71, thus still available to make final arrangements after Fonteius' departure. The next governor of the emerging province was probably Pompey's trusted legate, L. Afranius.<sup>36</sup> Another loyal Pompeian, M. Pupius Piso, was dispatched to Spain in 71 and perhaps held all of it until Antistius Vetus arrived in 69.<sup>37</sup> The pattern here increases the likelihood that Fonteius was also an adherent of Pompey, a proposal made recently by A. Ward on other grounds but resisted

<sup>34</sup>Broughton (*MRR* 2.104) and Badian (*Notes* 912) seem to be right in assigning Fonteius' *triennium* to the years 74–72. Pompey's letter to the Senate (*Sall. Hist.* 2.98M) was written the winter of 75/4; two new legions were sent to him in 74 (*App. BC* 4.1.111). See also Rice Holmes (above, n. 27) 378, 382–383; Brunt (above, n. 9) 465, 471.

<sup>35</sup>In addition to sections 12–14 (above, 365) see 4.8 (A. Boulanger [*Éditions Budé*, Paris 1961] 29 attributes this fragment to the missing *exordium*.), 11, 16, 18, 20, 26, 49.

<sup>36</sup>*MRR* 2.130–131. Afranius celebrated a triumph by 67. Broughton suggests a praetorship in 71 and 70–69 for his provincial command (Spain or Transalpina) and triumph. But 71 seems early for Afranius' praetorship since, as Pompey's most effective lieutenant, we might expect that he was kept on active duty during much of that year. On Afranius' long and loyal service to Pompey, especially on military campaigns, see E. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley 1974) 63, 85, 132–133 (cited hereafter as *LGRR*). Cf. Badian, *FC* 113 and Brunt (above, n. 9) 465 (following Broughton).

<sup>37</sup>*MRR* 2.124 and 133. On his association with Pompey, see Gruen, *LGRR* (above, n. 36) 61, 63, 85, 132–133.

by E. Gruen.<sup>38</sup> It appears that Pompey, at least for a time, was able to secure the appointment of provincial governors who would maintain his interests in the western provinces.

In late 72, or in 71, Pompey set up a trophy in the Pyrenees to commemorate his victories.<sup>39</sup> Such trophies, and Pompey was not the first to set one up, have implications beyond the mere glorification of conquering generals. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and Q. Fabius Maximus each set one up in Gaul in 121 (Strabo 4.1.11; Florus 1.37.4-6). They are noted as unprecedented in Roman history (Florus *l.c.*). Also in Gaul is the famous Augustan trophy near Monaco which announced the final subjection of the Alpine tribes.<sup>40</sup> The trophies were physical reminders of Roman conquest. It is significant, therefore, that both the Pompeian and the Augustan trophies were inscribed with the names of the recently subjugated peoples. Pliny's description (3.18) of Pompey's trophy is brief: . . . *Pompeius Magnus tropaeis suis quae statuebat in Pyrenaeo, DCCCLXXVI oppida ab Alpibus ad fines Hispaniae Ulterioris in ditionem a se redacta testatus sit*. He later notes (HN 7.96) that it did not mention Sertorius. He also (HN 3.136-137) provides a full list of names from the Augustan trophy, which can be verified from extant fragments of the original inscription. Officially and legally the named tribes or towns constituted a list of the *dediticii*, the unprivileged class of Roman subjects in a province, as contrasted with others who had entered into relations with Rome under more favorable circumstances and were, in fact, allies and friends with certain obligations to Rome but not legally subjects.<sup>41</sup> The inscriptions on the trophies, therefore, provide information that would be reflected in subsequent provincial organizations.

The figure of 876 *oppida* on the Pompeian trophy implies a detailed

<sup>38</sup>A. M. Ward, "Cicero's Support of Pompey in the Trials of M. Fonteius and P. Oppius," *Latomus* 27 (1968) 802-809 and *idem*, "Cicero and Pompey in 75 and 70 B.C.," *Latomus* 29 (1970) 58-71; E. Gruen, "Pompey, Metellus Pius, and the Trials of 70-69 B.C.: the Perils of Schematism," *AJP* 92 (1971) 1-16 and *idem*, *LGRR* (above, n. 36) 268. Ward makes a good case for Pompey's interest in Fonteius' defense, but not, as Gruen shows, for a Metellan interest in the prosecution. It would appear that the Gauls, encouraged by the recent successful prosecution of Verres, managed to prevail upon some not very powerful, but obliging, patrons to plead their case.

