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The "classic" sites for the study of the Roman Republican Army and Weapons: recent reexamination of old finds and new research

The archaeology of the Roman army has traditionally had one of its major sources of information in Historia. Adolf Schulten's field research, early in the 20th century, focused on the Roman military camps at the Numantine Wars (154-133 BC) and particularly on the siege of Numantia by Scipio in 133 BC, as well as on other Republican camps in Hispania, providing us with some of the best archaeological correlation for Polybius' description of the Roman camp. Likewise, weapons found by Schulten were central to the discussion about the origin and evolution of the pilum and of other Roman weapons. A. Engel's and P. Paris research at Otiuama brought light upon some relevant facts related to weapons and battles of the Civil Wars. In the same way, Paulsen's research in 1930 over the Settoriai age camp at Cáceres el Viejo widened Schulten's knowledge about Republican encampment fortifications. Some other minor works presented important Hispanic discoveries to the international scientific community, such as in the case of the roman catapult from Ampurias, re-published by S. Reineck in 1914.

However, interest on Roman Republican military archaeology in Hispania languished from the decade of the thirties onwards. Only some isolated and later works approached the subject, as in the case of the relatively recent study by G. Ulbert on Cáceres el Viejo, or of some general studies by A. García y Beltrán, mainly dealing with Early Empire motifs.

Yet, since 1990, we have witnessed a very vigorous retrieval of Roman military archaeology in Hispania, with new contributions, especially on the Republican period, that relate to many different aspects.

In the first place, there has been a profound re-examination of the materials excavated during Schulten's "classic" excavations at Numantia, mainly by M. Luik, using all the most recent bibliography, and updating most of our knowledge about the evolution of Roman weapons during
the 2nd century BC. However, this is still a very recent work, so that it hasn’t yet reached the general synthesis monographs. The renewal of archaeological work in Numancia and its surrounding camps has forced a re-examination of Schulten’s digs at the circumvalation, and in recent years some new research projects have been undertaken by A. Jimeno and F. Morales, as well as by others such as Breuer, Luijk and Müller. These projects, without modifying the main results and general layout of Schulten’s reconstruction of the perimeter and circumvalation walls, do change the classification of some of the legionary ‘camps’ reducing them to ‘forts’, and altering the layout and topography of the interlinking walls. It seems that the supposed camp at La Rasa has no relation with the Scipionic siege, but that we must now include a new site, La Peña del Jable, in the Scipionic circumvalation. These studies will eventually allow us to confirm or to reject parts of the conclusions reached by M.J. Dohsson in his recent doctoral thesis. On the other hand, some minor studies—the majority of which are very recent—dealing with coinage and pottery found at the Roman camps, such as those by M.V. Romero, E. Sanmarti and others, allow us to reinterpret and/or modify some of Schulten’s conclusions. For instance, it seems clear now that the lower layers of the ‘Gran Anfiteatro’ at Renieblas should now be considered contemporary with Scipio’s siegeworks, a result that does not contradict the fact that the place was recaptured during the Sertorian Wars. It looks as if we are going to witness some substantial variations in our knowledge of the siege of Numancia in the next few years.

The old discoveries of weapons at Osuna, of Castris and of Pompejanum date, have been very recently re-examined by Susan Sievers, putting them in relation with the contemporary finds from Aleita, updating the conclusions of P. Paris and A. Ugel, as well as the more recent work by R. Corro. The identification of a gladius hispaniaca and the new study of the numerous missile weapons are especially relevant. At the same time, the writings of J. Salas Álvarez have served to place the findings in their historic and historiographic context.

At the same time, new research has been done on the Sertorian age materials from the camp at Cáceres de Viejo, such as the ‘debateable-theory’ of Diets proposing to identify a curious articulated artefact as a mould for making greeves. Would this be true, it should represent one of the very scarce evidence for weapon making in campaigns conditions during the Republican age. As in Numancia, a new project for enhancing the touristic value of the site, financed by European funding, is being
developed at Cáceres el Viejo, and as a consequence, future digs are projected at the site.

