

Durham E-Theses

A study of the municipal aristocracies of the roman empire in the west, with special reference to north Africa

Michael Grierson Jarrett

How to cite:

Jarrett, Michael Grierson (1958) A study of the municipal aristocracies of the roman empire in the west, with special reference to north Africa. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/1980/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

A STUDY OF THE MUNICIPAL ARISTOCRACIES OF THE
ROMAN EMPIRE IN THE WEST,
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO NORTH AFRICA.

A dissertation presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Durham by

MICHAEL G. JARRETT, B.A.,
Hatfield College.

May, 1958.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

PREFACE.

The majority of the work for this thesis was done with the aid of a Durham Colleges' Research Studentship. My thanks are due to all who have assisted in any way. The maps were produced with the aid of Messrs. W. Dodds, R.W. Lucas and G. McWhirter. M. H.G. Pflaum most generously made available the galley-proofs of his forthcoming "Carrieres procuratoriennes équestres". Above all, thanks are due to Professor Eric Birley, who has supervised the project since its inception, has made available his own books and files, and has probably contributed more than he or I realises in conversation and discussion.

2.

LIST OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME ONE.

	PAGE.
Chapter One: Introduction.	5.
Chapter Two: The economic basis of town life.	10.
Chapter Three: The age of municipal magistrates.	14.
Chapter Four: The composition of the <u>ordo</u> : The Album of Timgad and the Album of Canusium.	14.
Chapter Five: <u>Praefectura fabrum</u> .	26.
Chapter Six: The <u>quinque decuriae</u> .	31.
Chapter Seven: <u>Equus publicus</u> .	34.
Chapter Eight: Equestrian officers from North Africa.	38.
Chapter Nine: Equestrian procurators from the North African provinces.	53.
Chapter Ten: Provincial councils.	62.
Appendix One: The organisation of Cirta and its associated colonies.	70.
Appendix Two: Priesthoods at Cuicul.	76.
Appendix Three: Auzia.	78.
Appendix Four: Carthage: Magistrates and priests.	80.
Appendix Five: Gighis.	83.
Appendix Six: Selected family histories.	85.
Abbreviations:	96.
Bibliography of works quoted in the text:	98.
Index of persons named in the text.	101.

VOLUME TWO.

Prosopography:	114.
----------------	------

PORTFOLIO:

Genealogical tables.

Maps.

LIST OF MAPS.

- ONE: Distribution of decurions from the North African provinces.
- TWO: Economic life in Roman North Africa.
- THREE: Distribution of praefecti fabrum.
- FOUR: Distribution of members of the quinque decuriae.
- FIVE: Distribution of recipients of the equus publicus.
- SIX: Distribution of equestrian officers.
- SEVEN: Distribution of equestrian procurators.
- EIGHT: Distribution of magistrates and priests from Carthage.

LIST OF GENEALOGICAL TABLES.

- ONE: The Servaei of Gigthis.
- TWO: The Ummidii of Gigthis.
- THREE: The Septimii of Lepcis Magna (as proposed by M.J. Guey.).
- FOUR: The Septimii of Lepcis Magna.
- FIVE: The Vetidii of Thubursicu Numidarum.
- SIX: The Caecilii of Volubilis.
- SEVEN: The Caecilii of Volubilis (hypothetical restoration.)

CHAPTER ONE.INTRODUCTION.

The municipal system in the Roman Empire as a whole has been treated by Abbott and Johnson; while this dissertation clarifies some points of detail, it is concerned with persons rather than systems. Professor Birley has shown that a large proportion of equestrian officers of all dates were drawn from men who served as magistrates in the towns of Italy and the provinces. From these equestrian officers were drawn many of the men who reached the highest posts in the equestrian service. It is the aim of this work to place in context the decurions of North Africa, and then to study the contribution of the North African provinces to the emperor's equestrian service.

Any such study must depend on a detailed study of individual careers. The prosopography (bound separately, as Volume Two, for convenience) is the first stage in processing of some of the material. The next stage is to be found in the chapters, especially those on the equestrian officers and procurators from North Africa. Included in the prosopography are all the equestrian officers and procurators of whose African origin I have been convinced; a number of similar men whose African origin is uncertain, or has been suggested by other scholars on what seem to be inadequate grounds; and some senators whose families had close connections with the upper classes of the African towns. Also included are a number of municipal dignitaries (e.g. C. Caecilius Gallus, L. Cosinius Primus) whose careers seemed to require special comment, and primipilares, many of whom will have received commissions as centurions on the basis of their equestrian status.

Two points connected with the prosopography are to be noted. It has been the aim to cite every relevant discussion of each career. RE is only quoted where the discussion is useful - for the most part the articles by Groag and Stein. Works which have been superseded are normally quoted when the view expressed in them differs from more recent opinions - e.g. Lambrechts II is rarely quoted, except where Barbieri is less adequate or unconvincing.

The second point is that the debt to M. H.G. Pflaum can scarcely be

67
expressed adequately in the Preface. Without the galley-proofs of his 'Carrieres procuratoriennes', the discussion of procurators would be far less adequate; in the prosopography, CP is only quoted at length when there is reason to question some of the views expressed in it; in the majority of notes on procurators, CP has been followed without question, a fact which may at first sight be concealed by the brief citation of M. Pflaum's discussion.

The material used throughout this work is mainly epigraphic; to avoid the distraction of numerous footnotes or references in the text, all persons mentioned by name are included in an index which gives the most convenient reference to an inscription or discussion. For Africans it also gives the origo, if this is known.

On a similar principle, printed works cited in the text are normally listed in the bibliography; only there will full details be found. The references in the text are normally given in the briefest intelligible form. Where only one work by an author has been used, the author's name seems to be sufficient; where more than one work is cited, a keyword is normally used; thus 'Les procurateurs équestres sous le haut-Empire romain' by H.G. Pflaum (Paris, 1950) is cited as Pflaum, Procurateurs; 'Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien' by A. Stein (Budapest, 1944) as Stein, Dacia.

The scope of this work, geographically and historically is limited. Except in the chapter on provincial councils, the area considered is that of the three African provinces of the first century A.D.; Africa Proconsularis, Mauretania Caesariensis, and Mauretania Tingitana. Numidia, which did not become a province de iure until the reign of Severus, has been regarded as a separate province (as it was by the imperial administration) throughout the period of the empire. The main period covered by this work is the first two and a half centuries of the Christian era; the bulk of the material which can be securely dated coming in the second and early third centuries. Some later developments in municipal organisation are considered, but there is no suggestion that this consideration is a full treatment of the subject.

The municipal magistracies held in provincial towns have been outlined

dicundo; the post of duovir quinquennalis, with census duties, was held every four years, usually by men who had already been duoviri. A priesthood of the imperial cult, involving a seat on the provincial council, was normally held after the duovirate. This pattern, with minor variations, seems to have held good throughout the African provinces.

As far as possible, an attempt has been made to compare the numbers of equestrian officers, praefecti fabrum, etc. produced by the various provinces. The comparisons have been made, but it is not clear how far they are valid; the number of men known as equestrian officers (for example) in any province will depend on several factors besides the number of such men who were natives of that province. 'Epigraphic consciousness' will be of considerable importance - the popularity of the custom of setting up inscriptions will vary from province to province and from period to period; geology will also be important, for where suitable stone has to be imported from a distance, inscriptions are likely to be erased and the stones re-used; also some inscriptions may be carved on wood or painted on stone. The relative wealth of individual provinces will also have had an effect on the number of inscriptions set up, and the number of inscriptions found is likely to be in direct relation to the amount of excavation which has been carried out - with the proviso that cemeteries will provide more inscriptions than public buildings, and public buildings more than private houses or industrial establishments. The amount of later building on Roman sites will be an important factor; on the one hand it may have the same effect as excavation, and result in the finding of inscriptions; on the other it may result in the destruction and re-use of inscriptions and the closing of a site to further investigation.

These arguments which suggest that a comparison of provinces may not be wholly valid are even stronger when we compare town with town. This will be seen from Map One, which shows the distribution of decurions for most of the towns of Africa. It is clear that the principal reason why Leptis Magna and Thugga have produced more evidence of decurions than Carthage or Hadrumetum is that they have been more intensively excavated, not that they were larger or more prosperous.

In any case, the majority of decurions are not recorded; at Thugga fifty-seven are known and at Cuicul fifty-three; but with an ordo of one hundred members, serving for about thirty years each, there would be three or four new decurions a year - or about a dozen every time the roll of the ordo was revised by the quinquennales. It will be clear that our records are far from complete. The only town with a reasonably high proportion of its decurions recorded at any date is Tingad, where we have an almost complete list of the members of the curia in the reign of Julian or his successor.

Several aspects of the main subject have not received full treatment. In particular, there is no major discussion of the cost of municipal office. The subject is one which is too complex for treatment in a work of this scale. The recording of the amount paid on election to a particular magistracy appears to have been particularly common in Numidia; it is less frequent in Proconsularis, and almost unknown in the Mauretanas. Several of the main factors involved in a study of this aspect of municipal life may be outlined. There was a minimum amount payable for each office, known as the legitima; this was probably stated in the charter of the town (cf the charters of Malaca and Salpensa, ILS 6089, 6088), and might therefore vary from town to town. Normally a magistrate was expected to pay more than the legitima. The taxatio appears to have been individual assessment, based on the wealth of the man concerned. Certainly the taxatio of L. Cosinius Primus (30,000 sesterces) was unusually high.

In this particular case, the money was spent on a covered market; the most common object was a statue for the forum or for a temple; at Cuicul there seems to have been a standard quality of statue in the second century, costing three thousand sesterces. Not infrequently money was spent on public games or banquets for the ordo, rather than on public works; such expenditure probably had the disadvantage that it had to be made at once, whereas the gift of a statue could be delayed for some time - there are frequent instances of flamines dedicating statues or buildings promised before election to the aedilate, probably eight or more years earlier.

1.

Each chapter of this dissertation contains a recapitulation of its main conclusions, so that little is needed here. It will be seen that normally the upper classes of the African towns made their living from agriculture or trade. Entering the ordo as decurions or quaestors in their early twenties, they would probably become duoviri soon after the age of thirty. Then many would have the opportunity to visit Rome as members of the quinque decuriae or as praefecti fabrum. A proportion might obtain commissions as equestrian officers, with the possibility (but not the likelihood) of appointment as procurators afterwards. A number of men achieved prominence by becoming chairmen of the provincial council; such men must have been at least in their late thirties; where they received any appointment in the imperial service, it was normally the tribunate of a legion held as the only post. Important as was the African contribution to the equestrian service, it only became important under Hadrian for the lower ranks and under Marcus for the procuratorships. By the end of the reign of Commodus, Africans were probably the largest provincial group in the imperial service, and under Severus, himself a native of Lepcis Magna, they became still more important.

In the third century a change becomes apparent; rather less Africans appear to have been admitted to the imperial service (but this may only reflect the lack of evidence); those who were seem to be divided into two groups. Most of the equestrian officers were recruited without previous experience as municipal magistrates and were natives of the frontier areas of Numidia and Mauretania Caesariensis; for the most part the men from the more romanised towns seem to have preferred a strictly civilian career, beginning as advocatus, fisci.

It appears that Africans were able to reach the highest posts in the empire from an early date. Ser. Sulpicius Similis, the last praetorian prefect appointed by Trajan, appears to have been a native of Carthage. Under Pius, Q. Lollius Urbicus became praefectus urbis; at the same time Cornelius Fronto, a native of Cirta, was tutor to Marcus Aurelius. The influence of these two men must have been considerable. It was perhaps due to this influence that so many Africans were appointed to high office in the second half of the second century, so that at the death of Commodus they were in an extremely strong position, holding two of the three provinces with three legions, as well as the

CHAPTER TWO.THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF TOWN LIFE.

Mr. A. N. Sherwin-White draws attention to the fact that Rostovtzeff's view of the North African towns is directly contrary to the judgments of those who have excavated individual town sites. Rostovtzeff regarded the towns as the homes of a land-owning aristocracy, with whom were associated government officials; in contrast cultivation was by peasants (tenants or hired labourers) who lived in squalid conditions, usually on their land rather than in the towns.

'The cities were only a superstructure based on a developed rural and agricultural life, and the city residents formed but a minority in comparison with the large number of actual tillers of the soil, the peasants, who were mostly natives, rarely descendants of immigrants.' (p. 287)

'The cities were inhabited by landowners who formed the ruling aristocracy. The landowners were the only legally recognized citizens of the city.' (p. 293)

By contrast, Gsell, in publishing his excavations of the sites of Thubursicu Numidarum, Madauros and Thibilis (Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Announa, passim.) showed that these three towns were primarily agricultural. Sherwin-White points out that the Mediterranean town is very often a peasant community, farming land at a considerable distance from the town, and perhaps living on the land during the summer. This, he suggests, was the typical pattern of the North African towns. The number of towns, small though many of them were, suggests that it is unlikely that they could have been inhabited exclusively by a land-owning upper class. It is likely that Madauros had between two and five thousand inhabitants; many of the other towns were considerably larger. There is no room for towns like those envisaged by Rostovtzeff. In the western empire, such towns only appeared at the end of the third century in Gaul; there many of the towns were deserted by almost everyone except the government officials, and the towns became small centres of civil and ecclesiastical administration. Such shrunken communities are unknown in Africa, which did not suffer from barbarian raids in the same way as Gaul.

Some towns were certainly commercial centres; this is of course especially true of the ports. In Numidia the ports were few, and Numidian

exports had to go by way of Rusicade, Hippo Regius or Carthage. In Proconsularis there were rather more ports. Those of Tripolitania served their own immediate hinterland, as did the group consisting of Hadrumetum, Leptis Minus, Acholla and Thaenae. Lepcis Magna was an important centre for the export of wild animals to Rome. The many towns of the Bagradas valley must have depended on Carthage for most of their trade; this is indicated by the road system, as well as by the absence of other convenient ports. In Caesariensis the position was different; the narrow coastal plain is almost cut off from the interior, and the ports of the province must have depended for their trade on their individual products. It is in this light that we are to see the garum (fish-sauce) and wine factories at Tipasa; the ports of Caesariensis could not live on the trade reaching them from the interior, and needed industries of their own. We should however note that a merchant from the date-producing area of Mesarfelta, north of Biskra, is buried at Tipasa; this may indicate a trade route. In the interior, only Cirta and Timgad suggest that they were more than market towns; both are situated at important road-junctions, and Timgad has produced evidence of three covered markets, as well as an industrial area. (See map 2 for the whole of this chapter).

Industrial towns, as such, are practically unknown in North Africa. Simitthu depended mainly on the famous Numidian marble quarries, which also brought some prosperity to Thabraca, its nearest port. Many other towns had industrial areas; fish-sauce was made at Tipasa (clearly for export; presumably fishing was also an important industry); At Timgad there was a foundry and a potter's workshop. Satafis, Theveste, Cuicul, Madauros, Volubilis and 'presque toutes les villes de Tunisie' had factories for the production of olive-oil. (Camps-Fabrer, p. 57). Caesarea, Cuicul, Madauros and Tipasa have produced evidence of wine-making, though usually on a small-scale. Most towns would have a pottery and perhaps a workshop for the production of mosaics; so at least we may deduce from the large number of mosaics found in the North African provinces. The bigger towns would also have craftsmen employed in luxury industries; Caesarea had a silversmith's guild and a lamp factory.

112.
It is clear however that none of these towns was primarily dependent on industry; agriculture was the main source of wealth for almost all the towns of Africa. A few, like Cuicul, might also add to the wealth derived from their position as a market-town, but for most of them the pattern of an agricultural town suggested by Sherwin-White seems to be the nearest to truth.

The importance of Africa to Rome lay in the production of corn. This at least is the most widely expressed view, though it is clear that it must be modified to some extent. Corn had been produced in the Bagradas valley in the first century and earlier, but by the second century the land was exhausted, and was turned over to olives and fruit. Corn was still grown, especially in a strip extending from Sitifis in the west to Sicca Veneria in the east, and including both Cuicul and Cirta. The prosperity of these towns and of others in this area indicated that corn was an extremely profitable crop. But the prosperity of the towns in the areas where the olive was the principal crop is also noteworthy, and it seems that the olive must have been almost as important as corn to the economy of Africa. It was in connection with the cultivation of olives that the great irrigation schemes round Theveste and elsewhere were undertaken. Oil was an important item in the annona: Sex. Iulius Possessor was adiutor praef. annon. ad oleum Afrum et Hispanum under Marcus and Verus. The mercatores frumentari et oleari Afrari set up an inscription to the praefectus annonae (ILS 1342 = VI 1620).

Vines were cultivated in most of the areas where the olive thrived. It has been suggested that from the time of Domitian the cultivation of the vine would be discouraged by the emperor; it is perhaps from such an imperial prohibition that the large-scale cultivation of the olive is to be dated. Much of the olive-growing land was on imperial estates - e.g. in the region of Theveste - revealing the fact that these estates were not exclusively concerned with the growing of corn for Rome.

It will be seen at once that we have little detailed evidence for the economic life of the African towns. There must have been much more industry - though probably on a small scale - than has come to light. We are still uncertain of the significance of the markets which occur at towns like Tingad

and Cuicul; we do not know whether they imply large-scale commercial dealings, or simply such transactions in agricultural goods as are expected in a modern market town. One thing is clear: by and large the towns of Africa prospered during the Roman period. * It was on this prosperity that the success of many of their dignitaries in the imperial service was based.

* It is true that we can find periods of unusual recession; some towns never recovered from occasional setbacks, but suffered a permanent decline. For instance, the ports of Byzacena, which had mostly traded with the east, were ruined by the imperial insistence that all African produce should go to Italy - for other ports already had a monopoly of the Italian trade. M. G-Ch. Picard, in making this point, quotes the 'Stadiasmus of the Great Sea' as saying that at that period (c A.D. 400) these ports of Byzacena could only take small vessels. (Karthago IV, pp. 121 - 135; for the Stadiasmus, see Thomson, History of Ancient Geography, p. 363).

CHAPTER THREE. THE AGE OF MUNICIPAL MAGISTRATES.

Material for the average age of men serving as magistrates in the towns of North Africa is slight; occasionally a man has died while aedile-designate or duovir-designate, so that we know the age at which he would have held the office. Apart from this we can only examine a few cases where it seems clear that a man has held office at a relatively early age, or has never held any or every office. It would be difficult to claim that we have sufficient material to put forward a clear picture. There is no evidence for the age of quaestors; the post of quaestor is one which is frequently not recorded on a cursus honorum (though it was probably held), and there are no records of men dying before holding any further posts. Inevitably, our evidence comes only from those towns where cemeteries have been excavated; but it is sufficiently unanimous for us to suggest that it would be valid for the whole of the North African provinces.

The age at which men might become members of the ordo must have been quite low; Cod. Th. XII, i, 19 states that as a general rule, curiales should not be expected to serve before reaching the age of eighteen. This was probably disregarded; even if we ignore the case of a child of five at Volubilis, we find that M. Ulpian Victor Seianus was a decurion at the age of sixteen and G. Gellius Seneca at eighteen. But at twenty-one Q. Caecilius Saturninus Iunior was still not a decurion, even though his father had been duovir.

The aedilate was normally held in the mid-twenties; the provision of Ulpian (Digest L, iv, 8) that no man should hold municipal office before the age of twenty-five seems to have been a dead letter. Q. Octavius Primus was aedile-designate at twenty-three, and P. Aelius Afininus was only a year older. Saturninus of Thubursicu Numidarum died as aedile or ex-aedile at the age of twenty-five, as did L. Fabius Fortunatus. However not every man reached office at the minimum age; M. Vetidius Vetidianus died as aedile-designate at the age of thirty-eight. L. Antonius Lucianus was still only a decurion at the age of twenty-four, L. Sittius Rufinus at twenty-seven (though he had

received the equus publicus) and Postumius Laetianus at twenty-eight. In addition there is a group of older men who never became magistrates - the oldest being C. Iulius Rogatus who was only a decurion at the age of eighty. Not every member of the ordo was likely to become a magistrate, and we are justified in including in this class all who had held no post before the age of fifty.

The case of M. Vetidius Vetidianus deserves further comment; he was possibly a man who did not become a decurion until he had established a position for himself by his own efforts, or he may have been called upon to fill an unexpected gap in the aedilate. His father had been flamen annuus - a municipal priest of lower standing than the flamen perpetuus. The family history (Appendix 6) shows that Vetidianus belonged to the less important branch of his family; in the same generation his cousin Q. Vetidius Iuvenalis held all the principal magistracies of the town, summing them up in the phrase omnibus honoribus functus. (In this case the honores included the post of duovir quinquennalis, though there is reason to suppose that this post was not always included.)

It is a well-known fact that the minimum age for the duovirate was thirty (Lex Malacitana - ILS 6089 - c 54); but as with the consulate at Rome, this did not mean that a man would normally reach the office at the minimum age. (A. & J. p. 59 suggests that the age dropped to 'twenty-five at least' in the first century A.D., This is based on a misinterpretation of Pliny, Epistles, lxxix, 2, which deals only with minores magistratus.) At the age of thirty-eight, M. Vetidius Vetidianus was only aedile-designate. At the age of thirty-seven T. Flavius Receptus was still only aedile, as were L. Laberius Vibullus at thirty-three and L. Fabius Fortunatus at thirty-five. These are by no means the oldest men who reached the aedilate without becoming duoviri. C. Iulius Urbanus was seventy-one and Sex. Sempronius Saturninus was ninety-five, though he had held a flamine; this was probably the municipal flamine mentioned above, since he had never been duovir as had most flamines perpetui.

During the Principate only one man, M. Pomponius Maximus is known to

have held the duovirate before the minimum age. At the age of thirty-two he had been duovir twice, pontifex and quinquennalis. It looks very much as though he must have been duovir at latest at the age of twenty-seven or twenty-eight. Sex. Pompeius Marianus and Q. Seius Iuvenalis died as duoviri at the age of thirty; either of them might have been in office at a younger age. Marius Victor was duumviru iter by the age of forty. At a later date another instance occurs at Lepcis Magna, where father and son held office together as duoviri at some time during the fourth century. The son, T. Flavius Vibianus Iunior, is described as innocentissimus puer and in parvulis annis. These examples must be set against others, where men in their thirties are still only aedilicii and against the sole case of a duovir-designate, C. Cornelius Flaccus, who was thirty-five. He had already been prefect of a cohort. For men like M. Pomponius Maximus, we may put forward the suggestion that an ante-date was permitted for a man with children, as it was with some of the senatorial magistracies at Rome.

Although this is the only case in which we know the precise age at which the duovirate was held, I suspect that it is somewhere near the average. Four men in their thirties were still aedilicii; only one man was duovir before the age of thirty, and two at thirty. L. Caecilius Clemens was duumviralicius by the age of thirty-three. It seems then that the normal age for the office of duovir was in the early or mid-thirties; we have no instance of it being held later.

The age at which a man might be duumvir quinquennalis cannot be clearly defined. Only a few inscriptions are relevant. The case of M. Pomponius Maximus, duovir before he was thirty and quinquennalis by the age of thirty-two, is clearly exceptional. His relative, Q. Pomponius Crispinus, had been tribunus militum and quinquennalis when he died at the age of forty-five. By contrast, C. Tullius Frontinus was quinquennalis designatus at fifty-one and M. Marius Felix Ofellianus at fifty-nine. Apparently there was normally a long interval between the ordinary duovirate and the post of duovir quinquennalis. Some men might become quinquennales without serving as duovir in an ordinary year, but we shall be justified in supposing that these will only be notable benefactors like C. Cosinius Maximus. They of course may be expected to reach the office at a relatively early age.

