

Romanization of Spain; socio-political aspect()*

J. B. TSIRKIN

SUMMARY.— Spain on the eve of the Romanization process was far from a uniform whole. Phoenician and Greek colonies were small but very significant cells of a developed slaveowning society. In Southern Spain Tartessis existed for quite a long period and after its desintegration on its remainder sprang up some petty kingdoms. Apart from these, in the South and Southeast of the Iberian Peninsula and, as an exception, in the East in one case, emerged primitive «nome states», city-states consisting of a city centre plus an agricultural area. Besides there were also several communities that still retained a clan society. Some of these societies were about change into states, each in its own specific way. Some Iberian tribes such as the Ilergetes and the Edetani were turning into monarchies on a tribal basis, whereas the Celtiberians were evolving as an aristocratic republic. Other clan and tribal amalgamations in the Indo-European and non-Indo-European zones of the Peninsula as well were more retarded and backward, each to a different extent. The further evolution was to a great extent interrupted by the Roman conquest.

PART I

Romanization is a complex and manifold process including four major aspects. The first is economic Romanization, i.e. the integration of a provincial economy into an imperial one. Secondly, it is social Romanization, i.e. the spreading in the provinces of the social relations of antique slave-owning society in its Roman variety including classical slavery. The third aspect of Romanization is political, i.e. the spreading of Roman citizenship, the superseding of native political institutions by Roman ones, the creation of municipia and colonies in place of local communities, the inclusion of the indigenous population into the political and order system

* Translated from the Russian by L. Chistonogova.

of Rome. And, finally, cultural Romanization implies the expansion of the Latin language and its supplantation of local tongues, the assimilation by the natives of the Roman culture, religion among other things and, generally speaking, of Roman ways of life. In short, Romanization means the incorporation of the provinces and their peoples into an integral system of the Roman state. Romanization was carried out through two complementary channels, namely, a) through the immigration into the provinces of the Roman-Italian people who brought their habitual and familiar institutions and forms of living and b) through the transformation of the local society under the influence of the ruling ethnic.

The history of the Roman provinces is to a considerable extent the process of their Romanization, which fully applies to the Spanish provinces as well. It is not surprising at all that historians and archaeologists, numismatists and philologists alike have paid so close attention to the Romanization of Spain. The works by A. García y Bellido, J. M. Blázquez, A. Tovar, A. Balil and many other researchers have greatly contributed to a successful study of the Spanish Romanization¹. But the problem remains so fathomless that many a generation of historians to come will have to approach it again and again.

In the present paper we propose to dwell specifically on the social and political aspects of this process. Therefore we deem it necessary to study first from this angle the state of the indigenous society on the eve of Romanization.

HISPANIA ON THE THRESHOLD OF ROMANIZATION

Around the turn of the fifth century B.C. Tartessus fell under the onslaughts of the Carthaginians, but the Tartessians' power, having lost its sway over the other ethnics of South Spain, persisted, in our opinion. The Tartessians did not disappear completely from the world political map. Ancient authors more than once mentioned the Tartessians as distinct from Iberians. The Pseudo-Scymnos mentions them twice. The first mention (162-166) probably concerns the previous epoch but the second (198-199) directly refers to the period when the first Carthaginian colonies had emerged on the southern coast of Spain (the latter are mentioned immediately before the former in the text), i.e. not until the close of the sixth century B.C.². The Iberians are mentioned almost side by side with Tartessians. Diodorus (XXV, 10) in his story of Hamilcar's campaign affirms

1. The bibliography on the subject is immense.

2. We have made an attempt to corroborate this date in greater detail in: Ju.B. Tsirkin. The Phoenician Culture in Spain. Moscow, 1976, pp. 29-34 (in Russian); Carthage and Her Culture. Moscow, 1986, pp. 46-47 (in Russian).

that Hamilcar fought the Tartessians and the Iberians. Among the Spanish peoples whose warriors Hannibal had led to Africa, Polybius (III, 33, 9) reports the Tersites, i.e. very same Tartessians³. Silius Italicus (III, 391-405) singles out «the domain of Arganthonios' grandchildren». Livy (XXIII, 26) describes the Tartessians' uprising against the Carthaginians in 216 B.C. Following this event the Tartessians are no more to be found in the sources available; instead of the Tartessians, the accounts are invariably devoted to the Turdetanians and smaller kingdoms that appeared on the Tartessis territory.

In all likelihood neither the initial blow of the Carthaginians nor Hamilcar's conquest could have ended Tartessis as a state subject to Carthage. However, during the decisive battle against Rome the Carthaginians could not afford to suffer so unreliable a subject in their rear and so upon the suppression of the revolt Tartessis as a political entity was eradicated and on its territory a number of insignificant states came into being.

Let us come back to the Tartessian power of the fifth to third centuries B.C. Silius Italicus' list of cities subordinated to Arganthonios' grandchildren gives a certain intimation of its territory. All the cities named by the poet are situated in the Baetis valley and on the extreme southern promontory of the Peninsula. Even during the initial period of Roman domination this region had an individuality all its own. According to Strabo (III, I, 6), the inhabitants of these parts had a vernacular and a script dissimilar to those of other Iberians; they had their own historical writings and versified laws. Up to the midfirst century B.C. the region was to a greater extent under Phoenician impact than other Spanish areas. Its culture is characterized by greater simplicity, it preserved and still practised old traditions and rites dating from the times of Tartessis⁴. This culture has traditionally been discriminated from the orientalizing civilization of Tartessos and is often called the Turdetanian culture.

The comparison of the territory of Tartessis II and the boundaries of Tartessian power shows that the Tartessians seem to have lost not only their dominion over the other tribes of South Spain but also a western part of their own lands including the Odiel valley, the major centre of ore mining and metal-working industry of their kingdom, and the town of Ono-

3. L. Á. García Moreno: Turdetanos, turdulos y tartessios, in: *Anejos de Gerión*, 5, 1989, p. 292.

4. A. García y Bellido: *Les religions orientales dans l'Espagne romaine*. Leiden, 1967, p. 5, 147; K. Raddatz: *Die Schatzfunde der Iberischen Halbinsel*. Berlin, 1969, s. 118-119; A. Vives: *La moneda Hispánica*. Madrid, 1924, t. III, p. 34-37; J. M. Solá Solé: *Miscelánea púnico-hispana III*, in *Sefarad* 25 (1965), p. 33-48; J. M. Blázquez: *Historia del Arte Hispánico. La antigüedad*, I. Madrid, 1978, p. 289-309; A. Ruiz: *Ciudad y territorio en el poblamiento ibérico de Alto Guadalquivir*, en *Los asentamientos ibéricos ante la Romanización*. Madrid, 1987, p. 9. *Historia de España*, 2. Madrid, 1989, pp. 255-268; J. Perina Sieso: *La cerámica ibérica de la cuenca del Guadalquivir*, II, en *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 46 (1989), p. 152-156.

ba in the river's mouth, another important economic zone of Tartessis⁵. This could not but tell on the economy of the Tartessian state in the fifth to third centuries B.C. The Baetis valley was remarkable for its fabulous agricultural wealth; the waters washing the Turdetanian lands provided the fishermen with enormous profits (Strabo III, 2, 4-7). On these riches was based the Turdetanians' and their predecessors' (i.e. Tartessians') prosperity which apparently gave rise to the rumours that the Carthaginians had found silver wine tuns and feeding troughs in the locals' homes (Strabo III, 2, 14). The metal-working industry now was on the decline (Strabo III, 2, 8). The reduction of metal smelting was also to be traced even in the centres still left within the confines of Tartessis, as, for instance, at Cordoba⁶. All this naturally resulted in the predominance of agriculture, especially of the cultivation of cereals and olives, the production of olive oil and cattle-breeding⁷.

We have no evidence of how the agriculture in Tartessis was organized and managed between the fifth and second centuries B.C., although recent research has claimed that private ownership prevailed there⁸. But we know well enough how the pits were worked and metals processed. Diodorus (V, 36, 3) asserts that the prior to the arrival of the Romans the pits were privately worked by individual masters in South Spain. A part of the metal ores must have been processed by the mine-owners then and there, as is the case with the mining settlements of the Odiel valley between the eighth and sixth centuries B.C. but undoubtedly a greater part of the extracted ore was transported to larger centres such as Cordoba in the Middle Baetis valley where the excavations have yielded some traces of metallurgic engineering, true less numerous than in the previous epoch. The same digs however have provided no vestiges of special workshops at Cordoba, thus we can conclude that the metallurgy of the time was a home affair⁹. For all the considerable amounts of native ceramics uncovered by the archaeologists they have failed to spot any potteries; evidently pottery was also a domestic chore.

Archaeological investigations in the Baetis valley have indicated the absence of an abrupt interruption in the evolution of the indigenous peo-

5. A. Blanco, J. M. Luzón, D. Ruiz: Excavaciones arqueológicas en Serro Salomon (Riotinto, Huelva), in *Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla*, ser. Filosofía y Letras 4 (1967); J. M. Blázquez, Poblados y necrópolis indígenas de influencia Semítica, in *Historia de España Antigua*, I, Madrid, 1983, p. 325-331; 339-343.

6. A. Marcos Pons: Localización y conocimiento de la Corduba prerromana, in *Ampurias*, 38-40 (1976-1978), p. 240.

7. J. M. Rodríguez Neila: *Historia de Córdoba*, I. Córdoba, 1988, p. 178-180; *Historia de España*, 2, Madrid, 1989, p. 242-245.

8. A. Ruiz Rodríguez, M. Molino Molinos: Algunas consideraciones para la reconstrucción de las relaciones sociales en los sectores dominantes de la producción económica ibera (agricultura y minería), in *Memorias de historia antigua*, III (1979), p. 149-150.

9. A. Marcos Pons: *Op. cit.*, pp. 420-421.

ple of South Spain at the turn of the fifth century B.C. The native cultures, the Turdetanian one included, —all the changes brought about by the new circumstances notwithstanding— were a fluent and natural continuation of the preceding ones¹⁰. It follows that the Tartessos state that had existed in the Baetis valley from the fifth to third centuries B.C. was but a direct descendant and successor to Tartessis, only on a sharply reduced scale.

The principal cell of this state was towns too. Silius Italicus (III, 391-405) named six cities, they are: Castulo¹¹, Corduba, Hispalis, Nabrisa, Hasta and Carteia. Thanks to numerous accounts by ancient authors and archaeological finds, though, it is well known that the territory under consideration had by far more cities to its credit. It looks as if in Tartessis there existed some sort of hierarchy of towns and those ones pointed out by Silius Italicus were obviously the capitals of areas where subordinated settlements were sited. This also looks like a heritage of the earlier times, suffice it to recall the distribution of the «plebs» among seven cities, reportedly initiated by the Tartessian king Habis (Iust. XLIV, 4, 13).

Among the Tartessian cities of this period stands out Hasta that had according to Pliny (III, 11) an epithet «Royal» (Regia). Some scholars were quick to recognize it as the sought city of Tartessos¹². Even if their belief is faulty (is it not as yet to be supported by archaeological evidence) at any rate Hasta was surely an ancient city, the likely residence of a local ruler¹³. Perched on a hill over the eastern extremity of the Lower Baetis floodlands, Hasta sprang into being as early as the Late Neolithic. Hasta carried on trade with the Phoenician town of Gades close at hand and was perhaps the first post of the Gaditan commerce in the Baetis valley. The finds —scanty as these may be— of Greek and South Italian ceramics alongside Phoenician wares testify to a wide scope of Hasta's trading operations in the fourth to second centuries B.C.¹⁴. Hasta's affluence may be amply illustrated by a treasure trove found near Evora; the treasures have been dated to a vast span of time between the sixth to third centuries B.C.¹⁵.

To Hasta belonged an urban area (ager Astensis) mentioned by Livy

10. M. Pellicer Catalán. *Problemática general de los inicios de la iberización en Andalucía Occidental*, in *Ampurias* 38-40 (1976-1978), pp. 11-21.

11. Castulo belonged to the Oretani, not the Turdetanians: J. M. Blázquez. *Cástulo I*. Madrid, 1975, pp. 12-20. The poet must be wrong. Or, perhaps, during the troubled times on the eve of Punic War II the Tartessians indeed managed to establishid for a while their control over Castulo.

12. M. Esteve Guerrero: *Asta Regia: una ciudad tartésica*, in *Tartessos*. Barcelona, 1969, p. 111.

13. T. Mommsen: *Bemerkungen zum Dekret des Paulus*, in *Hermes* 3 (1869), s. 265.

14. M. Esteve Guerrero: *Op. cit.*, pp. 114-118; M. Pellicer Catalán. *Siedlungsplätze in der orientalisierenden Epoche an Unteren Guadalquivir*, in *Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie*, 8 (1981), 37-39, 44-45.

15. M. Pellicer Catalán: *Siedlungsplätze...*, s. 44.

(XXXIX, 21). The area must be rather large, it included Lascuta (Turrís Lascutana) where in the year 189 B.C. Hasta slaves were billeted because Lascuta was quite far from Hasta (cf. Plin. III, 11, 15)¹⁶. During the Roman conquest Hasta put up a stiff resistance to the Romans so that the Roman military leader Aemilius Paullus was compelled to set his slaves free in order to cause damage to the besieged¹⁷, and some time later the Roman praetor was slain at the city walls (Liv. XXXIX, 21).