<sup>39</sup>MRR 2.124. For a discussion of the trophy, stressing its Hellenistic antecedents, see G. C. Picard, *Les Trophées romains* (Paris 1957) 181-189.

<sup>40</sup>J. Formigé, *Le Trophée des Alpes (la Turbie)* (Paris 1949); Picard (above, n. 39) 291-295. On the probable location of the tribes listed, see G. Barrauol, *Les Peuples pré-romaines du sud-est de la Gaule* (Paris 1969) 32-41.

<sup>41</sup>Rome could unilaterally impose any settlement upon *dediticii* since, usually as a result of war, they had surrendered themselves to the protection of Rome. The status of allies (*socii*), however, rested upon bilateral agreements if not always formal treaties. See Badian *FC* 5-6, 84-85, and *passim*.

inventory of the conquered peoples. Other similar references in ancient sources show that the figure is not out of line.<sup>42</sup> These *oppida* were, of course, merely named places and not recognized political units. Political existence, as seen from Rome, would normally be expressed by the term *civitas*. This is not the place to elaborate on the apparent inconsistencies of our sources in the use of these and related terms.<sup>43</sup> They are, I think, attributable to a real flexibility in application. In general, it can be said that several *oppida* (or *vici*, *pagi*, or similar small units) were attached to, or combined to make up, a *civitas* (or *gens*, *natio*, or some such larger unit). The task of setting out the political units that would be recognized, and responsible to Rome, was a large part of provincial organization.

Pompey followed what was, by now, a well established policy of organization, aimed at concentrating administrative responsibility in a few major centers. It was accomplished by a procedure aptly called "attribution."<sup>44</sup> Usually, an important town would be assigned administrative responsibility for the smaller towns and tribal units in the surrounding area. If no substantial center existed where one seemed warranted, strategic considerations would determine where to establish it, e.g., Lugdunum Convenarum (see below, 369).

There is another point to be made by comparing Pompey's trophy with the trophy of Augustus. The actual wording of the two dedicatory inscriptions strongly suggests their connection with provincial organization. The standard formula for creating a province was *redigere in provinciam* or *redigere in formam provinciae*. Variations on this formula appear on both the Pompeian and the Augustan trophies. On the Pompeian trophy we find: . . . *oppida . . . in ditionem a se redacta*. . . . On the Augustan trophy is: . . . *gentes Alpinae . . . sub imperium P. R. sunt redactae*.

A final indication of the organizational function of these trophies is their location on the boundaries of administrative units, not in, or even near, major population centers where they would have had more propaganda value for the conquering generals. Fabius' trophy was set up near the Isère, the river which marked the southern boundary of the Allobroges. Augustus' trophy anchored the boundary between Transalpine and the Alpine provinces. Pompey's did the same between Transalpine

<sup>42</sup>Strabo (3.4.3) for instance, cites both Polybius and Poseidonius on the figure of 300 poleis which Tiberius Gracchus claimed to have destroyed in Celtiberia, and he goes on to say that some authors ascribe more than 1000 to Iberia.

<sup>43</sup>For a discussion, with recent bibliography, see Barruol (above, n. 40) 119-135.

<sup>44</sup>E. Kornemann, "Attributio," *RE Supp.* 7 (1940) 65-71; Brunt (above, n. 9) 170-171, 249-250. See also Badian *FC* 122-124 on the organization of Spain before 133 and the question of synoecism there.

and Nearer Spain—probably marking a clear administrative division for the first time.<sup>45</sup>

Pompey took firm action to strengthen the boundary between the two provinces. He founded the town of Pompaelo (Pompeopolis, in imitation of Alexander?), modern Pamplona, on the approach to an important pass in the central chain of the Pyrenees.<sup>46</sup> Farther east, this time on the northern slope of the Pyrenees near the Garonne, he founded Lugdunum Convenarum (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges), which controlled the approach to another important pass. Here the confederate tribe of the Garunni, perhaps now freed from the domination of the Tectosages, were brought together to start the town. Some of the Garunni, as in the case of the Ruteni (near Rodez), were apparently left outside the province. Remnants of Sertorian irregulars from Spain were also settled there.<sup>47</sup> The Consoranni, to the east, may have been similarly organized around the *oppidum* at Saint-Lizier.<sup>48</sup> Though this is not attested in literary sources, similar epigraphic evidence and strategic considerations support the conclusion. Both the Convenae and the Consoranni were later attached to Aquitania by Augustus. Emporiae and Illiberis were in position to guard the coastal road from either side of the Pyrenees.<sup>49</sup> Thus reinforced, the Pyrenees became, for the first time, an effective barrier between Gaul and Spain.

