

Roman era Carthage and Lepcis Magna

a comparative study of the Romanization and the
Libyphoenician survival of the two leading cities
of Africa Proconsularis

Andreas Lagaard, Historisk Institutt, UiO, HIS4090 Vår 2008

Preface:

This thesis started off as an interest in the Phoenicians sparked off by Maria Eugenia Aubet's *The Phoenicians and the West* and especially her mention of the lost literary heritage from these peoples which intrigued me to no end. So when I had to choose a subject for my work I was really interested in doing a piece on them and their lost history. However there were no thesis councilors available for that time period and I had to move my chosen period into the realm of Antiquity when the Phoenician homelands were reaching their historical dusk so to speak. I vacillated in the beginning between doing a study on the Alexandrian siege of Tyre with possible comparative avenues of research pertaining to the previous sieges/attacks on the island city state and a study on the Western Phoenicians and their zone of influence. As Jon Iddeng, my future thesis councilor to be, was an expert in Latin Literature and the Romans in general I chose to follow a path of study detailing their archenemies the Punic peoples. At first I in my naivety thought that the whole Punic realm of the Western Mediterranean would be a fitting subject for study. I quickly realized the vast magnitude of such an undertaking and scaled down my subject to first just the Punic peoples in Africa and then later to just the populations of Punic Africa's heartlands in Tunisia and Libya. As for the time period I chose to limit myself to the period after the Roman invasion and occupation as the prior period had received thorough examination from illustrious scholars such as Serge Lancel, G.C. and Colette Picard and B.H. Warmington among others. I wanted to tackle the question of Punic survival in the face of Roman incursion as the subject of cultures being subjugated by others always has been an almost morbid interest of mine. Furthermore the area seemed to my inexpert knowledge to be much more of a virgin territory where I could however insignificantly break new ground. After a while as I perused the sources available on the subject I quickly realized that even limiting myself to the Punic heartlands in Africa would be a monumental undertaking especially for one of my meagre philological and archaeological skills. I had to limit myself further and since Lepcis Magna and Carthage were the two sites most readily available in English language sources and in the sources in general due to their historical importance in the Roman period I landed on them as my choice for subject matter. My intention was and is to do a comparative study as to how Romanization affected them and as to how Punic they remained after the Roman takeover. The two sites were ideally suited to this as they presented stereotypes for two very different urban constellations in Punic Africa. Carthage was the foremost Roman colony of the region re-founded by Julius Caesar and Augustus and Lepcis was the Punic stronghold which suffered little Roman immigration rendering it as pure a Punic site as possible given the circumstances.

With this in mind I strode to work and the present thesis is the end result.

I would like to thank my thesis councilor Jon Iddeng for pointing me in the right direction for valuable sources, helping me out with understanding the Latin inscriptions and giving invaluable comments upon my work in progress. Furthermore I want to thank Professor David Mattingly for supplying me with tips for source materials and Professor Karel Jongeling and his Ph.D student Robert M. Kerr for letting me read some of their unpublished work and helping me understand a bit more about the complexities of the Late Punic language and its epigraphic corpus.

Andreas Lagaard 29.04.08

Abbreviations:

AE: *L'Année épigraphique*

CIL: *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinorum*

CIS: *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*

IPT: *Iscrizioni Puniche Della Tripolitania*

IRT: *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*

Tables:

Table 1 p 32 Libyphoenician and Roman/Hellenistic deities in Carthage's Latin inscriptions

Table 2 p 33 Libyphoenician and Roman/Hellenistic deities in Carthage's Latin inscriptions alongside the Christian and Jewish inscriptions

Table 3 p 35 Inscriptions with and without Libyphoenician elements from Lepcis

Table 4 p 49 Carthage and Lepcis' Neo-Punic and Latin inscriptions

Table 5 p 54 Lepcis' Neo-Punic multilingual corpus

Table 6 p 56 Lepcis' public and possibly private Neo-Punic corpus

Table 7 p 63 Carthage and Lepcis' Latin corpus with Libyphoenician elements

Table 8 p 67 Lepcis' dated inscriptions, a development

Table of contents:

| | |
|---|------|
| Introduction Chapter | p 8 |
| 1. Historical background for the Canaanites | p 8 |
| 2. Historical background for the Tyrians and the Phoenicians in general | p 9 |
| 3. The colonies in the Western Mediterranean basin | p 10 |
| 4. The confrontations with Rome | p 11 |
| 5. Aftermath | p 12 |
| 6. Classical Historiography | p 13 |
| 7. Modern Historiography | p 13 |
| Theory & Method Chapter | p 15 |
| 1. The problem of Romanization | p 15 |
| 2. David Cherry's requirements for acculturation models and critique of other models | p 17 |
| 3. David Cherry's model | p 19 |
| 4. My approach | p 20 |
| 5. Important definitions | p 21 |
| 6. Availability of sources and problem statements | p 23 |
| 7. Selected intellectual cultural values | p 24 |
| Religion Chapter | p 26 |
| 1. Problematic sources | p 26 |
| 2. Carthage before the fall | p 26 |
| 3. Roman era Carthage | p 28 |
| 4. Lepcis Magna | p 33 |
| 5. Comparison | p 36 |
| 6. The Libyphoenician cults and Christianity | p 39 |
| 7. Running it through the Cherry requirements | p 41 |
| 8. Conclusion | p 42 |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Language Chapter | p 44 |
| 1. Historical context and background | p 44 |
| 2. Framework for analysis | p 46 |
| 3. Neo-Punic | p 46 |
| 4. Latino-Punic | p 59 |
| 5. Greco-Punic | p 61 |
| 6. Other major Libyphoenician sites in Tunisia and Libya | p 61 |
| 7. The Latin inscriptions | p 62 |
| 8. Running it through the Cherry requirements | p 64 |
| 9. Conclusion | p 65 |
| Institution chapter | p 69 |
| 1. Historical background | p 69 |
| 2. General political history and regional administrative framework in the Roman period | p 71 |
| 3. Framework for analysis | p 76 |
| 4. Lepcis Magna | p 77 |
| 5. Carthage's Libyphoenician institutions | p 80 |
| 6. Running it through the Cherry requirements | p 83 |
| 7. Conclusion | p 84 |
| Conclusion Chapter | p 87 |
| 1. Reservations on the available evidence/Cherry's model revisited | p 87 |
| 2. Summary of the argument so far | p 88 |
| 3. Final comparison | p 90 |
| 4. Final argument | p 92 |
| 5. Avenues for further research | p 96 |
| Source Chapter | p 98 |
| 1. Reservations regarding the selection of sources | p 98 |
| 2. Classical sources | p100 |
| 3. Contemporary sources | p103 |
| 4. Literature list | p112 |

Introduction Chapter

As the theme of this thesis I've chosen the Punic culture and civilization in the Western Mediterranean in the period after 146 B.C.E when Carthage the leading Punic city was destroyed by the Romans.

1. Historical background for the Canaanites

The origins of the Carthaginian and the other Punic citystates can be found in the area roughly comprising modern Lebanon. (Aubet, 2001, p 13) The people the Greeks called the Phoinikes and we today commonly call the Phoenicians did not themselves employ this term. Instead they called themselves Can'ani or what we would call Canaanites today. (Aubet, 2001, p 6-13) Up until approximately 1200 B.C.E and the end of the Bronze Age the Canaanite territory encompassed the coastal areas from the estuary of the river Orontes in modern day Syria to the Egyptian border in the south. As far back as the Early Bronze Age 3100-2300 B.C.E this territory was centred around great cities like Byblos, Tyre and Megiddo. Due to their geographical position these cities had strong political and commercial ties with Egypt, Mesopotamia and the strong Syrian states. In texts found in the ruins of the ancient city Ebla in contemporary Syria and dating back prior to 2500 B.C.E this territory is called Ga-na-ne (Canaan) or La-ba-na-an (Lebanon). Byblos was the leading city of this early period and the whole area became the most vital commercial link between Egypt and the Syrian states in the centuries from 2500 to 2300 B.C.E. In reality both Byblos and the other Canaanite cities were under strong Egyptian influence and could be said to have been nothing more than vassal states for the Old Kingdom of Egypt. But at the end of the Early Bronze Age the most important Canaanite cities were plundered and burnt by nomadic tribes of Semitic origin and the period from 2300 to 1900 B.C.E marks a stop in the sea trade with Egypt. After 1900 and up to approximately 1550 B.C.E Egypt regained its control over the important cities of Byblos, Ugarit and Megiddo although Tyre is now mentioned as an independent kingdom. In the following period from 1550 to 1200 B.C.E or what is called the Late Bronze Age the Canaanite cities formed a vital part of the great trade network in the Eastern Mediterranean which also included Egypt, Mycenea and Mesopotamia. But at the transition into the Iron Age the cities fall on bad times together with the rest of this trade network. Egypt's power fades, Mycenea collapses and Ugarit, one of the region's greatest cities is destroyed and abandoned. Three important explanations can help us understand the downfall of the Canaanite cities in this the beginning of the Iron Age. First the Israelite tribes invaded the mountainous areas in the south of Canaan approximately 1230 B.C.E.

Then the so called "Seapeoples" invaded and crushed the Hittite empire and burnt down several Canaanite cities before ultimately settling down in the southern coast region of Canaan around 1180 B.C.E. These invasions destabilized the region and left a political vacuum enabling the Aramaic tribes to establish themselves in northern and northeastern Canaan in what is Syria today at the beginning of the 11th century B.C.E. In just over 150 years the Canaanite peoples lost 75% of their territory and more than half their coastline. The eastern boundary of the Canaanite homeland now lay at the Lebanon mountains and east to west it did not exceed more than 30 kilometers on average. With their strong maritime traditions, a steadily increasing population and military pressure from stronger neighbours it is no wonder that the Canaanite cities saw the Mediterranean as their only possibility for expansion. The heavily reduced territory they were left with comprises approximately what is the state of Lebanon today.

2. Historical background for the Tyrians and the Phoenicians in general

From the onset of the Iron Age the Canaanites are called Phoenicians in the research literature owing to the history tradition of the ancient Greeks even though the Canaanites themselves continued to call themselves just that or used their city's name for denomination. Sidon and Byblos were the dominant cities in the Early Bronze Age spanning the dark years from 1200 to 900 B.C.E. Tyre, which was to make a spectacular comeback and become the most powerful Canaanite city from the 10th century onwards is totally absent from the sources prior to the coronation of Hiram the first in 969 B.C.E. Tyre was situated on an island with natural good harbours, a feature which is reflected in the areas they later colonized and particularly Gadir. An estimate of the city's population puts the number at somewhere between 30 and 40 thousand. This included the mainland satellite city of Palaeotyre and the surrounding agricultural districts. With the ever fading power of Egypt in the region, the defeat of the Philistines by the Israeli king David in 975 B.C.E and the still unstable situation of the Arameic kingdoms Tyre had the opportunity to expand. In cooperation with the Israeli king Solomon Tyre operated very profitable trade expeditions to the mythical land of Ophir which probably lay either in East Africa or on the Arabian peninsula. King Ithobaal of Tyre who reigned from 887 to 856 B.C.E was the one who really accelerated the city's expansion. During his reign Tyre incorporated the neighbouring city of Sidon as well as most of southern Phoenicia into his kingdom and there is mention of the first two colonies, one in Libya and one north of Byblos. Tyre profited greatly from their commercial dealings with the two Jewish kingdoms and the Aramaic states. King Pygmalion who reigned from 820 to 774 B.C.E is ascribed the next phase of colonization when Kition on Cyprus and colonies in the Western Mediterranean

were founded. But in the east the Assyrian empire's power was growing at an alarming rate and it forced Tyre and its neighbouring states and peoples to pay huge tributes. After several conflicts with the Assyrians Tyre was reduced in size to the island itself and the suburbs on the mainland. In 640 B.C.E even the little which was left of their mainland territory was swallowed up by an Assyrian province. The Neobabylonian empire then appeared on the stage conquering Nineveh, Jerusalem and Damascus before laying siege to Tyre for 13 years until its fall in 572 B.C.E. This spelled the end for the leading role of the Tyrian kingdom and Sidon assumed the role of being the most powerful and wealthy Phoenician state until the invasion of Alexander in the late 4th century B.C.E. (Aubet, 2001, p 7-60)

3. The colonies in the Western Mediterranean basin

Regarding the colonization of the Western Mediterranean there are two hotly disputed subjects we must pay attention to. First there's a centuries wide gap between Velleius Paterculus' (Hist. Rom. 1:2, 1-3) and the other classical sources' dating of the founding of the first Phoenician colony of Gadir in 1103-04 B.C.E and the earliest archaeological findings dating from the middle of the 8th century B.C.E. (Aubet, 2001 s 225-6, 261-2). Today Paterculus' dating is more or less discredited since he falls into the classical trap of assuming Homer's poetry to be historically accurate and intertwines the founding of Gadir with the story of Heracles' travels and the fall of Troy. There has been formulated a hypothesis of a precolonial period of trade which left virtually no archaeological trace in defense of Paterculus' dating so the debate is far from over yet. (Aubet, 2001 p 194-7) The second subject revolves around whether other Phoenician cities founded colonies in the West or not. According to myth Utica is supposed to be older than Carthage and possibly founded by other Phoenicians but this is yet to be supported by archaeological evidence. Neither have other colonies displaying traits reminiscent of the other Phoenician cities been seen as colonies of these and not Tyre. But there is of course a real possibility for other Phoenician peoples to have joined in the colonial enterprise under Tyrian leadership. Seeing as Tyre was such a small state this might be more than just a little probable. Carthage was to become the most important colony in the Western Mediterranean. According to F. Josephus (C. Ap. 1:125) it was Elissa the sister of king Pygmalion of Tyre who founded this colony after fleeing first to Cyprus and then on to North Africa away from her brother who had killed her husband Zakarbaal/Acherbas. This is supposed to have happened in the 7th year of Pygmalion's reign and 38 years prior to the first Olympiad which puts it in the year of 814-13 B.C.E. (Timaeus, Ant. Rom. 1:74, 1). The earliest archaeological finds date from approximately 775-750 B.C.E but this doesn't discount an even earlier founding which it

might be very hard or even impossible to find traces of today (Aubet, 2001, p 219). The name given to the new colony was Quarthadasht which means the new city (Aubet, 2001, p 219). Relations with Tyre seems to have been taken up again fairly quickly as ambassadors were sent out annually to bring sacrifices or tribute to the temple of Melquart in the mother city (Quintus Curcius 4:2, 10 and Aubet, 2001 p 217). The other colonies in North Africa, Sardinia and Sicily eventually fell under Carthage's influence and developed an urban and religious model with the Tophet as a unique religious institution and a militarism alien to the colonies in Spain, the West Coast of Africa and on Ibiza (Aubet, 2001 p 212-14). After the Neobabylonians conquered Tyre in 572 B.C.E Carthage assumed its mother city's mantle of being the protector of what from now on is called the Punic and not the Western Phoenician territories (Aubet, 2001 p 212-14). From the onset of the 6th century B.C.E and onwards Carthage was powerful enough to challenge the Greeks who had founded Massalia and to enter into an agreement with the Romans dividing up the Western Mediterranean into spheres of influence (Aubet, 2001 p 226). After centuries of struggle with the Greek colonies on Sicily where the Carthaginians burned and plundered everyone except Syracuse and the Greeks massacred the Punic population of Motya, the tyrant of Syracuse, Agathocles, launched an invasion of Carthage's North African territory in the years 310-07 B.C.E. The invasion was a failure but it brought with it a wary peace between the opposing parties (Raven, 1984 p 24-30).

4. The confrontations with Rome

Now the two most powerful states of the Western Mediterranean stood face to face. Carthage with its colonies on Sicily and Rome with its control of the Italian mainland. It all started with the Mamertines, a group of former mercenaries, who requested Carthage's help against the Syracusans. But when the Mamertines discovered that the Carthaginians had no intention of leaving they turned to Rome for help. The Romans regarded Carthage as a threat and despite a *senatus consultum* against war Appius Claudius Caudex took the case to the people's assembly and managed to persuade the vote for war. The first Punic war lasted from 264 to 241 B.C.E and cost the Carthaginians the control of Sicily and later Sardinia which the Romans occupied when the Carthaginian mercenaries revolted in the years 241 to 237 B.C.E. The second Punic war followed in the years 218 to 201 B.C.E when the Carthaginians with the Barca clan in the lead, which had secured control over the southern and western parts of the Iberian peninsula, were provoked into war by the Roman interference in their conquest of Saguntum a Greek colony in Spain. Even though Hannibal Barca ravaged Italy with his mercenaries for 13 years the result was once again total defeat for the Carthaginians and an almost complete demobilization of Carthage's fleet and

elephant cavalry and an enormous war indemnity of 10.000 talents. Spain and its silver mines were lost for Carthage and this war signalled the beginning of the end for Carthage as an independent state (Le Glay, Voisin, Le Bohec, Chery, 2000 p 71-80). The next 50 years Carthage assumed an almost overtly humble and obedient attitude towards the Romans. Ambassadors traveled back and forth to Rome to ensure that the Romans remained benevolent but also to complain of the Numidian king Massinissa's continuing encroachment on their territory. The Romans ignored most of the Carthaginians' complaints and usually ruled in favour of Massinissa. Finally the Carthaginians took to arms against the Numidians but almost all the 25.400 men who participated in this catastrophic campaign were killed. Still the Romans took this break of the peace to be a provocation against the treaty of 201 and they declared war on Carthage in 149 B.C.E.

Carthage tried desperately to surrender but the terms of surrender the Romans demanded were too harsh and war ensued ending in the fall of Carthage in 146 B.C.E. The Romans spent 6 days razing and burning the city to the ground. Only 50.000 of a population of 200-300.000 surrendered and most of these were sold into slavery (The Cambridge Ancient History Second Edition p 142-62 ed. Astin, Walbank, Frederiksen, Ogilvie & Appian, Lybica, 130).

5. Aftermath

The Romans tried unsuccessfully to colonize Carthage and the surrounding territory several times beginning with the Gracchians and onwards until Julius Caesar ordered the final and successful colonization in 46 B.C.E (MacKendrick, 1980 p 30). But several Punic cities including Utica, Hadrumetum and Thapsus had backed the Romans and thereby avoided their wrath (Mokhtar, 1981 p 460). Utica even assumed Carthage's role as the leading Punic city in North Africa for well over a century. Gadir in the west remained an important city long into imperial times and its Heracles/Melquart cult was eventually incorporated into the official pantheon under the emperors Hadrian and Trajan (Aubet, 2001 p 273-5). Masinissa, who had assisted the Romans in their last campaign against Carthage, and his descendants on the throne of Numidia allowed Carthaginian refugees to settle in their lands and the Punic culture continued to blossom there as well as in the neighbouring kingdom of Mauretania. A new and simplified version of the Punic language appeared which we call Neopunic today and which remained in use at least until the 2nd century C.E. (Mokhtar, 1981 p 460-463). Saint Augustine, Apuleius and Tertullian were all of North African descent and they all bore witness in their writings to a vital Punic cultural survival as late as the 5th century C.E. From these and other sources I'll try to piece together a picture of the Punic culture's survival after the fall of Carthage despite occupation and foreign cultural influences. Our focus will

be on the two principal African Punic cities of Lepcis Magna and Carthage.

6. Classical Historiography

Classical authors often turned to the treatment of the Punic/Phoenician peoples and Carthage in particular as they were the classic enemies of first the Greeks in their homeland and later in the Western Mediterranean and finally the Romans in three bloody wars. From Timaeus of Tauromenius' excerpts in Velleius Paterculus' work on the founding of Carthage (Timaeus, Ant. Rom. 1:74, 1) to Polybius and Appian's treatment of the Punic Wars (Appian, Libyca & Polybius, Histories) to Aristotle's treatise on the Carthaginian constitution. (Lancel, 1995, p 115-17) However, after the fall, the Libyphoenicians mostly disappear from the written sources except mentions in the *Jugurthine Wars* by Sallust. The Libyphoenicians themselves furnish us with no written sources themselves from their early history and the early Roman period outside of the occasional enigmatic inscription. Like with the Gauls after Caesar's conquest the military minded Romans mostly ignored their defeated enemies in favour of their new nemesis the Germans and the Parthians. The next written evidence for the Libyphoenicians come from the blooming of North Africa's own literary and political elites particularly Saint Augustine from the 4th and 5th centuries. (Augustine, Epistulae & Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 4-5) They are merely mentions in passing of the Libyphoenicians as no study of them directly is made or at least has not survived to this day. With the decline of North Africa after the Vandal invasion which finished off Augustine himself the Libyphoenicians vanish from the written sources.

7. Modern Historiography

The birth of oriental studies in the 19th century two monumental studies on the Phoenicians and their Western Mediterranean colonies written by Movers and Bérard came to conclude with the Mediterranean being a virtually Phoenician lake. A contrary trend at the end of the century set off by the spectacular Greek and Roman discoveries made the highly Eurocentric claims of Greek and Roman precedence both in culture, colonization and historical age. The Eurocentrists foremost exponents were Salomon Reinach and Julius Beloch and later Carpenter and Gimpera who were highly critical of any evidence for Phoenician settlements in the West. This state of affairs lasted until the 1940's but the wealth of new evidence uncovered at excavations of Carthage, Gadir, Byblos and Ugarit started to trickle into the historical works of the period. (Aubet, 2001, p 198-9) In 1968 G.C. Picard voiced criticism of writers such as Gsell and Warmington who discounted the

Punic civilization as static and unchanging. Picard wanted to demonstrate that the Punic civilization was equal to the Roman/Greek so idolized by the Classical Researchers of the world. He set off a tradition which has continued up until our day which has corroborated the few mentions of the Libyphoenician in classical sources with new archaeological evidence from excavations at Libyphoenician sites, especially Carthage under the supervision of UNESCO. (Picard, 1968, 1-4) His work has been continued by Serge Lancel, Marcel Le Glay and others.

1. The problem of Romanization

To work with the subject of cultural change in an area dominated by the Romans in the era of their Empire means getting to grips with the elusive term of Romanization. In short, how much did the culture of the conquerors influence the culture of their subjects? A general question pertaining to all kinds of cultural collisions throughout history from the “Egyptianization” of the Middle East in the 4th and 3rd millennia B.C.E through the “Phoenicianization” of Mediterranean coasts and islands and Hellenization in the wake of Alexander to “Arabianization” after the conquests of Islam in the 7th century C.E and many more. In our case Romanization is hardly an agreed upon term signifying only one straightforward meaning. (Cherry, 1998, p 75-6) To shed some light on the differences in approach to and understanding of the term I have consulted with different authorities on the subject. I have chosen 2 different works which I have found to be most relevant to my thesis to help illustrate this. David Cherry in his *Frontier and Society in Roman North Africa* defines Romanization as most commonly understood as the adoption or imitation of Roman ways of thought, behaviour, construction and manufacture. Furthermore he expresses doubts as to whether Romanization can be said to be a function of cultural change altogether in concurrence with J.F. Gilliam’s statement that being Roman was a matter of law not culture, but specifies that this is especially valid in the period from the late 2nd century C.E onwards when more and more provincials gained access to the governing elite. Though up until the latter part of the 2nd century C.E he states that it cannot be denied that there was an identifiable Roman cultural matrix. As regarding our subject area North Africa outside of Egypt Cherry emphasizes that the process of acculturation was mostly an one-sided affair except perhaps for the short time of the Severan dynasty. (Cherry, 1998, p 76-77) To complicate things most of the surviving evidence of indigenous culture stems from the wealthy elites whom were most likely to acculturate for political, economic and status reasons while ordinary indigenes’ life is virtually missing from the sources. Some, Martin Millett in particular according to Cherry, claim that the lower social classes comprising the brunt of the population emulated their elite compatriots in their acquiring of Roman cultural attributes creating a self-generating process of acculturation. In Cherry’s opinion this is not tenable as there is no evidence to back up this supposition. (Cherry, 1998, p 78-80) Lastly Cherry makes the distinction between material and intellectual acculturation with the latter being much harder to provide evidence for. For Cherry the intellectual acculturation is the most important signifier of Romanization as the adoption of material culture does not necessarily mean a break with

your core cultural elements. For example driving an American car or drinking Coke does not make you an American. The other significant work I've focussed on is Peter Garnsey & Richard Saller's *The Roman Empire. Economy, Society and Culture* from 1987. They stress Romanization as a process of fusion of imperial and local institutions and culture that was the joint product of government and local initiative. Furthermore they state that the Emperors lacked a grand plan for the spread of Roman culture for instance allowing eastern Mediterranean cities to retain their Hellenistic constitutions and even setting up new cities in the region with similar ones. For example even though Rome did not admit any new deities to the official pantheon until the 3rd century C.E. they only repressed in the Romans' eyes politically subversive and morally defunct cults i.e. Christians rejecting the imperial cult or cults which sacrificed humans. Still Garnsey and Saller claim that indigenous religions disintegrated, were simplified and reinterpreted, especially in the urban sites. In their opinion the degree of pre-Roman urbanization was a crucial factor in determining level of Romanization. As with Hellenism Romanization had little impact on the countryside instead being limited to the urban sites and their immediate surroundings resulting in an accentuation of the differences between the two. The more urban sites a region supported the more Romanization made its impact felt. With the Roman reliance on existing local elites governing the empire Romanization was fundamentally a voluntary act perpetrated by the elite in search of status and influence. As a result many inhabitants of the empire had little experience or conception of Rome. And in spite of the voluntary acculturation of the upper classes they continued to speak indigenous languages. But what is vital to keep in mind is that the Roman culture might have been the dominant cultural influence in the West but others also exerted influence such as the Hellenistic, Egyptian and even the Libyphoenician cultures in their own right. The Roman influence was not exclusive in a multifaceted empire. (Garnsey & Saller, 1987, p 201-3)

Now both works underline the important position of the elite as regarding Romanization but where Garnsey and Saller conclude with limited or no Romanization among the common people of the day Cherry makes no claim either way as he feels he cannot back it up with evidence. They both concentrate roughly on the period of the Principate though only Cherry makes the important distinction between material and intellectual acculturation and allows for a fading of the Roman cultural matrix from the later 2nd century C.E onwards. Garnsey and Saller links the spread of Romanization with the pre-existing urbanization of the different regions in the West while Cherry contains his comments on this subject to the elite of these urban sites. To put the process of acculturation into perspective Garnsey and Saller also underlines the fact that it was mostly a voluntary undertaking with no master plan for Romanization emanating from the emperors in Rome. But the most fundamental difference must be said to be their definition of Romanization.

Garnsey and Saller see it loosely as a process of fusion between two cultures. Cherry meanwhile describes it more narrowly as a process of acculturation on the part of the members of one of the two cultures and even gives four aspects of it ready to be measured if possible. In my thesis I'll try to benefit from both volumes' insights. Cherry's distinction between material and intellectual acculturation is very significant as well as both works' admittance to the scarcity of material documenting the life of ordinary people and their reluctance to extrapolate much or at all from the material pertaining to the elite to include the common folk. Garnsey and Saller's statement about the non-exclusivity of Roman cultural influence must also be noted as well as their refusal to see any grand scheme for cultural domination on the part of the imperial government. All changes cannot be attributed to the dominating culture as other cultures are not passive "victims" but rather influential factors themselves.

2. David Cherry's requirements for acculturation models and critique of other models

For Cherry, his goal is to try to measure the extent of the acculturation. He expands upon his sentiments by arguing against several different models for the measuring of Romanization that he regards as unworkable. A quick run through of them is necessary to spell out his opinions. First Cherry sets down three requirements for a model meant to measure Romanization.

Number 1:

It must describe the acculturation of core or embedded ideas or artefacts of the Roman culture or the substitution of core or embedded qualities of the exposed culture with Roman ones.

Number 2:

It must be possible to measure this/these acculturations over a broad range of social groups in the exposed culture.

Number 3:

Finally it must be able to describe acculturations in quantifiable ways with large samples.

With these requirements as ammunition he starts shooting down several models he finds inadequate.

In the case of Roman architecture appearing in the Provinces he casts doubt as to whether it is possible to discern between pre-Roman Hellenistic buildings and Roman ones as well as questioning whether this style of building allows us to automatically assume an adoption of Roman values in correlation. His finishing argument towards this model is to say that it does not tell us anything about those outside the elite. Regarding the adoption of Roman art he states that this again cannot really say anything about anyone other than the elite as the material record cannot discern between the taste and preference of the artist and the patron. The model assuming the adoption of urban habitation to be a sign of Romanization is dismissed by Cherry since most Roman era urban sites were inhabited before that and reflects a not specifically Roman trend towards urbanisation. Furthermore if it is Roman-style towns they want to measure it's really architecture we're talking about and see above. Considering the spread of epigraphy Cherry admits this to be a major Roman habit although surviving Libyan inscriptions indicate that it was not an exclusively Roman feature. Libyphoenician inscriptions both in Punic and Neo-Punic also ascribe to this being not a singularly Roman pursuit. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1 & 31) The adoption of Roman-style names is also problematic in Cherry's eyes as it is impossible to distinguish between Latin immigrants and the indigenous in the inscriptions. Still Cherry admits that this model can be based on many samples and is indicative of Romanization. Moving on to religious practices where Cherry's view is that in North Africa many indigenous gods were at least partially Romanized and that the elite eagerly embraced Roman religion. Changing forms of temples, images and votives are indicatives. But there is also a good deal of evidence for the continued practice of local beliefs and the difficulty of interpreting and categorizing the material record makes this model untenable also especially since inscriptions are few and far between. Cherry goes on to dismiss the model measuring the introduction of Roman coins by saying that this does not necessarily give evidence for anything other than the presence of Roman soldiers and tradesmen. It is also not likely that not using coins was an embedded core value of the provincial culture and the coins themselves can rarely be demonstrated to have been unquestionably Roman. Libyphoenicians did employ coinage prior to the Roman conquest and only switching currencies cannot be said to make much impact on the indigenous culture just as in the modern day example of the Euro.

