

FARLAND H. STANLEY JR.

CIL II 115: OBSERVATIONS ON THE ONLY SEVIR IUNIOR IN ROMAN
SPAIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 102 (1994) 226–236

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CIL II 115: OBSERVATIONS ON THE ONLY SEVIR IUNIOR IN ROMAN SPAIN

Spurious inscriptions are an interesting aspect of epigraphical studies, as has been testified by those who have considered the *falsae et alienae* sections of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.¹ Commenting on the list of fraudulent inscriptions in the *CIL*, Arthur E. Gordon emphasized that part of the interest in these false inscriptions lies in the possibility that "... at any time someone may challenge the list, by arguing either for the deletion of an item from the list or for the addition of an item ..."² One inscription which may fit into this category is *CIL* II 115 (= *ILER* 5673). It is particularly intriguing because, despite its long-term listing as a false inscription, recent books have included it in their texts without making reference to its spurious status.³ Because some appear to have accepted the inscription, without discussing why, an inquiry may be in order to consider possible reasons why its history as an invalid inscription could apparently be disregarded.

Long regarded as false, the inscription purports to record the career of a Roman soldier named C. Antonius Flavinus of the legion II Augusta from Eborac Liberalitas (modern Évora in Portugal). Certainly, one of the persuasive reasons why *CIL* II 115 has been considered to be fraudulent is because it was first catalogued by the infamous sixteenth century forger André de Resende (1498-1573), bishop of Évora in Portugal.⁴ And, as Abbott pointed out

¹ On general discussion about spurious inscriptions see: Frank Frost Abbott, "Some Spurious Inscriptions and Their Authors" *Classical Philology* 3 (1908) 22-30; John E. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy I: An Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions* (Chicago 1974: reprint of 1927 edition) 204-206; James C. Egbert, Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions (New York 1923) 10-12.

² Arthur E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley 1983) 8. Gordon notes the example of Syme demonstrating that *CIL* 6.616*, commonly considered false, is a genuine inscription: Cf. R. Syme *JRS* (1953) 154, 156.

³ See especially: Valerie A. Maxfield, *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army* (Berkeley 1981) 248. Julián de Francisco Martín, *Conquista y Romanización de Lusitania* (Salamanca 1989) 126, 150, 174; Robert Étienne, Georges Fabre and Pierre and Monique Lévêque, *Fouilles de Conimbriga: II Épigraphie et Sculpture* (1976) 69, n.17; Robert Étienne, *Le Culte Impérial dans la Péninsule Ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (Paris 1958). José Vives, *Inscripciones Latinas de la España Romana*, includes it in his work (no. 5673), but notes that it is listed as false in the *CIL*. Others do not acknowledge anything about its status at all: eg. Leonard A. Curchin, *The Local Magistrates of Roman Spain* (Toronto 1990); Jorge Alarcão, *Portugal Romano* (Lisbon 1971); and Patrick Le Roux, *L'armée romaine et l'organisation des provinces ibériques; d'Auguste à l'invasion de 409* (Paris 1982).

⁴ Resende received a laudable education in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew from distinguished Spanish scholars, which was followed by a credible teaching and academic career in several European cities. However, upon his return to the city of his birth (Évora, Portugal) where he established a school for Humanistic studies, his concentration on the study of local antiquities led him to perpetrate numerous epigraphical forgeries with the apparent purpose of enhancing the importance of his home town (ancient Eborac). Cf. P. O. Spann, "Lagobriga Expunged: Renaissance Forgeries and the Sertorian War", *TAPA* 111 (1981) 229-235; Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy I* 29; *CIL* II p. xi 17.

years ago, once a scholar has been shown to have falsified an inscription this is often sufficient reason to consider all of the remaining inscriptions associated with him as suspect.⁵

Although Resende's reputation as a notorious forger is not doubted, past explanations for denying the validity of the inscription, which are in several ways connected with his ill repute, may not be adequate to establish the falsity of the inscription. The purpose of this paper, therefore, is to question the arguments which have been used as the basis for denouncing its authenticity and to suggest that perhaps they are not as credible as heretofore believed. If the older arguments do not stand then we may have reason to reconsider the soundness of the inscription. However, it is recognized that subsequent appraisals may continue to sustain the rejection of the inscription and nullify comments made here by presenting arguments which demonstrate that all the while the inscription has been rightly judged as false. Those considerations are of course welcomed. Nevertheless, the following discussion will endeavor to illustrate that, as they are now expressed, the reasons which have been presented to deny the validity of the inscription are suspect and do not seem adequate to cast absolute doubt.

