

Brandão, José Luís , Cláudia Teixeira , and Ália Rodrigues , ed. *Confronting Identities in the Roman Empire: Assumptions about the Other in Literary Evidence*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2023. Bloomsbury Collections. Web. 7 Jan. 2025. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350354005>>.

Accessed from: www.bloomsburycollections.com

Accessed on: Tue Jan 07 2025 17:04:17 Hora padrão da Europa Ocidental

Copyright © Rúben de Castro, José Luís Brandão, Cláudia Teixeira, Ália Rodrigues and Contributors 2024. This chapter is published open access subject to a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). You may re-use, distribute, and reproduce this work in any medium for non-commercial purposes, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Self-Perception in the Construction of the Other: Case Study of Roman Portrayal of Viriathus, Boudica and Arminius¹

Rúben Henrique de Castro

When reading the works of the ancient Greek and Roman authors about their enemies, one cannot help but notice how much of the construction of the ‘other’, of Rome’s enemies and neighbours, is dominated by self-perception and self-portrait. We are left with a series of writings on people such as Viriathus, Boudica, and Arminius, three of the most iconic and memorable of Rome’s enemies, who occupy in the modern and contemporary collective imagination an in-between position that mixes history and myth.

In the narratives the ancient Greek and Roman authors left us, we are not informed of who those historical figures actually were, instead we are given a somewhat restricted access to how Romans portrayed others and, by doing so, how they portrayed themselves, their empire’s expansion, and their civilization. Through a small case study of the portrayals ancient authors provide of Viriathus, Boudica, and Arminius, we hope to give a better understanding of the political, philosophical, and narrative elements in the portraits of those figures, hopefully providing a deeper insight of how self-perception is present in the construction of the ‘other’ in the Roman world.

While each character in their own right has already received a great deal of attention,² few if any attempts have been made to offer a comparative analysis of the three portrayals. This chapter will provide a mini analysis of each of the three characters, before proceeding to a comparative reading of those portrayals.

Viriathus

The most defining trait ancient historians left us of Viriathus’ portrayal is his heroization. Such heroization is built upon three axes: his *romanitas*, constructed

in opposition to un-roman Roman commanders; his personal excellence; and his construction as a stoic and cynic hero.

Let us start by analysing Viriathus' heroization and his respective association with primitive Roman values. There is consistent recognition of Viriathus' achievements,³ presented in a positive light by all authors;⁴ Florus went as far as to call him *Hispaniae Romulus*.⁵ The Lusitanian chieftain is given attributes such as intelligence and cleverness,⁶ with expressions such as *ceterum Lusitanos Viriathus erexit, vir calliditatis acerrimae* (the Lusitanians were stirred to revolt by Viriathus, a man of extreme cunning)⁷ in Florus, or characterizations such as the following in Cassius Dio.

τοιούτου δ' αὐτῷ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἀσκήσεως ὄντος, πολὺ ταῖς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρεταῖς ὑπέφερε. ταχὺς μὲν γὰρ πᾶν τὸ δέον ἐπινοῆσαι καὶ ποιῆσαι ἦν ἵνα τε γὰρ πρακτέον ἄμα ἐγίνωσκε, καὶ τὸν καιρὸν αὐτοῦ ἡπίστατό, δεινὸς δὲ τὰ τε ἐμφανέστατα ἀγνοεῖν καὶ τὰ ἀφανέστατα εἰδέναι προσποιήσασθαι.⁸

And yet, possessed of such a physique, as the result both of nature and training, he excelled still more in his mental powers. He was swift to plan and accomplish whatever was needful, for he not only knew what must be done, but also understood the proper occasion for it; and he was equally clever at feigning ignorance of the most obvious facts and knowledge of the most hidden secrets.

His skill for oratory is also highlighted.⁹ Viriathus uses it to acquire his army (App., *Hisp.* 11.62), to reorganize his fleeing troops (App., *Hisp.* 12.67), and even to win Tucca's allegiance through a famous cynic fable (Diod., 33.7.5). To those qualities ancient authors add a sense of justice in distributing the spoils,¹⁰ which explains his inclusion in the *De Officiis* by Cicero as a symbol of the importance of justice, valued even among barbarians and bandits¹¹ (Viriathus was repeatedly portrayed as a *latro* at the start of his career).¹² Also important in ancient narrative is his courage,¹³ different from the typically barbarian *ferocitas*, with prudence and rationality added to the mix.¹⁴

Viriathus is thus presented as an exceptional general,¹⁵ capable of detecting opportunities in the heat of battle,¹⁶ inspiring troops in the most difficult moments,¹⁷ and willing to put himself at risk for his men,¹⁸ something which earned him unwavering loyalty.¹⁹ In the paragraph relating to Viriathus' funeral, Diodorus Siculus mentions all of these traits (33.21a).

Opposite to this positive portrayal of Viriathus, Rome's enemy, was the negative portrayal of the Roman generals.²⁰ They are often presented, especially by Greek historians, as cowardly, greedy, untrustworthy, incompetent, even cruel leaders.²¹

As Grünewald writes: ‘Viriathus was specifically selected as the embodiment of early Roman virtues, to be contrasted with Roman commanders regarded as self-seeking and untrustworthy representatives of the decadent senatorial oligarchy.’²² Thus, it is clear that there was a process of appropriation of Viriathus by ancient historiography, establishing him as the ‘héroe ajeno’,²³ a moralizing role model of traditional Roman virtues²⁴ which had been lost by the Roman elite of his time (the defence of the traditional virtues of Rome in opposition to the Roman present is a constant in Roman historiography).²⁵

Because of this, all accounts condemned Servilius Scipio’s role in Viriathus’ assassination.²⁶ Valerius Maximus, in his *facta et dicta memorabilia*, is perhaps the author who expresses those feelings the best, saying of Scipio’s behaviour that *uictoriamque non meruit, sed emit* (he did not deserve, but bought his victory).²⁷

Another impactful element in Viriathus’ literary characterization is his image as a stoic and cynic hero, in line with the philosophical concept of the ‘good savage’.²⁸ Both stoicism and cynicism had an enormous influence in the Classical World. Originating from Greece, they expanded to Rome, where stoicism would become one of the most defining²⁹ and dominating philosophical tendencies.³⁰ Cynicism never reached the same level, probably because of its more radical way of life³¹ (incompatible with public life³² due to the active condemnation of the *nomos* and *nomisma*)³³ and because of the similarities between stoic ideals and traditional Roman values.³⁴

The main element of Viriathus’ characterization, fitting both stoic and cynic beliefs, is his way of life according to nature. Diodorus³⁵ and Cassius Dio (influenced by Posidonius)³⁶ are the two authors who reveal his harmony with the natural world.

