

DUNCAN FISHWICK

FLAVIAN REGULATIONS AT THE SANCTUARY OF THE THREE GAULS?

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 124 (1999) 249–260

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FLAVIAN REGULATIONS AT THE SANCTUARY OF THE THREE GAULS?*

I

The federal priesthood of Q. Adginnius Martinus is documented by two inscriptions at the Confluence, the texts of which are known today solely from the version preserved in the manuscript tradition; the stones themselves were built into the tower of the church of St.-Pierre-les-Nonains at Lyon, where they are no longer legible. The first records a dedication that Adginnius Martinus made to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus:

IOVI · O · M
Q · ADGINNIUS · VRBIC
FIL · MARTINVS · SEQ
SACERDOS · ROMAE · ET · AVG
5 AD · ARAM · AD · CONFLVENS
ARARIS · ET · RHODANI
FLAMEN · II · VIR · IN · CIVITATE
SEQUANORVM

CIL 13, 1674

Two features of the nomenclature, both idiosyncracies of Gallo-Roman onomastics, are of interest. In the first place the dedicator is styled simply son of Urbicus. As L. Maurin notes¹, mention of the bare cognomen, a practice found in the case of other federal priests recorded at the Sanctuary², must imply that the praenomen and gentilicium of father and son are identical, in which case Q. Adginnius Martinus will have been the son of Q. Adginnius Urbicus. Secondly the name of the tribus Romana is omitted³, a peculiarity which suggests that the Roman tribe had by now lost much of its significance. At the Confluence it is usually replaced by the ethnic origin – here Sequanus – a qualification that calls attention to the distinction conferred by his sacerdotium on a priest's civitas and affirms the origin of the office-holder himself⁴. Otherwise the priesthood of Adginnius Martinus is defined as sacerdos Rom(ae) et Aug(usti), to which is added as commonly in the early history of the federal cult a reference to the altar at the meeting of the Rhone and the Saône⁵. Lastly, the inscription gives particulars of the priest's local career in his patria, where he had held the office of flamen and been elected duumvir in the civitas Sequanorum⁶.

* I am very much indebted to Prof. W. Eck for insightful commentary and criticism.

¹ L. Maurin, *Gaulois et Lyonnais*, in *Hommage à Robert Etienne*; REA 88, 1986, 109–124 at 117f. As a rule, the filiation repeats the gentilicium and cognomen of the father, usually with the praenomen. An exception to the normal pattern is CIL 13, 1691.

² Cf. ILA 18; AE 1967, 332; ILTG 341 = CIL 13, 3162.

³ Maurin, loc. cit. In the case of inscriptions engraved in a priest's patria federal priests do mention exceptionally the Roman tribe to which they belonged, a sure sign of Roman citizenship; cf. ILA 18; CIL 13, 939; AE 1979, 403. See further D. Fishwick, *The Federal Priesthood of M. Bucc[]* again, REA 98, 1996, 413–419 at 416f.

⁴ In one local instance the ethnic Aeduus is given in addition to the tribe, in this case because the Sequani have erected public on the territory of their own civitas a statue to C. Licinius, Pomptina (tribu) Latini fil., Campanus, Aeduus, who had completed a full domestic cursus (AE 1967, 332). See R. Frei-Stolba, *Die Kaiserpriester am Altar von Lyon*, in *Roman Religion in Gallia Belgica and the Germaniae*, Bull. des Antiq. Luxembourg, 22, 1993, Luxembourg, 1994, 36–54 at 50, n. 65.

⁵ D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (EPRO 108), Leiden 1987, Vol. I 2, 362f. (hereafter ICLW).

⁶ On the local career of Adginnius Martinus see M. Gschaid, *Studien zur Verehrung der römischen Gottheiten in den Gebieten der Sequaner und Ambarer* (Diss. Regensburg), Regensburg 1991, 71f., assigning his career to the Flavian period.

that have been decreed by the Three Gauls (l. 7) and that the dedication was funded from the *stips annua*. The fact that the dedication was to all appearances set up at the provincial Sanctuary, where A gives the priestly title in full, may also enter into the picture.

Of particular interest is the fifth line of the surviving text as recorded in the Gallic version. Hirschfeld restored *creatus* before the name of the consul M. Neratius Pansa, whereas Groag subsequently proposed *accensus*, a completion that has been accepted without demur by all subsequent commentators including PIR¹². A moment's consideration suggests this is most improbable. An *accensus* was an apparitor or orderly of a Roman magistrate, so in practice a low-level subordinate¹³. It is well-nigh impossible, therefore, to suppose that after a distinguished career in his native *civitas* Adginnius Martinus would have held so inferior a position and that in immediate succession to this he could have been elected to the priesthood of the Three Gauls, the most prestigious office that a native Gaul could attain in the entire province¹⁴. In that perspective Hirschfeld's *creatus* is preferable. The problem with this restitution is that the tenure of Adginnius is plainly dated to the consulship of Neratius Pansa, with whom on all analogy a second consul should be combined. It may therefore be proposed that by far the likeliest completion is to restore the name of a joint consul at the beginning of l. 5, where, to judge from l. 6 or l. 7, approximately 18 letter spaces would be available.

The career of M. Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa has been the subject of protracted discussion that seems finally to have settled on assigning his consulship to A.D. 73 or 74¹⁵. Evidently the name of one of the consuls from either of these years is to be supplied in l. 5, therefore¹⁶. As the consular dating could hardly have stood alone without some verbal form, it may be suggested that in l. 4 the (restored) ethnic qualification was abbreviated to *Seq.* – as in Text A – after which followed the participle before *sacerdos*: perhaps, then, [*Seq. creatus? sac*]erdos Romae et Aug¹⁷. This would leave 15 letter spaces before the left-hand break in l. 5 compared with 14 in l. 4, in both cases exclusive of *interpunctiones*. The identity of the consul whose name is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 5 can only be surmised but in view of the length of the line both he and Neratius Pansa could well have lacked the praenomen: for example, [. . . et Ner]atio Pansa co(n)s(ulibus). If the consulship of Pansa fell in A.D. 73, then the two might well have been *ordinarii* as the only names we have for this year are those of the *suffecti* Caesar Domitianus II, L. Valerius Catullus Messallinus¹⁸. In that case the entire year of the *flaminatus* of Adginnius Martinus would be indicated just as in two inscriptions at Corduba, where the honoree is stated to have completed his term in a year defined by *ordinarii*¹⁹. If, however, Pansa served as consul in A.D. 74, then he and his co-consul will have been *suffecti* as the *ordinarii* of the year were Imp. Vespasianus V, Titus Caesar III²⁰. On this view, not the year's term of Adginnius but the time of his appointment might be indicated as in a text at Mellaria²¹. Either possibility would fit *creatus* or a synonym, but the point can hardly be pressed as it rests upon a hypothetical restoration, the restitution of a supposed participle. Whatever the facts of the matter happen to be, it seems clear that in one way or another the priesthood of Adginnius Martinus at the Sanctuary of the Three Gauls is dated by consuls.

