THE PRACTICE OF *HOSPITIUM* ON THE ROMAN FRONTIER

J. NICOLS

APPIO IUNIO SILANO P(UBLIO) SILIO / NERVA CO(N)S(ULIBUS)
/ TILLEGUS AMBATI F(ILIIUS) SUSARRUS / |(CASTELLO) AIOBRI-
GIAECO HOSPITIUM / FECIT CUM LOUGEIS CASTELLANIS / TO-
LETENSIBUS SIBI UXORI LIBE/RIS POSTERISQUE SUIS EUMQ/UE
UXOREM LIBEROSQUE EIUS / IN FIDEM CLIENTELAMQUE SUA/M
SUORUMQUE IN PERPETUO CAS/TELLANEI TOLETENSIS RECE-
PERUNT / EGIT TILLEGUS AMBATI IPSE / MAG(ISTRIS) LATINO
ARI ET AIO TEMARI¹

Historians, both ancient and modern, assume that Romans interacted constructively with frontier peoples in ways that both parties understood. A central component of this interaction, and the basis of peaceful intercourse between people of different ethnic groups, was built around the practice of *iura hospitalis*.

Hospitium is one of those institutions that all claim to recognize. Yet it is a striking phenomenon in modern scholarship how little attention has been devoted to a systematic analysis of the expectations and rituals associated with the practice of *hospitium* in the Roman world. Mommsen's study remains even today central to any assessment. Only a very short article appeared in the RE. Occasional studies of the use of *hospitium* in Livy and in Cicero have been published more recently.² Moreover, and thanks to the development of 'metal defectors,' a good number of *tesserae* and *tabulae hospitalis* have been uncovered over

¹ P. Balbín Chamorro, *Hospitalidad y patronato en la Península Ibérica durante la Antigüedad* (Salamanca 2006), No. 50 = appendix below.

² Th. Mommsen, 'Das römische Gastrecht und die römische Clientel', in *Römische Forschungen* (Berlin 1864), I, 355–390; R. Leonhard, 'hospitium', RE VIII (1913) 2493–2498. On Livy, L. Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Early Rome* (Chicago 1977); on Cicero, J. Nicols 'Hospitium and Political Friendship in the Late Republic', in M. Peachin (ed) *Aspects of Friendship in the Greco-Roman World* = JRomArch Suppl. 43 (Portsmouth RI 2001) 99–108. Also O. Hiltbrunner / D. Gorce, 'Gastfreundschaft', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, VIII (Stuttgart 1972), Sp 1061–1123. Balbín Chamorro 2006, op.cit. (n. 1).

the last quarter century. These latter especially have provided important insights into the practice.

The evidence for the central period of Roman history (as distinct from the episodes described in Livy and dating to the earliest history of the city) is peculiar though hardly unique. That is, between Caesar and Tacitus we have a good number of references in the literary and legal corpus to the practice of *hospitium* especially on the Gallo-Germanic frontier.³ We also have now a considerable body of epigraphical / archaeological evidence, especially from Spain.

For our purposes here and in reference to the 'frontier' I wish to stress up-front that I understand 'frontier' in two senses, geographical and psychological. First, frontier refers to geographical space, to that area where Romans and peregrines interacted at or near the borders of the Empire. Conventionally, this frontier might be a military district on the upper Rhine or in that part of Northwest Spain pacified by Augustus and Agrippa. Even so, 'borderland' must be understood broadly to refer to areas that were 'more or less' or sometime even 'rather less than more' under Roman control. The 'frontier' may also be construed as psychological space, as a component of the intellectual and moral framework within which Romans and peregrines interacted regardless of where they were physically.

