

People of Carthago Noua (Hispania Citerior). Juridical status and onomastics

M. Cristina DE LA ESCOSURA BALBAS¹

Abstract. *The conquest of Carthago Noua in the summer of 209 BC was a traumatic moment of change for the Punic capital on the Iberian Peninsula. Literary sources tell us about its unique geographical position and its flourishing economy based on mining and port activities, but do not mention its political situation. What happened to their citizens? What was their legal status until the promotion to Roman colony at the end of the Republican era? In order to look for an answer to this problem, an onomastic database has been created, identifying the inhabitants of Carthago Noua with epigraphic mentions since 209 BC until the end of 1st century BC. Getting over the traditional separation between prosopography and epigraphy, this study seeks to make an interdisciplinary analysis with the main characteristics of both disciplines. The results show us a profoundly Romanized society since its conquest where the names of the Roman gentes were transmitted through the Republican era to the Empire on duo/tria nomina structures, which could only exist under specific legal conditions. This gives us important clues to explore the legal status of the city in the Republican era, probably a Latin colony.*

Rezumat. *Cucerirea cetății Carthago Noua în vara anului 209 a.Chr. a constituit un moment traumatizant al schimbării pentru fosta capitală punică a Peninsulei Iberice. Izvoarele literare ne vorbesc despre o poziție geografică privilegiată și despre o economie înfloritoare bazată pe activități miniere și portuare, dar nu menționează și situația politică a cetății. Ce s-a întâmplat cu locuitorii ei? Care era statutul lor juridic până la transformarea orașului în colonie romană la sfârșitul epocii republicane? Încercând să răspundem la aceste întrebări, constatăm că rezultatele investigației noastre cu precădere onomastice ne arată o societate romanizată profund de la începutul cuceririi. Aceste date ne oferă indicii importante în explorarea statutului cetății în epoca republicană, aceasta fiind probabil o colonie de tip latin.*

Keywords: Carthago Noua, database, onomastics, epigraphy, citizenship, Latin colony, gentes.

Introduction. The city of Carthago Noua

The conquest of *Carthago Noua* by P. Cornelius Scipio in the summer of 209 BC took place in the context of the Second Punic War². This was a traumatic moment of change for the Punic capital on the Iberian Peninsula. Twenty years before, *Qart Hadasht* was founded (as was

¹ Universidad Complutense Madrid; mc.escosura@hotmail.com.

² Polyb. 10.6., 10; Strab. 3, 4, 6; Liv. 26, 41042; Flor. 2, 6, 39.

told by Diodorus Siculus³) or organized (as claimed by Polybius⁴) by Hasdrubal, in the same place were *Mastia*, an Iberian *oppidum*, was located. Literary sources tell us about its unique geographical position and its flourishing economy, but don't mention its political situation. What happened to their citizens? How were they affected by this change of power? What was their legal status until the promotion to Roman colony at the end of the Republican era?

Ancient Cartagena's bay was structurally complex. On one side, it was composed of a series of natural docks surrounded by steepes, providing protection against wind. On the other side, a half-sunken rock held up the traffic to and from its harbours, protecting them against enemies⁵. Mountains surrounding the city contained big quantities of silver and lead which were intensively exploited by Punics as much as by Romans. In the second half of 2nd century BC, 110 kg of silver were extracted from its quarries each day⁶. Its exceptional position in the routes which linked Mediterranean Sea and Atlantic Ocean, as well as between Iberian Peninsula and northern Africa, helped the city become an extremely important sea harbour. Besides, the settlement bordered northwards on a fresh water lagoon and counted with salting and esparto on its boundaries. So, *Carthago Noua* was the referential commercial point towards the interior of the Iberian Peninsula as well as towards the exterior.

After the first administrative division of the Iberian Peninsula, *Carthago Noua* laid in the borderline between *Hispania Ulterior* and *Citerior*, working as capital city of the latter until the time of Augustus, when *Tarraco* became the definitive capital city. After the *conuentus* reform on the landscape, this last city acts as administrative capital of the extensive *C. Carthaginensis*. We also know that this territory belonged to the *ager publicus* which P. Servilius Rufus was willing to distribute in the agrarian laws of 64 BC, against which Cicero reacted⁷.

The city reached an importance (*urbem ... ipsam opulentam suis opibus*⁸) which hardly seems compatible with a possible condition of *civitas stipendiaria* until the Imperial time, when Pliny mentions it as a Roman colony⁹. The earliest dating for this legal promotion has been given by Abascal Palazón, placing it on 54 BC, identifying Pompey as ultimate responsible¹⁰. Grant¹¹ raised the possibility of *Carthago Noua* having a Latin period from 48 to 45–44 BC, until it became a Roman colony in 29 BC, a proposal which Abascal Palazón understands as highly unlikely¹². García Fernández, for her part, considers the Latin condition of the city as a fact

³ Diod. Sic. 25, 11–12.

⁴ Polyb. 2, 13, 1.

⁵ Polyb. 10, 10, 1.

⁶ Polyb. 34, 9, 8. Voir aussi LLORENS FORCADA 1994, 163.

⁷ LLORENS FORCADA 1994, 196–206.

⁸ LIV. 26.42.3

⁹ PLIN. HN. 3.13

¹⁰ ABASCAL PALAZÓN 2002, 27.

¹¹ GRANT 1946, 217.

¹² ABASCAL PALAZÓN 2002, 23.

already proved¹³. Fasolini suggested that a Latin colony was funded by Caesar as an explanation for the double tribal adscription¹⁴.

Then, who lived in *Carthago Noua*? Were they Romans, Latins, stipendiary *peregrini*? Where these Punic, Iberians, Italic immigrants?

The SPES database

In order to look up an answer to this problem, an onomastics database has been created, identifying the inhabitants of *Carthago Noua* with epigraphic mentions since 209 BC until the end of 1st century BC. Thus, SPES — *S(tudium) P(ersonarum) E(x) S(cripturis)* — was designed with the objective of getting over the traditional separation between prosopography and epigraphy because this study seeks to make an interdisciplinary analysis with the main characteristics of both disciplines.

