Preface. Spanish Turdetania, a Case Study for Shared Identities[*]

Continuity and change in societies conquered by Rome and the effects of such a conquest in Hispania are generally approached as part of the debate on romanization. The debate is neither new nor specific to the region of Hispania. Ever since Rome became important in the construction of post-enlightened Europe, it has been key for interpreting the role of empire.[1] For a long time, it was assumed that romanization in the west was a homogenous and one-way process, resulting from the progressive and steady implementation of everything Roman in all areas. It was ultimately perceived as a positive change, because it implied an increase in culture and civilization among populations, which were first subjugated and later absorbed. This process culminated with the spread of urbanism and citizenship as a socio-economic, spatial and political-juridical model for organization throughout the western empire, as well as with the widespread adoption of Latin as a common language and Roman culture as a genuine expression of civic fulfilment. With the termination of the *Bellum Cantabricum* in AD 19, Hispania, formerly an example of resistance to invasion, became, as of the Imperial period, a birthplace of emperors (Trajan, Hadrian, etc.), philosophers (Seneca, Quintilian…) and literary writers (Mela, Martial…).[2]

An essentialist and historicist approach dominated Spanish scholarship until the 1970s. From its perspective, evidences for pre-Roman continuity were seen as 'vestiges' without historical context, inoperative hindrances, resulting from varying degrees of romanization recorded in each area, which could be studied according to phases and differences in Roman impact.[3] Southern Hispania Ulterior (Baetica for the Latin speaking peoples and Turdetania for the Greek) has always been presented as a paradigmatic example of this traditional outlook. The remains of the great civilizations prior to the arrival of Rome, the monumental Roman past of many of today's cities (*Baelo* / Cádiz, *Italica* / Seville, for instance), or classical literature, which exalted the affinity with Rome of the region and its peoples (in the case of Strabo), all supported the view of a strongly essentialist and diffusionist archaeology in Spain. According to this approach, Tartessos, seen as the "most ancient civilization in the west", of "ancient political, social and cultural traditions, comparable to the Greek" (paraphrasing the words of A. Schulten),[4] became the most distinguished precedent of Roman Turdetania. Subsequent invasion or colonization of Tartessos / Turdetania (Greek, Phoenician, Punic and Roman) only reinforced the pre-existing culture. Therefore, the

[*] ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4477-0715

[1] Romanization in European scholarship has been the topic of a recent doctoral thesis: Crespo Mas 2008; vid. also Díaz-Andreu, and Champion 1996.

[2] Wulff 2003.

[3] The countless works of J.M. Blázquez on romanization since the 1960s were compiled in 1995. For Spain see: Gozalbes Cravioto, and González Ballesteros 2007, 37-48.

[4] 1922 (cf. Cruz Andreotti 1987, 227–240). An exception to the general trend was posed by the archaeologist A. García y Bellido (cf. Arce 1991, 209-211; Bendala Galán, Fernández Ochoa, Morillo Cerdán, and Durán Cabello 2005). See in general Álvarez Martí-Aguilar 2005, Bellón Ruiz, and García Fernández 2009, 51–74.

romanization of Turdetania signified the height of an ongoing, ancient process, in play since the time of the mythical Tartessos.

As of the 1960s and 1970s, changes began taking place, which affected the traditional way of thinking, partly due to increasing contact with European universities in the later years of the Franco regime. Historians and archaeologists with academic backgrounds acquired outside Spain incorporated new techniques and research methods, which questioned the dominating positivism and normativism. This phenomenon was not exclusive to Spain, although old paradigms remained stronger there, aided by the political context of the country and the control exerted by conservative sectors in academic institutions.[5]

All of the above led to a widening of perspectives. Regarding Roman Spain, attention began to be placed not only on the conqueror, but also on the conquered. New evidence, from inscriptions and material culture, which were previously ignored, was no longer only Roman. Against the notion that in Hispania the arrival of Rome launched a relentless process conducive to fully Roman ways of life and social organization, scholars began to point out social or cultural elements of pre-Roman origin that remained active, as forms of indigenous 'survival' or 'resistance' to romanization.[6] Pre-Roman material culture, language, and social and institutional structures were highlighted as continuities, which survived for centuries and experienced a rebirth in the Middle Ages.[7] A more heterogeneous outlook on Hispania was forged in the heat of new, forward-looking approaches, which understood conquest / contact from a bi-directional point of view, in which the 'conquered' also played leading roles. The conquest of Hispania was no longer seen as a uniform process towards becoming Roman.[8]