**SPECIFIC CONFERENCES ON ROMAN MILITARY ARCHAEOLOGY**

Aside from the re-evaluation of museum materials, and the resumption of excavation at some 'classic' sites, the recent celebration of different conferences and symposia dedicated to Roman Military Archaeology bears a special interest. The *First Congress of Roman Military Archaeology in Hispania*, held in 1998 at Segovia, chaired by Ángel Morillo, has produced a voluminous publication with the Proceedings including around fifty articles. Nevertheless, only five of them are devoted to the archaeology of the Republican period, and another three deal with literary sources. The II Conference held at Leon in October 2004 under the supervision of A. Morillo (proceedings in press) had as its specific subject the 'Production and supplies in the military context', and has produced many interesting contributions, though those dealing with the Republican period are still scarce. The *Roman Military Archaeology in Europe* Congress coordinated by Cesareo Pérez González and Emilio Illanregui, held again at Segovia in July 2001, repeats the same pattern of relevant contributions related mainly to the Imperial Age. On the other hand, the Conference 'Defence and territory in Hispania from the Scipios to Augustus' held in March 2001 at the Casa de Velázquez (Madrid), whose proceedings were published in 2003 under the supervision of A. Morillo, F. Cadíou and D. Hourcade, has produced some significant novelties, mainly related to the study of military camps, and of Rome's enemies in Iberia. We shall later return to this. It is also worth mentioning the Congresses on 'Towers, watchtowers and fortified houses. Exploitation and control over territory in Hispania', edited in 2004 by P. Moret and T. Chapeau; on 'War in the Iberian and Celtoiberian worlds (VI-II century BC)' coordinated by P. Moret and F. Quesada, and published in 2002; as well as the Conference on 'The Second Punic War in Iberia' (1998) and on 'Carthaginian military organization' (forthcoming) edited by B. Costa and J. Fernández.

**WEAPONRY**

It is surely in the field of specific studies on Roman republican weaponry where recent discoveries and research in Spain have produced the best results, as proved by the fact that the largest share of contributions, with up to seven papers, to the Colloquium on 'Équipement militaire et l'armement de la République' (held in September 1996 at Montpellier
Fig. 1. The origin of the *gladius bipaniensis* (after Quesada 1997).
and published under the coordination of M. Fouque in volume 8 of the *Journal of Roman Military Equipment Studies*, were dedicated to *Hispania*.

More recently Fernando Quezada has done some research on the interaction between 3rd to 2nd centuries BC Iberian and Roman Republican weapons, especially in relation to the supply of weapons to the Roman army in *Hispania* (Conferences of 2004 at León and 2005 at Toulouse). In both cases, emphasis was placed on the compatibility between many different types of Iberian weapons such as *istufera*, swords and daggers, with Roman individual fighting techniques.

The influence of Iberian weapons on the Roman Republican panoply has also been examined in depth by Fernando Quezada, especially in his 1997 monograph, and again in some specific papers related to the *gladius hispanicus*, that seem to identify the prototype of the Roman Republican sword to the satisfaction of other scholars such as Peter Connolly (Fig. 1). This would be a local modification of the Gaulish La Tène I sword with a 60 to 65 cm. long blade and a strong triangular point. This sword type was still in use in Iberia long after it had been abandoned in Gaul and substituted by a longer, exaggarated slashing weapon. The iron plate scabbard, vertically suspended from the waist by means of a *porten*, typical of Gaulish swords, was replaced in Iberia by a metal frame scabbard (with wooden or leather core) suspended by rotating rings from a baldric placed across the chest, precisely the model of scabbard adopted by the Roman Army. The study of the findings at La Azucarera (Roman Concurreu) – where the distinction between “La Tène I” swords and “gladius hispanicus” as argued by its authors seems redundant to us, is most important in this respect. We should also add the recent discovery of other swords of this type at the ‘Cerro de las Balas’ (Seville) – 2nd century BC. – La Caridad (Caminitel, Teruel) – first half of the 1st century BC. – Azaila (Teruel) – 1st century BC. –

These and other similar finds are providing an enormous increase in the available evidence for Roman Republican time swords, in addition to other, purely Roman, weapon discoveries at places as far away as Slovenia or Israel, all in agreement with the hypothesis already posed.

