

ARCTOS







ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLIX



HELSINKI 2015

INDEX

	MAURIZIO COLOMBO	<i>Lancea pugnatoria e minores subarmales. Contributo all'esegesi linguistica di Tab. Luguval. 16 (AE 1998, 839)</i>	9
	JAIME CURBERA	<i>The Jews in North Africa. Five Notes</i>	25
	ŠIME DEMO	<i>Painting the New Reality: Colours in Neo-Latin</i>	33
	SEPPO HEIKKINEN	<i>From Persius to Wilkinson: The Golden Line Revisited</i>	57
	URPO KANTOLA	<i>Neulesungen römischer Namen auf griechischen Inschriften</i>	79
	LAURA NISSIN	<i>Sleeping Culture in Roman Literary Sources</i>	95
	ARI SAASTAMOINEN	<i>Visual Language of Latin Building Inscriptions. The Case of North Africa</i>	135
	OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Making Sense of a tabula patronatus from Amiternum of AD 325 (AE 1937, 119)</i>	161
	HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCCVI-CCCXI</i>	195
		<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	269
		<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	335
		<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	339
		<i>Index scriptorum</i>	343

MAKING SENSE OF A *TABULA PATRONATUS* FROM AMITERNUM OF AD 325 (*AE* 1937, 119)

OLLI SALOMIES*

During the Roman Empire, patronage agreements between municipalities and individuals were often recorded epigraphically in bronze "tablets" of which there seem have been two versions, those which were offered to the patron and were meant to be hung up on the wall in the *domus* of the patron, and those order to document the patronage.¹ There are two main types of *tabulae*; there is a shorter type which consists in the main of a part recording the choice of someone as patron (e.g., *coloni coloniae ... Proculus ... cooptaverunt*, *CIL* VI 1687), and of a part recording the confirmation of the establishment of the patronate by the person who had been approached in the matter (e.g., *Proculus ... colonos coloniae ... in [fi]dem clientelamque suam ... recepit*, in the same tablet). The other type of *tabulae* recording patronage agreements, also attested in the case of patronage agreements between individuals and *collegia*,² contains a longer text which includes a quotation of the decree pertaining to the election of someone as patron; this type, attested only in Italy and only from the time of Domitian onwards,³ often ends with a formulation of the wish of the decurions that the

* Thanks are due to the two (unnamed) referees of this article.

¹ See below at n. 106. For a very full recent bibliography on the *tabulae patronatus* and on the patronate in general, see E. Cimarosti, *SEBarc* 10 (2012) 288, n. 1.

² For a selection of patronage agreements between individuals and *collegia* see *ILS* 7216ff. As these documents have much in common with the patronage agreements between municipalities and individuals, many of them will be referred to in the following as parallels.

³ The earliest *tabula patronatus* of this type seems to be *CIL* VI 31692 = *ILS* 6105 of AD 82. As *tabulae* quoting municipal decrees are apparently attested only in Italy, this type is sometimes called "Italian" (J. Nicols, *ANRW* II 13 [1980] 561; Cimarosti [above n. 1] 290). L. Harmand, *Le patronat*

person chosen as patron accept the election, and the text normally ends at this point and does not include a reference to the chosen person's reaction to his election as patron.⁴ It is a document of the latter type that is the topic of this article.

Until about the Severan period, the tablets recording patronage, both those between individuals and municipalities and those between individuals and *collegia*, are usually written in an understandable Latin and do not include a large number of errors, whether those of the person who drafted the text or those of the person who engraved the tablet;⁵ and even a *tabula* of AD 242 from Pelutium seems beyond reproach.⁶ But from about this time onwards, the *tabulae* start to contain more and more errors of all possible kinds and passages intelligible only with difficulty,⁷ and by the fourth century there are not many *tabulae* that can be read and understood with ease. In fact, very many of the *tabulae* of this period seem to contain passages whose contents one can only try to guess. That this is the case seems to depend on two factors. On the one hand, it is ob-

sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire, Paris 1957, 336 thinks that *tabulae* of this type "ne sont pas de vraies tables de patronat", but I fail to see the exact point of this assertion.

⁴ Obviously one had to be grateful for the election in a polite letter; for an example of a letter of this type observe the letter of Servilius Diodorus to the *dendrophori* (who had elected him patron), quoted among other documents in *AE* 1998, 282, V from Lavinium in AD 228 (note the reference here of Diodorus to his *consacerdotes*, also keen on being elected patron: *optantib(us) a vobis honorem patronatus*).

⁵ Although it must be admitted that there are several errors, e.g., in the *tabula* of AD 206 from Fidentia, *AE* 1991, 713; for instance, note *vir eximiae indolis praeditus* (apparently the author of the text had in the beginning thought of describing the prospective patron by using the genitive of quality, but had then, on second thoughts, added *praeditus* without remembering that he should have changed the genitive into an ablative); *tam larga et ultro semper obferentia cumulor(um) eius innumerabilia beneficia* (here one must read <se> *obferentia* or *oblata*, and *cumulor(um)* remains unclear); *cuius titulus ... gloriam n(o)stri(?) consensus declarat* also seems strange, as this text seems to imply that the *fabri* asserted that their *consensus* brought *gloria* to themselves rather than to the patron.

⁶ *CIL* IX 3429 = *ILS* 6110. Note, e.g., the correct orthography and that the writer can distinguish between *suus* and *eius*, a distinction not necessarily observed in this period.

⁷ Cf., e.g., *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 from Sentinum in AD 260, where for instance some verbs seem to be missing. For the evolution of the *tabulae patronatus* in later Antiquity see B. Díaz Ariño, "Patrono suo dedicavit. La evolución de las tábulas de patronato en época tardía", in A. Duplá Ansuategui et al. (eds.), *Miscelánea de estudios en homenaje a Guillermo Fatás Cabeza*, Zaragoza 2014, 227-34.

vious that those who engraved the tablets must by this period have been either extremely uneducated or incompetent or (rather) both. On the other hand, the language and the structure of the tablets of this period very clearly also point to the conclusion that those who wrote the texts must have had very great difficulties in trying to say what they thought they should be saying. The tablets can, then, be used as evidence for the "decadence" of both the knowledge of Latin in the "classical" sense and of "culture" in general.

Keeping this in mind I now turn to a document from Amiternum dated December 7, AD 225. As is the case with many inscriptions of this period, this document has been published and commented upon by archaeologists and historians rather than by philologists, and this has resulted in the fact that there seem to remain some passages which could in my view gain from some emendation and/or elucidation. My approach is almost purely philological; according to a referee of this article, I am not "serving my cause well by limiting the discussion to the philological", but I think there is a point in trying first to make sense of the text and only then moving on to a discussion of its historical implications.

The *tabula* I am about to discuss in this article was published (not very competently) by G. Annibaldi in *NSA* 1936, 94-104 (whence *AE* 1937, 119). It has later been republished and discussed by M. Buonocore in *MGR* 9 (1984) 235-41, with an Italian translation (this contribution was registered in *AE* 1984, 280) and in Id., *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente romano* III (Roma 1992) n. 47; by S. Segenni, *Suppl. It.* 9 (1992) Amiternum 34 (cf. Ead., *SCO* 55 [2009] 275f.); and by C. J. Goddard, in *MEFR* 114 (2002) 1027-31, with a French translation. There is a transcription of this document, of no real use, also in the mediocre publication by R. K. Sherk, *The Municipal Decrees of the Roman West (Arethusa Monographs 2, Buffalo 1970)* no. 21, and it has of course been reproduced and referred to in numerous other studies mentioned, if needed, below in the notes.

In the following, the contributions Annibaldi, Segenni and Goddard will be referred to as "Annibaldi", "Segenni" and "Goddard", whereas the two contributions of Buonocore will be referred to as "Buonocore 1984" and "Buonocore 1992".

