Careers at Rome traditionally followed a more or less fixed order of offices (cursus honorum). The applicability of such a rigid cursus to local magistrates in the provinces is a rather more complex question. The purpose of the present chapter is to examine the career structure of magistrates in Roman Spain, including the requirements for entry to various offices, the types of magistracy available, and career progression both within the local system and beyond. The evidence for this presentation consists principally of the surviving Spanish charters, which (as explained in chapter 2) are probably typical of the regulations in all privileged communities. Frequent reference will also be made to the career records of individuals from the Catalogue, illustrating the extent to which these laws were followed in actual practice.

Decurions

Since magistrates necessarily belonged to, and in essence composed, the ordo decurionum, it is necessary to begin by considering the nature of decurions in general and the prerequisites for admission to their order. The term ‘decurion’ originally signified a member of a decuria (*decem-viria, board of ten men). How this decadal structure relates to municipal senates is far from clear. The Oxford Latin Dictionary, under ‘decurio,’ assumes that the senates comprised ten panels of ten men each; but the ancients did not share this view. Pomponius (second century AD) believed that when a colony was founded, a tenth of the colonists were formed into a council. Isidore of Seville (seventh century) thought decurions were named after the curia or senate; but curia is derived from co-viria, and decurio is not a compound of it. Whatever the origin of their title, the fact remains that
decurions were local senators, and their presence indicates the existence of a self-governing town, of whatever type. Like the senators of Rome, decurions in Spain (and in the West generally) were also known as conscripti.

The number of decurions in Italian cities was sometimes one hundred, and this figure is accepted by modern handbooks as the norm for the Roman Empire. In fact the number was variable. In Italy and Africa, ordines of fifty to sixty members are common, and in both regions there is at least one instance of an ordo of thirty. At the opposite end of the scale, we find senates of three hundred to six hundred in the East, and of six hundred at Massalia under Tiberius and at Thuburbo Maius in Africa under Commodus. These large ordines seem to have emulated the Senate at Rome, whose membership under the Principate numbered about six hundred. In Spain, the large cities could undoubtedly have supported a local senate of one hundred or more, but in smaller towns this number would be neither feasible nor desirable. The Urso charter sometimes specifies a fixed quorum of twenty, thirty, forty, or (in one case) fifty decurions for various types of business; elsewhere it prescribes that two-thirds or a majority must be present. Discounting for the moment the lone mention of fifty, one could plausibly conjecture an ordo of, say, fifty-nine members, with thirty as a simple majority and forty as two-thirds. The business requiring fifty members is approval of applications to demolish buildings (Urs. 75). Granted that town planning may have been extremely important to local senates, it remains unclear why such a large quorum was needed in a town like Urso, when the Flavian municipia required only a simple majority of decurions for the same business (Mal. 62). Could the number ‘t’ in the Urso document represent an epigraphic error (e.g., for ‘xl’), or a passage transcribed too literally from a prototype charter, or an interpolation reflecting later conditions? The surviving copy of the Urso charter dates to the Flavian period, by which time the ordo might have been considerably larger than at the colony’s foundation a good century earlier.

More explicit evidence for the size of an ordo comes from the new Lex Irunitana. Chapter 31 of this charter provides that the duovirs shall arrange for the election of replacements if the number of decurions has fallen below sixty-three, ‘which there were, by law and custom of that municipium, before this charter was passed.’ The clear implication is that the town was to retain its traditional ordo of sixty-three senators; the phrase ‘iure more’ probably refers to conditions prior to the grant of ius Latii and not simply those between the date of the grant and the issuing of the charter.

To what extent does this figure apply to other municipia? As explained in the previous chapter, the existing municipal charters with their identical provisions are patently copies of a master municipal law, with a few blanks,
such as the name of the town, to be filled in locally. Since it is most unlikely
that unprivileged towns were obliged to have the same size of local council –
and the number sixty-three certainly seems peculiar – I would submit that
chapter 31 contained such a blank, in which each municipium was to insert
the number of senators to which it was accustomed. It may seem strange that
the granting of municipal status was not accompanied by a regularization of
the number of decurions, to the axiomatic one hundred, for example. But the
varying sizes of towns receiving privileges (whether municipal or colonial)
would have made rigid application of such an arbitrary number impractical.
In a large town the competition for the decurionate would have been fierce,
whereas in smaller municipia there might have been real difficulties in
finding one hundred suitably qualified persons. The drafters of the Flavian
municipal law may thus have found it expedient to respect the existing size
of local ordines, an allowance not inconsistent with the principle of local
self-government.

Archaeological evidence may also throw some light on the problem. Six
cities in Africa have senate houses (curiae) with an internal area of ca 120
square metres, which by modern calculations would have just accommodated
an ordo of one hundred. (The Curia at Rome, by comparison, had an interior
space of ca 455 square metres to accommodate a senatorial attendance which
seems rarely to have exceeded four hundred.) But the Flavian curia excavated
at Conimbriga in Lusitania has an internal area of only 74.25 square metres,
and indeed is one of the smallest in the Roman world. This suggests that
Conimbriga had an ordo considerably smaller than one hundred in this
period. The Conimbrigan curia could perhaps have accommodated fifty or
sixty elders, a size consonant with those proposed for Urso and attested in
the municipium Irnitanum.

At the other extreme we seem to have persuasive evidence from which a
senate considerably larger than one hundred at Barcino can be calculated.
An inscription from this city, datable to ca 160, records a legacy of one
hundred thousand sesterces from L. Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus:
this was to be invested at an interest of five per cent, and the resulting
annual earnings of five thousand sesterces were to be distributed at the rate
of four denarii (sixteen sesterces) to each decurion and three denarii (twelve
sesterces) to each of the Augustales (CIL II 4511 = EJER 34 = IRB 32). Provision
is made for an increased distribution per capita in the event of absentees,
the clear implication being that if all the decurions and Augustales were
present for the donative, the entire five thousand sesterces would be
expended at the specified rate. The number of Augustales serving at one
time was limited to six in this period, though former members of the college
could continue to use that title. But even if we assume an improbably
high figure of one hundred former and current Augustales, as well as the 'standard' one hundred decurions, the amount of the largesse would only be twenty-eight hundred sesterces – little more than half the allotted sum. Therefore the number of decurions must have been considerably higher than one hundred. The donative of five thousand sesterces would be compatible with a decurion:Augustalis ratio of 250:83, 275:50 or 300:16. Thus, in the absence of an adequate sample of precise figures from Spanish cities, caution should be exercised in positing assumptions about the 'standard' size of local senates.

There is some evidence to suggest that certain towns had a dual ordo, paralleling a situation occasionally found in Italy and Africa. A series of inscriptions from Valentia, in the late second or early third century AD, mentions the 'Valentini veterani et veteres' as well as 'uterque ordo' ('both senates') and 'universus ordo' (the latter expression presumably denoting both ordines combined).9 'Universus [ordo?] is also attested at Dertosa, and 'utrique sen[atu]' (if the reading is correct) at Pax Iulia (cIL 4060, 52 = Iler 1383, 1516). A better-preserved inscription includes the phrase, 'to this man the Old Senate (ordo vetus) of Singilia also decreed in its own name the same honours that it had decreed previously in the Combined Senate (in universum)' (cIL 2026 = Iler 1485). The rationale for a double senate, meeting separately on some matters and collectively on others, is not at all apparent; and for the same measure to be passed both separately and collectively seems redundant.

The recently published Lex Irnitana rules that the decurions are to vote 'each in his own ordo' ('quisque in suo ordine'), beginning with those who have the most children and ending with those who have none. Where several decurions have the same number of children or equivalent privileges (ius liberorum), the vote goes first to ex-duovirs, in order of seniority, then to other decurions in order of seniority (Irn. B). Clearly there is a pecking order here, similar to that at Rome, where opinion was sought first from the princeps, then from the consulars, then from other senators in order of seniority. However, neither at Rome nor in the municipium Irnitanum does this procedure show that there was more than one ordo (though the editor of the new law interprets it to mean that there were two ordines, one of duovirs and one of non-duovirs); 10 the phrase 'quisque in suo ordine' really means 'each in his own turn,' and has nothing to do with a multiple senate.

