

MAGISTRI OR MAGISTRATVS? A PROBLEM IN HISPANO-LATIN EPIGRAPHY

¿MAGISTRI O MAGISTRATVS? UN PROBLEMA EN LA EPIGRAFÍA HISPANO-LATINA

LEONARD A. CURCHIN
University of Waterloo
lcurchin@uwaterloo.ca

DOI: 10.1387/veleia.14987

Abstract: The epigraphic abbreviation *MAG*, when referring to the secular leaders of *gentes* and unprivileged towns, has been inconsistently interpreted by various authors as *mag(ister)*, *mag(istratus)* or *mag(isterium)*. A study of the meaning and usage of the terms *magistri* and *magistratus* suggests that the officials of *vici*, *pagi* and *castella* were called *magistri*, while those of *gentes* and unprivileged towns (*oppida*, *civitates*) were known as *magistratus*. This finding provides reliable criteria for determining the meaning of *MAG* in particular cases.

Keywords: *castella*, élites, magistrates, *oppida*, *pagi*, peregrine towns, *vici*.

Resumen: La abreviatura epigráfica *MAG*, cuando se refiere a los líderes políticos de *gentes* y de comunidades no privilegiadas, ha sido interpretada de manera inconsecuente como *mag(ister)*, *mag(istratus)* o *mag(isterium)* por varios autores. Un estudio del uso y de la significación de los términos *magistri* y *magistratus* concluye que los responsables de *vici*, *pagi* y *castella* se llamaban *magistri*, mientras que los dirigentes de *gentes* y de comunidades no privilegiadas (*oppida*, *civitates*) se llamaban *magistratus*. Este resultado proporciona criterios fiables para establecer la significación de *MAG* en determinados casos.

Palabras clave: *castella*, comunidades peregrinas, élites, magistrados, *oppida*, *pagi*, *vici*.

Recibido: 08-02- 2015

Informado: 18-03-2015

Definitivo: 28-04-2015

Anyone who studies the Latin epigraphy of Hispania will be familiar with the problem of the ambiguous abbreviation *MAG*, which can mean either *magister* or *magistratus*¹. In a phrase such as “per mag.” or “mag. IIvir”, which is the correct solution? Too often this question has been decided arbitrarily by educated guess or an editor’s opinion, rather on sound principles. In some cases, scholars have disagreed as to the meaning of this abbreviation in a particular inscription. In others, the published expansion is couched in a query such as “mag(istrum?)” or “mag(istratus?)”,

¹ According to the list of epigraphical abbreviations on the website of the American Society of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (<http://classics.case.edu/asgle/bookshelf/abbreviations-in-latin-inscriptions/>), *MAG* can stand for *mag(ister)*, *mag(isterii)*, *ma-*

g(isterio), *mag(isterium)*, *mag(istra)*, *mag(istras)*, *mag(istratibus)*, *mag(istratu)*, *mag(istratus)*, *mag(istreis)*, *mag(istri)*, *mag(istris)*, *mag(istro)*, *mag(istrorum)*, *mag(istros)*, *mag(istrum)*; to which should be added *mag(istratum)*.

indicating that the editor is not really certain. In one inscription, from Idanha-a-Velha (discussed below), various authors have proposed four possible solutions for *MAG*. While in recent years there has been an increasing tendency to interpret the *MAG* officials as “mag(istratus)”, a considerable number of scholars still see them as “mag(istri)”. Moreover, there are circumstances in which the interpretation “mag(istratus)” is not appropriate. The purpose of this article is to establish the difference between *magistri* and *magistratus*, and to provide a basis for deciding which expansion of *MAG* is appropriate in particular cases.

1. *MAG*: INVENTORY AND PREVIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

The abbreviation *MAG*, referring to civic officials, occurs on inscriptions in stone or bronze dating from the Augustan era to the end of the first century A.D. Oddly, there are no examples of *magistri* or *magistratus* in Hispano-Latin coin legends. In this section we list 14 inscriptions in which local officials are designated as *MAG*. Most of these refer clearly to non-religious office holders, although four of the inscriptions are votive, and in a few of these cases it is unclear whether *MAG* is a magistrate or a cult official.

1.1. *Provincia Lusitania*

a) Cáparra (*Capera*); A.D. 70-100. *HAE* 2574 = *AE* 1967, 197 = *AE* 2002, 705 = *HEp* 12, 93: *Aug[ustae] Trebar[unae] | M. Fidius Fidi f. Quir(ina) [Macer] | MAG III, Ilvir II, praef(ectus) fa[brum ---]*. Blázquez (1965, 59) developed *MAG* as “mag(ister)”, a solution accepted by Caballos Rufino (1998, 218-219). García y Bellido (1974, 9) opined that Fidius Macer was a *magistratus*. Hurtado de San Antonio (1977, n.º. 818), Rodríguez Neila (1993, 387), González Herrero (2002, 425), Andreu Pintado (2006, 376) and Ortiz de Urbina (2013, 286) all read “mag(istratus)”. However, Mantas (2000, 411), Salinas de Frías (2001, 194) and des Boscs-Plateaux (2005, 655 n.º. 194) read “mag(ister)”². M. Fidius Macer is known from two other inscriptions of *Capera* (*CIL* II, 834-835). The tribe Quirina and the title *duovir* imply that *Capera* was a Flavian *municipium*, though *MAG*, the first office held by Fidius Macer, could have antedated the municipal grant.

b) Álvega (*Aritium Vetus*); A.D. 37. *CIL* II, 172 = *ILS* 190: Oath of allegiance to the emperor Gaius, dated by the Roman consuls and by *MAG* | *Vegeto Taltici [f., Vibio [M]arioni[s f.]*. On this inscription, Hübner commented “Magistri duo fuerunt”, thereby implying that *MAG* should be expanded “mag(istris)”, a reading adopted by *ILS*. D’Ors (1953, 21) supplied “mag(istratibus)”. The equivocal reading “mag(istris vel istratibus)” offered by Encarnação (1984, n.º. 647) has been retained by Rosado Martín (2010, 343), although Encarnação himself subsequently opted for “mag(istris)” (Encarnação 2007, 357). Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12) and Melchor Gil (2013, 146 n. 28) regard Vegetus and Vibius as *magistratus*. *Aritium Vetus* at this time had the status of *oppidum* (“in Aritiense oppido veteri”, according to the same inscription).

c) Idanha-a-Velha (*civitas Igaeditanorum*); 16 B.C. *HAE* 1063 = *AE* 1967, 144 = *AE* 1992, 951 = *HEp* 2, 770: Commemoration of the donation of a sundial (*horologium*) by Q. Iallius of

² Des Boscs 2005, 202 n. 16, assumes that Fidius Macer was *magister* of some religious college. He could have been *magister* of the cult of Trebaruna. However,

given the Flavian date and his subsequent career, it is more probable that *MAG* refers to a civic office which Macer held prior to *Capera* becoming a *municipium*.

Emerita, per MAG | Toutoni Arci f. | Malgeini Manli f. | Celti Arantoni f. | Ammini Ati f. Almeida (1956, 140), Lambrino (1956, 18) and Mantas (1988, 421-422) construed *MAG* as “mag(istros)”. However, the editors of *AE* 1967 felt that the genitives following *MAG* demanded a development “mag(isterium)” or “mag(istratum)”, and so printed “mag(isterium?)”, a reading later adopted by Bonnin (2010, 186). Étienne (1992, 356-357) read “mag(istros)” but expanded the personal names as accusatives “Toutoni(um)”, “Malgeini(um)”, and so on. Ferrer Maestro (1991, 110) considered that the *magistri* in this inscription were the artificers who produced the sundial for the donor. However, Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12), Melchor Gil (2011, 156), Pérez Zurita (2011, 209) and Ortiz de Urbina (2013, 291) interpreted these same men as *magistratus*. Recently, Encarnação (2013a, 213; 2013b, 127) has defended the reading “per mag(istros)”, arguing that the *magistri* who accept the donation are representatives of four *gentilitates*, and that the personal names in the genitive are not the names of the *magistri* (who, being merely representatives, remain anonymous) but the names of the eponymous ancestors of each *gentilitas* (e.g. the *gentilitas* of Toutonus son of Arcus). By contrast, Castillo (2013, 300) suggests that “per” may not be a preposition but an abbreviation, and that we should understand “per(missu) m(agistratum)”. The town of the Igaeditani, possibly named among the Lusitanian *municipia* in a Trajanic inscription from the Alcántara bridge (*CIL* II, 760 = *ILS* 287)³ was still an unprivileged *civitas* in the time of Augustus (*AE* 1961, 350). Numerous inscriptions mentioning the tribe Quirina show that it received Latin rights under the Flavians (Wiegels 1985, 80).

1.2. *Provincia Baetica*⁴

a) Villanueva del Río y Minas (*Munigua*); early first century A.D.⁵. *HAE* 1922 = *AE* 1962, 287 = *CILA* 2/4, 1053: *Tabula hospitalis* of Sex. Curvius Silvinus, *quaestor pro praetore*, with the *senatus populusque Muniguensis*, concluding: *egerunt | L. Lucceius L. f. MAG | leg(atus) L. Octavius M. f. Silvanus*. Nesselhauf (1960, 146) considered “mag(istratus)” likelier than “mag(ister)”, while Galsterer (1971, 42) suggested “Mag(nus)”, construing “leg(ati)” as referring to both men. D’Ors (1961, 203), González Fernández (1990, n.º 20), Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12), González Román (2002-2003, 91), Balbín Chamorro (2006, n.º 72), Melchor Gil (2013, 147), Dopico Caínzos and Santos Yanguas (2013, 177 n. 21) all support “mag(istratus)”. *Munigua*, amply attested as a Flavian *municipium*, would still have been an unprivileged town at the time of this inscription.

b) Cauche el Viejo (*Aratispî*); A.D. 38. *CIL* II²/5, 732 = *AE* 1994, 923 = *HEp* 6, 647: *Tabula hospitalis* between Q. Lucius Fenestella and the *senatus populusque civitatis Aratispitana*, concluding: *egit | P. Vibius Rufinus MAG*. Corell Badía and Corell i Vicent (1994) read “mag(istratus)”, followed by Balbín Chamorro (2006, n.º 73), Dopico Caínzos and Santos

³ The transmitted text “Igeditani” is perhaps a misreading of “[Tur]d[e]tani”. See Carbonell, Gimeno, Stylow 2007 = *AE* 2007, 716 = *HEp* 16, 62.