(<http://website.leidenuniv.nl/~jongelingk/projects/neopunic-inscr/COINS/COINSFRAMES.html>)

In the case of graves and grave monuments Cherry argues plainly that there's not much difference between pre-Roman and Roman era practises. Material goods of Roman style or make can be counted and dated but according to Cherry they can't indicate much beyond the presence of Romans and of the taste of the elite capable of purchasing them. Likewise he discounts the model measuring the adoption of Latin language and dress as these cannot be shown to appear outside the

elite. The shift towards more Roman-style municipal government is also rendered invalid as a model by Cherry's 3 requirements as it predominantly affected the elite and when universal citizenship was bestowed it had lost its importance. The promotion in municipal status of the towns cannot likewise be taken as an indication of Romanization in Cherry's opinion as there is no proof of that in the sources. Lastly Cherry makes an estimate of the number of army recruits and states that their numbers never rose above a tiny fraction of the total North African population and this makes their cultural impact insignificant in his view. Even several models put together seemingly does not convince Cherry as he derides Ramsay MacMullen's "odd little list of gods, pots and Latin". (Cherry, 1998, p 75-100)

3. David Cherry's model

Cherry champions his own model of course after rejecting all of these. In his view the best way to measure Romanization is to measure the percentage of intermarriages between people with Roman names and people with indigenous names out of the grand total found in inscriptions. Cherry admits to this being less than perfect since there is no way to distinguish between an immigrant and an indigene with Roman-style names. Still he sees this as the great indicator of Romanization as it gives us an inkling of the intermarriage rate between Roman(ized) and indigenous in North Africa and the ensuing cultural exchange. Before we move on I must pen 2 serious reservations I have found with this approach. Cherry's requirements are quite harsh and his own model does not seem to live up to them. The first requirement raises the question: does this model really measure the acculturation of Roman core qualities or the supplanting of indigenous core qualities by Roman ones? All we have are names. According to Cherry himself they are indicative of Romanization but he also argues that someone wishing to advance in the army or the bureaucracy needed a Roman-style name. (Cherry, 1998, p 81) How Romanized is the army grunt taking a Roman name while remaining ignorant of most everything else in the Roman cultural matrix? Is this man really a facilitator of cultural exchange in anything but the slightest degree? Or the wealthy farmer seeking to impress his poorer neighbours? There are vast differences between emperor Severus' father who spent most of his childhood in Italy and was praised by Statius himself for his Roman cultivation (Birley, 1988, p 19-20) and the Libyan T. Flavius Ninus Achul and other wealthy compatriots of his commemorated in inscriptions across Tripolitania. (Mattingly, 1995, p 166-7) And even more so between the elder Severus and a hypothetical man of ambition but no means with a Roman-style name undocumented in the sources. How can we be sure of the level of Romanization in someone carrying a Roman-style name? We cannot and that is the first flaw of this model. The second flaw

pertains to the second requirement. If Cherry's estimate of a population of 6-8 million in North Africa is correct how can marriage inscriptions numbering in the hundreds be representative for the whole population and its entire social spectrum? (Cherry, 1998, p 101-34) Keep in mind that this is the population at any given time and the inscriptions span over centuries in their dating. Would not it be more likely if these inscriptions represented only an elite or sub-elite consisting of soldiers and wealthy people able to shoulder the cost of inscription in this mostly illiterate age? Not that this model is not fruitful in its own right it just does not hold up in the light of the requirements and even without them we might have trouble relying on its results as it stands alone lacking possibilities for corroboration. Now my intention was not to pour scorn on Cherry's work but to showcase how his 3 requirements are way too harsh criteria to apply to scanty evidence 2000 years old. Hypercritical one might say. They negate even his own model. In an ideal world this would be the ideal model. Sadly we who study history and especially those of us who venture into ancient history have to rely on untrustworthy and hard to find source material. Is quantification of Romanization even possible?

And if possible in only a limited way is it still preferable to several models approaching the subject from different angles? In my opinion Cherry dismisses the possibility of several models too casually. If you include his valuable insights regarding how representative the different models are they all could gain us some understanding of the process of acculturation. The key component here is Cherry's own division into material and intellectual acculturations. Models measuring several intellectual acculturations would provide us with more info than with just one limited quantifiable one.

4. My approach

For the finishing touch I have saved the complete turnaround of the subject. My thesis is not about Romanization per se. My goal is to find residual elements of the Libyphoenician culture surviving through the ages. Both the works I have commented upon above hesitates or totally abstains from extrapolating Roman acculturation of the elite to the common folk. But if we put it the other way around we might ask ourselves if lingering Libyphoenician cultural elements among the elite might indicate an even stronger indigenous cultural foundation among the mass of the population. It is still guesswork but can we seriously consider a hypothetical North African past where the common folk were equally or more Romanized than the elite? A throng of peasants citing Plato and Cicero dressed in togas lorded over by a "barbarian" child sacrificing landholder? Does not seem too likely. This approach might in a small way alleviate for the lack of sources for the cultural life of

ordinary people in the area and era we are studying. Still it remains to be vigilant in the search for indicators including larger parts of the populous and not resolving to mere extrapolation without making reservations regarding it. Here a renewed focus on material culture might provide useful. Even though intellectual cultural qualities would seem to give us more insights into the ancient cultural world material ones of poor and cheap nature pertaining to the life of ordinary Libyphoenicians must not be ignored. Even though they can't be seen to indicate the level of Romanization they might just be able to establish residual Libyphoenician cultural influence among a greater part of the population. So what are we left with after this long tirade? Well we should always have in mind the limited or nearly non-existent cultural imperialism of the Romans and their lenience towards foreign religions in most cases. Most evidence relates only to the subject of the elite and this must be made explicit in any argument and an attempt must be at least made to include more of the social spectrum. Cherry's separation of material and intellectual culture is vital although intellectual indicators should not be allowed to completely eclipse the material culture and the contributions we might draw from it. His 3 requirements must be seen as ideal types to work towards and not absolute requirements excluding much source material. Several different models must be employed in the author's opinion since there cannot be one perfect one giving us everything we want to know about the subject. In a fallible world more than one approach must be made and the results compared to try and safeguard against anomalies in any one model. The non-exclusivity of Roman cultural influence must also be kept in mind to avoid falling into the trap of focussing solely on the duality of the conquered and the conquerors denying oneself the richness of actual cultural exchange.

Now we have a sort of theoretic base to expand upon in the following exploration of the Libyphoenician world after the fall of Carthage.

5. Important definitions

If we are to brave this cultural environment of Roman Africa Proconsularis we must first pin down some necessary definitions.

5.1. General definitions

First we must define the elusive term which is culture. In the context of this thesis I will define culture as all transmitted knowledge. That is all knowledge which must be taught and which a human is not born with. For instance making a shirt, tying your shoelaces and telling stories are all

examples of culture. To complete our more general definitions I will define the term society as an important relationship between two or more people which serves to demarcate them from other groups. This is a very loose definition which can encompass anything from the basic family unit to the international society of states.

5.2 Thesis specific definitions

To work in the area of acculturation in Roman North Africa one must confront the term Libyphoenician. Birley and Lancel in their works use the term exclusively for the peoples of the Tripolitanian cities where supposedly the Libyans and the Phoenicians merged to a greater degree and gave birth to a mixed culture. The argument goes that the colonizing Phoenicians were not opposed to inter-marriage and cooperation with the local Libyans, probably out of necessity. What followed was then a mix of cultures forging an unique cultural group separate from both the Phoenician peoples of the homelands and the Libyan tribes of Africa. (Birley, 1988, p 3 and Lancel, 1995, p 288) However I will argue for the inclusion of all African Punic peoples in this category as after possibly 650 years of co-existence in 146 B.C.E. A cultural mix between the two ethnicities must have occurred on a grand scale. If Tyre had a population of merely 30-40.000 they could not have engendered a massive immigration wave akin to the European colonization of North America. To consolidate and populate their colonies into the important cities they later became a solid influx of Libyan tribesmen and women must have been vital. (Aubet, 2001, p 7-60) Whether they were drafted in as slaves, spouses, servants, labourers etcetera is not important. They became part of the society of the colonies bringing their own culture with them and out through the centuries they must have made a significant impact. Furthermore with the collapse of independent Carthage vast tracts of formerly Carthaginian territory fell under the Numidian kings which must have facilitated the cultural exchange to an even greater degree. (Birley, 1988, p 4-5) So we will in this present work demarcate the Phoenician colonies of Africa from their Sicilian, Sardinian, Spanish and Balearic counterparts by assigning them the denomination of Libyphoenicians. We can define this group as a North African of mixed Phoenician and Libyan heritage where the Phoenician cultural heritage constitutes an important but not necessarily a dominant part. The reason for including an important part in the definition is to be able to demarcate from Libyan tribesmen who could have attained some aspects of Libyphoenician culture, for instance material culture, without actually adhering to most or even some important core intellectual values of the Libyphoenician group. The term Libyan was a Greek word for the Caucasian denizens of North Africa outside of Egypt. So the Libyans we can define as North Africans of Caucasian origins, the ancestors of

modern Berbers. (Birley, 1988, p 3)

6. Availability of sources and problem statements

However we must narrow down our scope as the most readily available sources pertain to the cities of Carthage and Lepcis Magna. These two cities were the leading cities of their respective Libyphoenician regions, the Medjerda basin and Tripolitania respectively. Carthage under the Romans was to become again the leading trade and academic city of North Africa outside of Egypt and Lepcis was to field a host of Roman knights and senators and even an emperor as its crowning achievement in 193 C.E. Naturally these two cities have garnered the most attention and are most present in the sources. That attention makes itself especially known in the English sources as many of the lesser sites are covered only by French or Italian texts as a consequence of their lesser historic impact and former roles as either French or Italian colonies. So out of consideration for my limited philological capabilities I single out the two great cities of Libyphoenician Africa in my comparative study. Another singular quality of the two sites besides their proliferate source material is their being almost stereotypical examples of two of Africa Proconsularis' most common urban settlement types. Carthage was re-founded by the Romans into a Roman colony with Italian settlers while Lepcis remained more or less a bastion of Libyphoenician culture unaffected by Roman/Italian mass settlement. To comparatively study the two might give us valuable insights into the process of Romanization, Libyphoenician cultural survival and the cultural compositions of the North African Roman colony and the originally Libyphoenician urban constellation respectively. To facilitate this mode of approach I will formulate two problem statements to be examined and a hypothesis to underline my own personal preconceived notions on the subject.

6.1. Problem statement no. 1

What were the Libyphoenician cultural remnants at the respective sites and how did they develop?

Here I aim to research how much of the original Libyphoenician cultural matrix was left if any after the Roman invasion and subsequently how it developed during the years of Roman rule. Did re-founded Carthage, the Roman colony, have any leftover Libyphoenician traits? And if it did how did they hold up and/or develop in the Roman era? As for the case of Lepcis the strength of the Libyphoenician heritage is the question at the onset of the Roman reign and how much it changed or even if it faded out completely under their rule.

6.2. Problem statement no. 2

Did other cultural influences besides the Roman and Libyphoenician make an impact and if so how?

Here I will try to explore if possible whether other cultures such as the Libyan, the Greek or others made any important impact so as to avoid a purely narrow dichotomic approach to the subject. In a multi-faceted Mediterranean the Libyphoenicians and the Romans were far from alone.

6.3. My hypothesis

The Libyphoenician cultural traits survived at both sites throughout the Roman period albeit in changed and partially Romanized form.

Here I want to lay out my own personal opinion on the subject of the thesis in the open so as to remain true to the objective ideal of historical research. With this in my mind readers will not have to try and read between the lines so as to perceive my personal prejudices but can judge freely from my own admission of them before I started the current study. As an aspiring Historian I of course must pursue the task of disproving my own hypothesis at every possibility to prove my scientific honesty.

7. Selected intellectual cultural values

In the line of thinking of Cherry I have selected three intellectual core cultural values to measure the cultural matrix of the two sites. Inspiration for these three must be accredited to Serge Lancel whom in his chapter on the Libyphoenician survival in *Carthage. A History* from 1995 mentions four pillars making up the state of Antiquity. Number one is the institutions and laws of the state. Number two is its walls and buildings . Three is its temples and cults and four is its language and written records. Of these the religion and language of a state is most likely to survive a military destruction and to last the longest. (Lancel, 1995, p 428) So for my three core values I have chosen religion, language and finally the institutions of the two cities. Religion and language are quite self-evident choices as they constitute the core of any society's composition and cannot be destroyed easily by anything less than complete genocide or the willing abandonment of them by their

society's respective members. Institutions however are not so hardy but due to my knowledge of Lepcis' and Makhtar's Libyphoenician institutions' longevity I found it interesting to pursue the subject in regards to Carthage too. (Lancel, 1995, 430-1) The comparison might highlight important facts which only focusing on religion and language might omit. In regards to the material culture I at first tried to pursue the evidence for the hatchet shaped razors so peculiar to the Libyphoenician realm, their types of boats/ships, their artistic culture and their methods of construction, especially the type called *pavimenta Punica* found at Byrsa hill prior to the sack. (Lancel, 1995, p 206-7 & 120-133 & 303-356 & 156) In the case of the razors, the boats and the construction methods I found little to no evidence from the period after the fall of independent Carthage. I cannot tell if it is my lacking of archaeological expertise, my inability to access the myriad of sources in French and Italian or if the evidence for their continuance under Roman rule just has not been uncovered or never really existed. With regards to the artistic tradition the last period of independent Carthage saw a massive influx of Hellenistic influence in its making and I feel less than qualified to distinguish between quite subliminal differences between late independent Libyphoenician art which had strong Hellenistic traits and early Roman era art from the same region when you account for Roman artistic influences themselves being highly Hellenistic in nature. Regretfully I will leave the realm of material culture to the archaeologists and art historians more capable than me in procuring sources and discerning slight differences in the material evidence. However, unlike Cherry, I refuse to refute the value of material evidence. All evidence, however slight, might help us complement and embellish our argument. I will of course agree with Cherry with his assertion that core intellectual values are more important and indicative of a people's cultural orientations. Now equipped with Cherry, Garnsey and Saller's theoretic framework and my chosen three intellectual core values I will proceed to try and piece together the cultural development of Roman Lepcis Magna and Carthage.

Religion Chapter:

In this chapter I'll examine the residual Libyphoenician cults which continued to be observed in Carthage and Leptis Magna in spite of the Roman gradual conquest of North Africa from the fall of independent Carthage in 146 BCE. This to try and map out one part of the Libyphoenician cultural matrix and its continuation or lack thereof under the new Roman rule.

We'll focus on the twin patron deities of both cities as these both supply us with the most and with the best comparable evidence, though where it is expedient to do so other African/Libyphoenician deities will receive mention as to solidify or even undermine a particular argument. The particular focus on the *dii patrii* is warranted for reasons of ease of comparison and limitation on the scope of the thesis.

1. Problematic sources

A difficulty presents itself when dealing with this material though. The primary sources of Libyphoenician origin are themselves either uninformative or absent altogether. Much of what we know stems from classical Greek or Roman sources and the figurative monuments that are left behind. Names of deities abound but their specific function is often clouded in mystery.

Furthermore, no matter how obscure the Libyphoenician pantheon might seem to us today, the deities of the neighbouring Libyan peoples are even further enveloped in the darkness of ancient history. This lack of knowledge hampers our quest for certain facts about the Libyphoenician cults as the indigenous religion must have played an active, even if it was a subordinate, role in shaping the religious environment of Libyphoenician Africa. Their influence can be assumed but as of today not fully comprehended. (Brouillet, 1994, p29-32) Care must therefore be exercised when employing the evidence we do have available to us in the formulation of hypothesis' and theories.

2. Carthage before the fall

Carthage on the bay of Tunis, the most illustrious and famous of Libyphoenician cities remained a leading city of North Africa from the fall of Tyre in 573 B.C.E. (Lancel, 1995, p 82) to the Arab conquest and destruction in 698 C.E., a span of over a thousand years with only the dismal interlude of 146-44 B.C.E., when the city was in ruins according to contemporaries, to tar its image(Lancel, 1995, p 428-30 & Ennabli, 2004 p 8). Carthage had strong traditions and institutions of its own which the Roman sack could not wholly extinguish. Its two principal civic patron deities were Tanit

and Baal Hammon, both closely connected to the infamous molk rites of child sacrifice which the Romans and Greeks alike abhorred. These rituals of offering humans up as sacrifice, molk, or substitute animals, the molchomor, to these deities by burning the victims and placing them in urns in the infamous tophet was a longstanding practice. (Pedley, 1980, p 6-7) These two cults' predominance in the Carthaginian pantheon is evidenced by the thousands of ex-votos dedicated to them in the aforementioned tophet by the harbours. Still, Baal Hammon of the Libyphoenician heyday prior to the 3rd Punic War is somewhat of mysterious origins. Speculations abound of whether he's an indigenous North African deity of either Berber or Egyptian origin since his epithet Hammon is easily interpreted in highly different ways as either furnace, protector, chapel or mount Amanus in Syria. Baal itself however is a common Phoenician godly name meaning "Lord". However uncertain his origins this divinity was worshipped as far afield as Sardinia, Malta, Sicily and modern day Algeria and Tunisia, the core regions of Carthaginian colonization and power. His sphere of influence over the daily lives of Carthaginians seems to have included their prosperity, protection and fertility in all its complexity. On the other hand you have Tanit, or Tanit Pene Baal, Tanit the face of Baal. She emerges in the 5th century and slowly usurps Baal Hammon's prime position among the civic deities over the centuries. Her origins are also mysterious, lost along with the vast Phoenician literature one must assume to have existed from the writings of Josephus and others in Antiquity. She is inextricably linked to the Phoenician goddess Astarte, though in what concrete way is hard to ascertain. The earliest reference to her comes from the 600's B.C.E. in an inscription from Phoenician Sarepta excluding the possibility for an African origin in a way which we cannot in the case of Baal Hammon.(Lancel, 1995, p194-201) Despite this uncertainty of origins the priests of these twin deities, the kohanim, are well attested in the evidence left to us from inscriptions and ex-votos. From these the priesthoods appear to have been a hereditary privilege within the aristocratic families of Carthage as was much the common practice in the Orient. (Lancel, 1995, p 209) At the head of each particular temple there resided a high priest, rab kohanim, whom in contrast to the minor priests enjoyed far ranging religious powers affecting the city's economic life through the exaction of sacrificial tariffs and construction work on religious sites. A host of other minor occupations like scribes, musicians, barbers, butchers etc. were associated with the temples and the carrying out of rites and upholding the strict collection of sacrifices from the civic populace in the manner of Greek offerings where certain parts of the animal sacrifice were reserved for the priests and others for the dedicators. (Lancel, 1995, p 210-11) The temples themselves are assumed to descend from the prototypical Phoenician type employed in the building of Solomon's temple in Jerusalem consisting of 3 linked chambers, the vestibule, the great hall and the holy of holies. Albeit another single chamber type

also was employed the attestation of this to a late Hellenistic switch is somewhat dubious. (Lancel, 1995, p 212-15) Such were the priesthoods, temples and the twin deities before the fall of Carthage. Now we must move on to the period after this cataclysm.

3. Roman era Carthage

There are lots of evidence for the survival and continuation of native, African cults in North Africa outside of Carthage, despite the gradual Roman takeover starting with the fall of Carthage. (Rives, 1995, p 132-52 and Lancel, 1995, p 431-36). But what of Carthage itself, sacked, destroyed and abandoned for a century only to be colonized by Roman settlers on the bequest of Caesar and Augustus? The Byrsa hill, the famous centre of the Libyphoenician capital, was refashioned into a Roman forum, destroying any visible trace of its independent days. How did the great city's cults survive this massive onslaught of Roman intrusion? Carthage's ancient principal deities of Tanit and Baal Hammon survived and prospered in Africa Proconsularis among other local divinities. Hadrumetum's devotions to Baal Hammon, or Saturn as his syncretized Roman name was, dwindled away in the 2nd century C.E but this seems to have been an exception to the rule. Baal and Tanit, or Saturn and Caelestis, both remained vital cults in North Africa long after the onset of Christianity. (Rives, 1995, p146-52 and Lancel, 1995, p 431) Indeed, the infamous tophets were in continual use at many North African sites at least as late as the end of the 1st century C.E., albeit with molchomor substitution rites where lambs were sacrificed in lieu of children. (Lancel, 1995, p 435) But Carthage itself was re-founded by Romans, with a Roman civic charter, a thoroughly Roman setting separated by time and ethnicity from the Libyphoenician grand metropolis of the past. It would seem impossible for the ancestral patron cult to survive this? There are, of course, divergent opinions on the issue. Henry Hurst, in his *The Sanctuary of Tanit at Carthage in the Roman Period* from 1999 advocates a theory of continuity of both cults and population from Libyphoenician through to Roman times. He stresses the colonialist views of researchers from the 1920's to the 60's as the explanation for the theories of clean break with prior tradition in the destroyed capital of Libyphoenician Africa. For Hurst the reinterpretation of published material from the sanctuary of Tanit, the area of the tophet in Carthage, reveals a strong continuity of religious practice both for the cult of Tanit-Caelestis and Baal-Saturn. (Hurst, 1999, p 9-11 and 98-102) But in his work he also underlines its academic mission as one of suggesting possibilities for further research instead of proclaiming the unshakeable truth on the subject. He admits that his particular perspective needs more work and more evidence to back it up in the face of established opinion. But how can a continuity be possible in the ruins of Carthage,

reportedly so utterly destroyed and cursed in the accounts of Appian? The 50.000 survivors who surrendered were sold off to slavery and the city itself put to the flame. (Appian, *Libyca*, 130 & Lancel, 1995 p424-7) Could the accounts of the sacking be exaggerated for propaganda purposes? Could a portion of the population have been left in place? Or if not, could thousands have escaped and returned at the cease of hostilities to carve out a living in the ruins of their ancient city? Possibly. Lancel evokes the storm of the Byrsa Hill in his magnificent *Carthage. A History* and backs up the tales of destruction with his findings of ruined Libyphoenician houses there in the 70's. (Lancel, 1995, p 428-9) But as Hurst points out further research and excavation is in order to properly flesh out the old narrative of doom and gloom. And what of the Megara? This sprawling suburb of Carthage described by both Appian and Diodorus, could it have escaped the destruction that was heaped upon the Byrsa? Lancel describes a ruined home in the Megara and attributes it to the final siege but a thorough excavation might provide more conclusive answers. (Lancel, 1995, p 280) Even if the destruction was as complete as reported Carthage was a vast metropolis in its heyday certainly supporting equally vast suburban populations whom could have continued on the traditions of the old regime. This was the age of agrarian empires where up to 90% of the population sustained itself through farming necessarily leaving much of the merchant state of Carthage's population outside its city walls. (Garnsey & Saller, 1987, p 43) Furthermore, with Carthage's status as the chief religious and cultural site of Libyphoenician Africa the other cities of Phoenician origin scattered about Tunisia, Algeria and Libya whom avoided Roman sacking could easily have spawned migrations of people wanting to restore or keep alive the ancient ways of Libyphoenician deities and culture at the original site. Still, this is just pure speculation to be further researched upon before any adamant proclamations are made. Let us move on to the proponents of discontinuity. J.B Rives in his *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage* from 1995 phrases it most succinctly. First he emphasizes the magnitude of the cult of Saturn-Baal in Libyphoenician Africa in Roman times by citing the evidence. 1800 dedications found, 18 temples of various sizes unearthed and many prominent North Africans mentioned in those inscriptions makes it the most well documented and popular cult of Roman North Africa outside of Egypt. (Rives, 1995, p142-51) Its evidence stretches on into late Roman times as a stele from Ghorfa dated 323 CE clearly shows us. (Lancel, 1995, p 433) This great African cult was changed over the years from a pure Libyphoenician deity into a more Romanized but still inherently African entity by adding elements of Roman/Hellenistic religion to it. (Rives, 1995, p148) To announce the death of Baal by the introduction of his interpretatio Romana and sprinklings of GraecoRoman religious practices would be incorrect insofar as topsets were known to be in use in the old way all over Libyphoenician Africa until at least the end of the 1st century CE, confirming the indigenous nature

of the deity. (Lancel, 1995, p 435). The process of syncretisation was rarely one of supplanting and in the case of Saturn we have no evidence of this being the case. (Rives, 1995, p 151) For Tanit-Caelestis her worshippers did not adopt the Latinized version of her name, Juno, but rather her Latin epithet Caelestis. A continuity of her cult is equally present if not in such vast numbers as with Saturn.(Lancel, 1995, p 431) So how was the patron deities of preRoman Carthage revered in their Roman colonized city? Saturn, despite having major sites of worship in close proximity to the great city itself with inscriptions revealing the presence of Roman citizens among its worshippers was never accepted into the *sacra publica* of Roman Carthage. (Rives, 1995, p142-4 and p154) Evidence of his presence as a cult figure abounds but this in itself does not equal continuity when Carthage was part of a region where his cult was deeply entrenched allowing people from other parts of Libyphoenician Africa to import Saturn-Baal's worship back to its roots. Still, and just as importantly, it does not exclude the possibility for continuity altogether either. Caelestis on the other hand gained entrance to the *ordo's sacra publica* from the 2nd century C.E. onwards and was attributed with a great temple by Quodvultdeus as late as the 5th century C.E. Her worship, albeit in somewhat of a Roman guise, retained strong elements of Libyphoenician character. Rives attributes this not to a continuity from preRoman times but to the character of the local elite. The Roman elite of Carthage had in the course of two centuries of cohabitation intermarried with Africans and allowed members of the African elite into the citizenry. It was a thoroughly Romano-African elite in the 2nd century C.E. claiming heritage from both great civilizations and motivated by quest for status and romantic notions of the past that reinstated the ancient first goddess of Carthage. But this does not of course exclude the possibility of a continuation of the cult from before the fall outside of the *sacra publica* of Roman Carthage. Something which happened naturally in all other sites of Tanit-Caelestis cult in Libyphoenician Africa. One must keep in mind though that this tantalizing possibility needs more than speculation to back it up and the influx of Tanit-Caelestis worshippers from outside of Carthage can easily explain away any cult evidence from the 100 years of interlude after the sacking. (Rives, 1995, p 162-9) So what then are we left with? Aside from Hurst's hypothesis of continuation which he himself admitted to being insufficiently based in existing and available evidence to him we have the presence of both patron deities in both their ancestral home of Carthage and the rest of the region. But, as Rives skilfully argues, both cults were not direct continuations but re-institutions and Saturn-Baal did not even achieve becoming a member of the city's public cults, despite his popularity both in all of Libyphoenician Africa and Carthage itself. Can the fate of Carthage's other African cults shed some more light on the issue? Pluto, the Cereres-Ceres and Eshmoun-Aesculapius were all African deities of both the preRoman and Roman era and all were worshipped in Carthage. Pluto seems not to have been a public cult but

the Cereres and Eshmoun-Aesculapius were definitely part of the *sacra publica*. But how Libyphoenician were they? Rives maintains that some crossover between the African and Roman variants must have occurred, especially with the emergence of a Romano-African elite but that at their core Aesculapius and Ceres were Roman cults. (Rives, 1995, p 154-62) Pluto, by his absence from other parts of the Western Empire, might be considered African in origin but there is no available evidence to link him to any continuation of cult in Carthage. (Rives, 1995, p 140) So unless new evidence emerges it seems as though Hurst's theory of continuity stands alone and falters in the presence of Rives' theory of reinstitution by the new mixed elite.