The term ordo designated both the local senate and the decurial 'class,' a privileged elite whose membership was by no means accessible to the general public. Candidates for admission to the decurionate were required to meet several basic qualifications. One of these was citizenship or residence in the local community.11 Although decurions were normally natives of the town
in which they held office, resident aliens (incolae) were also eligible. Hence in Spain we not infrequently find citizens of one town belonging to the ordo of another, and sometimes pursuing the cursus at both, though not simultaneously. A native of Corduba, L. Lucretius Severus (24), specifically informs us that he rose 'ex incolatu decurioni' in the town of Axati; it is not necessary to suppose, with Hübner, that he actually acquired local citizenship. But the residence requirement was strictly enforced, and we know from the Urso charter that a decurion who did not maintain a domicile within one mile of the town could be expelled from the ordo (Urs. 91).

A further and hardly surprising requirement was free birth. Although Julius Caesar had allowed freedmen to hold office at Urso and other colonies, the free-birth requirement was strictly enforced under the Empire. Illegitimate children, on the other hand, were not debarred from the local senate, though Roman law required that preference be given to legitimate candidates. However, there was also an age restriction. Those under age twenty-five – thirty during the Republic, though allowance was made for military service – or over fifty-five (gradually extended to seventy in the Late Empire when there was a shortage of decurions) were not normally admissible. This requirement ensured that incoming decurions were mature but not decrepit.

A property qualification was also demanded, paralleling the senatorial census at Rome. At Comum in northern Italy during the time of Trajan, this was one hundred thousand sesterces. While the existence of a similar property qualification is assumed for cities in Spain, as a means of restricting senate entry to the local élite, we have no figures on its value. It may have been less in the provinces than in Italy, and it may have varied from city to city. Jacques suggests that one hundred thousand sesterces was appropriate to a medium-sized city: in smaller towns the local élite was probably less affluent and the property requirement proportionately reduced. We do know from I.86 that there were free men with property worth at least five thousand sesterces who did not qualify as decurions, whence it follows that the property qualification for admission to the ordo exceeded that figure.

The final prerequisite was freedom from any type of moral or legal stain which might reflect adversely on the dignity of the ordo. Persons barred under this provision included those convicted of theft or other criminal offence, whether at Rome or locally; those condemned in an action for trust, partnership, guardianship, or fraud; those who made a false accusation; those who abandoned a public prosecution without permission; debtors, bankrupts, and insolvent persons; army officers or soldiers who had been dishonourably discharged; and those employed in disreputable trades (auc-
tioneers, undertakers, sailors, gladiators, keepers of brothels or gladiatorial schools). These five prerequisites (residence, birth, age, wealth, respectability) ensured that the ordo was restricted to an affluent, and socially acceptable, local élite.16

It was the responsibility of the local magistrates to ensure that unqualified persons did not enter the ordo; they were also forbidden to increase the number of decurions, which might today be termed ‘stacking’ the house (Tab. Her. 83–8, 126–34). In cases where a candidate’s eligibility for admission to the senate was disputed, the question could be referred to the provincial governor (Pliny Ep. 10. 79–80, 112–13). It is clear from these provisions that the holding of a magistracy was not a prerequisite for admission to the ordo, whereas the holding of a magistracy would confer de facto membership. Obviously, when a new town was founded there would be no former magistrates to compose the ordo, and a local senate would have to be created ex nihilo. Also, there are numerous attestations of Spanish decurions who died without ever having held any magistracy.17

Admission to the ordo was effected either through election (creatio) or extraordinary means (adlectio). Election of qualified persons to vacant seats in the ordo was held annually, on a date agreed upon by the duovirs and decurions. Nominations were approved by vote of the decurions; but the exact procedure for nomination and election is not preserved. Under the Early Empire at any rate, the consent of the candidates was required.18

Adlection of unqualified persons (e.g. non-residents) could be made either by vote of the decurions – a process also known as cooptatio – or by the intervention of the emperor (presumably through patronage). Several examples of both types of adlection are attested in Spain.19 The list of decurions was revised every fifth year by the quinquennales and the names of new members entered into the official register (album); those decurions elected in the interval were known as pedan[e]i.20

The number of decurions required in attendance at any senate meeting depended initially upon the type of business to be conducted. Thus in chapter 69 of the Urso charter we see that for routine matters as few as twenty members sufficed; in other cases the number required is stated as thirty, forty, or fifty. Alternatively, in both the Urso and Flavian charters, we find the quorum expressed as a fraction of the total membership, e.g., two-thirds, three-quarters, or a majority. In later times, a quorum of two-thirds of the decurions was required for a local senate to be legally convened.21

At Urso, a decurion could be expelled from the ordo upon being convicted by a quaestio of conduct unbecoming a decurion (Urs. 105, cf 124). Such expulsions (as well as other penalties, such as exile) presumably applied in all towns, to judge from their repeated mention in legal sources and the
insistence (already mentioned) that decurions be men of untainted character. On this matter, unfortunately, the relevant section of the Flavian charters does not survive. In the case of temporary exile (relegatio ad tempus), the ex-decurion might subsequently be readmitted to the ordo (if, of course, there was a vacancy), although by the reign of Marcus Aurelius such reinstatement required the emperor's permission. Membership in the ordo was thus a revocable privilege, and it was in the interest of the local elite to ensure that any 'undesirable' members were removed from their prestigious circle.

Magistrates – Qualifications for Office

Since magistrates were members of the ordo decurionum, it followed that those who did not meet the qualifications for admission to the decurionate could not normally compete for municipal office either. Existing decurions could become magistrates if they met all necessary qualifications. In addition to being a citizen or resident of the town and having attained the requisite age, a candidate for office had to be solvent and owe no public debts. Since most magistrates (even aediles, as we now know from the Irni charter) handled public funds, the rationale for this restriction is apparent. Though minors were occasionally elected (e.g., 442 and 446, aediles of Barcino at age seventeen and eighteen respectively), boys under the age of puberty could not be admitted even if there were a shortage of candidates. Alfoldy suggests that the minimum age for office at Barcino was lower than elsewhere, but this is difficult to prove from only two examples. Free birth was normally a requirement, and although freedmen were theoretically allowed to hold office at Urso, none is attested. Criminals were of course excluded, although the son of a criminal, like the son of a freedman, was not necessarily debarred; and persons accused of a crime could not hold office until their case had been decided (with, we must assume, an acquittal). Women, not surprisingly, could not hold political office; but a man's religious beliefs were apparently not a barrier.

Candidates for the duovirate, and probably for other magistracies as well, could not have held office within the previous five years (Mai. 54). This provision was presumably intended to allow more decurions an opportunity to exercise these offices. It was also understood that a magistrate, once elected, would be required to perform certain public services out of his own pocket (see below, chapters 4 and 7). This expectation was consonant with the timocratic nature of the Roman ruling classes, which gave privileges to the rich but at the same time imposed obligations; a parallel is offered by the ancient Greek system of liturgies.
Since a magistrate’s term of office coincided with the calendar year, as shown in the Urso charter (Urs. 63), elections would be held the previous year (as was also the case at Rome, and in many modern systems). It is clear from the Flavian municipal law that the election of magistrates, unlike that of decurions, was the prerogative of the entire citizen body voting in comitia, not an intramural decision of the ordo decurionum. The magistrates to be elected normally comprised two duovirs, two aediles and two quaestors – a collegial system whose roots can be traced to the early days of the Republic, when the Senate refused to entrust power to one man.