⁴ I exclude the oath of loyalty to Augustus from Las Cabezas de San Juan (*Conobaria*) (*AE* 1988, 723 = *HEp* 2, 623, *HEp* 5, 694 = *CILA* 2/3, 990), issued by T. Quinctius T. f. Silo, P. [--- *MAG* ---] *senatus et populus Co[nobariensium]*, since the reading *MAG* here is only conjectural.

⁵ D’Ors 1961, 206-207, dated this inscription to A.D. 5/6, on the basis of its similarity to *CIL* II 1343 = *ILS* 6097 (from *Lacilbula*, A.D. 5) and *AE* 1952, 49 (from *Emerita*, A.D. 6). Nesselhauf (1960, 148) placed it between 27 B.C. and A.D. 40, while Alföldy 1969, 182-183, dated it to Augustus or Tiberius. On the career of Sex. Curvius Silvinus, see Schäfer 2000, 91.

Yanguas (2013, 177 n. 22). *CIL* prints “mag(istratus?)”, noting that one could equally understand “mag(ister)”.

c) Bienvenida (*Sisapo*); first century A.D. *AE* 1991, 956 = *HEp* 1, 81: *Domina(e) | [A]ttaegina(e) | [T]urubriga(e) | [cul?]tiribus suis | collectis | MA(G) f(e)cerunt(?) | s(---)*. For *MA* in the penultimate line, López Melero (1986) suggested, among other possibilities, “ma(gistri)”, a proposal adopted by *AE* and *HEp*. While the inscription is clearly dedicated (with some variation in spelling) to the amply attested deity Ataecina of *Turobriga*⁶, it is unclear whether the *MA(G)* are *magistri* of the cult, or magistrates of *Sisapo*. Pliny (*NH* 3,14) lists *Sisapo* as an *oppidum*.

1.3. *Provincia Tarraconensis*⁷

a) O Courel (also spelled Caurel), Lugo; A.D. 28. *HAE* 1965 = *AE* 1961, 96 = *AE* 2000, 748: *Tabula hospitalis* between Tillegus Ambati f. Susarrus of the *castellum Aiobrigiaecum* and the *Lougei castellani Toletenses*, enacted by *Tillegus Ambati ipse | MAG Latino Ari (f.) et Aio Temari (f.)*. Arias Vilas *et al.* (1979, n.º. 55), Zeidler (2007, 45) and Gómez Vila (2009, n.º. 18) read “mag(istris)”. However, D’Ors (1960, 144) and Rodríguez Neila (1995, 236 n. 12) believed these officials were *magistratus*. Balbín Chamorro (2006, n.º. 50), Martínez Melón (2006, 124 n. 138), Dopico Caínzos and Santos Yanguas (2013, 176 n. 17) likewise read “mag(istratibus)”, while García Martínez (1997, 43) lists both possibilities.

b) La Milla del Río, León; first century A.D. *CIL* II, 2636 = *ILS* 4509: *Deo | Vagodonnaego (or Vago Donnaego) | sacrum res p(ublica) | Ast(urica) Aug(usta) | per MAG G(aium) Pacatum | et Fl(avium) Proculum | ex donis || curante Iulio Nepote*. *CIL*, followed by Diego Santos (1986, n.º. 63) and Hernández Guerra (2008, 418 n. 53), expanded “mag(istros)”. Fernández Aller (1978, n.º. 14), followed by Mañanes Pérez (1982, n.º. 108), Wiegels (1985, 93), Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12) and González Rodríguez (2014, 210) read “mag(istratus)” (cf., ineptly, “mag(istratos)” in Rabanal Alonso 1998, 118). According to Reid (1913, 236), *magistri* is a title of the chief magistrates, indicating that *Asturica* was at first organized as a native rather than Roman town. Similarly, Olivares Pedreño (2002, 102; 2002-2003, 214) read “mag(istros)” but believed they were magistrates⁸. On the contrary, Pastor Muñoz (1977, 172), followed by Curchin (1990, 239-240), considered it likely that *magistri* referred to a religious college of *Asturica*. Mangas (1997, 194) saw them as officials in charge of cult places, citing *Lex Ursonensis* chapter 128, which provides that the duovirs, aediles or prefects will arrange for the appointment of “mag(istri) ad fana, templa, delubra” (*CIL* II²/5, 1022 = *ILS* 6087). However, it does not follow that the religious institutions in a Roman colony like *Urso* would necessarily be found in the towns of *Asturia*. Also, although several *magistri fani* are attested in central Italy⁹, our inscription says only *MAG*, not *MAG fani*. Two *magistri collegi(i)* are named on another inscription of *Asturica* (*AE* 1928, 167),

⁶ On the numerous other dedications to Ataecina *Turobrigenis*, see Abascal 2002, 53-54. The ruins of *Turobriga* have been identified in the Llanos de San Mamés near Aroche, Huelva.

⁷ I exclude an inscription from Montealegre de Campos, Valladolid dated A.D. 134 (*AE* 1985, 581 = *AE* 1994, 1005 = *HEp* 1, 645 = *HEp* 6, 987), renewing *hospitium* between *Amallobriga* and the *senatus populusque Caucensium*. The initial publication by

G. Bravo Castañeda 1985, interpreted *MAGI* at the end of line 6 as *magi(stri)* or *magi(stratus)*, whereas it is really part of the phrase *cognationis Magi\lancum*.

⁸ “La ofrenda se realiza, por tanto, por dos magistrados de la *Res Publica Asturica Augusta*” (Olivares Pedreño 2002-2003, p. 214).

⁹ *CIL* X, 3918, 3924, 3988 (*magistri fani Dianae* at *Capua*), 4620 (*magister fani Iunonis* at *Cubulteria*).

though without indication of the nature of the *collegium*. The *MAG* inscription was carved on four marble plaques found in 1816 at La Milla del Río (about 20 km north-east of Astorga), a site with mosaics and remains of buildings, but there is nothing (apart from the inscription itself) to suggest that it may have been a *fanum*, *templum* or *delubrum*. It may have been a Roman villa (Tranoy 1981, 299). Pliny (*NH* 3,28) describes *Asturica Augusta* as *urbs magnifica*, which gives no clearer indication of its juridical status than the ambiguous term *res publica* in this inscription. Several inscriptions mentioning the tribe Quirina suggest that the city was a Flavian *municipium* (Wiegels 1985, 92).

c) Herrera de Pisuerga (*Pisoraca*); A.D. 14. *HAE* 2452 = *AE* 1967, 239 = *AE* 2002, 785 = *HEp* 12, 363: Zoomorphic *tessera hospitalis* between the *MAG et senatus Maggavienses* and *Amparamus Nemaecanus Cusaburensis*, enacted *per MAG Caelione(m) | et Caraegium et Aburnum*. Galsterer (1971, 53) admitted that *MAG* could mean either “mag(istros)” or “mag(istratus)”. García y Bellido (1966, 152) read “mag(istratus)”, followed by González Rodríguez (1986, 132), Hernández Guerra (1994, n. 114), Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12, where the date “13 d.C.” is a misprint), Marco Simón (2002, 169-170), Balbín Chamorro (2006, no. 53), Dopico Caínzos and Santos Yanguas (2013, 174 n. 11). The town involved is described in the same inscription as *civitas Maggaviensium*.

d) Paredes de Nava, Palencia; 2 B.C. *Eph. Epig.* I (1872), 141 = *CIL* II, 5763 = *ILS* 6096: *Tessera hospitalis* between Acces Licirni (f.) of *Intercatia* with the *civitas Palantina, per MAG Elaisicum*. Emil Hübner in *Eph. Epig.* expanded *MAG* as “mag(istratum)”, but in *CIL* changed it to “mag(istrum)”, explaining that the *hospitium* was enacted “*per magistrum sive magistratum*”. The fact that “magistratum” is not in italics signifies that it is Hübner’s explanation of *magistrum* rather than an alternative expansion of the abbreviation. More recently, D’Ors (1953, 369), Solana Sainz (1981, 39 n. 48), Hernández Guerra (1994, n. 112), Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12), Beltrán Lloris (2001, 43), Balbín Chamorro (2006, n. 51), Pérez Zurita (2011, 209), Dopico Caínzos and Santos Yanguas (2013, 172 n. 2) read *mag(istratum)*. *Palantia* eventually received municipal status under Vespasian, as disclosed by the tribe Quirina (Wiegels 1985, 127)¹⁰.

e) Peñalba de Castro (*Clunia*); early first century A.D.¹¹. *CIL* II, 2782 = *Clunia II*, 28: *C. Calvisio Aionis f. Gal(eria) | Sabino MAG, flamine Romae | et divi Augusti*. Calvisius was “mag(istro)” according to Hübner, followed by Palol and Vilella (1987, no. 28), but *magister* of what? There is no attestation anywhere in the Empire of a *magister Romae et Augusti*. The balance of probability is that Calvisius is a local magistrate; thus Gómez-Pantoja (2003, 254) reads “mag(istratus)”. Mention of the tribe Galeria, together with indication of his father’s indigenous name, shows that C. Calvisius Sabinus, who is also honoured in a first-century inscription at *Uxama* (*CIL* II, 2822), acquired Roman citizenship in the Julio-Claudian period. *Clunia* may have received municipal status under Tiberius (Galsterer 1971, 35), since local coinage under that emperor designates *IIIviri* and *aediles*, or possibly under Augustus (Wiegels 1985, 162). Perhaps significantly, it was not until late in the reign of Tiberius that a road was built linking *Clunia* to *Caesaraugusta*¹². In any event, the title *flamen Romae et divi Augusti* cannot be earlier than Tiberius, though it is possible that the office of *MAG* was held earlier.