Cordoba too was an important city. Like Hasta it also lay on a hill. Over a kilometer long and 300 m. wide, it was one of the largest pre-Roman settlements in the Iberian Peninsula. Situated at a meeting place of land roads and the river, this city was a significant centre of agriculture, cattle-breeding and copper smelting from the ores transported from the nearby pits¹⁸. Summing up, Cordoba was the heart of a sizable region. Hispalis seems to be a major city too. Ships could reach it up the Baetis river¹⁹. The density of archaeological sites around Hispalis is absolutely unheard-of in South Spain. The archaeological strata here date back to the second millennium B.C. to Roman times²⁰.

The digs at modern Lebrija (more likely than not it coincides with ancient Nabrisa) have testified to a considerable antiquity of the town existed throughout the first millennium B.C.²¹. Pliny (III, 11) assures us that Nabrisa had a second name Veneria. Needless to say Venus here should not be confused with the Roman goddess. Surely it is a local deity. Most probably this is a female goddess of fertility whose cult was wide spread in the South and whose representations in the shape of a woman sitting on a throne were often encountered at various sites of the region²². Nabrisa proves to have been a notable centre of worship of this divinity identified by the Romans with their goddess Venus.

Beyond any doubt Carteia existed long before the advent of the Romans. It was a port of considerable size and importance in the year 206 B.C. Carteia was made the base of the Roman Navy during the combat with the Carthaginian fleet (Liv. XXVIII, 30-31). In the third century B.C. it was already a sizable settlement. True, archaeological evidence pertaining to the levels of the previous century is lacking²³, but some indirect

16. It must be pointed out that the issue of the identity of Lascuta and Tower awaits its ultimate solution. Some researches hold that these are different towns: L. A. García Moreno. Sobre el decreto de Paulo Emilio y la «Turrís Lascutana» (CIL II, 5041), in *Epigrafía hispánica de época romana-republicana*, p. 204.

17. A.V. Mishulin: On the interpretation of Aemilius Paullus' inscription, in *Izvestia AN SSSR*, 1946, pp. 166-169, 178-184 (in Russian).

18. A. Marcos Pons: *Op. cit.*, p. 418-422; R. C. Knapp: *Roman Cordoba*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1983, p. 4-8; J. F. Rodríguez Neila: *Op. cit.*, p. 166-169, 178-184.

19. A. Schulten, *Hispalis*, in *RE*, 16 (1913), Sp. 1964).

20. M. Pellicer Catalán: *Siedlungsplätze...*, s. 49-51.

21. *Ibid.*, S. 47-48.

22. J. M. Blázquez. *Religiones Prerromanas*. Madrid, 1983, pp. 140-144.

23. D. E. Woods: *Carteia and Tartessos*, in *Tartessos*, Barcelona, 1969, pp. 252-256.

considerations lead us to infer the importance and antiquity of Carteia. There existed an opinion cited by Pliny (III, 7) and Appian (Hisp. 63) that this was precisely the location of the mysterious Tartessos. Despite a glaring groundlessness of this opinion it is clear that it could have been prompted by the fame and renown of Carteia as a wealthy and ancient city. The geographical position of the city was extremely favourable; it was very good for ships to moor and in the Roman period Carteia was a major fishing centre (Strabo III, 2, 78; Plin. IX, 89; XXXI, 94). From the end of the seventh century and towards the start of the fifth century B.C. there existed a small Phoenician settlement on the site²⁴. It is not at all impossible that the Turdetanian city had some kind of connections with the former²⁵. It is hardly accidental that it was Carteia where the Romans had first deduced their Latin colony outside Italy (Liv. XLIII, 3).

To sum up, we have all the reasons to regard the cities enumerated by Silius Italicus as ancient cities playing a substantial role in the South of Spain. They all were important centres of economic or religious life and affected the surrounding territory. They all stem from the times of Tartessian power. This explains why they endured as the basic cells of «new» Tartessus as well.

But, as has been previously stated, there were other towns as well, such as Turba (Liv. XXIII, 44), Ascua (Liv. XXIII, 27), Turta (FHA III, p. 189). A. Schulten considered the latter (with a slim ground, though) to be the Turdetanian capital²⁶. The existence of other towns seems beyond a doubt. Plutarch (Aem. 4) attributed to L. Aemilius Paullus a peaceful submission of 250 towns. The figure is undoubtedly exaggerated but it can give an inkling of the impressive number of Turdetanian towns. Their presence is archaeologically evidenced. For instance, among the settlements situated around Cordoba some were quite big and could be easily regarded as towns²⁷. These towns were evidently in subjection to the five cities Silius Italicus told us about but we have no knowledge of either the nature or the form of their subordination.

Either the threat of incursions from the Meseta or dread of social upheavals urged the inhabitants of the Baetis valley and the surrounding districts to construct towerlike fortifications that stood guard over the major trading routes and the wealthiest agrarian areas (Liv. XXII, 19, 6; Bel. Hisp. V, 2-3)²⁸. In antiquity the construction of these fortresses was ascri-

24. H. Schubart: Phönizische Niederlassungen an Iberischen Südküste, in Phönizier im Westen. Mainz am Rhein, 1982, s. 213.

25. Doctor H. Schubart has recently advanced a thesis that Carteia may have been founded by the Phoenicians who had abandoned their settlement near by devastated by a natural cataclysm. We extend our gratitude to Dr. H. Schubart for this valuable information.

26. Fontes Hispaniae Antiquae III. Barcelona, 1935, p. 190.

27. J. F. Rodríguez Neila. Op. cit., p. 169.

28. F. Presedo. Organización política y social de los iberos, in Historia de España antigua, t. I. Madrid, 1983, p. 188; A. Ruiz Rodríguez: Las clases dominantes en la formación social ibérica del

bed to Hannibal (Plin. II, 181) but modern investigations have dated them back to 400 to 200 B.C. A specimen of such bulwarks was probably *Turris Lascutana* mentioned in the most ancient Latin inscription unearthed in Spain (CIL II, 5041) and dated from 198 B.C. The inscription, as is commonly known, contains the decree of L. Aemilius Paullus according to which the Hasta slaves who dwelt in the tower were proclaimed to be free people who could keep and dispose of the town and the field currently is their possession as they saw fit as long as the Roman people and the Senate willed it.

Some historians have arrived at the conclusion that this was a variety of collective slavery similar to helotry, whereas J. Mangas maintains that all other towers were also inhabited by the people subjected to the citizens of other more significant cities²⁹. Other scholars believe that we have to deal here with specific forms of dependence peculiar to Carthage and spread in the zone of Carthaginian influence in South Spain³⁰. We would like to offer a different interpretation of the decree that seems to us more plausible. In the wake of some momentous event (say, an uprising) the Hasta slaves (note, the slaves of individual slave-owners, not of the community) gathered at Lascuta first having captured it; the Roman commander who was waging a warfare with Hasta (cf. Liv. XXXIX, 21) by way of rewardint them for their assistance confirmed their right to possess the town and the land. If the slaves who occupied Lascuta Tower had been legitimate owners of the town and the land there would have been no necessity to sanction their privilege.

An analogy may be drawn to the agreement of the Romans with Viriatus (App. Hisp. 69): the Lusitanians were granted the right to own the lands they had already taken hold of in the course of the hostilities by the time treaty was signed. It is of little consequence indeed, that the treaty was never actually observed. The text of the decree deals in plain words not only with the town and the land but also with the emancipation of the slaves. The decree leaves no doubt that all concessions were conditioned by Rome's will and could be any moment revoked. As we see it, it proves that the decree was not at all meant to confirm the slaves's right of property in the town and the land; its message was, in our opinion, to improve the slave's social status and to affirm their property in what was already theirs (*ea tempestate possidissent*). An oblique observation to strengthen our view. Lascuta Tower as well as her sister towers was rather a formida-

Sur de la Península Ibérica, en *Memorias de historia antigua*, I (1977), p. 143; J. Mangas. *Servidumbre comunitaria de la Bética prerromana*, *ibid.*, p. 156; P. F. Lacort Navarro: *Cereales en Hispania Ulterior: silos de época ibero-romana en la Campiña de Córdoba*, in *Habis* 16 (1985), p. 376; J. F. Rodríguez Neila. *Op. cit.*, pp. 169-172.

29. A.V. Mishulin. *Ancient Spain*. Moscow, 1952, p. 220 (in Russian); J. Mangas. *Op. cit.*, p. 156-158.

30. L. A. García Moreno. *Op. cit.*, p. 214-217.

ble fortress. It is hardly likely that such strong bulwarks could be at the same time slave's dwelling places: a situation like this would have always been fraught with danger and menace to their masters. For this reason we assert that we have no evidence of «communal slavery» in South Spain (certainly it does not apriori mean that such form of slavery never existed in general).

It has already been pointed out in the historical science that these towers were very much like those erected by the Carthaginians in Africa, in Sicily and Sardinia with the purpose of defending the frontiers³¹. The purpose of the Spanish towers (no matter who built them) was most likely the same. They must have protected either the borders (like a series of fortifications in the North of the modern province of Cordoba) or economically prominent territories (perhaps this was the role assigned for Lascuta). At the same time the connection of such strongholds with the rural areas was specially manifest from both the decree of Paullus and the mention of Livy (XXXIV, 19) «ex agris castellis».

Coming back to the decree, it should be noted that it certified the presence of slaves in South Spain at the time immediately before the Roman conquest. The excavations have attested that among the population of this region there were there groups singled out: the nobility, the commoners and the slaves³². Iustinus (XLIV, 4, 13) holds that in «old» Tartessis there were also common people whom the historian named «the plebs» and those who performed «servile services». The continuity of Tartessian and Turdetanian societies has already been recognized in the present article. In this respect particularly note-worthy is Strabo's assertion (III,1,6) that some of Turdetanian ancient laws went back to the Tartessian epoch. The preservation of old juridical norms of necessity implies the preservation of ancient social practiques. Therefore we can insist with good reasons that between the fifth and the third centuries B.C. too we may single out slaves whose existence is unambiguously attested by Paulius' decree, and the «plebs». The «plebeians» must have been first and foremost producers of material values: they tilled the land, reared the cattle and went in for handicrafts on a domestic scale³³. Who were those «private persons» who, according to Diodorus (V, 36,3), exploited the mines, remains unknown. Were they «plebeians» or aristocrats? The amount of the finds of sculptures with their representations, of ornate sepulchres, of rich treasure troves and magnificent jewellery admits no doubt as to the existence of the aristocrats and their substantial wealth³⁴. Judging by the sculptures depicting priest

31. F. Jordá; J. M. Blázquez: Op. cit., p. 306-307.

32. F. Presedo: Pueblos ibéricos, in Historia de España antigua, t. 2; pp. 163-166.

33. A. Ruiz Rodríguez; M. Molinos Molinos: Op. cit., p. 150-153.

34. F. Jordá; J. M. Blázquez: Op. cit., pp. 292-296, 307-308; J. F. Rodríguez Neila. Op. cit., p. 185.

and priestesses, the presence of the priestly nobility cannot be ruled out either³⁵.

The endurance of the old laws bears witness to the endurance of the old political system, i.e. monarchy, too. Should Silius Italicus' narration about «Arganthonios' grandchildren» be taken literally, the survival of the ancient dynasty must be admitted as a matter of fact. However his problem proves to be a very hard nut to crack nowadays. The point is that in the sources devoted to the second half of the third century B.C. Tartessian kings are nowhere to be found. Arauricus and Phorcys who led, as Silius Italicus (III, 402-403) writes, the Tartessian army, were not kings, but «leaders» (duces). The name «Arauricus» is unquestionably Celtic. «The leaders of the Celts» was the title of Istolatius who was at the head of the Tartessians in their war against Hamilcar (Diod. XXV, 10). Chalbus, the commander of the last revolt of the Tartessians, was named by Livy (XXIII, 26, 6) «the noble leader of the Tartessians» (nobilis dux Tartessorum). Monarchs seem to have appeared on the historical scene in this region only after the final and decisive destruction of Tartessis.

This state of affairs may be explained by the following hypothesis. The Tartessian state was a complex political structure, the king in his royal capacity never performed the duties of a military commander and delegated them to another person. This could be the chief of the mercenaries. Livy (XXXIV, 17) notes that the Turdetanians were thought to be the least bellicose of other Hispanic peoples. On the whole, his view does not correspond to the historical reality as we know quite enough about bloody and arduous fightings of the Romans in Turdetania. Evidently, this view stemmed from the good use the Turdetanians had for their mercenaries. Celts (Diod. XXV, 10) and Celtiberians (Liv. XXXIV, 17) alike could have served as mercenaries.