The procedure for nomination of candidates was presumably spelled out in chapter 50 of the Flavian regulations, which is unfortunately lost. Chapters 51–2 provide that in the absence of any or sufficient candidates, a list of all persons qualified for office shall be posted by the presiding magistrate, i.e., the senior duovir. Each person on this list is allowed to present himself before this magistrate and to nominate candidates from the list. Whether resort was actually had to this procedure during the Early Empire is a doubtful question; it appears to have been merely a provision to cover a remote possibility. As has recently been suggested, the drafters of the Flavian regulations may have inserted this provision because they doubted the willingness of the provincials to undertake the required duties.

The senior duovir (the elder by birth) presided over the comitia for the election, and where necessary, by-election, of duovirs, aediles, and quaestors. The duovirs were elected first, followed by the other offices. Citizens voted in polling booths or compartments (consaepta), casting secretly marked ballots (tabellae) according to curiae, corresponding to the voting tribes at Rome; the new charter fragments show that the number of curiae was limited. Election was determined by a plurality of ballots in each curia; the two candidates receiving the largest number of votes in each curia were returned, and the pair who carried the greatest number of curiae were declared elected. In the case of a tied vote in any curia, preference was given to married men and those with children (an apparent reflection of Augustan marriage legislation, which awarded privileges to those who perpetuated their families). If the tied candidates had equal claims in this regard, the decision was made by drawing lots. Candidates winning a majority of the curiae were obliged to swear an oath that they would perform all duties of the office, and that they had not committed nor would commit any wrongful deed, including unlawful summoning of the decurions (Mal. 56, 59; Salp. 26). They were also required to provide sureties (bondsmen) and securities (property) as a pledge that they would not mishandle any public
moneys. This requirement applied even in the case of magistrates nominated compulsorily. The requirement for securities ensured against both embezzlement of municipal funds and insolvency of city officials. It was once thought that aediles would be exempt from providing securities, since their duties did not require them to handle public funds; however, the Lex Irnitana makes it clear that aediles not only handled such funds but had to submit accounts at the end of their aedilesip.30

Magistrates could run again for the same office after waiting the requisite five years; this repetition of the same magistracy was termed iteratio. Examples of magistrates holding the same office twice (bis, iterum) or even three times occur fairly frequently in Spain. There is no compelling evidence that this ‘waiting period’ could be waived or legally bypassed, allowing a magistrate to hold the same office two years in succession. The younger Balbus (96) had himself re-elected to the quattuorvirate, but illegally. Also, the phrase ‘designatus iterum’ (140–1) implies re-election for a second, but not necessarily consecutive, term. Although one scholar has suggested that the phenomenon of re-electing the same magistrates points to a shortage of candidates,31 a likelier explanation may be personal ambition and individual popularity. The ‘election fever’ evident in the Flavian graffiti from Pompeii certainly points to voluntary candidature and enthusiastic campaigning, not to political apathy.

Order of Offices

It was once believed – and the myth still has adherents – that there was a fixed progression of municipal offices in the Roman West, namely from quaestor to aedile to duovir.32 However, the number of municipal cursus which deviate from this supposed norm is so substantial as to cast doubt on the whole scheme. An examination of these three ‘standard’ offices is therefore in order.

Of all the links in the chain, the most vulnerable is the quaestorship. Since this office was a personal munus rather than an honor (in some towns at any rate), it could be held at any point in the cursus, if held at all. In the inscriptions it occurs sometimes after the aedilesip, sometimes after the duovirate, sometimes after a post-duoviral flaminate – in short, it seems, anywhere except the beginning of the cursus. Nor is this syndrome confined to Spain: we find similar irregularity of order in the inscriptions of Italy, Gallia Narbonensis and Africa.33 Moreover, Spanish quaestors occur almost exclusively in the conventus Tarraconensis (fifty-nine total). There are only seven attested in Baetica, four in Lusitania, and none at all in the rest of Hispania Citerior. Clearly the quaestorship did not exist in all towns, and
the quaestors' financial duties must have been undertaken by the other magistrates. From the fact that the quaestorship is mentioned in the charter of Salpensa (a municipium) but not that at Urso (a colony), Steven-}

son conjectured that colonies did not have quaestors. This theory is however disproved by the inscriptions, which attest numerous quaestors at the colonies of Tarraco and Valentia, plus one from either Emerita or Norba (890-4, 896-7, 899, 903, 907, 909-10, 950-5, 393); it is nonetheless disturbing to find none at Barcino. There may be some validity to Mackie's theory, that the odium attaching to quaestors in their role as tax collectors may have discouraged them from advertising this office on their inscriptions. Alternatively, if we accept that the quaestorship was a junior post and not an honor, it may have seemed too unimportant for an ex-duovir to bother mentioning. On the other hand, at Saguntum, the small number of quaes-

tors (compared with aediles and duovirs) and the fact that, in career inscrip-
tions, this office is cited after the duovirate and sometimes after the high-priesthood of the Salii have prompted Alfoldy to conclude that there was only one quaestor per year and that the quaestorship was the highest honour in that city. Though the dearth of quaestorial mentions could have other interpretations, the curious placement of the title at the climax of the cursus seems to support Alfoldy's view.

A particularly enigmatic problem is the interpretation of the designation 'q.' on certain coins. In inscriptions on stone, 'q.' usually stands for 'quaes-
tor,' rarely 'quinquennalis.' Many of the coins of Emporiae are stamped 'q.,' and this apparently stands for 'quaestor' since some of the coins give an alternative and fuller form, 'QVAI.' At Carthago Nova, on the other hand, we have monetal magistrates called 'iivir q.,' and here the 'q.' in at least three cases can be demonstrated to mean 'quinquennalis': Helvius Pollio (541) is called 'iivir q.' on some coins but 'iivir quin.' on others; King Juba is called 'iivir qu.' on coins but 'iivir quinq.' in an inscription; Laetilius Apalus (568) is called 'iivir q.' on coins but 'iivir quin.' in an inscription. It therefore appears that 'iivir q.' at Carthago Nova designates a quinquennalis.

What then of the 'iiviri q.' at Ilici? In the absence of evidence to the contrary, 'q.' should be 'quaestor'; 'quinquennalis' would be 'q.q..' But in view of the proximity of Ilici to Carthago Nova, where 'q.' is 'quinquennalis,' one has to admit uncertainty. Beltrán Lloris contends that the Ilici magis-

trates are quinquennales, but weakens his credibility by suggesting that 'q.' is 'quinquennalis' also at Emporiae, Valentia, Urso and Corduba. It might be argued that 'q.' may have a different meaning when it follows 'iivir,' especially since 'quaestor' is supposedly a lower office and should precede the higher. Such an argument is in fact very hazardous: Beltrán Lloris cites
a magistrate of Emporiae (L. Rosius Rufus, 727) with the titulary 'aed. iuviar q.' as evidence that 'q.' is 'quinquennalis' there; he is seemingly unaware of another magistrate from the same city (L. Minicius Rufus, 723) whose inscription reads, unequivocally, 'aed. iuviro quaestori'. In short, it seems that the quaestorship could be held at even a late stage of the cursus. As for the 'q.' abbreviation on coins, its meaning doubtless varied from place to place.

A final aspect of the 'q.' problem is the possibility that the abbreviation designates a quaestor of Rome rather than a local magistrate. Grant observed that 'L. Ap. Dec. q.' is attested on coins of Baelo, Urso and Myrtilis (28, 288, 358) as well as at Lilybaeum in Sicily. He argued that all these coins refer to the same individual, who by virtue of the multiplicity of mints involved cannot be a local official. Grant concluded that L. Ap. Dec. must be a Roman quaestor, and that the only context for the same man issuing coins in both Spain and Sicily was the civil wars of the 40s BC. More recently, Crawford has argued that these coins might better be dated, for metrological reasons, during the Sertorian War of the 70s BC, and that L. Ap. Dec. would be an otherwise unattested son of C. Appuleius Decianus, who was tribune in 98 BC. Unfortunately the coins themselves lend little support to the concept of multiple issues by a single individual. The Baelo example, formerly read as 'L. Ap. q./ actually reads 'L. Apo./' making an identification with Appuleius impossible. The Myrtilis coins display a bewildering variety of name-abbreviations which may or may not refer to a single magistrate, but none of them actually reads 'L. Ap. Dec.' and none of them includes 'q.' This inconsistent nomenclature and lack of titulary accord poorly with the hypothesis of an official issue by a Roman quaestor. Only the Urso coins read 'L. Ap. Dec. q./' but with Baelo eliminated and Myrtilis doubtful, the 'q.' could be a local magistrate, whose nomen could be Aponius or Appius as easily as Appuleius; and the Sicilian example (whose connection with Spain neither Grant nor Crawford can explain convincingly) may be unrelated.