¹⁰ To the two examples cited by Wiegels, add “C. Antonio Calaedi f. Q(uirina) Festo” (*AE* 1987, 615a = *HEp* 2, 607).

¹¹ Reign of Tiberius, according to Étienne 1958, 205 and Gómez Pantoja 2003, 252.

¹² Three milestones in Soria province attest construction of this road in A.D. 33/34 (Lostal Pros 1992, 42-44 and Mapa 3).

f) Arellano, Navarra; mid-first century A.D. *AE* 1951, 281: Altar with metric inscription recording successful completion of a vow to Iuppiter Appenninus during a trip to Rome by one *Flavus MAG victor et laetus*. Navascués (1934, 193-195) interpreted *MAG* as the cognomen “Mag(ilo?)”, followed by Mariner (1952, 213-214), Castillo *et al.* (1981, n.º. 18) and Cugusi (1985, 20). However, Mayer and Velaza propose reading “Flavus mag(istratus)”, explaining that the inscription alludes to «una *legatio* por cualquier motivo realizado por un comisionado de una comunidad» (Mayer and Velaza 1994, 521). While it is not known to which community Flavus might have belonged, the likeliest candidate is *Curnonium*¹³, plausibly identified with the 25-hectare archaeological site of El Castillo at Los Arcos, 11 km south-west of Arellano¹⁴. It should be noted that there were no privileged towns in Navarra in the mid-first century¹⁵.

g) Alcalá de Henares (*Complutum*); late first century A.D. *CIL* II, 2033: *Cn. Nonio | C. Noni fil. | Quir(ina) Crescent[i] | MAG, flamin[i] | Romae et Aug(usti) | d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*. González-Conde (1985, 135), Knapp (1992, n.º. 120), Ruiz Trapero (2001, n.º. 14) and Royo Martínez (2010, 380 n. 6) all read “mag(istro)”. The tribe Quirina reflects the status of *Complutum* as a Flavian *municipium*. As in the inscription from *Clunia* discussed above, we have the formula *MAG, flamin[i] Romae et Augusti*. According to G. Alföldy, it is unlikely that *MAG* indicates the *magister* of a *collegium*. Therefore, he argues, since the title *magister* is inappropriate to a *municipium*, either Nonius was *magister* of a *vicus* in the territory of *Complutum*, or he was *magister* at *Complutum* before it became a *municipium*, and *flamen* afterward (Alföldy 1987b, 63). While Alföldy does not consider the possibility that *MAG* represents “mag(istratui)”, Rodríguez Neila (1995, 263 n. 12), Andreu Pintado (2003, 170) and Melchor Gil (2011, 157) all accept the identification of Cn. Nonius Crescens as a *mag(istratus)*.

h) Caracuel de Calatrava (*Carucivium*); first century A.D. *AE* 1987, 686 = *HEp* 2, 280: [---] | *M. C[---] | Gal(eria) Flavu[s] | M. Valeriu[s] Proculus | MAG II*. According to Alföldy (1987, 236-237), *Carucivium*, a *mansio* known from the Antonine Itinerary (*IA* 445,1), would have been a *vicus* in the territory of *Oretum*. Therefore the two named men would be *magistri vici*. One of them belongs to the tribe Galeria, assigned to persons receiving Roman citizenship under the Julio-Claudians.

2. *MAGISTRI*

The term *magister* (apart from *magistri grammatici*)¹⁶ most often refers to an official of a religious college, such as the *magistri Larum (Augustales)*¹⁷ or, at Saguntum, the *magistri Saliorum*¹⁸. Not infrequently, *magistri* were also *seviri Augustales*¹⁹. The presence of *magistri* in some other cults may be suspected, for instance in the dedication to (Sol) Deus Invictus by Messius Artemidorus,

¹³ Ptol. 2,6,66; *CIL* XIII, 621, Bordeaux (*Curnoniensi*); cf. *HEp* 7, 479, Tafalla (*Cur(noniensi)?*).

¹⁴ Armendáriz Martija 2006; cf. Ramírez Sádaba 2006, 191 and Mapa n.º 4, who places Arellano in the territory of *Curnonium*.

¹⁵ Pliny (*NH* 3,24), writing in the time of Vespasian but using earlier sources, lists the *Andelonenses*, *Carenses* and *Pompeionenses* as *populi stipendarii*. *Pompeio* was still a *civitas* in A.D. 57 (*CIL* II, 2958 = *ILS* 6104).

¹⁶ *CIL* II²/7, 336; *CIL* II²/14, 377, 1282.

¹⁷ Baetica: *CIL* II, 1133; *CIL* II²/5, 773; *CIL* II²/7, 204, 323, 324, 327; *HEp* 9, 508. Tarraconensis: *CIL* II, 3113; *CIL* II²/14, 1242, 1247, 1251, 1253, 1261, 1262, 1264, 1266, 1267; *HEp* 10, 292.

¹⁸ *CIL* II²/14, 349, 364, 365, 690. On the role of the *magister* as president of the college of *Salii*, see Delgado Delgado 2014, 159.

¹⁹ *CIL* II²/14, 1242, 1243, 1251, 1253, 1256, 1259, 1261, 1263, 1266, 1267.

magister (AE 1984, 465). There are also inscriptions in which an individual is designated *magister collegii* (referring to either a religious, professional or funerary association) or simply *magister*; in nearly all cases this involves a slave or freedman²⁰.

Magistri can also appear in a civil context, denoting the officials in charge of a *vicus* or *pagus*²¹. These types of settlement, because of their small size and consequent lack of *dignitas*, were not autonomous entities but were rather attached to larger *civitates*²². Consequently, their officials lacked the *dignitas* of magistrates, and were instead known as *magistri*. This would explain the title *MAG* in the inscription from *Carcuuium* (*vicus*). A bronze decree of Hadrianic date from Agón (Zaragoza) prescribing irrigation regulations for several *pagi* (*pagus Gallorum*, *pagus Belsinonensis*, *pagus Segardinensis*) in the territories of *Caesaraugusta* and *Cascantum*, contains both the abbreviated phrase *MAG pagi* and full mention of *magistri pagi*²³. At Garlitos (*Mirobriga*) in the late first or early second century we have explicit mention of two *magistri pagi*²⁴. Later in this article it will be argued that *castella* also had *magistri*, a fact with possible implications for the O Courel inscription.

The abbreviation *MAG* for *magister* in these contexts poses no problem. The difficulty arises when *MAG* refers to the officials of a peregrine community (such as a *gens*, *civitas* or *oppidum stipendiarium*)²⁵. Much of the confusion is due to Emil Hübner, editor of *CIL* II, who seems to have subscribed to the belief that unprivileged political entities did not have *magistratus*. Despite the explicit mention of *magistratus Zoelarum* on a *tabula hospitalis* from Astorga with consular dating of A.D. 27 (see below), Hübner insisted on expanding *MAG* as *mag(istri)* in the inscriptions from *Aritium Vetus*, La Milla del Río, and Paredes de Nava. His *auctoritas* undoubtedly inspired later investigators to interpret *MAG*, referring to civil officials, as *mag(istri)* in other inscriptions discovered subsequently.

3. *MAGISTRATVS*

Apart from mentions of *magistratus* in colonial and municipal laws (such as the *Lex Ursonensis* and *Lex Irnitana*) and on the *Tabula Siarensis*²⁶, where the word is used as a generic term embracing the duovirs, aediles and, where applicable, quaestors of privileged cities, several literary

²⁰ Religious: *IRPac.* 146 (dedication to Venus); *AE* 1983, 470 = *HEp* 2, 810 (dedication to Dea); *AE* 1984, 465 (dedication to [Sol] Invictus). Professional, connected to commerce or production: *AE* 2003, 970 = *HEp* 11, 621; *CIL* II, 3433-3434; *HEp* 1, 487; cf. Díaz Ariño 2004, 465-468. Funerary, with religious overtone (*sacerdos familiae publicae, perpetuus magister*): *CIL* II²/7, 315; cf. Santero Santurino 1978, 52-53. Unclear: *CIL* II, 5007; *CIL* II²/14, 1200, 1270; *AE* 1928, 167; *AE* 1990, 511 = *HEp* 4, 169.

²¹ *Magistri vici* are mostly found in neighbourhoods of cities like Rome and Pompeii, but occasionally in provincial villages, such as the *magistri vici Eburomagi* in *Narbonensis* (*AE* 1969/70, 388) and a *magister vici Bodatii* in Belgica (*CIL* XIII, 4310). *Magistri pagi*, by contrast, are widely attested. Cf. Tarpin 2001, 278-281 (*magistri vici*), 287-289 (*magistri pagi*).