Following the ultimate fall of Tartessis there emerged on its territory a number of fairly insignificant kingdoms whose political structure got inevitably simplified and their kings began to take on themselves military functions too, as is instanced by Culchas, or Kolichas, as Polybius (XXI, 11, 13) calls him, who controlled in 206 B.C. 28 towns (Liv. XXIII, 13, 3) and in 197 B.C. —17 towns (Liv. XXXIII, 21, 6). His domain was somewhere in Turdetania, most probably— in the valley of the Baetis. The kingdom of another monarch —Luxinius— lay in the middle of the valley: he owned Carmona and Bardo (Liv. XXXIII, 21, 6). In South Spain were the kingdoms of Attenes who had rather many people in his power (Liv. XXVIII, 15,4) and of Corribilo, the ruler of Licabrum (Liv. XXXV, 22,5)³⁶ and, maybe, of other towns as well. Those kingdoms were not so very small af-

35. F. Jordá; J. M. Blázquez: Op. cit., pp. 304-305; F. Presedo. El arte ibérico, en Historia de España antigua, t. I, pp. 260-262.

36. F. Presedo: Organización política y social..., p. 185-186.

ter all though they were, of course, smaller than Tartessis even in its reduced dimensions. More than one town found themselves under the sway of Culchas and Luxinius. Corribilor is described by Livy as a «noble king» (*nobilis rex*) and Attenes is reported by the same source to have come over to the Romans with vast numbers of soldiers.

These states came into being under the complicated conditions of Punic War II and the military and political circumstances favoured their development. Polybius (XXI,II,3) mentioned Kolichas (Culchas) besides an Ilergete, Indibil by name, and a Numidian Masinissa as an example of people who from the obscurity of being insignificant and causal dynasts rose to be made kings. We are well informed of the fate of Masinissa who managed to establish himself as ruler in Numidia with Scipio's aid. Indibil was also closely linked with Scipio. Apparently with the assistance of the selfsame Scipio Culchas must have strengthened his position too. The Celtic name of Culchas, as well as the name of the other king —Luxinius— enables us to suppose that they both were originally chiefs of the Celtic or Celtiberian mercenaries³⁷. This fact in its turn could cast some light on the formation of new states in place of the totally disintegrated Tartessis. Sometimes (as was precisely the case with Culchas and Luxinius) the chiefs of mercenary bands might have seized power in this or that region and then making the most of the struggle of the two powers for supremacy in the Iberian Peninsula they expanded it. The Romans used such aid to the native dynasties as a mighty weapon against the Carthaginians. No wonder that, when the latter had been ousted from Spain, the Romans dispossessed Culchas of eleven towns.

As we have seen, under the king's authority there were the towns that may have persisted as the principal cells of those smaller states too. But the evidence as regards their role in the warfare is absent. For instance, a heavy battle occurred near Carmona between the Romans and the Carthaginians; from Appian's account (*Hisp.* 25, 27), though, it is not clear whether the residents of Carmona took any part in it at all. At the later time, too, when Carmona joined in the revolt against the Romans, it acted as a subject town of king Luxinius rather than a sovereign unit (*Liv.* XX-XIII, 21, 6). Obviously these towns had no authority of their own, they were entirely subordinate to royal power.

As for the kings they were active in diplomatic and military affairs. Livy (XXVIII, 13, 3) states that Culchas promised (perhaps in exchange for the aid in the consolidating of his personal power) to provide Scipio with infantrymen and cavalrymen. The Roman author uses the term «*conscripturus*». It spells a compulsory, forced enrolment of Culchas's subjects into his army. It follows that the king's authority was quite substantial: he was neither a sacred king nor a tribal chief, but a real sovereign. The army

37. L. A. García Moreno: *Hispaniae tumultus*, in *Polis I* (1989), p. 88.

he recruited comprised 300 infantrymen and 500 cavalrymen (Polyb. XI, 20). We cannot know how strong this force was in terms of the region at the close of the third and the start of the second centuries B.C. Diodorus (XXV, 10) recounts that Hamilcar, having murdered Istolaius, his brother and «all the rest» enlisted the remaining 3000 warriors into his army. It shows that the Tartessian army numerically exceeded Culchas' troops but to what extent remains unknown.

In the course of the second disintegration of Tartessis some towns independent of the kings must have evolved, as, for instance, Hasta. At the beginning of the second century B.C. this city offered the Romans a very stubborn resistance (Liv. XXXIV, 2). No kings are registered to have participated in the campaign. The city acted as a self-dependent entity and, consequently, it formed part of no big state.

Thus the development of South Spain perhaps may be reconstructed as follows. After the abortive clash with the Carthaginians at the close of the sixth or at the start of the fifth century B.C. Tartessis collapsed and its remainders fell under Carthaginian control³⁸. Under Carthage's sway this «new» Tartessis enjoyed considerable autonomy because normally the Carthaginians refrained from interfering into the inner affairs of their «charges» unless provoked to³⁹. During Punic War I or rather during the Libyan War the Tartessians shook off Carthage's yoke so that Hamilcar was obliged to restore (ἀνέτατο) Carthage's supremacy (Polyb. II, 1, 5). In this «new» Turdetanian Tartessis many of the former customs and usages persisted. In the socio-political aspect it was the continuation of the same early class society and state that had existed between the eighth and the sixth centuries B.C. though it was smaller in size. Economically the state was slightly different: the role of the mineral mining and metallurgy in Turdetania noticeably decreased. In 216 B.C. the Tartessians again rose up against the Carthaginians and the latter delivered Tartessis the final devastating blow.

This unstable situation was taken advantage of by the Romans who in the course of Punic War II supported some local rulers, consolidated their authority and gave them a chance to create their own states, as in instances by Culchas. Other kingdoms, though, could have emerged without the Romans' mediation. At the same time some cities such as Hasta must have become independent and turned into sovereign cities with fairly vast

38. The Carthaginians' rule in South Spain before Punic War I is testified by Polybius (1, 10, 5). This explains why many researches have adopted —with this or that reservation— the idea of the Punic supremacy in South Spain (A. Schuten. *Tartessos*. Hamburg, 1950, s. 72-73). However, some scholars have of late resolutely refuted this statement on the strength of archaeological evidence (A. Blanco Freijeiro. *El problema de Tartessos*, in *Actas del II congreso español de estudios clásicos*. Madrid, 1964, pp. 588-589). But the arguments in favour of the negation of Punic domination (above all, the absence of Carthaginian pottery in the Baetis valley and of Iberian pottery in Carthage) seem unconvincing.

39. S. Gsell. *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*, t. II. Paris, 1928, p. 313.

agrarian areas under their control. Having driven the Carthaginians out of South Spain, the Romans themselves set to capturing the region. They radically reduced the terrain of Culchas who in return revolted against Rome but suffered a defeat and lost his kingdom. Suppressed was also the multiny of the king Luxinius, defeated was Coribilo, crushed was Hasta's resistance. A Latin colony was deduced to Carteia. The territory of former Tartessis got incorporated into the Roman province of Hispania Ulterior.

The disintegration of Tartessis resulted in the break-away of the eastern territories. But some of the structures that had originated way back within the framework of the vaster Tartessian kingdom must have survived for a while. The native heirs of the Tartessian rulers were obviously the people buried in the graves adorned with ornate tombstones bearing zoomorphic pictures like those discovered at Pozo Moro. Such monuments are found to have been spread over a limited area and dated to the end of the sixth-fifth centuries B.C.⁴⁰. At a later period the majority of them disappeared or transformed into simpler and plainer ones. The same is true about Gaul where splendid «princely graves» similar to that of a «dame of Vix» became a thing of the past, too⁴¹. This signifies a victory of the aristocratic element over the monarchic one rather than democratization of the Celtic social system. The aristocratic nature of the Celtic society in Gaul is clearly discernible from Caesar's description: We believe it may be thought that liquidation or at least the lessening of the monarchic component of a social set-up is a salient feature of the Iberian society in Southeast Spain too.

The Iberian civilization took a long time to form; it expanded gradually on an enormous territory approximately from Gibraltar to the Pyrenees and at one time it stretched as far as Rhodanus, under the impact of various factors including Phoenicio-Punic and Hellenic influence⁴². The varied conditions of life of the Iberian peoples determined and shaped the differences in their social development. The general pattern on the eve of the Roman conquest seems rather diverse.

Towns constitute one of the system's elements. Perhaps the majority of those towns may be best described as proto-towns⁴³ but we better leave alone this much-disputed problem which still awaits its solution. These towns (or prototowns) were, as a rule, laid out on hills, they were well fortified. Normally they were not big in size, although some were quite large;

40. F. Chapa Brunet: La escultura ibérica zoomorfa. Madrid, 1985; passim; M. Almagro Gorgea: Pozo Moro, in *MM*, 24 (1983), p. 235, 264-265; J. A. Santos Velasco. Análisis sobre la transición a una sociedad estatal en la cuenca media de Segura en época ibérica, in *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 46 (1980), pp. 140-141.

41. J. Filip. The Celtic Civilization and Its Heritage. Prague, 1961, p. 26-48 (in Russian).

42. Simposi internacional els orígens del món iberic, in *Ampurias* 38-40 (1976-1978); J. M. Blázquez: Las raíces clásicas de la cultura ibérica, in *AEArq* 52 (1979), p. 141-165.

43. P. Rouillard: Urbanisme et la vie publique dans l'Espagne préromaine, VI-IV. s. av. J.C., in *Los asentamientos ibéricos ante la Romanización*. Madrid, 1987, p. 37-41.

in the South they were usually larger than in the East and Northeast of Spain. They were filled with comparatively small houses scattered in disorder, with no luxurious dwellings as yet. Besides such townlets there were also fortified posts almost as big as the former but peopled only from time to time, obviously at hazardous moments⁴⁴. Those must be the castles (*castella*) mentioned by the ancient authors (such as Livy XXXIV, II: 16) in their accounts of military campaigns in the Peninsula. The very presence of such fortified shelters for the neighbouring folks presupposes the existence of unfortified settlements and villages whose inhabitants found refuge behind their walls. The existence of villages is borne out by Strabo (III,4,13) who points out the absence of towns outside the coastal strip of the Mediterranean (however it should be noted that the Greek geographer means the whole of Iberia, i.e. Hispania).

Certain cities became with time autonomous units, as, for instance, Astapa in the South of Spain outside the remnants of Tartessian power. Both Livy (XXVIII,22.2) and Appian (*Hispania*, 33) testify that this city defended the Carthaginians with might and main and remained faithful to them even when all the surrounding area had already taken the Romans' side. The residents of Astapa preferred to perish and to destroy all their belongings rather than to surrender to discretion. This city can hardly be considered a polis in the true sense of the term⁴⁵ but its independence is beyond doubt. Judging from Livy's description all matters at Astapa were decided together by all city dwellers (he does not mention any officials, the more so officials appointed from without); there was a square in the town where the residents brought before the decisive battle their property, wives and the children.

On the Bastetanian terrain Orongis was most probably a similar community. Due to Livy (XXVIII, 3, 2-13) it is known that the city had its disposal some area with fields and mines. These possessions formed the foundation of the city's prosperity, Livy called it the richest town. Here, as well as at Astapa, was a square where evidently the citizens used to gather too. On the other hand, Livy stresses that Orongis was situated on the lands of the Maesses who in their turn were one of the Bastetanian peoples. Describing Spain at a much later time Pliny (III,4,9) mentions the town of Mentesa (*Mentesa Bastetanorum*). Towards the end of the third century B.C. Orongis was possibly in the sphere of Mentesa's (or Maessa's) influence or even it was the latter's subject. When Scipio stormed Orongis though, neither Mentesa nor other Bastetanian communities came in a hurry to its rescue. Whether the explanation of the event is to be

44. A. Arribas: *The Iberians*, London, 1974, pp. 97-115; F. Presedo: *Los pueblos ibéricos*, p. 157-163; M. Almagro Gorbea: *El área superficial de las poblaciones ibéricas*, en *Los asentamientos...*, pp. 24-31; J. A. Santos Velasco: *Op. cit.*, p. 131.

45. A. Ruiz Rodríguez: *Las clases dominantes...*, p. 145.

sought in the concrete march of the military operations or in the looseness of bonds between the Bastetanian communities is impossible to say.

Self-dependent and rather active was Castulo of the Oretani in the Upper Baetis, as is manifest from its conduct in the course of the Second Punic War when it changed sides allying first with the Carthaginians and then with the Romans and vice versa (Liv XXIV, 41.7; XXVI, 26.6; XXVIII, 19, 1-2; App. Hisp. 16). Livy calls this city «valida et nobilis». In order to cement his ties with the Iberians Hannibal wisely married a woman of Castulo (Liv. XXIV, 41.7). The wealth of the city was based on cultivation, stock-raising and metallurgy⁴⁶. The basis of the Castulonians' metallurgy were rich silver and lead mines in the neighbourhood (Strabo III, 2, 10-11) such as the renowned shaft of Baebelo which supplied Hannibal when he became its master, with more than three hundred pounds of silver a day (Plin. XXXIII, 97)⁴⁷. Artisans' workshops were clustered in a special part of Castulo⁴⁸ apparently the artisans has already formed a separate social group. This city carried on an extensive external trade too⁴⁹. Its foremost contractors before the advent to the Romans were more likely than not the Carthaginians through whose agency the Castulo nobility got Greek commodities, profuse Greek ceramics among them⁵⁰.

