

DUNCAN FISHWICK

A MUNICIPAL DECREE AT TARRACO

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 126 (1999) 291–295

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A MUNICIPAL DECREE AT TARRACO*

RIT 316 [. ---]rio
Q(uinti) [fil(io) Gal(eria) (?) (tribu)] F̄us[c]o (?)
Ilvir(o), flam(ini) Divi
Claudi, praef(ecto) orae
marit(imae),
flamini Divorum et
Augustor(um) p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae) c(terioris), provinc(ia)
Hispania citerior.

[Or]do Tarraconens(ium)
 honores decrevit.

I

The inscription of [. .]rius Q. f. Fuscus(?)¹ was apparently engraved on a statue pedestal dedicated by the province, that is the provincial council, of Hither Spain². The statue itself, like other monuments of its kind, has long since disappeared and the whereabouts of the surviving base are unknown, but the text, presently preserved in a manuscript copy³, records that Fuscus(?) had held the duumvirate and local flaminiate of Divus Claudius – precisely where is unknown as the second line of the text is defective⁴. He then served as prefect of the maritime shore before attaining the priesthood of the province with the title of *flamen Divorum et Augustorum p. H. c.* Whereas earlier commentators assigned the inscription to the reign of Vespasian, G. Alföldy holds out the possibility of a date as late as A.D. 100/120, from which time the office of *praefectus orae maritimae* is no longer attested. Given that the stone was found in 1803 at house no. 4, Calle de Enrajolát, at the lower end of Calle Mayor – therefore in the zone of the provincial forum on the middle terrace of the provincial enclave⁵ – it will have belonged among the thirty-three statue bases that stood here on the so-called Repräsentations-Platz, possibly in proximity to a grove⁶. The existence of a special Aufstellungsort⁷, where the honorific statues of past provincial priests were erected, conceivably in rows, is attested by the inscription of the

* I am very much indebted to Prof. W. Eck for helpful commentary and suggestions.

¹ Hübner thought [I]us[t]us also possible.

² G. Alföldy, *Flamines Provinciae Hispaniae Citerioris* (Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología 6), Madrid 1973, 92, no. 73. For the general context see *ibid.* 1–19.

³ For the background and earlier literature see Hübner ad CIL 2, 4217, cf. p. 488.

⁴ Alföldy, *Flamines* (n. 2) loc. cit., suggests Tarraco as his apparent *origo*.

⁵ The area can reasonably be called a forum despite the fact that three inscriptions originally thought to attest the word directly in this connection (RIT 349, 353f.) have now been shown to refer rather to the municipal forum in the lower city. See J. Ruiz de Arbulo Bayona, *El foro de Tarraco*, *Cypsela* 8, 1990, 119–138 at 135.

⁶ Alföldy (n. 2) 4–10; *id.*, *RE Suppl.* 15, 1978, 603, 618, s.v. Tarraco. See further D. Fishwick, *The Provincial Centre, in The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* (hereafter ICLW), Vol. III, 3, Leiden, forthcoming. For the suggestion that the statues may have been associated with a grove see X. Aquilué i Abadias, X. Dupré i Raventós, J. Massó, J. Ruiz de Arbulo, *Tarraco. Guide Archéologique*, Tarragona 1993, 69.

⁷ Contra W. Trillmich, ‘Foro provincial’ und ‘Foro municipal’ in den Hauptstädten der drei hispanischen Provinzen: eine Fiktion, in *Ciudad y Comunidad cívica en Hispania. Siglos II–III d. C.*, Coloquio Madrid 1990 (Collection de la Casa de Velázquez 40), Madrid 1993, 115–117. For a reply see D. Fishwick, ‘Provincial forum’ and ‘municipal forum’: Fiction or Fact?, *Anas* 7–8, 1994–95, 169–186 at 173.

archivist C. Valerius Arabinus, whose statue was to be set up *inter flaminales viros* in recognition of his services (RIT 333).