¹² PIR² N 56.

¹³ On *accensus* see F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (31 B.C.–A.D. 337), London 1977, 68f.

¹⁴ Cf. J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit von Augustus bis zum Ende des dritten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (Vestigia 6), Munich 1965, 126, citing Pliny's comment on the reputation of the council of Hither Spain: *scis quod iudicium provinciae illius, quantum sit gravitas* (Ep. 2, 13, 4).

¹⁵ For an overview of the discussion see PIR² N 56. W. Eck, in *RE Suppl.* 14 (1974) 283–286 prefers A.D. 74.

¹⁶ A. Degrassi, *I Fasti Consolari dell'Impero Romano*, Rome 1952, 21; cf. 23, placing the consulship before A.D. 79.

¹⁷ For a similar construction cf. ILS 2118: . . . factus miles in ead. cohorte Domitiano II cos. . . (A.D. 73).

¹⁸ Degrassi (n. 16) 21.

¹⁹ AE 1966, 181; CIL 2, 2221. For the texts see below, n. 41.

²⁰ Degrassi (n. 18) *ibid.*

²¹ CIL 2, 2344. For the text see below, n. 40.

The remainder of the text is taken up with a reference to the local career of Adginnius in his patria: to read [flamen iivir in c]ivitate Sequanorum looks assured by comparison with A. There follows a formula which records that the province, that is the provincial council, has decreed honours – patently to Adginnius – [impensis?] suis. What these honours can have been raises an interesting question but comparison with the similar formula found in texts at Corduba (below, pp. 254f.) strongly suggests they will have been decreed in recognition of his tenure as provincial priest, in which case they must have included a statue. That Adginnius paid for this himself, just as he paid for games in the amphitheatre during his term, can hardly be in question²². If the monument portrayed family members alongside himself, a Flavian example of which looks to occur in C (below, p. 253), the costs of raising a memorial to his own glory will surely have been supported by the honoree himself. Even if Adginnius was honoured with an individual statue, as rarely the case at Lugdunum²³, the provincial council can hardly have drawn on the *stips annua*, its only known source of revenue (below, p. 258). The proceeds of this were evidently used for religious purposes (B: l. 2) just as similar funds were used at Narbo for statues and busts (CIL 12, 6038, ll. 26f.). Besides, it is difficult to think the civitates would have contributed towards statues honouring provincial priests, a distinction that no-one from their own civitas might ever attain. Against this background, therefore, it seems clear that, here as elsewhere, *suis* is employed ungrammatically for *eius*²⁴; the reference is notionally, if incorrectly, to the remote subject Q. Adginnius Martinus rather than to the adjacent subject Tres Galliae. It is true that one normally finds the singular *impensa* in a similar context, notably in all the examples at Corduba (below, p. 255), but in each of these what is supported *impensa sua* is a single honour – in most cases a statue, at Mellaria a funeral²⁵. Presumably the mention of multiple honores in the case of Aginnius Martinus is responsible for the plural *impensis*; that is, if this word and not some other (*sumptibus*?) is to be supplied (see further below, p. 256).

The most striking features of dedication B, as analysed above, are therefore the dating by double consuls (l. 5) and the formula recording the grant of honours on the part of the province (ll. 7f.), which evidently included the erection of an honorific statue. In light of these features attention may be drawn to a third inscription which once stood with another stone outside the door of the chapel of St. Cosme at Lyon but again is known today only for the manuscript tradition. The facsimile in the Corpus can be conveniently reproduced once more:

GNO	CN
ANNO SEX	ANNO SE
SPASIANI	VESPASIANI
AVGVSTI VIT	VIT
5 IT IMP AVGE	5 IMP AVGF
E GALLIA	F GALLIA

CIL 13, 1713

Fragmentary as it is, the text of this inscription is very uncertain though plainly appropriate to a provincial priest. A. Allmer and P. Dissard, repeated by Hirschfeld, suggest: . . . ? Ma]gno . . . anno

²² Cf. F. Richard, Une nouvelle inscription lyonnaise d'un Sacerdos Sénon des Trois Gaules: Sextus Iulius Thermianus, CRAI 1992, 489–509 at 501f. with n. 29 and refs. While the exact wording is uncertain, the general sense of the pertinent passage in the *lex Narbonensis* is that the outgoing priest defrayed the costs of his own commemorative statue: below, p. 255. See further ICLW I 2, 221; C. H. Williamson, A Roman Law from Narbonne, *Athenaeum* 65, 1987, 173–189 at 184f.

²³ Cf. CIL 13, 1687 = AE 1983, 694; CIL 13, 1706; ILTG 223. To these should perhaps be added CIL 13, 1700, which seems not to have been a collective base; see Richard, *o.c.* 500, n. 25.

²⁴ Cf. Hirschfeld, CIL 13, p. 500 ad C. 3162: 1, ll. 27f.: . . . Tres Prov(inciae) Gall(iae) | primo umquam in sua civitate posuerunt; H.-G. Pflaum, *Le Marbre de Thorigny*, Paris 1948, 18.