In this paper, and relying on both the archaeological and literary evidence, I intend to develop a case for understanding more precisely how *hospitium* facilitated exchange and understanding on the Roman frontier. In brief, the argument is that:

1. The Latin literary evidence indicates that the Romans understood that peregrines practiced *hospitium* in a manner that was consistent with Roman expectations.
2. *Hospitium* was easily and frequently established by travelers on official and on private business.
3. *Hospitium* is an extra-legal institution; there were no legal remedies for failure to respect its conventions.
4. There were a variety of rituals associated with the establishment of *hospitium*, some very formal, others quite informal.
5. A significant number of everyday issues could be resolved by appealing to existing relationships based on *hospitium*.

³ Cases from the legal and literary evidence appear in the text below especially in sections 3–5 of this paper.

6. The intensity of the relationship varied, but as circumstances changed, the parties to the relationship claimed and respected the expectations of the partner 'for the most part'.

There are other questions that cannot be addressed here, for example: In times of imperial crises, the contending parties calculated their support based on their belief that *hospites* really could be motivated to act on their behalf. Moreover, the literary evidence is more concerned with the abuse of the *iura hospitii* (e.g. Verres) than it is with its proper functioning.⁴

I. TOWARDS A DEFINITION

The conventions surrounding the social institution called *hospitium* (hospitality, or 'guest-friendship') by the Romans provided a means by which members of different communities, either individually or as a collective, might find a way to interact with one another to the *mutual* advantage of both parties; the alternative, hostility, inevitably led to the disadvantage of one, if not of both parties. Though it cannot be explicitly demonstrated from the extant sources, there are many indications that the practice of hospitality, in many forms, was ubiquitous in the ancient world, and that it was universally viewed in a positive light. Indeed, the conventions surrounding hospitality were probably critical in the mitigation of conflict.⁵

The word *hospitium* covers a range of meanings. So, for example, in reference to the earliest events in Roman history, the sources generally refer to *hospitium* in the context of social connections established between individuals of different states. We may call this kind of relationship *hospitium privatum* (private hospitality).⁶ In practice, this entailed some kind of explicit agreement between the two parties not only to offer one another amenities (lodging, entertainment: *locus lautiaque*. E.g., *hospitium ac loca lautia mihi praebiturum*. Apul. *Metam* 3 26), but also to show care for the interests and safety of the partner; that is, to provide legal protection for the person and for his property. It is

⁴ See J. Nicols, 'Hospitality among the Romans' in M. Peachin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World* (OxfordUP, forthcoming).

⁵ Hiltbunner and Gorce 1972, op. cit. (n. 2), provide the most important references from Homer to the New Testament, and beyond.

⁶ For some early examples, Balbín Chamoro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1), 286 = *ILLRP Imagines* (Berlin 1965), 253. I have posted a sample of these texts at: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~nic/tess&tab=illustrations.html>.

implicit in these relationships that the parties, though of different communities, are of roughly equal social status, and that each should be capable of offering similar services to the other.⁷ During the course of the Republic, these private arrangements also acquired a public dimension, in that one of the partners to the arrangement was a collective. Hereafter, this form will be referred to as *hospitium publicum* (public hospitality) (appendix: *tessera* 2). Moreover, and already during the early period, *hospitium* also is applied to the actual structures devoted to providing hospitality; thus, *hospitium* may refer both to public buildings for entertaining visitors, and may also include guest houses. During the last decades of the Republic, and perhaps connected to the extension of citizenship to all Italians, *hospitium* was applied to include 'hospitable' arrangements even between Roman citizens.⁸ Despite the variations listed here, there is ample evidence that the word continued to be used in the traditional sense throughout Roman history, i.e., with respect to friendly relationships involving any combination of individuals or collectives (clan, tribe, *natio*, etc.) who were citizens / subjects of different states.

II. THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE

References to traditional *hospitium* appear throughout Latin literature, and they continue well into the Principate. The chronological context of these references is predominantly, however, the early Republic and the 'frontier' geographically and psychologically is Italy and the central Mediterranean. Livy is of course a major source for these early exchanges; Cicero and Caesar employ the term extensively to describe contemporary social relationships between Romans and peregrines. Pliny the Elder also provides a good number of references; Tacitus fewer, but what all four provide is consistently illuminating. In brief, the literary evidence indicates that *hospitium* in its many forms continued to be practiced throughout the central period of Roman history (roughly, the second century BC through the second century AD).⁹

The epigraphical evidence is also extensive, but unevenly distributed, geographically and chronologically. Some inscriptions referencing *hospiti-*

⁷ See the articles cited in footnotes 2 and 4.

⁸ Cicero, *Balbus*, 43 suggests that Balbus, now a Roman citizen, was considered the *hospes* of his home town of Gades—that is, Balbus retained the affection of his home state and defended its interests as *sanctissimum hospitem*.

⁹ For the details, see the following sections and Nicols forthcoming, op. cit. (n. 4).

tium are found in all periods of Roman history in Italy and North Africa, but few in the Rhine/Danube areas. The Iberian Peninsula is the most important single source of material. A good number of the inscriptions originating there (and in Gaul) were written in Keltic or Keltiberic languages.¹⁰ Such evidence, and the statement of Tacitus that the practice of *hospitium* was also a critical component in interstate and interpersonal relations among the Germans, leads to the conclusion that the institution was already well established here and presumably elsewhere before the Romans arrived.

III. ON THE INITIATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP

Hospitium is extended by a formal invitation, by a decree of the local senate if it is public, or by an individual who offers lodging, victuals and protection, if it is in the private sphere. In both cases, the formula is clear (respectively): *invitare eum tecto ac domo* (to invite him into house and home; *In Verrem* 2. 4. 25); *vocare in hospitium* (to offer hospitality; Livy 24. 16. 16), *eum domum suam invitare* (to invite him into one's home; *In Verrem* 2. 2. 89), or, *hospitio invitabit* (he will offer a hospitable relationship; Cicero *Orationes Philippicae* 12. 35). Depending on how formal the relationship was, a token (*tessera*, or later a *tabula*) might be prepared to commemorate the occasion (appendix: *tessera* 3).¹¹ The occasion might also be marked by the formal exchange of gifts, or by sacrificing and consuming an animal (cf. Statius *Achilleis* 1. 843: *munera . . . signum hospitii*, gifts which are a mark of hospitality). Alternatively, a political alliance might also complement *hospitium publicum*; for example, Caesar indicates that the Aedui enjoyed the *hospitium amicitiae populi Romani* (the hospitality and the friendship of the Roman people; *De bello gallico*. 1. 31).

How was the relationship initiated? As units of the Roman army progressed in the field and as caravans of traders proceeded to markets they had daily needs. Among them were to find water and fodder for their animals as well as campsites and / or secure places to spend the night. Both groups needed to gain access to local markets. Certain places lent

¹⁰ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1.), nos. 8, 21, 40, 41 = Plates on pages 251, 255, 264, 265. Also: some texts at: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~nic/tess&tab/illustrations.html>.

¹¹ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1), discussed p. 213 = No. 53; illustrated on page 275.

themselves well to these needs, and it is understandable that senior Roman soldiers and experienced traders not only knew which locations were most suitable, but also knew something about the locals who provided the services. I suspect that the connections were formed in a self-evident way: names were noted, services and gifts were exchanged, benefactions conferred and remembered. In some cases, the exchanges may have led to the establishment of formal *hospitium* but informal relationships surely also developed and were valued.

IV. *HOSPITIUM* ON THE FRONTIER AND IN THE LITERARY EVIDENCE

Caesar regularly employed as legates or as agents individuals in his army who had already established *hospitium* with the Gallic and German opponents. Hence, Marcus Mettius was sent to negotiate with his *hospes*, Ariovistus (*De bello gallico*, 1.47). Cicero comments that his brother, Quintus, was the *hospes* of Divitiacus, a Gaul and druid (*De Divinatione* 1.41.90). Valerius Proculus was the son of an enfranchised Gaul and *familiaris et hospes* of Caesar (*De bello gallico*, 1.53). Again, Caesar does not tell us how Mettius came to know Ariovistus and admittedly Mettius was not treated well when he arrived at the camp of the latter, but that should not distract from the fact that the relationship *hospitium privatum* existed, that this relationship was known to Caesar, and that Caesar felt he could build on it.