The text of the inscription is as follows:

C ANTONIO C G FLA
VINO VI VIRO IVN
HAST LEG II AVG TORQ
AVR ET AN CVPL OBVIRT
DONATO IVN VERECVN
DA FLAM PERP MVN EBOR
MATER FC

D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum) / C(aio) Antonio C(ai) f(ilio) Fla/vino VI viro (seviro) iun(iori) / hast(ato) Leg(ionis) II (secundae) Aug(ustae) torq(ue) / aur(eo) et an(nona) dupl(a) ob virt(utem) / donato Iun(ia) Verecun/da Flam(inica) Perp(etua) Mun(icipi) Ebor(ensis) / mater f(aciendum) c(uravit)

The detractors of the inscription are impressive, including from the last century Theodor Mommsen and Emil Hübner, and in more recent times the Portuguese scholar José D'Encarnaçãõ; nor, are they alone in their criticism.⁶ Other scholars who treat the epigraphy

On the works of André de Resende see his, *História de Antiquidade da cidade de Évora* (1553) which is included in *Obras Portuguesas* (Lisbon 1963: reprint of the 1576 edition) 29, with preface and notes by José Pereira Tavares. See also Hübner's discussion of Resende cf. *CIL* II p. 13f.

⁵Frank Frost Abbott, "Some Spurious Inscriptions and their Authors," *Classical Philology* III (1908) 25. Such is the case with particular Italians; cf. Egbert, *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions* 10.

⁶On the judgment by Theodor Mommsen that Resende recorded a false inscription: *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 4 (1881 Berlin) p. 238. On the initial approving comment in 1869 by Emil Hübner, "Descripti et genuinam iudicavi" see *CIL* II 115 p. 16. On his later opinion in 1892 that the inscription had been forged see

of Roman Spain have either considered *CIL* II 115 to be false or they have ignored the inscription altogether.⁷

When Mommsen first analyzed the inscription, his suspicions were aroused because parts its funeral formula appeared to him to be very similar to passages in Vegetius. In particular, he noted close similarities between the military awards won by Flavinus to the same awards mentioned in one passage of Vegetius (*De Re Militari* 2.7), which was followed in the next passage (2.8) by references to *hastati*. Mommsen also reasoned that the reference of the military awards of a gold torque and double corn rations and the position of a *hastatus* mentioned together on the same inscription was not a common occurrence. In fact, he felt that this was a novel circumstance because he observed that the person's rank of *hastatus* was recorded without a qualification as to rank (i.e. *prior* or *posterior*). As additional proof of the inscription's fraudulent status, Mommsen contended that Flavinus' office as a *sevir iunior* was a position never mentioned in epigraphical and literary sources except at Mediolanum. By the time he had made his final considerations about the inscription he was convinced that the authenticity of the inscription must indeed be doubted.⁸

In an earlier appraisal (1869), Hübner had evaluated the inscription and determined that it was genuine. However, later in 1892 it appears that he changed his mind about the inscription and judged it to be false. In his comments on the inscription, Hübner suggested that Resende may have forged the text of the inscription from *CIL* V 4365 (= *ILS* 2272), which is as follows:⁹

L ANTONIVS L F
FAB QVADRA
TVS DONATVS
TORQVIBVS ET
ARMILLIS AB
TI CAESARE BIS

As for the third principal detractor of *CIL* II 115, when the modern scholar José D'Encarnação evaluated the objections presented by Mommsen and Hübner, he agreed with their conclusions. In his estimation, he held that the interpretations of Mommsen and Hübner were 'practically faultless'.¹⁰

Considering Resende's reputation and the unique characteristics of the inscription, one may understand why Mommsen, Hübner, and D'Encarnação reached their conclusions.

CIL II vol. II p. 805. On José D'Encarnação's agreement with Mommsen and Hübner see his *Inscrições Romanas Do Conventus Pacensis* (Coimbra 1984) 443.

⁷ Cf. note 3.

⁸ Cf. note 6.

⁹ Cf. note 6.

¹⁰ D'Encarnação, *Inscrições Romanas do Conventus Pacensis* 433, says "Note-se que, do ponto de vista paleográfico, está tudo praticamente impecável".

However, each point of their criticism invites comments and offers opportunity for alternate interpretations.

