

PAPERS AND MONOGRAPHS OF THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS VOL. VII

THE GREEK EAST IN THE ROMAN CONTEXT
PROCEEDINGS OF A COLLOQUIUM
ORGANISED BY
THE FINNISH INSTITUTE AT ATHENS
May 21 and 22, 1999

Edited by Olli Salomies

HELSINKI 2001

© Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö (Foundation of the Finnish Institute at Athens) 2001

ISSN 1237-2684
ISBN 951-98806-0-7

Printed in Finland by Vammalan Kirjapaino Oy, Vammala 2001

Cover: Statue base honouring M. Vettulenus Civica Barbarus (see p. 175, n. 208).
American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations. Inv. no. I 4922.

Contents

Bengt E. Thomasson	
The Eastern Roman Provinces till Diocletian. A Rapid Survey	1
Christopher Jones	
Memories of the Roman Republic in the Greek East	11
Jean-Louis Ferrary	
Rome et la géographie de l'hellénisme: réflexions sur "hellènes" et "panhellènes" dans les inscriptions d'époque romaine	19
A. D. Rizakis	
La constitution des élites municipales dans les colonies romaines de la province d'Achaïe	37
Maria Kantiréa	
Remarques sur le culte de la <i>domus Augusta</i> en Achaïe de la mort d' Auguste à Néron	51
Kostas Buraselis	
Two Notes on Theophanes' Descendants	61
Mika Kajava	
Vesta and Athens	71
Simone Follet & Dina Peppas Delmousou	
Les dedicaces chorégiques d'époque flavienne et antonine à Athènes	95
Petros Themelis	
Roman Messene. The Gymnasium	119
Maurice Sartre	
Romains et Italiens en Syrie: Contribution à l'histoire de la première province romaine de Syrie	127
Olli Salomies	
Honorific Inscriptions for Roman Senators in the Greek East during the Empire. Some Aspects (with Special Reference to Cursus Inscriptions)	141
Heikki Solin	
Latin Cognomina in the Greek East	189
Index	
1. Persons	203
2. Greek personal names	205
3. Latin personal names	206
4. Geographical names	206
5. Inscriptions and papyri	209
6. Selected topics	217
Plates	219
Maps	229

Honorific Inscriptions for Roman Senators in the Greek East during the Empire

Some Aspects (with Special Reference to Cursus Inscriptions)

Olli Salomies

I. Introduction¹

The aim of this article is to examine some aspects of the inscriptions honouring Roman senators, or, to be more precise, the inscriptions attached to the monuments set up in honour of Roman senators. The focus will be on inscriptions honouring senators for some reason other than the fact that the honorand was the relative of someone; inscriptions honouring, for instance, sons of governors will thus not primarily concern us here, unless the sons had an official status of sorts and/or were described as *euergetai* or *ktistai* or as something other on these lines, which probably indicates at least some sort of independent activity. Inscriptions set up in honour of senatorial women (wives of governors, etc.) will also be excluded from this article, although it is true that their existence in some cases illustrates the phenomenon of honouring governors and other senators, inasmuch as one can, for example, deduce the existence of a (now lost) monument in honour of a governor from an inscription honouring the same man's wife (cf. below n. 65). In addition to this restriction concerning wives and children, the focus will be on the formulations of the inscriptions rather than, e.g., on the archaeological aspects of the monuments themselves, although it is quite clear to me that these aspects are of the utmost importance not only intrinsically but also because the archaeological aspects of a monument may, and in fact often do, have an influence on the formulations of the inscription attached to it. If there is, for instance, often a difference between the formulations of an inscription set up in the middle of a *forum* or of an *agorá*, and those of an inscription set up in the house of a senator by a slave, this is, of course, only what one would expect. As for the period this paper deals with, I shall concentrate on the period between Augustus and about the middle of the third century, my reasons for this being, on one hand, the fact that the Republican material from the Greek East has been dealt with by earlier scholars;² furthermore, since special attention is being directed towards cursus inscriptions - inscriptions enumerating the stages of the honorand's career - it seemed sufficient to take into consideration only the period in which inscriptions of this type are attested, that is from the Augustan period

¹ The following works will be referred to by the use of an abbreviation: Halfmann, *Senatoren* = H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (Hypomnemata 58, 1979); Tuchelt = K. Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien. Teil I: Roma und Promagistrate. Ist. Mitt. Beih. 23* (1979); PFOS = M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (Ier - IIe siècles)* (1987). The epigraphical publications are quoted in the traditional way, for instance the volumes of the series *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* by combining "I." (for in this case "Inschriften") with the key word (e.g. "Ephesos"); only in the case of Side the reference to the volume by J. Nollé, *Side im Altertum* is made by the use of the abbreviation "Nollé, Side", in order to avoid a possible confusion with G.E. Bean, *The Inscriptions of Side* (1965).

² See especially M.-J. Payne, *Aretas heneken. Honors to Romans and Italians in Greece from 260 to 27 B.C.* (Diss. Ann Arbor 1987); and now J. Tanner, 'Portraits, Power and Patronage', *JRS* 90 (2000) 18-50, with many references to earlier literature.

onwards. On the other hand, it seemed opportune to exclude the late-antique material from the later third century onwards, as this enables one to work on a material of some coherence. From the introduction of some novel aspects and formulations into the honorific inscriptions of the later period - especially the shift to the use of versified inscriptions, a phenomenon by no means limited to honorific inscriptions (building inscriptions come to mind) it follows that the late material belongs to a genre of its own, not in every way comparable to the earlier material. The late material pertaining to provincial governors has also been dealt with recently in a very complete and competent fashion by M. Horster.³ As for the definition of 'Greek East' in this paper, after having pondered upon this matter with some care, I have arrived at the conclusion that the most useful approach to the question is to concentrate on 'civilian' provinces, by which I mean provinces without a legionary garrison,⁴ my reason for this being the fact that the presence of a sizeable army introduces some special features into the epigraphical record of the province, especially to that referring to various aspects of the Roman administration. It obviously being of some use to concentrate on areas which are more or less comparable to each other, I have thus decided to omit the 'military' provinces (as defined above) and to deal with only the following eastern provinces: Achaia, Epirus, Macedonia, Thracia, Asia, Bithynia-Pontus, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cilicia, Cyprus, Creta-Cyrenae. Of course I know that, at some point of the period under review here, some of the above provinces belonged to 'military' areas (Galatia for instance being combined at times with Cappadocia), but this does not affect the overall picture and I am in any case thinking of the 'normal' situation during the earlier Empire.

By omitting the Eastern⁵ provinces, Moesia inferior and the provinces from Cappadocia to Egypt, from consideration in this paper, I am of course not implying that they represent a uniform group. Civilized urban life of the normal Eastern Roman type is well represented in the epigraphy of (say) Moesia inferior, whereas the second- and third-century epigraphy in Arabia (part of the Roman empire only from AD 106 onwards) very clearly concentrates on aspects of the Roman administration. However, the presence of Roman legions always introduces a special accent into the epigraphy of any province, and so I think I can be excused if I prefer to deal with only the group of 'civilian' eastern provinces. Furthermore, the inclusion of the 'military' provinces would not have much impact on the numbers of texts to be taken under inspection; my subject being inscriptions in honour of senators, I would not really gain much by extending the geographical scope, as have been able to locate only very few honorific inscriptions in the 'military' provinces (Cappadocia, for instance, seems to have produced only four texts.⁶) It seems notable that

³ M. Horster, 'Ehrungen spätantiker Statthalter', *Antiquité tardive* 6 (1998) 37-59.

⁴ However, one must note that minor military units were normally stationed even in provinces without legionary garrisons; cf. M. Sartre, *L'orient romain* (1991) 74 (and more generally, regarding proconsular provinces, W. Eck, 'Prokonsuln mit militärischem Kommando. Folgerungen aus Diplomen für prokonsuläre Provinzen', in: Id. & H. Wolff [eds.], *Heer und Integrationspolitik* [1986] 518-34 = Id., *Die Verwaltung des röm. Reiches in der hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge*, 2. Bd. [1997] 187-202). However, this fact does not influence the epigraphy of the province in general. (Note that in some cases the existence of garrisons has been disclosed by military diplomas, not by inscriptions in the same provinces.)

⁵ An 'eastern' province is here (as always) defined as a province in the East in which Greek was the predominant language, this in practice meaning the provinces southeast of Dalmatia, Moesia superior and Dacia and east of the province of Africa. (For the language border between Latin and Greek see A.D. Rizakis, in: H. Solin & al. [eds.], *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini Helsingiae ... 1991 habiti* [1995] 373f.). Greek-speaking areas in the West - most importantly Sicily - belong to a different category.

⁶ *IGR* iii 125 cf. *AS* 18 (1968) 94 no. 1; *AE* 1964, 4 = *AS* 18, 1968, 96 no. 1.02; *AE* 1909, 19; *SEG* xl 1314; *Studia Pontica* iii (1910) 244 no. 271.

this fact does not necessarily depend only on chance, but also perhaps on the so-called epigraphic habit; certainly it seems striking that, although e.g. Satala in Cappadocia has produced large numbers of inscriptions of soldiers, no inscriptions honouring Roman officials seem to have been found to date. (Note also that all the Cappadocian texts mentioned in n. 6 come from a civilian context.) On the other hand, the situation may also depend on other circumstances, e.g. on the fact that not all relevant material has been published; for instance, in addition to *AE* 1974, 650f., honorific inscriptions for senators from Apamea in Syria (a producer of a great number of inscriptions of soldiers) can be extracted only from various references in works not dedicated to the publication of inscriptions.⁷ Moreover, once the promised corpus of inscriptions from Caesarea is published, things will no doubt change, at least in the case of this city.

Of course, things are quite different in Arabia, where inscriptions, many of them set up by soldiers, honouring senators - Roman governors and in some cases their sons - have been found (and published) in great numbers both at Bostra and at Gerasa.⁸ But the fact that there is quite a lot of material in Roman Arabia does not really affect the assumption made above that it is not really useful to compare 'military' provinces to 'civilian' provinces, at least when discussing a subject such as mine. In any case, whenever useful, I have referred to material from outside the provinces under inspection.

II. Some Formal Aspects of, and General Questions related to, Honorific inscriptions

The original Greek form of honouring an individual was in the form of an honorific decree. The Greek honorific inscription, introduced around the turn of the third and second centuries BC, may be seen as representing a development of the honorific decree, it being, if seen in a simplistic way, a sort of summary or abstract of the main contents of a decree, although, in fact, things are not quite that simple.⁹ In any case, by the end of the Hellenistic period, the honorific inscription is the normal (though not the only¹⁰) type for honouring individuals, and in the case of Roman senators in the period under consideration here, it is practically the only type, although one can also locate a

⁷ J. C. Balty, in *ANRW* ii 8 (1977) 122 n. 127; Id., *JRS* 78 (1988) 93f.

⁸ For new relevant inscriptions from Bostra see M. Sartre, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Ἐπιγραφαί. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini* (2000) 971-990. And note that H.M. Cotton, in: Y. Le Bohec (ed.), *Les légions de Rome sous le haut-empire* vol. I (Lyon 2000) 354-6, suggests that *Gerasa* 435 no. 171 could be a cursus inscription, set up by soldiers of the *legio VI Ferrata* in honour of a legate of Arabia, perhaps Q. Corelius Gallus Gargilius Antiquus.

⁹ See G. Gerlach, *Griechische Ehreninschriften* (Halle 1908) I. 107-110 (p. 109 for the date of the introduction of the genre), and, above all, the extraordinary exposition of F. Gschnitzer, *Zwischen Denkmal und Urkunde. Kaiserzeitliche Neuerungen im Formular der Psephismata*, in: R. Günther and S. Rebenich (eds.), *E fontibus haurire. Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften* (Festschrift H. Chantraine, 1994) 281ff. On the formulations of the Hellenistic decrees, observe M. Wörle, 'Vom tugendsamen Jüngling zum «gestreßten» Euergeten. Überlegungen zum Bürgerbild hellenistischer Ehrendekrete', in: Id. and P. Zanker (eds.), *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus* (Vestigia 47, 1995), 241ff. Note that, although decrees are also inscriptions, the term 'honorific inscription' is here used to denote the *Ehreninschriften* as contrasted to decrees.

¹⁰ Cf. e.g. T.B. Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion* (1971) no. 76-83 for a series of honorific decrees of imperial date; or e.g. *IGR* iv 144-146, decrees from Cyzicus in honour of 'queen' Antonia Tryphaena (*PIR*² A 900) from the time of Tiberius and Gaius.

smallish number of inscriptions of the decree type.¹¹ These few instances will not be considered in this paper.

Another formal aspect which I will have to refer to at this point is the question of verse inscriptions. There are some early instances from the fifth and fourth centuries BC, but before approximately the time of Diocletian this type is extremely rare, becoming (as mentioned above) common (in fact, very common) only after this period.¹² The appearance of verse inscriptions in this period was mentioned above as one of the reasons for excluding the later period from the considerations presented here. However, the fact that there are also some verse inscriptions from my period cannot be concealed, and it is fair to add a few references to (possible) verse honorific inscriptions before Diocletian in a footnote at this point where I shall be leaving these texts for good.¹³

So the bottom line at this point is that although there are some honorific decrees, and some honorific inscriptions in verse from this period, these represent marginal groups which I shall not consider any more in this paper. This observation allows me to move on to other topics to be treated here. I shall have a look at the cases in which the honorand's name is rendered; then I shall briefly turn to inscriptions not designating senators as such; and finally I shall have to say a few words about the relation of honorific inscriptions to funerary ones.

First, as for the case used for the honorand's name, let us start with the only case other than the accusative and the dative attested in my material, that is the nominative. Now the use of the nominative¹⁴ is, of course, not really difficult to explain, as it can be viewed

¹¹ Note e.g. the following: *FD* iii 4, 438 (Augustan, honouring a proconsul); *SEG* xxiii 206 = *AE* 1967, 458 (decree in honour of P. Cornelius Scipio, quaestor of Achaia in c. AD 1 or 2; on the identity of the honorand cf. R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy* [1986] 59, 252); *IGR* i 1024 = J. Reynolds in J.A. Lloyd & al. (eds.), *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish. Benghazi (Berenice)* vol. I (1987) 244f. no. 17 (a decree by the Jews of Berenice in honour of a legate(?) of Creta-Cyrenae in (probably) AD 24); *IGR* iv 1410 = *I. Smyrna* 591 (decree in honour of a Neronian proconsul of Asia); *FD* iii 4, 47 (decree in honour of C. Caristianus Iulianus, proconsul of Achaia in AD 98); *Bull. ép.* 1999, 210: references to Athenian decrees of the Severan period honouring the local senator M. Ulpus Eubiotus Leurus. (The reconstruction of an Athenian decree in honour of Fulvius Plautianus the pretorian prefect by J.H. Oliver, *Hesperia* 19 (1941) 85-90 no. 37 is thought of as impossible by J. & L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1944, 82 [p. 204]).

¹² Cf. Gerlach, *op. cit.* (n. 9) 103-6.

¹³ Some instances dated, correctly or not, to a period preceding Diocletian: *Corinth* 8, 3, 129 (Herodes Atticus?); *I. Olympia* 352 (a Mod[estus], proconsul of Achaia?); *Corinth* 8, 1, 89 (a proconsul, perhaps before the middle of the third century); *IG* ii/iii² 4218 ("s. iii p."; cf. S. Follet, *Athènes au II^e et III^e siècle* [1976] 40); C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos* (1941) no. 477 = *AE* 1948, 197 (about Severan, honouring a senator of Rhodian origin; cf. *ibid.* no. 472ff.); T.B. Mitford, *The Inscriptions of Kourion* (1971) no. 89 = *AE* 1975, 823 (Poplicola Priscus, apparently a governor of the third century); *IGR* iii 883 cf. *Bull. ép.* 1950, 206. 1965, 210 (Tarsus, said to be probably Severan [not rejected by *PIR*² H 83], although note the *signa*). Then there is also a text from Sparta, *IG* v 1, 540 (set up by the daughter of the honorand), which seems to be not later than the *constitutio Antoniniana* (cf. Thomasson, *op. cit.* [n. 11] 200 no. 89); by the way, it is normally assumed that Χαρείσιον (in: τὸν κλυτὸν ἡγεμονῆα Χαρείσιον ἀνθετο κούρα Σπάρτας ἀ πρώτα, Πηνελόπεια νέα) is the name of the daughter, not that of the father in the accusative (thus E. Groag, *Die Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian* [1939] 86f.; Thomasson, *loc. cit.*; A.J. Spawforth, *ABSA* 79 [1984] 276f.), and it seems this must be true (one could also add the reason that, by taking Χαρείσιον to go with ἀνθετο κούρα, not with ἡγεμονῆα, a feminine caesura is produced, a most satisfactory result). It is true that with this interpretation the ἡγεμών / ἡγεμονεύς is left nameless, but a stone with his name may be missing.

¹⁴ Gerlach, *op. cit.* (n. 9) 30; Horster, *art. cit.* (n. 3) 38 n. 3. (Add e.g. *I. Olympia* 473 = *SIG*³ 882 of AD 212/213, in honour of a woman.) Cf. Gerlach p. 30f. for the genitive, of which I have found no instances in my material. There is also a rare type, not mentioned by Gerlach (and not appearing in my material), consisting of ὑπέρ followed by a name in the genitive, and ending in a dedication to a deity

as the definition of the person honoured by the statue the inscription is attached to.¹⁵ If the name accompanies a monument which is meant to honour an individual, the inscription can be seen as representing the category of honorific inscriptions, although it is true that all of the texts present features not normal in honorific inscriptions of the usual type and come from a special context. In my material, I have encountered the nominative being used in the following inscriptions:¹⁶ (1) *AE* 1965, 212 = *I. Perge* 108 and 109: inscriptions on statue bases of M. Plancius Varus, father of Plancia Magna, and of C. Plancius Varus, Magna's brother; both inscriptions start with κτίστης followed by the name in the nominative, and finish off with Περγαῖος. Here we are dealing with statues belonging to the series of statues of κτίσται (op. cit. no. 101ff., starting with Calchas), the inscriptions of which all have the same form.¹⁷ (2) *AE* 1979, 595 = *SEG* xxix 741 = B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidium* iii (1990) 65 no. 56 = G. Labarre, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale* (1996) 300f. no. 43 (Mytilene, large block now in the yard of the museum): the name, offices and other distinctions and achievements of the consul (in AD 115) M. Pompeius Macrinus, a man of local origin; though the text is fragmentary in the end, the formulations seem to imply that the stone was set up not by the man himself, but by someone else and meant to honour Macrinus.¹⁸ (3) *CIL* iii 12116 = 13618 = *ILS* 1050 = A. Dupont-Sommer – L. Robert, *La déesse de Hiérapolis Castabala* (1964) 54: the name (in the nominative and career of [P. Cassius?] Dexter, legate of Cilicia in the middle of the second century; this Latin text is followed by a Greek epigram, in which the doctor Lucius addresses himself to the local goddess and asks her ἡγεμονῆα τεδὸν σῶόν τε φύλασσε καὶ κλεινὴν ὑπατον πέμψων ἐς Εἵταλίην. Having mentioned his name and

(mentioned in the dative). In some instances these texts might be thought of as representing a sub-class of honorific inscriptions; *I. Cret.* ii 19, 2 (Ptolemy III and Berenice) is certainly treated in M. Guarducci, *Epigrafi greca* ii (1969) ii 147 under the "dediche onorarie pubbliche", and the phrase εὐνοίας ἔνεκα adds an honorific touch to the Vespasianic inscription from Rhodes, *AE* 1987, 932 = *SEG* xxxvi 744: ὁ δᾶμος ὁ Ῥοδίων / ὑπὲρ / Ὀφιλίου Μακέδονος ἐπιτρόπου ... Σεβαστοῦ εὐνοίας ἔνεκα. Θεοῖς. There are also inscriptions in which governors of provinces are included in a group, introduced by ὑπὲρ, consisting of the emperor, his family, the senate, etc. (e.g. *IGBulg.* ii 615. 660), but these belong, of course, to a different category.

¹⁵ The nominative is naturally also the normal case used in Latin honorific inscriptions of the *elogium* type.

¹⁶ Cf. n. 14; for a funerary inscription of a senator using the nominative see *CIL* III 7339 = *AE* 1948, 20 from Philippi (note that the name and career in the nominative are followed in the end by *C. Iulius ... fratri piissimo faciendum c(uravit)*). Note furthermore that the inscription of the funerary monument of Philopappus on the Hill of the Muses in Athens (Th. Schäfer, *Imperii insignia* [1989] 380f. no. B13; R.R.R. Smith, *JRS* 68 [1998] 70-73), built by Philopappus himself, uses the nominative (*CIL* iii 552 = *ILS* 845). - Normally of course inscriptions in which a name appears in the nominative (e.g. building or votive inscriptions) refer to something done by the man himself. For inscriptions of this type in which the career or at least several offices are enumerated, cf. e.g. *I. Ephesos* 17-19 (edict of Paullus Fabius Persicus); *ILS* 8821 = *IGR* iii 615 = *TAM* ii 282 (Xanthos); *I. Ephesos* 5106, 5107; and W. Eck, 'Statuendedikanten und Selbstdarstellungen in den römischen Städten', in: *L'Afrique, la Gaule, la religion à l'époque romaine. Mélanges à la mémoire de M. Le Glay* (Collection Latomus vol. 226, 1994) 550-62 (in Italian in W. Eck, *Tra epigrafia, prosopografia e archeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati* [Vetere 10, 1996] 346-57).

¹⁷ S. Sahin in the commentary on no. 109 assumes that both Plancii may have been already dead at the time of the dedication of the monument.

¹⁸ Note especially [---- ὑπὲρ τᾶς διατηρήσιος καὶ συναυξήσιος τᾶς τε ἐλευθερίας ----] in line 12. This inscription is designated as an "Ehreninschrift" by B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani* (1996) 56.

occupation he goes on by saying τόδε σοὶ βρέτας οὐ ἑτάροιο Δ ἔξτρου καὶ τούτους ὀκτῶ ἔδωκε τύπους. (The βρέτας of Dexter being given to the goddess, we are dealing with a situation similar to that in the next example.) The doctor thus set up a statue of the governor.¹⁹ (4) *IG* ii/iii² 4780 cf. J.H. Oliver, *AJA* 45 (1941) 540; M. Mitsos, *AD* 22 (1967) Chr. p. 14 no. 1 (a small - 23x17x12 as preserved - statue base in the Epigraphical Museum) "Κλαύδι[ος] Σεου[ή]ρος / δις ὑπάτος (AD 173), [κ]ηδεστῆς / Αὐτοκράτο[ρ]ος Ἀντωνίνου Γερμ[α]νικοῦ / ὁ ἀνάθεις τῇ θεῷ [Ἡρ]ῳδῆς.²⁰

As for the use of the dative in Greek inscriptions and of the accusative in Latin ones, I must start by saying that both cases seem to be fairly rare, the share of Greek texts using the dative and the Latin texts using the accusative being minimal if compared to the whole of the material. Both cases can no doubt be explained as being influenced by habits practised in the other language, although this observation does not take us very far. It is more instructive to observe that two Greek inscriptions honouring the same man but from different places both use the dative (and are also otherwise practically identical), namely two inscriptions set up in honour of the son of Valerius Asiaticus, proconsul of Asia in c. 108, one from Samos and the other from Ephesus (*IGR* iv 960 = *IG* xii, 6, 1, 381; *I. Ephesos* 695B). The identical formulations of the text and the use of the dative in both inscriptions must mean that the text to be inscribed must have been supplied to the dedicators by the honorand himself.²¹ Perhaps this is the explanation also in some of the other instances. In any case, if one looks at accusatives in Latin inscriptions, one observes that they are found mainly in two cities, in Ephesus (only in inscriptions set up by individuals)²² and in Corinth,²³ which does not come as a surprise, as these cities are

¹⁹ Cf. E. Groag, *PIR*² C 490; Dupont-Sommer - Robert, op. cit. 51. However, R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum* (1997) 582 n. 29 assumes, because of the use of the nominative, that "das Weihegeschenk im Namen des Statthalters von seinem Arzt gestiftet worden ist".