In Eastern Spain an independent city was Saguntum. It was a significant centre that even prior to Hannibal's assaults in the year 219 B.C. struck its own coins with the Iberian legend⁵¹. It must have traded actively with the Greeks and maybe with the Italics as well. Livy (XXI, 7, 3) among the treasures of Saguntum lists the produce of earth that bears witness to the existence of agricultural area. The city's vast agrarian possessions (chora) are also attested by Polybius (III, 17). This city was so outstanding and unlike its Iberian neighbours that the antique authors considered Saguntum a Greek colony (Strabo III, 4, 6; App. Hisp. 6) and Livy adds to the Hellenes of Zakynthos as the founders of Saguntum as the wealthiest town southward of the Ebro and opposes the Saguntians to the Spaniards. However nowadays its native origin seems out of the question⁵².

Livy's story (XXI, 7-15) of the siege and capture of Saguntum by Hannibal permits us to infer the general outline of the city's government. The community was headed by a praetor as Livy designates him after the Latin fashion. He was approached with a suggestion of a disgraceful peace

46. J. M. Blázquez, M. P. García-Gelabert. El iberismo en la ciudad de Cástulo, in *Los asentamientos...*, p. 47.

47. J. M. Blázquez, *Cástulo I*. Madrid, 1975, p. 23.

48. J. M. Blázquez, M. P. García-Gelabert, *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

49. J. M. Blázquez, *Castulo I*, p. 309.

50. J. M. Blázquez, M. P. García-Gelabert, *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

51. A. Arribas, *Op. cit.*, p. 128; F. Presedo, *Economía ibérica en Historia de España antigua*, t. I, p. 176; P.P. Ripollés Alegre: *La circulación monetaria en la Tarraconense mediterránea*. Valencia, 1982, p. 265.

52. F. Presedo: *Los pueblos ibéricos*, p. 161.

by a certain Alorcus who was simultaneously a *xenos* of Saguntum and warrior of Hannibal. But to pass singlehanded a crucial decision on which the city's life and death depended, was denied to the praetor. He convened a Senate which adopted the final decision in the presence of the people. Livy writes about «*populi concilium*», consequently it was not an unruly crowd of accidentally congregated citizens but a sort of popular assembly. The citizens constituted an important but passive body since the final say rested after all with the «Senate», that is, an aristocratic council. According to Zonaras (VIII, 21) or to be more exact, to Dio Cassius, the councillors assembled not in the square but in the acropolis. For all the unanimity of the ancient authors who admired the Saguntians' unity and courage when they opted to die rather than to betray the Romans and violate the pact with them, there may have been some discord among the nobility. In this respect suspicious is the act of Alco who deserted to Hannibal in the hope if Livy is to be trusted, of entreating him to conclude a more honourable peace pact but on learning the Carthaginian commander's adamant nature he turned a traitor. It is quite possible that this act expressed the pro-Carthaginian position of some noblemen of Saguntum.

Such cities as Saguntum or Astapa were in all likelihood the early city-states, consisting of a city proper and some area around it that were akin to «*nomos-states*» of Ancient Orient⁵³. However such city-states were sparse. Perhaps in the Southeast of the Peninsula they were numerous (owing to the influence of Tartessian heritage) but in the East Saguntum was the only exception to the general rule⁵⁴. Worthy of note is the fact that Livy in his description of Hannibal's wars in Spain (XXI, 5) enumerates some tribes (of the Olcades, of the Vaccaei, of the Carpetani) and the Saguntians, so that Saguntum seems to be ranked alongside the ethnics. It is clear that in most cases a tribe was the basic unit in the Iberian's life.

The towns situated on the tribal territories never acted on their own. We have the knowledge of only one independent action of theirs in 195 B.C. Cato demanded that the cities demolish their walls; for this purpose he sent to the cities express letters that were to be opened by his order on one and the same day (Liv. XXXIV, 17; App. *Hisp.* 41; Plut. Cato 10). But this event is easy to explain: for Cato it was imperative that the Iberian towns should have no time or chance to contact each other or higher tribal authorities and so they should act at their own discretion.

Social stratification in the Iberian tribes was already marked. Excavations at the necropolis bear witness to the existence of sometimes three groups, on other occasions of four differing groups. On the one hand there were primitive hollows in the earth with an extremely modest inventory.

53. History of the Ancient World. Early Antiquity. Moscow, 1989, pp. 40-41, 48-49 (in Russian).

54. P. Rouillard. *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

on the other -burial chambers under tumuli in which apart from local wares frequent were the objects manufactured by Greek and Phoenician artisans, especially vessels, a great part of which served as funerary urns. Between these poles there were comparatively plain graves of the «middle» stratum. In such cemeteries as those of Tutugi or El Cigarralejo these groups occupied different zones and were separated visibly from each other⁵⁵. This is to prove that the social differentiation of the society was already there to stay, the social groups were recognized not only *de facto* but also *de jure*.

People buried in the simplest cavities belonged most probably to the subordinate stratum, though we are in no position to state whether they were slaves in the proper meaning of the word or clients analogous to those whom Caesar had found and described in Gaul. The extant tradition ascribes the assassination of Hasdrubal to a slave who revenged his master's execution (Liv. XXI, 2, 6; App. Hisp. 8; Iust. XLIV, 5, 5). It can't be ruled out, though, that here Graeco-Roman ideas were applied to Spanish material. A considerable amount of the «slaves», tombs plus their placement in the same cemeteries side by side with other peoples' graves speak in favour of clientele rather than of true slavery.

The «middle stratum» were in all probability free members of society. It must be noted that some of their graves contained the weapons while the others contained none. In some places, as in necropoleis of Baza and El Cagarralejo, for instance, both types of graves are to be found in the same cemetery⁵⁶, while in others they are placed in different cemeteries. Thus the necropoleis of El Molar and Albuferreta situated near one another differ from each other in one respect: the former has weapons in its graves, the later has not⁵⁷. The free Iberians —at any rate in the southern part of the Iberian world— were apparently of two types: first, the armed people, and second, those who had no right to wear weapons, namely craftsmen, or farmers, or fishermen. Quite a considerable quantities of graves with weapons⁵⁸ among their grave goods do not point to professional bands. Diodorus (XXI, 10) mentions a 50000-strong Iberian detachment of Indortes who fought Hamilcar. It goes without saying that such an army could have been but tribal militia which enlisted nonetheless not

55. F. Presedo: Los pueblos ibéricos, 163-170; J. M. Blázquez; M. P. García-Gelabert: La necrópolis en «El Estaca de Robarinar». Cástulo, in APL 17 (1987), pp. 177-193; M. Almagro Gorgea: Pozo Moro, pp. 278-281; J. A. Santos Velasco: Análisis social de la necrópolis ibérica de El Cigarralejo y otros contextos funerarios de su entorno, in AEARq 62 (1989), p. 78-79, 90.

56. F. Presedo: Los pueblos ibéricos, pp. 65-166; J. A. Santos Velasco. Análisis social... p. 76, 86, 91-92.

57. S. Nordström: La céramique peinte ibérique de la province d'Alicante, I. Stockholm, 1969, pp. 31-32.

58. Cf.: M. P. García-Gelabert, J. M. Blázquez: El armamento de las necrópolis ibéricas de la Alta Andalucía, in Historia 16 (1989), pp. 105-107, 110-112; J. M. Santos Velasco. Análisis social... p. 91-92.

all adult males of the tribe but only a certain though quite formidable part of them. The Iberian vase-painting shows war scenes with warriors on foot and on horse back engaged in a combat. Often infantrymen are depicted as following a cavalryman. Votive statuettes found at the sanctuaries of Southeastern Spain also represent warriors both mounted and unmounted⁵⁹. Bearing in mind that in a «barbaric» society a horse was regarded as a nobleman's prerogative we may safely assume that footmen were free commoners and the horsemen the aristocrats.

The Iberian aristocrats are more than once recorded by ancient authors. Hamilcar was confronted by kings and «other mighty people» (App. *Hisp.* 5). Over 300 noblest Spaniards were mentioned by Livy (XXIV, 48, 7). Brief mentions of senators, elders, princepses occur many times in the descriptions of wars in the Iberian Peninsula. They all bespeak an active role of the nobility in the affairs of the community. Its organ was the council whose role was impressive. It was the members of such councils (senators, in Roman terminology) who were summoned in 195 B.C. by Cato in order to carry out his intention to raze all city walls (Liv. XXXIV, 17). The council could operate in concert with the monarch rendering him all sorts of services, as was instanced by the Illyrian king Indibil, but sometimes it could oppose the monarch: such was the story of Indibil's brother Mandonius who upon his brother's death was betrayed to the Romans by the members of the Illyrian council (Liv. XXIX, 3, 4).

The above episode of Mandonius' betrayal clearly shows that the aristocracy and the monarch constituted specific elements of the Iberian society. The fact that the royal family was distinguished from the other tribesmen is plain from Polybius' account of how the Edetan king Edecon had deserted to the Romans (X, 34). The historian underlines that it was not only the king who misbehaved but also his friends and relatives Polybius is reticent about the whole community's desertion to the Roman. Taking into account the phraseology of Hellenistic times we may decipher Edecon's «friends» as his courtiers, or to be more exact, his band⁶⁰.

The existence of monarchical institutions in the Iberian society is beyond all doubt. Describing the wars against the Iberians the antique authors frequently use the terms kings (*reges*, βασιλείες), kinglets (*reguli*), lords and sovereigns (*δυνασταί*). Alas, this terminology is too vague and indefinite, on the strength of these terms it is impossible to specify the powers, authority and sovereignty of the monarch⁶¹, but it is worthy of note that almost all these terms are connected precisely with South and East

59. A. García y Bellido: *El arte ibérico*, en *Ars Hispaniae*, I. Madrid, 1947, p. 219; F. Presedo: *Organización política y social...*, pp. 205-209.

60. Modern researches emphatically point out that the pact with Scipio bound him alone, the whole of Edecon's community had nothing to do with the treaty.

61. Cf.: A. V. Mishulin: *Ancient Spain*. Moscow, 1952, pp. 192-193 (in Russian).

Spain. As regards the Celtiberians, kings are mentioned only thrice, all these contexts are highly ambiguous and, as we shall see further, not quite accurate. In this connection very interesting are the terms used by Appian. Two times does he use the monarch's titles: in the narration about Hamilcar's death —the word «kings» (Hisp. 5) and in the phrase about the Ilergeti's chief Indibil— the word «dynast» (Hisp. 37), whereas the terms are never to be found in the accounts of the wars outside the South and East of the Iberian Peninsula.

The ancient authors regard Indibil as a monarch. True, his name is usually accompanied by his brother's name Mandonius, but the account of the events leaves us in no doubt as to who of the two played first fiddle: Livy (XXII, 21, 3) calls Indibil unequivocally the king of the Ilergeti; the other brother comes into the force after his brother's death only for a short while and with no success. Polybius (III, 76, 1) calls Indibil the Carthaginians' ally. In this case he uses the term «military leader», a bit farther —«king» (X, 18) and «dynast» (X, 35)⁶². And later, in 195 B.C. there was only one king of the Ilergeti— Bilistages (Liv. XXXIV, II). So there is no ground whatever to speak about a diarchy in the tribe.

Indibil as well as other Iberian monarchs is listed in the sources as a military commander or «a minister of foreign affairs». As we see it, it is to be explained by the sources' nature since they primarily deal with wars or diplomatic negotiations of the aborigines with the Carthaginians or Romans, the internal affairs of the tribes and communities seldom being their subject-matter. These brief passages on the «home policies» chiefly concern the matters of the succession to power which is undeniably a fixed prerogative of one kin. When Indibil was no more his brother immediately summoned his council in the capacity of the king, there is no evidence available as to an election of a new ruler: Mandonius acts with assurance and authority as the late king's brother, and consequently, as a new sovereign. After the death of the community of Iba's head his successor was his son, but the new chief's cousin would not stand it and the ensuing dispute between the contenders was settled in a combat (Liv. XXVIII, 21, 5-9). One thing seems conspicuous about this event: one of the rivals was the other's senior but this other was the deceased chief's son. Their combat was in fact a clash of two principles —the ancient, tribal principle, in accordance with which power was vested in the senior member of the family came into collision with a new hereditary principle according to which a father was succeeded on the throne by his son.

Thus the Iberian society had long since disposed of its original tribal equality. There were different social groups to be observed there. Merce-

62. The change in the terms as likely as not reflected the historical realities: between 218 and 209 B.C. the might and authority of Indibil grew and the Romans proved highly instrumental in this process.

naries were another pointer to its disintegration. Evidently part of the impoverished tribesmen, perhaps led by some aristocrats, who had found it for some reason or other impossible to stay on at home, became freelancers. They are mentioned already by Thucydides (VI, 90) who thought them to be the best soldiers of all barbarians. According to Dioidorus (XX, 71), Dionisius sent an Iberian contingent in 369 B.C. as far as to Sparta. Iberian warriors are more than once recorded in a Carthaginian army⁶³.

The crust of the society was the nobility, the society was governed by a monarch in concert with the aristocratic council. These two powers normally must have acted in full agreement but they also could come in conflict. In the latter case the king was not authorized to impose his will either on the whole tribe, as Edecon did upon the Edetani, or on the nobility, as Mandonius on the members of the Ilergete council. In some cases the king may perhaps have been a sacred figure as the name «Edecon» implies (it more or less coincides with the name of the tribe).