The reference for the processing of epigraphic information is the EDR web project (Epigraphic Database Roma)¹⁵ and so most of the database is designed in Latin. The main methodological attraction offered by EDR and the entire EAGLE federation is the treatment of the epigraphs as inscribed monuments, not as simple texts¹⁶. This allows collecting and taking into account substantial data of diverse nature that are important when carrying out analyses and complex historical considerations, reflection of the society that has created them. However, while it is based on the condition ‘one monument, one record’, SPES counts on an entry for each individual epigraphically recorded (including coinages).

At onomastics level, the database is inspired on the works of Gian Luca Gregori for the Roman *Brixia (Brescia romana. Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale)*¹⁷ and D’Isanto por *Capua*¹⁸. Their work made possible to identify the main tendencies in prosopographic and onomastics studies based almost exclusively on epigraphy. Yet, neither of the two examples alone could fulfil the required characteristics to develop an investigation such as the one proposed in this research. Then again, online prosopographic databases tend to be only onomastic compilations setting up through published *corpora* without direct control of the fonts by the compiler. That is the case for SNAP (Standards for Networking Ancient Prosopographies),

¹³ GARCÍA FERNÁNDEZ 2011, 52.

¹⁴ FASOLINI 2012a, 228.

¹⁵ EDR is part of the international ‘Europeana EAGLE project’ whose aims to collect all published Greek and Latin inscriptions up to 7th century AD in a single online database. As member of EAGLE (Electronic Archive of Greek and Latin Epigraphy), EDR brings together the inscription of the actual Italy, with the exception of Christian inscriptions (under EDB jurisdiction).

¹⁶ CALDELLI *et al.* 2014, 267.

¹⁷ GREGORI 1991, 1999.

¹⁸ D’ISANTO 1993.

which focuses in the elites and their associations¹⁹, or Trismegistos, which is limited to Egyptian territory even if it focuses on the non-privileged population²⁰ (like SPES does).

For this research, it was crucial to create an optimal model of database that compiled all the essential information, both textual and monumental, of each individual and the inscription(s) in which is recorded. This necessary implied to design a new prototype that would combine fields present in prosopographic databases (both traditions on paper and the new ones on metadata) with those from the epigraphic databases. Looking for multidisciplinary, the design of the file sheet was based on the EDR structure with the addition of onomastic fields: was recorded information on the legal status of each individual (Roman, Latin, freed, slave, *peregrinus*, unknown, unknown with filiation), sex (man, woman) and onomastics elements (*pranomen*, *nomen*, *cognomina* – simple names are recorded under the *cognomen* caption). All of this data has always the chance of including a question mark if we are not sure about its reliability. Furthermore, as any database setting up on metadata, we can change any information if there will be new discoveries.

In this data base it is included every person of whom there is a record within the city or its *ager* from the 3rd century BC²¹ until the ending of 1st century AD²². Every fragment whose interpretation is still a matter of debate is excluded (with the exception of ceramic graffiti), as well as *amphorae*, stamps on *sigillata* (both due to commercial implications that prevent us to consider every person reported as Carthaginian)²³ and Punic graffiti on ivory horns which were found in Carthaginian waters but belonged to a boat coming to the harbour,

¹⁹ “(...) we aimed to address the problem of linking together large collections of material (datasets) containing information about persons, names and person-like entities managed in heterogeneous systems and formats” (SNPD 2014, About).

²⁰ DEPAUW, GHELDOLF 2014, About (beta version 2011): “Trismegistos People is a tool dealing with personal names of non-royal individuals attested as living in Egypt in documentary texts between BC 800 and AD 800, including all languages and scripts written on any surface. Not included are pharaohs, emperors, and saints; people attested in texts outside Egypt (with the exception of some *Prosopographia Ptolemaica* entries) or people living outside Egypt (no consuls!); and names from non-documentary texts (e.g. narratives)”.

²¹ The steady Roman presence in the Iberian Peninsula officially begins with the Second Punic War. However, the existence of previous contacts is proved by epigraphic evident as a consequence of the increase of the Italic trades prior to the conquest (DÍAZ ARIÑO 2008, 36–38).

²² The reason to include in SPES individuals which chronology goes past the beginning of the Principate of Augustus (27 BC) lies in the use of the onomastic transmission hypothesis as the central axis of the research (*duo/tria nomina* could only be transmitted to the descendants if there was *ius conubii* and *ius commercii*, which Latin colonies had). In order to be able to come to conclusions, it is necessary, on one hand, to verify how the data behaves in periods when there is no doubt about the legal status of the *ciuitas* (that is the case for *Carthago Noua* since the Augustus era), and, on the other hand, to have plenty of related records to analyse.

²³ I am aware that I am qualifying as a ‘non-inhabitant’ a number of commercial staff that could, in some cases, be *ciues* of the city. The current state of the documentation and research does not allow us distinguish them. It is possible that new discoveries or the demonstration of some hypotheses in a cross sectional study will allow in the future to be more precise about these persons.

not from it²⁴. It is also excluded every member of the imperial family: they were not inhabitants of *Carthago Noua*. An special treatment is applied to not datable inscriptions, names appearing on ingots (since the individual could have never been in the city, but these records are important as reference for their freedmen)²⁵ and those not explicitly mentioned in texts but their *nomina* are implied (marched with an asterisk).

The development of this study is possible due to *Carthago Noua* possessing the greatest epigraphic record from republican time²⁶, with a great variety of formats and functions if we also include the 1st century AD epigraphy. However, there are problems when delimiting the city's *ager* and so the population which was actually legally attached to it. This problem is focused, in this case, in the mining area of Mazarrón, which is excluded from this study in view of the possibility of it having its own independent legal status in some moment, not datable (it was probably a *municipium* at the ending of 1st century AD)²⁷.