²⁵ W. Eck convincingly suggests *sepult(urae) impens(am)* rather than Hübner's *sepult(uram) impens(am)*: below, n. 40.

sex[to imp. Caes. Ve]spasiani [Aug.] – August[o n(ostro)?] VI Tit[o] imp. Aug. f. [IIII cos. tres provincia]e Gallia[e]²⁶. Whatever the merits of the proposed version with its various restorations, two elements of the text are of central interest to the present discussion: what looks very much like a dating by consuls – Hirschfeld suggests a reference to Vespasian and Titus, the ordinarii of A.D. 75²⁷ – and the name of the dedicator Tres Galliae, part of which appears at the foot of the stone. To all appearances, then, this defective text belongs to an honorific monument set up to a federal priest by the provincial council, the name of which must have run on one or more adjoining stones²⁸. Quite clearly in that case, this is an early example, the earliest to have been preserved in fact, of a form of monument which became common in the second century and later²⁹. This category of memorial has recently been treated in some detail by F. Richard, so it is sufficient to note that C must be part of a familial monument of a type that was imported into Lugdunum from the Greek East, where the Familiengruppe enjoyed a renaissance under the High Empire³⁰. By this kind of monument not only was the incumbent priest honoured but also the members of his family – his wife, son(s), brother, grandfather and so on in descending order of dignity – all on a common base (or stylobate in Hirschfeld's terminology) with accompanying texts that refer either to the priest himself or to the members of his family. As a rule, the name of the dedicator, usually Tres Galliae, runs in oversize letters along the base³¹. Whether this might have been the case in C is unclear; the manuscript version shows letters of equal height throughout but this is hardly decisive as such a feature might not have been recorded in the original transcription. The key point at issue for present purposes is that we appear to have definite evidence here for a group memorial to a priest, set up in the early Flavian period, with an honorific inscription which includes a dating by consuls. That this refers to the priesthood is not self-apparent but there seems to be no parallel to suggest, say, that the date refers to the erection of the statue by the Three Gauls. To all appearances, therefore, Text C constitutes important corroborative evidence for the interpretation placed on Text B in providing a second example of the same peculiarities.

The epigraphical evidence with which we are confronted thus confirms that early under Vespasian statues were erected to federal priests whose tenure was dated by consuls. In the case of B the text also incorporates what looks like a stereotype notice of the granting of honours by the provincial council to Adginnius Martinus. These features are of particular interest for the fact that by the age of Hadrian, when monuments to provincial priests proliferate, no further instance occurs of the use of a consular dating nor do we find later instances of a similar formula to register provincial honours. Instead honorific statues, in most cases of the familial kind, record the name of the honoree – more often than not in oversize letters³² – his filiation, ethnic origin, local cursus, provincial title, and the name of the dedicator, running along the stylobate which supported the multiple statues of the priest and his

²⁶ Hirschfeld ad CIL 13, 1713, citing A. Allmer and P. Dissard, *Inscriptions Antiques du Musée de Lyon*, Lyon 1889–1893, I 49.

²⁷ Degrassi (n. 16) 22.

²⁸ Cf. Hirschfeld's commentary loc. cit.: videtur igitur v. 6 per complures lapides continuatus fuisse, ut factum est in compluribus titulis ad aram positus.

²⁹ For family group statues see Richard (n. 22) 499f.

³⁰ Richard, o.c. 505–508, citing numerous examples (n. 55).

³¹ Cf. CIL 13, 1682, 1691, 1696, 1701, 1702, 1712, 1716. See further CIL 13, 1682, 1701. In some cases mention of the Three Gauls is a repetition from the dedication: CIL 13, 1716; CIL 13, 1702; so to be distinguished from the inclusion of Tres Galliae in the priestly title: AE, 1965, 341; 1979, 403; CIL 13, 1691 a+b, 11174. For the oversize name of the civitas followed by publice see CIL 13, 1704; cf. Richard, o.c. 500, n. 25.

³² For the name of the honoree in large letters see CIL 13, 2940g, 1676, 1691 a+b, 1694, 1710, 1712, AE, 1992, 1240; cf. Richard, o.c. 500 with n. 27;

family³³. The Flavian evidence plainly diverges, therefore, from what was to become standard usage at the federal sanctuary.

II

For an explanation one may turn to the so-called *Lex de flamonio provinciae Narbonensis* (CIL 12, 6038 = ILS 6963). Inscribed on a bronze plaque, this celebrated inscription was recovered on the site of what was plainly the provincial centre of Gallia Narbonensis, the official cult of which it regulated in remarkable detail with clauses pertaining to the present incumbent and his wife, the outgoing priest, the provincial council, and matters of ritual and finance³⁴. As new analysis of the content of the text makes clear, the law is to be dated under Vespasian, very probably to the opening years of his reign³⁵. Traditionally, the document has been considered a foundation charter that applied solely to the provincial cult of Gallia Narbonensis, but traces of similar provisions from a wide range of other provinces of the Latin West suggest a radically different conclusion. From comparison of the epigraphical evidence for provincial priests, to the extent that these are attested throughout the West³⁶, it emerges that comparable regulations were followed to varying degrees in Hispania Citerior, Proconsularis, Lusitania and Sardinia, as well as in Gallia Narbonensis, where as it happens, no evidence has survived beyond the tablet engraved with the law; in all probability this is because none could be unearthed before the site of the provincial cult was built over and so lost to archaeological exploration.

In Hispania Citerior the principal point of comparison is the practice itself of erecting a statue to the outgoing flamen exactly as laid down in the Narbonese charter. Here in Spain the analysis of G. Alföldy has established that honorific statues begin suddenly at the beginning of the Flavian period³⁷, roughly the span of years to which the *lex Narbonensis* can be assigned on the basis of both internal and external evidence. It is noticeable, though, that while the sudden appearance of honorific statues coincides almost exactly with the date of the Narbonese law, several of its prescriptions are not followed in exact detail. While the name, filiation, tribe, origin and priesthood of the honoree are given on the statue bases, the date of tenure is not specified and particulars of the full *cursus* are listed, a point on which the Narbonese law does not insist³⁸. The general impression one has, in consequence, is that provisions similar to those of the *lex Narbonensis* have been adapted to fit local conditions.

A very different picture is observable in Baetica³⁹. Here the first relevant text is a local inscription at Mellaria which seems to echo in part the formula in use at the provincial centre; this belongs to the age of Nerva/Trajan, so about thirty years later than the earliest evidence in Hither Spain and the approximate date of the Narbonne tablet⁴⁰. At Corduba itself the inscribed bases of priestly statues

³³ For the custom of honouring a provincial priest *en famille* see CIL 13, 2940g, 1676, 1682, 1684, 1691, 1692, 1694, 1696, 1702, 1712, 1714, 1716.; AE, 1992, 1240; cf. Richard, o.c. 499f., calculating a total of 24 inscriptions drawn from collective bases; Frei-Stolba (n. 4) 44 with n. 40 and examples.