3.1.The epigraphical remains

Now let us proceed to the primary sources at hand to flesh out the accounts from the contemporary sources. As I will go into more detail about in the language chapter there is great difficulty associated with accessing the Neo-Punic corpus of Roman Carthage. The only inscription out of 15 listed which is available here and transcribed into English is CIS 949. It does list the names of both the tutelary deities of the city but it also dates to the period of late independent Carthage. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1 & 31) This makes it rather useless in the context of this work. The only thing it really does is establish that there were epigraphical evidence for the two deities prior to the fall. So we must look to the Latin corpus for evidence from the Roman period. Of course, before I embark on this course of work I must stress that my expertise in Latin epigraphy is limited at best. All interpretations I make here are my own and are subject to scrutiny and I will be the first to acknowledge any faults in them. With that said let us move on to the texts. Only 14 inscriptions mention deities which can possibly be of Libyphoenician origins. But if we accept Rives' statement that the Cereres and Aesculapius of Carthage were Roman in nature we can remove AE 1901, 0004, AE 1920, 0029, AE 1924, 0033, AE 1909, 0164, AE 1968, 0553 and AE 1910, 0078 from the argument leaving 8 inscriptions to be dealt with. (Rives, 1995, p 154-62) One of those, AE 1897, 0036, mentions both the Cereres and Pluto. Rives argues that Pluto most likely was an African deity but as he is mentioned next to the Cereres I hesitate to attribute much to this particular inscription. I will label it as uncertain and ignore it for the purpose of this study. Of the remaining 8 three mention Saturn. AE 1899, 0046, AE 1899, 0047 and AE 1894, 0016. One, AE 1906, 0137, mentions a figure called *deo libero* and one, AE 1953, 0042 mentions the name *Mercurio*. Both of these can be seen as incarnations of both Libyphoenician, Hellenistic or Roman figures but I hesitate to call them either way as I am far from an expert on either divine names or their epigraphical expressions. I will lump them into the uncertain category with Pluto. AE 1951, 0071

mentioning Neptun and AE 1913, 0047 mentioning Caelestis are last two. The Caelestis one is certainly of at least the mixed Romano-African type we discussed above but Neptune's origins is harder to ascertain. Neptune was an ancient Roman divinity but in Africa Proconsularis the name also referred to a local African deity of springs. (Rives, 1995, p 130-1) But seeing as Carthage was a major port city I again hesitate to draw any firm conclusions here. The uncertain category is filling up. The Roman/Hellenistic pantheon is represented with 12 inscriptions. The aforementioned Aesculapius and Cereres and AE 1914, 0087 mentioning the Genti Augustae, AE 1922, 0118 mentioning Calliope, AE 1897, 0043 mentioning Daphnis and Hermetis, AE 1898, 0008 and AE 1922, 0056 naming the Matri deum magna, and AE 1957, 0053 naming Iovi Capitolino.

Table 1

| Libyphoenician divinity | Roman/Hellenistic divinity | Uncertain category | Total number of inscriptions | Total number with text |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 4 inscriptions | 12 inscriptions | 4 inscriptions | 182 inscriptions | 148 inscriptions |

At first sight one would draw the conclusion that there is a determined majority of Roman/Hellenistic divinities in the epigraphical material but the large proportion of uncertain inscriptions in regards to the whole, 20%, can with further and more diligent research sway the argument from predomination to near equilibrium. This puts a damper on any conclusions to be drawn from this. But there are other elements of a religious nature in the texts which we can try to quantify. Barring the inscriptions listed above three list the term flamen. CIL 08, 16322, AE 1907, 0018 and AE 1957, 0072. As the term sacerdos is used for a Libyphoenician deity in AE 1899, 0046 I hesitate to conclude that flamen was a term solely employed for Roman-style priesthoods. Let us then turn to the dating. Only four of the inscriptions which refer to religious elements can be approximately dated. AE 1951, 0071 which might be from the age of Augustus, CIL 08, 16322 from 138-61 C.E., AE 1910, 0078 from Hadrian's era and AE 1922, 0056 from the Severan age. Any development traced on such a small sampling would be tenuous to say the least. What can we conclude with based upon this evidence? Well, nearing 10% of the Latin inscriptions contained a reference to a Roman/Hellenistic divinity while a mere 3,5% contained mention of a Libyphoenician deity. However we must keep in mind that the Caelestis named in AE 1913, 0047 is most likely the Romano-African creation of the new elite and not a continuity of the ancient cult itself. So the proportion of Libyphoenician mentions are even less. But the uncertain origins of four inscriptions also undermines any too firm conclusions to be drawn. What of other influences? AE

1899, 0105bis, AE 1914, 0037, AE 1904, 0003 and AE 1906, 0040 seem to be of Christian origins and AE 1917/18, 0013 and AE 1917/18, 0014 seem to be of Jewish origins. So we can embellish our table a bit:

Table 2

| Libyphoenician divinities | Roman/Hellenistic divinities | Uncertain whether Roman or Libyphoenician | Christian text | Jewish text |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|
| 4 inscriptions | 12 inscriptions | 4 inscriptions | 4 inscriptions | 2 inscriptions |

But before we make any loud assertions we must acknowledge that this analysis can be overturned by one or two significant finds.

4. Lepcis Magna

The greatest of the 3 emporia, Lepcis, Sabratha and Oea, whom the region of Tripolitania would later be named after, this splendid city spawned a Roman Imperial family and numerous Roman senators and knights. The religious history of Lepcis is scantier in evidence than Carthage's but much more straight forward. The city did not experience a great discontinuity like Carthage since it first became subordinated to the Numidian kings prior to 149 B.C.E. and later more or less willingly merged into the burgeoning Roman Empire. (Birley, 1988, p 4-5) The twin patrons of Lepcis were Shadrapa and Milk'ashtart. The name Milk'Ashtart alludes to both Melquart and Astarte but in this case it certainly was a male deity which later would be known as Hercules in the tradition of giving deities new Roman names. (Di Vita, 1999, p32 and 248) Melquart was the tutelary male divinity of Tyre thereby linking the city intimately with the original founder of the Libyphoenician colonies. (Birley, 1988, p 5) Shadrapa, whom also seems to have been the patron of Sabratha, proceeded to be syncretised into the Roman Liber Pater. Shadrapa was originally a Phoenician god of healing and his cult can be traced back to the 7th century B.C.E. in Phoenicia proper. (Di Vita, 1999, p 32 and 249) Some of the other Libyphoenician sites in Tripolitania seem to conform to a more Carthaginian religious practice but the cults of Tanit and Baal Hammon seem to have had less importance here than in the rest of Punic Africa. And Lepcis itself was indeed host to a wide variety of both local and imported divinities as the finding of 19 temples so far indicates. But among that host of cults not one of Libyan origin has yet been discovered. (Mattingly, 1995, p 167-8) From the 2nd or 1st century B.C.E. it seems that these twin deities enjoyed the prime temple spots by

the old forum only for Milk'Ashtart to be evicted for the benefit of the cult of the deified Rome and Augustus in the last few years prior to the C.E. A smaller temple was added to the forum to house the now homeless patron deity. (Mattingly, 1995, p 118) 2 centuries later Septimius Severus would construct a great basilica dedicated to his hometown's twin gods, establishing without a doubt the longevity and importance of these divinities to Lepcis and its people. (Di Vita, 1999, p 145) So regardless of foreign intrusions in the form of new cults, syncretisation and Roman rule Lepcis kept up its continuity of ancestral beliefs up until at least the Severan age and most certainly longer. This in stark contrast to Carthage which suffered a century of catastrophic destruction and the influx of Roman/Italian settlers.

4.1 The epigraphical remains

Again I must stress my inexpert skill level in Latin and Neo-Punic epigraphical knowledge and my lack of access to Neo-Punic sources resulting in me only being able to procure 21 out of 67 of the Neo-Punic inscriptions from Lepcis. Be that as it may we must proceed with the study. Of the 21 Neo-Punic epigraphical expressions only 6 mention names of divinities or religious practices of Libyphoenician or other origins. IPT 18, 21, 24, 25, 27 and 31. IPT 25 refers to Shadrapa, IPT 31 to both the tutelary deities of Lepcis, IPT 18 to the god El and IPT 21 to the divine Emperors. IPT 24 and 27 refer to the mysterious ritual of 'zrm. Of these IPT 18 and 31 are set down in only Neo-Punic while the others are bilingual. If we move on to the Latin inscriptions there are 32 inscriptions which mentions religious elements out of a total of 159 rendered with text. Of those IRT 294, 318, 319 and 321 are bilingual versions of the Neo-Punic texts mentioned above. So there are only 28 purely Latin inscriptions dealing with the realm of religion. Of these IRT 263 and 264 mention Aesculapius, IRT 304 mentions Minerva and Mercurio, IRT 290 mentions Minerva and Jupiter Optimus, IRT 292 only Jupiter Optimus, IRT 295 and 299 refer to Liber Pater, 305 and 306 to Neptun, 279 to frugifero, 564 to Heraclii, the two inscriptions listed both as 317a refer respectively to Venus and Juno, 284 to the genius of the city and AE 2003, 1920 possibly to the Egyptian divinity of Serapis. The remaining 13 refer to the priesthood titles of flamen and sacerdoti which I hesitate to qualify as either a Roman or Libyphoenician term as sacerdot is applied to both possible Roman and Libyphoenician divinities, IRT 304 and 564, and that flamen is listed in association with sacerdot on two occasions, IRT 588 and 567. Furthermore the terms are used interchangeably throughout the Roman realm for municipal priesthoods. (Rives, 1995, p 94) As for Mercurio, Juno, Neptun, Venus and Aesculapius in this context they are all probably Libyphoenician deities in interpretatio Romana guise here in the Libyphoenician bastion of Lepcis Magna. (Rives, 1995, p

130-1, 136, 151-2 and 154-5) Frugifer is certainly a Libyphoenician deity as is also Heraclii, Liber Pater and most likely the genius of the city. (Rives, 1995, p 128 & 134) Minerva and Jupiter Optimus are unquestionably Roman though and if my interpretation is correct AE 2003, 1920 refers to Serapis. Fortunately we have more dates for these inscriptions so we can set them into a chronological schematic. For the sake of comparison I will only list the Neo-Punic versions of bilingual inscriptions in the table. And the inscription with both Minerva and Mercurio will be overlooked for the purpose of the comparison.

Table 3

| Type | Undated | B.C.E | 1 st century C.E. | 100-193 C.E. | Severan era | Post-Severan | Total |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Neo-Punic with Libyphoenician divine elements | 1 inscription bilingual | 2 inscriptions 1 bilingual | 2 inscriptions 1 bilingual | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 5 inscriptions |
| Neo-Punic with Roman divine elements | 1 inscription bilingual | 1 inscription bilingual | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 2 inscriptions |
| Latin with Libyphoenician divine elements | 10 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 12 inscriptions |
| Latin with Roman divine elements | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 3 inscriptions |
| Latin with other divine elements | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription |
| Latin with uncertain divine elements | 7 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 0 inscriptions | 5 inscriptions | 0 inscriptions | 13 inscriptions |
| Latin with no divine elements | 54 inscriptions | 1 inscription | 22 inscriptions | 15 inscriptions | 28 inscriptions | 4 inscriptions | 124 inscriptions |

What trends can we glean from this? What is the most striking is the numerous Latin epigraphical expressions with Libyphoenician religious elements. We must keep in mind that this is based on the current author's very fallible grasp of Latin. The fact that the Neo-Punic corpus drops off but the Latin corpus keeps up with the mention of Libyphoenician deities is significant. However the small sample available to us here forces us to be very cautious about drawing too sharp conclusions. The evidence is too scanty to extrapolate firm trends.

5. Comparison

Let us start out with the differences. To start off Lepcis had two male gods as patron deities in contrast to the old Phoenician tradition of one female and one male. (Markoe, 2000, p 116) Carthage was originally more orthodox in this respect. But this is but a slight deviation from the ordinary. Further on Lepcis had a proven continuity, despite an influx of foreign cults, of its two main deities seemingly from the 2nd century B.C.E. to at least the 3rd century CE. And realistically to conceive of the notion that the Lepcitanians were godless prior to the 2nd century B.C.E is ill advised. Lepcis most definitely had some sort of religious worship in place from its foundation most likely of Libyphoenician or even Phoenician origins. Carthage on the other hand most probably experienced a clean break, a discontinuity of the *dii patrii* cults with the syncretised Tanit-Caelestis appearing again as part of the official civic cults in the mid 2nd century C.E. after 300 years of absence. Saturn was never allowed back in from the cold so to speak even though his worship was exceedingly popular in most of Libyphoenician Africa, including Carthage. As a consequence of this disruption Roman Carthage never officially had two patron deities like Lepcis. The city only reinstated one of them as mentioned above. Furthermore Lepcis' prominent families, including the Severans, were vigilant supporters of their ancestral cults like the African elites were elsewhere. (Mattingly, 1995, p 121 and Rives, 1995, p 163) Carthage's new Italian elite, although later seen as devout followers of the two former patron deities, would not from the onset have had any religious affiliations with the old cults of Africa Proconsularis. (Rives, 1995, p 143-4 and 158) So until the resurrection of Tanit-Caelestis as the first Lady of Carthage both former *dii patrii* cults were excluded from the public patronage of the elite families of the city. As Rives shows in the case of Saturn there was certainly unofficial sponsoring going on but this lack of elite support must have had significant impact on both cults. In a world where the elite defined themselves and their identity and power with the gods they worshipped and where they alone determined the *sacra publica*, being excluded from this would mean a lot in terms of income and

recruitment for the stricken cults in question. Had not their worship stood as strongly in the rest of Punic Africa their cults might have just faded away in the face of the Roman invasion. A further difference to be expounded upon is in the direction of the acculturation process the different cults portrayed. Here there's more of a sharp distinction between Lepcis' dii patrii and Saturn-Baal on the one hand and Tanit-Caelestis on the other. Lepcis' Shadrappa and Milk'Ashtart became Liber Pater and Hercules and their worship gradually Romanized over the years. (Di Vita, 1999, p32)

Saturn's worship too took this route of evolution from a Libyphoenician to a more Roman mode of religion. (Rives, 1995, p148) Tanit-Caelestis in Carthage on the other hand, though the cult continued unabated in other parts of Africa, was reconstituted in the city by the mixed elite. The cult had clear Graeco-Roman as well as Libyphoenician elements but despite the intentions of the Romano-African upper classes it was not a continuation of an ancient religion in new Romanized form. It was more a new and mixed cult born by the new and mixed elite. Not wholly Roman and not wholly African. A sign of the Africanization of the new Carthaginian elite in contrast to the Romanization of Lepcis' and the rest of Libyphoenician Africa's cult practices.(Rives, 1995, p163-9) In short Lepcis had its original cults preserved in a Romanized guise while only the non-public Saturn was an original albeit Romanized cult in Carthage. Caelestis was an Africanized new invention. As mentioned earlier we cannot ascertain any cult continuity in Carthage no matter how tantalizing Hurst's hypothesis' are. But at the same time we cannot deny that there is a slight possibility for such an occurrence. Most likely the cult of Saturn was exported back to its roots though and if he was the recipient of such favour Tanit-Caelestis presumably was too.

The public cult with its Africanized features garners all the attention from its inception in the 2nd century CE but an unofficial cult of the goddess of Libyphoenician origin most probably already existed there as it did in other sites across Libyphoenician Africa. This divide is important to keep in mind as the dichotomy of two cities with two deities facing off in a comparison is nothing more than the author's construct. Saturn's non-public cult in Carthage would in many cases more readily fit in with Lepcis' ancestral deities than with his former companion goddess' publicly sponsored cult. The hypothetical but probable Libyphoenician Tanit-Caelestis worship in place before the birth of her new public cult would most likely be much more similar to Lepcis' dii patrii's and Saturn's origins and practice. Now I'll move on to commonalities between the two cities' approach to their ancient patron deities. Above all, the staying power of all four cults is amazing. Even Saturn-Baal and Caelestis-Tanit after centuries of exclusion from the public religion maintain strong holds on the local populace in and around Carthage. Liber-Shadrappa and Milk'Ashtart-Hercules are from the onset of Roman expansion seemingly much more likely to survive with their city being left virtually unscathed and under local control by the unruly centuries leading up to the C.E. Lepcis' dii patrii

can be traced as far ahead as the Severan age and Carthage's Caelestis-Tanit is mentioned up until the 5th century CE. (Rives, 1995, p162-9) For Lepcis this means a span of at least 3 and probably many more centuries and for Carthage a verifiable span of 8 or more centuries for Caelestis-Tanit, albeit probably interrupted for a century. Furthermore the Romanization of the cults is evident. In the climate of Roman rule where religious affairs were mostly left up to the local elites this was a voluntary process on their behalf to associate themselves more intimately with the imperial power. This does not equal a complete conversion of the faiths but more like a gradual and often cosmetic change spanning centuries. (Rives, 1995, p 150-1) But the iconography, cult architecture and symbolism were indeed affected by this process. But was this an exceptional occurrence? Phoenician culture had already absorbed many aspects of Egyptian and Mycenaean cultural attributes. (Lancel, 1995, p303-4) Hellenism came later exerting its own strong influence over the Libyphoenician lands through the contact points of Cyrenaica, Alexandria and Sicily. So the Romanization we might speak of in Libyphoenician Africa would be just an extension of Hellenization under which influence the Romans themselves were labouring. The Carthaginians adopted Hellenistic deities in 396 BCE in the wake of their catastrophic campaign on Sicily and their ritual iconography already showed a massive influx of Hellenistic attributes prior to the sacking of the city. (Lancel, 1995, p304-60) Seeing as Libyphoenician culture hardly was the closed monolithic entity some would expect but rather an open matrix ready to adapt and change to circumstances coupled with the Roman almost complete lack of cultural imperialism the influx of Romanization must be viewed as a continuation of a historic process of cultural intermingling rather than as a conquering and destructive force. In this context the *dii patrii* of Lepcis and Saturn of Carthage, though significantly changed, must have at their core still been genuinely Libyphoenician. The exception of Carthage's public Caelestis cult must be duly noted. There were no doubt several purer Libyphoenician Caelestis cults worshipped in North Africa and probably in Carthage itself by the influx of Libyphoenician migrants over the years, but the public cult instituted in the 2nd century C.E. seems for all purposes to be a new creation. Public Carthaginian Caelestis was therefore of course a sign of Romanization but also of Africanization of the originally Italian elite. With that being said there is no denying that all four deities and their worship, the three members of the *sacra publica* and the ostracized Saturn, all were imbued with Libyphoenician characteristics in spite of Hellenization and Romanization. (Brouillet, 1994, p 29 and Di Vita, 1999, p 32) Granted, the public cult of Caelestis in Carthage was a new addition to the pantheon even if the Roman Carthaginians' themselves did not see it as such. Still it had definite Libyphoenician characteristics and how much it related to neighbouring Caelestis cults or the hypothetical non-public cult preceding it is impossible to quantify with current evidence, but evoke

colourful musings on the subject. (Rives, 1995, p 163-9) Lastly all four cults, whether public or not, received patronage by the elite whether it was indigenous or of mixed stock. In the case of Lepcis Septimius Severus' construction of a great basilica and holding the Saecular Games in 204 C.E. in their honour is most striking. (Mattingly, 1995, p 167) For Saturn in Carthage the names of several Roman citizens inscribed on votive steles to his honour in sanctuaries in close proximity to Carthage, in an age where only citizens of Carthage and members of the elite were granted the Roman citizenship, gives strong indication of elite sponsorship. (Rives, 1995, p 143-4) Also AE 1966 0504 and 0505 and AE 1894 mention the position of sacerdos to Saturn in Carthage, a position unlikely to be bestowed upon anyone not of the elite. Caelestis' reinstitution as a public cult is in itself a strong proof of elite support. (Rives, 1995, p 163) If we further compare the epigraphical evidence we encounter a problem. Not many of Carthage's inscriptions are dated so a chronological comparison is difficult. Carthage had inscriptions detailing its religious life set down at least up until the Severan age but the Saturn and Caelestis inscriptions remain undated. Lepcis' corpus with religious inscriptions is more easy to date and the two major trends is the drop off of Neo-Punic inscriptions from 92 C.E. and the last reference to a Libyphoenician or any religious element being from the Severan age. In that respect they are equal. What needs to be mentioned is that the last inscriptions altogether from Lepcis ends at the end of the 3rd century C.E. with IRT 544 while Carthage's Latin corpus remains sizeable and ends in the 6th century with AE 1986, 0716. The ratio of Libyphoenician religious elements mentioned in the epigraphy versus the Roman is of course different between the two sites corroborating with the other evidence. 12 Latin inscriptions sporting Roman/Hellenistic religious elements versus only 4 sporting Libyphoenician ones, a ratio of 3:1, in Carthage stands in stark contrast to Lepcis' 1:4 respectively. All this depends upon many factors like the number of undetermined inscriptions and the current author's imperfect interpretations so any conclusions would be easily overturned by new or re-interpreted evidence.

6. The Libyphoenician cults and Christianity

But what of the Christian dimension in Roman Africa? How did that affect the *dii patrii* of Lepcis and Carthage and their cults? Saturn is attested in steles from the 4th century C.E. in other sites. (Lancel, 1995, p 433-5) In the close proximity of Carthage it is attested at the sanctuary of Djebel bou Kournein across the bay from the city around 212 C.E. (Rives, 1995, p 144) Caelestis in Carthage is mentioned as late as the 5th century by Quodvultdeus. (Rives, 1995, p 164) For the two patrons of Lepcis the Severan basilica of the early 3rd century C.E. seems to be the latest evidence. (Mattingly, 1995, p167) Carthage and Lepcis both have well documented Christian sects,

particularly in regards to the Donatist schism. But Lepcis has only one early 5th century C.E. church attested to be of a pre-Byzantine type and it coincidentally lies right on top of the Severan pagan forum mentioned above. (Mattingly, 1995, p 210-1) Can we attribute this to a Christian takeover and the end of paganism in Lepcis? No, not quite. For the time being we do not have the evidence to conclude with either a pagan survival or death in the face of advancing Christianity here. The paucity of documentation can be somewhat mended upon with the mention of Libyan pagan practices and Christian practices persisting up until the 11th century, in spite of Arab Islamic occupation. (Mattingly, 1995, p 213 and 217) On this background we cannot absolutely rule out a Libyphoenician cultic survival but we have of course no firm archaeological or textual base to support this hypothesis with. In Carthage the aforementioned Christian writer's account lead us to believe that its pagan practices were alive and well as late as the 5th century. This particular passage only alludes to Caelestis, but it does not completely deny the presence of other pagan deities. However, that is about how far it goes when it comes to the evidence. As in the case of Lepcis can one assume that Christianity simply vanquished the pagan cults in Carthage at around this point? No. But one must keep in mind the sweeping changes encountered all over Libyphoenician Africa in the centuries following the Severan era. Many of them with religion profoundly embedded at their cores. After decades of suppression the Christian sects finally achieved legitimacy in the reign of Constantine. However the Donatist schism would trouble the region with religious infighting for centuries from the election of Donatus in 313 CE and up until the 6th century. (Mattingly, 1995, p 210-1) Then came the Vandals bringing with them their Aryan brand of Christianity seizing Carthage in 439 and Tripolitania in 455. In 533 CE the Byzantines managed to reclaim the region on behalf of their variant of the Roman Empire along with their approach to Christianity. They again fought it out with nomadic tribes of the interior whom still worshipped pagan Libyan deities. Finally the Arabs conquered this slice of Africa beginning in the middle of the 7th century C.E. ensuring Islam's firm grip on the region up until this day. (Mattingly, 1995, p 215) Coupled with this there were other factors such as earthquakes, more nomad ravagings and corruption of Imperial officials adding to the calamities of ancient Libyphoenician Africa leaving Lepcis in particular in almost uninhabited ruin. (Mattingly, 1995, p 183-5) All these contributed to making life in Carthage and Lepcis very volatile and dangerous in the years after the period of the Principate. Competing religious groupings arrived with the sword of the conquerors to back them up and it likely chipped away at the foundations of the pagan practices in the two cities or even destroyed them outright altogether. We cannot exclude the possibility for a survival extending beyond the 5th century but in light of the lack of tangible evidence the likelihood of their at least eventual demise seems pretty strong. Both Carthage and Lepcis faded away into the darkness of past history after the

Arab invasions as they both were deserted and ceased to be urban sites. (Ennabli, 2004, p 39 & Di Vita, 1999, p 44-46 & 145) If there was, unlikely as it is, a pagan presence in either of the cities clinging on to life this late the end of Islamic religious tolerance in the 11th century must probably have put an end to it. But the eventual predominance of Christianity must be noted. Already in the 3rd century it constituted at least a significant minority and the wealth of Christian writers and the numerous bishops hailing from North Africa outside of Egypt clearly demonstrate Christianity's pre-eminence from at least the 4th century onwards. (Rives, 1995, p 223-34) How exactly this influenced the pagan cults is hard to qualify but the eventual superiority and growth in numbers in favour of the Christian sects would have whittled away at the base of worshippers available for the pagan cults. But again we cannot affirm their dissolution at any point. We can only ascertain that the evidence drops off.

7. Running it through the Cherry requirements

Religion must be seen as a core quality for determining a culture's traits. Much of the resources in most societies went towards religious festivals, constructions and the like and much of what set different peoples apart was the different pantheons celebrated by their respective flocks. So we have met requirement number one quite clearly here. Requirement number two is the main problem. As the inscriptions, elaborate tombs and religious constructions reflect only directly upon the tastes and wishes of the elite wealthy enough to finance these undertakings we cannot say that the evidence meets the standards of the second requirement. However we can indirectly presume that the elite did not live in a religious apartheid regime so to completely dismiss the possibility of the common folk worshipping the same divinities as the elite would be too hasty without any evidence to back this case for an elitist religious isolation. But even though the evidence establishes that these cults were in place and we can presume that at least some of the commoners adhered to these creeds we cannot say anything about how many or in what way. That door is metaphorically speaking closed to us with our current evidence at hand. So the current model of research for this subject does not meet the second requirement at all. As for the third requirement we have several sources but of very different natures. We have Latin and Neo-Punic inscriptions. We have temples and citations from classical and contemporary authors. How do you quantify different types of evidence? How many inscriptions is a major temple worth? What about a minor one? The quantification criteria is met in this chapter only through the inscriptions. But to exclude all other evidence to satisfy stringent criteria demands would be to close one's eyes to the complexity of reality. And in the case of the inscriptions their low number and difficult interpretation makes them very imperfect tools for any

major quantifiable analysis. Here the Cherry model falters in the face of Antiquity's scarcity of sources. Only part of this chapter's evidence, the inscriptions, meet the third requirement and only imperfectly so.

8. Conclusion

After surveying this evidence we can ascertain that both sites had Libyphoenician cults in situ until the beginning of the 3rd century C.E. and Carthage can claim the presence of the Roman-African Caelestis cult until the 5th century. Lepcis' evidence for the *dii patrii* follows Saturn's pattern and abruptly halts in the third. If we confront our problem statements we can establish that both tutelary deities of Lepcis were present in Libyphoenician guise under the Numidian rule and later were given Roman-style names but most likely remained Libyphoenician at their cores until they disappear in the evidence. When exactly the change of name happened is impossible to determine with the sources at hand as we do not have all or even most of the Late Punic epigraphical corpus available to us here. The introduction of the cult of the deified emperors elbowed out one of the two from their old temple but otherwise we have no evidence for a degeneration of the cults. In Carthage, if we accept Rives' version of events, both tutelary deities disappeared for a while after the fall but Saturn made a spectacular albeit non-public comeback. The original Libyphoenician Caelestis cannot be said to have had such success but a re-institution of the cult with Libyphoenician elements albeit not as a true Libyphoenician cult at its core had great success and lasted at least until the 5th century C.E. The development was multi-faceted with the Libyphoenician deities of Lepcis Romanizing in at least some aspects and the old cult of Saturn/Baal and the new Carthaginian Caelestis contributing to the Africanization of Roman Carthage despite their own added or inherent respectively Roman qualities. In regards to the influence of other factors than the Roman and Libyphoenician we saw that there was an inscription of possibly Egyptian religious connections in Lepcis and the city had a host of temples. The absence of Libyan deities among the evidence uncovered is significant of course but on the whole the scanty sources make any inferences from this material pure speculation. One would expect Egyptian, Greek and especially Libyan religious practices to have been of at least some influence. Later Christian and Jewish influences would of course have made an impact. We know that the Severan basilica was turned into a Byzantine Church. So Christianity at least had some serious impacts upon the city. More research, preferably of an archaeological nature is needed here. In Carthage you have the Christian and Jewish inscriptions and a dated Christian presence from 180 C.E. and a significant Jewish community in place in the 2nd century. (Rives, 1995, p 215 & 223) Again Christianity's future

predominance must have had severe impacts on the two cults but in what way and how much is impossible to pin down without further evidence.

