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When Augustus and the Romans conquered the central and western Alps at the end of the first century B.C.E., most of the newly subjugated regions were brought under direct Roman control. The central portion of the western Alps, however, was left in the hands of a native dynasty, the Cottians, where it remained until the reign of Nero over a half-century later. The Cottians thus serve as one of many examples of a form of indirect Roman rule, its “two-level monarchy,” wherein the rulers of smaller kingdoms governed as friends and allies of the Roman state in an asymmetrical power relationship with Rome.1 This article explores how a native dynasty like the Cottians presented and legitimized their relationship with Rome to a domestic audience. Although similar work has been done before with regard to the better attested dynasties of the eastern borders, the Cottians present a rare opportunity to examine in the context of the Celtic west the self-presentation of reges socii (“allied kings”) who reigned alternatively as kings and prefects.2 Relationships between Rome and its reges socii date back at least to the middle republic and continued on in the Bosporus until the fourth century C.E.3 They existed across the Roman world, from Britain to the Black Sea and from Mauretania to Judaea.4 The not uncommon classification of these allied kings

1 Millar 1996: 244. For surveys of recent scholarship on Rome’s allied kings, see Coskun 2005b and 2008a; Kaizer and Facella 2010; and Wilker 2008. Still essential are Braund 1984; Cimma 1976; Millar 1996; and Paltiel 1991. For bibliography on particular dynasties and rulers, see the database of Amici Populi Romani (Coskun 2012).

2 For similar studies of Herod the Great, see Wilker 2005 and 2007; Gruen 2009. Dahmen (2010) provides discussion of the targeted audience for allied kings’ coinage, for which unfortunately there are no Cottian comparanda.

3 The existence of such relationships in the middle republic has long been noted; see Cimma 1976; cf. Badian 1958 and Gruen 1984. Burton (2003) offers bibliography on the subject and frames the discussion in terms of anthropological theory. On the long-lived kingdom of the Bosporus, see Heinen 2008; Millar 1996; and Barrett 1977b.

as “client kings” is inaccurate—the phrase is not used in ancient literature—and finds only the slightest support in a passage of Suetonius. The use of “friendly kings,” while closer to the sense of the descriptors reges socii and amici populi Romani (“friends of the Roman people”), is not without problems due to the difficulty of conveying the full range of meanings inherent in amicus and amicitia.

As a dynasty that reigned first as kings, then as prefects, then as kings again, the Cottians demonstrate the complexities of legitimization in Rome’s system of indirect rule.

THE COTTIAN KINGS

References to the kings of the Cottian Alps are few and brief, so reconstructing the policies of the Cottian kingdom is not without its perils; nevertheless a basic sketch of the dynasty can be made. The earliest known member of the dynasty was king Donnus, attested in his son’s inscriptions. His son, Cottius i, succeeded him, but after making peace with Augustus during the latter’s Alpine campaigns gave up his title of king in exchange for the title of prefect sometime between 13 and 9/8 B.C.E. Cottius was eventually succeeded by his son, probably Donnus ii, who in turn was succeeded by a Cottius ii. The emperor

for monarchs in Emesa (Barrett 1977a), Osroene (Sommer 2010), Commagene (Facella 2010), and Cilicia Trachaea (Sullivan 1979). It should be noted, however, that not all allies in Rome’s two-tier monarchy were kings, as there is evidence of sovereign priests in the Roman near east as well (Kaizer 2005).

5 Suet. Aug. 60. On the inadequacy of the term, see Coşkun 2008a; Gruen 2009; Millar 1996; and Williams 2008.

6 Williams 2008.

7 For a general survey of the Cottian dynasty, see Letta 1976; Pothecary 2005: 161–179; and Prieur 1968. For ancient literary references to the Cottian kings and their kingdom, see Strabo 4.1.3 (discussion of the boundaries of land of Cottius), 4.6.6 (a brief reference to the land of Cottius); Vitr. De arch. 8.3.17 (description of a fatally poisonous spring in Cottius’ kingdom); Amm. Marc. 15.10 (discussion of Cottius making peace with Augustus and building a road); Suet. Tib. 37 (the Pollentia riot); Dio 60.24.4 (Cottius ii for the first time called king); and Suet. Nerva 18 (description of the annexation of Cottius’ kingdom).

8 Prieur 1968. Augustus’ Alpine campaigns took place in three phases from 34 to 14 B.C.E. On the 34 B.C.E. campaign, see Dio 49.34, 49.38 and App. Ill. 17; on the 25 B.C.E. campaign, Dio 53.25; on the 17–14 B.C.E. campaigns, Dio 54.20–23; Vell. Pat. 2.95; Suet. Aug. 21 and Tib. 7; Liv. Per. 138; Res Gestae 26; and the inscription of the Tropaeum Alpium, which is preserved in part on the physical monument (CIL V 7817) and in its entirety in Plin. HN 3.136–138 (see also Arnaud 2004 and Lamboglia 1983); cf. Gabba 1988.