²⁰ The inscription is referred to as honorific by Oliver, *loc. cit.*; Follet, op. cit. (n. 13) 37; W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* ii (1983) 178ff. no. 187. The goddess is, of course, Pallas Athene (Mitsos).

²¹ No doubt one can apply the same explanation to the fact that a Flavian proconsul of Cyprus is honoured by Greek inscriptions using the dative both in Curium and in Salamis (below n. 29). On the other hand, note that, from the three Greek inscriptions from Ancyra in honour of the legate of Galatia (in 138), C. Iulius Scapula, *IGR* iii 176, 177, 178, the first two use the accusative but the third (no. 178) the dative, at the same time being very similar to 177 whereas 176 has features of its own (cf. below n. 263).

²² *I. Ephesos* 620 (a bilingual inscription set up by Vibius Salutaris in honour of a man from Xanthus; note that in the very end the Greek text lapses into the use of the dative); 664 (3rd century, set up by a *strator*; also 3089, in honour of the same man); 718 (set up by a *cliens*); 811add. (set up by Flavius Damianus); 1543 (*CIL* iii 6076 = *ILS* 1095, set up by two individuals *honoris causa*; at the end, the text lapses into the use of the dative, perhaps influenced by the many datives ending in -o in the indication of the vigintivirate). Note also how the sepulchral inscription of Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (*ILS* 8971 = *I. Ephesos* 5103), formulated in the dative, ends with *Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus patrem suum*. (For a general overview of the Latin inscriptions of Ephesus see E. Weber, in: H. Friesinger and F. Krininger [eds.], *100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos. Akten des Symposions Wien 1995* [Öst. Ak. d. Wiss., Denkschr. 260, 1999] 139ff.) - For *ILS* 8970 = *Milet* i 5, 53f. no. 1 (not an honorific inscription) see G. Alföldy, *REA* 100 (1998) 367ff.

²³ *CIL* iii 7270 (fragmentary); *Corinth* viii 2, 56, 57; *ibid.* 3, 126 (set up by the city); B.E. Thomasson, *A Survey of Greek and Latin Inscriptions on Stone in Swedish Collections* (1997) no. 165; F. Grelle, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Ἐπιγραφαί. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini* I (2000) 455-62 (probably from Corinth and set up perhaps by the city; cf. below n. 205).

important suppliers of Latin honorific inscriptions. Otherwise there are only scattered, mainly latish, instances which do not lend themselves to any useful interpretation.²⁴

As for the dative in Greek inscriptions, in some early instances the use of the dative is explained by the presence of a cult concerning the honorand.²⁵ In an instance from Nicaea, the dative depends on the use of the most uncommon expression εὐ[χα]ρίσ[τ]ει (Museum Iznik i 53, 54).²⁶ Otherwise, there are some examples in Ephesus,²⁷ Lycia²⁸ and Cyprus,²⁹ and scattered instances in other places, the explanation of all of them probably being the influence of Latin practices, sometimes no doubt transmitted by the honorand himself (cf. above at n. 21).³⁰

Now I shall turn to inscriptions honouring senators which omit any mention of the senatorial status of the honorand. Looking at the material, it appears that this phenomenon is attested in mainly two groups of inscriptions, on one hand in early texts honouring various Romans, outside Athens often simply designated as patrons (in Athens references

²⁴ CIL iii 12241 = IGR iv 778 = Tuchtelt p. 136 (Apamea in Phrygia, Augustan; set up by three men from nearby Metropolis; the Latin text is preceded by the Greek one); I. Perge 154; CIL iii 13639 (Iconium); I. Central Pisidia 44 (Cremna); CIL iii 252 = 6754 (Ancyra). Cf. e.g. CIL iii 6885 (Hadrian honoured in Comama in Pisidia); CIL iii 251 = ILS 1373 (an equestrian in Ancyra); CIL iii 90 = IGLS xiii 9078 (a third-century governor in Bostra).

²⁵ I. Mylasa 410 (C. Marcius Censorinus cos. 8 BC and proconsul of Asia; note the verb καθιέρωσαν and the reference to the K[η]νσῶρινῆα); IGR iv 963 = OGI 469 = IG xii, 6, 1, 365 (C. Vibius Postumus cos. AD 5 and likewise proconsul of Asia, the monument being an altar from near Pythagorio; note the commentary of Hallof in IG: "Ex ἡρώε colligitur Vibium post mortem honoratum esse ... titulus non est honorarius, sed spectat ad sacra quaedam a Samiis in Vibii ara instituta"). For "honours culturels décernés à des magistrats romains" see now J.-L. Ferrary, in: M. Christol & O. Masson (eds.), *Actes de Xe congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine* (1992), Paris 1997, 216-8. - The "honours culturels" of course explain the use - fairly common - of the dative in inscriptions in honour of emperors.

²⁶ Cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* 10 (1955) 58-62 (this instance being mentioned on p. 60). - Note furthermore another special case, IG ii/iii² 3700 (referring to the Athenian senator M. Ulpius Eubiotus and his sons), inscribed in the theatre of Dionysus on a "sella marmorea" to be used by the senator.

²⁷ I. Ephesos 734 (in a bilingual text, the Greek being preceded by the Latin); 1535 (fragmentary). Cf. Valerius Asiaticus' son, above at n. 21.

²⁸ *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii 129f. no. 49 = AE 1981, 829 (on p. 130 Balland observes that the text is written "au datif "honorifique" sous l'influence de l'usage latin"); ibid. 136 no. 51 = AE 1981, 831; ILS 8818 = IGR iii 551 = OGI 560 = TAM ii 563 (Tlos).

²⁹ AE 1956, 186 (Paphos); I. Kourion 87 (= AE 1975, 821); ibid. 88 (= AE 1975, 822); *Salamine de Chypre* xiii (1987) 55 no. 123 (the same man as in I. Kourion 87).

³⁰ IGR iv 1508 = *Sardis* vii 1 (1932) no. 36 (a proconsul of Asia in the time of Tiberius; set up by a private person); IGR iv 524 = OGI 476 (Dorylaeum, set up by the city in honour of a Vespasianic proconsul); *Museum Iznik* ii 1204, 1205 (L. Catilius Severus honoured perhaps in his country residence, cf. n. 206); AE 1958, 15 (Argos, soon after 169); IGR iii 392 = I. Central Pisidia 152 (Severan or later). Cf. also the case from Ancyra (above n. 21) and e.g. ILS 1103a = IGR i 931 = CIL viii 7052 = ILLAlg. ii 636, a Greek inscription set up in Rome (but later moved to Circa) in honour of the legate of Arabia by the city of Adraa, and (from an earlier period) OGI 477 (Delos). - Cf. on the use of datives in Greek inscriptions and accusatives in Latin ones also P. Veyne, *Latomus* 21 (1962) 68-75; M. Crawford, in P. Garnsey & C. Whittaker (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World* (1978) 196.

are more often made to *euergesia*, *arete*, etc., although often just the name is given³¹), and on the other in later texts honouring eastern senators of local origin, who are referred to as holders of local offices or as benefactors of varying merits. In the latter group, the establishment of the fact that we are dealing with senators is not a grave problem, as there is not normally a problem about the identity of the honorand and as his status can be deduced from other sources; the same goes for many cases in the first group. However, there are also cases in which the fact that an honorand is a senator must be inferred almost on the basis of his nomenclature alone. For instance, Sex. Vibidius Virro (honoured by the *demos* in *IG ii/iii*² 4161) and M. Titius L. f. (honoured in Eleusis in *IG ii/iii*² 4202) have names which look senatorial, and may in fact both be identified with senators known from other sources. I have thus classified the above texts as inscriptions honouring senators.³² For other early - mainly Augustan - inscriptions from Athens which omit a reference to the senatorial status of the honorand, note *IG ii/iii*² 4123 (Agrippa designated as εὐεργέτης), 4124, 4128, 4129, 4131, 4132 (4128ff. being inscriptions honouring Paullus Fabius Maximus cos. 11 BC, to which *SEG* xxiii 122 should perhaps be added), 4135, 4137, 4139, 4140, 4144, 4145, 4149, 4173; *ID* 1605 (from Delos but set up by the *demos* of the Athenians).³³ The explanation for the fairly large number of texts from Athens seems to be that, because of the special status of Athens, many Roman senators were honoured there not as officials in the province, but for various other reasons (the same explanation also goes for the Julio-Claudian inscriptions of this type; for Romans in Athens cf. P. Graindor, *Athènes sous Auguste* [1927] 55ff.; Id., *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan* [1931] 29ff.). For further early inscriptions of this type from other places note *IGR* iv 1719 = *IG* xii, 6, 1, 362 (Samos, the proconsul of Asia, Sex. Appuleius, described only as 'patron'; *AE* 1993, 1476 (Ephesus; perhaps triumphal); I. Ephesus 3435 (Metropolis; a proconsul); *Tuchelt* p. 148 (Halicarnassus; Q. Lepidus proconsul of Asia); *I. Pergamon* 421 = *OGI* 465 = *Tuchelt* p. 227 (the proconsul Paullus Fabius Maximus); *ibid.* 422 = *Tuchelt* p. 228 (C. Marcius Censorinus, proconsul of Asia); *ibid.* 423 = *Tuchelt* p. 229 (the proconsul C. Antistius Vetus); *ibid.* 424 = *Tuchelt* p. 223; *ibid.* 425 = *Tuchelt* p. 230 (L. Piso, a proconsul?); *CIL* iii 12241 = *IGR* iv 778 = *Tuchelt* p. 136 (Apamea in Phrygia; the proconsul C. Antistius Vetus designated simply as 'patron' in a bilingual text); *IGR* iv 1564 = *Tuchelt* p. 245 (Teos, A. Vibius Habitus, cos. AD 8, honoured as the brother of an *euergetes* who is, in fact, proconsul); *Anc. Soc.* 27 (1996) 154 fig. 1 (Sagalassos, M. Lollius, legate of Galatia, designated as 'patron').³⁴

After the time of Tiberius, this sober type becomes extremely rare. From Athens there are also some dedications of this type from the later Julio-Claudian period (*IG ii/iii*² 4185, 4186 [a private dedication], 4189),³⁵ and at other places one finds occasional even

³¹ E.g. *IG ii/iii*² 4145 (Acropolis) 'Ο δῆμος / Γάιον Ἀνθέστιον / Γαίου υἱὸν Οὐέτερα (apparently C. Antistius Vetus cos. 6 BC and proconsul of Asia). Just the name of a proconsul and no further details are given also e.g. in *I. Pergamon* 422 = *Tuchelt* p. 228.

³² On the other hand, I have excluded e.g. *IG ii/iii*² 4143, 4166, 4168, 4172 (not to speak of texts too fragmentary to be taken into consideration) honouring men with names which do not seem to imply senatorial status.

³³ I think that the reading of the name must be modified and that we are dealing here with M. Aemilius Lepidus cos. AD 6 (and not with his brother L. Paullus); I think that the following reading would be satisfactory: [Μάρκον Αἰ]μίλιον Παύλ[λου Λεπέ]δου υἱὸν Λέπ[εδον] (see my *Die römischen Vornamen* [1987] 320 n. 107).

³⁴ Perhaps *IGR* iv 1508 = *Sardis* vii 1 (1932) no. 36, set up by a private person to his 'friend and euergete' (the man in fact being a Tiberian proconsul) should be added to this group.

³⁵ Note also *I. Olympia* 337, a private dedication set up in honour of P. Memmius Regulus (governing Greece in the years 35 to 44, but designated simply as *euergetes*), by the same man who set up the

later instances, of which *CIL* iii 6817 = *ILS* 998 (from Pisidian Antioch),³⁶ *TAM* ii 133. 134; *Opusc. Ath.* 9 (1969) 76³⁷ and *IG* vii 2879 (the *boule* and the *demos* of Coronea honouring Πόπλιον Αἴλιον Ἀδριανόν, that is, Hadrian before he was emperor; cf. below n. 178) are perhaps the most striking ones. But normally one finds in this period references to senatorial status being omitted mainly in the case of local notables and benefactors whose senatorial status, known by all, did not necessarily have to be pointed out on every occasion. Thus one finds the senator from Xanthus, M. Arruntius Claudianus (probably to be dated to the time of Trajan), known from many inscriptions from Xanthus, referred to simply as πάτρωνα [καὶ εὐ]εργέτην and αἰεὶ προπρεσβεύσαντα τῇ πατρίδι³⁸ in two of them (*Fouilles de Xanthos* vii no. 55. 56 = *AE* 1981, 800. 801). In *IG* v 1, 971 from Asopos in Laconia, C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus, the first senator from Sparta,³⁹ is designated simply as ἀρχιερέα διὰ βίου τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἀπὸ προγόνων; in *AE* 1994, 1606 from Sparta, his name only is mentioned.⁴⁰ In the latest inscription honouring A. Iulius Quadratus from Pergamum (cos. II 105), *Altertümer von Pergamon* viii 3 no. 20 from after AD 120,⁴¹ set up by the local *boule* and the *demos*, Quadratus is described only as ἀρχιερατεύσαντα φιλοτείμως καὶ ἀξίως ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ. Another senator from Pergamum, L. Cuspius Rufinus (perhaps the consul of 142), is honoured in, and by, his πατρίς because of his *arete* and his *eunoia*, no titles being added. In Perge, the local senator C. Iulius Plancius Varus Cornutus, legate of Cilicia under Hadrian, is honoured by the *boule* and the *demos* as πάτρωνα καὶ εὐεργέτη[v] and as the winner of all ἀθλήματα θέμιδος Οὐαρείου named after his father (*AE* 1965, 208 = *I. Perge* 128). In Ephesus, M. Peducaeus Plautius Quintillus (cos. 177) is honoured by a private person as γαμβρόν τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοκράτορος Μ. Αὐρηλίου Ἀντωνείνου Σεβαστοῦ, υἱὸν Κειωνίας Φαβίας ἀδελφῆς θεοῦ Οὐήρου (*I. Ephesos* 704, between AD 169 and 180).⁴² In Athens in the time of Severus Alexander, the

statue, with a similar inscription, of a certain C. Vaternius Pollio (*I. Olympia* 338), who must have had something to do with Q. Vaternius Pollio, proconsul of Achaia in about the same period (known from an honorific inscription from Thespieae, *AE* 1928, 47). In *Olympia* there are, by the way, several inscriptions which might honour senators not designated as such (e.g. *I. Olympia* 351). - *IG* xii 5, 757 (*SIG*³ 811. 812) honouring P. Glitius Gallus and his wife is a special case, as Gallus had been expelled from the senate in AD 65 and was in exile on Andros (as one learns from this inscription).

³⁶ "Cn. Pompeio / Collegae / patrono col[.] / d d." Collega was legate of Galatia-Cappadocia in the time of Vespasian.

³⁷ Inscriptions set up by the *boule* and the *demos* of Lydae in Lycia εὐχαριστίας ἔνεκεν (not a common phrase) in honour of Iulius Marinus, Iulius Quadratus and Mettius Modestus, legates of Lycia-Pamphylia at the end of the first century; these men are designated only as *soter* and *euergetes*.

³⁸ For the meaning of this, cf. *SEG* xxxi 1316 (p. 345); J. & L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1982, 379 (who think that this inscription could date from a period when Claudianus had not yet started his career; but who would use a description like this of a young man? In this inscription, only one aspect, a most important aspect indeed, of the activities of Claudianus is emphasized).

³⁹ On whom see A.R. Birley, *ZPE* 116 (1997) 210f., 216f.

⁴⁰ Although perhaps one could think that, as he is referred to as the son of C. Iulius Laco, Eurycles is honoured as a young man.

⁴¹ For the date, see Habicht, *ibid.* p. 42.

⁴² Or rather between the early 170s and 180, if Fadilla, Quintillus' wife, was born only in 159 (thus A.R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius. A Biography* (1987) 114). Cf. below n. 208.

Areopagus honoured L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, consular corrector of Achaia (and a man known from very many honorific inscriptions from the Greek East) only as τὸν ῥήτορα, adding a reference to his πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς εὐνοία and to his κηδεμονία τῶν Ἀθηναίων (IG ii/iii² 4217). No doubt Lollianus' status in Athens was not based only on the fact that he held an office in Achaia, and it seems clear that the Areopagus had decided to describe him by the use of expressions thought of as pertinent at the moment of the erection of the monument. (Note that Lollianus is praised for his oratorical talent also in *I. Smyrna* 635).⁴³ Finally, it may be pointed out that Herodes Atticus and members of his family are often found honoured in inscriptions which omit any reference to the senatorial status of the honorands;⁴⁴ but we are, of course, dealing with a family the status of which surpassed that of all other Greeks of the period and also that of any Roman official active in Achaia, and so the omission of a mention of senatorial rank is not in need of explanation.

In a study of honorific inscriptions, one question one has to deal with is that of the relation between honorific and funerary inscriptions. One also has to deal with the existence of honorific inscriptions of a "commemorative" nature, set up in honour of deceased persons. During the Roman period, this question is of extra importance because of the fact that funerary inscriptions - or at least their formulations -, especially those pertaining to persons of the higher orders, share some common features with honorific texts. For instance, both funerary and honorific inscriptions may set out the career in a similar way, and until fairly recent times the possible relevance of the distinction between the two types of inscriptions was rarely observed, funerary inscriptions of senators being often included in a vague class of "inscriptions of senators". As a result, senators who had died in their youth could be thought of as being identical with consuls and governors with the same name. It is to the credit of especially Werner Eck to have pointed out the basic importance of taking into account the nature of an inscription before using it for further study.⁴⁵ As for how to distinguish a funerary inscription from an honorific one, the distinction can be established on the basis of many different factors varying from case to case. Inscriptions coming from funerary monuments, or having the form of a funerary monument, these monuments normally being situated outside city centres and dedicated by family members, should of course be classed as funerary, whereas those inscriptions which have been set up by a public body in a public space, or, say, by a subordinate at the home of the honorand, should be viewed as honorific inscriptions. I must note here that many aspects of this question have been studied, in the case of Italian inscriptions, with

⁴³ Follet, op. cit. (n. 13) 42, noting that the consular status of the honorand is not mentioned, thinks that the inscription belongs to an earlier period, but I find this hard to believe. - Note also that M. Ulpius Eubiotus, the early-third-century Athenian senator, is referred to in an inscription in honour of his son (IG² ii/iii 3701) simply as 'euergete' and 'eponymous archon' at a time when he was already of consular status.

⁴⁴ E.g. SIG³ 859A (Delphi). 862 (Athens) (= W. Ameling, *Herodes Atticus* [1983] no. 103 and 202).

⁴⁵ See W. Eck, 'Senatorial Self-Representation. Developments in the Augustan Period', in: F. Millar & E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects* (1984) 133ff. = Id., *Tra epigrafia prosopografia e archeologia. Scritti scelti, rielaborati ed aggiornati* (Vetere 10, 1996) 273ff. (who observes in n. 29 [p. 155 = 288] that the inscription of a certain Ti. Latinius Pandusa, CIL xiv 2166, is a funerary inscription, which makes it impossible to identify this man with a legate of Moesia; note also e.g. CIL xiv 2607 referring to the quaestor M. Gavius T. f. Vel. Appalius Maximus: this is probably a funerary inscription (W. Eck, quoted in ZPE 53 [1983] 213), and so the man cannot be identical with a consul of AD 155 as suggested by G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (1977) 167; Id., CIL vi 8, 3 p. 4712 on no. 1556.). See also the paper of W. Eck cited in n. 50.

great care by A.M. Andermahr in a memorable monograph.⁴⁶ However, the problem is that, in many cases, one does not know enough of an inscription to establish its *genre*. In numerous cases, no information is available on the exact findspot or on the form of the epigraphical monument, and many inscriptions are so fragmentary that the dedicator remains unknown. There are also many inscriptions which do not mention a dedicator at all, this being a feature both of funerary and of honorific inscriptions. However, in the case of texts without dedicators which honour Roman officials in provincial cities, it seems that one can assume fairly safely that that these were set up by the city (often represented by e.g. the *boule* and the *demos*) itself.⁴⁷ Furthermore, although family members - wives, children, etc. - normally appear as dedicators of funerary inscriptions, one can also observe them setting up monuments which must be classed as honorific because of their position - a central space in the forum etc. Many of these monuments may be of the "commemorative" type, honouring deceased relatives, no doubt persons of merits surpassing the average. On the other hand, it appears that private persons could in some cases receive the authorization to set up honorific monuments in the public sphere for a relative still alive and well. For a recent absolutely certain example of this, although from outside the area we are examining, note the remarkable inscription from Lavinium south of Rome published by D. Nonnis.⁴⁸

Looking at inscriptions pertaining to senators from my area using either the accusative or the dative (and not simply mentioning senators as dedicators of monuments or in some other occupation), one finds that, unlike in the city of Rome, where the majority of these monuments are funerary or at least set up after the honorand's death,⁴⁹ most of the inscriptions are honorific. This is, of course, only what one would expect, for in provincial epigraphy, honorific monuments set up in public spaces for governors and other Roman officials, and later also for senators of local origin, played an important role, whereas only very few senators ever had the possibility of being honoured in a public space in Rome (honorific inscriptions from Rome mostly coming from private locations). As for funerary monuments, in the beginning one finds them only in the case of Roman officials dying on a provincial mission, funerary monuments for senators of local origin appearing only gradually with the appearance of provincial senators themselves.

There are some instances of archaeological remains of senatorial tombs.⁵⁰ However, normally the existence of funeral monuments must be deduced on the basis of inscriptions. I have already mentioned funerary inscriptions (or inscriptions pertaining to a

⁴⁶ A.M. Andermahr, *Totus in praediis. Senatorischer Grundbesitz in Italien in der frühen und hohen Kaiserzeit* (1998) 10-25.

⁴⁷ R. Haensch, *Capita provinciarum* (1997) 595 n. 88.

⁴⁸ D. Nonnis, *RPAA* 68 (1995-96 [1999]) 248ff. Here the wife of an equestrian official and a local notable sets up, in AD 227/228, a statue of her husband; the inscription (*C. Servilio Quir. Diodoro v. e. ... coniugi incomparabili Egnatia Salviana eius*) could, to judge from the formulations, be funerary, but that the husband was still alive (and probably well) at the time appears clearly from the documents attached to the other sides of the statue base. (Note for instance that the honorand himself interestingly describes his wife as acting *pro sua pietate erga me*).

⁴⁹ W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 45) 133 = Id., *Tra epigrafia* etc. (n. 16) 273f.

