

## Romanization of Spain: Socio-political aspect (IV). Romanization during the Early Empire. Conclusion I

JU. B. TSIRKIN

The Flavian reforms had put an end to the purely legal Romanization of Spain but the depth and intensity of the process seem to have varied in different regions of the country. Like in the late Republican times, in the first and second centuries A.D. Spain had three zones of Romanization - a wholly (or almost wholly) Romanized zone, a Romanizing zone and a non-Romanized region but unlike the previous period the boundaries of them were absolutely different. The former covered practically the whole of Baetia and East Tarraconensis (except the Balearic Islands).

South and East Spain had long since been integrated into the Mediterranean economic system. Extensive immigration of the Italics and Romans and the Spanish involvement into the Roman attraction orbit had brought about the increased imports from both Italy and the lands of the Hellenic Orient whose produce had been successfully finding its way into the Italian market too. Whence came to Spain wines, oil, ceramics, articles of luxury and works of art.<sup>1</sup> The colonists' influence could not but affect the tastes of the local inhabitants.

The situation had considerably changed in the Augustian days. It was the time when Laëtanian wine was first exported from North-Eastern Spain. Towards the close of Augustus' rule Spanish wine amphorae made up 32 per cent of all finds in a Ostian hoard. It was also the time that the olive oil production got under way in Baetica, although on a modest scale so far. So the native artisans were encouraged to manufacture vessels for the transportation of those products. In the first century Spanish amphorae containing olive oil from Baetica and wines from Tarraconensis were found in an

---

<sup>1</sup> J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, *La economía de Hispania Romana*, en *Historia de España*. Madrid, 1982, t. II, I, pp. 337-339.

impressive quantity in Italy and Rome and from the midfirst century onwards over 30 per cent of the material undug in Ostia seem to have come from Spain; those were the fragments of Spanish vessels <sup>2</sup>.

Economic changes in Italy proper were the most likely explanation of such state of things. After a temporary prosperity under Augustus, the Italian agriculture must have suffered another crisis. On the one hand wealthy senators and equestrians and on the other libertines like Petronius' Trimalchio, who had grown rich, began to acquire more and more plots of land superseding middle and petty estates <sup>3</sup> though some of the latter persisted. And yet latifundia were spreading and expanding so that Pliny had reasonable grounds to write that the latifundia were Italia's undoing (XVIII, 35). Characteristically, Pliny believed Virgil to be a defender and advocate of middle-sized estates and herein lies the difference between Pliny's time and that of Augustus.

In the year 22 Tiberius addressed the Senate with a message on account of the extravagant luxury of the Roman nobility. He castigated the enormous dimensions of the noblemen's country-side villas and hordes of slaves at their service there. And what is more, the emperor points out the situation in Italy and Rome: Italy needs an outside help whereas the Romans' daily life is precarious depending on the uncertainty and changeability of the sea and storms. The emperor emphasizes that it was only the wealth of the provinces that nourished the masters and slaves alike and even the fields too, the sole alternative to which he saw in the revenue from the pleasure gardens and villas (Tac. Ann., III, 53-54).

Under these circumstances the provision with foodstuffs in Italy and Rome and the Roman army became a priority with the Roman government; to combat the shortage of supplies the administration had to draw very lavishly on the provincial resources. It is hardly accidental that the finds of Spanish amphorae with the remains of wine and especially oil have

<sup>2</sup> W. JONIGMAN, *The Economy and Society of Pompei*, Amsterdam, 1991, p. 125; K. RANDSBORG, *The Metamorphosis of Antiquity*, en *Acta Archaeologica*, 60 (1989), p. 168; A. TCHERNIA; F. Zezi, *Amphores vinaires de Campanie et de Tarraconaise à Ostie*, en *Recherches sur les amphores Romaines*. Rome, 1972, pp. 54, 67.

<sup>3</sup> E. LEPORE, *La società italiana della «pax Augusta» alla fine dei Giulio-Claudii*, en *Storia della società italiana*, p. 1, v. 2. Milano, 1983, p. 292; M. A. LEVI, *L'Italia antica*. Milano, 1991, pp. 286-287, 306-326; H. BELLEN, *Die Krise der italischen Landwirtschaft unter Kaiser Tiberius (33 n. Chr.)*, en *Historia*, 25, 2 (1976), S. 228-229; S. MROZEK, *Die grossen Vermögen in Italia des ersten Jahrhundert u.Z.*, en *Eos*, 78 (1990), S. 371-373; K. P. JOENE, *Kolonen und Kolonenwirtschaft nach den literarischen Quellen*, en *Die Kolonen in Italien und den westlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches*. Berlin, 1983, S. 88.

been located above all in Ostia and Rome, in the South of Gaul; from this area the amphorae must have gone to the Rhein area and later after the conquest of Britain, to that island too <sup>4</sup>.

As the local agriculture grew more and more effective Spanish articles began to replace the imported ones from the Spanish markets too. For instance, while in the Republican epoch Campanian and South Italian wine and oil exercised complete sway in the Hiberus valley economy, since the Augustian time and in the first century, rose to prominence, side by side with the Campanian imported items, the output of Tarraconensis proper <sup>5</sup>.

