

Leszek Mrozewicz
(Gniezno)

FLAVIAN URBANISATION OF AFRICA

Abstract

The article is concerned with urbanisation processes in Roman Africa, initiated by the Flavian dynasty (69–96). Emperor Vespasian and his successors focused their attention primarily on Africa Proconsularis. The new cities they created — colonies and municipia — were to perform an important strategic role, i.e. protect the territories of Africa Proconsularis against the southern tribes. With the great private latifundia and imperial domains, the province played a significant role in supplying the city of Rome with grain. Also, from the point of view of the state, the undertakings meant internal consolidation of the province.

Key words

Imperium Romanum, Africa, Flavians, urbanisation, Romanization, colonies, municipia

Throughout the last half-century of studies of the Roman North Africa¹, it has become an established notion in science that the reign of the Flavian dynasty was a decisive turning point in its history², and rightly so. This breakthrough embraced all areas of life, while the nature of the transformation is best reflected by the view that it was only thanks to the Flavians that Africa became fully Roman³. What is more, this is accompanied by the well-founded thesis that without the achievements of the Flavians, the great prosperity of the Flavian provinces in the 2nd–3rd centuries would not have been possible: their successors reaped what the Flavians had sowed⁴. Without going into too much detail, one should also recognise the rationality of the postulate to set apart the Flavian period in the history of Roman Africa as an era in its own right⁵.

The above remarks apply to the urbanisation activities as well, i.e. to founding new towns and stimulating development of the existing ones. As we know, Northern Africa became an object of Roman colonisation, both initiated by the authority as well as spontaneous ones, as early as 2nd cent. BC, but Julius Cesar and

¹Provinces Africa Proconsularis, Mauretania Caesariensis, Mauretania Tingitana; Numidia was established only by Septimius Severus, by separating the western part of Proconsularis, i.e. the former (dating back to Caesar) Africa Nova.

²T. Kotula, A propos d'une inscription reconstituée de Bulla Regia (Hammam-Darradji). Quelques municipes « mystérieux » de l'Afrique Proconsulaire, MEFRA LXXIX 1967, p. 207–220, esp. p. 218–219; idem, Afryka Północna w starożytności, Wrocław 1972, p. 149–154; M. Leglay, Les Flaviens et l'Afrique, MEFRA LXXX 1968, p. 201–246.

³M. Leglay, Les Flaviens, p. 246: “sur tous les plans de la vie de l'Afrique et des Africains, au point de vue de la administration, comme au point de vue de la défense et de la colonisation du pays, comme aussi pour la romanisation de ses habitants, la dynastie fondée par Vespasien a joué un rôle primordial et décisif. Punico-romaine jusqu'à César, romano-punique ensuite, l'Afrique du Nord ne devint vraiment romaine que sous les Flaviens...”; cf. H. Bengtson, Die Flavien, München 1979, p. 129 (taking into account the review by W. Eck, Gnomon 53, 1981, p. 343–347).

⁴See ibidem, p. 234: “Les Antonins on récolté en Afrique ce que les Flaviens avaient semé”; the phrase has become a classic, see T. Kotula, Afryka Północna, p. 154: “we shall have to repeat the words of a French historian: « **In Africa, the Antonies were to reap the crop of the grain sowed by the Flavians** »”; H. Bengtson, Die Flavien, p. 128: “Die Flavien sind es gewesen, die die Grundlagen für den Wohlstand der nordafrikanischen Provinzen geschaffen haben, **wenn auch erst die Kaiser des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr., die Antonine, hier geerntet haben, was die Flavien gesät hatten**”; Y. Le Bohec, Histoire de l'Afrique romaine 146 avant J.-C. — 439 après J.-C., Paris 2005, p. 65: “C'est au siècle suivant qu'ils en tirèrent les bénéfices « Les Antonins, a écrit M. Le Glay, on récolté en Afrique ce que les Flaviens avaient semé »”; cf. paraphrase on p. 73 “Les Africains [...] ont récolté sous les Antonins ce qu'ils avaient semé sous les Flaviens”.

⁵T. Kotula, Inscription de Bulla Regia, p. 218; M. Leglay, Les Flaviens, p. 234.

Octavian Augustus were particularly active in that field, founding and establishing several dozen colonies and municipia⁶. They found Africa indispensable in order to satisfy the needs of the soldiers and offset the tensions among the Roman plebs. Later however, from Augustus to Vespasian, no new municipium or colony appeared in Africa Proconsularis. Noteworthy developments took place only in the west, in the newly established (42 AD) provinces of Mauretania Caesariensis and Tingitana, where Claudius should be credited with several colonies and municipia, with *optimo iure* municipal rights granted to Volubilis⁷.

The crisis of the year of four emperors did not spare Africa either⁸. In the middle of 68, Clodius Macer, the legate of the Legio III Augusta (stationed at the time in Ammaedara), renounced his allegiance to Nero on receiving the

⁶W. Barthel, *Zur Geschichte der römischen Städte in Africa*, diss. Greifswald 1904, p. 8–49; S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l’Afrique du Nord VIII*, Paris 1928, p. 170–182; T.R.S. Broughton, *The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis*, Baltimore–London 1929, p. 49–68; F. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik unter Caesar und Augustus*, Wiesbaden 1952, p. 81–85, 110–118 (with Mauretania), see the map at the end of the work showing the deductio of Caesar and Augustus; L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen in Nordafrika*, Berlin 1962, esp. p. 120–126 (Caesar), 229–233 (Augustus); J. Gascou, *La politique municipale de l’Empire romain en Afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à Septime-Sévère*, Rome 1972, p. 21–27 (quoted henceforth as Gascou I); a very good, concise outline of the state of urbanisation in the pre-Flavian times: C.R. Whitaker, *Roman Africa: Augustus to Vespasian*, CAH² XI, 1996, p. 603–610.

⁷Cf. L. Chatelain, *Inscriptions Latines du Maroc*, Paris 1942 (= ILM), 56: Ti. Claud(io) Caes(ari) Aug(usto) / divi fil(io) Ger(manico) p(ontifici) m(aximo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) / (quarta) co(n)s(uli tertium), (consuli) desig(nato quartum) imp(eratori octavum) / p(atrici) p(atriciae) Munic(ipium) Volub(itanorum) im(petrata) c(ivitate) R(omana) et conubio / et oneribus remissis / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) d(edit) / M. Fadius Celer Flavianus / Maximus proc(urator) Aug(usti) proleg(ato) / dedicavit; 116: M. Val(erio) Bostaris / f(ilio) Gal(eria) tribu Severo / aed(ili) sufeti Ilvir(o) / flamine primo/⁵ in municipio suo / praef(ecto) auxiliior(um) adversus Aedemo/nem oppressum bello / huic ordo municipii Volub(itanorum) ob me/rita erga rem pub(licam) et legatio/¹⁰nem bene gestam qua ab divo / Claudio civitatem Ro/manam et conubium cum pere/grinis mulieribus immunitatem / annor(um) decem), incolas, bona civium bel/¹⁵lo interfectorum quorum here/des non extabant, suis impetra/vit / Fabia Bira Izelatae f(ilia) uxor indulge/ntissimo viro honore usa impensam / remisit / et d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) d(e)dic(avit); 57: Divo Claudio / Volubitani civitate / Romana ab eo donati; o Volubilis (Ksar Pharaoun, Maroko): RE IX A1 (1961), p. 864–873 (M. Euzennat); PECS, p. 988–989; ASM, p. 860–863; DNP 12/2 (2002), p. 318–319; R. Thouvenot, *Volubilis*, Paris 1949; Ch. Saumagne, *Volubilis, municipe latin*, *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 30, 1952, p. 388–401; J. Gascou, *Municipia civium Romanorum*, *Latomus* 30, 1971, p. 133–141 esp. 136–141; M. Risse (ed.), *Volubilis. Eine römische Stadt in Marokko von der Frühzeit bis in die islamische Periode*, Mainz 2001.

⁸Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l’Afrique romaine*, p. 62–63.

news about the events in Gaul and Spain⁹. In order to strengthen his forces, he created another legion — *Legio I Macriana liberatrix*¹⁰. Although the move was local in nature, Macer found supporters in Sicily¹¹; he also blocked the supply of grain from *Proconsularis*¹², which led to famine in Rome during the last weeks of Nero's reign and perhaps contributed to his eventual downfall¹³. When Clodius Macer took identical action when Galba, of whom he disapproved, ascended to power, it caused the emperor to lose popularity among the people of Rome¹⁴. In early spring 68, Clodius Macer was killed on Galba's orders¹⁵. However, this was no the end of the 'African' turmoil: Galba appointed one procurator, Lucceius Albinus, to oversee both Mauritanian provinces, *Tingitana* and *Caesariensis*¹⁶, thanks to which the latter gained command of a small army, comprising 19 cohorts and 5 *alae*¹⁷. After Galba's downfall, Lucceius Albinus recognised the authority of Oton who, following *Ius Latii*, executed administrative incorporation of the *Maurorum civitates*, i.e. the municipalities of *Mauretania* to *Bettica*¹⁸.

⁹P. Romanelli, *Storia delle province romane dell'Africa*, Roma 1959, p. 279–282 (on p. 279 note 1: listing of sources); M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 206–207; Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion d'Auguste*, Paris 1989, p. 349–352; A. Kunisz, *L'insurrection de Clodius Macer en Afrique du Nord en 68 de notre ère*, Wrocław 1994, on dating see p. 37–48, esp. 43, 45–46; complete listing and appraisal of sources (Tacitus, Plutarch, Suetonius): p. 9–15; course of the rebellion: p. 143–161; T.E.J. Wiedemann, *From Nero to Vespasian*, *CAH*² X, 1996, p. 259; C.R. Whittaker, *Roman Africa*, p. 599.

¹⁰RE XII 2 (1925), p. 1417–1418 (E. Ritterling); cf. R. Cagnat, *L'armée romaine d'Afrique et occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs*, Paris 1913, p. 141–146.

¹¹Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 350; A. Kunisz, *L'insurrection*, p. 104–106, 147; cf. P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 281.

¹²Tac. Hist. I 2; 73,2; Plut. Galba 6;13; Suet., Galba 2; 2/3 of Rome's demand for grain was satisfied by Africa, while Egypt supplied a quarter, see M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 230; G.Ch. Picard, *Néron et le blé d'Afrique*, *Cahiers de Tunisie*, 4,14, 1956, p. 163–173; C.R. Whittaker, *Roman Africa*, p. 599.

¹³A. Kunisz, *L'insurrection*, p. 43–44, 145–146; the author follows the thesis of K. Bradley, A "publica fames" in A.D. 68, *AJPh* 93, 1972, p. 451–458.

¹⁴T.E.J. Wiedemann, *From Nero*, p. 263, cf. 599.

¹⁵Tac. Hist. I 7,1; 37,1; IV 49,7; Suet. Galba 11; Plut. Galba 15; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 282; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 206; Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 350; A. Kunisz, *L'insurrection*, p. 149.

¹⁶B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani. Senatorische und ritterliche Amtsträger in den römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diokletian*, Stockholm 1996, p. 198.

¹⁷RE XIV 2 (1930), p. 2374.

¹⁸Tac. Hist. 78; RE XIV 2 (1930), p. 2374 (St. Weinstock).

After yet another change on the throne, Albinus did not recognise Vitellius and started preparing for the invasion of Spain. In response, his opponents began to spread the information¹⁹ that Albinus intends to establish a separate state, that he wishes to proclaim himself king and adopt the name of Juba. Apart from the Mauritanian provinces, the state was allegedly to include Spain as well, or least its part²⁰. Upon instigation of the governor of Hispania Tarraconensis, Cluvius Rufus, Albinus was eventually murdered²¹. Another personage to cause trouble was L. Calpurnius Piso²², proconsul of Africa, who had been appointed to the post by Vitellius. There was a rumour that he had been suggested proclaiming himself emperor, that he was making his way to Germania to lead the rebelling troops of Vitellius²³. Energetic action undertaken by a legion legate, Valerius Festus²⁴, led to the death of the proconsul²⁵. On top of that, there was the unrest caused by the nomadic tribes, especially the Garamants²⁶ and the Nasamons²⁷.

Vespasian was not alien to African realities: he had been proconsul there in *Realia* 63–64²⁸. However, he was not all too well remembered²⁹ which, taking

¹⁹As above.

²⁰P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 283–284; C.R. Whittaker, *Roman Africa*, p. 600.

²¹Tac. Hist. II 58; 59; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 284; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 63.

²²B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 42.

²³Tac. Hist. IV 38; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 207–208; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 286–288.