⁵⁰ In addition to the famous funerary monument of C. Iulius Antiochus Philopappus in Athens (above n. 16), note the mausoleum of a consular, the inscription of which has not been preserved, at Attaleia (Th. Schäfer, *Imperii insignia* [1989] 373 no. B1; W. Eck, 'Rome and the Outside World: Senatorial Families and the World They Lived In, in: B. Rawson & P. Weaver (eds.), *The Roman Family in Italy* (1997) 91 (with references). From outside the area under consideration here, note the tomb of the legate of Arabia T. Aninius Sextius Florentinus at Petra (*CIL* iii 14148, 10; K.S. Freyburger, *Damaszener Mitteilungen* 5 [1991] 1-8).

funerary monument) using the nominative.⁵¹ Now let us have a look at inscriptions using the dative or the accusative, and let us start with Latin inscriptions which are less problematic than the Greek ones; note that in all the Latin texts (except *CIL* iii 252) the whole career is described. At Ephesus, two Latin inscriptions both pertaining to legates of Asia and both lacking the mention of a dedicator, have been identified as funerary inscriptions, there being no doubt about this.⁵² Another Latin inscription referring to the burial of an official in Ephesus is *CIL* iii 429 = *I. Ephesos* 654, set up for a quaestor of Asia by his surviving son.⁵³ Then there is a Latin inscription from Ancyra, introduced by the formula *d. m.*, and mentioning the deceased in the genitive, pertaining to a young military tribune who died on his way to (probably) the Parthian war of L. Verus.⁵⁴ A legate of Galatia, L. Petronius Verus, also died in Ancyra (in AD 198), but the inscription set up for him by two beneficiarii and cornicularii, *CIL* iii 252 = 6754 = Bosch, op. cit. (n. 54) 283 no. 218, where he is referred to as already deceased by the use of the formula *c(larissimae) m(emoriae) v(irum)* is perhaps not a funerary monument *stricto sensu* but rather a commemoration.⁵⁵ All these instances pertain to officials dying during a mission, but in the case of an inscription from Philippi, where the text is inscribed on a funerary altar, we seem to be dealing with a local man.⁵⁶

Let us now move on to Greek inscriptions which, unlike the Latin ones, all belong to senators of local or at least Eastern origin; here we face some problems of interpretation. There are some texts which clearly can be regarded as funerary. Although the inscriptions from the Celsus library in Ephesus in honour of Ti. Julius Celsus Polemaeanus (cos. 92), the builder of the same library (*I. Ephesos* 5101-6), are all dedicated by Celsus' descendants, they otherwise present no feature which would clearly separate them from honorific inscriptions, and five of them are on statue bases (no. 5101 is on an architrave). The fact that Celsus' sarcophagus was found in the crypt of the building shows that the inscriptions are actually part of the ornamentation of Celsus'

⁵¹ Above, n. 16 (with references to an inscription from Philippi enumerating the whole career and to that of the monument of Philipappus in Athens).

⁵² W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 50) 91 n. 56: *CIL* iii 6074 = *ILS* 975 = *I. Ephesos* 683 = Schäfer, op. cit. [n. 50] 377 no. B7 (M. Helvius Geminus); *CIL* iii 6072 = *I. Ephesos* 631 = Schäfer, op. cit. 377f. no. B8 (M. Calpurnius Rufus). Note that both monuments were found outside Ephesus on the road to Magnesia on the Maeander. (Both are in the British Museum, although this is mentioned only in the case of *I. Ephesos* 631.) The monuments both belong to the middle of the first century. (There has been some unnecessary debate on the date of the monument of M. Calpurnius Rufus; cf. W. Eck, *ZPE* 86 (1991) 97-102.)

⁵³ The stone ("im Pflaster des Kastells verlegt") was not found *in situ*.

⁵⁴ *CIL* iii 6755 = E. Bosch, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Ankara im Altertum* (1967) 235 no. 175. Cf. J. Fitz, 'Tribuni laticlavii in Pannonien', *Tituli* 4 (1982) 323.

⁵⁵ Note that the text ends with *praesidem sanctissimum h(onoris) c(ausa)*. Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 589 describes this operation by "ehrten den ... verstorbenen Statthalter". However, the possibility that this is the inscription from the governor's tomb cannot perhaps be altogether excluded.

⁵⁶ *AE* 1992, 1527 (from Th. Schäfer, op. cit. [n. 50] 261 no. 15): *L. Salvio Secundino Secundi filio Quirina quaest. urbano, adlecto inter aedilicios ab imp. Antonino Aug., praetori urbano, legato pro praetore provinciae Asiae Petrusidia Augurina uxor faciendum curavit*. It is true that the man does not have the local tribe Vol. and held an office in Asia at the time he died, but it is hard to see why he would have been buried in Philippi unless he was a local man or at least had connections to Philippi. (In any case, there is no reason to assume that this is a man from Italy, as Schäfer does.)

tomb.⁵⁷ Again, an inscription of the earlier third century from Dorylaeum, inscribed on an architrave, mentions a young military tribune of senatorial status (AE 1976, 664); the text was dedicated by the πόλις, but in spite of this, this is a funerary inscription as it seems to come from a *heroon*.⁵⁸ Then there are inscriptions set up by close relatives which either belong or at least may belong here. There can be no doubt about an inscription, now lost, from Claudiopolis in Bithynia, *IGR* iii 73 = *I. Klaudiu polis* 65, set up for Μάρκον Δομίτιον Εὐφρημον τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικόν etc. by Μάρκος Δομίτιος Τειμολέων ὁ κρ(ά)τιστος) μυστάρχης who says he is honouring τὸν γλυκύτατον ἀδελφόν. One learns from the annotation to the latter publication that the statue base with the inscription was found outside the city in what appeared to be a "cimetière", and this, combined with the identity of the dedicator and the use of the adjective γλυκύτατον, establishes the nature of the inscription. No adjective is used in the case of *IGR* i 1017 = *I. Cret.* iii 3, 20 from Hierapytna, set up for [Λ.] Φ[λ.] Σουλπ[ικία]νὸν Δωρίωνα Πολύμνιν ... τὸν υἱόν by his father. No exact findspot is given (the stone is now in the museum of Iraklio), but when the fact that the career ends with the designation to a praetorship, and the fact that the monument is described as a tabula (78 x 70 x 9.5) is combined with the fact that the dedicator is the father and that the monument may have been found outside the city centre, one may legitimately suspect that the monument belongs to a tomb.

But as for the use of the adjective γλυκύτατος, an inscription from Hierocaesarea (in Lydia), *IGR* iv 1741 = *ILS* 8842 (cf. *SEG* xl 1034, ca. Severan), which was set up for a consular (who, the stone being fragmentary, cannot be identified) by his wife, the text ends in κρατίστη ὑπατική τὸν γλυκύτατον ἄνδρα. Here, too, one assumes that the adjective γλυκύτατος implies a funerary context,⁵⁹ and the same goes for another acephalous inscription, also set up by the wife, describing a career (ending with the man being praetor designate), *IGR* iii 188 from Ancyra (early third century).⁶⁰ However, in the case of those inscriptions where the archaeological context is unknown, there is a problem, namely the fact that the use of this adjective by relatives is also attested in cases where we seem to be dealing with honorific inscriptions. In Delphi in the time of Severus Alexander, a consular from Thespieae, T. Flavius Philinus, was honoured by his wife Flavia Amphiclea, the inscription ending with τὸν γλυκύτατον καὶ σεμνότατον ἄνδρα, ψηφίσματι Ἀμφικτ[υόνων] (*AE* 1953, 51 = *SEG* xii 265). Now it is possible that the husband was already dead by this time, this inscription then belonging to the category of commemorative inscriptions, but in the case of *I. Cret.* iv 292 (an equestrian statue found near the praetorium in Gortyn⁶¹) set up shortly before AD 70 ψηφισαμένης τῆς κρατίστης Γορτυνίων βουλῆς for the quaestor of Creta-Cyrenae, A. Larcus Lepidus Sulpicianus, ταμίαν εὐσεβέστατον καὶ γλυκύτατον υἱόν, by his mother Sulpicia Telero (herself from Crete), we know that the honorand was far from being dead, as he

⁵⁷ This is pointed out by W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 50) 89. For the library and its monuments see W. Wilberg & al., *Forschungen in Ephesos* V, 2 (1953²); for the sarcophagus see p. 43-6 and for the library as a *heroon* see p. 81-4 (J. Keil); cf. also R.R.R. Smith, *JRS* 68 [1998] 73-75.

⁵⁸ Th. Drew-Bear and W. Eck (the publishers of the text), *Chiron* 6 (1976) 305. However, Halfmann, *Senatoren* 208 refers to the inscription as an "Ehreninschrift".

⁵⁹ Thus J. Keil in the commentary on *TAM* v 2, 923 (*IGR* iv 1212 from Thyatira). This inscription, describing the cursus of the same man, is so fragmentary that its nature cannot be established.

⁶⁰ Cf. H. Halfmann, in *Tituli* 5 (1982) 644.

⁶¹ The size of the statue base is given in *I. Cret.* as 140 x 340 x 210, and it said that we are dealing with a "statua fortasse equestris". Cf. W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 45) 162 n. 127.

was later to proceed to further offices.⁶² The same should not necessarily be assumed in the case of another man honoured in Gortyn by an inscription on a statue base, setting out his career, *ILS* 8834b = *IGR* i 971 = *I. Cret.* iv 299. The monument was set up by a woman, Volumnia Caleda, for her γλυκύτατον καὶ εὐσεβέστατον υἱόν who was probably a Larcius (cf. *PIR*² L 87); the statue base was found between the villages of Ag. Deka and Mitropoli, that is, somewhere in the area of the praetorium and the theatre, and so this is clearly not a tomb.

The fact having been established that the wording of an inscription does not necessarily imply that it belongs to a funerary context, and, on the other hand, that people could set up monuments in honour of relatives, sometimes still active but probably more often already deceased, in public places, we can move on to further instances. To stay in Gortyn, there are two statue bases in honour of the young senator M. Roscius Lupus Murena (quaestor of Creta-Cyrenae and most probably of local origin), one set up by his wife, the other by the same wife's grandmother (one supposes that there might once have been even more similar bases), both setting out the honorand's career (*I. Cret.* iv 297; *ILS* 8834a = *IGR* i 969 = *I. Cret.* iv 296). Both were found close to the church of St. Titus, that is, in the area of the forum. Again, the inscriptions are obviously not funerary but honorific, although probably of the commemorative type.

This is certain in the case of *I. Ephesos* 648 (Severan, a statue base found near the baths of Scholasticia, coming from a construction built by the dedicator herself - cf. *ibid.* no. 639 -, set up for [M.] Κλ. Σεβήρον [κρ]ατίστης μνήμης, [πρ]ῶτον ὑπατεύσαντα Ἐφεσίων ... τὸν πατέρα by Claudia Caninia Severa, ἡ κρατίστη ὑπατική. On the other hand, the honorand of the other inscription set up by Severa in the same building (*I. Ephesos* 639), her ἀδελφιδοῦς Ti. Claudius Artemidorus ὁ λαμπρότατος ἀνθύπατος may perhaps have still been active, as this inscription has no reference to his μνήμη. Another instance of an honorific inscription set up by a relative is *ILS* 8835 = *IGR* iii 667 = *TAM* ii 426 from Patara, set up by the daughter for her father Ti. Claudius Flavianus Titianus Q. Vilius Proculus etc., a man from Patara (middle of the 2nd century); the inscription, on a "basis quadrata" (157 x 57 x 54) was found "prope murum ad septentriones a teatro", so I do not think we are dealing with the tomb of the senator. The whole, detailed cursus of the honorand, up to the curatorship of the *via Flaminia*, has been added; perhaps one may conclude that he was dead at the time of the erection of the monument.⁶³

⁶² The later career of the man is described in his (acephalous) funerary inscription from Antium, *CIL* x 6659 = *ILS* 987; cf. *PIR*² L 94. There is, however, a problem which I must mention here. That the inscription from Antium belongs to a man called Larcius Lepidus is certain as the name is supplied by Josephus (see *PIR*) and because, moreover, his daughter is a [La]rcia. As this man was quaestor of Creta-Cyrenae as was the man called A. Larcius Lepidus Sulpicianus (the province is not specified in *I. Cret.* iv 292, but can be inferred with quasi-certainty), scholars have always taken for granted that we are dealing with one and the same man, and I think that this can hardly be doubted. The only thing which makes me wonder is the wording of *I. Cret.* iv 292. If someone would read the text of the inscription from Gortyn without knowing that it is from the late sixties of the first century, she or he would probably think of the Severan period. In fact, who would even think of the possibility that an inscription in which a senator is introduced as συνκλητικός, a quaestor is defined as εὐσεβέστατος and the *boule* of Gortyn as κρατίστη, could date from ca. AD 70? Still, the facts are there and so many things speak for the identity of the two Larci that this conclusion must remain above suspicion.

⁶³ For other probably honorific inscriptions set up by relatives see e.g. *IGR* iii 960 (Paleopaphus, set up for a young senator by his sister; the man is no doubt from Cyprus, but he cannot be found on any list of senators from this province); *TAM* iv 1, 41 (Nicomedia, in honour of the senator and author Arrian by his ἀνεψιός); *IG* x 2, 1, 147 (Thessalonica) in honour of the dedicator's συγγενής, a Severan senator probably (I think) from Thessalonica. For an honorific monument which also includes a reference to the honorand's death, note the early Hadrianic statue base from Pergamum honouring the prominent senator C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus, Chr. Habicht, *Alt. von Pergamon* viii 3, 21 (= B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi*

So the bottom line here is, then, that whereas the Latin inscriptions in honour of deceased senators (mainly provincial officials) all seem to be parts of actual funerary monuments, Greek inscriptions for deceased senators (all, as it seems, local men) tend to be commemorative honorific monuments placed in public spaces (perhaps often, as in the case of Claudia Caninia Severa, in constructions built by members of the family) also used for honours aimed at living persons, actual funerary monuments being not easy to trace. Moreover, we have seen that monuments set up, according to their inscriptions, by close relatives, this *a priori* indicating that the honorands were already deceased, were in fact set up in honour of persons still alive. In any case, in the following I shall include in the group of honorific inscriptions also those which have, or may have, been set up in honour of deceased persons, whereas I shall not consider those inscriptions which can clearly be identified as funerary.

III. A General Overview of the Material

My aim here is to present some general observations on the numbers and the nature of the material. As defined above, my material consists of inscriptions from the provinces of Achaia, Macedonia, Epirus, Thracia, Asia, Bithynia-Pontus, Lycia-Pamphylia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Cyprus, Creta-Cyrenae, set up in honour of men of senatorial status not defined simply as someone's sons, in the period between Augustus and about the middle of the third century. Excluding three cases in which the same senator is the honorand on a number of monuments coming from the same city (these cases all being counted as one instance),⁶⁴ the total number of inscriptions I have been able to trace is 585.⁶⁵ According to the type (with or without a cursus), the language and the findspots of the inscriptions the material can be divided as follows:⁶⁶

praesidium iii [1990] 62 no. 46), found "vor den Stufen der Nordhalle in der Gegend des Theaters" (its size being 97 x 55 x 52). The monument was set up by the city of Seleucia Zeugma in Syria (governed by Quadratus Bassus before his command in Dacia), which had sent an ambassador to supervise the erection of the monument. The latest office mentioned (although this is in a lacuna, but the restoration is certain, cf. Habicht, p. 47) is Dacia. The front of the base is occupied by the honorific inscription setting out his career in extraordinary detail; but one of sides has an additional inscription saying that Quadratus Bassus died in Dacia and mentioning interesting details in connection with this (cf. Eck, art. cit. [n. 50] 90). Now the monument must have been set up at the point when Quadratus was leaving Syria for Dacia, his hometown being a suitable place for a monument of this type. In any case, Quadratus Bassus must have been alive at this point. However, after he had died in Dacia, and was (as we learn from the second inscription) taken back to Pergamum to be buried there, the other inscription was added. (It is clearly an addition, although not very much later than the original text, cf. Habicht, p. 53.) Though the site of the actual tomb is not known, no doubt it must have been in Pergamum ("vielleicht", Habicht p. 52; but see Eck, loc. cit.).

⁶⁴ A. Iulius Quadratus in Pergamum (*I. Pergamon* 436ff., *IGR* iv 275, 373ff.; cf. H. Halfmann, *Städtebau und Bauherren im röm. Kleinasien* [2001] 47), C. Novius Rusticus (*CIL* iii 6814ff.) and C. Arrius Calpurnius Frontinus Honoratus (*CIL* iii 6810ff.; *AE* 1914, 130) in Pisidian Antioch.

⁶⁵ For some "new" inscriptions see e.g. *IG* xii 6, 1, 366, 368; *JRS* 89 (1999), Plate v 3 (an unpublished inscription from Aphrodisias). Unpublished inscriptions from Perge (not taken into consideration here) are referred to by R. Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 610; cf. *PIR*² vii 1, p. 53, where a certain Naucellius Reginus, proconsul of Lycia and Pamphylia, is registered. The total number must, of course, remain uncertain for many reasons, e.g. because of the fact that there is some uncertainty about the date of some inscriptions and because some early texts may in fact not refer to senators at all (cf. above on inscriptions leaving out the mention of the honorand's senatorial status). Also, for instance, among the inscriptions of Olympia, there are numerous fragments (e.g. *I. Olympia* 360, 363, 364 etc.) with traces of expressions such as ὑπατος or ἀνθύπατος, which might belong to inscriptions honouring senators. Note furthermore that one could add to the total of 585 inscriptions those texts whose existence can be inferred from the existence of inscriptions in honour of wives and children, for e.g. in the case of governors one can assume

	With cursus			Without cursus			Total
	Greek	Latin ⁶⁷	Total	Greek	Latin ⁶⁷	Total	
Achaia	24	21	45	119	1	120	165
Macedonia	2	-	2	15	10	5	16
Epirus ⁶⁸	-	-	-	1	1	2	2
Thracia	1	1	2	5	-	5	7
Asia	44	14	58	151	8	158	216
Bithynia-Pontus	2	1	3	12	-	12	15
Lycia-Pamphylia	25	2	27	46	1	47	74

with quasi-certainty that statues of wives and children were not set up without the father being honoured at the same time. Cf. below on the geographical distribution of honorific inscriptions.

⁶⁶ Of course I know that the numbers presented below do not represent the whole truth; the survival of individual inscriptions is based mainly on chance, and the chance for inscriptions to survive varies from site to site. In cities which were not abandoned during the Middle Ages, the survival rate of inscriptions must generally be smaller than in abandoned sites which have been excavated. In Ephesus, one finds more than 80 inscriptions in honour of senators (to which a large number of monuments in honour of senatorial women and children could be added), whereas Thessalonica, a very important city and like Ephesus, the capital of a prosperous province, offers only 7 instances. (Note also the absence of inscriptions in honour of Roman senators in Cyzicus, below at n. 162.) The relation cannot reflect the "historical truth". One of the explanations for the unimpressive epigraphic record of Thessalonica must be that there has not been much archaeological study of the central area of ancient Thessalonica, where one would expect to find honorific monuments. On the other hand, one does not necessarily have to postulate the existence of honorific inscriptions everywhere, the epigraphic culture varying from town to town. It has been observed that in Cologne, a city with a rich epigraphic heritage, it was obviously not customary to set up honorific inscriptions (W. Eck, in *Epigrafi e ordine senatorio* ii [1982] 543). One might also note, although these are minor cities, that Pompeii and Herculaneum, of which we no doubt know all honorific monuments which existed in AD 79, do not leave the impression of having been generously equipped with the same. In fact, during the 100 years of imperial Herculaneum the only senator honoured there was M. Nonius Balbus (cf. below at n. 69).

⁶⁷ The bilingual inscriptions, usually with some less important parts in Greek, are included in the number of Latin ones. For instances see *ILS* 928 (Athens, Augustan); *ILS* 308 (Hadrian, Athens); *ILS* 1036 (Hierapolis Castabala, 116/7); *I. Ephesos* 811 add. (170s); *CIL* iii 7059a + 12243 (Apollonia in Mysia). Cf. above at n. 19 on *ILS* 1050. Inscriptions mentioning more or less the same things in both Latin and Greek are rare: *I. Cret.* iv 289 (from Gortyn, Augustan, with the Greek text preceding the Latin one); *CIL* iii 12241 = *IGR* iv 778 = Tuchelt p. 136 (Apamea in Phrygia, Augustan, with the Greek text preceding the Latin one; note that the honorand, proconsul of Asia, 'patron' in the Greek text, has no title at all in the Latin one); *ILS* 976 = *IGR* iv 675 (Prymnessus, from the time of Tiberius; cf. below n. 77, 203); *I. Ephesos* 620 and 3027 (inscriptions set up by C. Vibius Salutaris, a firm believer in bilingual inscriptions, in the time of Trajan; note how in 620 some additional details - filiation and tribe, the *dona militaria*, etc. - are omitted from the Greek part); *I. Ephesos* 734. For a bilingual inscription setting out the career both in Greek and in Latin in honour of an equestrian see e.g. *AE* 1915, 46 (Attaleia, set up in honour of a local knight by some city, obviously Latin-speaking, not identical with Attaleia).

⁶⁸ *AE* 1985, 771 (Augustan, in Latin); *AE* 1949, 265 (third century, in Greek), from Buthrotum. (At the time of the erection of the first inscription Buthrotum was, of course, still part of Macedonia.)

Galatia	13	13	26	17	4	21	47
Cappadocia	1	-	1	4	-	4	5
Cilicia	2	2	4	10	-	10	14
Cyprus	5	-	5	8	-1	9	14
Creta-Cyrenae	4	-	4	7	-	7	11
	121	56	177	388	20	408	585
Percentage	68.4	31.6	100	95.1	4.9	100	

This number does not include inscriptions by cities or larger units within the defined area set up in cities lying outside the same (e.g. Cretan cities and the *koinon* honoring the Augustan proconsul M. Nonius Balbus in his hometown of Herculaneum, *CIL* x 1430-34), a category of inscriptions now studied by F.J. Navarro, *Veleia* 14 (1997) 255-293 (who takes into consideration the material from all parts of the Roman empire). He seems, however, to have missed an inscription in which ἡ μητρόπολις τῆς Γαλατίας Ἀγκυρᾶ honours a former governor of Galatia, L. Fabius Cilo, as τὸν ἑαυτοῦ προστάτην⁶⁹ in Rome, no doubt in the senator's residence on the Aventine (*IG* xiv 1078 = *IGR* i 138 = *IGUR* 68).⁷⁰ - We shall come back to this phenomenon within our area below.

Now looking at the numbers above, one may make a few observations (not all of them surprising). First of all, one sees that, almost one third of the inscriptions setting out the whole cursus are in Latin, whereas only about five percent of the inscriptions without cursus are in Latin. This means that, if one used Latin, the propensity to mention not only the name and the title, but to set out the whole career was higher than in the case of Greek inscriptions, there of course being a strong tradition to attach the cursus of the honorand to an honorific inscription in Latin epigraphy.⁷¹ Comparing the number of cursus inscriptions to the total number of honorific inscriptions in each province,⁷² one observes that Galatia and Lycia-Pamphylia occupy a special place. In Galatia, more than a half of the surviving honorific inscriptions include the cursus of the honorand, in Lycia-Pamphylia the percentage is almost 38. The latter province is, however, more interesting

⁶⁹ Cf. Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 593 n. 77; *IG* ii/iii² 3697f.; *IGR* i 797 = *I. Perinthos* 21; *I. Ephesos* 1539.

⁷⁰ For the residence, see F. Guidobaldi, in: E.M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon topographicum Urbis Romae* II (1995) 95f. (this stone was, however, not found *loco suo*). Note that the monument was set up more than ten years after Cilo's tenure in Galatia, as the inscription mentions Cilo's second consulate in 204, whereas Cilo was in Galatia before 193 (Thomasson, op. cit. [n. 11] 258 no. 32; one is reminded here of the dedication made in honour of P. Memmius Regulus in Delphi, *ILS* 8815 = *FD* iii 1, 532, mentioning Regulus' proconsulate of Asia, which, although not exactly datable, must have followed a number of years after Regulus' tenure in Greece). On the other hand, Cilo was also Severus' *comes* on his "oriental expedition" against Pescennius Niger in 194, at about which time he was honoured in Pisidian Antioch (*AE* 1926, 79), and he must have maintained some connections of uncertain nature to Asia Minor as he was also honoured by a statue after his second consulate in Ephesus (*I. Ephesos* 3204; cf. below n. 212). - For a city setting up a monument in another city cf. also e.g. *IGR* i 622 = *ISM* ii 57 (the *boule* and the *demos* of Heraclea on the Chersonese honouring a legate of Moesia inferior in Tomi, the main city of the province).