As far as the *pilum* is concerned, some recently published discoveries provide us with some of the oldest known ranged *pila*, such as the Castellfrí (Gerona) examples, dated to the end of the 3rd century BC, and the Iberian samples on the Roman Republic (Fig. 2). The republican *pila* examples from Spain span a period from the Second Punic War down to the Caserian period, with new examples from La Almoina (Valencia), found in a battlefield context together with other
Fig. 2. Early roman pile (end 3rd century BC) from Camilhfal (Gerona) (after Alveses Ato and Cobena 1999).
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weapons and even skeletons of executed prisoners. Both the light and heavy _pila_ from La Cardad (Tertúll), also dated to the 1st half of the 1st century BC, appeared in association with a variety of other weapons (Montefortino helmets, scuta boss plates, swords and even a catapult). To these very closely dated examples we must add a _pilum_ from Bordeassos (Gerona), and those from Pontón de la Oliva and Langa de Duero, probably of Republican date. If we add to these the well-known examples from Numancia, Cádiz, Cieza, and Oseña, the repertoire of _pila_ from Spain is probably the biggest one known so far (Fig. 3).

It seems clear that the roman _p因其_ derives from the Celtiberian _dothlelaudae_ (double disc hilt) dagger. This weapon might have been originally adopted by Roman legionaries as an attractive piece of booty during the Numantine (century 153–133 BC) or Sertorian Wars (century 75 BC). The temporal gap between these daggers and the Early Imperial ones, although still significant, is starting to be filled by discoveries such as the Basel example published by G. Helmsig, dated around 15 BC, as well as a stele from Padua dated to 2 BC. At the present time some Research Projects focused on Celtiberian, Roman and transitional daggers are underway by C. Fernández and by E. Kavanagh. To these we should add the recent analyses by E. Cabré, C. Fernández, I. Filloy, E. Gil, F. Quezada and J. Ruiz Vélez, clarifying the history, typology and diffusion of these daggers. Some relevant discoveries are been made, especially related to the chronological classification of blades, hilts, and particularly the suspension system of these daggers.

Furthermore, some relevant new research dealing with Montefortino-type _helme_ (mainly related to the interaction between Roman republican and Iberian weapons in the Second Punic War and later) has been done. On the one hand, some new discoveries have significantly increased the number of the known examples to more than sixty, as the cases of Pico Moro— with a Latin inscription—, Almácies—of the Widermouth type—, La Carrova, Soterra de Alos, Guadalajóvits, etc. On the other hand, catalogues, typological analysis and synthesis works due to J. García Muñoz and F. Quezada have clarified the situation. It is now possible to distinguish the different chronological phases of the different models of helmet in their archaeological context, their geographical distribution and typology. Around the second half of the 3rd century BC and the early decades of the 2nd, most of these helmets come from indigenous funerary contexts in the Southeast of Iberia. From the beginning of the 2nd century BC we witness the Roman army advance via the Ebro valley into the Eastern 'Meseta'. There are some helmets with Latin epigraphic inscriptions such as the helmet from Pago
Fig. 3. A selection of Roman weapons of early first century date from La Caridad (Tarragona) (after Vicente et alii 1997) (at different scales).
de Gorrita (Valladolid). The Buggenum-type helmets, already from Caesarian age, concentrate at the south-west of the Peninsula, while in the Augustean age we find local imitations in the Galician area (Fig. 4). Small iron boss plates are rare, but they have appeared associated with Roman weapons at sites like La Avacaera, La Cariñada and La Almoina, all of them dating to the end of the 2nd century BC or to the beginning of the 1st. They are characterized by iron bosses with trapezoid wings or flaps, different from the rectangular wings characteristic of the sites with Celtic influence in Catalonia. The boss-plate from Alvaradó, although originally published as bronze, is iron apparently.

The Iberian Peninsula has provided some of the most significant examples of ancient artillery of Republican date. They have been recently studied by R. Saez Abad. To the long-known catapult from Empúries (Ampurias) we must add the Cantareiral catapult, widely published and studied in recent years, together with elements of others found at Azaila (Teruel), subject of a very recent brief publication that we hope is only preliminary. A set of stone projectiles also found in Azaila is kept at the National Archaeological Museum (Madrid). The Azaila ensemble seems datable during the first half of the 1st century BC, the Sertorian period—according to the latest revision by F. García Díez—, as well as the Cantareiral catapult, although the context of the latter at least seems to indicate that it was no longer in use by the time the site was abandoned.