Caesar also notes among other similar cases, that the Aedui enjoyed the *hospitium atque amicitia populi Romani* (*De bello gallico*, 1.31). Here we have *hospitium publicum*, and we may assume that it was formally confirmed by a decree of the Roman senate and by some action of the Aedui.¹²

¹² The most important episode for this process is Livy's story about Roman ambassadors (*legati*) on their way to Delphi to bring a gift to the god Apollo. When they came to Lipari, the chief magistrate, Timasitheus, entertained them *in publicum hospitium* (surely to be understood here as a public building specifically intended, at least in part, for entertaining important guests), and assisted the legates on their voyage to and from Delphi. After the legates had returned safely to Rome, a covenant of hospitality was made with Timasitheus by a decree of the senate, and gifts were presented to him in the name of the state (Livy 5. 28. 4–5). Here we find almost all the ingredients of the relationship: a chance encounter, a party in need, protection offered, the use of public facilities, mutual obligation, a senatorial decree authorizing *hospitium publicum*, and the arrangement for gifts to be provided at public expense.

In other passages Caesar mentions that Ambiorix enjoyed *hospitium* with the Menapii, and that both had ties with the Germans through the Treveri. So too did the Bellovaci send 2000 troops against the Roman at the request of their *hospes* Commius (*De bello gallico*. 7.75). Indeed, Caesar takes for granted that such relationships existed, but he does not explain how they came about. What is significant is that Caesar clearly perceives that what we might label 'diplomacy' is indeed covered by the rituals of *hospitium*. Moreover, his use of the words *hospes* and *hospitium* here makes it manifest that he judged that the peregrine version functioned in a manner that Romans understood. That peregrines and their communities would establish such relations is confirmed by the surviving *tesserae* from Spain to be discussed below.

Tacitus provides a good number of examples of the practice of *hospitium* on the Roman frontier: In the *Germania*, 2.1 he notes how *hospitium* served to facilitate blending among the various tribes. In one case, also, a disagreement between a legionary, his local *hospes*, and a member of a Batavian cohort turned violent when the Batavian accused the *hospes* of the legionary of fraud, and the latter came to the defense of his guest friend (*Historiae* 2.66.2). Furthermore, Tacitus mentions how the soldiers of Vitellius instilled fear in the hearts of their *hospites* as they marched toward Rome. Antonius Primus interpreted these depredations as a sign of weakness (*Historiae* 3.2.1). This episode confirms the suggestion above about how Roman soldiers and administrators might come to rely on local *hospites* for support while traveling. Moreover, and in connection with the same events, Valens regularly abused the *hospitium* provided to him by locals as he proceeded (*Historiae* 3.41). Most illuminating however is the description of the relationship between the Lingones and the legionaries in their midst. 'The *civitas Lingonum*, following an ancient custom, had sent clasped right hands to the legionaries as a sign of *hospitium*' (*Historiae* 1.54)¹³

In sum: we have sufficient evidence in the literary sources to conclude that Romans and peregrines easily established relationships of *hospitium* on the frontier. The formalities associated with such relationships varied considerably, but even from the brief episodes provided here we can understand that private relationships facilitated the provision of food and lodging for travelers, as well as protection and support when needed. So too is it readily apparent that those participating in *hospitium* came

¹³ Appendix: tessera 4; illustrated also at <http://www.uoregon.edu/~nic/tess&tab/illustrations.html>.

from *all social ranks*. Admittedly, providing *hospitium* did not guarantee that the good will would be reciprocated, but expectations were generally respected.