As of the 1980s and 1990s, a further step was taken. Indigenous culture (particularly in northern Spain) no longer signified a mere continuity of the past or resistance to Rome, but an integral part of a multifaceted romanization, which adapted to a noticeably heterogeneous reality. The proliferation of epigraphic and archaeological finds and the contextualized reading of written sources contrasted with the 'literary archaeology' practiced previously, opening the way for new approaches. Indigenous social structures in the Indo-European region, which survived well into the Imperial period, evidenced widely in inscriptions, were now explained as a Roman adaptation to new political and administrative circumstances. If romanization was to survive as a concept, despite its ideological baggage, it could no longer refer to a genuinely Roman context, but to a mechanism of domination, strongly conditioned by extremely heterogeneous situations of conquest and exploitation; indigenous continuity, when inscribed in new structures, ceased to be characterized as

[5] Reference works: Díaz-Andreu 2002 and Díaz-Andreu *et al.* 2009

[6] The work of M. Vigil (1963, 225–233) was emblematic and foreshadowed these changes.

[7] Barbero, and Vigil 1991[5], particularly the introduction by Marcelo Vigil.

[8] The meeting at Cortona in 1981, published in 1983, marked a turning point for ancient history: *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes. Actes du colloque de Cortone (24–30 mai 1981). Collection de l'École française de Rome* 67. Rome: *École Française de Rome.* For Hispania see Bendala 2006a, 189–200 and 2006b, 289–292.

'vestiges' of the past to constitute new forms of organization in the Roman world.[9] In this context, research on ethnic identities gained central stage,[10] a trend, which was part of the late development of processual stances of New Archaeology in Spain.

In the south and the Levant, new voices demanded a different approach to romanization. The idea of a population immediately converting into Romans (Strabo 3.2.15), after the arrival of Scipio in 218 BC and the expulsion of the Carthaginians, had to be contested. Although the Mediterranean coast and the interior of the Guadalquivir Valley were unquestionably 'romanized' at an early stage, due to prior conditions and an early Roman presence, the process was no longer seen as homogenous. It became evident that the establishment of purely Roman socio-cultural forms brought in by Italian contingents clashed with clearly indigenous elements, such as the survival of urban structures or beliefs of Phoenician, Punic or Iberian origin.[11]

These past years, excavations have multiplied, mainly in urban and rescue archaeology, and early interventions of the 1960s and 1970s have been revised, particularly regarding large quantities of materials that remained unstudied. In comparison to what was known in previous decades, now there is a much greater understanding of the complex urban and rural network along the Guadalquivir Valley and adjacent rivers (the heart of Turdetania), which developed during the progressive penetration of Rome in the region.[12] The network involved economic and social relations, inheritances and transformations from previous socio-economic models, the convergence of diverse ethno-cultural groups in shared spaces, as well as a cultural and religious panorama under Roman rule, which was far from homogeneous or uniform.[13]

All of this resulted in a very heterogeneous scenario, in terms of settlement patterns and territorial organization, as well as cultural elements and identities, which were re-adapted and / or revived in complex negotiations between the Roman and indigenous worlds–understood as Punic, Phoenician, Greek or local. In sum, the romanization of the area known as Turdetania in the Roman Republican and early Imperial periods necessarily caused a confrontation and subsequent accommodation of different identities, not without political and social tensions, which are difficult to reconstruct. Much of the advances previously attributed to the Italian colonization–coinage, civic and political models, to name some–were already operative before the arrival of Rome. Hence, it was Rome that adapted to

[9] The works of G. Pereira Menaut (1983a, 167–192; 1983b, 199–212; 1984, 271–288; 1992, 35–44), J. Santos Yanguas (1985; ed. 1993; and González Rodríguez 1994), or M.C. González Rodríguez (1986; 1988, 181–188) played a fundamental role in the paradigm shift. Recently: Pereira Menaut 2010, 239–253.