Claudius allowed Cottius II to assume the title of king, but the new Cottian kingdom was short-lived, since when Cottius II died without heirs Nero annexed the kingdom into the province of the Alpes Cottiae.\textsuperscript{10} The cessation of indirect rule in the Alps was part of a larger trend of annexing small states upon signs of instability; the 60s and 70s also saw the ends of the kingdoms of Pontus and Commagene.\textsuperscript{11} After Cottius’ death there were at least two sources of potential instability: the lack of heirs and also growing questions about the citizenship status and the attributio of smaller mountain communities, questions that had already proved problematic in the central Alps during the reigns of Tiberius, Gaius, and Claudius.\textsuperscript{12}

Thus, for a brief time between Augustus’ Alpine campaigns and the reign of Nero, the Cottian Alps were governed by a native dynasty who ruled by the acquiescence of the Roman state. They appear to have been reliable and useful allies for the Romans. When the people of Pollentia, a municipium in the nearby Tanarus river valley, attempted to hold the body of a primus pilus centurion hostage until they could extort a gladiatorial show from the centurion’s family, Tiberius sent two cohorts, one from Rome and one from Cottius’ kingdom (a Cotti regno), to surprise and then punish the people of Pollentia.\textsuperscript{13} The Cottian kingdom thus could and did supplement the Roman state in policing northern Italy, which since the Augustan settlement had been a largely demilitarized zone, with no significant forces outside of the Praetorian Guard, urban cohorts around Rome, and the two fleet bases at Misenum and Ravenna.\textsuperscript{14} By providing a ready source of military aid, the friendly Cottian kingdom allowed the Romans to leave northwestern Italy—parts of which had only recently been taken under Roman control—ungarrisoned, which in turn strengthened Augustan and Julio-Claudian portrayals of Italy as unified, free, and peaceful.

The service of the Cottians to the Roman state may explain why Claudius allowed Cottius II to assume the title of king as a sign of gratitude. Allowing Cottius II to call himself rex may have at the same time fit into Claudius’ larger self-presentation, particularly in contrasting him with his predecessor Gaius, most likely successor, although such an identification is not entirely secure. Given his death during Nero’s reign, Cottius II is probably either Donnus II’s son or nephew, but it is not impossible that Cottius II is to be identified with Cottius, the son of Cottius I and brother of Donnus II.

\textsuperscript{10} On Cottius resuming the title of king, see Dio 60.24.4. On Nero’s annexation of the kingdom, see Suet. Nero 18. Letta (2005: 88) dates the death of Cottius and provincialization of the Cottian Alps to 63, when the Maritime Alps were given Latin rights, on the grounds that the provincialization of the Cottian Alps necessitated a larger regional restructuring.

\textsuperscript{11} See Facella 2010 and Paltiel 1991 on the mid-first century C.E. Roman trend of annexing smaller allied states on the grounds of dynastic or political problems within those states.

\textsuperscript{12} Suet. Tiber. 37. Kelly (2007: 158) examines the Pollentia incident in the context of Roman expectations about riot control.

\textsuperscript{13} On the praetorians and urban cohorts, see Freis 1967 and Keppie 1996. For the fleets at Misenum, see Panciera 1978; Parma 1994; and Susini 1967.
who had executed another of Rome's allied kings, Ptolemy of Mauretania, in 40 C.E. Claudius also had interests in the Alps: his father had been involved in the Augustan era conquests, and Claudius himself intervened in a citizenship dispute in the Trentino and had the Via Claudia Augusta, linking the Adige and Danube valleys, constructed over the Alps.

For Rome, the Cottian kingdom was a useful but not absolutely necessary state for most of the Julio-Claudian era. From the point of view of the Roman state, the Cottians would seem to be the model of "friendly" kings. From the Cottian perspective, the relationship was more complicated.

For the Cottii, there was immediate advantage to an alliance with Rome. Foremost, the cessation of hostilities with Rome meant peace and survival. Cautionary examples to the contrary could be found nearby and in the recent past. The Salassi in the Alpes Graiae resisted Roman conquest, and their territory was forcibly annexed by Augustus. In 25 B.C.E., Aulus Terentius Varro Murena led a Roman army against the Salassi, and captured and sold into slavery 36,000 of them. The conquest was then solidified by the establishment of a colony at Aosta (Augusta Praetoria). A decade of peace followed Murena's campaign, but when hostilities in the Alps resumed in 17 B.C.E., memories of the treatment of the Salassi must still have been fresh for their neighbors to the south. A satisfactory end to the war with the Romans protected both Cottius and his subjects from a similar treatment.

For Cottius, peace also produced political capital. Ammianus, in reference to Cottius, says:

Huius sepulcrum reguli, quem itinera struxisse retulimus, Segusione est moenibus proximum, manesque eius ratione gemine religiose coluntur, quod iusto moderamine rexerat suos, et assitus in societatem rei Romanae, quietam genti praestitit sempiternam.