The flamine again presents considerable difficulties when we seek to find the age at which it was held. The difficulties are increased by the existence in various towns of minor flamines, sometimes distinguished by the title annuus; it is not always possible to see which type of flamine a man has held. Normally the flamine of the imperial cult has the title perpetuus or is attributed to one of the deified emperors; but it is sometimes described as a flamine without further qualification. Such a flamine gave its holder a seat on the provincial council, though not for life; only the title was perpetuus. It was normally held after the duumvirate; but at Carthage it might come at an earlier stage in the career.

There are no clear instances of the age at which men became flamines perpetui. We know that the flamine was normally available only to men who had already served as duovir - this is indicated by an overwhelming majority of the inscriptions giving a complete municipal career. This would mean that a man would not normally be ^{flamen}~~duovir~~ before reaching the mid-thirties. The indications are, though the evidence is not conclusive, that the flamine would normally follow soon after the duumvirate.

There are one or two instances of a flamine being held at an early age; Q. Valerius Hilarianus was flamen when he died at the age of eighteen and L. Fabius Fortunatus was flamen as well as quaestor and aedile by the age of twenty-five. Neither of these flamines is qualified in any way, and neither follows the duumvirate, so that we shall be justified in supposing them to be minor municipal flamines, not carrying a seat on the provincial council.

For the age of flamines perpetui we have no direct evidence at all. We do know that it was not the inevitable sequel to the duovirate - Sex. Aelius Ladibelus who died at the age of fifty-three had never held the flamine. The only other relevant instance is that of the man attested on VIII 9073; Claudius onor edilicii pl. f; CIL suggests that the last three letters are to be interpreted as flamen perpetuus. The text throughout is dubious, but if the age of fifteen is correctly recorded it is difficult to believe that Claudius was flamen perpetuus or even aedile.

It will be clear that in the Roman Empire it was customary for men to rise to the highest posts in their towns at a relatively early age. As in senatorial careers, the aim seems to have been to secure men for magistracies while they still retained something of their youth; neither in Rome nor in the towns of the Empire was it the custom to appoint men to office when they had passed middle-age.

That men reached the highest municipal posts at an early age is of importance for another reason. It was still possible for a man who had been a magistrate to begin a career in the imperial service. For the emperor the system had the further advantage that he could secure experienced administrators who were still young enough to adapt themselves to the new conditions of the army or the civil service.

CHAPTER FOUR.THE COMPOSITION OF THE ORDO:THE ALBUM OF TIMGAD AND THE ALBUM OF CANUSIUM.

Numbers of magistrates are known from many of the African towns, but only one town, Timgad, has left us a complete list of the ordo at a given date. Without this it would be difficult to reconstruct the composition of a typical municipal council of the late fourth century. For a comparable document of the Principate, we have to turn to Italy, which has produced a similar list from Canusium, dated to 223 (IX 338 = ILS 6121 - part only reproduced by Dessau). The Timgad list (VIII 2403 = 17903 = ILS 6122 - part only; corrected in a paper by M. Louis Leschi in *Rev. des ét anc.*, 1) is dated by M. Leschi to 363 - 364. M. André Piganiol dates it to soon after the recall of the clerici to the ordo by Julian on 13 March 362, probably during the summer of that year. This must be wrong, for Leschi had already pointed out that the ordo was revised on the first of March, so that the clerici would not be included until March 363 (Cod. Th. XII, 1, 28).

At Canusium, the ordo consists of thirty-one senatorial and eight equestrian patrons, seven quinquennialicii including the two in office in 223, four men allecti inter quinquennialicios, twenty-nine duumviralicii including three who had served twice, nineteen aedilicii, nine quaestoricii, thirty-two pedani and twenty-five praetextati. Most of these groups are self-explanatory. The pedani were decurions who had not yet served as quaestors, so called from the low bench on which they sat; the praetextati are young men of decurion families, not yet old enough to be full members of the ordo - or for whom there was as yet no vacancy. Clearly the Album of Canusium was set up after the revision of the roll of the ordo by the quinquennales; possibly the praetextati are listed so that they could fill any vacancies which might arise before the next revision four years later.

The Album of Timgad contains many more groups than that of Canusium. There are ten clarissimi, but only five of them are patrons. The two

perfectissimi appear to be members of the ordo who have achieved this distinction; as Stein (Ritterstand, p. 458) points out, the title perfectissimus by this period must have a primarily municipal connotation. Hence it is not necessary to follow the verbal interpretation of M. H.G. Pflaum, quoted by Piganiol, that these men should be regarded as vir(i) p(rincipales) or p(rimarii) rather than p(erfectissimi).

Two sacerdotales, one a patron, the other flamen perpetuus, are described by Leschi as 'prêtres de la province', by Warmington (pp. 6 - 7) as 'lawyers and ex-curialibus'. If earlier history is any guide, Leschi is right, and these men are former chairmen of the provincial council. Unless they were of such prominence, there is no reason why they should appear in the list before even the curator of the town. The curator is also flamen perpetuus; his position in the list reveals that he had been elected by the ordo, not nominated by the emperor, as was the original practice with curatores (Ulpian, Digest, L, iii, 2: 'in albo decurionum in municipio nomina ante scribi oportet eorum qui dignitates principis iudicio consecuti sunt, postea eorum, qui tantum municipalibus honoribus functi sunt ').

The curator is followed by two duumviri, one of whom is augur and the other flamen perpetuus, and next come thirty-two flamines perpetui, former members of the provincial council. Unfortunately there is no means of telling how many of the thirty-six flamines recorded on the list were actually serving on the provincial council. Two of the thirty-two are exactores, with responsibility for the arrears of municipal taxes. (Piganiol prefers to retain the old view that they are excusati: but it is then difficult to see why they had become flamines, or, conversely, if they were flamines, from what they were excusatus.) The flamines are followed by four pontifices and three augures - the fourth augur is one of the duumviri. This presumably is the relative seniority of these priesthoods; the flamines, as we might expect from their provincial responsibility, are the most important, and are followed by pontifices and augurs. Since each of these latter colleges has four members, we may suggest that there were also four flamines in any one year. The high number recorded is due to the fact

that the title (but not the function) was perpetuus: flamines were not members of the provincial council for life.

The augurs are followed by the two aediles for the year, and then by one of the quaestors - the other has disappeared from the list. A list of fifteen duumviralicii follows. It is noteworthy that none of these men are flamines: the question therefore arises whether we are to suppose that the flamines are also duumviralicii. If there were only two duumviri per year at this date, the answer is probably that they were not, for this would give a total of fifty-one former duumviri - men whose tenure of office must have spread over something like thirty or thirty-five years. The Canusium list has some thirty-eight duovirates recorded. It seems likely therefore that flamines were no longer appointed from the ranks of the duumviralicii, or that duoviri, like the consuls at Rome at a much earlier date, had ceased to hold office for anything like the full year. The cost of office would perhaps explain such a change, but the evidence at the moment is insufficient to solve the problem.

After the duumviralicii follow the names of at least six men who are edilicii non excusati, at least three men who are quaestorici (sic) non excusati, at least thirty non honores functi excusati and at least fifty non honores functi non excusati. The term excusatus presumably implies that for some reason the men so designated are exempt from service as magistrates; since the chief objection to holding office was financial, it is not unreasonable to suggest that the excusati had paid a fine in order to obtain exemption. That service by one's father did not gain exemption seems to be implied if Sessius Cresconius, one of the decuriones non excusati, is the son of the duumvir of the same names.

After the decuriones non excusati are placed eleven clerici, Christian clergy who had been recalled to service with the ordo by Julian. Since the beginning of the century it had been the practice of wealthy to take orders so that they might escape service as decurions. In 319, clergy had been exempt from munera (Cod. Th. XVI, ii, 2); the corollary to this was the law of 320 (Cod. Th. XVI, ii, 3) forbidding decurions and their sons to seek

ordination. This however did not solve the problem, for many continued to seek refuge from the responsibility of service with the ordo by ordination as clergy. Only in 362 was something done for the towns, when Julian recalled the curiae all Christian clergy who had avoided municipal service.

The clerici are the last group of members of the ordo as such. They are followed by a number of government officials, presumably those employed at Timgad. No discussion of these men would be relevant to our subject, apart from the statement that the names of the various officials suggest that they had links with the members of the ordo. This is especially true of the office of the consularis of Numidia; three of the members of this staff are clearly related to members of the curia.

It will be noticed that the Album of Canusium contains considerably less names than that of Timgad. Even when we have deducted the seventy officials from the Timgad list, there are at least one hundred and seventy-four members of the ordo, as against one hundred and sixty-four at Canusium. The difference is not revealed in these overall numbers but in the number of effective members. Thirty-nine patroni and twenty-five praetextati must be removed from the reckoning at Canusium, only five patroni at Timgad. The important figures are therefore one hundred at Canusium, compared with at least one hundred and sixty-nine at Timgad. By the reign of Julian, the ordo could no longer afford to be an exclusive body, but depended on compelling as many men as possible to serve. This point is borne out by the presence of the clerici on the Timgad list - municipal service had become ruinously expensive since the government had made it the responsibility of the ordo to collect taxes.

Absent from the curia at Timgad are quinquennales and quinquennialicii, the duoviri appointed every four years to revise the roll of the council. Their functions appear to have been taken over by annually appointed curatores. (For a discussion of the position and duties of curatores in Africa, see Lucas, JRS xxx, pp. 56 ff.)

From the number of aedilicii and quaestoricii we can form some picture

of the speed of promotion in the fourth century. Neither list is necessarily complete, but it seems unlikely that more than one or two names are missing. There are three quaestoricii: as there were two quaestors per year, this suggests that it would be at least two or three years before a quaestor could expect to reach the aedilate. * Similarly there were at least six aedilicii, implying an interval of at least four years between the posts of aedile and duovir.

- * It is possible that if the quaestors served alone for six months, instead of in pairs for a year - thus explaining why only one quaestor is recorded in office - there would only be one clear year's interval between the posts of quaestor and aedile.

At Canusium, the intervals between the posts must have been considerably longer. There were nineteen aedilicii; even allowing for two of them in office in 223, there seems to be a normal interval of about ten years between the aedilate and the duumvirate; the nine quaestoricii suggest an interval of five years must be postulated between the quaestorship and the aedilate. This would suggest that few duoviri at Canusium were under the age of forty. We must, however, take into account the fact that some men would die before they reached the highest post, and many others would not get beyond the quaestorship or aedilate. There is no certainty that every man who became quaestor would eventually reach the duumvirate. Certainly, if we look at the magistracies at Rome, not every praetor became consul; there is no necessity to suppose that every aedile became duovir.

The cursus honorum during the Principate and in the fourth century.

We are familiar with the pattern of municipal office under the Principate from a number of sources, and this has been adequately treated by Abbott and Johnson. The young man started as quaestor, and became in succession aedile and duovir iure dicundo; he might then pass to the priest-hoods - the flamine, pontificate or augurate - and finally become duovir quinquennalis. Sons of decurions might become decurions before holding office, but other men would only become members of the ordo when they held

their first magistracy or ifso-opted by the quinquennales. This still obtained when the Album of Canusium was set up. The Album of Timgad, and the inscriptions of the same period indicate that the pattern of office had changed almost beyond recognition by the middle of the fourth century.

The two quaestors and the two aediles were still the junior magistrates, but it seems likely that all priesthoods were now held before the duumvirate and not after. The most important office was no longer that of duovir but that of curator rei publicae. Aelius Julianus held this office at some time after the Album was set up, in the years 364- 367. On the Album he was recorded merely as flamen perpetuus. Before 367 he was iterum rei publicae curator. At some later date he received the title praesidialis, ob reparationem civitatis, having presumably been appointed by the governor of the province, and was made patron of Timgad for this service. This same inscription reveals that he was a Christian, even though holding the pagan flamine. VIII 2388 gives us further insight into municipal office in the fourth century. It describes Aelius Iulianus as iterum rei publicae curator, and is datable to 364 - 367 by its dedication to Valentinian and Valens without Gratian. It records three flamines. Two of them, Flavius Aquilinus and Antonius Petronianus, are recorded as flamines on the Album, which is datable to 363 - 364. The third flamen, Antonius Ianuarianus, is not mentioned on the Album at all, unless he is one of the men in the lower ranks whose names have been lost; in any case he rose to be flamen in four years, which would not have been possible during the Principate. We have inscriptions relating to four curatores of Timgad between 360 and 367: Flavius Aquilanus under Julian - between 360 and 363; Octavius Sosinianus, recorded on the Album, therefore in office in 363 - 4 or 364 - 5; and Aelius Iulianus twice between 364 and 367. It is noteworthy that the title curator seems to have been held only during the year of office; Flavius Aquilinus is only flamen perpetuus on the Album, although he had held office as curator some years earlier.

One other contrast between the ordo of the third century and that of the fourth has already been pointed out. The Timgad list contains the names of many more men who were members of the ordo but had not yet held office. There are at least eighty such names, in addition to the clerici: of them

some thirty are excusati, the others non excusati. It seems reasonable to suppose that the excusati had purchased their privilege, since the liabilities of the magistrate were chiefly financial; but the ^{immunity} purchased extended only to honores and magistracies, and not to service on the ordo. From the large number of men who were non excusati it is difficult to see how they could all be expected to fulfil their honores, unless some system of electing more than the nominal number to each magistracy applied; a certain proportion of those elected would then have to pay the amount due for the office, although they would never in fact hold that office. As an alternative to this view, we may suggest that some decurions would be compelled to compound for their magistracies - thus becoming excusati. The whole arrangement of the Album indicates a pre-occupation with the financial obligations of the decurionate and magistracies; it may not be wrong to see this in the case of the excusati as well.

CHAPTER FIVE.PRAEFFECTURA FABRUM.

The importance of the post of praefectus fabrum for men entering the equestrian service has been brought out by Professor Birley (RBRA 139 ff); it seems clear that the praefecti fabrum were selected almost exclusively from the upper classes of the towns, and that the post gave a man an excellent chance of obtaining a commission as an equestrian officer. It is on this basis that we shall seek to examine the careers of those men from North Africa who held the post.

We are at once faced with the problem of small numbers. Only fifteen men from North Africa are known to have been praefecti fabrum. A further problem is that they rarely state whether the appointment was in the provinces or at Rome. Of the fifteen praefecti, C. Caecilius Gallus held office twice to a consul and twice to a praetor. Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus was praefectus fabrum Romae before being adlected to the quinque decuriae; Gallus also served on the decuriae after his prefecture. Since the unknown man of AE 1954, 140 served in the decuriae, it is feasible that he also was praefectus fabrum at Rome; this is especially probable because he was praefectus after being a member of the jury-panels. Sex. Cornelius Dexter may also have held the office at Rome, as he came from a province governed by an equestrian; he was praefectus three times before having a distinguished military and procuratorial career under Hadrian and Pius. Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus certainly settled at Rome early in life, and probably held his appointment there. Ti. Claudius Hispanus held the post of scriba quaestorius at Rome after being praefectus fabrum; but he could well have been taken to Rome by a returning proconsul whom he had served as praefectus fabrum.

On the other hand, it is highly probable that M. Aemilius Super and his brother, M. Aemilius Respectus were praefecti fabrum to proconsuls of Africa. They were of a family originating in Rome, but the evidence suggests that they were the élite of first century Leptis Minus, who might be expected to stay at home rather than seek a career in the emperor's service.

Respectus did indeed receive a commission as tribunus militum; but it was with III Augusta, and he appears to have had no intention of pursuing his fortune in the army. Similarly, C. Otidius Iovinus and his brother C. Otidius Praenestinus appear to have been men who had no thought of leaving Africa; Iovinus became chairman of the provincial council of Africa in 109 - 111, and there is no sign that either he or his brother ever left the provinces.

In no other case is there any indication as to where the post of praefectus fabrum was held. It must be admitted that there is inadequate evidence in some of the careers outlined above, and in only two cases can we be certain that the prefecture was at Rome.

Senators responsible for choosing praefecti fabrum normally sought them from the municipal or provincial worthies with whom they were acquainted. Of the fifteen praefecti fabrum from the North African provinces, five clearly held the post after a distinguished municipal career, two held it in the middle of such a career, and another was sacerdotalis provinciae Africae; this certainly implies a municipal career of unusual distinction. Only in the case of Salvius Fuscus is there any possibility that the prefecture was held before municipal office; and it is probable that the post is recorded first because it is the most important one in the career, and the only one held outside his home town and its municipal cursus. The only other case deserving special mention here is that of Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus, who must have left Caesarea while fairly young, since he was praefectus fabrum Romae and a member of the quinque decuriae before holding six appointments as an equestrian officer. At some stage of his career, while still away from Caesarea, he received omnes magistratum honores. Such a procedure is unusual, and we shall be justified in supposing that he received his initial appointment on the strength of his father's position and reputation, rather than his own proven merit.

The geographical distribution of the praefecti fabrum from North Africa is much what we should expect in view of the nature of the appointment; twelve of the fifteen were from the senatorial province of Africa Proconsularis, and it seems likely that most of them served with proconsuls of Africa.

(See Map 3.)

The sole praefectus from Numidia, C. Caecilius Gallus was four times prefect at Rome; it is possible that he was originally taken to Rome by a legate of III Augusta who had been promoted to the consulship. The two men from Mauretania Caesariensis probably served at Rome also, since there was no opportunity for them in an equestrian province. Both came from important coastal towns with a long tradition of romanisation. Within Proconsularis, the praefecti are well distributed. Simitthu, Leptis Minus, Thugga and Hippo Regius each produced two, no other towns more than one. Five of the twelve were from towns associated with Carthage, two at least having been magistrates in the provincial capital, and therefore having special opportunities to attract the attention of the proconsul.

Of the fifteen praefecti fabrum on our list, three had previously the equus publicus, one served on the quinque decuriae before being prefect and three after. Seven men received appointments as equestrian officers, in six cases immediately after the prefecture or after being scriba quaestorius or a member of the jury-panels; in the other case the post of flamen perpetuus intervened. Four men became procurators, and another, L. Iulius Crassus, received senatorial aedilicia ornamenta from Gaius. It appears that holders of the post were the pick of the local magistrates, and therefore had better prospects than others if they entered the imperial service. But we must not forget that the post in itself implies senatorial patronage, and we should not be surprised to find that this patronage continued after the prefecture itself ended.

Professor Birley has shown (RBRA 141 ff) the importance of such patronage for men entering the equestrian service:

'It is no great strain on the imagination to suppose that the consul or proconsul who had chosen a municipal worthy for service as praefectus fabrum on his staff might be the man mainly responsible for his subsequent entry into the imperial service as praefectus Cohortis.'

When the patron in question was the proconsul of Africa, a consular of some twelve or fifteen years standing, we may expect that the patronage would be

correspondingly effective. In two cases we may certainly suppose the continuing patronage of a proconsul; M. Aemilius Respectus and Ti. Claudius Hispanus both received commissions as tribunes of III Augusta, and we may suppose that the proconsul recommended these appointments immediately on relinquishing office. True, Hispanus served as scriba quaestorius after his prefecture; but if this post was not merely a sinecure, it may have been regarded as a further test before he was granted a commission.

The fact that of seven men serving only as tribunes of legions, three were former praefecti fabrum is extremely significant; the praefecti fabrum were the pick of the municipal magistrates, and the men serving only as military tribune were the social cream of the equestrian officers, men who served with the colours for the distinction it brought them, rather than because they wished for a career in the army.

It is clear that the praefecti fabrum, chosen by senators for that post, were men of unusual distinction in local affairs, and men who if they chose had excellent prospects for a career in the emperor's service. It is also clear that they were often men of especially good families - the Aemilii proudly retained the urban tribe Palatina, the Otidii bore a nomen which was extremely rare outside Italy, and which occurs nowhere else in Africa, one of them emphasising his Italian ancestry with the cognomen Praenestinus. That this family was important is borne out by the fact that in each of these cases two brothers served as praefecti fabrum.

It remains now to consider how long the post of praefectus fabrum was of importance. Most, if not all, the fifteen prefects from Africa can be dated to a period, if not to a specific year. One man was prefect under Tiberius, and six others later in the first century. Six prefects are datable to the first half of the second century, and another to some period within the second century. The latest of the group is C. Calpurnius Rogatianus, who was granted the equus publicus by Marcus and Verus after serving as prefect. From this evidence it will be clear that the post was one which declined in importance; relatively few of the inscriptions relating to this work as a whole can be shown to belong to the first century,

but half the praefecti fabrum are of that period. Probably by the end of the second century, the post of praefectus fabrum had ceased to exist. Professor Birley has informed me that he can trace no equestrian officer serving after the reign of Severus who had held the praefectura fabrum. Without surveying the evidence from the rest of the empire, it is impossible to say whether the African picture is an accurate reflection of the whole; perhaps the fact that the African material has been treated may encourage scholars to examine the wider problem.

CHAPTER SIX.THE QUINQUE DECURIAE.

The five jury-panels at Rome are well known as one of the posts from which municipal dignitaries often obtained commissions as equestrian officers or centurions ex equite Romano. One of the reasons is that such service at Rome enabled the potential officer to prove his talents to the emperor or his secretary ab epistulis, as well as to prominent senators who might be able to further his career. Such opportunities were less frequent in the provinces, where only the provincial governor would be sufficiently important to offer patronage to an equestrian.

From the four North African provinces, we know of twenty-six men who served on the quinque decuriae. Guey has suggested in his discussion of the career of L. Septimius Severus {I} that the members of the quinque decuriae may be divided into two groups; some were young men hoping to obtain military appointments, and others were older men who had served as magistrates in their home-towns, and who usually expected no appointment after their jury-service. This seems a convenient division, but it is by no means certain that it is valid. Five men after service on the decuriae became equestrian officers and one a procurator; of these six, only one cannot be shown to have been a municipal magistrate before his adlection. Professor Birley has shown that the largest group of equestrian officers were men who had served as magistrates before entering the imperial service (RBRA p. 139). We shall have occasion to modify this conclusion with respect to the third century, but it seems to have held good for the first and second centuries; and we shall see that the third century is irrelevant to a study of the quinque decuriae. The whole basis of appointments as equestrian officers seems to have been the experience a man had already gained. Almost the only men who were regularly taken before municipal service were the sons of soldiers or administrators; presumably they were expected to have gleaned much information from the experiences of their fathers. Professor Birley has shown that these younger men (some of whom might have served on the decuriae for which the minimum age was twenty-five) were never a majority of the equestrian officers. Normally the men selected for service with the

quinque decuriae seem to have been chosen on the basis of their proven ability in their home towns. Twenty of the twenty-six men on our list can be shown to have served for all or part of their municipal cursus before adlection. The implication of Guey's paper is that magistrates were normally elderly or at least middle-aged; we have seen in chapter three that this is wrong. Of the six members of the decuriae who cannot be shown to have held municipal office before adlection, one became an equestrian officer, and another was commissioned as a centurion ex equite Romano. The equestrian officer is Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus, who appears to have left Caesarea at an early age, and clearly constitutes a special case. The centurion is C. Iulius Aquila; the first recorded point in his career is a grant of the equus publicus by Trajan or Hadrian; there is no evidence that he ever became a magistrate at Sicca.