So we can see that commodity relations were steadily gaining momentum in Spain's agriculture. As is well known, commodity production needs a specific type of management capable to bring in maximum profits. Such was a middle slave-owning estate, a villa —to use a conventional term— of 100 to 500 iugera, more often of 200 to 300 iugera, tilled by a score of slaves and bringing in 5 to 10 per cent of annual income <sup>6</sup>. Such estates were quite numerous in Italy in the second and first centuries B.C.; in the first century A.D. though they were forced to give way to *latifundia* but now they began getting under way in Spain <sup>7</sup>. The antique system of economy shifted as it were to the provinces, to the Spanish ones in particular.

All this could not but lead to the restructuring in the socio-economic space. Thus, for example, in the North-East of Tarraconensis already under the Republic the ancient forms of rural settlement began to be replaced first by petty estates and then by villas, especially on the coast and in the valleys, in other words, in places with the best arable land. First such estates must have been larger than those in Italy —of 400 to 500 iugera. Somewhat smaller villas (no more than 200 iugera) appeared in the Baetis valley whose fabulous fertility was able to yield greater crops and incomes from smaller areas. Some time later though petty estates of about 200 iugera came into existence in North-East Spain too <sup>8</sup>. Their labour

---

<sup>4</sup> M. H. CALLENDER, *Roman amphorae*. London, 1965, *passim*; J. LE GALL, *La Tibre, fleuve de Rome dans l'antiquité*. Paris, 1953, pp. 239-244.

<sup>5</sup> J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 359-360; M. BELTRÁN LLORIS, *El comercio del aceite en el valle del Ebro a finales de la República y comienzos del Imperio romano*, en *Producción y comercio del aceite en la antigüedad*. Madrid, 1980, pp. 217-224; *idem*. *Las ánforas romanas en España*. Zaragoza, 1970, pp. 599-600.

<sup>6</sup> V. I. KUZISHCHIN, *Antique Classic Slavery as Economic System*. Moscow, 1990, pp. 154-162 (in Russian).

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 151.

<sup>8</sup> A. ARRIBAS, *La Arqueología romana en Cataluña*, en *Problemas de la Prehistoria y de la Arqueología Catalanas*. Barcelona, 1963, pp. 197-198; A. AGILAR; P. PICÓN, *Aproximación a la*

force was slaves<sup>9</sup>. For all the paucity of epigraphic evidence available at present we can reasonably suspect a remarkable increase of slaves in the Early Empire as compared with the Republic<sup>10</sup>.

Some elements of the antique socio-economic structure were introduced to Spain by its colonization. From the Lex Ursonensis we have learned that part of the lands during the deduction of colonies became common property. On them there were fields, and plots, and forests, and roads, and boundary posts (Lex Urson, LXXVIII, LXXXII, SCVI). Some unassigned lands can be found on the Emerita territory, to<sup>11</sup> (although Emerita Augusta was the capital city of Lusitania, being so close to Baetica it may well be regarded as a Romanized area). This colonial property could be leased on certain terms (Lex Urson, LXXXII, XCIII). In all appearance municipal farming did not exist. Another part of the area was distributed among the colonists and became their private property (*privata*) and even urgent repairs or other common maintenance within the colony's boundary could not be allowed at the expense of the private owners (Lex Urson, LXXVII, LXXIX, C). We do not know the size of private estates at Urso; at Emerita they were as large as 400 iugera<sup>12</sup>. In general, the enormity of this colony's territory even necessitated the creation of several *praefectura*<sup>13</sup>. Other colonies especially those in the thickly populated Baetica, had less land and accordingly the colonists' private plots were smaller too.

Unlike the colonies founded by the Romans either on an empty spot or, more often, on the sites of the native settlements of previous times,

---

estructuración territorial en época romano-republicana y alto imperial en el comarca del Vallés occidental (Barcelona), en SHHA, 7 (1989), pp. 35-36; J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, Gran latifundia o pequeña propiedad en la Bética (Hispania) en época imperial, en *αλλάς χ'απιν*, Roma, 1979, p. 250; K. GREEN, *The Archaeology of the Roman Economy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1986, pp. 110-114; J. ESTRADO y L. VILLARONGA, La «Lauro» monetar y el hallazgo de Cánovas, en *Ampurias*, 29 (1967), pp. 149-163; M. TARRADELL, Población y propiedad rural en el este peninsular, en *Actas del III Congreso español de estudios clásicos*, t. III. Madrid, 1968, pp. 165-167; M. SARTRE; A. TRANOY, *La Méditerranée antique*. París, 1990, pp. 68-69; M. J. PENA, *Emporiae*, en *Dialoghi di archeologica*, anno 10, 1992, p. 77; F. J. LOMAS, La relación campo-ciudad y el espacio social gaditano en época altoimperial, *ibíd.*, p. 150.

<sup>9</sup> P. P. ABREU FUNARI, O asentamiento micro-regional en la Campaña en época romana, pp. 4-5; A. SAKAGUCHI, *Agricultural Labor in the Early Roman Empire*, en *Forms of control and subordination in antiquity*. Leiden-New York-København-Köln, 1988, p. 282.

<sup>10</sup> J. MANGAS MANJARRES, *Esclavos y libertos de la España Romana*. Salamanca, 1971, pp. 59-60.

