

## THE TEMPLE OF THE THREE GAULS

By DUNCAN FISHWICK

Almost nothing is known of the provincial temple at Lugdunum beyond the bare fact of its existence within the federal sanctuary.<sup>1</sup> For this information we are dependent upon the titles of the provincial *sacerdotes*, which at some undetermined period begin to define the high priesthood as *ad templum*; until then the priest had served *ad aram*: that is, at the celebrated altar dedicated by Drusus in 12 B.C. at the confluence of the Rhone and the Saône.<sup>2</sup> Apparently the temple stood in the near vicinity of the altar, for inscriptions from the turn of the second century now give the priestly title as *ad aram . . . apud templum . . .* or a variant.<sup>3</sup> But confirmation depends in the long run upon archaeological exploration, which has so far been precluded by the circumstance that the presumed site of the temple now lies beneath an area of dense habitation.<sup>4</sup> The only other possible evidence is a medallion from the Rhone Valley that depicts games (a *venatio*) in progress around a central *podium*, bearing a small round temple, a larger gabled temple, and a column supporting a statue.<sup>5</sup> Alföldi stresses the abstract nature of this composition and has suggested that the complex may represent provincial monuments at Lugdunum.<sup>6</sup> If this identification is correct, the medallion would appear to confirm the existence of these structures under Hadrian or very shortly after.<sup>7</sup>

The purpose of this paper is to bring out a number of points implicit in what little data we do have and on the basis of these to suggest a tentative date for the construction of the temple. It seems reasonable to hold that a relative *terminus ante* is provided by the earliest of the priestly titles to mention the temple and that if these make no previous reference the reason must be that the edifice was not yet in existence. Granted this basic assumption, the principal argument to be pressed is that the temple clearly took its place in the provincial cult subsequent to an important modification in the character of the worship. As originally instituted, the cult was addressed to Roma and the living emperor Augustus. Significantly, it was centred upon an altar—not a temple, as at Pergamum or Nicomedia;<sup>8</sup> where provincial temples are found in the Western provinces, they are associated rather with divinized emperors: for example, the temple of *divus Augustus* at Tarraco and of *divus Claudius* at Camulodunum.<sup>9</sup> The initial form of the cult at Lugdunum

<sup>1</sup> A. Audin, *Essai sur la topographie de Lugdunum*<sup>3</sup> (1964), 154, noting that two fragments of a marble architrave discovered east of the amphitheatre have usually been attributed to the temple.

<sup>2</sup> Dio LIV, 32; Livy, *Epit.* cxxxvii; cf. Suet., *Cl.* 2. For discussion of the titles see E. Kornemann, 'Zur Geschichte der antiken Herrscherkulte', *Klio* I, 1901, 108–110. Unless otherwise stated, references to *CIL* denote Vol. XIII.

<sup>3</sup> This suggests a scheme closely resembling that at Camulodunum, where an altar similarly flanked by Victories was immediately adjacent to the Temple of Claudius: M. R. Hull, *Roman Colchester* (1958), 175–77; cf. xxv–xxviii (Introduction by I. A. Richmond).

<sup>4</sup> I am much indebted to A. Audin for an illuminating letter confirming that preliminary geological soundings have encountered building stones certainly belonging to the temple. There seems no hope of further progress in the foreseeable future. For earlier discussion see A. Grenier, *Manuel d'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine* IV, 2 (1960), 512, n. 1 with refs.

<sup>5</sup> A. Audin and W. Binsfeld, 'Medaillons d'applique rhodaniens du Musée de Cologne', *Kölnner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* VII (1964), 14–18; A. Alföldi, 'Ein Festgeschenk aus den Töpfereien des römischen Rhonetals', *Helvetica Antiqua* (Festschrift Emil Vogt: 1966), 247–52. Prof. Alföldi kindly drew my attention to this medallion.

<sup>6</sup> Could one recognize a statue of Victory mounted on the column and the provincial temple in the gabled edifice? The small round temple might con-

ceivably be the shrine dedicated to the *numina Augustorum*, though this appears not to have been directly linked with the federal centre; cf. Audin, *Essai* 129, with map p. 151; see further below p. 47. For a different interpretation see Audin-Binsfeld, o.c. 15, who take the *podium* to be a *spina* crowned by two small *fana* and a column bearing a statue.

<sup>7</sup> On the approximate date of the medallion see the arguments of Audin-Binsfeld, 17.