The tomb of this prince, who, as we said, built these roads, is at Susa next to the walls, and his shades are venerated for a double reason: because he had ruled his subjects with

---

15 Suet. Calig. 35.
16 Levick 1990: 143. On the Via Claudia Augusta, see Kainrath 2010; Mosca 2009; and milestones CIL V 8002 (= ILS 208) and CIL V 8003 (= CIL XVII 4.1). The citizenship dispute is preserved in an inscription found in the Val di Non: CIL V 5050 (= ILS 206 = AE 1983: 445).
17 On the general use of allied kings by the Julio-Claudian state, see Hekster 2010; Millar 1988; and Paltiel 1991.
18 Strabo 4.6.7. Strabo's discussion of the Salassi shows long-standing hostility between the Romans and the Salassi. The Salassi had a tradition of extracting tolls from users of the Great Saint Bernard Pass, while the Romans had taken the Salassi's gold mines. The Roman publicani attached to the gold mines further infuriated the Salassi with disputes over water rights (Strabo 4.6.7).
19 Strabo 4.6.7; Dio 53.25. Cf. ILS 6753.
a just government, and when admitted to alliance with the Roman state, procured eternal peace for his nation.20

According to Ammianus, Cottius’ manes were still being worshipped as late as the fourth century c.r. At least by then, a key part of Cottius’ posthumous reputation rested on his obtaining peace for the western Alps.

An alliance with Rome, however, meant more than peace. For Cottius’ subjects it brought obligations in terms of military contributions, as the Pollentia episode demonstrates; for Cottius it brought an expanded territory, which extended in the west to Ocelum, in the south to the border with the Maritime Alps, in the west probably to the Durance River, and in the north probably to the Orco River.21 Cottius could now claim lands not controlled by his father Donnus or possibly even more distant ancestors; again it appears that the Roman alliance was a boon for him.

Yet what was Cottius’ position in the new alliance? He was no longer a king. Whether he gave up the title voluntarily or whether Augustus requested it is unclear, although the choice of praefectus civitatum in place of king is significant. Before Cottius, the title is unattested, although there are a few examples of praefecti civitatum in the early principate. All appear to be equestrian governors of either small provinces or, more frequently, regions within provinces. L. Marcii Optatus, the praefectus Asturiae in Spain, is a good example of the latter.22 The nearest parallel is that of C. Baebius Atticus, primus pilus centurion and procurator for the emperor Claudius in Noricum, who also held during his career the posts of praefectus civitatum Moesiae et Trebilliae and praefectus civitatum in Alpibus Maritimae.23 Similarly, a Sextus Iulius Rufus was praefectus civitatum Barbariae in Sardinia.24 In Pannonia L. Volcacius Primus was praefectus ripae Danuvi et civitatium duarum Boiorum et Azaliorum.25 The title used by Cottius, that of praefectus civitatum, is found only in those cases cited above; praefecti gentis, such as Publilius Memorialis, the praefectus gentis Numidarum, are more frequently attested although generally of a later date.26 Unlike Cottius, few were from the areas that they were governing, and none can be identified as former reges. Thus the title of praefectus civitatum

20Amm. Marc. 15.10.7. Tr. J. Rolfe.
21Strabo 4.1.3; see also Nenci 1951 and Prieur 1968. On the Pollentia riot, see above, 355 and Suet. Tib. 37.
22CIL II 4616 = ILS 6948.
24CIL XIV 2954 = ILS 2684 (from Praeneste). Brunt (1983: 56) dates the inscription to the early principate.
25CIL IX 5363 = ILS 2737 (from Firmum Picenum).
26Publilius Memorialis’ cursus is recorded on CIL XI 7554 (= ILS 9195 = AE 1952: 34). Other praefecti gentis are attested in AE 1922: 19; CIL VIII 10500 (= ILS 1409); CIL VIII 9195 (= AE 1993: 1781) CIL VIII 5351 (= ILS 1435 = AE 1922: 19 = AE 1950: 145), CIL VIII 19923, AE 1999: 814, and CIL VI 3720 (= CIL VI 31032 = ILS 1418). The last is the one possible exception
appears to have been a fairly if not entirely new creation by the time Cottius assumed it, although the title of praefectus was older. The title could be made to suit both Cottius' and Augustus' purposes. For Augustus, having Cottius as praefectus and not king would emphasize the totality of his Alpine victories, while for Cottius the title praefectus gave him the appearance of being part of the Roman state without having that part defined too precisely.

MONUMENTALIZING THE COTTII: THE ARCH AT SUSA

The title was a key part of Cottius' new image, which was reinforced through a programme of building and euergetism in the Cottians' capital at Susa (ancient Segusio) and the surrounding territory. The best preserved Cottian monument is the arch at Susa, dedicated by Cottius and his subjects to Augustus in 9/8 B.C.E., a date provided by the arch's inscription:

\[\text{Imp(eratori) Caesari Augusto divi filio} \text{ pontifex maximo tribunicia potestate XV imp(eratori) XIII | M(arcus) Iulius regis Donni filius} \text{ Cottius praefectus cicitatium quae subscriptae sunt Segoviorum Segusiorum | Belacorum Caturigum Medullorum Tebaviorum Adanatium Savincatium Ecdiniorum Veaminiorum | Venisamiorum Iemeriorum Vesubianiorum Quadratiatium et cicitates quae sub eo praefecto fuerunt}\]

To the imperator Caesar Augustus, son of the deified (Julius), pontifex maximus, in his 15th year of tribunician power and imperator for the 13th time, Marcus Iulius Cottius the son of king Donnus, prefect of the communities which are written below—the (communities of the) Segovii, the Segusini, the Belaci, the Caturigi, the Medulli, the Tebaviori, the Adanati, the Savincati, the Ecdinii, the Veaminii, the Venisamii, the Iemerii, the Vesubianii, the Quadrati—and the communities which were under him as prefect (dedicated this monument).