<sup>11</sup> *Die Schriften der römischen Feldmesser*. Berlín, 1848, pp. 51-52.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>13</sup> H. GALSTERER, *Untersuchungen aum römische Städtewesen auf Iberischen Halbinsel*. Berlín, 1871, S. 23.

municipia were indigenous (or Greek and Phoenician) towns transformed on the Roman pattern. To date it is difficult to define property relations existent in them before they turned into municipia. However there is a curious article in the Lex Ursonensis (LXXIX) in accordance with which the colonists could possess and own some strip of land and also roads, streams, bogs, etc., on exactly the same conditions as their previous owners. The phrase «habebunt prossidebunt.. habuerunt possiderunt» reads like a Roman standard formula used (as has been shown in our previous paper) by the Romans to confirm and seal the original system prior to the conquest. It is perhaps possible to hold that at least in Baetica private ownership of land within the town communities was a fact <sup>14</sup>.

Even so the very creation of a municipium in place of and on the site of a stipendiary or federate community could have entailed the spread of the Roman property law and the property relations reflected by it. The municipal laws are indicative of the same structure of land ownership as in the law of Colonia Genetiva. There were to be seen communal lands, roads, buildings, etc., and also private plots whose inviolability was guaranteed by special laws (Lex Mal. LX, LXIII; Lex Irn. LX, LXIII, LXIV, LXXXVII). Private lands are also indicated on the boundary stones (CIL II, 3443, 4048). The presence of private lands (*privata*), their sanctity and prohibition to cause them any damage as a result of maintaining the communal land property—this is the antique, Roman rule, pure and simple, dating back to the Twelve Tables laws (VII, 8b).

Judging from the city laws the colonial and municipal magistrates were in charge of (apart from the common money, duties, taxes and the like) the city itself but also of the fields, woods ditches, roads and so on (lex Urson, LXXXIII, XCVI; Lex Irn., XIX, LXXVI). The Lex Iritana mentions some *vici* that came under the aediles' jurisdiction (XIX). J. González has translated this word «the districts» <sup>15</sup> which is fair enough since Corduba is known to have two city districts: the *vicus* of the Spaniards and the *vicus* of the foreigners <sup>16</sup>. But Irni was a small town, though, it was not even mentioned by Pliny, so it seems most unlikely that it was further subdivided into smaller territorial units; besides the mentioning of the *vici* next to the town itself (*oppidum*) presupposes that they were situated outside the

---

<sup>14</sup> It shall be recalled that on the territory that was to become Baetica the mines belonged to private owners well before the Roman conquest (Diod., V. 36).

<sup>15</sup> J. GONZÁLEZ, The Lex Iritana, en *JRS*, 76 (1986), p. 182.

<sup>16</sup> J. F. RODRÍGUEZ NEILA, Historia de Córdoba. Córdoba, 1988, pp. 219-220; L. A. CURCHIN, *Vici and Pagi in Roman Spain*, en *REA*, 87 (1985), pp. 329-330.

city walls. In the light of all this we believe the Irnitana vice should be best regarded as «villages». The laws under consideration repeatedly mention various sections of the population in the colonies and municipia. At Urso the law mentions colonists and settlers (XCV, XCVIII, CIII, CXXVI), guests and new-comers <sup>17</sup> (CXXVI). In the municipia there are also Roman Citizens, former magistrates among them (Lex Salp., XXI, XXII; Lex Irn., XXII, XXIII), municipals-Latins (Lex Salp., XXVIII; Lex Irn., XXVIII; XXXI, XCVII), senators, undoubtedly Roman citizens (Lex Irn., XXI), incolae who were both Roman and Latin citizens (Lex. Mal., LIII, LXIX; Lex Irn., LXXI, LXXXIV, XCIV), and also freedmen who became Latin citizens and slaves, common ones inclusive (Lex Irn., LXXII, LXXVIII). But no document mentioned as separate sections of the population town-dwellers (oppidani) and villagers (vicani or pagani). The Lex Ursonensis stipulates a possibility for the city magistrate to have a domicile on the rural territory of the colony, a thousand paces away from the city a most (XCI). It follows that the division into colonists or municipals and settlers known from the law concerns both town-dwellers and the inhabitants of its rural area.

That is not to say, though, that the countryside population living on the territory of the colony or municipium had no units all their own. They had pagi. Isidorus of Seville (Etym. V, 2, II) describes them as little settlements, very much like vici and castella, «undecorated by the city's worth» but populated by common people (vulgari) and —on account of their insignificant size— attached and subordinated to big communities. Pagi have been found to exist in South and East Spain exclusively; none of them in the central or northern or western regions of the Peninsula. The zone of the pagi thus neatly coincides with the most Romanized and urbanized zone of Spain <sup>18</sup> where the process of Romanization, especially under the Republic, was affected and accelerated by the Roman and above all Italian colonization. This historical fact, as well as a wide spread of pagi in Italy <sup>19</sup>, enables us to infer that this form of a rural community was borrowed from Italy and no doubt under the Republic at that. The earliest inscription with the mention of a pagus is the so-called bronze of Bonanza (CIL, II, 5042) dated back to the Augustian time. This is most likely a juridical formula rather than an entry of a concrete special

<sup>17</sup> The «guests» (hospites) are more likely than not people who are connected with the colony by the bonds of hospitality (hospitium) (cf. Lex Urson, CXXXI), whereas «strangers» (adventores) are those who came to the city to stay for a while.