[10] Cruz Andreotti, and Mora Serrano 2004.

[11] Studies by Keay 1992 and 1998; Díaz-Andreu, and Keay 1997, Cunliffe, and S. Keay 1995 already pointed in this direction. Likewise, so did the works of M. Bendala and others in relation to the cities of *Carteia* or Carmona in the Punic-Roman period (1976; 2001, 37–52; Martínez Lillo *et al.* 1994, 81–116), or the continuity of the Iberian tradition in such a central issue as urbanism (Abad Casal *et al.* 1987, 121–140; Abad Casal, and Bendala Galán 1997, 11–20), to cite only some examples.

[12] Ferrer Albelda, and García Fernández 2002, 133–51; Ferrer Albelda, García Vargas, and García Fernández 2008, 217–46.

[13] García Fernández 2015, 223–41.

the local reality and merely provided a new context for native continuities, which previously appeared so difficult to explain.[14]

Other academic debates were also influential, particularly discussion on the meaning of 'pre-Roman' in southern Iberia. As explained above, for the traditional approach, history prior to the arrival of Rome was understood as a 'prelude' to the great cultural development brought by Rome. The indigenous communities were completely acculturated by the colonizers, becoming civilized Turdetanians, who fully adapted to the Roman world. The reality was, however, very different. It became increasingly evident that the Phoenician colonization (ninth–sixth centuries BC) significantly affected the local populations far beyond a mere commercial interaction, notably influencing social and territorial structures along the coast and the Guadalquivir Valley, which developed from mixed or hybrid communities; likewise, it became clear that Punic presence was not limited to simple conquest and military control of resources, considerably impacting the organization and ways of life of a wide area of southern Iberia.[15] Acknowledging Phoenician and Punic influence radically transformed the vision held for the centuries prior to the arrival of Rome, and particularly, the scope and effective dimension of the subsequent romanization, viewing the pre-Roman influence as determining.

The territory spanning the Betis-Guadalquivir rivers was never a homogenous ethnic or geographical reality. Furthermore, it was visibly different and opposed to other Iberian worlds, such as the north or the central plateau. Archaeological evidence and a critical and contextualized reading of the literary sources demonstrate that, from Scipio's first entrance with his armies until the Imperial period of the first century AD, these territories were never authentically Roman in any political, social or cultural form, despite not being Punic, Phoenician or local either. As recently noted: "…account needs to be taken of regional Iberian contexts and the ways in which Iberians might have chosen to interpret, deploy or use them, a complex series of processes which give rise to the emergence of new cultural forms that are neither Iberian, Greek, Carthaginian, Italic nor Roman–but hybrid and different. The long cultural shadow cast by the cultural developments in pre-Hellenistic Iberia (i.e. fourth century BC and earlier) suggests instead that we need to think of these kinds of evidence in the context of the changing local and regional social strategies in which they were created".[16]

Processes of contact and / or conquest cannot be seen from a linear perspective; defining 'Roman' has become increasingly complicated.[17] Societies were comprised by multiple

[14] Cf. n. 11. See the works of Eduardo Ferrer Albelda, Francisco José García Fernández, Ruth Pliego Vázquez and Enrique García Vargas in this same volume, as well as those included in the bibliography. Also see: García Fernández 2003b.

[15] See Wulff, and Álvarez Martí-Aguilar 2009, for a comprehensive synthesis: this work compiles the contributions of the main groups leading the break from essentialist, historicist and functionalist approaches in research to date (cf. García Fernández, and Fernández Götz 2010, 47–78). A critical history of changes in research trends, particularly in archaeology, in García Fernández, and Bellón Ruiz 2009, 75–132.

[16] Keay 2013, 319.