<sup>8</sup> L. Cerfaux and J. Tondriau, *Le Culte des Souverains* (1957), 316 with refs. The municipal temple in the forum at Vienne may originally have been to Roma and Augustus but was later dedicated to *divus Augustus* and *diva Augusta* (Livia): J. Formigé, *CRAI* (1924), 275 ff. (= *AE*, 1925, no. 75); cf. A. Bruhl in P-W VIII A (1958), 2120, s.v. Vienna; Grenier, *Manvel* III, 1 (1958), 396 f.

<sup>9</sup> For the temple at Tarraco see 'Flamen Augustorum' *HSCP* 74 (1970), 307 f. On the status of the temple at Camulodunum see now 'Templum divo Claudio constitutum' *Britannia* III (1973), forthcoming. The same point would apply to the temple of *divus Augustus* at Narbo, though this must be municipal rather than provincial; cf. 'The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (Festschrift J. Vogt) III (1973), forthcoming. The original status of the 'Maison Carrée' erected by Agrippa at Nemausus (16 B.C.) is unclear, but it would appear to have been rededicated to C. and L. Caesar in A.D. 1 (*CIL* XII, 3156); see in general J. C. Balty, *Études sur la Maison Carrée de Nîmes* (1960); cf. Grenier, o.c. 148.

was thus in strict conformity with official Augustan policy that the living emperor might be worshipped by non-Roman provincials but only in company with *dea Roma*.<sup>10</sup> At a later stage, however, an inscription gives the priestly title as: *sacerdos ad aram Romae et Augustor(um)* (C. 1718); there is no mention as yet of the temple. On the other hand, in what is very probably the earliest title attesting the temple to have survived, the formula is given (this time in full) as *sacerdos ad templum Romae et Augustorum* (C. 1706); here there is no mention of the altar. From this it follows that the plural *Aug(ustorum)* should very probably be understood in titles giving the abbreviated form *sacerdos ad templ. Rom. et Aug.* (C. 1049, 1714, ? 1716); certainly the plural occurs after *templum* in C. 1691, 11174, and there is no example *in extenso* of the form *ad templum Romae et Augusti*.<sup>11</sup> Thus the temple appears to have served only the later, expanded cult of Roma and the *Augusti*, never that of Roma and Augustus, the change having taken place at a time when the altar was still the principal monument. Kornemann seems to imply that both the altar and the temple did duty for the enlarged cult simultaneously,<sup>12</sup> yet the few inscriptions we possess make no mention of the two *in combination* before the very end of the second century. At this point Roma and the *Augusti* are associated exclusively with the temple, whereas the altar now served the cult of *Caesaris nostri*/*Caesarum nostrorum*.<sup>13</sup> One might equally well hold, then, that the temple eclipsed the altar as the focal point<sup>14</sup> of the provincial worship during the interval when the priestly titles omit all mention of the *ara*. More evidence will be needed before this point can be settled.

It is fundamental to the issue to recognize that the change from *Augustus* to *Augusti* can only indicate the inclusion of divinized dead emperors within the cult. This is made obligatory by the following considerations: (i) *Augusti* cannot mean two living emperors in at least one inscription (C. 1706 above), which is dated by its letter-forms long before the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, the first pair of joint *Augusti* (A.D. 161–69) (see further below, p. 48). Double *Augusti* are in any case more usually marked by the double G than the full plural; (ii) *Augusti* cannot denote successive emperors since a provincial priest served only one year;<sup>15</sup> (iii) to substitute the *divi* for the living emperor would not only have broken sharply with the traditional form of the cult, but would have associated Roma with past emperors exclusively in a way that seems unparalleled elsewhere.<sup>16</sup> The term for divinized emperors as opposed to living or living and dead conjointly is in any case *divi* rather than *Augusti*;<sup>17</sup> (iv) C. 1678 records a dedication *numinibus Augustor(um)* by Ti. Eppius Bellicus, who is also attested as a provincial priest (C. 1692). Since *Augustor(um)* is written *in extenso*, it seems likely that the dedication does not date from a double reign, in which case the plural must signify the inclusion of *past* emperors.<sup>18</sup> As the find-spot makes clear, the inscription was set up not at the provincial altar, as Hirschfeld maintained, but on the site of another sanctuary approximately three hundred metres to the south-west.<sup>19</sup> Nevertheless, in view of the fact that Eppius Bellicus was certainly a federal priest it seems legitimate to see in this formula a reflection of the provincial worship of past and present *Augusti*. The same point would also apply to an altar found slightly to the west which Ti. Claudius Genialis likewise dedicated to the *numina Augustorum* (C. 1677); (v) a second-century *cursus* recently discovered at Lyon records

<sup>10</sup> Suet., *Aug.* 52; Tac., *Ann.* iv, 37; cf. P. Wuilleumier, *Lyon, Métropole des Galles* (1953), 33 f.; J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Vestigia: Beiträge zur alten Geschichte, Band VI, 1965), 100.