Dio’s description of Viriathus’ way of life is one of the best examples of the cynic nature of his character (22.73.2): a frugal eating regime (also valued, even if differently, by stoics)³⁷ determined by what he was able to gather from nature;³⁸ and living the life of a homeless nomad³⁹ which strengthened his body and spirit, allowing him to find satisfaction from whatever was at hand⁴⁰ (this state of contentment and adaptability was also strongly valued by stoics).⁴¹ All those elements are to be found in cynicism and, in a more moderate fashion, in stoicism.⁴²

Similarly, Viriathus criticized customs and money,⁴³ *nomos* and *nomisma*, considered ‘the twin corrupters of nature’⁴⁴ by cynics. The thought he offers on wealth at his wedding is quite close to cynic doctrine⁴⁵ (as indeed the whole episode is).⁴⁶ Two elements of cynic philosophy are present: his disdain for wealth and his criticism of its illusory and transitory nature. Alongside this

contempt of the *nomisma* typical of cynicism, the occasion of Viriathus' wedding also offers an image of his feeling of disdain for the *nomos* (that which Liv Yarrow calls 'his lack of social graces').⁴⁷ Not only is his frugality on display in Diodorus, but also a strong disregard for what was socially expected, abstaining from eating with guests and from showering (Diod., 33.7.2–3), something common in cynicism.⁴⁸ The taking of his wife to the mountains shows also a clear parallel with the story of Hipparchia and Crates,⁴⁹ as others have stated.⁵⁰

The typology of his speech is also another important element of his cynic characterization, with Diodorus (Diod., 33.7.5–7) telling us that his oratory was direct and natural, unaltered by formal education, and filled with metaphors (elements of cynic inspiration).⁵¹

While our analysis has attempted to show the closeness of Viriathus' portrayal with the cynic doctrine, there are some elements of his characterization that undermine a full identification with the cynics: he got married; he participated in religious rites;⁵² and he was a military chieftain.⁵³ All those elements were condemned by cynic philosophers.⁵⁴ Despite his stoic and, mainly, cynic, conception, Viriathus' portrayal was above all else that of the noble savage, a virtuous, righteous, primitive being uncorrupted by the vices and temptations stoics and cynics found in their own civilizations.

Boudica

Just like the Viriathus that lives in the pages of his enemies' history, Boudica's portrayal was also tainted by the cultural, literary, and philosophical conceptions of the authors who wrote of her. However, the portrayal of Boudica, even if different in the two main sources, is clearly negative. As Carolyn Williams highlighted, 'Dio's approach to the character of Boudica is almost entirely different from Tacitus'. Instead of partly presenting her as a wronged Roman matron (as Tacitus does), Dio stresses Boudica's monstrous, barbarian features.⁵⁵

Unlike that of Viriathus, the characterization of Boudica is determined by the actions of her army, with no attempt by the ancient sources to differentiate between the queen and her followers. On the contrary, there is many affirmations of Boudica's culpability,⁵⁶ her responsibility for instigating⁵⁷ and commanding⁵⁸ the rebellion.

The portrayal that both Cassius Dio and Tacitus (in his *Annales* and *De Vita Iulii Agricolae*) present of the rebellion is negative, invoking the alleged barbarity

of her army (the use of the word barbarian to classify Britons is a constant throughout their history).⁵⁹

Both authors describe regularly and vividly the violence perpetrated by her army, whom *nec ullum in barbaris saevitiae genus omisit ira et victoria* (in their rage and their triumph, they spared no variety of a barbarian's cruelty).⁶⁰ Those portrayals go from the generic statement of the destruction caused by the rebellion – δύο τε γὰρ πόλεις ἐπορθήθησαν, καὶ μυριάδες ὀκτὼ τῶν τε Ῥωμαίων καὶ τῶν συμμαχῶν αὐτῶν ἐφθάρησαν, ἢ τε νῆσος ἠλλοτριώθη (two cities were sacked, eighty-thousand of the Romans and of their allies perished, and the island was lost to Rome)⁶¹ – to the specific mention of the terrible mortality caused by episodes such as the fall of Londinium – *neque enim capere aut venundare aliudve quod belli commercium, sed caedes patibula ignes cruces, tamquam reddituri supplicium at praerepta interim ultione, festinabant* (for it was not on making prisoners and selling them, or on any of the barter of war, that the enemy was bent, but on slaughter, on the gibbet, the fire and the cross, like men soon about to pay the penalty, and meanwhile snatching at instant vengeance).⁶²

Cassius Dio goes as far as to offer a detailed description of the torture inflicted on massacred civilians, sometimes linking such violence to the performance of native religious rituals (D.C. 62.7.2–3). So, there is use of native religion (specifically the practice of human sacrifices) to forge the estrangement between the reader and the Britons.

The barbarization of Boudica and her rebellion is more visible in Cassius Dio than in Tacitus.⁶³ Cassius Dio provides a more violent portrayal of the rebellion, offering details of tortures whose occurrence is merely stated by Tacitus; increasing the death toll,⁶⁴ and associating the violence of the rebellion with native religion (while Tacitus limits the reference to human sacrifices to the isle of Nola,⁶⁵ never a mention in relation to Boudica's rebellion). But the barbarization of Boudica is also present in Dio's physical description of the queen. She was tall and robust, a common feature of 'barbarians', striking terror in others just by her looks, with her ferocious gaze, rough (*trachu*) voice, and long loose hair (D.C. 62.2.3–4).

It is interesting how Cassius Dio, who comes from a very patriarchal society, describes Boudica, giving her one trait that suggests a partial masculinization of her character: her voice. As Carolyn Williams has intelligently pointed out, the word chosen to characterize her voice, *trachu*, is usually applied in the adjectivization of adolescent boys, thus her voice is 'transgressing the bounds of proper femininity, yet lacking the legitimate authority of mature manhood'.⁶⁶

There is constant emphasis in our sources of the fact that the rebellion's leadership is in the hands of a woman.⁶⁷ Tacitus regularly mentions the

irrelevance of gender in the laws of succession of her people.⁶⁸ Cassius Dio, with maximum expression of the strangeness of the Roman world to such reality, writes that ἀναπέισασα, τῆς τε προστατείας αὐτῶν ἀξιωθεῖσα καὶ τοῦ πολέμουπαντὸς στρατηγήσασα, Βουδοῦϊκα ἦν, γυνὴ (possessed of greater intelligence than often belongs to women),⁶⁹ considering simultaneously that the shame caused by the temporary success of the defeat was exacerbated by its female leadership.⁷⁰

While both authors place considerable emphasis on Boudica being a woman, they do so in different ways.⁷¹ Tacitus uses Boudica's gender as a basis for the portrayal of the abuses she suffered, promoting, at an early stage of his narrative, a sympathetic view of her through her partial transformation into a 'wronged Roman matron'.⁷² Cassius Dio highlights her gender especially through the incorporation in her speeches of a series of philosophical elements tending towards the creation of a dichotomy between the corruptive nature of civilization and the idealized primitive purity of the Bretton world.⁷³

Boudica's rebellion is used by both authors for the elaboration of a critical reflection on Roman expansionism and rule. But they do it in different ways, with Cassius Dio exploring, philosophically, the dichotomy of the two worlds, and Tacitus putting its focus on the abuse suffered by the locals at the hands of Rome.