The military awards recorded for Flavius, the gold torque and double corn rations, may not be as irregular or as uncommon as implied by critics of the inscription. Here, Valerie Maxfield's study of military decorations is particularly helpful and informative through its illustration that there was a period of time when these awards were in vogue. She demonstrates that during the Principate the standard awards for a soldier below the rank of centurion were *torques*, *armillae*, and *phalerae*. These awards continued to be a standard from the late Republic throughout most of the early empire when a soldier was awarded, in the majority of cases, all three awards together, though one or the other might be omitted.¹¹ By the Severian period, as Maxfield points out, the practice of bestowing the awards in combination according to the standard procedure of *torques*, *armillae*, and *phalerae* "changes sharply in its character and falls off dramatically in quantity."¹²

Specifically Maxfield asserts that there was a distinct change in the character and quantity of military rewards when the symbolic military *dona* were replaced by a more practical form of reward which comprised payments in money, larger rations, or promotion; thus, as illustrated by Maxfield, the award of a *torq. aur. et an. dupl.* was not as unusual for that period as Mommsen suspected.¹³ In her discussion Maxfield draws attention to three inscriptions which "point towards a change of direction over the question of military rewards..." She cites the inscription which is the focus of this paper (CIL II 115) and she points to an inscription from the early third century which refers to a *miles torquatus et duplarius* (CIL III 14416 = ILS 7178) with no mention of the other *dona* previous associated with the ordinary soldier (i.e. the *armillae* and *phalerae*). In citing this inscription she points out that it is unique as the single example of a reward made by the emperor Caracalla alone (A.D. 211-217) of a money payment. The reward, along with a promotion, is made to a centurion named T. Aurelius Flavinus in the amount of 75,000 sesterces. In addition, and dating to the approximate same period, Maxfield draws attention to a third tombstone inscription which records a veteran of legion XIII Gemina named Aurelius Iovinus (CIL III 3844 + 13398 = ILS 2434: *mil(es) torquatus et duplarius*). As the inscription illustrates, Iovinus was a soldier who was decorated with a *torques* and was given double rations. This inscription is as follows.

D. I. M. / AURELIUS / IOVINUS / VETER. LEG. / XIII GEM. / MIL. TORQUATUS /
ET DUPLARIUS / EMESIS / SUP. / AUREL. URSE / COIUGI / KARISSIME
D(is) I(nferis?) M(anibus?) / Aurelius / Iovinus / veter(anus) Leg(ionis) / XIII Gem(inae) /
mil(es) torquatus / et duplarius / emesis sup(eriore?) / Aurel(ia) Urse / coiugi / Karissime.¹⁴

¹¹ Maxfield, 64.

¹² Maxfield, 148.

¹³ Maxfield, 248, 253.

¹⁴ Maxfield, 237, 248, 250; Aurelius Iovinus (CIL III 3844 + 13398 = ILS 2434).

The change in direction regarding military rewards, Maxfield professes, is true also in the case of our inscription which records a gold torque and double corn rations rather than the traditional awards.¹⁵ Therefore, with the awards system having changed form by the third century A.D., we may have an explanation for why the standard awards normally expected to have been given to soldiers (i.e. *torques*, *armillae*, and *phalerae*) do not appear in *CIL* II 115 and are replaced by a gold torque and double corn rations. In fact, based on the types of awards held by Flavius, Maxfield suggests that, although the stone is not dated, a third century context would not be out of place.¹⁶ We will return to further comments on a possible third century date when consideration is given below to the Secular Games of Septimius Severus held in A.D. 204.

Another objection about *CIL* II 115, which was embraced by Mommsen, relates to the 'rare' occurrence of the rank of *hastatus* without an indication as to its category of rank. That is, Mommsen argues that because there was no indication whether Flavius was a *prior hastatus* or *posterior hastatus* the authenticity of the inscription must be questioned. It may be, however, that it was not unusual for the designation of '*prior*' to be absent from the title of the *prior hastatus* of one particular cohort of a legion, the first cohort. Here, we note that for centurions in cohorts II through X there was little differentiation of status, apart from seniority, while for centurions of the first cohort there did exist a difference in their titles. In the first cohort, which had only five centuries, the ranks of the centurions were designated in ascending order as *hastatus posterior*, *princeps posterior*, *hastatus*, *princeps*, and *primus pilus*. In this hierarchical structure the designation of *prior* is a missing qualifier for the position of *hastatus*, perhaps suggesting that the absence of the specific designator or rank may have been understood. Because the term *posterior* is used in two ways to designate two specific ranks in the first cohort (i.e. *hastatus posterior* and *princeps posterior*), with *prior* not mentioned for a third, it might mean that *prior* simply was not needed to distinguish the office of a *prior hastatus* since standing alone the term *hastatus* was a sufficient indication of that rank.¹⁷ Thus, the absence of a qualifier to his title might simply mean that Flavius was a '*prior*' *hastatus* in the first cohort of II Augusta.¹⁸

¹⁵ Maxfield, 248.