<sup>11</sup> Grenier, l.c. (misrepresenting Hirschfeld, C. p. 229), gives the formula *sacerdoti ad templum Romae et Augusti* with reference to C. 1691, 1706 (where the plural *Augustorum* is explicit), 1714 (where the title has the abbreviation *Aug.*) and 1702, 1712, 1716 (where some form of the word has to be restored).

<sup>12</sup> o.c. (above n. 2), 109.

<sup>13</sup> See Kornemann's list, to which add C. 11174: . . . *sa*[cerdoti] *apud ar*[am] / *Ca*[sar]um / [*a*]d *tem*[plum] *Rom*[ae] / [*e*]t *Augu*[storu]m / . . . All commentators have followed Kornemann in taking the altar of the Caesar(s) to be the same structure as that

originally dedicated to Roma and Augustus. There seems no reason to doubt this identification. On the cult of the Caesar(s) see 'The Severi and the Provincial Cult of the Three Gauls', *Historia* 23 (1974), forthcoming.

<sup>14</sup> For parallels see Wissowa, *RuKR*<sup>2</sup> 470.

<sup>15</sup> Deininger, *Provinziallandtage* 153.

<sup>16</sup> The cult of Roma and *divus Augustus* is, of course, fairly common under the early principate; cf. *ILS* III<sup>1</sup>, p. 572; *CIL* XII, 3180; cf. 3207. I take this to mean an original cult of Roma and Augustus which continued to flourish after Augustus' death.

<sup>17</sup> 'Flamen Augustorum' (above, n. 9), 304 f.

<sup>18</sup> 'Numina Augustorum', *CQ* xx, 1970, 191–97. The thesis argued in this paper would be further confirmed by the view taken above of C. 1677 f.

<sup>19</sup> cf. Audin, *Essai* 129 f., and above, n. 6.

that Ti. Aquius Apollinaris was municipal *flamen divorum*.<sup>20</sup> The civic worship of a community need not have strictly conformed to that of the province wherein it was situated; but when the official cult established from above began first, as at Lugdunum, and when the town was in fact the home of the provincial centre, one could expect the local worship of the emperor to be patterned on the official model and to be sensitive to subsequent modifications. If so, the manifest presence of the *divi* in the municipal cult at Lugdunum may be a corollary of a change at the federal centre, for which the flamine of Ti. Aquius Apollinaris therefore provides indirect confirmation.

When exactly the scope of the provincial worship was widened is a rather more difficult question to answer. The latest dated evidence for the original form of the cult is an inscription recording that Q. Adginnius Martinus was [*accensus a M. Ner*]atio Pansa, *cos.* following a municipal career in the *civitas Sequanorum* but *before* holding the priesthood of Roma and Augustus (*C.* 1675 = *ILS* 4537). Whether Pansa was consul in A.D. 73 or 76 is of marginal interest here:<sup>21</sup> the *sacerdotium* is certainly provincial and must have occurred under Vespasian or later (cf. *C.* 1674 = *ILS* 7013). Any deviation from the pattern set by Augustus would in any case have been unthinkable under the Julio-Claudians and an official cult that centred on the living emperor and Roma was everything that could be desired for Flavian purposes. In fact Vespasian seems to have established exactly the same form of worship in north-west Spain,<sup>22</sup> while in Tarraconensis and Lusitania he probably added Roma and the living Augustus to the existing cult of the *divi*.<sup>23</sup> The provincial worship of Baetica was apparently directed to Roma and the living Augustus in company with the *divi* from its inception under Vespasian.<sup>24</sup> Again, the *arae Flaviae* in the newly-won *Agri Decumates*, whatever their precise connotation, presumably imply ruler cult at an altar.<sup>25</sup> Even though the latest direct evidence we have, then, is the Adginnius inscription, there is every reason to believe that the form of the worship at Lugdunum would have continued in its original form at least down to the death of Domitian.