The aedileship tends to occur rather more regularly than the quaestorship, and normally precedes the duovirate. Its omission from many inscriptions leaves a non liquet as to whether the office had actually been skipped, or whether its mention was merely considered superfluous beside that of the duovirate. The irregularity in the sequence of priesthoods in the municipal cursus might suggest that there were alternate avenues of advancement: for instance, that one could bypass the aedileship by holding a sacerdotium or quaestorship. On the other hand, the flaminate and pontificate seem to have ranked even higher than the duovirate, and frequently follow it in the cursus; moreover, priesthoods are not proper magistracies. In any event, it
seems unlikely that the aedileship was a necessary stepping stone to the duovirate, though it was often used as such. There were only two aediles and two duovirs per year; therefore, if one of the aediles died, retired from political life, or went on to other office (e.g., an equestrian career or a priesthood), there would be a shortage of qualified candidates for the duovirate (except by iteration of a previous duovir after a five-year interval). In such a situation it might be necessary to elect a duovir who was not an e-aedile. In fact, there are plenty of career inscriptions attesting aediles who never became duovirs, which would suggest that the aedileship was not merely an intermediate rung in a cursus, nor an automatic springboard to the duovirate, but could be a terminal post, either by the desire of the individual or by his failure to secure election to higher office. Thus the aedile-to-duovir transition was by no means a fixed step in one’s career.

Additional light on the order of offices may be provided by chapter 54 of the Flavian municipal law. This chapter, which demonstrates that duoviri iure dicundo have superior potestas to aediles and quaestors, lumps together these last two offices as if to suggest that they had equal potestas. Aediles and quaestors have, moreover, the same minimum age requirement of twenty-five rather than a sliding scale. This requirement suggests that one could hold either the aedileship or the quaestorship as the first office, followed later by the duovirate. The quaestorship, of course, could also be held later, whereas the aedileship could only be a preliminary office. In towns where the quaestorship existed we sometimes find the cursus ‘quaestor iivir’, which may suggest that the quaestorship was held instead of the aedileship.

However, chapter 54 also gives the minimum age of the duovir as twenty-five. We know that in the Late Republic the minimum age for all magistracies was thirty. The theory that Augustus reduced it to twenty-five has never been proved; however, if the age could be thirty across the board (rather than a sliding scale), there is no reason why it could not later be twenty-five across the board. If so, the basic age requirement of twenty-five for all three positions would mean, in effect, that there was no municipal cursus: one could run for the duovirate without holding any previous office. Against this solution there are two technical obstacles: first, chapter 54 is preserved only in the Malaca copy, and the mention of age twenty-five (xxv) for the duovir could be a transcription error for thirty (xxx) or thirty-five (xxxv); secondly, chapter 25 of the same law (preserved in two copies, as well as in one of the Lauriacum fragments: Salp. 25 = lrm. 25 = Fira 1² 26) stipulates that the minimum age for the prefect who replaces the duovir is thirty-five, and there is no evident reason why a twenty-five year old could only be replaced by a thirty-five year old. The minimum age for the duovir thus remains in doubt. If it was thirty-five, there is still no explicit requirement
that he must first serve as aedile or quaestor. If, on the other hand, one could hold the duovirate without any preliminary office, it is curious that a large number of Spanish magistrates chose to begin with at least one of the junior posts. The third possibility is that there was an ‘unwritten law’ that one should hold a junior office first; needless to add, what was unwritten cannot be recovered now.

**Duovirs versus Quattuorvirs**

A further problem is the tendency of some cities to call their chief magistrates *duoviri* (or *duumviri*, the terms apparently being interchangeable), and of others to call them *quattuorviri*. Various hypotheses have been advanced to account for this inconsistency. One is that colonies had duovirs, while *municipia* had quattuorvirs. A second is that communities which already had two chief magistrates retained duovirs, while the others adopted quattuorvirs. A third hypothesis holds that communities which were Roman in origin had duovirs, while those that were Roman only by incorporation (i.e., hitherto autonomous) had quattuorvirs. And according to a fourth hypothesis, quattuorvirs are found only in places chartered before a certain date. The first hypothesis, as Stevenson pointed out long ago, was applicable only to Italy, not the provinces; and even for Italy, both the first and second have now been superseded by the third. This hypothesis is not, however, valid for Spain, since the vast majority of *municipia* (which were previously self-governing) have duovirs. Neither is the fourth hypothesis viable: Rudolph’s contention that new *municipia* were quattuorviral until Julius Caesar and duoviral thereafter, and likewise Frere’s statement that quattuorvirs were unfashionable in Spain by the Flavian period, are disproved by the appointment of quattuorvirs at the new Flavian *municipia* of Munigua and Sabora. All four hypotheses must therefore be discarded and the problem examined afresh.

Nearly all incorporated communities in Spain, be they colonies or *municipia*, had duovirs. Six known *municipia* (Asido Caesarina, Sabora, Gades, Munigua, Carmo, Sigarra) had quattuorvirs, although the first four named also had duovirs. There is no apparent rationale for these anomalies. Gades, an Augustan *municipium* (and once the seat of two *sufetes*) had quattuorvirs both before and after Augustus (96, 98, 102, 104). Both it and Munigua seem to have had duovirs and quattuorvirs simultaneously. Sabora, upon becoming a *municipium* in AD 77, converted its magistrates from duovirs to quattuorvirs. The *civitas* of Liria had both types of magistracy (782–4), while L. Porcius Serenus of Aeso (a town of unknown status) was both a quattuorvir and duovir (401).
Roman colonies in Spain did not have quattuorvirs. Carteia had them, conceivably because it was a Latin colony, where quattuorvirs were the rule. But Knapp postulates, not unreasonably, that Carteia became a municipium ca 90 BC; and a recently discovered inscription from Carteia bearing the phrase ‘in munic...’ appears to confirm this status, if not the date. The quattuorvirs at Clunia apparently antedate the granting of colonial status under Galba: all but one of them appear on coins of Tiberius, and the other also belongs to the first century (634–49, 659). Perhaps Clunia was formerly a municipium. A possible quattuorvir at Emerita (334) is doubtful and unlikely, for there is no other quattuorvir in Lusitania. The sole remaining exception is a ‘mvir iuvir’ at the Augustan colony of Ilici (761), neither of whose titles is explicable. Ilici otherwise has duovirs and aediles, not quattuorvirs.

The likeliest explanation for the quattuorvirate in the municipia is that it was simply an alternate title. As explained above (chapter I, n 15), the quattuorvirs were a joint board comprising two duovirs and two aediles. Thus a duovir could legitimately call himself a quattuorvir, in addition to or instead of his title of duovir, since he belonged to both the board of two and the board of four. This is the only feasible way to account for the simultaneous presence of duovirs and quattuorvirs in the same town, and for the apparent tenure of both offices by the same individual. Moreover, the use of the title quattuorvir in certain municipia and unincorporated towns seems to have been a matter of local preference, rather than in accordance with the dictate of Rome. In other towns the title was apparently unfashionable: among this group the Roman colonies figure prominently. Being more closely controlled by Rome, they had little or no choice in the matter.