¹⁶ On Iovinus: Maxfield, 239, 249. On the date of the stone: Maxfield, 248.

¹⁷ In more modern times, in the United States Army terms (unofficial) are sometimes applied to the names of officers to distinguish different status within the same rank. By example, the term "buck" is sometimes used in common parlance to apply to the lowest level of a private to distinguish him from a private first class. The same would apply to a "buck" sergeant (the lowest grade of a sergeant). Likewise, a "light" colonel sometimes is used to designate a lieutenant colonel. Cf. John R. Elting, et al., *A Dictionary of Soldier Talk* (New York 1984) 40, 184, 185.

¹⁸ Cf. Eric Birley, "Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army, II: The Centurionate" *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* (1963-64), 21 ff.; G.R. Watson, *The Roman Soldier* (New York 1987) 22; Lawrence Keppie, *The Making of the Roman Army: From Republic to Empire*, (Totowa, New Jersey 1984) 174; Graham Webster, *The*

Furthermore, despite Mommsen's reference to the rarity of centurions being designated simply as *hastatus*, the indices of the *CIL* and the *L'Année Epigraphique* do record a number of such *hastati*, perhaps suggesting that they were not as completely uncommon as Mommsen would have us believe. Out of a total of forty-four samples of various *hastati* which I have located in the *CIL* and the *AE*, fifteen (34%) are listed simply as *hastati* without any qualifier as to specific rank. Eighteen (41%) are listed as *hastatus primus* or *hastatus prior*, nine (20.4%) as *hastatus posterior* (one (2.3%) as *hastatus re...?* and one (2.3%) as *tertius hastatus*.¹⁹ It may be, then, that there is at least sufficient epigraphical evidence to question Mommsen's position that the listing of a *hastatus* in *CIL* II 115 without a qualifier is one basis for appraising it as a false inscription.

Finally, there remains the issue that because *CIL* II 115 records the only known *sevir iunior* in the Iberian peninsula, this is also basis for judging it a false inscription. In addressing objections based on this point, it may first help to review briefly what is known about the office of a *sevir iunior* and the ceremonies with which the office was connected. This digression will necessarily include comments about Mediolanum where the majority of the *seviri iuniores* are cited. These remarks may also have some relevance to Maxfield's suggestion that the inscription may be assigned a third century date.

Closely connected with the position of a *sevir iunior* was the ancient equestrian ceremony called the *lusus Troiae*. This was an equestrian ceremony performed by Roman boys and is particularly remembered for its portrayal in the fifth book of the *Aeneid*, for its revival by Augustus, and for its connection with the festival called the *ludi Saeculares* (the Secular Games), which were apparently instituted in 249 B.C.²⁰ Although the *Troia* was

Roman Army (Totowa, New Jersey 1985) 114. On five centuries in the first cohort: Hyginus, *De munitionibus castrorum* 3; 4 and Vegetius II, 8, *CIL* VIII 18072; Webster, *The Roman Army* 110.

¹⁹ I have located a total of fifty-one different *hastati*, seven of which are listed as assistants to a *hastatus* and have not been included in my calculations. On the assistants see, *hastatus strator*: *CIL* II 4114; *optio hastatus*: *CIL* III 4328, *CIL* VIII 2555, 18072; *optio hastatus posterior*: *CIL* VIII, 2555, 18072 (bis); and *optio hastatus*: *CIL* VIII 18072. A *Optio Hastatus* was a junior officer who was chosen by a centurion or decurion to be his assistant, while a *Strator* was a personal aid whether in the army or the civil service. Cf. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1990).

For *hastati*: *CIL* II 4146, *CIL* III 8112, *CIL* III 6293, *CIL* III 14477, *CIL* VIII 1574, *CIL* VIII 2640, *CIL* VIII 2825, *CIL* VIII 15576, *CIL* XIII 1881, *CIL* XIII 6997, *AE* (1901) 30, *AE* (1909) 132, *AE* (1939) 61, *AE* (1971) 418, and *AE* (1987) 878.