<sup>18</sup> L. A. CURCHIN, op. cit., pp. 338-340.

<sup>19</sup> E. M. STAERMAN, Ancient Rome. Moscow, 1978, pp. 14-37 (in Russian).

case <sup>20</sup>. Consequently, a pagus was by then a fairly common institution, at least in Baetica.

In Italy, in its northern regions in particular, a pagus was a communal territory, a vicus —a settlement on this territory and a castellum was the centre of an amalgamation of vici <sup>21</sup>. However we do not deem it reasonable enough to apply unconditionally Italian relations to the provinces. It is A. Schulten who first pointed out the inevitable dissimilarity between an Etruscan and Sabinian pagus in Italy <sup>22</sup>. African and Gallic pagi unmistakably differed from those in Italy <sup>23</sup>. Therefore we think a Spanish pagus merits a special consideration.

As has been stated above, the zone of most pagi was extremely urbanized. What did a pagus have to do with a city? Partly the answer can be derived from the inscription from Curiga (CIL, II, 1041) where two pagi were identified: Translucanus and Suburbanus. In the vicinity of this city has been localized the pagus of Marmorariensis (CIL, II, 1943). Thus in the Curiga area there were at least three unions of such type; their names expressly of the former two, are indisputably given as if from within the city: Suburban, Beyond the Forest. In these pagi two categories of inhabitants are mentioned: municipes and settlers. How do they correlate with the city residents? It depends on the interpretation of the inscription that reads thus: «... ul... mutatione oppidi municipes et incolae pagi Translucani et pagi Suburbani». The first word of the inscription may be a remnant of a word somehow related to the name of Caesar. In this respect it must be noted that Curiga itself, according to Pliny (III, 14), had originally belonged to the city of Iulia Contributa Ugultina and it was not until the year 196 that Curiga became an autonomous community <sup>24</sup>. It looks highly probable that the territory of this city was the most likely location of the pagi.

This inscription allows several interpretations. A. Schulten in his time divided the phrae tentatively into two segments: the former attests to the transformation of a stipendiary town into a municipium, owing to which

---

<sup>20</sup> V. M. SMIRIN, Slavery in Roman Spain, en Slavery in the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire in the first to third centuries. Moscow, 1977, p. 39, n.º 15; F. J. FERNÁNDEZ NIETO, El derecho en la España Romana, en *Historia de España*, t. II, 2, p. 206.

<sup>21</sup> E. SERENI, La comunità rurali nell'Italia antica. Roma, 1955, pp. 381-388, 398, 561; A. W. VAN BUREN, Vicus, en RE, Hbd. 16A (1958), Sp. 2.091.

<sup>22</sup> A. SCHULTEN, Die Landgemeinde in römischen Reich, en *Philologus*, 53 (1894), S. 634.

<sup>23</sup> J. TOUTAIN, Pagani, pagus, en *Dictionnaire d'Antiquité*, t. IV, p. 1, p. 275; E. KORNEMANN, Pagus, en RE, Hbd. 36 (1949), Sp. 2.327.

<sup>24</sup> H. GALSTERER, op. cit., S. 20-21.

fact its inhabitants becoming municipals (*mutazione oppidi municipes*), whereas the second part of the inscription is believed to testify to the city receiving an agricultural area <sup>25</sup>. The word «*mutatio*» can indeed mean «a change of the state» like in the Christian literature a word can turn into flesh (*mutatio verbi in carnem*). But when applied to something that is situated on the site or in some place, this word implies a spacial shift of movement in space, as for instance, of camps or stopping places (*Caes. Bel. civ.*, II, 31, 4; *Tac. Hist.*, I, 66, 3). The collocation «*mutatio oppidi*» is used only once, only in this inscription <sup>26</sup>. That is why T. Mommsen supposed that the phrase under study is used to denote a «movement» of the *pagi* from one town to another <sup>27</sup>. Hence, the inscription should be regarded as a whole, therefore it follows that on the *pagi*'s land there lived municipals and settlers, the more so that the phrases like «*municipes et incolae, municipes incolaeque, municipes incilaeve*» are rather frequently used and found in inscriptions and in cities' laws as well. The former appear beyond doubt to be citizens of the very *municipium* on whose land the *pagi* were situated.

The internal structure of such unions is evidenced by the above mentioned «bronze of Bonanza» (*CIL*, III, 5042). The bronze tells us about a loan of money on the security of an estate complete with the slaves. The names of the partners in the deal are L. Baianius and L. Titius, they are represented by their slaves *Dama* and *Mida* and the witness C. *Seius*. This «*fundus Baianus*» is situated in the «*ager Veneriensis*» which in its turn lies in the «*pagus Olbensis*». Although this document is a juridical formula, its geographical names are «fastened» to a concrete geographical locality coinciding with the place where this inscription has been discovered. *Stephanos Byzantios* (v. ) mentions the town of *Olba* in Spain. A. Schulten has contended, though, that it is not *Olbia* but *Olba*, i.e. modern *Huelva* <sup>28</sup> situated not far from the *Baetis* mouth near which the inscription has been found. Close to the site of the finding lies *Nabrissa* that *Pliny* (III, II) calls *Nabrissa Veneria*. There was the temple of *Venus* in *Nabrissa Veneria*. Not far from the *Baetis* estuary was an island dedicated to the *Venus Marina* (*Av. Or. mar.*, 415); This *Venus* was the Phoenician *Astarte*'s heiress; no wonder that her cult was so widespread

<sup>25</sup> A. SCHULTEN, *Die Landgemeinde...*, S. 642; E. KORNEMANN, *Polis und Urbs*, en *Klio*, 5 (1905), S. 86.