Besides the Azaila catapult stones, we know of other lots found in long known sites, such as Arcobriga (Zaragoza), NonantJA, Osuna and Cáceres de Viejo, to which we should now add the 314 projectiles found in Calahorra, as published in 2003. This is an important find, some of the stones bearing Latin inscriptions such as comitato Marisitá; seemingly datable to Sertorian times. Finally, an extremely important and still largely unpublished set of Carthaginian stone artillery projectiles, dated to the Second Punic War, was found in the fortified Punic precinct of Tarac de Monzón (Albacete), by the team directed by Manuel Olivo. It is thus possible that the first torsion artillery was introduced in Iberia by the Carthaginians before the coming of Rome, as may be inferred from the booby captured by Scipio in the arsenals of Carthage Nova (Cartagena). However, very recent work and revisions of old material from the heavily fortified site at Ullastret (Gerona), close to Empúries, undertaken by E. García, might come up with some surprises of Hellenic origin.

Slings bullets (lead glades and sometimes clay balls and even pebbles) and stoneheads are too plentiful to list here. For an initial repertoire of
Fig. 4. Italic and Roman republican helmets in *Hispania* (after Quesada 1997).
glandes see Annex IV of E. Quesada 1997, completed by some later works, especially one due to C. Aranegui supporting the hypothesis of a more widespread early use of slings by the Iberians than maintained by Quesada, on the basis of some sling projectiles bearing Greek inscriptions, perhaps coming from Sagunto. The glandes from La Caridad still show remnants of flash, as they come straight out of the casting mould. Many lead glandes have been also found at the battlefields of Baccuia (Sanab Tomé, Jaén) (?), perhaps belonging to the Second Punic War, and at Andagoste (Navarra) (century 40-30 BC), as well as in many other possible battle sites, such as “Cerro de las Balsas” (Écija, Seville), perhaps related to the battles of Munda, where furtive excavations using metal detectors have located literally hundreds of such projectiles, often bearing inscriptions.

Reasonably enough, Roman Republican military iconography is very scarce in Spain, although the Minerva relief with acroter carved at the walls of Tarraco is widely known. In this respect, the recent work by J. M. Negueria on Iber-Roman sculpture, and the reappraisal both by F. Leon and P. Rouillard of the Osuna reliefs—a series of which clearly represents Roman auxiliary troops—, all constitute an essential starting point to the study of the Tarraco, Osuna and Estepe reliefs. Furthermore, we know of the existence of at least another unpublished sculpture wearing a loricamamata, possibly Republican, in a private collection. The iconography of some pottery vessels of the so-called Litia style at S. Miguel de Lluch might perhaps be read in a Second Punic War Roman or possibly Carthaginian context, as could be inferred from the quite homogeneous and complete weaponry worn by some of the warriors represented on these scenes, including some details that could perhaps depict scale or chain mail, which was not employed by Iberians, according to the exhaustive archaeological evidence so far examined. This question was previously posed by A. García Bellido (although with a mistaken date to Sertorian or Augustelean times), and has been rekindled by E. Quesada in 1997, 2002 and 2003 in relation to its possible attribution to the Second Punic War, an opinion also held to a certain extent by F. Gracia.

MILITARY CAMPS

The study of military camps belonging to the Republican era in Hispania has received a considerable impulse in recent times, especially since the conference coordinated by A. Morillo et alii, published in 2003. The catalogue of military camps has also increased considerably. In the first place we have to mention those excavated by Schulzen at the
beginning of the 20th century (Numancia, Aguilar de Anguita, Cáceres el Viejo, Rentielas), in relation to which the general 1996 work by Pannocchi Salvatore on Republican military camps provides an adequate summary of the data prior to recent research (Fig. 5). Most of these camps have not been subsequently re-excavated, although their chronologies have been subsequently updated on the basis of the modern study of known materials from the excavations carried out at the beginning of the 20th century (Fig. 6). Some topographical work at Rentielas, and the recent creation of an Archaeological Park at Cáceres el Viejo has been carried out that includes planning for future excavations. Besides these, we must take into consideration a series of very old camps, well known from literary sources, such as those at Tarraco and Emporion, which have only recently received some archaeological confirmation as a result of archaeological fieldwork.

To the previously cited list we must now add a new series of camp sites as a result of the development of surface surveying and of 'Spatial Archaeology', the best introduction to which is the complete synthesis written by A. Morillo in 2003—incorporating all the related bibliography—a work that clearly reveals a extraordinary project in comparison with another similar synthesis by the same author in 1991. The majority of Republican camps concentrate in the eastern part of the Meseta (the central plateau of Spain), most of them related to the Celtiberian and, later, to the Servian Wars (about a dozen of these, some of which still unconfirmed). A further group lies in Lusitania (about half a dozen camps). The most active research line emphasizes archaeological work in these sites, instead of pits using literary sources to pinpoint possible locations for camps without real archaeological confirmation. In any case, research based primarily on literary sources, such as E. Cadou, 2003, still does provide us with important information.