The analysis

Database contains 317 individuals in 227 inscriptions including 68 women, 246 men and 3 of uncertain sex. This ratio between men and women responds to what is expected for two reasons: Roman society was patriarchal and we have found a certain type of epigraphy in the city²⁸. Concerning the division basing on legal categories, it counts on 43 Romans, 100 freedmen, 13 slaves and 3 *peregrini*, these latter being three foreigner kings *patroni* of the city. There are also 161 individuals of undefined condition ("unknown"), 60 of which present filiation in *duo/tria nomina* structures, indicating that they could only be Romans or Latins.

These global figures are almost senseless out of a chronological context and without considering the formal and functional characteristics of the sources in which these individuals are recorded. The first filter through which these individuals are classified is chronologic, though the epigraphic dating is always complicated, including very wide lapses and confusing criteria, to which the chronological problems of coin series is summed²⁹.

²⁴ SANMARTÍ ACASO 1986, 89–91; MEDEROS MARTÍN & RUÍZ CABRERO 2004, 275–277.

²⁵ We know for sure that the ingots seals were stamped in *Carthago Noua* or her *ager*. We cannot confirm the same for the seals of *amphorae* and *sigillata*. Therefore, the latter are excluded as well as the ingots countermarks.

²⁶ ABASCAL PALAZÓN 1995; DÍAZ ARIÑO 2008, 42–43, 46–47; PENA GIMENO 2008, 688, 705.

²⁷ NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2001–2002.

²⁸ The large number of funerary inscriptions is due to chronological factors related to the Principate of Augustus. That was the space of epigraphic representation to which women have access, especially those found in the provinces within this chronology. Of the 68 female records, 64 appears in funerary inscriptions of varied chronology and only two are registered on honorary epigraphs (HEp 07, 1997, 423 = HEpOl 12928 = HD037544 = DECAR 32 and CIL II, 3437, p. xlvi = HEpOl 09524 = HD037578 = DECAR 50), both of the first century AD.

²⁹ About the problems of the Carthaginian coins, see BELTRÁN MARTÍNEZ 1949; LLORENS FORCADA 1994; and ABASCAL PALAZÓN 2002.

The division on stages that has been chosen as the frame of analysis in this study resides in the academic discussion on the dates of the *Carthago Noua*'s colonial promotion (Latin, Roman or both). As we have seen, we are dealing with a *ciuitas* that takes on great importance from the beginning of the Roman conquest of the Iberian Peninsula, as capital of the province *Hispania Citerior* and as an economic centre of the first order. So, the hypotheses of juridical promotion given by the Historiography until this moment seems not to measure up to the characteristics of the city and all the Republican epigraphic material present on it. The objective is to be able to compare the behaviour of the data in the different stages that have been individualized for *Carthago Noua* under the suspicion that, *a priori*, its epigraphy and onomastics indicate a much earlier chronology for some kind of legal promotion. Thus, the database is divided in three stages based in the attempt to determine if *Carthago Noua* was a Latin colony and, if so, since when.

The first stage, so called "Republican", includes every dating previous to 54 BC (the oldest date proposed by a researcher, Abascal Palazón, for Cartagena as Roman colony, as we have seen earlier). Almost all the authors consider the city a *ciuitas stipendiaria* during this stage which gives to this period its *raison d'être* as a unit of analysis. The second, or "colonial", stage is significantly shorter: it begins at 54 BC and symbolically concludes at 27 BC, at the beginning of the Principate. The existence of this stage, in spite of the small number of years that form it, is justified because it centres the academic discussion of the Roman colonial promotion of the city. The "Imperial" stage, from 27 BC until records whose oldest lapse date is previous to 100 AD. Eight remaining inscriptions can't be accurately dated but belong to the chosen chronology, and so they are included in case they can provide indications for the rest of trends.

Republican stage

In this study we will stress the "Republican" stage in order to determine what kind of population inhabited the city after the Roman conquest and until the granting of Roman colony statute. Although we accept Abascal's date, the analysis of these results could qualify or even determine this 54 BC promotion³⁰. In this stage, whose datings vary between the *grafitti* of the beginning of the 3rd century BC³¹ and an honorary inscription of the middle of the 1st century BC made by 4 individuals (with filiation), probably members of a *collegium*³², 83 individuals are recorded.

³⁰ This paper is part of a still developing project called "Movilidad, onomástica e integración en la Hispania republicana".

³¹ HEp 17, 2008, 091 = ELRH C18; HEp 6, 1996, 662 = ELHR C19; ELRH C20; ELRH C21.

³² CIL I, 1555 = CIL II, 3408, p. 952 = HEpOl 9505 = HD018335 = ELRH C15 = DECAR 34.

The presence of *tribus* proves that 9 of them are Romans³³, but all but one are registered in lead ingots. This is a fundamental piece of information since we can't prove that the franchisees of surrounding mining exploitations were physically present in the city, much less if any of them could be one of its inhabitants. However, it is important to consider the *gentes* to which they belong, since many of them are recorded afterwards in the city onomastics: *Atellia* (9 files on SPES CN), *Pontiliena* (8), *Cornelia* (6), *Turullia* (4), *Seia* (2), *Roscia* (4) y *Vtia* (only the one on the ingot). The ingots are the more frequent support to our theory during this stage which comes to prove the economic component of the epigraphy at this moment. The only Roman not registered in an ingot is mentioned, together with his sister (whose condition could also be considered as Roman) in a non-preserved inscription of which authenticity many authors have doubts and its function is unknown³⁴. *Nomen* of both individuals, *Lumnesius*, is an epigraphic *hapax* and the text doesn't provide more information.

The tribes to which the Romans of this "Republican" stage belong are characterized by not being represented in the following, with the exception of the *Menenia* (with a case in the "colonial" time that does not register a *nomen*³⁵) and the *Fabia* (to her they ascribe the *ciues C. Pontilienus M.f.* that seals ingots around 90/80 BC³⁶ and the *duoviro L. Magio Gn.f. Sabello*, which is mentioned in the Augustan period in an inscription that could be honorary or funeral³⁷). The most recorded *tribus* of this stage are the *Maecia* (in four occasions, three in its archaic form *Maicia*)³⁸ and the *Menenia* (in three)³⁹. If we look at the general data provided by Fasolini for *Hispania Tarraconensis*, both tribes are scarcely represented with 0.30% and 0.80% respectively⁴⁰. Furthermore, there are two records of the *tribus Aemilia* (in its archaic version: *Aimilia*), in a lead ingot and an individual with indication of *origo* (*Formianus*)⁴¹. These data reinforce the hypotheses on the Italic immigrant status of these Romans.