³⁴ For recent discussion of the content of the law see Deininger (n. 14) 108f.; M. Gayraud, *Narbonne antique des origines à la fin du IIIe siècle* (RAN, Suppl. 8), Paris 1981, 384–396; Williamson (n. 22) o.c. with full review of previous editions, analysis of the physical characteristics of the tablet, and translation of the text.

³⁵ D. Fishwick, *Our First High Priest: a Gallic Knight at Athens*, *Epigraphica* 60, 1998, forthcoming.

³⁶ For full discussion see *The Provincial Priesthood in ICLW III 1*, forthcoming.

³⁷ G. Alföldy, *Flamines Provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris* (Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología 6), Madrid 1973, 14–19, noting that the overwhelming majority of the relevant texts at Tarraco were recorded in the period from Vespasian to Marcus Aurelius with a single example after A.D. 170.

³⁸ Deininger (n. 14) 122, cf. 108f.; Alföldy (n. 37) 10f.

³⁹ See Fishwick, *ICLW I 2*, 219–221.

⁴⁰ C(aio) Sempronio Sperato | flamin(i) Divorum Augg(ustorum) | provinciae Baeticae. | Imp. Nerva Traiano Caes(are) Aug(usto) Germ(anico) III | [A.] Vicirio Martiali et L. Maecio Postumo co(n)s(ulibu)s, | hic provinciae Baeticae consensu flamin(i)s | munus est consequutus. Peracto honore | flamin. et feciali omn. concil. et consensus | statuam decrevit. | Huic

plainly date the tenure by consulships and give the name, filiation, tribe, origin and priestly title of the honoree⁴¹. They therefore conform precisely to the main requirements of the Narbonese provisions: . . . Si placuerit ius sta]tuae ponendae nomenque suum patrisque et unde sit et quo anno fla[men fuerit inscribendi permitti, . . . (ll. 11f.). What is striking about these texts, however, is the variation in how the priest's tenure is indicated. At Mellaria C. Sempronius Speratus is recorded to have attained the provincial priesthood by agreement of the concilium in the consulships of A. Vicerius Martialis and L. Maecius Postumus, the *suffecti* for July and August of A.D. 98 (CIL 2, 2344)⁴². In this instance, then, the inscription documents the date of his election and the record preserves a valuable clue to when the provincial council held its annual meeting⁴³. At Corduba the practice differs. C. Antonius Seranus completed his term of office under P. Cluvius Maximus and M. Servilius Silanus, one of the pairs of *suffecti* for A.D. 152 (AE 1971, 183)⁴⁴. On the other hand, L. Cominius Iulianus held office in the consulships of Apronianus and Mauricus, A.D. 191 (AE 1966, 181), and an *ignotus* served Cattio Sabio II, Cornel(io) Anull[in]o co(n)s(ulibus), A.D. 216; in both of the latter cases the tenure is recorded by the *ordinarii* of the year⁴⁵.

Equally significant for present purposes is that the formula recording the grant of honours to the retiring priest of Baetica corresponds closely to lines 7f. of inscription B. As the latter are partly restored by Hirschfeld, these could be easily emended to coincide more closely with the wording on the Corduba

ordo Mellariensis decreverunt sepult(uram) | impens(am) funeris laud(ationem) statuas equestres duas | [. . .] Venusta uxor honore accept(o) | imp(ensa) remissa p(osuit) (CIL 2, 2344: A.D. 98; cf. Hübner's observation, CIL 2, 1, p. 325: verba ET FECIALI OMN. CONCIL. ET CONSENSU (sic) sensu omnino carent. Despite the garbled Latin, ll. 7–9 evidently record that the provincial council unanimously decreed a statue in honour of his priesthood.

⁴¹ C(aio) Antoni[o . . .] fil(io) Gal(eria) | Serano [I]porcens[i] | fl(ami)ni Divorum Aug(ustorum) provinc(iae) | Baeticae. | Huic consummato honore fl(ami)ni | P(ublio) Cluvio Max(im)o et | M(arco) Servilio Silano co(n)s(ulibus) consensu concil(ii) Baetic(ae) de[cre]ti sunt honores quantos q(uis)q(ue) | maximos [con]secutus est cum statua h(on)ore | [a]ccepto impensam remi[sit] (AE, 1971, 183: A.D. 152).

L(ucio) Cominio L(ucii) f(ilio) Gal(eria) Iulian(o) | Ilurconensi fl(ami)ni | Divorum Aug(ustorum) provinc(iae) | Baeticae. Huic consummato honore fl(ami)ni | Aproniano et Maurico | co(n)s(ulibus) consensu concilii pr(ovinciae) | Baetic(ae) decret(i) sunt honor(es) | quant(os) quisq(ue) max(im)os consecutus | est cum statua cuius honor(e) | accept(o) impensam remisit (AE, 1966, 181: A.D. 191).

[. Fabio M(arci) f(ilio) Gal(eria) . . .]do | [flam]ini Divor(um) Aug(ustorum) | provinc(iae) Baet[icae]. | Huic consummato hono[re flam]oni | Cattio Sabio II Cornel(io) Anull[in]o co(n)s(ulibus) | consensu concilii universae prov(inciae) Baet(icae) | decreti sunt honores quantos quisque | maximos plurimosque flamen est | consecutus cum statua. | M(arcus) Fabius Basileus Celt(itanus) pater | honore accept(o) impens(am) remisit (CIL 2, 2221: A.D. 216).

⁴² Degrassi (n. 16) 29. The consular dating Imp. Nerva Traiano Caes(are) Aug(usto) Germ(anico) III presumably refers to the decree of the ordo of Mellaria granting Sempronius Speratus various honours. If so, this will have taken place in A.D. 100 (therefore the true date of the inscription), at a time when the former provincial flamen had returned to Mellaria, where he died in the year following his term of office (A.D. 99). R. Étienne, *Le culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (BEFAR 191), Paris 1958, 128 with n. 7, followed by Degrassi (in correspondence), emends III to II so as to coincide with the consulships of Vicerius Martialis and Maecius Postumus in A.D. 98. For the third consulship of Trajan in A.D. 100 see Degrassi, o.c. 30. J. Deininger makes the interesting suggestion that the exceptional honours decreed by his patria to Sempronius Speratus may result from the successful proceedings brought by the province against Caecilius Classicus in A.D. 98; id., *Zur Begründung des Provinzialkultes in der Baetica*, MDAI(M) 5, 1964, 167–179 at 178, n. 71, cf. 175f. A connection may well exist, though on the above reconstruction the flaminiate of Sempronius will have fallen in A.D. 99. Conceivably he led the provincial action against Caecilius the previous year, whether before or after his designation as flamen.