In the eastern half of the province, the well established policy was to increase the territory and responsibility of Massilia. Pompey followed it. In a troublesome passage Caesar (*BCiv.* 1.35.4) explains how both he and Pompey became patrons of Massilia: . . . *Cn. Pompeium et C. Caesarem, patronos civitatis* [sc. *Massiliae*], *quorum alter agros Volcarum*

<sup>45</sup>Pompey's trophy is recognized by later sources, notably Strabo (3.4.19 and elsewhere), as a specific boundary marker between Transalpina and the Spanish provinces. Strabo points out, however, that earlier authorities indicate other divisions of the country, explaining that the Romans adjusted boundaries from time to time as it suited them. Cf. Pliny (*HN* 3.18): *Citerioris Hispaniae sicut complurium provinciarum aliquantum vetus forma mutata est*. Polybius (3.39.4–5) refers to the Pyrenees only as a geographical boundary between Iberia and Gaul. We cannot assume that they represented a political boundary as well.

<sup>46</sup>Strabo 4.3.10; A. Schulten, "Pompaelo," *RE* 22.2 (1952) 1994.

<sup>47</sup>Strabo 4.2.1; Pliny *HN* 4.108; Caesar *BCiv.* 3.19.2; Jerome *Adv. Vigil.* 4; Isodorus 9.2.108. The source of Jerome and Isodore may well be Sallust: Hirschfeld *CIL* 13.5. For discussion, see R. Lizop, *Les Convenae et les Consoranni* (Toulouse-Paris 1931) 3–24, followed here. The only mention of the Garunni, along the upper Garonne, is Caesar *BG* 3.27.

<sup>48</sup>Lizop (previous n.) 20–23. Geography and the frequency of the *nomen* Pompeius are the best evidence.

<sup>49</sup>Emporiae, a colony of Massilia, was Rome's firm ally from the time of the Second Punic War: Livy 21.60 (in 218), 34.9 (in 195).

*Arecomicorum et Helviorum publice concesserit, alter bello victas Gallias attribuerit vectigaliaque auxerit.* Although there is some doubt about the nature of Caesar's benefactions (the text has been questioned), there is no reason to doubt that the policy of attributing Gallic lands to Massilia is correctly stated.<sup>50</sup> Nor should we doubt the essential accuracy of the report on Pompey's dispositions. Cicero (*Font.* 14) seems to refer to this action of Pompey's when he lists among the witnesses against his client, Fonteius, those Gauls who were forced to leave their lands *ex. Cn. Pompei decreto*.

The Volcae Arecomici controlled a large territory from the lower Rhone west to the Hérault; their principal center was Nemausus (Nîmes). The Helvii were their neighbors to the north. How much of their land was turned over to Massilia, and on what terms, is an open question. There is some reason to believe, however, that all of it was. Archaeological evidence reveals a strong Massiliot economic interest which might well have been indulged by Pompey.<sup>51</sup> Massiliot coinage circulated widely in the region and the *monnaies à la croix* of the Arecomici show an obverse type of Massiliot inspiration.<sup>52</sup> And with the Massiliot colony of Agathe (Agde) situated at the mouth of the Hérault, it must have seemed reasonable to grant Massilia all of the intervening territory.

In the *pro Fonteio* (12–14) Cicero reveals, rather circuitously, that Pompey's settlement was confirmed by the Senate and imposed, in large part, by Fonteius. To dramatize his client's position, Cicero presents three brief historical sketches of the Transalpine Gauls, Fonteius' accusers, alternated with accounts of Fonteius and his supporters in the province. The parallel descriptions of the Gauls follow a fairly close chronological scheme with interlocking variations in detail that can be cross-referenced. Certain geographical distinctions can also be made. Parallel sections are numbered:

*Provinciae Galliae M. Fonteius praefuit, quae constat ex iis generibus hominum et civitatum, qui, ut vetera mittam, (1) partim nostra memoria bella cum populo Romano acerba ac*

<sup>50</sup>It has been suggested that the actions attributed to Pompey and Caesar ought to be reversed by postulating a chiasmus—a radical proposal which explains nothing. The reading *victas Gallias* has appeared too broad to some and the emendation *victos Sallias* has been proposed. But there is no record of Caesar's fighting the Salluvii, a significant omission in view of the documentation on the Gallic Wars. On the difficulties of the text, see Barruol (above, n. 40) 225; F. Pomponi, "Rome et les Volques: le territoire des Arécomiques au temps de Pompée et de César," *38<sup>e</sup> Congrès de la Fédération historique du Languedoc-Roussillon* (Nîmes 1965) 109–116.