The 20 freedmen are recorded in a quite more varied epigraphic range. The oldest ones (ending of the 3rd century – beginnings of the 2nd century BC) are recorded in lead ingots: is the series of *A(ulus et) P(ublius) Furieis C(ai et) P(ubli et) L(uci) l(ibertus)* found on the French

³³ *CIL* I, 1481 = *CIL* II, 3439, p. 925 = *CIL* II, 6247, 4 = HEpOl 9526 = ELRH SP34 (2 persons); DOMERGUE 1990, n. 1013; *CIL* I2, 2396 = AE 1913, 147 = AE 1997, 862f = HEpOl 25747 = ELRH SP5; AE 1930, 38 = ELRH SP28; EphEp 8, 428, 3 = ELRH SP37; AE 1983, 604 = HEp 6, 1996, 667c = HEpOl 16212 = ELRH SP35; EphEp 9, 428, 1 = ELRH SP41.

³⁴ *CIL* II, 5932, p. lxxx = EphEp 3, 37 = HEpOl 12222 = HD037767 = DECAR 148. WIEGELS (1985, 105) raised the possibility that *Maec[us]* was not an indication of *tribus Maecia* but the *cognomen Maecianus*.

³⁵ *CIL* II, 3430 = EphEp 9, p. 128 = HEp 3, 1997, 251 = HEp 5, 1999, 592 = HEpOl 09517 = DECAR 22.

³⁶ AE 1930, 38 = ELRH SP28.

³⁷ EphEp 9, 332 = HEpOl 14100 = HD037669 = DECAR 108.

³⁸ *CIL* I, 1481 = *CIL* II, 3439, p. 925 = *CIL* II, 6247, 4 = HEpOl 9526 = ELRH SP34 (2 persons); *CIL* II, 5932, p. lxxx = EphEp 3, 37 = HEpOl 12222 = HD037767 = DECAR 148; EphEp 8, 428, 3 = ELRH SP37.

³⁹ *CIL* I2, 2396 = AE 1913, 147 = AE 1997, 862f = HEpOl 25747 = ELRH SP5; AE 1983, 604 = HEp 6, 1996, 667c = HEpOl 16212 = ELRH SP35; EphEp 9, 428, 1 = ELRH SP41.

⁴⁰ FASOLINI 2014, 394.

⁴¹ DOMERGUE 1990, n. 1013.

coast, near *Massilia* (Marseille)⁴². But since the ending of the 2nd century, and until the middle of the 1st BC, they appear as dedicators of the first votive inscriptions of the city: a mosaic to *Iuppiter Stator*⁴³ and a base (?) to *Salaeco*⁴⁴. The freedmen of this stage are also magistrates of some kind of *collegium* consecrating, together with *ingenui* and slaves, an important honorific inscription, lost today⁴⁵, and the inscription which reminds the building of some of harbour's structures⁴⁶. The 8 slaves recorded in this stage are all of them member of these *collegia*. The oldest funerary inscriptions of this stage reports freedwomen: the *carmen* dedicated to *Plotia Prune* (100/70 BC)⁴⁷ and the *tabula* of *Atellia Cleunica* (70/30 BC)⁴⁸. As can be seen, the freedmen appear in this first stage as a social group very active in the activities of the city and are represented in all available epigraphic spaces. Nevertheless, it can be affirmed little regarding its origin, except, perhaps, in the case of the two freedmen of the *gens Auia* that dedicate the single altar to the *Hercules Gaditano* registered outside Cadiz⁴⁹. Given the type of inscription in which some of them appear and the presence of its *gentes* in later dates, it is possible to hypothesize that a significant number probably lived and died in *Carthago Noua*. Possibly they were commercial emissaries of its Italic patrons. The freedmen were a group that sought social acceptance and made themselves visible through the epigraphy from its appearance in the city until the end of the period studied here (the percentage that measure their presence is steady in the three stages). It is also to be expected that some of the individuals classified as "unknown" (without affiliation) also belong to the group of manumitted slaves who hide their status as freedmen in epigraphic practice.

The division of the group of individuals with category "unknown" is justified by the different possibilities and probabilities that both have in relation to their potential, but indeterminable, legal status. On one hand, the "unknown", especially those with a Greek *cognomen*, were probably freedmen hiding their late condition of slaves not stating the information of their *patrono*⁵⁰. On the other hand, we have those individuals whose legal condition is unknown but who mention their filiation. This necessarily implies their Roman or Latin condition, since their onomastics has a *duo/tria nomina* structure. These 17 individuals (16 if accept the sister of *Aulus Lumnesius* as Roman) are recorded in a wide range of inscriptions (considering the epigraphic moment and the provincial environment).

⁴² HEP 4, 1994, 566 = HEPol 12741 = ELRH SP12.

⁴³ AE 1995, 938 = AE 1996, 926 = HEP 6, 1996, 655 = HEPol 12730 = HD037876 = ELRH C16 = DECAR 204.

⁴⁴ AE 2010, 754 = HEP 19, 2013, 218.

⁴⁵ *CIL* I, 1478 = *CIL* II, 3433, p. 952 = HEP 4, 1994, 565 = HEP 18, 2012, 254 = HEPol 9520 = HD037922 = DECAR 217.

⁴⁶ *CIL* I, 1477 = *CIL* II, 3434 = HEP 5, 1999, 587 = HEP 18, 2012, 257 = HEPol 9521 = HD037489 = ELRH C10 = DECAR 1.