After the dedication to Augustus, Cottius gives his own new tria nomina and titulature and then lists tribes under his control. Of the fourteen tribes listed as being under Cottius' authority, six—the Caturges, the Vesubianii, the Medulii, the Adanates, the Ecdinii, and the Veaminii, all in the western part of the Cottian Alps—are listed on the Tropaeum Alpium erected by Augustus in 6 B.C.E. at La Turbie to commemorate his Alpine victory. Cottius thus seems to have expanded his territory with the addition of some of the tribes beaten during Augustus' Alpine campaigns. As for the communities quae sub eo praefecto fuerunt in the last line of the inscription, it has been suggested that the tense to the tendency for such praefecti to be placed in charge of small provinces; Ti. Claudius Pollio is described as "praef(ectus) gentium in Africa."

27 The surviving evidence for the layout of Cottian Susa is surveyed in Barello 2007 and Dall’Aglio 2007.
28 CIL V 7231 = ILS 94. The inscription, preserved in situ, was originally done in bronze letters.
29 For comparable early high-status citizens in the Roman near east, see Raggi 2010.
30 This monument, according to the elder Pliny (HN 3.24.138), did not list any non-hostile tribes; Letta 2004 and 2005: 86–87.
of the verb indicates that Cottius no longer was prefect of these communities.\footnote{Contra Letta (2005: 87), who concludes that these tribes were only temporarily under Cottius’ authority, were removed by at least 9/8 B.C.E., and were restored to Donnus ii, who is described on the Turin theater inscription (AE 1899: 209b) as being prefect of all those communities over which his father the king ever was. Cf. Letta 2001.}

Since, however, the tense of the understood main verb—a *dedicaverunt*, *fecerunt*, and/or *posuerunt*—would be perfect, *fuerunt* would merely indicate that those communities were under Cottius’ authority when the monument was dedicated.

The arch’s inscription highlights the change from king to prefect. Cottius is not merely *Donni filius* but rather *regis Donni filius* and does not attempt to hide in the titulature the change from kings to prefects. And indeed the inscription presents the change positively. Donnus may have been a *rex*, but Cottius is the *praefectus* of an extensive list of *civitates* and in control of more peoples than his father the king ever was. The list presents to the reader a clear reminder of the extensive territorial expansion brought about by *praefectus* Cottius, who in the last line of the inscription further emphasizes that position by repeating the title. Regal descent was still an important part of Cottius’ self-presentation, but the Susa inscription suggests that after 9/8 B.C.E. his new title was also significant.

The Susa arch also points to another key part of Cottius’ new image: a close association with Augustus and with the Roman state.\footnote{For further discussion of the arch at Susa, see Calvi 1976; de Maria, 1977; Felletti Maj 1960–1961; Ferrero 1901; Prieur 1968: 451–459. Letta (2006–2007) provides a full and recent bibliography. On the style of the arch in relation to Cisalpine and Narbonese architecture, see Saletti 1974.} The inscription places Cottius’ name—now in the Roman *tria nomina*—and new title directly below that of Augustus on the right side. The frieze positioned below the inscription strengthens the association.\footnote{The frieze is preserved *in situ* in Susa (for the location of the arch and its relationship to other structures at Susa, see Manino 1994 and Rossignani *et al.* 2009: 186–201), and there are nineteenth-century casts in the Museo di Antichità in Turin that show the frieze in a better preserved state (Mercando 1989).} It shows a sacrificial procession running left to right around the monument on all four sides.\footnote{The argument that the friezes show a continuous narrative was advanced by Felletti Maj (1960–1961).} The long sides, facing north and south, both show a *suovetaurilia*, the sacrifice of a pig, a ram, and a bull. Accompanying the stylistically exaggerated animals are attendants, togate figures (with one nearest the altar *velatus*), musicians, cavalry, and foot soldiers. While the friezes are very similar, the southern frieze also shows figures of Castor and Pollux at the extreme ends of the frieze—possible symbols of Cottius’ equestrian rank as *praefectus*—and one extra bull among the sacrificial animals.\footnote{Letta 2006–2007: 357–359. The arch just slightly predates Gaius Caesar’s naming as *princeps iuventutis*, but postdates Augustus’ adoption of Gaius and Lucius Caesar. Gaius and Lucius were often associated with the Dioscuri and as *principes iuventutis* with the equestrian order as well (see Buxton forthcoming).} The eastern and western friezes both show political ceremonies. On the western side
are two centrally placed togate figures seated in curule chairs with a table and standing togate figure between them. Flanking these central figures are two scribes, six lictors, and fourteen togate figures, standing for each of the fourteen tribes listed on the above inscription. The poorly preserved eastern side shows another ceremonial administrative act, with togate figures and possibly a *capsa*, a box for holding scrolls.