At the opposite end of the scale there is no datable evidence for the inclusion of the *divi* before the inscriptions of the *Caesares*, which taken as a group attest the presence of the temple by the beginning of the third century.<sup>26</sup> That the *divi* had taken their place in the cult long before this seems very probable on general religious grounds, for apart from the last months of Commodus' reign the whole trend of the ruler cult between the Flavians and the Severi was towards the worship of deified past emperors.<sup>27</sup> Political, moral and religious considerations all played their part in this development. A date somewhere in the second century is also suggested by the formula *numinibus Augustorum* in the dedication made by Ti. Eppius Bellicus (*C.* 1678, above);<sup>28</sup> the altar dedicated by Ti. Claudius Genialis (*C.* 1677) is definitely dated to the second century by its letter-forms. Within this period we are left with two factors that seem to narrow the discussion to the earlier part of the century. The letter-forms of *C.* 1706 were taken by Hirschfeld to be 'saec. I ex. vel II incipientis', which seems to be the basis of Kornemann's cautious dating of the temple 'frühestens gegen Ende des ersten Jahrhunderts'.<sup>29</sup> On the other hand, the municipal priesthood of Ti. Aquius Apollinaris—if this can legitimately be used in evidence—appears to be Antonine rather than later.<sup>30</sup> First appearances to the contrary,

<sup>20</sup> A. Bruhl and A. Audin, 'Inscription du Lyonnais Tiberius Aquius Apollinaris', *Gallia* XXIII, 1965, 267-72 (= *AE* 1966, no. 252).

<sup>21</sup> M. Torelli, 'The Cursus Honorum of M. Hirrius Fronto Neratius Pansa', *JRS* LVIII, 1968, 170-75.

<sup>22</sup> R. Étienne, *Le Culte impérial dans la péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (1958), 178-89, 291, 453.

<sup>23</sup> 'Flamen Augustorum' (above, n. 9), 307-10.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* 310 f.; *Historia* XIX, 1970, 97 f., 111.

<sup>25</sup> Deininger, *Provinziallandtage* 112.

<sup>26</sup> Kornemann, *o.c.* 109.

<sup>27</sup> J. Beaujeu, *La Religion romaine à l'apogée de l'Empire* (1955), 415-18, quoting Appian's observation that the Antonines respected the principle of divinization after death: *Bell. Civ.* II, 20, 148. The only exception to this would be Trajan's policy in the Danube region, see below, n. 36.

<sup>28</sup> *JRS* LIX, 1969, 87.

<sup>29</sup> *op.cit.* 109.

<sup>30</sup> The main clue is the circumstance that the stone appears to have been placed against the wall of the Odeon which dates from the middle of the second century: Bruhl-Audin (above, n. 20), 269, 272. The fact that Apollinaris is designated *iudici in quinque decuriis sublecto* would put this post before the death of Commodus at the latest, the municipal flamine having been held earlier; cf. R. P. Duncan-Jones, 'Equestrian rank in the cities of the African provinces under the Principate', *PBSR* XXXV, 1967, 152, n. 25, noting that in Africa adlection to the *decuriae* appears to have virtually stopped after Commodus; see further H. G. Pflaum in *Ant. Afr.* II, 1968, 153-95. We also know for what it is worth that Q. Aquius Antonianus, apparently another member of the family Aquia, offered a taurobolium in A.D. 184 (*CIL* XII, 1782 = *ILS* 4130) presumably in the sanctuary of Cybele at Lugdunum.

moreover, *flamen divorum* need not imply that Roma and the living emperor were excluded from the civic worship: <sup>31</sup> it could mean that the cult of the *divi* was of relatively recent institution and that the priest's title therefore reflects the latest change in the cult.<sup>32</sup> Admittedly this is very little to go on, but it does point to the first decades of the second century as the most likely time when divinized emperors were added to the existing cult of Roma and the living emperor.<sup>33</sup> In that case we have a rough *terminus post* for the construction of the temple. Its erection at this particular period would be consistent with the practice whereby divinized emperors received an individual *aedes publica* in Rome.<sup>34</sup>

Lastly, can any further considerations be brought to bear that might indicate a more precise date within this approximate period? There remains one general argument based upon the overall development of the imperial cult. Since this is an official provincial worship, it is reasonable to suppose that any modification would be contingent upon imperial policy made in Rome rather than solely upon local initiative at Lugdunum. The problem is, therefore, which emperor of the period could be expected to have made an important change in the nature of the cult, the first since Augustus shaped its basic form more than a century previously. Fortunately this question at least can be answered without difficulty. There is nothing to indicate the hand of Nerva and very little that would recommend Trajan, though he certainly deified his predecessor and in some sense his own father <sup>35</sup> and appears to have established a provincial cult in Dacia.<sup>36</sup> Everything, on the other hand, points to Hadrian, whose interest in both the *divi* and Roma is abundantly testified. Whether the systematic deification of imperial princesses had already begun under Trajan is still *sub iudice*,<sup>37</sup> but it is at any rate clear that the cult of the *divi* was