Tacitus' portrayal is made in two different stages of his literary career (in his early career with the *De Vita Iulli Agricolae* and in his late career with the *Annales*). Such a time gap allows for small differences in his exploration of the events.⁷⁴ For example, in the biography of Agricola, Tacitus does not go into detail on the offences suffered by Boudica (which are to be found in Tac., *Ann.* 14.31 and 14.35), opting instead for vague allusions to abuses on the life and property of the Britons.⁷⁵ But even in that context, he seems to mitigate the accusations by writing that the Britons *conferre iniurias et interpretando accendere* (compared their wrongs, and exaggerated them in the discussion).⁷⁶ This situation matches the difference of his perspective on Roman rule in the two works, with the *Agricolae* (and the *Histories*, in a certain way) being more positive, and the *Annales* offering a negative and critical vision.⁷⁷

While in the *Agricolae* the only apparent criticism of Roman rule is the speech made by Calgacus to its troops, in the *Annales* Boudica's rebellion is used to provide a wholly negative view of Roman expansionism. This initially sympathetic view of the queen and her suffering changes as the violence of the rebellion is exposed by Tacitus, and the Britons become unhinged barbarians: *quod uberrimum spolianti et defendentibus intutum* (who delighted in plunder and were indifferent to all else).⁷⁸ Still, both Tacitus and Cassius Dio criticize Roman

rule,⁷⁹ with the denunciation of the rapacity that allegedly gave birth to the empire;⁸⁰ an assertion of the abuses perpetrated by Roman troops;⁸¹ of the cowardliness⁸² and incompetence⁸³ of the Romans, with a clear opposition between the pre-Roman freedom and the oppression of Roman rule⁸⁴ (which, according to Cassius Dio's Boudica, was worse than slavery).⁸⁵ The very speech of Suetonius Paternus to his soldiers before the decisive battle seems to prove Tacitus' accusation of Roman greed, with the general having to ask his soldiers to focus on the fight and not on plunder before the enemy was destroyed, *praedae immemores: parta victoria cuncta ipsis cessura* (without a thought of plunder: when once the victory had been won, everything will be in your power).⁸⁶

Cassius Dio presents, through Boudica's speeches, an image of the natives strongly marked by philosophical conceptions like the ones that dominated Viriathus' portrayal. In those speeches, Cassius Dio's Boudica constructs a utopic portrayal of life before Rome, 'linked to a vision of pre-Roman Britain as an idyllic golden age, free from the vicissitudes of "civilized" life'.⁸⁷ Tacitus also contributed to this idealized vision based on stoic and cynic ideals.⁸⁸

The establishment of a clear link between romanization and the loss of freedom is present throughout the texts of both authors,⁸⁹ but let us focus on an excerpt from Tacitus (Ann. 21.3):

inde etiam habitus nostri honor et frequens toga; paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum, porticus et balinea et conviviorum elegantiam. idque apud imperitos humanitas vocabatur, cum pars servitutis esset.

step by step they were led to things which dispose to vice, the lounge, the bath, the elegant banquet. All this in their ignorance, they called civilization, when it was but a part of their servitude).

The text refers to the corruptive nature of civilization (expressed in the words *paulatimque discessum ad delenimenta vitiorum*), destructive of virtue, purity, and freedom, elements which the Roman elite associated with primitive societies. As we have also seen for Viriathus, classic literature tends to the adoption of philosophical conceptions that make the civilization a synonym of fragility, not only moral but also physical.⁹⁰ Cassius Dio is particularly useful in this regard. His text from 62.5.2 to 65.5.6 includes in the speech of Boudica a series of considerations regarding the moral and physical superiority of the Britons, exactly because of their primitive and uncorrupted state. It is this philosophical conception that is at the heart of Boudica's claim which has obvious similarities with the portrayal of Viriathus.

ἐν τε οὖν τούτοις παρὰ πολὺ ἡμῶν ἐλαττοῦνται, καὶ ἐνέκεινοις, ὅτι οὔτε λιμὸν οὔτε δίψος, οὐ ψῦχος οὐ καῦμα ὑποφέρουσιν ὥσπερῆμεῖς, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν καὶ σκιάς καὶ σκέπης σίτου τε μεμαγμένου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ἐλαίου δέονται, κὰν ἄρα τι τούτων αὐτοὺς ἐπιλίπη διαφθεύονται, ἡμῖν δὲ δὴπᾶσα μὲν πόα καὶ ῥίζα σιτός ἐστι, πᾶς δὲ χυμὸς ἔλαιον, πᾶν δὲ.⁹¹

There is also the fact that they cannot bear up under hunger, thirst, cold, or heat, as we can. They require shade and covering, they require kneaded bread and wine and oil, and if any of these things fails them, they perish; for us, on the other hand, any grass or root serves as bread, the juice of any plant as oil, any water as wine, any tree as a house.

The highlighting of the disparity of wealth between Romans and Britons⁹² corresponds not only to an attempt to highlight the alleged Roman avarice,⁹³ but also a certain philosophical defence of Boudica's society, poor but free. It is in that line of thought that Cassius Dio places Boudica telling her troops that ἐγνώκατε δὲ ὅσῳ καὶ πενία ἀδέσποτος πλούτου δουλεύοντος (and you have come to realize how much better is poverty with no master than wealth with slavery),⁹⁴ just like Tacitus had Calgacus mentioning the uselessness of wealth against strength,⁹⁵ two visions shared by cynical philosophers.

Arminius

If Viriathus' portrayal is positive, despite the accusation of banditry, and if Boudica's characterization is mostly negative, that of Arminius is surely a more complex one. While all other authors offer a clearly negative portrayal, in Tacitus' *Annales*, the main source, there is a mixed image, with the progressive growth of positive aspects of Arminius as the narrative nears its end, with an entirely negative portrayal during the Battle of Teutoburg Forest evolving to a more complex image afterwards.

The first mention of the famous massacre of the Teutoburg Forest is made by Ovid in two of his poems, one written some months after the event,⁹⁶ the other after about a year.⁹⁷ At around the same time Marcus Manilius published the poem *Astronomica*, which mentions the battle.⁹⁸ These three compositions mark the beginning of the negativity which will characterize Roman narratives, with a criticism of the events, of Germans in general, and of Arminius in particular.⁹⁹ German actions are permanently seen as treason by all authors,¹⁰⁰ and the violence of the battle results in expressions such as *fera Germania*.¹⁰¹ In line with

the *feritas* and *ferocia* of Germans (a typically barbarian trait),¹⁰² there is denouncement of their brutality during the battle itself by Ovid (*Tr.* 4.2.29–38) and Manilius (*Astr.* 1.899–900). The characterization that Ovid gives of Arminius is illustrative of the negativity that is shown by all authors at this early stage:

ille ferox et adhuc oculis hostilibus ardens
hortator pugnae consiliumque fuit.
perfidus hic nostros inclusit fraude locorum,
squalida promissis qui tegit ora comis
illo, qui sequitur, dicunt mactata ministro
saepe recusanti corpora capta deo.¹⁰³

This fierce fellow with hostile eyes still ablaze was at once the instigator and planner of the fight. This traitor here trapped our men in a treacherous place – the one who now conceals his unkempt face with his long hair. That one following him they say was the priest who sacrificed captives to a god who often refused them.