For *hastati primi*: *CIL* II 1681, *CIL* II 4147, *CIL* III 3846, *CIL* VII 597, *AE* (1976) 379, *AE* (1986) 482; *hastati priores*: *CIL* III 6092, *CIL* III 263, *CIL* III 8047, *CIL* III 6592, *CIL* III 2836, *CIL* III 6605, *CIL* VII 112, *CIL* VIII 2938, *CIL* XIII 1859, *AE* (1902) 89, *AE* (1940) 14, *AE* (1977) 467; *hastati posteriores*: *CIL* III 1480, *CIL* III 13360, *CIL* III 9973, *CIL* III 2883, *CIL* III 15045 (2), *CIL* III 4454, *CIL* III 9973, *CIL* V 896, *CIL* VIII 2877. Other ranks of *hastati* include: a *tertius hastatus*: *AE* (1939) 157, and a *hastatus re...?*: *CIL* II 2890*.

²⁰ For the Secular Games see: G.B.Pighi, *De ludis saecularibus Romani Quiritium*, (Rome 1941); L.R.Taylor, "New Light on the History of the Secular Games," *AJPh* 55 (1934) 101-120; Joe Park Poe, "The Secular Games, The Aventine, and the Pomerium in the Campus Martius," *Classical Antiquity* 3 (1984) 57-81; A.Piganiol, "Jeux séculaires" *REA* 38 (1936), 219-224. On the origins of the Secular Games see:

apparently celebrated on numerous occasions in Rome, there are relatively few occasions when the sources specifically refer to the celebration of the *Troia* at the festival of the *ludi Saeculares*. The *Troia* had been performed under Sulla, a second time in 46 B.C., twice under the direction of Agrippa in 40 and 33 B.C., and four times under Augustus in 29, 28, 17, and 2 B.C. In A.D. 47 the games were celebrated by order of Claudius, in A.D. 88 by direction of Domitian, in A.D. 204 the emperor Septimius Severus commanded their celebration to mark his rule as the beginning of a new age, and in A.D. 248 they were celebrated by Philip in honor of Rome's thousandth birthday.²¹

In design, the archaic ceremonies of the *Troia* consisted of equestrian exercises that imitated similar war-time maneuvers, which according to George Houston were envisioned by Augustus as valuable for inspiring young boys with the patriotic *idea* to train for war.²² Another interpretation, by Lily Ross Taylor, goes a step further to view the ceremonies as much more important than a ceremony which inspired the *idea* of patriotism in Roman youths. That is, in reality the exercises had a practical utility as a specific pre-military training exercise for young boys who were training for a military career.²³ Indeed, Taylor maintains that the celebrations of the *Troia* at Rome bear close resemblances to another municipal celebration named the *lusus iuvenalis* which were celebrated in towns of the western provinces and Italy.²⁴

In her discussion of the development of the *sevir iunior*, Taylor emphasizes that the *lusus iuvenalis* was apparently similar to the *Troia* in its purposes for the military training of young men, and is related to the evolution of the young officers which led the youthful celebrants of the *Troia*. Taylor's thesis illustrates that a military officer unknown prior to Augustus, that of the *sevir equitum*, may be traced to the *tribunus celerum*, the officer who led the celebrations of the *lusus Troiae*. She asserts, however, that the position of the *sevir equitum* at the local municipal level derived itself from a local tradition of freeborn boys grouped in bands called *sodales* during the Republic and *iuvenes* in the empire. To support this point, she cites examples of municipal *seviri equites* who originated from a local

H. Wagenvoort, "The Origin of Ludi Saeculares," *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture, and Religion* (Leiden 1950). John F. Hall III, "The 'Saeculum Novum' of Augustus" *ANRW* 16.3 (1986) 2564-2589; see especially II. "The Origin of the Ludi Saeculares at Rome" 2569-2574. On the *Troia*: George Houston, "The *Lusus Troiae* and Augustan Patriotism", *The Augustan Age* (1981/2) 8-12; Farland H. Stanley Jr., "The Augustan Revival of the *Lusus Troiae*: A Municipal Result?", *The Augustan Age* (1988) 54-58; Stefan Weinstock "Lusus Troiae and the Funeral Games" in *Divus Julius* (Oxford 1971) 88-90.

²¹ Cf. Phighi, *De ludis saecularibus populi Romani Quiritium*.

²² Houston, "The *Lusus Troiae* and Augustan Patriotism" 12.