⁴⁷ *CIL* I, 1479 = *CIL* II, 3495, p. 952 = HEP 18, 2012, 256 = CLE 410 = CLEC 1 = HEPol 9569 = HD037782 = ELRH C45 = DECAR 163.

⁴⁸ *CIL* 12, 2272 = *CIL* II, 3451 = HEPol 9538 = HD037681 = ELRH C37 = DECAR 120.

⁴⁹ *CIL* II, 3409 = HEPol 09506 = ELRH C14 = DECAR 35.

⁵⁰ About the Greek names in a Roman context, v. SOLIN 2003.

The first thing that draws the attention in this group is that almost half of the records are registered in series of lead ingots whose dating extends throughout the chronological arc of the stage. This fact point, most likely, that they were Romans who do not clearly show their condition through the mention of the *tribus*. However, it cannot be excluded that they were Latins, from what would be the Latin colony of *Carthago Noua*.

Another six “unknown” were members or one or other of the already mentioned *collegia*. The presence of these *collegia* reinforces the hypothesis of that possible *colonia latina* status, since the life of the city and the individuals who inhabited it (and whose names had come to us) are organized in structures of Roman influence. The presence of a strong contingent of Italic immigrants would explain the recreation of this kind of associations, while Latin law would have favoured the integration of the different types of populations that would compose the colony. Furthermore, there are four persons recorded in what was a column (now disappeared) dedicated to *Genio op(p)idi* and dated in 60/40 a.C.⁵¹. The debate of this monument is centered on two levels related to each other that determine the chronology of the inscription. On the one hand, the authors argue the qualification of *oppidum* given to the city; on the other, the nature and status of the four individuals mentioned: magistrates of the local administration⁵² or members of a *collegium*⁵³? The previously mentioned examples of *collegia* confirm that this practice was spread in the pre-Caesar *Carthago Noua*. So, it is acceptable that these four persons belong to a *collegium* that dedicates a monument to the *Genius* of the city.

It remains to mention two particular cases: a senatorial range individual in a fragmentary honorific inscription (whose circumstances make it impossible to be a legal inhabitant of the city)⁵⁴ and a child of the important *gens Pontiliena*, which we will tackle afterwards, and to whom a funerary *carmen* is dedicated⁵⁵.

The 29 individuals classified as “unknown” cannot, as a group, be assigned to a particular legal category, but in some cases it can be hypothesized. Their onomastic structures are *duo/tria nomina* that follow the patterns of Roman/Latin onomastics but without patronymics or filiation. Thus, they could be Romans, Latins or *liberti*. The names of some of these individuals are presumed from those of other persons already analysed: they are the owners of some slaves and have a different treatment on the study of the SPES data. We cannot be sure about their presence in the city, but it is important to know the *gentes* of the slaves.

⁵¹ CIL I, 1555 = CIL II, 3408, p. 952 = HEpOl 9505 = HD018335 = ELRH 15 = DECAR 34.

⁵² DEGRASSI 1950, 338–340; FASOLINI 2012a, 231.

⁵³ BELTRÁN MARTÍNEZ 1950A, 261; MARÍN DÍAZ 1988, 60; SOLANA SAÍNZ 1989, 75; LLORENS FORCADA 1994, 18–19; ABASCAL PALAZÓN & RAMALLO ASENSIO 1997, 158.

⁵⁴ HEp 3, 1997, 250 = HEpOl 14075 = HD037572 = ELRH C11 = DECAR 47.

⁵⁵ CIL I, 3449 g = HEp 12, 2002, 352 = CLEC 2 = HEpOl 8162 = HD037603 = ELRH C31 = DECAR 69.

Some “unknowns” owes their onomastic structure to the type of support in which they are recorded, like the ceramic graffiti. They evidence the presence of Latin speakers in the city prior to the Punic foundation of *Qart Hadash*. It is another example of the importance of this Iberian *oppidum* in the Mediterranean trade routes and the attraction that already was for the Roman world.

As expected from the data so far, we have “unknowns” individuals who seal lead ingots from the mines around Cartagena throughout this phase⁵⁶. All of them (except one whose *nomen* is not preserved⁵⁷) belong to *gentes* registered in the city after them. Although, by statistics, the probability of being *ingenui* is higher⁵⁸, nothing in the analysed data allows us to assure this. Also, SPES CN freedmen who seal ingots belong to *gentes* settled in the city in one way or another, and occupy all possible positions within the internal ordering of them⁵⁹. The existence of these individuals as a group can only reinforce the idea of the importance of the argent and lead mines exploitation and how different were the individuals who participated in it. In this same context, we have the lost monument of *A(ulus) Verg[ilius], arge[ntarius]*⁶⁰.

We have six moneyers⁶¹ whose chronology, in one way or another begins in this period although both Llorens Forcada⁶² and Abascal Palazón⁶³ place these three pairs sometime after 54 BC⁶⁴. Types, archaeology, epigraphy and dispersion allow us to locate any of the pre-Augustus issues throughout the 1st century BC. The names of these magistrates do not provide data that compel us to discard this idea. On the contrary, when comparing it with that presented by the moneyers of the Latin colony of *Carteia*⁶⁵, we find similar characteristics.

⁵⁶ CIL 13, 10029, 26; EphEp 8, 00254, 2 = HEpOl 25753 = ELRH SP36; CIL 02, 06247, 3 = ELRH SP33.

⁵⁷ AE 1983, 605 = HEpOl 6804 = HD000020 = ELRH SP42.

⁵⁸ According to SPES, 57.14% of the ingots were stamped by *ingenui* (Romans or “unknown” with filiation), in contrast to 16.67% by freedmen.

⁵⁹ The *gentes* and chronology of these freedmen on ingots are: *Atellia*, 100/30 BC; *Aurunculeia*, 1/100 AD; *Aurunculeia*, 100/1 BC; *Furia*, 230/171 BC; *Furia*, 230/171 BC; *Iuuentia*, without date; *Laetilia*, 50 BC/30 AD.

⁶⁰ CIL II, 3440 = HEpOl 09527 = HD037672 = DECAR 111.