**Prefects**

The prefects (praefecti) attested in Spanish communities were not ordinary magistrates, but rather promagistrates appointed to assume the functions of duovirs who for one reason or another (death, illness, absence, impeachment) were unable to perform them. The institution stems originally from the praefecti iure dicundo sent out by the praetor to govern Rome’s early settlements in Italy. In the Imperial period we still find prefects being appointed in peregrine civitates and in some of the less romanized provinces (e.g., the Danubian provinces and the Three Gauls): these were not sent from Rome, but were selected from among the local aristocracy. There is very little evidence for this type of prefect in Spain. Hyginus mentions prefectures at Emerita, and one such prefect is possibly attested in an inscription (334). In Baetica, inscriptions of the Imperial period attesting...
praefecti iure dicundo at the conventus capitals of Corduba, Astigi, and Gades, led Knapp to assume that such prefects were a legacy of Roman prefects who had originally dispensed justice at these towns under the Republic. This ingenious theory fails to explain why the praefectus i.d. at Gades was ab decurionibus creatus (97); nor does it account for juridical prefects in cities which were not conventus capitals, such as Urso and Salpensa. The charter of the latter town informs us (in chapter 25) that the prefect was appointed, not by the decurions, but by whichever of the duovirs was last to leave town; he must be a decurion, not less than thirty-five years of age, and must take an oath of office. Moreover, it appears that most of the prefects attested in career inscriptions from Spain had already held the duovirate.

A special type of prefect, the praefectus Caesaris, was appointed by the emperor when a town offered the office of honorary duovir to a member of the Imperial family. This prefect exercised the same rights as a sole duovir. If however (as occurs until the reign of Tiberius) the emperor or another dignitary was offered the honorary duovirate jointly with a local decurion, there was no requirement for the appointment of a prefect, for the local duovir would discharge the duties of the honorary one. Conversely, when both duovirates were held by Imperial appointees in the same year (as sometimes occurs in Spain under Tiberius) a prefect was presumably required. Apart from members of the Imperial family, we find King Juba of Mauretania and his son Ptolemy holding honorary duovirates at Carthago Nova; Juba was also honorary duovir at Gades.

Curators

While any local magistrate might be called a curator, i.e., person in charge of a certain portfolio (cura), the curator rei publicae was a special and powerful official in a category by himself. Curatores r.p. were appointed to assist with local finances and administration. They first make their appearance under the Flavians (or possibly under Nero), and under Trajan and Hadrian the office becomes widespread in most of the Empire, although none is attested in Africa until the Severan period. In the senatorial province of Baetica we have a tantalizingly truncated mention of a ‘... curato[r]’ in an inscription dated by Hübner to the reign of Trajan (interestingly enough, from Trajan’s home town of Italica). There is no guarantee that this supposed magistrate (143) is a curator r.p., rather than some locally appointed official or even a ‘[pro]curato[r].’ Nor is the approximate dating to Trajan necessarily accurate: we could have here a curator r.p. from a later period. It may be relevant that Italica was granted colonial status by
Hadrian; the emperor expressed surprise at the town's request, since colo-

nies were less autonomous than *municipia* and more liable to financial

interference by Rome (Gell. *NA* 16.13). Also in Baetica we find two curators

under the Antonines (295, 298), one in 196 (267), five in the third century

(110, 151, 152, 153, 262), and one undated (91). Lusitania has one in the

third century (349) and one undated (320); a lone curator appears at Tarraco

in the fourth century (921).

There has been much debate among scholars as to whether the curator

was a magistrate or a professional civil servant. A recent re-examination of

the problem makes it clear that the curatorship was neither a magistracy

nor a required stage in an Imperial career.⁵⁷ The position of *curator r.p.*

was, however, prestigious for the individual, as well as having a decided

impact on the management of the city.

Curators were normally appointed by the emperor, held senatorial or

equestrian status, and were non-natives of the city where they held office.⁵⁸

However, two of the Baetican curators were apparently locals, for both held

the duovirate: Q. Vibius Laetus of Corduba (91) and C. Aufidius Vegetus

of Villafranca (298). Moreover, the latter of these two curators dates to the

mid- or late second century. If the man was really a *curator r.p.*, the date

of this example would contradict Burton's contention that curators did not

become local officials until the late third century.⁵⁹

### Unusual Magistracies

Previous scholars have remarked upon the 'bewildering variety' of municipal

offices in the provinces. Spain in particular provides a number of offices

other than the normal duovirs, aediles and quaestors. In most cases these

are remnants of a pre-romanized local government. In particular, the vague

title *magistratus* (of which twenty-four are attested) could mask a variety

of indigenous officials.⁶⁰ The fact that four or more so-called *magistratus*

can occur simultaneously (351–4, 666–70) suggests that the term denotes

all members of the board of local magistrates, not just the chief magistrate

or pair of magistrates.

**Praetors** With the exception of two examples at Bocchoris in the Baleares

in 6 BC (whose title may be the Latin translation of a Punic magistracy),⁶¹

praetors are found only in the Ebro Valley. The earliest magistrates attested

at Contrebia Belaisca (87 BC) are a praetor and five *magistratus*, all with

indigenous nomenclature (665–70). The office of praetor is very strange in

such a context: Roman colonies often had a pair of praetors in charge, both

in Italy and outside,⁶² but here we have a single praetor in what is patently
not a Roman town. The board of five magistrates is equally suspicious (cf below on quinqueviri). It would appear that we are dealing with an intermediate stage in the romanization of Contrebia: the princeps and his council have adopted equivalent Latin titles for their appointments, but have not actually adopted the Roman magisterial system. The same inscription shows that Contrebia had a senatus and iudices; the names of these bodies clearly imitate those at Rome (perhaps too closely), but one suspects that they are romanized in name only and are basically pre-Roman institutions.

During the third quarter of the first century BC we find pairs of magistrates styled ‘pr. iivir’ on coins of Celsa and Calagurris. One of the pairs from the former city is ‘pr. quin.’ ‘Pr.’ is probably again praetor, imitating the pre-duoviral title of the chief magistrates of Roman colonies, and numerous parallels may be adduced epigraphically. The other possible interpretation, ‘pr[ae]fecti pro iivir[iis]’ and ‘pr[ae]fecti pro quin[quennalibus]’ is more complex but cannot be entirely ruled out, since a praefectus pro iiviro would enjoy all the powers of a duovir, including coinage.

Principes While principes (chieftains, leaders) were common enough in the pre-Roman period, only a few survive in inscriptions, all from the north: 819 (Palantia), 790, 791, and 967 (all conventus Lucensis). These inscriptions cannot be closely dated, but perhaps belong to the first century AD. Principes are still found in other provinces in the second century.

Censors Three censors are attested on the coinage of Carteia in the second half of the first century BC (55–7). The appearance of this office at Carteia is perhaps explained as a remnant of this town’s earlier status as a colonia Latina, for censors are often found in Latin towns. The office recurs sporadically throughout the Empire, and it is interesting to note that local censors are still found in Bithynia in the second century AD. It is clear that the appointment of censors in Italy and the provinces was part of a gradual process of decentralization of the tasks of the censors at Rome. However, the dearth of attestations of this office in Spain makes it equally clear that local censorial duties were in most towns performed not by censors but by the duovirs.

Strange Numbers of Magistrates Inscriptions record the office of decemvir at Cartima in Baetica (71), and possibly at Lara de los Infantes (ancient name unknown) in Tarraconensis (776), as well as decemvir maximus at the Baetican cities of Ostippo (234) and Ulia (271). The three Baetican examples range in date from 49 BC to AD 54. The adjective maximus presumably designates the senior decemvir, like praetor maximus or pontifex maximus.
at Rome. The office of *decemvir* is probably based on the Italian municipal system, where the decemvirates antedates the granting of *ius Latii* to a town, although there remains a possibility that in Baetica it represents the continuity of a Punic institution. Mackie has suggested that *decemvir* at Ostippo is a title contrived to mark the town’s special status as an *oppidum liberum*. This hypothesis hardly explains the appearance of this magistracy at Cartima, unless we assume without evidence (as Mackie does) that the latter town also held free or federate status. Few will be deluded by the circular nature of this reasoning, and the new inscription from Ulia should lay Mackie’s hypothesis to rest.