<sup>31</sup> An earlier municipal cult of Roma and the living emperor is very probably attested at Lugdunum by a fragmentary funerary inscription that Hirschfeld dated, principally by its letter-forms, to the first century (C. 1927). The cursus certainly includes a local priesthood of Roma and there seems no reason to doubt that with Roma would have been included the living Augustus as at the federal centre. As the municipal title was later *flamen*, Hirschfeld's restoration . . . *flaminis] Romae | [et] Aug(usti)* seems justified; cf. C. 548. It is even possible that from a purely technical point of view *flamen divorum* can include Roma and the living emperor. *Flamen divorum* is an unusual title but a municipal example from Pax Iulia (Lusitania) is instructive: CIL II, 53 (= ILS 6897); cf. CIL II, 34 (= ILS 6894: Salacia); Étienne, *Culte impérial* 200. If one compares CIL II, 53 with CIL II, 51 (also from Pax Iulia), it is clear that *flamen divorum* is simply a variant on *flam(en)] divo[ru]m Aug[us]*. Now as I have argued in detail elsewhere (above, n. 9, 304-7), in the provincial cult of Hither Spain *flamen divorum Augustorum* is a variant on *flamen divorum et Augustorum*, *flamen Romae, divorum et Augustorum*, and the short form *flamen Augustorum*. All these varying titles denote one and the same thing: a high priest charged with the cult of Roma, the living Augustus, and the *divi*. The same need not necessarily be true of municipal priesthoods, but the point holds good that priestly titles do not always give a complete picture. If, therefore, the municipal cult at Lugdunum had already been directed in the first century to Roma and the living Augustus, and if *flamen divorum* (at least in Spain) can be a shortened form of *flamen divorum Augustorum* with all that this implies, it is not impossible that Roma and the living Augustus were still included in the civic cult at the time Ti. Aquius Apollinaris was municipal *flamen divorum*.

<sup>32</sup> cf. CIL II, 473 and my discussion in *AJP* xci, 1970, 79-82. Although the province certainly paid worship to both *divus Augustus* and *diva Augusta*, the priest's title reads *flamen divae Augustae provinciae Lusitan(iae)*—in all probability because Livia had only recently been consecrated.

<sup>33</sup> Étienne, *Culte impérial* 296 f., 488, dates the

Spanish municipal cult of the *divi* collectively from the time of Trajan-Hadrian. Letter-forms seem to provide the only basis for beginning this development under Trajan; *ibid.* 199-212.

<sup>34</sup> The practice apparently ceased with M. Aurelius and from the middle of the second century a temple on the Palatine served the cult of the *divi* collectively, each *divus* having his own *aedicula*: Wissowa, *RuKR*<sup>2</sup> 345-47.

<sup>35</sup> As Traianus *pater* was never on the list of consecrated *divi* in the *fasti publici*, he was clearly never a *divus* in the same sense that Augustus and other deified emperors were. His rank can therefore be properly defined as second-class; cf. Pliny, *Panegyricus* LXXXIX, 2 and the cogent discussion by J. H. Oliver, 'The *Divi* of the Hadrianic period', *JThR* XLII, 1949, 36 f.

<sup>36</sup> Deininger, *Provinziallandtage* 32 f. The worship focused uncompromisingly on the living emperor at an altar—apparently without the inclusion of Roma; so also in the Pannonias and Lower Moesia, where the provincial cults look decidedly Trajanic in character. Full discussion in 'The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship . . .' (above, n. 9).

<sup>37</sup> Matidia was consecrated in A.D. 119. Oliver, *op. cit.* 35-40, argues that her mother Marciana, *diva cognominata* in A.D. 112, also cannot have been consecrated until early in Hadrian's reign. Both appear in the *fasti publici* as reconstructed for A.D. 183, 218, 224. Beaujeu (who attributes to Oliver the consecration of Marcian specifically in A.D. 119) follows the *communis opinio* that Marciana was consecrated already in A.D. 112: *Rel. romaine* 416. Yet he draws a parallel with the divinization of Traianus *pater*, whom he agrees cannot have been of equal rank with divinized emperors. The only real objection to Oliver's view that Marciana remained a second-class *diva* until consecrated by Hadrian is the two series of coins honouring *diva Augusta Marciana* with the legend *CONSECRATIO*. Strack and Mattingly date the beginning of both issues under Trajan, Bickermann puts one at the beginning of Hadrian's reign: Beaujeu, *o.c.* 89, n. 2 with refs.; Mattingly-Sydenham, *RIC* II, pp. 299 f. Oliver would date both under Hadrian. There seem to be no conclusive numismatic arguments either way.