Adlection to the quinque decuriae must have depended on the recommendation of imperial officials, whose attention might be attracted by an outstanding municipal magistrate; no doubt many such recommendations suggested men for the decuriae because they seemed likely to make useful equestrian officers. But whereas a man might apply for appointment as an equestrian officer (cf Q. Gargilius Martialis, militiae petitor), there is no evidence that he could apply for adlection to the quinque decuriae, where he would have the opportunity of showing his capabilities to those who might further his career.

As we should expect, members of the decuriae are more widely distributed than praefecti fabrum within the four North African provinces. (See Map 4.) Nineteen are from Proconsularis, five from Numidia and two from Caesariensis. Five are from Thugga, while several towns have produced two. On the whole, service appears to have been the crown of a municipal career, rather than a prelude to a career in the emperor's service. Only seven men entered the imperial service after being members of the decuriae. While adlection might offer opportunities to the man ambitious for a career in the imperial service, it was by no means a sine qua non. The predominance of Thugga can probably be explained without suggesting that the town was unusually important - though as a dependence of Carthage its citizens had great opportunities for

attracting the attention of the proconsul - since it has produced more inscriptions relating to municipal dignitaries than any other town in North Africa. . . Carthage at least produced a higher proportion of members of the decuriae among the known decurions.

Nine of the twenty-six members of the quinque decuriae from North Africa had previously been granted the equus publicus; in every case except one the equus was granted immediately before adlection. Clearly the two are closely related, and we may suppose that after acceptance for the imperial service (probably implied by the grant of the equus) no post was immediately available in the army, and the man was therefore adlected into the decuriae; in the three cases where no further appointment is recorded, we may suppose that in the probationary appointment with the decuriae the man proved unsuitable for further posts. Two men served on the decuriae after being praefectus fabrum, and one before.

There is no evidence for men from North Africa serving with the decuriae before the Flavian period. The earliest was probably C. Caecilius Gallus, although his career is not precisely dated. The earliest certain appointment was during the last years of Domitian (M. Vettius Latro). After this date there seems to be a steady stream of men going to Rome to serve on the jury-panels. Our dated material gives us one example under Nerva, two under Trajan, three under Hadrian and seven under Pius. None are recorded under Marcus or Commodus. C. Iulius Crescentianus Instantianus appears to have owed his promotion to Pertinax and Q. Sittius Faustus to Caracalla. These are the latest dated instances of Africans serving on the quinque decuriae; there is nothing to suggest that appointments continued to be made after this period, and it is suggested that the decuriae had already lost much of their importance by the time of Marcus Aurelius.

CHAPTER SEVEN.EQUUS PUBLICUS.

Grants of the equus publicus are conventionally expressed in the form 'equo publico exornatus ab imperatore' or in similar phrases, the name of the emperor being frequently given. In consequence a considerable number of them can be dated. Others, e.g. the grant to C. Iulius Crescentianus Instan~~f~~ianus can be dated by inference; where a dedication to an emperor is made by a man who had received no other imperial favours, it is reasonable to suppose that the emperor in question was responsible for bestowing the equus publicus. Unfortunately no adequate study of the equus publicus has been made, and no ancient source informs us of its precise significance. With this proviso, some attempt will be made to deal with the outstanding problems, in the light of the African evidence. As in the case of the quinque decuriae, it is not possible to reach a final estimate on the importance of this post until all the known cases from the empire as a whole have been studied.

We have seen that the grant of the equus publicus was nominally made by the emperor. While the emperor himself might not see many of the candidates himself, his secretary ab epistulis would presumably deal with them individually. As in the case of the quinque decuriae, grants of the equus publicus must have been mainly dependent on the recommendation of the provincial governors. This is borne out by the fact that those who received the equus seem normally to have completed their municipal cursus; in doing this they will have had the opportunity to attract the attention of the governor or his staff.

The grant of the equus publicus is closely linked with service on the quinque decuriae or as praefectus fabrum; it normally occurs before any post in the imperial service, although many careers do not mention the equus at all. The equus is never granted to a man who is already an equestrian - it seems clear that in every case where it is granted to a member of the decuriae or to a equestrian officer, the grant occurs before (usually immediately before) the other service. The suggestion is therefore put forward that the

equus was given as a sign that a man had been made an equestrian; when the grant is mentioned in a career, it will mark the stage at which the man became an equestrian. We are then left with the question whether the grant of the equus implies more than that the recipient became an equestrian. Professor Birley has suggested that it may imply acceptance for equestrian public service. On the basis of the North African evidence, we must regard this suggestion as 'Not proven'. Of the fifty-seven men from North Africa known to have received the equus, only eleven are known to have entered the imperial service; but none certainly failed to do so. Q. Iulius Aquila obtained a direct commission as centurion after service in the quinque decuriae, presumably preferring the chance of permanent employment offered by the centurionate (as Pertinax did at a rather later date, SHA Pertinax i, 5 - 6). But this does not necessarily imply that he was not originally accepted for service as an equestrian; he would be accepted for the centurionate ex equite Romano. This was his qualification for a commission, just as another person might be qualified as evocatus Augusti; the phrase does not imply that he ceased to be an equestrian. M. Helvius Melior Placentius Sabinianus Samunianus, after receiving the equus publicus, became flamen and then sacerdotalis provinciae Africae before holding two procuratorships. While the interpretation of this career is uncertain it is not unlikely that the emperor regarded the chairmanship of the provincial council of Africa as adequate qualification for promotion to a procuratorship without the usual preliminary of equestrian military service. The other nine men who entered the imperial service all had straightforward careers as equestrian officers.

We are however faced with the problem of forty-six men who were granted the equus but are not recorded in the imperial service. Three of these forty-six, P. Curius Servilius Draco, M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus and C. Iulius Crescentianus Instantianus, may have proved unsuitable for further employment during their probationary period with the quinque decuriae. C. Caecilius Gallus seems to have been engrossed in local and provincial affairs, and may not have wished for a post in the imperial service. Many of the other men set up inscriptions on the occasion of the grant of the equus, and are clearly inadmissible in evidence. The remainder record merely municipal appointments; they may not have wished for appointments in the imperial

service if no post was immediately available. We cannot reject Professor Birley's theory, but must admit that the North African evidence is inconclusive.

The geographical distribution of recipients of the equus publicus is far less general than that of equestrian officers. (See Map 5, and compare it with Map 6.) Twenty-nine of the fifty-seven grants of the equus publicus went to men from the Proconsularis, twenty to inhabitants of Numidia and only six to men from Caesariensis and two to men from Tingitana. The explanation is not difficult to find; of the equestrian officers from Caesariensis, a large proportion are datable to the third century. We shall see that the equus publicus as such is last known under Caracalla. The greater influence of the senatorial governors of Proconsularis and the de facto province of Numidia may also have relevance; in any case the distribution of the equus publicus seems to reflect pretty accurately the relative backwardness of municipal life in Caesariensis and Tingitana.

As we have indicated above, the last datable grant of the equus publicus to a man from North Africa is under Severus and Caracalla. This is the case of C. Pompeius Felix Octavianus who was 'equo publico ornato ab divis Severo et Magno Antonio'. No other person is known to have received the equus after the reign of Pertinax, except presumably Q. Paedius Victor Candidianus. As late as the reign of Elagabalus or even Severus Alexander he may have been equo publico exornatus, for immediately after this he records that he was mag. sac. Cerer. anni. CCLXIIII. This is to be dated to the period 219 - 223; if the grant of the equus publicus immediately preceded it, that grant will be considerably later than any other known from the North African provinces. However by the reign of Severus Alexander the use of the term seems to have died out. Men still continued to be made equestrians in order to qualify them for the imperial service as praefecti cohortium; but they did not use the words equus publicus. Q. Rupilius Honoratus was in equestres turmas adlectus a divo Alexandro, and L. Caecilius Athenaeus had clearly no knowledge of the phrase, for he describes the stage of his career between the flamine and equestrian military service as eq(ues) R(omanus). We may postulate a mason's error at this point, since

some scholars find other items in the inscription suggestive of carelessness; but to postulate errors by the mason to explain all difficulties is a dubious expedient. I suspect that L. Caecilius Athenaeus intended eq.R. to be on the stone because he had not received the equus publicus since this term had ceased to exist by the reign of Severus Alexander. We have only one inscription mentioning the equus publicus under Severus (ILA 137), and we may suggest that it was under Severus that the term finally dropped out of use. Two inscriptions (VIII 1576 and 6995) suggest that it still persisted under Pertinax, though they are not conclusive of his generosity.

Almost all the datable examples of the equus publicus are from the second century. It is surprising to find that the earliest example is from Tingitana, M. Caecilius Ibzatha, perhaps from the reign of Claudius. M. Vettius Latro and C. Caecilius Gallus received their grants under the Flavians, and there may have been one or two others from this period. In the second century, Trajan has two grants, Hadrian four, Pius three, Marcus (sometimes with Verus or Commodus) nine and Commodus one. Two grants were probably made by Pertinax and one dates to the reign of Severus and Caracalla. It would appear therefore that the granting of the equus to Africans was almost restricted to the second century.

CHAPTER EIGHT.EQUESTRIAN OFFICERS FROM NORTH AFRICA.

It will be noticed at once that few of the equestrian officers whose careers are precisely dated are of the first century. Two only, both natives of Thugga, are to be placed before the accession of Vespasian. The first of these is L. Iulius Crassus who was duovir at Carthage or at Mustis before becoming tribune of XXI Rapax in Germany; he received aedilicia ornamenta for some service to Gaius, and on returning to Africa became duovir quinquennalis. The other man is mentioned on AE 1922, 109; he was prefect of a cohort by 54, when he made a dedication to Claudius. He was also flamen Augusti (presumably at Carthage) and perhaps patron of Thugga as well.

Some explanation of the importance of Thugga at this period seems to be necessary. A double community of pagus and civitas is recorded under Hadrian, but in the first century only the pagus is recorded; it lay within the territorium of Carthage, and many men from the town held magistracies in the provincial capital. The importance of magistracies at Carthage will be seen from the discussion in Appendix Four. It is presumably due to this close connection with Carthage, and to the very large number of inscriptions found at Thugga, that we owe the apparent supremacy of Thugga in the first century contribution to the equestrian service.

In the period from the accession of Vespasian to the death of Trajan, rather more Africans obtained commissions as equestrian officers. Four are certainly known. A man from Sabratha (IRT 98) served on the quinque decuriae at Rome under Vespasian or Titus; he was later decorated. The text is fragmentary, but the man is likely to have received his decorations for service as an equestrian officer rather than as a centurion; progress from the five jury-panels to the centurionate was the exception rather than the rule. Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus, a native of Caesarea, was praefectus fabrum at Rome, and then a member of the quinque decuriae before being prefect of two cohorts, tribune of two legions and prefect of two alae; the known career concludes with two further posts at Rome, as scriba quaestorius and scriba aedilicius. The inscription to him was set up to record his promotion

in absentia to all the magistracies of his home town. M. Vettius Latro was a native of Thuburbo Maius, but like other men he served as a decurion and magistrate at Carthage. In 93 he was priest of Ceres (cf Appendix Four), and before the death of Domitian received the equus publicus and became iudex at Rome. The post of praefectus fabrum was followed by equestrian military service, in one post in each of the tres militiae. This in turn was followed by a number of procuratorships, culminating, after a break in his career, in the ducenarian procuratorship of Mauretania Caesariensis, in which he is attested in 128. The final career in this group is that of Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus, who seems to have been granted the equus publicus and adlected to the five jury-panels after a municipal career which rose as high as the flamine of Nerva. One military appointment followed, the tribunate of VI Victrix, held early in the reign of Hadrian. On return to Carthage, he was successively magister sacrorum Cerealium, duovir, and duovir quinquennalis.

It is noteworthy that of the men so far mentioned, two held only the military tribunate, and two are not known to have proceeded beyond the command of a cohort. Only one became a procurator, and M. H.G. Pflaum has shown that it is likely that he only became a ducenarian through the accident of service on the Danube with the future emperor Hadrian. It is fairly clear that even as late as the reign of Trajan, the African contribution to the equestrian service was of little importance, although there are one or two men not mentioned above, whose careers are probably to be assigned to the first century - e.g. M. Aemilius Respectus and Q. Pomponius Crispinus.

Under Hadrian and his immediate successors, a change becomes apparent. From 117 to 192, we know of twenty-six certainly dated equestrian officers from the African provinces; after the death of Commodus, twenty-two are known. It is quite clear that Severus was only able to promote so many Africans to the highest posts because they already had some experience in the imperial service. Q. Aemilius Laetus, the praetorian prefect responsible for the death of Commodus and Pertinax, was an African; he was himself put to death by Didius Iulianus. L. Alfenus Senecio the elder was procurator of Gallia Belgica and the Two Germanies under Marcus or Commodus; his son became a senator, and became consular governor of Syria Coele and Britain under Severus;

his career had almost certainly started under Commodus. Subatianus Proculus and his elder brother Subatianus Aquila, who were respectively consul (210 - 211) and prefect of Egypt (203 - 210) under Severus, must both have started their equestrian careers before that emperor's accession. P. Messius Saturninus, one of the distinguished jurists of the reign of Severus, and Plautianus, the praetorian prefect, must similarly have been in the imperial service before 193. In 193, the important consular provinces of Upper Pannonia and (if we can believe SHA) Britain were both governed by Africans. We may reasonably suspect that Africans were already the largest single provincial group in the imperial service; while it is true that Severus came to the throne because he was nearer to Rome than his rivals, and because he was able to defeat his rivals, it may also be true that he received support in Rome because of the number of Africans in Government service; certainly it cannot be said that he was solely responsible for the influx of Africans into the imperial service in the late second century. At most, he assisted a strong and increasing tendency to place Africans in all ranks of the senatorial and equestrian services.

Statistical analysis shows that there are significant contrasts between the careers beginning before 193 and after that date; for convenience, we may regard these groups as second and third century respectively. In the first group, twenty-five strong, are seven men from Africa Proconsularis, eleven from Numidia and three from Mauretania Caesariensis. (In all these analyses, those men not accounted for by provinces are assignable only to the African provinces as a whole, usually on the basis of nomenclature). The third century group includes seven from Proconsularis, seven from Numidia and seven from Caesariensis in a total of twenty-two. This in itself does not seem to reveal much, apart from the increasing importance of Caesariensis, and especially of Auzia, which produced four of the seven men here recorded. (See Map Six).

If we turn to a wider survey, dividing almost all the known careers between the second and third centuries on the basis of style and form (there are sufficient differences between the two periods to enable us to do this fairly accurately), and ignoring the handful of proven first-century date, we

can see the change in recruiting far more clearly. This wider range gives us fifty-four second century careers and thirty-eight of later date.

In the first period there are thirty men from Proconsularis, fifteen from Numidia and nine from Caesariensis. In the third century, the contribution of the senatorial province drops to ten; Numidia is almost unchanged, with thirteen, and the contribution of Caesariensis rises to fifteen.

It seems clear that in the third century the conditions of military service had become less attractive to the more highly Romanised section of the community. Even in the western provinces of North Africa, this is apparent. Ten of the fifteen Numidians in the third century group were natives of the military area - four came from Lambaesis, two from Batna, two from Mascula and two from Timgad. In the second century, with the same total of Numidians, this military area had produced only four equestrian officers; the majority came from Cuicul (four), Cirta (two) and Thubursicu Numidarum (two). In the third century, Cuicul produced two equestrian officers, and neither Cirta nor Thubursicu has revealed any. In Caesariensis, the change can be seen with equal clarity. The old towns of the coastal area like Caesarea, Saldae and Tipasa produced eight out of the nine equestrian officers from Caesariensis in the second century (four of them coming from Caesarea itself). The ninth man was probably also a native of Caesarea. Of the fifteen third century equestrian officers from Caesariensis, this group produced only seven (three from Caesarea) while the inland military zone produced five - all from Auzia.

The rise to importance of Auzia requires some explanation (cf Appendix Three). Although chartered as a municipium by the reign of Marcus and Commodus it does not appear to have flourished until after the establishment of a colony by Severus. It is to the third century that almost all the inscriptions found at Auzia belong, and all the equestrian officers from the town are of this period. Auzia was primarily a military settlement, directed against the tribes of the Mauretanian interior. In its territory, a vexillation of Moorish cavalry was stationed, and there are indications that it was in the nature of a local militia, commanded by decurions of Auzia.

We are, I believe, justified in seeing in the rise of Auzia a growth in the importance of the military elements within the empire. By the third century, military service was no longer attractive enough to tempt the upper classes of the highly Romanised towns, and as a class they were dropping out of the imperial service, just as were the older senatorial families in the same period. For a time it was possible to raise the necessary officers from military settlements like Lambaesis and Auzia, but by the end of the third century, equestrian officers of municipal origin had ceased to be more than a memory.

Yet it would be wrong to see in Auzia a purely military settlement. One of the equestrian officers from the town seems to be the Gargilius Martialis who was responsible for a treatise on Horticulture and other rustic subjects which has been compared favourably with the work of the elder Pliny; he is also reputed to have written a history of Severus Alexander (cf RBRA p. 170 and Prosopography no. 80). The point is not capable of definite proof, but the dating of the writer and the equestrian officer appear to be almost the same; the opportunity for the study of the olive in North Africa can scarcely be paralleled elsewhere in the empire (cf Camps-Fabrer, passim).

Further points arise from a comparison of the periods before and after 193. Taking the narrower basis given by those careers which are not securely dated, we find that in the second century nine men are not recorded as holding any post beyond the command of a quingenary cohort, compared with two in the second period (which includes four less careers than the first). Only nine men reached the third militia as praefectus equitum and only one man the fourth (the command of a milliary ala, cf RBRA pp. 148 - 149) in the earlier period. Nine out of twenty-five became procurators on leaving the equestrian military service. By contrast, the third century affords at least twelve men out of twenty-two who rose to command alae and three who commanded alae milliariae, in addition to four others who were a militiis * and who may have been praefecti equitum before retiring.

* The term a militiis does not mean that the three militiae had been completed; simply that the holder of the title had left the equestrian military service. Q. Gargilius Martialis was successively prefect of a cohort, tribune of a milliary cohort and a militiis; P. Aelius

Twelve of the twenty-two men from the third century are known to have become procurators after the end of their military career. It will be clear from the figures (not all drawn from inscriptions recording complete careers) that at no period was promotion to the procuratorial service certain, and that a majority of equestrian officers had probably no hope of a permanent career in the imperial service.

Such promotion to procuratorships appears to have been given to only a small proportion of equestrian officers. Of a total of one hundred and seven equestrian officers assignable to the North African provinces, only twenty-five are known to have received equestrian procuratorships on completion of their military service. Even making allowance for those who were still serving when our record of the career was set up, it is apparent that only a small proportion of equestrian officers had a chance of becoming procurators. Of the twenty-five men who became procurators after equestrian military service, nine began their careers before 193 (though two may have owed their promotion to Severus) and twelve after that date; the others cannot be dated clearly. Prospects were clearly better for the man who began his career as an equestrian officer under the Severan dynasty. How far the improved prospects were due to the African origin of the imperial family, and how far to the greatly increased number of procuratorial posts, we cannot say. M. Pflaum lays great stress on the importance of Africans under Severus; I should be prepared to question his conclusion that Africans were over-represented in the 'Civil Service' due to the African origin of the emperor. The over-representation is not as great as M. Pflaum suggests - several of his 'African' procurators might have been natives of any province in the west of the empire. The suggestion that the many procuratorships in Proconsularis and Numidia were reserved for Africans must be rejected; the evidence is insufficient to warrant any such conclusion. It is not valid to assume, as M. Pflaum seems to do in one or two instances, that service in African or a dedication in Africa is sufficient to establish the African origin of a procurator. We know of several instances where men from Africa did serve as procurators in their own provinces; but this is not a valid reason for saying that a procurator serving in Africa is ipso facto of African origin.

The period following the accession of Severus shows a marked decline in the number of men who were magistrates in their home towns before becoming equestrian officers. In the second century group, six men are known to have been magistrates, and another served as praefectus fabrum; in the third century group only one man, L. Caecilius Athenaeus of Sufetula, is known to have been a magistrate before receiving his commission. There is no case from the African provinces after 193 of a man serving as praefectus fabrum or as iudex on the quinque decuriae before military service, though the quinque decuriae survived ^{until} the reign of Caracalla at least. Nor, after the reign of Caracalla, was acceptance for ^{equestrian} ~~military~~ service still described as an imperial grant of the equus publicus; in fact the term had dropped out of use, so that in the reign of Severus Alexander (if M. Pflaum's tentative dating is correct), L. Caecilius Athenaeus had to describe his acceptance for the equestrian public service (after being duovir and flamen perpetuus) by the phrase equus Romanus inserted in the middle of his career.

It has been known for some time that at all periods a number of men entered the emperor's service with direct commissions as tribunus militum angusticlavus, and Professor Birley has shown that the men who served in only this one post must have been carrying out duties which were administrative and judicial rather than military; it seems likely that they had no desire for a military career as such (RBRA p. 138). The only two such careers which can be securely dated have already been mentioned. L. Iulius Crassus must have served as tribune of XXI Rapax under Gaius or Tiberius; Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus was tribune of VI Victrix in the early years of Hadrian, though his career began with a grant of the equus publicus from Trajan. None of the other five careers of this type which occur among the equestrian officers from North Africa contains anything to suggest that it is to be dated after the end of the second century. In two cases the tribe mentioned is an urban tribe. Q. Pomponius Crispinus belonged to Collina and M. Aemilius Respectus to Palatina; both came from coastal towns where Roman settlement was of considerable antiquity, and there is every reason to suppose that they are to be dated to the first century (cf. Prosopography for detailed reasoning).

It is noteworthy that all but one of the men in this small group who

received direct commissions as tribune, and who served in no further appointment, had municipal careers of some distinction; with them we may compare the evidence from Spain, where many provincial priests became tribuni and held no other military appointment. L. Iulius Crassus was duovir at Carthage and praefectus fabrum before becoming tribune; he afterwards received aedilicia ornamenta from Gaius and rose to be duovir quinquennalis at Carthage. Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus seems to have been flamen at Carthage before receiving the equus publicus from Trajan. Hadrian adlected him into the quinque decuriae and made him tribune of VI Victrix; after leaving this post he was priest of Ceres at Carthage - an important municipal priesthood - and rose to be quinquennalis. Q. Pomponius Crispinus was duumvir quinquennalis before being commissioned, and Ti. Claudius Hispanus was flamen perpetuus, praefectus fabrum and scriba quaestorius before becoming tribune of III Augusta. M. Aemilius Respectus was praefectus fabrum and flamen perpetuus before appointment as tribune. L. Pompeius ----- ianus was another man who became flamen perpetuus before his tribunate. His service with II Adiutrix is qualified by the term sexmenstris, used also by the younger Pliny in requesting a tribunate for Varisidius Nepos (*Epistulae* IV, 4); it well indicates that Pompeius had no desire for a military career of any length. Q. Herennius Martialis received the equus publicus before becoming tribune, and died while still tribune at the age of thirty-seven; such an age makes it virtually certain that he had served as duovir in his home town, for which the minimum age was thirty. Only Castus of Lepcis has no earlier career recorded. The careers here outlined seem to support Professor Birley's view that these men were serving in a magisterial capacity, and that they had no desire for a specifically military career. It also seems clear that the number of men commissioned as tribune for one tour of duty was declining from the first century onwards.