<sup>26</sup> *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, v. VIII, f. XI, *Lipsiae*, 1966, col. 1717-1718.

<sup>27</sup> *CIL*, III, p. 134; The same opinion has been shared by E. M. STAERMAN (op. cit., p. 41). H. GALSTERER (op. cit., S. 21; Anm. 41); R. PORTILLO MARTÍN (*Incolae. Córdoba*, 1983, p. 61).

<sup>28</sup> A. SCHULTEN, *Olba*, en *RE*, Hbd. 34 (1937), Sp. 2.397; *idem*. *Olbia* 5), *ibid.*, Sp. 2.424.



in this region <sup>29</sup>. It is quite possible that a concrete case that had occurred here at one time, gave rise to a general juridical rule. All this can justify our supposition that the pagi of this region could possibly have been internally structured on the analogy of the Olba pagus.

Judging by the inscription a pagus was subdivided into «fields» (agri) where small estates (fundi) were laid out <sup>30</sup>. According to Ulpian (Dig., 50, 16, 27; 60); the «ager» is a place without the owner's house (a villa in its merely architectural sense of the term); the «fundus» is a whole estate without a villa either. The owners of fields and estates evidently lived either in the pagus' centre (in Olba, in our case) or else directly in a municipium or a colony. This correspond with the archaeological material, in accordance with which the lower valley was engaged in grain farming, hence the absence of permanent population and dwelling-houses there; only barns for storing agricultural implements were built there <sup>31</sup>. It should be recalled that the inscription under consideration has been undug in such a lower valley, in the river's mouth. Perhaps, the structure of the pagus like this one was specifically characteristic of grain growing regions.

In other areas a pagus could be structured differently (at any rate agri as its structural subdivision are not to be met anywhere else). But in any case it had to be made up of several estates. Can this possibly mean that a cluster of such estates of necessity constituted a pagus? In the inscription from Siresa (Tarraconensis) mention is made of a «solum pag (anicum)» that was obviously to be understood as the pagus's common land (HAEp., 492). The inscription dates back to a later period, the IVth century. It should be borne in mind that the historical process was mostly channelled along the lines of gradual privatization of communal lands. So if the pagus's land persisted in the fairly Romanized zone as late as the fourth century, the similar state of things seems more than probable in the first second centuries.

The Bonanza inscription, apart from direct partners of the bargain and the witness, mentions a «people» (populus), any representative of which could be present at transactions. It bears witness to a considerable role the

---

<sup>29</sup> E. KOCH, Venus, en *RE*, Hbd. 15A (1955), Sp. 883-884; J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, *Religiones Prerromanas*. Madrid, 1983, p. 41.

<sup>30</sup> L. A. CURCHIN maintains that this inscription must be understood as follows; the estate was attached to the pagus for the purpose of property qualification and taxation (op. cit., p. 342). Whereas the enumeration of pagus, ager, fundus logically yields a more precise localization of the estate.

<sup>31</sup> K. GREEN, op. cit., p. III, P. P. ABREU FUNARI, op. cit., p. 10.

citizens of a pagus had to play in business deals concerning the property of the pagus' members. Evidently, a consent of «conpagani», explicit or implicit, was a must in land transactions. Since the text under study is silent about the «populus» power to set a veto on a land deal it may be concluded that no supreme power over the estate's land actually existed; but there is no denying the existence of communal traditions and some kind of control over land transactions. The term «populus» indicated a popular assembly similar to the comitia in colonies and municipia rather than a chance casual gathering of the pagus members.

The inscriptions convey some valuable information on some other salient features characteristic of a pagus as an association of a communal type. A pagus had its own deity —the pagus genius (CIL, II, 1043)<sup>32</sup>. In the external world a pagus acted as a whole entity. In the year 74 the dedication to Vespasian was a collective doing of the pagani pagi Carbulensis (CIL, II, 2.322). In the legal proceedings against a landowner, a certain Valeria Faventina, her opponent were collectively «conpagani rivi Larensis» (CIL, II, 4125). This case was tried by the provincial legatus and it is a proof that the pagus, although situated on the city's territory, had some juridical autonomy and could, if need be, appeal directly to the provincial authorities.

Thus we can say that the Spanish pagus had the following characteristics. It was situated on the city's territory; within its boundaries there were a number of private landed estates but the pagus was entitled to exercise some control over real property deals, no matter how formal this control might be. The pagus must have had some common land (we are in no position to specify whether it was a pasture as in Italy or something else); in its deals with the external world it was a whole legal entity, the pagus enjoyed a certain juridical independence, had its own genius and could bury its own members. We have no knowledge of its organs of government but with a fair degree of certainty we can surmise the existence of a popular assembly. The pagus resembles an association of a communal type although the communal institutions seem already to be decaying. These features make the pagus in Spain look like community in Asia Minor also situated on the urban territory (though not like an independent community) and the Italian pagus<sup>33</sup>.