In the same volume of the *Notizie degli scavi*, Annibaldi also published another *tabula* from Amiternum pertaining to the son of the man whose patronate is the subject of the *tabula* discussed here (*AE* 1937, 121 = S. Segenni,

Suppl. It. 9 Amiternum 35, AD 335). It was originally my aim also to deal in this article with this latter document; however, this will have to happen in another context, as the AD 325 document already offered more than enough material for an article. But this later document, obviously of some interest from the point of view of our text, will be referred to several times in the following (as "AE 1937, 121" but also, e.g., as "the other tablet from Amiternum").

The text of this *tabula* of December 7, AD 325 runs as follows. I present here Goddard's text, although with a number of slight modifications and corrections (e.g., *Iovianus* instead of "*Iovanius*", which is a simple mistake), most of them explained in the notes. Goddard's text is in the main based on those of his predecessors, so that a reference just to his text (e.g., "*Septi{a}miana* Goddard" in n. 8) does not mean that a certain feature would not be found in the earlier editions of this document. Note that errors (or "errors" in the case of *atcrescere*, etc.) of the type *abendi* for *habendi*, *atcrevisse* for *adcrevisse*, *aetiam* for *etiam*, *onorem* for *honorem*, *ededit* for *edidit*, etc., common in inscriptions of this period, have been indicated thus, "(h)abendi", rather than being "corrected" with square brackets (e.g., "<h>abendi ") or furnished with a "sic"; forms such as *aetiam* and *ededit*, easily understood and common in this period, have been left as they are. A text incorporating the corrections and modifications to the text proposed in this article, some of them tentative, will be presented at the end of this article.

Paulino et Iuliano co(n)ss(ulibus) VII Idus Dec(embres). / Amiterni in curia Septimiana⁸ Augustea anno die freq<u>entissimo, / cum frequentes numerus decurionum obvenissent ordinis (h)abendi / causa{usa}, scribundo adfuit Avidius Iovianus principalis, ibi / ⁽⁵⁾ Atrius Arrenianus et Vergilianus Albinus sen(atores)⁹ principale<s> v(erba) f(ecerunt): /

⁸ *Septi{a}miana* Goddard, but the reading is *Septimiana*, as the engraver Antistius Lucentius (l. 36), who in the beginning engraved *SEPTIA-*, later corrected the *A* to an *M*.

⁹ That the abbreviation *sen.* should be understood as *sen(atores)* seems to be the opinion of all scholars who have dealt with this inscription (in addition to those mentioned above, e.g., P. Ginestet, *Les organisations de la jeunesse dans l'Occident romain*, Bruxelles 1991, 235f., n. 113). However, one wonders whether one could not understand *sen(ior)*, Albinus in that case being the father of a man of the same name; *sen.* for *senior* is not uncommon, and since Avidius Iovianus is referred to simply as *principalis* one could conclude that the term *principalis* does not necessarily have to be defined by the addition of *senator*.

*ob honorem floridum*¹⁰ *ordinis n(ostri) et dignitatem patriae civium-
q(ue) sp<l>endorem atcrevisse confidemus, d(omini) c(onscripti), quod
aetiam vestrum / consensum acc'i`re*¹¹ *fidi sumus{umus}, pro humanitatis
et laborum adque industriam / similem ex origine prisca cooptemus,
quod quidem nos olim*¹² *fecisse opor*⁽¹⁰⁾ *tuerat ut omnes rogemus hunc
(h)onorem nostrum conprobare / dignetur C. Sallius Pompeianus
Sofronius, pronepos Salli Procu/[l]*ⁱ¹³ *pat(roni), fil(ius) Sal(li) Proculi
patroni pat(riae) ord(inis) Aveia{ia}tium Vest(inorum) patronum co-
{h}optemus, si modo de eius dignatione testimonium perportemus quis
/ etenim immo `exultet',¹⁴ et suam proferat volumptatem. Ideo*¹⁵ *igitur;
domini co(n)s*⁽¹⁵⁾ *cripti, quod ex origine prisca genus eiusdem patronatus
olim pro/cesserint et labores quantos [[et quantos]] et quales in nos
[[contulit]] / et patriam nostram contulit; quiq(ue) ex suis laboribus
munera patro/natus dena et sena magg(istratibus) filiorum suorum
sple<n>didissima[[e]]*¹⁶ *civita/ti n(ostrae) cum favore ededit; Aquas
Arentani, quas*¹⁷ *iam delaps(a)e fuerant, /*⁽²⁰⁾ *civitati n(ostrae) additis*

¹⁰ *florid{i}um* Goddard, but the *I* has been corrected to a *V*.

¹¹ The reading of the tablet is *accere* (accepted by some editors, see Goddard p. 1027), but what is meant is, of course, *accīre* (Annibaldi p. 97 and Buonocore 1984 and 1992 suggest *acc<ip>ere*, but *vestrum consensum accire* – "solliciter" in Goddard's translation – seems more plausible than *vestrum consensum accipere*). Note that "*acc[i]re*" in Goddard's text in fact means *acc'i`re*.

¹² *olim[[n]]* Goddard (and others), but what one sees in the photo is that the engraver started engraving an *N* but then corrected it to an *F*, the first letter of *fecisse*.

¹³ *Procu/[li]* Goddard, but one can see traces of the *I*. The earlier editors read *Procu/li*.

¹⁴ This word has been engraved in small letters above this line, i.e. between lines 13 and 14.

¹⁵ Goddard (following Buonocore and Segenni) prints *id[[o]]eo*, but the photo suggests that the engraver first engraved *IDO* and then corrected the *O* to *E* and then added another *O*.

¹⁶ Goddard probably by mistake prints *sple<n>di{di}ssima[[e]]*, as if *sple(n)dissima* were the required reading. As for the *E* at the end, according to the photo the engraver began by engraving *SPLEDIDISSIMACIVITA/TI*, but then tried to make the *C* look like an *E*, the result being a sort of ligature of *E* and *C*. For the need to read *splendidissimae* and not *splendidissima* see below at n. 78.

¹⁷ Of course, one has to understand *quae*. Whereas Buonocore 1984 adds a "(sic)", Goddard adds a footnote (p. 1029 n. 16) which says "*Id.*" which does not seem to refer to anything.

*laci castellisq(ue)*¹⁸ *salientes restituit; / thermas, quas*¹⁹ *iam olim disperierant*²⁰ *antiquitus inpendiis et pecunia `sua`*²¹ */ cum porticis novis factis et omni ornamento at*²² *pulcri<tu>dinem restauravit / statisque decoravit et nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes(aris) nata/le Idibus Nob(embribus) dedicavit, quarum dedicatione*²³ *biduum t(h)eatrum et dena Iuve/(²⁵)n aliorum spectaculis*²⁴ *exs(h)ibuit sub*²⁵ *pr(a)esentia Cl(audi) Urani v(iri) p(erfectissimi) corr(ectoris) n(ostri); cives et or/dinem n(ostrum) aepulis ex suis viribus*²⁶ *confrequentavit, ergo merito consen|{se}tiri*²⁷ *nos et C. Sallium Pompeianum patronum pr(a)e-*

¹⁸ Goddard, following Buonocore and Segenni, reads *c[[o]]astellisq(ue)*. But what one reads now is not *COAST-* but *CAST-*, where the engraver himself, who had in fact began to engrave *CO-*, has corrected the *O* to an *A*.

¹⁹ Here, too, Goddard adds a footnote (p. 1029 n. 17) saying "*Id.*", referring to the previous footnote with the same contents.

²⁰ Goddard, following others, reads *disperier[[e]]ant*, but the reading is *-RANT* (not *-REANT*), where the *A* has been corrected from an original *E*.

²¹ *sua* has been added in the space between two lines above *pecunia*. Since Annibaldi, all editors of the text have read *`sua` pecunia*, placing *sua* before *pecunia*, but the fact that *inpendiis* precedes *pecunia* seems to advocate the reading *pecunia sua*, as *sua* can, as it must, in that case more aptly be referred also to *inpendiis*.