Some reference has been made to the previous careers of equestrian officers. Professor Birley has already provided the main outline of the subject (in his paper on 'The Equestrian Officers of the Roman Army', *RBRA* p. 133 f), but some further points may justifiably be mentioned. Professor Birley shows that the principal means of entry into the equestrian service was by means of municipal magistracies; from the North African careers at

least, it appears that municipal service was not usual for the equestrian officer of the third century; possibly men were recruited younger; certainly they were serving longer, and more men were being recruited from the ranks of the legions and of the praetorian guard. By the third century, the quinque decuriae at Rome had either ceased to exist, or at least to provide recruits for the equestrian service. Similarly the post of praefectus fabrum disappears from equestrian careers by the time of Commodus. Third century careers leave us with little information as to the posts held before entering the equestrian militiae; it is possible that municipal magistracies were no longer regarded as sufficiently important to deserve mention; but it is also possible that it had ceased to be the custom for men to complete their municipal cursus before entering the imperial service. We have already seen that the third century saw a shift socially as well as geographically. If there was less and less in the military career to attract the inhabitants of Italy or Proconsularis, it is likely that there was less and less to attract men who had already risen to positions of importance in their home towns. Similarly the better prospects of a permanent career for the equestrian officer would attract the young man, rather than the middle-aged man with an established position in his home town. It is worthy of comment that while third century conditions were likely to attract younger men, it is probable that imperial policy required such men. For with the creation by Severus of many new procuratorships in the lower grades, it became necessary to retain men on the pay-roll for longer periods; while this continued, it seems that inevitably policy would be directed towards recruiting younger men for the equestrian militiae.

We have now to pass to a consideration of the provinces in which the equestrian officers from North Africa served. Undoubtedly, the most significant appointment will be the first. As we should expect from the size of the army of Britain, more first appointments were to Britain than to any other province (eleven, against five to Upper Germany and three each to Egypt and Syria). When we divide the first appointments between groups of provinces, we find seventeen to the Celtic provinces, ten to those of Africa, eleven to those of the Danube and eight in the east. It seems clear that there was no area closed to officers of African origin, though

as we should expect there are relatively few appointments to posts in the Greek-speaking provinces.

Unfortunately there is only one clear case of promotion being dependent on a senatorial commander, that of Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus, who went to his first command (in Lower Moesia) with the ex-consul whom he had served as praefectus fabrum. For the most part the transfers of equestrian officers seem to lie outside the normal pattern of senatorial promotion. In one or two cases it is possible that a legionary legate given the command of a praetorian province took an equestrian officer with him.

A study of the total number of posts held by the equestrian officers from North Africa, by provinces, gives results rather different from those of first appointments. Britain has still the largest total, with sixteen appointments, Syria has seven, Upper Germany seven and Egypt five. Cappadocia has eight posts (four of them as tribune of XII Fulminata; only III Augusta had as many African tribunes), and Lower Pannonia nine. By groups of provinces, the Celtic provinces have twenty-five, Africa seventeen, the Danube provinces twenty-five and the eastern provinces twenty-one. One reason for the relatively large share of the Danube and eastern provinces in these totals is the tendency for men once in the east to serve in several commands there. Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus was prefect of cohorts in Lower Moesia and Syria, tribune of legions in Syria and Cappadocia and prefect of alae in the same two provinces. M. Vettius Latro served all his three militiae in Lower Pannonia, unless he was with the ala Siliana when it moved to Dacia. C. Aufidius Maximus was prefect of a cohort in Judaea and then tribune of XII Fulminata in Cappadocia. After commanding a cohort in Syria, C. Iulius Corinthianus held three further appointments before his death, one in Upper Moesia and two in Dacia. This pattern of continued service within a group of provinces does not appear to the same extent in Britain and the Germanies, or in Africa, where equestrian officers appear to be more mobile. Typical patterns for the man starting in one of the western provinces are: Britain, Upper Germany, Cappadocia (Sex. Cornelius Dexter); Tingitana, Cappadocia, Upper Germany (Ti. Antistius Marcianus); Britain or Raetia, Lower Germany, Hispania Tarraconensis (M. Fabius Mettianus). A far

greater proportion of men serving in the west are recorded in only one post.

It may perhaps be of value to summarise the conclusion of this chapter. It will have been clear to the reader that from the time of Hadrian Africans were of increasing importance in the equestrian service, and were recruited in considerable numbers; by the middle of the second century, an African, M. Sempronius Liberalis, had risen to be prefect of Egypt. In the Senate, a man from the tiny vicus of Tiddis, Q. Lollius Urbicus, had become governor of Britain, and eventually prefect of the city. The accession of Severus was a sign of the predominance of Africans in both equestrian and senatorial posts, though it was also the signal for a further increase in the number of Africans employed in the imperial service. This increase does not seem to be as large as some scholars have suggested. Only a proportion of the equestrian officers from North Africa reached the post of praefectus equitum, and a still smaller proportion entered the procuratorial service. Prospects became better after the reforms of Severus, and the subdivision of many of the great procuratorial departments; a far higher proportion of third century equestrian officers reached the third militia or entered the procuratorial service. Recruiting within the African provinces shows a distinct change during the period of the Principate; starting in Carthage and its immediate hinterland, it shows a tendency to move west and south in the period beginning with the accession of Severus; it is clear that army conditions had become far less attractive to the inhabitants of the more Romanised towns. Recruiting in the third century was largely from the frontier areas - southern Numidia and Mauretania Caesariensis. One negative point may also be mentioned; there are no equestrian officers known to be natives of Tingitana. The equestrian officer from North Africa found no real limitations as to the provinces in which he might be asked to serve; there was a tendency for the man once in the east or on the Danube to remain there for two or three commands. Finally, it must be clear that we cannot subscribe to the view that it was only under Severus that Africans became of importance in the imperial service; it would seem that their introduction to administration came under Hadrian, and that by the end of the second century they were perhaps the largest single provincial group in the emperor's service.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER EIGHT.LIST OF EQUESTRIAN OFFICERS FROM NORTH AFRICA.

The first column gives the reference to the Prosopography; the second the name of the equestrian officer; the third his town and the fourth the dating suggested in the Prosopography.

3.	P. Aelius Primianus	Auzia	Third century.
4.	Q. Aelius Rufinus Polianus	Batna	Second century.
5.	Aelius Rufus Ianuarius	Lambaesis	Third century.
6.	P. Aelius Silvanus	Timgad	Third century.
8.	Aemilius Crispinus	Thysdrus	Third century.
12.	M. Aemilius Respectus	Leptis Minus	First century.
13.	L. Aemilius Salvianus	Lambaesis	Severan.
15.	L. Alfenus Senecio I	Cuicul	Second century.
17.	Q. Ancharius Felix	Lambaesis	Third century.
18.	L. Annius Fabianus	Caesarea	Second century.
19.	C. Annius Flavianus	Timgad	Second century.
21.	L. Antistius Lupus Verianus	Sicca Veneria	Second century.
22.	Ti. Antistius Marcianus	Circina	Severan.
23.	-. Anullius Geta	Castellum Celtianum	Severan
24.	-. Aponius Rogatianus		Third century.
29.	T. Atilius Iuvenalis	Batna	Second century.
33.	C. Aufidius Maximus	Cirta	Second century?
34.	-. Avitius Rufus	Sabratha	Second century.
35.	T. Bebenius Iustus	Seressi?	Second century.
37.	Q. Bullatius Sabinus	Lambaesis	Third century?
39.	L. Caecilius Athenaeus	Sufetula	Third century.
40.	L. Caecilius Caecilianus	Thaenae	Second century.
42.	M. Caecilius Donatianus		Second century.
45.	L. Caninius Ianuarius Flavianus	Gillium	Third century.
47.	M. Cascellius -----	Sicca Veneria	Second century.
49.	P. Cassius -----	Cuicul	Second century?
50.	Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus	Caesarea	Flavian +
51.	Ti. Claudius Hispanus	Madauros	~~Madauros~~ Second century.

52.	L. Claudius Horat ^{us}	Cuicul	Second century.
53.	M. Claudius Restitutus	Cirta	Second century.
54.	Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus	Cuicul	Second century.
55.	M. Clodius Faustus Secundus	Muzuc	Second century.
56.	Clodius Lucifer	Lambaesis	Third century.
59.	Sex. Cornelius Dexter	Saldae	Second century.
61.	C. Cornelius Flaccus	Thubursicu Numidarum	Second century.
62.	Sex. Cornelius Honoratus	Portus Magnus	Severan.
63.	G. Cornelius Peregrinus	Saldae	Third century ?
68.	P. Divius Italicus	Caesarea ?	Second century.
69.	Q. Domitius Victor	Calama	Second century.
70.	L. Egnatuleius Sabinus	Thysdrus	Second century.
71.	Fabius Honoratus		Third century ?
72.	M. Fabius Mettianus	Segermes	Second century.
73.	T. Flavius Gallicus	Thisiduo	Second century.
80.	Q. Gargilius Martialis	Auzia	Third century.
82.	Geminus Clemens	Auzia	Third century.
87.	C. Helvidius Diogenes	Timgad	Second century ?
88.	M. Helvius Clemens	Carthage	Third century.
90.	Q. Herennius Martialis	Saldae	Second century.
92.	Horatius Paritor	Lambaesis	Third century.
93.	Iulius Antoninus	Caesarea	Third century.
94.	C. Iulius Barbarus		Second century.
95.	C. Iulius Corinthianus	Theveste	Second century.
96.	L. Iulius Crassus	Thugga	Pre-Claudian.
97.	C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus	Cuicul	Second century.
98.	L. Iulius Crispus	Mascula	Third century.
99.	-. Iulius Fidus Aquila	Sicca Veneria	Second century.
100.	Q. Iulius Frontinus	Timgad	Second century.
103.	C. Iulius Pudens	Caesarea	Third century.
104.	C. Iulius Rogatianus		Third century.
105.	C. Iulius Sabinus	Rus ^u ccurru	Third century.
108.	M. Iulius Silvanus	Thubursicu Numidarum	Second century.
111.	-. Iulius -----dianus	Mascula	Third century.

112.	-. Iulius -----	Caesarea	Second century ?
114.	P. Licinius Agatopus	Gadiaufala	Third century.
117.	-. Longei Karus	Choud-el-Batel	Second century.
119 119A	} The two sons of L. Marcius Victor	Tupusuctu	Third century.
124.	P. Messius Augustinus Maecianus	Pheradi Maius	Severan.
126.	P. Messius Saturninus	Pheradi Maius	Severan.
127.	M. Minthionius Tertullus	Mactaris	Second century ?
131.	L. Petronius Florentinus	Saldae	Second century.
132.	Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus	Mactaris	Second century.
133.	M. Plotius Faustus	Timgad	Third century.
134.	L. Pompeius -----ianus	Sufetula	Second century ?
135.	Q. Pomponius Crispinus	Saldae	First century.
137.	M. Pomponius Vitellianus	Caesarea	Third century.
138.	C. Porcius Saturninus Iunior	Thuburbo Minus	Second century ?
139.	L. Postumius Felix Celerinus	Hippo Regius	Third century.
140.	P. Quintius Terminus	Sicca Veneria	Third century ?
142.	M. Sempronius Liberalis	Acholla	Second century.
148.	C. Sextius Martialis	Mactaris	Second century.
149.	Q. Sittius Caecilianus		Second century.
150.	-. Sittius -----	Thibilis	Second century ?
155.	L. Titinius Clodianus	Cuicul	Third century.
155A.	L. Turranius Honoratus	Tipasa (M.C.)	Third century.
160.	M. Valgius Aemilianus	Sufetula	Third century.
161.	Sex. Verteblasius Victor	Lambaesis	Second century.
162.	M. Vettius Latro	Thuburbo Maius	Flavian +
163.	L. Vibius Latinianus Valens	Uzappa	Second century ?
166.	Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus	Carthage	Second century.
167.	-. -----ius Annianus	Tipasa	Second century.
168.	-. -----lius ----- Aquilinus	Sicca Veneria	Second century.
169.	----- Castus	Lepcis Magna	Second century ?
170.	----- Crescens Licinianus		Second century ?
172.	----- Marcellus	Auzia	Third century.
174.	----- Quadratus Laetianus	Segermes	Second century ?
175.	----- Sallustianus	Thibursicum Bure	Third century.

- | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|
| 178. ----- ----ianus | Auzia | Third century. |
| 180. VIII 15437 | Thibaris | Second century. |
| 181. VIII 15529 = ILT 1381 | Thugga | Second century ? |
| 183. VIII 17415 = ILAlg. I, 9. | Hippo Regius | |
| 184. VIII 21054 | Caesarea | |
| 186. AE 1922, 109 = ILA 559 = ILT 1499 | Thugga | Claudian. |
| 187. AE 1949, 37 | Acholla | |
| 188. AE 1954, 140 | Hippo Regius | First/second century. |
| 189. IRT 98. | Sabratha | Flavian. |

CHAPTER NINE.

EQUESTRIAN PROCURATORS FROM THE NORTH AFRICAN PROVINCES.

A total of fifty-two equestrian procurators can be shown to have been natives of the North African provinces. Of these, M. Aedinius Iulianus cannot be assigned to a specific province, though the odds are about two to one in favour of Proconsularis rather than Numidia. This man will therefore be omitted from any reckoning to which he cannot contribute, and discrepancies between the general total and the totals recorded in any particular case will be explained by this. For convenience, and because they will normally have been procurators, holders of equestrian prefectures and secretariats have been included in the list of procurators appended to this chapter.

Of the fifty-two procurators, thirty-four are from Proconsularis, twelve from Numidia, and five from Caesariensis. (See Map 7). Tingitana has produced none. It is at once clear that Proconsularis has a far higher proportion of procurators than of equestrian officers (thirty-four out of fifty-two procurators, as against forty-four out of one hundred and six equestrian officers). When analysed according to date of entry, it is seen that the proportions for the individual provinces remain fairly constant from the time of Hadrian onwards. There is not the same influx in the third century from the frontier areas as there is with the equestrian officers.

There are no procurators from North Africa known in the pre-Flavian period. (Decianus Catus must be regarded as an Italian, even though the only other instances of the nomen are from Carthage and Rome; the name is clearly of Italian rather than African origin, and we should scarcely expect to find an African as procurator of Britain under Nero.) It is only at the end of the first century that we find an African starting a career which was to end thirty years later as procurator of Caesariensis. Receiving the equus publicus from Domitian, and being adlected into the quinque decuriae by the same emperor, M. Vettius Latro served as an equestrian officer and as a procurator under Trajan; he must have retired towards the end of Trajan's reign and received the appointment to Caesariensis in 128 on the occasion of the visit of Hadrian, who was presumably his friend. At the same period,

another African, Ser. Sulpicius Similis, enjoyed a meteoric rise from being a primipilaris in 98 to become prefect of Egypt in 107 and praetorian prefect in 112 or 113; he retired, against the will of Hadrian, in 119. The only other procurator beginning his career before 117 was T. Flavius Macer. His career was undistinguished; he held three appointments on imperial estates in Africa, before becoming procurator of Sicily; the career suggests that he was an agriculturalist.

In the period between the accession of Hadrian and that of Severus, the number of Africans serving as procurators increased; there were twenty-four in this period, of whom sixteen were from Proconsularis, six from Numidia and two from Caesariensis. Four of the six Numidians were from Cuicul, and three of them achieved distinction. L. Alfenus Senecio rose to the senior ducenarian procuratorship of Gallia Belgica and the Two Germanies, Subatianus Aquila became prefect of Egypt in 203 and his brother T. Claudius Subatianus Proculus was adlected into the Senate after one procuratorship, becoming consul in 210 or 211. We have no evidence to show the posts held by the other man from Cuicul, Q. Iulius Silvanus. The other two Numidians, C. Annius Flavianus and M. Claudius Restitutus rose no higher than centenarian posts in Africa. Some note should therefore be taken of the importance of Cuicul at this period; it was to produce a consular governor of Britain (the younger Alfenus Senecio) and a prefect of the vigiles, P. Cassius, under Severus and a prefect of Egypt under Gallienus, (L. Titinius Clodianus). In part this importance may be explained by the economic prosperity of Cuicul; but one cannot help wondering whether there was not a considerable amount of pride in the town amongst those who went into the imperial service; this might well take the form of supporting the candidature of another man from Cuicul, even if he were not personally known; in effect 'the Old School Tie'.

However it was not only Numidia which produced men capable of reaching the highest posts. M. Sempronius Liberalis, a native of Acholla, was prefect of Egypt c 154 - 159; Q. Aemilius Laetus, the praetorian prefect responsible for the appointment of Severus to the governorship of Pannonia Superior, and for the murder of Commodus and Pertinax, was a native of Thaenae. A native of Sicca, P. Licinius Papirianus, was a rationibus during the joint reign

of Marcus and Verus. A man from Saldae, in Caesariensis, Sex. Cornelius Dexter, became procurator of Belgica and the Two Germanies under Pius. P. Messius Saturninus of Pheradi Maius must have started under Commodus the career which ended as trecenarian secretary a declamationibus Latinis under Severus. Similarly Plautianus, the praetorian prefect of Severus, must have been in the imperial service before 193. Clearly by the reign of Commodus, it was possible for a man of African birth to rise to the highest equestrian posts, and as has been suggested elsewhere in this dissertation, Africans may well have been the dominant provincial group in the imperial administration before the accession of Severus.

Under Severus, the influence of Africans is well known. Seventeen of the procurators from North Africa seem to have begun their career in the imperial service between 193 and 217. Of these, ten were from Proconsularis, four from Numidia and two from Caesariensis. To them may be added the man of uncertain African origin, M. Aedinius Iulianus. Prominent among the procurators of this period is M. Opellius Macrinus, praetorian prefect under Caracalla and successor of that emperor. P. Cassius ----- would also appear to have become prominent at this period, if M. Pflaum's dating is correct. He probably became praefectus annonae ^{at least}. Apart from these two men, no procurator who started his career under Severus is known to have reached more than a junior ducenarian post. The Africans whom Severus appointed to the highest posts were already in the imperial service before 193. Severus was responsible for the creation of a large number of junior procuratorial appointments, and it was to fill these that many of the Africans of this period were recruited.

After the death of Caracalla, we find another eight Africans recruited as procurators. Five were from Proconsularis, two from Numidia and one from Caesariensis. Of these, M. Attius Cornelianus became praetorian prefect under Severus Alexander, and a relative, C. Attius Alcimus Felicianus, was praefectus annonae under the two Philips, deputising on different occasions for the praetorian prefects and for the praefectus vigilum. L. Titinius Clodianus had a lengthy career which culminated in the prefecture of Egypt under Gallienus. None of the other men of this period achieved any comparable

distinction, but when we remember that Aedinius Iulianus was praetorian prefect at the beginning of the reign of Severus Alexander, we realise that the number of Africans in the highest equestrian posts was as great as it had ever been, even if there is not the evidence for a large number of Africans in junior posts.

When we consider the types of career followed by the procurators from North Africa, the geographical distribution is significant. Of the six men whose careers may be termed 'civilian' five were from Proconsularis, and the other from Caesariensis. This man was M. Opellius Macrinus, the future emperor, and he clearly constitutes a special case, since his qualification for the emperor's procuratorial service was employment as the steward of Plautianus. The general pattern of civilian-type procuratorial careers suggests that these men came primarily from the more highly romanised provinces, and in Africa specifically from the proconsular province.

Only three men demonstrably followed the type of career which we may term 'military' - that which was normally served in provincial appointments, often as procurator-governor with command of troops. Of these three men, one, Ser. Sulpicius Similis seems to have been a native of Carthage; he was praetorian prefect at the end of Trajan's reign. The others were both natives of Cuicul. We have not a complete record of the career of L. Alfenus Senecio, but he is known to have held two military sub-prefectures at the beginning of his career as a procurator, and to have become governor of Mauretania Caesariensis, in command of a considerable force of auxiliary troops. L. Titinius Clodianus started by serving in the four militiae - a fact which in itself suggests military distinction - and in the course of a varied career became acting governor of Numidia, procurator of the ludus magnus and prefect of Egypt with the command of its legion. The small numbers in this group are in part explained by the number of inadequately recorded careers; several other men who might qualify for this group - e.g. Clodius Lucifer - are only known from their service in one or two posts which do not enable us to determine the type of career followed.

As might be expected, the vast majority of the men who can be assigned

to a specific type of procuratorial career fall into the class of men who held only minor provincial appointments. Eighteen careers are certainly of this type, and many of the others which are incomplete will probably have fallen within this classification also.

In considering the earlier careers of procurators, we must bear in mind the fact that many of them do not tell us what they had done before entering the imperial service. Only six procurators from Africa Proconsularis and two from Numidia can be shown to have held municipal office. Probably the number was much greater, since most procurators will have been equestrian officers, and the largest group of equestrian officers will previously have been magistrates in their home towns. Others who became procurators after the post of advocatus fisci may also have been magistrates before entering the imperial service.

Eight procurators from North Africa can be shown to have held the post of advocatus fisci before becoming procurators. (This does not include men who held as a centenarian appointment the post of advocatus fisci Romae.) In two cases, this was the prelude to a distinctively civilian career; in the others the career is one served in minor provincial posts, or is not completely recorded.

Twenty-five of the fifty-two men on our list are known to have served in the equestrian militiae. In chapter eight we have already discussed the possibilities of advancement for these men, and have shown that their chances of obtaining procuratorships improved considerably as a result of the reforms of Severus and his creation of a large number of sexagenarian posts. We must however correct that suggestion slightly, by saying that the balance of the posts in the different grades before Severus (as enucleated by M. H.G. Pflaum) is questionable. Some at least of the posts ranked by M. Pflaum as centenarian and ducenarian in the second century (on the basis of third century evidence) must have been up-graded to those ranks under Severus. Even so, the procuratorial service must have been unbalanced before the subdivision of some of the great bureaux and the appointment of a number of junior procurators within them.

It will now be clear that there is nothing to suggest a westward shift in the areas from which procurators were drawn, comparable with the change in the areas from which equestrian officers were recruited. There is no increase in the importance of Numidia and Caesariensis in the third century for the recruiting of procurators. But only three of the procurators from these provinces seem to have been in the imperial service before the reign of Marcus; M. Claudius Restitutus who had reached his highest post by the middle of the second century, Sex. Cornelius Dexter, who served under Hadrian and Pius and Annius Postumus, whom M. Pflaum dates to the early second century on stylistic grounds. Similarly only three of the procurators from Proconsularis of the period 117 - 193 can be shown to have started their careers in the imperial service before 161. They are Iulius Fidus Aquila, procurator of Lower Dacia under Hadrian; P. Licinius Papirianus who had risen to be a rationibus under Marcus and Verus; and the man recorded on AE 1954, 140, whose fragmentary career suggests a date at latest early in the second century. We may then be correct in suggesting that Africans were still not common in the procuratorial service as late as the reign of Antoninus Pius, and that they were first employed in considerable numbers under Marcus Aurelius. We may justifiably suspect that two Africans, C. Cornelius Fronto, and Q. Lollius Urbicus, who were prominent in Rome at this period may have had much to do with the change of attitude.

Fuller discussions of all the procurators mentioned in this chapter will be found in the prosopographical section. The number of procurators who have been regarded as Africans is smaller than it might have been because insufficient evidence has been found to prove M. Pflaum's contention that all procurators employed on the imperial estates in Africa were of African origin; such men have only been included when there has been other evidence to suggest that their birth-place was in one or other of the African provinces. In view of the statement of the Severan jurist Paul (V, xii, 5) that officium fiscale administrare prohibetur in a man's own province, M. Pflaum's theory is extremely improbable. Moreover, some of the men who entered the imperial service under Severus seem to have been regarded by M. Pflaum as Africans because of that. Here again it seems that unwarranted assumptions have been made. A general study like that of M. Pflaum must of course find

origins for as many procurators as possible. When a study like the present one is concerned with the study of the procurators from a particular region, it must inevitably be much more cautious in its assignation of origins, and must submit every claim to African origin to the closest scrutiny.