²² “Vici, castella et pagi hi sunt qui nulla dignitate civitatis ornantur sed ... propter parvitatem sui maioribus civitatibus attribuuntur” (Isid. *Etym.* 15.2.11).

²³ *AE* 1993, 1043 = *AE* 2006, 676 = *HEp* 9, 612 = *HEp* 13, 731. For a detailed study of this inscription, see Beltrán Lloris (2006).

²⁴ *CIL* II²/7, 875 = *AE* 1986, 314 = *HEp* 5, 72: *C. Caecilius Pic|us et L. Sempr|onius Pollio | pagi magis- tri | Iovi O(ptimo) M(aximo) vo|verunt.*

²⁵ The bizarre notion of A.M. Canto 1996, 318, that Pliny’s *oppida stipendiaria* were not “unprivileged” or “peregrine” towns but rather *municipia* which had recently received Latin status under Vespasian, has been convincingly refuted by García Fernández 2000.

²⁶ “mag(istratus) et legatos municipiorum et coloniarum”: *AE* 1999, 891 = *HEp* 9, 524, frag. II, col. b, lines 24/25.

and epigraphic sources provide explicit evidence for unprivileged towns or peoples of Hispania having *magistratus*:

- a) In 49 B.C., Caesar summoned the *magistratus principesque omnium civitatum* of Hispania Ulterior to a meeting at *Corduba* (Caes. *Bell. civ.* 2,19). At this time, most of the towns in this province would have been peregrine.
- b) Las Merchenas, Salamanca; Late Republic. *HAE* 1051 = *CIL* I², 3466: *Tes(s)era | Caurie(n) sis | magistratu | Turi*. While previous editors (Alonso Ávila and Crespo Ortiz 1999, n.º. 184; Hernández Guerra 2001, n.º. 195) understood “magistratu Turi(o)” “when Turius was magistrate”, it is possible to construe *magistratu Turi* as “during the magistracy of Tuross” (so Balbín Chamorro 2006, no. 28). Alternatively, *Turi* might be a toponym, cognate with *Turiaso*, *Turibriga* and the river *Turia* (cf. Abascal 1995, 100). *Caurium*, modern Coria, is listed as a stipendiary town in Pliny, *NH* 4,118.
- c) Astorga (*Asturica Augusta*); A.D. 27. *CIL* II, 2633 = *ILS* 6101: Renewal of *hospitium* between two *gentilitates* of the *gens Zoelarum*, enacted *per Abienum Pentili magistratum Zoelarum*. Both the magistrate of the Zoelae and the six men who conclude the agreement have peregrine names. The Zoelae are listed by Pliny (*NH* 3,28) as one of the 22 *populi* of the Astures, together with the Gigurri, who are called *gens* on the El Bierzo decree (*gente Gigurrorum*: *HEp* 7, 378 = *AE* 2000, 760). Pliny later (*NH* 19,10) refers to the Zoelae as a *civitas* of Gallaecia. The near-synonymous terms *populus* and *gens* refer to a suprafamilial group occupying a particular district, with a town (*oppidum*) or place of assembly (*forum*, e.g. *Forum Gigurrorum*: Ptol. 2,6,37; *Rav.* 320,8) at their centre. The Zoelae eventually had their own senate, the *ordo Zoelar(um)* (*CIL* II, 2606). The word *civitas* is more ambiguous, referring to anything from an unurbanized tribal district to a city-state (Mangas 2000, 57-58)²⁷. A parallel for the *magistratus Zoelarum* as official in charge of a *gens*, *populus* or *civitas* is afforded by “Flav(u)s Vihirmatis fil(ius) summus magistratus civitatis Batavorum” in Germania Inferior in the first half of the first century A.D. (*CIL* XIII, 8771). The Batavi are listed by Pliny (*NH* 4,106) and Tacitus (*Germ.* 1,29) as one of the *gentes* of Germania.
- d) Botorrita (*Contrebia Belaisca*), 87 B.C. *Tabula Contrebiensis* (*AE* 1979, 377 = *HEp* 5, 914): This famous inscription records a judgement (*sententia*) by the senate of *Contrebia*, with the approval of the provincial governor, concerning the right of the Sosinestani to sell land to the Salluienses, and of the latter to dig a canal. The *magistratus Contrebienses* who witness the decision consist of one *praetor* and five others who are simply styled *magistratus*.

Inscriptions from Africa provide explicit evidence for *magistratus* as the title of civic magistrates in peregrine towns: C. Arruntius Faustus Arrunti Proculi f., *magistratus* of the *res publica Silensium* in Numidia (*CIL* VIII, 5884 = *ILS* 3906 = *ILAlg.* II, 6865); P. Ligarius Potitus Ligari Maximi f., decurion and *magistratus annualis* of the *civitas Goritana* in Africa Proconsularis (*CIL* VIII, 12421 = *ILS* 5071); P. Cornelius Viator and Iustus Bithes, *magistratus* of the *civitas Sivalitana* in the same province (*AE* 1996, 1706). As Tissot (1883, 216-218) pointed out long ago with reference to the first two examples, the term *magistratus* designated the officials of a unit that was superior to a *pagus* but inferior to a *municipium*; in other words, an unprivileged town.

²⁷ Although *civitas* theoretically denotes a political entity while *gens* and *populus* refer to social groups, the Romans applied these terms unsystematically to indigenous organizational units, often referring to the same

people by all three terms (see Rodríguez Álvarez 1993, 456 with n. 19-21). On the distinction between *gens* and *civitas Zoelarum*, see González Rodríguez 1994, 162-163; González Rodríguez 2006, 70-71.

4. *MAG*: TOWARDS A SOLUTION

In section 1 we listed 14 inscriptions in which local officials are designated *MAG*. These officials occur sometimes individually (at *Capera*, *Munigua*, *Aratispī*, *Palantia*, *Clunia* and *Complutum*), sometimes in pairs (*Aritium Vetus*, *Asturica* and the *castellum Toletensium*). They number three at *civitas Maggaviensium*, and four at *civitas Igaeditanorum*. The contexts in which these officials are recorded include votive inscriptions (*Capera*, *Sisapo*, La Milla del Río, Arellano), honorific inscriptions (*Clunia*, *Complutum*), hospitality agreements (*Munigua*, *Aratispī*, the *castellum Toletensium*, Herrera de Pisuerga and Paredes de Nava), oath of loyalty to the emperor (*Aritium Vetus*), and donation of a sundial (*civitas Igaeditanorum*). Although many of the inscriptions come from Galicia or the northern Meseta, one can no longer subscribe to the view of Galsterer that *mag(istri)* or *mag(istratus)* are found only in the North-west, in what he calls “the still rather barbaric part of *Tarraconensis*”²⁸.

While some scholars have advocated the reading “*mag(istratus)*” in these inscriptions, others have insisted on retaining the traditional reading “*mag(istri)*”. What particularly strikes the attentive observer who studies these inscriptions is the inconsistency of the approach: scholars have often been content to repeat the solution offered by their predecessors, which has become the *communis opinio*, even when it defies logic. Why, for instance, should the representatives of the *Maggavienses* in the inscription from Herrera de Pisuerga be universally accepted as *mag(istratus)*, when the *MAG* officials of larger towns such as *Clunia* and *Complutum* have been identified by the majority of scholars as *mag(istri)*? While those who advocate the interpretation of *MAG* as *mag(istratus)* undoubtedly feel that their solution is the correct one, there are other recent scholars (e.g. Mantas 2000; Ruiz Trapero 2001; Salinas de Frías 2001; des Boscqs-Plateaux 2005; Zeidler 2007; Encarnação 2007 and 2013a-b, Gómez 2009; Royo Martínez 2010) who do not share this view and who favour the expansion *mag(istri)* in some of these inscriptions. Of course, it is possible that *MAG* could mean *mag(istratus)* in some inscriptions and *mag(istri)* in others, but if so, we would need reliable criteria for deciding the correct solution in each case.

What these *MAG* inscriptions have in common is that they all refer to communities that, to the best of our knowledge, were unprivileged prior to the Flavian period. All except two of the inscriptions are probably pre-Flavian. The two Flavian examples, from *Capera* and *Complutum*, involve men who could have been *MAG* prior to the grant of municipal status by Vespasian, and certainly prior to the receipt of their city’s charter under Domitian. The four unabbreviated mentions of *magistratus* cited in section 3, as well as the African parallels, similarly refer to unprivileged communities.

The case of M. Fidius Macer of *Capera* is important, because after being *MAG* he was subsequently duovir. This suggests he served as magistrate when the town was still unprivileged; after it received Flavian grant of *municipium*, he held the duovirate, thereby receiving Roman citizenship *per honorem*²⁹. Cn. Nonius Crescens of *Complutum* also seems to have been *MAG* before the Flavian grant of *municipium* to his town, after which he became a priest of the imperial cult. The inscription of C. Calvisius Sabinus of *Clunia* cannot be earlier than the reign of Tiberius,

²⁸ “handelt es sich immer um Inschriften aus dem nordwestlichen, im 1. Jh. noch ziemlich barbarischen Teil der *Tarraconensis*” (Galsterer 1971, 43 n. 48).