The two last verses are especially interesting because, just as we verified for Boudica, they link the native religion to the perceived violence of the natives' actions, something Tacitus also does.¹⁰⁴

The attempt to create a negative image of Arminius and his followers by emphasizing their violence is consistent among all authors. Cassius Dio writes that they provoked great destruction.¹⁰⁵ Florus highlights the brutality of the massacre and the tortures inflicted upon the Romans (2.30.36–37). Velleius Paterculus mentions the extermination of every Roman captured by the Germans (Vell. 2.119.2) and details the mangling of Varus' corpse (Vell. 2.119.5). The abhorrence in Roman culture of the mutilation of a dead person's body, and its religious implications for life after death, make Paterculus' portrayal of the German violence quite shocking for his readers. The negative image of the Germans (the words 'savage' and 'barbarian' are regularly found in the texts)¹⁰⁶ is very impactful in the narratives of the Battle of Teutoburg Forest, even if Varus is also a target of criticism, qualified as an incompetent, proud, greedy, and cruel man.¹⁰⁷

Upon being introduced to the reader, Arminius is presented as the instigator and leader of the rebellion,¹⁰⁸ a true *turbator Germaniae* (troubler of Germany),¹⁰⁹ and an instigator of the tortures suffered by Romans.¹¹⁰ Thus, he is said to be clever and treacherous¹¹¹ (or *perfidus*, as Ovid calls him)¹¹² – matching the characterization of his people as ferociously belligerent.¹¹³ Tacitus tells us of his *insitam violentiam* (naturally furious temper)¹¹⁴ and *ferocitas*,¹¹⁵ which is also pointed out by Ovid¹¹⁶ and Velleius Paterculus.¹¹⁷ His *insitam violentiam* leads to

his ferocity in battle, his violent reaction at the capture of his wife,¹¹⁸ and his famous discussion with his brother.¹¹⁹ Even his physical appearance matches the appearance of a barbarian in the Roman imagination, with a ferocious gaze and unkempt long hair (Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.31–33).

In Tacitus,¹²⁰ and in part in Velleius Paterculus¹²¹ there is the progressive presentation of a positive portrayal of Arminius. So, Arminius can be included in a certain Roman historiographical tradition where ‘one sees a developing fascination with paradoxical characters, individuals in whom great virtues and great vices coexist.’¹²² So, Arminius is seen as the defender of the traditions and ancestral freedom of his people (Tac., *Ann.* 2.10), freedom counterposed by the servitude of the Romans.¹²³ Tacitus inserts the subject of German freedom in Arminius’ speeches to his troops¹²⁴ (we are told that Arminius was a gifted speaker)¹²⁵ and in the argument with his Roman-loyalist brother;¹²⁶ and he writes it explicitly: *liberator haud dubiae Germaniae* (undoubtedly the liberator of Germany);¹²⁷ *Arminium pro libertate bellantem fauor habebat* (Arminius aroused enthusiasm as the champion of liberty).¹²⁸ Velleius Paterculus also mentions Arminius’ *ultra barbarum promptus ingenio* (possessing an intelligence quite beyond the ordinary barbarian),¹²⁹ thus placing him above his countrymen. Such intelligence, *ultra barbarorum*, allowed him, on certain occasions, to refrain from his *insitam violentiam*, as is verifiable in his disagreement with Inguiomerus about the best strategy to adopt against that portion of the Roman army they had been able to isolate.¹³⁰ Against Inguiomerus’ proposed full frontal assault, which would eventually lead to the Germans’ defeat, Arminius offers a cautious and risk-adverse strategy.

Another positive concession to the character of Arminius is the apparent parallel Tacitus tries to draw between Arminius and Germanicus. Besides the existence of a similar narrative rhythm,¹³¹ Tacitus, as Rhiannon Ash highlights,¹³² associates both characters with the idea of *libertas* (making them symbols in the fight ‘against the forces of tyranny’).¹³³ This association with the concept of *libertas*¹³⁴ makes both characters, in a certain measure, anachronistic figures, representative of ancient Roman virtues. Such reality places them against their respective families: while Arminius is placed in opposition to Segestes (his father-in-law),¹³⁵ Inguiomerus (his uncle),¹³⁶ and Maroboduus,¹³⁷ Germanicus is placed in opposition to Tiberius, his uncle. But the ‘popular young hero, fighting wars in an old-fashioned way, is ultimately no match for the older, less attractive, but very shrewd modern manipulator.’¹³⁸ And so, they both fall.

The portrayal Tacitus provides of Arminius’ death is the zenith of his positivity (2.88); if he was introduced as *turbator Germaniae*, he now departs as a *liberator haud dubiae Germaniae*.

Comparative analysis

Having completed a brief study of each of the portrayals in question, let us now offer a comparative analysis.

Of all the portrayals, the positivity of Viriathus' representation stands out. Thomas Grünewald, however, believes that Viriathus did not fit the category of respected enemy of Rome, even if he admits the positivity inherent to his presentation as noble bandit, 'exemplifying the morally admirable'.¹³⁹ While excluding Viriathus, Grünewald does include Arminius in the list of the most respected enemies of Rome.¹⁴⁰ A similar focus on the positive dimensions of the portrayal of Arminius is offered by Rhiannon Ash,¹⁴¹ probably because her study focused solely on the work of Tacitus. The analysis offered in the previous pages prevents adherence to such conclusions. Thomas Grünewald highlights the gradual manner in which the positivity of Viriathus' characterization is built.¹⁴² He ignores, however, that same representation for the portrayal of Arminius.

Viriathus' characterization is gifted a stronger and more encompassing positivity than that of Arminius, and less negativity, restricted to his classification as a bandit. We should not overstress the positivity of Arminius' portrayal in Tacitus to the point of ignoring the negativity of all the other accounts, and even of Tacitus' account at the Battle of Teutoburg. While the 'barbarization' of Arminius has as background the massacre of Roman soldiers in Teutoburg, Viriathus is presented as a noble barbarian, the ideal stoic-cynic man. The negative dimensions of Viriathus' characterization are ambiguous and can be seen as partly positive: his promotion of a guerrilla warfare is presented as *latrocinium* (banditry) and simultaneously as a proof of his alleged military genius. So, we have a positive portrayal of Viriathus, built upon his alleged personal excellence (true *exemplum bonum*),¹⁴³ and on his status as a symbol of traditional Roman virtues and values. This last element, allied to his presentation as a prototype of stoic and, especially, cynic ideals, consubstantiate in his quasi-utopian transformation as noble savage and noble bandit.

Boudica is clearly the target of the most negative portrayal, even if her rebellion is used by Cassius Dio and Tacitus to criticize Roman rule. While the barbarization of Viriathus is tinted by a positive philosophical construction, and that of Arminius is partially diminished by the evolution of Tacitus' narrative, neither argument can be fully used for Boudica.

We can thus claim that the three analysed portrayals present different degrees of positivity and/or negativity: Viriathus' characterization is clearly positive; Arminius' portrayal is gifted of a strong complexity and ambiguity, a mixed

image; and Boudica's depiction is the one with the clearest negativity, even if inserted in a narrative that strongly criticizes Roman behaviour towards the queen and Roman rule.