²⁴C. Calpetanus Rantius Quirinalis Valerius Festus, leg(atu)s pro praet(ore) ex[er]cit(us) Afri]cae: CIL V 531 = ILS 989 (Tergeste); Tac. Hist. II 98,1; IV 49–50; Pln. epist. III 7, 12; see RE III 1 (1897), p. 1363–1364 (Groag); M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 213; B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 134.

²⁵Tac. Hist. IV 38; 48–50, 1–2; C.R. Whittaker, *Roman Africa*, p. 599.

²⁶Tac. Hist. II 98,1; IV 49, 1–2; Pln. Epist. III 7,12; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 288–292; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 215–216; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 763–64; A. Gutsfeld, *Römische Herrschaft und einheimischer Widerstand in Nordafrika. Militärische Auseinandersetzungen Roms mit den Nomaden*, Stuttgart 1989, p. 82; see also J. Desanges, *Catalogue des tribus africaines de l'Antiquité classique à l'ouest du Nil*, Dakar 1962, p. 93–94; Ch. Daniels, *The Garamantes of southern Libya*, Sussex 1970, esp. p. 21–24; M. Bénabou, *La résistance africaine à la romanisation*, Paris 1976, p. 101–103.

²⁷Cass. Dio LXVII 4,6; Ios. BJ II 381; J. Desanges, *Catalogue*, p. 152–154; M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 104–106; A. Gutsfeld, *Römische Herrschaft*, p. 83–86.

²⁸U. Vogel-Weidemann, *Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.*, Bonn 1982, p. 205–214 esp. 212; B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 40.

²⁹Tac. Hist. II 97,2: Quippe integerum illic ac fvorabilem proconsulatum Vitellius famosum invidiosumque Vespasianus egerat; Suet. Vesp.4,3; cf. Suet. Nero 4: Africam integerrime nec sine magna dignatione administravit.

into account the anti-Flavian mood in Africa when Vespasian was proclaimed emperor certainly did not make his task any easier³⁰.

One of Vespasian's first decisions was to transfer, in 74–75, the seat of the Legio III Augusta from Ammaedara (Haïdra) to Theveste (Tébessa)³¹. Still, Lambaesis (Tazzoult) in Numidia became their permanent base: an element of the legion arrived there already in 81³², while the entire unit was transferred in the second decade of the 2nd century, at the latest³³. Meanwhile, in place of the former camp in Ammaedara, Vespasian established a veteran colony: Colonia Flavia Augusta Emerita Ammaedara³⁴.

³⁰M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 207–209.

³¹F. de Pachtère, *Les camps de la Troisième légion en Afrique au premier siècle de l'empire*, CRAJ 1916, p. 273–284 esp. 282; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 293; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 216–217; PECS, p. 913–914 (Thevestis); Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 353.

³²The erection of a military camp in Lambaesis is confirmed in a building inscription from 81 (July–September) — L. Leschi, *Inscriptions latines de Lambèse et de Zana (Diana Veteranorum)*, I. Un nouveau camp de Titus à Lambèse, *Libyca* I 1953, p. 189–197 = AE 1914, 137: Imp(eratore) T(ito) Caesare divi Ves(pasiani) f(ilio) Aug(usto) pon(tifice) max(imo) / trib(unicia) pot(estate) [[XI]] co(n)s(ule) VIII / [[Imp(eratore) XV cens(ore) p(atrici) p(atre) et Caes(are) di] vi f(ilio) Domitiano co(n)s(ule) VII] / L. Tettio Iuliano leg. Aug. pr.pr. / leg(io) III Aug(usta) / muros et castra a solo / fecit; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 218; Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 354 note 230, 369; idem, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 64; B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 137.

³³Construction of the so-called large camp was completed no later than 129, see M. Janon, *Recherches à Lambèse, Antiquités Africaines* 7, 1973, p. 200–215, esp. 211–215; idem, *Lambèse et l'occupation militaire de la Numidie meridionale*, [in:] *Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms II*, Köln–Bonn 1977, p. 473–485 esp. 479–485; idem, *Lambaesis, Antike Welt* 8, 2, 1977, p. 3–20; DNP 6 (1999), p. 1076–1078; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 66.

³⁴CIL VIII 308: Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) / M. Aurelio / Valerio / [Maximi]ano / ⁵pio felici / invicto / Aug(usto) / Col(onia) Fl(avia) Aug(usta) / Aemerita (sic!) / Ammaed(ara) / d(ono) d(ato) p(ecunia) p(ublica); 309 = 11532: DDNN [Val(erio) Diocletiano Aug(usto) VII et [Maximiano] Aug(usto) VI co(n)s(uli) / Kal(endis) Aprilib(us) porticus theatri sumptu publico / coloniae Ammaedarensium restitutae; cf. CIL VIII 302; RE IV 1 (1900), p. 554 (E. Kornemann); RE VI 2 (1909), p. 2684 (R. Weynand); PECS, p. 50; ASM, p. 819–820; J. Assmann, *De coloniis oppidisque Romanis, quibus imperatorum nomina vel cognomina imposita sunt*, diss. Langensalzae 1905, p. 109 (ascribes foundation of the colony to Domitian); M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 217–219; B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Untersuchungen zu den Beinamen der Städte des Imperium Romanum*, *Epigraphische Studien* 9, 1972, p. 73, 75, 98 no. 5; M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato nelle province romane dell'Africa*, Roma 1974, p. 61–67; Gascou I, p. 29–30; idem, *La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord I. De la mort d'Auguste au début du III siècle*, ANRW II 10.2 (1982), p. 161–162 (quoted later: Gascou II); C. Lepelley, *Les cités de l'Afrique romaine au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1981, II, p. 64–65; N. Duval, *Topographie et ur-*

The honourable appellation “Flavia” and assigning Ammaedara to tribus Quirina³⁵ betoken the Flavian initiative, while “Emerita” clearly indicates that we are dealing with a *deductio veteranorum*³⁶. This is validated by the traces of veteran settlement in Ammaedara and in the immediate vicinity³⁷. Nevertheless, establishing a colony, irrespective of satisfying the needs of the veterans, had a hidden, thoroughly strategic aim. The void left by Legio III Augusta had to be filled, thus ensuring protection from the threat of the *Musulamii*, a tribe whose lands adjoined to Roman territories, including Ammaedara³⁸, and bordered on the imperial domains³⁹. At the beginning of the

banisme d’Ammaedara (actuellement Haïdra, Tunisie), ANRW II 10.2 (1982), p. 633–671, esp. p. 637–639.

³⁵W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum*, Wien 1889, p. 136, 138–139; cf. CIL VIII 5351 (Calama): T. Flavio T.f. Quir(ina tribu) Macro II vir(o) flamini perpetuo Ammaedarensium...

³⁶B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Untersuchungen*, p. 75; A. Berthier, *La Numidie. Rome et le Maghreb*, Paris 1981, p. 131; contra J. Lassère, *Ubique populus. Peuplement et mouvements de population dans l’Afrique romaine de la chute de Carthage à la fin de la dynastie des Sévères (146 av. C. — 235 p. C.)*, Paris 1977, p. 250: “Ammaedara était une colonie honoraire, sans déduction effective de colons...”

³⁷ILT 463 (Haïdra): Q. Fabius Vic(tor) vetera(nus) leg III Aug(ustae) / vixit annis LXXI / h(ic) s(itus) e(st); ILT 465 (Haïdra) Gallico / militi leg(ionis) III Aug(ustae) / (centuria) Volusi militavit ann(is) / XXVIII /⁵ h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / M. Cornelius Martialis com(militi)o et amicus (centuria) Cluenti d(e) s(ua) [p(osit)] ? /⁵ fecit pro meritis Gallici amici; both texts originate from the 1st century, which is chiefly evinced by the format of the notation (*hic situs est*, no *dis manibus*); as regards the second tombstone, it belonged most probably to a veteran; as for *colonia veteranorum* see reservations of Lassère’s, as above.

³⁸ILAlg 2939bis (Khabguet Nasser): [Ex] autoritate / im(peratoris) Ne(rvae) Trai(a)ni Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Ger(manici) / [Da]cici co(n)s(ulis) VI / imp(eratoris) XIII /⁵ L. Acilius Strabo / Clodius Nummus / I[e]g(atus) Aug(usti) pr(o) p(raetore) inter / Aug(ustum) et Amedere(nses — sic!) et Musul(amios); J. Desanges, *Catalogue*, p. 117–121; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 216–217; Gascou I, p. 33; M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 558; still valid: J. Toutain, *Le territoire des Musulami, Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de France* 57, 1896, p. 271–294, esp. p. 293: “Mais des colonies romaines, Ammaedara, Thelepte, Madaura, ont été fondées tout autour, sinon même à l’intérieure de leur territoire de parcours; les postes militaires, comme Thala et Sufes, créés pour les surveiller et les contenir, ont vu naître sous leurs remparts des cités prospères; les terres laissées aux *Musulamii* ont été délimitées”.

³⁹E.g. ILAlg 2988 (Ain Kamelle): [E]x auc(t)ori(tate) / Imp(eratoris) Nerva(e) Traiani / Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Ger(manici) Dacici / L. Minucius Natalis /⁵ leg(atus) Aug(usti) pro pr(aetore) / inter Aug(ustum) et / Musul(amios) XXXI / PMP .. VI DCCC; ILAlg 2989: Ex auc(t)ori(tate) / Imp(eratoris) Ne(rvae) Traiani / Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Ger(manici) D(acici) / co(n)s(ulis) VI im(p(eratoris)) XIII /⁵ L. Acilius Strabo Clod(ius) Nummus leg(atus) Aug(usti) /

new era Legio III Augusta was deployed precisely in view of the necessity to keep the Musulamii in check⁴⁰.

The second Flavian veteran colony was Madaura (Madauros; Mdaourouch)⁴¹, located some 25km south of Tagasta, and around 80km north-west of Ammaedara. The fact that it was a *deductio veteranorum* is confirmed in two sources: information from Apuleius from Madaura about the city having been established by veterans⁴² and an inscription found in the forum with the name *Colonia Flavia Augusta Veteranorum Madaurensium*⁴³. The inscription confirms at the same time that Flavians were the founders of the colony⁴⁴. This is additionally corroborated by the fact that Madauros belonged to the *tribus Quirina*⁴⁵. Unfortunately, only a few tombstones of the former soldiers attest to the veteran settlement. Naturally, there is no certainty that their settling to live in Madauros is directly linked to the establishment of the colony⁴⁶. An echo of the actions of Vespasian and his sons may be sought in the relatively substantial group of Flavii in the onomastic material from Madauros⁴⁷, yet it should be remembered that there are equally numerous instances of Iulii,

pr(o) pr(aetore) inter / Aug(ustum) et Musul(amios); M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 204, 209 (about emperor's saltus); M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 437.

⁴⁰P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 186; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 204.

⁴¹RE XIV 1 (1928), p. 201–202 s.v. Madauros (H. Dessau); DNP 7(1999), p. 631 s.v. Madauros; PECS, p. 541–542; M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 273–284.

⁴²Apul. Apol. XXIV 8: *Ac deinceps veteranorum militum novo condita splendidissima colonia*.

⁴³ILAlg 2152: spl[endidus ordo co](loniae) Fl(aviae) Aug(ustae) vete[rano(rum) Madauren]sium...

⁴⁴P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 294; Gascou I, p. 32–33; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 127–128; J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 252–254; Gascou II, p. 163; B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Untersuchungen*, p. 75; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 64 erroneously ascribes Madaura the status of *municipium*; the reconstruction of the inscription suggested by S. Gsell is beyond any doubt (J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 252: “la restitution très certaine par Gsell”).

⁴⁵W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum*, p. 136, 151–152.

⁴⁶It concerns among others ILAlg 2197: Ti. Clau[us]/i(us) Cresce(n)[s eq(ues)] / ala Gal[lo]ru(m) m(ilitavit) an[n(is)] /⁵ XXXVI v[ix(it)] / ann(is) LXX[X] ? / XV h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / p(ius) in(n)oce(n)s); ILAlg 2201: Dis / Manibus / sacr(um) / L. Fotidius L(ucii) f(ilius) / Pol(ia teribu) Absens /⁵ veter(anus) flam(en) Aug(usti) / per(petuus) mil(itavit) an(nis) XXVI / vix(it) an(nis) LXXXX / h(ic) s(itus) e(st); both inscriptions originate from the early period, i.e. from the turn of the 1st and the 2nd century (as the formula suggests), hence veterans may, but only may, have been associated with *deductio coloniae*, see J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 252–254.