Language Chapter:

1. Historical context and background

In this thesis I will exert my focus on analyzing post-independent Libyphoenician Africa and in the current chapter the very important intellectual cultural core value of language is to be examined. But before we head on down to the task at hand a summary of Late Punic's, the language in question's, historical background and context. Late Punic derives from Punic which is the common academic denomination for the Phoenician languages in the Western Mediterranean basin. Phoenician itself was a North-West Semitic language belonging to the Canaanite branch of that language group. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p1) Through their colonization of the Western Mediterranean coastlines the Phoenician peoples' language is disseminated into these new territories. In time the two, mother tongue and the new colonial speech, developed in separate directions as ties with the homeland weakened and different cultural influences made their impact. Punic was the official language of Carthage, the dominant city-state of the Phoenician colonies. As Carthage faltered and lost in their three wars with the expanding Roman Empire the original Punic script swiftly disappeared to be replaced by Neo-Punic, a more informal script which had already been developing before the destruction of Carthage in 146 BCE. But for all intents and purposes the spoken language in question was the same only the mode of writing differed. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p1) This language would in the ensuing centuries be presented in three separate types of script. The aforementioned Neo-Punic employing modified traditional Punic letters, Latino-Punic which was written with Roman letters and finally Greco-Punic where Greek script was used to put down the Libyphoenician tongue. The total number of left over inscriptions in these 3 script versions of late Punic number only in their hundreds but they are the most important primary sources we are left with for analysing this ancient language. Classical secondary sources like Strabo, Sallust, St. Jerome, Apuleius and most importantly St. Augustine clearly indicate a survival of Punic up until at least the end of the 4th century CE. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 2-6) Their evidence is by nature anecdotal and sporadic and besides documenting the continued existence of Punic they have little practical use within the scope of this thesis which seeks to quantify and compare evidence from two distinct geographical sites. The focus here will remain with the primary sources emanating from Carthage and Lepcis Magna from 146 BCE onwards i.e the inscriptions. But what of the indigenous Libyan influence? Libyan remains a mystery for us up until this day. It seems to have been a distant ancestor of modern Berber but whether it was a single language or a span of related dialects is unclear. We know little about it and the inscriptions

remaining to us are hard to date. The Romans, whom produced most of the secondary sources in this age seem to have had little knowledge of it. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005 p 5) According to Sallust (Jugurthine War 78) the language of Lepcis Magna was the only thing to have altered in the centuries of intermarriage with the Numidians and St. Jerome (In Galatas II) mentions that the Africans had changed the Phoenician language. The presence of numerous non-Semitic names in the Neo-Punic inscriptions indicates a strong Libyan presence among the inscribers. What does this entail? Late Punic seems to have been the common tongue or Lingua Franca of the common people of both Libyan and Libyphoenician origin. This widespread use is evidenced by the vast array of find sites stretching from modern Algeria eastwards into Libya and even in one case Wales. Libyan loanwords seem to have entered Latin through Punic so some sort of influence was naturally at play. The likely explanation for this, as indicated by the cessation of pronouncing traditional Punic consonants, is that the spread of Punic among the Libyans in turn gave their tongue or tongues influence over the development of the Late Punic language. Further evidence for this is the comparison between Punic and Late Punic inscriptions where the former contained a majority of Semitic names while the latter contained a majority of Libyan and Latin ones. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1-7) And what of Latin? Late Punic epigraphy seems to mostly have followed Latin custom and the Latino-Punic inscriptions often employed Latin loan words. But despite these clear Latinate influences the language rendered in even the latest dated Punic and Latino-Punic inscriptions is seemingly grammatically correct Punic and the loan words are mostly technical terms. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 5-6) So even in the face of Libyan and Latin pressures Late Punic remained a vital language of its own at least up until the age of St. Augustine. And even though the Latin inscriptions numbering in their tens of thousands vastly outnumber the hundreds of Late Punic ones it cannot be said that this indicates a dying or fading language. Epigraphy was in much more restricted use in independent Libyphoenician Africa reflecting its oriental heritage where public inscriptions were lacking until the onset of the Persian era. Furthermore the elite and/or sub-elite wealthy and knowledgeable enough to set down expensive inscriptions were also the social stratas most exposed to Roman culture and language and thereby the most easily influenced. These groups were also more inclined to show disdain for the use of Punic something which the classical sources corroborate. Put together this would entail that the parts of society capable of expressing themselves through epigraphy were much more likely to employ Latin. This would in itself seriously limit the number of Late Punic inscriptions. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 5-6)

2. Framework for analysis

In the present chapter I will try to analyse the evidence of the epigraphic finds in three sections and all in three stages. First I will exert my focus on the Neo-Punic inscriptions, then on the Latino-Punic ones and finally the Greco-Punic finds from Lepcis Magna and Carthage. To augment this analysis I will sort to employing the Latin contemporary inscriptions for comparison and I will include them as a separate entry at the end of the chapter to see if they can divulge any significant information regarding possible lingering Libyphoenician cultural elements. The first stage of analysis I will employ is the quantitative one. The good old-fashioned way of counting the evidence. What insights do I hope to gain from this? How widespread the use of the three different scripts was at the two sites would be indicated by their find frequency if all other factors are nominally the same. Was Late Punic more used in inscriptions in Carthage, the capital of Roman Africa outside of Egypt, or in Lepcis Magna, the leading city of Tripolitania? This is but a one-dimensional analysis which must be augmented by further steps. The next stage of analysis pertains to the dating of the inscriptions. In which of the two cities did Late Punic remain in use the longest for epigraphy? This comparison will give us an inkling of which site's inhabitants, or at least their elite and/or sub-elite, continued to employ the old language for epigraphy the longest. The third stage delves into the type of inscription involved. Were they funerary, votive or building inscriptions? Most importantly, were they public or private epigraphic expressions? Did the Roman era Lepcitanians and Carthaginians have different preferences when it came to type of inscriptions? What could possibly explain any differences or similarities? And in the case of public versus private inscriptions, where was Late Punic sanctioned the most in public epigraphy, if it was at all? Furthermore with the abundance of bi- and trilingual inscriptions at Lepcis what were the preferences at Carthage in comparison? (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 16-23) And how does the contemporary Latin corpus relate to the Neo-Punic one? Coupled with the two preceding stages this will give us an analytic tool to compare the cities in question and their epigraphic practices.

3. Neo-Punic

First I will attempt to analyze the Neo-Punic inscriptions of the two respective cities. My reason for starting at this end is the fact that they are the first type of Late Punic epigraphy to be noted going back as far as before the end of independent Carthage in 146 BCE and being the most numerous of the three varieties. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2004, p 1 & 96-104) My primary source for the Neo-Punic inscriptions is the 2005 volume *Late Punic Epigraphy* by Karel Jongeling and Robert M. Kerr.

Their selection of inscriptions is not complete and most certainly not representative as they admit to themselves. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, preface) The work was intended just as an introductory course in Late Punic and not as a comprehensive listing. The real definite sources on this material is *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* from 1881 and *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania, 1927-1967* from 1987 by Giorgio Levi Della Vida. Disappointingly I have not been able to procure English language translations of these as they are in Latin with Neo-Punic plates and Italian respectively, all three languages which elude my philological grasp. With this reservation in mind we can progress.

3.1 Quantitative analysis

Let us start off with the quantitative analysis. Out of 698 Neo-Punic inscriptions currently known, 67 hail from the site of Lepcis Magna and 15 from the site of Carthage. Taken at face value this is a major discrepancy between the two cities and their use of Neo-Punic for epigraphic purposes. Have we here a straight forward chain of evidence for the greater vitality of the Libyphoenician cultural matrix in Lepcis over Carthage's? After all Lepcis' Neo-Punic inscriptions outnumber Carthage's by more than 4:1. However if we were to settle with this conclusion our analysis would be a shallow one. For one, the site of Carthage has been ravaged much more severely by the passage of time than the ruins of Lepcis ever were. Lepcis lay off the beaten path for the new rulers, the conquering Arabs, and most of its artefacts and buildings were left undisturbed by humans as the desert sands enveloped them in the centuries after the Islamic takeover. (Di Vita, 1999, p 44-6) Carthage on the other hand was situated right next to one of Islamic North Africa's most important cities, the city of Tunis, and was pillaged for building materials for use there and in the building of the great Mosque of Kairouan. The pillaging of materials became an industry of sorts supplying the ports and cities of the Mediterranean with quarried columns and marbles leaving only the foundations of the ancient city's great monuments. After this centuries' long period of pillaging, an at least equally destructive force emerged in the form of European colonial powers and their increasing urbanization of the site both before and during the Protectorate. Whilst medieval Carthage had been a rural backwater, sparsely inhabited, Colonial era Carthage became a Christian centre with several religious buildings, among them a Cathedral right on the summit of Byrsa hill, being erected amidst the urbanization boom. Independence proved no better as the head of State located his residence in the now fashionable suburb of Carthage enticing his entourage to follow suit. (Ennabli, 2004, p 37-45) A counter force to this explosive building boom since the late 1800's was the scientific work and excavations set off by Father Delattre and followed by a host of other scholars and amateurs alike. Their combined effort has saved much of what would have been

lost to the ages and has increased the awareness of Carthage as an important national and international historic site. This work ultimately resulted in the creation of the Carthage Sidi Bou Said National Park in 1992, shielding what is left to us from further harm. (Ennabli, 2004, p 44-52) On the basis of this the fewer recovered Neo-Punic inscriptions from Carthage seem to be a natural result of different historical fates after the abandonment of both sites and not an expression of divergences in epigraphic practices. Is there a way for us to test this? What other remains can we compare between the cities which should roughly correspond to the Neo-Punic inscriptions and their occurrence at the two sites in question? For once, we have the Latin inscriptions emanating from our two subject cities. If they fall into the same pattern they might indicate that the ravages of time are the chief culprits responsible for the divergence. If we consult the Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg (<http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html.de>) we find that of 1750 Latin inscriptions in Tunisia 182 were found in Carthage. As for Libya the total are 361 versus Lepcis Magna's 162 inscriptions. The trend here is the other way around probably reflecting Carthage's status as the first city of Roman Africa outside of Egypt. And this is in spite of that city being literally razed to the ground by material pillaging over the centuries. Can we come to any definite conclusions on this? Can we definitely conclude that Neo-Punic was more in vogue in Lepcis Magna than in Carthage? The evidence certainly points in that direction. If we compare the number of Neo-Punic inscriptions in Carthage with the number of Latin ones we see a ratio of approximately 12:1. For Lepcis it's approximately 2:1. The difference here is pretty striking. What we can definitely say is that Latin was in much more widespread use in inscriptions in Carthage than Neo-Punic. This is in itself very indicative of the fact that the Carthaginian elite and/or sub-elite in Roman times were much more inclined to employ Latin in their epigraphy, a fact which correlates with their background being that of Italian colonists in the wake of the Caesarean re-founding. (Rives, 1995, p 100) We cannot of course infer anything definite from this knowledge of the elite's preferences to the non-epigraphical common people so to speak but what we can say is that the evidence at hand certainly supports the supposition that the Libyphoenician language was held in higher regard and employed more in inscriptions by the elite and/or sub-elite in Lepcis Magna than in Carthage. Lastly the discrepancy between the ratio of Latin inscriptions compared to the region total must be accounted for. Why did Lepcis divulge almost half of the Latin inscriptions found in Libya while Carthage only left us a little under a quarter of the total recovered in Tunisia? Can this divergence give us any insights in regards to the difference between Carthage and Lepcis' occurrence of Neo-Punic inscriptions? Probably not. The region of Tripolitania was much less urbanized than what was back then known as Africa Proconsularis. The former region was centred around the three cities of Oea, Sabratha and Lepcis and some minor urban sites while the latter was

host to a multitude of urban centers such as Carthage, Hadrumetum, Tunis, Utica, Thugga, Thysdrus, Sicca, Thuburbo Maius, Thabraca and Mactar among others. (Manton, 1988, p 82) Furthermore the once important site of Oea in Tripolitania is now almost completely lost beneath modern Tripoli. Lepcis' predominance in this context is hardly surprising as on the other hand Carthage's lesser share of the total would strike one as natural as well.

To sum up the argument we can express it with a table:

Table 4

| City | Neo-Punic Inscriptions | Latin Inscriptions |
|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Carthage | 15 | 182 |
| Lepcis Magna | 67 | 162 |

But before we make any too resounding conclusions we must complete our next two steps of the analysis.

3.2 Reservations regarding quantitative and dating analysis

However we must confront two major obstacles to our analysis before making any more inroads into it. Number one, many Late Punic inscriptions lack adequate dating as illustrated by the fact that Jongeling and Kerr's 2005 volume *Late Punic Epigraphy* contains only mention of 1 dated Neo-Punic inscription from each of the 2 cities and 1 Latino-Punic one from Lepcis and none from Carthage. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1-2) Birley gives dates for some inscriptions in his *Septimius Severus, the African Emperor* (Birley, 1988, p 8-37) but these are only for Lepcis' corpus. A schematic line-up and comparison of chronological evidence is thereby rendered impossible. What we have of dated evidence must suffice but will force us to concede major reservations regarding formulating any profound conclusions based on them. This problem also directs us towards difficulty number two. The Late Punic inscriptions are scattered across a vast diversity of volumes with the most important ones being *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, *Iscrizioni Puniche Della Tripolitania* and *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*. The first collection mentioned above was first issued in 1881 and is almost entirely composed of plates of the Late Punic inscriptions with little comment and what comment there is has been rendered in Latin. The second focuses solely on the Tripolitanian region and is only available in Italian. The third only covers the Latin parallels of the Late Punic inscriptions from Tripolitania. Beyond these three major

collections there are literally hundreds of volumes in at least five different languages including English, German, French, Italian, Latin and of course Late Punic itself, where only plates are given, as attested by professor Jongeling's eminent website

<http://website.leidenuniv.nl/~jongelingk/projects/neopunicinscr/NPTXTS/LIBYAframes.html>. As the task of accessing all of these sources in an effort to compare Lepcis and Carthage's Late Punic corpus would be monumental in the least and impossible without serious philological capacities which this author regrettably lacks this has been wilfully foregone to keep the undertaking within the scope of 1 thesis. The only volume readily accessible and easily attainable for the author has been Jongeling and Kerr's work from 2005 mentioned above. It contains transcriptions of only 1 out of 15 of Carthage's Neo-Punic texts and only 18 out of 67 of Lepcis'. For the Latino-Punic ones it contains only 2 out of 4 from Lepcis and only 1 of 1 Graeco-Punic from Carthage in total to boot. And only dates for 1 Neo-Punic and 1 Latino-Punic inscription from Lepcis and 1 Neo-Punic from Carthage are given here. The supplementing information from Birley's work will help us a little bit along the way but that will only suffice to assist us in the case of Lepcis. Carthage's inscriptions are left virtually in the dark for us in their volume. With the clear notion that we're dealing with imperfect conditions and less than complete source tools I will nevertheless try to draw what conclusions and insights I can from the material at hand.

3.3 Dating analysis

First we will approach the dating and timeline given to us by Birley for Lepcis Magna. Birley starts off in the late second or early first century BCE with inscription 31 from *Iscrizioni Puniche Della Tripolitania*, from here on onwards abbreviated into IPT. It honoured the town's *Dii Patrii* and mentions the particularly Punic official title of *Sufet*. (Birley, 1988, p 5) Then he gives us IPT 21 from approximately 8 B.C.E and IPT 24 from 4-3 B.C.E. both of which were set down in both Latin and Neo-Punic and were commissioned by an Annobal Tapapius Rufus:

IPT 24

“Annobal, who adorns the country, who loves the complete knowledge, sacrificer, *sufet*, lord of the 'zrm-offering, the son of Imilco Tapapi Rufus, made it according to plan at his own expense and consecrated it.”

His name was a sign of the adaptation of the Libyphoenician elite to the now established Roman

regime. The Punic Tabahphi was given a Latin style, he took on the name Rufus to fit in with the Roman tria nomina but his first name remains unmistakably Punic in character. There are also two other contemporary Latin inscriptions namely Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania's, from here on abbreviated to IRT, number 320 and 520. (Birley, 1988, p 9-12 & 231) Then from the year 10 CE hails a Latin inscription, IRT 324, with the Romanized Punic name Iddibal Caphada Aemilius the son of Himilis. Birley continues on to mention inscriptions made during and after the Tacfarinas revolt but gives only source for one and that is IPT 22. Further on in approximately 35-6 CE two Latin inscriptions, IRT 308 and 330, are set down. In 43 CE another Latin inscription with a Punic name, Iddibal Tapapius the son of Mago, was set down in dedication to the Di Augusti. It is rendered as IRT number 273. At the end of Claudius' reign a further bilingual inscription is set down, IPT 26, which gives further proof of the Romanization of the elite's names as Gaius, Macer and Commodus are given as names for members of the family responsible for the works honoured by the epigraphical expressions. Still though Punic names such as Ba'alyaton, Anno and Balitho are part of the name mix:

IPT 26

“Gaius, the son of Anno, in the name of Gaius, his grandson Macer the columns and the place let repair, and the forum he had paved according to their work at his own expense; Baliton Commodus, who entered among the sons with Macer, the son of Gaius, through the means of a document concerning the affairs of the house of Gaius, the son of Anno, let it be made and completed it.”

Birley then goes on to describe a Latin inscription from the early 60's CE, IRT 341, which gives the Punic name Ithymbal Sabinus Tapapius the son of Arish. Birley also hints at another inscription in Neo-Punic commissioned by the same man in honour of his aunt Arishut bat Yatonbaal but unfortunately does not give any sources for it. A strictly Neo-Punic inscription from the 60's CE , IPT 18, records the names of two sufetes and four mahazim, the highest official titles of the city. The sufetes and two of the mahazim bear Punic style names but the two remaining mahazim are recorded as Candidus and Donatus. Another indicator of the elite's self-imposed integration into the Roman cultural matrix. Then finally in 72 CE an Iddibal son of Balsillec is the last member of the city's elite to go on record with his Punic style names in IRT 300. The transformation of Lepcis Magna's epigraphic custom is nearing its completion. At last in 92 CE Tiberius Claudius Sestius is the last known notable of the city to commission a bilingual inscription, IRT 318 and 347 and IPT 27:

IPT 27

“[Tiberius Claudius Quirina Sestius] the son of Tiberius Claudius Sestius, the lord of the 'zrm-sacrifices, sacrificer of the divine Vespasianus, sufet, sacrificer for ever, the one who loves the country, who loves the sons of the people, the one who adorns the country, saviour of the sons of the people, lover of the complete knowledge, the one to whom before the mighty ones of Lepcis and the people of Lepcis according to the merits of his fathers and his own merit(s) they permitted the use of the purple striped toga for his whole life, an altar and a podium made according to the work to be done, at his own expense.”

This was to be the last dated Neo-Punic inscription we know of today. Strikingly though are the mention of Punic style titles such as adorning of his country and lover of concord which are given to the aforementioned Sestius in the Latin text. In spite of the centuries' long transition residual Libyphoenician cultural traits still make their appearance. A further example hails from the 120's CE when IRT 357-9 adorns the Lepcitane Quintus Servilius Candidus with Latin translations of traditional Punic titles in the form of *amator patriae*, *amator civium* and *amator concordiae*. Neo-Punic as an official epigraphic language was now gone. Latin had replaced it. Still Libyphoenician terms like these were in use. (Birley, 1988, p 13-23) Of the inscriptions given to us by Birley only 4 are set down in Jongeling and Kerr's 2005 volume. The 4-3 BCE bilingual IPT 24 and IRT 321-3, the bilingual inscription from the end of Claudius' reign namely IPT 26 and IRT 338, IPT 18 which is the solely Neo-Punic one from the 60's CE and the bilingual but last Neo-Punic one altogether IRT 318 and 347 and IPT 27. With these now forming part of a timeline set forth by Birley we can head on. From Carthage we have but one Neo-Punic inscription available to us out of a grand total of 15. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 31 & 97-8) What kind of timeline can we make of this one entry? The special feature of this inscription number 949 from *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum*, from here on abbreviated to CIS, is that it's partially in Punic and partially in Neo-Punic:

CIS 949

“To the lady, to Tinnit Fane Baal and to the lord to Bal Amun which dedicated Balpado, the son of Bodashtart”

This is ascribed by the two authors to a practice of stonecutters making ready-made votive stones

where they only had to fill in the name of the buyer. Jongeling and Kerr also dates this particular inscription to before the Roman occupation of 146 BCE. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1) It is an example of the transition from the more formal Punic to the more vernacular Neo-Punic. So compared to Lepcis' Neo-Punic corpus this certainly precedes even its earliest entrant in Birley's timeline by several decades if not even more. Still it is only 1 out of 15 and the other 14 remain inaccessible to us. With these severe limitations forced upon the analysis it's hard to make any really definite conclusions upon the matter at hand. What we can say is that Lepcis Magna had the latest dated Neo-Punic inscription that we know of. They also had a somewhat clear timeline with several dated inscriptions. That the only one available to us from Carthage predates the Roman invasion hints at the possibility of Neo-Punic being much less in use there after the calamity brought on by the war and therefore of earlier dating. But to remain objectively true to the analysis we cannot say anything but that Lepcis had the latest dated inscription in Neo-Punic as well as the larger total corpus as far as we know of today. With this crippled conclusion to the timeline question we move on to types of inscriptions to see what if any facts can be gleaned from the meagre evidence at hand.

3.4 Typological analysis

Again Lepcis Magna's corpus will be analyzed first. So what can we say about the Neo-Punic epigraphical evidence left to us from that city? If we see it in context with the contemporary Latin inscriptions of the city we see that there was seemingly a tradition of bilingual expression. Only two of the ones mentioned in Birley's timeline with sources were purely Neo-Punic. The first one from the end of the second and the beginning of the first century BCE, IPT 31 and the last one from the 60's CE, IPT 18. The earlier one can of course be explained by Romanization not having reached the city to a substantial degree since it lay outside of initial Roman territory and it had been subjected to the Numidian kings, who themselves were employers of the Punic language as a language for education, for a long time. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 3) The latter might be more of an anomaly of course. Let us try to find out. The number of bilingual ones given to us by Birley is 5. IPT 21, 22, 24, 26 and 27. So there's a 5:2 ratio and if you consider only the same century under one it's 5:1 with the unsourced mention of Iddibal's inscription to his aunt to balance the books a bit. So the solely Neo-Punic one seems not to have been too much of an anomaly when we consider Birley's timeline. If we prod deeper into the source material and confront the ones Jongeling and Kerr present us with the overall picture deepens. With Birley's three which aren't covered in their volume, IPT 21-22 and 31, the total number is 21 Neo-Punic inscriptions. Of these 6 are bilingual, 2

are trilingual with Greek as the third language and the remaining 13 are solely Neo-Punic. So here the pure Neo-Punic ones are in a definite majority 13:8. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 16-23 & Birley, 1988, p 5, 9 & 13)

Table 5

| Total Neo-Punic corpus | Total accessible to analysis | Solely Neo-Punic | Bilingual | Trilingual |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 67 | 21 | 13 | 6 | 2 |

How does this stack up to the number of private versus public inscriptions? Here I have defined public inscriptions as those set down to commemorate public works carried out such as statue raising or construction work performed on public buildings such as temples, roads, forums etc. A rather more shaky definition applies to the ones I lump together in the private inscriptions category. Where the sources are clear tomb inscriptions are defined by me as private inscriptions. But sadly all of these are not clearly marked as such in the Jongeling and Kerr volume. Most are just given as short inscriptions of names which I have assumed to be tomb inscriptions or at least some sort of private inscription. Only IPT 10 is clearly stated as a tomb inscription in the source material:

IPT 10

“Macer, the *rds*, made (this) for himself and his brother Aygo and for everyone to be later in *the family*”

But the undoubtedly public ones are IPT 9, 18, 21-2, 24-7 and 31 as all commemorate either statue raising or other public works. 9 out of 21 and of those 2 are solely Neo-Punic. And since one of them, IPT 31, hail from the preRoman era of late 2nd or early 1st century BCE the odd one out, IPT 18 from the 60's CE, seems to be an anomaly:

IPT 18

“For the lord, to El, the creator of Earth, has built and consecrated the *exedra* and this portico completely on his own expense Candidus, the son of Candidus, the son of Anno, the son of Abdmelquart, because he heard his voice, blessed him.”

Maybe this was a private inscription made on some private building? Or it was just someone going against the grain of the development of the land? Maybe a Latin parallel existed but is now missing? All this are just speculations though as the sources available for this thesis do not cover it. But what is important to note is that the ratio of bilingual to solely Neo-Punic unquestionably public inscriptions in Lepcis the last century Neo-Punic was employed is 7:1. That seems pretty significant. So what of the last 12? They are all short and range from one word in IPT 61 to four lines in the confirmed tomb inscription IPT 10. The unquestionably public ones are all longer except IPT 9 which seems to be very much incomplete:

IPT 9

“... for the work of the place on ...”

The short and possibly private ones consist of 10 solely Neo-Punic ones and two, IPT 12 and 13, which are trilingual and both mention a character by the name of Clodius the doctor making the two seem very closely related:

IPT 12

“Berekht, the daughter of Balshillekh, the mother of Clodius the doctor.”

IPT 13

“Bodelquart, the Mekrathi, Clodius, the doctor.”

This discrepancy with the more elaborate and definitely public inscriptions is also very interesting. As for the two trilingual inscriptions Jongeling and Kerr attribute these to the tradition for doctors to be the ones to almost singularly employ Greek among Punic speaking people. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 17) But still the ratio of multilingual epigraphical expressions to Neo-Punic ones is 1:5. A stark contrast to the 7:1 noted above for the longer and undeniably public inscriptions.

Table 6

| Total accessible inscriptions | Probable Public inscriptions | Probable Private inscriptions | Multilingual Probable Public inscriptions | Multilingual Probable Private inscriptions |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 21 | 9 | 12 | 7 | 2 |

How can we explain this? If the shorter works are indeed private affairs the fact that Punic was the spoken vernacular in Lepcis Magna would make less important inscriptions meant only for the locals themselves unnecessary to put down in two languages. The more significant and public ones would justify the expenditure of bilingualism as they were meant to be read also by visiting dignitaries and other foreigners to the benefit of the city's status. But can we with this definitely classify the shorter inscriptions as private? No. The sources available here do not support this despite the allure of assumption. What we can say is that the longer and definitely public ones are much more likely to be bilingual due to their apparently more important official nature. The shorter ones are much more likely to be set down in only Neo-Punic possibly due to them being of more local interest as they often just depict the names of the people who commissioned them and/or their relatives. If we move on past the issue of single or bilingual epigraphy we can try to analyse what type of inscription they constitute. What is interesting is that all 12 short Neo-Punic inscriptions, excepting IPT 9 which seems to be part of a lost larger work, all only give us names and in some cases several whom are put down as relatives. There is no mention of any deities, patrons or officials besides the aforementioned Clodius the doctor, which is not a very high or very official title. This in stark contrast to the longer more public ones where of the 9 available to us here 6 mention official titles with a possible 7th in IPT 9. 3 honour deities and 5 honour the deified emperors and 2 mentions the sacrifice ritual of zrm. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 16-23 and Birley, 1988, p 5, 8 and 13) All of them contain at least one of the above factors that the other 12 lack. This enforces the notion that the two groups of inscriptions are of somewhat separate types. Can we further discern between the two groups by analysing the type of names employed in them? Of the 9 unquestionably public ones IPT 31 of the preRoman era unsurprisingly employs only Punic style names as do also IPT 25:

IPT 25

“This statue has erected for the lord Shadrafa Bodmelqart, the son of Mutumbal

'*sdby*.....sufetes.....and sixty two.....denarii fifty three”

As neither Birley nor Jongeling and Kerr gives any dating for it we might assume that this last one also is of earlier date. We cannot be sure of this however due to the incompleteness of the available sources and it might just as well be a later work where the commissioner just happened to be named in Punic style. IPT 9 is very short and mentions only Vespasian's name but the 6 remaining all mention Latin or Latinized Punic names of which four also give us purely Punic names and one only Latin names. So 6 out of 9, 7 if you count IPT 9, give us Latin or Latinized names. If we look at the remaining 12 shorter inscriptions the ratio is as follows; 6 give us only Punic style names, 2 with both Latin and Punic style names, 1 with a Greek name, 2 with Latin names and 1 with a Latinized Punic style name. Here we have a further discrepancy with the longer and undoubtedly public inscriptions in that half of the shorter inscriptions have no foreign names versus the former group's 2 out of 9. All 6 of the shorter inscriptions which give no foreign name are of course in solely Neo-Punic but what is interesting is that the other half of them do contain foreign names. A sure sign of the Romanization undertaken willingly by the elite/sub-elite. But here we must stop and factor in that we have presently only 21 out of 67 available to us through the sources we have at our disposal here. Any trend which is not very significant must be treated with scepticism and 1:1 ratio of solely Punic names to inclusion of foreign names in the shorter inscriptions and a 1:2 (or 2:7 if you include IPT 9), is not a highly significant difference in this context. The significance of purely Neo-Punic works vs multilingual works in the shorter inscriptions, 5:1, and the same for the longer and undoubtedly public ones, 1:7, is striking enough to warrant attention. The fact that no mention is made of either emperors, officials or even other religious connections in any of the shorter inscriptions versus the more elaborate and unquestionably public ones whom all contain at least one of the above elements must be taken note of. Even IPT 10 which is a confirmed tomb inscription does not contain any religious elements. How does this stack up versus the dating of the inscriptions? Sadly, none of the shorter inscriptions are available to us in dated form. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 16-23) But what other insights can we garner from the dated ones? We see a seemingly clear transition from purely Neo-Punic writing with only Punic style names in IPT 31 in the preRoman era to the bilingual inscriptions of the Roman era where the names are increasingly Latinized and Latin, to the final use of Punic style names in the Latin inscription IRT 300 in 72 C.E. and finally the last Neo-Punic inscription IPT 27 from 92 C.E. which only refers to Latin names. The anomaly of IPT 18 from the 60's CE which is in solely Neo-Punic must be noted but might be considered just that, an anomaly. Since we have mentioned IRT 300, what then of the other Latin inscriptions? We will attend to them further down. Then let us move on to Carthage. The only

inscription available to us is CIS 949. It's in a mixture of Punic and Neo-Punic and it's a votive for Tanit and Baal Hammon. As a votive inscription it can be placed in the private inscription category. It contains, unsurprisingly, only Punic style names but it does not refer to any official titles. In this way it differs from the shorter Neo-Punic inscriptions from Lepcis as it does mention divine names. However none of the available Neo-Punic inscriptions from Lepcis seem to be purely votive works so any comparison might be deemed null and void. And it is also just one out of 15 remaining to us making any comparison with Lepcis' corpus pure speculation. Coupled with the fact that it pre-dates even the earliest inscription from Lepcis with several decades as it hails from before the fall of Carthage in 146 B.C.E it is also mostly pointless to compare it to the later Latin corpus as well. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 1 and 31) All in all we have little basis for comparison based on the relative abundance of available evidence from Lepcis and the singular example we have available to us from Carthage. What could be more fruitful is to scan the Latin inscriptions from both sites for signs of remaining Libyphoenician elements as only the quantity of Neo-Punic inscriptions give any real insights in the present comparative work. We can conclude this Neo-Punic section of the chapter with stating what we have garnered so far of insights. Neo-Punic was much more in vogue as an epigraphical form of expression in Lepcis Magna than Carthage in the period after the fall of independent Carthage, a fact which is underlined by the sole example we have available of Neo-Punic epigraphy hailing from before the Roman invasion. A ratio of approximately 1:2 of Neo-Punic epigraphical expressions to Latin ones in Lepcis versus Carthage's 1:12 makes this seem quite apparent. Unfortunately the analysis of the dating gives us little to conclude upon as the available sources are scanty and incomplete in their dating of the corpus of both cities. We can state that Lepcis is the site which the last known Neo-Punic inscription hails from but without adequate sources for the dating of Carthage's corpus this means pretty much nothing. It indicates later usage of late Punic script in Lepcis but does not determinedly decide this question. The same goes for the tradition of bilingual inscriptions in Lepcis. Without more sources no valid conclusion can be made. We have gained some insight into the Lepcis Magna corpus and the way Latin and Latinized names make their entry into the inscriptions and finally lead to Punic style names disappearing altogether after 72 CE. The way the undoubtedly public works are much more likely to be bilingual and especially if you only consider the last known century of Neo-Punic's usage versus the much more frequently solely Neo-Punic shorter inscriptions. For the sake of the comparison though only the quantitative analysis holds any water when it comes to drawing conclusions. To highlight the difference between the two sites I will divert some attention to the quantifiable epigraphic evidence left to us from other Libyphoenician cities. Let us now see what, if any, we can draw from the Latino-Punic and the Greco-Punic corpus of the sites.