receiving special emphasis under Hadrian.<sup>38</sup> Indeed, if the date and restoration are correct, a Hadrianic war-memorial from Jarrow goes so far as to call Hadrian *divorum] omnium fil[ius]*.<sup>39</sup> Political reasons, especially the need for a parvenu to secure a respectable pedigree, undoubtedly lie behind this policy.<sup>40</sup> Hadrian's attachment to Roma, on the other hand, is shown by the new festival of *Natalis Urbis* which he substituted for the old *Parilia* (21st April) in A.D. 121.<sup>41</sup> Roma joined the official Pantheon for the first time, but it was now a personification of the city rather than a Greek tutelary divinity that became the object of rites,<sup>42</sup> her cult served in the capital by a new college of *duodecimviri* and in the provinces by *sacerdotes*. The propagation of the new cult was further served by the great temple of Roma and Venus begun by Hadrian perhaps as early as A.D. 121, though not officially consecrated until A.D. 136/7.<sup>43</sup> This, of course, was only one of the many temples he built or restored throughout the empire; the full list he included in his *res gestae* inscribed on the Pantheon of Athens (Paus., *Descr. Gr.* 1, 5, 5).

Taken together, these factors suggest Hadrian's reign as the most likely period in the second century when the provincial cult at Lugdunum would have been widened to include the *divi*. The Gauls were thus brought into line with Spain, where by a converse development the *divi* had been first in the field (above, p. 48). Can one go further and suggest an actual date when this reform was initiated? In A.D. 121 Hadrian passed through Gaul both on his outward journey to Britain and again on his return.<sup>44</sup> Whether a fragmentary dedication set up by [*negotiatores ?vi]nari* (C. 1788) honours his presence at Lugdunum is very uncertain, but a visit to the capital of the Three Gauls would have been appropriate at some stage of his journey,<sup>45</sup> particularly in view of the minor towns of Narbonensis he honoured by his presence.<sup>46</sup> Whatever the facts may be, we have definite evidence that the theatre at Lyon was enlarged early in his reign,<sup>47</sup> and it seems very probable that he was responsible for extending the forum and constructing or at least strengthening a fourth aqueduct at the foot of the Mont Pilat.<sup>48</sup> Most significantly of all, Hadrian made an important contribution within the federal sanctuary. It was apparently during his reign that the original columns supporting the statues of Victory were replaced by columns of Egyptian Syenite, the four halves of which today support the cupola of the church of St. Martin at Ainay.<sup>49</sup> A second building-project can be dated with more precision to

<sup>38</sup> R. O. Fink, A. S. Hoey, W. F. Snyder, *The Feriale Duranum*, YCS VII, 1940, 145, 154; cf. 174 f., 182 f., 187. The cults of Matidia and in all probability of Plotina begin early under Hadrian. That of Marciana, even if she had been consecrated under Trajan, must have been stressed for its propaganda value by Hadrian.

<sup>39</sup> *RIB* 1051 quoting I. A. Richmond and R. P. Wright: 'Stones from a Hadrianic War Memorial on Tyneside', *Arch. Ael.* 4, xxi, 1943, 93-106. But see Birley's reservations, *Research on Hadrian's Wall* (1961), 159. If the inscription is rather to be assigned to the early third century on the score of its lettering, the formula *divorum] omnium filius* (surely the only possible restoration) could very well echo Severus' fictitious adoption into the Antonine family as son of M. Aurelius, thus giving his dynasty additional legitimation through the support of an illustrious line of deified emperors; cf. J. Hasebroek, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus* (1921), 88-93; A. Birley, *Septimius Severus the African Emperor* (1971), 184. The unparalleled use of *omnium* would be not incompatible with such a view.

<sup>40</sup> Oliver, o.c. 37 f. Fishwick, *Phoenix* xv, 1961, 228. When Plotina died, Hadrian wrote hymns in honour of 'her to whom he owed the Empire': Dio LXIX, 10, 3. For the significance of the title *divi filius*, see Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (1970), 200 f.; M. Hammond, 'Imperial elements in the formula of the Roman Emperors during the first two and a half centuries of the Empire', *Mem. Amer. Acad. Rom.* xxv, 1957, 55-58.

<sup>41</sup> *Fer. Dur.* 103-112; Beaujeu, *Rel. romaine* 133-36.

<sup>42</sup> Wissowa, *RuKR*<sup>2</sup> 340 f. The distinction should

not be pressed too far; cf. *Fer. Dur.* 104, n. 374; Weinstock, 'Treueid und Kaiserkult', *Mitt. deutsch. arch. Inst., ath. Abt.* LXXVII, 1962, 311 f.