[17] Other, more specific studies should also me mentioned, by S. Keay (2007, 305–358–with G. Earl), J.M. Egan (2013), or the recent synthesis by B. Lowe, which offers an economic perspective (2009) and Revell 2016, esp.

identities, which acted differently in relation to the public and private spheres, either as part of the elites or of the dominated population, according to gender, ethnic group or individuality. Identities were sometimes imposed, although in other cases, they arose from the hybrid mix of cultures. Identities could be central to the negotiation of indigenous continuities, adapted to the conditions of empire–as in the case of ethnic identities in Turdetania surviving well into the Roman period–, although they could also play secondary roles, with indirect effects; in sum, all these forms of identity built diverse societies.[18] In southern Iberia, the progressive military, political and territorial establishment of Roman and Italian contingents, was achieved in part by the active participation of local populations. They constructed new political and ethnic identities, influenced by the growing Roman-Italian presence in the territories of Ulterior-Baetica, which ultimately led to the transformation of pre-existing structures. Under the active sponsorship and cultural umbrella of Rome, new ethnic, political and cultural identities were created, which shared the common denominator of urban and civic development, creating a very different reality from what Rome encountered at the beginning of the second century BC, but also substantially different from what was previously considered to be genuinely Roman-Italian. This new approach directly disputes the previously unquestioned Roman hegemony, and is clearly reflected in the form acquired by cities, which combined Roman models in public spaces with Punic urban planning.[19]

In the pages that follow, the contributing authors will analyse some of the aspects that built this choral image of romanization and its shared identities, using Turdetania as a paradigmatic example. A first approach to this image in the pre-Roman period was offered in a previous, edited volume, which set the bases for future research.[20] Some of the arguments put forth then will be continued and developed further in the following chapters, presenting Turdetania as an ideal laboratory for the examination of shared identities, precisely because of the pre-existing ethno-cultural heterogeneity, which resulted in a very diverse and uneven process of romanization, converging at different public and private levels, and varying across territories and different historical moments. Therefore, the starting premise for this book will be to break the artificial and conventional temporal limits determined by a 'before and after Rome'. The authors will go back and forth in time as much as it may appear necessary to clarify the continuity of ethnic and political identities, which affected the development of these territories and its peoples well into Roman times, approximately until the Flavian period. Despite being a merely instrumental Graeco-Roman concept, the term Turdetania / Turdetaninan is used for convenience. All evidence, susceptible of providing new interpretative keys, will be considered, thereby overcoming the

29–39. For other areas under Roman domination between the Republic and the Imperial period: Mattingly. ed. 1997 and 2011; Keay, and Terrenato 2001; Terrenato 1998; Van Dommelen, and Terrenato 2007; Woolf 2011. For Hispania: Cruz Andreotti, and Mora 2004; Santos Yanguas, and Cruz Andreotti 2012; Caballos Rufino, and Lefebvre 2011. For Andalusia: Wulff, and Álvarez Martí-Aguilar 2009.

[18] Wulff 2009b, 11–50.

[19] Wulff 2001.

[20] Wulff, and Álvarez Martí-Aguilar 2009.

obsolete opposition between written and material sources. The literary sources referenced throughout were produced outside the volume's historical context, for Turdetania unfortunately lacked, or lost, any literary production of its own. However, a contextualized reading of the Greek and Roman sources produces interpretations, which go beyond mere literality. Likewise, material culture will not be seen as isolated elements, but from a processual point of view, connecting phenomena relating to identities with the Roman world at different levels in space and time.