<sup>51</sup>See F. Benoit, *Recherches sur l'hellénisation du Midi de la Gaule* (Gap 1965); J. de Wever, "La *χώρα* massaliote d'après les fouilles récentes," *AntCl* 25 (1966) 71–117; J. Arnal et al., *Le Port de Lattara* (Bordighera-Montpellier 1974).

<sup>52</sup>Allen (above, n. 17) 45–46. The western frontier of the Negroid head type (derived from the Artemis of Massilia) of the Arecomici is the Orb or the Hérault. West of the Hérault, the dolphin type of the Tectosages (or Tolosates) predominates.

*diuturna gesserunt, (2) partim modo ab nostris imperatoribus subacti, modo bello domiti, modo triumphis ac monumentis notati, modo ab senatu agris urbibusque multati sunt, (3) partim qui cum ipso M. Fonteio ferrum ac manus contulerunt multoque eius sudore ac labore sub populi Romani imperium dicionemque cederunt.*

After a brief mention of the respectable elements in the province, Cicero returns again to the Gauls (the chronological order is reversed):

*... M. Fonteius, ut dixi, praefuit; (3) qui erant hostes, subegit, (2) qui proxime fuerant, eos ex iis agris, quibus erant multati, decedere coegit, (1) ceteris, qui idcirco magnis saepe erant bellis superati, ut semper populo Romano parerent, magnos equitatus ad ea bella quae tum in toto orbe terrarum a populo Romano gerebantur, magnas pecunias ad eorum stipendium, maximum frumenti numerum ad Hispaniense bellum tolerandum imperavit.*

In a final review, Cicero suggests to the jury the motivation of the witnesses against Fonteius:

*... (1) dicunt contra, quibus inuitissimis imperatum est, (2) dicunt, qui ex agris ex Cn. Pompei decreto decedere sunt coacti, (3) dicunt, qui ex belli caede et fuga nunc primum audent contra M. Fonteium consistere.*

The first category, dated by *vetera mittam* and *nostra memoria*, refers especially to the tribes defeated repeatedly by Roman generals from 125 to 121. The victories of C. Marius in 102, Coelius Caldus in 90, and Valerius Flaccus might be included here, but the text should not be forced. It is enough to realize that the emphasis in the second category is on Pompey's actions. At the time this speech was delivered in 69,<sup>53</sup> Pompey's exploits in Spain and Transalpina were still fresh in everyone's mind. Aside from his actually being named, his recent record is alluded to in detail: his recent triumph (70), his trophy, the confiscations associated with his foundation of Lugdunum, and his award of lands to Massilia. If Cicero's description does not exclude others from a share in the glory, that merely reflects his diplomatic skill. Pompey was the man foremost in the minds of his audience. The third category refers to those Gauls who opposed Fonteius himself.<sup>54</sup> His actions are distinguished from Pompey's. Cicero's purpose is to show that Fonteius was simply the effective agent of Roman policy in Transalpina.

The divisions of Cicero's text suggest some geographical distinctions as well. In the case of the first category (campaigns of 125–121), where the Gallic tribes involved are mentioned in the sources they are located east of the Rhone. The major tribes, "confederations" as Barruol describes

<sup>53</sup>The date is generally accepted; it could not be earlier: A. E. Ward, *Latomus* 27 (1968) 802.

<sup>54</sup>F. Pomponi (above, n. 50) 113–115, questions all of the relevant texts in an effort to deny that Pompey accomplished anything in Transalpina. Taking some of Cicero's remarks out of context, he views the actions of Fonteius and Pompey as a unit—limited to enforcing earlier senatorial decisions.

them, are the Salluvii, the Vocontii, and the Allobroges.<sup>55</sup> The Arverni, who figure in Domitius' triumph, were, of course, still outside the province during Caesar's tenure in Gaul.<sup>56</sup> The Cavares, who occupied a sizeable territory along the Rhone above the delta, do not figure in accounts of Roman fighting in the area nor in the triumphal *fasti*. They may have been allies, or subjects of Massilia by that time and thus not hostile to Rome.<sup>57</sup>