The exact identities of the figures and ceremonies commemorated on the frieze have been controversial. It has been suggested that the frieze shows a census, a lustration of the army under the new command of Cottius as prefect, the signing of a *foedus*, the formalization of *amicitia*, or the bestowal of the *ius Latii* on Cottius’ people. Almost universally Cottius has been identified as being present on at least the three well-preserved sides and probably the eastern side as well, but whether Augustus is shown as the other figure seated on a *sellā curulīs* or whether it must instead be a legate is less certain. All of these possibilities, however, would emphasize Cottius’ connections with the Roman state.

The exaggerated and disproportionate size of the animals on the frieze need not be the fault of shoddy provincial sculptors but rather the result of a desire to emphasize to a domestic audience that this was a *suovetaurilia*. To hold such an archetypally Roman ceremony and then to commemorate it so emphatically on the arch suggests that again, for a domestic audience at Susa, Cottius was playing up his new status as a part and partner of the Roman state.

The large

---


37 Letta (2006–2007) surveys the history of scholarship on the frieze’s subjects. Letta discounts the theory that the west frieze shows the formalization of *amicitia* on the grounds that such an arrangement can only be between sovereign states, which Cottius’ kingdom cannot be under his rule as a prefect. While Cottius was ruling as a *praefectus* of the Roman state, the Cottians do seem to have maintained significant but not total autonomy. Suetonius refers to Cottius’ territory as a *regnun*, Dio refers to that of Cottius as his *nepopov úrx}n*, and there are comparanda from Rome’s eastern frontier of native *praefecti* ruling small kingdoms in Cappadocia and Armenia (see Saddington 1978: 331–332).

38 The arguments (in Felleti Maj 1960–1961 and Letta 2006–2007) over whether Augustus is present on the arch hinge upon his possible presence at Susa; nevertheless, it should not be assumed that the frieze shows a specific historical event exactly as it occurred.

39 The arch’s relief has been categorized as less skilled provincial art in Kleiner 2010: 95 and Ryberg 1955: 104–106. Ryberg (1955: 105) does say that “the chief interest of the relief, apart from its value as an historical document, lies in the fact that it is the most detailed representation of the Suovetaurilia before the Column of Trajan.” The level of detail may be the result of the artists attempting to over-explain the ceremony to their audience; a Roman audience would need fewer visual cues.

40 The *suovetaurilia* as consisting of a bull, pig, and sheep was by the Augustan period typically Roman, at least in the geographic context of northern Italy and central Europe. The Lusitanian inscription from Cabeço das Fráguas (for the text, see Untermann 1997) has been interpreted as describing a *suovetaurilia* (Prósper 1999: 153 and López Monteagudo 1987: 248, n. 10), but
size of the animals may also imply prosperity, fitting in with the theme of a better fortune present in the arch’s inscription.

Beyond the programme of the inscription and frieze, the choice of an arch itself is telling. By the time Cottius dedicated the arch at Susa, Italy was awash in recently constructed Augustan arches. At Rome the Senate had dedicated to Augustus a triumphal arch in the Forum Romanum in 29 B.C.E. for his Actian victory and probably a second arch in 19 B.C.E. for his Parthian victory. In 27 B.C.E. at Rimini the Senate had erected an arch to Augustus to commemorate his restoration of the Via Flaminia, while further up the Adriatic Trieste had built a commemorative arch as early as 33 B.C.E. Closer to Susa, a commemorative arch was erected at Aosta sometime in the early Augustan period, probably shortly after the Alpine campaign of 25 B.C.E. By erecting a triumphal arch to Augustus, Cottius was following the now familiar model propagated by the Roman Senate itself, and his adoption of this model fit well with his new title of praefectus, as part of the Roman administrative apparatus.

The Cottian appropriation of Augustan imagery and the enthusiastic promotion of their Augustan connections on the Susa arch are not anomalous, and Cottius was not the only ally of Rome to attempt to link his image with that of Augustus. In a similar fashion, Rhoemetalces of Thrace minted coins with his face on one side and that of Augustus on the other, so that “it remains ambiguous whether he himself or Augustus constitutes the obverse.” Likewise, Suetonius reports:

Reges amici atque socii et singuli in suo quisque regno Caesareas urbes condiderunt et cunctis simul adem Iovis Olympii Athenis antiquius incobatam perficere communi sumptu destinaverunt Genioque eius dedicare; ac saepe regnis relictis non Romae modo sed et provincias peragranti costidana officia togati ac sine regio insigni more clientium praestiterunt.

Each of the allied kings who enjoyed Augustus’ friendship founded a city called “Caesarea” in his own domains; and all clubbed together to provide funds for completing the Temple of Olympian Zeus in Athens, which had been begun centuries before, and dedicating it to his Genius. These kings would often leave home, dressed in the togas of their honorary

Prósper’s translation of the text—“a sheep to the pond of the village, and a pig to the swamp [?], a pregnant one to Ekwona, goddess of the prairies, a one-year-sheep to the brook of the village and a male bovine to the river (of the village?)”—suggests a series of sacrifices different from the Roman suovetaurilia. On Roman depictions of the suovetaurilia, see MacKinnon 2001 (on the portrayal of pigs in such depictions) and Felletti Maj 1960–1961 (focusing on the arch at Susa).