If the first eight lines of the text conform to the general format of similar dedications on memorials to provincial priests⁸, the last two distinguish the statue base of Fuscus from that of any other *vir flaminialis* at Tarraco. An appendix, separated by a line space, records that the *ordo Tarraconensium* has decreed honours, patently to Fuscus(?). In itself such a measure on the part of the town senate is unremarkable. Honours (RIT 278, 342) or dedications of one sort or another (RIT 86, 129, 145, 151, 156, 173, 343, 339?, 346, 347) are similarly recorded by numerous other inscriptions, some found near the provincial forum (RIT 343), some on the lower colonial forum (RIT 86, 145, 173?), some in the early-Christian necropolis (RIT 156, 342, 347), others of unknown origin (RIT 129, 151, 278, 339, 346). More important for present purposes is that on the central terrace of the provincial sanctuary the colony erected *ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* a statue with inscribed base to C. Calpurnius Flaccus, who evidently restored the town walls and the ‘Temple of Augustus’ about the time that Hadrian visited Tarraco in the winter of A.D. 121/122 (RIT 264)⁹. The statue will therefore have been dedicated by the *ordo Tarraconensium* independently of the provincial council, to which the text does not refer. With this may be compared an inscribed base from a statue to the provincial priest L. Fonteius Maternus Novatianus, likewise dedicated *ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* but found in the region of the Calle de San Agustín – so outside the provincial forum, from which it looks nevertheless to have been removed (RIT 279). Here too there is no mention of the *concilium*. Again, a text found in the temple precinct, to which it was probably transferred from the forum immediately below, records simply that the *cives Tarraconenses* have set up a statue with inscribed base to the provincial *flaminica* Aurelia Marcellina, whose husband may have been provincial *flamen* (RIT 320). To all appearances, therefore, the inscription of Fuscus(?) is unique among surviving records in attesting the attachment of a municipal decree to a dedication by the provincial council. The combination raises two obvious questions. What were the *honores* decreed by the *ordo Tarraconensium* and why should these be mentioned as a rider to the dedication which the council inscribed on the base of the honorific statue to Fuscus(?).

Comparison with other epigraphical texts at Tarraco might suggest as a first possibility the conferral of *honores aedilicii*. For instance, L. Fonteius Maternus Novatianus was awarded *aedilicii honores* by the *ordo*, very probably of Tarraco in light of his offices, tribe, and the dedication by the senate (RIT 278f.). Comparison of the two inscriptions that document his career shows that after receiving honours as an aedile he served as *duumvir*, *quaestor*, *iudex decuriarum III*, and *flamen Divi Vespasiani* before Nerva bestowed the public horse, more probably during rather than before his provincial flamine. It is difficult to see how similar honours could have been intended in the case of Fuscus(?), however, as the appendix to his inscription seems to indicate that *honores* were awarded subsequently to the provincial flamine, after the close of the recorded *cursus*. Had *honores aedilicii* been meant, these should have been awarded earlier, before the *duumvirate*. In any case why should a grant of aedile honours by the town *ordo* be mentioned as a supplement to the honorific statue set up by the provincial council? Much the same point holds for the inscriptions of M. Granius Probo, who discharged *aedilicii honores* after serving first as *decurio*, then as *pontifex* (RIT 345), or of Aemilius Valerius Chorintus (sic), who is described simply as *homo bonus* (RIT 336). The inscription of P. Fabius Lepidus, in contrast, records that he was honoured with a posthumous statue *ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) Tarr(aconensium), adiectis ornamentis aedilici(i)s* (RIT 343), but in his case the grant of aedile honours after his death is plainly appropriate for someone whose career in no way matched that of Fuscus(?). These seem to be the only examples at Tarraco of the grant of *honores*, which in all cases except that of Fuscus(?) are explicitly termed *aedilicii honores*, *honores aedilicii* or *ornamenta aedilicia*. Otherwise the term *honores* appears

⁸ Alföldy (n. 2) 10–14, 57; (n. 6) 619.

⁹ Alföldy (n. 2) 66f., no. 13; D. Fishwick, The ‘Temple of Augustus’ at Tarraco, *Latomus* 57, 1998, forthcoming.

in the common umbrella formula *omnibus honoribus in re publica sua functus* (RIT *ibid.*), a turn of phrase unconnected with the notice recorded in the appendix to the inscription of Fuscus(?).