What formal or informal restraints were placed upon these tribes to ensure "that they would be forever obedient to the Roman people" is not clear. The Salluvii are accounted for, at least in part, as assigned to Massilia. The Vocontii and the Allobroges may have been given treaties.<sup>58</sup> In any event, they were all obliged to support Pompey's effort in Spain. And it appears from Cicero's account that they did, but apparently with increasing resentment as the war dragged on and the demands upon them began to be made more systematically (Cic. *Font.* 26: . . . *qui optima in causa sunt, equites, frumentum, pecuniam semel atque iterum ac saepius invitissimi dare coacti sunt*). We know of at least one Vocontian who fought with Pompey in Spain, the ancestor of the Augustan historian Pompeius Trogus.<sup>59</sup> In the end, the Vocontii seem to have offered armed resistance to the exactions of Fonteius. A mere mention of a Vocontian War is preserved in the incomplete text of the *pro Fonteio*; Cicero's comments on the war have not survived.

The second category refers primarily to those tribes who opposed Pompey's passage into Spain. Geographically, they should be located west of the Rhone for the most part. It is only natural to expect that the Spanish revolution inspired greater enthusiasm in neighboring areas, and that is where Pompey's new arrangements are specifically attested. The Gauls of the western half of the province offered armed resistance to Pompey and were eventually punished with the confiscation of their lands.

The third category (Fonteius' tenure) is merely an adjunct of the first two in terms of affairs in Transalpina. It is clear, however, from this and other passages of the *pro Fonteio*, that Fonteius was responsible for both halves of the province.

The outline of a new arrangement for Transalpina was now in place. Pompey was its principal author. Perhaps feeling the full weight of Roman

<sup>55</sup>G. Barraul (above, n. 40) 187–307, discusses these peoples in detail.

<sup>56</sup>Caesar *BG* 1.45.2–3.

<sup>57</sup>G. Barraul (above, n. 40) 233–234.

<sup>58</sup>Pliny *HN* 3.37: *Vocontiorum civitatis foederatae*. . . . The Allobroges had a roughly similar history of relations with Rome, though perhaps displaying a more belligerent attitude in the late Republic.

<sup>59</sup>Just. *Epit.* 43.5.11–12.

rule for the first time, the Transalpine Gauls, especially the Allobroges, continued to give trouble in the sixties. It was to be expected. Similar unrest had been generated by provincial organization elsewhere (*i.e.*, the Spanish provinces after 197, Asia after 132). The level of resistance might even be held a crude indicator of the degree of change imposed. The model of Fonteius' oppressive tenure was apparently followed by his successors—as Cicero had argued that, for the good of the state, it should be.

L. Afranius celebrated a triumph in the early sixties, probably from Transalpina (above, n. 36). C. Piso, one of the consuls of 67, was awarded both Gallic provinces, which he held until 65. He put down a revolt of the Allobroges in 66 (*MRR* 2.143, 154, 159). L. Murena probably held the single province of Transalpina in 64 and 63, where he made a reputation collecting debts from Gauls.<sup>60</sup> In 63, the Allobroges were tempted to join Catiline—apparently by the prospect of better treatment.<sup>61</sup> C. Pomptinus became governor in 62 and stayed on until Caesar's arrival in 59.<sup>62</sup> Pomptinus found it necessary to campaign against the Allobroges once again (*MRR* 2.176, 185). The province was generally quiet during Caesar's long tenure. But he had large armies with him, and the fruitless policy of resistance was perhaps by then discredited.<sup>63</sup>

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY,  
MOUNT PLEASANT, MICHIGAN

<sup>60</sup>Badian, *Notes* 913–917; Brunt (above, n. 9) 466.

<sup>61</sup>Cicero *Cat.* 3.5; *Flac.* 94–95, 102; Sall. *Cat.* 45.

<sup>62</sup>The doubt expressed by Badian in *FC* 311 about which Gallic province Afranius might have taken up after his consulship in 60 is resolved in favor of Cisalpina in *Notes* 917. The dedication to Afranius by the colony of Valentia (*ILS* 878), which refers to him as consul, is surely the Spanish Valencia, not Valence. Cf. Klebs, "Afranius," *RE* 1.1 (1893) 712.

<sup>63</sup>I wish to thank the journal's anonymous referees, who read an earlier version of this article and made many helpful suggestions for improving it; final responsibility for what appears here is, of course, my own.