²³ Cf. L.R. Taylor, "Seviri Equitum Romanorum and Municipal Seviri: A Study in Pre-Military Training Among the Romans" 13-14 *JRS* (1924) 158-171.

²⁴ Taylor, "Seviri Equitum Romanorum and Municipal Seviri" 165.

tradition, not from the Roman *sevir equitum*, and celebrated games called the *lusus iuvenalis*.²⁵

Again, Taylor's study of municipal *seviri* illustrates that the office of the *sevir equitum* of Rome had its imitators in central and northern Italy as seen in the numerous free-born *seviri iuniores*, both offices being similar in that they were regularly the first office held by youths who were preparing for a further military career.²⁶ There were, then, distinct parallels between the *seviri iuniores* chosen from the free-born citizens of Mediolanum and the *sevir equitum* selected from youths at Rome who were being prepared for a senatorial career. Furthermore, whatever its original designation, the example of Mediolanum indicates that celebrations similar to the *Troia* appear to have been celebrated on some occasions at the local level outside of Rome. However, as I have suggested elsewhere, whatever the objectives for the *Troia*, whether to inspire the *idea* of patriotism or to serve the function of a pre-military training organization, its effectiveness in achieving its goals seems questionable, especially as illustrated in the municipality of Mediolanum in northern Italy where we have the most inscriptions testifying to the position of a *sevir iunior*.²⁷

At Mediolanum a total of thirty-four inscriptions are known which record thirty-seven individual *seviri iuniores*.²⁸ Interestingly, upon closer analysis, the *seviri iuniores* at Mediolanum seem to suggest that the purposes of the *Troia* may not have achieved laudable results outside of Rome. This is particularly noted by the fact that only one of the thirty-seven *seviri iuniores* went on to a subsequent military career and only eight others held any kind of local municipal office.²⁹ What may be particularly significant with the *seviri iuniores* at Mediolanum is that the majority of the thirty-seven officers did not achieve any municipal or military success above that of the *sevir iunior*, suggesting that functioning as a

²⁵ Taylor, "Seviri Equitum Romanorum and Municipal Seviri" 168. Specifically, Taylor points to an inscription from Nepesin in Etruria (CIL XI, 3215) which records a *sevir equitum* which she considers an example of a municipal *sevir equitum* modelled on a local tradition. It is, consequently, evidence which she believes illustrates that the *seviri* recorded on municipal inscriptions were associated with the *lusus iuvenalis*. As evidence for the young age of a *sevir*: CIL XI, 6147 records a *sevir* who died at the age of thirteen.

²⁶ Anthony R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* (Oxford 1981) 14-15, points out that young senators or young men destined to be senators could serve in the honorific position of a *sevir equitum Romanorum* before or after the quaestorship. He points out that the office was considered important enough to be recorded by more than one-hundred senators. Cf. W. Eck, "Beförderungskriterien innerhalb der senatorischen Laufbahn, dargestellt an der Zeit von 69 bis 138 n. Chr." *ANRW II*. 1 (1974) 177.

²⁷ Cf. Stanley, "The Augustan Revival of the *Lusus Troia*: Some Municipal Results?"

²⁸ In CIL V there are twenty-five inscriptions listing twenty-eight individuals who held only the position of *sevir iunior*: 5472, 5509, 5555, 5613, 5676, 5830, 5939, 5846, 5853, 5857, 5865, 5867, 5877, 5883, 5884, 5885, 5887, 5896, 5902, 5905, 5910a, 6349, 6351, 6663, 7026. Nine other inscriptions record nine individuals who held at least one additional position above that of a *sevir iunior*: 5445 (pontif., decur.), 5525 (mil.), 5768 (decur.), 5900 (pontif.), 5908 (quattuorvir), 6665 (aug.), 5841 (decur., quattuorvir), 5890 (tresvir, quattuorvir), 5906 (cur. aer.).

²⁹ One was a soldier (5525); One was a *tresvir* and *quattuorvir* (5890); one was a *pontifex* and *decurion* (5445); one was a *decurion* (5768); one was a *pontifex* (5900); one was a *quattuorvir* (5908); one was an *augustales* (6665); one was a *decurion* and *quattuorvir* (5841); and one was a *curator aerium* (5906).

preparatory stage for later military careers the games were not particularly successful either as a mechanism to inspire the *idea* of patriotism or to be a practical training ground for a further military career.