The dating of the arch to 27 B.C.E. is provided by the accompanying inscription: CIL XI 365 = ILS 84. On the Rimini arch in general, see Mansuelli 1960. Pavia should not be included on the list of Augustan arches in northern Italy; see Rose 1990. On the Trieste arch, see Farolfi 1936.

Curtis (1908) dates the Arch of Augustus at Aosta to 25 B.C.E., following the campaign of the same year.

citizenship, without any emblems of royalty whatsoever, and visit Augustus at Rome, or even when he was visiting the provinces; they would attend his morning audience in the fashion of clients.\textsuperscript{45}

Suetonius' description appears to ignore Cottius \textsuperscript{1}. There is no known Caesarea in the Cottian Alps, and, while it is certainly possible that Cottius contributed money to the temple of Olympian Zeus, there is no indication that he did or that such a donation would have been as important to him and to his subjects as it was to rulers in the Eastern Mediterranean. Nevertheless, the description highlights the common adoption of elements of Augustus' image by his foreign amici.\textsuperscript{46}

\textbf{MONUMENTALIZING THE COTTII: ROADS}

Crucial to Cottian self-presentation was the building of Alpine roads. Ammianus, in the context of the geography of Gaul with which he follows the accession of Julian, says:

\textit{quas rex Cottius, perdomitis Gallis solus in angustiis latens inviaque locorum asperitate confusis, lenito tandem tumore in amicitiam Octaviani receptus principis, molibus magnis exstruxit ad vicem memorabilis muneri, compendiarias et viantibus aortalas, medias inter alias Alpes vetutas super quibus corperta paule postea referemus.}

There (in the Cottian Alps) King Cottius, after the subjugation of Gaul, lay hidden alone in their defiles, trusting to the pathless ruggedness of the region; finally, when his disaffection was allayed, and he was admitted to the emperor Octavian's friendship, in lieu of a remarkable gift he built with great labor short cuts (compendiarias) convenient to travelers, since they were midway between other ancient Alpine passes, about which I shall later tell what I have learned.\textsuperscript{47}

Ammianus continues to describe the pass and hazards associated with crossing it:

\textit{In his Alpibus Cottiis, quarum initium a Segusione est oppido, praecelsum erigitur iugum, nulli fere sine discrimine penetrabile. Est enim Gallis venientibus praon humilitate devesum pendentium saxorum visu terribilis praeorsum verno tempore, cum liquente gelu nivibusque solutis flatu calidore ventorum per diruptas utrimque angustias et lacunas pruinarum congerie latebrosas descendentes cuntantibus plantis homines et iumenta procidunt et carpenta; idque remedium ad arcendum exitium repertum est solum, quod pluraque vehicula vastis funibus inligata pone cohibente virorum vel boum nisu valido sivix gressu reptante paulo tuitius develevuntur. Et hae, ut diximus, anni verno contingunt. Hieme vero humus crustata frigoribus et tamquam levigata idioque labilis incessum praccipitantes impellit et patulae vallae per spatia plana glacie perfidae vorant non numquam transientes. Ob quae locorum callidi eminentes ligneos stilos per}


\textsuperscript{46}The adoption was not entirely mono-directional; see, for example, Nero's emulation of hellenistic regal imagery (Van Overmeire 2012).

\textsuperscript{47}Amm. Marc. 15.10.2. Tr. J. Rolfe.
cautiora loca defigunt, ut eorum series viatorem ducat innoxious: qui si nivibus operti latuerint, montanisve defluentibus rivis eversi, gnaris agrestibus praeviis difficile pervadunt. A summitate autem Italici clivi planities ad usque stationem nomine Martis per septem extenditur milia, et hinc alia celestudo erectior aegreque superabilis ad Matronae porrigitur verticem, cuius vocabulum casus feminae nobilis dedit. Unde declive quidem iter sed expeditius ad usque castellum Brigantium patet.

In these Cottian Alps, which begin at the town of Susa, there rises a lofty ridge, which scarcely anyone can cross without danger. For as one comes from Gaul it falls off with sheer incline, terrible to look upon because of overhanging cliffs on either side, especially in the season of spring, when the ice melts and the snows thaw under the warmer breath of the wind; then over precipitous ravines on either side and chasms rendered treacherous through the accumulation of ice, men and animals descending with hesitating step slide forward, and wagons as well. And the only expedient that has been devised to ward off destruction is this: they bind together a number of vehicles with heavy ropes and hold them back from behind with powerful efforts of men or oxen at barely a snail’s pace; and so they roll down a little more safely. But from the peak of this Italian slope a plateau extends for seven miles, as far as the post named for Mars; from there on another loftier height, equally difficult to surmount, reaches to the peak of the Matrona, so called from an accident to a noble lady. After that a route, steep to be sure, but easer to traverse extends to the fortress of Brigantia (Briançon).