⁷¹ Note e.g. that all the Latin honorific inscriptions one finds in Athens are cursus inscriptions.

⁷² Obviously there is no use in doing this in the case of provinces with a minimal number of inscriptions such as Cappadocia or Cilicia.

here, for Galatia with its colonies, above all Pisidian Antioch, and with its epigraphically rich capital Ancyra is in a unique position. In Lycia-Pamphylia, there are no colonies to explain, at least in part, the existence of cursus inscriptions, and Latin inscriptions are extremely rare; in fact only a small minority of the cursus inscriptions (this being in great contrast to other provinces), 2 out of a total of 28, are in Latin, both being from the capital Perge. It thus seems that one could conclude that in the province of Lycia-Pamphylia - and in fact both in Lycian and in Pamphylian cities - there existed a fairly strong epigraphical tradition of adding the cursus of a senatorial honorand.⁷³

Let us move on to an overview of the cities where one finds inscriptions set up in honour of senators. At this point I must observe that I have been able to trace Latin and bilingual inscriptions, with or without cursus, only in the following cities: in Achaia: Athens, Corinth, Patrae; in Macedonia: Dium, Philippi; in Epirus: Buthrotum; in Thracia: Perinthus; in Asia: Alexandria Troas, Apamea (Phrygia), Ephesus, Parium, Pergamum, Prymnessus, Synnada; in Bithynia-Pontus: Apamea; in Lycia-Pamphylia: Perge, Side (thus only in Pamphylia); in Galatia: Ancyra, Antioch, Cremna, Germa, Iconium; in Cilicia: Hierapolis Castabala; in Cyprus: Paphos. One sees that what we have here is basically a list of either Roman *coloniae*⁷⁴ or capitals of provinces which are prone to produce Latin inscriptions because the presence of a Roman bureaucracy.⁷⁵ (Note by the way that in all cases when we have more than just a minimal amount of material, the tendency is that the Latin inscriptions concentrate in the earlier period, the Greek ones in the later.⁷⁶) The only cities which do not belong to these two categories are Athens, Apamea in Phrygia, Pergamum, Prymnessus, Side, Synnada, and Hierapolis Castabala. Of these cities, the very special character of Athens easily explains the presence of Latin inscriptions there. As Apamea, Pergamum and Synnada are *conventus* centres, and thus in a way centres of the Roman administration, the use of Latin is perhaps not something in need of explanation (and in any case, the inscription from Pergamum, *ILS* 962 is a private dedication in honour of P. Memmius Regulus). In the other cities, we are dealing with special cases: the bilingual inscription from Prymnessus (*ILS* 976 = *IGR* iv 675) is a dedication, probably from the time of Tiberius, to a young noble by the *Prymness(enses) et c. R. [qui ibid(em) nego]tiantur*, the latter group explaining the language choice.⁷⁷ In Side, we are dealing with an inscription set up by a governor's *strator* (*AE* 1966, 476 = Nollé, *Side* 67).⁷⁸ As for Hierapolis Castabala, where we find both *CIL* iii 12117 = *ILS* 1036 (Pompeius Falco) and *CIL* iii 13618 = *ILS* 1050 (cf. above at n. 19), perhaps the status and the

⁷³ Cf. below at n. 266. For cursus inscriptions from Lycia-Pamphylia in honour of equestrians see e.g. *IGR* iii 487. 670. 777; *AE* 1915, 46 (Attaleia); *AE* 1966, 472 = Nollé, *Side* 55; for the use of Latin in Perge see W. Eck, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 643ff.

⁷⁴ Corinth, Patrae, Dium, Philippi, Buthrotum, Alexandria Troas, Parium, Apamea in Bithynia, Antioch, Cremna, Germa, Iconium.

⁷⁵ Perinthus, Ephesus, Perge, Ancyra, Paphos. For the definition of a 'capital' of a province and its characteristics see the book of R. Haensch (above n. 11).

⁷⁶ Cf. B. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor* (1967) 130ff.; A.D. Rizakis, in: H. Solin & al. (eds.), *Acta Colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae ... 1991 habiti* (1995) 383-6.

⁷⁷ As the inscription refers to him only as an augur and city prefect during the Latin festival (and also as *Pompei Magni abn[epos]*), he cannot be thought of as a quaestor of Asia. Cf. on him M. Christol - Th. Drew-Bear, *Tyche* 1 (1986) 59f. n. 82 (who, however, still think that he could have been quaestor), and on this inscription also below n. 203.

⁷⁸ Cf. Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 610.

characteristics of this city should be reconsidered.⁷⁹ In any case, *ILS* 1036 was set up by a centurion of the Roman army and in *ILS* 1050, the honorand and his career appear in the nominative, this indicating special circumstances (cf. above at n. 19).

Let us now move on to have a look at the locations, not only of the Latin inscriptions, but of all the material as a whole. In the following list, I shall also mention cities in which inscriptions in honour of senators are attested only indirectly, through inscriptions honouring wives and children of senators, as their existence must imply the existence of inscriptions honouring husbands and fathers of the same (cf. n. 65).

Cities or locations in which inscriptions honouring senators are attested (in alphabetical order within each province):

Achaia: Argos;⁸⁰ Athens; Corinth; Coronea (n. 178); Delos;⁸¹ Delphi; Epidaurus; Gythium; Megara; Olympia; Patrae;⁸² Phalanna (in Thessaly);⁸³ Plataeae;⁸⁴ Sparta; Tegea; Thebes; Thespieae.

⁷⁹ Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 270f. considers the possibility that Hierapolis was the capital of Cilicia, only to dismiss it. But in this discussion he seems to consider only *ILS* 1050, although he also mentions *IGR* iii 904 in his list of sources on Cilicia (p. 582-5); and *ILS* 1036 does not seem to appear either in the discussion or on the list. One could also note *AE* 1920, 71 (Augustan), although at this time Hierapolis was part of the province of Syria.

⁸⁰ One might also add Asopus in Laconia, with an inscription honouring C. Iulius Eurycles Herculaneus (*IG* v 1, 971), but he is honoured simply as ἀρχιερέα διὰ βίου τῶν Σεβαστῶν ἀπὸ προγόνων (cf. above at n. 40).

⁸¹ *ID* 1605 (I think this is not L. Aemilius Paullus cos. AD 1 but his brother M. Lepidus, cos. AD 6; cf. above n. 33), 1625, 1626, these inscriptions all being from the time of Augustus. - For Republican senators, often governors and other officials in Asia, being honoured on Delos and on other islands see J.-L. Ferrary, *Chiron* 30 (2000) 185ff.

⁸² *AE* 1979, 577 = Rizakis, *Patras* 34; *AE* 1989, 660 = *ibid.* 35. For the city of Patrae honouring the consular author A. Claudius Charax in Pergamum (Charax' *patris*) see *AE* 1961, 320 = *SEG* xviii 557 = *ibid.* 364.

⁸³ *Arch. Delt.* 10 (1926) Parart. 51 no. 2 (quoted in Groag, op. cit. [n. 13] 46; the proconsul Q. Acutius Flaccus); *IG* ix 2, 1239 (the wife of the proconsul L. Cocceius Iustus).

⁸⁴ *IG* vii 1676 (the proconsul Iunius Gallio). For the city of Plataeae honouring the *corrector* L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus (time of Severus Alexander) in Thebes (perhaps a more suitable place for honours of this kind in the third century) see *IG* vii 2510 (cf. below n. 172).

Macedonia: Argos (Paeoniae);⁸⁵ Dium;⁸⁶ Hadrianopolis (?);⁸⁷ Heraclea Lyncestis;⁸⁸ Idomene;⁸⁹ Philippi; Thessalonica.

Epirus: Buthrotum (cf. n. 68).

Thracia: Nicopolis ad Istrum;⁹⁰ Perinthus; Philippopolis.

Asia I: The islands: Andros; Chios;⁹¹ Chalce;⁹² Cos; Lesbos; Naxos;⁹³ Paros;⁹⁴ Rhodes;⁹⁵ Samos; Tenos.⁹⁶

⁸⁵ An inscription of perhaps the second century presenting problems in the reading of the name; for the various editions of this text see Thomasson, op. cit. (n. 11) 187 no. 51. Note that, instead of the letters Λο[--] now being edited as the beginning of the text, the reading in the original publication ZA 3 (1953) 222 (photo on p. 223) was Λοδ[--].

⁸⁶ AE 1915, 114 = Sasel-Kos 178.

⁸⁷ The questionmark applies here to the name of the city, not to the existence of the inscription. There is an inscription in honour of the proconsul Cornelius Rufus (between 161 and 169) from Sandanski (IGBulg. 2262 = SEG xxiv 617); this city is identified with Hadrianopolis by M. Zahrnt, in: *Inscriptions of Macedonia. Third International Symposium on Macedonia, Thessaloniki 8-12 December 1993*, (Thessaloniki 1996) 232-235.

⁸⁸ IG x 2, 2, 71 (= CIG 1999b) (ca. Severan, the wife of the proconsul A. Pontius Verus).

⁸⁹ Cf. F. Papazoglou, *Les villes de Macédoine à l'époque romaine* (1988) 177-80. The inscription: SEG xix 438.

⁹⁰ IGBulg. ii 603.

⁹¹ AE 1932, 7 (Augustan).

⁹² IG xii 1, 959 = IGR iv 1112.

⁹³ IG xii 5, 58. This inscription may well be only from the fourth century (see PIR² C 469; PLRE I Cassianus 1).

⁹⁴ Attested only indirectly in the inscription IG xii 5, 328 (around the middle of the third century), set up in honour of a deceased son of a local senator and benefactor.

⁹⁵ A. Maiuri, *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* (1925) 4f. (Severan); C. Blinkenberg, *Lindos* (1941) no. 472 = AE 1948, 191 (also Severan), cf. ibid. 474 = AE 1948, 194 (and in general no. 473ff. = AE 1948 192ff.; for an epigram in honour of the same man see above n. 13).

⁹⁶ IG xii 5, 940 = ILS 8812 = OGI 463 (a young senator accompanying Augustus in 21/20 (cf. P.M. Ngdelis, Πολίτευμα και κοινωνία των πόλεων των Κυκλάδων [1990] 163).

Asia II: The continent: Acmonia; Aezani;⁹⁷ Alexandria Troas; Alia;⁹⁸ Apamea in Phrygia;⁹⁹ Aphrodisias; Apollonia (Mysia);¹⁰⁰ Blaundus;¹⁰¹ Caunus;¹⁰² Cibyra; Clarus;¹⁰³ Cnidus;¹⁰⁴ Cyme;¹⁰⁵ Didyma; Dorylaeum; Ephesus; Eumenia;¹⁰⁶ Halicarnassus;¹⁰⁷ Heraclea ad Salbacum;¹⁰⁸ (a funerary inscription from Hierocaesarea: see above at n. 59); Iasus;¹⁰⁹ an unknown Lydian city at Kula;¹¹⁰ Laodicea on the Lycus;¹¹¹ Magnesia on the Maeander;¹¹² Magnesia by Sipylus;¹¹³ Metropolis;¹¹⁴

⁹⁷ *IGR* iv 570.

⁹⁸ *AE* 1991, 1513 = *SEG* lxi 1174 (a governor of Phrygia-Caria in 250).

⁹⁹ *CIL* iii 12241 = *IGR* iv 778 = Tuchtelt p. 136 (cf. above at n. 24, n. 67); inscriptions in honour of Sosia Polla, the wife of the proconsul Pompeius Falco (*IGR* iv 779; 780 = *OGI* 490 = *ILS* 8820 = *MAMA* vi 182).

¹⁰⁰ *CIL* iii 7059a + 12243.

¹⁰¹ *IGR* iv 717 (third century, referred to as the son of a *hypatikos*, but also as *euergetes* and *ktistes*).

¹⁰² *SEG* xiv 646, the wife of a Tiberian proconsul; 648, the sister of A. Iulius Quadratus designated as δικαιοδότης (this is interpreted as 'iuridicus Cauniorum' in *PIR*² I 507 and by Halfmann, *Senatoren* 114, an interpretation which strikes me as problematic; I think that Quadratus is here referred to as legate of Asia); Chr. Marek, *MH* 57 (2000) 89 (a most remarkable cursus inscription set up in honour of Pompeius Falco, no doubt in connection with his proconsulate of Asia). (There are numerous monuments honouring Republican senators in Caunus.)

¹⁰³ Tuchtelt p. 168 (Augustan; note that this is the last of a long series of honorific monuments from Clarus).

¹⁰⁴ *SEG* xii 452 = Tuchtelt p. 170 = *I. Knidos* 87 (P. Vinicius, cos. AD 2, later proconsul of Asia; note that, unlike in some other places where one finds monuments in honour of Roman senators ending with the time of Augustus, no monuments pertaining to prominent Romans earlier than this are attested in Cnidus).

¹⁰⁵ The early Augustan proconsul Sex. Appuleius and his wife and daughter (*AE* 1966, 422. 423a. b. = *I. Kyme* 18a. b.).

¹⁰⁶ *MAMA* iv 331 (Severan).

¹⁰⁷ Le Bas - Waddington 506 = Tuchtelt p. 148 (Augustan; cf. J.-L. Ferrary, *Chiron* 30 [2000] 190).

¹⁰⁸ *MAMA* vi 103 = L. & J. Robert, *La Carie* II 168 no. 52 (perhaps from the later second century).

¹⁰⁹ *I. Iasos* 86 = *AE* 1979, 609 (middle of the third century).

¹¹⁰ *IGR* iv 1382 = *TAM* v 1, 213b (the daughter of a *hypatikos*).

¹¹¹ *I. Laodikeia am Lykos* 37, 39.

¹¹² *I. Magnesia a. M.* 152 = Tuchtelt p. 183 (the brother of the Augustan proconsul C. Vibius Postumus; cf. below n. 123).

¹¹³ *IGR* iv 1338 = Tuchtelt p. 185 = *I. Magnesia am Sipylus* 2 = *TAM* v 2, 1366 (the Augustan proconsul Potitus Messalla).

¹¹⁴ *I. Ephesos* 3435. 3467.

Miletus; Mylasa;¹¹⁵ Nysa;¹¹⁶ Palaeapolis;¹¹⁷ Parium;¹¹⁸ Pergamum; Prymnessus (cf. n. 77); Sardis; Sebaste;¹¹⁹ Smyrna; Stratonicea;¹²⁰ Synnada;¹²¹ Tabala;¹²² Teos;¹²³ Thyatira; Tralles. (Note furthermore that the city of Cotiaeum set up a monument in honour of the Augustan proconsul Sex. Appuleius in Pergamum,¹²⁴ and that the city of Cyzicus honoured a late Severan legate of Thrace in Perinthus, cf. n. 164.)

Bithynia-Pontus: Amastris;¹²⁵ Apamea (a colony);¹²⁶ Claudiopolis;¹²⁷ Nicaea; Nicomedia;¹²⁸ Prusa;¹²⁹ Prusias;¹³⁰ Sinope.¹³¹

¹¹⁵ *SEG* ii 549 = *I. Mylasa* 410 (the Augustan proconsul C. Marcius Censorinus).

¹¹⁶ *AE* 1926, 13 = *SEG* iv 405 (the son of a consul of local origin, second century).

¹¹⁷ *AE* 1979, 604 = *I. Ephesos* 3707 (AD 211/2).

¹¹⁸ *CIL* iii 727 = *I. Parion* 13.

¹¹⁹ *IGR* iv 1697 (Severan, cf. *PIR*² D 63; the honorand [---] Dexter looks like a local man, and should thus perhaps be added to the lists of Halfmann).

¹²⁰ *Tuchelt* p. 242 = *I. Stratonikeia* 1010.

¹²¹ *ILS* 9483 (a Latin inscription in honour of an early Tiberian proconsul; as the inscription is fragmentary in the end, the dedicator(s) cannot be ascertained). For Synnada as the findspot of the inscription see Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 639 n. 96.

¹²² *IGR* iv 1378 = *TAM* v 1, 209 (honouring a certain Curtia Iulia Valentilla [*PFOS* 305], one suspects of local origin, who had built a bath at Tabala; so in this case it is perhaps not necessary to assume that this monument implies one in honour of her husband).

¹²³ *IGR* iv 1564 = *Tuchelt* p. 245 (a brother of the Augustan proconsul C. Vibius Postumus; another brother of the same proconsul was honoured in Magnesia on the Maeander, see above n. 112).

¹²⁴ *IGR* iv 402 = *I. Pergamon* 418 = *Tuchelt* p. 220; cf. below at n. 166/7.

¹²⁵ Chr. Marek, *Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia* (1993) 163 no. 16 (= *IGR* iii 85), 17.

¹²⁶ *CIL* iii 335 cf. 6991, 14188,1 = *I. Apameia (Bithynien) und Pylai* 2 (a Vespasianic senator most probably of local origin).

¹²⁷ *I. Klaudiu polis* 68 (Severan or later). For the funerary inscription of the local senator M. Domitius Euphemus (ibid. no. 65) see above at n. 58.

¹²⁸ *TAM* iv 1, 41, the author Arrian (from Nicomedia) being honoured κατὰ τὸ κρίμα τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, but without any reference to his senatorial status, by a relative (cf. above n. 63).

¹²⁹ *IGR* iii 33 = *I. Prusa ad Olympum* 12: the legate of Bithynia-Pontus in about the time of Severus Alexander, L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, who is described as τὸν οἰκιστὴν τῆς πατρίδος; *patris* cannot also refer to Lollianus, but only to the dedicator(s) ("of our hometown"). For scholars thinking that Lollianus might be a man from Prusa see Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 607 n. 130. But he is clearly a member of an important Italian family on whom see F. Chausson, *JS* 1997, 211ff.; cf. below at n. 176.

¹³⁰ *SEG* xiv 772 = *I. Prusias ad Hypium* 45 (240s), a local senator.

¹³¹ *AE* 1906, 1 (C. Marcius Censorinus cos. 8 BC as πρεσβευτῆς Καίσαρος; cf. *PIR*² M 222).

Lycia-Pamphylia: Adada (Pisidia);¹³² (Aspendus¹³³); Attaleia; Balbura; Cadyanda;¹³⁴ Cyaneae;¹³⁵ Lydae; Myra;¹³⁶ Oenoanda; Patara; Perge (cf. also above n. 65); Phaselis;¹³⁷ Sagalassus;¹³⁸ Selge;¹³⁹ Side; Sidyma;¹⁴⁰ Telmessus;¹⁴¹ Tlos; Xanthus. - (For inscriptions from Termessus and Trebenna (and Sagalassus) in honour of the governor Terentius Marcianus who seems to belong to the time of Diocletian, see Thomasson, op. cit. [n. 11] 287 no. 74.)

Galatia: Ancyra; Antiochia; Apollonia;¹⁴² Cremna;¹⁴³ Germa;¹⁴⁴ Hadrianopolis (Paphlagonia);¹⁴⁵ Iconium;¹⁴⁶ Laodicea Catacecaumene;¹⁴⁷ Pappa-Tiberiopolis;¹⁴⁸

¹³² *IGR* iii 363 cf. *SEG* xxxii 1290 (Severan or later); *IGR* iii 367 = *ILS* 8838 (a third-century proconsular legate - so it seems - of Lycia-Pamphylia, but also a citizen of Sagalassus, another Pisidian city then belonging to Lycia-Pamphylia).

¹³³ It now having been established that the Curtii Crispini who built a theatre at Aspendus (*IGR* iii 803) had reached senatorial status, one of them now being attested as consul in 159 (see P. Weiß, *Chiron* 19 [1999] 162ff.), one is entitled to postulate monuments in honour of members of this family in Aspendus.

¹³⁴ *IGR* iii 512 = *TAM* ii 658 (a governor, c. AD 81)

¹³⁵ *IGR* iii 703 (a governor, reign of Claudius).

¹³⁶ *IGR* iii 724 (probably L. Luscius Ocrea, governor in the time of Vespasian). For the city of Myra setting up a monument in Ephesus see *I. Ephesos* 3902 (cf. below).

¹³⁷ *IGR* iii 763 = *ILS* 8828 = *TAM* ii 1201 + *SEG* xxxi 1300 (the governor Q. Voconius Saxa Fidus in the time of Pius).

¹³⁸ *Anc. Soc.* 27 (1996) 154 fig. 1 (honouring the Augustan governor of Galatia, M. Lollius); Sagalassus as part of Lycia-Pamphylia: *IGR* iii 356, 357 (in honour of third-century senators of local origin).

¹³⁹ *AE* 1990, 981 = *I. Selge* 12 (a senator of local origin, middle of the third century). In the later second century, the city of Selge set up a monument in honour of a former governor of Lycia-Pamphylia in Ephesus, the governor's home (*I. Ephesos* 3036; cf. below).

¹⁴⁰ *IGR* iii 581 = *TAM* ii 194 (a Severan senator of local origin).

¹⁴¹ *IGR* iii 1510 = *TAM* ii 21 (the father of a governor under Titus).

¹⁴² *IGR* iii 316 (a second-century governor being promoted from Galatia to Pontus-Bithynia).

¹⁴³ *I. Central Pisidia* 26. 27. 44 (= *AE* 1988, 1034), honouring three Severan Ulprii, of whom one (in no. 44) was certainly from Cremna, the other two most probably.

¹⁴⁴ *AE* 1971, 463 = 1973, 534 (M. Plancius Varus from Perge, but owning land in Germa, being honoured in Latin by a man with a tribe, perhaps a magistrate of the colony).

¹⁴⁵ *IGR* iii 151 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 188 no. 2 (a legate of Galatia in AD 138).

¹⁴⁶ *CIL* iii 13639, a Latin inscription known only from an inadequate description, but which seems to set out the career of a senator, probably of local origin because of the name *Anch[arenus]* (cf. S. Mitchell, *Historia* 28 (1979) 423). Moreover, there is *AE* 1926, 81 = 1928, 101 (also in Latin) in honour of the wife of the Trajanic legate L. Cossonius Gallus (on whom, and his possible identity with the legate of Galatia known from *ILS* 1038, see H. Wolff, *Ostbair. Grenzmarken* 41 (1999) 14f. with n. 8). Note that M. Zahrnt, *ZPE* 71 (1988) 242ff. argues that there was a colony at Iconium already from the

Pompeiopolis; (Sagalassos: cf. n. 138); Tavium;¹⁴⁹ a city located at Kocaaliler (E of Sia and S of Cremna).¹⁵⁰

Cappadocia: Comana; Nicopolis;¹⁵¹ Zela.¹⁵²

Cilicia: Adana;¹⁵³ Cestrus;¹⁵⁴ Claudiopoli;¹⁵⁵ Hierapolis Castabala; Iotape;¹⁵⁶ Palaea Isaura;¹⁵⁷ Nephelium;¹⁵⁸ Olba;¹⁵⁹ Soli.¹⁶⁰

Cyprus: Citium;¹⁶¹ Curium; Palaeopaphus; Paphus; Salamis.

time of Augustus (and not only from the time of Hadrian), this having an effect on a possible *terminus post quem* for the two inscriptions.

¹⁴⁷ *IGR* iii 249 = *JHS* 38 (1918) 174, a cursus inscription, perhaps from the time of Hadrian, in honour of one of the Ti. Iulii Frugi (on whom see S. Sahin, *EA* 3 (1984) 41-1; B. Rémy, *Epigraphica* 45 (1983) 79-93), who most probably came from Laodicea (B. Rémy, *Les carrières sénatoriales dans les provinces romaines d'Anatolie* [1989] 74).