The first three contributions define what the written sources understand as Turdetania (Cruz Andreotti, Moret and Castro Páez). They all identify Strabo as the main author for Hispania, as the creator of a narrative on southern Iberia, which will determine what ancient and modern scholarship understood as such. For the geographer, Turdetania was located along the Guadalquivir Valley, and had been assimilated into Roman Baetica. It is presented as ethnically homogenous, as a continuation of the mythical Tartessos, which achieved the perfect state of civilization with the arrival of Rome. Other components to consider in its ethno-cultural composition, such as Phoenician and Punic influence, are side-lined. However, there is evidence in this text, as in other authors (Polybius, Posidonius, Artemidorus, Livy, Pliny, Ptolemy, Appian, etc.), of traces of other ethnic groups and communities (Bastuli, Bastetani, Phoenician, Punic, Turduli, Celtic, etc.) with their own identities, contradicting to a certain extent Strabo's homogeneous view, which is, on the other hand, quite particular to the author. These contradictions expose Turdetania as no more than a notion, an ethno-territorial agglutinant, created by the Romans for administrative purposes, for, in reality, it comprised different ethnic identities converging around a common denominator: the urban centre as a form of civic and territorial organization. The Turdetania of the literary sources did not always refer to the same thing, and therefore did not always include the same geographical space or the same ethnic groups. Far from posing an obstacle, these differences expose ethnicity as active through space and time, and not as a still photograph. A range of possible interpretations emerge from the same classical sources, which, although written from an *etic* perspective, offer interesting insights, relating to the rise and development of identities under the Turdetanian umbrella, characterized by a shared Roman affinity.

After assessing and enriching the information provided by the main literary sources, the contribution of F.J. García Fernández goes on to radically deconstruct the old paradigms relative to the identification between ethnic group and archaeological culture. He first reviews the different positions concerning identity, ethnicity and archaeology, before delving into the question of Turdetania. Neither Turdetania nor the Turdetanians (or Turduli) constitute a recognizable ethnic group or territory, before or during the Roman period. The ethnic variety resulting from ethnogenetic processes, in operation since the fourth century BC, makes it impossible to speak of a common ethnic group. Moreover, there is no 'archaeological culture' to complement them, i.e., there is no distinctive material culture to clearly label as Turdetanian, not even among the communities inheritors of the orientalising or Tartessian culture. Clues may be found in elements linked to daily life and

social practice (*habitus*), which changed constantly and are difficult to follow. However, in order to continue speaking of the Turdetanians in archaeological terms, evidence is, for now, restricted to an archaeology of daily life. Further associations should not be attempted, for the record available does not allow for it.

Having clarified the general historical and archaeological contexts, another set of contributions (Ferrer Albelda; Álvarez Martí-Aguilar, Pliego Vázquez and Machuca Prieto) set out to identify the Phoenician-Punic impact among the complex ethnic identity scenario of Turdetania, which was anything except homogenous. The Phoenician and Punic communities of Iberia played an important role, both in the political and ethnic configuration of the pre-Roman period and in the construction of the new Roman reality in southern Iberia. As previous scholars have argued, such as M. Bendala[21] or J.L. López Castro,[22] the evidence for Phoenician-Punic influence carries enormous weight and potential to counteract traditional approaches. E. Ferrer Albelda emphasizes on this central role and points out the city as the main scenario for identity negotiations in the new historical realities, examining both literary and archaeological evidence. Likewise, new readings of the written sources (such as the one offered by Álvarez Martí-Aguilar of Pompey Trogue) make it possible to reconstruct historical contexts between the fourth and third centuries BC. This period was marked by the territorial and economic expansion of *Gadir* throughout the ancient Phoenician area of influence (expressed in the foundation of colonies, such as *Carteia*, and the continuity of strong ties with the Tyrian metropolis), territorial tensions, and the first intervention of Carthage, before the arrival of the Barcid dynasty. The contribution of Pliego Vázquez reinforces this idea. Faced with the weakness of other evidence, coinage allows her to trace the presence of Carthage in Iberia back to the fourth century BC, changing substantially the idea held until now of Punic activity in the western Mediterranean before the Barcids. It is no longer possible to speak of a mere 'supervised commercial hegemony'. Rather, there existed a continued and effective military presence. Only in the context of an ancient Punic-Gaditanian hegemony may one explain the Phoenician-Punic political and cultural influence over Roman Turdetania, which developed to become a central component of romanization, viewed here as a choral phenomenon. Machuca Prieto elaborates on this concept. While cities of Phoenician-Punic origin underwent Roman monumentalization and urbanization between the second and first centuries BC, local signs of identity were reinforced, such as the claim to ancestral Tyrian origins, and the persistence of writing, material culture or burial practices, which the author describes as the 'Phoenician way of being Roman'.