In the Augustan period we find an *octovir* in Lusitania. This odd title is possibly the remnant of a pre-Roman local government, although parallels from Italy can be adduced. Since the findspot of the inscription, Alburquerque, is equidistant from Norba and Emerita, Galsterer suggests that the *octovir* may have belonged to the latter city and have somehow been involved with the prefectures. However, Norba, as the earlier foundation, may have a stronger claim to this archaic title.

An inscription from Lacippo in Baetica possibly mentions a *quinquevir* (167), and an intriguing if unrelated parallel is provided by the board of five *magistratus* at Contrebia, already cited. *Quinqueviri* did exist as commissioners at Rome, but they were hardly *magistratus*. Another odd number is evident in the *triumvir* attested at Ilici, if the reading is sound (761). There is also some indirect evidence for the possible existence of triumvirs at Castulo around the end of the second century BC (three names on each coin: 585–7) and at Maggava in AD 14 (three magistrates named on a *tessera hospitalis*: 793–5). One is reminded of the odd numbers of magistrates in semi-romanized towns of Africa: triumvirs at Cirta, three *sufetes* at Mactar, and *undecemprimi* elsewhere.

*Interreges* Chapter 130 of the Urso charter stipulates that persons proposing or publishing a decree illegally may be prosecuted by a *duovir* or *interrex* or prefect. The mention of *interrex* has been interpreted either as an interpolation, or as a perpetuation of the Italian practice (also copied in Narbonensis) of appointing an *interrex* in times of emergency, or when no duovirs were elected. The latter view now seems likelier, in view of the recent discovery of an inscription from the territory of the *municipium Siarense* naming an actual *interrex* (248). The man in question had already served as duovir, and one may doubt whether there was in fact much difference in function between an *interrex* and a *praefectus*. The editor dates this text to ‘probably the end of the Republic’ (has he been influenced by the Urso charter?). At
any rate the fact that the magistrate’s tribe is Galeria strongly suggests that Siarum received municipal status under Julius or Augustus Caesar.

Omnibus honoribus functus In the two Imperial provinces, and particularly in Tarracensis, members of the local élite are sometimes said to have discharged omnes honores. As Alfoldy has rightly pointed out, this catch-all title does not make its appearance before AD 120 (RIT 253). But what is meant by omnes honores? Although Ladage would have us believe that it refers to magistrates only, omnes honores seems rather a lofty title for only three posts (or two, since the quaestorship is a munus, not an honor). Apparent proof that priesthoods could be included in this designation is provided by a text describing a woman of Mago as omnibus honoribus functa. Since women could not be magistrates, this can only refer to the holding of religious offices. Moreover, there is some indication in legal sources that honores and magistracies were not synonymous: Gaius mentions Roman citizenship being granted to those who held ‘vel magistratum vel honorem’ (Gaius Inst. 1.96).

But although priesthoods were not necessarily excluded from omnes honores, it should be noted that the title became commonplace, a synonym for having progressed to the top of the local ladder. Thus omnes need not always be taken literally, nor does it imply the same offices in different towns. Thus at Tarraco (as Alfoldy has again discerned) it regularly means ‘aedile, quaestor, iūvīr,’ but not priesthood, while at Barcino at least one example shows omnes honores as equivalent to ‘iūvīr, flamen’ (438, referring to an outsider who apparently skipped the aedileship by ‘purchasing’ the top magistracy).

Legates The position of municipal envoy was somewhat anomalous, in that it did not figure in the formal cursus honorum, nor was it a publicly elected office. Ambassadors were not even chosen at regular intervals or for a standard term of office, but rather on an ‘as-required’ basis for a specific mission. The procedure for approving the dispatch of an embassy is detailed in chapter 92 of the Urso charter and chapter c of the Lex Irnitana. The duovir proposes the embassy to the decurions, who decide by majority vote of those present. The actual selection of legates is arranged annually by dividing all decurions under the age of sixty into three decuriae of equal size. Lots are then drawn to decide the order in which the decuriae will provide embassies, as well as the order of names of potential legates in each decuria. This is certainly a more complicated method than the seniority system recommended in the Digest. A person chosen to perform such an
embassy must either do so, or provide a substitute; failure to comply with
this law would incur a fine (ten thousand sesterces at Urso, twenty thousand
at Irni). According to Ulpian, the delinquent legate would also be expelled
from the ordo. Serving magistrates, ex-magistrates whose accounts had not
yet been approved, persons in charge of public funds or who lacked the right
to prosecute, and former gladiators were all ineligible to serve as legates.78

Distribution of Offices

The distribution of attested magistracies and quasi-magistracies in Roman
Spain (Table 1) reflects regional and historical disparities amongst the three
provinces, as well as illustrating the wide range of magisterial titles. Baetica
retains such oddities as censors, quinquevirs, and interreges, which are
lacking in the other provinces. Also of interest are the paucity of quaestors
outside of Tarraconensis and the complete absence in Baetica of the omnibus
honoribus functus formula. It may also be noted that there are well over
sixty quattuorvirs – far fewer, certainly, than the duovirs, but sufficient to
undermine a recent contention that the quattuorviral title was ‘very rare in
Spain.’79 Despite the conformity which romanization endeavoured to
impose, there was clearly great variety in magisterial titulary.

The Local Cursus: An End in Itself?

Whereas at Rome there is no question that the apex of the cursus honorum
was the consulship, the situation in the provinces was more ambiguous.
True, one could advance to the duovirate and perhaps to a priesthood, the
highest positions available in the community; but it was also possible to
leave one’s home town and enter the Imperial civil service or the army, to
become a knight or a senator or even (as in the case of Trajan) emperor.
Yet, given the influence of local aristocratic families within their own com-
munities, we may reasonably ask how many magistrates were content with
local honours.

Certainly there was an attraction to being domi nobilis, a large fish in a
small pond, rather than a ‘new man’ in the capital. In 59 bc Cicero laments
to Atticus that he would rather be one of the duovirs in the town of
Antium than consul at Rome. In recent studies, Syme and Drinkwater have
documented the continuing control of local offices in the Three Gauls by
aristocrats ‘averse from ambition or display,’ while Finley and Garnsey have
shown how members of the Sicilian and African élites spurned Imperial
service for local careers. Hopkins claims to discern a chronological pattern:
in the early period, rich provincials were content with local offices, whereas
# Career Progression

**TABLE 1**  
**Distribution of Attested Magistrates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baetica</th>
<th>Lusitania</th>
<th>Tarraconensis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decurio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decurialis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decurionatus ornamenta</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decurionatus honor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quaestor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilis designatus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilicia potestas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilicii honores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aedilicia ornamenta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovir (duumvir)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovir q. (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovir quinquennalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quinquennalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovir designatus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovir iure dicundo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duoviralis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duoviralis potestas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duovirales honores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duoviralia ornamenta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quattuorvir</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quattuorviralis potestas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefectus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefectus Caesaris (Imperatoris)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefectus iure dicundo</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefectus pro duoviro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praefectus quinquennalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curator (rei publicae)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>praetor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pr. quin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>princeps</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>censor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decemvir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>octovir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quinquevir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the course of the Empire they expanded their horizons and, having acquired Roman citizenship, began competing for Roman honours. While perhaps valid on general lines, Hopkins’ theory fails to take into account the whims of individuals – for after all, the decision to leave home and pursue a career abroad is a personal one. Far from being only a function of time, this ‘career decision’ is largely a function of ambition and individual preference. Members of the same family, even brothers, made widely different choices, as two Spanish examples will illustrate.