⁴³ A date in July–August would correspond to the date of *ca.* 1 August when the federal priest was elected at Lugdunum. See Étienne (n. 42) 128f.; ICLW I 1, 118. When precisely the new priest took office is unknown but see below, n. 45.

⁴⁴ Degrassi (n. 16) 43 (where only M. Servilius Silanus is registered).

⁴⁵ Degrassi, o.c. 53, 60. Whether Cluvius Maximus and Servilius Silanus were the last *suffecti* of the year (A.D. 152) is unclear, but the fact that in the last two instances the flaminiate is dated by the *ordinarii* of the year (A.D. 191, 216) suggests that the incumbent held office from 1 January to 31 December: in other words according to the Roman year, as evidently the case in Lycia; cf. Deininger (n. 14) 150. This would be consistent with the fact that the newly elected flamen could be termed *designatus* in Baetica (CIL 2, 2220) as in Hispania Citerior (CIL 2, 4196, 5124); cf. Alföldy (n. 37) 44. The term is not attested in Tres Galliae.

bases: for example, . . . cui tres provincia]e Galliae honores | [maximos impensis] suis decreverunt. As for what were the honores of Adginnius Martinus other than a statue, if regulations like those of the *Lex Narbonensis* were followed at Lugdunum, the past priest will have enjoyed a whole range of rights. In addition to membership in the *curia* of his *patria*, where he could give his opinion and vote (below, p. 260), he would have been entitled to participate on the same basis in meetings of the provincial council, to attend public shows in the amphitheatre wearing the *toga praetexta*, and to wear his vestment on the days he had offered sacrifice when a *flamen* (CIL 12, 6038, ll. 13–16). Some at least of these privileges would have involved costs, hence presumably *impensae* (in the plural).

A somewhat similar situation is observable in *Proconsularis*⁴⁶. Here we have no inscribed bases from what was presumably the provincial centre at Carthage but, just as in *Baetica* a text at Mellaria seems to incorporate the formula in use at Corduba⁴⁷, so in *Proconsularis* texts at Simitthus, Bulla Regia and Furnos Maius and seem to echo a similar formula at the provincial centre in giving the name, filiation, tribe and exact date of the priest's tenure⁴⁸; the origin is omitted as superfluous in a local inscription whereas the *cursus* is included as in Hither Spain contrary to the practice in *Baetica*. The principal difference in *Proconsularis* is that, instead of a dating by consuls, priesthoods are reckoned by the year of an era, a system apparently copied from a local era used in connection with the priests of the *Cereres*⁴⁹. In one respect, however, the African evidence is more germane to the point at issue as the era by which priests date their tenure begins in *ca.* A.D. 72–74: in other words roughly at the beginning of the Flavian epoch, precisely the period when evidence begins in *Hispania Citerior*.

In *Lusitania* a different point of comparison emerges. An inscription at Emerita records that the province has dedicated what must be a gold protome of 5 lbs. weight to Titus; along with the province the text mentions the high priest and the provincial *legatus Augusti*⁵⁰. If one turns to lines 26–28 of the *lex Narbonensis*, it is stipulated there that surplus funds can be expended by the provincial *flamen* on statues and busts of the emperor – with the approval of the Roman provincial governor⁵¹, or so it would appear (the text is partly corrupt): Qui flamonio abierit is ex ea pecunia [. . . 65 . . . statu]las imaginesve imperatoris Caes[aris . . . 45 . . . arbitrato(?) eius qui eo anno pro-] vinciae praeerit . . . What we seem to have at Emerita, therefore, is a text that attests the practical application in *Lusitania* of precisely such a clause, so unmistakable evidence of conformity with a statute similar to the *lex Narbonensis*.

⁴⁶ For detailed discussion see Fishwick, ICLW I 2, p. 262; id., *The Provincial Priesthood of L. Calpurnius Augustalis*, *Mélanges G. Souville: AntAfr* 34, 1998, forthcoming.

⁴⁷ N. 40.

⁴⁸ C(aio) Otidio P(ublilii) f(ilio) Quir(ina) Iovino | praefecto fabrum | sacerdoti provinc(iae) Afric(ae) | anni XXXVIII qui primus | ex colonia sua hunc honorem gessit | cui cum ordo pecunia publ(ica) | statuam decrevisset titulo | contentus pecunia sua posuit | curatore Q(uinto) Otidio P(ublilii) f(ilio) Quir(ina) | Praenestino fratre praefecto (CIL 8, 14611).

L(ucio) Iulio L(ucii) f(ilio) Quir(ina) Cereali q(uaestori) aed(ili) praef(ecto) i(ure) d(icundo) flam(ini) | [A]ug(usti) perp(etuo) municipi(i) su(i) flam(ini) Aug(usti) provinc(iae) | [A]fric(ae) anni XXXX quem honorem ex municipio | [s]uo Bullensi(um) Regio(rum) prim[us] gessi[t] huic cum pr[ovinc]iae Afric(ae) leg(at[us]?) [---] (AE, 1964, 177; cf. 1916, 75 = ILAfr 458).

P(ublio) Mummio L(uci) f(ilio) Papir(ia) | Saturnino sac(erdoti) p(rovinciae) A(fricae) a(nno) CXIII | dec(urioni) P(ubli) m(unicipi) | Furnitani cui cum ordo honorem fl(amonii) obtulisset pron(aum) cum or(n)ament(is) temp(li) Merc(uri) | [ob] excusation(em) honor(is) | [s]ua p(ecunia) feci[t] ob cu[us] d(edicatio)nem [---] (CIL 8, 12039 = ILS 6812).

⁴⁹ For new analysis see D. Fishwick, *On the Origins of Africa Proconsularis III: The Era of the Cereres again*, *AntAfr* 32, 1996, 13–36.