Coinage is a particularly rich source of evidence in the archaeological record of southern Iberia during the Roman Republican period. The contribution of Mora Serrano further strengthens the choral image. The information afforded by the coinage belonging to cities of Phoenician-Punic or Iberian tradition, such as *Gadir*, *Malaca*, *Sexs*, *Abdera*, *Ebusus*, *Baria*, *Castulo*, *Obulco*, *Urso*, etc., cannot be reduced to representing only one identity. There are, in

[21] Vid. n. 11.

[22] His monograph of 1995 was determining in this sense.

fact, coin types–particularly at the beginning of the Roman occupation–representing a very ancient descent of individual cities, whether Phoenician-Punic or local, and with important local differences depending on the civic tradition from which they originated. Likewise, Roman influences may also be detected in the coinage, such as the adoption of Latin by some mints, while others continued using old place names. On the other hand, the appearance of specific themes or types, Hellenistic in origin, denote adaptation and versatile identities among the urban elites, which were already fully incorporated into the Roman world.

This volume concludes with a study by García Vargas on the role played by the Italians in the romanization of southern Iberia. Although it is impossible today to quantify the number of Italian contingents that arrived in southern Iberia, there is sufficient data to assess their qualitative effect, more in social and economic than in cultural terms, contesting traditional views on the role of the Italians. They were so influential in economic activities, such as mining and the distribution of goods (and, therefore, in changes to the productive system), that they began transforming social consumption habits. This progressive italianization has been clearly exposed by archaeological research of the last decades.

The view offered here on the romanization of Turdetania or its historical predecessors is not a closed one. It would be a rash and senseless position to adopt nowadays. On the contrary, the authors in this volume review different ways of understanding the romanization of Turdetania, as well as the limits and possibilities of research in the area, and of the literary and archaeological record. One conclusion comes clearly across. Neither Rome nor Hispania should be thought of in the same way as before, nor other aspects, such as romanization, Roman imperialism, changes among the local elites and their signs of identity, transformations in the socio-economic or religious spheres, or the continuity of identity markers among the pre-existing communities living in new realities. Roman Turdetania was created by a mix of civic and political experiences of Mediterranean tradition, which contributed to the development of important civic communities, extending throughout the territory. Local elites promoted by Rome competed for gaining visibility for their own, ancient identities, while at the same time actively and enthusiastically collaborating with the Roman authorities, with whom they shared common interests. A similar phenomenon may be perceived in Italy in the years previous to the Social War. The Italian model was applied to Iberia, wherever the socio-economic conditions allowed for it.[23]

This volume is part of the aims and conclusions of three research projects: *La construcción y evolución de las identidades étnicas en Andalucía en la Antigüedad* (*siglos VII a.C.–II d.C.*) (HUM 03482), funded by the Council for Innovation, Science and Enterprise of the regional government of Andalusia, *Identidades étnicas e identidades cívico-políticas en la Hispania romana: el caso de la Turdetania-Bética* (HAR2012–32588) and *Historiografía y geografía antigua: representación del espacio y transmisión de saberes* (HAR2016–76098–C2–1–P), funded by the Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness of Spain. It is a product of the synergies generated in recent years among varied research teams,

[23] Wulff 1991, 2006 and 2007.

particularly–although not exclusively–from the Universities of Malaga and Seville, who met in Malaga to discuss these issues and exchange ideas at a workshop, which took place the 25th and 26th of September of 2014 (*Fronteras de las identidades: qué fronteras para qué identidades*). The results of this meeting are presented in this publication. I would therefore like to thank all authors for their active participation and exciting contributions, as well as their patience with the editing process. References to classical literature follow OCR[3] lists; bibliographic references and lists, as well as abbreviations for journals and collections, follow the *American Journal of Archaeology* standard and the publisher's style book (except for the use of 'ibidem / ibid.', 'passim' or 'vide / vid.', without italics). Any possible errors are, of course, my own.

Finally, this publication would not have been possible without the patient and careful translation of Teresa Erice and the enthusiastic and unbiased reception by Brill Publishers, particularly Giulia Moriconi: to all of them, my most sincere gratitude.

Gonzalo Cruz Andreotti