L. Cornelius Balbus Maior was born into a noble family of Gades. After a distinguished military career with the Roman army in Spain, he became Caesar’s lieutenant, was one of the most powerful men in Rome, and in 40 BC became the first provincial consul. Lucius’ brother Publius, on the other hand, is an unknown. Probably the elder of the two (his son was consul only eight years after Lucius), Publius presumably remained in Gades looking after the family business (his father was dead by 72 BC). Publius’ son followed in his uncle’s footsteps rather than his father’s, and became the first provincial ever to win a triumph (19 BC). A more familiar example is provided by the sons of the elder Seneca, a Roman knight from Corduba. The two eldest sons (L. Junius Gallio, the governor of Achaea who tried St Paul; and the younger Seneca, the Stoic philosopher and Nero’s chief minister) attained the highest offices of state. The third son, M. Annaeus Mela, scrupulously avoided the Roman forum and preferred to remain a knight, much to the disappointment of his family. Yet the son of this black sheep was the celebrated poet Lucan.

The local magistrates of Spain have left no opinion of life in their home towns, but some instructive testimony is provided by the Spanish poet Martial (ca 40–104). Like Cicero he developed a distaste for Rome and longed for the small-town life, so he packed his bags and returned to his native Bilbilis. But boredom soon set in and he regretted his decision; he
was depressed by the lack of intellectual and recreational outlets in this *provincialis solitudo* (Mart. 12 pr.). No doubt many Spaniards felt a similar dissatisfaction with a small-town existence and desperately sought external career progression; others were apparently content to remain in a familiar, unhurried environment and to boast about their exclusively local achievements in inscriptions.

Of course, the failure of a career inscription to mention honours beyond the community level does not necessarily mean that the individual never held such higher posts. In some cases the erection of the inscription may have preceded the attainment of further offices. Moreover, persons who did proceed to a loftier *cursus* may not have bothered to mention in their career inscriptions the junior posts which would enable us to trace their local roots. Senators in particular are notorious for omitting reference to their early careers. Nonetheless, there appear to have been many Spanish magistrates who lacked either the will or the ability to achieve offices outside their home town. A case in point is the magistrates of Saguntum, a seemingly closed elite which neither admitted newcomers nor sought (with rare exceptions) rewards beyond the municipal level – a far cry from the upwardly mobile elite of Tarraco.83

**The Religious Cursus**

When discussing Roman priesthoods we must bear in mind that Roman religion had political overtones, and especially so under the Empire when the Imperial Cult was flourishing. The Imperial Cult served indeed as a legitimation and glorification of the reigning emperor in that it showed his descent from (or succession to) a divine predecessor. Religious office was accordingly an important and prestigious reward for those of proven loyalty to the emperor. The lowest priesthood, the sevirate, was normally allotted to a handful of deserving freedmen, who of course could not hold magistracies, although free-born sevirs are also known, and at least one (39) seems to have reached the local senate.84 The pontificate or flaminate within a town often went to a local magistrate, while the provincial priesthood was, in origin, an equestrian post. The Imperial Cult in Spain has been the subject of extensive work by Etienne and Alföldy, and it would be redundant to iterate their conclusions here.85 However, a few remarks are in order concerning the relationship of magistracies to priesthoods.

The exalted status of the local priesthood is indicated by its position in the *cursus honorum*. Although there are exceptions and variants, the priesthood was commonly held after the duovirate; in other words it was considered a higher honour than the top magistracy. We may draw a parallel
with the city of Rome, where the office of *pontifex maximus* was usually held by an ex-consul in Republican times and by the emperor under the Principate. The office of augur also tends to fall at the end of the municipal *cursus*; the augurate clearly held the same prestige as the pontificate or flaminate. Priesthoods were important for another reason as well: while Rome had no political representative in local governments, it did have a religious representative, the priest of the Imperial Cult.  

The local priest is called *flamen* in Tarraconensis and Lusitania, whereas in Baetica he is more often designated *pontifex*. Etienne is probably correct in suggesting that in the two Imperial provinces the new Imperial Cult with its distinctive priestly title (*flamen*) would be received much more readily than in a senatorial province like Baetica, where conservatism favoured retention of the older, traditional title (*pontifex*) even when used to designate priests of the Imperial Cult. In all three provinces, however, the provincial high priest is called *flamen*.

Just as the secular *cursus* varied from town to town and from individual to individual, so the holding of local religious office claimed no fixed place in the career. So far as is known, priesthoods were not a prerequisite for local magistracies, nor vice versa. Strictly speaking, the priestly *cursus* was an independent mechanism, with advancement based on service to the cult or temple in question. Since in actual practice, however, both magistracies and priesthoods tended to be held by members of a small local élite, individuals are frequently attested holding offices in both spheres. The homogeneity of the two groups is indeed illustrated at Urso, where the residence requirement and expulsion procedures for decurions and priests are identical, and where priests are elected in the same manner as duovirs (Urs. 68, 101). And although the order of offices was flexible, the top-ranking priesthoods tended to be held by the top-ranking magistrates. To complicate the picture further, career inscriptions occasionally list offices in reverse chronological order (e.g., 881), or in order of prestige and importance to the individual; thus, for instance, M. Valerius Propinquus (780) lists the provincial flaminate before his earlier offices. Nonetheless, the overwhelming preference was to list offices in the order held; and it is therefore not surprising to find the prestigious municipal priesthood listed after a municipal magistracy or even after an equestrian post, while a provincial priesthood, the culmination of a successful career, is regularly the last appointment named.

A priesthood peculiar to Saguntum is that of the Salii. At Rome the Salii or dancing priests of Mars were a priesthood restricted to patricians. At Saguntum this priesthood was similarly the preserve of the local aristocracy, and its distinctive Italian title perhaps recalls the close relationship and *fides*.
which existed between Saguntum and Rome in Republican times. While Saguntum also had pontifices and flamines to look after the Imperial Cult, the Salii (to judge from their position later in the cursus) held even higher status, and their leader, the magister Saliorum, was regularly an ex-duovir.  

In Baetica, the evidence for magistrates entering the provincial priesthood is disappointing: only three instances, all second century or later (93, 145, 247). The provincial priests of Lusitania, on the other hand, include both first and second century examples; three of the six known priests come from Emerita. Only Tarraconensis gives us a large body of evidence – the so-called flamines provinciae Hispaniae citerioris. The previous careers of the provincial priests in that province follow four patterns, already identified by Alfoldy. The first of these involves equestrian army officers who were not magistrates. The second is for local magistrates who became equestrian army officers before attaining the provincial flaminate; these two groups date mostly to the Flavian period and the early second century. The third model involves local magistrates who held the position of iudex at Rome as a stepping-stone to the provincial flaminate; these examples span the entire second century. The fourth and most frequent pattern, chiefly confined to the second century, is for local magistrates to proceed to the provincial priesthood without holding intermediate offices. Many of these examples date to the second half of the century, when few Spaniards were receiving equestrian positions in either the army or the civil service. Many provincial priests simply sum up their early careers with the comprehensive phrase, 'omnibus honoribus in re publica sua functus.'

In its early phases the provincial flaminate was undoubtedly a position of prestige and importance. Its easier accessibility in the second century suggests that it had become less prestigious and open to men of humbler background (and in some demonstrable instances, of obscure origo). There is, of course, no proof that these latter-day priests were not equites; but the lack of equestrian offices in their cursus is suspicious.

The Military Cursus

Military service was important not only as a means for provincials to acquire Roman citizenship (an alternative to local office-holding), but as the stepping-stone to an equestrian career. A substantial number of Spanish magistrates undertook military service either before or after their magistracy. The varying sequence in which they held their military and civilian posts reinforces what was stated earlier in this chapter about the irregularity
of the *cursus honorum*.

The principal military posts (in descending order of rank) which were actually held by Spanish magistrates are discussed separately in what follows.