⁵⁰ T(ito) Caesari Aug(usti) f(ilio) | Vespasiano pontif(ici) | imp(eratori) XII trib(unicia) pote(state) VII | co(n)s(uli) VI | provincia Lusitania | C(aio) Arruntio Catellio | Celere leg(ato) Aug(usti) pro pr(aetore) | L(ucio) Iunio Latrone | Conimbricense flamine | provinc(iae) Lusitaniae | ex auri p(ondo) V (CIL 2, 5264 = ILS 261). For discussion see D. Fishwick, *A Gold Bust of Titus at Emerita*, *AJAH* 6, 1981, 89–96.

⁵¹ The provision can be added to the data usefully collected by W. Eck on the religious and cultic duties of a Roman provincial governor: id., *Die religiösen und kultischen Aufgaben der römischen Statthalter in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, in Mayer M. (ed.), *Religio Deorum. Actas del Coloquio Internacional de Epigrafía. Culto y Sociedad en Occidente*, Sabadell 1993, 151–161 at 152–156.

A similar correspondence, in this case to a different clause, arises from two inscriptions at Cornus and Bosa in Sardinia, both defective but plainly recording that a provincial priest has been ‘adlected’ into the *ordo Caralitanorum*, the town council of Carales, the chief city of the province and seat of the provincial cult⁵². In the first instance the provincial council has assented to this arrangement and its approval is possibly to be restored in the second text. As is clear from the *lex Narbonensis*, the current provincial *flamen* profited from various privileges at Narbo during his year’s term: *lictors*, membership in the local *ordo*, presumably on a par with the town *duoviri*, a front seat at the games: [.42.]iique *lictors* q[ui . . . apparent . . . ei apparento] | [. 37 .]um *iusque eius provinciae* [. . . 42 . . .] | [.35.]ui in *decurionibus senatuve* [sententiae dicendae signandique . . . 12 . . .] | [. 15 . inter *decuriones* s]enatores-ve *subsellio primo spectan*[di *ius esto* . . . 30 . . .] (Il. 2–5)⁵³. The two texts in Sardinia appear to show, then, that past provincial priests put on a permanent basis the temporary membership of the *ordo Caralitanorum* they had enjoyed in office, in which case these inscriptions reflect indirectly the operation in Sardinia also of provisions like those of the Narbonese charter.

III

To return to texts B and C, everything suggests that the principal features of these inscriptions, as outlined above, likewise reflect the operation of regulations parallel to those of the *Lex de flamonio provinciae Narbonensis*. Here it should be recalled at the outset that precisely such an administrative reorganization in *Tres Galliae* was earlier proposed by L. Maurin⁵⁴. The basis for his hypothesis is that from the early Flavian period, more precisely commencing with Text B, the records of provincial *sacerdotes* begin to refer to *Tres Galliae*. Until this time there is no reference to the Three Gauls in such traces of provincial priests as have survived; elsewhere, for example in Tacitus, *Ann.* 11, 23 and in the epigraphical copy of Claudius’ address to the *primores Galliae* (CIL 13, 1668: 2, l. 31), the term *Gallia Comata* appears to have continued in common usage⁵⁵. Maurin suggests that the new emphasis on the tripartite division of the region, as introduced under Augustus apparently from 16–13 B.C.⁵⁶, seems consistent with an administrative reform at the outset of the Flavian era. It might be added in amplification of this observation that a formal change in the manner of referring to the Confluence is likewise perceivable from the same period. Under the Julio-Claudians two of the three priestly titles we have define the priesthood as *ad aram quae est ad confluentem* or simply *ad confluentem* (ILA 7, 18). From now onwards, however, one begins to find the plural . . . *ad confluentes Araris et Rhodani* or *inter confluentes Araris et Rhodani*, whenever the rivers are mentioned (CIL 13, 1674, 3144 et passim). In itself this might seem a small variation in comparison with the insistence on *Tres Galliae*, yet it reinforces the impression of an administrative reform which has left its traces in modified formulae.

⁵² [. . .]tiano [. . .] Ba[s]so co(n)s(ulibus) | [. . .]nconi[n]i[.] fil. Crescenti | sac[er]d(oti) prov(inciae) Sard(iniae) adlec[to] | ab splendidissim[o] ordin(e) | [Ka]ral(itanorum) ex consensu prov(inciae) Sar[d(iniae)] | [pont]if(ici) [. . .] ci[v]i[t]atis ç[.]t[un]ei | [. . .]no civi equo [. . .]ssii[.]iii | [. . .]ua[.]cu[.] | [. . .]s . çç[.]o[.] or[di]nis continetu[r] | munificen[tia] colle[.]gii | [. . .] Arrio Iscini[.] | [. . .]s[.] (CIL 10, 7917: Cornus). For a version of the text see A. Mastino, *Cornus nella storia degli studi*, Cagliari 1979, 111f.; cf. G. Sotgiu, *L’epigrafia latina in Sardegna dopo il CIL X e l’E.E. VIII in ANRW II* 11, 1, Berlin 1988, 552–739 at 663; F. Zentile, *Le iscrizioni lapidarie del museo G. A. Sanna di Sassari*, Università degli studi di Sassari, Tesi di laurea, Sassari 1990–91, 134–136. For detailed discussion of the priesthood see D. Fishwick, *Un sacerdotalis provinciae Sardiniae à Cornus (Sardaigne)*, CRAI 1998, 449–459.

[. . .] sac(erdos) | Urb(is) Rom(ae), flam(en) prov(inciae) Sard(iniae), adl[e]c[t]u[s] ab] splendidiss(imo) [o]rd(ine) Kal[ra]lit(anorum)? . . .] s[t]udiis [populi ex consensu prov(inciae) Sard(iniae)?] (CIL 10, 7940 (Bosa Vetus). For discussion see D. Fishwick, *A Priestly Career at Bosa, Sardinia*, in *Imago Antiquitatis: Mélanges R. Turcan*, Paris 1999, forthcoming.

⁵³ See Williamson’s discussion (n. 22) 181f.

⁵⁴ N. 1, 112; cf. Frei-Stolba (n. 4) 38, n. 11.

⁵⁵ Maurin (n. 1) 111. with nn. 11–14.

⁵⁶ See D. Fishwick, *Dio and the Provinces in Y. Le Bohec (ed.), L’Afrique, la Gaule, la Religion à l’époque romaine; Mélanges Marcel Le Glay* (Coll. Latomus 226), Brussels 1994, 116–28 at 119–121.