If, therefore, the solitary appearance of a *sevir iunior* in the Iberian peninsula seems unusual, it may be little more than a reflection of the overall inability of the ceremony to be effectively adopted as a part of provincial celebrations, whether as an instrument of inspiring patriotism in young men or as a pre-military training organization. Considering its apparent lack of success beyond Mediolanum, the single known occurrence of this office in Spain perhaps should cause no great surprise. The fact that Flavinus held the office of a *sevir iunior* may simply imply little more than the respect which some held for certain important archaic traditions, one of which was the celebrations of the *ludi Saeculares* which celebrated the *Saeculum* or the beginning of a new century or new age, part of which would be the celebration of the *Troia*.

As mentioned earlier, Maxfield has suggested a third century date for *CIL* II 115 which is based on similarities that the inscription had to other inscriptions of the same period. If Maxfield's suggestion is correct, we may ask if there was any special occasion which would warrant the appearance of a *sevir iunior* in the third century. Here we recall the revival of the *ludi Saeculares*. There were appropriate occasions in the third century when the appearance of a *sevir iunior* could have particular relevance. This would be either in A.D. 204 when the Secular games were offered by Septimius Severus or in A.D. 248 when Philip celebrated Rome's thousandth birthday. There were several reasons to justify Septimius proclaiming that the celebration of the Secular games be held in A.D. 204. The civil wars were ending, Spain had been conquered, and the legionary standards lost to the Parthians had been recovered. This is all reminiscent of Augustus who, as the 'restorer' of the Roman state, had chosen to celebrate the Secular Games in 17 B.C.³⁰

³⁰ On the Secular Games, the standard work is that of G.B.Pighi, *De ludis saecularibus Romani Quiritium* (1941). Anthony Birley, *Septimius Severus: The African Emperor* (Garden City, New York 1972 [1988]) 244, also offers a helpful discussion of the celebration of the *Saeculum*. The origins of this celebration were unclear, but it had been used previously to mark the beginning of a new age, and was traditionally supposed to be held at intervals of one-hundred years. Augustus had revived the Secular Games in 17 B.C. to suit his political purposes and to celebrate his accomplishments. Two-hundred and twenty years later, Severus found that the ceremony was perfect to mark his own accomplishments. There was little concern if the celebration would not be held on the exact year, because the precedent had been established by several prior emperors who held the Secular games when it suited their purposes. On whether and when the games would be held: Barbara Levick, *Claudius* (1990) 121; Tacitus *Annales* 11.11. 1 f.; R.Syme, *Tacitus* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1958), 705; M.T.Griffin, 'De Brevitate Vitae' *JRS* 52 (1962) 104-113.

Claudius held his games in AD 47 (they should have been celebrated in AD 94!). Levick points out that Claudius held the games to publicize his confidence in Rome's future: Cf. Levick, *Claudius* 87; Tacitus *Annales* 11.11.1-4; V.Seramuzza, *The Emperor Claudius* (Cambridge, Mass. 1940) 284 n.12. Domitian, ignored Claudius' games, and held them in AD 88: cf. Birley, *Septimius Severus* 224. The celebration of when the first Games were held is not confirmed, but it may have been in 348 B.C. There is more certainty about the celebration of the games in 249 B.C. and the games of 146 B.C. These were followed by the games which

Most of our information about the celebration of the *ludi Saeculares* applies to its celebration at Rome.³¹ However, in light of the importance of the celebrations to the emperor, we might suspect that local observances of the *Saeculum* may have also been celebrated at various cities in the empire. Indeed, one may wonder whether the position of a *sevir iunior* in Lusitania could be a provincial imitation and reflection of the Augustan tradition which was being remembered by Severus when he celebrated the Secular Games in A.D. 204.³² Certainly, as the *Troia* was an integral part of the Secular Games, *seviri iuniores* were no doubt part of the celebration on the last day of the Games offered by Severus at Rome.³³ And, it may well be that something resembling the *Troia* was part of ceremonies held in the Iberian provinces.

With regard to the imperial cult, we note the accomplishments by one other family member whose name is recorded on the inscription. The dedicator of the stone was the mother of the deceased, Iunia Verecunda, who is recorded as a *Flaminica* or priestess of the imperial cult. Her position is designated as *Flaminica perpetua municipii Eborensis* which, of the forty-one imperial priestesses examined by Étienne, is unique for being only one among nine in the peninsula which is recorded with the distinction of *Flaminica perpetua*.³⁴ Interestingly, Verecunda does not seem to have been the only *flaminica* which may have had some connection with an equestrian celebration. At least three other Spanish inscriptions record the names of *flaminicae* who may have been involved in some fashion with the production of chariot races or circus games.³⁵

Augustus offered in 17 B.C. The celebrations by Claudius in A.D. 47 were in celebration of the eight-hundredth birthday of Rome. Domitian's celebration in A.D. 88 and those of Septimius Severus in A.D. 204 were followed by the thousandth anniversary celebration by Philip in A.D. 248.