²⁹ A possible parallel is provided by an inscription from *Volubilis* in Mauritania (*AE* 1916, 42 = *AE* 1992,

1943), concerning a Punic magistrate (*sufes*) who became duumvir and received Roman citizenship under the emperor Claudius when the city was made a *municipium*.

since he was priest of the deified Augustus, but his office of *MAG* presumably antedates the grant of municipal status to that town. Since Tiberian coins of *Clunia* were issued by *IIIviri* and *aediles*, Calvisius Sabinus must have been *MAG* either in the earlier part of Tiberius' reign, or else under Augustus. These three men (Fidius Macer, Nonius Crescens, Calvisius Salvinus) are the only *MAG* officials displaying a voting tribe, emblematic of Roman citizens³⁰. However, it is unclear how Nonius Crescens and Calvisius Sabinus received Roman citizenship. According to the Flavian Municipal Law (*AE* 1986, 333, chap. 21) citizenship was granted for holding a magistracy after the town became a *municipium*. There is no legal provision for citizenship grants to *flamines*, nor to those who had been local magistrates when the town was still peregrine. Nevertheless, these two individuals may have been recipients of *viritim* grants in recognition of their civic service. C. Calvisius Sabinus, for instance, was a noted benefactor who distributed grain to the people of *Clunia* when the price was high ("populo frumentum annona cara dedit") and was also honoured by the decurions of *Uxama* "ob plurima in rem publicam merita" (*CIL* II, 2822).

Rodríguez Neila (1993, 387) explained the title *magistratus* as belonging to a town's "pre-municipal" phase. Similarly, Melchor Gil (2011, 154) has proposed that the term *magistratus* was used to refer to those who held power in unprivileged communities, although these could also be known by indigenous titles. In view of the unprivileged status of the towns in the *MAG* inscriptions, as well as the explicit term *magistratus* in several other texts, these interpretations would serve to explain the *MAG* officials as *mag(istratus)*. Obviously, the magistrates of peregrine communities could not legitimately call themselves *duoviri* or *quattuorviri*, as they had not yet received a grant of colonial or municipal status. For the civic officials of these towns, the more general term *magistratus* was appropriate. None the less, it is noteworthy that in several towns they are attested in pairs, and at *civitas Igaeditanorum* in fours, as if in emulation of *duoviri* and *quattuorviri*³¹. The solution *mag(istratus)*, a title appropriate to the civil officials of unprivileged towns, seems to fit most of our examples.

The position of *magistratus* in the local political hierarchy varied from place to place. Caesar, already cited, mentions *magistratus principesque* in all the *civitates* of Hispania Ulterior. In the *Tabula Contrebiensis*, the six local magistrates (all with indigenous names) comprise one praetor and five *magistratus*. This unusual number perhaps reflects a pre-Roman institutional structure, like the three magistrates of *Maggavia*(?) in the inscription from Herrera de Pisuerga. The office of praetor is attested at *Saguntum* in 219 B.C. (Livy 21,12,7), while a pair of praetors appear at *Bocchoris* in A.D. 6 (*CIL* II, 3695)³². In the hospitality tablet from *Munigua*, it is unclear whether the town is represented by one *mag(istratus)* and one *legatus*, or whether the *legatus* (with the very Roman-looking name L. Octavius M. f. Silvanus) is the representative of the honorand, Sex. Curvius Silvinus.

³⁰ On the evidence for the Roman voting tribe (*tribus*) as an indicator of municipal promotion in the imperial period, see Le Roux 2010; Fasolini 2012.

³¹ It can be deduced from a famous letter of Vespasian in A.D. 77 (*CIL* II, 1423 = *CIL* II²/5, 871 = *ILS* 6092), addressed to the *quattuorviri* and decurions of *Sabora* but published by the *duoviri*, that the title *quattuorviri* included both duovirs and aediles. This supposition is verified by the title *IIIvir aedilicia potes-*

tate in an inscription from *Gades* (*CIL* II, 1728 = *ILS* 8131).

³² Possible pairs of praetors are named on coins of *Calagurris* and *Celsa* in the latter half of the first century B.C. (Curchin 1990, n^o. 523-524, 606-613), but it is unclear whether to read "pr(aetores) IIvir(i)" or "pr(aefecti pro) IIvir(is)". Both solutions pose problems: how could the coining magistrates be praetors and duovirs at the same time? Or why have both duovirs been replaced by prefects?

In a few instances we find the prepositional phrase “per *MAG*”. At *Pisoraca*, where this is followed by three names, we should understand “per mag(istratus)”. In the inscription from Paredes de Nava, where it is followed by a single name, “per mag(istratum)”. The example from the *civitas Igaeditanorum* is more complicated because “per *MAG*” appears to be followed by four genitives. While I am convinced that we are dealing here with *magistratus*, not *magistri*, and that “per” is a preposition rather than an abbreviation for “per(missu)”, it remains doubtful whether to read “per mag(istratum) Toutoni, etc.”, understanding “mag(istratum)” in the sense of “magistracy”, or “per mag(istratus) Toutoni(um), etc.”, expanding the genitives into accusatives. However, the wording “per magistratum + genitive” is awkward and does not appear in inscriptions anywhere in the Empire. And while the name Celtius is amply attested, we have epigraphical evidence in Lusitania for the nominative forms Toutonus, Malgeinus and Amminus³³ (never Toutonius, Malgeinius, Amminius, though the genitives Toutoni, Malgeini, Ammini are ambivalent)³⁴; so the accusatives would not be Toutonium, etc. but Toutonum, Malgeinum, Amminum. In place of the existing hypotheses, I would suggest that the drafter of this inscription was not entirely fluent in Latin and inadvertently used the wrong grammatical case (genitive instead of accusative) after “per”. Therefore, using the standard epigraphical convention for correction of letters inscribed erroneously, we should read: “per mag(istratus) Touton<um> Arci f., Malgein<um> Manli f., Celti<um> Arantoni f., Ammin<um> Ati f.”.

Mentions of *MAG* in the votive inscriptions from *Sisapo* and La Milla del Río are more ambiguous, since they could be either *magistri* or *magistratus*. The altar from *Sisapo* dedicated to the indigenous goddess Attaegina Turubriga by two *MA(G)* might certainly refer to *magistri* of her cult rather than to local magistrates. In the inscription from La Milla del Río, considering that the officials who act on behalf of the *res publica Asturica Augusta* make a dedication to the indigenous god *Vagodonnaegus*, and that the inscription was found in a rural setting some distance from the town, it could be argued that they are *magistri* of the god’s cult. However, just as religion in Latin municipalities was the responsibility of the *duovirs*³⁵, so in peregrine communities —particularly if they were endeavouring to emulate the institutional models of privileged towns— religion may well have been the responsibility of their counterparts, the *magistratus*. The mention of “ex donis” in the La Milla del Río inscription suggests that the dedication may be the result of a public subscription by the inhabitants of *Asturica Augusta*³⁶. Thus, while certainty is unattainable, there is good reason to believe that in the texts from *Sisapo* and La Milla del Río we are dealing with *mag(istratus)*. In support of this hypothesis, it can be argued that the *magistri* of an indigenous deity would not likely wield sufficient authority to act as official representatives of a *res publica*.

A special problem is posed by the *tabula hospitalis* from O Courel, issued by the *Lougei castellani Toletenses* (“the Lougei of the *castellum* of the Toletenses”, or “the *castellani Toletenses*”).

³³ Toutonus Arconis f. (Almeida 1956, n°. 63 = *HAE* 1113); cf. dative Toutono Matuceni f. (*HAE* 927); [H]elvius Malgeinus (*Eph. Epig.* IX, 173); [Ma]lgei[nus] (Encarnação 1984, n°. 476); Malgeinus Leuri f. (*AE* 1985, 517 = *HEp* 1, 698); [M]ailg[e]nus [C]umel[i] f. (*AE* 1987, 482b = *HEp* 2, 903); Malgeinus [Ba]liti f. (Vaz 1997, n°. 36); cf. datives [M]alce(i)no [Ma]aelonis f. (*AE* 1990, 520), Malgeino Bovi f. (*AE* 2000, 689 = *HEp* 10, 727); Amminus Andaitiae f. (*CIL* II, 454); Amminus Taltici f. (*AE* 1984, 468); T. Iulius Amminus (*HEp* 6, 485).

³⁴ Vallejo Ruiz 2005, 132 and Grupo Mérida 2003, 84 list a nominative Amminius, but the only evidence they cite is the *MAG* inscription from Idanha-a-Velha!

³⁵ “[En] las comunidades latinas ... los responsables de la religión municipal fueron los *duumviri*” (Le Roux 2009, 278).

³⁶ “es incontestable el carácter público y oficial de la dedicación al dios Vago Donnaego por parte de la ciudad de *Asturia Augusta* a través de sus magistrados” (González Rodríguez 2014, 212).

belonging to the Lougei”³⁷. The Lougei, in whose territory this *castellum* was located, were an ethnic subdivision of the Astures, attested as *civitas Lougeiorum* on a *tabula hospitalis* of A.D. 1 (*AE* 1984, 553 = *HEp* 1, 458). The document from O Courel is signed by two *MAG* officials, Latinus Ari f. and Aius Temari f. Are these men “the magistrates of the *Lougei castellani Toletenses*” (Salinas 2013, 27), or are they magistrates of the *civitas Lougeiorum* who act as guarantors of the transaction (Beltrán Lloris 2003, 45-46)? Scholars have equivocated on this question. Balbín Chamorro (2006, 144) says these magistrates are “quizás ... ajenos ... [a] los *castellani toletenses*”. Rodríguez Colmenero (1996, 175 and n. 280) asserts that they are magistrates of the *castellum*, the counterparts of *magistri pagi*, unless they are magistrates of the *civitas Lougeiorum*³⁸. Melchor Gil (2011, 156) calls them “magistrados ¿de los lougei?”. Dopico Caínzos and Santos Yanguas (2013, 185) describe them as “los principales de la comunidad”: but of which community, the *civitas* or the *castellum*?³⁹. The unfortunate truth is, we cannot know for certain. If these *MAG* officials are representatives of the *civitas Lougeiorum*, they should be *magistratus*, just like those of the Zoelae⁴⁰.