Having pointed one of the weaknesses of 'Les procurateurs équestres', this chapter must conclude with a tribute to that work, and to M. Pflaum's prosopography of procurators, which I have been allowed to use in proof-form. Without M. Pflaum's work, this chapter and the prosopographical notes on individual procurators could never have been written in their present form. Only a proportion of the cases treated by M. Pflaum can be criticised at all, and only a small handful have had to be corrected in this work. Without M. Pflaum's work for reference, this chapter must of necessity have been far longer, yet less adequate.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER NINE.LIST OF PROCURATORS FROM NORTH AFRICA.

The first column gives the reference to the Prosopography; the second the name of the procurator, and the third his town. Further details will be found in the Prosopography.

1.	Q. Acilius Fuscus	Thibursicum Bure
2.	M. Aedinius Iulianus	
5.	- Aelius Rufus Ianuarius	Lambaesis
7.	M. Aemilius Clodianus	Theveste
9.	Q. Aemilius Laetus	Thaenae
13.	L. Aemilius Salvianus	Lambaesis
15.	L. Alfenus Senecio I	Cuicul
19.	C. Annius Flavianus	Timgad
20.	- Annius Postumus	Saldae
22.	Ti. Antistius Marcianus	(Circina)
31.	C. Attius Alcimus Felicianus	Mun. Aurelium Commodianum...
32.	M. Attius Cornelianus	Uchi Maius
39.	L. Caecilius Athenaeus	Sufetula
41.	Sex Caecilius Crescens Volusianus	Thuburbo Minus
49.	P. Cassius	Cuicul
53.	M. Claudius Restitutus	Cirta
54.	Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus	Cuicul
56.	Clodius Lucifer	Lambaesis
59.	Sex. Cornelius Dexter	Saldae
62.	Sex. Cornelius Honoratus	Portus Magnus
70.	L. Egnatuleius Sabinus	Thysdrus
73.	T. Flavius Gallicus	Thisiduo
74.	T. Flavius Macer	Ammaedara
77.	L. Fulvius Kastus Fulvianus	Mustis
78.	C. Fulvius Plautianus	Lepcis Magna
79.	- Fulvius	Lepcis Magna
89.	M. Helvius Melior Placentius Sabinianus Samunianus	Althiburus

91.	M. Herennius Victor	Thibilis
99.	- Iulius Fidus Aquila	Sicca Veneria
102.	Q. Iulius Maximus Demetrianus	Sidi Amor el Djedidi
106.	T. Iulius Sabinus Victorianus	Madauros
109.	Q. Iulius Silvanus	Cuicul
110.	L. Iulius Victor Modianus	Thagaste
113.	M. Iunius Punicus	Lepcis Magna
115.	P. Licinius Papirianus	Sicca Veneria
126.	P. Messius Saturninus	Pheradi Maius
129.	M. Opellius Macrinus	Caesarea.
132.	Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus	Mactaris
136.	- Pomponius L... murianus	Sufetula
137.	M. Pomponius Vitellianus	Caesarea.
142.	M. Sempronius Liberalis	(Acholla)
147.	C. Servilius Serenus	Gigthis
148.	C. Sextius Martialis	Mactaris
151.	Subatianus Aquila	(Cuicul)
153.	Ser. Sulpicius Similis	Carthage.
155.	L. Titinius Clodianus	Cuicul
162.	M. Vettius Latro	Thuburbo Maius
165.	A. Vitellius Felix Honoratus	Thugga
173.	 Nepotianus	Sicca Veneria
*174.	 Quadratus Laetianus	Segermes
175.	 Sallustianus	Thibursicum Bure
188.	AE 1954, 140	Hippo Regius

* Probably not a procurator; cf. Prosopography.

CHAPTER TEN.PROVINCIAL COUNCILS.

A dual purpose in the system of provincial concilia has long been recognised. On the one hand they were responsible for the imperial cult, and on the other they were able to discuss provincial affairs and present lists of grievances to the emperor. In particular they might comment, favourably or adversely, on a retiring governor, and if necessary prefer charges against him.

Much of the material in this chapter is drawn from unpublished dissertations by A.T. Longshaw and B. L. Cooke. Neither of these works gives an entirely satisfactory discussion of the material available; but they do provide a collection of the material, and many of the answers to questions about the organisation of provincial councils. Unfortunately both authors are preoccupied with the problem of further careers of members and chairmen of provincial councils, although little can be known on these subjects; most of the inscriptions referring to chairmen were set up while they were still in office or immediately after they ceased to hold office.

Most of the provincial councils of the western empire seem to have been created early in the first century. Terraconensis had a council founded in A.D. 15 (Tacitus, Annales i, 78); that of Baetica was created during the reign of Augustus, since it was then that the council set up VI 3126. A pontifex (ordinary member of the council) is recorded in A.D. 19 (II 2039). In Lusitania, the council existed before the reign of Caligula, since M. Aurelius C f. Gal was flamen Ti. Caesaris Aug. In the Three Gauls, the joint provincial council was formed as early as 12 B.C. but that in Narbonensis does not seem to exist before the reign of Domitian (AE 1947, 69, and Cooke pp. 14 - 15). We have little information on the foundation of the African councils; the use of annus provinciae in Caesariensis as a means of dating inscriptions refers to the creation of the province in A.D. 39, and not necessarily to the foundation of the provincial council. In the first century, neither M. Pomponius Maximus nor C. Pomponius Crispinus held the flamine; but this is only negative evidence. The dating used in the temple of Ceres

at Carthage refers to the new foundation of the city in 44 B.C., not to the provincial council of Africa Proconsularis.

Some dating evidence may however be supplied by the title of the chairman of this provincial council. The earliest recorded sacerdos is C. Otidius Iovinus, who held office 'anni XXXVIII'. Another of the sacerdotes, P. Mummius Saturninus, who was in office in the fourth consulship of Commodus (183 - 185), gives his year as CXIII. On Roman reckoning therefore the first year must be between A.D. 71 and 73, and Iovinus must have been sacerdos in 109 - 111. Reference is made to this by M. H. G. Pflaum in ILAG. II, 36, which records the career of C. Caecilius Gallus; He suggests that the title flamen provinciae (sc. Africae) was first used under Vespasian. He is presumably referring to the occasion from which sacerdotes are dated. Two other flamines are known; a man from Bulla Regia whose name is lost (AE 1916, 75 = ILAG 458) and C. Iulius Crescens from Cuicul. The former is undated, but Crescens was the grandfather of C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus who received the equus publicus under Pius. The grandfather therefore was probably flamen Augusti provinciae at some time between c A.D. 80 and 105. If he was, and if, as seems likely, the title flamen provinciae is an earlier equivalent of that of sacerdos, the change of title must have come at some date between the chairmanship of C. Iulius Crescens and that of C. Otidius Iovinus. This will give us a date not earlier than the reign of Domitian but before 109 - 111.

In his discussion of C. Caecilius Gallus, Monsieur Pflaum suggests that the title flamen provinciae replaced that of flamen divi Iuli 'en usage sous le principat des Julio-Claudiens'. This however is not a satisfactory statement, since the only flamen divi Iuli I have been able to find in the North African provinces is this same C. Caecilius Gallus. We must therefore assume that the creation of a flamen provinciae in 71 - 73 marks the beginning of the provincial council on an official basis; the flamines mentioned on IRT 319 in 8 B.C., and on other inscriptions of later dates, must be regarded as purely local, rather than provincial, unless in fact the action of Vespasian in 71 - 73 was a reorganisation rather than a foundation of a provincial council. (For local or curial flamines, sometimes qualified as

flamen annuus, see Hirschfeld in Hermes, xxvi, pp. 150 - 152). It is difficult to suppose that a provincial council existed without imperial recognition from the time of Augustus to the time of Vespasian.

Twelve sacerdotes provinciae Africae are known, in addition to the three flamines who also seem to be chairmen of the council. Only Cuicul has produced two such men, C. Iulius Crescens and Q. Iulius -----, who was the great-grandfather of the son of C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus. He was therefore the maternal grandfather of Crescentianus or his wife, unless he has been confused with the father of Crescentianus, whom we know to have been named Quintus. The latest known chairman is Basilius Cirrenzianus, who was sacerdotalis p(rovinciae) A(frica) e and curator reipublicae at Calama during the reign of Julian (360 - 363). Astius Mustelus however was described as flamen perpetuus as late as 525 - 526. This does not imply that the provincial council continued in existence into the Vandal period. Mgr. L. Duchesne has pointed out that by this date the title implied little more than nobility.

Mgr. Duchesne's study is important for a discussion of the position of Christians who sought to become prominent in municipal and provincial affairs. The Council of Elvira was summoned as early as the reign of Diocletian to discuss the position of Christians involved in pagan worship. It was immediately relevant to the Diocese of Spain (though Tingitana was not represented), but it gives us an insight into a problem of the whole empire. It seems to indicate that the flamine was normally annual, and that the title perpetuus indicated only a continuance of title, not of function; this we should in any case guess from the number of flamines perpetui recorded in the Album of Tingad; it is scarcely likely that one town would have thirty-six representatives on the provincial council. Duchesne suggests that by the late fourth century the title had become hereditary, even for those who never themselves exercised the flamine. As early as the third century, it had been the custom for duoviri and curatores to add the title of flamen perpetuus. (It should be noted, however, that one of the duoviri on the Album of Tingad was augur, but not flamen). The problem of Christians holding pagan flamines was a very real one even after the conversion of

Constantine. Even though Christian emperors forbade sacrifice in the imperial cult, everything else continued. It was repeatedly hinted that flaminates should be left to pagans, and in 386 an imperial edict ruled that Christians might no longer hold the provincial priesthood (Cod. Th. XII, i, 112). This law seems to imply that the chairmanship of the provincial council was still attractive by its honours and immunities. The canons of Elvira list the terms on which those who had held flaminates might be admitted to the fellowship of the Church; normally they were excluded during their term of office, but might be re-admitted afterwards, sometimes after a delay. Catechumens who became flamines were to be allowed baptism after another three years (canon 4). Even duoviri were not admitted to fellowship while in office (canon 56). The canons deal in detail with the different offences against orthodoxy which might be committed by flamines, and the terms of re-instatement. That Christian flamines were a problem in Africa at the beginning of the fourth century is revealed by Gesta purgationis Caeciliani, P.L. t.viii, pp. 750 - 753, quoted by Duchesne; the curator of Cirta in 303 was flamen perpetuus although a Christian dignitary.

Provincial councils received considerable encouragement in the fourth century from emperors anxious to use them as a check on their governors. By 392, attendance at meetings of the provincial council had become compulsory for its members (Cod. Th. XII, xii, 13). It is at this period that the emperors insisted that the council should be completely independent of the governor. Cod. Th. XII, xii, 1, is of particular interest in this connection; it is an edict of Constantius and Constans dated to 355, addressed to the praetorian prefect Taurus, and insists that the councils in all the African provinces (presumably those formed out of Africa Proconsularis, but not the Mauretaniae) should have an unchallenged right to pass resolutions and to send them to the emperor through legati. An example of this practice is furnished by Quintus of Gigthis, who was sacerdotalis (sc. provinciae Tripolitanae) and who undertook a legatio, presumably to Rome. A similar edict of Gratian (Cod. Th. XII, xii, 9) strictly prohibited the interference of imperial officials, in provincial and diocesan councils, and makes it clear that such councils had the right to meet without reference to the governor, vicar or praetorian prefect.

Membership of the provincial or diocesan council in the fourth century seems at first sight to have been considerably larger than in the Principate. Cooke asserts (p. 73) that a missive of Honorius dated to 418 lists the men whose attendance at the diocesan council of Viennensis was compulsory. The two main groups appear to be honorati and curiales. I have been unable to trace this document, but if Cooke's interpretation is correct, and all curiales were compelled to attend, the council must have been very large indeed. Cooke incidentally suggests, in view of this document, that membership must have become primarily official rather than elective. It must however have been impossible for the whole number of curiales from a province to meet in a council; when the idea is extended to a diocesan level, it becomes clear at once that the curiales whose attendance Honorius sought to enforce must have been elected representatives only. The honorati are presumably the only official members of the council; they are probably the ex-chairmen, but may be the men holding the highest offices or honores in the towns. I have suggested that the elected representatives from Tingad under Julian may well have been four in number, as were the other priestly colleges of the town; in addition the two sacerdotales were presumably members as well.

Longshaw and Cooke have clarified, for the first time, the titles of members of the provincial councils in the provinces with which they have dealt. In Baetica, the ordinary member of the council was pontifex perpetuus, and the chairman flamen provinciae. This latter title is given to the chairmen of the councils of Lusitania, Terraconensis, Narbonensis, Tingitana and Caesariensis. Members of the councils were known as flamines in these provinces and in the Three Gauls. In Tingitana the title was flamen coloniae (AE 1935, 63, Tingi) or flamen municipii (VIII 21841 = ILM 104, Volubilis). The title perpetuus was normally accorded to the flamen in Proconsularis and Numidia. In both of these provinces, the chairman was known as sacerdos provinciae; in the Three Gauls his title was sacerdos Romae et Augusti ad confluentes Araris et Rhodani.

We have no exact knowledge of how long members or chairmen of provincial councils served. It is difficult to see that continuity could be preserved

if they served for only one year; on the other hand it is clear that they did not serve for life. Hermogenianus tells us that a provincial priest might hold office more than once - sponte provinciae sacerdotium iterare nemo prohibetur (Digest L, iv, 17).

It seems clear that during the Principate many civitates might provide chairmen of the council. There seems to have been no question of a monopoly of the office by any one town or canton. We have already seen that in Africa only Cuicul is known to have produced two sacerdotes. In the Three Gauls the Petrucorii produced five sacerdotes, the Santones four, the Redones, Arverni and Mediomatrici three each, and the Lemovices, Aedio and Carnutes two each. No other canton has produced more than one sacerdos. In Narbonensis, Nîmes has produced four flamines provinciae, no other towns more than one; but the total known is only ten, so that it would be unwise to suggest that Nîmes was exceptionally important. In Lusitania three towns have each produced two chairmen of the council and six other towns one each. Baetica has produced records of only seven flamines provinciae, of whom four are recorded at Cordova. This is of no significance, since the council met in this town. A similar situation can be seen in Tarraconensis, where thirty of the eighty-three known flamines provinciae are recorded at the meeting-place of the council in Tarraco. It is clear that not all these men were natives of Tarraco. In fact it appears that in no province did any one town have a commanding position; even in the small province of Tripolitania the apparent supremacy of Lepcis Magna can be explained by the intensive excavations there and the large number of inscriptions found.

From some of the late provinces we have no evidence of the workings of the provincial councils. In particular, we know nothing about the chairmen of the provincial councils of Africa Byzacena and Mauretania Sitifensis. Evidence of membership of these councils might be forthcoming if a close analysis were made of inscriptions found at the towns of these provinces.

Neither Longshaw nor Cooke has been able to produce much evidence for the further careers of provincial priests. A high proportion of the men from Spain who obtained appointments in the equestrian militiae after service

on the provincial council are known to have been chairmen of the council. Only three such men became procurators, and none went beyond sexagenarian posts; C. Cludius Rectus became procurator monetae after being praefectus fabrum; M. Porcius Aper was successively praefectus fabrum, tribune of VI Ferrata and procurator ab alimentis; C. Aemilius Fraterus was praefectus fabrum twice, tribune of V Alaudas, and (apparently) procurator ad census accipiendos in Aquitanica. (The phrase used is 'hic census egit in provinc. Gallia Aquitanic.') Professor Birley suggests that the formula implies a Julio-Claudian date at latest, before a regular procuratorship ad census accipiendos was established. No chairman of either of the Gaulish councils is known to have proceeded beyond the tribunate of a legion; in Gaul, as in Spain, this was normally the only post in the militiae. Only one African provincial priest is known to have obtained any post in the imperial service after his chairmanship. After being sacerdos provinciae Africae, M. Helvius Melior Placens Sabinianus Samunianus became procurator Augusti bis. This phrase suggests an early date in the first century, before it became customary to create specific procuratorships, but if the argument above on the title of the high-priest of Africa is correct, then M. Helvius..... Samunianus cannot have been sacerdos before c A.D. 80 at the earliest.

One reason for the failure to discover more further careers of provincial priests is that many of the inscriptions relating to them were set up to commemorate their priesthood; but the series at Tarraco seems to have been set up at some date later than the period of office, for it frequently records further careers; we may assume therefore that where this series does not record a further career, no further career exists. We can then see what proportion of provincial priests obtained posts in the imperial service - though there is no absolute guarantee that the evidence from Tarraco will apply to other provinces. Sixteen of the eighty-three known chairmen of the provincial of Tarraconensis are known to have held posts in the imperial service - approximately nineteen per cent. Of these only two rose to procuratorships; the majority held only the tribunate of a legion, which in such cases need not be regarded as a strictly military post (cf RBRA pp. 138 - 139). There is certainly no sign that the chairmanship of the provincial council of Tarraconensis was an important stepping stone for a

career in the imperial service. The only member of any of the Spanish councils who rose to a post of any distinction was C. ~~P~~^Apius Vetustinus, who became procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis (See Lambertz in RE XXII, 228 - 232). He had only been an ordinary member of the council, not its chairman.

The reason why provincial priests rarely reached high rank in the imperial service is easily found. Normally, a man would not be elected to the provincial council until he had been duovir; for this the minimum age was thirty, and the usual age just a little higher. A man might expect to be flamen at about the age of thirty-five; probably he would have to serve on the provincial council for several years before being elected as chairman of the council. It is unlikely that any significant number of provincial priests held office before their fortieth year, and many were no doubt a good deal older than this. There can therefore have been little purpose in recruiting them for the imperial service, and we shall not be surprised to find that the overwhelming majority of the provincial priests who served in the army served only as tribuni militum.

It will therefore be clear that in view of their post, the chairmen of provincial councils were the most important men of their provinces; but because of the age at which the post would be held - and also perhaps because they were of necessity wealthy men - they would have little hope of attaining a position of any note in the empire as a whole, or desire for a lengthy career in the emperor's service.

APPENDIX ONE.THE ORGANISATION OF CIRTA AND ITS ASSOCIATED COLONIES.

The starting point for any study of Cirta is the African campaign of Julius Caesar in 46 B.C. An Italian adventurer, P. Sittius of Nuceria, was associated with Caesar in that campaign, and as reward he and his followers were given lands in Numidia based on the towns of Cirta, Chullu, Rusicade and Milev. These towns received charters as colonies, and their nomenclature even under the principate reveals their origin. Sittius is of course by far the commonest nomen, but other Italian nomina of restricted distribution occur frequently. No work has been published upon the nomenclature apart from that of M. H.G. Pflaum on the names of castellum Celtianum, one of the pagi of Cirta, in Carnuntina, Band III, 1956. One of the features of the names of that pagus is the high proportion of Italian names, such as Anullius and Bennius, which never became popular in the empire as a whole. Names like these are a sure sign of Italian colonisation at an early date, before a small number of nomina became dominant. It is comparable with the nomenclature of another early colony, Thuburnica, though in that case the record of thirteen different tribes also suggests an early date.

Little is known about the history of the four colonies from their foundation until the reign of Trajan when we find them associated as a single administrative unit. This association, involving common magistracies, continued until the reign of Diocletian. It is with the question of the magistracies that we are chiefly concerned, since there is no adequate treatment of the system of office in the Cirtan complex.

Gsell (Atlas Archéologique de l'Algérie, feuille 17, no. 126, pp. 11 - 20) mentions the existence of duoviri and quattuorviri at Cirta, and suggests that they occurred before the association of the four colonies. This federation of the colonies, he says, is the first recorded under Trajan, though triumviri are known from the first century (C. Caecilius Gallus). Triumviri must certainly be regarded as the sign of the federation (a point which escaped Gsell), so that their earliest appearance will be some time after it took place; similarly, the latest record of duoviri will be before

the federation. Triumviri are unknown as municipal officers in single colonies or municipia in the provinces.

Only one of the four known duumviri can be securely dated. This is L. Iulius Arrenus, who is mentioned on a boundary mark of 26 B.C. The earliest dated record of a triumvir is of A.D. 125 (VIII 10877). At some time between these two dates the federation must have been established. To judge by the recorded duumviri, the federation occurred early in this period, for there is nothing in their careers to suggest that they are later than the beginning of the first century A.D. Unfortunately, most career inscriptions of this area contain no evidence of date.

We should expect from the organisation of the four colonies that the federation came at an early date; it is at least hypothetically possible that they were linked from the beginning, but that the unique form of magistracies was not evolved until later. Certainly there must have been strong connections from the beginning between the colonies in the territory of Sittius.

The municipal career in the Cirtan complex has been analysed by Gsell (op. cit.), and by Broughton (ch. 6). Broughton does little except follow Gsell, and the time is ripe for a further study of the subject.

As has already been indicated, the principal magistracy of the federation was a triumvirate, in place of the usual duumvirate. This magistracy was for the whole federation, but there is reason to suggest that it involved responsibility at Cirta alone, for the other three colonies had praefecti iure dicundo, who were usually ex-triumviri.

The triumvirate was preceded by the aedilate, which was normally the first post held. It might involve quaestoria potestas; where the quaestorship was held it occurred after the aedilate, as sporadically in the Italian towns, and not before it, as was usual in provincial chartered towns (cf ILS 3243). Quaestoria potestas was presumably a financial responsibility added to the aedilate, in a year when no regular quaestors were appointed. In

one case a triumvir had aedilician and quaestorian power (L. Iulius Martialis), but this is an exception; normally the triumvirate carried no such added responsibility.

After the aedilate, and the quaestorship where this was held, the post of praefectus pro triumviris sometimes occurs. In the normal town, the post of praefectus pro duumviris implies the absence or incapacity of the regular magistrates, and the appointment of a deputy to carry out their functions; a praefectus was also appointed when the emperor (or in the early Principate a prominent senator) had been appointed to office. (For instance, L. Septimius Severus, grandfather of the emperor, was praefectus for Trajan in the first year of the new colony of Lepcis Magna; in such cases the emperor was normally specified.) The lex municipalis Salpensana (ILS 6088), chapters XXIV and XXV, gives the regulations regarding praefecti for a typical Spanish municipium. It is not certain whether the praefecti at Cirta were acting on behalf of absent triumviri, or whether they had a permanent position in the municipal cursus. Broughton suggests that they had a specific responsibility in the pagi and castella, presumably acting there in place of the triumviri. VIII 10860 tends to confirm this view; it is a list giving some twenty-two or more names (the stone is damaged), found at Signus. The name heading it is that of P. Sittius Veloxs, m(agister) p(agi), which suggests that this is the album of a local sub-council for the affairs of the pagus. Before the list is the heading [praef.] pro III vir. [-----] d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). If then the praefectus pro triumviris was a man holding a regular office, it would seem that he had responsibility in the pagi rather than in the coloniae. It is difficult to evaluate the fact that while praefecti are rare elsewhere, four are known from the Cirtan federation, unless the office was in fact a regular one. It cannot imply that the practice of electing the emperor to the highest magistracy was more common at Cirta than elsewhere, for such prefects would name the emperor for whom they had acted.