⁶¹ RPC 146; RPC 152–153; RPC 154.

⁶² LLORENS FORCADA 1994, 144.

⁶³ ABASCAL PALAZÓN 2002, 32.

⁶⁴ Now, all these orders are intimately related to the historiography linked to the legal promotion to Roman colony of the city.

⁶⁵ On SPES CRT are registered as moneyers: C(aius) Curman(us); L(ucius) Marci(us); M(arcus) Cur(manus); L(ucius) Mar(---); M(arcus) Septu(mius); Num(---); M(arcus) Arg(---); C(aius) Nini(us); Q(uintus) Curui(us); Q(uintus) Opsil(ius); Q(uintus) Pedecai(us); Cn(aeus) Am(m)i(us); L(ucius) Arg(---); L(ucius) Rai(us); L(ucius) Agri(us); P(ublius) Iuli(us); Aufidius Rufus; Maecilius; C(aius) Maius C(ai) f(i)lius Pollio; P(ublius) Mion; P(ublius) Falcidius; L(ucius) Atini(us); C(aius) Nucia(nus?); C(aius) Mini(us) Q(uinti) f(i)lius; C(aius) Vibi(us); C(aius) Pe(decaius); C(aius) Vib(ius).

Comparing stages

If we compare these individuals with those appearing in the two next stages, or even in the non-datable ones, there are not big differences concerning figures in any of the typologies we have established so far. The onomastics of *Carthago Noua* inhabitants is characterized all through its history by its homogeneity and to limit to a Roman canon which is hard to identify in most of provincial areas, especially in such an early moment. It is more common to find more variable structures, combining indigenous names in typically Roman structures or Latinizing native names in indigenous structures, with presence of *peregrini*, and so on. The epigraphic history of Roman world makes formats and functions change with the rise of funerary epigraphy from Augustus time, especially in provincial epigraphic productions⁶⁶. Moreover, the exhaustion of mines leads to the disappearance of lead ingots⁶⁷. The rising of coinage in this period, or its preferential dating in it, implies methodological problems of the chicken-or-the-egg kind, as previously explained. Formats change and so the kind of information we can extract from names, but these don't change and neither do the structures in which we identify them.

Further than the fact that we cannot check big changes in the kind of inhabitants recorded in the city, all the individuals of the "Republican" stage (in which *Carthago Noua* is historiographically a *ciuitas stipendiaria*) show us a deeply Romanized society. We must remember that, considering all the written record of the Republican period in *Hispania*, the number of documents showing indigenous languages is rather superior to Latin materials⁶⁸. Although the Phoenician and Punic areas of influence are characterized by the scarcity of materials, due to the custom of writing in perishable materials, the abundance of Latin epigraphy in *Carthago Noua* and the practical inexistence of inscriptions in other language in the city make a first argument supporting some kind of legal promotion much earlier than proposed up to date.

Gentes and onomastic transfer

If we develop a transversal study in the time and legal conditions of each individual and we analyse them from the perspective of the *gens* they belong to, we can try to approach to the way these *nomina* have been transferred through time. For this kind of analysis we start from the view that onomastic transfer of Roman *duo/tria nomina* can only take place under a very specific series of legal conditions. Rome sets these conditions through the granting of *commercium* and *conubium*, especially the latter, which sanction a mixed marriage as a legal

⁶⁶ MEYER 1990; ALFÖLDY 1991; WOOLF 1996, 22.

⁶⁷ ANTOLINOS MARÍN & NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2013, 350.

⁶⁸ DÍAZ ARIÑO 2008, 29.

procedure. These rights are part of the usual package granted to the Latin colonies, whose presence beyond italic soil in early dates is attested by the foundation of *Carteia* (Titus Livius tells us about its foundation in 171 BC from an old Punic settlement)⁶⁹.

In *Carthago Noua* there are 125 *gentes* recorded, although some of them cannot be totally developed. Of these, 52 are already present during the “Republican” stage, but only 27 are recorded more than once. Again, these figures are merely illustrative. The consideration and importance that a *gens* can count on when trying to determine a possible Latin condition through the onomastics transfer is deeply conditional on the position of every individual in the whole onomastics study, and this depending on the epigraphic criteria of the piece involved.

After studying these figures, it seems unquestionable that, again, there are no big differences in the documentation’s behavior. That is to say, those *gentes* exclusively recorded in the republican stage (*Pontiliena*) have similar features to those appearing all through the selected chronology (*Atellia*) or the ones recorded only in Imperial times (*Aemilia - Carthago Noua* is certainly a Roman colony from Augustus).

Despite some *gentes* do not provide reliable clues on the legal status of Cartagena’s population (Roman, Latin or *peregrini*) and despite our study cannot identify families⁷⁰, it seems clear that there must have been some legal mechanisms for permitting *gentes* such as the *Atellia* or the *Aquinia* to transfer their *nomen* from generation to generation. In both cases, despite the numeric difference of individuals belonging to each one (9 to 5), they are *gentes* deep-seated in the city. The *Atelii* present a much richer record. After a first stage based on ingots⁷¹, they offer one of the very first examples of funerary epigraphy (a freedwoman)⁷² and the considered to be the first coinage of *Carthago Noua* (57 BC according to some researchers)⁷³. Afterwards, the *ingenui* become part of the local elite (they are recorded as moneyers)⁷⁴ while their freedmen are reflected in tombstones⁷⁵.

The *Aquini*, on their side, are recorded in a very early stage with a freedman in a votive mosaic⁷⁶. More than half of a century later they stamp lead ingots⁷⁷, the greatest number of them ever recorded in the Carthaginian coast. Although ingots must be prudently considered, the above mentioned votive inscription raises the chance for these individuals to really be

⁶⁹ Liv. 43.3.1–4.

⁷⁰ Writing about *clientelae*: “de los datos disponibles sólo pueden extraerse conclusiones referentes a *gentes*, no a familias y mucho menos a individuos” (PINA POLO 2013, 73).