V. THE *TESSARAE HOSPITALES* (TOKENS OF GUEST-FRIENDSHIP)

The earliest *tesserae* (tokens) may have been of earthenware, having the head of Jupiter *Hospitalis* stamped upon them (Plautus *Poenulus*. 5. 1. 25; 2. 87–99). More common in the late Republic and early Principate was the use of metal *tesserae* and *tabulae*, especially in those cases involving the conclusion of a *hospitium publicum*. These objects, and most are found in areas that were on the Roman frontier, are sometimes in the form of animals, e.g., a pig (appendix: *tessera* 3), perhaps to commemorate an animal slaughtered as part of a ritual meal confirming the relationship.¹⁴ The *tesserae* at least in some cases appear to be deliberately broken in half, or constructed with interlocking parts, so that the two parties could recognize one another on a subsequent occasion by fitting the pieces together again.¹⁵ Later bronze tablets tend to take either a pentagonal (appendix: *tesserae* 1 and 6) or quadratic form (appendix: *tessera* 2).¹⁶ Though there are many variations, all record at least the names of the *hospites*, their intention to formalize a relationship, and the intention that the relationship should continue to future generations.¹⁷ In many cases, *hospitium* is brought into connection with other social relationships—most notably with forms of patronage that would seem to undermine an otherwise implicit notion of equality of status and services.

Another way to formalize such a relationship was the transmittal of clasped right hands as a sign/symbol of *hospitium* (appendix: *tesserae* 4 and 5). The Lingones, as described above, sent clasped right hands to the nearby legions as a sign of hospitality (Tacitus *Historiae* 1.54, and at His-

¹⁴ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1). Dozens of such items are to be found in Balbín Chamorro's plates, pp. 249 ff. Fish and a variety four-legged, domesticated examples may be found. Note also the much-published pig from Pisuerga (No. 53). I have posted a sample of these texts at: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~nic/tess&tab/illustrations.html>.

¹⁵ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1): Plate No. 38. This one appears to be manufactured to achieve the same result.

¹⁶ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1): Plates 54 and 55 for examples of rectangular items; nos. 58, 72, 73 for the pentagonal.

¹⁷ ... *liberis posterisque*—for their children and descendants; also in literary texts, e.g., Livy 27. 16. On these formulations, see J. Nicols, 'Tabula Patronatus' in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 13 (Berlin 1980), 535–561.

toriae 2.8.11 where Syrian legions sent a similar gift to the praetorians). Tacitus is here explicit that this was a well-established Lingonian practice.¹⁸ In this case, the reference is clearly to *hospitium publicum*. Significant is the fact that the references from Pliny the Elder, from Statius, and from Tacitus confirm the archaeological record, namely, that *hospitium* continued to be initiated in a fairly conventional way well into the 2nd century AD.

It should also be noted that the identical form, clasped hands, may also been found on bronze *tesserae* that were fabricated to commemorate an alliance between peregrines (appendix: *tessera* 5), that is where Latin is not employed. Such *tesserae* confirm the conclusion mentioned earlier that the practice and rituals associated with *hospitium* have a universal quality.

VI. SERVICES

Aside from providing for the comforts of visitors, *hospites* also provided services, some of which are not at all easily distinguishable from those provided by patrons and clients. Recall the episode mentioned earlier, in which a legionary went to the aid of a *hospes* accused of fraud during the Year of the Four Emperors. The evidence, which is primarily epigraphical, also indicates that the Romans were not particularly troubled by the consequences of combining relationships that had very different implications in respect to equality or inequality of status and of service. Indeed, a significant number of *tesserae* and *tabulae* record not only the establishment of *hospitium* (appendix: *tesserae* 1 and 3), but also of *patrocinium/clientela* (patronage/ clientship).¹⁹ Moreover, these texts are explicit in saying that both relationships—i.e., hospitality and patronage—are being established at the same time. Though much scholarly ink has flowed on this issue, the evidence is consistent in at least two respects, namely, that: a) the Romans and peregrines did not see the two relationships (again, hospitality and patronage) as mutually exclusive; and b) an individual could thus simultaneously be both a *hospes* and a *cliens* and/or *patronus*. Indeed, the Romans do not appear to have been troubled by the fact that the

¹⁸ Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1): Plates 1, 24, 41. There is some reason to believe that the symbol *signum hospitalis* may have originated in Persia (cf. Xenophon *Anabasis* 2. 4).