II

The decree of the *ordo Tarraconensium* conferring honours which seem to supplement or cap the distinction of a statue set up by the province becomes comprehensible once it is considered in the context of new regulations that were evidently introduced at the provincial centre of Hispania Citerior in the early years of the Flavian era. As argued in detail on a previous occasion¹⁰, provisions akin to those of the *Lex de flamonio provinciae Galliae Narbonensis* (CIL 12, 6038 = ILS 6964) look to have been followed in a wide range of other provinces of the Latin West; one clause or another of similar regulations are to all appearances echoed or reflected in inscriptions from *Tres Galliae*¹¹, Hispania Citerior, Baetica, Africa Proconsularis, Lusitania and Sardinia. In Hither Spain the most obvious correspondence is the practice itself of erecting honorific statues to outgoing priests on satisfactory completion of their term, an honour regulated in careful detail by a clause of the *Lex Narbonensis* (Il. 11f.). This conclusion is considerably strengthened, if not confirmed, by the circumstance that statues to provincial priests begin all of a sudden at the beginning of the Flavian era, precisely the period when on both internal and external evidence the *Lex Narbonensis* appears to have been issued as a *lex data* by the central Roman administration¹². There are some minor differences in the exercise of what was evidently the same ruling, more particularly the inscribed statue bases at Tarraco omit to give the exact year of the flamate and set out the *cursus in extenso*, a point on which the Narbonese law does not insist¹³. But with the same clause followed in other provinces, if with variations in application, there is no reason to doubt that in the early years of Vespasian's reign similar regulations were introduced at Tarraco to those that applied elsewhere. What one could expect in consequence is that other clauses known from the *Lex Narbonensis* would likewise be operative at the Tarraco provincial centre.

Two of these are of particular interest in the present context. It seems clear from the Narbo text, much restored though it is, that the provincial *flamen* will have resided at Narbo throughout his year and in his capacity as chairman of the provincial council have had a place on the local senate, possibly on a par with the town *duoviri*: that is, he will have been an honorary decurion of Narbo (Il. 4f.)¹⁴. If a parallel provision applied at Tarraco and the chairman of the concilium of Hither Spain was a member of the local *ordo* at the colony of Tarraco, it is easy to see how a relevant decree of the Tarraco senate could be appended to a dedication set up by the provincial council. A second regulation concerns the outgoing *flamen*. As provided in the *Lex Narbonensis*, he is to have the right to express his opinion (*ius sententiae dicendae*) and to vote (*ius signandi*), both in his own curia and in the provincial assembly, seated among (the men) of his rank. Other honours include participation in the provincial assembly, a seat at the games, and permission to wear his vestment on festival days just as he did during his term as priest at the provincial centre: *Eidem li]n curia sua et concilio provinciae Narbonensis inter (homines) sui ordinis secundum le[... 35 ...]l sententiae dicendae signandique ius esto; item spectaculo publico in provincia [... 22 ... interesse liceto prae]textato eisque diebus, quibus cum flamen esset sacrificium fecerit, ea veste pe[... 42 ... vacat] ...* (CIL 12, 6038: Il. 13–16; cf. 5.)¹⁵. On the basis of these lines one can then restore the provision regarding the place of the provincial *flamen* on the local council of Narbo:

¹⁰ D. Fishwick, *Flavian Regulations at the Sanctuary of the Three Gauls?*, ZPE 124, 1998, 249–260 at 254ff.

¹¹ Cf. CIL 13, 1675, 1713; Fishwick (n. 10) 250–253 with nn. 37–53.

¹² D. Fishwick, *Our First High Priest: a Gallic Knight at Athens*, Epigraphica 60, 1998, 83–112.

¹³ Alföldy (n. 2) 3, 10–14.

¹⁴ C. H. Williamson, *A Roman Law from Narbonne*, Athenaeum 65, 1987, 173–189 at 181f. ad CIL 12, 6038: l. 4.

¹⁵ Cf. Williamson (n. 14) 182, 186f.; Fishwick, ICLW, Vol. I, 1, 32; II, 1, 479f., 579f., 617f. For Athenian priests entitled to a special seat at the theatre of Dionysus see IG 3, 243ff.

[.35.]ui in decurionibus senatue [sententiae dicendae signandique ... 12 ... | ... 15 ... inter decuriones]enatoresve subsellio primo spectan[di ius esto ... 30 ...] (Il. 4f.).