The pass here is the Col de Montgenèvre, the lowest major pass in the western Alps. The Col de Montgenèvre connects Briançon with Susa and lies between Mont Cenis and the Little St Bernard Pass to the north and the Maddalena pass to the south. Ammianus is vague about what or where exactly these *compendiares* were, but the best candidate would be the road passing through the arch at Susa and then crossing over the Col de Montgenèvre. Since the Mont Cenis pass also connects with the Susa valley, it is possible that a road from Susa crossed that as well, since Ammianus’ description of the shortcuts as *medias inter alias Alpes vetustas* implies that at least two of the roads were significant passes. As Ammianus’ descriptions of the dangers of Alpine travel suggests, these new roads were a practical and no doubt welcome piece of euergetism, but their construction was also highly symbolic. These routes linked Cottius’ territory with the surrounding area, which now was entirely Roman territory, and as Cottius was now a part of the Roman state apparatus (at least nominally), so his territory was connected to the road and river systems of southern Gaul and northern Italy. Cottius’ euergetism also found a parallel in the actions of

---

48 Amm. Marc. 15.10.3–4. Tr. J. Rolfe.
50 Brecciaroli Taborelli 1991.
51 On the importance of the Po river system in terms of trade, see Calzolari 2004 (cf. Harris 1989 for a more conservative view of the river’s importance); Mosca (2009) describes the connections of the river and road systems of the central-eastern Po valley.
Augustus, who repaired Italian roads, most notably the Via Flaminia. Statues of Augustus at Rome and at Rimini (Ariminium) commemorated his renovation of the Via Flaminia, as did the inscribed triumphal arch set up by Senate at Rimini. Augustus’ roadwork was well commemorated and highly visible; by following this model in the western Alps, Cottius linked himself further with the Princeps.

MONUMENTALIZING THE COTTII: THE HERŒON

Cottius’ efforts to transform himself from Alpine king to praefectus appear to have brought him great popularity at home, where Ammianus says he was venerated for bringing peace and the Roman alliance. In recognition a tomb was constructed for him, possibly by his successor, by the civitas, or by Cottius himself, at Susa. The tomb, a modest tetrastyle temple, was placed within the pomerium of Susa, within the forum itself.

Other symbols of Cottian and Roman authority surrounded the mausoleum within the forum. Within this area were also found a colossal statue of the emperor Claudius, fragments of two loricate statues, and a fragment of a gilt bronze statue of Agrippa, most likely matching up with a dedication to Agrippa by Cottius’ two sons Cottius and Donnus. The forum also lies at the base of the monumental arch dedicated to Augustus.

The careful and highly visible siting of the tomb highlights Cottius’ importance to the dynasty and commemorates, as Brecciaroli Taborelli has suggested, the reorienting of the kingdom’s outlook after the treaty with Rome.

---

52 Dio 53.22.1–2
53 For statues set at Rome and Rimini (Ariminium), see Dio 53.22.1–2. For the inscription on the arch of Augustus at Rimini, see CIL XI 365 (= ILS 113). Augustus’ euergetism was supplemented by that of the imperial family; his adopted son Gaius repaved “all the roads” (vias omnes) at Rimini (CIL V 366 = ILS 133).
54 Cottius’ road-building is to be contrasted with the earlier attitude of the neighboring Salassi, who threw rocks at Caesar’s troops because they were building roads and bridges (Strabo 4.6.7). Caesar’s road building posed a possible economic as well as military threat to the Salassi, who had a history of exacting tolls on passing Roman armies (Strabo 4.6.7).
55 Amm. Marc. 15.10.7.
56 Brecciaroli Taborelli (1994) provides the most complete discussion of the tomb, of which the most important surviving piece is a stone funerary urn now kept in the Museo Civico in Susa. Barello (2007) provides further discussion of the tomb in the context of the history of excavation at Susa and the layout of the town.
59 On this pass in its historical context, see Brecciaroli Taborelli 1991.
Domestically, the placement of the heroon in a space with such strong iconographic links both with imperial power and with the Cottian manipulation of that power was designed to reposition the dynasty’s image. The tomb recast the euergetistic, peace-making praefectus as a new city founder, much as the nearby Augustan arch recast the change from kings to prefects as an improvement of the territory’s fortunes.

**MONUMENTALIZING THE COTTII: THE THEATER AT TURIN**

Cottius had established a precedent for euergetism, a model that his successors continued. At Turin Donnus II and his son Cottius II helped decorate the local theater, a benefaction recorded in four fragments of a local inscription:

```plaintext
```

Caius Iulius Donnus, the son of Cottius and grandson of king Donnus, prefect of those communities of the Cottians over which his father was prefect, and Marcus Iulius Cottius the son of Donnus and grandson of Cottius donated a portico and a household (of actors?)

The theater was an appropriate venue for Cottian self-promotion. Roman theaters were popular sites for honorific statues of local elites and dedications to the imperial family; renovating the theater allowed the Cottians to compete with Torinese elites and associate themselves once again with the imperial family.