⁴⁷See ILAlg 2235, 2294, 2296, 2352, 2443–2446, 2448–2452, 2454–2476.

Claudii, Marcii, Cornelii, Sempronii, etc. In this respect, one should concur with the view expressed in the literature of the subject that the appearance of Flavii in Madauros marked an end to a stage of Romanisation which started with Marius, in the 2nd century BC⁴⁸.

Colonia Flavia Augusta Veteranorum Madaurensium did not appear from a scratch. The history of Madauros dates back at least to the late 3rd century BC. At the time, the town belonged to Syphax, and after the Second Punic War to Masinissa⁴⁹. In establishing the colony (?), Vespasian anticipated the strategic significance of Madauros, which was situated, to quote Apuleius, on the borderlands of Numidia and Gaetulia⁵⁰. Immediately to the south, there lay the frontier with the Musulamii⁵¹, so it was undoubtedly the task of the colonists to secure the Roman possessions, including imperial domains⁵², from potential pressures exerted by the tribe⁵³.

Both Ammaedara and Madauros were colonies based on *deductio*, i.e. associated with the settlement of specially chosen settlers. A different arrangement applies in the case of Hippo Regius⁵⁴, the third “African” colony of the Flavians. Already in 78, Hippo Regius, a town of Phoenician tradition⁵⁵, had

⁴⁸J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 254: “L’installation des vétérans flaviens à Madaure a donc complété un début de romanisation”; see also the authors’ deliberations on p. 254–257.

⁴⁹According to the account of Apuleius, *Apol.* XXIV 7–8; see Gsell, *ILAlg*, p. 181; *RE XIV 1* (1928), p. 201; Gascou I, p. 33; Gascou II, p. 163; J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 254.

⁵⁰*Apul. Apol.* XXIV 7–8: *sitam Numidiae et Getuliae in ipso confinio*; see Gascou I, p. 33.

⁵¹*ILAlg 2828*: *Ex auctorita[te] / Imp(eratoris) Nervae Traiani / Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Germani/ci Dacici /⁵ L. Minicius Natalis / leg(atus) Aug(usti) pro pr(aetore) inter / Madaurenses et Musulamios (fines posuit)*; cf. 2829: *[Ex auc]tori[tate] / Imp(eratoris) Nervae Traiani / Caes(aris) Aug(usti) Ger(manici) Daci(ci) / co(n)s(ulis) VI [im]p(eratoris) XIII /⁵ L. Acilius Strabo Cl[od] / ius Nummus leg(atus) Aug(usti) / pr(o) pr(aetore) inter Musul(amios) / et Madaurenses*; *RE XIV 1* (1928), p. 202; Cillium, p. 284–286, 293; Gascou I, p. 33; Gascou II, p. 163.

⁵²See above, note 39; cf. inscription of T. Flavius Macro (*CIL VIII 5351*) who was *proc(urator) Aug(usti) praediorum saltum [Hip]oniensis et Thevestini* (see above, note 35).

⁵³Gascou I, p. 33: “La déduction d’une colonie à Madauros paraît donc entrer dans le cadre d’une avance de la colonisation vers l’Ouest et d’un contrôle plus étroit des Musulames”; Gascou II, p. 163.

⁵⁴*RE VIII 2* (1913), p. 2627–2628 (H. Dessau); E. De Ruggiero, *Hippo Regius*, *DE III* (1922), p. 744; *PECS*, p. 394–396; *ASM*, p. 846; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 113; *DNP 5* (1998), p. 579; see E. Marec, *Hippone la Royale. Antique Hippo Regius, Alger 1954*; H.V.M. Dennis, *Hippo Regius. From the earliest times to the Arab conquest*, Amsterdam 1970 (reprinted Princeton 1924); M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 268–272; L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen*, p. 163–164.

⁵⁵As above.

the status of *municipium*⁵⁶ awarded by Augustus⁵⁷. Also it does not feature on Pliny's list of African colonies⁵⁸. Ptolemy was the first to mention Hippona as a colony⁵⁹. Apart from that, *colonia Hippona* appears only twice in non-epigraphical sources: in *Itinerarium Antonini*⁶⁰ and in *De Civitate Dei* by St. Augustine⁶¹. In inscriptions, *Colonia Hippo Regius* is first recorded only under Severans⁶². Since Claudius Ptolemy did not use sources dated later than Trajan, Hippona must have obtained the status of a colony between 78 and the reign of that emperor (97–117)⁶³.

⁵⁶AE 1949, 76 (*Hippo Regius*, on the paving stones of the forum, excellent photographs: Marec, *Hippone la Royale*, p. 75; L. Leschi, *Algérie antique*, Paris 1952, p. 13); C. Paccius *Africanus pont(ifex) co(n)s(ul) proco(n)s(ul) patronus municipii dedic(avit)...*; see also E. Marec, *Les fouilles d'Hippone*, CRAI 1948, p. 558–559; idem, *Le forum d'Hippone*, *Libyca II* 1954, p. 383–385; date: 78 at the latest, i.e. year of proconsulate (77/78) of Paccius Africanus, see B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 44.

⁵⁷ILAlg 109: *Munic(ipium) Aug(ustum) Hipp(onensium) Reg(iorum)*; in this matter see F. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation*, p. 115; L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen* (as note 6), p. 163–164 (*municipium ex iure Latini*).

⁵⁸Pln. NH V 29: *Ad hunc finem [with Cyrenaica] Africa a fluvio Ampsaga [on the border with Mauretania] populos DXVI habet, qui Romano pareant imperio; in his colonias sex, praeter iam dictas Uthinam, Thuburbi; the remaining colonies are listed by Pliny in paragraphs 22 and 24; all in all, the list is as follows: Cirta, Sicca (§22), Carthago, Maxula (§24), Uthina i Thuburbi (§29); see comment p. 141–142; see H.V.M. Dennis, *Hippo Regius*, p. 29.*

⁵⁹Ptol. *Geogr.* IV 3.5 ed. Müller p. 615–616; on the reading see Gascou I, p. 34; H.V.M. Dennis, *Hippo Regius*, p. 29.

⁶⁰*Itinerarium Antonini (provinciarum)* p. 3: 20,3 *Hippone Regio colonia* [O. Cuntz (ed.), *Itineraria Romana. Vol I. Itineraria Antonini Augusti et Burdigalense, Lipsiae MCMXXIX*]; see H.V.M. Dennis, *Hippo Regius*, p. 29.

⁶¹XXII 8,11: *quod Hipponensi coloniae vicinum est.*

⁶²AE 1958, 141: *Coloni[a] / Augusta / Hippo / Regius /⁵ restituit / felic(iter)*; cf. no. 142, where 'colonia' was completely reconstructed, see E. Marec, *Inscriptions recueillies à Hippone dans les Thermes du Nord et du Sud*, *Libyca IV* 1956, p. 291–317 esp. p. 306–309 no. 1–2; AE 1960, 104: *Resp(ublica) col[oniae] Hipp[on]o(nis) Reg(ii) — from 276; E. Marec, *Le forum d'Hippone*, p. 382: *Terra mar[i]/que victor[i] / ac publica[e] / libertati[ps] restituito[ri] / d(omino) n(ostro) Fl(avio) Val(en)ti victori / ac triumfa(tori) sempe[r] / augusto / Respublica (sic!) / Col(oniae) Hipp[on]o(nensium) Reg(iorum) / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)*, see AE 1955, p. 48 —from the year of 364 A.D.*

⁶³Gascou I, p. 34; Gascou II, p. 164; M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 418; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 113; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 64.

There is a general consensus of scientific opinion, especially since the publication of the article by Tadeusz Kotula⁶⁴, that Hippo Regius was created by the Flavians⁶⁵; possibly it was Vespasian himself, in the last months of his reign. The Flavian option is supported by the tribus Quirina, where Hippo Regius was enrolled⁶⁶, the tombstones of the Flavii in Hippona⁶⁷ and in the area as well as increased activity in road construction⁶⁸, e.g. repairs were made to the road from Carthage to Theveste and new routes were traced, connecting Theveste — Hippo Regius and Theveste — Thelepte⁶⁹; the important road leading from Hippo Regius to Cirta was renovated as well⁷⁰. The presence of the Flavian imperial inscription in Hippona⁷¹, as well as discovery of remnants of a monumental statue of Vespasian at the forum, with a perfectly preserved head, are facts that cannot be easily discounted⁷².

The colony of Hippo Regius was established as a consequence of change in the legal status of the town: it was elevated from municipium to the rank of titular colony, the first such colony in Africa⁷³. This means that no uniform group of colonists was brought to Hippo Regius⁷⁴. The change concerned the

⁶⁴T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 217–218; see Gascou I, p. 34–35; Gascou II, p. 164.

⁶⁵A completely different view was expressed by J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 248: in his opinion Hippo Regius obtained the rights of a colony only in 198 from Septimius Severus, which is attested to in the inscription AE 1958, 141 (above, note 62).

⁶⁶W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum*, p. 146.

⁶⁷T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 217 note 4, and Gascou I, p. 34 note 8.

⁶⁸P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 299; T. Kotula, *L'inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 217.

⁶⁹P. Salama, *Les voies romaines de l'Afrique du Nord*, Alger 1951, p. 25–26, 34; see map: A. Berthier, *La Numidie*, p. 186.

⁷⁰E. Marec, *Le forum d'Hippone*, p. 376 nr 2 = AE 1955, 145: [Caes]ar Vespasia[nus] ... mandavit anno ... [vi]am ab Alpibus us[que ad ... s]inum ...; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 299; T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 217.

⁷¹E. Marec, *Le forum d'Hippone*, p. 377 = AE 1955, 146: [Imp. T. Vespasiano Caep. Aug. D]ivi Vespasiani [Caes. Aug. Filio po]ntifici max(imo) trib(uniciae) [pot(estatis) IX Imp(eratori) X]V p(atrici) p(atriciae) co(n)s(uli) VIII desig(nato) IX cens(ori); E. Marec, *ibidem*, no. 5: one fragment of a marble slab with the name of Vespasian (VESP).

⁷²T. Kotula, *L'inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 217; see E. Marec, *Le forum d'Hippone*, p. 404 no. 3 (description of the head of Vespasian's statue); *idem*, *Hippone la Royale*, p. 35 (photograph); L. Leschi, *Algérie antique*, Paris 1952, p. 15 (photograph).

⁷³Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l'Afrique romaine*, p. 64; G. Di Vita-Evrard, "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna", *BAC n.s.* 17, 1981 (1984), fsc. B, p. 208.

⁷⁴See Gascou II, p. 164, quoting J. Desanges, *RHD* 51, 1973, p. 429 (?); also *idem* (ed.), *Plinie l'Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre V, 1–46 (L'Afrique du Nord)*, Paris 1980, p. 201–203.

former inhabitants of the Municipium Augustum Hipponensium Regiorum. Naturally, this does not preclude the possibility of veterans settling there, but this would have been individual enterprise. Nevertheless, it should be noted that data on veterans in the epigraphic material from Hippo Regius and the area are more than modest⁷⁵.

Colonia Hippo Regius is an example of urban development policy of a different kind, consisting in upgrading the existing communities — either peregrine or communities of Roman citizens (*conventus civium Romanorum*) — to the rank of a city. Those were municipia which as a rule received *ius Latini*⁷⁶. In Africa Proconsularis, three to five such municipia were created in the Flavian times. Working from the south upwards, the first is Lepcis Magna⁷⁷, a town of long Phoenician-Punic traditions, the peregrine *civitas Lepcitana*⁷⁸ (*libera*⁷⁹), until the moment it received Roman rights. The municipal status of Lepcis is confirmed in the first place by a monumental inscription from an honorific arch of Vespasian and Titus⁸⁰, dated to 77-78. It mentions the patron of the municipium⁸¹ — the proconsul C. Paccius Africanus known from

⁷⁵ILAlg 31 (Hippo Regius): D(is) M(anibus) / Cl(audius) Sverus ve[t(eranum)] / vix(it) an(nis) LXI d(iebus) / XII m[en]s[ur]a(it)avit an(nis) /⁵ XXV Cl(audius) Rest(utus-, itutus?) / p(at)ri piiss[im]i / mo; 32 (Hippo Regius): Severus vete[ra]nus coh(ortis) III / praetoriae vix(it) / annis LVIII /⁵ pius suis h(ic) s(itus) [e(st)].