⁷¹ HEPol 25748 = ELRH SP6; CIL 12, 2396 = AE 1913, 147 = AE 1997, 862f = HEPol 25747 = ELRH SP5; STEFANILE 2009.

⁷² CIL 12, 2272 = CIL II, 3451 = HEPol 9538 = HD037681 = ELRH C37 = DECAR 120.

⁷³ RPC 146.

⁷⁴ RPC 169; RPC 185–186.

⁷⁵ CIL II, 3449 = HEPol 9536 = HD037680 = DECAR 119; CIL II, 3450 = HEPol 9537 = HD037605 = DECAR 74.

⁷⁶ AE 1995, 938 = AE 1996, 926 = HEP 6, 1996, 655 = HEPol 12730 = HD037876 = ELRH C16 = DECAR 204.

⁷⁷ HEP 1, 1989, 479 a = HEP 6, 1996, 667 b = HEPol 14901 = ELRH SP3; HEPol 25754 = ELRH SP4.

inhabitants of the city. The fact that some years later this *gens* is recorded in a funerary inscription (probably of a freedwoman)⁷⁸ which mentions the “most real” Carthaginian population and, above all, the moneyer (*duovir quinquennial*) for the year 22/21 BC⁷⁹ increase this chance.

Conclusions

This little introduction to the analysis of the population of *Carthago Noua* leads us to reconsider the dates for the legal promotion proposed up to date. Onomastic lists always imply a deal of risk when developing any kind of historic assessment. This is why for this work a database full of variables has been developed, in order to cross different values and count on a more realistic approach to the information available. 317 individuals recorder throughout 4 centuries of local history do not seem to be quite a substantial base for drawing big conclusions. Literary sources do not help us to determine what happened to *Carthago Noua*'s population. We know that it was an important city, a provincial capital during the Republic, a crossroad and administrative and justice centre during the civil wars of the 1st century BC. We also know that its mining was intensively exploded by Rome and that its exceptional situation made a first line commercial spot out of it.

Now we also know that its population was deeply “Romanised” from a very early stage, with almost no trace of Punic epigraphy or onomastics (at 1st century AD SPES records some Punic *cognomina* in Latin). According to these data, it seems like Punic people would have never existed or inhabited the city in the Republican time. However, archaeology shows us that there were people of Punic origin who kept using the same material culture after the Roman conquest of 209 BC. Only a Latin colony could bear the presence of an important Italic immigrant community, many of them Roman citizens, living together with a probably reduced community composed by the previous inhabitants and a minority of administrative staff who managed all these human groups. The existence of mixed marriages which transfer the *tria nomina* to their sons thanks to the *ius Latii* and the capacity of Latins to carry these *tria nomina* lead to think that *Carthago Noua* must already be a Latin colony at the beginning of the 1st century BC, and probably even before, though it is difficult, with the data known so far, to establish a date for it.

Acknowledgements. This work was realize as part of the “Nuevas bases documentales para el estudio histórico de la Hispania romana de época republicana: onomástica y latinidad (III-I a.C.) (HAR2015-66463-P)” project, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness. I want to thank the directors of my PhD thesis, Prof. Silvia Orlandi (Sapienza, Università di Roma) and

⁷⁸ *CIL* II, 3448, p. 952 = HD037679 = DECAR 118.

⁷⁹ RPC 157.

Prof. Estela García Fernández (Complutense Univ. of Madrid) for their advice. Moreover, I want to thank the Museo Arqueológico Municipal de Cartagena, the Museo del Teatro Romano de Cartagena, the Museo Nacional de Arqueología Subacuática, and the Museo Arqueológico Nacional de Madrid that gave me permission to study the inscriptions and coins of *Carthago Noua*. David Serrano Lozano and Elena Duce Pastor were of big help in this research.

Abbreviations

AE = *L'Année Epigraphique*. Paris.

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin.

CLE = *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*.

DECAR = *Vide* ABASCAL PALAZÓN, RAMALLO ASENSIO 1997.

ELRH = *Vide* DÍAZ ARIÑO 2008.

EphEp = *Ephemeris epigraphica: Corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum*. Roma–Berlin.

HD = *Epigraphic Database Heidelberg*. Heidelberg.

HEp = *Hispania Epigraphica*. Madrid.

HEpOl = *Hispania Epigraphica Online Database*.

RPC = *Vide* BURNETT, AMANDRY, RIPOLLÈS 1992.

References

- ABASCAL PALAZÓN, J.M. 1995. *La temprana epigrafía latina de Carthago Nova*. In: F. Beltrán Lloris (ed.), *Roma y el nacimiento de la cultura epigráfica en Occidente: Actas del Coloquio Roma y las primeras culturas epigráficas del Occidente Mediterráneo (siglos II a.E. - d.E.)*, 139–149. Zaragoza.
- ABASCAL PALAZÓN, J.M. 2002. La fecha de la promoción colonial de Carthago Nova y sus repercusiones edilicias. *Mastia* 1, 21–44.
- ABASCAL PALAZÓN, J.M., S.F. RAMALLO ASENSIO 1997. *La ciudad de Carthago Nova: la documentación epigráfica*. Murcia.
- ALFÖLDY, G. 1991. Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation. *Gymnasium* 98, 289–324.
- ANTOLINOS MARÍN, J.A., J.M. NOGUERA CELDRÁN 2013. *Los recursos minerales del ager de Carthago Nova: explotación, modelos de gestión territorial y jerarquización de los asentamientos*. In: J-L. Fiches, R. Plana-Mallart, V. Revilla Calvo (eds.): *Paysages ruraux et territoires dans les cités de l'occident romain. Gallia et Hispania / Paisajes rurales y territorios en las ciudades del occidente romano. Gallia e Hispania*, 341–351. Montpellier.
- BELTRÁN MARTÍNEZ, A. 1949. *Las monedas latinas de Cartagena*. Murcia.
- BURNETT, A., M. AMANDRY, P.P. RIPOLLÈS (eds.) 1992. *Roman Provincial Coinage. Vol I: From the death of Caesar to the death of Vitellius (44 BC–AD 69)*. London–Paris.
- CALDELLI, M.L., S. ORLANDI, V. BLANDINO, V. CHIARALUCE, L. PULCINELLI, A. VELLA 2014. EDR – Effetti collaterali. *Scienze dell'Antichità* 20, 267–289.