If, however, the *MAG* officials on the O Courel tablet are representatives of the *castellum*, a different solution is in order. Since most towns of pre-Roman origin were situated on hilltops and would have been protected by circuit walls, the basic difference between a *castellum*, or fortified hilltop settlement, and an *oppidum* was one of size. There is no way that the *castellum Toletensium* can be compared with substantial towns like *Munigua* or *Asturica Augusta*. *Castella* were not independent towns with magistrates, but were part of a *gens* or *civitas* whose political hierarchy (to judge from the surviving evidence) probably consisted of a *princeps*⁴¹ and *magistratus*. A *castellum* is more closely comparable to a *vicus*; indeed, some inscriptions refer to the inhabitants of *castella* as *vicani* (never *oppidani*)⁴². It is therefore to be expected that *castella*, like *vici* and *pagi*, would have had *magistri*. An example is provided by the *mag(ister) castelli Phuensium* in Numidia (*CIL* VIII, 6292, 19281 = *ILAlg.* II, 8962, 8956)⁴³. Although some African *castella* became sufficiently large or important by the Late Empire to assume the title of *res publica*⁴⁴, this phenomenon is not attested in Hispania. Thus, if the *MAG* officials in the inscription from O Courel are representatives of the *castellum Toletensium*, they should probably be seen as *mag(istri)*.

³⁷ Cf. “los Lougeis del *castello* Toletense” (Santos Yanguas 1985, 19); “los *castellani Toletenses* pertenecientes al pueblo de los Lougei” (Orejas *et al.* 2001, 91).

³⁸ “poseen [magistrados] también, a su nivel, los *castella*, como parece deducir de la primera de las *tabulae* del Caurel, viniendo a ser una réplica de los contemporáneos *magistri pagi*.... A no ser *Latinus Ari* y *Aius Temari* fuesen los *magistri* de la *civitas* de los Lougei que ... podrían ser que verdaderamente sancionan el pacto.”

³⁹ The same article (p. 181, table) lists both the *castellum Toletum* and *civitas Lougeiorum* as the “comunidades” involved in this transaction.

⁴⁰ Note, however, that in the inscription of A.D. 1 cited above, the *civitas Lougeiorum* is represented by *legati*, not *magistratus*.

⁴¹ E.g. “[Vecc]o Veci f. princeps Co[pororum]” (*CIL* II, 2585); “Nicer Clutosi (f.) principis Albionum” (*AE* 1946, 121); “Doviderus Amparami f. princeps Cantabrorum” (*AE* 1997, 875 = *HEp* 7, 380). But the supposed “pr(inceps) Argailo(rum)” (*CIL* II,

5762) is a misreading: see *AE* 1994, 1006 = *HEp* 5, 656(b). See above, n. 22, on *castella* being attached to *civitates*.

⁴² E.g. the *vikani consistentes castell[i] Veluniate* on the Antonine Wall in Britain (*AE* 1958, 105 = *AE* 1962, 249 = *RIB* 3503) or the *vicani veteres consistentes castelli Mattiacorum* near Mainz (*CIL* XIII, 6740a, 7250, 7301, 11804). Of course, not all *vici* were hillforts: Florus *Epit.* 2,7 distinguishes “vicos, oppida, castella” in Sicily.

⁴³ On the equivalence of *magister castelli* and *magister pagi* in the context of the Phuenses, see Gascou 1983, 203-204.

⁴⁴ E.g. *castellum Biracsaccarenium* (*AE* 1904, 145 = *CIL* VIII, 23849); *castellum Mastar(ensium)* (*CIL* VIII, 6356 = *ILAlg.* 10130); *castellum Subzuavitianum* (*CIL* VIII, 6002 = *ILAlg.* 7384); *castellum Tidditanorum* (*AE* 1969/70, 693); *castellum Zugal* (*AE* 1930, 55 = *ILAlg.* 8377). On Late Roman *castella* see Martínez Melón 2006, 123-125.

5. CONCLUSIONS

There is no doubt that the abbreviation *MAG*, when referring to the officials of religious or professional *collegia*, stands for *mag(istri)*. The civil officials in charge of a *vicus*, *pagus* or *castellum* would also be *mag(istri)*. But Hübner and many subsequent scholars have assumed that *MAG*, when referring to the civil officials of a peregrine town, likewise represents *magistri*. While Rodríguez Neila (1995) and some later investigators have championed the idea that *MAG* in this context means *magistratus*, there has been no consensus on the issue, nor a formal argument in favour of such an interpretation. On the contrary, as we have seen, a large number of recent scholars persist in seeing these *MAG* officials as *magistri*. This article has endorsed the concept that peregrine towns, variously known as *civitates*, *res publicae* or *oppida stipendiaria*, had *magistratus*, not *magistri*, at their helm. This idea is reinforced by several examples in which local officials are explicitly labelled *magistratus*. These towns had not yet received municipal status, which in most cases would have been granted under the Flavians, and their magistrates were not Roman citizens, except in three cases where a magistrate's career seems to have spanned the transition from peregrine town to municipality. Therefore, in the inscriptions from *Capera*, *Aritium Vetus*, *civitas Igaeditanorum*, *Munigua*, *Aratispi*, Herrera de Pisuerga (referring to the *civitas Maggaviensium*), Paredes de Nava (referring to the *civitas Palantina*), *Clunia*, Arellano (referring perhaps to *Curnonium*) and *Complutum* we should understand *mag(istratus)*. That *gentes* (also known as *civitates*) had *magistratus* is unequivocally demonstrated by the inscription of the Zoelae. If the guarantors of the O Courel tablet are officials of the *civitas Lougeiorum*, they too should be *mag(istratus)*.

However, in situations involving officials of a *vicus*, *pagus* or *castellum* rather than an *oppidum*, we should interpret *MAG* as *mag(istri)*. This would apply to the inscription from the probable *vicus* of *Carcuvium*, and also to the O Courel inscription if the officials named are those of the *castellum Toletensium*. The *pagus* officials on the Agón bronze are called both *MAG* and *magistri*. Although the votive inscriptions from *Sisapo* and La Milla del Río (referring to *Asturica Augusta*) might involve cult officials (*magistri*) rather than magistrates, a good argument can be made that they are actually *magistratus*, since these officials were, in peregrine communities, the equivalent of the *duovirs* who were in charge of religion in privileged municipalities.

In the case of the inscriptions from *Capera*, *Complutum* and possibly *Clunia*, the careers of these officials began before the grant of privileged status and continued after, so that they were *mag(istratus)* while the town was still unprivileged, and *duoviri* or *flamines* of the imperial cult thereafter. The inscriptions of these three men, all of whom acquired Roman citizenship, furnish valuable evidence for the romanization of local élites⁴⁵.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABASCAL PALAZÓN, J. M., 2002, «Ataecina», in: *Religiões da Lusitânia: Loquuntur saxa*, Lisboa: Museu Nacional de Arqueologia, 53-60.
 ALFÖLDY, G., 1969, *Fasti Hispanienses*, Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
 —, 1987a, «Epigraphica Hispanica IX: Inschriften aus Ciudad Real», *ZPE* 67, 225-248.

⁴⁵ I am grateful to the referees of *Veleia* for suggesting various improvements to this article.