²² *at* is of course the same as *ad* (cf. *at = ad* in l. 31, *atrevisse* in l. 7 and, e.g., *set* for *sed*, common in inscriptions from the imperial period). I cannot understand Goddard's observation on this point (p. 1029 n. 19): "Pour A. Annibaldi [in *NSA* 1936] *at* a été confondu avec *ad*. Je préfère le conserver pour ma part."

²³ *dedicatio[[b]]ne* Goddard (following Buonocore and Segenni). Here again I would prefer just *dedicatione*, as this is the reading of the tablet, where, however, the *N* is the result of a correction, a *B* having originally been engraved by mistake.

²⁴ Goddard adds a footnote (p. 1029 n. 20) saying – correctly – that one should expect the accusative *spectacula*.

²⁵ *sub[[u]]* Goddard following Buonocore 1992 (Buonocore 1984 reads *sub pres-*) and Segenni, and the engraver has indeed engraved *SVBV*, but then corrected the second *V* to *P*, the first letter of *presentia*.

²⁶ *vi[[b]]ribus* Goddard, again following Buonocore and Segenni. But *VIB-* has been corrected to *VIR-* and what one reads here is, then, just *viribus*.

²⁷ Goddard reads *consen|{e}tiri[e]*, but this is an error, as the first two letters in this line are *SE*. As for the rest of the word, the reading of the tablet is */SETIRI*; by writing *-tir[e]* and elaborating this in n. 21, Goddard implies that *consentire* should be the correct reading. However, *consentiri* seems acceptable (cf. below at n. 68).

*ficiamus, / cuius defens{s}ionis auxilia concur`r`entibus²⁸ bene{ne}ficiis²⁹
 pluria / in nos conferrī speremus. Q(uid) d(e) ea r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret),
 universi i(ta) c(ensuerunt): / ⁽³⁰⁾ placet ius[[ius]]tae³⁰ allegationi Atri
 Arreni`ani³¹ et Verg(ilian) Albinī principa/lium ordinis n(ostr)ī recte at
 ordinem n(ostrum) referentibus consentiri nos,³² / et C. Sallium Sofronium
 patronum³³ ordinis et patriae n(ostrae) praeficia/mus, qui meritus ex
 origine dignus hunc honorem ob{b}latum a {no} / nobis {su}suscipiat
 patronatus aere inciso tabula hospiti³⁴ et / ubi iusserit confrequentari
 praecipiat. / Scul(psit) Ant(istius) Lucentius.*

Let us now have a closer look at this text, starting from l. 2.

L. 2: *Amiterni in curia Septimiana Augustea anno die freq<u>entissimo*: *anno* here seems out of place, on the one hand because the year has already been indicated with the names of the consuls in l. 1 and on the other because *anno ... frequentissimo* – if we wish to understand *anno (et) die frequentissimo*, cf. the translation of Goddard, "une année et un jour de grande affluence" – does not seem to mean anything: the author of the text, although of course interested in describing the circumstances of the very *day* of the passing of the decree, can

²⁸ A second, very small, *R* has been added between the *R* and the *E*.

²⁹ *be[[s]]ne{ne}ficiis* Goddard, again following Buonocore and Segenni. However, the engraver did engrave *BES-*, but then corrected the *S* to *N*, and in my view the result should be represented in print as *bene{ne}ficiis*. From the photo one can see that someone has tried, although not with much success, to delete the second pair of the letters *NE*.

³⁰ *ius[[ta ius]]tae* Goddard following Segenni (Annibaldi just writes *iustae*). Buonocore 1992 writes "*iustae*" *iustae* (" " being equivalent to [[]]), Buonocore 1984 *placet[[i]] {ius}[[ta]]iustae*, but what one does read in the tablet after the three initial letters *IVS* are, as correctly observed by Annibaldi, three letters which were surely originally *IVS*, which Lucentius the engraver, having noticed his mistake, had tried to correct to *TAE*, which he later, having made a mess of all this, tried to delete, adding the letters *TAE* after the three deleted letters. As a result, we have thus either the reading *IVS[[IVS]]TAE* or the reading *IVS[[TAE]]TAE*.

³¹ *ANI* has been added between the lines above *ET V* in *et Vergilian*.

³² Goddard writes *no[s]*, but traces both of the *O* and the *S* seem to be visible.

³³ *patronu{a}m* Goddard following Buonocore and Segenni, but the reading is *patronum* with the last letter corrected from *A*, originally engraved by mistake.

³⁴ *hospit<al>i* Goddard, whereas Buonocore and Segenni keep *hospiti* (i.e., *hospitii*); cf. below at n. 103.

obviously not be expected to have expressed his opinion also on the character of the whole year. Perhaps the only solution is that proposed (with a questionmark) by Annibaldi (p. 100) and accepted by Buonocore 1984 (p. 239), namely correcting *anno* to *anni*; the author would then have wished to say that on this very day of this particular year the meeting of the town council attracted the largest number of decurions; but of course about the same thing is said in the next line.

L. 3f.: *cum frequentes numerus decurionum obvenissent ordinis (h)abendi / causa*. The *constructio ad sensum*³⁵ has, of course, been noted by about all those who quote this inscription, but whereas one can find parallels for this construction, the use of *obvenire* (noted by Annibaldi 99) in the sense required here and the use of *ordo* in the meaning "meeting" seems quite unparalleled. As for *obvenire* (which is also used in the document of AD 335, *AE* 1937, 121), it must mean about the same as *convenire*, a verb which is in fact used in similar contexts,³⁶ although from the third century onwards the more common expression seems to have been *adesse*.³⁷ As for *obvenire*, this verb is only very rarely used in contexts in which one or more persons are its subject.³⁸ The two *tabulae* from Amiternum are listed (as "N^oSc. 1936, p. 96" and "p. 105") in *TLL* IX 2, 311, 23-34 under the heading "respicitur notio veniendi, apparendi sim.", but of the four other instances cited there not one comes even close to the normal meaning of *convenire*.³⁹ One can thus conclude that the use of *obvenire* instead

³⁵ Cf. *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (Sentinum, AD 260), *cum ... freque(n)s numerus coll(egii) fabr(um) Sentinatium convenissent*; *CIL* XI 5750 (also from Sentinum and also from AD 260), *coll(egium) centon(ariorum) cum ... frequentes scribundo adfuissent*.

³⁶ *CIL* XI 3805 = *ILS* 6579 (Veii, AD 26; *centumviri ... cum convenissent*); *AE* 1998, 282 (Lavinium, AD 228; *cum ordo ... convenisset*); *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (Sentinum, AD 260; *cum ... numerus ... convenissent*).

³⁷ *CIL* XI 5750 of AD 260 (n. 35); fourth-century decrees from Paestum: *CIL* X 476 (*ILS* 6112, AD 337) and 477 (AD 347); *AE* 1990, 211 (AD 347). All these decrees use the phrase *cum ... adfuissent* (perhaps one should read [*cum frequens adfuisse*]t – rather than *adesse*]t – *n(umerus) cent(onariorum)* also in the decree of AD 255 from Luna, *CIL* XI 1354 = F. Frasson, *Le epigrafi di Luni romana* I, Alessandria 2013, 105-11). It is only by a curious mistake that *cogere* is used in the same sense in another decree from Paestum, *CIL* X 478 = *ILS* 6114 = *I. Paestum* 108 of AD 344 (*cum cibes frequentes ... coegissent*).

³⁸ See *TLL* IX 2, 310, 47ff. and 85ff. (of subordinates etc. being assigned to their superiors, e.g., quaestors to consuls); 311, 13ff. and 23ff.