Despite those differences, there are evident similarities between the portrayals. All three characters are barbarized; there is in all three characterizations a dialectic between the enemies of Rome and the Romans themselves, with a certain presentation of the enemies as representative of primitive Rome and a criticism of contemporaneous Rome and its leaders; and there is the centrality and omnipresence of philosophical conceptions of cynic-stoic influence, which tend to see the state of Roman civilization as corrupt and weak. So, there is in the studied sources a clear auto-reflection, a colonizing treatment of enemy nations by classical historiography.¹⁴⁴ There is what we may call a dichotomous and self-centred interpretation of the 'other' by Roman historiography, seen in the light of classical civilization and classical philosophy.

Viriathus' portrayal is the only one in which his 'barbarian' nature (as it was understood by Romans) is not linked to negative conceptions. The personality that ancient authors constructed for him is different from the classical representation of a 'barbarian'; certain traits such as *feritas*, *ferocitas*, *avaritia*, cruelty, and irrationality are not ascribed to him. The very presentation of his *barbaritas* at the light of the cynic and stoic idealizations of 'noble savages' leads to an almost utopic presentation of Viriathus. Quite the opposite is the 'barbarization' of Arminius and Boudica, with an attempt by the ancient sources to emotionally distance the reader from said characters, except in very specific moments. For both characters there is not only a clear barbarization of the peoples they lead (by highlighting their cruelty and its link to their religion), but also of themselves. The role religion played in both accounts is very interesting. It is one of the instruments used by classical authors to reinforce the barbarity of the two nations in question (thus reinforcing the emotional distance between the reader and the peoples portrayed). This use of religion and human sacrifice to provide 'otherness' to Celtic and Germanic tribes is a common element in classical historiography, being observable not only for the studied characters, but also for the peoples of Gaul¹⁴⁵ and Hispania¹⁴⁶ (even if, for Hispania, not during the portrayal of Viriathus' war).

During our analysis of Boudica, we noted the importance that her gender assumes. Her gender is used as an exacerbating tool for the cultural disparities between the worlds of the Romans and the Britons, but it is not limited to the Iceni queen. Despite the exceptionality of Boudica, there are parallels between the characterization of Briton, Germanic, and Hispanic women as transgressive

of the gender boundaries of the historians' own societies. It is in such light that we should understand Boudica's claim that women were as courageous as men.¹⁴⁷ The same courage is attributed by Tacitus to Arminius' wife, who was capable of maintaining a stoic attitude after being captured by the Romans.¹⁴⁸

As Tomás Aguilera Durán explained in his study of the pre-Roman barbarian stereotype, the positive version that is occasionally given by ancient authors of Rome's northern enemies 'deriva de ciertas tendencias filosóficas y políticas que se valen de la imagen idealizada del primitivo como contrapunto para la crítica de determinadas políticas y personajes romanos' (derives from certain philosophical and political tendencies that use the idealized image of the primitive as a counterpoint to the criticism of certain Roman policies and characters).¹⁴⁹ Concomitantly with this statement there is, in the analysed portrayals, the existence of a certain dialectic between the enemies of Rome and the generals and emperors who fought them, with a critical reflection not only of certain Roman figures, but also of the moral state of the empire. In the case of Viriathus there is a demonization of the Roman generals who fought against him, and a dichotomic presentation of the vices of these Romans against the moral and personal virtues of the Lusitanian chief. Tacitus and Cassius Dio, as we have seen, use the narrative of Boudica's rebellion to elaborate a negative image of Rome's rule and its decadence. Also, in the portrayal of the Battle of Teutoburg Forest, there is strong criticism of Varus and his role in the Roman defeat.

In addition to the criticism that is made of Rome, there is also a certain 'romanization' of the studied characters. This 'romanization' did not associate the three characters with the Rome they were fighting, instead attempting to turn them into flawed representatives of the traditional values of that lost Urbe of which Livy writes with wistfulness (Liv., 1.pr.11), in opposition to the morally degraded Rome of his days (Liv., 1.pr.9).

It is in considering the transversality of the idea of moral decay of the contemporary Urbe that we must frame the association of some of Rome's enemies with a long-lost virtuous archaic Rome.¹⁵⁰ As Rhiannon Ash puts it, 'that old Rome is to be found in the most remote parts of the Empire, or even beyond the empire's bounds.'¹⁵¹ It is in such a category of adversaries 'more Roman than the Romans'¹⁵² that characters such as Viriathus must be included. In the case of Boudica's portrayal, such characterization is not verifiable beyond the partial and transitory romanization subjacent to her presentation as 'wronged Roman matron'¹⁵³ by Tacitus. In the case of Arminius, such presentation is more problematic, even if verifiable. That association with the noble Roman past is

made, in Arminius' portrayal, through two elements: by the parallel Tacitus seems to attempt to build between Arminius and Germanicus, and by a generational conflict present in the *Annales*, in which the younger leaders are representative of an idealized past in opposition to older leaders, better examples of moral decay.

Regarding the positive traits of the studied figures, it is important to highlight the recurrent acknowledgment of attributes such as courage, persuasiveness, defence of freedom, and sagacity. These elements are not only present in the portrayal of Viriathus and Arminius, but also in the portrayal of Boudica.¹⁵⁴

To understand the levels of positivity and negativity of each character, it is important to acknowledge the degree of separation between the portrayal of the studied figures and their respective peoples. Arminius is presented to the reader as sharing several traits with his people, still, he had the *ultra barbarum promptus ingenio* that made him the ideal leader. In contrast, Boudica's portrayal tends to dilute her personality into that of her people. For Viriathus we are offered a mixed portrayal in this regard. Just like his people, he is shown as a primitive and brave bandit. But unlike the *ferocitas* of his people,¹⁵⁵ his courage is linked to his intellect and military genius, clearly superior to that of his fellow countrymen in several instances.¹⁵⁶

The process of association of the studied characters to traditional Roman values is linked to the subgency of the noble savage's conception, glorifier of a simple and virtuous life, associated by Roman historiography with the beginnings of Rome. As Liv Yarrow explains, the concept of noble savage provides a way to glorify a simpler past, with the moral strength of such a way of life being regularly glorified as the reason for Rome's rise to power in the Mediterranean.¹⁵⁷ It is in conformity with such historiographical reality that we must understand the regular contamination of Roman histories with philosophical conceptions conducive to an expression of the alleged corruptive character of civilization, in opposition to a virtuous primitivism in line with the image of noble savage.

Of all the three studied characters, Viriathus is the one who more clearly expresses that contaminative action of classical authors, presented as a true prototype of cynic and stoic ideals, a true noble savage whose heroism is contraposed to the morally corrupted Roman generals. The speeches of Cassius Dio's Boudica are an even clearer expression of this opposition between the physical and moral superiority of primitive nations and the contrasting physical and moral decay subjacent to the process of romanization. In her speeches it is not just Boudica who is shown as fitting the concept of the idealized savage, but her entire people, with the presentation of an unspoiled and utopian image of the Britons in opposition to a negative Roman image.