⁷⁶G. Alföldy, Notes sur la relation entre le droit de cité et la nomenclature dans l'Empire romain, *Latomus* 25, 1966, p. 37–57; P. Le Roux, "Municipium Latinum" et "municipium Italiae": à propos de la "lex Irnitana", [in:] *Epigraphia*, Rome 1991, p. 565–582; A. Beschaouch, Aspects du droit latin en Afrique romaine, *Bulletin de la Société nationale des antiquaires de France* 1996, p. 252–262.

⁷⁷KIPauly 3 (1969), p. 581–582; PECS, p. 499–500; DNP 7 (1999), p. 75–78; P. Romaneli, *Leptis Magna*, Roma 1925 (p. 1–36: Storia della città); idem, *Leptis Magna*, *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica Classica e Orientale* IV 1961, p. 572–594; L. Teutsch, Das Städtewesen (as note 6), p. 130–134; M. Floriani Squarciapino, *Leptis Magna*, Basel 1966 (p. 4–30: Geschichte der Stadt); M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 23–45; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 335–368 (*Lepcis Magna*); Gascou I, p. 75–83; I.M. Barton, *Africa in the Roman Empire*, Accra 1972, p. 51–54; D.J. Mattingly, *Lepcis Magna (Lebda)*, [in:] idem, *Tripolitania*, London 1995, p. 116–122; A. Di Vita, *Leptis Magna. Die Heimatstadt des Septimius Severus in Nordafrika*, *Antike Welt* 27, 2, 1996, p. 173–190; G. Di Vita-Evrard, *Lepcis Magna*, [in:] *La Libye antique. Cités perdues de l'Empire romain*, Paris 1998, p. 44–145.

⁷⁸IRT 301, 330, 331.

⁷⁹See G. Di Vita-Evrard, "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna", p. 197–198.

⁸⁰Ibidem, p. 200; see R.G. Goodchild, *Two Monumental Inscriptions of Lepcis Magna*, *PBSR* XVII 1950, p. 77–82 (*The Dedication of Flavian Arch*).

⁸¹IRT 342 = AE 1949, 84 inscription on both sides of a limestone block, dated 77–78): A. —

Hippo Regius⁸². This is “accompanied” by a whole range of official Flavian inscriptions. 83 is the assumed dating of the titulus⁸³ of L. Nonius Asprenas, also a proconsul of Africa⁸⁴ and patron of the Lepcis Magna municipium⁸⁵. In one of the texts, unfortunately surviving only in fragments, one may surmise the title of [prin]ceps mun[icipii]⁸⁶. It is a dedication from some monumental edifice, most likely from the times of Diocletian: in the first line of the text there are visible marks of martellation, which may be associated, given the archaeological context, only with that particular emperor⁸⁷.

Another interesting item⁸⁸ is the inscription from the theatre, dated to 92, whose protagonist, Ti. Claudius Sestius⁸⁹, besides numerous honourable titles,

Imp(eratori) Caesa[r]i Vespasian[o Aug(usto) p]ont(ifici) max(imo) / [trib(unicia)] pot(estate) [VIII imp(eratori) XVIII p(atri) p(atriciae) co(n)s(uli) V[III] / [T(ito) Imp(eratori)] Caes[ari] Vespasi]ano Aug(usti) f(ilio) / pont(ifici) [imp(eratori)?] co(n)s(uli) VI /⁵ [C(aius) Pa]ccius Africanus pon[tif(ex) co(n)s(ul) / [pr]oco(n)s(ul) Africae patronu[s] per / Cn(aeum) Dom[itium] Pont[ic]um pr(aetorem) leg(atum) / pro [pr(aetore) **patronum municipii** dedic(avit) / **B.** — [Imp(eratori)] Caesari V[espasia]no Aug(usto) po[nt(ifici) max(imo)] / [tr]ib(unicia) po(testate) VI[III imp(eratori) X]VIII p(atri) p(atriciae) c[o(n)s(uli) VIII / T(ito) Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) [Vespasian]o Aug(usti) [f(ilio)] pont(ifici) i[mp(eratori)?] co(n)s(uli) [VI?] /⁵ C(aius) Pac[ci]us Africanus pontif(ex) [co(n)s(ul) / pr[oc]o(n)s(ul) Africae patronu[s] per / Cn(aeum) Domitium Pont[ic]um pr(aetorem) leg(atum) / p(ro) p(raetore) **patronum [muni]cipi**.

⁸²B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 44 no. 49a.

⁸³G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna”, p. 200: “IRT 346, dédicace monumentale, provenant d’un édifice non déterminé et gravée d’après un texte émanant de la chancellerie du proconsul...”

⁸⁴As above, p. 45 no. 51.

⁸⁵IRT 346 (enormous inscription on seventeen blocks; I quote only a fragment): Imp(eratore) Caesare divi Vespasiani [[f(ilio) Domitiano Aug(usto) pontif(ice) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) II imp(eratore) III] p(atre) p(atriciae) co(n)s(ule) VIII]] L. Nonius L. f. Pom(ptina) tribu) Asprenas ... proco(n)s(ul) provinciae Africae patronus municipii dedicavit legato pro pr(aetore) M(arco) Cornelio Firmo; see B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 35.

⁸⁶IRT 350; G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna”, p. 200.

⁸⁷G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna”, p. 200: “très fragmentaire, est également une dédicace de monument où se lisait, sous la titulature érasé de Domitien, le nom de l’évergète, notable et partant magistrat, responsable de la construction”.

⁸⁸Other inscriptions from the Flavian era: IRT 343 (with Vespasian’s titulature), 344 (probably part of the previous inscription), 345 (“probably Vespasian and Titus”), 348 (Domitian, year 93–94), 349 (Domitian), 349 a (Domitian).

⁸⁹IRT 347: Imp(eratore) Caesare divi Vespasiani [[f(ilio) Domitiano Augusto Germanico pontif(ice) max(imo) trib(unicia) potest(ate) XI imp(eratore) XXI co(n)s(ule) XVI censore pe[r]petu]o patre patriae]] / Ti(berius) Claudius Quir(ina) tribu) Sestius Ti(berii) Claudi(i) Sesti f(ilius) praefectus sacrorum flamen divi Vespasiani suus flamen perpetuus amator patriae ama-

mentions the dignity of the *sufes*, a vestige of the Punic times⁹⁰. In the epigraphic material dated to the period before Trajan or to the beginning of his reign, there appears the office of *quatuovir*⁹¹. At the latest, Lepcis Magna received the title “*colonia*” from Trajan in 109/110, which is when it appeared for the first time in inscriptions⁹². Meanwhile, the most immediate preceding mention of Lepcis Magna as *municipium* features in a text dated to 100–102. This is a fragmentarily preserved inscription which the editor princeps linked to Commodus⁹³. In a slightly modified form, it also appeared as *titulus Commodianus* in a corpus of inscriptions from Tripolitania⁹⁴. Both readings were categorically objected to by Ginette Di Vita-Evrard, who seems to be wholly justified to have done so⁹⁵. In her opinion, the first line does not read *DIVI M AURE* but *DIVI NERVAE*, therefore the personage in question is Trajan, not Commodus. The second line⁹⁶, providing the numerical value of *tribunica potestas*, allows the

tor civium ornator patriae amator concordiae cui primo ordo et populus ob merita maiorum eius et ipsius lato clavo semper uti conce[ssit] / podi(um) et aram d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(uravit).

⁹⁰See A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford² 1973, p. 363,

⁹¹IRT 305: Neptun[o] / Aug(usto) s[ac(rum)] / C(aius) Sossius [.c. 5 ..] / nus IIIIv[ir aed(ilicia)?] /⁵ pot(estate) de sua [pecunia fecit]; cf. Di Vita-Evrard, “*Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna*”, p. 203: “appartenant [...] selon toute vraisemblance à la fin de Ier s. ou à la décennie du IIe s. qui précède l’accession au statut colonial...”

⁹²IRT 353 (Arch of Trajan): [Imp(eratori) Cae]sari divi Nerv[ae filio] Nervae T]raiano Au[gusto Germ(anico)] / [Dacico pont(ifici)] max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) XIII imp(eratori) VI co(n)s(uli) V] p(atr)ia p(atr)iae con[sensu omnium] / [ordo et populus] **coloniae Ulpiae Tr[ai]anae fid[el]is Lepcis [Magnae arcum]** / cum ornamen[tis pecunia pub]lica feceru[nt].

⁹³R. Bartoccini, *Le Terme di Lepcis (Leptis Magna)*, Bergamo 1929, p. 92–93: Imperatore Cae]sare divi M. Aure[li filio] / [Ger. Sar]m. pont. max. trib pot. V... / [Deo Herc]uli Genio municipi / quib ma / municipi mi fc.

⁹⁴IRT 286: [Imp(eratore) Caesa]re divi M[arci filio] M(arco) Aurelio Commodo Aug(usto) / [.. c.8 ..] pon[t(ifice) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) V... / [Deo Herc]uli genio municipii [.. / ...]qu[... / .. c. 8 ..] minicipii [...3–4 ...]mi[...]; remark on line 1.: “The letters which follow the M are no longer legible”.

⁹⁵G. Di Vita-Evrard, “*Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna*”, p. 201; she mentioned the concept earlier in the article entitled: *Quatre inscriptions du Djebel Tarhuna: le territoire de Lepcis Magna*, *Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia (QAL)* 10, 1979, p. 96 note 134.

⁹⁶[Ger]m(anico) pon[t(ifice) max(imo) trib(unicia) pot(estate) V ...

inscription to be dated to the period from December 10th, 100 to the end of 102 (Trajan adopts the cognomen *devictae gentis* — *Dacicus*)⁹⁷.

Thus we arrive at a certainty that Lepcis Magna was a *municipium* in the Flavian period, from the beginning of Trajan's reign until 109 at the outside. There is also every indication that it was Vespasian who elevated Lepcis Magna to the rank of *municipium*, as at that very time (in 77/78) the term appears in the source material⁹⁸. The potential consideration of the persons of Claudius or Nero⁹⁹, in view of the *tribus Quirina* found in Lepcis¹⁰⁰, is utterly unwarranted, outweighed by the evidence of exceptional activity of the Flavians¹⁰¹. It also seems that the attempts to interpret the title of the *sufes* featured in the inscriptions from Magna¹⁰² as a proof of the survival of their "own" law¹⁰³ — i.e. from before the establishment of the *municipium* — or

⁹⁷G. Di Vita-Evrard, "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna", p. 201; D. Kienast, *Die römischen Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*, Darmstadt 1990, p. 123.

⁹⁸See above, note 81; Gascou I, p. 35–36; the use of the term "municipium" in the inscription IRT 544, dated to the late 3rd cent. or beginning of the 4th cent. is difficult to explain: L. Volusio Basso Cereali / c(larissimo) v(iro) legato gotius / innocentiae et / aequitatis et consi⁵milis moderatio/nis viro / Lepcimagnenses ex de/creto ordinis mu/nicipi patrono perpetuo; on Bassus Cerealis see B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 124.

⁹⁹P. Romanelli, *Leptis Magna*, DE IV 1953, p. 660: "forse sotto Nerone"; p. 662: "Leptis fu elevata sotto Nerone"; evidence: ITR 431 (under Nero) mentions a *sufes*, while IRT 432 (Vespasian) and IRT 346 (Domitian) features "municipium".

¹⁰⁰W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum*, p. 150; Gascou I, p. 75, 78; Claudius and Nero were also associated with that *tribus*; the *tribus Papiria* found in Lepcis Magna is obviously unequivocally linked to Trajan and his establishing of the colony.

¹⁰¹See the accurate formulations by Gascou I, p. 78–79; Ginette Di Vita-Evrard takes an unequivocal stand here, the title of her article — "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna" — is akin to a manifesto; as regards construction undertakings of the Flavii, p. 204; see also idem, *La dédicace du temple d'Isis à Sabratha: une nouvelle inscription africaine à l'actif de C. Paccius Africanus*, *Libya Antiqua III–IV 1966–1967*, p. 13–20.

¹⁰²IRT 347, see above, note 88; also the famous inscription in honour of the grandfather of Septimius Severus: IRT 412; see Gascou I, p. 76.

¹⁰³H. Herzog, *Die Laufbahn des Lucius Septimius Severus, Sufes, und das Stadtrecht von Lepcis Magna*, *Chiron* 2, 1972, p. 395–404, cf. p. 404: "Die vormalige, noch 35–36 nachweisbare civitas (libera?) organisierte und bezeichnete sich in flavischer Zeit als *Municipium*, wobei sie offenbar ihr eigenes Recht beibehielt und nur der Administration municipalem Vorbild anpasste"; M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 23–45, esp. p. 23–25; see G. Di Vita-Evrard, "Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna", p. 208–209.

existence of a “double community”¹⁰⁴, meaning a municipium and a peregrine civitas are pointless and have been rightly questioned by science¹⁰⁵. The view that “by virtue of imperial decision Lepcis was officially transformed into a municipium, and was effectively governed by the *sufes*”¹⁰⁶ should be recognized as correct.