³⁹ Note, e.g., Liv. 29,34,8, *Masinnissam ... hostem ad pugnam elicere iubet Scipio ...; se in tempore pugnae obventurum*.

of *convenire* is without a single parallel. But if *obvenire* in the required sense seems odd, one can surely say the same thing about *ordo* being (apparently) used in the sense of "meeting of the *ordo*" ("séance de l'ordre", as translated by Goddard),⁴⁰ a sense for which I cannot find any parallels in the *Thesaurus*.⁴¹

L. 6-10: *ob honorem floridum ordinis n(o)stri et dignitatem patriae civium/q(ue) sp<l>endorem atcrevisse confidemus, d(om)ini c(ons)cripti, quod aetiam vestrum / consensum acci`re fidi sumus {umus}, pro humanitatis et laborum adque industriam / similem ex origine prisca cooptemus, quod quidem nos olim fecisse oportuerat*: this in many parts obscure clause Buonocore (1984, 239) translates as follows: "Per lo splendido rispetto del nostro ordine ed il credito della città e dei cittadini confidiamo che ne abbia aumentato il prestigio, o decurioni, e siamo certi, anzi, di ricevere il vostro unanime consenso; ed aggiungiamo alla benevolenza ed operosità anche uno zelo di antica data, cosa che una volta ci è stato vantaggioso fare". Goddard again offers the following translation: "Pour l'honneur éclatant de notre ordre, nous espérons bien avoir accru et la dignité de la patrie et la gloire des citoyens. Messieurs les Conscriptis: parce que nous sommes assurés qu'il sollicite encore votre accord, élisons (le) en raison de sa bienveillance et de ses travaux, et en vue d'une activité semblable (à celle qui fut déployée) depuis une ancienne origine". Both translations, with some more or less odd features, do seem to reflect the obscurity of the Latin, but, to say the least, do not in my view really correspond to what the *principales* or the writer of the text had wished to say; and both seem to be (again to say the least) misguided in details. It should, for instance, be obvious that the perfect infinitive *atcrevisse* must (as often) stand for the present infinitive *adcrescere*, for the point of the whole passage is surely to be an introduction to the motion of appointing Sofronius as patron. Moreover, there would, of course, be no point in referring to a past "increase" in the city's honour (based on what exactly?), for it is a characteristic of *tabulae patronatus* that they often refer to the positive *future* consequences of someone's election to patron, a theme taken up in this document also later (l. 28f.), although from the point of view of *auxilia* and *beneficia* expected to be delivered by the patron rather than from that of the *honor*

⁴⁰ For the decurions of a city being described as *ordo* see *TLL* IX 2, 961, 53ff.

⁴¹ *TLL* IX, 951ff.; *ordo* in *ordo agendarum rerum* in the inscription from Tymandus *CIL* III 686 = *ILS* 6090 = *MAMA* IV 236 referring to the constitution of the *civitas* just means the "order" in which things should be done.

and *dignitas* of the city. Moreover, the *tabulae* also tend to stress the proposed patron's personal qualities and, in the case of descendants of patrons, his ancestors' merits. It should in any case be obvious that what we have here must have been intended to express thoughts along these lines.

Although it seems that what the *principales* had wanted to say cannot be determined in all its details, I would like to offer the following observations. First of all, it must be noted that the engraver Lucentius must have mistakenly left out an uncertain amount of text which figured in the original decree, for we can be certain that he has omitted at least the name of the person whose election is suggested. It is true that Pompeianus Sofronius is mentioned in l. 11, but in that passage the two *principales* express their hope that Sofronius would accept the honour of the patronate. In the passage discussed here, the suggestion that Sofronius be elected is put forward, and it is quite impossible to assume that this could have been done without any mention of his name. In other words, the verb *cooptemus* in l. 9, now missing an object, must have originally been preceded by its object, i.e. Sofronius (cf. Goddard's awkward translation, "élisons (le)", where "le" remains obscure to the reader who has not yet read the rest of the translation).⁴² That is why I suggest adding < *Sofronium patronum*> before *cooptemus* (the exact form, and location within the clause, of the name must remain uncertain). As for l. 6f., the *principales* can surely not have been referring to their *own* former accomplishments, as implied (if I understand the translation correctly) by the translation of Goddard "nous espérons bien avoir accru et la dignité de la patrie et la gloire des citoyens", where the transitive *accroître* ("to increase [something]") has been substituted for *accrescere*, attested (with one exception) only as an intransitive verb, as in Buonocore's translation⁴³ ("to increase in size", "grow larger", as defined by the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* under no. 1).⁴⁴ Instead, what the two *principales* say must have been meant to justify

⁴² In the translation of Buonocore, *industriam similem ex origine prisca cooptemus* has been translated as "aggiungiamo alla benevolenza ed operosità anche una zelo di antica data", a translation which in my view is very far from the original Latin.

⁴³ See above; in his translation, "prestigio" must correspond to *sp<l>endorem*; Buonocore thus interprets *sp<l>endorem* as the subject of *atrevisse* and the genitives *patriae civiumq(ue)* as defining *dignitatem* ("il credito della città e dei cittadini").

⁴⁴ See *TLL* I 337f. The only exception noted in the *TLL* (p. 337 l. 56ff.) is *Plin. nat.* 11,112 *quae (uruca) adiectis diebus accrescit ... araneo accreta* ("i. aucta") being added here, *quam chrysallidem appellant*.

their proposition to elect Sallius Pompeianus as patron of the city, passages of this nature being normal in decrees dealing with the election of patrons. Because of the verb *confidemus* (which must, of course, be understood as the present *confidimus*, for the men cannot be referring to their future sentiments) it is clear, as already pointed out above, that the *principales* are here referring to what they think will follow from Sofronius' election.

As for the words *ob honorem* etc., whereas Buonocore has the nouns *honorem* and *dignitatem* depend on the preposition *ob*, but takes *splendorem* to be the subject of *atrescere* (see n. 42), Goddard separates *ob honorem ... ordinis n(ostri)* (followed in his text by a comma) from what follows ("Pour l'honneur ... de notre ordre, nous espérons bien avoir accru et la dignité ... et la gloire ..."). However, this translation does not seem to make much sense and the formulation *honorem ... ordinis n(ostri) et dignitatem patriae civiumq(ue) sp<l>endorem* in any case makes it clear that *honorem*, *dignitatem* and *sp<l>endorem* are all subjects of *atcrevisse* (note that in order to arrive at his translation, Goddard has to ignore the presence of *et* before *dignitatem*). What the *principales* wish to say is that as a result of Sofronius' election as patron the *honor* of their *ordo*, the *dignitas* of their *patria* and the *splendor* of the citizens will "increase".⁴⁵ The perfect infinitive *atcrevisse* must therefore, as mentioned above, stand for the present infinitive *adcrescere*.⁴⁶

As for the preposition *ob* preceding *honorem*, perhaps it is permissible to assume that its presence here is due to some error either of the person who drafted the text or of the engraver. If it is an error of the former, perhaps one could assume that he had started to express his thoughts by a construction introduced by the preposition (i.e., by a construction of the type *ob honorem augendum* etc.) but that, having arrived at *splendorem*, he had already forgotten this and moved on to another construction.

In what follows (l. 7f.), *quod aetiam vestrum / consensum acc'i're* (cf. n. 11) *fidis sumus*, the formulation *fidus esse* instead of *confidere* seems unparalleled;⁴⁷ perhaps one could assume that the author of the text, who had

⁴⁵ Cf. below n. 94 for similar references to expectations as to what will follow from someone's election to patron.

⁴⁶ For perfect infinitives instead of present infinitives, see J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, München 1965, 351f.; cf. *fecisse oportuerat* in l. 9f.

⁴⁷ Although note that under *fidus* the TLL has a section "i. q. *fidens, fiduciae plenus*" (TLL VI 1, 706,

just used the verb *confidere* in the previous line, aimed at some variation (but he could have written, e.g., *pro certo habemus*). In any case, this clause does not seem to be in its intended position, for the *principales* can hardly have meant to say (as implied in Buonocore's translation) that they thought that the other decurions would agree that the *honor, dignitas* and *splendor* of the city and its citizens "had increased" or "would increase", as they have not yet clarified on what this "increase" would according to them be based. One could perhaps assume that this clause is meant to refer to what is going to be said in the following, but a more natural position for it would be after *cooptemus*, and in the tentative reconstruction of the whole passage below I have moved it to this position.