While Arminius' portrayal does not share the omnipresence of philosophical conceptions like those of Viriathus and Boudica's characterizations, his people play an important role in the construction of such conceptions in classical historiography, taken as one of the best examples of the fortifying nature of life in accordance with the natural world. Authors as varied as Julius Caesar,¹⁵⁸ Tacitus,¹⁵⁹ and Cassius Dio¹⁶⁰ create a hierarchy of braveness and strength of several peoples, with Germans occupying a position of primacy. Julius Caesar compares several times the Gauls, Britons, and Germans, comparisons in which the Germans are presented as superior due to the greater primitivism of their societies,¹⁶¹ with a similar thought process being followed by Tacitus (Tac., Ag. 11).

Conclusion

It is important to conclude this analysis by restating the imagistic, thematic, and conceptual wealth of the portrayal constructed for three of Rome's biggest western enemies. It is true that our records of ancient Rome are contaminated in terms of 'historical truth'. It is also true that such contamination is nothing but an opportunity to understand how ancient authors and their societies understood not only their own world, but that of the 'other', how they portrayed themselves and their past when they attempted to portray their enemies. Hopefully, we have made evident the self-reflective and, in a way, colonizing treatment of foreign peoples and their leaders by ancient historiography.

We have attempted to understand the similarities and dissimilarities between the different portrayals, with their respective degrees of positivity and negativity. Viriathus is presented as the prototype of the noble savage; for Arminius we are left with a complex, ambiguous image; and Boudica is clearly the portrayal in which there is a pre-eminence of negative barbaric elements, even if framed by a narrative quite critical of Rome's civilization and Rome's rule. Despite the differences highlighted during the short case study of each character, we have attempted to show the reader how there is evidence, in all portrayals, of the transversality (even if to different degrees) of narrative, political, literary, and philosophical elements such as the expression of the barbaric nature of all three characters; the framing of Boudica in the transgressive nature of 'gender frontiers' assumed by 'barbaric' women; and the dialectic built between the studied characters and the Romans they fought, a relationship which tends to express the association of certain enemy leaders with an idealized image of archaic Rome, in

opposition to the corruptive nature of Roman civilization and the consequent negativity of the present Roman leaders.

Through our small case study, we hope to have contributed to a better understanding of the similarities and differences between the narrative and philosophical elements present in each characterization and, by doing so, maybe we have provided a clearer insight on how self-perception is present in the construction of the 'other' in the Roman world.

Notes

- 1 The research for this paper was funded by Fundação para a Ciência e para a Tecnologia (scholarship SFRH/BD/146403/2019).
- 2 For Boudica, the following works were found impactful: Adler 2008; Williams 2009; Ash 2012. For Arminius, Wells 2003; Benario 2004; Ash 2012. And for Viriathus, Alvar Ezquerro and Blázquez Martínez 1997; Pastor Muñoz 2003; Grünwald 2004; Pérez Abellán 2006; Yarrow 2006; and Gorges 2009. For an analysis of the portrayal of Iberians, I recommend the following works: Thollard 1987; Gómez Fraile 1999; Cruz-Andreotti 2002; García Moreno 2002; Gorges 2009; ar 2011, 2012; Sánchez Moreno and Aguilera Durán 2013.
- 3 For example, see: D.C. 22.73.1–3; App., *Hisp.* 11.62, 12.67, 12.69; Cic., *Off.* 2.40; *Amm.* 14.11.33; Sil., *Punica.* X.215–234; Vell., 2.90.3; Diod., 33.1.5, 33.2.1a; etc.
- 4 The same was stated by Grünwald 2004: 36 and Pastor Muñoz 2003: 203.
- 5 Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.15.
- 6 Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.15; D.C. 22.73.3; App., *Hisp.* 12.69–70; Diod., 33.7.7.
- 7 *Epit.* 1.33.15.
- 8 D.C. 22.73.3.
- 9 That is why Diodorus (33.7.7) tells us that τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος ὅτι πολλῶν εἰδόντων οὐδεὶς ἐπεβάλετο λαβεῖν ἢ αἰτῆσαι, τί οὖν, εἶπεν, ἄνθρωπε, διδόντων σοι τὴν ἄδειαν καὶ τὴν ἀσφαλῆ τούτων ἀπόλαυσιν τῶν κρατούντων, καταλιπὼν τούτους ἐπεθύμησας τῆς ἐμῆς ἀγρραυλίας καὶ ἀγενείας οἰκεῖος γενέσθαι; ἦν δὲ οὗτος κατὰ τὰς ὁμιλίας εὐστοχος, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτοδιδάκτου καὶ ἀδιαστρόφου φύσεως φέρων τοὺς λόγους (He is said to have made many other pithy remarks as well, for though he had had no formal education, he was schooled in the understanding of practical affairs. For the speech of one who lives according to nature is concise, being a by-product of virtuous pursuits; and when a thing is stated simply, briefly, and without frills, the speaker is credited with a pointed saying, while the hearer has something to remember).
- 10 See App., *Hisp.* 12.75.
- 11 Cic., *Off.* 2.40.

- 12 D.C. 22.73.1; App., *Hisp.* 12.71; Diod. 33.1.2, 33.1.3 or 33.1.5; Vell., 2.1.3; Liv., *Per.* 52.8; Cic., *Off.* 2.40; Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.15.
- 13 App., *Hisp.* 12.75.
- 14 App., *Hisp.* 12.70 and App., *Hisp.* 12.69.
- 15 See Diod., 33.21a, 33.1.2, 33.1.5; App., *Hisp.* 11.62, 12.67, 12.69.
- 16 E.g., Diod., 33.21a or App., *Hisp.* 12.67.
- 17 E.g., App., *Hisp.* 11.62.
- 18 E.g., App., *Hisp.* 12.67.
- 19 Diod., 33.1.5.
- 20 App., *Hisp.* 10.59, 10.60, 11.61, 11.63, 12.74; D.C., 22.74.1, 22.74.2, 22.77.1, 22.78.1; Vell., 2.1.3, 2.90.3; Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.17; Val. Max., 6.4 and 9.6.
- 21 App., *Hisp.* 10.59, 10.60, 11.61, 11.63, 12.74; D.C., 22.74.1, 22.74.2, 22.77.1, 22.78.1; Vell., 2.1.3, 2.90.3; Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.17; Val. Max., 6.4 and 9.6.
- 22 Grünewald 2004: 35.
- 23 Alvar Ezquerro and Blázquez Martínez 1997: 139.
- 24 Grünewald 2004: 35–44; Pastor Muñoz 2003: 203; keark 2014: 139.
- 25 Grünewald 2004: 35; Ash 2012: 58–64.
- 26 Diod., 33.1.4 and 33.21a; App., *Hisp.* 12.74; Flor., *Epit.* 1.33.17; Val. Max., 9.6.
- 27 Val. Max., 9.6.
- 28 Two works are of importance to this subject and highly impacted our own analysis: Pastor Muñoz 2003 and Lens Tuero 1986.
- 29 Sedley 2004: 238.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 165, 204.
- 31 Desmond 2008: 101.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 110–11.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 99.
- 34 Sandbach 2001: 142; Sedley 2004: 202.
- 35 Diod., 33.1.1–2.
- 36 Grünewald 2004: 42.
- 37 Pastor Muñoz 2003: 188.
- 38 Desmond 2008: 77.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 80.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 83–4; Pastor Muñoz 2003: 188–91.
- 41 Long 2006: 391.
- 42 Sandbach 2011: 21; Desmond 2008: 77, 78, 80, 101.
- 43 App., *Hisp.* 12.75; Diod. 33.21a, 33.1.5; Cic., *Off.* 2.40.
- 44 Desmond 2008: 99.
- 45 Diod., 33.7.1.
- 46 Pastor Muñoz 2003: 189; Gorges 2009: 12.
- 47 Yarrow 2006: 335.