<sup>32</sup> L. A. CURCHIN, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. E. S. GOLUBTSOVA, *The Agricultural Community in Asia Minor*. Moscow, 1972, pp. 139-147, 170-172 (in Russian); eadem. *The Ideology and Culture of the Rural Population in Asia Minor*. Moscow, 1977, pp. 11-54 (in Russian); E. M. STAERMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-37; E. SERENI, *op. cit.*, pp. 404-405; L. A. CURCHIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-343.

A. Schulten was the first to point out that Spanish pagi had Roman names. Of a great interest are the Italian names of the Olbian pagis: Titius, Baianius, Seius. Even if these are collective names what matters is that Italian names (of all others) are used as typical «pagani» names. Even more significant is the name of a Marmorariensis pagus man called L. Alfius Lucanus. He was unquestionably a Lucanian settlers's descendant. It is noteworthy that so many inscriptions with the names of pagi have been unearthed in the southern areas of Central Italy and the northern districts of South Italy (including Lucania) <sup>34</sup> —i.e. those areas that have yielded the greatest masses of Itali— an colonists.

Descendants of the natives could also become members of a pagus. For instance, C. Fabius Nigellio made a dedication to the Augustian pagus' genius (CIL, II, 2194). The purely Roman name Fabius allows us to think (as has repeatedly been stressed in part II of our paper) about a Romanized local man. This name as well as the antroponym Nigellis and similar to it Nigellus are frequently to be met in various parts of Spain <sup>35</sup>. C. Fabius Nigellio had something to do with the cult of the pagus genius, so in all likelihood he was a member of the pagus as well. True, we cannot confirm this assumption. As we have seen, in the pagi Suburbanus and Translucanus there lived not only «municipes» but also settlers (incolae) who were in principle not barred out from the local cult. As likely as not those people came to stay in these quarters after pagi had been constituted. It should not be excluded, though, that some locals who failed to join a civil community could also belong to the pagi <sup>36</sup>.

The pagus was very likely a rather open organization which could unite both Italian immigrants and indigenous inhabitants alike. It must be correlated with the Romano-Italian colonization. Some colonists chose to settle in the countryside rather than in towns bringing along their familiar forms of organization. The identical economic and partly legal conditions were conducive to the further unification of settlers and indigenes. The adoption by the latter of Roman forms of territorial agricultural associations could have been facilitated by the similar forms existing in South Spain in the pre-

---

<sup>34</sup> E. KORNEMANN. Pagus, Sp. 2.321-2.322.

<sup>35</sup> R. SYME, Tacitus, Oxford, 1958, p. 783; J. UNTERMANN. Elementos de un atlas antropónimo de la Hispania antigua. Madrid, 1965, pp. 138-139.

<sup>36</sup> Cf.: J. F. RODRÍGUEZ NEILA, La terminología aplicada a los sectores de población en la vida municipal de la Hispania Romana, en *MHA*, I (1977), pp. 210-211; R. PORTILLO MARTÍN, op. cit., p. 15.

Roman epoch<sup>37</sup>. This process must have started under the Republic, as by Augustus time the Spanish pagus had come into its own; besides, as has been shown previously, the Italian colonization came to its end precisely during this emperor's reign. There was another possible way of a pagus' birth: a local settlement of relatively modest dimensions turned, upon receiving a Roman or Latin citizenship, into a pagus, not a municipium, and thus was subject to a larger town. In this connection let us recall the testimony of Isidorus of Seville about a small settlement not adorned by city's worth. Such was apparently the road traversed by Carbula.

The question may arise: how widely spread was a pagus in Spain? Inscriptions mentioning pagi as a unit of the rural population are by no means numerous, yet they have been found in different areas in Baetica and East Tarraconensis. On the other hand it is worth stressing that in the municipal laws (and in the colonial law at Urso as well) a pagus as contrasted to «fields» and «villages» (if our interpretation of the vius in these laws is correct) is not mentioned. On the Emeritan territory there were praefectura, which was predetermined by the great size of the region (see above). Higinus in his account of the Emeritan praefectura is silent about pagi<sup>38</sup>. In all appearances the pagus was not an obligatory form of uniting landowners or a territorial unit of municipal or colonial structure.

A sizable part (if not the largest) of the urban land apparently belonged to colonists, municipes and incolae extramurani<sup>39</sup> whose estates were outside the pagi. These estates, as we already know, were not large. Yet, there were wealthy men of property<sup>40</sup> who held in their hands a whole number of such estates. Take, for instance, one P. Rufius Flaus who bequeathed to his wife's libertines his Suburban estate (CIL, II, 4332) —undoubtedly he possessed some more valuable pieces of property. From amphorae brands it follows that the Ennii Iulii had the estates Saenians and Rivens. Several fundi belonged to the Aurelii Heraclae, to Qu. Fulvius Rusticus, Qu. Stertinus, the anonymous Q.A.G.<sup>41</sup>. The fact that each fundus was separately stamped on a brand testifies that each landed estate preserved its economic autonomy when a number of estates do not merge into a single plantation. Such estates could be located in different parts of

<sup>37</sup> J. MANGAS, Servidumgre comunitaria en la Bética prerromana, en *MHA*, I (1977), pp. 155-158.