In l. 8f., the passage *pro humanitatis ... cooptemus* must have originally contained the proposition to elect Sofronius as patron; it is true that comparable documents do sometimes offer statements of a more general nature regarding the advantages of electing a prestigious person as patron at this point,⁴⁸ but in both texts cited in n. 48 these considerations are immediately followed by the transition to the name of the person whose election is suggested. To continue, this passage must have been preceded by a conjunction, and the expected conjunction is of course *si*, the *si* clause explaining what is needed in order to make the *honor, dignitas* and *splendor* of the city "grow"; this clause should, then, have taken the form *si Sofronium patronum cooptemus*. As for what precedes *cooptemus*, *pro humanitatis et laborum adque industriam similem*, I would prefer not to have to assume that the words clearly meant as genitives, *humanitatis et laborum*, should be simply taken as ablatives or rather, because of the accusative *industriam similem*, accusatives depending on *pro* (Buonocore apparently understands them as datives). Instead, something can be made of this passage if we delete *adque* and take the preposition *pro* to have been used with the accusative instead of the ablative (cf. *TLL* X 2, 1437, 13ff.) and the genitives *humanitatis* and *laborum* to define *industria*; in that case, one could assume that the author had wished to say that Sofronius should be elected because of

21ff.), with one instance from Ammianus (16,12,24, *fidus ingenti robore lacertorum*) and several from the sixth-century author Gregory of Tours.

⁴⁸ *CIL* XI 1354 (AD 255?), *ess[e tutel(ae) i]n perpet(uum) coll(egio) n(ostro), si {eos} patr(onos) nobis coopt(emus) hon(oribus) ill]ustr(ibus) praedit(os), bon(ae) vit(ae) mansuet[u(dine)] plenos; CIL* XI 5749 = *ILS* 7221 = *AE* 1992, 562 (AD 261) *cum sit oportunum crebris beneficiis et adfectionem amoris [erg]a n(umerum) n(ostrum) exhibentibus adsistere et munificentia(m) [eo]rum, sicut oportunitas testimonium perhiberet, [re]munerare.*

(*pro*) his *industria* in exercising his *humanitas* and *labores*.⁴⁹ Moreover, because *industriam* is followed by *similem* defined by *ex origine prisca*, where *origo prisca* is of course a reference to Sofronius' ancestors (cf. *ex origine prisca* etc. in l. 15, *ex origine dignus* in l. 33),⁵⁰ it seems clear that the author had wanted to say, although perhaps not with much success, that Sofronius' *industria* was similar to that of his ancestors. To conclude with this section, keeping in general the fourth-century style, but modifying, correcting and adding some details, one could arrive at the following reconstruction of what the author of the text might have said in the passage in l. 6-10 had he been more capable of expressing his thoughts in the right order in Latin: *honorem floridum ordinis n(o)stri et dignitatem patriae civiumq(ue) splendorem ad crescere confidimus, d(omi)ni c(onscripti), <si> pro humanitatis et laborum industria simili ex origine prisca < ... Sofronium patronum > cooptemus – quod quidem nos olim fecisse oportuerat –,⁵¹ quod etiam vestrum consensum accire confidimus.*

As for l. 10ff., the preceding passage is followed by the words *ut omnes rogemus, hunc (h)onorem nostrum conprobare dignetur*, this again being followed by the full name of Sofronius in the nominative. Here the *ut* is odd,⁵² for there is nothing in the text that precedes it that would require a following final clause; as for interpreting *ut* as consecutive, the only possibility, as far as I can see, would be to see it as somehow explaining *fecisse oportuerat* ("something we should have done long ago, namely to ask ..."). But what is meant

⁴⁹ Goddard, who says (p. 1028 n. 14) that it is "surprising" that *pro* is followed by genitives, in his translation (p. 1030) separates, in my view incorrectly, *humanitatis et laborum* from *industriam similem* ("en raison de sa bienveillance et de ses travaux, et en vue d'une activité semblable ...").

⁵⁰ Buonocore's translation, "zelo [for *industriam*] – di antica data" is in my view incorrect. For the use of *origo* in late Antiquity in this sense when referring to ancestors, cf., e.g., *CIL* X 478 = *ILS* 6114 (*aequitas* etc. *ex origine propagata*) and *CIL* X 5349 (*ex origine patronatus*); for the terms *ex origine patronus* and *patronus originalis* see *TLL* IX 2 (1980) 987, 52ff. and 980, 19ff. R. González Fernández's article on the term *origo* in inscriptions, *Zephyrus* 68 (2011) 229-37, does not deal with this aspect of *origo*.

⁵¹ In this clause, *quod* is without doubt the relative pronoun; but Goddard in his translation (p. 1030) takes it to be the conjunction "parce que" which produces a translation which does not really seem to correspond to what one assumes the Latin is meant to say ("parce qu'autrefois, en vérité – this seems to be a translation of *quidem* –, il avait importé de faire en sorte de demander tous cet honneur, le nôtre qu'il daigne l'accepter"). For the construction *nos fecisse oportuerat*, cf. *CIL* XIV 4570 (Ostia), *oportuerat te ... sollicitudine(m) adhibuisse*.

⁵² Interpreting *ut* as an equivalent of *et* (thus Buonocore 1984) does not seem to be of any real use.

by *fecisse* has already been made clear by the verb *cooptemus*, and so there is no need for further elaboration; and the verb in a consecutive clause depending on *fecisse oportuerat* should of course not be in the present subjunctive. Taking into account this and the fact that what one would expect here is *itaque* introducing the logical conclusion – *itaque omnes rogemus* – of what has been said in the preceding lines,⁵³ and furthermore the fact that there would be a suitable place for *ut* after *rogemus* (although an *ut* before *dignetur* is surely not indispensable)⁵⁴ one wonders whether one could not assume that the engraver has mistakenly replaced an *itaque* before *omnes* by an *ut* originally intended to be inserted between *rogemus* and *hunc*. The result would then be ‘*itaque omnes rogemus, <ut> hunc (h)onorem nostrum conprobare dignetur*’⁵⁵ *C. Sallius Pompeianus Sofronius*. The names of Sofronius are followed in the genitive by those of his great-grandfather, also patron of Amiternum (*pronepos Salli Proculi pat(roni)*),⁵⁶ and of his father in Goddard’s text and in that of other

⁵³ For *itaque* in a similar context, following on a description of a person’s merits, cf., e.g., *AE* 1998, 282 (Lanuvium, AD 228); *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (Sentinum, AD 260); *CIL* X 476 = *ILS* 6112 (Paestum, AD 337); *CIL* IX 10 = *ILS* 6113 (Neretum, AD 341); *CIL* X 477 (Paestum, AD 347). In the last three cases, the person whose merits are discussed is already patron, but has not yet received a *tabula*.

⁵⁴ Cf. *impetrent, dignetur* in *CIL* VI 1492 (cited in next n.).