When looking for the reason why civitas Lepcitana was promoted to the rank of municipium, one should draw attention to its frontier dispute with the town of Oea. In 69, it eventuated in an armed clash, with the participation of the Garamants whom the inhabitants of Oea called in to help. The whole story ended in a military intervention led by Valerius Festus, the legate of the Legio III Augusta, who resolved the affair in favour of Lepcis Magna¹⁰⁷. Most likely, the situation drew the attention of Vespasian to the problems in southern Africa Proconsularis and made him aware of the necessity of definitive solutions. This explains *ius Latinum* for Lepcis Magna, in itself an important economic centre¹⁰⁸, a fact which undoubtedly played a significant role in Vespasian’s calculations, combined with the delimitation of the frontiers of the new municipium in 74¹⁰⁹. This would mean that Lepcis Magna was granted municipal rights between 74 and 77¹¹⁰. The operation of delimiting the frontiers was executed, *ex auctoritate Imperatoris Vespasiani*, by C. Rutilius Gallicus¹¹¹, in the rank of a *legatus Augusti pro praetore*. He may also be seen as the direct conditor

¹⁰⁴P. Romanelli, *Leptis Magna*, DE IV 1953, p. 662: “l’ordinamento punico [...] come organo comunale per gli indigeni accanto al comune romano, cioè al municipio e alla colonia”.

¹⁰⁵Gascou I, p. 76–77; L. Teutsch, *Gab es “Doppelgemeinden” im römischen Afrika?*, RIDA, ser. 3, 8, 1961, p. 281–356 (non vidi, quoted after Gascou).

¹⁰⁶G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna”, p. 199: “*Lepcis a été officiellement transformé en municipe en vertu d’une décision impériale et ce municipe est effectivement régi par des suffètes*”; cf. p. 206–209.

¹⁰⁷Pln. NH V 5. 38; Tac. Hist. IV 50; see G. Di Vita-Evrard, *Quatre inscriptions*, p. 92.

¹⁰⁸Gascou I, p. 79.

¹⁰⁹G. Di Vita-Evrard, “Municipium Flavium Lepcis Magna”, p. 205; cf. eadem, *Quatre inscriptions*, p. 77–83: two boundary stones with the formula “*limitem inter Lepcitanos et Oenses derexit*”.

¹¹⁰G. Di Vita-Evrard, *Quatre inscriptions*, p. 97; see Gascou II, p. 165 note 149.

¹¹¹G. Di Vita-Evrard, as above, p. 83–87: Q. Iulius Cordinus C. Rutilius Gallicus, for more on that personage see B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani*, p. 43 no. 48 (“Kaiserlicher Sonderlegat”).

municipii Lepcis Magnae¹¹². For Lepcis Magna, this represented a kind of compensation for the events of 69/70¹¹³.

However, Lepcis Magna was relatively remote from the areas of chief urbanisation undertakings of the Flavians, i.e. the northern regions of Africa Proconsularis, where the establishment of municipia was accompanied by the creation of three colonies. Of the various proposed lists of Flavian municipia¹¹⁴, only Sufetula and Bulla Regia give rise to no objection.

Sufetula (Sbeitla)¹¹⁵ was situated 72km south-east of Ammaedara and around 40km north-east of Cillium. The distance to Carthage was 212km. The municipal status of Sufetula is confirmed in inscriptions¹¹⁶; the only problematic issue is the date of the grant, as the relevant fragments of texts are not dated. However, it has been highlighted that both occurrences of *tribus Quirina* as well as a fair number of those who bore *gentilicium Flavius* may be found in Sufetula¹¹⁷. A fragment of monumental inscription to the honour of Vespasian and Titus was discovered at the forum in Sufetula¹¹⁸ which, considering the lack of imperial inscriptions from the pre-Flavian period — renders probability to the role of the Flavians as *conditores municipii*¹¹⁹. The Flavian municipium was most likely based on a *castellum* which the Romans installed there relatively early, roughly at the same time as the legionary garrison in

¹¹²G. Di Vita-Evrard, *Quatre inscriptions*, p. 98.

¹¹³Gascou I, p. 36.

¹¹⁴For example: T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, passim: Bulla Regia, Sufetula, Cillium; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 221–222: Sufetula, Cillium, Thelepte (“*bénéficia peut-être aussi grâce à Vespasien du statut de municipe*”); Gascou I, p. 29–35; Gascou II, p. 161–166: Sufetula, Bulla Regia; Y. Le Bohec, *Histoire de l’Afrique romaine*, p. 64; Madauros, Sufetula, Bulla Regia.

¹¹⁵Gascou I, p. 30–31; Gascou II, p. 162; PECS, p. 865–866; DNP 11 (2001), p. 1089; N. Duval, Sufetula, *EAA VII* (1966), p. 549–551; idem, *L’urbanisme de Sufetula = Sbeitla en Tunisie*, *ANRW X 2* (1982), p. 596–630; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 308–309; M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 64–67.

¹¹⁶IL Afr 136 (Sbeitla): *Iulia[e filiae] / Lucina[e coniugi] / L. Turan[i]/ni Felic[iani?] / ord[o] /^s splend[idissimus] / Mu[nicipii] / [p(ecunia) p(ublica)]*; see also CIL VIII 23222–23225: *p(ublicum) M(unicipii) S(ufetulensium)*.

¹¹⁷T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 215–216; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 221; see T.R.S. Broughton, *The Romanization of Africa Proconsularis*, Baltimore 1929, p. 102.

¹¹⁸CIL VIII 23216: *[Imp(erator) Ca]es(ar) Ves[pasianus] / [Imp(erator) T(itus) Ca]es(ar) Ves[pasianus]*.

¹¹⁹T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 216; Gascou II, p. 162.

Ammaedara¹²⁰, and at the latest during the Musulami revolt led by Takfarinas (117–124)¹²¹.

In a 3rd century inscription, most probably dating from the reign of Severus Alexander¹²², Sufetula is mentioned as a colonia¹²³. In all likelihood, the status was granted in the 2nd century¹²⁴.

From the strategic point of view, the location of Sufetula offered great advantage, securing the road from Ammaedara to Tacapae and the road running along the coast to Gightis and the cities of Tripolitania (Sabratha, Oea, Lepcis Magna). It was an important junction, where eight different communication routes converged¹²⁵.

Bulla Regia (Hamman Daradji)¹²⁶, former residence of the Numidian kings¹²⁷, an oppidum liberum in Pliny¹²⁸, owes its final “promotion” to the list of Flavian municipia to an inscription found in two fragments in the Grand Baths of the city, discovered forty years apart (1914–1956)¹²⁹. C. Iulius Cerealis,

¹²⁰Gascou I, p. 31.

¹²¹C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 308; according to Gascou II, p. 162. One cannot rule out a different scenario of the development of Sufetula: with the Legio III Augusta relocated to Theveste, Vespasian built a fortlet (castellum) of auxiliary forces to the south-east of Ammaedara, whose task was to safeguard the fertile and densely populated areas in the north of the province. This would explain the presence of gentilicium Flavius. If this is the case, the municipium would have to be credited to Trajan, which in turn would be validated by the tribus Papira found in inscriptions.

¹²²H. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Paris 1960, vol. I, p. 824–826.

¹²³CIL VIII 11340: *splendidissimus ordo et universus popul(us) curiarum Col(oniae) Sufetulensis*.

¹²⁴T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 215–216 suggest the close of the 2nd century; see Gascou I, p. 30.

¹²⁵Gascou I, p. 31; N. Duval, *L’urbanisme de Sufetula = Sbeitla en Tunisie*, ANRW X 2 (1982), p. 599 (map), 602.

¹²⁶PECS, p. 171–172; DNP 2 (1997), p. 841–842; Y. Thébert, *La romanisation d’une cité indigène d’Afrique: Bulla Regia*, MEFRA LXXXV 1973, p. 247–310; M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 150–155; A. Beschtaouch, R. Hannoune, Y. Thébert, *Les ruines de Bulla Regia*, Rome 1977.

¹²⁷See Orosius V 21, 14 (king Hiarbas).

¹²⁸Pln. NH V, 22.

¹²⁹AE 1916, 75 = ILAfr 458; AE 1964, 177 = P. Quoniam, *Deux notables de Bulla Regia*, *Karthago XI* 1961/1962, p. 3–8: L(ucio) Iulio, L(ucii) f(ilio), Quir(ina tribu), Cereali, q(uaestori), aed(ili), praef(ecto) i(ure) d(icundo), flam(ini) / [A]ug(usti) perp(etuo) municipi(i) su[i], flam(ini) Aug(usti) provinciae / [A]fric(ae) anni XXXX, quem honorem ex municipio / [s]uo Bullensi(um) Regior(um) prim[us gessi]t, huic, cum pr[ovinci]ae Afric(ae) leg[at]us(?)...

whom the text celebrates, in addition to a range of important functions held in 'his municipium', including flamine, was also honoured with the dignity of *flamen provinciae Africae*, in the fortieth year from its establishment. This provides a reference point for the dating of the inscription of *Cerealis*¹³⁰. There are two other similar cases of determining when the function of province priest was held: *C. Otidius Iovinus* from *Simitthu*¹³¹ was a *sacerdote Africae* in XXXIX (or year before the flamine of *Iulius Cerealis*), while *P. Mummius Saturninus* from *Furnus Maior*¹³² in the CXIII year of the provincial era. The person of *Saturninus* represents a special case: honoured by the *ordo* of his city with the office of priest of the imperial cult (*flamen*), he refused it, but by way of apology funded the *pronaos* at the temple of *Mercury*, which is confirmed in further four inscriptions¹³³. All of those come from the times of *Commodus*, but only in the last (CIL VIII 12030) is the information about his consulate preserved: *cos. IIII. Commodus* held the fourth consulate in 183, and the subsequent (the fifth) in 186¹³⁴. This means that the inscription from *Furnus Maior* (CIL VIII 12039) was made between 183 and 185. The CXIII year of imperial cult in Africa may have been 183, 184 or 185. This would mean that it was introduced in 70-72, and therefore at the beginning of the Flavian rule¹³⁵.

Returning to the inscription from *Bulla Regia* and the person of *L. Iulius Cerealis*: in consequence, *annus XXXX* should be the year 110, 111 or 112¹³⁶. We also know that *Bulla Regia* was already a *municipium* at the time. This obviously begs the question when it received the status. It is rather doubtful whether *Trajan* should

¹³⁰See D. Fishwick, *The Foundation of the Provincial Cult of Africa Proconsularis*, [in:] *idem*, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West I 2*, Leiden 1987, p. 257–268.

¹³¹CIL VIII 14611 (*Simitthu*): *C. Otidio P. f. Quir(ina tribu) Iovino / praefecto fabrum / sacerdoti provinc(iae) Afric(ae) anni XXXVIII qui primus /⁵ ex colonia sua hunc honorem gessit / cui cum ordo pecunia publ(ica) / statuam decrevisset titulo / contentus pecunia sua posuit /¹⁰ curatore Q. Otidio P. f. Quir(ina tribu) / Praenestino fratre praefecto / fabrum.*

¹³²CIL VIII 12039 (*Furnus Maius*): *P. Mummius L. f. / Saturnino sac. p(rovinciae) A(fricae) a(nni) CXIII / dec. Ilvi[rali] municip(ii) / Furnitani cui cum or/do honorem fl. ob/tulisset pron. cum or/nament(is) temp(li) Merc. / [ob] excusation(em) / honor(is) / [s(ua) p(ecunia) feci]t ob cu[ius de/dicatio]nem...*

¹³³CIL VIII 12027–12030.

¹³⁴A. Degrassi, *I fasti consolari del'Impero Romano*, Roma 1952, p. 51–52; D. Fishwick, *The Foundation*, p. 258.

¹³⁵For further detailed deliberations on that issue see D. Fishwick, *The Foundation*, p. 257–268.

¹³⁶T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 209.

be credited here. During the times of Hadrian, Bulla Regia was already a colony¹³⁷, most likely from 128¹³⁸ onwards: the interval between one and the other promotion was too short. Besides, in the epigraphic material from Bulla Regia there is no trace of tribus Papiria, which is associated with Trajan¹³⁹. Augustus is out of the question, because Pliny (NH V 22) speaks of oppidum liberum. Claudius and Nero did not display any kind of city-making initiative in Africa, so they cannot be taken into account either. This leaves the Flavians, or more precisely, Vespasian¹⁴⁰.