The next post of regular occurrence is the triumvirate. As in other towns, the supreme magistracy involved census duties every four years, and as we should expect, the triumvir quinquennalis was normally a man who had

already been triumvir. Only one exception is known, the case of P. Iulius Proximus, and the ordinary triumvirate may have been omitted from his career inscription in order to economise on the use of space. As we have suggested, the triumvirate, nominally held in the four colonies together, may in practice have involved responsibility at Cirta alone, since the other three towns had praefecti iure dicundo, who normally held this office immediately after the triumvirate.

The praefectus iure dicundo was presumably fulfilling the same functions as the triumviri, since their full title would be triumviri iure dicundo. His functions were defined as being held in one or more colonies. Broughton, following Gsell, suggests that the prefecture might be held in different colonies at the same time. While the evidence is not clear, it seems more likely that it was held successively in different colonies, where two or three colonies are mentioned. It is quite clear that this prefecture might be repeated in the same colony; L. Iulius Civilis and ----- Commodus were both prefects of Milev twice. As no praefectus iure dicundo is recorded for Cirta, it might be thought that the equivalent there was the praefectus pro triumviris; but Cirta was the most important of the four colonies, so that it is unlikely to have had a man of junior status as prefect; we must therefore assume that the triumviri acted at Cirta, the praefecti iure dicundo in the other colonies, and the praefectus pro triumviris - if he had a regular office - in the pagi, vici, and castella; beneath him would be the magistri pagi, probably nominated by the ordo of the confederation though not always members of it.

Priesthoods at Cirta, as elsewhere, were held by the same classes as magistracies. As in other towns, the flamine of one of the deified emperors normally occurred after the principal magistracy. Sometimes it does not occur until after the post of triumvir quinquennalis. On the other hand, many of the flamines are not recorded as holding any other post; such men are usually natives of the pagi rather than the coloniae, and it may be suggested that their flamine was of municipal rather than provincial significance.

The augurate is rather more difficult to assess. In most towns, it

is not held until after the duumvirate; this may be the case at Cirta, but two of the three known holders of the office place it before the aedilate in the cursus honorum. With such a small number of careers as the basis for study, it is impossible to say whether the post is here placed in its correct position or not. The fact that the college of augurs had a magister, as it had at Cuicul, suggests that it was a senior priesthood held after the triumvirate, and that in the careers where it is given first place this was done only to give the office prominence; the same feature may be observed on career-inscriptions of senators, where the consulship is regularly recorded immediately after the name, out of chronological order. As at Cuicul, the magister augurum had always been augur before reaching this post. At Cuicul, he normally seems to have been augur twice before becoming magister; one of the two magistri recorded at Cirta had been augur once and the other twice; it is by no means impossible that the second augurate was comprehended in the office of magister.

At Cuicul, the college of pontifices appears to have been parallel to the college of augurs. At Cirta only two pontifices are recorded; C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus was settled at Cuicul, and probably served as pontifex there; Annus ----- seems to have been a native of Rusicade, and presumably served as pontifex of the four colonies. Clearly the evidence is insufficient for us to discuss this office in any more detail.

We have seen that there are many flamines who were clearly natives of the pagi and other dependent areas; the question therefore arises as to whether the pagi made a similar contribution to the magistracies. Cirta has produced far more records of magistrates of the federation than any other colony or dependent area. This however does not necessarily give a true picture. As it was the centre of the federation, we should expect magistrates to be recorded there even though it was not their home town. Moreover Cirta has produced more inscriptions than any other part of the federation. Some at least of the men recorded at Cirta came from elsewhere. P. Sittius Velox is recorded at Cirta as triumvir (VIII 7118 = 19441); he is almost certainly the man recorded as magister pagi at Sigus (VIII 10860),

and buried there (VIII 5852). In view of these considerations, it is impossible to say how great was the contribution of the pagi to the ordo of the four colonies. The negative evidence from Castellum Celtianum (where no records of magistrates of the four colonies have been found in extensive excavations in the cemetery area) and the fact that P. Sittius Velox is the only magister pagi known to have served as a magistrate of the four colonies, suggests that it was probably the colonies rather than the pagi which supplied the majority of the decurions of the confederation.

The importance of the Cirtan federation as a recruiting ground for the imperial service is difficult to assess. As the oldest town in Numidia, Cirta enjoyed considerable prestige, but in size, wealth and importance it seems to have fallen behind Cuicul. We have already noted elsewhere the importance of Cuicul as a source of imperial servants in the late second century. Cirta also produced men of prominence - Cornelius Fronto, tutor of Marcus Aurelius, the lawyer Pactumeius Clemens, and the Christian writer Minucius Felix. These men however are exceptions; as far as we can tell they did not enter the imperial service by the normal means. The sole man of prominence in administration during the second century was Q. Lollius Urbicus, the youngest son of an otherwise undistinguished family at Tiddis. This contrasts unfavourably with the contribution of Cuicul outlined elsewhere. Cuicul has produced seven equestrian officers and five procurators; the whole Cirtan federation four equestrian officers and one procurator. It should however be remembered that Fronto and Urbicus would have considerable influence, and that more inscriptions have been found at Cuicul than at Cirta; also that there was a close connection between Cuicul and the four colonies, many men serving as magistrates in both places; it is consequently very difficult to assess the relative importance of either.

Despite the superior wealth of Cuicul, and the fact that Maxentius ruined Cirta for the support it gave the usurper Domitius Alexander, Constantine chose Cirta as the new provincial capital after the governor had lost all his military power. The reason for this must be the longer historical development of Cirta, and its prestige as one of the original Numidian towns.

APPENDIX TWO.PRIESTHOODS AT CUICUL.

There is little material for a study of priesthoods in the North African provinces as a whole. Cuicul has been selected, since it provides more information than most of the towns of Africa. The priesthoods held by members of the ordo are normally the flamine (involving a seat on the provincial council), which at Timgad in the fourth century seems to be the senior priesthood; the pontificate and the augurate.

The post of augur at Cuicul normally seems to occur after the duovirate. L. C....sius Barbarus was q(uaestor), aed(ilis) augur; he set up the inscription ob honorem auguratus. The office had involved him in a promise to provide a statue of Victory at a cost of six thousand sesterces. (L. Gargilius Augustalis paid four thousand sesterces for the aedilate.) L. Pompeius Novellus described himself as aed(ilis), IIvir, aug(ur), mag(ister) aug(urum) bis in 147. L. Flavius Aufustianus, at a date unspecified, had a career which ran aed(ilis), praef(ectus) pro IIviris, aug(ur), IIvir. He then set up an inscription to commemorate the fulfilment of the promise of two thousand sesterces which he made on receiving the aedilate - not every magistrate was able or willing to fulfil his vows immediately. The career of Q. Rutilius Saturninus down to November 182 was aedile, augur and praefectus pro IIviris, and the inscription was set up at a cost of five thousand sesterces in recognition of his augurate. (We must correct the nomen from Rufilius to Rutilius, since the latter is the name of his brother and sons). L. Claudius Brutto set up two statues of Victory and Mercury, with the necessary bases, in recognition of his augurate, at a cost of ten thousand sesterces. Ti. Claudius Cicero has left us a fuller record of his career; quaestor, aedile, prefect pro IIviris, IIvir, praefectus iuventutis, flamen of Augustus, duovir quinquennalis, and finally augur. C. Cassius Fortunatus was successively quaestor, aedile, duovir, prefect pro duumviris and augur. L. Flavius Celsus served as aedile, prefect, IIvir, prefect pro quinquennalibus, augur, and magister augurum. In return for the augurate, he set up three statues at a total

cost of twenty-one thousand sesterces. From these inscriptions it would appear that the augurate was normally held as the next post after the duovirate.

The post of pontifex appears to be exactly parallel to that of augur, for it usually occurs immediately after the duovirate, and is frequently followed by a post described as magister pontificum, which like the comparable post of magister augurum may be held twice (cf AE 1914, 44, 236). AE 1914, 43, provides another interesting case, where this post is described as magist(er) pont(ificum) q(uin) q(uennalis). We have no record of a corresponding office of magister augurum quinquennalis, although it presumably existed. The posts of pontifex and augur seem to be mutually exclusive; the holders rarely becoming flamines.

There are only four cases in which the flamine is recorded in the same career as the pontificate or the augurate. Ti. Claudius Cicero was flamen Aug. after his duovirate, but before he became quinquennalis or augur; L. Cosinius Primus, builder of the covered market, was quinquennalis, pontifex, and then flamen perpetuus; Ti. Iulius Honoratus was pontifex and then flamen perpetuus, as was M. Iulius Rogatus.

It is not clear whether Cuicul provides a particular instance, from which it is safe to generalise about priesthoods in other towns. In particular, it seems that there is a case for supposing that the post of praefectus pro duoviris was a regular feature of the municipal cursus at Cuicul, as the corresponding post was at Cirta; if this is so there may have been other anomalies in its constitution. But the large number of known praefecti may only indicate that there were many magistrates at Cuicul who were natives of other towns; we know that C. Cosinius Primus was a native of Carthage, and the popularity of the tribe Quirina among magistrates - Cuicul was enrolled in Papiria - and the custom of holding office in the Cirtan federation as well as at Cuicul, may explain the number of praefecti. There is insufficient evidence to state that both pontificate and augurate existed in all towns.

APPENDIX THREE.AUZIA.

Auzia, the modern Aumale, is recorded as a municipium during the procurator-governorship of the elder L. Alfemus Senecio, dated by M. H.G. Pflaum to c. 169 to 176. It was still a municipium when C. Octavius Pudens Caesius Honoratus was procurator of Caesariensis, at some date between 198 and 211 (VIII 9049); after that, but before 211, it was made a colonia, for it bore the title colonia Septimia Aurelia Auziense (VIII 9062). The colony is attested in 210 (VIII 9015). Dr. Mann has concluded (p. 80) that few if any veterans settled in the colonies founded after the reign of Hadrian, and that those who did would normally be men returning to their home towns. This is doubtless a fair generalisation, but it is evident that Auzia was an exception. Some eighteen veterans are recorded, most of them clearly in the third century, and there are indications of the military character of the place which suggest that there may have been many others. Whether there was a deduction of veterans at the foundation of the colony we cannot say; on the whole it is unlikely. But the increase in prosperity and importance after the foundation of the colony suggests that there may have been a considerable incentive given to veterans to make their home at Auzia. VIII 20816, dated to the reign of Commodus, tells of the building and refurbishing of frontier works in this area securitati provincialium. The careers of P. Aelius Primianus and Q. Gargilius Martialis speak of the importance of Auzia in the defence of the southern frontier of Mauretania Caesariensis. Both these men appear to have been recalled, after being a militis, to take command of units stationed in the immediate neighbourhood of Auzia.

It seems clear that Auzia was primarily a military settlement directed against the tribes of the Mauretanian interior. The indications are that the vexillations of Moorish cavalry recorded in the area were in the nature of a local militia, and on two occasions at least they were commanded by decurions of Auzia. Despite the possibility that Q. Gargilius Martialis is the writer of those names, it seems clear that Auzia was not, and never became, primarily a centre of romanisation or culture. Its position, in relation to the frontier and to the troublesome tribes of the frontier zone, ensured that its chief interest would be self-defence, and with it the defence of the more civilised

parts of the province to the north. We may reasonably suspect that if Gargilius Martialis of Auzia was the writer on horticulture and other rustic subjects, he learnt them at Rusguniae, where he was also a decurion.

APPENDIX FOUR.CARTHAGE: MAGISTRATES AND PRIESTS.

It has long been recognised that a considerable area in the immediate hinterland fell within the territorium of Carthage. Kubitschek, in his discussion of Arnensis, lists four towns (Agbia, Thibursicum Bure, Thignica and Thugga) which were originally dependent on Carthage. It seems clear that at an early date there must have been others - e.g. Furnos Minus, the civitas at Thuburbo Maius, Uchi Maius, and perhaps the postulated civitas at Neapolis. Of the towns listed by Kubitschek, Thugga has produced six magistrates and Thignica two decurions. But several other towns have produced either magistrates or decurions. (See Map Eight). (Priests elected from the ordo - flamines, pontifices and augurs - are grouped with magistrates for convenience; most of them will have held magistracies, even if these are not specified.) Thuburbo Maius has produced five magistrates, Theveste two, and Cuicul, Gurza and Thubba one each. Two decurions are recorded at Thibarais, and one each at Furnos Minus, Gillium, Numlulis, Thimida and Uchi Maius. M. Caelius Phileros, a freedman from Clupea in Italy was a magistrate soon after the foundation of the colonia in 44 B.C. It will be seen that there is no overlap between these two lists - the town which has produced magistrates has not produced decurions who did not hold office as magistrates - but there is probably no significance in this fact. Many of the instances of magistrates or decurions show us men who clearly sought office at Carthage for its prestige value. This is especially likely in the case of men who held office in another town before they became magistrates at Carthage. It seems to be the case with the two men from Theveste, Salvianus and Iulianus, though of course they may have had business interests in both towns; it is clearly the reason why as late as the joint reign of Honorius and Arcadius []inius Salvianus of Thuburbo Maius held office as aedile and later became patron. The provincial importance of magistracies at Carthage probably meant that, like the consulship at Rome, they were normally held considerably later than the minimum age.

Three main factors can be elucidated in the supremacy of Carthage as revealed by the distribution of its magistrates: its historical associations as the oldest and greatest of the Punic cities, which had once been able to

challenge Rome itself; its position as provincial capital and seat of a consular proconsul; and its importance as a commercial centre, in part arising from the other two factors.

With the magistrates and civic priests, we may also consider another great priesthood of Carthage which drew its members from the same class of municipal dignitaries, although it may not have been under the direct control of the ordo of Carthage - the priesthood of Ceres. The holders of this office are known by one of two titles - sacerdos Cereris or magister sacrorum Cerealiu. These titles appear to be synonymous, and there is no question of one replacing the other, for the earliest known magister held office in 133, while sacerdotes are found in 129, 154 and 191. Almost all these priests are dated to a specific year, the usual formula being 'sacerdos Cereris anni..'. The reckoning is from the granting of a colonial charter by Caesar in 44 B.C. Distribution of priests of Ceres is much the same as that of magistrates and decurions - the principal area is in the thickly clustered towns of the valleys of the Bagradas and Miliana. Six are recorded at Carthage itself, three at Thuburbo Maius, two at Furnos Minus, and one each at Bisica, Saradi, Thugga and Uchi Maius. Some at least of the priests held office after their towns had received an imperial charter; for instance, Furnos Minus became a municipium under Caracalla, but its two recorded priests held office in 220 and 232. It was not only the dependent communities of Carthage which produced priests of Ceres; as with the magistracies of the town, this priesthood had a quasi-provincial significance. Its importance is shown by the fact that of its fifteen holders, M. Vettius Latro became procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis and Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus had previously been tribunus militum.

We have seen that magistracies and priesthoods at Carthage were more important than those in other African coloniae. This is seen most clearly in the case of L. Cosinius Primus, who was only aedile and augur in his home town of Carthage, but rose to be quinquennalis, flamen and imperial prefect at Cuicul. As far as it has been possible to ascertain, this enhanced prestige did not apply to any other provincial capital; it was eventually summed up in the application to Carthage - even in other African towns - of the epithet

alma. Carthage had no possible rival in Africa, and could therefore be regarded with pride untinged with jealousy.

APPENDIX FIVE.GIGTHIS.

The history of Gigthis is tolerably well known. Originating as the tribal centre of the Cinithii, it received the latium maius before the reign of Pius - perhaps under Hadrian (VIII.22737 = ILS 6780); a discussion of this point of view will be found in Broughton, p. 123, note 17) and became a municipium under Pius (VIII.22707). The chief problem raised by this sequence is that at least two of the important families in Gigthis, the Memmii and the Servaei, can be shown to have received the citizenship during the Flavian period (cf the notes on these families). Dessau, in RE VII 1357, favours the view that it was Hadrian who granted the latium maius, but there is no direct evidence for this view; the fact that L. Memmius Messius Pacatus is given a tribal rather than a municipal origo under Pius proves nothing, for he would presumably do so until Gigthis became a municipium. There is no evidence to suggest that Gigthis ever became a colonia; indeed its epigraphic evidence after the end of the second century is very scanty. It is however more than likely that, like the Byzacenian ports further north (Thaenae, Acholla, Thapsus), Gigthis suffered a decline in prosperity due to the imperial insistence that African produce should go to Italy; previously Byzacena had depended on trade with the east; under the new system, it was difficult for these southern ports to compete with Hadrumetum and the ports north of it. *

- * As applied to the ports of Byzacena, this theory is put forward by M. G-Ch. Picard in *Karthago* (v, 130-35); he quotes the late 'Stadiasmus of the Great Sea' as evidence (cf. Thomson, The History of Ancient Geography, p. 363). The Stadiasmus notes that at the time of its compilation these ports could only take small craft. As applied to Gigthis, the theory is my own, based on the decline in the volume of the epigraphic material; I have been unable to check this conclusion with the archaeological evidence.

Gigthis is situated in the coastal olive growing area, and like towns on both sides of it, must have depended on oil for its prosperity. The importance of this crop is revealed by II 1180, and is discussed more fully in the chapter on economic life.

Some of the families of Gigthis are discussed in Appendix Six. It is clear that they were all thriving in the late second century, and it is almost equally clear that a small group of families - the Servaei, the Memmii, the Servilii and the Messii - had control of the ordo at this period. We have not such a clear case for a small oligarchy in any other North African town, though it is likely that this is no more than an extreme case of a common phenomenon. The evidence suggests this small oligarchy at Gigthis was not only exclusive; it had also important contacts with the imperial administration. Under Hadrian, before the town received a charter, three men attracted imperial attention. By the end of the second century, C. Servilius Serenus had become a procurator. Early in the third century members of the Memmii and the Servaei became senators. The Memmii at least appear to have left Gigthis and settled in Italy, and by the middle of the fourth century a representative of the family was a member of the senatorial aristocracy. Whether he still retained estates in Africa, we do not know, but there is no evidence to show that he did, and everything suggests that the senatorial branch of the Memmii cut its ties with Gigthis in the third century.

It is just at this period, when members of two of its leading families had reached the Senate, that evidence for the history of Gigthis dries up. The town did not cease to exist, for in 383 we find that Quintus, vir laudabilis, flamen perpetuus, and sacerdotalis of the province of Triploitania, had returned from a mission to Rome undertaken on behalf of the whole province. Unfortunately we cannot say what this legation was about; it is unlikely to have been concerned with the scandalous behaviour of the comes Africae Romanus, for he had left Africa in about 370. Another inscription of similar date is known. VIII 11024 is ascribed by CIL to Valentinian I (364 - 375), but by Pallu de Lessert (Fastes II, p. 300) to Valentinian II (375 - 392). For our purpose, the question is of little importance; it indicates that Gigthis was still in existence in the late fourth century; beyond this we know nothing.

APPENDIX SIX.SELECTED FAMILY HISTORIES.

The family histories contained in this appendix are only a few of these which would repay careful study; briefer studies appear in the Prosopography, notably under number 19 and 96, but there are several interesting families which have not been discussed, like the Fulvii of Lepcis, or the inter-related families of the Nicii and the Nicanii of Calama. The studies which follow are of all the major families in second-century Gigthis; the imperial family of the Septimii; a native African family from Thubursicu Numidarum, the Vetidii; and the Caecilii of Volubilis, a group of families which cannot now be distinguished from one another.

1. The Memmii of Gigthis.

It is not possible to reconstruct a genealogical table for this family. It is however clear that during the second century it was one of the most important in Gigthis; in the third and fourth centuries the only members of the family known were senators. Under Hadrian C. Memmius C.f. C.n. Africanus was adlectus in turmas equitum Romanorum. At latest therefore he must have been born c A.D. 110; his father will have been born during the Flavian period - perhaps c A.D. 80. It is therefore likely that the citizenship was granted by C. Memmius Regulus, consul ordinarius in A.D. 63 and proconsul of Africa under Vespasian, to the grandfather of Africanus; we know from VIII 22729 = ILS 9394 that the family was of native stock, being members of the local tribe of the Chinithii.

It is this inscription which mentions another member of the family, L. Memmius Messius L.f. Pacatus, who attracted attention under Hadrian; after being flamen perpetuus he was adlected into the quinque decuriae. (In view of the filiation recorded on this inscription, Warmington is wrong to describe the man as 'the first of the family' - p. 69; in any case the ancestors of C. Memmius Africanus carry us a generation further back; presumably the first C. Memmius was the grandfather of L. Memmius Messius Pacatus as well as of C. Memmius Africanus.) L. Memmius Messius Pacatus is of particular

interest for his connection with the Messii Pacati. This branch of the Messii has left us no independent records, but the names are borne by another Memmius --. Memmius C.f. Messius Pacatus, who is to be dated to the end of the second century or the beginning of the third. The only Messius known to us is L. Messius Rufinus, q.v.; his family, like the Memmi, presumably received the citizenship in the first century, for L. Memmius Messius Pacatus was probably the son of a Messia Pacata. The Messii are important to us because they provide the link which proves inter-marriage between the Memmi, the Messii, the Servaei and the Servilii.

--. Memmius Messius Pacatus was flamen perpetuus and omnibus honoribus functus; a few years later, under Severus, two members of the family were adlected into the Senate -- Q. Memmius Pudens and M. Memmius Caecilianus. Caecilianus appears to have been the father of C. Memmius Caecilianus Placidus who became consul in the middle of the third century, and the ancestor of M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus, consul in 343 and praefectus urbis in 346. He appears to have been a member of the senatorial aristocracy, and had probably lost all his connections with Gigthis; the last members of the family to be recorded there are the two Severan senators.

The history of the Memmi shows that a family of municipal origins might hope to achieve the highest posts in the empire; but the two hundred and seventy years which elapsed between the grant of citizenship to the founder of the family and the appointment of Furius Placidus as prefect of the city show that a family need not rise rapidly.

2. The Servaei of Gigthis.

The nomen Servaeus is not common in the Roman world. Schulze (LE pp. 371, 398) suggested an association with the rarer name Serva. It is clearly a name of Italian origin, and the earliest holders to achieve prominence must themselves have been Italians; witness Q. Servaeus, comes of Germanicus in his eastern campaign. Later we find Q. Servaeus Innocens as suffect consul in A.D. 101. Senators bearing the nomen appear at Sufetula in

the third century (Barbieri, no. 2101), but cannot be shown to be descended from the consul of 101, or to be related to the family at Gigthis.

Of the thirty-seven instances of the name recorded in CIL, twenty are from North Africa and ten from Rome. Twelve of the North African instances are from Gigthis (including one freedman). Clearly, like so many Italian names, Servaeus became more popular in Africa than it had ever been in Italy.

Q. Servaeus Q.f. Macer was made a member of the quinque decuriae by Hadrian; his father must have been born during the Flavian period. In compiling a probable genealogical table of the family (Table One), I have chosen to regard him as the first member of the family to receive the citizenship; it is possible that Q. Servaeus Innocens, consul in 101, was proconsul of Africa c 116 - 117, and made a grant of the citizenship then. (His colleague as suffect consul, M. Maecius Celer, was proconsul in c 117 - 118 - Pallu de Lessert, Fastes.) This date is rather too late for convenience; if Innocens was responsible for the grant of citizenship, it is more likely that he had been legate to a proconsul of Africa in c A.D. 85 to 90. Too little is known of the fasti of the consulship and of the proconsulship of Africa for us to exclude the possibility that there was another Servaeus who became proconsul of Africa under Domitian.