⁵⁵ That *dignetur* depends on *rogemus* can in my view not be doubted, although Goddard (p. 1030 n. 24) seems to think otherwise (however, the reasons for this are unclear). Goddard (*ibid.*) also wants to separate *honorem* and *nostrum, nostrum* (“le nôtre”), according to him referring to Sofronius. But *noster* cannot be used in this way and *honorem* needs to be defined by *nostrum* (“the honour we are conferring”). As for *dignetur* (mistranslated by Buonocore 1984, 239 as “sia degno”, this being continued by “eleggere”; in his 1992 text Buonocore puts a semicolon between *conprobare* and *dignetur*), *dignari* (“to deign to”; not *dignare*) is, of course, the expected expression in this context; cf. *CIL* VI 1492 = *ILS* 6106 (c. AD 101), *legatos ..., qui ab eo impetrent, in clientelam amplissimae domus sua municipium nostrum recipere dignetur*; *AE* 1998, 282 (Lavinium AD 228) *qui nos et in clientela sua recipere dignatur*; *CIL* IX 3429 = *ILS* 6110 (Peltuinum, AD 242); *CIL* XI 1354 (Luna, AD ?255); *CIL* XI 6335 = *ILS* 7218 (Pisaurum, AD 256); *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (Sentinum, AD 260); *CIL* XI 5749 = *ILS* 7221 = *AE* 1992, 562 (Sentinum, AD 261); *CIL* X 476 = *ILS* 6112 (Paestum, AD 337); *AE* 1992, 301 (Larinum, AD 344); *CIL* X 478 = *ILS* 6114 (Paestum, AD 344); *CIL* X 477 (Paestum, AD 347); *Suppl. It.* 2 Histonium 3 (AD 383); *CIL* VI 29682 = *CIL* XI 712a; *CIL* V 5815; *AE* 1975, 367 = *Suppl. It.* 2 Histonium 3 (AD 383). For *dignatio*, also sometimes used in similar contexts, see below n. 60.

⁵⁶ For this man of about Severan date, mentioned in several inscriptions (*CIL* IX 4206. 4207. 4208. 4399), see Harmand (above n. 3) 272; S. Segenni, *Suppl. It.* 9 (1992) 34 (on *CIL* IX 4206).

editors as follows: *filius Sal(li) Proculi patroni pat(riae) ord(inis) Aveia{ia}tium Vest(inorum)*. In the translation of Buonocore 1984, this is rendered as follows: "di Sallius Proculus, patrono di Aveia vestina", in that of Goddard as "patron de la patrie et de l'ordre des Aueatins et des Vestins".⁵⁷ Buonocore thus seems to ignore the words *pat(riae) ord(inis)* altogether, whereas Goddard refers *pat(riae)* to Amiternum and *ord(inis)* to Aveia. However, as we see from the description of the great-grandfather, *pat(roni)* or *patroni* would have been quite enough if one wanted to say that someone was patron of Amiternum, and although one could say *patronus patriae nostrae* to make things sufficiently clear (cf. *patronum ... patriae n(ostrae)* in l. 32), I very much doubt whether *patronus patriae* (without the defining *nostrae*) would have been an acceptable expression. Moreover, the abbreviation *pat.*, in the description of the great-grandfather, was just used as an abbreviation of *patronus*, and if *pat(riae)* were a reference to Amiternum and *ord(inis)* to Aveia one would like to have an *et* (added in the translation of Goddard) between the two words. I thus wonder whether we could not assume that what comes after *patroni*, the description of Sallius Proculus the father, would be a description of Sofronius himself, i.e., that we would have to read *pat(ronus)* and that the text would be saying that Sofronius was, at the time when his election for patron of Amiternum was proposed, already patron of the *ordo* of Aveia, the patron of which city he certainly was ten years later in AD 335⁵⁸ and the patron of which his great-grandfather had been (see n. 56).⁵⁹ With

According to the inscriptions cited above he was patron also of Aveia, Foruli and Peltuinum. On the Sallii from Amiternum in general, see S. Segenni, *SCO* 41 (1991) 395-401.

⁵⁷ The translation "et des Vestins" is not really correct, as the reference here is not to the Vestini in general (thus including also the people of Aufinum, Peltuinum, Pinna, etc.), but only to the *Aveiates*, described here, as often, as *Vestini* (the translation of Buonocore is thus correct). For the Vestini cf. E. Dupraz, *Les Vestins à l'époque tardo-républicaine: du nord-osque au latin*, Mont-Saint-Aignan 2010.

⁵⁸ In the *tabula* concerning his son *AE* 1937, 121 = *Suppl. It.* 9 Amiternum 35 he is said to be (in the genitive) *pat(roni) ord(inis) e[t] populi civitatum Amiterninorum, Reatinorum, Interamnatum Praetuttinorum* (sic) *et Ave<ia>tium*. If there is a difference between *patronus ordinis* and *patronus ordinis et populi* (cf. the descriptions of Sallius Proculus the great-grandfather as patron of Amiternum as *patrono decurionum et populi* in *CIL* IX 4206 and as [*patrono*] ... *ordinis et populi* in *CIL* IX 4208), the patronate of the *populus* had been added sometime between 325 and 335.

⁵⁹ Possibly Sallius Proculus the great-grandfather had also first been elected patron of Aveia, for in *CIL* IX 4207 (*ILS* 5015) he is honoured only as patron of this particular city.

this interpretation, the mention of Aveia (in any case ignored in the case of the great-grandfather) would have a certain point. To conclude with this section, I think that a version of this passage which could come closer to what the *principales* wanted to say could have been something like this: *itaque omnes rogemus, ut hunc (h)onorem nostrum conprobare dignetur C. Sallius Pompeianus Sofronius, pronepos Salli Proculi pat(roni), fil(ius) Sal(li) Proculi patroni, pat(ronus) ord(inis) Aveiatium Vest(inorum)*.

After the mention of Sofronius in the nominative, as the subject of *dignetur*, the text goes on with *patronum cohoptemus* (sic), *si modo de eius dignatione*⁶⁰ *testimonium perportemus*⁶¹ (l. 12f.). Here, too, something is clearly missing, for *cohoptemus* cannot stand without an object, i.e. Sofronius. And as this clause is obviously meant as a sort of recapitulation of what has been said earlier, an *igitur* would certainly not be out of the place here.⁶² I thus suggest

⁶⁰ The expression *dignatio* (cf. *dignari*, above n. 55) seems to have been misinterpreted by Buonocore and Goddard. Buonocore translates the words *de eius dignatione testimonium* as "qualche prova di questo suo credito presso di noi", Goddard as "témoignage de la considération dont jouit ce dernier". Now it is true that *dignatio* does have the meaning "[t]he fact of being esteemed, repute, honour" (*OLD* 2). But here this expression is without doubt used as the noun corresponding to *dignari* "to deign to" and, accordingly, in a different meaning, namely in that defined in the *TLL* (V 1, 1132, 14f.) as "*actio dignandi, abiit in sensum benevolentiae, gratiae, clementiae*" (for the latter nuance cf., e.g., *AE* 1990, 211 [Paestum, AD 347], *cum Aquilius ... nos municipes sua dignatione unice diligit*), which one could translate as "assent", "compliance"). The term *dignatio* is thus not used here to describe the feelings of the people of Amiternum towards Sofronius, but (as in other documents of a similar nature, for which see below) those of Sofronius himself; *dignatio* here expresses the benevolent compliance of Sofronius with the wish of his citizens to offer him the patronate. For other instances of the expression *dignatio* used of the disposition of patrons or future patrons, cf., e.g., *CIL* IX 3429 = *ILS* 6110 (Peltuinum, AD 242, with a reference to *dignatio benignitatis eius*); *CIL* XI 6335 = *ILS* 7218 (Pisaurum, AD 256); *CIL* IX 1681 = *ILS* 7219 (Beneventum, AD 257). In the tablet from Amiternum of AD 335 (*AE* 1937, 121 = *Suppl. It.* 9 Amiternum 35), the abstract expression *eius [digna]tio* is used to refer to the future patron himself (*petendumq(ue) sit de eius [digna]tione, ut hanc scripturam nostram ... suscipiat*).

⁶¹ According to *TLL* X 1 (1998) 1655, 25-33, cf. 2786, 37f., *perportare* is extremely rare and, in addition to this inscription, attested only in *Tab. Vindol.* III 642 ii 5, in *P. Tjäder* 37, 35 of AD 591 and in *Gloss.* V 132,4.