- 48 Desmond 2008: 77–8.
- 49 Desmond 2008: 189.
- 50 Pastor Muñoz 2003: 189–90.
- 51 Desmond 2008: 77–8, 148.
- 52 See Diod., 33.7.2.
- 53 D.C., 22.73.4.
- 54 Desmond 2008: 78, 92, 111–12.
- 55 Williams 2009: 181.
- 56 D.C., 62b.1.1, 62b.2.2, 62b.7.1.
- 57 Tac., *Ann.* 14.35; Tac., *Ag.* 16.1; D.C., 62b.2.2, 62b.2.3, 62b.7.1.
- 58 D.C., 62b.1.1, 62b.2.2, 62b.2.3, 62b.6.4, 62b.7.1; Tac., *Ag.* 16.1.
- 59 Tac., *Ag.* 5.9, 16.1, 11, 33.1; Tac., *Ann.* 12.35, 14.32, 14.33, 14.36; D.C., 39.51.3, 60.20.2, 62b.12.1.
- 60 Tac., *Ag.* 16.1–2.
- 61 D.C., 62b.1.1.
- 62 Tac., *Ann.* 14.33.
- 63 Adler 2008: 189.
- 64 Williams 2009: 37.
- 65 Tac., *Ann.* 14.30.
- 66 *Ibid.*, 61.
- 67 Tac., *Ag.* 16.1, 31; Tac., *Ann.* 14.31, 14.35; D.C. 62b.1.1, 62b.2.2, 62b.2.3, 62b.6.4.
- 68 Tac., *Ag.* 16.1; Tac., *Ann.* 14.35.
- 69 D.C., 62b.2.2.
- 70 D.C., 62b.1.1.
- 71 Williams 2009: 120.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 181.
- 73 Adler 2008: 190–4.
- 74 Ash 2012: 182.
- 75 Ash 2012: 182.
- 76 Tac., *Ag.* 15.
- 77 Ash 2012: 183–4.
- 78 Tac., *Ann.* 14.33.
- 79 See Tac., *Ann.* 14.31, 14.32, 14.35, 14.36; D.C., 62b.2.1, 62b.3.2, 62b.4.2, 62b.6.4.
- 80 E.g., D.C., 62b.3.4 or Tac., *Ag.* 15.
- 81 Tac., *Ann.* 14.31.
- 82 Tac., *Ann.* 14.32.
- 83 Tac., *Ag.* 15.
- 84 Tac., *Ag.* 11, 21.3, 24.3, 30; Tac., *Ann.* 12.37, 14.31, 14.35; D.C., 62b.3.1, 62b.4.3, 62b.6.4.
- 85 D.C., 62b.3.3.

- 86 Tac., *Ann.* 14.36.
- 87 Adler 2008: 192.
- 88 *Ibid.*, 194.
- 89 For such dichotomy between the freedom of the primitive world and the oppression subjacent to the process of romanization, I recommend reading the following excerpts: Tac., *Ann.* 14.31; Tac., *Ag.* 13.1, 30; D.C., 62.3.1, 62.4.3, 62.3.1, 62.4.3.
- 90 See Caes., *Gall.* 1.39, 5.14, 6.21, 6.24; Tac., *Ag.* 11; D.C., 40.39.2.
- 91 D.C., 62b.5.5.
- 92 D.C., 23.3, 31, 60.33.3c, 62b.3.1.
- 93 E.g., D.C., 62b.3.4 or Tac., *Ag.* 15, 30.
- 94 D.C., 62.3.1.
- 95 Tac., *Ag.* 32.
- 96 Ov., *Tr.* 3.12.45–48.
- 97 Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.1–2, 4.2.29–38.
- 98 Man., *Astr.* 1.896–900.
- 99 Wells 2003: 37–41.
- 100 Ov., *Tr.* 3.12.47–48, 4.2.34.35; Man., *Astr.* 1.888–889; Vell., 2.118.1; D.C., 56.18.4, 56.19.5.
- 101 Man., *Astr.* 1.896–900.
- 102 Dauge 1981: 424–36.
- 103 Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.31–36.
- 104 In the narrative of the battle (Tac., *Ann.* 1.61) and in a previous debate between Arminius and his brother (Tac., *Ann.* 2.10).
- 105 D.C., 56.19.5.
- 106 E.g., Flor., *Epit.* 2.30.36; Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.1; Tac., *Ann.* 1.57, 1.65, 1.68; Vell., 2.118.2, 2.119.5; or D.C., 38.47.5.
- 107 D.C., 56.18.3; Flor., *Epit.* 2.30.34; Vell., 2.118.1.
- 108 Tac., *Ann.* 1.55, 1.57, 1.58, 1.61.
- 109 Tac., *Ann.* 1.55.
- 110 Tac., *Ann.* 1.61.
- 111 See Tac., *Ann.* 2.17; Vell., 2.118.2; D.C., 56.19.2; Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.34.
- 112 Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.34.
- 113 Tac., *Ger.* 4; Tac., *Ann.* 1.68; Vell., 2.118.1; D.C., 38.35.2, 38.45.4; App., *Gall.* 1.3; and Man., *Astr.* 1.896–900. Tac., *Ann.* 1.55, 1.57, 1.68, 2.44; Flor., *Epit.* 2.30.32. Tac., *Ann.* 1.57.
- 114 Tac., *Ann.* 1.59.
- 115 Tac., *Ann.* 1.59, 2.10, 2.19.
- 116 Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.31–34.
- 117 Vell., 2.118.2.

- 118 E.g., Tac., *Ann.* 2.17.
 119 Tac., *Ann.* 2.10.
 120 Ash 2012: 308.
 121 Vell., 2.118.2.
 122 Marincola 2007: 106.
 123 Tac., *Ann.* 1.59, 2.9, 2.15.
 124 Tac., *Ann.* 2.15.
 125 Ov., *Tr.* 4.2.29–38; Tac., *Ann.* 1.55, 1.59, 1.61, 2.45; Vell., 2.118.3.
 126 Tac., *Ann.* 2.10.
 127 Tac., *Ann.* 2.88.
 128 Tac., *Ann.* 2.44.
 129 Vell., 2.118.2.
 130 Tac., *Ann.* 1.68.
 131 Ash 2012: 308.
 132 *Ibid.*, 306–9.
 133 *Ibid.*, 306.
 134 *Ibid.*
 135 Tac., *Ann.* 1.59.
 136 Tac., *Ann.* 2.45.
 137 Tac., *Ann.* 2.44.
 138 Ash 2012: 307.
 139 Grünewald 2004: 163.
 140 *Ibid.*, 33.
 141 Ash 2012: 308–9.
 142 Grünewald 2004: 36–7.
 143 *Ibid.*, 37.
 144 Marincola 2007: 48; Alvar Ezquerro and Blázquez Martínez 1997: 140; Habinek 2001: 100; Ash 2012: 95; Dauge 1981: 250.
 145 E.g., Caes., *Gall.* 6.16, 6.17.
 146 Sánchez Moreno and Aguilera Durán 2013: 229.
 147 D.C., 62.6.4.
 148 Tac., *Ann.* 1.57.
 149 Aguilera Durán 2012: 545.
 150 Pastor Muñoz 2003: 193; Ash 2012: 59–65.
 151 Ash 2012: 59.
 152 *Ibid.*, 64–5.
 153 Adler 2008: 181.
 154 See Tac., *Ann.* 14.35 ; D.C., 62.2.2, 62.6.4, 62.8.2.
 155 Dauge 1981: 78–9; Aguilera Durán 2012: 545.
 156 Diod., 33.21a, 33.1.2, 33.1.5; App., *Hisp.* 11.62, 12.67, 12.69.