This is true, however, not about the whole of Iberian society. It was not always kings or princeps that the Roman and Carthaginians had to deal with. More often than not, especially in the northern zone, the conquerors' contractors were entire tribes and the Ilergetes who lived also in the North were certainly an exception. For instance, in 195 B.C. Cato had his dealings with Bilistages, king of the Ilergetes (Liv. XXXIV, 11), and the tribes of this region —Sedetani, Ausetani, Suessetani, Lacetani (Liv. XXXV, 20)—. The archaeological excavations in the Middle Hiberus have testified to the absence of clear traces of the class stratification in the period prior to the Roman conquest⁶⁴. The process of the disintegration of the tribal system was less rapid in this area.

Thus, Iberian society cannot be regarded as a single whole, an entity. Here it is already possible to single out «nome states» such as Astapa, Orongis, Castulo and Saguntum. A number of other Iberian «populi» might have more or less reached the stage when a late tribal society could turn into a tribal state. The Ilergetes must have approached this landmark before the Edetani. The process of the formation of a new society took longer in the Middle Hiberus and in small ethnic groups between the Hiberus and the Pyrenees. The further evolution was interrupted by the Roman conquest.

Among the peoples of inside Hispania stood out the Celtiberians populating the eastern Meseta and mostly the right bank Middle Hiberus. Pliny (III, 26) makes mention of four «populi» of the Celtiberians. The

63. F. Presedo: Organización política y social... p. 201-203; M. P. García-Gelabert, J. M. Blázquez: Mercenarios hispanos en los fuentes y en la arqueología, in *Habis* 18-19 (1986-1987), p. 258-260. True, the last-named authors believe the Celtiberians to have been the mercenary but in more ancient times they were plainly Iberians.

64. A. Beltrán: Problemática general de la iberización en el valle de Ebro, in *Ampurias* 38-40 (1976-1978), pp. 199-201.

selfsame four Celtiberian tribes are recorded by Strabo (III, 4, 13). Since in different sources (e.g. in Appian) different tribes are sometimes listed as Celtiberians modern scholars are inclined to believe that there were five Celtiberian tribes: the Arevaci and the Pelendones, inhabiting the so-called Celtiberia Ulterior, and the Tittos, the Lusones and the Bellos dwelling in the so-called Celtiberia Citerior⁶⁵.

The tribes could be headed by the chiefs. Ancient authors call them either «dux» (Flor. I, 33, 13; 34. II; 13) or στρατηγός (App. Hisp. 44, 45, 50 and others). Only once Livy (XXXV, 7, 6) mentions the king Hilernus when speaking about the allied troops of the Vaccaei, Vectones and Celtiberians. But what matters most is not so much their ancient names as their real functions. First and foremost, they are elected and, it must be stressed for a specific, purely military purpose. For instance, when the war against the Romans broke out, the Arevaci, Bellos and Tittos gathered together in Numantia and elected Karos their leader (App. Hisp. 45). Despite the fact that the election took place in Numantia, the town of Arevaci, and the residents of Segeda, the town of Bellos, acted as petitioners, it was a man from Segeda who was chosen a leader because he was, as Appian writes, the most experienced and skilled in the warfare. The decisive factor was his military expertise, not his origin, so it is impossible to treat him as a monarch. Karos was a valorous warrior and too, and active part in the battle where he was slain; after his death again new chiefs were elected — Ambon and Leucon who were in no way related to Karos (App. Hisp. 46). Later on came the fore other chiefs unrelated with their predecessors. Detailed as Appian's account may be, the chiefs' names are seldom given by him and as a rule only once. All this indicates limited and short-lived functions of the chosen leaders.

Chiefs were elected at the assemblies. At an assembly like these the Arevaci as well as other Celtiberians voted for Karos. After the latter's death, Appian relates, the Arevaci without delay during the same night congregated at Numantia and chose (ἤρουντο) Ambon and Leucon their military generals. Assemblies could decide other important issues as well. Diodorus (XXXI, 42) asserts that the Arevaci discussed the problem of war against Rome at an assembly and that it was the people (πλῆθος) that took the decision about the war.

As a single whole, however, a Celtiberian tribe, to say nothing of a union of tribes, acted only in exceptional cases. On the tribe's territories there were various towns: the Lusones had the towns of Contrebia, Nertobriga, Bilbilis, Complaga; the Arevaci had Clunia, Termantia, Uxama, Segontia, Numantia, Contrebia Leucada, Aregada and other towns; the Be-

65. F. Wattenberg: Los problemas de la cultura celtibérica, in I Symposium de prehistoria peninsular. Pamplona, 1960, p. 153-154; F. J. Lomas. Pueblos celtas en la Península Ibérica, in: Historia de España antigua, t. I, pp. 83-90; Historia de España, 2, p. 47.

llos possessed Segeda, Arcobriga, Attac, Ocilis, Segobriga and Contrebia Belesca⁶⁶. Besides these towns the sources also mention fortified fortresses (castella) and unfortified villages (vici, κωμῆαι) (Liv. XL, 33; 47; XXXV, 22, 5; App. Hisp. 77; Strab. III, 4, 13). The unfortified villages were small and housed some 50-100 persons⁶⁷. They may be evidently considered to be clan settlements, whereas towns were more densely populated. Their population reached several thousands of people: so, Numantia had about 8000 residents, Termantia 6500 people⁶⁸. These towns were centres where a number of clans united. For instance, among the citizens of Contrebia Belesca one can find representatives of at least ten clans⁶⁹.

These communities precisely were in fact real socio-political units. Thus, absolutely autonomous were Complega, Segeda, Numantia, Ocilis, Nertobriga and Palantia (App. Hisp. 44-50; 55). To these towns were subordinated smaller townlets and also perhaps castles and villages⁷⁰. We know, for instance, that the Numantians had their garrisons stationed in a small town of Malia (App. Hisp. 77). Following the Roman conquest similar communities became the principal cells of the Roman administrative system⁷¹. By way of comparison it must be pointed out that in Gaul whole tribes became such basic cells.

Information on the administration of the communities is to be found in the Latin inscription from Contrebia Belesca (A.é., 1979, 377) which bears an exact date: May 15, 87 B.C. when all indigenous institutions still persisted intact, and also in Celtiberian inscriptions from the same town⁷². At the head of the community was a senate, i.e. town council. It had judicial powers. In other towns by the senate's order coins were struck and pacts concluded⁷³ and it is unlikely that in Contrebia its powers were less significant.

The executive powers were exercised by six magistrates headed by a praetor (his vernacular title is unknown to us). They all belonged to different clans. In all likelihood each of them either represented his clan or

66. F. Wattenberg. *Op. cit.*, p. 154.

67. A. Schulten *Keltiberer*, in *RE*, Hbd. 21, Sp. 153.

68. F. Wattenberg. *Op. cit.*, p. 155; A. Montenegro Duque. *Historia de España*, t.I. Madrid, 1972; *Historia de España*, 2, p. 445.

69. A.é. 1979, 377; M. Lejeune: *La grande inscription celtibère de Botorita*, in *CRAI*, 1973, pp. 622-647; M. L. Albertos Firmit: *Organisaciones suprafamiliares en la Hispania antigua*, in *BSAA* 45-46 (1975), p. 15.

70. J. Rodríguez Blanco: *Relación campo-ciudad y organización social en la Celtiberia Ulterior*, in *Memorias de historia antigua*, I (1977), p. 173-175; *Historia de España*, 1, pp. 419-420, 442-444.

71. Cf.: E. Ortiz de Urbino. *Aspectos de la evolución de la estructura indígena del grupo de población Autrigón en la época prerromana y altoimperial*, in *Congreso de Historia de Euskal Herria*, t. I. Vitoria-Gasteiz, 1988, p. 169.

72. M. Lejeune. *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

73. H. Galsterer. *Untersuchungen zum römischen Städtewesen auf der Iberischen Halbinsel*. Berlin, 1971, s. 53.

was elected by his clan at the popular assembly. As no less than ten clans lived in this town it is plain that not all of them could be simultaneously represented through magistrates. Representatives of one clan could not apparently occupy two offices at a time. Praetor and magistrates were at the same time the community's eponyms since the date of the Latin inscription is indicated not only by the official Roman date but also by the local one: «when this matter was considered, the Contrebia magistrates were...» (A.é., 1979, 377, 15-18).

This evidence permits to bear out the information of the narrative tradition. Thus, a council is to be found at Belgeda (App. Hisp. 100). In other places were the elders who in all probability were members of the council. Diodorus (XXXI, 9) gives us the name of one of the elders at Belgeda (Segeda) —Kakyros. More likely than not, it is Karos whom we have already mentioned earlier— the one chosen to lead the joint army at Numantia. If it is a fact then it becomes clear that the Celtiberians had to elect their leaders from among the elders. Evidently, Numantia's magistrates were the archons recorded by Plutarch (Tib. Grac. 6) who enjoyed *vas* authority in the city. Livy (XL, 49) supplies a unique evidence of a monarchic title in connection with the Celtiberians: «*regulus*» Turrus whose children were taken captives by the Romans in the town of Alce. Perhaps, a praetor is meant in this context.

The fundamental cell of the organization of the Celtiberians was a clan community, *gentilitas*⁷⁴ which entered the network of the town communities. Some scores of mentions of such *gentilitates* have come down to us⁷⁵. In most texts the name of the *gentilitas* stands between the person's first name and his patronymic which bears witness to a greater significance of a clan bond than that of a family. In women's names too the husband's name stands after the *gentilitas*' name⁷⁶. True we do not know whether the husband's clan or his wife's clan is mentioned in this case. The *gentilitates* may have been headed by the princeps (CIL II, 5763; A.é. 1946, 121, 122) but it cannot be ruled out that the office itself came into being well after the Roman conquest.

Thus, the Celtiberian society had preserved the basic traits of the tribal society, but the tribal equality of antiquity was already a thing of the past. On the one hand, in the ancient society the nobility became very conspicuous. Undeniably noble by birth was Allucius whom Livy (XXVI, 50, 2) called the Celtiberians' princeps. «Outstanding leaders» were, according to Diodorus (XXV, 10), Indortes and Istolatus and their companions-in-

74. Historia de España, 2, p. 441.

75. M. L. Albertos Firmat: Op. cit., pp. 9-31. The inscriptions in which *gentilitates* were mentioned are mostly Latin: it is obvious that this is a local, pre-Roman institution. In Celtic inscriptions the *gentilitates*' names are used in Genitivus Pluralis where as in Roman ones the gentilic name (*nomen*) is always used in Latin Nominativus Singularis.

76. Ibid., p. 14, n. 81.

arms who sided with the Tartessians in their war against Hamilcar. The nobles of Alce are mentioned by Livy (XL, 49). Valerius Maximus (III, 2, 21) considers a certain Pyrresus the most remarkable of all the Celtiberians in noblesse and worth. A Numantian aristocrat was Rhetogenes nicknamed Karaunios (App. Hisp. 94). Florus (I, 34, 15) calls the last Numantian chief Rhoecogenes. It is selfsame Rhetogenes. From all this we can infer that supreme power in the society belonged to the aristocrats: They even lived in special quarters of the town (Val. Max. III, 2, 7).

The aristocracy possessed also most riches and wealth in the community. Almost all necropoleis had rich and poor graves but the latter out-numbered the former; for example, in the necropolis Miraveche containing over a hundre of graves there were only 17 rich tombs. The same is true about other necropoleis. Poor tombs had usually only an urn with the ashes, a knife and a fibula, rich graves contained also some weapons⁷⁷. This is a pointer that the nobility monopolized the armouries and prevented the commoners from taking part in wars under normal conditions. It was only under extreme conditions when it was a matter of freedom or enthralment, of life or death of the whole community that all the population of the place joined in the battle, as was the case in Numantia when it was besieged by the Romans.

Among the Celtiberians as well as the Spanish Celts in general, there were no priests like the Druids beyond the Pyrenees. Yet the aristocrats were certain that they were immediately conected with heavenly forces. So, according to Florus (I, 33, 13-14) the Celtiberian chief Olindicus shook his spear with a silver tip, allegedly received by him from heaven. Well-known is a mystical faith the Celtiberians pinned on Sertorius believing him to be connected throught his white fallow-deer with the deities. Evidently the Celtiberians regarded the mutinous Roman general as the heir of the ancient indigenous aristocracy.

On the other hand, however, there were in the Celtiberian society dependent people. Onomastic studies of the Roman period have demonstrated that amont the Celtiberians there were descendants of the so-called *ambacti*⁷⁸. Ennius wrote and Festus cited him (p. 4) that «ambactus» was the Celtic for «a slave». Another group of «slaves» was *doiderii*⁷⁹. Most probably, slaves were those servants who followed Rhetogenes and his friends during the sally from Numantia (App. Hisp. 94). Those were appa-

77. W. Schüle: Die Mesta-Kulturen der Iberischen Halbinsel. Berlin, 1969. s. 78-80.

78. M. Sevilla: *Ambactes en la epigrafía hispánica*, in *Memorias de historia antigua*, I (1977), pp. 163-165.

79. *Ibid.*; J. Santos: *Contribución al estudio de los restos de formas de dependencia en el área céltica en época romana*, in *Memorias de historia antigua*, 2 (1978), pp. 137-143. True, recently an opinion has been advanced that *ambacti* and *doiderii* have no relation with the pre-Roman social units (E. Ortiz de Urbino. *Op. cit.*, p. 168). However, the disproof notwithstanding, we certainly find the arguments by M. Sevilla and J. Santos incontrovertible.

rently the menials or armourbearers. The very word «ambactus» meaning «one who is around» and the ambacti's functions with the transpyrenean Celts⁸⁰ plainly indicate that here a military suite is meant. Those were unfree persons made use of primarily during a wartime. The translation of Ennius is silent about their similarity with Roman slaves, it just speaks about an unfree status of these people. There is no evidence as to whether such «slaves» were exploited in agriculture or industry.