⁶² There is another *igitur* in l. 14 at the beginning of the enumeration of Sofronius' merits. For *igitur* in a similar context cf., e.g., *CIL* XI 5750 (Sentinum, AD 260) *igitur si cunctis videtur; tabulam aeream continentem testimonium circa eum nostr(a)e adfectionis < ---- ? >*; *CIL* X 478 = *ILS* 6114 = *I. Paestum* 108 (344), *igitur Helpidio honestissimo viro pro dignitate sua patronatum offeramus*.

that the original form of this clause could have been of the type <*Pompeianum igitur Sofronium*> *patronum cohoptemus* etc. A translation of this passage could then be (taking into account the meaning of *dignatio* as explained in n. 60) "let us thus coopt Pompeianus Sofronius as patron, if only we could receive from him an assurance of his compliance (with our wish)".

The text now moves on to say that everyone would be extremely happy if Sofronius accepted the patronate being offered to him, this being formulated as a question (l. 13f.): *Quis etenim immo exultet, et suam proferat volumptatem?* In this form, this clause can surely not be correct, for because of the interpretation of *volumptas* as that of Sofronius himself (see below) a *non* must be missing – of course the writer of the text must be asking not "who would rejoice (if Sofronius gave his assent)?" but "who would *not* rejoice?" – and something should be done about *immo*. Now one of the main uses of the particle *immo* is to "introduce the correction of a preceding statement" (*OLD*).⁶³ It seems to follow that we need to postulate another verb preceding *immo*; as *ex(s)ultare* is a fairly strong expression ("to show unrestrained pleasure, exult" *OLD* 3), any verb with the meaning "to be glad, pleased", but less forceful than *ex(s)ultare*, would do. The verb *gaudere*, for instance, would be suitable, although one could also think about *laetari*; I would thus suggest that this clause could have originally been of the type *Quis etenim <non gaudeat>, immo exultet ...?* But there is one more detail, namely *voluntas* or, as the writer of the text puts it, *volumptas* (a common "vulgar" form).⁶⁴ Whose *voluntas* is meant? In Buonocore's and Goddard's translations, the *voluntas* seems to be attributed to the people of Amiternum.⁶⁵ But asking "and (who would not) show his approval?" *after* the question "who would (not) rejoice/exult?" seems extremely lame, and since the writer of the text has just said *si modo de eius dignatione testimonium perportemus*, it seems obvious to me that *voluntas* here must correspond to *dignatio* and is thus a sentiment that has to be attributed to Sofronius himself. What the writer wanted to

⁶³ Cf. *TLL* VII 1, 478, 8ff., "*praeualet notio corrigendi i. q. 'atque adeo', 'vel potius'*".

⁶⁴ M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München 1977, 216f. (although Leumann mentions only manuscripts; for inscriptions cf. *CIL* XI 4095 = *ILS* 5696; *AE* 2010, 1294 = *Tituli Aquincenses* II 591).

⁶⁵ "che qualcuno certamente esprima la sua gioia e manifesti il proprio consenso" (Buonocore 1984); "qui, vraiment sursauterait et différerait son consentement" (Goddard, who thus appears to take *proferre* "to display" to mean the same as *differre* "to postpone").

say is surely that everybody would be extremely happy once it became known that Sofronius had given his consent – something like this must be the meaning of *voluntas* here – to his election as patron. With this interpretation, *et* before *suam proferat* must be changed to (e.g.) *cum*, but taking into account the state of the text as inscribed this seems permissible. In conclusion, I think that this passage should have approximately the following form: *quis etenim <non gaud-eat,> immo 'exultet', 'cum' suam proferat volumptatem.*

Now the *principales* move on to a detailed description of Sofronius' merits which are indeed impressive, the whole being framed by the formulation of their proposal – already expressed in l. 9ff., but repeated here – to elect Sofronius as patron, presented to the representatives of the *ordo*: *Ideo igitur, domini co(n)scripti* (l. 14f.) ... *ergo merito consen{se}tiri nos et C. Sallium Pompeianum patronum pr(a)eficiamus* (l. 26f.). Here, too, some particulars may have gone wrong. On the one hand, the combination of *ideo*⁶⁶ and *ergo*⁶⁷ seems awkward (perhaps the writer, having arrived at the end of the list of Sofronius' merits, had simply forgotten that he had started with *ideo*); on the other, there is the infinitive *consen{se}tiri* (corresponding to *vestrum consensum* in l. 7f.), and some have also raised a question about the *et* before *C. Sallium*. As for the infinitive *consen{se}tiri*, because of some parallels (cf. below) it is probably meant as an impersonal passive infinitive (cf. *TLL* IV 397, 39f.), although the pronoun *nos* (combined with *consentiri* present also in l. 31) is in that case disturbing (one thus wonders if the writer of the text might not have thought that he is dealing with a deponent verb **consentior*, cf. *assentior*).⁶⁸ In any case, an infinitive certainly comes somewhat unexpectedly at this point where one

⁶⁶ For *ideo* in a similar context cf., e.g., *AE* 1991, 713 (Fidentia, AD 206), *et ideo cum sit Virius ... vir eximiae indolis (sic) praeditus ... placuit universis tabulam aeneam patrocinal(em) ei poni*; *CIL* XI 2702 = *ILS* 7217 (Volsinii, AD 224), *et ideo Anchariam ... patronam ... cooptemus*; *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (Sentinum, AD 260) *et ideo cum sit Coretius Fuscus splendide natus ... <placuit> ei tabulam aeream ... offer(r)i*.

⁶⁷ For *ergo* cf. *CIL* XI 1354 (Luna, AD 255?), *ergo cu[m] sit L. Cot(tius?) Proculus vir splen[d(idus)] etc.*

⁶⁸ However, seeing that in this period either those who wrote or those who inscribed inscriptions often fail to differentiate between active and passive infinitives (e.g., *CIL* VI 29682, *placet ... tabulam ... [ad]ferri deberi*; *CIL* IX 10 = *ILS* 6113 (Neretum, AD 341) *placet ... tabulam ... ei offerre devere (= debere)*, one should probably not overinterpret the reading *consentiri*.

would perhaps rather expect the subjunctive form *consentiamus*.⁶⁹ The explanation may, however, be this. The infinitive *consentiri* is in fact found both below (l. 31) in the very same document and in other similar documents, but not at this point, within the proposition presented (in this text by the *principales*) to the members of a group (here the decurions of Amiternum) expected to come to a decision in a certain matter, but in the section in which the decree is set out. Thus we find here (l. 30f.) *placet ... allegationi ... consentiri nos*, and in *CIL* XI 1354 from Luna of AD ?255, *placere ... relationi ... consentiri*. In this latter instance, the infinitive *placere* is to be explained by the fact that these sections are normally formulated as indirect speech; but this, again, takes us to the *tabula* of AD 261 from Sentinum, *CIL* XI 5749 = *ILS* 7221 = *AE* 1992, 562. In this text, the decree is also formulated as indirect speech, but without the introductory *placere* which, then, could in some cases be omitted (although one could perhaps assume that this expression has been omitted only by mistake): *qu(id) f(ieri) p(laceret) d(e) e(a) r(e), i(ta) c(uncti) c(ensuerunt): quod in praeteritum* etc. (reasons being given here for the *consensio*), *adque ideo consentiri relationi* etc. This makes me wonder whether one could not assume that the person who wrote this text thought that it would be a good idea to use already in the proposition the phrasing, or at least parts of it, of the result of the proposition, namely the decree itself, especially as the formulations here (*consen{se}tiri nos et ... pr(a)eficiamus*) are in part identical with those in the decree quoted in l. 30ff. (*consentiri nos et ... praeficiamus*). There is, of course, the fact that in imitating at this point the decree the writer has omitted a dative indicating the object of the *consensus* (*allegatio* in the decree, l. 30), and perhaps also the verb *placet* or rather *placeat*; but this can surely not have bothered him too much. As for the *et* before *C. Sallium* etc., Annibaldi p. 98 and Buonocore 1992, p. 75 suggest that it should be corrected to *ut* (with the result *consentiri nos, ut pr(a)eficiamus*); but if the writer of the text is quoting here the decree where we have *et praeficiamus*, this correction is surely unnecessary. Finally, it should be observed that the expression *aliquem patronum praeficere*, also used in the decree proper in l. 32f. and in the *tabula* of AD 335, l. 16f., is otherwise without a parallel.