¹⁹ For detailed account of the issue, see Balbín Chamorro 2006, op. cit. (n. 1), 21 ff.

first relationship assumes equality between the parties involved, and the latter inequality. There is not much sense in trying to bring (what we would perceive as) order to the system. One may guess that the circumstances dictated (in a fashion reasonably clear to a Roman) whether one responded as a guest-friend, as a patron, or as a client. Furthermore, the flexible nature of the structure may have made it more attractive to all the participants, allowing each to stress what seemed most important at any given moment.²⁰ That is, in seeking aide, an inferior might variously play the role of *hospes* in one situation and *cliens* in another. So, too, the superior party might also emphasize his status as *patronus* in one case or as *hospes* in another.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The literary and especially the epigraphical evidence suggest that Romans and peregrines easily entered into hospitable relationships. The process was so 'selbstverständlich' that the Latin authors comment on the fact only when there were cases of abuse (for example as Cicero does at length in the *Verrines*) or when Romans made specific calculations based on the connection (as Caesar does with Mettius). The self-evident nature of the relationship is amply confirmed by the *tesserae*. They document a wide variety of connections between individuals, between individuals and communities, and between communities. Moreover, the sources, both epigraphical and literary, are consistent that Romans and peregrines alike had a common understanding of what was involved.

And how might we describe the services and benefactions? Certainly they begin with the provision of accommodations and shelter, of victuals and fodder. They also involved a commitment to the security of person and property of the *hospites* and are emphatic that the children and

²⁰ Cicero *Cato* 32 notes Cato's on-going obligations to friends, clients, and *hospites*. Cf. also Cicero *Epistulae ad Familiares* 9. 16. 7, where *hospitium* and *amicitia* (friendship) are complementary; and *Epistulae ad Familiares* 13. 25, where Cicero commends Hegesaretus of Larissa as his *hospes* and *familiaris* (close acquaintance), and also as a grateful and good man, the first in his state. One might think also of C. Avianus Philoxenus, whom Cicero calls *antiquus hospes meus* (my long-standing guest-friend), and also *familiaris* (intimate acquaintance); as a favor to Cicero, Caesar made Philoxenus a citizen of Comum (Cicero *Epistulae ad Familiares* 13. 35). Reputable *amici et hospites* were summoned and tortured (Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 176) on his restoration (Cicero *Pro Cluentio* 202). Cicero offers *hospitium* to Atticus, clearly a generalized meaning here (Cicero *Epistulae ad Atticum* 2. 16. 4).

descendants of those who concluded the original treaty should continue enjoy the responsibilities and benefits.

Admittedly, there was considerable variation in the intensity of the relationships, but the very existence of the *tesserae* and *tabulae* constitute an important reminder of how seriously the participants took their commitments at least at the time that *hospitium* was established. Moreover, both in form and in content these document allude to the well-developed ritual that was employed to formalize the connection. Ritual means, exchange of gifts and tokens all appear to be part of the process.

In respect to the question that forms the theme of this volume, *hospitium* functioned on the Roman frontier to ameliorate the tensions that might arise when one party found himself a stranger in another community and thereby served to facilitate peaceful exchange on the frontier. It surely played a significant role in the process of Romanization.