- , 1987b, *Römisches Städtewesen auf der neukastilischen Hochebene*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- ALMEIDA, F. DE, 1956, *Egitânia: História e arqueologia*, Lisboa: Universidade de Lisboa.
- ALONSO ÁVILA, Á., CRESPO ORTIZ, S., 1999, *Corpus de inscripciones romanas de la provincia de Salamanca*, Valladolid: Los autores.
- ANDREU PINTADO, J., 2003, «Incidencia de la municipalización flavia en el *conventus Caesaraugustana*», *Salduie* 3, 163-185.
- , 2006, «Munificencia y promoción política de las élites hispanas en época flavia: Ideología y procedimientos», in: J.F. Rodríguez Neila, E. Melchor Gil (eds.), *Poder central y autonomía municipal: La proyección pública de las élites romanas de Occidente*, Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba, 373-403.
- ARIAS VILAS, F., LE ROUX, P., TRANOY, A., 1979, *Inscriptions romaines de la province de Lugo*, Paris: de Boccard.
- ARMENDÁRIZ MARTIJA, J., 2006, «Bases arqueológicas para la localización de la ciudad vascona de *Curnonium* en Los Arcos (Navarra)», *Trabajos de Arqueología Navarra* 19, 85-108.
- BALBÍN CHAMORRO, P., 2006, *Hospitalidad y patronato en la Península Ibérica durante la antigüedad*, Valladolid: Junta de Castilla y León.
- BELTRÁN LLORIS, F., 2001, «La hospitalidad celtibérica: Una aproximación a partir de la epigrafía latina», *Palaeohispanica* 1, 35-62.
- , 2003, «Una variante provincial del *hospitium*: Pactos de hospitalidad y concesión de la ciudadanía local en la *Hispania Tarraconense*», in: S. Armani, B. Hurlet-Martineau, A.U. Stylow (eds.), *Epigrafía y sociedad en Hispania durante el Alto Imperio: Estructuras y relaciones sociales*, Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, 33-56.
- , 2006, «An irrigation decree from Roman Spain: The *Lex Riui Hiberiensis*», *Journal of Roman Studies* 96, 147-197.
- BLÁZQUEZ, J. M., 1965, *Caparra*, [Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España 34], Madrid: Ministerio de Educación Nacional.
- BONNIN, J., 2010, «Les *horologia romana* en Hispanie, mobilier, histoire et réalités archéologiques», *AEspA* 83, 183-198.
- BRAVO CASTAÑEDA, G., 1985, «Avance sobre un nuevo bronce del año 134, hallado en Montealegre (Valladolid)», *Gerión* 3, 309-316.
- CABALLOS RUFINO, A., 1998, «Los equites y la dinámica municipal de la Lusitania, I: Catálogo prosopográfico», in: L. Hernández Guerra, L. Sagredo San Eustaquio (eds.), *El proceso de municipalización en la Hispania romana*, Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 205-233.
- CANTO, A. M., 1996, «*Oppida stipendiaria*: Los municipios flavios en la descripción de Hispania de Plinio», *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología* 23, 212-243.
- CARBONELL, J., GIMENO, H., STYLOW, A. U., 2007, «*Pons Traiani*, Qantara es-Saif, puente de Alcántara: Problemas de epigrafía, filología e historia», in: M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta, A. Guzmán Almagro (eds.), *XII Congressus internationalis epigraphiae Graecae et Latinae (Barcelona 2002)*, Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans/Universitat de Barcelona/Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 247-257.
- CASTILLO, C., 1993, «Miscelánea epigráfica hispano-romana II», *SDHI* 59, 299-313.
- , 2013, «La munificencia cívica de un emeritense (*AE* 1967, 144)», in: E. Melchor Gil, A.D. Pérez Zurita, J.F. Rodríguez Neila (eds.), *Senados municipales y decuriones en el Occidente romano*, Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla/Universidad de Córdoba, 295-302.
- , GÓMEZ-PANTOJA, J., MAULEÓN, M. D., 1981, *Inscripciones romanas del Museo de Navarra*, Pamplona: Diputación Foral/Institución Príncipe de Viana.
- CORELL BADÍA, J. L., CORELL I VICENT, J., 1994, «Nueva “*tabula patronatus*” procedente de la Bética», *Epigraphica* 56, 59-67.
- CUGUSI, R., 1985, *Aspetti letterari dei Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Bologna: Pàtron.
- CURCHIN, L. A., 1990, *The local magistrates of Roman Spain*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- DELGADO DELGADO, J. A., 2014, «El sacerdocio salio de Sagunto: La recepción del programa religioso de Augusto en un municipio de *Hispania Citerior*», *Veleia* 31, 143-162.
- DES BOSCS-PLATEAUX, F., 2005, *Un parti hispanique à Rome?*, Madrid: Casa de Velázquez.

- DÍAZ ARIÑO, B., 2004, «*Heisce magistris: Aproximación a los collegia de la Hispania republicana a través de sus paralelos italianos y delios*», *Gerión* 22, 447-478.
- DIEGO SANTOS, F., 1986, *Inscripciones romanas de la provincia de León*, León: Diputación Provincial.
- DOPICO CAÍNZOS, M. D., SANTO YANGUAS, J., 2013, «Los magistrados de los documentos de hospitalidad en Hispania», in: E. Ortiz de Urbina Álava (ed.), *Magistrados locales de Hispania: Aspectos históricos, jurídicos, lingüísticos*, [Anejos de *Veleia*, Acta 13], Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco, 171-187.
- D'ORS, A., 1953, *Epigrafía jurídica de la España romana*, Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estudios Jurídicos.
- , 1960, «Miscelánea epigráfica», *Emerita* 28, 141-149.
- , 1961, «Miscelánea epigráfica: Los bronce de Mulva», *Emerita* 29, 203-218.
- ENCARNAÇÃO, J. d', 1984, *Inscrições romanas do conventus Pacensis*, Coimbra: Instituto de Arqueologia.
- , 2007, «O culto imperial na epigrafia da Lusitânia ocidental: Novidades e reflexões», in: T. Nogales, J. González (eds.), *Culto imperial: Política y poder*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 349-368.
- , 2013a, «Gentes e divindades na Lusitânia pré-romana ocidental», *Palaeohispanica* 13, 209-215.
- , 2013b, «Novidades epigráficas dos conventus Scallabitanus e Pacensis», in: J. López Vilar (ed.), *Actes 1^{er} Congrès internacional d'arqueologia i món antic (Tarragona, 29-30 de novembre i 1 de desembre de 2012)*, Tarragona: Fundació Privada Mútua Catalana, 125-133.
- ÉTIENNE, R., 1958, *Le culte impérial dans la Péninsule Ibérique*, Paris: de Boccard.
- , 1992, «L'horloge de la civitas Igaeditanorum et la création de la province de Lusitanie», *REA* 94, 355-362.
- FASOLINI, D., 2012, *Le tribù romane della Hispania Tarraconensis: L'iscrizione tribale dei cittadini romani nelle testimonianze epigrafiche*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- FERNÁNDEZ ALLER, M.^a C., 1978: *Epigrafía y numismática romanas en el Museo Arqueológico de León*, León: Colegio Universitario de León.
- FERRER MAESTRO, J. J., 1991, «En torno a la ejecución de las obras públicas en la Hispania romana: Promotores y artifices», in: *Millars: Geografía-Historia* 14, 102-117.
- GALSTERER, H., 1971, *Untersuchungen zum römischen Städtewesen auf der Iberischen Halbinsel*, [Madrider Forschungen 8], Berlin: de Gruyter.
- GARCÍA Y BELLIDO, A., 1966, «*Tessera hospitalis* del año 14 de la Era hallada en Herrera de Pisuerga», *BRAH* 158, 149-163.
- , 1974, «Arcos honoríficos romanos en Hispania», in: *Colloquio italo-spagnolo sul tema: Hispania romana (Roma, 15-16 maggio 1972)*, Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 7-24.
- GARCÍA FERNÁNDEZ, E., 2000, «Plinio y los *oppida stipendiaria*: A propósito de un artículo de Alicia M.^a Canto», *Gerión* 18, 571-591.
- GARCIA MARTÍNEZ, S. M.^a, 1997, «Reglamento jurídico no Noroeste peninsular», *Douro: Estudos & Documentos* 4, 39-62.
- GASCOU, J., 1983, «Pagus et castellum dans la Confédération Cirtéenne», *Antiquités Africaines* 19, 175-207.
- GÓMEZ-PANTOJA, J. L., 2003, «*Ex ultima Celtiberia*: Desarrollo municipal y promoción social en las viejas ciudades arévacas», in: C. Castillo, J.F. Rodríguez Neila, F.J. Navarro (eds.), *Sociedad y economía en el Occidente romano*, Pamplona: Universidad de Navarra, 231-282.
- GÓMEZ VILA, J., 2009, *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de Lugo*, London: Lulu Enterprises.
- GONZÁLEZ-CONDE, M. P., 1985, «Promoción jurídica y administración municipal de *Complutum* en el Alto Imperio», *Lucentum* 4, 133-146.
- GONZÁLEZ FERNÁNDEZ, J., 1988, «The first oath pro salute Augusti found in Baetica», *ZPE* 72, 113-127.
- , 1990, *Bronces jurídicos romanos de Andalucía*, Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.
- GONZÁLEZ HERRERO, M., 2002, «M. Fidius Fidi f. Quir(ina) Macer, benefactor en *Capera*», *Gerión* 20, 417-433.
- GONZÁLEZ RODRÍGUEZ, M. C., 1986, *Las unidades organizativas indígenas del área indoeuropea de Hispania*, [Anejos de *Veleia*, Series Maior 2], Vitoria/Gasteiz: UPV/EHU.
- , 1994, «Reflexiones sobre las unidades organizativas indígenas del área indoeuropea», in: M.C. González [Rodríguez], J. Santos [Yanguas] (eds.), *Las estructuras sociales indígenas del Norte de la Península Ibérica* [Anejos de *Veleia*, Acta 1], Vitoria/Gasteiz: UPV/EHU.