4.Latino-Punic

The Latino-Punic corpus consists of 75 inscriptions of which 74 emanate from modern Libya. They can be roughly dated to the third and fourth centuries CE. The first dated example is from Zliten in the first century CE, the second from Lepcis in the 120's CE and the last dated one is from Bir ed-Dreder in approximately 340-50 CE. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 2 & 105-6) Already the predominance of Latino-Punic in Libya has been established but let us look further and compare the corpuses of our designated cities. Lepcis Magna has rendered us with 4 Latino-Punic inscriptions one of which is the second earliest of its kind to be dated. It is listed in the volume *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler* from 2002. From here on abbreviated to KAI. It might even be the oldest as the Zliten dating is in question. It is a stamp used on tiles in the imperial baths which means it cannot be dated later than 127 CE. It gives the name of the craftsman as Rogatus, a clearly Latin denomination:

KAI 178

“Hand-craftsmanship by/of Rogatus, a skilled craftsman”

The second inscription listed in Jongeling and Kerr's volume is IRT 827 and it is clearly a tomb inscription with seemingly Libyco-Berber name elements mixed with Punic and Latin traits. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 68-9):

IRT 827

“For Mythicsin, 'amigo', the viginturion, erect(ed)? it (?) Mylthe”

The last 2 inscriptions of Lepcis Magna are not given to us in their work. Well, let's see how Carthage stacks up. The only Latino-Punic inscription coming to us from outside of Libya hails from Henchir Smala and it is debatable whether it is Latino-Punic or Greco-Punic as no words are really discernible. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 105-6) So there is a definite discrepancy here. The albeit small corpus of Lepcis attests to a later employment of a Late Punic script than in Carthage. Still the small number of inscriptions in Lepcis might leave us wondering whether the aforementioned ravaging of Carthage's remains might account for its lack of Latino-Punic inscriptions. As the evidence stands today that is not very probable. Latino-Punic epigraphy was

certainly a most singular Tripolitanian enterprise as the 74 inscriptions coming out of Libya out of 75 total clearly underlines. And when you factor in the uncertainty of the odd one out's origins the case is pretty definite. A comparison of timeline and types of inscriptions are rendered impossible by this clear discrepancy but we must note that the 2 available to us from Lepcis were respectively a stamp tile from approximately 127 CE and an undated tomb inscription. But before we move on to the Greco-Punic texts we should consider the context of which within the Lepcis Magnan corpus was created. 3 sites in Libya had an equal to or greater number of Latino-Punic inscriptions than Lepcis. Bir ed-Dreder with 21, Sirte's 12 and Wadi e-Amud with 4. What is significant here is that neither Oea nor Sabratha, the other two major urban sites of Tripolitania, are present. Oea of course is more or less lost beneath the modern urban sprawl of Tripoli but Sabratha's absence seems conspicuous. If we consider their geographical location we see that Bir ed-Dreder and Wadi e-Amud both belong to the furthest hinterland of Tripolitania. (Mattingly, 1995, p xix) This conforms with Jongeling and Kerr's opinion that the Libyphoenician language was more dominant in the inland territories than on the coast where Latin was more popular. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 4) This is emphasized by the fact that the isolated frontier site of Bir ed-Dreder has supplied us with 5 times as many Latino-Punic inscriptions as metropolitan Lepcis Magna. Sirte however is also a coastal site and this complicates the issue. It probably originated as an oasis settlement for the Macae tribe, a Libyan tribal confederation which seems to have coexisted with the Libyphoenician and Roman elements without problems. It was a smaller city and might have been a civitas. (Birley, 1995, p 32, 48 & 59) Could its smaller size and Libyan tribal instead of Libyphoenician origins explain the difference? Of the 31 established find sites for Latino-Punic epigraphy in Libya only Zliten, Silin, Lepcis and Sirte were by the coast. (Birley, 1995, p xix and Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 105-6) Zliten and Silin were so close to Lepcis as to be virtually part of the city itself but Sirte lies much further east on the Greater Syrtic coast. Sirte's corpus can be explained by its tribal associations and lesser status which would have insulated it a bit from Roman cultural influence which centred around the more important urban sites. However this does not fully explain why such a metropolitan site as Lepcis with its important role in Roman political life and its openness to Roman cultural influence furnish us with several Latino-Punic inscriptions despite the conspicuous absence of evidence from the region's other major urban sites. Can these missing pieces of evidence be victims of the ravages of time and modern development which indeed would be plausible in the case of Oea? Or was the first city of Tripolitania also the biggest recipient of Latino-Punic users from the surrounding countryside and this is reflected in the corpus? Or did the city mould its own tradition of Latino-Punic in correlation with the inland territories? Sadly the evidence is too brief to warrant any definite conclusions which are not at least half speculation.

5. Greco-Punic

The Greco-Punic corpus is by far the lesser of the Late Punic epigraphical traditions with only 5 confirmed inscriptions. There are 7 others which might belong to this grouping but their state of preservation makes it impossible to determine whether they are Latino- or Greco-Punic and must therefore be passed by in this analysis. The Greco-Punic inscriptions are thought to have been of earlier dating than the Latino-Punic corpus. Carthage and Lepcis both furnish us with only 1 inscription in this script each and none of them are rendered in Jongeling and Kerr's volume. This makes any analysis outside of the quantitative one impossible to see through. And since they only have 1 each and this would in any case be insufficient to base anything substantial on this whole line of analysis falls through. Not much can be garnered here for further employ in the thesis. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 2 & 105-6)

6. Other major Libyphoenician sites in Tunisia and Libya

To flesh out the analysis I will add quantifiable evidence from other important Libyphoenician sites. I will not delve into a discussion on dating or type of inscriptions as this is tenuous at the least in regards to Carthage and Lepcis and expanding this type of comparison to comprise more subjects would only dilute the meagre findings and conclusions I have come to so far. In Tripolitania only Tripoli/Oea and Sabratha have sizeable Neo-Punic corpuses with 10 and 19 respectively. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005 p 96-7) In Tunisia Teboursouk with 21, Sousse/Hadrumetum with 32, Hr. Meded with 28, Hr Makhtar with 130, Hr Guergour with 10 and Dougga/Thugga with 6 have sizeable corpuses. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 98-100) This clearly establishes that the denizens of the Tunisian part of Africa Proconsularis weren't less prone to employ Neo-Punic in their inscriptions than their counterparts in the modern Libyan parts of the region. Almost quite the opposite in the case of Makhtar. One might rather favourably compare Carthage with the other Roman strongholds in Africa Proconsularis like El Djem and Utica which have divulged respectively 1 and 2 Neo-Punic inscriptions. But to make any profound conclusions based on such fleeting knowledge I have of these sites would be to venture too far from the ideal of objectivity. To state that Neo-Punic was in vogue in many major sites in Africa Proconsularis and leave it at that for the purpose of this thesis is the most prudent thing to do.

7. The Latin inscriptions

Of Carthage's 182 Latin inscriptions as given by the Heidelberg Databank only 40 can be dated and some only very approximately like *L'Année épigraphique*, from here on abbreviated to AE, 1985 no. 0855 which is dated to 301-500 CE. Included in those 40 dated are also some which have been inexpertly approximately dated by the author through their mention of emperors by name. For instance AE 1897 no. 0038 which mentions Augustus and cannot have been set down before his reign at least and probably not too long after it either. Sadly 34 of the inscriptions are not listed with text so the basis for our analysis are the 148 remaining. This should still be a big enough proportion to make a valid representation of the epigraphic material. Only 2 of the dated inscriptions, AE 1985 no. 0855 and 0856 are listed without text. Of these 148 only one Latin inscription gives us an unambiguous reference to a word of Libyphoenician origin:

AE 1908 no. 0071

“(H)annibal i[n pace] / Aurelius i[n pace]”

We might assume it is from the reign of Marcus Aurelius but without further sources I will refrain from making any too firm conclusions regarding the dating of this inscription. Furthermore the name Hannibal, even though it originates from the Libyphoenician language, was a *nome celebre* in its own right. After the invasion of Italy by Hannibal the name was legendary amongst not only the Libyphoenicians but also his Roman enemies and the other peoples of the Mediterranean basins. So I hesitate to lend too much weight to it in one inscription from Carthage. Other possibly Libyphoenician names in the Latin corpus are *Renobatus* in AE 1912 no. 0031, AE 1940 no. 0126 mentioning a *Sidonius* and the wealth of names derived from Saturn. As I am no expert in Libyphoenician nor Roman names and there is no valid way of systematically discern between the names of Roman immigrants and Romanized Libyphoenicians after the disappearance of Libyphoenician names, this evidence will only stand as a very weak indication of Libyphoenician cultural survival. Without further sources to back it up it is virtually of no use to us here. (Cherry, 1998, p 86-7) Several of the inscriptions mention possible Libyphoenician deities by Roman names but this problem will be tackled in the Religion and Institution Chapters as they don't pertain to the strictly linguistic issue at hand. The timeline of the Latin inscriptions starts off with AE 1959 no. 0189 which hails from 120-1 B.C.E. and which appears to have been a border marking. It ends with AE 1985 no. 0860 put down somewhere between 551-600 C.E. So we have a timeline of between

720 and 551 years and only one dubious reference to a Libyphoenician word. Let us move on to Lepcis' corpus to see if there is a similarity or difference there.

Of 162 Latin inscriptions from Lepcis we can approximately date 87. Some only very roughly like AE 2003 1921 dated to 101-300 CE, AE 2003 1922 dated to 201-300 CE and IRT 538 from 51-200 CE. Included in those 40 dated are also some which have been inexpertly approximately dated by the author through their mention of emperors by name. 3 are rendered without text, IRT 294, 309 and 559. The earliest Latin inscription is AE 2003 1920 from the 1st century B.C.E and the latest is IRT 544 from 271-300 C.E. giving a timeline of 3-400 years. Of the 159 with text 9 contain Libyphoenician names. IRT 300, 321, 319, 273, 269, 615, 338, 324 b and c. The earliest dated is IRT 321 from 1-2 C.E. and the latest is IRT 300 from 72 C.E.

IRT 321

Imp(eratore) Caesare Divi f(ilio) Aug(usto) pont(ifice) max(imo) tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) XXIV
co(n)s(ule) XIII patre patr(iae) / Annobal Rufus ornator patriae amator concordiae / flamen sufes
praef(ectus) sacr(orum) Himilchonis Tapapi f(ilius) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) fac(iendum) coer(avit) /
idemq(ue) dedicavit

IRT 300

Imp(eratore) Caesare Vespasiano [Aug(usto) pont(ifice) m]ax(imo) trib(unicia) potest(ate) III
imp(eratore) X co(n)s(ule) IIII des[ig(nato) V p(atre) p(atriciae)] / Q(uintus) Manlius Ancharius
Tarq[uitius Saturni]nus proco(n)s(ul) patronus d[edicavit] / [-] Volumnius Memor Felix [legatus]
pro pr[aetore ---] / Iddibal Balsillecis [f(ilius)] Annobalis n(epos) Asmunis pro[nepos ---]us
templum Matris Magna[e ---] / et exor[navit e]x HS CC m(ilibus) n(ummum) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia)
d(edit) [---]is et Passienus Maris E(?)[&

7 contain mention of the specifically Libyphoenician institution sufet namely IRT 600, 347, 348, 349a, 319, 321 and 412. The earliest is IRT 321 from 1-2 C.E. and the latest is IRT 412 from 202 C.E. Libyphoenician titles expressed in the Latin tongue, such as amator patriae, amator civium, ornator patriae, amator concordiae or varieties thereof are rendered in 6 inscriptions. Again the earliest dated is IRT 321 and the latest approximately dated is IRT 357-9, as mentioned earlier, from the 120's C.E. (Birley, 1988, p 13-23) Furthermore there are several mentioning Libyphoenician deities but these are dealt with in the Religion Chapter as they do not add to the

purely linguistic subject at hand. So in total there are 16 inscriptions of the 159 rendered with text with Late Punic linguistic elements. As close to 10% of the corpus as one can come versus Carthage's approximate and only possible 0,5%.

Table 7

| City | Total no. of Latin inscriptions | Total number rendered with text | Inscriptions with Libyphoenician elements |
|--------------|--|--|--|
| Carthage | 182 | 148 | 1 |
| Lepcis Magna | 162 | 159 | 16 |

So the evidence is pretty staggering when you compare the two cities. Lepcis has a wealth of inscriptions mentioning Libyphoenician linguistic elements. Carthage has only one and even it is of dubious origins. The Carthaginian one is hard to assign a date to but the latest Libyphoenician reference in the Latin inscriptions hails from as late as 202 C.E. The strength of the Libyphoenician linguistic heritage in Lepcis is very much underlined by this evidence.

8. Running it through the Cherry requirements

Language as a core cultural value must be accepted in regards to requirement number one. The spoken tongue of differing human societies has been seen as the first and foremost marker of ethnicity and cultural belonging. The period of European nationalism was more or less founded on this belief and is still considered the basis for cultural cohesion or separation in our modern world. But again the evidence we are currently working with cannot satisfy requirement number two. Inscriptions are the cultural remains of the elite capable of shouldering their costs. So directly we do not span a broad range of social groups. We can infer that in the case of Lepcis the incomplete Romanization of the elite would entail that the commoners much less in contact with Romans and their culture were presumably also much less Romanized. Their cultural composition in all respects other than this weak indication is not present for us in the sources we have at hand. Again our sources fail to meet the criteria of requirement two. But requirement number three is met pretty definitively except in the case of Greco-Punic which has such a small sampling. 82 Neo-Punic inscriptions in total from Lepcis and Carthage out of a total of 698. 75 total Latino-Punic inscriptions of which 4 from Lepcis. 162 Latin inscriptions from Lepcis and 182 from Carthage. While studying Antiquity this is a wealth of evidence material and even though Cherry might object and demand a larger sampling this evidence in this context definitely meets the third requirement's

criteria.

9. Conclusion

So all in all, what have we gained from these discussions? First we can discard the Greco-Punic evidence in regards to the comparative purposes of the thesis. We can note the fact that there was one inscription at each site but the scarcity of evidence and the fact that both sites have an equal number makes any comparison of little value. The fact that there was production of this type of Late Punic inscription must be noted though. But the other Late Punic inscriptions are very intriguing. Even if we disregard the qualitative and chronological aspects of the analysis the sheer difference in quantity speaks volumes. The Neo-Punic corpus of Lepcis is more than four times the number of the Carthaginian one. And if we focus on the period of Roman rule in Africa we can even eliminate one more of the Carthaginian corpus in CIS 949. Quite possibly more if sources successfully dating the inscriptions can be found. If we move on to the Latino-Punic epigraphical expressions the picture is even more skewed in favour of Late Punic in Lepcis. No inscriptions in Carthage versus Lepcis' four. Coupled with the fact that Latino-Punic is regarded as the latest written expressions of the Late Punic language Lepcis trumps Carthage not only in quantity but in longevity of the written Late Punic. If we add on the evidence of the Latin inscriptions of the period the case for Lepcis' greater preference for Late Punic becomes only more clear. 16 of the inscriptions contain clear Late Punic linguistic traits such as expressions, titles or names compared to just one questionable one from Carthage. A major difference here too. This in a region where most cities had a strong Libyphoenician component with Late Punic epigraphical traditions of their own. So the case is quite clear to see. Roman era Lepcis had a much greater tradition for the use of Late Punic in inscriptions than Roman era Carthage. So what might we infer from this? Since epigraphic customs only directly reflects the cultural traits of the elite and sub-elite economically capable of having made costly inscriptions we cannot directly attribute the cultural traits of the mass of commoners subject to this elite. But as I argued earlier the assumption that the commoners were more Romanized than their superiors is a truly ridiculous notion. The Roman culture instilled in the Libyphoenician elite was achieved through costly education, travels and wielding of official power far outside of the monetary realities of the manual labour earnings of the commoners. So they would have been of a more conservative Libyphoenician and/or Libyan cultural stock. We cannot ascertain that they were either more Libyphoenician or more Libyan in cultural outlook but a mix of the two seems most likely but of course unsubstantiated by the above evidence. This argument is further strengthened by Cherry's theory (Cherry, 1998, p 76-77) about the dissipation of the strength of the Roman

cultural matrix when faced with the influx of foreigners from all over the Empire into higher positions from the 2nd century CE onwards. That would entail a period of truly strong Roman cultural influence only lasting 2-300 years in Africa with maybe only 200-250 years for the site of Carthage from the refounding onwards and approximately the same for Lepcis from the Caesarean civil war onwards. Compared with the Libyphoenician presence from the 8th century B.C.E. in the case of Carthage and from the 6th century B.C.E. in the case of Lepcis and both extending to at least the 3rd century C.E. and most probably beyond this Roman interlude so to speak is relatively brief. One can speculate whether the commoners and elite were indeed heavily influenced by the Greek culture emanating out of Alexandria and Cyrene but we have no evidence for any major Hellenization outside of the artistic and architectural realms and in the singular cases of doctors. So any notions of a Hellenized common folk versus a Romanized elite is as ridiculous as the above notion of a more Romanized common people than the elite. So what we can gather here is that the Lepcitanian elite and sub-elite was much more likely to employ the written form of Late Punic than their Carthaginian counterparts. Coupled with this we can safely assume that they were also much more likely to speak Late Punic and the more hazardous assumption that the mass of common people also were more likely to be Late Punic speakers in Lepcis than in Carthage rings true until confronted with opposing evidence. In short the Latinization of the Roman era Lepcitanian people's language was much less than that of the Roman era Carthaginian population. Even though the dated Late Punic inscriptions don't survive past the 4th century C.E. we have no reason to believe that the language itself died out until the coming of the Arabs and it might possibly have survived even longer. To temper the argument a bit I must add that St. Augustine mentioned Late Punic and its speakers as late as the 5th century CE in his region of Africa. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, p 4-5) A site much closer to Carthage than Lepcis. Any firm conclusion cannot be drawn from this but it does suggest that we should not over-emphasize the lesser use of Late Punic among the Carthaginian elite versus the Lepcitanian one to the extent that we delude ourselves to believe it necessarily has the same ramifications for their respective commoners. If we try to fit the evidence into our problem statements we can try to formulate some partial answers to them. Carthage's Libyphoenician language traits were restricted to 15 inscriptions in Neo-Punic and 1 in Greco-Punic. One of the Neo-Punic ones was commissioned prior to the fall of independent Carthage so it is irrelevant for the period we are focusing on and more of them might also be if sources with secure dating can be procured. Any development is impossible to pin down without the dating but it would of course be very surprising if the Late Punic inscriptions of Carthage antedated the Latino-Punic ones which are the last known as of today. When you factor in the Latin inscriptions which have just one questionable Libyphoenician element and 181 others without any at all the fact of the

matter seems to be that the Roman influence was dominant in the realm of epigraphical expression in Roman Carthage. While as for Lepcis the case is more complex. Lepcis has 67 Neo-Punic inscriptions spanning a time period of around 200 years with a development from the purely Neo-Punic in IPT 31 to the period of mostly bilingual public inscriptions from 8 B.C.E until finally the last dated Neo-Punic one from 92 C.E. Unfortunately we cannot date the presumably private shorter Neo-Punic inscriptions so they must be downplayed in the context of a development analysis. As for names the development again starts off with IPT 31 and ends with the last dated inscription with Libyphoenician names in 72 C.E. The process of Romanization of the elite's names is well documented by the several dated inscriptions where Roman-style names make their presence felt from Annobal Tapapius Rufus in B.C.E to the aforementioned one. And the last dated Libyphoenician element we can find in Lepcis' inscriptions is the mention of the title of *sufet* from 202 C.E. And since the four Latino-Punic epigraphical expressions are in one case datable to 127 C.E. and the others are presumable more recent than all Neo-Punic ones Lepcis' development can be expressed in a table with all the datable evidence. The Latin versions of bilingual inscriptions are omitted so as not to over represent them in the analysis:

Table 8

| Early 1 st /Late 2 nd century B.C.E | Late 1 st century B.C.E | 1 st century C.E | 2 nd century and up until 211 C.E | Later |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 Neo-Punic | 2 Neo-Punic | 3 Neo-Punic | 0 Neo-Punic | 0 Neo-Punic |
| 0 Latino-Punic | 0 Latino-Punic | 0 Latino-Punic | 1 Latino-Punic | 0 Latino-Punic |
| 0 Greco-Punic | 0 Greco-Punic | 0 Greco-Punic | 0 Greco-Punic | 0 Greco-Punic |
| 0 Latin with Libyphoenician elements | 0 Latin with Libyphoenician elements | 6 Latin with Libyphoenician elements | 1 Latin with Libyphoenician elements | 0 Latin with Libyphoenician elements |
| 0 Latin without Libyphoenician elements | 1 Latin without Libyphoenician elements | 18 Latin without Libyphoenician elements | 42 Latin without Libyphoenician elements | 4 Latin without Libyphoenician elements |

We can see that the 1st C.E. century seems to have been the heyday of Libyphoenician epigraphy and the inclusion of Libyphoenician linguistic terms in Latin epigraphy. The vast majority of Latin inscriptions in the 2nd century and up until the death of Septimius were set down during his reign. But the dated Latin ones without any Libyphoenician elements far outnumber the rest so the tradition for having Libyphoenician inscriptions or Libyphoenician elements in Latin ones, albeit a seemingly vital one, was far overshadowed by the more dominant purely Latin tradition. So even

though Lepcis was a bastion of Libyphoenician culture its datable and undatable Latin corpus was much larger than the Late Punic corpus even if you include the Latin inscriptions with Libyphoenician linguistic elements. We can see a development from singularly Late Punic inscriptions prior to the 8 BCE one and a period of a 100 years with both Late Punic and Latin ones, several times bilingual but also of just one or the other, to a period of a few Latino-Punic and mostly Latin without Libyphoenician elements to a disappearance of Libyphoenician elements after the Severan age and a vanishing of epigraphical expressions completely in the beginning of the 4th century. For Carthage we cannot do a similar comparison as the Late Punic corpus is not accessible to us in dated versions from the Roman period. But the fact that there is but one Latin inscription with just a dubious Libyphoenician element among 148 rendered with text stretching out from the late 1st century BCE to the 6th century CE speaks volumes. As remarked earlier we cannot infer much from the epigraphical evidence to the trends of the common folk but for the elite's preferences it is quite clear. Regarding our secondary problem statement the impact of Libyan seems to have been significant as evidenced by a classical source and the change of the language itself from Punic to Late Punic which might have had Libyan influences as a cause. The wealth of Libyan names in the Late Punic corpus, for example the undated one transcribed in Jongeling & Kerr's volume, might be an indication of that. Furthermore the way Latin epigraphy functioned as a model for the Late Punic corpus must be noted.

Institution chapter:

1. Historical background

Serge Lancel expresses in his work *Carthage, a History* (Lancel, 1995, p 428) that the ingredients constituting a state in Antiquity consists of its physical representation in its walls and buildings, its temples and cults, its language and written history and its laws and institutions. In line with this thinking I shall now move on to the subject of the specific Libyphoenician institutions of Carthage and Lepcis Magna. Independent Carthage has left us with the earliest mention of these of the two cities. In the foundation myth Dido/Elissa/Elishat was of the royal Tyrian line and founded the city with other important exiles from their Phoenician mother city. (Lancel, 1995, p 23) At its outset the city seems to have had at least a partial monarchic and possibly aristocratic/oligarchic component. But this is itself just a myth which we cannot take at face value leaving us with nothing but a very weak indication of early Carthaginian institutions. If you compare with the mother city itself it had a monarchic rule augmented by a council (Lancel, 1995, p 113). A similar state of affairs might be assumed for Carthage but can't be rated as better than an educated guess. Carthage might also just as easily have been merely a colony supervised by the Tyrian king's representative on the scene something which the yearly paying of tribute to the mother city might suggest. (Lancel, 1995, p 36-7) Like other foundation myths Carthage's could easily have been a political re-write or even fabrication of actual events to further any later goals and agendas of the emerging power. But the tradition of monarchy and aristocracy/oligarchy inherited from Tyre must be noted. The first mention of any institutions after this can be found in Justin (XVIII, 7). Here he describes the general Malchus' laying siege to Carthage after having been exiled. Subsequently his crucifixion of his own son, the priest of Melquart Carthalon, for disobedience. And finally his execution of senators in front of the People's Assembly after his capture of the city and his own subsequent execution for the crime of tyranny. Here the institutions of senators, the priesthood of Melquart, a People's Assembly and a military general is put into writing. This was all supposed to have transpired in the 6th century. But Justin is the sole source for this particular story and doubts as to its accuracy has been sown by the general's name being a thinly veiled version of MLK or king in Phoenician. It seems likely that this is more of a symbolic tale of the the archetypical Carthaginian king and the sacrifice of the archetypical king's son instead of a true rendering of actual events. (Lancel, 1995, p 112) At this point a clarification must be made. Many classical authors label any Carthaginian leader as king despite them being for instance in the time of Hannibal the elected magistrates of suffetes, something which complicates matters. This makes any change in government institutions hard to discern. The royal dynasty of the Magonids which took power in

the 6th century wasn't a hereditary absolutist monarchy but a family of military commanders, first among the great families of the city, vested with power by law but also subject to the law themselves. When Himilcho Mago led a catastrophic campaign in Sicily in the beginning of the 4th century it signaled the end of his dynasty. After his suicide the nobility supposedly set up a council of the One Hundred and Four to govern the city. (Lancel, 1995, p 113-4) The tradition of military kingship continued on under a new family, that of Hanno the Great, but his and later the general Bomilcar's downfall for attempts to usurp supreme power underlines the more aristocratic/oligarchic elements' power versus that of the military commanders/kings. (Lancel, 1995, p 114-5) Still until Aristotle wrote his treatise on the subject in the 4th century BCE we have little definite sources regarding the government institutions. All our knowledge is muddled and uncertain before this point but we mustn't fall into the trap of assuming the institutions of Aristotle's time to have been present at earlier stages in the city's development. Aristotle bases his treatise on contemporary Carthage and labels its constitution as being of the mixed type much idealized by him in his writings. Here he puts executive power in the hands of kings, basileis, oligarchic power in the hands of the Council of Elders and the tribunal of the One Hundred and Four and democratic power in the hands of the People's Assembly which decided matters the kings and the oligarchs couldn't agree upon. Like many classical authors Aristotle doesn't mention the term suffetes but neither does almost any other text relating to the Libyphoenicians in Greek. The term is almost exclusively contained in Punic, Late Punic and Latin texts. This ambiguity has made it impossible to really establish whether the annual magistrature of the suffetes was a later development to replace the former executive power of the military kings or if it had been the highest office all the way from the colony's inception. (Lancel, 1995, p 115-117) The institution of the suffetes-ship was very much like the consulship in Rome. Two annually elected magistrates with executive powers and the responsibility for convening the People's Assembly. They might well have been the equivalent of the Judges of their fellow Semitic speakers the Israelites. (Birley, 1988, p 5) They are known from texts as far back as the end of the 4th century BCE and might originate from the same institution employed in Tyre in the 5th century BCE. There are theories that equates the appearance of the suffetes-ship with a democratic revolution which overthrew the former military monarchy. (Lancel, 1995, p 118). Polybius himself supports this notion by lamenting the loss of oligarchic influence versus democratic power at the end of the 3rd century BCE which stands in stark contrast to Aristotle's praising of the balanced power of the 4th century BCE Carthaginian State. (Polybius VI, 51 & Lancel, 1995, p 118-9) However these are speculations based on little evidence spanning centuries. What we do know is that Hannibal when serving as suffet had a falling out with the oligarchic powers to be in the 190's BCE. he bypassed their authority by appealing directly to the

People's Assembly but was forced to go into exile when the Oligarchs swayed the Romans to their point of view. (Lancel, 1995, p 119) Of this Assembly little is known. We know that on rare occasions foreigners were given citizenship but any other qualifications for membership are lost to us. It had the power to elect generals and to decide on matters brought to it either by the suffetes/kings or the oligarchic institutions which they didn't agree upon among themselves and in this instance it also had the right to put forth its own proposals to the vote. (Lancel, 1995, p 117-20) Besides the suffetes, the Council of Elders, the One Hundred and Four and the People's Assembly there were other specifically Carthaginian and therefore Libyphoenician civic institutions. Assistants to the suffetes were called MHSBM or accountants and were magistratures in charge of finances. A civic office attested from Malta, DR RKT, might be equated with the Roman censor. The mahazim, MHZM, of Lepcis Magna were in charge of markets much like the Roman aedile. All these civic officials were in need of clerks, the sopherim or SPR and finally the title of rab, RB, which if used in connection with sopherim means chief of the clerks but in other contexts is apparently a more vague denomination for a notable person. (Lancel, 1995, p 120) Of all these civic institutions the office of the suffetes is most easily recognizable in the source material. The institution was employed in all of the Libyphoenician world (Birley, 1988, p 5) albeit with some local differences like at Makhtar where there were three suffetes instead of two in accordance with the city's Numidian heritage. (Lancel, 1995, p 431).