Still another group of Celtiberian subordinate people were clients. Such clients were brought by Allucius to Scipio (Liv. XXVI, 50, 14). J. M. Blázquez maintains that Rhetogenes' five friends were also actually clients⁸¹. This is quite possible if we take into account that in Cisalpine Gaul Celtic clients formed a sort of association (Polyb. II, 17, 12) as evidently did the Gauls too (Caes. *Bel. Gal.* VI, 30, 3)⁸². Some noblemen had quite a few clients. For example, Allucius rallied from among his clients 1500 horsemen and took them to serve Scipio. It shows that clients as well as ambacti participated in the aristocracy's military campaigns. The only difference between ambacti and clients seems to be in their social status —the former were unfree whereas the latter enjoyed the official position of free members of their society.

Clients must be evidently distinguished from a specific group of people tied with their chief. These are people who dedicated themselves to somebody and who died together with their patron. Strabo (III, 4, 18) and Sallust (in *Serv. Georg.* 4, 218) contend that this was the Celtiberians' custom. It has been believed that such *devoti* were Rhetogenes' companions-in-arms who, as Florus relates (I, 34, 13-15), made a sally in order to perish but after the sally those who survived destroyed themselves, their relations and the city «by the sword, poison and arson»⁸³. What was the source of such people and why did they form closer alliances with their patrons than common clients? This is not yet known. Could they have been mainly foreigners for whom this sort of relations was the only social link possible?

After the loss of independence client relations persisted. The Celtiberians' patron was Sertorius⁸⁴. In this capacity he lavishly disposed of silver and gold, he provided his warriors with all necessary things, he met their wishes (Plut. *Sert.* 14). This, it seems, throws some light on the client —patron relations which were not unilateral, but mutual, very similar to those among the Gauls (Caes. *Bel. Gal.* VI, 11-14). Clients obeyed their su-

80. N. S. Shirokova. The Institution of Clientele in the Ancient Celts, in *On the Socio-Political Organization and Ideology of Antique Society*. Leningrad, 1984, p. 146-147 (in Russian).

81. J. M. Blázquez: El legado indoeuropeo en la Hispania Romana, in *I Symposium de prehistoria peninsular*, p. 30.

82. N. S. Shirokova: *Op. cit.*, p. 147.

83. A. Prieto Araniega: La devotio ibérica como forma de dependencia en la Hispania prerromana, in *Memorias de historia antigua*, 2 (1978), p. 132.

84. *Ibid.*

perior, took part in his wars and the patron reciprocated with generous gifts. The patron's repudiation of his obligations could result in the discontinuation of client ties, as is illustrated by the event when some Celtiberians started to oppose Sertorius because his military commanders began to levy, allegedly by Sertorius's order, heavy duties and severe penalties (Plut. Sert. 25). And yet their client bonds with Sertorius finally came to their end only upon the latter's death.

Thus, in the Celtiberian society there were two distinct poles: clan aristocrats versus different categories of dependent people. The two poles were closely bound with one another. Of their ambacti, clients and «devoti» the aristocrats made up their military bands, as, for instance, did Allucius at the end of the third century B.C. and Sertorius in the first century B.C. With such troops they could fight not only in the homeland but also on the side of foreigners as, for example, Allucius in Scipio's service. Ancient literature and archaeological researches are very rich in evidence of Celtiberian mercenaries in the service of the Tartessians, other Hispanics, Cathaginians and Romans⁸⁵.

Archaeological excavations have testified to the existence in Celtiberia of a vast section of free people, not involved in the client—patron links and exempt from military obligations in normal peaceful times⁸⁶, which determined their subordinate position in society. Most likely these people were chief toilers and producers—peasants and artisans. Celtiberian craftsmen must have been wandering ones, similar to their counterparts in Homer's Greece⁸⁷.

The Celtiberians' relations with the outer world were regulated above all by two institutions, namely mercenaries and hospitality (hospitium). Of course both institutions were not alien to many other peoples especially those standing on the same or close rungs of social development. But in Spain Diodorus especially underlines the hospitable disposition of the Celtiberians (V; 34, I): they are gracious and kind with their guest and they even compete with each other in hospitality because they thought that those who entertained guests, were favoured by gods. The last phrase (θεοφιλεῖς ἡγοῦνται) implies that the hospitality institution received some sacred outward expression. It is also attested by a the extant tesserae made in the shape of either sacred animals (that leaves no doubt whatever as to a sacred nature of the rite) or of clasped hand and bearing inscriptions in the Celtic language but in Iberian script (as the Celts, the Celtiberians included, had no script of their own) and later also by Latin inscriptions⁸⁸. In the absence of international and interethnic law the custom of hospitality

85. M. P. García-Gelabert, J. M. Blázquez: *Mercenarios...* p. 260-269.

86. W. Schüle: *Op. cit.*, S. 79.

87. *Historia de España*, 2, pp. 435-438.

88. J. M. Blázquez: *El legado indoeuropeo...* p. 338-340; F. J. Lomas: *Instituciones indoeuropeas*, in *Historia de España antigua* t. I, pp. 113-117.

secured and guaranteed an intercourse between different communities and peoples.

The customs of hospitality and mercenary service promoted the necessary contacts the Celtiberians could not do without. From Diodorus (V, 35) we know that the Celtiberians bought wines from overseas traders (probably, due to the mediation of the littoral Iberians). The influence of the neighbouring Iberians is to be detected in the adoption by the Celtiberians of *falcata*, in some women's ornaments such as fibulae and belt buckles and the script⁸⁹. At the same time no traces of Greek or Phoenician imports in pre-Roman Celtiberia have come to light yet, which undeniably proves that the Celtiberians failed to establish any kind of direct contacts with the world of the classic Mediterranean, the one exception being wars, in the course of which the Celtiberian mercenaries could bring home rich booty. Sometimes the loot could be quite enormous. Strabo (III, 4, 13) assures us that Marcellus managed to get from the Celtiberians an indemnity of 600 talents. The geographer is amazed at the number of talents, the more so that the Celtiberian's lands were not fertile. Naturally such riches could have been amassed only thanks to the participation of Celtiberian warriors in innumerable wars.

So, the Celtiberian society emerged as a late tribal one. The principal unit of social life was a clan collective a *gens a gentilitas* but *gentes* or *gentilitates* made up communities with a town at the head and this very community formed a real framework of the society's organism. Tribes may be regarded rather as unions of such communities. At times, in the face of an imminent disaster such as the Romans' menace, for example, Celtiberian tribes also forged a union. In the society could be discerned the nobility on the one hand and on the other various groups of subordinate populace. Besides these, there were a lot of the free common inhabitants, who after all were not entirely equal with the aristocrats, for they were not allowed to take part in military undertakings, unquestionably more privileged and lucrative.

The Lusitanian society seems more archaic. Although *gentilitates* are but seldom mentioned on the Lusitanian territory, still they bear witness to the clan nature of this ethnic⁹⁰. Pliny writes (IV, 117) that in the Roman province of Lusitania there lived 45 peoples, a considerable number of them were more likely than not Lusitanian «*populi*» proper. An inscription of the year 104 B.C. recently unearthed tells us about one such «*populus*» Seano. In this case the largest settlement obviously dominated over six smaller ones. The chief settlement of Seano itself consisted of houses

89. F. J. Lomas: *Pueblos celtos...*, p. 85; F. Jordá, J. M. Blázquez. *Op. cit.*, pp. 276-286; J. Unterman: *Op. cit.*, S. 84-88.

90. *Historia de España*, t. 2, p. 483.

and fields (*agros et aedificia*)⁹¹. Ancient authors mentioned Lusitanian towns more than once⁹² but in fact the Lusitanians had yet no towns in the proper sense of the word. Evidently what the sources meant were prototowns (*oppida*), castles (*castella*) and unfortified villages (*vici*) (Sall. Hist. 1, 112). Such a «populus» coinciding with the clan association must have been and actual socio-political cell in the Lusitanian society.

The communities were governed by the elders whom Plutarch (Sert. 10) calls archons. For military purposes some communities could enter into more powerful unions led by elective chiefs. Such chiefs were certain Punicus and Kaisaros, his successor but no relation to him as Appian (Hisp. 56) simply writes about «a man Kaisaros by name». It was only once that the Lusitanians were able to form a larger union embracing all their tribes and also several others. This exploit was performed by Viriatus whom Florus (1, 33, 15) called the Romulus of Hispania. Viriatus was elected leader in extreme circumstances (App. Hisp. 61-62) and though he is sometimes designated in the sources as «dynast» (Diod. XXXIII, 1, 3) his authority was primarily based on his enormous personal prestige and was not officially institutioned. No wonder that upon his assassination this confederation immediately fell apart. Diodorus (XXXIII, 1, 5) asserts that the Lusitanians thought Viriatus to be their «benefactor» (*εὐνοργέτης*) and «saviour» (*σωτήρ*). If it is not just a sheer transference on this ethnic of usual Hellenistic notions of a monarch⁹³ one can suppose that the success of Viriatus' military operations gave birth to some religious sanction of his power. However, it must be noted that even so side by side with Viriatus there were special Lusitanian leaders (App. Hisp. 68, 73).

Inside the Lusitanian society property differentiations began to be noticeable. Thus, a wealthiest man was a certain Astolpas who became Viriatus' father-in-law (Diod. XXXIII, 7). We do not know if property differentiations in Lusitania brought about social stratification in the society. But even so the Lusitanian aristocrats were hardly likely to form an isolated stratum as the Celtiberian noblemen did. The stories about Lusitanian's wars carry information on considerable Lusitanian armies, which have been impossible if the chief military forces had been made up of aristocrats' bands. Livy (per. 52) relates that Viriatus had been first a shepherd, later a brigand, a bandit, and finally, a chief⁹⁴. Such a career in an aristocratic society, like the Celtiberian one, was practically impossible and unheard-of.

91. D. Nörr: Aspekte des römischen Völkerrechts. Die Bronzetafel von Alcántara. München, 1989, p. 23, 25-26.

92. F. J. Lomas: Pueblos celtos, pp. 106-107.

93. H. Gundel: Viriatus, in RE, Hbd. 17A, 1961, Sp. 227.

94. There is an opinion that this and other accounts of ancient authors about Viriatus' ignoble origin and career are none other than literary topos and they do not correspond to the real facts (H. Gundel. Op. cit., Sp. 206). But at our disposal we have no data whatever to refute the unanimous antique tradition.

The Lusitanians must have lingered in the period of the so-called «military democracy» and this fact explains their especially bellicose disposition⁹⁵. The Lusitanians had also a custom, in keeping with which young people who had no property but plenty of valour and strength left for inaccessible places and united in bands, became fugitives and outlaws and earned their living by banditry and robbery far and wide outside Lusitania (Diod. V. 34). The custom of the time of the disintegration of clan relations is reminiscent of the Italic «sacred spring»⁹⁶; it was probably one of the major ways for the Lusitanians to spread and settle young and, consequently, most dynamic elements of the Lusitanian society must obviously have formed those detachments that opposed and harried the Romans. They knew no regular clan formation. Appian (Hisp. 68) narrates about the bands of Curius and Apuleius who attacked the army of Servilianus in Lusitania; the author calls the leaders *λήσταιρχοι* (the ringleaders of bandits). In all likelihood, this opposition of the bands to Viriatus' more or less regular troops betrays also different principles of the formation of armed forces.

The peoples of the North-West of the Iberian Peninsula —the Gallaeci, the Asturians and the Cantabri— lived in the clan system. All authors tell us how many small tribes lived there, Mela (III, 15) calls them «populi», Pliny (III, 28)— «populi» or «civitates». Pliny assures us that Asturia had 22 peoples, Cantabria —9 communities and Gallaecia— 40. In the composition of Asturian and Cantabrian tribes, as well as of Celtiberian tribes, remarkable were gentilitates⁹⁷. As in Celtiberia, in this region the membership in these collectives was of greater significance than family ties. Judging by the pacts concluded by the gentilitates with each other already in Roman times, such as the ones between Desoncori and Tridavi (CIL II, 2633), they were autonomous and carried out independent policies. The gentilitates acknowledged the authority of a larger confederation of a tribe, though. For example, the above —mentioned Desoncori and Tridavi were aware of their belonging to the tribe of the Zoels. Strabo (III, 3, 8), Pliny (III, 27), Ptolemy (II, 6)— they all write about tribes. Following the Roman conquest tribes were accepted by the Romans as an administrative unit (like in Gaul).