- DEGRASSI, A. 1950. Quattuorviri in colonie romane e in municipi retti da duoviri. *Memorie Accademia Lincei* 8/2, 281–348.
- DEPAUW, M., T. GHELDOF 2014. Trismegistos. An interdisciplinary platform for ancient world texts and related information. In: Ł. Bolikowski, V. Casarosa, P. Goodale, N. Houssos, P. Manghi, J. Schirrwagen (eds.), *Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries - TPD 2013 Selected Workshops (Communications in Computer and Information Science 416)*, 40–52. Online: www.trismegistos.org (accessed: 05.11.2017)
- DÍAZ ARIÑO, B. 2008. *Epigrafía latina republicana de Hispania*. Barcelona.
- D'ISANTO, G. 1993. *Capua Romana: ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale*. Roma.
- DOMERGUE, C. 1990. *Les mines de la Péninsule Ibérique dans l'Antiquité romaine*. Roma.
- EDR n.d. *Epigraphic Database Roma*. Sapienza – Università di Roma. Online www.edr-edr.it (accessed: 20.01.2017).
- EHD n.d. *Epigraphic Database Heidelberg*. Universität Heidelberg. Online: edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de (accessed: 20.01.2017).
- FASOLINI, D. 2012. *Le Tribù romane della Hispania Tarraconensis. L'iscrizione tribale dei cittadini romani nelle testimonianze epigrafiche*. Milano.
- FASOLINI, D. 2014. *La distribuzione della ascrizione tribale nell'Impero romano*. In: A. Caballos Rufino, E. Melchor Gil (eds.), *De Roma a las provincias: las elites como instrumento de proyección de Roma*, 387–398. Sevilla.
- FORNI, G. 1977. *Il ruolo della menzione della tribù nell'onomastica romana*. In: H.-G. Pflaum, M. Noël Duval (eds.), *L'onomastique latine: Paris 13–15 octobre 1975*, 73–101. Paris.
- GARCÍA FERNÁNDEZ, E. 2011. *Movilidad, onomástica e integración en Hispania en época republicana: algunas observaciones metodológicas*. In: J.M. Iglesias Gil, A. Ruiz Gutiérrez (eds.), *Viajes y cambios de residencia en el mundo romano*, 47–66. Santander.
- GRANT, M. 1946. *From imperium to auctoritas: a historical study of aes coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 BC – AD 14*. London.
- GREGORI, G.L. 1991. *Brescia romana. Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale, I. I documenti*. Roma.
- GREGORI, G.L. 1999. *Brescia romana. Ricerche di prosopografia e storia sociale, II. Analisi dei documenti*. Roma.
- HEP01 n.d. *Hispania Epigraphica Online Database*. Universidad de Alcalá de Henares. Online: eda-bea.es (accessed: 20.01.2017).
- LLORENS FORCADA, M. M. 1994. *La ciudad romana de Carthago Nova: las emisiones romanas*. Murcia.
- MARÍN DÍAZ, M. A. 1988. *Emigración, colonización y municipalización en la Hispania republicana*. Granada.
- MEDEROS MARÍN, A., L.A. RUÍZ CABRERO 2004. El pecio fenicio del Bajo de la Campana (Murcia, España) y el comercio del marfil norteafricano. *Zephyrus* 57, 263–281.
- MEYER, E.A. 1990. Explaining the epigraphic habit in the Roman Empire: the evidence of epitaphs. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 80, 74–96.
- NOGUERA CELDRÁN, J.M. 2001–2002. Técnicas en la escultura romana: materiales, imprimaciones y coloraciones. A propósito del grupo escultórico de Mazarrón. *Anales de Historia y Arqueología* 17–18, 393–414.
- PENA GIMENO, M.J. 2008. *Consideraciones sobre epigrafía republicana de la Citerior: el caso de Carthago Nova*. In: J. Uroz Sáez, J.M. Noguera Celdrán, F. Coarelli (eds.), *Iberia e Italia: modelos romanos de integración territorial*, 687–710. Murcia.

- PINA POLO, F. 2013. *Generales y clientelas provinciales: ¿qué clientelas?*, In: J. Santos Yanguas, G. Cruz Andreotti, M. Fernández Corral, L. Sánchez Voigt (eds.), *Romanización, fronteras y etnias en la Roma Antigua: el caso hispano*, 55–80. Vitoria.
- SANMARTÍ ACASO, J. 1986. *Inscripciones fenicio-púnicas del sureste hispánico (I)*. In: G. del Olmo Lete, M.E. Aubet Semmler (eds.), *Los Fenicios en la Península Ibérica*, 89–103. Sabadell.
- SNPD 2014. *Standards for networking ancient prosopographies: data and relations in greco-roman names*. Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). Online: snapdrgn.net (accessed: 05.11.2017).
- SOLANA SAÍNZ, J.M. 1989. *Colonización y Municipalización bajo César y Augusto: Hispania Citerior*. In: *Aspectos de la colonización y municipalización de Hispania*, 71–106. Mérida.
- SOLIN, H. 2003. *Die Griechischen Personennamen in Rom : ein Namenbuch*. Berlin.
- STEFANILE, M. 2009. Il lingotto di piombo di Cn. Atellius Cn. f. Miserinus e gli Atellii di Carthago Nova. *Ostraka* 2, 559–565.
- WIEGELS, R. 1985. *Die Tribusinschriften des römischen Hispanien. Ein Katalog*. Berlin.
- WOOLF, G. 1996. Monumental writing and the expansion of Roman society in the Early Empire. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 86, 22–39.



© 2017 by the authors; licensee Editura Universităţii Al. I. Cuza din Iaşi. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons by Attribution (CC-BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).