On the other hand, some relevant research on some possible Late-Republican camp sites is currently underway, as in the case of the digs at Villa Joiosa (Alicante), conducted by A. Espinosa, or of work in the site of the province of Granada (Andalusia) such as in Pueblo de D. Padrique, directed by A. Adroher. These works, together with other already mentioned finds, such as the battle camp in Andagoste (Alava), provide for a significant increase of the typological variety, chronology and spatial distribution of Republican camps, beyond the narrow chronological and spatial limits of their association with the best documented wars (Hamilcar and Numantine and Lusitanian Wars).

The discovery in Andalusia of some probable Carthaginian military camps, even earlier than the Second Punic War, is also relevant in the
Fig. 5. Roman Republican camps in Hispania (after Morillo 2002 updated).
Fig. 6. Reinterpretation of Schulten’s idea of the Scipionic siegeworks at Numantia (after E. Morales 2004). Notice that some camps (La Rasa) are now missing, and other forts have been added. Only two —Castilejo and Peña Redonda— seem to qualify as full legionary camps.
context of the wars fought in Iberia. However, their location is usually based on casual finds of coins and weapons, mainly projectiles, without proper archaeological context, such as in the case of the camp at Gandul (Alcalá de Guadaíra, Sevilla). It would be also essential to obtain some archaeological confirmation for these interesting hypotheses put forward by authors such as M.P. García-Bellido, F. Chaves or R. Plego.

PERMANENT FORTIFICATIONS

Permanent fortifications of Roman Republican age are best understood in the context of subsequent planning carried out by Augustus, as analyzed and synthesized by Hourcade in 2003, although some cases, such as the chronology and the different phases of the Terraco city wall, now properly defined, find relevance in the context of the initial phase of the conquest, as has been proved by Xavier Aquilué, X. Dupré, J. Masó and J. Ruiz de Arbulo. A first—not too high—extensive wall with many potentes for a large army, with the nearby immediate addition of towers capable of holding artillery, designed for a more reduced garrison, probably belongs to the age of Scipio, at the end of the 3rd century BC, or perhaps to the years around 197 BC. A second wall with straight walls without towers, but much higher, and partially filled with mudbrick, replaced this wall towards the middle of the 2nd century BC, an addition perhaps related to the increase of the garrison that might be related to the Numantine wars. M. Bendala’s recent 2003 paper poses the novel idea of the possible existence of a previous Carthaginian stone fort, the remains of which—consisting of a stretch of ashlar masonry wall with mason’s marks—are visible in the precinct of the modern Archbishop’s palace.

Other relevant discoveries are being documented by different Research Projects dealing with Carthaginian walls of the second half of the 3rd century, often remodelled in Roman times. Such is the case of the Carthago Nova, Tossal de Manises, Cartenia and Castillo de Doña Blanca city walls, and belonging to the Barcid Age, some of which document the casemate technique. In particular, the discovery of a well preserved stretch of the Barcid Period wall of Carthago Nova—re-used by Scipio after the conquest—has served to document the existence of different rooms inside the walls, connected by doors, that were used as storage space for weapons and food. This structure is similar to the one found at Doña Blanca which seems to have been another important Carthaginian base of ancient Phoenician origin in the bay of Cadiz. Both are in turn similar to the recently examined wall at Cartesia, excavated by M. Bendala and J. Blanqué. The site at Tossal de Manises documents some artillery
towers, *poteichisma*, stone catapult projectiles, all of which is associated to Hannibal’s war, followed by a Roman Republican period in the 2nd century BC which made partial use of the Carthaginian fortifications, according to the ongoing research by M. Okiny. There is, on the other hand, a certain degree of disagreement in relation to the date and function of the bastion and gate at Carmona’s city wall (Fig. 7).