¹⁴⁸ *IGR* iii 1469 (a Trajanic legate).

¹⁴⁹ *IGR* iii 238 = *RECAM* ii 414, cf. *SEG* xxxix 1517, a legate of Cappadocia - it seems that Tavium belonged to Cappadocia at this period - under Philip. Note that this man, M. Antonius Memmius Hiero, seems to have been of Eastern origin (see K. Dietz, *Senatus contra principem* [1980] 78 n. 183).

¹⁵⁰ *IGR* iii 392 = *I. Central Pisidia* 152, a cursus inscription in honour of the local senator Ulpius Quirinius Quadratianus, perhaps to be connected with the Ulpia in Cremna (n. 143).

¹⁵¹ *AE* 1909, 19 (a legate of Cappadocia in the 240s).

¹⁵² *Studia Pontica* iii (1910) 244 no. 271, a legate of Cappadocia ca. 160.

¹⁵³ *IGR* iii 888 (about Augustan; R. Syme, op. cit. [n. 11] 211 thinks that this Valerius might be a Messalla); *IGR* iii 889 (a senator from Magarsus - another Cilician city - probably of the second century; cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 208).

¹⁵⁴ *AE* 1972, 651b = St. Hagel - K. Tomaschitz, *Repertorium der westkilikischen Inschriften* (1998), 150 Kestros 20b, a Trajanic governor of Cilicia, his son being honoured at the same time (ibid. 651a = ibid. 20a).

¹⁵⁵ *IGR* iii 821 = *AE* 1972, 656, [P. Cassius] Dexter, legate of Cilicia in c. 150. For this Claudiopoli, a colony and identical with Ninica (*colonia Ninica Claudiopoli*), see S. Mitchell, *Historia* 28 (1979) 426-35.

¹⁵⁶ *AE* 1966, 485 = Hagel - Tomaschitz, op. cit. (n. 154) 129 Iotape 18, a Trajanic governor of Cilicia.

¹⁵⁷ *IGR* iii 290 = *OGI* 576 = *ILS* 8827, a legate of Cilicia in the time of Pius.

¹⁵⁸ *AE* 1995, 1556 = *SEG* xlv 1835 = Hagel - Tomaschitz, op. cit. (n. 154), 324 Nephelion 1: a governor of Cilicia (in AD 157).

¹⁵⁹ *IGR* iii 875 = Hagel - Tomaschitz, op. cit. (n. 154) 324 Olba-Diokaisareia 1, a governor of the third century. (I do not think that [τὸν ἡγε]μόνα is the correct restoration in *IGR* iii 850 = Hagel - Tomaschitz 326 no. 10.)

¹⁶⁰ *IGR* iii 874, a senator of the third century, either *PIR*² A 1059 or P 536. Cf. below n. 227.

¹⁶¹ *IGR* iii 978, a Neronian proconsul.

Creta-Cyrenae: Gortyn; Hierapytna.¹⁶²

There is, of course, a lot of variation in the numbers of inscriptions attested in these cities, at least as represented by the material that has been transmitted to us (cf. above n. 66). Both Athens and Ephesus have produced around 80 inscriptions each, whereas in many of the cities listed above, only one inscription relevant here has been preserved, this meaning that one can easily expect new epigraphical finds to add new cities to the list. Certainly there are cities absent in the above list in which one would expect to find monuments of the kind studied here. One city which comes to one's mind is Cyzicus, an important city with a large territory. Although this is a city with a significant number of inscriptions of the Roman period (many of which are, it is true, hard to come by, as a complete corpus does not yet exist), inscriptions honouring Roman senators have (as far as I can see) not yet turned up there, something which can hardly reflect the situation in antiquity.

We have already encountered instances of cities setting up honorific monuments in other cities (cf. above at n. 69 with a reference to an article by F.J. Navarro). Let us now come back to the subject as revealed in the material under scrutiny here. In those cases studied by Navarro, one is dealing with former governors being honoured with monuments after their provincial terms, usually either in their hometowns or in the capital. Let us now have a look at other cities honouring senators in cities within my area. Here we find the following instances:

<u>Site of monument</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Dedicator</u>	<u>Senator being honoured</u>	<u>Inscription</u>	<u>Reason</u>
1. Athens	Hadrian	Tripolis (Phoenicia)	L. Aemilius Iuncus	<i>IG</i> ² ii/iii 4210	native of Tripolis, corr.in Achaia ¹⁶³
2. Thebes	c. 230	Plataeae	L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus	<i>IG</i> vii 2510	governor honoured in regional centre
3. Thebes	c. 230	Thespieae	"	<i>IG</i> vii 2511	"
4. Perinthus	Severus Alex.	Cyzicus	M. Ulp. Senecio Saturninus	<i>IGR</i> i 797 = <i>I. Perinthos</i> 21	Special reason ¹⁶⁴
5. Ephesus	Tiberius?	Myra	M. Lepidus?	<i>I. Ephesos</i> 3902	patron honoured in new office ¹⁶⁵
6. Ephesus	Trajan	Laodicea (Syria)	A. Iulius Quadratus	<i>I. Ephesos</i> 614	governor honoured in his residence?
7. Ephesus	Hadrian	Neapolis Samaria	Q. Pompeius Falco	<i>I. Ephesos</i> 713	governor honoured in new office? ¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² *IGR* i 1018 = *I. Cret.* iii 3, 21. For what seems to be the same man's funerary inscription see above at n. 58/59.

¹⁶³ Cf. below n. 209.

¹⁶⁴ Senecio Saturninus was legate of Thracia, but seems to have been settling problems between Thracian and neighbouring Asian cities, as he is described as τὸν τῆς ὁμονοίας τῶν πόλεων προστάτην.

¹⁶⁵ C. Eilers, *Tyche* 10 (1995) 9-12 suggests, with some plausibility, that the honorand may be M. Lepidus cos. AD 6 and proconsul of Asia for three years in the late 20s. His long stay in Asia, and the fact that at the time Lycia was not yet part of the Roman empire, would explain him being honoured in Ephesus. Eilers does not offer any opinion on the question of when Lepidus (or one of his ancestors) became patron of this Lycian city; however, Oenoanda certainly had a Roman senatorial patron in c. 100 BC (*SEG* xlv 1816; Eilers p. 9).

¹⁶⁶ The editors of the *Année épigraphique* say that this monument (which mentions the proconsulate of Asia) must be connected with the very same proconsulate and the resulting presence of Falco in Ephesus; however, Haensch, op. cit. (n. 11) 625 n. 72 assumes that Falco may also have had some possessions in

8. Ephesus	178>	Selge	Cn. Pompeius Hermippus etc.	<i>I. Ephesos</i> 3036	governor honoured in hometown
9. Pergamum	Augustus	Cotiaeum	Sex. Appuleius	<i>I. Pergamon</i> 418	governor honoured in major city
10. Pergamum	Trajan	Gerasa	A. Iulius Quadratus	<i>I. Pergamon</i> 437	governor honoured in hometown
11. Pergamum	Trajan	?	"	<i>I. Pergamon</i> 451	gov. honoured in hometown? ¹⁶⁷
12. Pergamum	Hadrian	Seleucia / Zeugma	C. Iulius Quadratus Bassus	<i>Alt. v. Perg.</i> viii 3, 21	governor honoured in hometown
13. Pergamum	Pius	Patrae	A. Cl. Charax	<i>AE</i> 1961, 320	historian honoured in hometown
14. Didyma	Trajan	Tyrus	A. Iulius Quadratus	<i>I. Didyma</i> 151	governor honoured in cultic centre
[15. Apamea (Phrygia)]	Augustus	3 men from Metropolis	C. Antistius Vetus	<i>CIL</i> iii 12241	governor honoured in regional centre]
16. Xanthus	Vespasian	Phellus	M. Neratius Marcellus	<i>AE</i> 1981, 841	son of gov. hon:d in regional centre
17. Cremna	Severan	Sagalassus	M. Ulpius Italicus	<i>I. Centr. Pisid.</i> 26	patron honoured in hometown
18. Ancyra	III cent.	?	Sempronius Metrophanes	<i>SEG</i> xxvii 845	<i>soter</i> etc. hon:d in hometown ¹⁶⁸
19. Adana	Augustus	Mallus	Valerius [-] ¹⁶⁹	<i>IGR</i> iii 888	patron honoured in regional centre
[20. Adana]	II cent.	the priests of Athena Magarsia	[-]Iulius [Oco-]avianus	<i>IGR</i> iii 889	senator from Magarsus honoured in regional centre

Here, then, we have some examples of the reasons which lead cities to erect monuments honouring senators in some other city (I have added similar cases in which the dedicators are private persons). The most common case is, of course, the wish to honour a governor in his hometown at the point when he is leaving his province, this type of honour being most common also in the western part of the empire. This type is here represented in nos. 8, 10, 11, 12. In no. 13, a senator from Pergamum is honoured in the same city on the basis of his literary activities, in no. 17 a patron of another city, in no. 18 a *soter* etc. is honoured in his hometown. As for former governors, one sees that they could also be honoured by statues in other places (outside the province, that is): in no. 14 we find Iulius

Ephesus. It is true that it would certainly be striking if the city of Neapolis in Judaea had decided to set up a monument in honour of a former governor no less than about fifteen years later in a city in which Falco resided for only one year as proconsul of Asia, and perhaps one must conclude that Falco had more connections to Ephesus than just the one-year proconsulate. This does not of course rule out the assumption, in my view unavoidable, that the monument dates from the proconsular year. The career of Falco is formulated in such an irregular and loose way (cf. below at n. 248) that this could point to it belonging to the private sphere. On the other hand, in the Greek East a loose formulation of the career is not unparalleled and the fact that the monument was found built into the walls of the Scholasticia Baths, and thus probably originates from somewhere nearby, seems to mean that it is a public one.

¹⁶⁷ From the mention of ambassadors at the end of the inscription, one sees that the monument was set up by some other city. I am not quite sure whether there are absolutely compelling reasons for dating this inscription after the second consulate and the proconsulate of Asia, and would rather think that this could be another monument set up by a city in Syria after Quadratus' tenure in Syria.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. H. Halfmann, in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* ii (1982) 645. The dedicating city must have been mentioned in the beginning of the text.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. above n. 153.

Quadratus being honoured in the oracular centre at Didyma,¹⁷⁰ in no. 6 in Ephesus; perhaps one could conclude from this that Quadratus had a residence in the capital of the province of Asia.¹⁷¹ Then there are honorific monuments erected for senators of various merit when taking up a new appointment. In no. 1, we find a native of Tripolis, now corrector in Achaia, honoured by the same city on the Acropolis at Athens; in no. 5 a Lycian city honours a patron, now proconsul of Asia, in Ephesus; in no. 7, a city in Judaea set up a monument in honour of a former legate about fifteen years later in Ephesus, when the man was proconsul of Asia (but probably had some other connections, too, with Ephesus, cf. n. 166).

But it also clearly emerges that minor cities could choose to set up a monument honouring a governor in some other city of the same province, a regional centre of sorts no doubt conceived of as being a more suitable location for an honour of this type. Thus in the 230s the people of Plataeae and Thespieae clearly thought that a monument located in Thebes, not in their hometown, would be what was needed.¹⁷² This is interesting information on the status of Thebes in the third century; it is also useful to know that Adana, between Augustus and the second century, was regarded by people from other Cilician cities as a suitable place for honorific monuments. On the other hand, it is no great surprise that people from the rather insignificant city of Metropolis in Phrygia chose to set up a monument in nearby Apamea, an important city,¹⁷³ and about the same can be said of the people of Cotiaeum in Phrygia, an out-of-the-way place, setting up a monument in Pergamum (no. 9) and of the people of Phellus doing so in Xanthus (no. 16).¹⁷⁴

IV. The Chronological Distribution of Monuments in Honour of Senators

The chronological distribution of monuments in honour of senators, and of epigraphical monuments in general, in different areas and cities depends on various factors of which most important are no doubt the prosperity, the importance, and the role in Roman administration of the place in the period with which we are concerned. But there are also other factors; there is the "epigraphic habit" which may differ from town to town and from province to province,¹⁷⁵ this habit also depending on the possible presence or absence of people prone to set up honorific inscriptions - say, local men with connections to the imperial administration. The appearance of senators of Eastern origin, in need of honorific monuments, later affects the numbers and the chronology of honorific inscriptions, this depending on the date of appearance of these senators. Furthermore, one should not

¹⁷⁰ For some thoughts on why exactly the Tyrians chose Didyma see A. Rehm, in *I. Didyma* p. 135.

¹⁷¹ The inscription *I. Ephesos* 614 was not found *in situ*, and no measures are available. It is thus not possible to infer the original character of the monument. - Cf. below n. 206.

¹⁷² The latest honorific inscription from Thespieae itself is from the time of Commodus (*IG* VII 1866), the honorand here being himself from Thespieae. There are no honorific monuments from Plataeae after *IG* vii 1676 from the time of Nero.

¹⁷³ Cf. A.H.M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937) 69f.

¹⁷⁴ It is certainly just by chance that there is no example of a small city in Asia setting up a monument in honour of a governor in Ephesus. (For such a case in Moesia inferior see n. 70.)

¹⁷⁵ Note that no Syrian inscription honouring a governor before the tenure of A. Iulius Quadratus in 100-104 is mentioned in E. Dabrowa, *The Governors of Roman Syria from Augustus to Septimius Severus* (1998; on Quadratus see p. 79-81). (Note, however, *IGR* iii 1209 = 1540 cf. *SEG* xl 1395, with *PIR*² P 837; *IGLS* vi 2779, no doubt an earlyish text.)

expect much early material from areas such as Lycia which became part of the Roman Empire only after Augustus. Finally, the influence and authority of certain individuals may affect the distribution and the chronology of inscriptions. I am here thinking of persons such as Herodes Atticus and A. Iulius Quadratus; in the case of Herodes Atticus his unquestionable merits will have motivated the numbers of honorific inscriptions, but in the case of Iulius Quadratus, honoured so often in Pergamum but also in other places, one suspects that he must himself have had something to do - perhaps by giving a discreet hint or two - with the monuments. A different kind of person altogether is L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, a familiar figure in epigraphical circles with an interest in early third-century eastern epigraphy; unlike Herodes Atticus and Iulius Quadratus he is not an eastern man of wealth and influence,¹⁷⁶ but a normal Roman official governing, between AD 218 and the 240s, several eastern provinces, Galatia, Bithynia-Pontus, Achaia (as *corrector*) and Asia (see *PIR*² E 36). In spite of this, he is a most remarkable person inasmuch as he is the honorand of an impressive number of dedications, some of them going to great lengths in praising him.¹⁷⁷ The number of monuments in his honour is so large that it has some effects on the numbers of honorific inscriptions in general. In Thebes and Prusa, only monuments in honour of Lollianus have survived; in Coronea and in Metropolis near Ephesus, of two relevant texts in each case, one is in honour of Lollianus.¹⁷⁸ In Miletus, there are only Augustan inscriptions honouring senators after the Augustan ones until one appears in honour of Lollianus.¹⁷⁹ And the many other inscriptions in his honour from other places play a significant role as a group in the total number of honorific inscriptions from the same period.

This having been said, let us have a look at the impressions one gets on the basis of my material. I would like to define 'early' here as the Augustan period and the first century, and 'late' everything from Trajan till the later third century. Now there are places where the material shows a heavy concentration in the early period; in many cases we are dealing with cities whose importance diminished in imperial times, which we know from other sources; there is, for instance, nothing after the Augustan period from cities such as Chios, Clarus, Cnidus,¹⁸⁰ Cyme, Delos, Halicarnassus, Tenos, Teos, but these are places with very little relevant material. Of sites with four or more honorific inscriptions of the period under discussion, the texts concentrate in the earlier period e.g. on Cos¹⁸¹ and

¹⁷⁶ Cf. above n. 129.

¹⁷⁷ The most recent one to have been published is *AE* 1996, 1480 from Aphrodisias. There do not seem to be inscriptions in Lollianus' honour from his Galatian period.

¹⁷⁸ Thebes: *IG* vii 2510. 2511 (cf. above at n. 172); Prusa: above n. 129. Coronea: *IG* vii 2879 (a statue in honour of Hadrian before he was emperor; cf. A.R. Birley, *ZPE* 116 [1997] 214 with n. 37, 215 n. 53; Id., *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor* [1997] 322 n. 8); *SEG* xxxvi 427 = xli 456 (Lollianus). Metropolis: *I. Ephesos* 3435. 3467 (the latter inscription honouring Lollianus).

¹⁷⁹ *Milet* i 7, 339 no. 268. This is followed by another of about the same period, in honour of the *hypatikos* Iunius Quintianus (*Milet* i 9, 171 no. 344). - At this point, note also e.g. the heavy domination in the honorific epigraphy of Thyatira of the family of M.Cn. Licinius Rufinus (*TAM* v 2, 984-88; *AE* 1997, 1425).

¹⁸⁰ Note that, unlike e.g. in Clarus and in many other places not prominent during the Empire, there does not seem to be relevant material of Republican date in Cnidus (at least there is nothing in Tuchelt).

¹⁸¹ The latest relevant inscription seems to be *AE* 1934, 94 (Calvisius Ruso, proconsul of Asia in the 90s).

Samos.¹⁸² Sites with material extending from Augustus to the third century, but with a concentration in the earlier period are Athens, Thespieae¹⁸³ and Pergamum. According to my calculations, almost 50% of the honorific inscriptions in Athens are from, or are at commonly dated to, the time of Augustus; in Pergamum, if one leaves out the monuments in honour of Iulius Quadratus mostly from the time of Trajan, one finds that half of the monuments are, or are least said to be, Augustan.

On the other hand, there are places where one finds only inscriptions of the later period; to this group belong cities such as Perinthus, Philippi, Thessalonica (nothing before Commodus),¹⁸⁴ Tralles (nothing before the Severans), and to mention cities with only two or three relevant inscriptions each, Argos, Sparta, Tegea, Thebes, Philippopolis, Rhodes, Laodicea ad Lycum, Amastris, Cremna. Then there are cities in which there are also early texts, but where the accent is clearly on the later period; this is the case with e.g., Corinth, Megara, Ephesus,¹⁸⁵ Aphrodisias,¹⁸⁶ Ancyra, and, in fact, with the cities in the province of Bithynia-Pontus in general.

But then one also finds cities in which there seems to be a concentration of inscriptions in honour of Roman senators in a kind of a 'middle' period between the late Julio-Claudians and the Antonines. This seems to be the case with many cities in Lycia-Pamphylia, where one must, of course, observe that Lycia was not part of the Roman Empire before AD 43. (A concentration in the earlier part of the second century can also be observed in parts of Cilicia, although it is true that here the number of relevant texts is much smaller.¹⁸⁷) In many cases, when we have honorific inscriptions later than the Antonine period, they tend to be inscriptions in honour of local senators, not of governors. In Lydae, the six relevant texts are all between the 60s and the middle of the second century;¹⁸⁸ in Tlos, there are more than ten inscriptions from the period between the 50s and Trajan, but otherwise only one text, in honour of a governor, from the 240s (*ILS* 8840

¹⁸² The fairly numerous honorific inscriptions, mostly from the time of Augustus and Tiberius, seem to end with *IG* xii 6, 1, 384 (probably Trajanic), cf. 381 in honour of the son of Valerius Asiaticus, proconsul of Asia in c. 108.

¹⁸³ In addition to the early texts (*AE* 1928, 44. 45. 46. 47; *IG* vii 1852 = *BCH* 50 [1926] 440 no. 76), of which the one in honour of the proconsul Q. Vaternius Pollio may be from the 60s or 70s, there is the monument in honour of a local senator, *IG* VII 1866, from the time of Commodus. For the city of Thespieae setting up a monument in Thebes in the third century, see above at n. 172.

¹⁸⁴ The epigraphic material of Thessalonica in general shows a heavy concentration in the second and third centuries.

¹⁸⁵ About 80% of the Ephesian honorific inscriptions are from the time of Trajan or later (about 30% apparently being Severan or later). The share of the Augustan inscriptions seems to be about 10%. The percentages change if one studies only the honorific inscriptions which set out the whole career, for about 70% of these are from the period between Trajan and Commodus.

¹⁸⁶ In addition to three Augustan inscriptions (*AE* 1984, 879, 880a, 880b) there is an impressive series of later dedications starting around the time of Commodus (this seems to be the date of *CIG* 2783 and *MAMA* viii 517 cf. J Reynolds, in: P. Scherrer & al. [eds.], *Steine und Wege. Festschrift D. Knibbe* [1999] 330f.).

¹⁸⁷ Governors between Trajan and Pius (and no one else) are honoured at least in the following Cilician cities: Cestrus, Claudiopolis, Iotape, Nephelium, Palaea Isaura (see above n. 153ff.).

¹⁸⁸ For the inscriptions see *TAM* ii 131ff.; *Opusc. Ath.* 9 (1969) 76. The earliest is *TAM* II 131 in honour of the legate Sex. Marcius Priscus, the latest *TAM* ii 136 in honour of C. Iulius Maximianus Diophantus, a senator of local origin from about the middle of the second century (cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 201 no. 137).

= TAM ii 572);¹⁸⁹ Then there are a number of Lycian cities with only one or two monuments each, but only from this period, e.g. Cadyanda, Cyaneae, Myra, Oenoanda, Phaselis. Most of the more than ten inscriptions of Xanthus are from this period (and, in addition to this, there are also many texts from this period in honour of members of the governors' families), but there are also some Severan inscriptions,¹⁹⁰ set up, however, in honour of local senators. In Patara, one finds governors, partly with their family members, being honoured in the time of Hadrian and Pius,¹⁹¹ and then a governor who seems to be of local, or at least Lycian, origin in about the time of Severus.¹⁹² It is true, however, that there are also cities in which one finds nothing before the Severans, although one must note that in these late cases we are always dealing with inscriptions in honour of local senators. This is the situation e.g. in Sidyma¹⁹³ and, to move from Lycia to other parts of the province, Sagalassus and Selge.¹⁹⁴ In the larger Pamphylian cities, on the other hand, the inscriptions relevant here tend to extend from the Flavians to the third century; this seems to be the case in Attaleia, Perge and Side.¹⁹⁵ To round off this section, let me enumerate some sites in which the relevant material seems to be fairly evenly distributed between the early empire and the third century; to this category belong cities such as Delphi, Epidaurus, Olympia (note that these are not quite "normal" cities), and in Asia Minor e.g. Smyrna and Pisidian Antioch (the inscriptions here starting in the middle of the first century).

One sees, then, that certain differences in the chronological distribution of honorific inscriptions in my material can be observed. In most cases, the existence of inscriptions in honour of senators in certain cities at certain times seems to fit the picture which one gets from other source types. One thus observes cities flourishing in the Hellenistic period of the type of Cos and Samos giving way in importance in the Roman to cities such as Perinthus, Thessalonica and Aphrodisias, and the difference in the share

¹⁸⁹ The inscriptions in honour of governors' sons and wives are also from the same period (TAM ii 568. 570. 594).

¹⁹⁰ TAM ii 279f.; AE 1993, 1550b.

¹⁹¹ TAM ii 421 (for the Hadrianic date cf. Thomasson, op. cit. [n. 11] 280 no. 25; R. Syme, *Roman Papers* vi (1991) 352; vii (1991) 594 n. 43); ILS 8835 = IGR iii 667 = TAM ii 426 (a senator of local origin).

¹⁹² S. Sahin, *EA* 31 (1999) 50f. no. 17. For the origin of this senator, implied by items of his nomenclature, see Sahin, p. 51.