- 157 Yarrow 2006: 334.
 158 See Caes., *Gall.* 1.39, 5.14, 6.21, 6.24.
 159 E.g., Tac., *Ag.* 11.
 160 See the presence of such idea on Cassius Dio in the excerpt 40.39.2.
 161 See Caes., *Gall.* 1.39, 5.14, 6.21, 6.24.

Sources

- Ammianus Marcellinus (1950), *Rerum Gestarum*, trans. J. Rolfe, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Appian (1899), *Historia Romana*, trans. H. White, New York: Macmillan.
 Cassius Dio (1914), *Historia Romana*, trans. E. Cary, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Cicero (1913), *De Officiis*, trans. W. Miller, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Diodorus Siculus (1967), *Bibliotheca historica*, trans. F. Walton, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Florus (1929), *Epitome*, trans. E. S. Forster, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Julius Caesar (1869), *De Bello Gallico*, trans. W. S. Bohn, New York: Harper.
 Livy (1959), *Periochae*, trans. A. Schlensinger, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Marcus Manilius (1992), *Astronomica*, trans. G. P. Goold, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Ovid (1939), *Tristia*, trans. A. L. Wheeler, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Silius Italicus (1961), *Punica*, trans. J. D. Duff, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 Suetonius (1889), *De Vita Caesarum*, trans. A. Thomson, Philadelphia, PA: Gebbie.
 Tacitus (1942), *Annales*, trans. A. J. Church, New York: Random House.
 Tacitus (1942), *De Vita Iulii Agricolae*, trans. A. J. Church, New York: Random House.
 Tacitus (1942), *De Origine et Situ Germanorum Liber*, trans. A. J. Church, New York: Random House.
 Valerius Maximus (1935), *De Factis Dictisque Memorabilibus*, trans. P. Constant, Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères.
 Velleius Paterculus (1924), *Historiae*, trans. F. Shipley, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bibliography

- Adler, E. (2008), 'Boudica's Speeches in Tacitus and Dio', *Classical World*, 101: 173–95.
 Aguilera Durán, T. (2011), 'La utopía del bárbaro: Imágenes idealizadas del pasado prerromano en la España contemporánea', *El Futuro del Pasado*, 2: 371–87.

- Aguilera Durán, T. (2012), 'Una visión historiográfica alternativa: la deconstrucción del estereotipo del bárbaro prerromano', *Antesteria*, 1: 543–55.
- Alvar Ezquerro, J. and Blázquez Martínez, J. M., eds (1997), *Héroes y antihéroes en la antigüedad clásica*, Madrid: Cátedra.
- Ash, R. (2012), *Tacitus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benario, H. (2004), 'Arminius into Hermann: History into Legend', *Greece & Rome, Second Series*, 51: 83–94.
- Clark, J. H. (2014), *Triumph in Defeat: Military Loss and the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, C. (2002), *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cruz-Andreotti, G. (2002), 'Iberia e Iberos en las fuentes Histórico-Geográficas griegas: una propuesta de análisis', *Mainake*, 24: 153–80.
- Dauge, Y. A. (1981), *Le barbare: recherches sur la conception romaine de la barbarie et de la civilización*, Brussels: Latomus.
- Desmond, W. (2008), *Cynics*, Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing.
- Feldherr, A. and G. Hardy, eds (2011), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing, vol. 1: Beginnings to AD 600*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- García Moreno, L. (1989), 'Hispaniae tumultus: rebelión y violencia indígena en la España romana de época republicana', *Polis: revista de ideas y formas políticas de la Antigüedad Clásica*, 1: 81–107.
- García Moreno, L. (2002), 'Polibio y la creación del estereotipo de lo Hispano en la etnografía y la historiografía Helenísticas', *Polis: revista de ideas y formas políticas de la Antigüedad Clásica*, 14: 127–46.
- Gómez Fraile, J. (1999), 'Los conceptos de Iberia y Ibero en Estrabón', *SPAL: revista de prehistoria y arqueología de la Universidad de Sevilla*, 8: 159–88.
- Gorges, Jean-Gérard (2009), *Lusitânia romana: entre o mito e a realidade*, Cascais: Câmara Municipal de Cascais.
- Grünewald, T. (2004), *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality*, London: Routledge.
- Habinek, T. (2001), *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lens Tuero, J. (1986), 'Viriato. Héroe y Rey Cínico', *Estudios de Filología Griega*, 2: 253–72.
- Long, A. (2006), *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Marincola, J. (2007), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, vol. 1, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Méry, L. (2005), 'Barbares et civilisés chez les auteurs romains du 1er s. av. J.-C.', *Cahiers Kubaba*, 7: 153–85.
- Neves, M. (2010), 'Entre nacional e local, entre história e memória: estratégias para uma patrimonialização identitária de Viriato', *Sphera publica: revista de ciencias sociais y de la comunicación*, 2010 (spec. issue): 211–29.

- Nice, A. (1993), 'Superstition and Religion in Tacitus' and Dio's Accounts of the Boudican Revolt', *Pegasus*, 36: 15–18.
- Pastor Muñoz, M. (2003), *Viriato: a luta pela liberdade*, Lisboa: Ésquilo.
- Pérez Abellán, J. (2006), 'Problemática en torno al estudio de la figura de Viriato', *Panta Rei: revista de ciencia y didáctica de la historia*, 5: 45–56.
- Sánchez Moreno, E. and T. Aguilera Durán (2013), 'Bárbaros y vencidos, los otros en la conquista romana de Hispania', in C. López and G. Fernandes (eds), *Debita verba: Estudios en homenaje al profesor Julio Mangas Manjarrés*, vol. 1, 225–44, Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo.
- Sandbach, F. (2001), *The Stoics*, London: Duckworth.
- Sedley, D. (2004), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thollard, P. (1987), *Barbarie et civilisation chez Strabon: étude critique des livres III et IV de la Géographie*, Besançon: Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté.
- Wells, P. (2003), *The Battle that Stopped Rome: Emperor Augustus, Arminius, and the Slaughter of the Legions in the Teutoburg Forest*, New York: W. W. Norton.
- Williams, C. (2009), *Boudica and Her Stories: Narrative Transformations of a Warrior Queen*, Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.
- Yarrow, L. (2006), *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