The Gallaeci had centuriae in place of gentilitates⁹⁸. What a centuria was like is a disputable issue⁹⁹. As we see it, a centuria was a clan organi-

95. C.f.: A. Montenegro Duque: *La conquista de Hispania por Roma*, in *Historia de España*, t. II, I, Madrid, 1982, p. 61.

96. W. Einsenhut: *Ver sacrum*, in *Keine Pauly*, Bd.V, Sp. 1181-1183.

97. M. L. Alberts Firmat: *Op. cit.*, p. 10-13.

98. *Ibid.*, p. 31-33.

99. E. M. Štaerman holds that centuriae were a transitory stage from clans to local communities (E. M. Štaerman. *Morality and Religion of Subordinate Classes in the Roman Empire*. Moscow 1961, pp. 40-41, in Russian). M. L. Albertos Firmat (*Op. cit.*, p. 65) and M. Pastor (*Historia de*

zation like a *gentilitas*. We are informed of a smaller number of *centuriae* than of *gentilitates*. The reason for this is that all mentions of such collectives have come down to us from Latin inscriptions from Roman times. Gallaecia was more Romanized than Asturia and Cantabria were, therefore the indigenous institutions were not numerous. Each clan lived in a village all its own. Scores of such villages —castros— round or oval in shape, situated on tops of hills have been undung by archaeologists¹⁰⁰. Depending on the authority of a clan and their population, the villages varied: the territory of the castro of Briteiros was 3 hectares and it had about 150 houses, the castro of Sabrosa had the territory of one hectare and 40 houses. Since in inscriptions the names of *centuriae* are usually accompanied by the names of the people or the community¹⁰¹, it seems logical to think that the latter were the structural units of Gallaecic society.

The inscriptions are indicative of an undoubtedly patriarchal society, and yet some vestiges of matriarchy were typical for the Cantrabri and, perhaps, for the Asturians. Strabo (II, 4, 18) states that the Cantabrian men gave their wives a dowry, their daughters inherited their property and married off their brothers. Apparently it is connected with the specific nature of their agriculture, for the selfsame Strabo (III, 4, 17) and Iustinus (XLIV, 3, 7) assure us that it was women who tilled the land and engaged in agriculture. But the people mentioned in the *gentilitates* call themselves after their fathers (matronymics are nowhere to be found). Among the known deities of this region very infrequent are matriarchal *Matres*¹⁰². It should be borne in mind besides, that the main branch of rural economy like in Gallaecia was stockraising (Strabo III, 3, 7)¹⁰³ and it was purely men's occupation. Northern tribes had possibly already begun to form a military aristocracy and the deceased of noble kin were heroized in the shape of steeds¹⁰⁴ but the demarcation line ran between the clans rather than inside a clan.

In several regions of Hispania there lived some tribes that were still on even more primitive stages of clan system, as, for example, the Characians dwelling in caves (Plut. Sert. 17).

The picture of the socio-political relations of pre-Roman Spain will be incomplete if we leave out the Phoenicians and Greeks who also lived in

España, t. 2, p. 501) deny the existence of *centuriae* and insist that the sign refers not to *centuriae*, but to *castellas*. F. J. Lomas (Pueblos celtos, p. 103) maintains that the system of *centuriae* reflected a clan system.

100. Historia de España, t. 2, pp. 506-511; F. Jordá Cerdá, Notas sobre la cultura castreña del Noroeste peninsular, in *Memorias de historia antigua*, 6 (1984), pp. 7-9; F. Arias Vilas: La cultura castreña en Galicia, *ibid.*, pp. 16-20.

101. M. L. Albertos Firmat: *Op. cit.*, p. 30-34.

102. Cf.: J. M. Blázquez. *Religiones prerromanas*. Madrid, 1987, pp. 297-298.

103. N. Santos Yanguas: La arqueología castreña y el sector económico agropecuario, in *Memorias de historia antigua* 6 (1984), pp. 44-47.

104. J. M. Blázquez: *Religiones prerromanas*, pp. 269-272.

the Peninsula. The Phoenicians first appeared on the Spanish soil at the close of the second millennium B.C. Their first colony —Gades— was founded, according to the tradition, around 1105 B.C. (Vel. Pat. 1, 2, 3). Although the archaeologists have failed so far to produce convincing material evidence to confirm so high a dating, there are no grounds to deny this unanimous testimony of antique literature. The studies of the Phoenician colonization show that it fell into two stages and the first stage embraced the second half of the twelfth and the first half of the eleventh century B.C. It was within this period that Gades came into being off the Peninsula¹⁰⁵. During the second stage of the colonization the Phoenicians made a number of settlements eastward of Gibraltar. Both in their economic and socio-political aspects. Phoenician colonies and factories were more advanced and progressive. Towards the end of the sixth-beginning of the fifth century B.C. they submitted themselves to Carthage. The Carthaginians too built in Hispani their outposts. Actually, one of them —Ebusus— had been built even earlier, about 663 B.C. (Diod. V. 16, 23). Ebusus, as well as Carthaginian colonies, occupied a comparatively privileged position in Carthaginian power, as it had its own armed forces¹⁰⁶ and struck its own coin. Gades was even officially equalled with Carthage. It also had its own coinage, its navy and a semblance of city militia. Despite its rivalry with the capital city, Gades, like other Phoenician and Carthaginian settlements in Hispania, remained loyal to Carthage when the aborigines betrayed the latter during the First Punic or the Libyan War. In the year 237 B.C. Gades became the base of Hamilcar's campaign against Hispania. As the result of the activities of Hamilcar, Hasdrubal and Hannibal, there emerged a Spanish power of the Barquidae, where after Hannibal's departure his brothers Hasdrubal and Mago reigned. Although officially the authority the Barquidae were vested with was hardly superior to that usually enjoyed by the magistrates at Carthage, they were rather independent in its execution thanks to their close ties with the army, to their substantial contacts with the democratic faction at Carthage itself and, finally, to their particular relationships with the subject population of Hispania¹⁰⁷. We shall dwell on the last mentioned problem in greater detail.

The official equality of Gades and, perhaps, of other Tyrian colonies with Carthage determined and conditioned their relations with the Barquidae. Mago called himself «Gades' ally and friend» (Liv. XXVIII, 37, 1). Apparently such was the nominal position of the military leader as re-

105. Ju.B. Tsirkin. Carthage and its culture. Moscow, 1986, pp. 12-16 (in Russian).

106. It is obvious that only thanks to its armed forces could Ebusus withstand the Romans in 217 B.C. (Liv. XXII, 20, 7-9).

107. Ju. B. Tsirkin. The Barquidae Power in Spain, in *Antique Polis*, Leningrad, 1979, p. 81-92 (in Russian); E.C. González Wagner: *Fenicios y Cartagineses en la Península Ibérica*. Madrid, 1983, pp. 439-478.

gards Gades. During the final stage of the Second Punic War the Carthaginians quartered their garrisons at Gades where they indulged in violence and outrage (Liv. XXVIII, 2, 16; 36, 3). The stationing of the garrison must have caused the Gaditans' particular indignation and they promised to the Romans to surrender both the city and the Carthaginian army (Liv. XXVIII, 30, 14). Evidently prior to the year 207 B.C. there had been no Carthaginian troops at Gades. There is not a piece of evidence concerning any extortions except those registered in the concluding period of the war. The Barquidæ most likely tried not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Tyrians unless provoked to in cases of necessity.

The same holds true, perhaps, of the ancient Carthaginian colonies that were now subject to the Barquidæ's control. Three towns in Spain owe their foundation to the Barquidæ themselves: Akra Leuke originated by Hamilcar (Diod. XXV, 10), Carthago-Nova and a nameless town both built by Hasdrubal (Diod. XXV, 12). The towns sprang into being for they were meant to serve as forts and strongholds where the Barquidæ's troops could be billeted at least in winter time (Diod. XXV, 10; Liv. XXI, 153). But even in summer the citadel at Carthago-Nova housed as many as 1000 or even 10000 soldiers (Polyb. X, 12, 2; App. Hisp. 19). As runs Polybius' account of the fall of Carthago-Nova, the townfolk had not been armed before the Romans' attack, and it was only at the time of the Romans' storm that the garrison commander gave arms to about 2000 most healthy and strong citizens (X, 12-15). The city administration reflected this state of affairs. Nothing is known about the city magistrates. Money coined at Carthago-Nova was not minted by the city but by the Barquidæ themselves¹⁰⁸. The commander of the Carthaginian garrison is called by Polybius (X, 12, 2) τεταγμένος ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως («placed above the city»); this title seems to be the translation of the Punic title «he who is above the city» (§ 1 qrt). It is quite possible that he exercised the same power and control at Carthago-Nova as did the analogous official «he who is above the lands» in the Libyan districts within the Carthaginian state that formed part of Carthage's chora¹⁰⁹. The lands and mines around Carthago-Nova belonged not to the residents but to the state, or rather to its representatives - the Barquidæ. It may be deduced from the fact that after the Roman conquest they passed into the possession of the Roman state (Strabo III, 2, 10; Cic. Agr. 1, 5; 11, 51). On the other hand, we do know that Scipio returned to the town people all their belongings that were spared by the war and plunder (Liv. XXVI, 47, 1). Consequently, the pits and the neighbouring lands were not the townfolk's property and it is only too logical and natural that they passed from the Carthaginian state to the Roman state.

108. J. M. Blázquez: Los Barquidas en la Península Ibérica, in *Historia de España antigua*, pp. 453-454.

109. G. Charles-Picard. L'administration territoriale de Carthage, in *Mélanges offerts à André Pigagnol*, t. 3. Paris, 1966, pp. 1259-1265.

The bulk of the native population of the Barquidae power were local ethnics. The Carthaginians preserved their original socio-political structure but they took hostages (Polyb. III, 98, 1; X, 8, 3; Liv. XXII, 22, 4; XXVI, 47, 4)¹¹⁰. Hispanic towns apparently had no troops billeted in them and only shortly before the end of the war did the military leader of Cartage deploy his army in his communities (Liv. XXVIII, 2.1 6). Prior to this time, notwithstanding the historians' detailed narrations of these events, we fail to come across any mentions of the garrisons. Moreover, the desertion of a number of towns and tribes to the Romans (e.g. Polyb. III, 99, 7; X, 34, 3; Liv. XXIV, 41, 7) could have taken place only when and if these towns had no Carthaginian soldiers quartered in them.

There were some exceptions to these policies. Hannibal ordered that the Saguntians should leave their city and settle where he told them to (Liv. XXI, 12, 5). Following the downfall of Saguntum the general gave his soldiers many citizens as reward for their valiant services; the other residents were just anished from the city (Liv. XXI, 15, 1). As is known, a Punic band was stationed at Saguntum (Polyb. III, 98, 5; Liv. XXIV, 42, 10). The tribe of the Bargusii was «directly» subordinated to the Carthaginians too. As Polybius (III, 35, 4) narrates, after conquering the lands to the North of the Hiberus, Hannibal appointed Hanno chief (ἡγεμόνα) of the whole country and lord (δεσπότην)¹¹¹ of the Bargusii. As we have seen, in the course of the Second Punic War Tartessis was no more.

So cruel a treatment of the Iberians could be accounted for by the military-strategic considerations exclusively. Never before had the Carthaginians displayed similar severity even when provoked by the stubborn resistance by Salmantica or Arbocala (Polyb. III, 14; Polyen VIII, 48). There is no denying, of course, as is the practise of war, that towns were revaged, fields were devastated, enormous loot was plundered, the population was partly taken into captivity, but their victory had never brought about a change in the socio-political structure of the vanquished. A different fate befell, however, Saguntum and the Bargusi. The former was allied with the Romans and Hannibal had reasons to suspect that at any moment it could turn into the Romans' springboard south of the Hiberus. As for the Bargusi, they were the only tribe north of the river who had accorded a hearty welcome to the Roman ambassadors on the eve of the war (Liv. XXI, 19, 7). Hence Hannibal's cruelty. The revolt a Tartessos, a catalyst of the states ruin, also occurred during a tense period of the warfare against Rome (Liv. XXIII, 26).

The Carthaginians surely collected some kind of duty from their sub-

110. Cf.: S. Gsell. *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*, t. 2. Paris, 1928, p. 313; E. C. Gonzalez Wagner. *Op. cit.*, p. 476.

111. The term δεσπότης has in Polybius' accounts various meanings but always designates an omnipotent ruler: A. Mauersberger. *A Polybios-Lexikon*. Berlin, 1956-1966, col. 442-443.

jects¹¹². Polybius (II, 13, 7) remarks that Hannibal imposed money taxes on Altea and other cities that he had captured. According to Livy (XXI, 5, 5), having gathered an abundant booty, Hannibal remitted unpaid taxes. Most probably, such duty was paid not individually, but by the whole community, as was done also in the Carthaginian regions of Sicily¹¹³. Some of the pits were the Carthaginians' property, as, for instance, the mines of Carthago-Nova. Pliny (XXXIII, 96) testifies that the pit at Baebelo brought into Hannibal a daily return of 300 pounds of silver. A daily return bears witness to the fact that Hannibal not just levied taxes on the pit; on the contrary the pit belonged to Hannibal and he was its owner. But we also know that the inhabitants of Orongis continued to extract precious metals from their own pits (Liv. XXVIII, 35).