Macer had two sons, Q. Servaeus Fuscus and L. Servaeus Firmus; Firmus in his turn was father of another Q. Servaeus Fuscus and of Q. Servaeus Felix. Yet another Q. Servaeus Fuscus has to be placed in the third generation as the son of an unknown P. Servaeus. Other members of the family are recorded at Gigthis, but cannot be related to any one branch recorded in the genealogical table. Q. Servaeus Fuscus Cornelianus c.v. might be descended from any of the Fusci; since he is dated by Barbieri to the third century (probably elevated to the Senate under Severus), he is most likely to be the son of Q. Servaeus L.f. Fuscus. His career is discussed at length in the prosopography.

C. Servaeus C.f. Messius Pacatus, equus Romanus, is more difficult to relate to the known members of the family. The praenomen Gaius is otherwise

unattested in the family. The Messii Pacati are known only through this man, and through two Memmii who bear these names. (Pacati also occur in the family of the Ummidii, but without the extra nomen Messius.) C. Servaeus Messius Pacatus is important not only for his connection with the Messii Pacati (and thus, indirectly, the Memmii) presumably through his mother, but also because he married a member of the Servilii. In view of the intermarriage implied, he is presumably to be dated to the late second century or a little later.

Servaeus Q.f. Honoratus is another man whose relationship to the family cannot be proved directly. He presumably lived in the late second or early third century, for his filiation would not be recorded later, while the phrase omnibus honoribus functus would not occur earlier. The Q. Servaeus ----- of VIII 22709 might of course be any of the Q. Servaei living at the time of his dedication to Marcus and Verus (A.D. 164). Unless the reconstructed genealogy is completely in error, we must assume that it was during the Antonine period and the years immediately after that the family was at its most influential; but the lack of evidence for the ruling classes at Gigthis in the third century must leave this generalisation open to a little doubt.

3. The Servilii of Gigthis.

As in the case of the Memmii, it is impossible to reconstruct a genealogical table for this family. Six members of the family are known, but this is enough to show that it must have been an important part of the oligarchy which controlled the ordo of Gigthis in the second century.

M. Servilius Plautus is recorded as aedile and as flamen perpetuus; his son, C. Servilius Maurinus, flamen perpetuus, was married to Valeria Paulina, whose family is unknown.

VIII 22741 is a dedication to Servilia ----- ma, wife of C. Servaeus Messius Pacatus and daughter of C. Servilius Serenus, e.m.v. Serenus was presumably a procurator; his son-in-law is known as an equestrian.

M. Servilius P.f. Quir. Draco Albucianus was duovir and flamen perpetuus, and undertook legationem urbicam gratuitam ad latium maius petendum. This dates his career to the reign of Hadrian at latest. (An Albucianus, who may be the same man, is mentioned on VIII 22738.) A descendant of M. Servilius Draco Albucianus, P. Curius P.f. Quir. Servilius Draco, was given the equus publicus and became scriba quaestorius trium decuriarum at Rome. The relationship of these two men to the other Servilii is uncertain; in the second case it would appear that the name Servilius was inherited through the female line.

4. The Ummidii of Gigthis.

The Ummidii appear to have been on the fringe of the ordo of Gigthis in the second century. According to the genealogical table proposed (Table Two), M. Ummidius Sedatus will have flourished in the last days before the grant of a municipal charter, and his son will have become a decurion soon after the establishment of the municipium under Pius.

It is however possible that VIII 22693 is referring to the elder C. Ummidius Sedatus of VIII 28 = 11042 and VIII 29 = 11043, and that it was his father Marcus (the cognomen is unknown) who was ornator patriae. This latter title must certainly be dated before the creation of the municipium; it is extremely common in first century Lepcis Magna, but dies out after the granting of a charter by Trajan.

These two men are the only members of the family to achieve any sort of distinction in the ordo. CIL suggests that M. Ummidius Annianus Quadratianus was 7. leg(ionarius), but Cagnat was quite rightly sceptical about this reading, and suggested that we should really read a leaf-stop, followed by FEC(it). The names of this man suggest that his family may have received the citizenship through one of the many senatorial Ummidii Quadrati; probably through one who became proconsul of Africa. If this is so, the most likely candidate is C. Ummidius Quadratus, consul in 118; though we cannot completely exclude Um[midius] who is mentioned in the Fasti Ostienses as consul during

the Flavian period, or C. Ummidius Durmius Quadratus who was consul c 39 - 48 (Degrassi ad locc.).

Nothing more is known of this family, which seems to have been considerably less important than the other families from Gighthis which we have been able to discuss.

5. The Septimii of Lepcis Magna.

The genealogy as proposed by M. J. Guey is given as Table ~~Four~~ ^{Three}. Several points in it call for comment. Guey was the first person to suggest that there was an Italian branch of the family which produced the emperor Septimius Severus. In particular M. Guey uses the literary evidence to establish this connection.

According to Guey, Septimius Severus (C 1) was born c A.D. 63; he was the recipient of a poem by Statius (Silvae IV, 5) written c A.D. 95. He was a native of Lepcis, though he had settled at Veipi in Italy. The question arises as to whether he need be different from the Septimius Severus (C 2) who was the grandfather of the emperor. This is discussed more fully in the prosopography.

By about 168 Septimius Severus (D 1) was bis iam consularis; he was adfinis of the emperor Severus (SHA Severus 1, 5). The question arises as to whether he is the same man as the consular Septimius Severus, patruus magnus of the emperor (D 3). This latter man Guey, following Mommsen, regards as uncle rather than great-uncle of the emperor. Unfortunately neither of them is recorded by Degrassi, and one cannot help wondering whether they are not an invention of the writer of SHA. If they did exist, it is most likely that they were the same man. As great-uncles, Septimius Severus (D 3) and Septimius Aper (D 2) should be brothers of Trajan's prefect at Lepcis, the grandfather of the emperor. This is unlikely, for L. Septimius Severus (C 2) must have been born c A.D. 80 at latest, and his brothers would presumably be born in the ten or fifteen years following; but Aper was not suffect consul until 153.

11.

It therefore seems unlikely that he was the great-uncle of the emperor, for it would mean that he was over sixty when he became consul. Nor is it any more likely that he was the uncle of the emperor, for there is no indication at Lepcis that any member of the Septimii became a senator before the emperor's brother Geta. The name of this consul is recorded as Septimius Aper on II 2008, and it is not in the least probable that he was connected with the Septimii of Lepcis in any way. Nor can we accept the suggestion of M. Guey that Septimius Severus (D 3) was the C. Iulius Severus who became consul in 155. It appears that SHA has attempted to provide a number of senatorial relations for the emperor; of these the two Septimii Severi probably never existed, and Septumius Aper was probably no relation.

We must also discard from the genealogy P. Septimius Geta (E 1), recorded on IX 5899 = ILS 441; he is described as co[gnatus] of the emperor, and avunculus of Caracalla. The inscription was set up by the ordo et plebs of Ancona. Clearly the man recorded on this inscription is the elder brother of the emperor, despite the use of the term avunculus. He eventually reached a second consulship in 203. If confirmation were needed, it is supplied by the cursus honorum of the emperor's brother (AE 1946, 131 = IRT 541); it reveals that Geta had been curator rei publicae at Ancona before his praetorship.

From this it will be seen that M. Guey's proposed genealogy is unsatisfactory, and another table has been constructed (Table Four). This records only those members of the family who are attested by inscriptions, the two mentioned by Statius, and the descendants of the emperor's father recorded in SHA. For in speaking of the descendants of the emperor, the historian had far less temptation to invention than he had in dealing with his ancestors; while SHA is not sufficiently reliable to give us certainty about these later generations of the family, their existence is not demonstrably untrue or even improbable.

It will be seen that in three generations the Septimii rose from holding municipal offices to the imperial throne; while the rise is more

spectacular than that of other families, there were many families which produced municipal magistrates in one generation, equestrian procurators in the next and senators with a chance of reaching the consulship in the third.

6. The Vetidii of Thubursicu Numidarum.

The nomen Vetidius is probably of Italian origin (LE pp. 428, 456). Some nine examples are recorded in the Italian volumes of CIL; eighteen are known in the African provinces. Whatever the origin of the nomen, it is clear, as Professor Syme points out (Tacfarinas etc. pp. 126 - 127) that the Vetidii of Thubursicu were a native family. This is indicated by the cognomina used - Mustis, Mustiolus, Mustacia - and by the marriage of Vetidia Mustacia to the son of Gellius Masse.

We know how at least one of the Vetidii made his living; Q. Vetidius Iuvenalis was 'in foro iuris peritus, agricola bonus'. His sons became equites Romani, and two of them seem to have followed a legal career, for they were 'utraque lingua eruditus'; presumably the languages were Latin and Greek. This would certainly be the meaning in most parts of the empire; but at Thubursicu, where many of the native population probably knew little or no Latin it is just possible that the second language was Punic. If success in the courts required a knowledge of Punic, the Vetidii with their native origin would be especially well qualified.

It will be seen from Table Five that Mustus, the earliest known member of the family, may not have been a Roman citizen. There is certainly a good case for supposing that if he was a citizen he received the citizenship after the birth of Mustiolus but before that of Felix, since Mustiolus continued to bear a native name as his cognomen. In the second generation, the family produced a local flamen - almost certainly the term annuus (VIII 17167) is intended to contrast with perpetuus and show that this was one of the minor civic flamines (cf Hirschfeld, in Hermes xxvi pp. 150 - 152). In the third generation, M. Vetidius Vetidianus was aedile-designate when he died at the age of thirty-eight, and Q. Vetidius Iuvenalis was omnes honores

functus and quinquennalicius. His sons became equestrians, but at least two of them seem to have died young.

The distribution of Vetidii in Africa is of some interest. The nearest example to Thubursicu (where there are thirteen) is at Madauros; L. Vetidius Quir. Iucundus. There is no other example at Madauros, despite Professor Syme's reference to ILAlg. I, 2713; the nomen on this stone is Vettius. Two further examples occur at Lambaesis; Vetidius Saturninus and L. Vetidius Terfullus (VIII 3265, not 3625 as given by Professor Syme in a footnote). The only other example in Africa is at Tipasa in Mauretania Caesariensis, where Vettidia Impetrata was the wife of M. Cincius Hilarianus. The only concentration of the name is at Thubursicu, and it is possible that all the other bearers of the name were related to those at Thubursicu. This, however, is not capable of proof. The tribe Quirina of L. Vetidius Iucundus is not that in which the Vetidii of Thubursicu were enrolled; they were in Papiria (AE 1904, 82). The change of tribe may simply correspond with a move from the Trajanic municipium of Thubursicu to the town of Madauros with its many Flavian settlers enrolled in Quirina.

7. The Caecilii of Volubilis.

The first noticeable thing about the nomenclature of Volubilis is the high proportion of all classes who have the nomen Caecilius. Only four praenomina are used, Lucius, Quintus, Marcus and Gaius. Gaius occurs only once and Marcus twice. None of the men bearing these names can be shown to be related to any of those bearing the more common praenomina, and we may suggest that C. Caecilius Flaccus and M. Caecilius M.f. Quir. Ibzatha represent separate families from the other Caecilii. In particular, it seems likely that Ibzatha and his father (whose cognomen has not survived) are to be dated to the first century, for their tribe Quirina is not that of Volubilis, which was enrolled in Claudia. Quirina was used for personal grants of citizenship under Claudius, though Claudia was the tribe of towns chartered by that emperor. It seems likely that Ibzatha and his father received the citizenship before Claudius made Volubilis into a municipium.

The cognomen Ibzatha is clearly of native African origin, and is unlikely to be used by a Roman citizen by birth. It is therefore the more surprising to find that Ibzatha was equo publico designatus; we may suggest that his father played a prominent part in the subjection of western Mauretania, and was rewarded by a grant of the citizenship, with the equus publicus for his son.

Other Caecilii were enrolled in Quirina; again the tribe probably indicates that they received a private grant of the citizenship under Claudius; it is less likely that the grant was made under the Flavians, since the town was chartered by Claudius.

Another unexpected tribe is Galeria, in which two groups of Caecilii were enrolled. One of these groups, Q. Caecilius Q.f. Gal. Plato and his parents is recorded on an inscription which Chatelain (ILM 97) describes as 'belle écriture du I^{er} siècle'. This again is what we should expect, for there is a tendency throughout the empire for the tribe represented by one or two families to die out in favour of the tribe in which the town was enrolled. It is probable that the other group enrolled in Galeria, L. Caecilius L.f. Kassianus, are also to be dated to the first century. The tribe Galeria suggests that these men received the citizenship through a Spaniard - probably a wealthy merchant from Baetica; Tingitana was more closely linked to Spain than to the other African provinces.

All the other Caecilii were enrolled in Claudia and used the praenomen Lucius. Without postulating second marriages or cognomina where these are lacking, it is impossible to link the various groups. That they were linked is almost certain, though it is not likely that they are to be traced back to a single L. Caecilius. Probably there were two or three men who assumed these names on receiving a grant of Roman citizenship through a man who bore them, either a man important in the conquest of Mauretania or a merchant trading with Volubilis. Unfortunately there is not a record of any such man, and it has proved impossible to find any L. Caecilius prominent at this period who had a connection with Tingitana.

A close study of the genealogies in Table Six will show that in reconstructing them I have gone beyond the relationships directly attested by inscriptions. In particular, I have assumed that L. Caecilius Caecilianus (1), father of the homonymous man who married Manlia Romana, is the same as the L. Caecilius Caecilianus who is recorded as the husband of Valeria Manlia and father of Caecilia Caeciliana. I have also suggested that Caecilia Romana was the daughter of Manlia Romana, and further that C. Caecilius L.f. Cl. Flaccus was her brother; both received dedications from the same two men.

The study of the Caecilii is complicated by the fact that none of the inscriptions is dated, and that few are datable on grounds of style. It is therefore possible to build up a genealogical table of nine generations which would fit all the known facts (cf Table Seven); but too much has in such a case to be assumed to make it in any way probable. We must for the moment rest content with the few relationships which can be proved.

ABBREVIATIONS.

AA4:	Archaeologia Aeliana, fourth series.
AE:	L'Année épigraphique.
A & J:	F.F. Abbott and A.C. Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire. Princeton and Oxford, 1926.
BCTH:	Bulletin du Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques.
BGU:	Ägyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin. Griechische Urkunden.
CIG:	Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum.
CIL:	Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. (Volumes are referred to by the Roman numeral, without the prefix CIL.)
Cod. Th.:	Codex Theodosianus (ed. Mommsen and Meyer, Berlin, 1954).
CP:	H.G. Pflaum, Carrieres procuratoriennes équestres. (Forthcoming.)
CW2:	Transactions of the Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society, second series.
Digest:	Digesta Iustiniani Augusti, Societa Editrice Libreria, Milan, 1931.
D & N:	Transactions of the Architectural and Archaeological Society of Durham and Northumberland.
EE:	Ephemeris Epigraphica.
IG:	Inscriptiones Graecae.
IGRR:	Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes.
ILA:	R. Cagnat & A. Merlin, Inscriptions Latines de l'Afrique, Paris, 1923.
ILAlg:	Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie; volume I, by S. Gsell, Paris, 1922. volume II, by H.G. Pflaum (Paris, 1957) is not normally cited.
ILM:	L. Chatelain, Inscriptions latines du Maroc, Paris, 1942.
ILT:	A. Merlin, Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie, Paris, 1944.
ILS:	H. Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae.
IRT:	J.M. Reynolds and J.B. Ward Perkins, Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania. Rome and London, 1952.
JRS:	Journal of Roman Studies.

- KV2: Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diokletian.
Second ed., Berlin, 1905.
- LE: Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen, 1904.
- Libyca: References in all instances are to the series 'Archéologie -
epigraphie' .
- NAM: Nouvelles Archives des Missions scientifiques.
- ND: Notitia Dignitatum, ed. O. Seeck. Berlin, 1876.
- Pap. Flor.: Papiri Fiorentini. .
- Pap. Oxy.: The Oxyrhyncus Papyri, ed. Grenfell & Hunt. London,
1898 - 1957.
- PIR: Klebs, de Rohden and Dessau, Prosopographia Imperii Romani,
1897 - 8.
- PIR2: E. Groag & A. Stein, Prosopographia Imperii Romani, second
edition. Berlin and Leipzig, 1933 - (in progress).
- P. Lond.: Greek Papyri in the British Museum. London, 1893 - 1917.
- RBRA: E. Birley, Roman Britain and the Roman Army. Kendal, 1953.
- RE: Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft.
Stuttgart, 1893 - (in progress).
- Rev. Belge: Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire.
- Rev. des ét.
anc.: Revue des études anciennes.
- RO: A. von Domaszewski, Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres.
Bonn, 1908.
- SHA: Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Loeb edition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- G. Barbieri. L'Albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino, (193 - 285). Rome, 1952.
- E. Birley. The Governors of Numidia, A.D. 193 - 268. JRS xl, 60 - 68.
- E. Birley. Senators in the Emperor's service. Proceedings of the British Academy (PBA), xxxix, 197 - 214.
- T.R.S. Broughton. The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis. Baltimore & London, 1929.
- H. Camps-Fabrer. L'olivier et l'huile dans l'Afrique romain. Algiers, 1953.
- B. L. Cooke. Provincial councils in Roman Gaul. Durham B.A. dissertation, 1957. Unpublished; available in the Department of Archaeology, Durham.
- L. R. Dean. A study of the cognomina of the soldiers in the Roman legions. Princeton, 1916.
- A. Degrassi. I fasti consolari dell'impero Romano. Rome, 1952.
- S. J. de Laet. La composition de l'ordre équestre sous Auguste et Tibère. Rev. Belge xx (1941), 511 ff.
- S. J. de Laet. Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains etc. Recueil - Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Gand. 1949.
- B. Dobson. The primipilares of the Roman Army. Durham Ph. D. dissertation, 1955. Unpublished; available in the University Library, Durham.
- L. Duchesne. Le Concile d'Elvire et les flamines Chrétiens. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Études sciences philologiques et historiques, fasc. lxxiii (1887); 'Mélanges Renier'. pp. 159 - 174.
- E. Groag. Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian. Vienna & Leipzig, 1939.
- S. Gsell. Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie. Paris, 1901.
- S. Gsell & C.A. Joly. Khamissa, Mdaourouch, Announa. Paris, 1914 - 1922.
- J. Guey. L'inscription du grand-père de Septime-Sévère à Leptis Magna. Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, Mémoires et Dissertations lxxxii (Series IX, vol. ii), 161 - 226.

- L. L. Howe. The pretorian prefect from Commodus to Diocletian. Chicago, 1942.
- W. Hüttl. Antoninus Pius, vol. II. Prague, 1933.
- A. H. M. Jones. The elections under Augustus. JRS xlv, 9 - 21.
- W. Kubitschek. Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum. 1889.
- P. Lambrechts. Le composition du sénat romain de l'accession au trône d'Hadrien à la mort de Commode (117 - 192). Antwerp, 1936.
Le composition du sénat romain de Septime Sévère à Dioclétien (193 - 284). Budapest, 1937.
(Cited as Lambrechts I & II respectively).
- L. Leschi. L'Album municipal de Timgad et l'"ordo salutationis" du consulaire Ulpius Mariscianus. Rev. des ét. anc. 1, 71 - 101.
- A. T. Longshaw. Provincial councils in Imperial Spain. Durham B.A. dissertation, 1955. Unpublished; available in the Department of Archaeology, Durham.
- C. Lucas. Notes on the curatores rei publicae of Roman Africa. JRS xxx, 56 - 74.
- J. C. Mann. The settlement of veterans in the Roman Empire. London Ph.D. dissertation, 1956. Unpublished; available in University Library, London.
- A.D. Pallu de Lessert. Fastes des provinces africaines. Paris, 1896 & 1901.
- H. G. Pflaum. Les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain. Paris, 1950.
- H.G. Pflaum. Une inscription de Castellum Arsacalitanum. Recueil des Notices et Mémoires de la Société Archéologique de Constantine, lxxix, pp. 147 - 172.
- H. G. Pflaum. Le Marbre de Thorigny. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études vol. 292.) Paris, 1948.
- H. G. Pflaum. Remarques sur l'onomastique de Castellum Celtianum, in Carnuntina (Römische Forschungen in Niederösterreich, Band III), pp. 126 - 151. Graz & Cologne, 1956.
- G. Ch. Picard. Deux sénateurs Romains inconnus. Karthago iv, 121-135.
- A. Piganiol. La signification de l'Album Municipal de Timgad. Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1949 ?, 97 - 101.

- M. Platnauer. The life and reign of the Emperor Lucius Septimius Severus. Oxford, 1918.
- O. W. Reinmuth. The prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian. Leipzig, 1935.
- E. Ritterling. Ein Offizier des Rheinheeres aus der Zeit des Caligula. Germania 1, 170 - 173.
- M. Rostovtzeff. The social and economic history of the Roman Empire. Oxford, 1927.
- A.N. Sherwin-White. Geographical factors in Roman Algeria. JRS xxxiv, 1 - 10.
- A. Stein. Die Reichsbeamten von Dazien. Budapest, 1944.
- A. Stein. Die Präfekten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit. Berne, 1950.
- A. Stein. Die Legaten von Moesien. Budapest, 1940.
- A. Stein. Der römische Ritterstand. Munich, 1927.
- R. Syme. The friend of Tacitus. JRS xlvii, 131 - 135.
- R. Syme. Tacfarinas, the Musulamii and Thubursicu. Studies in Roman economic and social history in honor of Allan Chester Johnson, ed. P.R. Coleman-Norton, pp. 113-130. Princeton, 1951.
- W.H. Waddington. Fastes des provinces asiatiques de l'empire romain depuis leur origine jusqu'au regne de Dioclétien. Paris, 1872.
- W. Wagner. Die Dislokation der römischen Auxiliaformationen etc. Berlin, 1938.
- B. H. Warmington. The North African provinces from Diocletian to the Vandal conquest. Cambridge, 1954.
- G. R. Watson. Roman military book-keeping. Durham M. Litt. dissertation, 1953. Unpublished; available in the University Library, Durham.
- L. P. Wenham. Notes on the garrisoning of Maryport. CW2 xxxix, 19 - 30.

INDEX OF PERSONS MENTIONED IN THE TEXT.