Eugene, Oregon, and Munich, Germany, August 2010

APPENDIX: SELECTED TESSERAE

I have posted a sample of other texts at: <http://www.uoregon.edu/~nic/tess&tab/illustrations.html>

Tessera 1

- **Date:** 28 d.C.
- **Balbín Chamorro Plate on Page 273 = No. 50**
- **Form:** pentagonal
- **Transliteration:** *Appio Iunio Silano P(ublio) Silio / Nerva co(n)-s(ulibus) / Tillegus Ambati f(ilius) Susarrus / (castello) Alobrigiaeco hospitium / fecit cum Lougeis castellanis / Toletensibus sibi uxori libe/ris posterisque suis eumq/ue uxorem liberosque eius / in fidem clientelamque sua/m suorumque in perpetuo cas/tellanei Toletensis receperunt / egil Tillegus Ambati ipse / mag(istratibus) Latino Ari (filio) et Aio Temari (filio)*
- **Place Found:** Lugo

Tessera 2

- **Date:** ca. AD 40
- **Balbín Chamorro Plate on page 276 = No. 54**
- **Form:** Quadratic
- **Transliteration:** *C(aio) Laecanio Basso / Q(uinto) Terentio Culleo/ne co(n)s(sulibus) / Clunienses ex Hispania / Citeriore hospitium fe/cerunt cum C(aio) Terentio / Basso C(aii) f(ilio) Fab(ia) Mefanate / Etrusco praefecto Alae / Augustae liberis posteris / que eius sibi liberis posteris/ sque suis / Egerunt leg(ati) / C(aius) Magius L(ucii) f(ilius) Gal(eria) Silo / T(itus) Aemllius Fuscus*
- **Place Found:** Burgos

Tessera 3

- **Date:** 14 d.C.
- **Balbín Chamorro, discussed p. 213 = No. 53; illustrated on page 275.**
- **Form:** pig
- **Transliteration:** Part A: *Sex(to) Pompeio Sex(to) Appuleio co(n)-s(ulibus) / k(alendis) Augustis / Caraegius er Abuanus et Caelio mag(istratus) et / senatus Maggavienses Amparamum / Nemaieca-num Cusaburensim / civitate honoraria donata libertos / posterosque*

ita vota omnia ei fecerunt / finibus Maggav(i)ensium quae / civi(s) Maggaviensiu(m)

Part B: *Sex(to) Pompeio Sex(to) Appuleio / co(n)s(ulibus) Apparamus Nemaioq[um / Cu]saburensis hospitium fecit cum / civitate Maggav(i)ensium sibi liberis liber/ [t]isque posterisque suis eunque liberos / libertos posterosq(ue) eius omnis Maggav(i)e(n)s/es in hospitium fidem clientelamque suam / suorumqui receper(un)t eademq(ue) condicione / esset qua civi(s) Per mag(istratus) Caelione(m) / er Carae-gium et Aburnum / actum*

- **Place Found:** Palencia

Tessera 4

- **Date:** early Principate
- **Balbin Charmorro, No. 24, plate on page 255.**
- **Form:** Clasped hands
- **Transliteration:** *Tessera de hospitalis / cum P(ublico) Turullio P(u-blii) f(ilio) / Mai(cia)*
- **Place found:** Teruel (?)

Tessera 5

- **Date:** Late Republic??
- **Balbín Chamorro, No. 41; plate on page 265**
- **Form:** hand, clasped??
- **Transliteration:** *lubos aliðo / kum aualo ke / kontebiað / belaiskað*
- **Place found:** Zaragoza

Tessera 6

- **Date:** early Principate
- **Balbín Chamorro, No. 72. Plate on page 285**
- **Form:** Pentagonal
- **Transliteration:** *Sex(tus) Curvius Silvinus q(uaestor) pr(o) / pr(ae-tore) hospitium fecit cum senatu / populoque Muniguensi Hispaniae / Ulterioris eosque liberos posteros / que eorum in fidem clientelamque / suam liberorum posterorumque / suorum recepit / Egerunt / L(ucius) Luceius L(ucii) f(ilius) mag(istratus) / leg(atus) / L(ucius) Octavius M(arci) f(ilius) Silvanus*
- **Place Found:** Munigua (Mulva)