![Fig. 7. The recently discovered 2nd century BC city wall at Segeda, enclosing one of the biggest urban areas in Iron Age Iberia. In the background lies the city centre at Poyo de Marín (courtesy F. Barillo).](image)

This is not the place to analyze the role of the pre-Roman indigenous fortifications—either Iberian or Celtiberian—of the Republican period. An already huge bibliography is already available, the best starting point being the monograph written by P. Moret in 1996. However, some of these walls, such as that of Segeda, played a relevant role in triggering off the Roman military actions (*vide infra*), and many others played a role in the operational and strategic planning of the Roman armies. Also in this respect, the recent works by P. Moret, L. Berrocal, and other authors represent a significant advance. The *vehæret* polemic that has been going on in *Eladian* between F. Gracia, P. Moret and F. Quesada since the year 2000, shows the amount of argument and disagreement on the relative degree of sophistication of Iberian fortifications and their
adjustment or not to Hellenistic types and poliortetic techniques. The debate is lively and still current. As far as watchtowers, towers and fortified houses of the Republican era are concerned, they pose different problems and contexts to those dealt with in this overview. The problems were adequately reviewed, updated and summarized in a recent Conference held at the Casa de Velázquez, coordinated by P. Moret y T. Chapa (2004). Research is particularly indebted to P. Moret for his relevant appreciations in relation to these small fortified settlements, along with A. Rodriguez and P. Orto among others (Fig. 8).

Fig. 8. Late 3rd century Carthaginian (left) and Roman mid 2nd century BC (right) walls at Tomas de Manises (after M. Olcina 1998).
BATTLEFIELDS

Some of the most interesting current Research Projects deal with the archaeological identification of battlefields of the Republican period. The traditional method used was literary sources to trace the strategic and operational situation, then pinpointed sites on the map, without much archaeological surveying and much less fieldwork. Arguments then became endless. Modern field surveying techniques using GPOS, combined with a much better knowledge of the timespan covered by many diagnostic materials (pottery, weapons) now allow us to check the a priori hypotheses with real archaeological data. Recent work on the site at Las Albahacas has located a promising battlefield that could probably be identified with the battle of Baeza: analysis of sources, inherent military probability, local topography and surface surveying—that has yielded coins, arrowheads, sling bullets and some pottery—all combine to create a much convincing picture for the location of Baeza at Santo Tomé-Las Albahacas than the traditional—and archaeologically unsubstantiated—location at modern Baeza. Ongoing work by a team directed by A. Ruiz will perhaps provide proof for what is now a promising hypothesis.

One of the more important ongoing projects in relation to the Numantine Wars is the archaeological study of Segeda and its surroundings, conducted by F. Basilio. One of his most relevant finds is the probable identification of the wall that was, according to Appianus, the castra beli in the year 154 BC and the justification given for Rome’s declaration of war and the later intervention at Numantia. Furthermore, current research seems to have identified a Roman camp in the surroundings of this Celtiberian city.

Other works have provided us with indications related to the location of other battlefields, as in the case of Munda in Caesar’s time, but the necessary systematic projects must be undertaken in order to add evidence to the scientific nature of the literary sources and to casual finds most of them part of private collections.

Finally, the works of Uría Rosta and Ocházar at Audagne (Navarra) have served not only to locate a temporary camp of the triumviral period, towards 40-30 BC, but also to trace the development of a battle by analyzing the dispersion of remains, such as slingballs, arrowheads and catapult projectiles, as well as caligae nails, and other non-specifically military objects. The detailed publication of the finds and, in particular, of detailed dispersion maps of the objects will represent a relevant advance in our knowledge about the last moments of the Republic prior to the Celtiberian wars of Octavian Augustus.
Fig. 9. Triunviral camp and battlefield at Andagoste (Navarra) (After J. A. Ochran and M. Urrutia, 2002).
Already in the transitional period to the Imperial Era, the work of E. Peralta on the now indisputable military camps and battlefields of the Cantabrian Wars, some showing evidence of belonging to the earlier campaigns, are likely to enhance our understanding of this last stage of the Roman conquest of the Iberian Peninsula.

CONCLUSION

In this brief overview we have not dealt with the very relevant data provided by Numismatics, analyzed in a different chapter, nor with the works of a general historic nature mainly based on literary sources related to the Second Punic War in Iberia and to the conquest of Hispania, about which a considerable mass of information has already been published, often of a speculative nature as far as battlefield locations and the routes followed by the armies are concerned. Although often very valuable, their methodology and focus are different from the archaeological matter we have been dealing with.

In general, we may conclude that since 1990 work on the Republican army in Hispania has experienced a most relevant improvement, especially as far as the different types of Roman weapons—always scarce—, temporary camps and battlefields is concerned. The numerous ongoing Research Projects on these and other aspects promise new and very substantial advances in the near future.