Could, then, either of these provisions lie behind the honores decreed by the ordo Tarraconensium in the case of Fuscus? Certainly not the second. In the first place, if we suppose that Fuscus(?) originated from Tarraco, he will surely have been a member of the local ordo at the time he served as legatus and attended the one or several meetings of the provincial council held at the provincial centre. During his term as provincial priest, when by similar regulations he will have served on the local senate of the city where the provincial centre was located, he presumably remained in theory an inactive member of his local curia, to which he returned with full privileges on conclusion of his mandate. But it so happens in the case of Fuscus(?) that the local senate on which he served as provincial priest will have been that of the provincial capital Tarraco – in practice his own local curia if Tarraco was his patria. It follows that on this view he will have been a member of the ordo Tarraconensium before, during and after his provincial office, in which case the decree appended to the text on his honorific statue can hardly have conferred honours that he already possessed or rights he was already exercising. Nor can the reference be to a special rank in the local ordo of Tarraco as this is already laid down in the relevant provision of the Lex Narbonensis, a version of which was evidently operative in Hispania Citerior. The emphasis of the clause is on the right of the former flamen to speak and vote, whether in his own curia or at the provincial centre, *inter (homines) sui ordinis*, so the main difference in his position after having served as high priest of the province is that he now enjoyed a higher social rank than previously when he was an ordinary member of the local ordo¹⁶. Evidently election to the provincial priesthood brought a step up in society by admitting an ex-priest to the class recorded in Hispania Citerior and Baetica as *virii flamines*¹⁷. At all events a decree of the ordo Tarraconensium along these lines would have been unnecessary and superfluous.

These difficulties disappear if Fuscus(?) was in fact a native of somewhere other than Tarraco. Given the state of the second line of RIT 316, which would certainly have given his tribe, perhaps also his origin, this is a distinct possibility. In that case the supplement to the honorific text set up by the provincial council could very well record admission to the ordo Tarraconensium of a past priest from another community. For two key parallels one can turn to Sardinia, where inscriptions at Cornus¹⁸ and Bosa¹⁹ record that a priest of the province has been “adlected” by the ordo of Carales – *adlecto ab splendidissimo ordine Karalitanorum* – that is, the local senate of the provincial capital, which accommodated the provincial centre and headquarters of the provincial council. In the Cornus text this is stated to have occurred with the consent of the province – *ex consensu provinciae Sardiniae* – and a similar phrase is possibly to be supplied in the missing section of the Bosa text. At Tarraco the

¹⁶ See in general Williamson (n. 14) 185f., noting the descending order of the fourth-century album of the ordo of Thamugadi, in which provincial sacerdotales (2) are listed in third place after patroni viri clarissimi (10) and patroni viri perfectissimi (2) but above the curator reipublicae, the highest elected official (CIL 8, 2403); cf. A. Chastagnol, L’Album municipal de Timgad, Antiquitas ser. 3, 22, Bonn 1978, 26, 28.

¹⁷ The statue of C. Valerius Arabinus (above, p. 291) was to be set up *inter flamines viros* (RIT 333). For the term *pietissimus vir flaminialis provinciae Baeticae* see EE8, 89 (Zafra), reading C. Varinius Fidus.

¹⁸ [...]tiano [...] Ba[s]so cos. | [...]nconij[i].] fil. Crescenti | sac[er]d. prov. Sard. adlec[to] | ab splendidissim[o] ordin. | [Ka]ral. ex consensu prov. Sar[d.] | [pont]if. [...] ci[v]i[t]a.tis c[on]s[ul]t[is] | [...]t[is] | [...]no civi equo [...]ssii[...]iii | [...]ua[...].] | [...]s . c[on]s[ul]t[is] | [...]o[.] or[di]nis continetur [...] | munificen[tia] colle[gi]i | [...] Arrio Iscini[...].] | [...]s[...].] (CIL 10, 7917: Cornus). For a version of the text see A. Mastino, Cornus nella storia degli studi, Cagliari 1979, 111f., developing ... sac[er]d[ot]i (l. 4); cf. G. Sotgiu, L’epigrafia latina in Sardegna dopo il CIL X e l’E.E. VIII in ANRW, Berlin 1988, II, 11, 1, 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, 1997, 449–459.