- , 2006, *Los astures y los cántabros vadinienses: Problemas y perspectivas de análisis de las sociedades indígenas de la Hispania indoeuropea*, 2ª ed., [Anejos de *Veleia*, Series Minor 10], Vitoria-Gasteiz: UPV/EHU.
- , 2014, «Los santuarios del territorio en las *ciuitates* de la *Asturia augustana*: El ejemplo del *deus Vagus Donnaegus*», in: J. Mangas Manjarrés, M.A. Novillo López, (eds.), *Santuarios suburbanos y del territorio de las ciudades romanas*, Madrid: Instituto de Investigación en Ciencias de la Antigüedad de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 205-233.
- GONZÁLEZ ROMÁN, C., 2002-2003, «La Lex Irnitana y la onomástica de los municipios flavios», *Memorias de Historia Antigua* 23-24, 77-102.
- GRUPO MÉRIDA, 2003, *Atlas antroponímico de la Lusitania romana*, Mérida/Bordeaux: Fundación de Estudios romanos/Ausonius Éditions.
- HERNÁNDEZ GUERRA, L., 1994, *Inscripciones romanas en la provincia de Palencia*, Valladolid/Palencia: Universidad de Valladolid/Diputación Provincial de Palencia.
- , 2001, *Epigrafía romana de la provincia de Salamanca*, Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid.
- , 2008, «Algunas consideraciones sobre municipios flavios en la Meseta septentrional», *Gerión* 26, 407-438.
- HURTADO DE SAN ANTONIO, R., 1977, *Corpus provincial de inscripciones latinas (Cáceres)*, Cáceres: Diputación Provincial.
- KNAPP, R. C., 1992, *Latin inscriptions from Central Spain*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/Oxford: University of California Press.
- LAMBRINO, S., 1956, «Les inscriptions latines inédites du Musée Leite de Vasconcelos», *O Arq. Port.* n.s. 3, 5-73.
- LE ROUX, P., 2009, «Cultos y religión en el noroeste de la Península Ibérica en el alto Imperio romano», *Veleia* 26, 265-285.
- , 2010, «Tribus romaines et cités sous l'Empire: Épigraphie et histoire», in: *Atti della XV^e Rencontre sur l'épigraphie (Bari 8-10 ottobre 2009)*, Bari: Edipuglia, 113-121.
- LÓPEZ MELERO, R., 1986, «Nueva evidencia sobre el culto de Ategina: El epígrafe de Bienvenida», in: *I Jornadas sobre manifestaciones religiosas en la Lusitania*, Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura, 93-112.
- LOSTAL PROS, J., 1992, *Los miliarios de la provincia Tarraconense*, Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- MANGAS, J., 1997, «Financiación y administración de los *sacra publica* en la *lex Ursonensis*», *SHHA* 15, 181-195.
- , 2000, «*Castellum, gens y civitas* en el edicto de Augusto (15 a.C.)», in: F.J. Sánchez-Palencia, J. Mangas (coords.), *El edicto del Bierzo: Augusto y el noroeste de Hispania*, León: Fundación Las Médulas, 47-62.
- MANTAS, V. G., 1988, «*Orarium donauit Igaeditanis*: Epigrafía e funções urbanas numa capital regional lusitana», in: *I Congreso peninsular de historia antigua*, vol. II, Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 415-439.
- , 2000, «A sociedade luso-romana do município Ammaia», in: J.-G. Gorges, T. Nogales Basarrate, *Sociedad y cultura en Lusitania romana: IV mesa redonda internacional*, Badajoz: Junta de Extremadura, 391-420.
- MAÑANES PÉREZ, T., 1982, *Epigrafía y numismática de Astorga romana*, Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- MARCO SIMÓN, F., 2002, «*Vota omnia finibus*. La tésera de Herrera de Pisuerga y la ritualización de los pactos de la Hispania indoeuropea», *Palaeohispanica* 2, 169-188.
- MARINER, S., 1952, *Inscripciones hispanas en verso*, Barcelona: Escuela de Filología.
- MARTÍNEZ MELÓN, J. I., 2006, «El vocabulario de los asentamientos rurales (siglos I-IX d.C.)», in: A. Chevarría, J. Arce, G.P. Briogio, *Villas tardoantiguas en el Mediterráneo occidental* [Anejos de *AEspA* XXXIX], Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 113-131.
- MAYER, M., VELAZA, J., 1994, «El *carmen epigraphicum* de Arellano (Navarra)», *Príncipe de Viana* 203, 515-526.

- MELCHOR GIL, E., 2011, «Sobre los magistrados de las comunidades hispanas no privilegiadas (s. III a.C.-s. I d.C.)», in: A. Sartori, A. Valvo (eds.), *Identità e autonomie nel mondo romano occidentale Iberia-Italia Italia-Iberia*, Faenza: Fratelli Lega Editori, 151-171.
- , 2013, «Instituciones de gobierno de las comunidades hispanas no privilegiadas (s. III a.C.-s. I d.C.): *Senatus* y *magistratus*», in: E. Ortiz de Urbina Álava (ed.), *Magistrados locales de Hispania: Aspectos históricos, jurídicos, lingüísticos*, [Anejos de *Veleia*, Acta 13], Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco, 135-158.
- NAVASCUÉS, J. M. DE, 1934, «Inscripciones hispano-romanas», *AEspA* 10, 189-206.
- NESSELHAUF, H., 1960, «Zwei Bronzeurkunden aus Munigua», *Madrider Mitteilungen* 1, 142-154.
- OLIVARES PEDREÑO, J. C., 2002, *Los dioses de la Hispania céltica*, [Bibliotheca Archaeologica Hispana 15], Madrid/Alicante: Real Academia de la Historia/Universidad de Alicante.
- , 2002-2003, «Religión romana y religión indígena en las ciudades de la Céltica hispana», *Lucentum* 21-22, 207-225.
- OREJAS, A., SASTRE, I., SÁNCHEZ PALENCIA, F.-J., PLÁCIDO, D., 2001, «El edicto de Augusto del Bierzo y la primera organización romana del Noroeste peninsular», in: F.-J. Sánchez Palencia, J. Mangas (eds.), *El edicto del Bierzo: Augusto y el Noroeste de Hispania*, Ponferrada: Fundación Las Médulas.
- ORTIZ DE URBINA ÁLAVA, E., 2013, «Sobre los procesos de (re)organización institucional cívica en *Hispania*», in: E. Ortiz de Urbina Álava (ed.), *Magistrados locales de Hispania: Aspectos históricos, jurídicos, lingüísticos*, [Anejos de *Veleia*, Acta 13], Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco, 279-308.
- PALOL, P., VILELLA, J., 1987, *Clunia II: La epigrafía de Clunia* [Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España 150], Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- PASTOR MUÑOZ, M., 1977, *Los astures durante el imperio romano*, Oviedo: Diputación Provincial.
- PÉREZ ZURITA, A. D., 2011, *La edilidad y las élites locales en la Hispania romana*, Córdoba/Sevilla: Universidad de Córdoba/Universidad de Sevilla.
- RABANAL ALONSO, M. A., 1998, «Las formas de organización ciudadana en las comunidades urbanas del *conventus astur*», in: L. Hernández Guerra, L. Sagredo San Eustaquio (eds.), *El proceso de municipalización en la Hispania romana*, Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 103-138.
- RAMÍREZ SÁDABA, J. L., 2006, «Las ciudades vasconas según las fuentes literarias y su evolución en la tardeoantigüedad», in: *Espacio y tiempo en la percepción de la antigüedad tardía*, [Antigüedad y cristianismo 23], Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 185-199.
- REID, J. S., 1913, *The municipalities of the Roman empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RODRÍGUEZ ÁLVAREZ, P., 1993, «Sobre las *gentes* de Hispania», in: J. Untermann, F. Villar (eds.), *Lengua y cultura en la Hispania prerromana*, [Acta Salmanticensia 251], Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 445-460.
- RODRÍGUEZ COLMENERO, A., 1996, «Pueblos prerromanos del convento jurídico Lucense: Organización sociopolítica y distribución territorial», in: A. Rodríguez Colmenero (coord.), *Lucus Augusti, I: El amanecer de una ciudad*, A Coruña: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 129-242.
- RODRÍGUEZ NEILA, J. F., 1993, «Gestión administrativa en las comunidades indígenas hispanas durante la etapa pre-municipal», in: J.F. Rodríguez Neila (ed.), *Actas del I Coloquio de historia antigua de Andalucía*, Córdoba: Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 385-412.
- , 1995, «Organización administrativa de las comunidades hispanas y magistraturas monetales», in: M.P. García-Bellido, R.M. Sobral Centeno (eds.), *La moneda hispánica: Ciudad y territorio*, [Anejos de *AEspA* XIV], Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 261-273.
- ROSADO MARTÍN, M. C., 2010, «El juramento de fidelidad a Octaviano del año 32 a.C.», *El Futuro del Pasado* 1, 337-347.
- ROYO MARTÍNEZ, M. M., 2010, «Onomástica y sociedad en la epigrafía latina antigua de la Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid», *Espacio, Tiempo y Forma*, serie II, Historia Antigua, 23, 369-394.
- RUIZ TRAPERO, M., 2001, *Inscripciones latinas de la Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid (siglos I-VIII)*, Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid.

- SALINAS DE FRÍAS, M., 2001, *Los vettones: Indigenismo y romanización en el occidente de la Meseta*, Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- , 2013, «Personal onomastics and local society in ancient Lusitania», in: J.L. García Alonso (ed.), *Continental Celtic word formation: The onomastic data* [Aguilafuente 197], Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 17-35.
- SANTERO SANTURINO, J. M., 1978, *Asociaciones populares en Hispania romana*, Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.
- SANTOS YANGUAS, N., 1985, *Comunidades indígenas y administración romana en el Noroeste hispánico*, Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco.
- SCHÄFER, N., 2000, *Die Einbeziehung der Provinzialen in den Reichsdienst in augusteischer Zeit*, Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- SOLANA SAINZ, J. M., 1981, *Los cántabros y la ciudad de Iuliobriga*, Santander: Librería Estudio.
- TARPIN, M., 2002, *Vici et pagi dans l'Occident romain*, [Collection de l'École Française de Rome 299], Paris: École Française de Rome.
- TISSOT, CH., 1883, «Inscriptions découvertes par M. Fonsagrives en Tunisie», *Bulletin Épigraphique* 3, 213-221.
- TORRENT RUIZ, A. J., 2013, «Los *magistri pagi* en la *Lex Rivi Hiberiensis*: naturaleza y funciones», in: *Direito romano: Poder e direito*, [XV Congresso internacional de direito romano], Coimbra: Coimbra Editora, 109-129.
- TRANOY, A., 1981, *La Galice romaine*, Paris: de Boccard.
- VALLEJO RUIZ, J. M., 2005, *Antroponimia indígena de la Lusitania romana*, [Anejos de *Veleia*, Series Minor 23], Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco.
- VAZ, J. L. I., 1997, *A civitas de Viseu: Espaço e sociedade*, Coimbra: Comissão de Coordenação da Região Centro.
- WIEGELS, R., 1985, *Die Tribusinschriften des römischen Hispanien*, [Madrider Forschungen 13], Berlin: de Gruyter.
- ZEIDLER, J., 2007, «Celto-Roman contact names in Galicia», in: D. Kremer (ed.), *Onomástica galega, con especial consideración da situación prerromana*, [Verba Anexo 58], Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 41-56.