The proclamation of Hasdrubal a strategos-autocrat vastly contributed to the consolidation and strengthening of the Barquidae's power in the Peninsula (Diod. XXV, 12). It's unknown what Spanish or Punic title was granted to the Carthaginian general by the Spanish chiefs and kinglets. Reporting a similar episode concerning Scipio, Polybius (X, 42, 2-4) and Livy (XXVII, 19, 2) used the word «king» (βασιλεύς, rex). The Sicilian historian preferred to call Hasdrubal a strategus-autocrat. It permits us to conclude that apparently here in Spain, as well as in the Hellenistic world, all diplomatic and military powers were concentrated in the same hands without any radical alteration of the political set-up¹¹⁴. Of course, Diodorus plainly overestimated and exaggerated the unanimity with which all the Iberians proclaimed Hasdrubal their leader and ruler but the historicity of the fact itself is beyond doubt. Evidently the Hispanics had to recognize Hasdrubal; no matter voluntarily or forced, as their supreme chief.

Hasdrubal's recognition by the Iberians must have spread over his successors as well. Having mastered the lands and tribes to the North of the Hiberus, Hannibal appointed Hanno ruler of this territory. Livy (XXI, 231) calls Hanno «praefectus» (to be more precise, the author uses the verb «praefecit»), Polybius (III, 35, 3)-hegemon (ἡγεμών). G. Charles-Picard points out that the Latin title «praefectus» correspond exactly to the Punic title ḥ'1 («he who is above something»)¹¹⁵. This was the name of state officials in the lands directly subordinate to Carthage¹¹⁶. South of the Hiberus there were no Carthaginian praefects in this capacity. True, we hear of a certain Hanno, Mago's praefect (Liv. XXVIII, 30, I), but in

112. S. Gsell. Op. cit., p. 314.

113. W. Enßlin. Der Einfluss Karthagos auf Staatsverwaltung und Wirtschaft der Römer. in Rom und Karthago. Leipzig, 1943, S. 271; I. Sh. Schiffmann. Slavery at Carthago, in Slavery in the Periphery of Antique World. Leningrad, 1968, p. 248 (in Russian).

114. H. Bengtson: Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Bd. I, I. München, 1937, S. 6-9.

115. G. Charles-Picard. Op. cit., p. 1258.

116. Ibid., p. 1258-1259, 1265.

this context «praefect» is a Latin rank of an officer in command of a small detachment. We are given to understand, that the Spaniards living North of the Hiberus, unlike their southern compatriots, refused to acknowledge the Carthaginian general as their supreme sovereign and that was the reason why Hannibal was obliged to try and organize the administration of the region in the Libyan manner. In the South of the country that measure was superfluous.

The announcement of Hasdrubal «strategus-autocrat» gave an impetus to the formation of a new kind of relationship between the Carthaginian commander and the indigenes (now he is their own chief), which no doubt greatly benefited by the marriages of Hasdrubal and Hannibal to their Spanish wives (Diod. XXV, 12; Liv. XXIV, 41, 7). Diodorus eloquently connects the two events: «When he took an Iberian king's daughter to his wife then all the Iberians acclaimed him their strategus - autocrat». These marriages as it were incorporated the Carthaginians into the community.

When the Barquidae became sovereign chiefs of the Hispanic subject of their power, the position of the indigenous soldiers in their army noticeably changed too. Previously the Hispanics had served in the Carthaginian army as mercenaries, as, for instance, during the First Punic War (Polyb. I, 17, 4). Now the situation became different. In Livy's description of the battle on the Hiberus (XXIII, 29, 4) in 215 B.C. the Spaniards placed in the army's centre are sharply contrasted to the mercenaries on the left flank. The same may be discerned from the fact that on the eve of the war the Spanish warriors were sent to Libya and the Libyans to Spain (Polyb. III, 33, 8-9; Liv. XXI, II-13). Evidently, from that time onwards, the position of the Spanish and Libyan warriors was identical¹¹⁷. Polybius's catalogue of the peoples sent to Africa by the Punic general may give an idea of those Hispanics who acknowledged Hannibal as their chief: the Tersiti (Tartesiensians), the Iberians proper, the Mastieni, the Olcades, the Oretes (Oretani), i. e. all the ethnics who lived in the South and South-East of Hispania. Among them the Carthaginians conscripted their soldiers, as did, for instance, another Hannibal in 206 B.C. (Liv. XXVIII, 12, 13).

In both hostile armies the Celtiberians served as mercenaries, while the Ilergetes —as their allies (Polyb. III, 76, 6). This mirrors the different relations the Barquidae maintained with various sections of native population for some of them they were only employers, for others— their allies, for still others —their supreme chiefs, for others— lords and masters. In the capacity of strategus-autocrats the Barquidae functioned in foreign affairs as the protectors of their subjects. For example, the conflict between the Saguntians and the Turdetanians (or Turboleti) subordinated to Cart-

117. O. Meltzer. *Geschichte der Karthager*. Bd. II. Berlin, 1896. S. 503; S. Gsell. *Op. cit.*, p. 313-314.

hage (no matter that the conflict was provoked and instigated by Hannibal himself) was used later by the Carthaginian general as an opportune ground to besiege Saguntum (Polyb. III, 15, 8; Liv. XXI, 13, 5; App. *Hisp.* 10).

Having described Hasdrubal's marriage and his proclamation a strategus-autocrat. Diodorus goes on to narrate that as the result of these (ὄθεν) Hasdrubal founded Carthago-Nova and another town. Carthago-Nova was situated on the lands of the Mastieni who among other tribes recognized the Carthaginian as their strategus-autocrat. The new social status most likely permitted the Punic general to control and dispose of the lands of the subject tribes. True, we must not forget that even before Hasdrubal Hamilcar had founded Akra-Leuke, but the ancient authors emphatically distinguish between the two commanders pointing out that Hamilcar resorted to crude force whereas Hasdrubal's weapon was diplomacy (Polyb. III, 36,2)¹¹⁸. Obviously, Hamilcar's act was an unambiguous manifestation of the right of the strong whereas that of his son-in-law stemmed from his new status of the head of the union.

Summing up, in Hispania there emerged and existed within thirty years (half this time, however, saw a continuous warfare against Rome and a decline) a new political entity whose salient feature was a strong authority of the ruler supported by the army and considerable sections of the native population; the very authority largely resting upon an act of a conquest. Besides, the Barquidae beginning with Hasdrubal too, pains to win over the local people both the Phoenicians and the Spaniards. They minted coins stamped with Melqart, so adored and venerated in Iberia (and half so much at Carthage itself), although under the guise of this god they depicted themselves¹¹⁹. With the same aim in view Hasdrubal and Hannibal married Iberian wives¹²⁰, and Hasdrubal had declared himself strategus autocrat. All this makes the power of the Barquidae resemble the Hellenistic monarchies of the Eastern Mediterranean. The fact that the Barquidae minted coins after Hellenistic pattern and that some coins were stamped with allegedly Hasdrubal's profile crowned with a royal diadem¹²¹, suggests that the Barquidae were well aware of their likeness with diadochs. However, there is a significant difference between the Barquidae power and the Hellenistic states: the former emerged within the framework of the Carthaginian republic and legally was subject to the central administration, and this subordination grew more real and pronoun-

118. E. C. González Wagner. *Op. cit.*, p. 403.

119. J. M. Blázquez: *Los Barquidas...*, p. 433-454; *idem*. Consideraciones históricas en torno a los supuestos retratos barquidas en las monedas cartaginesas, in *Numisma* 26 (1976), p. 3-12; H. H. Scullard. *Scipio Africanus: soldier and politician*. London, 1970, pp. 252-253; R. Marchetti. *Historie économique et monétaire de la deuxième guerre punique*. Bruxelles, 1971, pp. 369-371.

120. E. C. González Wagner. *Op. cit.*, p. 449.

121. *Historia de España*, t. 2, p. 150; G. et C. Charles-Picard. *La vie cotidienne à Carthage au temps d'Hannibal*. Paris, 1958, p. 211.

ced eventually as the Barquidae's army began to lose battles one after another.

The power of the Barquidae was an important event in the political history of Iberia. It was an enormous state whose territory surpassed that of Tartessus at its hey-day. Within the framework of this confederation there shaped up complicated relationships between the rulers and the ruled. It is quite possible to imagine that the further evolution of Hispania could have taken the road of «punization» and development of relations typical of Hellenistic society. But the power of the Barquidae fell and the formation of antique society in the Peninsula followed the road of Romanization.

Before the Roman appeared in the Peninsula Emporion was the most significant Greek colony. Its original name was, perhaps, Pyrene, given to us by Avienus (557-561)¹²², and Emporion was the name of the trading harbour of the city, like the emporia of the Egestians and the Acragantians (Strabo VI, 1, I). But already as early as the same century when the colony was founded, this name was transferred on the whole city, as is attested by the letter of the last third of the sixth century B.C., in which it is already named Emporion¹²³. For the Greek ear the name sounded very strange and had a foreign ring for a long time: it is no wonder that the Pseudo-Scylax (2) and the Pseudo-Scymnos (202-204) and Polybius (III, 76, I) and Appian (Hispan. 7, 10) all give the reader to understand that it is a city that is meant in their writings. Livy, a Roman, gives no such specifications. Yet it is exactly its trading potential and significance¹²⁴ that made such an extraordinary name stick to this settlement.

Close to Emporion there was a native town of Indica. Actually, it was a double town split by a wall into two parts— the Hellenic and the Hispanic ones (Strabo III, 4, 8; Liv. XXXIV, 9). The relations between the Hellenes and the Indicetes were originally, according to archaeological evidence, quite good-neighbourly¹²⁵. But after 300 B.C. something was the matter and the Hellenes' city was as good as a besieged fortress where the aborigines were not welcome (Liv. XXXIV, 9)¹²⁶. The Emporites were allowed to

122. L. M. Korotkikh: Avienus' Text as Source on the History of the Colonization of Spain, in *Norcia 2. Voronezh*, 1978, pp. 43-44.

123. R. A. Santiago. E. Sanmartí: Notes additionelles sur la lettre sur plomb d'Emporion, in *Zeitschrift für Papirologie und Epigraphik*, 72 (1988), pp. 100-102.

124. Cf.: E. Sanmartí. Una carta en lengua ibérica, escrita sobre plomo, procedente de Emporion, in *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise*, 21 (1988), p. 110.

125. M. Almagro: Excavaciones de la Palaiápolis de Ampurias. Madrid, 1964, pp. 63, 68, 82-83, 74-76, 92; idem. Ampurias. Barcelona, 1951, pp. 117-118, 130; idem. Las necrópolis de Ampurias. Barcelona, 1953, p. 31-32; F. J. Fernández Nieto. Los griegos en España, in *Historia de España antigua*, i, p. 582; E. Sanmartí. Op. cit., p. 111.

126. The date (around 300 B.C.) is conditioned by the fact that in the necropolis of Martí alongside Greek graves with inhumation there also native graves with cremation dating back to the same period. The necropolis was most intensely used in the fourth century B.C. (F. J. Fernández Nieto. Op. cit., p. 582) and it was abandoned around the year 300 B.C.

enter Indica, though, so that the ties between the two cities were not altogether severed.

In the first century B.C. Emporion had in its possession a fertile land in the interior, called the Iuncarian plain (Strabo III, 4, 9). This name derives from the Latin word «iuncus» (reed). It would have been strange if the Greeks, long having had this region in their hands, had not kept either the Greek or the vernacular name and had adopted, instead, the Latin name. It must be borne in mind, that Strabo's sources in his description of Hispania were the Greeks Poseidonius and Artemidirus; had the Hellenic name of the plain existed at the time, they would have used it. Besides the mention of the fact the Emporites possessed the plain as well as the territory near the Pyreness as far as Trophy of Pompeius, does not agree with Livi's description of the almost besieged city. Hence our conclusion: the Emporites came to possess this agricultural region well after the Roman conquest.

To sum up, in terms of socio-political organization Spain on the eve of the Romanization process was far from a uniform whole. Phoenician and Greek colonies were small but very significant cells of a developed slave-owning society; their further evolution went along the lines of the Roman variety of this society rather than becoming a class society. As far as Iberian peoples proper are concerned, in Southern Spain Tartessis existed for quite a long period and after its disintegration on its remainders and ruins sprang up some petty kingdoms which came in contact with Rome. Apart from these, in the South and Southeast of the Iberian Peninsula and, as an exception, in the East in one case, emerged primitive «nome states», city-states consisting of a city centre plus an agricultural area. Besides there were also several communities that still retained a clan society.

These societies were on different stages of a clan system some —on rather advanced stages at that. Some of these societies were about to change into states, each in its own specific way. Some Iberian tribes such as the Ilorgetes and the Edetani were turning into monarchies on a tribal basis, whereas the Celtiberians were evolving as an aristocratic republic. Other clan and tribal amalgamations in the Indo-European and non-Indo-European zones of the Peninsula as well were more retarded and backward, each to a different extent. The most socially backward tribes were, most likely, the characetani and perhaps —the mountainous Vasconi and some other ethnics—.