One of the most frequent tribus appearing in the inscriptions from Bulla Regia is Quirina, characteristic of the Flavians¹⁴¹. C. Iulius Cerealis was also enrolled there. The most popular nomen gentile was Iulius, but there are instances, though rare, of Flavius¹⁴². Finally, the finds from the forum are associated by the researchers with the transformation of oppidum liberum into Municipium (Flavium) Bulla Regia: the artefact in question is the head of Vespasian, a remnant of a colossal statue erected in honour of the emperor by the city's inhabitants¹⁴³; the head may be compared with the one discovered in Hippo Regius. This is also the time when the great thoroughfare connecting Carthage and Hippo Regius, and running through Bulla Regia was being expanded or repaired¹⁴⁴. It had a major impact on the economic situation of the city¹⁴⁵, bringing prosperity, which in turn became a factor when the decision to establish a municipium was to be taken¹⁴⁶. All that, as well as the introduction of a provincial cult of the em-

¹³⁷CIL VIII 25522 ... Colonia Ael(ia) Hadriana Augusta Bulla Reg(ia); M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 132; Gascou II, p. 182–183.

¹³⁸Quoniam, *Deux notables*, p. 5; see idem, *Fouilles récentes à Bulla Regia (Tunisie)*, CRAI 96, 1952, p. 467: “certainement lors du voyage de 128”; Gascou I, p. 118–119.

¹³⁹Gascou I, p. 116.

¹⁴⁰See outstanding argumentation of Gascou I, p. 116–117

¹⁴¹See Quoniam, *Deux notables*, p. 4 note 7; T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 211 note 2; Gascou I, p. 116.

¹⁴²CIL VIII 14498; see T. Kotula, as above; J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 249.

¹⁴³A. Merlin, *Le temple d'Apollon à Bulla Regia*, [in:] *Notes et Documents I*, Paris 1908, p. 27; Quoniam, *Deux notables*, p. 5; T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 211; Gascou II, p. 163–164,

¹⁴⁴CIL III 22190 (from 76), the works were carried out by the soldiers of the Legio III Augusta; T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 211; Gascou I, p. 117; Gascou II, p. 164; see also P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 299.

¹⁴⁵A. Merlin, *Le temple*, p. 27; Gascou I, p. 117.

¹⁴⁶Gascou I, p. 117.

peror in Africa, overlaps with the early period of Vespasian's reign. This justifies the thesis that Bulla Regia was granted municipal status at that very time.

In 1967, Tadeusz Kotula¹⁴⁷ spoke unequivocally in favour of the previously advanced view¹⁴⁸ that in the Flavian era, under Vespasian to be more exact¹⁴⁹, the municipium status was also granted to Cillium (Kasserine)¹⁵⁰, located some 40km south-west of Sufetula, by the route connecting Hadrumentum with Thel-epte and continuing to Theveste and Lambaesis. He resorted to the following arguments: there was no doubt that throughout its history Cillium achieved the status of municipium and colonia. This is borne out by two inscriptions which may be dated¹⁵¹ respectively to the latter half of the 2nd century¹⁵² and to the times of Commodus¹⁵³. The frequent occurrence of Flavii in Cillium, also in the inscriptions at the Mausolaeum Flaviorum¹⁵⁴, as well as the presence of origo of a soldier named Fla(vio) Cilio in the laterculus militum from

¹⁴⁷T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 212–215.

¹⁴⁸E. De Ruggiero, s.v. Cillium, *DE II*, Roma 1900, p. 236; L. Poinssot, [in:] *BAC 1934*, juin, p. XIII and subseq. (non vidi, quoted after T. Kotula and P. Romanelli); L. Châtelain, *Notes sur des découvertes archéologiques au Maroc*, *BAC 1934–1935*, p. 179: “N'est-il pas dès lors tentant de supposer que Vespasien ou Titus pourrait bien être le fondateur du *municipium Cillitanum* dont le *curiae universae* ont [...] dédié une base à *Aelia Valeria Capitolina Pompeiana*” [the inscription in question is *CIL VIII 23207*]; T.R.S. Broughton, *The Romanization of Africa proconsularis*, Baltimore 1929, p. 101 and subseq.; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 294: “Anche Cillium nella Bizacena sembra abbia avuto l'epiteto di Flavia: comunque dalla frequenza dei Flavii nelle sue epigrafi non paro dubbio che essa avesse avuto da Vespasiano, o da uno dei suoi figli, il diritto di municipio Romano o latino”. *EAA VI* (1965), p. 585 (p.v. Qasrin; G. Picard): “Eretta a municipio da Vespasiano o da Tito (*municipium Flavium Cillium*), la città divenne colonia nel III secolo”; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 221: “La ville [Cillium] dut recevoir de Vespasien ou d'un de ses fils le statu de municipe romain ou latin”.

¹⁴⁹Idem, p. 215: “Cillium, municipe de Vespasien à notre avis...”

¹⁵⁰On Cillium: *PECS*, p. 224; *EAA VI* (1965), p. 585 s.v. Qasrin (G. Picard); M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 73; *Gascou I*, p. 86–89; *Gascou II*, p. 172; *Gascou III*, p. 303–304; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 287–288.

¹⁵¹T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 213.

¹⁵²*CIL VIII 23207*: *Aeliae Va/leriae Kapit/olinae Pom/peian[ae] C(ai) Ofil/ili(i) Bu[...c]on/iugi c[uriae u]ni/versae m[un]cip(ii) / Cillitani ob eximi/um in se mariti /¹⁰ eius amorem.*

¹⁵³*CIL VIII 210 = ILS 5570; ILT 330*: [... / ...] / *coloniae Cillitanae / Q. Manlius Felix C. Filius Papiria (tribu) Receptus, post alia arcum quoque cum insignibus colo[n]iae / solita in patriam liberalitate erexit, ob cuius dedicationem decurionibus sportulas, curiis epu[las] ded(it)*].

¹⁵⁴*Les Flavii de Cillium. Étude architecturale, épigraphique, historique et littéraire du mausolée de Kasserine (CIL VIII, 211–216)*, Rome 1993, esp. p. 61–63, 219–227 (J.-M. Lassère); see also M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 70–73.

Lambaesis¹⁵⁵ are, in Kotula's opinion, strong indications supporting the thesis that it was the Flavians, preferably Vespasian, who granted municipal rights to Cillium¹⁵⁶. This would appear to be very logical, especially considering the very active endeavours of the Flavians in Africa.

The notion was very firmly opposed by Jacques Gascou¹⁵⁷. He believed that Cillium might have obtained municipium status no earlier than Trajan, as the sole tribus to feature in the inscriptions is Papiria, associated with this emperor. It is also believed that the text in the laterculus militum from Lambaesis does not refer to a name of the city: Flav(io) Cilli(o) but to a pseudo-tribus: Fla(via tribu) Cilio. "Cilium is a municipium of Trajan, not one of the Flavian emperors", writes Jacques Gascou¹⁵⁸. As regards the colony status, the inscription of Q. Manlius Receptus should not be dated to the times of Commodus, but to the late 2nd or the 3rd century¹⁵⁹. Thus the rough outline of the history of Cillium would be as follows¹⁶⁰: Flavian castellum — Trajan's municipium — Severan colony.

The argumentation of Jacques Gascou, supported by the analysis of the occurrence of the nomen gentile Flavius in Cillium¹⁶¹ and the use of pseudo-tribus

¹⁵⁵CIL VIII 2568 = 18055 (line 46): C. Iulius Septiminius <F>LA CILIO; F written in the shape of E.

¹⁵⁶See De Ruggiero, p. 236: "*Fl(avium) Cillium* in un [...] laterculo militare di Lambaesis (C. VIII 2568 lin. 2)... Dall'appellativo Flavius si vede chiaro che sotto Vespasiano e i suoi figli divenne forse prima municipio e poscia colonia e fu iscritto nella tribù Papiria".

¹⁵⁷Gascou I, p. 31–32; 86–89; Gascou II, p. 172; Gascou III, p. 303–304.

¹⁵⁸Gascou I, p. 87: "Cillium est un municipe de Trajan et non d'un empereur flavien", cf. p. 89; Gascou III, p. 303; accepted by: M.S. Bassignano, *Il flaminato*, p. 70; *Les Flavii de Cillium*, p. 7–8; C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 287.

¹⁵⁹Gascou II, p. 87; Gascou III, p. 304, quoting C. Lepelley, *Les cités*, p. 287–288, who dates the inscription of Receptus to no later than the Severan times; therefore according to Gascou, Cillium might have become a colony "avant ou après le mort de Septime-Sévère".

¹⁶⁰J. Toutain, *Les progrès de la vie urbaine dans l'Afrique du Nord*, [in:] *Mélanges Cagnat. Recueil de mémoires concernant l'épigraphie et les antiquités romaines*, Paris 1912, p. 338 ("Cillium, avant de devenir une cité, avait été certainement un *pagus* ou *castellum* de la colonie de Thelepte, fondée par Trajan").

¹⁶¹Gascou I, p. 87 assumes that all Flavii mentioned in the inscriptions on the Monumentum Flaviorum were from Thelepte; however, M.S. Bassignano rightly observes (p. 72, see above, note 103) that not all names are accompanied by the information on priestly offices held in Thelepte; by default, it should be assumed that those who have no such information attached, but who held functions as well, must have come from Cillium, the place where Monumentum Flaviorum was erected, see *Les Flavii de Cillium*, p. 225; this means that Cillium may be ascribed much larger number of Flavii than presumed by J. Gascou.

does have its weak points. One has the impression that the French scholar was too hasty in interpreting Fla. Cilo from the Lambaesian laterculus as pseudo tribus. The analysis of the laterculus, dated to the close of Hadrian's and beginning of Antoninus Pius' reign¹⁶² demonstrates that none of the soldiers (names of 85 persons are preserved in their entirety or in fragments), provides a tribus¹⁶³. Obviously, this poses a question why Septimus should have done any different. I believe that one should concur with the view expressed in the literature, namely, that it is not information concerning the tribus but an honorary ap-

¹⁶²Gascou I, p. 86; in featuring in the list of Aelia (lines 9, 36, 66 and 69) they prove that the soldiers were enlisted in 117 at the earliest, i.e. after Hadrian assumed the rule, because that was when they received Roman citizenship.

¹⁶³Some doubt arises in the 36th line of the laterculus: TIB CLAVDIVS LUCIVS AEL PILADEL EMESE; one could presume pseudo-tribus Aelia to be referred to in the notations (so CIL VIII, Index, p. 243), and origo in Emesus (as in CIL VIII, Index, p. 256), which would be in favour of Gascou's thesis; if so, the names of the legionary should be read as follows: Tib. Claudius Lucius Ael(ia tribu) PILADEL Emese, whereby the publishers of CIL failed to address (Index, p. 19) the word PILADEL, although it was placed among the cognomina in the index of cognomina; also, in the commentary ad n. 2568 they are certain that it is a cognomen: Piladel(plus) Emese; the fact that PILADEL betokens cognomen P(h)iladelp(h)us of Greek provenance (Thieling, p. 87, 111) is doubtless, as it is confirmed in the sources (in Africa: CIL VIII 18392 — Philadelphus; 20713: M.V[an]tidius M. f. Quir[ina] Philad[elphus]); Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 317, aptly drew attention to the onomastic problems that such interpretation of the 30th line would entail: the information about the tribus would thus be placed between two cognomina — a completely untypical procedure. This is probably why W. Thieling, *Der Hellenismus in Kleinafrika. Der griechische Kultureinfluss in den römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas*, Leipzig—Berlin 1911, p. 111, interpreted line 36 in the following fashion: "Tib. Claudius Lucius Aelius Philadelp(us) aus Emesa in Syrien", so he excluded pseudo-tribus, acknowledging the highly elaborate anthroponymy of Claudius Lucius, which is not the most fortunate solution either; it seems that the most correct interpretation was suggested by Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 314: there are two persons recorded, i.e. Tib. Claudius Lucius and Ael(ius) Piladel(plus). If so, it would be the only case in the Lambaesian laterculus where two persons appear in one line, as well as the only instance of omitted prenominal, and as regards Tib. Claudius Lucius — one of the few cases (9, 64, 65) of missing origo. In the context of the entire laterculus, such notation would be very unorthodox and incomprehensible. It appears that the problem might be relatively easily explained, once we assume that line 36 mentions two soldiers from the same city, namely Emesus in Syria, which was their shared origo. The cognomen of Claudius and the prenominal of Aelius were the same — 'Lucius'. For this reason, perhaps to save space, the name of 'Lucius' was inscribed just once; on the praenomen 'Lucius' in the function of cognomen see I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, p. 40, 172 ("Cognomina obtained from praenomina"); consequently, line 36 should be read as follows: Tib(erius) Claudius Lucius (and) Lucius Ael(ius) Piladel(plus), (both) from Emesa.

pellation in the name of the city¹⁶⁴. We should also remember that the tribus stated by the citizens was not always the tribus to which a given community actually belonged.