<u>NAME</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
Q. Acilius Fuscus	Thibursicum Bure	Pros. 1
M. Aedinius Iulianus		Pros. 2
P. Aelius Afininus	Rusguniae	VIII 9251 = 20860
Aelius Celsus		SHA <u>Severus</u> , xiii, 2
Aelius Iulianus	Timgad	VIII 2388; AE 1895, 108; AE 1913, 25
Sex. Aelius Ladibelus	Nova Sparsa	VIII 4626
T. Aelius Longinus	Auzia	VIII 9015
P. Aelius Primianus	Auzia	Pros. 3
Aelius Rufinus Polianus	Batna	Pros. 4
Aelius Rufus Ianuarius	Lambaesis	Pros. 5
P. Aelius Silvanus	Timgad	Pros. 6
Aelia Celsinilla		PIR2 A 290
M. Aemilius Clodianus	Theveste	Pros. 7
Aemilius Crispinus	Thysdrus	Pros. 8
C. Aemilius Fraternus		II 4188
Q. Aemilius Laetus	Thaenae	Pros. 9
L. Aemilius Marcellinus	Lambaesis	Pros. 10
Aemilius Papinianus		Howe p 71; PIR2, A 388
Aemilius Pudens	Thaenae	Pros. 11
M. Aemilius Respectus	Leptis Minus	Pros. 12.
L. Aemilius Salvianus	Lambaesis	Pros. 13
Q. Aemilius Saturninus		Howe p 70; PIR2 A 403
M. Aemilius Super	Leptis Minus	Pros. 14
Agrius Celsinianus		PIR2 A 464
L. Alfenus Senecio I	Cuicul	Pros. 15
L. Alfenus Senecio II	Cuicul	Pros. 16
Q. Ancharius Felix	Lambaesis	Pros. 17
Annius Arminius Donatus I	Timgad	cf Pros. 19
Annius Arminius Donatus II	Timgad	cf Pros. 19
L. Annus Fabianus	Caesarea	Pros. 18
C. Annus Flavianus	Timgad	Pros. 19

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
T. Annius Maximus Pomponianus		V 3266 = ILS 2725
Annius Postumus	Saldae	Pros. 20
Annius ----	Rusicade	VIII 7983
L. Antistius Lupus Verianus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 21
Ti. Antistius Marcianus	Circina	Pros. 22
T. Antonius Alf. Arignotus		ILS 8853
L. Antonius Lucianus	Volubilis	ILM 85; ILA 635 = ILM 48.
Antonia Tertulla Valeria Asinia Sabiniana	Acholla ?	X 6704
Anullius Geta	Castellum Celtianum	Pros. 23
Aponius Rogatianus		Pros. 24
C. Arrius Calpurnius Longinus	Avioccala	Pros. 25
Sex. Asinius Rufinus Fabianus	Abbir Cella/Acholla	Pros. 26
M. Asinius Rufinus Valerius Verus Sabinianus	Acholla	Pros. 27
M. Asinius Sabinianus	Acholla ?	Pros. 28
Astius Mustelus	Ammaedara	VIII 10516 = 11528 = ILT 432
T. Atilius Iuvenalis	Batna	Pros. 29
Sex. Atilius Rogatianus	Carthage	Pros. 30
C. Attius Alcimus Felicianus	Mun.Aur. Commodianum	Pros. 31
M. Attius Cornelianus	Uchi Maius	Pros. 32
C. Attius Felix Postumus	Aubuzza	ILT 1632
C. Aufidius Maximus	Cirta	Pros. 33
Avitius Rufus	Sabratha	Pros. 34
M. Aurelius C.f. Gal.		II 49
T. Aurelius Flavianus		XI 6336 = ILS 2769, Dobson, 85
M. Aurelius Hermogenes		CP 352
Aurelia Antonina	Gigthis	VIII 22722
Badius Comnianus		XIII 3162
Basilius Cirrenianus	Calama	VIII 5338 = 17488
T. Bebenius Iustus	Seressi	Pros. 35

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
Bebenia Paulina	Seressi	VIII 937 = 11216; VIII 11214
Bullatius Festus		Pros. 36
Q. Bullatius Sabinus	Lambaesis	Pros. 37
Sex. Caecilius Aemilianus	Thuburbo Minus	cf Pros. 41 PIR2 C 37.
M. Caecilius Africanus (1)		Pros. 38
M. Caecilius Africanus (2)	Rusicade	VIII 8024
L. Caecilius Antonianus	Volubilis	ILM 96
L. Caecilius Athenaeus	Sufetula	Pros. 39
L. Caecilius Caecilianus	Thaenae	Pros. 40
L. Caecilius Caecilianus (1)	Volubilis	ILA 626, 627
L. Caecilius Caecilianus (2)	Volubilis	VIII 21838
L. Caecilius Celsinus	Volubilis	ILM 96
L. Caecilius Clemens (1)	Volubilis	VIII 21838
L. Caecilius Clemens (2)	Volubilis	ILA 628
Sex. Caecilius Crescens Volusianus	Thuburbo Minus	Pros. 41
Q. Caecilius Domitianus	Volubilis	ILM 91
M. Caecilius Domitianus		Pros. 42
L. Caecilius Felix	Volubilis	VIII 21822
C. Caecilius Flaccus	Volubilis	ILM 92
L. Caecilius Fronto	Volubilis	AE 1923, 18
C. Caecilius Gallus	Rusicade	Pros. 43
M. Caecilius Ibzatha	Volubilis	AE 1922, 64
L. Caecilius Kassianus	Volubilis	ILM 95
L. Caecilius Latro	Volubilis	ILM 96
Caecilius Modestus	Volubilis	AE 1916, 90
L. Caecilius Plato	Volubilis	ILM 96
Q. Caecilius Plato	Volubilis	ILA 629
Q. Caecilius Priscus	Volubilis	VIII 21831
L. Caecilius Rogatus	Volubilis	AE 1922, 32; ILM 28
L. Caecilius Saturninus	Volubilis	AE 1922, 32; ILM 28
Q. Caecilius Saturninus II	Tingi	AE 1955, 45
Q. Caecilius Seneca Gracilis	Volubilis	ILM 91

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
L. Caecilius Silvanus	Volubilis	AE 1916, 90
L. Caecilius Vitalis	Volubilis	ILM 48
Sex. Caecilius Volusianus	Thuburbo Minus	cf Pros. 41; PIR2 C 87
Caecilia Antoniana	Volubilis	ILM 91
Caecilia Caeciliana (1)	Volubilis	ILA 629
Caecilia Caeciliana (2)	Volubilis	ILA 626
Caecilia Caeciliana (3)	Volubilis	AE 1923, 18; ILA 628
Caecilia Dideia	Volubilis	AE 1955, 44
Caecilia Modesta	Volubilis	AE 1916, 90
Caecilia Petroniana Aemiliana	Thuburbo Minus	ILT 1162
Caecilia Romana	Volubilis	VIII 21832
Caecilia Valeriana	Volubilis	ILM 128
M. Caelius Phileros		X 6704; VIII 26274 with Broughton p 64.
L. Caelius Plautius Catullinus	Sufetula	Pros. 44
L. Caninius Ianuarius Flavianus	Gillium	Pros. 45
C. Cascellius Optatus	Lambaesis ?	Pros. 46
M. Cascellius -----	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 47
Q. Cassius Agrianus Aelianus	Mactaris	Pros. 48
C. Cassius Fortunatus	Cuicul	AE 1914, 237
P. Cassius -----	Cuicul	Pros. 49
Cassia Caeciliana	Volubilis	ILM 96
M. Cincius Hilarianus	Tipasa (M.C.)	VIII 20934
L. Claudius Brutto	Cuicul	AE 1911, 105
Ti. Claudius Cicero	Cuicul	AE 1913, 22
Ti. Claudius Helvius Secundus	Caesarea	Pros. 50
Ti. Claudius Hispanus	Madauros	Pros. 51
L. Claudius Honoratus	Cuicul	Pros. 52
M. Claudius Restitutus	Cirta	Pros. 53
Ti. Claudius Subatianus Proculus	Cuicul	Pros. 54
Q. Clodius Clodianus	Auzia	VIII 9020
M. Clodius Faustus Secundus	Muzuc	Pros. 55
Clodius Lucifer	Lambaesis	Pros. 56

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
C. Cludius Rectus		II 4206
M. Cocceius Romanus	Tipasa (M.C.)	Pros. 57
M. Coculnius Quintilianus	Cirta	Pros. 58
Sex. Cornelius Dexter	Saldae	Pros. 59
Sex. Cornelius Dexter Maximus	Saldae	VIII 8935 = ILS 5484
Cornelius Egrilianus	Theveste	Pros. 60
C. Cornelius Flaccus	Thubursicu Numidarum	Pros. 61
Sex. Cornelius Honoratus	Portus Magnus	Pros. 62
G. Cornelius Peregrinus	Saldae	Pros. 63
Cornelius Rusticus	Thibilis	VIII 5528, 5529
C. Cosinius Maximus	Cuicul	Pros. 64
Cosinius Maximus	Cuicul	Pros. 65
L. Cosinius Primus	Carthage	Pros. 66
P. Curius Servilius Draco	Gigthis	VIII 11033; 22710
L. C ----sius Barbarus	Cuicul	VIII 8310 = 20148
Decianus Catus		Pros. 67
L. Decianus Extricatus	Carthage	AE 1915, 22
Decianus Melissus		VI 1056
Didia Cornelia Ingenua	Cuicul	AE 1920, 115
P. Divius Italicus	Caesarea	Pros. 68
Q. Domitius Victor	Calama	Pros. 69
L. Egnatuleius Sabinus	Thysdrus	Pros. 70
L. Fabius Fortunatus	Mustis	VIII 15588 = ILT 1546
Fabius Honoratus		Pros. 71
Fabius Honoratus	Giufi	VIII 12377
Q. Fabius Honoratus		VI 1343
M. Fabius Mettianus	Segermes	Pros. 72
L. Flavius Aufustianus	Cuicul	AE 1908, 241
L. Flavius Celsus	Cuicul	AE 1916, 12, 16
T. Flavius Gallicus	Thisidium	Pros. 73
T. Flavius Macer	Anmaedara	Pros. 74
T. Flavius Receptus	Cillium	VIII 219 = 11305

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
T. Flavius Secundus	Cillium	Pros. 75
T. Flavius Vibianus Iunior	Lepcis Magna	VIII 14 = 22673
Flavius -----	Carthage	Pros. 76
L. Fulvius Kastus Fulvianus	Mustis	Pros. 77
C. Fulvius Plautianus	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 78
Fulvius -----	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 79
Q. Gabinius Barbarus	-	CP 265
L. Gargilius Augustalis	Cuicul	VIII 8300
Q. Gargilius Martialis I	Auzia	cf Pros. 80
Q. Gargilius Martialis II	Auzia	Pros. 80
Gargilius Venator	Bulla Regia	Pros. 81
G. Gellius Seneca	Molubilis	AE 1955 44
Geminus Clemens	Auzia	Pros. 82
Q. Geminus Marcianus	Thibilis	Pros. 83
Geminus Modestus I		Pros. 84
Geminus Modestus II	Cirta	Pros. 85
Q. Geminus Sabinus	Vicus Annaeus	Pros. 86
C. Helvidius Diogenes	Tingad	Pros. 87
M. Helvius Clemens	Carthage	Pros. 88
M. Helvius Melior Placentius		
Sabinianus Samunianus	Althibussus	Pros. 89
Q. Herennius Martialis	Saldae	Pros. 90
M. Herennius Victor	Thibilis	Pros. 91
Horatius Paritor	Lambaesis	Pros. 92
Iulius Antoninus	Caesarea	Pros. 93
Q. Iulius Aquila	Sicca Veneria	cf Pros. 99
L. Iulius Arrenus	Cirta	AE 1955, 202
C. Iulius Barbarus		Pros. 94
C. Iulius Barbarus	Cirta	VIII 6942 = ILS 6854
C. Iulius Barbarus	Sila	VIII 19204

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
C. Iulius Barbarus	Lambaesis	VIII 3189
L. Iulius Civilis	Cirta	AE 1942/43, 10
C. Iulius Corinthianus	Theveste	Pros. 95
L. Iulius Crassus	Thugga	Pros. 96
C. Iulius Crescens	Cuicul/Cirta	AE 1925, 23 = 1949, 40
C. Iulius Crescens Didius Crescentianus	Cuicul	Pros. 97
Iulius Crescentianus	Cuicul	AE 1946, 104
C. Iulius Crescentianus Instantianus	Mustis	VIII 1576
L. Iulius Crispus	Macula	Pros. 98
Iulius Fidus Aquila	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 99
Q. Iulius Frontinus	Timgad	Pros. 100
P. Iulius Geminius Marcianus	Cirta	Pros. 101
Ti. Iulius Honoratus	Cuicul	VIII 8309 = 20135
L. Iulius (Vehilius Gratus) Iulianus		ILS 1327
L. Iulius Martialis	Cirta	VIII 6965
Q. Iulius Martialis	Cirta	VIII 18234
C. Iulius Maximus	Cuicul	AE 1916, 13
Q. Iulius Maximus Demetrianus	Sidi Amor-el-Djedidi	Pros. 102
Sex. Iulius Possessor		II 1150
P. Iulius Proximus	Cirta	AE 1938, 38
C. Iulius Pudens	Caesarea	Pros. 103
C. Iulius Rogatianus		Pros. 104
C. Iulius Rogatus	Mustis	VIII 27439 = ILT 1553
M. Iulius Rogatus	Cuicul	AE 1916, 14
C. Iulius Sabinus	Rusuccurru	Pros. 105
T. Iulius Sabinus Victorianus	Madauros	Pros. 106
Sex. Iulius Severus	Caesarea	Pros. 107
M. Iulius Silvanus	Thubursicu Numidarum	Pros. 108
Q. Iulius Silvanus	Cuicul	Pros. 109
L. Iulius Victor Modianus	Thagaste	Pros. 110
C. Iulius Urbanus	Madauros	VIII 4683 = ILAlg. I, 2208

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
Iulius ----- dianus	Macula	Pros. 111
Q. Iulius -----	Cuicul	AE 1916, 13
Iulius -----	Caesarea	Pros. 112
Iulia Cornelia	Cuicul	AE 1913, 21 & 1916, 1
Iulia Ingenua	Cuicul	AE 1946, 104
C. Iunius Flavianus		ILS 1342
M. Iunius Punicus	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 113
L. Laberius Vibullus	Sicca Veneria	ILAlg. I, 1348
P. Licinius Agathopus	Gadiaufala	Pros. 114
P. Licinius Papirianus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 115
Q. Lollius Urbicus	Tiddis	Pros. 116
Longelius Karus	Choud-el-Batel	Pros. 117
M. Macrinus Avitus (Catonius Vindex)		ILS 1107
Q. Maecius Laetus		Howe, p. 71
M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus		Pros. 118
M. Manlius Modestus Quietianus	Curubis	ILA 320
Manlia Romana	Volubilis	VIII 21838; ILA 627 ; ILM 119
L. Marcius Victor	Tupusuctu	cf Pros. 119
M. Marius Felix Ofellianus	Mustis	VIII 15581
Marius Victor	Auzia	VIII 9073
C. Memmius Africanus	Gigthis	VIII 11007
M. Memmius Caecilianus	Gigthis	Pros. 120
C. Memmius Caecilianus Placidus	Gigthis ?	Pros. 121
Memmius Messius Pacatus	Gigthis	AE 1915, 44 = ILA 22
L. Memmius Messius Pacatus	Gigthis	VIII 22729 = ILS 9394
Q. Memmius Pudens	Gigthis	Pros. 122
Memmius Valerianus	Lambaesis ?	Pros. 123
P. Messius Augustinus Maecianus	Pheradi Maius	Pros. 124
L. Messius Rufinus	Gigthis	Pros. 125

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
P. Messius Saturninus	Pheradi Maius	Pros. 126
L. Minicius Natalis		ILS 1029
M. Minthוניus Tertullus	Mactaris	Pros. 127
P. Mummius Saturninus	Furnos Minus	VIII 12039 = ILS 6812; cf VIII 12027 - 12030
P. Nonius Felix	Carthage	Pros. 128
M. Oclatinus Adventus		Howe, p. 73
Q. Octavius Primus	Thuburnica	VIII 14703
M. Opellius Macrinus	Caesarea	Pros. 129
C. Otidius Iovinus	Simitthu	VIII 14611 = ILS 6811
C. Otidius Praenestinus	Simitthu	VIII 14611 = ILS 6811
Q. Paccius Victor Candidianus	Furnos Minus	VIII 25808 c.
P. Petronius Felix	Thuburbo Maius	Pros. 130
L. Petronius Florentinus	Saldae	Pros. 131
M. Petronius Honoratus		ILS 1340; CP 117
A. Platorius Nepos		ILS 1052
Ti. Plautius Felix Ferruntianus	Mactaris	Pros. 132
M. Plotius Faustus	Timgad	Pros. 133
C. Pompeius Felix Octavianus	Sufetula	ILA 137
Sex. Pompeius Marianus	Ghardimau	VIII 14730
L. Pompeius Novellus	Cuicul	VIII 20152; AE 1912, 154
L. Pompeius -----ianus	Sufetula	Pros. 134
Q. Pomponius Crispinus	Saldae	Pros. 135
L. Pomponius L---murianus	Sufetula	Pros. 136
M. Pomponius Maximus	Saldae	VIII 8941
Q. Pomponius Saturninus	Saldae	VIII 20862
T. Pomponius Suavis	Saldae	VIII 20862
M. Pomponius Vitellianus	Caesarea	Pros. 137
Pomponia Crispina	Saldae	VIII 8966

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
M. Porcius Aper		II 4238
C. Porcius Saturninus Iunior	Thuburbo Minus	Pros. 138
L. Postumius Felix Celerinus	Hippo Regius	Pros. 139
Q. Postumius Laetianus	Ammaedara	ILA 165
C. Postumius Saturninus Flavianus		VIII 11174 = ILS 1440
Sex. Pullaienus Florus Caecilianus	Thugga	VIII 26615
P. Quintius Terminus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 140
M. Rossius Vitulus		CP 224
Q. Rupilius Honoratus	Mactaris	VIII 627
Q. Rutilius Saturninus	Cuicul	AE 1908, 242
L. Sallustius Processus		Pros. 141
M. Sadius Rufus	Lambaesis	VIII 18227
Q. Seius Iuvenalis	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 4892 = ILA1g, I. 1353.
M. Sempronius Liberalis	Acholla	Pros. 142
Sex. Sempronius Saturninus	Mustis	VIII 15592
D. Senius Vitalis		XIII 8314 = ILS 2572
T. Sennius Sollemnis		XIII 3162
P. Septimius Geta	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 143
L. Septimius Severus I	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 144
L. Septimius Severus II	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 145
M. Septimius -----		AE 1911, 128; Dobson 401
Q. Servaeus		Tacitus, <u>Annals</u> vi, 7; PIR S 398
Q. Servaeus Felix	Gigthis	VIII 22722
L. Servaeus Firmus	Gigthis	VIII 11039; 22722, 22736
Q. Servaeus Fuscus I	Gigthis	VIII 22734; 22736
Q. Servaeus Fuscus II	Gigthis	VIII 22734
Q. Servaeus Fuscus III	Gigthis	VIII 11040; 22722

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
Q. Servaeus Fuscus Cornelianus	Gigthis	Pros. 146
Servaeus Honoratus	Gigthis	VIII 11034
Q. Servaeus Innocens		PIR S. 401; RE IIA 1755
Q. Servaeus Macer	Gigthis	VIII 22698; 22699; 22736
C. Servaeus Messius Pacatus	Gigthis	VIII 22741
M. Servilius Draco Albucianus	Gigthis	VIII 22737 = ILS 6780
C. Servilius Maurinus	Gigthis	VIII 22695; 22739
M. Servilius Plautus	Gigthis	VIII 22700; 22739
C. Servilius Serenus	Gigthis	Pros. 147
Servilia ----ma	Gigthis	VIII 22741
C. Sextius Martialis	Mactaris	Pros. 148
M. Sittius Caecilianus	Icosium	VIII 9259
Q. Sittius Caecilianus		Pros. 149
Q. Sittius Faustus	Tiddis	VIII 6710, 6711
M. Sittius Martialis	Thibilis	VIII 19052
L. Sittius Rufinus	Thibilis	VIII 5534
P. Sittius Velox	Sigus	VIII 5852; 7118 = 19441; 10860
Sittius -----	Thibilis	Pros. 150
Subatianus Aquila	Cuicul	Pros. 151
T. Sulgius Caecilianus	Tuccabor	Pros. 152
Ser. Sulpicius Similis	Carthage	Pros. 153
M. Tannonius Bassus		Pros. 154
M. Tarquitiu Saturninus		XI 3801 = ILS 2692 XI 3805 = ILS 6579
L. Titinius Clodianus	Cuicul	Pros. 155
C. Tullius Frontinus	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 4886 = ILa1g. I. 1354
C. Turranius Honoratus	Thibica	VIII 23120
L. Turranius Honoratus	Tipasa (M.C.)	Pros. 155A

<u>NAME.</u>	<u>TOWN.</u>	<u>REFERENCE.</u>
M. Valerius Gypasius	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 156
Q. Valerius Hilarianus	Sicca Veneria	VIII 1649 = 15834
M. Valerius Maximianus		Libyca iii, p 135 ff.
M. Valerius Propinquus Grattius Cerealis		II 4251 = ILS 2711
Valerius Romanus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 157
M. Valerius Severus	Volubilis	Pros. 158
Valerius -----	Sitifis	Pros. 159
Valeria Gaetula	Volubilis	ILM 96
Valeria Manlia	Volubilis	ILA 626
Valeria Prisca	Volubilis	VIII 21831
M. Valgius Aemilianus	Sufetula	Pros. 160
Sex. Varius Marcellus		X 6569 = ILS 1423; CP 237
Sex. Verteblasius Victor	Lambaesis	Pros. 161
Q. Vetidius Felix	Thubursicu Numidarum	ILAlg. I, 1357; AE 1904, 82
L. Vetidius Iucundus	Madauros	ILAlg. I, 2712
Q. Vetidius Iuvenalis	Thubursicu Numidarum	AE 1903, 319 - 321; 1904, 82
M. Vetidius Mustiolus	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 17167
Vetidius Mustus	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 17167
L. Vetidius Tertullus	Lambaesis	VIII 3265
Vetidius Saturninus	Lambaesis	VIII 4122
M. Vetidius Vetidianus	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 4893
Vettidia Impetrata	Tipasa (M.C.)	VIII 20934
M. Vettius Latro	Thuburbo Maius	Pros. 162
C. Vettius Sabinianus Iulius Hospes		ILA 281
T. Vettius Severus		III 947
L. Vibius Latinianus Valens	Uzappa	Pros. 163
C. Vibius Marinus	Timgad	Pros. 164
A. Vitellius Felix Honoratus	Thugga	Pros. 165
M. Ulpus Victor Seianus	Calama	VIII 5373 = 17498 = ILAlg. I, 330

NAME.TOWN.REFERENCE.

M. Ummidius Annianus Quadratianus	Gigthis	VIII 22691
C. Ummidius Haterianus	Gigthis	VIII 29
L. Ummidius Pacatus	Gigthis	VIII 29, 30
C. Ummidius Sedatus I	Gigthis	VIII 28, 29
C. Ummidius Sedatus II	Gigthis	VIII 22693
M. Ummidius Sedatus	Gigthis	VIII 28, 29; 22693; 22743

Q. Voltedius Optatus Aurelianus	Carthage	Pros. 166.
---------------------------------	----------	------------

Cognomina and single names.

----- Annianus	Tipasa	Pros. 167
----- Aquilinus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 168
----- Castus	Lepcis Magna	Pros. 169
----- Commodus	Cirta ?	VIII 8210
----- Crescens Licinianus		Pros. 170
----- Heridianus	Ammaedara ?	Pros. 171
----- Iulianus	Theveste	VIII 16558
----- Marcellus	Auzia	Pros. 172
----- Nepotianus	Sicca Veneria	Pros. 173
----- Quadratus Laetianus	Segermes	Pros. 174
Quintus	Gigthis	VIII 27 = 11025 = ILS 787
----- Sallustianus	Thibursicum Bure	Pros. 175
----- Salvianus	Theveste	VIII 16530
----- Salvianus	Thuburbo Maius	AE 1914, 57
----- Saturninus	Thubursicu Numidarum	VIII 4891
----- Victorinus	Lambaesis	VIII 2757