2. General political history and regional administrative framework in the Roman period

If we are to examine the history of the Libyphoenician institutions in Roman era Lepcis Magna and Carthage we must first briefly examine the cities' general political histories and the administrative framework of the region.

2.1 Lepcis

Lepcis originated as a Carthaginian trading post most likely in the 6th century BCE. It was a response to the Greek expansion in Africa creeping out from Cyrene in eastern Libya. The form of governance it had at the time is lost to us and the only significant event to have been recorded in the available sources was the expulsion of Dorieus, a Greek adventurer, by the Carthaginians and the local tribes in approximately 511 BCE. (Birley, 1988, p 2-3) In this environment of powerful Libyan tribes, Saharan scorching winds and mostly arid landscape Lepcis and her two sister cities of Sabratha and Oea flourished the next three hundred years until they resurface in the sources.

Massinissa, their future overlord, sought refuge in the Emporia region after a defeat in the 2nd Punic War and saw its affluence for himself. Lepcis' wealth at the time is underlined by the fact that it paid a tribute to Carthage of a talent a day. After the end of the war as Massinissa assumed control of the Numidian kingdom a long power struggle ensued between him and the Carthaginians over territorial disputes throughout Libyphoenician Africa. It ended in the 160's BCE with the Emporias winding up under Numidian control. Still, the vast distance separating the three cities from the Numidian heartlands enabled them to maintain some semblance of independence. No sources detailing their form of local government has yet to appear. (Birley, 1988, p 3-4 and Livy 29.33.9 & 34.62.2) With the onset of the Jugurthine War in 112 BCE Lepcis sought an alliance with Rome against their Numidian former masters and was granted the rights of a *civitas foederata* for their efforts. When the war ended in 105 BCE Lepcis was finally a free State of its own. The first mention of the *suffetes*-ship comes from this period in IPT 31 (Birley, 1988, p 5) Half a century later the last of the Numidian kings, Juba, took up the practice of his forefather of trying to confiscate Libyphoenician possessions, this time not from Carthage but from Lepcis itself. Roman arbitration ruled in favour of Lepcis but the conflict kept on simmering until the start of the great civil war of Rome in 49 BCE. Juba and his Republican allies were defeated and Lepcis was fined heavily by Caesar for allowing Cato's forces to winter in their city. When the war ended Roman Africa was greatly expanded by Caesar's establishing of colonies in Carthage and all across the territory and the annexation of the Numidian kingdom. Augustus carried on his work of consolidation but the Emporia was left independent for now. (Birley, 1988, p 6-7) There were frequent disturbances the next century as Roman legions had to stamp out multiple tribal insurrections and incursions. Lepcis continued on its course towards Romanization by currying the favours of Roman dignitaries with construction work and setting up their own branch of the Imperial Cult. The Romans on the other hand rewarded their efforts with essential road construction and of course shielding Lepcis from its hostile Libyan neighbours and on one occasion even from the Oeans in a border dispute. In the 30's CE, despite ambiguities regarding Lepcis' official status, it was effectively treated as part of Roman Africa. At the latest in 78 CE Lepcis was granted the rights of a *municipium* and the *ius Latii* or Latin right. Despite all public titles changing into Roman forms at this time the title of *sufet* remained as the head magistrature and the four *mahazim* were merely renamed *IIIviri aedilicia potestate* (Birley, 1988, p 8-16) Finally in 109 CE Lepcis was granted the rights of a *colonia* and replaced the title of *sufet* with the *duoviri* and in Roman fashion renamed the *IIIviri aedilicia potestate* aediles and reduced their number from four to two. (Birley, 1988, p 22 & Mattingly, 1995, p 53 and 57) After a period of trouble at the end of the 1st century CE with tribal incursions Lepcis and the rest of Tripolitania enjoyed a peaceful and prosperous 2nd

century with several of its leading members gaining high positions in the Imperial Administration. (Mattingly, 1995, p 53) This culminated in the ascension of Septimius Severus to the post of Emperor in 193 CE. He bestowed the *ius Italicum* upon the city in 203 CE, the crowning achievement of this city's quest for status. It is probably from this time that the separate concepts of a *regio Tripolitania* and a *limes Tripolitanae* hails, an administrative demarcation which points forward to the splitting up of *Africa Proconsularis* into smaller more manageable provinces. The Severan dynasty also marked the beginning of financial hardship for the city. The vast local estates of the emperor, his family and the praetorian prefect Plautianus were incorporated into the imperial estates and when Caracalla seized power he further expanded them by confiscating land from local prominent citizens. Coupled with this calamity was the oil dole offered by Lepcis to the city of Rome which was freely given at first but would later be levied as a tax. A severe strain was put on the remaining elite of Lepcis. (Mattingly, 1995, p 54-5) The general unrest of the 3rd century CE caused the military presence in the region to be scaled down and the aforementioned financial straits are evident in the sudden halt of major construction work in Lepcis. (Mattingly. 1995, p 56) The regional administration of *Africa Proconsularis* in the early Empire was headed by the senatorial proconsul. He had at his disposal the assistance of three legates, one of the *Legio III Augusta* and two junior legates of praetorian rank. The legate of the legion was set up independently from 39-40 CE and financial matters was increasingly handled by procurators of equestrian status in the course of the 1st century CE. This hollowing out of the proconsul's authority continued in the 2nd century with the establishment of the office of *procurator provinciae Africae* which oversaw the work of an ever increasing host of procurators. Furthermore local financial officials branded *curatores* usurped the former proconsular task of administrating town finances in the same period. All of this was the result of the Roman bureaucracy swelling its ranks from the reign of Augustus to the end of the 3rd century CE. (Mattingly, 1995, p 56-7) The 4th century CE proved even worse for Tripolitania than the civil war ridden 3rd as at least two major earthquakes, several severe tribal raids and Roman inability to quell these attest to. At the beginning of the century Tripolitania was made into a province of its own with Lepcis as its capital. (Mattingly, 1995, p 116, 171, 173-77 and 180-1) The post of vicar of Africa was set up to govern the new provinces of Tripolitania, Byzacena, Numidia and Mauretania with special responsibilities for the *annona* and judicial proceedings and reporting directly to the Emperor. Under him the local governor, *praesides*, was based at Lepcis. The *praesides* had in the beginning of the 4th century CE military command under the authority of the vicar but from maybe as early as the 330's the position of *comes Africae* was created to specifically administer all military affairs. The Tripolitanian *praeses* might have been an exception here but his military command was definitely relinquished to

the comes Africae in the 360's. (Mattingly, 1995, p 172) In the later 4th century a military position subordinate to the comes Africae, a dux provinciae Tripolitanae, is found in Tripolitania and later two more military positions, a dux et corrector limitis Tripolitani and a comes et dux provinciae Tripolitanae. These military positions with the comes Africae at the top were in reality the real power in late Roman Africa. (Mattingly, 1995, p 173) Lepcis Magna still had families of equestrian status holding important posts in the 4th century CE but the compounding of problems including a vicious legal battle with the comes Africae Romanus leading to the execution of the praeses and several leading members of the community underlines the physical evidence. There are no confirmed building activity at Lepcis after 360 and some of the coastal villas of the rich were abandoned or if not fortified. (Mattingly, 1995, p 182-3) With continuing instability both at its borders and in the central capital of Rome the 5th century was also a period marked by a negative development as tribal raids continued and the Vandals slowly conquered Roman Africa from 430 until Tripolitania finally was ceded to them in 455 CE. However even before this occupation ensued most of the Tripolitanian hinterland was probably in the hands of the Libyan tribes. (Mattingly, 1995, p 215) Still the Vandals paid little attention to the region. Several attempts at reconquest were set in motion by the Eastern Emperors but it was only in 533 CE that they successfully managed to crush the Vandals. (Mattingly, 1995, p 173) By this time the city of Lepcis had already been temporarily abandoned due to the lack of territory left to it outside its walls by the surrounding tribes. (Mattingly, 1995, p 185) The new Byzantine Tripolitania encompassed not much more than the coastal areas and Lepcis was hardly more than a fortified port at this time vastly smaller in size than its 2nd century former self. The Byzantines promptly got into a conflict with the Libyan tribes and it took serious military effort to stamp out the opposition. Tripolitania was apparently now under the authority of a Byzantine dux and his Greek-speaking officials. Public buildings and spaces were now more and more employed as residential areas, sometimes fortified ones. When the Arabs came conquering in the 640's CE the Byzantines fled and the Tripolitanian cities were overrun. (Mattingly, 1995, p 215-6) Lepcis remained as an Arab stronghold until the 9th century CE when it ceased to be altogether covered by the desert sand. (Di Vita, 1999, p 26)

2.2 Carthage

Carthage fared differently, if not exactly better in the end.

The city was thoroughly destroyed by the Romans albeit not as malevolently as some have suggested with the sowing of salt in the ruins and so forth. (Lancel, 1995, p 428) Appian reported that a commission of Roman notables had the remnants of the sacked city razed to the ground.

(Libyca, 134) The Gracchian attempt at a re-founding in 122 BCE faltered and the urban site lay abandoned watched over by the Roman governor situated in Utica. A ban on employing the site seems to have been in effect. (Lancel, 1995, p 429) Only when Caesar nearing the eve of his assassination in 44 BCE ordered the re-founding and later when Augustus carried it through did the city arise again from the ashes. This time with its central Byrsa hill completely remodeled into a Roman forum.(Lancel, 1995, p 430) The administration of Roman Africa was left to a proconsul based at Carthage responsible for both civilian and military matters. There was a lot of fighting to be done and several nominees received extended terms of office to facilitate these military responsibilities. (Mattingly, 1995, p 51-2) When the legate of the legion was set up independently in 39-40 CE the proconsul was left with two junior legates and as noted above curatores and the procurator provinciae Africae took on the financial responsibilities of the proconsular office from the 2nd century onwards. (Mattingly, 1995, p 56-7) The proconsul was mainly occupied with keeping the peace and upholding the laws in his province. This meant presiding at judicial hearings and supervising the local towns. Even after having the legion removed from his authority the proconsul still had 2 cohorts of soldiers to enforce the law. (Rives, 1995, p 77-8) The provincial assembly which was instituted by Vespasian in 70-72 CE had as its main focus the propagation of the imperial cult and was constituted by representatives from all the province's towns with the Latin right or higher. It was headed by an annually elected sacerdos provinciae and held yearly meetings in a sanctuary at Carthage. Despite being formally just a religious body it was de facto a political player in the province actively engaging in litigation versus former governors and keeping in contact with the emperor. (Rives, 1995, p 85-96) As for the local municipal administration of Carthage this was handled in a fairly ordinary Roman way. Two duoviri magistrates presided over the local council meetings and were also the chief judiciary civil servants. Under them the Roman-style aediles held sway over the realm of public works, substituted for the duoviri when necessary and held lesser executive duties. The magistratures at the lower end of this hierarchy were the quaestors whom served as financial officials to the aediles and duoviri. Furthermore you had the duoviri quinquennales whom were elected for a four year term as opposed to the one year in office of the magistratures mentioned above. This position busied itself with the census of the town. Finally you had the praefectus iure dicundo whom acted as a judicial representative of the duovir in the more distant reaches of the Carthaginian territory. (Rives, 1995, p 29) There were also Roman-style pontifices and augurs co-responsible for the sacra publica with the magistrates and these priesthoods were usually reserved for the notable members of Roman Carthaginian society which lent these offices some political weight. (Rives,1995, p 30-31) But all real municipal authority in Roman Carthage sprang out from the council of decurions, the ordo decurionum. Like the Roman

Senate it had wealth and age requirements and it was the main body of municipal politics. Its responsibilities included municipal public finances, the establishing and maintenance of public cults, public buildings, embassies, the water supply and general public municipal business. (Rives, 1995, p 32-4) With the Diocletian reforms Carthage remained in the hands of a proconsul but now within the much smaller confines of the province of Zeugitana. Unlike the rest of former Africa Proconsularis Zeugitana wasn't subject to the vicar of Africa and the proconsul there continued to report directly to the emperor. The new province and its proconsulship remained an important place in the Roman hierarchy as the list of proconsuls who hailed from important families and who went on to illustrious careers underline. The proconsulship however gravitated towards the younger senators at the start of their political life rather than already accomplished ones, a fact one might ascribe to the vastly smaller size of the province. But as in the rest of Roman Africa the ascent of the comes Africae and the real power of military force wielded by this office probably overshadowed the influence of the proconsul and the vicar of Africa alike. It is not likely that Carthage and Zeugitana suffered as much from the tribal incursions, the corruption of the comes Africae Romanus and the earthquakes that destabilized Lepcis Magna. (Mattingly, 1995, p 176-8 and 180-3) But the steady decline of the cash-based economy of the Mediterranean must have had serious impact on the port and trade city of Carthage. (Mattingly, 1995, p 214) Carthage finally fell to the Vandals in 439 CE and spent nearly a century under their monarchic rule until the Byzantine reconquest in 533 CE. (Mattingly, 1995, p 171-3) The Vandals replaced the landowners of Byzacena's and Zeugitana's prime land but left the rest of Vandal Africa more or less to itself. When the Byzantines smashed the Vandal kingdom in 533 CE they followed the Vandals' example by establishing themselves as the landowning class of the best land and they introduced a Greek-speaking ruling class of officials to govern the province. (Mattingly, 1995, p 215) When Carthage fell to the Arabs in 698 CE the site was abandoned in favour of Tunis. (Ennabli, 2004, p 8 & 39)

3. Framework for analysis

In my comparative approach here I'll first focus on the civic title of sufet in the two cities in question. My choice of this civic position as the first to undergo scrutiny is based on its relative preponderance in the sources compared to all other Libyphoenician titles I've found. And as the official title for the highest magistrature of the Libyphoenician cities it represents the culturally specific urban organization and institutions of the Libyphoenician people. This mode of urban constellation was on par with the Greek polis and the Roman civitas for a long time in Libyphoenician Africa. (Lancel, 1995, p 431) Its apex symbol is the suffetes-ship. I will try to

compare the employment of this title in the two cities and see how long it was in use and if possible how much prestige and/or power was left to it in Roman era Africa. To flesh out my investigation of the survival of Libyphoenician institutions I'll try and piece together what I can from the evidence available to me regarding other institutional titles. But as the source material is scant I suspect that this will only bring minor additions to the argument. Let us again start off with Lepcis Magna and their Libyphoenician institutions.

4.Lepcis Magna

4.1.Suffetes

Before the first mention of the suffetes in IPT 31 we cannot assume that the position existed in Lepcis. It could easily have been a new fixture of its public life accompanying its new status as a *civitas foederata*. The possibility of it being of older origin of course is very real and tangible but without any sources to verify it we have no recourse but to merely speculate. But that the system of governance was of Libyphoenician origin whether or not it had the suffetes magistracy at its peak can be safely assumed however. No other urban system of government existed in independent Libyphoenician Africa prior to the onset of the Roman era. As it were the prime institution of the suffetes-ship remained at the head of the Lepcitanian city state for approximately two centuries ending only with the transition to *colonia* status in 109 CE. (Birley, 1988, p 22 & Mattingly, 1995, p 53 and 57) 6 Latin inscriptions reinforce this argument. IRT 347, 348 and 349a from Vespasian's reign, IRT 321 from 1-2 CE, IRT 319 which seems to be from the reign of Tiberius and the undated IRT 600. In the following centuries we have no sources revealing any shift back to its original form of government and the city's rich history culminates in its 9th century abandonment. (Di Vita, 1999, p 26) There is one aberration from this though. In IRT 412 the emperor Septimius Severus is titled amongst other things as a *sufes* in the year 202 CE in an inscription from his hometown:

“Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) L(uci) Septimi Se/veri Pii Pertinacis / Aug(usti) Arabici Adiabenici / Parthici max(imi) t(ribunicia) p(otestate) X imp(eratoris) / XI co(n)s(ulis) III p(atris) p(atriciae) proco(n)s(ulis) / avo d(omini) n(ostri) / L(ucio) Septimio Severo sufeti prae//f(ecto)// publ(ice) creato cum primum ci/vitas Romana adacta est / du(u)mvir(o) fl(amini) p(er)p(etuo) in decuriis / et inter selectos Romae / iudicavit Lepc(i)t(ani) publ(ice)”

Was the office still in place or was it just a cultural reference to their ancient heritage? As the

suffetes-ship isn't attested elsewhere in the epigraphic material it is hard to put too much weight to this one exception. To honour a local notable turned emperor with an ancient title of power from his city might have been just a way to curry his favour or to underline his connection with his city of birth and its cultural heritage. The title of duoviri which replaced the suffetes as chief magistrates seems to have been firmly entrenched by the time of the Lepcitanian emperor. (Birley, 1988, p 22 and Mattingly, 1995, p 57) In my three main sources regarding Tripolitania and Lepcis Magna I have found nothing to suggest that Lepcis ever returned to its old customary ways of government. Mattingly's *Tripolitania* which deals with the region from pre-Roman to Arab times makes no mention of it. (Mattingly, 1995, p 57) Di Vita's *Libya, The lost cities of the Roman Empire* which also spans from the age of independent Libyphoenician Africa to the Arab reign does not mention either. (Di Vita, 1999, p 28) The same goes for Birley's *Septimius Severus* which concentrates on Lepcis' history first and foremost from early Libyphoenician beginnings until the Severan age. (Birley, 1988, p 22) So what of the power of the institution itself? Was it merely a figurehead, a symbol devoid of real influence in contrast to the suffetes of independent Carthage which wielded temporary but quasi-kinglike powers? The way the title is ascribed to leading members of the Lepcitanian elite such as Annobal Tapapius Rufus, 2 other Tapapii Bodmelquart ben Bodmelquart Tabaphi and Abdmelquart Tabaphi and of course Lucius Septimius Severus, the future emperor's paternal grandfather, indicates that it was not an obscure merely honorary position but a vital and highly sought after office in the wealthy city. (Birley, 1988, p 9, 13, 15 and 23) The Tapapii were evidently by their epigraphic renderings one of the most foremost of the Lepcitanian families and the Septimii spawned several Roman senators, consuls and of course an emperor. (Mattingly, 1995, p 58-9). So we can conclude with the institution being of the utmost importance and influence in Lepcis from the late 2nd/early 1st century BCE until the administrative makeover in 109 CE. There is of course the possibility for an earlier dating of this system of government with the suffetes at its peak under the Numidian and independent Carthage's rule but the lack of hard evidence allows only for speculation.

4.2 Mahazim in Lepcis Magna

The position of Mahazim might be equalled to the position of the Roman aedile and is directly translated the inspector of markets. Of the origins of this position we know little. It is only attested in Lepcis but could have been a feature of all the Libyphoenician towns. (Lancel, 1995, p 120) We cannot assume this however on the basis of the evidence of one city and I have only found it attested in 1 inscription from the 60's CE. (IPT 18 and Birley, 1988, p 15) It is very difficult to

extrapolate anything from this other than that it was in place at the time the inscription was put down. As the suffetes-ship itself cannot be certainly established prior to the last part of the 2nd century BCE in IPT 31 we cannot assume that the even more obscure in the sources position of Mahazim was. With these obscure beginnings dealt with we can move on to its longevity. The position was renamed IIIIviri aedilicia potestate in 74 CE but the number of officials of this type remained the traditional Libyphoenician of four instead of the Roman traditional of two. Finally in 109 CE when Lepcis Magna became a colonia the number was reduced to two and they were renamed aediles in the Roman municipal fashion. (Mattingly, 1995, p 57)

4.3 Religious Libyphoenician institutions in Lepcis Magna-

Religious functions were closely connected to municipal offices in the world of Antiquity. Even so, like the pontifex and augur of the Roman world, there were religious officials so to speak outside of the hierarchic administrative bureaucracy of the cities. IPT 24 and 27 mentions the mysterious ritual of 'zrm and designates one lord of this ritual each. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005 p 19 & 21-22) The inscriptions are from approximately 4-3 BCE and 92 CE respectively so this institution must have had at least an existence spanning a century and probably more. Here they are in English translation quoted from Jongeling and Kerr's 2005 volume:

IPT 24

“Annobal, who adorns the country, who loves the complete knowledge, sacrificer, sufet, lord of the 'zrm-offering, the son of Imilco Tapapi Rufus, made it according to plan at his own expense and consecrated it”

IPT 27

“[Tiberius Claudius Quirina Sestius] the son of Tiberius Claudius Sestius, the lord of the 'zrm-sacrifices, sacrificer of the divine Vespasianus, sufet, sacrificer for ever, the one who loves the country, who loves the sons of the people, the one who adorns the country, saviour of the sons of the people, lover of the complete knowledge, the one to whom before the might ones of Lepcis and the people of Lepcis according to the merits of his fathers and his own merit(s) they permitted the use of the purple striped toga for his whole life, an altar and a podium made according to the work to be done, at his own expense”

The institution of flamen and sacerdos are mentioned separately or together in IRT 304, 397, 564, 572, 541, 321, 412, 413, 607, 588, 589, 567, 319, 600 and 347 and AE 1989 0770. So it is well attested. But can we by any means gauge if these are purely Roman institutions or just syncretized Libyphoenician priesthods? IRT 304 and IRT 564 are the only inscriptions to mention a priesthood in conjunction with a deity outside of the Imperial cult. IRT 304 lists Mercurio and even though the cult of Mercury was a syncretized Libyphoenician entity in other parts of Roman Africa I hesitate to lend too much weight to this one inscription from Lepcis Magna which could easily be solely dedicated to the Roman original. (Rives, 1995, p 115-7, 136 and 138) IRT 564 is more interesting as it lists the term Heraclii, auguri and sacerdoti in the same inscription:

“Heraclii / benignissimo viro principi/pali prudentissimo et integ<e=I>rr(imo) / T(ito) Fl(avio) Frontino Heraclio v(iro) p(erfectissimo) au/guri sacerdoti Lauren(tium) Labinat(i)um / Ilviro ob diversarum volup/tatum exhibitiones adque(!) / admirabilem ludorum / editionem amoremque / incomparabilem in pa/triam et cives suos suf(f)ra/gio quietissimi populi / et decreto splendidis/simi ordinis”

Since Hercules/Heraclius was likely the syncretized Melkart/Milk'Ashtart in Lepcis this inscription is most probably an expression of a Libyphoenician cult at its origins and an official priesthood associated with it. But the Liber Pater/Shadrappa cult which Emperor Septimius probably dedicated half his magnificent basilica to and which was a tutelary deity of the city certainly had important priesthods. (Di Vita, 1999, p 32 & 132) And if the cults of Liber Pater and Hercules were Romanized Libyphoenician entities as I argued in my Religion Chapter above their priesthods must've been Libyphoenician institutions at their core, albeit somewhat Romanized.

5. Carthage's Libyphoenician institutions

5.1. Suffetes

We know from Livy that the suffetes-ship was still going strong prior to the razing of Carthage by him mentioning Hannibal's term of office in the 190's BCE. (Lancel, 1995, p 402 and Livy, XXXIII, 46, 3) But what of the period after the catastrophe? What of the suffetes-ship in this period? I have found nothing in all the sources I have scoured to indicate that the suffetes-ship ever was part of Roman era Carthage's system of governance. Lancel devotes an entire chapter to the

surviving vestiges of Libyphoenician/Carthaginian culture in the wake of the Roman conquest but does not mention anything about any suffetes in Roman Carthage. He does mention the title surviving in other Libyphoenician towns like Makhtar, Althiburos, Thugga, Lepcis Magna, Calama and Cirta which would make it preposterous to believe that he would've made an omission in the case of Carthage, the subject of his work. (Lancel, 1995, p 430-1) Rives in his work on the religious environment of Roman Carthage stresses the municipal Roman-style administration and doesn't mention with a word the possible existence of a Libyphoenician suffetes-ship. (Rives, 1995, p 28-38) Coupled with the fact that out of 148 Latin inscriptions listed with text in the Heidelberg Databank none render the title of the suffetes. (<http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html.en>) Furthermore the title of duovir is mentioned in two inscriptions.

AE 1928 0024

“[Quod postulantibus universis decurionibus] / [Pompeius Faustin]us v(ir) c(larissimus) p(atronus) c(oloniae) IIVir q(uin)q(uennalis) v(erba) f(ecit) de [statua] / [de publico ponen]da Aelio Maximo o(ptimo) v(iro) q(uid) de [e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret)] / [de e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) magnitu]dinis nostrae congruens [col(oniae)] / [Karthaginis] meritos viros testimon[ium pro]/[bitatis esse] iam pridem Aelio Ma[ximo statua] / [ponenda esset qui] honorem aedilitati[s func]/[tus erit insigni in]nocentia in anno [IIVirat(us)] / [spectaculum etia]m gladiatoru[m et African(arum)] / [amplius summae legitim]ae cum [HS --- mil(ia) n(ummum)] / [promisisset ediderit propter quod statuam] / [ei publice ponendam decuriones decreverunt]”

AE 1910 0078

“Q(uinto) Voltedio L(uci) [f(ilio) ---] / Optato Aurelian[o fl(amini)] / divi Ner(vae) equo pub(lico) adle[cto a divo] / Traiano et in quinq(ue) dec(urias) ab [Imp(eratore)] / Caes(are) Hadriano Aug(usto) trib(uno) mi[l(itum) leg(ionis)] / VI victricis p(iae) f(idelis) aed(ili) praef(ecto) i(ure) [d(icundo) sacerdoti] / Cer(erum) sacr(um) ann(o) CLXXVII [IIVir(o)] / IIVir(o) quinq(uennali) qui ob honorem / cum HS CC mil(ia) promisisset inla[tis] / aerar(um) HS XXXVIII mil(ibus) leg(at)is am[pliata] / pec(unia) spectaculum in amphitheatro] / gladiatorum et Africanaru[m] / quadriduo dedit d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)”

This further entrenches the notion that the Libyphoenician institutions of government had all but

disappeared. This is most certainly the most clear-cut piece of evidence that the Libyphoenician administrative system was well and truly dead in Carthage from the point in time of its fall to the Roman besiegers. But to broaden the analysis I will also tend to other Libyphoenician civic titles and their possible survival.

5.2. Mahazim in Carthage

No Mahazim has ever been attested in Carthage. We can speculate that they were part of independent Carthage's administration but we cannot definitely say anything about this as the only attestation is 200 years later in Lepcis Magna. (IPT 18 and Lancel, 1995, p 120) Again the evidence underlines the lack of Libyphoenician features in the sources regarding the institutions of Roman Carthage.

5.3. Libyphoenician religious institutions in Carthage

The cult of Caelestis again sets the most striking example. The cult was organized in a way so as to emulate Libyphoenician traditions of worship and it was a major cult in the city at least from the second half of the 2nd century CE onwards. However this cult was not a continuance of the original as much as it was an establishment of a new cult with mixed Romano-Greek and Libyphoenician traits. (Rives, 1995, p 162-9) Without continuity the priesthoods in question cannot be said to have been Libyphoenician institutions. In the Heidelberg Database I have found no mention of any Caelestis priesthood. Saturn on the other hand has several inscriptions detailing his priesthoods. AE 1966 0504, 0505 and AE 1894, 0016 all describe a position of sacerdos to Saturn.