¹⁹ [...] sac[er]dos] | Urb[is] Rom[ae], flam[en] prov[inc]iae Sard[in]iae, ad[le]c[t]u[s] ab] splendidiss[im]o [o]rd[in]e Karalitanorum? [...] s[t]udiis [populi ex consensu prov[inc]iae Sard[in]iae)? (Bosa Vetus). For analysis see D. Fishwick, A Priestly Career at Bosa, Imago Antiquitatis: Mélanges R. Turcan, Paris 1999, forthcoming, ad CIL 10, 7940.

terminology refers to the passing of the relevant decree – *ordo Tarraconensium honores decrevit* – rather than to its implementation, but in either case the reference is evidently to the same step, admission to the local order. There is no equivalent at Tarraco to the consent of the province, as recorded at Cornus, but the very fact that the supplementary clause is appended to the text inscribed on the base of the honorific statue which the province has granted Fuscus(?) surely implies its agreement to the decree of the local *ordo*. Despite formal differences, then, the Tarraco inscription provides a clear equivalent to the two texts from Sardinia recording the adlection of a past priest to the local *ordo*. It might be added that other instances of admission to the *ordo* of Tarraco are attested by the regular *adlectus* formula²⁰.

Why a former provincial priest should be admitted to the local *ordo* of Carales or Tarraco emerges from the first of the provisions of the *Lex Narbonensis* mentioned above. As ll. 4f. make clear, the current provincial priest will have been a temporary member of the municipal senate of the provincial capital during his term of one year. As such, he would have had the right to speak and vote, in particular on matters that concerned the interaction between the provincial council and the local *ordo*. What has plainly happened, therefore, at Tarraco as at Carales, is that once his term was completed (presumably) a provincial priest has taken the opportunity to put on a permanent basis the membership of the prestigious *ordo* of the provincial capital which he had enjoyed during his mandate²¹. In all three cases the *ordo* has acceded to his wishes with the express or implied consent of the provincial council.

If this interpretation is correct, what the inscription of Fuscus(?) preserves is an indirect reflection of regulations like those of the *Lex Narbonensis*. As such, it provides invaluable confirmation that the inference we have drawn from the sudden appearance of honorific statues to provincial priests is in fact correct, namely that similar regulations to those of the *Lex Narbonensis* were in force at the provincial centre of Tarraco²². The curious attachment of a municipal decree of Tarraco to a provincial dedication in honour of a provincial priest – an occurrence difficult, if not impossible, to explain on other grounds – looks comprehensible in the light of directives similar to those of the *Lex Narbonensis*. In that case the text is of outstanding significance in preserving a further echo of regulations, varying aspects of which we have identified in so many other provinces of the Western Roman empire.

University of Alberta

Duncan Fishwick

²⁰ See in particular *dec. Tarrac. adlectus* (RIT 172); *adlectus in ordine Tarracon.* (RIT 338); *decuri[o ad]lec[t]. in col. Ta[rrac.]* (RIT 339); cf. *[adlectus int]er quinqu[en]na[les ex dec]ret. ordi[ni]s col.] Tarr[ac.]* (RIT 342). In each instance the *adlectus* formula belongs to a *cursus* within an inscription set up privately or by local authorities, and the same is true of the Cornus and Bosa texts. The different formulation in the case of Fuscus(?) is presumably to be explained by the circumstance that this is an appendix to the text which the provincial council has placed on the statue base. It follows that Fuscus(?) will have been admitted to the *ordo Tarraconensium* following completion of his year's term as provincial flamen. On the admission of outsiders to a local *ordo* see recently J. C. Saquete Chamizo, *Las elites sociales de Augusta Emerita, Mérida*, 1997, 89.

²¹ Fishwick (n. 18) 454.

²² *Hispania Citerior* is one of the few Latin provinces where the initiative for establishing a provincial cult came from below (Tac., Ann. 1, 78); a similar proposal by an embassy from Baetica was unsuccessful (Tac. Ann. 4, 37). Under Vespasian the provincial cults of both provinces were plainly regulated by the central administration in Rome.