¹⁹³ IGR iii 581 = TAM ii 194, cf. *SEG* xli 1392.

¹⁹⁴ Sagalassus: IGR iii 356, 357 (for an Augustan legate of Galatia being honoured in Sagalassus see above at n. 34); Selge: AE 1990, 981 = *I. Selge* no. 12 (proconsul of Lycia-Pamphylia originating from Selge; for the city of Selge setting up a monument in Ephesus see above n. 139).

¹⁹⁵ In Attaleia, where the series begins with an Augustan text in honour of the legate of Galatia, M. Plautius Silvanus (AE 1974, 634 = Tüchelt p. 139), the latest inscription is clearly IGR iii 776 = *SEG* xvii 572 = AE 1960, 314 in honour of the proconsul P. Aelius Bruttus Lucianus (because the item *P. Aelius* no doubt about Severan or later). In Perge, where the inscription honouring senators appear later, the material also extends to the third century, as there are unpublished inscriptions (cf. above n. 65) which do not appear in the first volume of *I. Perge*, covering the pre-Severan period. Cf. also *I. Perge* 157, honouring the wife of the governor Fl. Severinus, an inscription which is (I think) not correctly dated by Sahin, but must belong to the third century (thus also W. Eck, *Chiron* 30 [2000] 645 n. 17). As for Side, the inscription honouring a *logistes* and *epanorthotes* (Nollé, *Side* 66) and another one presenting the traces of a fragmentary cursus (ibid. 69 = AE 1993, 1553) clearly belong to the third century.

of Augustan inscriptions between Pergamum and Ephesus illustrates well the evolution of the status of these two cities, respectively. With the Augustan inscriptions, one is, of course, on somewhat problematic ground, as the numbers of Augustan inscriptions are not altogether comparable to the numbers of later inscriptions. This comes from the fact that, epigraphically, the Augustan period forms a continuation of the Republic, Roman senators still retaining much of the authority - this resulting e.g. in the exercise of useful acts of patronage - they commanded during the Republic, this again motivating the erection of monuments, some of which might have been left undone in later times. The personal authority and influence of the *princeps* developed only gradually during the reign of Augustus, but fairly early the emperor eclipsed everyone else as a potential source of *beneficia*. This no doubt had some effect on the numbers of monuments honouring senators. This is especially obvious in Athens. As we have seen, about half of all monuments honouring senators are from the time of Augustus, which is a share which is clearly in no relation to Athens' importance in later times and to the numbers of Roman senators actually having a connection to Athens. It is also notable that, among the honorands, there are so many men with no official business there, proconsuls of Asia on their way to that province, etc. The explanation is that clearly in the time of Augustus it was still regarded as most important to attract the attention, by the erection of honorific monuments, of as many senators (and of course other influential Romans) as possible, and that connections of a concrete nature - such as someone being or having been governor - did not play the role they did later. After Augustus, the number of inscriptions honouring senators drops very visibly, the emperor now taking over most of the roles played by senators in earlier times. The Augustan dedications thus in fact belonging to a somewhat different category than the later ones, this being especially clear in Athens but also in other places, one should, when dealing with imperial inscriptions honouring senators, perhaps concentrate on the period beginning only with the Julio-Claudians. In any case, it is certainly true that the existence, and numbers, of the early texts do not necessarily illustrate the same phenomena as a corresponding number of (say) Severan inscriptions at a certain site.

V. Reasons for setting up monuments in honour of senators

What led a public body such as a city or a private individual to set up a monument in honour of a senator? (The dedicators of the same monuments will be studied in the next section.) It is, of course, well known (and has already been touched upon in this article) that provincial officials such as governors were a frequent target of those aiming to set up honorific monuments; another large group of honorands were senators honoured in their hometowns either as local benefactors or on the basis of other merits - e.g. (as we have seen above) as former governors of provinces. However, it is clear that there must have been a great variety of reasons to set up a monument in honour of a senator, and we shall have a look at various possibilities as they can be studied on the basis of the material under scrutiny here.

Let us have a look at a table meant to illustrate the distribution of honorific inscriptions by the honorand, the dedicator, and the reason for the dedication. In my material, there are altogether 405 inscriptions which were erected at a certain place either (a) because the honorand held an office in the province (or in the case of *curatores*, etc. in the city) where the dedication was set up; or (b) because the honorand was a citizen of the city where the dedication was set up; or (c) for a certain, identifiable reason (cf. below). (The inscriptions set up without an easy explanation are also interesting, but I shall come back to them later.) I have divided the inscriptions into those with a *cursus* and those just giving the name and the title. There are 128 *cursus* inscriptions and 290 other inscriptions which can be considered here (e.g. because of the fact that they are not too fragmentary). These numbers do not include Athenian dedications, for the Athenian honorific epigraphy (with e.g. its numerous obscure honorands) has a character completely of its own, this

resulting in the observation that a comparison of this material with the rest does not seem really useful in this connection. In any case, what we find can be tabulated as follows:

I Inscriptions honouring provincial officials

Dedicator	Cursus total	Earliest inscription	No cursus total	Earliest inscription
a. Private person	17	42/3	41	Augustus
b. Soldier	3	ca. 161	6	Domitian
c. Individual & City ¹⁹⁶	1	II cent.	10	Augustus
d. City ¹⁹⁷	19	Augustus	124	Augustus
e. No dedicator ¹⁹⁸	4	Trajan	9	Domitian
f. Larger body ¹⁹⁹	-	-	7	Augustus
g. Dedicator uncertain	19		16	
	63 48.8%		213 73.4%	

II Inscriptions honouring senators originating in the city with the dedication

Dedicator	Cursus total	Earliest inscription	No cursus total	Earliest inscription
a. Private person	17	Domitian	19	Trajan
b. Soldier	-	-	-	-
c. Individual & City	3	mid-II cent.	7	Hadrian
d. City ²⁰⁰	23	Vespasian	17	Trajan
e. No dedicator	2	Titus	5	Hadrian
f. Larger body	-	-	-	-
g. Dedicator uncertain	5	-	2	-
	50 38.8%		50 17.2%	

III Inscriptions set up for a special reason

Dedicator	Cursus total	Earliest inscription	No cursus total	Earliest inscription
a. Private person	3		6	
d. City	9		17	

¹⁹⁶ With this I mean types such as ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ συνπολιτευόμενοι Ῥωμαῖοι (AE 1974, 634 = Tuchelt p. 139; Attaleia) or ὁ γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου ... καθὼς ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐψηφίσαντο (AE 1971, 456 = I. Ephesos 619A).

¹⁹⁷ This category, of course, includes inscriptions set up by various bodies operating within, or representing, the city (the *boule* and the *demos*, the *gerousia*, etc.).

¹⁹⁸ In most cases the dedicator was probably the city in which the inscription was found (cf. Haensch, op. cit. [n. 11] 595 n. 88).

¹⁹⁹ E.g. οἱ Ἀχαιοί (IG iv 1² 665 cf. W Peek, *Inschriften aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros* [1969] no. 289) or τὸ κοινὸν Θεσσαλῶν (Arch. Delt. 10 [1926] Parart. 51 no. 2).

²⁰⁰ A 'city' here can mean both the home city of a senator or another city setting up a monument in the honorand's *patria*.

e. No dedicator	3		4	
g. Dedicator uncertain	1		1	
	16	12.4%	27	9.3%
Total	129	100%	291	100%
			420	

Looking at these numbers, one observes some interesting things. It is, of course, no surprise to find that inscriptions set up in honour of senators in their hometowns start only in the Flavian period, as it is only in this time when one starts to find eastern senators in larger numbers. Instead, it is interesting to note (although even this is probably not a very big surprise) that the share of cursus inscriptions is much larger among the inscriptions honouring senators in their hometowns than among the inscriptions set up in honour of provincial officials. Furthermore, in most cases here - in group II - the earliest cursus inscriptions are earlier than the non-cursus inscriptions set up by the same categories of dedicators. The earliest cursus inscription in this group set up by a private individual is from the time of Domitian, the corresponding earliest non-cursus inscription is from the time of Trajan;²⁰¹ the earliest cursus inscription set up by a city is from the time of Vespasian, whereas the earliest corresponding non-cursus one is from the time of Trajan.²⁰² On the other hand, in group I, inscriptions honouring provincial officials, one observes the tendency of private dedicators apparently to be more likely to set out the whole career of the honorands: 17 of a total of 62 cursus inscriptions, i.e. 27%, were set up by individuals, whereas among the 213 non-cursus inscriptions 41, i.e. 19%, were set up by individual dedicators. The difference is not very large, but perhaps one might interpret this as indicating private dedicators being more concerned with including all relevant information regarding the honorands in their dedications.

But it is true that whatever one observes on the basis of the numbers above is bound to be fairly uncertain, as the bare numbers do not take into account factors such as differing habits in different places and at different times. So one should perhaps refrain from making too many deductions on the basis of the table. Instead, let us move to the group of dedications made for special reasons and then turn to an overview of the cases where there is no obvious reason for the setting up of the monuments.

As for the "special" cases, I have classified under this group all those dedications which do not come under group I (provincial officials) or II (senators honoured in their hometowns), but for the erection of which an explanation of sorts can be put forward without much trouble. First of all, during the earliest empire we still often find senators, normally representatives of Republican noble families, honoured as patrons, this relationship not necessarily being connected with a provincial office of the honorand;²⁰³

²⁰¹ Cursus from the time of Domitian: *ILS* 9485 (from Pisidian Antioch, that is from a colony, where special circumstances obtain); non-cursus from the time of Trajan: *IGR* iv 386 (A. Iulius Quadratus, Pergamum). The next ones are from the time of Pius (*IGR* iv 424, 425 [*OGI* 491], also from Pergamum).

²⁰² Cursus from the time of Vespasian and Titus: *ILS* 8817 = *OGI* 482 = *IGR* iv 644 = *MAMA* vi 262 (Acmonia); non-cursus from the time of Trajan: *IGR* iv 387.

²⁰³ E.g. *AE* 1985, 771 (Buthrotum, L. Domitius Ahenobarbus cos. 16 BC); *I. Ephesos* 3902, a patron of Myra (in Lycia, at this time not part of the Roman empire) honoured when proconsul of Asia; cf. above n. 165). *Milet* I 2, 116 no. 12b = Tuchelt p. 190 (L. Domitius Ahenobarbus cos. 16 BC; note also *Milet* I 9, 161f. no. 333 = Tuchelt p. 191); *I. Pergamon* 425 = *IGR* iv 410 = Tuchelt p. 230; *IGR* iv 411 = Tuchelt p. 231 (Augustan Pisones). Perhaps the striking, bilingual monument honouring a young Arruntius from Prymnessus (*ILS* 976 = *CIL* iii 7043 = *IGR* iv 675; cf. above n. 67, 77) could also belong here. For patrons of Greek cities (up to the time of Augustus) see J.-L. Ferrary, in: M. Christol & O. Masson (eds.), *Actes de Xe congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine* (1992), Paris 1997, 219-224.

then there are intellectuals of senatorial rank being honoured because of their status as intellectuals.²⁰⁴ Furthermore, there is a group of senators with possessions and influence outside their hometowns, whom one observes being honoured in various cities and sites belonging to a larger area; this group is well represented by Herodes Atticus and members of his family,²⁰⁵ but there are many other instances.²⁰⁶ Some senators earned a monument by doing a special favour for a city; thus an Augustan proconsul of Cyprus is honoured in the temple of Asclepius in Cos because he had taken care of the interests of Cos regarding a *ἱερὰ καὶ δαμοσία ἀμῶν ἐν Κύπρῳ χώρα* (AE 1934, 86).²⁰⁷ In the

²⁰⁴ Thus one finds Arrian honoured as a 'philosopher': AE 1971, 437 (Athens, now in the epigraphical museum; here also designated as *hypatikos*); Corinth viii 3, 124 = AE 1968, 473 (here also designated as legate of Cappadocia; note furthermore that Arrian was also honoured - without any titles - in his hometown Nicomedia [TAM iv 1, 41] and apparently - as *anthypatos philosophos* - in an unpublished inscription from Byblos, cf. J.-P. Rey-Coquais, JRS 68 [1978] 65 n. 288); the city of Patrae set up a monument of the consular historian Claudius Charax in his hometown Pergamum (AE 1961, 320); in Olympia, the consular *rhetor* Claudius Aristocles of Pergamum (on whom see Philostratus, VS 2, 3; Halfmann, *Senatoren* 193 no. 121) was honoured by a monument mentioning no dedicator (*I. Olympia* 462). These dedications, of course, illustrate the genre of monuments honouring intellectuals rather than a category consisting of "senatorial" inscriptions.

²⁰⁵ E.g. Corinth viii 2, 58 (AE 1977, 774 will probably have been identical) and AE 1986, 632 (Olympia), in honour of Herodes Atticus' father; IG vii 88 (Megara); *I. Olympia* 454 (Herodes Atticus); *I. Olympia* 619, 620 (relatives). As for Herodes Atticus himself, note also the Latin inscription of unknown origin now in Stockholm, published at last by B.E. Thomasson, *A Survey of Greek and Latin Inscriptions on Stone in Swedish Collections* (1997) no. 165 and by F. Grelle, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Ἐπιγραφαί. Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini I* (2000) 455-62; I should say that this looks like another inscription from Corinth (Grelle p. 458 also considers Corinth). One could go on with this list, although it is true that many of these inscriptions do not make a reference to the senatorial status of the honorand.

²⁰⁶ Thus M. Plancius Varus of Perge is honoured in c. AD 70 in Attaleia by the *demos* of Attaleia (EA 28 [1997] 150 = AE 1997, 1505) and by a 'friend' (SEG vi 650 = AE 1973, 539), and in Germa by (probably) a municipal notable (AE 1971, 463 = 1973, 534); A. Iulius Quadratus is honoured not only in his hometown Pergamum but also in Didyma (cf. above at n. 170) and Ephesus, where he may well have had a residence (cf. above at n. 171; *I. Ephesos* 614, 3033); L. Catilius Severus, cos. in 110 and 120, a man with a Bithynian background, perhaps from Apamea (Halfmann, *Senatoren* 133ff. no. 38), is honoured by two inscriptions mentioning no dedicators at a site outside Nicaea (*Musum Iznik* ii 1204, 1205; for the exact spot see S. Sahin, *ibid.* p. 283b), perhaps in a villa he owned here (cf. n. 212); at about the same time, the Spartan senator C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus from Sparta is honoured in Gythium (IG v 1, 1172); in the time of Pius, the senator from Nysa, Sex. Iulius Maior Antoninus Pythodorus, is honoured by the city of Pergamum because of his *eusebeia* towards "the God" (i.e. Asclepius) and his *eunoia* for the city; a senator from Messene in the time of Marcus, Ti. Claudius Frontinus Niceratus, whose influence and interests no doubt extended over the whole of the Peloponnese, is honoured both at Sparta (IG v 1, 533) and at Argos (IG iv 588; note that these two texts are almost identical); at about the same time, one finds an inscription from Epidaurus (IG iv 1² 682) in honour of the *synkletikos* and *euergetes* Veturius Paccianus, a man probably from Corinth (Halfmann, *Senatoren* 192 no. 118). The about Severan senator from Rhodes, Ti. Claudius [Aqui?]la Theopropos (cf. Halfmann in *Tituli* 2 p. 625), is honoured as *hypatikos* by a private person on the small island of Chalce just off the N. coast of Rhodes (IG xii 1, 959 = IGR iv 1112). Furthermore, the monument (AE 1953, 51 = SEG xii 265) that Flavia Amphiclia set up in Delphi *ψηφίσματι Ἀμφικτ[υόνων]* in honour of her husband T. Flavius Philinus from Thespieae most probably also belongs under this heading.

²⁰⁷ A somewhat similar case is that of the suffect consuls of AD 23, C. Asinius Pollio and C. Stertinius Maximus being honoured in the Heraeum on Samos (IGR iv 1724a.b = IG xii 6, 1, 367 i. ii), for it was in their consulate that the senate confirmed the asylum rights for the temple of Iuno on Samos (Tac. *ann.* 4.14).

time of Marcus Aurelius, various relatives of the emperor were thought of as needing to be honoured by monuments;²⁰⁸ finally, there are various other dedications which can be classified as having been set up for special reasons.²⁰⁹

But there is still a fairly large number of honorific monuments which seem difficult to explain. It is true that in some cases in which a senator is honoured by a former subordinate in a certain city, it seems possible to assume that this happened not because the senator himself had something to do with the city, but because it was the home of the dedicator; this has been suggested e.g. in the cases of Rutilius Gallicus being honoured in Ephesus and Pompeius Falco being honoured in Hierapolis Castabala,²¹⁰ and this makes

²⁰⁸ In Argos, M. Vettulenus Civica Barbarus cos. 157 was honoured after the year 169 as ἀδελφὸς Ἀ. Καίσαρος, θεῖος Σεβαστῶν (AE 1958, 15, the senatorial career also being added), and in Athens as ὑπάτος by Herodes Atticus who calls himself Ἡρώδης Ἀττικοῦ Μαραθῶνιος and a friend of the honorand (SEG xvi 166 cf. xvii 76, a statue base from the Agora); Cn. Claudius Severus (later cos. II in 173), a son-in-law of Marcus, is honoured in Ephesus as 'the father of Ummidius Quadratus' and as κηδεστής τῶν θειοτ[άτων αὐτο]κρατ[όρων] (I. Ephesos 1539); in Athens, the same Severus is honoured by Herodes Atticus in an inscription in which the nominative, not the accusative is used as δις ὑπάτος, [κηδεστής of Marcus (above n. 20); M. Peducaeus Plautius Quintillus cos. 172 is honoured in Ephesus by a private person as Marcus' son-in-law and Verus' sister's son (I. Ephesos 704, no senatorial offices being mentioned; cf. above n. 42).

²⁰⁹ Thus we have young senators accompanying the emperor (ILS 8812 = IG xii 5, 940 = OGI 463, Tenos; IGR iv 418 = I. Pergamon 424 = OGI 464 and IGR iv 419, from Pergamum, all set up in honour of the young senator P. Quinctilius Varus, who was accompanying Augustus on his eastern tour in 21/20 BC; he was also honoured in Athens, IG ii/iii² 4124); we have a senator expelled by Nero being honoured, together with his wife, in his exile in Palaeopolis on Andros (IG xii 5, 757; cf. n. 35); we have the senator P. Aelius Hadrianus honoured in Athens as archon (CIL iii 550 = ILS 308) and in Coronea without any title (IG vii 2879; cf. above n. 178), the monument no doubt being from the same period and indicating that Hadrian's interests were not limited to Athens; in Ephesus, we find a young senator, only a *monetalis*, being honoured by a lictor, the explanation perhaps being that we have here a grand-nephew of Hadrian coming to Ephesus to meet his great-uncle on his way back from the Jewish war (I. Ephesos 734, cf. E. Champlin, ZPE 21 [1976] 88f.; R. Syme, *Roman Papers* iii [1984] 1168; cf. A.R. Birley, *Hadrian. The Restless Emperor* [1997] 309); we have the Hadrianic senator from Tripolis in Syria, Aemilius Iuncus, being honoured as *poleites* and *euergetes* by his hometown on the Acropolis in Athens, the dedication being done according to a *psephisma* of the *demoi* and two councils of Athens and coinciding with the office of *corrector* in Achaia of the honorand (IG ii/iii² 4210 = OGI 587; cf. on Iuncus in Achaia now J.-L. Ferrary and D. Rousset, BCH 122 [1998] 292ff.). Moreover, if A. Vibius Habitus (cos. AD 8), the brother of the proconsul of Asia, C. Vibius Postumus (cos. AD 5), is honoured in Teos, at the time no doubt being of consular status, he cannot be being honoured simply as a brother accompanying the proconsul (IGR iv 1564 = Tuchelt p. 245); finally, if a quaestor of Macedonia and *curator* of Philippi was honoured in the time of Marcus by a local notable as his *amicus* in Philippi (AE 1934, 55), a *kratistos tamias* (also of Macedonia) by a private man as his *philos* in Thessalonica in the middle of the third century (IG x 2, 1, 149), one suspects that the two young honorands may have had more intensive connections with the towns where they were honoured than just those arising from the fact that they were provincial quaestors (in fact, in the case of the man honoured in Philippi it has been suggested that he came from Philippi, cf. PIR² M 669 and AE 1996, 1374f.). - The honorific inscriptions of Athens, left out here because of their very special nature, would provide much illustration of the variety of "special" reasons for a senator appearing as an honorand of an honorific monument.

²¹⁰ Rutilius Gallicus: ILS 9499 = I. Ephesos 715 (cf. W. Eck, in Id. [ed.], *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte* [1993] 373 n. 19); Pompeius Falco: ILS 1036 = CIL iii 12117 (cf. PIR² L 5; for the name *Laberius* - that of the dedicators - in a recently published inscription from Cilicia see K. Tomaschitz, *Unpublizierte Inschriften aus dem Nachlass T.B. Mitfords* [1998] 12 no. 5). Perhaps one could think of this explanation also in the case of the monuments set up in honour T. Clodius Aurelius Saturninus in Ephesus (I. Ephesos 657. 817), an explanation which one could connect with a lengthy stay of the honorand in Ephesus, no doubt in connection with Severus Alexander's eastern campaign in

one think of cases in which local men set up monuments in honour of 'friends'.²¹¹ In these cases, one could assume that the monuments were part of the dedicators' "self-representation", the monuments being meant to point out the dedicators' connections with men of very high social rank. (But of course here, too, the honorands may have had connections with the places where they were honoured totally obscure to us.) Again, in some cases one might think that a senator is honoured at a place where he had property.²¹² Connections of a varying and not necessarily clear nature to us, of course play a large role here. If two Tineii, both the consul of 158 and his son, consul in 182, are honoured in Side (Nollé, *Side* 60f.), this seems to have something to do with the elder Tineius' wife, Volusia Laodice.²¹³ The fact that L. Calpurnius Proculus, a senator from Ancyra in the time of Commodus, is honoured in Pisidian Antioch by the the city of Antioch (*AE* 1926, 77), can perhaps be illuminated by the fact that Proculus' grandson L. Calpurnius Reginianus was also honoured there,²¹⁴ the fact that L. Cossonius Eggus Marullus cos. 184 was honoured as ὑπατικός and ὁ ἑαυτοῦ θρέψας καὶ εὐεργέτης in Ephesus by a certain T. Aelius Aurelius Neo, παράδοξος (*I. Ephesos* 660), by the fact that Marullus' niece was honoured in the same city (*I. Ephesos* 896). If M. Flavius Carminius Athenagoras from Attuda received an honorific monument in Aphrodisias (*CIG* 2783), this has surely something to do with the fact that the family had connections with Aphrodisias appearing also in other sources.²¹⁵ Again, in the case of the jurist M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus from Thyatira, some connections with Macedonia, relevant for the interpretation of the honorific inscription from Thessalonica, *IG* x 2, 1, 142, can be established.²¹⁶ Then there are of course patrons²¹⁷ and various *euergetai* and/or *ktistai*

which the honorand took part as the emperor's *comes* (cf. C. Badel, in *XI. Congresso internazionale di epigrafia Greca e Latina, Roma ... 1997. Atti* [1999] 505).

²¹¹ Thus e.g. in the case of M. Pompeius Macrinus from Mytilene (cos. 115) being honoured ψ(ηρίσμου) β(ουλή)ς by a 'friend' (also called M. Pompeius) in Tegea (*IG* v 2, 151, with *cursus* and *all*).