<sup>43</sup> Beaujeu, *Rel. romaine*, 128-33.

<sup>44</sup> M. Labrousse, 'Note sur la chronologie du premier voyage d'Hadrien', *Mélanges Soc. Toul. d'Étud. Class.* II, 1948, 130, 135.

<sup>45</sup> His itinerary would probably have taken him along the Rhone valley; cf. SHA *Hadr.* x, 1: *post haec profectus in Gallias omnes civitates variis liberalitatibus sublevavit*. An inscription set up by the *nautae Rhodanici* near Tournon (*CIL* XII, 1797: A.D. 119) is too early to coincide with his passage, as suggested by Wuilleumier, *Lyon* 21.

<sup>46</sup> B. W. Henderson, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Hadrian* (1923), 82 f.

<sup>47</sup> P. Quoniam, 'Hadrien et le théâtre de Lugdunum', *Bull. des Musées et Monuments Lyonnais*, 1959, 67-76; cf. *Gallia* XVIII, 1960, 57-82; XIX, 1961, 437.

<sup>48</sup> cf. Wuilleumier, *Lyon* 21 f., 72, 102. The Odeon is now dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius by the similarity of its construction to that of the sanctuary of Cybele: Bruhl-Audin, above, n. 30; A. Audin, *Les Fouilles de Lyon* (1968), 17.

<sup>49</sup> The principal chronological indication is the simplified Doric style of the columns: A. Audin and P. Quoniam, 'Victoires et colonnes de l'autel fédéral des Trois Gaules: données nouvelles', *Gallia* XX, 1962, 116. A. Audin gives me to understand that in his view the columns were certainly replaced under Hadrian, and that in the opinion of Mr. Ward-Perkins they may have come from the quarries of the *Mons Claudianus*, exploitation of which had hardly begun before the end of the first century.

c. A.D. 130–36, when C. Iulius Celsus enlarged the federal amphitheatre to accommodate a greater number of spectators.<sup>50</sup> As originally begun by C. Iulius Rufus, provincial priest, in A.D. 19 (*ILTG* 217), this had included, apart from the arena itself, only a narrow *podium* reserved for the delegates of the sixty Gallic tribes.<sup>51</sup>

The possibility that Hadrian enlarged the official worship of the Three Gauls in A.D. 121 seems, therefore, very strong: this was the time when he was pre-occupied with the *divi* for political reasons, and when he may well have visited Lugdunum in person. If so, it was presumably now that he saw to the restoration of the Victory columns flanking the altar, which remained for the time being the nodal point of the federal cult; cf. *C.* 1718, above. But it also seems highly likely that Hadrian was responsible for erecting the provincial temple. Reference has already been made to his proclivity for building and restoring temples in the course of his travels: 'eius itinerum monumenta videas per plurimas Asiae atque Europae urbes', observes Fronto in admiration (ed. Naber, p. 206). We have an example in the temple he ordered built at Nemausus when news of Plotina's death reached him during his stay there in A.D. 121.<sup>52</sup> This could well have been dedicated to *diva Plotina* for there is a distinct possibility that Hadrian had her consecrated also.<sup>53</sup> But the most significant parallel for present purposes is the temple at Tarraco that Hadrian restored at his own expense on the occasion of his visit there in the winter of A.D. 121–22.<sup>54</sup> Although the *Vita* explicitly says 'aedem Augusti restituit' (*SHA Hadr.* 12, 3), the temple must have been originally dedicated to *divus Augustus* since Augustus was already deceased when Tiberius acceded to the request of the Spaniards (*Tac., Ann.* 1, 78: A.D. 15). As such, it became the centre for a provincial cult that was apparently addressed to *divus Augustus*, followed in due course by *diva Augusta* and presumably *divus Claudius*, until Vespasian added the cult of Roma and the living emperor.<sup>55</sup> Thus the temple Hadrian restored at Tarraco<sup>56</sup> was one that served a provincial cult corresponding exactly to that we have now postulated for the Three Gauls, following the reform of Hadrian.

That Hadrian could have commissioned the construction of a provincial temple at Lugdunum a matter of months before his visit to Spain seems *prima facie* very possible. How long the construction took or when the building was dedicated there is no way of telling,<sup>57</sup> though one would expect it to have been finished before the extension of the amphitheatre, which was itself an appendage of the federal sanctuary. Perhaps, then, a case could be made for assigning the erection of the temple to the interval between A.D. 121 and c. A.D. 130–36.<sup>58</sup> This would be late, but not too late, for Hirschfeld's opinion of the letter-forms of *C.* 1706—always an uncertain basis for dating, particularly it seems at

<sup>50</sup> J. Guey and A. Audin, 'L'Amphithéâtre des Trois Gaules', *Gallia* XXI, 1963, 152 f.; XXII, 1964, 49; A. Audin and M. Leglay, *Gallia* XXVIII, 1970 67–89. For the date see H. G. Pflaum, *Les Carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain* (1960), no. 106 bis (135), pp. 253–57 (*add.* 969–72).