The selection of Turin (Augusta Taurinorum) as the recipient of their euergetism was not haphazard. Turin was, along with Bene Vagienna (Augusta Bagiennorum) and Aosta (Augusta Praetoria), one of a series of new Roman colonies in northern Italy designed to solidify and commemorate Augustus’ Alpine campaigns.

---


62. See, for example, the concentration of imperial statuary and dedications at the theater at Roman Corinth.


64. On the foundation and history of Augusta Taurinorum, see Cresci Marrone 2008.
The Dora Riparia connected Susa with Turin, and therefore the Po acted as the main waterway for northern Italy. From the point of view of the Cottians, Turin connected their territory with northern Italy, which under Augustus had lost its provincial status and acquired new prestige. Bestowing their beneficence on Turin gave the Cottians an opportunity to establish good relations with an economically important town, associate themselves again with the campaigns of Augustus, and connect both economically and politically with Augustan Italy.

KINGS AGAIN

The younger Cottius mentioned on the Turin theater inscription took on the title of king during the reign of the emperor Claudius and was allowed to retain that title until his death during the reign of Nero. Why, if Cottius I and Donnus II had successfully managed the transition to prefects, would Cottius II resume the title of king in 44?

The switch to kingship may have brought Cottius II greater prestige. By the reign of Claudius Augustus’ rule had evolved into a kind of dynasty, with emphasis placed on dynastic connections through four generations of imperial dynastic monuments. By calling himself king, the younger Cottius may have been keeping up with a more monarchial Roman ideology current in surrounding Roman territories. Claudius’ attempted reorganization of the equestrian service may have also prompted Claudius to reexamine Cottius II’s position as praefectus or alternatively for Cottius II to reexamine the usefulness of the title in its domestic context.

At home in the western Alps, the title of king appears still to have been important and to have legitimized its holder. The Cottians continued to use rex to describe Donnus I, at least when they commemorated their benefaction at the theater in Turin. This suggests that the title still had prestige around Susa and Turin, and Cottius II, when given the opportunity to renegotiate his position under an emperor especially involved in Alpine affairs, took the title of rex. Cottius II’s reign as king did not outlast the Julio-Claudians, and most likely from 63 C.E. onward the Cottian Alps were officially integrated into the Roman state as the province of the Alpes Cottiae. By then the legacies of the earlier kings and prefects were their benefactions at Susa and Turin, roads in the Alps, a few surviving freedmen, and the name of the province.
The Cottians not only made peace and acted the part of dutiful allies until the dissolution of the kingdom but also played up connections, whether real or not, with Rome. The Cottians’ enthusiastic adoption of all available associations with Rome, Augustus, and the imperial family would not necessarily have been of importance, or even interest, to the Roman state; for Augustus and his own successors, peace and the occasional military help were more desirable. Peace with Cottius, for Augustus in particular, meant one fewer campaign in a lengthy and complicated conquest of the Alps. The honor of an arch or statue might warrant an embassy to Rome, but the combined programme of Cottian activity requires further explanation.⁶⁹

The actions of the Cottians in their territory, at their capital at Susa, and at the neighboring Roman colony at Turin point instead to a domestic audience. The kinds of evidence available in the western Alps scarcely permit the reconstruction of the perspectives of the Cottians’ subjects, and the parameters of political legitimization are more difficult to discern in the Alps than in the Hellenized world of Rome’s eastern frontier.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, the Cottians must have thought that their efforts would gain them favor, and Ammianus indicates that Cottius I at least was successful in this. Although again the paucity of sources advises caution, there is no hint that Cottius’ actions met with significant opposition, certainly not of the ferocity encountered by Herod when he displayed Roman symbols and trophies in Jerusalem.⁷¹

For Cottius I and his successors at Susa, Rome represented both a threat and an opportunity. Resistance to Roman power meant a fate like that of the Salassi in the Val d’Aosta, and friendship meant survival, but that friendship could also be manipulated at home by appropriating the self-presentation of Augustus and the Julio-Claudians. Rather than being seen at home as capitulating to Rome, Cottius I could present himself through his monuments, titulature, and euergetism as being an active partner of a newly peaceful and prosperous Roman state, and Augustus’ Alpine conquests could be assimilated as Cottius’ own. Cottius’ successors continued to emphasize their connection to Rome. In their monuments and actions, the Cottian rulers did not go so far as to claim incorporation by Rome; rather they played up the ambiguity of their new position—they were prefects descended from kings, independent but intimately connected.

Thus the Cottian kings demonstrated one way in which local rulers might react to a Roman alliance, in this case with behavior that was not designed solely for Roman consumption but rather made for a domestic audience. Using the

---

⁶⁹ On the language of honor used regarding civic benefactions, see Lendon 1997.
⁷⁰ Segard (2009) surveys the evidence available for reconstructing Alpine economic histories, while papers in Leveau and Rémy 2008 examine the evidence of Alpine villas.
language and imagery of Roman power, the Cottian rulers sought to blur the distinction between the larger and smaller powers, and to present the alliance as a positive piece of both foreign and domestic policy.
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