AE 1966 0504

“Saturno / Aug(usto) sac(rum) / Q(uintus) Caecilius / Fortunatus / sac(erdos) Saturni / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) a(nimo)”

AE 1966 0505

“[Sat]urno / [Au]g(usto) sac(rum) / [---] P]ompeius / [---]lus sac(erdos) / [v(otum)] s(olvit) l(ibens) a(nimo)”

AE 1894

“Neapolitano / Saturno / Aug(usto) sacr(um) / C(aius) Alfius Quad/ratus sacerdos / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito)”

Despite Saturn's non-public status he had an active cult following including priests, initiates and more casual worshippers. The mention of a neighbourhood of Saturn in the 3rd century indicates the presence of a shrine or temple. The term sacerdos however should not be taken to mean a priesthood but rather the aforementioned initiates in this particular context. We cannot on this basis doubt the existence of priesthods however. (Rives, 1995, p 209-11) And the same goes for Caelestis of course. Major public cults did have priesthods even if the epigraphic remains do not spell it out straightforwardly. Another cult mentioned with priesthods are the Cereres in AE 1899 0196, 1909 0164, 1910 0078, 1920 0029 and 1897 0036. The same goes for Aesculapius in AE 1901 0004 and 1968 0553. But as J.B Rives convincingly argues both of these cults were at their cores Roman cults which may have been subject to Libyphoenician outside influences but for the most part stayed true to their origins. (Rives, 1995, p 155-161)

5.4 Other possible Libyphoenician institutional survivals:

In Carthage you have attested the title of MHSBM prior to the Roman occupation. I haven't found any mention of this institution either in Roman era Carthage or Lepcis Magna. Another title, the DR RKT, has only ever been attested in Gozo. And I haven't found any mention of the sopherim or the raab sopherim either in regards to the two cities after the Roman takeover. (Lancel, 1995, p 120)

6. Running it through the Cherry requirements

The particular institutions of a culture/civilization must be said to be a core intellectual value albeit less so than the religion and language factors. Institutions represent a culture specific political system of administration as the monarchy of the Scandinavian countries for example or the many different types of priesthods within Christianity exemplify. The second requirement is again too hard an obstacle to surmount as the institutions we have been able to study in our accessible source material are all of elite nature. Unless it were in extraordinary circumstances the high official positions were restricted to the elite capable of shouldering the cost of prolonged absences from their own productive ventures and the associated costly duties expected of a benefactor in these

positions. The third requirement is like with the Religion chapter only covered insofar as the inscriptions are dealt with. They are really the only quantifiable material we have available and again Cherry's strict criteria strikes one as almost exclusively epigraphical in nature.

7. Conclusion

What are we left to conclude with? Well, the Libyphoenician system of government with the suffetes-ship at its peak was alive and well in Lepcis Magna from at least the end of the 2nd century BCE/beginning of the 1st century BCE to the year 109 CE when it completely disappeared in favour of the Roman municipal model of government. We can assume quite safely that the system of government prior to the first mention of the suffetes-ship was still Libyphoenician in nature as the ties to Carthage and the lack of any other competing urban model of governance existed in Tripolitania proper at this time indicate. We could speculate whether it had a Greek model of urban administration due to Tripolitania's proximity to Cyrene but this would just amount to speculation without any basis in sources. So from the first mention of Lepcis in 511 BCE to 109 CE there was a Libyphoenician public institutional system in place. In contrast Carthage's public Libyphoenician institutions seem to have vanished altogether in the wake of the destruction of the city in 146 BCE. The eventual re-founding was done along Roman lines substantiating the fact that it was peopled solely with Italian colonists. From independent Carthage's murky beginnings in the 9th century BCE to its death in 146 BCE it remained firmly Phoenician/Libyphoenician in its mode of government only to have this system wiped out by the Roman occupation and replaced with the Roman model from the re-founding in 44 BCE to the Vandal invasion in 439 CE. The Byzantine Roman model was instituted in 533 CE only to be lost alongside the city itself with the Arab takeover in 698 CE. So the catastrophe of 146 BCE marks an important water-shed in the history of Carthage, at least when it comes to public institutions. Lepcis kept up its Libyphoenician municipal heritage for approximately 250 years longer. This is significant. The public institutions of Roman Carthage were in no way reminiscent of the prior Libyphoenician varieties. Lepcis' was changed slowly but willingly to accommodate its interests within the Empire. But only the public government institutions give off such a black and white picture. Many of the religious institutions of Lepcis were decidedly Libyphoenician albeit in syncretized guise until at least the beginning of the 3rd century CE. The Imperial Cult and other foreign imports were of other origins but the religious life of Lepcis never strayed completely from its Libyphoenician past until the 3rd century CE and maybe even much later. Here the contrast with Carthage isn't too great. For sure if you accept Rives' conclusion that the public cult of Caelestis was a new creation of the emerging Romano-African

elite of the 2nd century CE like I did in the Religion Chapter above then it in itself cannot be held to be a true Libyphoenician institution. It only reflects the influence of the Libyphoenician heartlands surrounding Carthage had on its former mother city and its new Italian elite. But if you look at the evidence for Saturn and his worshippers in Carthage you see at once how Libyphoenician religious institutions remained in the city despite the razing and the genocide of 146 BCE. We cannot confirm that there were direct continuities between the Roman Carthaginian cult of Saturn and its independent Carthaginian predecessor but what we can establish is that religious institutions of Libyphoenician origins were in place in Roman Carthage. They were not recognized as part of the public cults but nonetheless were present. This can again be just a matter of the Libyphoenician region surrounding Carthage influencing the Italian colonists and their city through migration, inter-marriage and socializing. But it does leave the door open for a continuity of Libyphoenician culture in Carthage as Hurst so enticingly suggests. Nonetheless if Libyphoenician Saturn was present with religious initiates and priesthoods and such we cannot completely rule out the presence of other Libyphoenician cults and their institutions in Roman Carthage on the lack of evidence alone. So the public official postings of Roman Carthage were of purely Roman origin but the city contained Libyphoenician religious institutions at least until the 3rd century CE, maybe even later. Lepcis clung on to its Libyphoenician system of government until the start of the 2nd century CE and its Libyphoenician religious institutions at least until the 3rd century CE, possibly even longer. With this we have already confronted our first problem statement but the second one remains. What other influences can be found? In Makthar for instance the number of suffetes were three in the Libyan custom. (Lancel, 1995, p 431) Can any Libyan influences be found in the two sites of our concern? In the sources at hand I have found no such indication and as I mentioned in the Religion chapter the lack of any Libyan cult evidence in Lepcis can be seen as an indicator for Lepcis' insulation from the Libyan surroundings, at least at elite level. Other religious institutional influences would be the host of foreign cults both Lepcis and Carthage contained as mentioned in the same previous chapter. Chief among them Christianity which had in the time of Cyprian in the 3rd century maybe as much as 8 presbyters in Carthage alone. This number most certainly did not dwindle with the coming of general acceptance of the faith in the 4th century and the Catholics were just one among several sects of Christianity in Carthage at that time. (Rives, 1995, p 223-34) The Jewish presence albeit less significant must have constituted a cultural influence on the religious institutions to a lesser degree. (Rives, 1995, p 214-23) For Lepcis we have less evidence but the fact of the Severan Basilica getting supplanted by a Byzantine Church is an indicator of how the religious institutions would have changed under Christianity's pressures. And the Vandals and Byzantines changed the administration of the realm to fit their culture specific whims so at the end of Roman Africa the

official institutions would have been under strong influence of or even completely transformed into Romanized Vandal and eventually Greek/Byzantine ones.

Conclusion Chapter

This thesis has aimed at describing the cultural history of Lepcis Magna and Carthage in the Roman era. First we must reiterate our problem statements and my hypothesis. The first statement asked whether there were Libyphoenician cultural elements in either of our two sites and how they developed in the course of the centuries. The second asked what other influences might have played in besides the Latin and Libyphoenician interplay and how. My hypothesis claimed that there indeed was a Libyphoenician presence in the two cities and that they retained albeit in changing form these characteristics as far as we can trace in the source material.

1. Reservations on the available evidence/Cherry's model revisited

First to start off this final analysis I must pen my primary reservation to the evidence at hand and any subsequent conclusions drawn from it. None of the three core cultural values I have chosen to represent and measure the Libyphoenician cultural traditions of my two selected sites truly represent the common people of the two cities, what with the evidence that is accessible to us. Cherry's requirement two is only met in the most indirect and tenuous way. The institutional core value is probably the most far removed from the ordinary people of that day as the *suffetes-ship* and likewise the other high public offices and priesthoods most likely were far removed from anything the common people of the two sites could ever hope to attain. This value most clearly represents directly only the elite and the sub-elite and their Libyphoenician cultural traditions. As for religion the measurable evidence left to us in the form of inscriptions, ruined temples, ruined altars and the like and mention by classical authors certainly directly only represents the elite and sub-elite with the economic means to furnish cults with such trappings and the ability to spread knowledge of their worship to the men of letters of the Roman world. However, to suppose that the elite and sub-elite lived in a sort of religious apartheid from the commoners is far-fetched without any sources supporting the notion. So indirectly the evidence indicates not only what the elite worshiped but also the preferences of the poorer classes. Further on the core value of language again is represented only by direct hard evidence from the elite and sub-elite in the form of inscriptions. We cannot suppose that the common folk of the cities were mostly if at all literate or capable of commissioning expensive inscriptions of their own. But the language preferences of the elite sections of the populace which were subject to a much higher degree of exposure and integration into the dominant Roman culture can be seen as a sort of negative test on degrees of Romanization of the common folk. Even if the elite was completely and thoroughly Romanized we cannot infer from this that the

lower classes were. However if the elite and sub-elite were not wholly Romanized and give us examples of how they maintained their Libyphoenician cultural heritage then we cannot assume that the less exposed common folk were more Romanized than the elites. That would be a ridiculous notion. Of course we cannot ascertain the relative Romanization of the elite/sub-elite to the lower classes based on the scarcity of evidence available to us. But what we can definitely say is that the lower classes were not more Romanized than their betters so to speak. A further reservation must be made here in that the lack of sources preventing us from gaining direct insight into the Libyphoenician cultural strength of the lower classes also hides the fact whether other cultural influences than the Roman made an impact with them. It is wholly reasonable to speculate whether the surrounding multitudes of Libyan tribes had significant influence on these already mixed populations, particularly on the common people who probably had more contact with the tribesmen than with the Roman dignitaries. Did the Phoenician elements of Libyphoenician cultural traits slowly whittle away in the presence of Libyan cultural pressures as the elites adopted the foreign Roman culture and stopped their reinforcing completely or partially of the Libyphoenician traditions through festivals, public constructions, religious worship and the likes? Quite possibly. The tumultuous centuries starting with the death of Emperor Septimius in 211 CE leading up to the final Arab takeover 400 years later certainly put an immense strain on Libyphoenician society and probably hit the common people the hardest, leaving the possibility of quitting the cities and adopting the rural lifestyle and culture of the Libyans a tempting and possibly necessary option in the extreme years of hardship. More research must be made and new sources uncovered to support this hypothesis of course but it is a titillating possibility. As for the possibility of any extensive Greek/Hellenistic influence this is a more remote but still real possibility due to the greater distance to the closest Greek sites and their small size in Africa outside of the quite far removed Alexandria. Language, religion and institutions are decidedly core intellectual values of the culture or cultures in question so the first requirement is met perfectly. The third is not so straightforwardly met as only the epigraphical material can be quantified to any great degree. All the other evidence cannot be reckoned as quantifiable as such. With that cleared up we can proceed.

2. Summary of the argument so far

2.1 Carthage:

As we have seen above Carthage according to our available sources lacked any official Libyphoenician institutions. This would mean that there indeed was a clean break with the

political/administrative Libyphoenician traditions and a switch to purely Roman institutions in the wake of the refounding of Carthage as a Roman colony with predominantly Roman/Italian inhabitants. However Carthage did have non-public Libyphoenician religious institutions which leads us into the subject of these traditions. Here Carthage had the new cult of Caelestis which probably was instituted in the 2nd century CE and which most likely was not an original Libyphoenician tradition but more of a new creation by the Carthaginian Romano-African elite with included Libyphoenician elements. We cannot wholly exclude the hypothetical possibility of there having been a continuous Caelestis cult from the time of independent Carthage but without any supporting sources this remains just a mere unsubstantiated possibility. But despite this cult not being of traceable Libyphoenician origin there was a cult of such origins present in Roman era Carthage. The cult of Saturn, widely observed throughout Libyphoenician Africa, was present as several inscriptions definitely establishes. The cult was not included in the official pantheon, the *sacra publica*, but it had nevertheless a significant following in and around Carthage. Hurst suggests the possibility for it being a continuous cult hailing from the Libyphoenician Carthage destroyed by the Romans in 146 BCE. However Hurst himself admits that these findings need elaborating upon to warrant more attention and we follow here Rives' arguments for the cult being a later introduction. This does not make it any less Libyphoenician in nature of course and its presence underlines the reality of the Libyphoenician culture being alive and well at least to some degree in its former cultural capitol. And with more sources other cults, religious practices and divinities of Libyphoenician origins might possibly be added on to the sole example of Saturn's worship. As for language there is a problem with the sources for the written examples of Late Punic in Carthage. Our analysis had to limit itself to a quantitative approach where Carthage came off the worse when compared to Lepcis' corpus. We know from Augustine's writings that a Libyphoenician tongue of sorts was in use in his parts of Roman Africa. But Carthage's Late Punic epigraphy corpus is limited to only 15 in Neo-Punic and 1 in Greco-Punic. And the one we could date from our sources, CIS 949, was an early example of Neo-Punic from before the sack. It is very questionable to assign anything but speculative notions to the dating and content of the remaining inscriptions we cannot access though. What we can say is that there was indeed a production of Late Punic inscriptions in the city. Whether these were commissioned prior to the fall of independent Carthage, set down by immigrants from the Libyphoenician heartlands surrounding the city or made at the instigation of original Carthaginians of Libyphoenician origins is impossible to ascertain. The two first options seem to be more likely when we regard the last one in the light of the total destruction suffered by independent Carthage as reported by classical authors. We cannot completely deny the possibility of there having been a continuous Libyphoenician population of course. But if we look to the Latin

inscriptions and see the almost absolute lack of any Libyphoenician elements we can definitely say that the elite and sub-elite of Carthage predominantly preferred the Latin language for epigraphy expressions. This might be an indication of the new Carthaginian elite being of at least mostly Roman/Italian origins in the wake of the re-founding. So despite Roman era Carthage lacking any Libyphoenician political institutions and official religious ones there were non-public Libyphoenician religious institutions present, traditional Libyphoenician worship practised and probably Late Punic inscriptions being set down.

2.2 Lepcis Magna:

Lepcis on the other hand had a continuous Libyphoenician heritage extending from its vague beginnings in the 6th century BCE and at least up until the crises in the 3rd and 4th century CE and probably longer. It had its *dii patrii* cults of Melquart/Hercules and Shadraba/Liber Pater lasting at least until the 3rd century CE and probably further on. The *suffetes*-ship was in use until the beginning of the 2nd century CE along with the public office of the *mahazim* albeit this last office with a different more Romanized denomination probably from 78 CE. Along with this Libyphoenician religious institutions continued on unabated until at least the 3rd century and Late Punic inscriptions were commissioned until at least the 2nd century CE and probably even later. Romanization was present here in the form of institutional change when the city became a *colonia*, syncretization of deity names and cult practices and the cessation of the practice of commissioning inscriptions in Neo-Punic. But of course the vein of Libyphoenician cultural traditions was measurably stronger here.

3. Final comparison

So what can we definitely say about the cultural natures of the two cities when it comes to the interplaying aspects of Libyphoenician heritage and Romanization? Lepcis had a continuous habitation of Libyphoenician people with only a few Roman additions from its beginnings and at least until the temporary abandonment of the site prior to the Byzantine reconquest in the 6th century CE and possibly even longer. An earlier break in the continuity of the Libyphoenician populace of Lepcis is of course possible but only if such a significant event has escaped us in our current sources. For now we must conclude with a minimum of a 1000 years of Libyphoenician cultural heritage in the city. As for Carthage the population issue is even more unclear. It seems that the site was definitely abandoned in the century preceding the re-founding but one might ask oneself if

there was the possibility of some of the original Carthaginian population surviving and keeping parts of their culture intact? Of course. Carthage at the height of its power was a maritime nation with fleets and trading posts overseas and many subject cities in Libyphoenician Africa which it had strong cultural, political and of course familial bonds with. When the catastrophe befell Carthage itself there were most likely thousands of native Carthaginians abroad on trading voyages or living in the other Libyphoenician cities which were spared. We can also easily imagine thousands more being able to flee the inferno of the sack as the city was populated by hundreds of thousands with many kilometers of city walls and access to the sea. The Roman Army was an efficient war machine indeed but would it be plausible to suppose that they managed to block off such a huge city completely day and night? And could not some survivors have hidden in the ruins? If thousands of people could survive in the ruins of Stalingrad through hellish fighting for 6 months why could not Carthaginians do the same in the ruins of their city? Lastly the 50.000 or so Carthaginians sold into slavery could well have worked their way to freedom eventually seeing as many probably were of good education and/or skill or their relatives from other Libyphoenician cities might have purchased their freedom for them. In any case the complete genocide portrayed by the Roman authors might not have been so complete after all. It seems rather likely that it was not. We cannot unfortunately establish this fact for sure but we need to be aware of the possibility. What we do know is that Carthage was colonized by Italian settlers and that the elite they constituted was of Roman heritage. But the presence of Libyphoenician religion and epigraphy establishes the presence of this people in this the first city of Africa Proconsularis too. Where did these people come from? As Carthage again became the most important city in Africa outside of Alexandria the commerce, politics and metropolitan atmosphere of the city must have attracted fortune seekers, traders, students, labourers and ambitious notables in their thousands over the years. As the city was a virtual lone Roman outpost in the midst of Libyphoenician lands the majority of these migrants would naturally have been of that people. We cannot exclude a continuous habitation of original Carthaginians either. How was the relation between these two groups? In the early years of the colony the Italian settlers must have been the sole sovereigns of the city. But as the years passed intermarriage and other social dealings with the predominantly Libyphoenician peoples of modern day Tunisia and the other Libyphoenician territories must have had an impact on the Italians and their culture. In the 2nd century CE after 200 years of cohabitation the elite of Carthage instituted the Caelestis cult as part of their sacra publica. A fitting symbol of how the Italian settlers had mixed and merged with the surrounding Libyphoenicians. Still we cannot definitely pin down how the relation was in terms of numbers, intermarriage and so forth. On one extreme end there might have been a mixed elite ruling over an urban populace of almost exclusively Libyphoenicians and/or Libyans or on the other

extreme it could have been a city of Italian stock with minimal intermarriage and a Libyphoenician small minority. A middle ground between the two extremes seems the most likely scenario but with the sources at hand we have no way of ascertaining this. One might consider the possibility for a completely segregated society with an ethnically monolithic Carthage consisting solely of inhabitants of Italian stock but as the Romans were far from predominantly segregationist in their attitudes to other cultures this seems very far-fetched and would need solid evidence which we do not have accessible to us to substantiate. As for the cultural compositions of the two cities this is also very hard to determine outside of the elite and sub-elite based on these sources. What we can say is that the elite and sub-elite of Lepcis Magna most likely was a more or less uniform Libyphoenician group which Romanized voluntarily over the years to gain the benefits and status accompanying Roman citizenship, education, political and military careers. The rest of the city's populace and their cultural makeup is impossible to discern directly with the sources at hand but it is indeed most likely that they enjoyed a far lesser degree of Romanization if they did at all in most respects. They certainly were not more Romanized than their social superiors. And when you consider the accounts of the emperor Septimius himself having an African accent and his sister Septimia allegedly being barely able to speak Latin after the family had spent 100 years in the the highest reaches of Roman society as knights or senators is quite indicative of the strength of their Libyphoenician cultural identity. (Birley, 1988, p 35 & 220) And if even the highest ranking members of the Lepcitanian elite elicited such blatant signs of their Libyphoenician identity it casts grave doubts over whether the common folk were much Romanized at all. In Carthage the elite started out as a Roman/Italian elite and up through the years it probably Africanized itself through intermarriage and acculturation with the probably much more numerous Libyphoenicians. As in the case of Thugga's native civitas and Roman pagus which over the course of the centuries mixed into one Romano-African unit the elite of Carthage most likely followed the same route albeit on a much grander scale. (Rives, 1995, p 114-132)

4.Final argument

In the end we are only able to discern anything solid from our three chosen cultural values that which pertains to the elite and/or sub-elite of the two cities. All other conclusions would be borderline speculative and assumptive at the least. Here we fall into David Cherry's trap of only examining the sources emanating from these higher reaches of the Roman era cities' societies. We can infer some assumptions from the evidence at hand such as the likely fact that the common folk were not more Romanized than their social superiors but the real cultural identity of these the lower rungs on

the social ladder and indeed the majority of the cities' populations cannot be definitely ascertained. In the case of Leptis they could have spanned from a mostly Libyan tribal mode of culture subjected to a Romanized Libyphoenician elite to a wholly Libyphoenician people with some instances of Romanized characteristics under a more Romanized elite. For the common people we just cannot say for sure based on our sources at hand. For Carthage the possibilities are more complex as both Libyan, Libyphoenician and Roman influences must be calculated into the equation. What we can definitely say is that at the time of the re-founding the city was most likely wholly or at least predominantly Roman. The Roman/Italian settlers had no Libyphoenician backgrounds to speak of and even though there might have been a residual Libyphoenician presence at the site it probably was not too significant when compared to the Roman influx. If it was we would expect it to yield more sources confirming its presence. After this however what entailed is less clear. Both Libyan and Libyphoenician influences might have made an impact on the common folk through migration, socializing and intermarriage. Even though the Numidian kingdom and other Libyan tribal associations had been influenced by Libyphoenician culture we cannot infer from this that their Libyan cultural identity was more than just a little augmented by this. So the extent to which the common folk of Carthage acculturated with the Africans and which cultural entity, Libyan or Libyphoenicians, made the most impact is very hard to ascertain with our elite-centered sources. It could span from a mostly Roman urban populace with some Libyphoenician and/or Libyan acquired traits to a full blown Libyan and/or Libyphoenician populace with some Roman traits. We cannot really tell based on our evidence. The elite and/or sub-elite which we have evidence for can be more easily classified though. The Lepcitanian elite was mostly of Libyphoenician origins and it Romanized voluntarily over the centuries but still retained much of its heritage as evidenced by Late Punic inscriptions, a Libyphoenician-style municipal government in place until 109 CE and Libyphoenician religious cults and institutions maintained up until at least the Severan age. After the 3rd century the evidence becomes more scarce but the complete disintegration of the Libyphoenician cultural matrix among the elite can hardly be attributed to earlier than the Vandal take-over and the temporary abandonment of its site. And we cannot wholly exclude the possibility for it surviving even these catastrophes. In Carthage the elite and/or sub-elite certainly was almost exclusively Roman at the onset of the refounding of the city. But their acculturation is evidenced by the worship of Libyphoenician cults such as Caelestis and Saturn and their setting up of the public Caelestis cult in the 2nd century CE. However the lack of Libyphoenician elements in the municipal government, the lesser and possibly non-existent Late Punic corpus of inscriptions and their refusal to admit Saturn into the *sacra publica* shows that there were indeed limits to this acculturation. So the elites of Roman Carthage cannot be said to have

turned completely Libyphoenician but to have mixed with the local cultures in such a way as to have become a truly Romano-African entity with the stress on the Roman constituent parts. In conclusion then we can say that the Lepcitanian elite was of mostly Libyphoenician stock and cultural values which Romanized over the years but still retained its Libyphoenician core culture probably at least until the coming of the Vandals. The common folk of Lepcis is harder to pin down but could certainly not be more Romanized than their leaders and was either Libyphoenician or Libyan or a varying mix of the two in its cultural outlooks. The Carthaginian elites were of Roman origins originally and acculturated with their Libyan and Libyphoenician neighbours at least to a slight degree while the common folk also hailed from mostly Roman/Italian origins but how Africanized they became through Libyan and Libyphoenician influences is impossible to ascertain with our sources at hand. So to answer our problem statements more clearly we can say that Lepcis' elite went from a pure Libyphoenician entity to a Romanized and quite possibly Libyanized to some degree too constellation in Roman times. Libyphoenician linguistic elements in the epigraphical remains and evidence of the original tutelary deities disappear in the beginning of the 3rd century C.E. But still the extent of that Romanization cannot have been complete or perhaps even predominant as as late as the Severan age the Emperor himself spoke with an accent and his sister did not even speak proper Latin and presumably mostly Late Punic. This indication of a less than complete Romanization of the elite strongly indicates the even lesser acculturation of the common folk. After the Severan age we have little evidence but the Christian influence was increasing and might have supplanted the Libyphoenician religion to a great extent at least. Only with the Vandal period do we see a catastrophe of such magnitude so as to possibly provide the destruction of the Libyphoenician elements completely. However this is not validated either way in the sources. The Byzantine reconquest probably infused the little what remained of the city with Greek/Byzantine culture. Again it is not possible to measure this with the sources. In Carthage the evolution probably went from a Roman/Italian elite in the wake of the re-founding which actually Africanized to the extent that they started worshipping originally Libyphoenician cults and even re-instituted the Caelestis cult. This was however a new creation but with Libyphoenician element. The official institutions were however of purely Roman type but the priesthoods of the non-public Saturn and the newly created Caelestis were of Libyphoenician type at least to some degree in the case of the latter. The extent of the religious acculturation must be tempered with the lack of any significant dateable epigraphical evidence with Libyphoenician elements. There was a production of Late Punic inscriptions in Carthage but as we cannot access or date any of the ones which might possibly be from the Roman era we cannot base much on this. They could have been made prior to the fall or set up by Libyphoenician immigrants from the other cities and rural areas of Libyphoenician Africa.

So the Africanization was far from complete and quite possibly only slight. As in the case of Lepcis the Vandal and Byzantine periods probably constituted cultural pressures particularly on the elites which would have been ousted from the best estates. However the impact cannot be measured with our current sources. The Carthaginian commoners cannot be extrapolated upon much from this evidence. An African presence among the elite indicates at least a presence of either Libyan or Libyphoenician elements among them too but it is impossible to say anything more based on our accessible sources. And the Arabs finished off both sites as urban entities. That covers our first problem statement but what can we gather about the questions asked in the second? Libyan probably influenced the Libyphoenician language according to Jongeling & Kerr so any other influences are quite reasonable to assume. Especially in Lepcis which was situated in a much less urbanized region where the Libyan tribes probably were more prevalent. But the emntion of no Libyan sites of worship found in Lepcis is a tempering fact. Hellenism did have an architectural and art influence but if this originated mostly from the Romans or the Greeks themselves is hard to quantify. The most important Greek influence was probably the latter period's Byzantine infusion. Christianity posed another cultural pressure which most likely gained a significant presence at both sites from the 3rd century as evidenced by the Christian writers. If we confront my hypothesis we can establish that Lepcis at least had a continuous Libyphoenician cultural matrix demonstrably up until at least the beginning of the 3rd century. The drop off in evidence then is perhaps not a sign of collapse but as Latin epigraphical evidence disappears relatively shortly after the socio-economic situation of Lepcis might just as much be responsible for the vanishing of these cultural expressions. In Carthage Hurst provides some very interesting opinions but as he admits their tenuous nature himself the objective researcher must not resort to wishful thinking and for the sake of intellectual honesty look away from that possibility until more evidence surfaces. The continuity of the Libyphoenician cultural matrix was seemingly broken in Carthage. The reappearance of Libyphoenician cults and the albeit undated production of Late Punic inscriptions are strong indications of the re-emergence of Libyphoenician culture in Carthage however. What can we conclude this investigation with? Lepcis followed a pretty straightforward path from purely Libyphoenician to Romanized Libyphoenician and became probably a site of Christian Romanized Libyphoenicians in the 3rd-4th centuries C.E. The Vandal invasion destroyed the city almost altogether and the few remnants resurrected by the Byzantines were probably subject to their cultural influences. A Christian Romanized Libyphoenician city with Byzantine influences. Carthage most likely suffered a break of a century after the fall and was reconstituted as a Roma colony which slowly Africanized in the face of the vastly Libyphoenician and Libyan region. A move from a more or less pure Roman elite to an Africanized one. With the increase of Christianity

in the 3rd century C.E the city must have been influenced heavily especially from the 4th when the religion achieved dominance through its various sects. A Christian Africanized Roman elite much likely. The Vandals then reigned for a century imposing their brand of Christianity and probably demoted or replaced much of the former elite. With the coming of the Byzantines the Vandals were expelled and replaced by them as the elite end of the social hierarchy.

5.Avenues for further research

The main problem with this study which have focused on mainly written sources is the way they most often omit the majority of the population, namely the mass of commoners. As one cannot assume that even a large minority of the commoners were even literate they are hardly likely to contribute much in the realm of written sources or indeed major material ones as the high public offices and large scale economic capabilities necessary for influencing, patronizing or bankrolling major construction works was most often dependent upon at least quasi-literacy in the instigator/funder. A more archaeological approach with a focus on burial customs, usage of material goods and architecture especially as employed by the common folk versus the more well documented elite could provide good insights. Any continuity or break in practices or influxes of new ones can help to flesh out the analysis of the cultural makeup of the two cities and any relevant changes up through the years. Furthermore if elites are to remain the focus of one's study encompassing other sites in Libyphoenician Africa might be of great value so as not to extrapolate from only Carthage and Lepcis, whom both are archetypical entities of Roman Africa as they represent respectively the Roman colony and the more or less undisturbed Libyphoenician setting. Despite them being such archetypes they are also both quite exceptional as they were both major harbours and metropolitan sites with much more contact with the rest of the Mediterranean world than what the typical Roman colony or Libyphoenician site enjoyed. Coupled with the fact that they also were the leading communities of their two respective regions and furnished the Roman hierarchy with the most higher officials, knights and senators they are definitely not representative of Roman Africa's cities as a whole. As mentioned above they are also both major harbour sites making them even less representative of the sites found inland in Africa Proconsularis. And the scope of this thesis only touches upon the realities of the urban side of Roman African existence. The rural countryside where the majority of the populace resided is not included in any significant way here. A juxtaposition of urban versus rural to examine differences and similarities could prove quite fruitful and might furnish us with explanations for cultural changes we see in the cities which might have originated in the rural setting. As the Genographic Project of National Geographic has

shown DNA analysis can be a very helpful tool to map out population fluxes and migrations. A study encompassing this type of evidence might give us answers pertaining to the amount of Italians successfully migrating and setting up shop so to speak in Africa and the ratio of indigenous Libyans/Berbers to the original Phoenicians/Libyphoenicians. By examining grave deposits for DNA samples an even more comprehensive understanding might be reached if a significant and representative enough sampling could be procured. Finally a linguistic approach to further our understanding of the Libyan language(s) might prove valuable in giving us insights in how it influenced Late Punic as a language and how the three, Latin, Libyan and Late Punic interacted in their centuries of co-existence.