<sup>51</sup> Could one recognize the *podium* of the amphitheatre in the *podium* at the centre of the Rhone-Valley medallion (above, n. 5)?

<sup>52</sup> Dio LXIX, 10, 3; *SHA Hadr.* XII, 2; cf. *CIL* XII, 3232. Strack conjectures that the *vaos* mentioned by Dio (as opposed to the *basilica* given in the *Vita*) was rather one built in Rome following the consecration of Plotina, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des zweiten Jahrhunderts* II: *die Reichsprägung zur Zeit des Hadrian* (1933), 113. Nemausus may have been the home of Plotina's family, cf. Syme, *Tacitus* II, 604.

<sup>53</sup> Her name is very probably to be restored in *Fer. Dur.*, col. 1, line 10; *YCS*, l.c. 73; cf. Oliver (above, n. 35), 35, 40.

<sup>54</sup> Étienne, *Culte impérial* 485. For the chronology see Labrousse, above n. 44, 135–38.

<sup>55</sup> Above, n. 23. Roma offers a Victory to Vespasian on coins struck at Tarraco, A.D. 69–70: *RIC* II, no. 265, cf. no. 385.

<sup>56</sup> This cannot have been the occasion when Roma

was added to the provincial cult of Hither Spain for she was already included under Vespasian; cf. *CIL* II, 4225 (= *ILS* 2714). *Contra* M. Krascheninnikoff, *Philologus* LIII, 1894, 169, 175, n. 132; Kornemann, l.c. 111 f. What seems very possible is that the cult of Roma already existing within the provincial worship now began to receive greater emphasis than hitherto. This would explain her more frequent mention within the titles of the provincial priests: cf. *CIL* II, 4249 (= *ILS* 6933), 4235. It could also be the case that both at Tarraco and Lugdunum Roma now became in practice *Roma aeterna*, though at neither centre do the titles of the provincial priests ever give *urbs Roma* / *urbs Roma aeterna*, this particular formula being restricted to the *sacerdotium* of Eternal Rome; cf. Wissowa, *RuKR*<sup>2</sup> 341, n. 3.

<sup>57</sup> The dedication of the temple would presumably have taken place when construction was completed; cf. Wissowa, *RuKR*<sup>2</sup> 473 f.; Beaujeu, *Rel. Romaine* 129 with nn. 8, 9. Whereas the great temple of Roma and Venus took almost ten years to erect, rebuilding of the much smaller Capitoline temple lasted five years (A.D. 70–75).

<sup>58</sup> All that is certain is that the building stones found on the presumed site of the temple (above, n. 4) are of a material not used before the reign of Claudius.

Lugdunum.<sup>59</sup> On the other hand it would dovetail nicely with the date of the Rhone Valley medallion, if in fact this preserves a likeness of the temple of the Three Gauls.<sup>60</sup> Thereafter, if the surviving titles of the provincial priests are a reliable index, the temple took pride of place over the altar until the end of the second century, at which juncture the altar regained its ancient pre-eminence. Further than that it is hardly possible to go in the absence of more substantial evidence. There seems to be nothing at present that would tell decisively against the reconstruction this paper has proposed and until there is it can stand as a working hypothesis.

*University of Alberta, Edmonton*

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Bruhl-Audin, above, n. 20, 272 (*à propos* the inscription of Ti. Aquius Apollinaris): '... mais les lapicides lyonnais sont restés fidèles à une bonne écriture jusqu'à une époque tardive; ce n'est donc pas un moyen de dater avec certitude'.

<sup>60</sup> For the medallion to be relevant it is necessary only that one of the temples it portrays could have been *inspired* by the provincial temple. As Felix, the artist responsible, certainly worked at Lugdunum, this is quite possible. For example, another medallion

of Felix, two copies of which are preserved, portrays a composite harbour scene with the words *portus Augusti*: Audin-Binsfeld, o.c. (above, n. 5), 14 f. At least one winged victory is included in the scene, while on either side of the central group stands a column bearing a divinity, much resembling the column topped by a statue in the *venatio* medallion. In both cases, the artistic composition could have been influenced by the Victories flanking the federal altar at Lugdunum.