In part political considerations may have dictated a change at a centre that had welcomed the forces of Vitellius⁵⁷. More significant in the context of the present discussion, however, is that both B and C (in all probability) appear to date a priesthood precisely by consulships. The consular reference appears in B in the course of a dedication by the high priest, whereas in C it looks to be incorporated in a text inscribed on what is to all appearances a group statue honouring the provincial priest and perhaps members of his family (above, p. 253). In that case Text C follows the prescription of the *lex Narbonensis* exactly in respect to a key feature of the epigraph to be placed on a statue honouring an outgoing provincial priest; Text B rather reflects the same provision. Too little of C is preserved to allow one to tell whether the text gave the priest's name, filiation and origin, as laid down in the Narbonese charter, but the very fact that an honorific statue was set up to a provincial priest a few years into the reign of Vespasian parallels the situation in Hispania Citerior where the principal correspondence to the *lex Narbonensis* is the erection of honorific statues from the early years of Vespasian. We have seen that in Text B the phrase *impensis] suis* (l. 8) in all likelihood implies the erection of an honorific statue, but what can be stressed now is the similarity of the formula here to that recorded on statues bases at Corduba, a resemblance which would be all the closer on the proposed modification of Hirschfeld's restitution (above, pp. 251, 255f.). A further point which holds in this connection is that the council of the Three Gauls evidently decreed honours to Adginnius at his own expense. This parallels exactly the situation at Corduba where the text states more diplomatically that the honoree took it upon himself to pay the costs of his statue.

As Kornemann noted long ago, this is a feature very much in keeping with the tight-fisted administration of Vespasian's regime⁵⁸. It raises in turn the question of the *stips annua* mentioned in l. 2 of Text B. We have no evidence before the Flavian period for the existence of an annual contribution paid in this or any other province of the West; that none existed in Britain, for instance, looks corroborated by the circumstance that levies imposed ad hoc by imperial priests to support construction of the temple at Camulodunum were a principal cause of the great rebellion in A.D. 60 (Tac., *Ann.* 14, 31)⁵⁹. As argued in detail elsewhere, slow and halting progress on construction of the provincial temple of Hither Spain at Tarraco may be ascribable in part to the problem of collecting financial contributions towards its construction⁶⁰, a difficulty that would imply in turn the absence of any regular income. Now for the first time anywhere in the Latin West we have a reference in the second inscription of Adginnius Martinus (B) to a *stips annua* (l. 2). In light of the sweeping administrative measures that are evidently to be inferred at the sanctuary in the early years of Vespasian's reign, everything suggests that the institution of an annual levy was part and parcel of the same reform. Such an innovation would certainly be in keeping with the penny-pinching mentality of an emperor who was himself the son of a tax-collector and not averse to tapping less savoury sources of revenue.

The *stips annua* will undoubtedly have been paid into a federal chest (*arca*), the existence of which is plainly attested by the enigmatic posts of *iudex arcae Galliarum*, *allectus arcae Galliarum* and

⁵⁷ In the same way the massive building programme that got under way in the Flavian period at the provincial centre of Tarraco put a new imperial stamp on a centre that had supported Galba. See in detail TED'A (Taller Escola d'Arqueologia de Tarragona), *El foro provincial de Tarraco, un complejo arquitectónico de época flavia*, *AEspA* 62, 1989, 141–191 at 151–157; cf. *eid.*, *Un Abocador del Segle V D.C. en el Fòrum provincial de Tàrraco, Memòries d'Excavació* 2, 1989, 435, 437–440; X. Dupré i Raventós, *Un gran complejo provincial de época Flavia en Tarragona: Aspectos cronológicos* in W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, *Stadt und Ideologie*, Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss., phil.-hist. Klasse, Abh. n. F. 103, 1990, 319–325. Even more obviously the Severan reform of the provincial cult at Lugdunum was clearly a reaction to the support that Lugdunum had given to Clodius Albinus. See Fishwick, *ICLW* 1, 2, 347–49.

⁵⁸ E. Kornemann, *Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte*, *Klio* 1, 1901, 51–146 at 126.

⁵⁹ Fishwick, *ICLW* I 2, 216.

⁶⁰ D. Fishwick, *Four Temples at Tarraco*, in A. M. Small (ed.), *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of the Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity* (*JRArch. Suppl.* 17), Ann Arbor 1996, 165–184 at 179–182; Fishwick, *The 'Temple of Augustus' at Tarraco*, *Latomus* 58, 1998, forthcoming.

inquisitor Galliarum, evidence for which is recorded in the epigraphic sources⁶¹. If the federal levy was instituted under Vespasian, it seems reasonable to infer in turn that the origin of the officials associated with the treasury likewise dates from the early Flavian period, when it will have formed part of the same administrative reorganization. Here is not the occasion for extensive speculation on the function of these federal “civil servants”, though their general oversight of financial matters is self-apparent⁶², but one possibility is worth broaching in passing. The final clause of the Narbonese law requires that on completion of his term the retiring priest shall present his accounts for examination by an auditor: *seque omnia ut hac lege cautum est de] l'ea re fecisse apud eum qui ra[tiones putabit probato . . . 58 . . .]* (Il. 28f.). It may be proposed that a comparable official in Tres Galliae is to be identified in the inquisitor Galliarum, who will consequently have acted as a sort of comptroller charged with supervising the financial dealings of the provincial priest. Such a function would certainly come within the definition of the term inquisitor, no satisfactory interpretation of which has so far established itself⁶³. The role of the inquisitor Galliarum would then be concerned with one side of the council finances that came within the purview of the *iudex arcae Galliarum* and *allectus arcae Galliarum*.

An interesting question raised by R. Frei-Stolba in this connection is whether Hadrian's unparalleled triple grant of *immunitas* to Q. Otacilius Pollinus, inquisitor III Galliarum (AEpig, 1972, 352) could be linked with the emperor's visit to Lugdunum in A.D. 121⁶⁴. She suggests that in his capacity of inquisitor Otacilius Pollinus might have acted generously in respect to the public works programme that the emperor launched: construction of the provincial temple, replacement of the Victory columns flanking the altar with pillars of Syenite, enlargement of the amphitheatre towards the end of his reign⁶⁵. In point of fact the amphitheatre was extended by C. Iulius Celsus (CIL 13, 1808; ILTG 218), who presumably supported the costs just as did C. Iulius Rufus and his cousin(?) with respect to the original structure under Tiberius (ILTG 217; ILA 7, cf. 18 with pp. 132f.); but the new Victory columns and the Temple of the Three Gauls could very well have been subvented from a provincial fund that was certainly utilized for religious purposes, as inscription B shows. If Hadrian had in fact prevailed upon Otacilius Pollinus to loosen the federal purse strings in connection with these large-scale building projects, the role of the inquisitor as a kind of Gallic comptroller would be confirmed.