**Military Tribunate** Six magistrates (three from Baetica, three from Tarraconensis) held the tribunate before their magistracy; twelve (one from Lusitania, eleven from Tarraconensis) held it after. In both cases the inscriptions span rather evenly the first and second centuries, so there is apparently no question of a shift in trend between one period and another. Geographically there seems to have been a tendency in Baetica to hold the tribunate before, and in Tarraconensis to hold it after the magistracy, but the samples are fairly small. What is remarkable is the flexibility in the order of posts.

**Prefecture of an Auxiliary Cohort** Here again we find a military appointment which could be held either before or after a local civic career, although there is still a tendency for the magistracy to occur first. Again, the examples are well spread over the first two centuries AD. Ten men (two from Baetica, eight from Tarraconensis) held their magistracy before their prefecture. One magistrate and one decurion from Tarraconensis, and one possible magistrate from Baetica (109) held the prefecture first. Of three magistrates recorded as holding both the prefecture and military tribunate, one held both offices before his magistracies while two held them after. Of course, nearly all tribunes will have held the prefecture as a requisite preliminary office, even if they do not bother to record it. Since there is no example of a split military career (e.g., prefect to *duovir* to tribune), we can probably conclude that in two-thirds of the cases (twelve out of eighteen) both the prefecture and the tribunate were held after the magistracy.

**Centurionate** Five centurions subsequently became magistrates or decurions – two in Baetica, three in Tarraconensis. There is no example of a magistrate subsequently becoming a centurion. In one instance (445) a retired centurion held the *duovirate* three times and left a legacy to the city.

**Legionaries** The only example of a ranker becoming magistrate occurs in the remote (though epigraphically rich) region of Lara de los Infantes, where a ‘veteranus legionis *vii Geminae Felicis*’ (the only legion in Spain) became *duovir* (770). The rural provenance of his epitaph, the naming upon it of an heir (which implies an estate), and the presumed property qualification for the *duovirate* combine to suggest that this man may have compensated for his undistinguished military career by subsequent success as a farmer.

The available evidence suggests that a minority of the equestrian officers, and all of the centurions, who entered municipal politics did so at the conclusion of their military service. After the compulsory tour (twenty years minimum for legionaries, twenty-five for auxiliaries) behind the colours, most of these will not have been young men; indeed the equestrian
officers would include some who had risen from the ranks. But the majority of prefects and tribunes had held their municipal offices (including the duovirate or equivalent) first. This sequence is not at all surprising, since a large proportion of the equestrian officers of the Roman army were in fact ex-duovirs, who were granted equestrian rank on the basis of their proven ability, administrative experience, and maturity. Magistracy also conferred the Roman citizenship necessary for entry to these offices. The evidence from Spain conforms with the pattern in the Empire as a whole. What is disappointing is the failure of these ex-duovirs to complete the tres militiae: eighteen were legionary tribunes but only one became praefectus alae.

Magistrates in the Civil Service and Judiciary

The period from Vespasian to Hadrian, inclusive, is marked by a surge of Spanish ex-magistrates into the administrative hierarchy of the Empire. The timing of this phenomenon can hardly be coincidental: this same era witnessed the admission into the Roman Senate of dozens of Spanish notables (often of Italian stock), culminating with the Spanish emperors Trajan and Hadrian. Vespasian, who granted Latin rights to Spain, also apparently instituted the policy of admitting members of the Spanish elite into the equestrian and senatorial ranks of the Roman state.

Nonetheless, the top posts seem to have been the preserve of Italian candidates, for not a single Spanish magistrate (excluding curators) is known to have advanced beyond the lowest grade of procurator (sexagenarius). Just as only one out of eighteen tribunes reached the next military rank, so too we find but a single procurator Augusti ab alimentis (505); another procurator Augusti (892) holds an unspecified portfolio. A possible procurator Baetis (218) is obviously a minor official, for he apparently held this office before the prefecture of a cohort; he was subsequently a comes et adsessor legati.

No known Spanish magistrate held an important prefecture, but several exercised minor ones. Specifically, there are five prefects of the seacoast (praefecti orae maritimae), two prefects of the Balearic Islands, and one prefect of Asturia. All of these local prefectures precede, coincide with, or replace the prefecture of a cohort. It therefore appears that they were at least partly of a military nature, and perhaps involved guarding the Asturian mines and the ports along the Costa Dorada and in the Baleares. So far as is known, these prefectures were always held by Spaniards, who were presumably more familiar than outsiders with local conditions in the zones in question, and were terminal offices, not leading to further advancement.
The other administrative, or rather judicial, post available to Spanish ex-magistrates was that of judge (iudex) of the five decuriae. The elder Pliny notes that these iudices came to Rome from as far away as Gades (NH 29.18). Ten ex-magistrates, all from Tarraconensis, served in this capacity, having been adlected by the emperor. Many of them mention that they had received the equus publicus, entitling them to membership in the eighteen centuries of Roman knights. Three iudices specify that they belonged to a particular decuria, viz. the first (907), the third (899), and the fourth (910). The last of these would not have been an equestrian, since the fourth and fifth decuriae consisted of ducenarii, those who met only half of the knights’ census of four hundred thousand sesterces.94

Magistrates in the Roman Senate

Only one known Spanish magistrate was a Roman senator, and the circumstances were unusual. L. Cornelius Balbus Minor (96) was already a Roman senator, serving as quaestor in Hispania Ulterior, when he assumed the quattuorvirate of his native Gades (and secured an illegal re-election). According to the Digest, a Roman senator could still retain honores in his home town.95 However, in the normal course of events one would presumably hold local offices at the beginning of the cursus, not after becoming a senator at Rome. It is frustrating that senators from Spain seldom give details of their early careers, for some of them may have been local magistrates in such prominent towns as Italice and Tarraco. After the mid-second century, however, very few Spaniards are attested as senators or even knights, and indeed in the fourth century it was made illegal for a municipal decurion to become a Roman senator.96

Syme has recently suggested that Roman senators from the western provinces tended to be recruited, not so much among Italian colonists (who were mostly discharged soldiers or impoverished civilians) but among the indigenous élite, who were already men of power and influence.97 If these native aristocrats provided the majority of provincial senators at Rome, it would be perverse to suppose that they did not also dominate the local ordines, except perhaps in the colonies themselves – and even here there may have been a strong indigenous element, for many colonies were founded on or adjacent to the sites of pre-Roman towns (e.g., the joint Roman-indigenous colony at Corduba). But we cannot be certain that Syme’s argument is valid for Spain. Thus, in Baetica for instance, while the Corneli Balbi were presumably natives, the Annaei of Corduba and the Ulpii of Italica (Trajan and Hadrian) were apparently of Italian origin.98 The most
illustrious senatorial family on Spain's east coast, the Pedanii of Barcino, were immigrants from Rome, belonging to the urban tribe Palatina. In Lusitania, the Roscii of Emerita represent half the attested senators; their family seat is Brescia in Italy. And although we do find senators from the 'Spanish' tribes Galeria and Quirina, the vast majority of the approximately seventy-five known senators from Spain are of uncertain tribe and origin.

Whether of indigenous or Italian stock, both Roman senators and local magistrates came from prominent families in Spanish communities. However, the evidence suggests that they were not necessarily the same individuals. While a few senators may have begun their political careers as local officials, the majority probably abandoned their home towns at an early stage to pursue a loftier cursus. Wealthy scions of equestrian families, who displayed proficiency in military and administrative posts or in the courtroom, and who enjoyed the support of an influential patron, might eventually gain admission to the senatorial order at Rome without ever holding a local magistracy.

We have seen that the cursus honorum for local élites was not rigid. The order of civic offices, priesthhoods, and the relationship of military service to a local career could vary considerably, even in a single town. Comparatively few local magistrates advanced to a higher career in the equestrian echelons, or as senators at Rome. On the other hand, the natural reluctance of local aristocrats to abandon privileged positions in their home towns may have made the local career an adequate and rewarding ambition. The holding of the same magistracy several times (which may strike a modern observer as career stagnation) was for local magnates the renewal of an honour and a reassertion of the family's claim to political influence.
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