Source Chapter

1. Reservations regarding the selection of sources

1.1 Language difficulties

In my efforts to gather the most comprehensive set of sources possible to me I have had to face some very severe obstacles and I have had to concede to serious setbacks in my pursuit. To make a representative selection from any age is a daunting task in any case but for the period of Antiquity the sources are themselves inherently biased as the literary and other cultural productions of many civilizations are virtually completely lost to us. But in this particular thesis other problems also arose as the region in question, Libyphoenician Africa under the Romans, now is divided between the modern states of Tunisia, Algeria and Libya and have had very diverging paths through to our modern day. The most important difference pertaining to the thesis at hand was the colonial history of the region. Libya came under the sway of the Italian colonial rule from 1912-1943 and Algeria and Tunisia was absorbed into the French colonial realm from 1830-1962 and 1880-1956 respectively. From this ensued the fact that French historians and archaeologists produced many if not most of the sources from Algeria and Tunisia and that the Libyan territories were represented mostly in the Italian tradition. As the task of accessing all these sources directly would demand a thorough knowledge of academic Italian and French which this author regretfully lacks the sources available in English, either translated or written by English-speaking authors, have been selected to represent the whole. This cannot of course be seen as a truly representative selection but more as an academic compromise to facilitate the production of the thesis while not being able to access the French and Italian language sources. The probably most important sources missing for this thesis due to an inability to access French material are *Ubique populus: Peuplement et mouvements de population dans l'Afrique romaine de la chute de Carthage a la fin de la dynastie des Severes (146 a.C.-253 p.C.) (Etudes d'Antiquites africaines)* by Jean Marie Lassere from 1977 and *Saturne Africaine* by Marcel Le Glay from 1966. Two glaring omissions when considering the subject of the thesis. I wanted originally to include the tracing of Libyphoenician noblemen lineages as one of my avenues of research into the survival of the Libyphoenician cultural matrix but with the loss of such a monumental source as *Ubique populus* I had to discard the idea altogether. The loss of *Saturne Africaine*, albeit serious, still left with me with several sources detailing the religious environment of Libyphoenicia Africa so I kept this particular subject alive. But I had to pen my reservations accordingly here in the source chapter to remain true to the objective nature of the work at hand.

Furthermore when we are debating philological difficulties the issue of Latin and Neo-Punic/Late Punic must come up. *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* which is the definite source to Late Punic inscriptions was only available to me in the original from the late 1800's where the inscriptions are rendered only as photographic plates. As my knowledge of Late Punic is even more dismal than my knowledge of Italian and French this otherwise magnificent source was of little help to me. My dabbling with the Late Punic inscriptions were wholly reliant upon Jongeling & Kerr's 2005 volume and the rare quote in English rendered in my other sources. In regards to the purely Latin sources such as the Heidelberg Datenbank my understanding of Latin is far from perfect and allowed me only the slightest of glimpses of their full meaning but with the help of my thesis councilor Jon Iddeng the more important inscriptions have been translated for me. However this thesis must all in all be regarded as a product of the English sources available on the subject offset here and there by some Latin interjections. In no circumstances should the thesis be considered a definite product of all available sources so as to open up for future augmenting of its conclusions and insights by other sources.

1.2 The problem of secondary literature

In a thesis encompassing two major metropolitan sites spanning half a millennium one cannot exclusively rely on primary archaeological or literary sources to formulate one's conclusions and insights. The task would be epically monumental to say the least if one were to do so. However the ideal of remaining as true as possible to the primary sources is so important that to void their use entirely would be to seriously misstep in the research of historical themes. In this thesis my effort of balancing the secondary sources I have been indebted to for a wide array of subjects has been chiefly to consult the most primary sources one can find, namely the inscriptions of the age. These are used to offset the possible personal opinions and stresses of the authors of the secondary literature and in this way try to remain faithful to the ideal of primary sources by weighing them against each other. Where the inscriptions say otherwise the secondary sources' insights have been downplayed or altogether avoided. And as an extension of the language difficulties expounded upon above my selection of secondary literature has been made so as to include translations of or works themselves sourcing from the Italian, Latin, Late Punic and French sources. This is why di Vita of the Italian tradition, Brouillet and Lancel of the French tradition and Birley, Rives and Mattingly who extensively source from both Latin, Late Punic, French and Italian sources have been given such prominence among the secondary literature. This is done so as to include all these important schools of research and all the different languages the wealth of sources are set down in. But as an

aspect of reality we must concede to the fact that secondary literature is a practical must in a work of this magnitude. It is far from ideal but a practical compromise and in so doing we must be aware of the fact that any new or unmentioned source might turn the whole line of thinking upside down. This especially pertains to the subject of archeology. As a student of history with little background from archaeological studies I am greatly indebted to the aforementioned scholars for their takes on the archeology of the Libyphoenician realms. Here my pick of source authors have been a conscious selection where possible of authors with in depth knowledge and expertise from archaeological digs in the region. Studies of Antiquity with its scarcity of literary evidence is very dependent upon the myriad of sources provided by archeology and the researchers skilled in its uncovering and interpretation. Here as in the case with my lacking philological abilities my research and conclusions depend upon the work of other more accomplished scholars and any fault in their research and interpretation is surely projected into my work as I currently have not the grasp of archeology to challenge their assertions.

2. Classical sources

2.1 Augustine of Hippo's *Epistulae* from 386-429 C.E.

Augustine lived from 354 to 430 C.E. and documented many of his North African homelands' traits and events in his letters. In my work I have used him as a source for the survival of the Libyphoenician language.

2.2. Marcus Junianus Justinus' *Historiarum Phillipicarum libri XLIV* from the 2nd to the 4th century C.E.

This volume, in spite of its uncertain dating is a very important source for Roman and other Mediterranean peoples' histories. It is an epitome of an earlier lost work written in the age of Augustus by Pompeius Trogus on the history of the Macedonian monarchy. I have only referenced in the institution chapter as it details possible Carthaginian institutions.

2.3. Polybius' *Histories* from after 146 B.C.E

Polybius was a Greek Historian from Megalopolis who lived from ca. 203-120 B.C.E. His main work which we have left to us details the Roman expansion from 264-146 B.C.E. His work is one

of the best sources to the period as it is written by more or less a contemporary. In my work I have employed him as a reference for the institutions of late independent Carthage.

2.4. Titus Livius' *Ab Urbe Condita* from after 27-25 B.C.E

Titus Livius was a Roman Historian living from ca 59 B.C.E to 17 C.E. His main work was the history of Rome from its inception until the Augustan age and it broaches a wide range of subjects. In my thesis I have employed him as a source for the last period of independent Carthage and the fate of Tripolitania in the same period.

2.5. Appian of Alexandria's *Roman History* ca 165 C.E.

Appian was a Greek Historian living from ca 95-165 C.E. His main work details the histories of various peoples and lands from their earliest beginning until their incorporation into the Roman Empire. In my study I apply him merely as a reference for the fate of independent Carthage.

2.6. Strabo's *Geographica* from ca 24 C.E.

Strabo was a Greek Geographer living from ca 63/64 B.C.E to 24 C.E. His surviving work describes various peoples and locations of the known world at his time. As a source I have employed him to document the continued existence of Late Punic after the fall of independent Carthage.

2.7. Gaius Sallustius Crispus' *Bellum Iugurthinum* from after 46 B.C.E

Gaius Sallustius Crispus was a Roman political figure and historian living from ca 86-34 B.C.E. I have employed excerpts from his *Bellum Iugurthinum* to illustrate the survival of the Late Punic language.

2.8. Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus' *In Galatas* from 387 C.E.

Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus was an Illyrian theologian who lived from 347-420 C.E. His work on the Galatians provide my thesis with a commentary on the language of the Libyphoenicians.

2.9. Lucius Apuleius Platonicus' *Apologia* from the middle of the 2nd century C.E.

Lucius Apuleius Platonicus was a North African philosopher, poet and rhetorician from Madauros who lived from c. 123-170 C.E. His work the *Apologia* is used in my work to illuminate the situation for the Libyphoenician language in his day and age.

2.10. Marcus Velleius Paterculus' *History of Rome* from c. 29 C.E

Paterculus' was a Campanian officer and historian serving under Augustus born in c. 19 B.C.E. and who died c. 31 C.E. His work, though inconsistent, deals with the history of the Mediterranean from the fall of Troy until 29 C.E. I refer to him in my study for the dating controversy regarding the founding of Carthage.

2.11. Titus Flavius Josephus' *Contra Apionem* from c. 97 C.E.

Josephus was a Roman citizen and a Jewish scholar who lived from c. 37-c.100 C.E. His attack on the Greek writer Apion furnishes me with a source for the foundation of Carthage.

2.12. Quintus Curtius Rufus' *Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis* from c. 31-41 C.E.

Rufus was a Roman senator who died c. 53 C.E. and wrote a history of Alexander the great spanning from 333-321 B.C.E. In my work I have used him as a source for the annual tribute sent from Carthage to Tyre.

2.13 Timaeus' excerpts in *Roman Antiquities* from c. 3rd century B.C.E.

Born in Tauromenium in Sicily this Greek historian lived from approximately 345-250 B.C.E. Most of his works are lost to us He is quoted in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities* from c. the last half of the 1st century B.C.E. I have employed him only as a reference for the founding of Carthage in my work.

3. Contemporary sources

3.1 Sources from the French tradition

3.1.1 Serge Lancel's *Carthage. A History* from 1995

This is the translation of a French original first penned in 1992. It was translated by Antonia Nevill. Serge Lancel's study centers around the history of independent Carthage prior to the Roman sack. It gives a very broad and far-reaching introduction to Libyphoenician Carthage and its colonial empire. He devotes a chapter to the survival of Libyphoenician culture and the research effort expended in the last centuries uncovering its remains. However the treatment is relatively brief as the focal point for the study is predominantly independent Carthage. So in the context of my work I have mostly mined Lancel's study for background information on the Libyphoenician cultural matrix and employed what little he mentions of Roman Carthage for what it is worth.

3.1.2 Monique Seefried Brouillet's *From Hannibal to Augustus. Ancient Art of North Africa from the Musée du Louvre* from 1994

This work was done as an art catalogue describing an art exhibition of North African objects at Michael C. Carlos Museum at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. It contributes English language articles of Maurice Szyner, Annie Caubet, Brouillet herself and several others from the French tradition. Brouillet grew up in Carthage among the French greats of Pierre Cintas, Gilbert and Colette Picard and others. The articles give brief but thorough treatments of key Libyphoenician issues such as religion, Christianization, language and the influence and culture of the Libyan tribes. At the time of the writing of this work Brouillet was Curator of Near Eastern Art at the Michael C. Carlos Museum.

3.1.3 Gilbert Charles Picard & Colette Picard's *The Life and Death of Carthage* from 1968

This classic study tries to piece together a coherent history of independent Carthage from its humble beginnings to its death at Roman hands. They argue quite successfully for a changing society where culture, religion and government continually evolved in the face of Greek, Roman and possibly Libyan influences. They disagree vehemently with Gsell and Warmington's description of Carthage as an unchanging monolithic culture. This book was written prior to the major excavations done in

the 1970's and Lancel's later work expand upon much of their insights. In my work I have benefited greatly from its description of Carthage's independent history but as Lancel employs much more recent evidence which has come to light he has been preferred for the sake of this study. Colette Picard had a history Ph.D and Gilbert Charles Picard was a professor in Roman archeology at the university of Sorbonne.

3.2 Sources from the Italian tradition

3.2.1 Antonino Di Vita & Ginette Di Vita-Evrard's *Libya. The lost cities of the Roman Empire* from 1999

This volume is devoted to the history of the Tripolitanian and Cyrenaican regions of Libya up until the end of the Roman era. It deals extensively with the architectural remains and gives the historical context and the Libyphoenicians themselves only relatively brief mention. Still, alongside Mattingly and Birley's works this has been my primary source for the region of which Lepcis was the leading city.

3.3 Other contemporary sources

3.3.1 Anthony R. Birley's *Septimius Severus, the African Emperor*. Revised edition from 1988.

This book is a revised edition of a 1971 original. Inspired by Severan findings in Great Britain Birley set out to do a biography of the Libyphoenician Emperor and in the face of new evidence arising after its publication he decided to make a revised edition. (Birley, 1988, p x) The book naturally centers around the person of Septimius but in his opening chapters he gives a brief but thorough run through of the evidence for the earlier history of the emperor's hometown and less thoroughly a schematic of the earlier history of the whole Tripolitanian region. Further on in the chapters revolving around the emperor and his career there are several references to the Libyphoenician nature of Septimius himself and his family and other brief references to the culture of the Libyphoenicians. Sadly the book ends with the death of Severus Alexander in 235 CE and gives little to no information about the remainder of the thesis' time period.

3.3.2 David Mattingly's *Tripolitania* from 1995

This book started off as a Ph.D. thesis on the Tripolitanian region by the author back in 1984 and has since been expanded, revised and developed into the final publication from 1995. The book focuses on the Roman period and only briefly alludes to pre- and post-Roman Libyphoenician Africa. But it does span the whole time scope for my thesis and has been one of my most valuable sources for the region. It does focus quite heavily on the archaeological finds and the Libyan tribal context and much less on the Libyphoenicians and their culture than I would have preferred. But with Mattingly's background from the UNESCO Libyan Valleys Survey in 1979-84 this is a very natural approach. (Mattingly, 1995, p xi)

3.3.3 J.B. Rives' *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine* from 1995

Rives' book began life as a doctoral thesis handed in at Stanford University in 1990. While teaching at the Classics and History departments at Columbia University he expanded and revised the original to encompass all the material available to him up until the summer of 1993 before publishing the current edition in 1995. (Rives, 1995, p v) The book deals mostly with the period of the Principate from the onset of Augustus' reign to the 3rd century CE Constantine but does give some information about both the prior and subsequent periods. Aside from its main focus on the religious themes of Roman Carthage it also gives me the most comprehensive English language source for both the municipal history of the Roman era city and its cultural makeup. It is by no means a definite source for this as the religious subject is always in the fore-ground but when lacking other English sources it will have to suffice.

3.3.4 Peter Garnsey & Richard Saller's *the Roman Empire. Economy, Society and Culture* from 1987

This volume contains a wealth of information regarding the Roman Empire in the age of the Principate. It tries to enrich the reader with a full study of all elements of Roman society from its economy, to its culture, religion and of course the more traditional themes of military and administrative doings. It is more of a background source for the whole period it treats and it does not really contribute much specifically regarding the Libyphoenicians. Still its emphasis on Roman lack of major cultural imperialism and religious indifference to its conquered and original populations makes for a good foundation to understand the way indigenous cultures adapted to Roman authority. In my work I have employed it as a sort of cultural backdrop for the affairs of

Libyphoenician Africa from which I can draw conclusions to compare with my more pertinent material at hand.

3.3.5. Abdelmajid Ennabli's *Carthage. A site of cultural and natural interest* from 2004.

This work is meant more for the casual reader giving a very brief introduction to the site of Carthage and its history. However it details the fate of the site after the abandonment suffered under the Arabs and the later excavation and preservation efforts starting in the 18th century. Ennabli's book was written to draw attention to the plight of the site in modern times but also the successes achieved in the fields of preservation and research. (Ennabli, 2004, p 7) Mr Ennabli was formerly the curator of the site and museum of Carthage.

3.3.6. Maria Eugenia Aubet's *The Phoenicians and the West. Politics, Colonies and Trade* 2nd edition from 2001

This book is an English translation of a Spanish original dealing mainly with the historical origins of the Phoenician peoples and their colonial expansion until their decline in the 6th century BCE. It is an invaluable background source for their colonies of the central Mediterranean and even if it stops short of the Roman era by several centuries it still has a wealth of information regarding the culture, language and economy of the Phoenicians and their colonies. At the time of writing this volume Aubet was a Professor in the Department of Archeology at the Universidad Pompeu Fabra.

3.3.7 Glenn E. Markoe's *Phoenicians* from 2000

This was published by British Museum Press on behalf of its Ancient Near East Department. It gives a decent introduction to the history of the Canaanites/Phoenicians from approximately 1200 to the last centuries BCE. It delves only slightly in the material concerning the Western Phoenician colonies and in my work I have only referred to it for background history of the ancestral Tyrians. I have much preferred Aubet's more thorough work as reference material.

3.3.8 E. Lennox Manton's *Roman North Africa* from 1988

This book gives a decent overview of the history of Roman North Africa but it contains no source references and some inaccuracies. Like page 15's assessment that the Phoenicians lived only in the

vicinity of Tyre and that they lived alongside the Canaanites which is in stark contrast to Aubet's sourced argument for them being the same people. On page 53 he claims that Septimius Severus' family was not seen as worthy of senatorial rank although P. Septimius Aper, presumably of the same family, became a consul suffect as early as 153 C.E. (Birley, 1988, p 24) Furthermore on page 115 he use the crass term “dour Punic ancestry” clearly evincing his prejudice. Coupled with the fact that he does not refer to any sources I have avoided using him as a source for anything not of very general and well known character.

3.3.9 David Cherry's *Frontier and Society in Roman North Africa* from 1998

David Cherry is an Associate Professor of History History at Montana State University, Bozeman. This work is a study of the Romanization in the Algerian frontier lands of the Roman Empire and it has contributed valuable methodological insights and source material for my thesis despite my disagreement with his strict requirements for source material.

3.3.10 John Griffiths Pedley's *New Light on Ancient Carthage* from 1980

At the writing of this book Pedley was a director of the Kelsey Museum of Archaeology at the University of Michigan. This book gives many good primary archaeological sources for the excavations at the site of Carthage done in the 70's which the Kelsey Museum was deeply involved in. In this work I have mainly used it as a reference for archaeological data.

3.3.11. Henry Hurst's *The Sanctuary Of Tanit At Carthage In The Roman Period: A Re-interpretation* from 1999

This is a reinterpretation of old archaeological evidence and an inclusion of newer finds to re-assess the conclusions made on the state of the sanctuary in Roman times. Henry Hurst is a Reader in Classics and Fellow and Director of Studies in Classics at Churchill College, Cambridge. I have employed his book to suggest other possibilities for the interpretation of Carthage's religious cultural history than what I have concluded with myself.

3.3.12. B.H. Warmington's *Carthage* from 1969

This book was written by the Historian B.H Warmington originally in 1960 but I have referred to

the revised edition from 1969. It details the preRoman Carthaginian history but in my work I have preferred the Picard and Lancel works as I have found them more informative.

3.3.13. G. Mokhtar's *Vol. II: Ancient Civilizations of Africa (General History of Africa)* from 1981

This is a work on all ancient African cultures and it contains a chapter by Warmington above which details some of the Libyphoenician cultural survival in Africa. I have hesitated to refer to this source too much as it is very sparse in its literature sourcing itself.

3.3.14 Paul MacKendrick's *The North African Stones Speak* from 1980

This work is an attempt at writing North African cultural history through the use of mostly archaeological material. I have only employed it as a source for the foundation of the Roman colony of Carthage.

3.3.15. *The Cambridge Ancient History 2nd edition volume VIII* editors Astin, Walbank, Frederiksen and Ogilvie

The definitive source on the history of the Mediterranean Antiquity. I have unfortunately only found it useful as to document the demise of Carthage.

3.3.16. Susan Raven's *Rome in Africa* from 1984

An eminent study of North Africa outside of Egypt in Antiquity. I have confined my reference to it to the events of the Carthaginian/Greek wars over Sicilia in the centuries preceding the Punic Wars.

3.3. 17. Le Glay, Voisin, Le Bohec and Cherry's *A History of Rome* from 2000

The most acclaimed single volume history of the Romans. I have used it for period information and as a source for the second Punic War's consequences.

3.4 Epigraphy sources

3.4.1 Karel Jongeling & Robert M. Kerr's *Late Punic Epigraphy* from 2005

Jongeling & Kerr's 2005 volume intends to give the readers an introductory overview of the Late Punic corpus. It is by no means a complete listing and the authors admit to it being an attempt at listing representative but relatively comprehensible Late Punic texts. (Jongeling & Kerr, 2005, preface) In its introduction chapter it gives a very thorough but brief rundown of the language of Late Punic and its epigraphical expressions. This has been of invaluable assistance to in my work. But as the booklet does not contain the full texts of more than a small minority of Late Punic inscriptions my attempts at comparing the Carthaginian corpus and the Lepcitanian one outside of the quantitative dimension has been severely impaired. Jongeling & Kerr list the number of inscriptions found at each site however so the quantitative approach has been achievable. Still the book is my most important source for the Late Punic inscriptions and it has also furnished me with knowledge of the other epigraphical sources mentioned below. Karel Jongeling has a Ph. D. in Semitic languages and has been a lecturer in North-West Semitics and Welsh in Leiden since 1979. Robert M. Kerr is currently doing his doctoral work on late Punic.

3.4.2. Giorgio Levi Della Vida's *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania, 1927-1967* from 1987

This is one of the primary works on Punic and Late Punic inscriptions and even though I could not access its Italian language text it is referred to frequently in Jongeling & Kerr's work and is one of the more respected primary sources on the subject. For my part I only used it as an inspiration but for anyone wishing to study closer the Punic and Late Punic texts this is an invaluable tool worth mentioning. Levi Della Vida was a professor at the university of Rome from 1945 until his retirement in 1959 and he was respected as an international authority on Semitic languages and the history and culture of the Near East until his death in 1967.

3.4.3. Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum from 1881

A volume containing most of the North-West Semitic inscriptions and more. This is the foundation primary source for all Punic and Late Punic epigraphy. Sadly the version I was able to lay hands on rendered only the inscriptions as plates of the texts themselves with the little commentary there was in Latin. I could not employ it much to my ends but it still is the most important primary source for epigraphical studies of Late Punic of all.

3.4.4 Research Center of the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences' *Epigraphische Datenbank*

Heidelberg from 1997 and onwards.

The most comprehensive listing of Latin inscriptions I have found and an invaluable source for study and research. I spent weeks upon end working with the Carthaginian and Lepcitanian Latin inscriptions and owe much of my work on them to the Heidelberg Database at <http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html.en> It is currently headed by Professor Christian Witschel who specializes in Ancient History at the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg.

3.4.5. René Cagnat's *L'Année épigraphique* founded in 1888

This journal of epigraphy, despite it being virtually inaccessible to me because of its solely French language renditions, is one of the main sources to Late Punic inscriptions. In my work I have only sourced it as a primary source through Jongeling & Kerr's work but it is an important source tool for any student of Late Punic texts. Cagnat replaced Ernest Desjardins as the chair of epigraphy and Roman Antiquity in the College of France in 1887.

3.4.6 Joyce Marie Reynolds and JB Ward-Perkins' *The inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* from 1952

This volume details the Latin inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania and among them the Latin versions of the bilingual Neo-Punic ones. As a source it has only been referred to by me through the work of Kerr & Jongeling but for students and researchers wishing to pursue the matter more closely it is of great interest.

3.4.7 Herbert Donner & Wolfgang Röllig's *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler* from 2002.

Among the epigraphy sources I have used this has been the most difficult to obtain and access. I have only sourced it through Jongeling & Kerr's work for this reason. Röllig is a professor in the Ancient Orient at the Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen. Herbert Donner is a professor at the University of Kiel.

3.4.8. Karel Jongeling & Robert M. Kerr's website *THE NEO-PUNIC INSCRIPTIONS and COIN LEGENDS* (<http://website.leidenuniv.nl/~jongelingk/index.html>)

As barely an amateur in the field of philology this website remains beyond my linguistic grasp. It is however a very good overview of the Late Punic inscriptions and gives an excellent biography which has proven very helpful in my research. As mentioned above Karel Jongeling has a Ph. D. in Semitic languages and has been a lecturer in North-West Semitics and Welsh at Leiden University since 1979. Robert M. Kerr is currently doing his doctoral work on late Punic under his tutelage.

3.4.9 Theodor Mommsen's *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* started in 1863

The definitive source for Latin inscriptions, rendered in Latin. I have here used it as a primary source for some of the epigraphical material.

4. Literature list

- L'Année épigraphique* from 1888 onwards. Founded by René Cagnat.
- Appian of Alexandria c. 165 C.E. *Roman History*
- Apuleius; Lucius Apuleius Platonicus mid 2nd century C.E. *Apologia*
- Astin, Walbank, Frederiksen and Ogilvie. *The Cambridge Ancient History 2nd edition volume VIII*
- Aubet, Maria Eugenia 2001. *The Phoenicians and the West. Politics, Colonies and Trade*
- Augustin 386-429 C.E. *Epistulae*.
- Birley, Anthony R. 1988. *Septimius Severus, the African Emperor*. .
- Brouillet, Monique Seefried 1994. *From Hannibal to Augustus. Ancient Art of North Africa from the Musée du Louvre*
- Cherry, David 1998. *Frontier and Society in Roman North Africa*
- Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* 1863
- Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum* 1881.
- Di Vita, Antonino & Di Vita-Evrard, Ginette 1999. *Libya. The lost cities of the Roman Empire*
- Donner, Herbert & Wolfgang Röllig 2002. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler*
- Ennabli, Abdelmajid 2004. *Carthage. A site of cultural and natural interest*.
- Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg* 1997 (<http://www.uni-heidelberg.de/institute/sonst/adw/edh/index.html.en>)
- Garnsey, Peter & Saller, Richard 1987. *The Roman Empire. Economy, Society and Culture*.
- Hurst, Henry 1999 *The Sanctuary Of Tanit At Carthage In The Roman Period: A Re-interpretation*
- Jerome, St.; Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus 387 C.E. *In Galatas*
- Jongeling, Karel & Kerr, Robert M. 2005. *Late Punic Epigraphy*
- Jongeling, Karel & Kerr, Robert M. *THE NEO-PUNIC INSCRIPTIONS and COIN LEGENDS* (<http://website.leidenuniv.nl/~jongelingk/index.html>)
- Josephus, Titus Flavius c. 97 C.E. *Contra Apionem*
- Justin; Marcus Junianus Justinus 2-4th century C.E. *Historiarum Phillipicarum libri XLIV*
- Kerr, Robert M. & Jongeling, Karel 2005. *Late Punic Epigraphy*
- Kerr, Robert M. & Karel Jongeling. *THE NEO-PUNIC INSCRIPTIONS and COIN LEGENDS* (<http://website.leidenuniv.nl/~jongelingk/index.html>)
- Lancel, Serge 1995. *Carthage, a History*
- Le Glay, Voisin, Le Bohec and Cherry 2000. *A History of Rome*
- Levi Della Vida, Giorgio 1987. *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania, 1927-1967*

- Livy; Titus Livius after 27-25 B.C.E. *Ab Urbe Condita*
- MacKendrick, Paul 1980. *The North African Stones Speak*
- Manton, E. Lennox 1988. *Roman North Africa*
- Markoe, Glenn E 2000. *Phoenicians*
- Mattingly, David 1995. *Tripolitania*.
- Mokhtar 1981. *Vol. II: Ancient Civilizations of Africa (General History of Africa*
- Paterculus, Marcus Velleius c. 29 C.E. *History of Rome*
- Pedley, John Griffiths 1980. *New Light on Ancient Carthage*
- Picard, Gilbert Charles & Picard, Colette 1968. *The Life and Death of Carthage*
- Polybius after 146 B.C.E. *Histories*
- Raven, Susan 1984. *Rome in Africa*
- Reynolds, Joyce Marie & JB Ward-Perkins 1952. *The inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*
- Rives, J.B. 1995. *Religion and Authority in Roman Carthage from Augustus to Constantine*.
- Rufus, Quintus Curtius c. 31-41 C.E. *Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis*.
- Röllig, Wolfgang & Herbert Donner 2002. *Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften mit einem Beitrag von O. Rössler*
- Saller, Richard & Garnsey, Peter 1987. *The Roman Empire. Economy, Society and Culture*.
- Sallust; Gaius Sallustius Crispus after 46 B.C.E. *Bellum Iugurthinum*
- Strabo c. 24 C.E. *Geographica*
- Timaeus 3rd century B.C.E. Excerpts in *Roman Antiquities* from the latter half of the 1st century B.C.E by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.
- Ward-Perkins, JB & Joyce Marie Reynolds 1952. *The inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*.
- Warmington, B.H. 1969 *Carthage*