<sup>38</sup> Die Schriften der römischen Feldmesser, p. 171.

<sup>39</sup> R. PORTILLO MARTÍN, op. cit., pp. 134-137.

<sup>40</sup> L. A. CURCHIN, Personal Wealth in Roman Spain, en *Historia*, 32 (1983), pp. 277-284.

<sup>41</sup> M. CALLENDER, op. cit., *NN*, 581, 160, 1.454, 1.506, 1.417.

the province. Such was certainly the case recorded by M. Callender under N.º 4.792 when a certain man of wealth owned an oilmill in the Italica area, another oilmill in the vicinity of Arva and still another in what is now Vilar de Brenes. We also know about one C. Cornelius Romanus, a duumvir in two cities —Osicerdum and Tarraco (CIL, II, 4267) who, consequently, possessed an enviable property, land as well, in both the cities. Romanus being a duumvir implies that he was a citizen. There were perhaps settlers, too, who had their landed estates on the area of the cities whose citizens they were not.

The great amount of the estates' stamps concentrated on a comparatively small area of the Middle Baetis bears witness to a remarkable density of these estates. For instance, in the Hispalis area there were as many as 35 estates, in the Corduba area —49 and near Astigi— 95 estates<sup>42</sup>. As would be expected, not all of them had been active for a century and a half or two centuries but it should be borne in mind that a great many estates and workshops have not yet been substantiated by written evidence<sup>43</sup>. On the other hand, the abundance of amphorae fragments undug at Monte Testaccio alone, betokens a profuse output of Baetica's manufacturers. It was possible only under the conditions of rather intensive labour in well-managed slave-owning estates that were market-oriented and their agricultural produce was marketable.

Speaking about Baitica and its capital, Martial mentions two major sources of their wealth - olive oil and white fleece (for instance, Mart., XII, 63; 96); it totally corresponds with the archaeological data<sup>44</sup>. That is why it is probably true to say that such shepp-breeding and olive-growing (and, hence, oil-making) farms were especially remarkable for their intensive commodity production. Listing the presents which the poet allegedly gives his friends in Rome, he mentions Cerretanian sausage and Tarraconensis wine (XIII, 54; 118). The latter, he insists, is second only to that of Campania. The good fame of the wine from North-East Spain has been attested by a sizable amount of wine amphorae fragments unearthed in

---

<sup>42</sup> J. LE GALL, op. cit., p. 243; J. REMESAL RODRÍGUEZ, Reflejos económicos y sociales en la producción de ánforas olearias béticas (Dressel 20), en *Producción y comercio del aceite en la antigüedad*. Madrid, 1980, pp. 131-137.

<sup>43</sup> Cf.: E. RODRÍGUEZ ALMEIDA, El monte Testaccio hoy: Nuevos testimonios epigráficos, en *Producción...*, pp. 83-91.

<sup>44</sup> J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, La economía de la Hispania romana, en *Historia de España*, t. II, I, Madrid, 1982, pp. 383, 391; G. WOOLF, Imperialism, empire and the integration of the Roman economy, en *World Archaeology*, 23, 3 (1992), p. 286.

this region <sup>45</sup>. This fact may serve as a demonstrable proof of a marked nature of the wine manufacture in Tarraconensis.

However, far from all farms of South and East Spain were oriented at the intensive commodity production. Side by side with these, there were also estates meant for pleasure and relaxation of their owners (we shall point out on passing that their existence presupposes the fact that their landlords must have had other estates bringing in profits and incomes). Such was most probably the estate of Licinianus in Tarraconensis where he usually lived in the winter time: there were some hunting grounds, a wood and nearby lived his neighbour, a kin soul, another huntsman who gladly accepted his invitation to dinner (Mart., I, 49). Perhaps, it was a suburban estate; if this is the case, Flaus's suburban estate was probably of the same type.

The estates outside the principal wine—and oil—making zone were undeniably non market-oriented. Their sample may be the farm of Martial's parents (X, 96): there the affluent household lives on the land produce; small as it might be, the estate is able to provide a required wealth and felicity, the table is laid with the bounty of the soil and there is no need to go to market (macellum). Needless to say, this idyll was drawn both by the actual reality and by the sweet memories of a rustic childhood, so dear and delightful in a big city, but also by the opposition, dating from Alexandrian poetry, between a corrupt, vicious and uncomfortable urban civilization and a simple, unspoilt, innocent life in the lap of nature. And yet it is hardly likely that the poet fabricated the facts themselves. We know about a similar middle-sized estate, quite self-contained and seemingly not connected with the market—that is an estate Martial received as a gift from his patroness Marcella when he had been forced to come back to his native place <sup>46</sup>. Here on this farm they unhurriedly till the land, they have a grove, some streams, an artificial pond with eel in it, a vineyard, a meadow and a rose garden; the house is run by a villica, the slaves are ordered about by a vilicus (Mart., XVIII; XXXI). So we can see here a small-sized slave-owning country seat which catered for the needs and tastes of its lord.