²¹² Thus there is a monument in honour of L. Fabius Cilo (cos. II 204) found at a place called *Belevi* in the lower Cayster valley about 15 km from Ephesus (*IGR* iv 1674 = *I. Ephesos* 3204; the inscription is broken in the end so that the dedicator cannot be ascertained); in view of the findspot and of the fact that Cilo never held an office in Asia, one might perhaps think of property owned by Cilo here. Pompeius Falco, honoured by a city in Judaea in Ephesus, most probably had a residence of sorts in the area (cf. above n. 166). Again, L. Catilius Severus is the honorand of two monuments from outside Nicaea, the findspot pointing to a country villa owned by Severus (n. 206).

²¹³ Raepsaet-Charlier (*PFOS* no. 837) in fact thinks that she was from Side; Nollé, *op. cit.* 343 assumes that she is from somewhere in the larger area (cf. also *IGR* iii 829 from Syedra in Cilicia).

²¹⁴ *IGR* iii 299 (cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 207); perhaps one could assume that Calpurnius Proculus' wife Domitia Regina (*PFOS* no. 332) came from Antioch.

²¹⁵ Cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 36f.

²¹⁶ See A.B. Tataki, *Ancient Beraea* (1988) 214f. no. 809; P. Hermann, *Tyche* 12 (1997) 112.

²¹⁷ E.g. C. Arrius Calpurnius Frontinus Honoratus, a patron of Pisidian Antioch in the Severan period (*CIL* iii 6810-12; *AE* 1914, 130. Honoratus, a patrician from Cirta with no service in the provinces, had no doubt inherited the patronate; one would like to know from whom exactly. To go back a bit in time, one also wonders how the man honoured in the time of Nero in *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii no. 48 = *AE* 1981, 828 had become patron and *euergete* of Xanthus. The man - *inter alia* military tribune 'in Britain', quaestor 'in Gaul' (i.e. of Gallia Narbonensis), and, at the end, 'legate of Nero Claudius (etc.) in Syria' - never came even close to Lycia during his career. Could this be a local man? Attaleia in Pamphylia produced the first senator in the time of Claudius (Halfmann, *Senatoren* 101 no. 2).

labelled as such in honorific inscriptions, the exact nature of whose operations escapes us.²¹⁸

In the case of these *evergetai*, one is dealing with men from Asia Minor operating in the same area, something which does not seem too surprising. But there are some cases remaining which seem fairly striking and for which even speculation does not seem to provide an explanation of sorts. Let me present here in quick review some instances which seem worthy of mention. First of all, one would like to know exactly why the young senator, adlected to the patriciate before the quaestorship, L. [Ped]anius Se[c]undus Pompeius Festus [M]unatianus, received an honorific monument in Ephesus, set up by the *boule* and the *demos* together with two brothers referring to the honorand as their *evergete* (all the dedicators strikingly being mentioned in the nominative). The inscription (*AE* 1968, 482 = *I. Ephesos* 701) enumerates the whole career up to the office of quaestor of the emperor Vespasian. The origin of the connection with Ephesus must remain uncertain, unless one wishes to adduce the fact that L. Pedanius Secundus cos. 43 (*PIR*² P 202), no doubt a close relative, had been proconsul of Asia in the early 50s.²¹⁹ An interesting case is certainly the Greek inscription in honour of L. Minicius Natalis Quadronius Verus cos. 139 (*PIR*² M 620) from Megara (*IG* VII 89); this inscription, fragmentary in the end so that the dedicator cannot be ascertained - but one assumes that the monument will have been set up by the city itself - sets out the whole career, closely following the renderings in Latin of the man's offices in other inscriptions pertaining to him, the stone in its present state reaching the legateship of Africa.²²⁰ On official business, Natalis never even came close to Greece, although it is true that he is attested as having at least been there, as he won the four-horse chariot race at the Olympics of 129; moreover, it has been suggested that Natalis, a former quaestor of Hadrian, was accompanying the emperor on his visit to Greece in 128-129.²²¹ But the dedication in Megara can hardly be explained by the athletic victory or by the young senator's possible presence in the entourage of the emperor. E. Groag (*RE* xv 1840 under Minicius no. 19) says that Natalis had provided some "benefactions" to the city, and I have nothing to say against that; however, I think that one should rather wonder how, when and in what capacity Natalis got a connection with the city.²²² A rather obscure case seems to me to be an inscribed epistyle (58 x 107 x ?) from Apollonia ad Rhynchadum in Mysia, *CIL* iii 7059a cf. 12243 = *IGR* iv 124, a

²¹⁸ E.g. *I. Ephesos* 3040 (C. Asinius Protimus Quadratus from Sardes); *IGR* iv 717 (the son of the same Quadratus in Blaundus).

²¹⁹ W. Eck, *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian* (1970) 107 n. 84 thinks that this man may after all have been quaestor of Asia (but does not repeat this statement in *RE* Suppl. xiv [1974] 371 no. 11). But why should this have been omitted in the inscription? As for the connection perhaps arising from the elder Pedanius Secundus' proconsulate, this seems fairly dubious to me (Secundus the Younger, whether a son or not, cannot have been more than a few years old during the proconsulate), but one might adduce the parallel of the senator C. Iulius Scapula (*PIR*² I 552) being honoured, in the time of Pius, by a private person on the Acropolis (*IG* ii/iii² 4212, with the cursus), this perhaps having something to do with the fact that his father had been proconsul of Achaia in c. 135 (*PIR*² I 553). Cf. below n. 269.

²²⁰ Note that the transcription of the text in *IG* is defective and has to be corrected on the basis of the majuscule copy.

²²¹ Birley, *op. cit.* (n. 209) 216.

²²² According to Pausanias, Megara, unlike many other cities in Greece, did not gain from the reign of Hadrian and he does not seem too optimistic about its prospects (1. 36. 4, cf. S. Alcock, *Graecia capta* [1993] 160); however, U. Kahrstedt, *Das wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit* [1954] 121-4 is no doubt right in saying that things were not that bad; certainly one is struck by the number of inscriptions of the Roman period there.

monument set up in honour of a young senator of whose name only the cognomen [*Ae*]quus, [*Anti*]quus or [*Propin*]quus²²³ is left on the stone; no other office than that of a *III* *viarum cur[andarum]* seems to be mentioned, and the monument was set up apparently by two clearly young men of senatorial status - the first perhaps a quaestor designate, the other a military tribune - who most surprisingly move on to the use of Greek after having mentioned the honorand and his office. How this man has ended up in Apollonia seems beyond conjecture.²²⁴ Further senators receiving honorific monuments not easily explained could be M. Nummius Albinus honoured by a private person as *hypatikos* in Adada in Pisidia (in the province of Lycia-Pamphylia);²²⁵ C. Sallius Aristaenetus, a Severan senator from Byzantium, also honoured as *hypatikos* (perhaps by the city itself) in Amastris;²²⁶ [---?] Armenius Peregrinus being honoured as *lamprotatos* (also possibly by the city itself) in Soli (Pompeiiopolis) in Cilicia.²²⁷ However, we cannot speculate on these men, as we must move on to the last section of this paper.

VI. Cursus Inscriptions in the East. Some Observations

In this last section I shall briefly discuss some aspects related specifically to cursus inscriptions beginning with a definition or description of cursus inscriptions as contrasted with "normal" honorific inscriptions. Then we shall move on to some features of those cursus inscriptions which one encounters in our area.

In principle, the definition of cursus inscriptions, as contrasted with the rest of honorific inscriptions, is simple: Cursus inscriptions set out the career of the honorand, whereas the other inscriptions normally mention only the highest office. In practice some questions, however, may arise now and then, as cursus inscriptions often do not mention all the offices, and "normal" inscriptions sometimes mention more than just one office. But basically one can say that one can define as cursus inscriptions those which either set out the career or at least try to give a description of some of its stages, whereas one should (I think) define as non-cursus inscriptions those texts which, while mentioning more than one office, refrain from trying to give an enumeration of even a selection of the honorand's offices but rather mention an additional office which defines the main office - for instance the provincial governorship in a text from the same province - by being either (a) an indication of the rank (say, *hypatikos*) of the honorand when being honoured because of a certain office, or (b) a closer definition of the office, or, when a following office is mentioned, (c) an indication of the future activities of the honorand.

²²³ In *PIR*, he is registered under *Propinquus* (*PIR*² P 1012).

²²⁴ C. Cichorius (*AM* 4 [1889] 249) suggests reading [χιλίαρχος] πλατύσημο[ς] λεγ(ε)ωνος ζ' as the office of the second dedicator, and (his name beginning with Γ. Io-) proposes to identify him with C. Iulius Scapula cos. c. 138 (*PIR*² I 553), who was tribune of the *legio VII Gemina*. This may be correct but does not seem to take us very far.

²²⁵ *IGR* iii 363 cf. *SEG* xxxii 1290, quoting J. Nollé, *Nundinas habere et instituere* (1982) 57 n. 125. Nollé assumes that this is the same man who is attested as legate of Asia; but what is he doing as consular in Lycia-Pamphylia?

²²⁶ *ÖJh* 28 [1933] Beiblatt 74 no. 23 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 163 no. 17. For his *patris* see Halfmann in *Tituli* 2 (1982) p. 637.

²²⁷ In *PIR*² A 1059 it is said that this may be L. Armenius Peregrinus, attested as praetor in 213, or this man's son, Ti. Pollenius Armenius Peregrinus, consul in 244. The consul is registered in *PIR*² P 536, but here this inscription is not mentioned as a possible source for the consul's activities.

Let us have a quick look at these variations as they appear in our material.²²⁸ As for the first case, when an honorand is also characterized by an indication of his rank, I would count as belonging to these cases those in which a priesthood is added (these being predominantly Latin inscriptions), most often to the mention of a consulate, but (normally in the case of patrician or noble consuls) also to minor offices; this is, of course, something which one is accustomed to find in the early period,²²⁹ but in our material one finds both early and later instances.²³⁰ In a late second-century text from Side, a reference to the patrician status of the honorand is most strikingly added to the combination.²³¹ Another combination already found in the early period is that of the consulate and the proconsulate of a province held after the consulate, i.e. either Africa or Asia. Here the mention of the consulate is no doubt added to produce a combination of the highest, and the most impressive, offices of the honorand²³² and perhaps also meant to underline the fact that the proconsulate is one requiring consular status. However, instances of this combination are not really very common, because normally a senator of this rank was already in possession of a priesthood which at least in the earlier period was thought worthy of mentioning.²³³ Thus a normal type of giving a summary of the achievements of a proconsul of Asia or Africa was to use a combination consisting of the consulate, the

²²⁸ About the same things could be said of honorific inscriptions from all around the Roman world. Note that I am here talking only about what can be labelled as 'offices'; of course, it is well known that honorands could be described by the use of many more terms (e.g. as patrons, friends, citizens, etc.). Note furthermore that whereas *hypatikos*, although also indicating a certain rank within the senatorial order, can be seen as registering an office, that of a (former) consul, whereas the term *synkletikos* simply denotes a rank within the social structure of the Roman empire, and does not indicate the man so labelled as having held a certain office. I shall thus not consider cases in which this term is combined with an office, especially as this is in fact most uncommon (e.g. συνκλητικὸν, ταμίαν *I. Cret.* iv 292; συνκλητικὸν, τριβούνον *IGR* iii 960 from Palaeopaphus [this man should perhaps be added to the lists of senators from Cyprus]), the term normally being used to describe young senators who have not yet held an office.

²²⁹ E.g. *ILS* 919 (Hadria) *cos., pontif.* (Paullus Fabius Maximus *cos.* 11 BC). Cf. W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 45) 166 n. 166 (= *Id., Tra epigrafi* etc. [n. 16] 281, 283, 297 n. 172).

²³⁰ E.g. *pontif., cos.* *AE* 1985, 771 (Buthrotum, in honour of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus *cos.* 16 BC); ὑπάτων (in the later inscriptions δις ὑπάτων), ποντίφικα *AE* 1939, 26 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 136 no. 3; *IGR* iii 135 = 1447 = *OGI* 546 = *ILS* 8832 = Marek 137 no. 4; Marek 137f. no. 5-7 (Pompeiiopolis, in honour of the local senator Cn. Claudius Severus, *cos.* II in 173); *I. Ephesos* 1539 (ὑπατικὸν, ποντίφικα: the same Claudius Severus). Priesthood combined with minor offices: *ILS* 976 = *CIL* iii 7043 = *IGR* iv 675 (augurate combined with the urban prefecture for the Latin holidays; cf. above n. 203); *I. Ephesos* 734 (a *monetalis* and an *pontifex*; cf. above n. 209).

²³¹ Nollé, *Side* 60 (cf. *ibid.* 61 = *IGR* iii 808) [Κ]όιντον Τινείον Σακέρδωτα ὑπατικὸν, πατρίκιον, ποντίφικα.

²³² Among representatives of this category one can no doubt also count combinations which include a proconsulate of Asia or Africa and the city prefecture (e.g. *I. Ephesos* 3030) or the city prefecture and an iterated consulate (e.g. *I. Ephesos* 3204).

²³³ In *I. Ephesos* 659A (in honour of Cn. Lentulus Augur proconsul in c. 2/1 BC) one reads *cos., [pro]cos.*, but here something may be missing between *Au]guri* and *cos.* From a later period, there are somewhat more instances, e.g. δις ὑπάτων καὶ ἀν[θύπατων Ἀσίας *IGR* iv 386 (and 388), from Pergamum and in honour of A. Iulius Quadratus; *I. Ephesos* 3082 (Severan, consulate and proconsulate of Africa of a senator from Ephesus); *IGR* iii 614 = *TAM* ii 279 (Severan, consulate and proconsulate of Africa of a senator from Xanthus).

proconsulate and the priesthood.²³⁴ In Africa, one also finds many proconsuls equipped with two priesthoods, the definition of the status of the proconsul in these cases consisting of altogether four items;²³⁵ in my material, I have observed only the bilingual inscription from Ephesus honouring L. Nonius Asprenas, proconsul in c. 107/8, where one must supply one priesthood between the augurate and the proconsulate (*I. Ephesos* 3027).²³⁶

But besides proconsuls of Asia and Africa, one of course finds the rank of *consul(aris) / hypat(ik)os* being applied to other consular governors, of which one finds in my material e.g. special legates²³⁷ and (later) *correctores*.²³⁸

As for those cases in which a closer definition is given of an office, by this I mean a reference to an additional mission during the tenure of the main office, an office of this type being represented in my material by curatorships held during a provincial tenure either as governor²³⁹ or as a minor official.²⁴⁰ However, perhaps the most common type, at least if one considers honorific inscriptions in general, is that in which the current and the next office, already known to the dedicators, are mentioned together. The most common case is, of course, that in which a governor of a praetorian province is either designated to the consulate or holds the consulship *in absentia* during the provincial command or in some cases is honoured only after having left the province for Rome. In our material, however, the mention of a designation to the consulate, common in the honorific inscriptions in some provinces,²⁴¹ seems to be rather rare (in cursus inscriptions

²³⁴ In my material one finds at least *cos., [VII]viro epu[lon]um, pro cos.* *CIL* iii 727 = *I. Parion* 13 (L. Volusius Saturninus *cos.* 12 BC); *[VII]viro epu[lon]um, cos., pro cos.* *AE* 1968, 483 = *I. Ephesos* 706 (M. Plautius Silvanus *cos.* 2 BC). In African inscriptions referring to proconsuls this is a common combination, not only on honorific inscriptions but also on those set up by the proconsuls themselves (see e.g. the inscriptions of M. Pompeius Silvanus proconsul in AD 53, *IRT* 338, *CIL* viii 11006).

²³⁵ Cf. e.g. the inscriptions of Q. Marcius Barea procos. 41/3 (*CIL* viii 11002. 19492 = *ILAlg.* ii 550. *AE* 1935, 32. *IRT* 273) or the inscription of C. Pomponius Rufus etc. procos. 113, *ILAlg.* i 1282.

²³⁶ In *I. Ephesos*, the restoration *sodali Augustali* is suggested. In *PIR*² N 133 this question is not referred to. Note also P. Memmius Regulus (legate in Greece in 35-44) being honoured as legate, ex-consul and member of altogether three priesthoods which, however, are not enumerated separately (*IG* iv 1² 667 + 669 cf. Peek, op. cit. [n. 199] no. 290).

²³⁷ P. Memmius Regulus (cf. previous n.): *IG* ii/iii² 4174; *IG* iv 1² 668 (but for instance in *IG* vii 87 Regulus is designated only as 'legate'). For regular governors of various other provinces being designated as consulars and governors see e.g. *IGR* iii 616 = *TAM* ii 277; *IGR* iii 85 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 163 no. 16; *AE* 1991, 1513 = *SEG* lxi 1174.

²³⁸ Thus two *correctores* of Achaia in the earlier third century, Cn. Claudius Leonticus (see the inscriptions from Delphi, Megara and Epidaurus at *SIG*³ 877B.C.D.E) and L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus (*IG* vii 2510; *SEG* xxxvi 427 = xli 456). The inscription in honour of Ti. Claudius Callippianus Italicus, λογιστὴν καὶ ἐπανορθωτὴν τῶν ἐλευθέρων πόλεων in the Severan period (*IG* ii/iii² 4215) adds that he also had the title πρεσβευτὴν καὶ ἀντιστράτηγον τῶν Σεβαστῶν.

²³⁹ *AE* 1949, 265 (Buthrotum, third century); cf. also *Milet* I 9, 171 no. 344 (from the time of Philip).

²⁴⁰ *AE* 1934, 55 (Philippi); *BCH* 47 (1923) 87f. no. 6 (likewise); *I. Ephesos* 696.

²⁴¹ Especially in the case of legates of the legio III Augusta in Africa from about the time of Marcus onwards (B.E. Thomasson, *Fasti Africani* [1996] 154ff.) and in Arabia (e.g. *IGLS* 9064. 9065. 9069. 9079; *IGLS* xxi 4, 46; *Gerasa* 433 no. 165; M. Sartre, in: G. Paci (ed.), 'Επιγραφαί. *Miscellanea epigrafica in onore di Lidio Gasperini* (2000) 975 no. 3).

this seems to be somewhat more common),²⁴² and about the same goes for those instances in which governors of praetorian provinces are described as *hypatoi* or *hypatikoι*.²⁴³ In an inscription from Attaleia in honour of the Vespasianic legate of Lycia-Pamphylia, M. Petronius Umbrinus, the priesthood (interestingly mentioned before the other offices) is added to the mention of the consulate and the governorship (AE 1972, 615 = SEG xvii 569), the result being that we have here an enumeration of three offices.

Whereas it is, generally speaking, quite common to find the consulate being referred to as an honorand's next appointment, other impending offices are found less often. These texts have been studied by E. Birley.²⁴⁴ In my material, I seem to be able to find subsequent appointments other than the consulate being referred to only in the case of two inscriptions from Pergamum, both of (probably) Severan date and honouring quaestors of Asia leaving their posts for new appointments in the capital.²⁴⁵ However, perhaps one might add, from the very end of our period, an inscription from Aphrodisias set up in honour of T. Oppius Aelianus Asclepiodotus (PIR² O 115), τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικὸν, ἡγεμόνα Καρίας καὶ Φρυγίας, ἀνθύπατον καὶ ἐπανορθωτὴν Ἀσίας (AE 1981, 770 = SEG xxxi 910 = C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* [1989] 16 no. 7). The man seems to be identical with an Asclepiodotus attested as governor of Caria-Phrygia in 282/3.²⁴⁶ If one could assume that the inscription was set up during this governorship, one would have to conclude that Asia is mentioned as the following post. But as the honorand is himself from Aphrodisias (this is clear from the wording of the inscription), one might also assume that the monument was set up after the conclusion of his career and that his most important offices were mentioned.

If the latter alternative is the correct one, this text would come close to cursus inscriptions (and the same could perhaps be said also of some of the other inscriptions

²⁴² Non-cursus inscriptions: IGR iii 151 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 188 no. 2 (Hadrianopolis, AD 138); *I. Olympia* 356 (early third century); probably also *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii 136 no. 51 = AE 1981, 831. In a Latin inscription from Ancyra set up after the death of the honorand, legate of Galatia in 197-8: CIL iii 252 = 6754 = Bosch, op. cit. (n. 54) 283 no. 218. As for cursus inscriptions, see e.g. in CIL iii 7394 = ILS 1093 = *I. Perinthos* 19; ILS 9499 = *I. Ephesos* 715; IGR iii 176; AE 1969/70, 601 cf. 1971, 462 (Ancyra); *I. Perge* 154 and TAM ii 1201 cf. SEG xxxi 1300 (Voconius Saxa); for *cos. II des.* see *I. Ephesos* 3026-7, for designated praetors see CIL iii 6076 = ILS 1093 = *I. Ephesos* 1543, CIL iii 6814ff., IGR iii 188, for designated quaestors *I. Ephesos* 4110, IGR iii 134 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 136 no. 2. Cf. also *I. Ephesos* 697B (fragmentary).

²⁴³ *Hypatoi*: IGR iii 186 = Bosch, op. cit. (n. 54) 208 no. 159 (legate of Galatia, time of Pius); IGR iii 290 = ILS 8827 (legate of Cilicia, time of Pius); IG x 2, 1, 146 (late Severan proconsul of Macedonia); IGR iii 556 = OGI 568 = ILS 8840 = TAM ii 572 (τὸν εὐγενέστατον ὀρδινάριον ὑπατον [in 244] καὶ ὑγιέστατον ἀνθ(ύ)πατον) [of Lycia-Pamphylia in the early 240s]. *Hypatikoι*: IGBulg. 5407 (legate of Thrace, Severan); legates of Phrygia-Caria: AE 1996, 1481; *I. Laodikeia am Lykos* 39.

²⁴⁴ E. Birley, 'Inscriptions Indicative of Impending or Recent Movement', *Chiron* 9 (1979) 495-505.

²⁴⁵ *Altertümer von Pergamon* viii 3 no. 24 (now becoming *ab actis senatus*); IGR iv 407 (becoming aedile, the exact nature of the office not being specified). As I am here interested in non-cursus inscriptions mentioning more than just one office, I shall not deal with cursus inscriptions mentioning future activities. For some instances, note *Alt. von Pergamon* viii 3, 21 (cf. above n. 63); AE 1972, 575 = *I. Ephesos* 735 (a legate of Asia headed for a new post in Moesia). - Of course I am thinking here only of officials honoured because of that same office, senators of local origin belonging to a completely different category. Inscriptions in honour of such senators naturally also often included references to future posts (note e.g. *I. Ephesos* 4110; IGR iii 392 = *I. Central Pisidia* 152).

²⁴⁶ Cf. C. Roueché, in A. Chastagnol & al. (eds.), *Splendidissima civitas. Études d'histoire romaine en hommage à François Jacques* (1996) 238.

referred to above), for among those inscriptions which I would like to class as cursus inscriptions there are quite a few which do not enumerate all stages of the honorand's career. Let us now turn to this aspect of cursus inscriptions as reflected in our material.²⁴⁷

There are, then, non-cursus inscriptions which mention more than just one office, and cursus inscriptions which omit offices, sometimes a significant number. In ascribing inscriptions to either one of the two categories, I have classed as cursus inscriptions all those which make at least a modest effort to give a description of the career leading to that stage in which he is honoured by the monument equipped with the inscription in question. The most important criterion seemed to me to be the mention of offices, or even just one office, which the honorand had formerly held, unless it is an office indicating the honorand's general rank such as *hypatikos* (cf. above). So, in the most extreme case an inscription with two offices of which is earlier would be classed as a cursus inscription, whereas another inscription with two offices of which the other is an office to which the honorand is being promoted, would be classed as a non-cursus inscription.