A final point to round that argument off is that in the preceding clause (Il. 26–28) there is a reference to *pecunia*, which could well be the equivalent fund in Narbonensis to the monies accruing to the *arca Galliarum* from collection of the *stips annua*. Apparently the retiring priest is entitled to spend any surplus on statues or busts of the emperor at the discretion of the provincial governor: *Qui flamonio abierit is ex ea pecunia [. . . 65 . . . statu]las imaginesve imperatoris Caes[aris . . . 45 . . . arbitratu(?) eius qui eo anno pro]vinciae praeerit . . .* We have seen that in inscription B a subvention from the *stips annua* is used similarly for religious purposes, though in this case Adginnius Martinus has made a dedication to an unknown deity and Mars Segomo. That discrepancy aside, however, there is a clear parallel in that he has set up the dedication at a time when the provincial council had already decreed him various honours – inferentially inclusive of a statue. As this can only have taken place on completion of the priestly term, a further correspondence arises in that Adginnius has drawn on federal funds at the close of his year, exactly as provided in the *lex Narbonensis*.

⁶¹ For lists of these officials see L. Maurin, *Saintes antique des origines à la fin du VI^e siècle après Jésus Christ*, *Saintes* 1978, 198f.; Frei-Stolba (n. 4) 45 with nn. 42–44, cf. 39.

⁶² For the point that the *arca* was not an organ of the concilium but existed rather as a treasury of the collectivity represented by the council, that is to say the province, see A. Aymard, *Notes sur des inscriptions de Lugdunum Convenarum: II Arca provinciae, et non concilii*, *REA* 43, 1941, 229–239; Deininger (n. 14) 140.

⁶³ For earlier suggestions see Hirschfeld, *CIL* 13, 1, p. 230; Deininger, *o.c.* 103. See now Fishwick (n. 36).

⁶⁴ R. Frei-Stolba, *Q. Otacilius Pollinus: Inquisitor III Galliarum*, in P. Kneissl and V. Losemann (edd.), *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Festschrift K. Christ)*, Darmstadt 1988, 186–201 at 200f.

⁶⁵ Fishwick, *ICLW* I 2, 308–316.

What the evidence suggests in sum, then, is that early under Vespasian similar regulations were introduced into Tres Galliae to those operative in Hither Spain, Lusitania, Baetica, Proconsularis and Sardinia; this new departure coincides with the contemporary change to Tres Galliae and *confluentes* in the priestly formula which is observable from the outset of the new Flavian regime. In contrast to the situation in other provinces, however, the innovation had no discernable impact on the existing federal worship but was rather in the nature of an administrative reorganization that affected the day-to-day functioning of the provincial cult and the role of the federal priest. In the Three Gauls the new arrangements look to have also included the introduction of an annual levy along with the appointment of officials to supervise income and expenditure. Comparable institutions are not directly in evidence elsewhere⁶⁶ but it would follow that, if similar regulations were in force at the Lugdunum sanctuary as at Narbo and elsewhere, the federal priest of Tres Galliae will have been *ex officio* a member of the local *ordo* of Lugdunum⁶⁷. Equally, he will have become on retirement a member of the senate of his own patria, with the right to give his opinion and vote as provided by the *lex Narbonensis*: *Eidem] | [i]n curia sua et concilio provinciae Narbonensis inter (homines) sui ordinis secundum l[. . . 35 . . .] | sententiae dicendae signandique ius esto* (ll.13–15; cf. above, p. 256). In that case everything suggests that the former priest will have been a member himself of the municipal body that in the name of the *civitas* occasionally authorized a monument to be erected in honour of a federal *sacerdos* at the Confluence (cf. CIL 13, 1704) or locally in his patria (cf. CIL 13, 1541: Cahors).

Quite clearly in Tres Galliae as elsewhere in the West the role of Rome in this connection must be construed as proactive rather than reactive⁶⁸; there can be no question that such innovations, paralleled in so many different provinces, were introduced by the provincials themselves. It should be stressed, however, that, just as in other fields, the provinces were plainly allowed considerable discretion in implementing the new guide lines. We have seen that in Hither Spain in particular statues in honour of past provincial priests suddenly appear at the beginning of the Flavian period, yet their inscribed bases omit to date the priest's tenure and as a rule include his *cursus*, a feature not required by the *lex Narbonensis*. In Tres Galliae, on the other hand, comparable regulations look to have been followed more closely in the initial years, though the texts we have reviewed are our sole evidence for the Flavian period. By the reign of Hadrian, when evidence accumulates on an increasing scale, a change is observable. The inscribed bases of statues never again date the tenure precisely by consuls in the examples that have come down and, as in Hither Spain, it becomes the rule to include the *cursus* of the priest, which is for the most part resumed in the umbrella formula *omnibus honoribus apud suos functus*⁶⁹. By contrast, the financial officers who serviced the Sanctuary continue to operate as before. It follows that the whole development is in retrospect an object lesson in that sensitive reconciliation of imperial requirements with local preferences which contributed so remarkably to the successful running of an empire.

University of Alberta

Duncan Fishwick

⁶⁶ While there is a trace of a freedman of the province at Tarraco (RIT 335), at the provincial centre of Hispania Citerior individuals were evidently appointed *ad hoc* to undertake specific duties; cf. RIT 264, 294.

⁶⁷ As reflected indirectly at Carales in Sardinia, above, p. 9 with n. 52.

⁶⁸ For the theory of a predominantly passive emperor see Millar (n. 13) *passim*.

⁶⁹ For the origins of this stereotype about the time of Hadrian see L. Wierschowski, *AE* 1980, 615 und das erste Auftreten der Formel *omnibus honoribus in colonia sua functus* in den westlichen Provinzen, *ZPE* 64, 1986, 287–294 at 289ff.; cf. Alföldy (n. 37) 19.