Thus we may conclude that in this zone Spain had rural manors of three types. First, there were market-oriented estates producing first and fore-

<sup>45</sup> G. WOOLF, *op. cit.*, pp. 285-286.

<sup>46</sup> R. HELM, Velerius Martialis, en *RE*, 15A (1955), Sp. 58; J. M. BLÁZQUEZ, *Nuevos estudios sobre la romanización*. Madrid, 1989, p. 287.

most the export items in a great demand beyond the Peninsula boundaries—such as olive oil and wool (as would be expected, sheep—raising farms were larger in size than olive-growing ones). On such farms packages were most probably manufactured too to store the produced goods. The second type of country houses were suburban villas meant for their owners' rest and leisure, and the third type was made up by natural or deminatural farms that bore no or little relation to the market. The latter type of estates also belonged to the municipals (cf.: Mart., XII, praef. 15). So that they all constituted the antique sector of the provincial economy. The very same types of rural manors were spread in Italy too in the last two centuries of the Republic and at the dawn of the Empire<sup>47</sup>.

Did large-sized property exist in the agriculture of South and East Spain? We know that in the 80-s of the first century B.C. i.d. in the days prior to Caesar and even Sertorius, there was a spectacularly rich man, a certain Vibius Pacianus, whose seaside estate (ἄγροὶ παραλίοι) was so enormous that a cave on it could serve as a hiding place to young Crassus and his followers for days and neither the landlord himself saw anything of them nor his neighbours wver heard about it (Plut. Crass., 4). His relative or, perhaps, even his son was L. Vibius Paciecus, an officer of Caesar, homo eius provincias notus (Bel. Hisp., 3)<sup>48</sup>. The name Paciecus (and consequently the Latinized Pacianus) was obviously Iberian<sup>49</sup> and if this is so, the patron of young Crassus seems to be a native landowner with a Roman citizenship (the presence of the gentilium and cognomen is a patent proof of it). Unfortunately neither the dimensions nor the structure of pacianus's estate are known to us.

In the late republican and early imperial times owners of very big property were the Annaei of Corduba and the circle of their friends in general, that embraced both the descendants of the Italian immigrants and people of the native stock<sup>50</sup>. In the reign of Tiberius the richest Spaniard was S. Marius. It was his wealth that brought about his death on the emperor's initiative who immediately on his death claimed Marius's possessions (Tac. Ann., VI, 19). Tacitus writes that Marius owned gold and silver mines and the memory of them reverberated for many a year in the name of a special variety of copper (Plin., XXXIV, 4) and in the pit name (CIL, II, 1179; CIL, XIV, 52). After Marius a mountain chain was called ὄρος

---

<sup>47</sup> V. I. KUZISHCHIN, *Roman Slave-Owning Estate*. Moscow, 1973, pp. 53-179 (in Russian).

<sup>48</sup> C. CASTILLO, *Prosopographia Baetica*. Pamplona, 1965, p. 176.

<sup>49</sup> H. G. GUNDEL, *Paccianus*, en *Kleine Pauly*, 4 (1979), 393.

<sup>50</sup> J. F. RODRÍGUEZ NEILA, *Historia de Córdoba*, T. I. Córdoba, 1988, pp. 347-348.

Μαρτανόπ (Ptol., II, 4, 12) and this name has come down to us<sup>51</sup>. Though Marius was most probably only an equestrian, not a senator, any association with him seemed rather profitable and therefore a Baetica community concluded with him a agreement on hospitality (which is still a very rare event since other pacts of this kind were usually signed with the senators)<sup>52</sup>. We do not know if Marius had any agricultural estates besides his pits; nor do we know if he was a unique figure standing out all by himself, or if we can regard him as a representative of Baetica's rich proprietors. The preservation of his name in the toponym up to these days betokens the first interpretation.

Evidently, the confiscations of the local wealthy people's property made up the imperial property made up the imperial property in Spain. Plutarch (Galbe, 5) mentions Nero's estates but we have no information, in what regions of Tarraconensis they were situated. Curiously, however, according to Plutarch, these estates attracted numerous buyers—evidently Spain had at that time quite a number of rather rich men. The Tarraconensis conventus erected an honorary statue with an inscription to the Caesarean procurator M. Acilius Rufus (CIL, III, 3840), so that in all likelihood, the sphere of this procurator's activities covered North-East Spain. The existence of the emperor's property in the senatorial Baetica is demonstrably proved by the presence there of Augustus' procurators<sup>53</sup>. As is known, the imperial property was outside the city's jurisdiction.

<sup>51</sup> Stein, Marius, 28, en *RE*, Hbd. 28 (1939), Sp. 1.821; A. SCHULTEN, Mons Mariorum, en *RE*, Hbd. 31 (1931), Sp. 200.

<sup>52</sup> E. ECK; F. FERNÁNDEZ, Sex. Marius in einem Hospitiumvertrag aus der Baetica, en *ZPE*, 85 (1991), S. 217-221.

<sup>53</sup> H. G. PFLAUM, Les carriers procuratoriennes equestres sous le Haut-Empire. Paris, 1960, pp. 1.048-1.049.