Having adopted “Flavium” as a legal indication of the city¹⁶⁵, it may be assumed that Cillium obtained municipal rank from the Flavians; quite conceivably from Vespasian¹⁶⁶. This is confirmed by the laterculus from Lambaesis, which may be dated to more or less mid-2nd century¹⁶⁷. The evidence for the existence of Municipium Cillitanum in the 2nd century is provided by the inscription of Aelia Valeria Kapitolina Pompeiana, honoured by the c[uriae u]niversae M[un]cip(ii) Cillitani¹⁶⁸, undoubtedly from the latter half of the century¹⁶⁹, by the inscription commemorating the erection of a monument in honour of Antoninus Pius and Lucius Verus, and the silver imago of Faustina the Younger, wife of Marc Aurelius, therefore after 145¹⁷⁰. The founder was an aedilis et augur (municipii)¹⁷¹. In the 3rd century, most probably under the Severans, Cillium rose to the rank of colony¹⁷².

The creation of the Municipium Cillitanum was a part of the strategic plan of the Flavians, associated with the expansion towards the south-west, along the main communication route Carthage — Ammaedara — Theveste — Lambae-

¹⁶⁴Y. Le Bohec, *La Troisième Légion*, p. 321: “Septiminus mentionne sans doute un surnom tiré de Flavius et attribué à Cillium”; T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 213.

¹⁶⁵B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Untersuchungen* (as note 34), p. 73–76, 100 no. 15.

¹⁶⁶As above, note 49.

¹⁶⁷See B. Galsterer-Kröll, *Untersuchungen*, p. 100, note 15: “Flavia Cillium: VIII 2568,46 = 18055 (domus) ... Ob sich die domus-Angabe auf das Municipium oder die Kolonie bezieht, ist nicht zu entscheiden”.

¹⁶⁸CIL VIII 23207; see above, note 154.

¹⁶⁹R. Cagnat, *Notes sur des découvertes épigraphiques*, BAC 1901, p. 117–118 no. 12.

¹⁷⁰Marc Aurelius married Faustina the Younger (Annia Galeria Faustina, daughter of Antoninus Pius), see D. Kienast, *Die römischen Kaisertabelle* (as note 97), p. 136.

¹⁷¹AE 1957, 77 = G. Picard, *Rapport sur l'activité du Service des Antiquités et de la Mission archéologique française en Tunisie pendant l'année 1953*, BAC 1954, p. 122–123: [Imp. Caep. T. Aelio Hadriano / Antonino Aug. Pio et] / L. Aelio Imp. Caep. Aug. Pii /⁵ fil(io) C. Ant[...]*us aedi/lis et aug(ur) s[tat]uas [...]* duas ob ho/norem aedilitatis ex HS XII mil. / Aug. liberique eius promisit / ex HS X mil. CCCCVII n. posuit et /¹⁰ ad supplendam pollicitatio/nis suae summam imaginem / argenteam Faustinae Aurelii / Veri Caes. Imp. Antonini Aug. /¹⁴ Pii fil(ii) (uxoris) secund[um]...

¹⁷²CIL III 210; Gascou I, p. 86.

sis¹⁷³. Cillium, situated south of the artery, was to provide additional security¹⁷⁴. Therefore, in the Flavian times, one observes an intensified settlement in the area, i.e. between Hadrumentum and Thelepte. The appearance of large number of Flavii in Cillium and in Thelepte to the west (Medinet-el-Kedima, ca 30km), engendered the thesis that the latter, certainly a colony in the 2nd century¹⁷⁵, was elevated by the Flavians to the rank of municipium¹⁷⁶. However, apart from the imperial nomen gentile Flavius, and the simultaneous lack of mention of the tribus Quirina and no traces of municipium's existence, the thesis is no more than pure speculation. On the other hand, there is much legitimacy in the claim that Flavians made great efforts to create military strongpoints (castella) which were to secure the south flank of the fertile and well developed areas of Africa Proconsularis, and simultaneously ensure communication with the south. One of such strongpoints (castellum) was Thelepte¹⁷⁷. One should draw attention to the fact that when moving north-west, towards Theveste and Lambaesis, we encounter relatively numerous traces of similar Flavian activity. Flavian settlement, undoubtedly military in nature, appears in Mascula, Aquae Flaviane, Vaizavi (Zoul) or Lambafundi (Hr. Touchine) between Timgad and Lambaesis¹⁷⁸. Lambaesis itself, where at first, though already under Flavians, there appeared a "small camp" for a detachment of the Legio III Augusta, is the best example. In later times some of those military settlements¹⁷⁹, reinforced with

¹⁷³See very apt recapitulation of the problem T. Kotula, *Afryka Północna*, p. 150.

¹⁷⁴See M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 419: "Thelepte [...] est transformée en colonie de vétérans: dans ce secteur des Hautes Steppes, où des tribus les Musulames et les Musunii Regiani ont leurs terres de parcours, Thelepte est probablement chargée d'une besogne de contrôle [...]. Non loin de Thelepte, Cillium (si ce n'est pas un municipe flavien comme le croit généralement, mais un municipe trajanien comme le croit J. Gascou) aurait été transformé en municipe latin pour des raisons analogue".

¹⁷⁵See CIL VIII 211; 214–216 = *Les Flavii de Cillium* (above, note 154), p. 61–64.

¹⁷⁶G.-Ch. Picard, *La civilisation de l'Afrique romaine*, Paris 1959, p. 185; PECS, p. 906; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 222.

¹⁷⁷Gascou I, p. 83–86; see P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 316; M. Bénabou, *La résistance*, p. 419 (above, note 26).

¹⁷⁸M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 222.

¹⁷⁹See also C.R. Whittaker, *Roman Africa*, p. 541.

settlers — veterans, obtained the status of a colony: this applies to Thelepte¹⁸⁰, but also to Theveste¹⁸¹ and Thamugadi¹⁸².

The urbanisation activities of the Flavians were focused primarily on Africa Proconsularis. Mauretania, so intensively colonised by Augustus¹⁸³, and then Claudius¹⁸⁴, remained usually outside the scope of their interest. There was one exception though — Icosium (Algiers)¹⁸⁵, a city of Punic origin¹⁸⁶, located on the coast, 80km east of Caesarea and ca 25km west of the Augustan colony of Rusguniae¹⁸⁷. Vespasian founded, or more precisely granted Icosium the status of titular colony, as reported by Pliny the Elder¹⁸⁸. His account is confirmed by an inscription from 74–76, where the denomination *colonia* appears¹⁸⁹. A Flavius [---]ninus whom it mentions was one of the first officials of the newly established colony (aedile, *duovir quinquennial*), and with all certainty Icosium's first

¹⁸⁰As in note 174.

¹⁸¹PECS, p. 913; Gascou II, p. 173–174.

¹⁸²P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 314–315; PECS, p. 899; Gascou II, p. 174.

¹⁸³Founded 12 colonies: 7 on the coast and 5 across the country, see F. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation*, p. 116–118; DNP 7 (1999), p. 1050; J. Gascou, *Sur le statut de quelques villes de Numidie et de Maurétanie Césarienne*, *Antiquités Africaines* 40–41, 2004–2005, p. 262; cf. L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen*, p. 229–233.

¹⁸⁴Founded 4 colonies and 4 municipia; RE III 2 (1899), p. 2825 (E. Groag); Gascou II, p. 145–159 (map after p. 150).

¹⁸⁵RE IX 1 (1914), p. 856 (H. Dessau); S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne d'Afrique du Nord*, tome VIII: Jules César et l'Afrique. Fin des royaumes indigènes, Paris 1928, p. 204; idem, *Atlas archéologique de l'Algérie*, Alger² 1997, Feuille No 5, p. 2–5 nr 11; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 168, 205, 294; L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen*, p. 200–201; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 224; idem, *À la recherche d'Icosium*, *Antiquités Africaines* 2, 1968, p. 7–54; Gascou II, p. 159–161; M.S. Bassigiano, *Il flaminato*, p. 354–355; J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 255–256; DNP 5 (1998), p. 886–887 p.v. Icosium; J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 261–264.

¹⁸⁶M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d'Icosium*, p. 10–16.

¹⁸⁷Gascou II, p. 159–160.

¹⁸⁸Pln. NH V 20: *Latio dato Tipasa, itemque a Vespasiano Imperatore eodem munere donatum Icosium*.

¹⁸⁹CIL VIII 20853 = M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d'Icosium*, p. 20: [I]mp(eratori Vespasiano / A[u]g(usto) / [p(ontifici)] m(aximo)] tr(ibuniciae) p(otestatis) [V]I im[p(eratori)...] / co(n) s(uli) V p(atrici) [p(atriciae)] / Flaviu[s ...] ni/[n]us aed(ilis) IIVI[r qui]nq/[u]enna(lis) pontifex p[ri]mus in colonia ex / [d(ecreto)] d(ecurionum) / ob honorem ponti/ficatus e[p]ulo / dato d(e)d(icavit); the numerical value of tribunicia potestas may also be reconstructed as [VI]I, the consulate likewise: either V[I] or V[II]; see comment of CIL: “tribuniciae potestatis fuisse videtur VI aut VII; ita ut titulus positus sit inter kal. Iulias a. 74 et 76”; cf. J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 263 note 28.

ever pontiff (pontifex primus in colonia). The legal status of Icosium is corroborated by two more inscriptions. One of those may be indirectly dated to the first half of the 2nd century, because it only mentions ordo Icositanorum¹⁹⁰, whereas in the second, originating from 209–211, there is a patronus coloniae¹⁹¹. As a colony, Icosium is also mentioned in the *Itinerarium Antonini*¹⁹².

The history of Icosium until the Flavian times, i.e. the establishment of colony by Vespasian, appears to have been quite interesting, especially in the light of the new interpretation of Pliny the Elder (NH V 20)¹⁹³. Until recently, there had been no doubt in science that the relation concerned granting Icosium the rights of Roman colony ex iure Latini¹⁹⁴, because Pliny compares Icosium with Tapsa: “Latio dato Tapsa, itemque a Vespasiano imperatore eodem munere [=Latio] donatum Icosium”. This would make Icosium the sole African colony founded on ius Latii¹⁹⁵, elevated to that rank from the status of conventus civium Romanorum which had been created there much earlier.

In 33–25 BC, demobilised legionaries were settled there by Octavian Augustus, as part of colonisation undertaking, but the status of colony was withheld at the time. The former soldiers organised themselves into a separate community, or conventus civium Romanorum¹⁹⁶, next to or within the peregrine city. At the time, Mauretania was under direct administration of Rome; in 25 BC Augustus conferred Mauritanian throne to the son of Juba, king of Numidia from the times of Caesar, who reigned as Juba II¹⁹⁷. Then the conventus civium Romanorum in Icosium was formally appended to the colony Ilici in Hispania

¹⁹⁰CIL VIII 9259 = M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d’Icosium*, p. 21: P(ublio) Sittio M(arci) f(ilio) Quir(in) a tribu / Plocamian(o) / ordo / Icositanor(um) / M(arcus) Sittius P(ubl)ii f(il)ius Quir(in) a tribu / Caecilianus / pro filio / pientissimo / h(onore) r(ecepto) i(mpensam) r(emisi).

¹⁹¹M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d’Icosium*, p. 21 (found in Algiers): M(arco) Messio Mas/culo / ex testamento / eius P(uvl)ius Corne/ilius Hono/ratus flamen / Auggg(ustorum trium) per/petuu pa/tronus co/loniae nepos / et per success/sionem ex par/te heres.

¹⁹²Ed. O. Cuntz, p. 2.

¹⁹³J. Desanges (ed.), *Pline l’Ancien, Histoire Naturelle, Livre V, 1–45, L’Afrique du Nord*, Paris 1980, p. 166–169; M. Coltelloni-Trannoy, *Royaume de Maurétanie*, Paris 1997, p. 130–131 (non vidi, quoted from Gascou); J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 261–264.

¹⁹⁴S. Gsell, *Atlas*, p. 2; P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 294; L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen*, p. 200–201; M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d’Icosium*, p. 20; J. Lassère, *Ubique populus*, p. 255–256; Gascou II, p. 159–160.