One faces only rarely a situation as that described above (cursus inscriptions mentioning only one earlier office are, of course, only to be expected in the case of young honorands). But it is true that among the inscriptions in my material there are quite a few which seem curiously defective and inadequate. Let us have a look at these texts now. First of all, one finds a category of cursus inscriptions which does not seem to exist at all outside the East, namely those texts in which it is said that, in addition to some offices mentioned by name, the honorand also held "many" other offices. In this category we find an inscription from Ephesus honouring A. Iulius Quadratus, *I. Ephesos* 1538 cf. *AE* 1997, 1435, in which Quadratus is described as [πρεσβευτῆ]ν καὶ [ἀντιστράτηγον] Ἀὔ[τ]οκράτορος [Νέρου]α Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος [Σεβασ]τοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Συρίας [καὶ πολλῶν] ἄλλων ἐπαρχειῶν. In another inscription from Ephesus, Q. Pompeius Falco, proconsul of Asia in 124, is honoured (perhaps with some exaggeration) as πρεσβευτὴν Σεβαστοῦ καὶ ἀντιστράτηγον Λυκίας καὶ Παμφυλίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Μυσίας καὶ Βρεταννίας καὶ πολλὰς ἄλλας ἡγεμονίας διατελέσαντα, Ἀσίας ἀνθύπατον (*I. Ephesos* 713, cf. above n. 166). In a fairly impressionistic description of the career of a third-century *corrector* of Achaia, an inscription from Sparta renders the honorand's career up to the appointment in Greece with the phrase μετὰ [πολλ]ὰς καὶ ἄλλας [Ῥωμαίων] ἀρχὰς ἢ[γ]ε[μόνα] καὶ διορθωτὴν [τῆς] Ἑλλάδος (*IG* v 1, 538 cf. *AE* 1913, 244).²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷ There are also, of course, cursus inscriptions from other parts of the Roman empire which can be shown to leave out offices of the honorand. The best way to study this phenomenon is to compare, when possible, two or more cursus inscriptions set up in honour of the same person. It is true that there are cases in which the offices of the honorand are set out in a similar fashion in the inscriptions, which can no doubt be explained by assuming that the honorand himself had furnished the dedicators with his own curriculum vitae (cf. W. Eck, "Tituli honorarii", curriculum vitae und Selbstdarstellung in der hohen Kaiserzeit", in: H. Solin & al. [eds.], op. cit. [n. 5] p. 211-37 = Id., *Tra epigrafia* etc. [n. 16] 319-340). On the other hand, there are also numerous cases in which the comparison of two or more cursus inscriptions honouring the same man reveals notable differences and omissions. We shall have a look at eastern cases here, but note among inscriptions from other parts of the empire e.g. the inscriptions describing the career of the Flavian senator L. Funisulanus Vettonianus (*PIR*² F 570), *ILS* 1005 and *Suppl. It* 10 Forum Populi 1 (the latter set up by the man himself), of which the first omits the vigintivirate and the *cura aquarum*, whereas the latter omits the legionary command and the prefecture of the *aerarium Saturni*. Interesting omissions are also revealed by the study of the cursus inscriptions e.g. of the senators L. Catilius Severus (*ILS* 1041 and *ILAfr.* 43), C. Arrius Antoninus (*ILS* 1118 and 1119), M. Pontius Varanus (*AE* 1982, 956 and *ILJug.* 1418).

²⁴⁸ Cf. Groag, op. cit. (n. 13) 85; A.J. Spawforth, *ABSA* 79 (1984) 274-6.

Again, one finds quite a few *cursus* inscriptions which concentrate on just a part of the honorand's career. In some cases, only the consular stages are included;²⁴⁹ this seems to be the case in *ILS* 962 = *CIL* iii 7090 (Pergamum, in honour of P. Memmius Regulus) and in the inscription from Ephesus set up (no dedicator being mentioned) in c. 162 in honour of the proconsul C. Popillius Carus Pedito, *I. Ephesos* 3028 (to be contrasted with *ILS* 1071 with his whole career).²⁵⁰ Only the part of the career starting with the praetorship is rendered in the inscriptions from Lycia-Pamphylia honouring the Vespasianic governor L. Luscius Ocrea; only the praetorian career is set out in the case of Q. Caelius Honoratus, proconsul of Cyprus in the time of Trajan.²⁵¹ Furthermore, one observes a number of *cursus* inscriptions in which the offices are enumerated either incompletely or in a haphazard way or both. In Attaleia, an inscription (*AE* 1972, 620) in honour of the local senator L. Marcus Celer M. Calpurnius Longus, now attested as consul in 148,²⁵² renders the career as military tribune, (proconsular) legate of Pontus-Bithynia, holder of an office in Achaia, thus no doubt omitting more than just the *quattuorvirate viarum curandarum* which appears in another inscription (*ibid.* 621). In *I. Ephesos* 3027 of c. 180 in honour of L. Saevinius Proculus (to be contrasted with *AE* 1968/70, 601 cf. 1971, 462, from Ancyra), the quaestorship is omitted and the rest of the offices are enumerated in an order which is incorrect in each detail, starting with the praetorship which is followed by the tribunate of the plebs. In another inscription from Ephesus, *I. Ephesos* 735, Veturius Paccianus, then legate of Asia, is honoured by Flavius Damianus as quaestor of Macedonia, proconsul of Creta-Cyrenae, legate of the diocese of Ephesus, and as "legate of the legion of upper Mysia",²⁵³ this being his next appointment. Perhaps Damianus chose to mention only the offices Paccianus had held in a province. In a Latin inscription from Pisidian Antioch in honour of L. Calpurnius Proculus from Ancyra, *AE* 1926, 77 (to be contrasted with *IGR* iii 180 = *OGI* 548 from Ancyra; from about the time of Commodus), no office is recorded between the *sevirate [equitum Romanorum turmae deducendae]* (omitted in the inscription from Ancyra which also omits the quaestorship) and the praetorian offices beginning with a *cura viarum*. In a Severan inscription from Sidyma in honour of a local senator, *IGR* iii 581 = *TAM* ii 194 cf. *SEG* xli 1392, formulated in a most idiosyncratic way, no offices are mentioned other than that of *hypatikos*, quaestor of Achaia, legate of Asia, curator of Callatis in Moesia (inferior).²⁵⁴

²⁴⁹ This is also what one finds e.g. in the enumeration of the offices of the Pollienius Auspex the Elder (*PIR*² P 537) in the inscription from Xanthus set up in honour of his grand-granddaughter, *ILS* 8841 = *TAM* ii 278.

²⁵⁰ The inscription from Ephesus also enumerates the consular offices in an incorrect order. Cf. on the two texts G. Alföldy, *Fundeberichte aus Baden-Württemberg* 8 (1983) 55ff.

²⁵¹ Ocrea: *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii 129f. no. 49 = *AE* 1981, 829; *AE* 1929, 27 cf. W. Eck, *ZPE* 6 (1970) 73 n. 37 (Attaleia); *IGR* iii 724 (Myra). Honoratus: *IGR* iii 970 = *I. Kourion* 86.

²⁵² G. Camodeca, *ZPE* 112 (1996) 235ff.; J.H. D'Arms, *JRS* 90 (2000) 135f. 140.

²⁵³ Cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 192 (no. 118).

²⁵⁴ It is possible that something was added in the lacuna after Μυσ[ί]ας, but this would not change much in the overall picture. – Note also e.g. *AE* 1964, 4 = R.P. Harper, *AS* 18 (1968) 96 no. 1.02 (Comana in Cappadocia), mentioning only the quaestorship, the praetorship and the governorship of Cappadocia-Galatia of L. Iulius Proculeianus (cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* 111); *IGR* iii 174f. from Ancyra in honour of C. Iulius Severus which omit the praetorship (mentioned in *Corinth* viii 2, 56); *I. Ephesos* 3029 (contrast *AE* 1997, 721) in honour of the proconsul in c. 170, M. Nonius Macrinus, where the governorship of Pannonia inferior is collocated in the wrong place; *IG* ii/iii² 4220 in honour of a senator

It is also notable that quite a few cursus inscriptions in my material start the career only with the quaestorship.²⁵⁵ Of course this may in some cases mean that we are dealing with former equestrians,²⁵⁶ but in many cases the careers belong to men who certainly do not look like former knights (thus in *I. Olympia* 619 and 620)²⁵⁷ and at least in the case of M. Plancius Varus from Perge, whose career is described as starting with the quaestorship in AE 1997, 1505, we know that he did start as *decemvir stlitibus iudicandis*, as this is specified in the Latin honorific inscription from Germa, AE 1973, 534. So it seems that one can observe in these cases, too, a certain tendency in my material to omit now and then an office or two, although it is true that, to get a general picture of the merits of the honorand, one does perhaps not really need to know the exact details of the lowest offices. Also, the rendering in Greek of the offices of the vigintivirate presented some difficulties clearly reflected in the wonderful variety of various renderings of these offices in the relevant inscriptions.²⁵⁸ But be that as it may, it is any case clear that, in the solemn world of the Latin honorific career inscription in Italy and in the West, the conscientious enumeration of all the offices was normally considered essential.

Of course, the observation that one finds, now and then, a cursus inscription defective in some way in the eastern material, does not mean that there are not many texts mentioning all the necessary offices in perfect order. In some cases it seems clear that this is to be explained by the fact that the list of offices was based on a curriculum vitae furnished by the honorand himself (cf. the article of W. Eck referred to in n. 247); this is the case when we find two or more inscriptions from different places honouring the same man with practically the same wording. In this category one can place e.g. the inscription from Megara in honour of L. Minicius Natalis, *IG* vii 89, which reproduces the formulas

whose name has been lost, where the *praefectura frumenti dandi* is mentioned between the quaestorship and the praetorship; and the cursus rendered in *I. Ephesos* 5106f.

²⁵⁵ Thus e.g. *IG* ii/iii² 4220; *IG* v 1, 1172; *IG* VII 1866 (Thespieae); *I. Olympia* 619 and 620; *SEG* xlv 1088 (Mytilene); *I. Ephesos* 735; *IGR* iv 1697 (Sebaste, Severan; as the man is a *candidatus* both in his quaestorship and in his tribunate, he does not leave the impression of being a *homo novus*; note moreover that this young senator, of whom only the cognomen *Dexter* has survived - he is registered as *PIR*² D 63 -, honoured in Sebaste in Lydia by some local men as their *filos* and *euergetes*, must be of local origin himself, and should be added to the lists of senators from Asia); *ILS* 8818 = *IGR* iii 551 = *OGI* 560 = *TAM* ii 563 (Tlos); AE 1997, 1505 (cf. below); AE 1975, 821 (Curium); AE 1964, 4 = AS 18 (1968) 96 no. 1.02 (Comana, Cappadocia).

²⁵⁶ Thus probably or certainly in the cases of A. Claudius Charax (AE 1961, 320, cf. W. Eck, *RE* Suppl. xiv 99 no. 107a; A.R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain* [1981] 251); L. Flavius Sulpicianus Dorio Polymnis (*IGR* i 1017 = *I. Cret.* iii 3, 20; T. Flavius Damianus jr. (*I. Ephesos* 677). Cf. also e.g. (to mention an instance from the East but outside the area studied here) M. Sentius Proculus from Berytus (AE 1926, 150 cf. 1992, 1689).

²⁵⁷ Cf. W. Eck, *ANRW* ii 1 (1974) 180 n. 88 on the two texts.

²⁵⁸ Not much of this variety is reflected in H.J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions* (American Studies in Papyrology, Vol. 13, 1974). For instance, in the case of the decemvirate *stlitibus iudicandis*, there seem to be as many versions of a Greek rendering as there are inscriptions mentioning this office, some inscriptions producing surprising results (e.g. δέκα ἀνδρῶν πρώτ[ω]ν *ILS* 8835 = *TAM* ii 426: "mire erravit scriptor Graecus" Dessau; for other attempts at a rendering see e.g. *IG* ii/iii² 4071; *IG* v 1, 533 and *IG* IV 588; *I. Ephesos* 701, 3029; *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii 48; *IGR* iii 134, 249; *MAMA* vi 262; *ILS* 8829; *IG* xiv 719 = *IGR* i 431; perhaps the translator, who simply transcribed the office as δεκεμόρουμ στλετιβους ιουδικάνδεις [*TAM* ii 1201 cf. *SEG* xxxi 1300], chose the easiest solution).

found in the other cursus inscriptions pertaining to this man.²⁵⁹ The same goes for the inscriptions in honour of Q. Voconius Saxa Fidus, legate of Lycia-Pamphylia in the 140s, *I. Perge* 154 (Latin) and *TAM* ii 1201 cf. *SEG* xxxi 1300 (Greek), which seem almost identical (*mutatis mutandis*),²⁶⁰ and the two absolutely identical inscriptions in honour of the Messenian senator Ti. Claudius Frontinus Niceratus, *IG* v 1, 533 = *ILS* 8831 (Sparta) and *IG* iv 588 (Argos).²⁶¹ Another instance are the two completely identical inscriptions in honour of the Trajanic legate of Lycia-Pamphylia, L. Iulius Marinus Caecilius Simplex, *IGR* iii 470 from Balbura and *IGR* iii 554 = *TAM* ii 567 from Tlos.²⁶² However, here one sees that other versions of a certain cursus could also circulate, for the inscription from Xanthus, *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii 133 no. 50 = *AE* 1981, 830, gives a shorter version of the quattuorvirate *viarum curandarum*, omits the military tribunate altogether, leaves out the specification '*kai antistrategon*' from the mention of the quaestorship of Macedonia - but somewhat unexpectedly adds '*demou Romaion*', missing in the other texts, to *agoranomon*.²⁶³ In any case, in all those instances mentioned above it is not only the fact that one finds practically identical inscriptions from different places which is striking, but also the fact that it is a common feature of all these texts that they offer detailed and accurately presented information on the careers of the honorands, undoubtedly because the dedicators were closely following instructions supplied by the honorand himself. The same must be assumed in those many other cases in which we find a satisfactory and informative rendering of the honorand's career (e.g. *IG* ii/iii² 4212). However, the material seems also to offer instances of a procedure in which the dedicators decided to formulate the honorand's career themselves, this in some cases leading to various defects in the career's presentation.

As for the relation between cursus and non-cursus inscriptions, it does not seem possible to explain in each case why some dedicators chose to set out the career of the honorand and some preferred to settle for just mentioning the most important offices.²⁶⁴ It is a very good thing for us that the κηπουροί of Thyatira decided to describe the career of the honorand, M. Cn. Licinius Rufinus, in all its details (*AE* 1997, 1425), but it does not seem possible to provide an explanation for the fact that, in doing this, they chose to

²⁵⁹ See *PIR*² M 620 (for the Greek inscription from Callatis, apparently almost identical with the text from Megara, see now *ISM* iii 114). Cf. W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 247) 220 = Id., *Tra epigrafia* etc. (n. 16) 323; above n. 220.

²⁶⁰ Cf. W. Eck, art. cit. (n. 247) 219f. n. 41 = Id., *Tra epigrafia* etc. [n. 16] 337 n. 41; Id., *Chiron* 30 (2000) 645f.

²⁶¹ There has only been a misunderstanding in the Greek rendering of the decemvirate *stlitibus iudicandis*.

²⁶² A most remarkable instance of a career being rendered in an absolutely identical way in different places are the inscriptions honouring the son of D. Valerius Asiaticus, proconsul of Asia in c. 108, *IGR* iv 960 = *IG* xii, 6, 1, 381 from Samos and *I. Ephesos* 695B, in both of which all the stages of the father's - mentioned in the genitive - career are set out (cf. above at n. 21).

²⁶³ Note also e.g. the inscriptions in honour of C. Iulius Scapula, legate of Galatia in 138, from Ancyra, *IGR* iii 176, 177, 178, which are almost identical (178 however using the dative, not the accusative) with the exception that 176 shows a tendency to abbreviate (thus *Did(ymou)* instead of *Didymou Eusebous* in the mention of the military tribunate, only *tamian* instead of *tamian eparcheias Baitikes*, only *anthypaton* instead of *anthypaton Achaia*). That there could be different versions of the career of a senator could receive some most instructive illumination from the material pertaining to Q. Pompeius Falco (observe the striking formulations of the new inscription from Caunus, above n. 102) and A. Iulius Quadratus.

²⁶⁴ On this point in late antique inscriptions, see Horster, art. cit. (n. 3) 41.

disregard the by now well-established τὸν λαμπρότατον ὑπατικὸν phrase used by the βυρσεῖς and the other dedicators of monuments in Thyatira in honour of the same man (*IGR* iv 1214ff.; *TAM* v 2, 984ff.). However, it is true one can see some general trends in the use of cursus and non-cursus inscriptions. First of all, in those cases when Latin was used, the enumeration of the career was, in general, much commoner than in Greek inscriptions, "career inscriptions" belonging to the Latin epigraphic culture (cf. above at n. 71). The language choice would probably normally be one made by the dedicators, and to stay with the dedicators, one can make, on the basis of the tables above at n. 196ff., some interesting observations. From table I can be seen that, when a private person set up a monument in honour of a provincial official, the likelihood that she or he added the whole career was clearly higher than in those cases when the monument was set up by the city. I observed above (at n. 202) that one could interpret this as pointing to private dedicators being more concerned about including all relevant information regarding the honorands in their dedications. On the other hand, things change completely when we turn to monuments set up in honour of local senators (table II): in this case cities were much more prone to enumerate the stages of the honorand's career, there now being more cursus than non-cursus inscriptions. This can no doubt be explained by the fact that, in these cases, both the honorand and his professional background were well known to the dedicating cities and that the addition of the career of a familiar figure was more often than not thought of as desirable.

Moreover, one seems to be able to recognize a preference for cursus inscriptions in some places and areas. Ancyra, with its interesting number of cursus inscriptions,²⁶⁵ may be a special case, as it was the capital of the province of Galatia and as such also produced Latin inscriptions, and, furthermore, seems to have had various connections and contacts with the colonies of the same province, especially with Pisidian Antioch (cf. e.g. above at n. 214), the existence of these colonies being the explanation for the impressive number of cursus inscriptions in Galatia in general (cf. above at n. 72). But in the case of the cities of Lycia-Pamphylia, it seems one could conclude that there was a sort of a tradition of mentioning the details of the honorand's career in the honorific inscriptions, the honorands being in the beginning exclusively provincial officials; we saw above (at n. 73) that almost 38 percent of all honorific inscription in Lycia-Pamphylia are cursus inscriptions, a percentage surpassed only by Galatia where, however, special circumstances obtain (cf. above). The cities of Lycia-Pamphylia are additionally interesting because there the cursus inscriptions are practically all in Greek with only Perge, the capital, furnishing instances of Latin inscriptions; one also notes that the inscriptions make their appearance right in the beginning, starting with the first governor, Q. Veranius under Claudius (*IGR* iii 703 from Cyaneae).²⁶⁶

But there can be no doubt that the wishes of the honorand himself also, at least sometimes, played a role. We have already seen some cases in which one must assume that certain formulations must be due to the honorand himself (cf. above at n. 21 on datives in Greek inscriptions; and cf. the paper of Eck cited in n. 247), and considering this, one may formulate the hypothesis that not only the wording of cursus inscriptions but also the use of cursus inscriptions (as contrasted to non-cursus inscriptions) itself could be due to the honorand. It is hardly just by chance that almost all the inscriptions in honour of A. Iulius Quadratus, from Pergamum and from other places, are cursus inscriptions; no doubt the full rendering of the stages of his career was something

²⁶⁵ *IGR* iii 176-178; 180; *CIL* iii 254; *AE* 1969/70, 601 cf. 1971, 462.

²⁶⁶ Things are very different e.g. in Arabia, where one finds a very large number of inscriptions in honour of governors mainly in Bostra and Gerasa (cf. above n. 8), which almost all follow the practice of mentioning only the governorship (and possibly the designation to the consulate). Only the very first governor of Arabia, C. Claudius Severus, manages to become the honorand of a (Latin) cursus inscription in Petra (*AE* 1968, 525 [cf. Halfmann, *Senatoren* p. 135] = *IGLS* xxi 4, 45).

Quadratus himself preferred.²⁶⁷ The same can perhaps be assumed in the case e.g. of C. Iulius Scapula, legate of Galatia in 138, of whom only cursus inscriptions seem to be known, the one from Hadrianopolis being almost identical with the texts from Ancyra,²⁶⁸ and this seems to have run in the family, since the only inscription in honour of this Scapula's son (*PIR*² I 552) is also a cursus inscription, not a common item in mid-second-century Athens.²⁶⁹ The list of senators in the case of whom only cursus inscriptions seem to be attested could be extended,²⁷⁰ but I think we have reached the bottom line here, which seems to be that one can expect cursus inscriptions (as contrasted with non-cursus inscriptions) in various circumstances which depend on the language used, the dedicator(s), the site of the dedication, and last, but certainly not least, on the honorand himself.

ADDENDUM. By mistake, the texts from Hierapolis in Phrygia were omitted from the discussion. I have observed four relevant inscriptions: (1) *IGR* iv 813 cf. *SEG* xxx 1478 (a proconsular legate; with cursus); (2) *IGR* iv 814 cf. *SEG* xxxi 910; (3) *IGR* iv 815; (4) T. Ritti, in: *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina. Atti* (1999) 291-6 (T. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus as proconsul of Asia). Note also the omission of *SEG* xiv 645 (C. Fufius Geminus) from the enumeration of the relevant texts from Caunus (above n. 102).

There is now a new inscription in honour of Herodes Atticus from Olympia: L. Schumacher, 'Eine neue Inschrift für den Sophisten Herodes Atticus', in: A. Mallwitz (ed.), *XI. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia* (1999) 421-437 (a publication not available to me; I owe this reference to Chr. Settiani, *Continuité gentile et continuité familiale dans les familles sénatoriales romaines à l'époque impériale* [Prosopographica et genealogica 2, Oxford 2000] 536).

²⁶⁷ There are, of course, also some non-cursus inscriptions in honour of Quadratus, but they are either from the very end of his career, when the early details did not matter quite in the same way as before (cf. e.g. *IGR* iv 386, 387, 388 with the mention only of the two consulates and - in the case of 386 and 388 - of the Asian proconsulate; *Altortümer von Pergamon* viii 3 no. 20, the latest inscription mentioning Quadratus, with no mention at all of his senatorial status, cf. above at n. 41), or otherwise belong to special circumstances (*IGR* iii 520 = *TAM* ii 133, from Lydae and belonging to the series of inscriptions referred to in n. 37; *IGLS* vii 4010 from Arados in Syria, set up by a certain Νοαρος Νοαρου τοῦ Βαδρου, perhaps a man not in full command of all the details of Quadratus' career).

²⁶⁸ Ancyra: *IGR* iii 176, 177, 178. Hadrianopolis: *IGR* iii 151 = Marek, op. cit. (n. 125) 188 no. 2 (although this text is fragmentary in the end, the beginning is so similar to the texts from Ancyra that one must assume that here, too, the cursus followed).

²⁶⁹ *IG* ii/iii² 4212 (cf. above n. 219).

²⁷⁰ Note e.g. C. Iulius Severus from Ancyra (Halfmann, *Senatoren* 151 no. 62), proconsul of Achaia and cos. c. 138, apparently known only from cursus inscriptions (*IGR* iii 174f.; *Corinth* viii 2, 56f., viii 3, 126). Similar cases are those of L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus (*Corinth* viii 2, 54; *IG* ii/iii² 4126 = *ILS* 928, these inscription from the time of Augustus perhaps being the earliest known honorific inscriptions with the cursus being attached, cf. W. Eck, art. cit. [n. 45] 150 = Id., *Tra epigrafia* etc. [n. 45] 283) and of Ti. Claudius Frontinus Niceratus (*ILS* 1087, *IG* v 1, 533; *IG* iv 588; above n. 206).