³¹ Cf. Pighi, *De ludis saecularibus Romani Quiritium*.

³² On the Secular Games held by Severus: Birley, *Septimius Severus* 156 ff.

³³ *Septimius Severus* 159. On the edict calling for the Secular Games: CIL VI 32326-35; Pighi, *Le ludis saecularibus Romani Quiritium* 137 ff.

³⁴ Excluding Verecunda, the eight other municipal *Flaminicae* which held the status of *perpetua* were: Flavia Rufina (Salacia and Emerita: CIL II 32 and ILS 6893: Vespanianic); Domitia Proculina (Caesaro-briga: CIL II 895 and ILS 6895: Vespanianic); Iunia Rustica (Cartima: CIL II 1956: Vespanianic); Lucretia Campana (Tucci: CIL II 1663 and ILS 5080; Caracalla, A.D. 198-217); Porcia Materna (Tarraco: CIL II 4241: Hadrianic, A.D. 117-138); Fulvia Celera (Tarraco: CIL II 4270 and *AE* 1928, 197); Aemilia Paterna (Aeso: CIL II 4462); Munnia Severa (Tarraco: *AE* 1930, 149).

As seen, nine of the imperial priestesses are specified as a *Flaminica perpetua* (Lusitania - 4; Barticaa - 1; Tarraconensis - 4) and fourteen are recorded simply as *Flaminica* (Lusitania - 3; Baetica - 4; Tarraconensis - 7). Seven were *sacerdos perpetua* (Baetica) and eight are recorded as *sacerdos* (Baetica 6; Tarraconensis - 2). One held both the position of *sacerdos* and *Flaminica*. One is recorded as having held *honus sacerdoti* and one was either a *sacerdos* or *Flaminica*. - Cf. Robert Étienne, *Le Culte Impérial dans La Péninsule Ibérique D'Auguste a Dioclétien* (Paris 1958) 238 f.

³⁵ Iunia Rustica (Cartima: CIL II 1956 = ILS 2054: Vespanianic); Lucretia Campana (Tucci: CIL II 1663 = ILS 465 = ILS 5080: Caracalla, A.D. 198-217); and Aponia Montana (Astigi: CIL II 1471 = ILS 432).

In addition to the specific mention of a *sevir iunior* in the inscription, we might suspect that information derived from the military experience of Flavinus may posit at least indirect evidence which may support the presence of this position. Here, we note that members of the legion in which Flavinus served, the II Augusta, were recruited both from Spain and from Mediolanum where most of the known *seviri iuniores* are attested.³⁶ A possible Troia connection, therefore, might seem suggested by a *sevir iunior* recorded in Lusitania and *seviri iuniores* attested in northern Italy.

Finally, reflecting on the preceding discussion, one of the more significant arguments for reconsidering the status of *CIL* II 115 seems to be Maxfield's demonstration that the awards possessed by Flavinus were not unknown in the third century. One might wonder if Resende was aware that these awards were becoming more common and thus included them on the stone to enforce the impression of its validity. However, this seems to be giving him more credit as a forger than he was capable. It is rather doubtful that Resende possessed sufficient knowledge of military awards to have falsified this feature of the inscription. Unfortunately, Maxfield does not discuss this issue. Consequently, if her proposed third-century date is acceptable on the basis of the awards, an argument for the validity of the inscription gains strength. This is of no small importance for it might also suggest that the remaining information recorded in the inscription, including the position of a *sevir iunior*, may be more valid than formerly held.

In conclusion, despite long-standing doubt about the inscription, objections to its validity based on the arguments of Mommsen, Hübner, and D'Encarnação, are not beyond criticism. It appears that when these objections are more closely examined the validity of the inscription cannot be summarily dismissed without bringing into question the reasons which have been presented for its denial.

The University of Oklahoma

Farland H. Stanley Jr.

³⁶ H.M.D.Parker, *The Roman Legions* (1980, reprint of 1928 ed.), shows recruiting areas for some members of Leg. II Aug. 174-5, 272.