¹⁹⁵Gascou II, p. 160.

¹⁹⁶L. Teutsch, *Das Städtewesen*, p. 200–201; J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 262, 264.

¹⁹⁷RE XIV 2 (1930), p. 2371–2372; DNP 7 (1999), p. 1050.

Bettica: thus the Roman citizens living in Icosium were excepted from the authority of the king of Mauretania¹⁹⁸. The information about the Spanish attribution is provided by Pliny the Elder in his description of Hispania¹⁹⁹. Until 40 AD, the peregrine city of Icosium, subjected to the Mauritanian king and the community of Roman citizens, organised into a *conventus civium Romanorum* and excluded, by virtue of being appended to Ilici, from the rule of the king developed next to one another²⁰⁰. Once the kingdom of Mauretania was liquidated and transformed into a Roman province, which took place after 40 AD, the attribution of the *conventus civium Romanorum* to Ilici was nullified as there was no further need for it. Both communities began to merge into one entity. In consequence, Icosium was granted the rights of Roman colony in titular mode²⁰¹. And here lies the crux: Roman colony founded on *ius Latii*²⁰², as it has been assumed so far. In the commented edition²⁰³ of the fifth book of *Naturalis Historia*, in the parts concerned with Africa (V 1–46), Jacques Desanges suggested a completely different reading of the fragment relating to Icosium. He set out from the premise that the information about *Oppidum Novum* and *Tipasa* is an interjection and has nothing to do with Icosium. This means that Pliny did not compare the legal status of the colony granted by Vespasian with *Tipasa* but with *Caesarea* which, as we know, was a *ius Latii* colony and, importantly, a titular one, i.e. which developed without concentrated settlement (of the veterans)²⁰⁴. It would follow that what Icosium received from Vespasian was not *ius Latii* but fully Roman entitlement²⁰⁵. Simultaneously, the

¹⁹⁸P. Romanelli, *Storia*, p. 205; M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d'Icosium*, p. 17; Gascou II, p. 160; J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 262.

¹⁹⁹Pln. NH III 19: “*colonia immunis Ilici, unde Ilicitanus sinus, in eam contribuuntur Icositani*”.

²⁰⁰J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 260.

²⁰¹J. Desanges admits the possibility that before becoming a colony, Icosium reached the status of *municipium*, which would correspond to the ‘normal’ course of development; unfortunately there are no documents available that would enable positive verification of the theory; see J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 263.

²⁰²Enrolled in the *tribus Quirina*: W. Kubitschek, *Imperium Romanum*, p. 164.

²⁰³Desanges, as above, note 193.

²⁰⁴Gascou II, p. 152–154.

²⁰⁵According to J. Desanges, the relevant fragment from Pliny (NH V 20) should be read as follows: ... *oppidum... celeberrimum Caesarea, ante vocitatum Iol, Iubae regia a Divo Claudio coloniae iure donata — eiusdem iussu deductis veteranis Oppidum Novum et Latio dato*

emperor allowed a complete merger of the *conventus civium Romanorum* with the peregrine community (city) of Icosium; in short, the privilege applied to both communities, now treated as one entity²⁰⁶. Besides, there is no doubt that among the inhabitant of the peregrine Icosium there were Roman citizens who attained their status individually²⁰⁷. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that one of the first officials of the colony bears the nomen gentile Flavius, hence it may be assumed that we are dealing with a peregrine who received Roman citizenship when Icosium was elevated to the rank of colony²⁰⁸.

The new *lectio* of the NH V 19 fragment advanced²⁰⁹ by J. Desanges explains very much. First of all, it demonstrates the continuity and consistency of the Flavian urbanisation policy: each of the colonies established in Africa had full Roman citizenship status²¹⁰. Secondly, the last Latin colonies were created under Augustus, and thereafter only *ex iure Quiritum*. Thus Icosium would be an exception²¹¹, only that this “uniqueness” has no particular justification.

The principal effort of Flavian urbanisation was concentrated in the northern part of Africa *Proconsularis*, on the territory of the former *Africa Vetus*. *Lepcis Magna* in the south of *Proconsularis* (in *Tripolitania*) and Icosium in *Mauretania Caesariensis* were exceptional cases. The newly created cities — colonies and *municipia* — were to perform an important strategic role, i.e. to protect the territories of *Africa Proconsularis* against the tribes from the south. The area was urbanised, had considerable economic significance and yielded

Tipasa — itemque a Vespasiano Imperatore eodem munere donatum Icosium; see J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 263.

²⁰⁶J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 264.

²⁰⁷This is attested to by the inscriptions from Icosium of the “royal” period — CIL VIII 9257 = M. Le Glay, *À la recherche d’Icosium*, p. 18: [R]egi Ptolemae[o] / reg(is) Iubae f(ilio) / L(ucius) Caecilius Rufus / Agilis f(ilius) honoribus / omnibus patriae / suae consummatis / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit) et consecravit; CIL VIII 9258 = ibidem: [L(ucius) Caecili]us Rufus Agilis f(ilius) fl(amen?) / [ob honorem flamin?]atus de s(ua) p(ecunia) donum d[edit]; see J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 262: “Caecilius Rufus peut très bien être un maurétanien, citoyen de la ville pérégrine d’Icosium, qui aurait reçu ou dont le père aurait reçu à titre personnel la civitas Romana”.

²⁰⁸CIL VIII 20853 (above, note 189); J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 263: “Il s’agit certainement d’un pérégrin qui a reçu la citoyenneté romaine au moment où Icosium a été dotée du statut de colonie honoraire, et quoi a été pourvu du gentile de l’empereur qui avait octroyé ce statut”.

²⁰⁹Fully accepted by Gascou (*Sur le statut*) and M. Coltelloni-Trannoy, *Royaume de Maurétanie*, p. 130–133.

²¹⁰On ‘titular’ colonies see F. Vittinghoff, *Römische Kolonisation*, p. 27–33.

²¹¹J. Gascou, *Sur le statut*, p. 263.

high profit. Both extensive private latifundia and imperial domains which were to be found there²¹², played an important role in supplying Rome with grain. From the point of view of the state, the changes also contributed to the internal consolidation of the province. Urbanisation of Africa, besides the introduction of cadastre, institutional forms of imperial cult and forcing nomadic tribes to settled life²¹³ served that very end²¹⁴. This involved strictly military reorganisation of the province²¹⁵, which was best manifested in the relocation of the Legio II Augusta to Theveste and then to Lambaesis. The Flavians also embarked on expansion and repairs of the road network²¹⁶. Apart from their important economic and political functions, *coloniae veteranorum* — Ammaedara and Madauros — as well as the *municipia* Sufetula and Cillium had the task of guarding the access to the fertile lands of Africa Proconsularis. There is no doubt that the policy of the Flavians was a long-term one, while the actions of Trajan, Hadrian and the Severans represented its direct continuation²¹⁷.

ABBREVIATIONS

AE — l'Année épigraphique

AJPH — American Journal of Philology

ANRW — Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, New York–Berlin

ASM — Antike Stätten am Mittelmeer, Stuttgart–Weimar 1999

BAC — Bulletin Archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques

²¹²R.M. Haywood, *Roman Africa*, [in:] T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV*, Baltimore 1938, p. 83–102; J. Kolendo, *Kolonat w Afryce rzymskiej w I–II wieku i jego geneza*, Warszawa 1962, p. 13–41; idem, *Le colonat en Afrique sous le Haut-Empire*, Paris 1976, p. 7–19; see also D.J. Mattingly, *Africa: a Landscape of Opportunity?*, [in:] D.J. Mattingly (ed.), *Dialogues in Roman Imperialism. Power, Discourse, and Discrepant Experience in the Roman Empire*, Portsmouth 1997 (JRA Suppl. Series No. 23), p. 117–139.

²¹³J. Kolendo, *Kolonat*, p. 57–58; idem, *Le colonat*, p. 30–32; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 227–230.

²¹⁴T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 218–219.

²¹⁵M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 215–222.

²¹⁶Salama (as in note 69), p. 25–26: “Vespasien (69–79) et ses fils Titus (79–81) et Domitien (81–96) furent [...] les premiers grands fondateurs de réseau routier”.

²¹⁷T. Kotula, *Inscription de Bulla Regia*, p. 218–219; M. Leglay, *Les Flaviens*, p. 234; Gascou I, p. 36; Gascou II, p. 165–166.

- CAH — The Cambridge Ancient History
 CIL — Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
 CRAI — Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres
 DE — Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane
 DNP — Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike
 EAA — Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica
 Gascou I — J. Gascou, La politique municipale de l'Empire romain en Afrique proconsulaire de Trajan à S Septime-Sévère, Rome 1972
 Gascou II — J. Gascou, La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord I. De la mort d'Auguste au début du III siècle, ANRW II 10.2 (1982), p. 136–229
 Gascou III — La politique municipale de Rome en Afrique du Nord II. Après la mort de Septime Sévère, ANRW II 10.2 (1982), p. 230–320
 ILAfr — R. Cagnat — A. Merlin — L. Chatelain, Inscriptions latines d'Afrique (Tripolitaine, Tunisie et Maroc), Paris 1923
 ILAlg — Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie, Paris 1922–
 ILM — L. Chatelain, Inscriptions latines du Maroc, Paris 1942
 ILS — H. Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae selectae, Berlin 1892–1916
 ILT — A. Merlin, Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie, Paris 1944
 IRT — J.M. Reynolds, The inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania, Rome 1952
 KLPauly — Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike in fünf Bänden, Stuttgart
 MEFRA — Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'École Française de Rome, Antiquité
 PBSR — Papers of the British School at Rome
 PECS — The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites
 RE — Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
 RHD — Revue d'histoire du droit (Tijdschrift voor Rechtsgeschiedenis)
 RIDA — Revue internationale des droits de l'Antiquité

Leszek Mrozewicz

FLAWIJSKA URBANIZACJA AFRYKI

Streszczenie

Na przestrzeni ostatniego półwiecza badań nad rzymską Afryką Północną utrzymało się w nauce słuszne przekonanie, że panowanie dynastii flawijskiej stanowiło w jej dziejach zasadniczy przełom. Objął on wszystkie dziedziny życia, a istotę przemian

najlepiej odzwierciedla pogląd, że to dopiero dzięki Flawiuszom Afryka nabrała charakteru w pełni rzymskiego. Co więcej, towarzyszy temu uzasadniona teza, że bez osiągnięć Flawiuszów niemożliwa byłaby wielka prosperity afrykańskich prowincji w II–III wieku: następcy zebrali plon z ich zasiewu. Niewątpliwie za racjonalny też uznać wypadnie, nie wchodząc w szczegóły, postulat wyodrębnienia w dziejach rzymskiej Afryki czasów flawijskich jako epoki *à part*.

Bezsporną zasługą Flawiuszów było podjęcie w Afryce dzieła urbanizacji. Główny ich wysiłek skoncentrowany został na północnej części Africa Proconsularis, na obszarze dawnej Africa Vetus. Lepcis Magna na południu Proconsularis (w Trypolitani) oraz Icosium w Mauretania Caesariensis stanowią całkowity wyjątek. Nowo utworzone miasta — kolonie i municypia — miały odgrywać ważną rolę strategiczną, to jest zabezpieczać tereny Africa Proconsularis przed plemionami z południa. Był to obszar zurbanizowany, o dużym znaczeniu gospodarczym, wysoce dochodowy. Tu znajdowały się wielkie latyfundia prywatne i cesarskie domeny, które odgrywały istotną rolę w zaopatrywaniu miasta Rzymu w zboże. Chodziło także, z punktu widzenia interesów państwa, o konsolidację wewnętrzną prowincji. Urbanizowanie Afryki, obok wprowadzenia katastru, instytucjonalnych form kultu cesarskiego i zmuszania plemion nomadycznych do osiadłego trybu życia, temu właśnie służyło. Wiązała się z tym ściśle militarna reorganizacja prowincji, co najpełniejszy wyraz znalazło w translokacji legionu III Augustowskiego do Theveste, a później do Lambaesis. Flawiusze podjęli też dzieło rozbudowy i naprawy sieci dróg. Coloniae veteranorum — Ammaedara i Madauros — oraz municypia Sufetula i Cillium miały za zadanie, obok ważnych funkcji gospodarczych i politycznych, regulować dostęp do urodzajnych ziem Africa Proconsularis. Nie ma wątpliwości, że polityka Flawiuszów miała charakter długofalowy, a działania Trajana, Hadriana i Sewerów stanowiły jej prostą kontynuację.