⁶⁹ I cannot understand the point and meaning of Goddard's affirmation (p. 1031 n. 27) that this is "un infinitif d'exclamation".

But between the beginning of this section in l. 14f. (*ideo igitur ...*) and its conclusion, just discussed, in l. 26f., there is in l. 15-26 a long list of Sofronius' merits, introduced in the beginning with the conjunction *quod*; however, the next merit is introduced by *quiq(ue)* and the other items in the list are simply enumerated without any introductory conjunctions or pronouns:

- (1) *quod ex origine prisca genus eiusdem patronatus olim processerint et labores quantos [[et quantos]] et quales in nos [[contulit]] et patriam nostram contulit* (l. 15-17);
- (2) *quiq(ue) ex suis laboribus munera patronatus dena et sena magg(istratibus) filiorum suorum sple<n>didissimae civitati n(ostrae) cum favore ededit* (l. 17-19);
- (3) *Aquas Arentani, quas – i.e., quae – iam delaps(a)e fuerant, civitati n(ostrae) additis lacis castellisq(ue) salientes restituit* (l. 19-20);
- (4) *thermas, quas – i.e., quae – iam olim disperierant antiquitus, inpendiis et pecunia sua cum porticis novis factis et omni ornamento at pulcri<tu>dinem restauravit statuisque decoravit et nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes(aris) natale Idibus Nob(embribus) dedicavit, quarum dedicatione biduum t(h)eatrum et dena Iuvenaliorum spectaculis – i.e., spectacula – exs(h)ibuit sub pr(a)esentia Cl(audi) Urani v(iri) p(erfectissimi) corr(ectoris) n(ostri)* (l. 21-25);
- (5) *cives et ordinem n(ostrum) aepulis ex suis viribus confrequentavit* (l. 25-26; however, this act must be a continuation of what was said under the preceding heading, cf. below).

In the first item in the list (*quod ex origine prisca genus eiusdem patronatus olim processerint* etc.), the *principales* observe that the family had furnished patrons of Amiternum for a long time⁷⁰ and that members of the family had offered numerous impressive *labores* ("benefici" Buonocore 1984; "travaux" Goddard) to the decurions and to the city in general. For *ex origine prisca* cf. the same formulation in l. 9, and *genus* in the meaning of *gens* is not unknown in late-

⁷⁰ I am not sure whether this has been rendered correctly by Buonocore, who translates *quod ... processerint* as "anche per il passato sarà stato ambito tale patronato" (this seems in part to be based on what Annibaldi says on p. 101). In *TLL* X 2, 1502, 65f. the whole passage, quoted under the section "procedunt animantes", is described as being "syntaxi turbata".

Antique inscriptions.⁷¹ As *genus eiusdem* must be the subject of this clause, *patronatus*, if this is the correct reading, should be either a genitive singular or a plural accusative and thus the object of *processerint*. But I cannot possibly see how interpreting it as a genitive could take us anywhere,⁷² and there does not seem to be much that could be done with *patronatus* (acc.) *procedere*, this verb being intransitive and thus not in need of an object. That is why I suggest reading *patronatu{s}*, where *genus* would be the subject of *procedere*, the nature of which would, again, be defined by the ablative *patronatu*, *procedere patronatu* literally meaning, e.g., "to proceed with/by the patronate", but which could possibly be taken to mean something like "to hold the patronate continuously". As for the verb *procedere* itself, it may be worth noting that it is also used in other *tabulae patronatus*, although not in a similar context: in *CIL XI 5749 = ILS 7221 = AE 1992, 562* (Sentinum, AD 261 it is hoped that *beneficia* would also in the future be *processura* from Coretius Fuscus, the patron of Sentinum the document is dealing with. In the *tabula* of AD 335 from Amiternum (*AE 1937, 121 = Suppl. It. 9 Amiternum 35*), this verb may also have been meant to have *beneficia* as its subject; in *CIL VI 29682* its subject is unclear. As for the reading *processerint*, if *genus* is, as I suggest, the subject of this verb, then one would of course expect the singular, and correcting this reading to *processeri{n}t* has in fact been suggested.⁷³ However, the plural can perhaps be kept if one assumes that this is a *constructio ad sensum* of sorts, as *genus* does include several persons (cf. Goddard p. 1029 n. 15).

As for what follows (l. 16f.), in a clause introduced by *quod* one would of course not expect *labores quantos et quales* but *labores tantos et tales*, but Buonocore and Goddard may well be right in taking this passage to have been

⁷¹ Cf., e.g., the references to *genus eius* in the *tabula patronatus* of AD 260 from Sentinum, *CIL XI 5750*, and in the fourth-century honorific inscription from Abellinum, *CIL X 1126*.

⁷² Goddard, however, who translates "parce que depuis longtemps ils ont tiré d'une ancienne origine la source d'un même patronat", does seem to take it as a genitive, and thus apparently a genitive depending on *genus*; but although *genus* can perhaps be translated in many ways, I fail to understand how it could end up meaning "source". Moreover, Goddard's translation seems to presuppose that *procedere* could be translated as a transitive verb meaning "tirer" ("to draw", "to pull"), which is not only in my view, but clearly also in that of the *Thesaurus*, not possible.

⁷³ This is the reading of Buonocore 1984 and 1992 and Segenni. Annibaldi and Goddard keep the plural.

intended as an exclamation;⁷⁴ note also that the expression *qu[anta] et qualia (beneficia?)* seems to have been used similarly in the document of AD 335 from Amiternum, line 16f.

In lines 17-9 we find the second reason for conferring the patronate on Sofronius, this being now introduced by *quiq(ue)*, namely that, in order to celebrate his sons' magistratures, Sofronius had paid for sixteen *munera* in each case,⁷⁵ this generosity having been received with enthusiasm (*cum favore*).⁷⁶ The expression *ex suis laboribus* is assumed to mean "among his achievements" (i.e., "(to mention one) of his achievements") both by Buonocore and by Goddard,⁷⁷ but because of the preposition *ex* (rather than *inter*) my impression is that by using this expression the writer of this text rather wanted to indicate the source of the funding of the *munera*, this phrase perhaps meaning something like "from his own resources". The abbreviation *magg.* must, as already seen by Annibaldi (p. 100), stand for *magistratibus*, this surely being a temporal ablative. For the reading *sple<n>didissimae*, see above n. 16; it is true that some scholars have preferred to read *sple<n>didissima*, taking this expression to define *munera*,⁷⁸ but the *munera* are described in a satisfactory way by *dena et sena*, whereas the expression *civitati* is, in addition to *n(ostrae)*, in need of a more specific characterisation, for which task the dative *splendidissimae* is of course perfect.

The list goes on with achievement no. 3 (l. 19f.), namely the rebuilding of an aqueduct known as *Aquae Arentani* (cf. Annibaldi p. 102). In this section, one observes the accusative *quas* instead of *quae* (*Aquas ... quas ... iam delaps(a) e fuerant*), something which I would *a priori* prefer to attribute to the engraver – who had just engraved *Aquas* – rather than to the general "vulgar" and late tendency to substitute accusatives for nominatives. However, what makes one

⁷⁴ "e quanti e quali sono stati i benefici che ha arrecato a noi ed alla nostra città!", Buonocore 1984, 240; "de travaux de quelle grandeur et de quelle qualité", Goddard p. 1031.

⁷⁵ Here the use of a distributive number is of course justified, whereas *dena* in l. 24 is clearly an error.

⁷⁶ "attirandosi, in questo modo, il consenso [di tutti]", Buonocore 1984, 240; Goddard (p. 1031) seems to leave this untranslated.

⁷⁷ "Tra le sue prestazioni", Buonocore 1984, 240; "Parmi ses travaux", Goddard p. 1031.

⁷⁸ Thus Annibaldi and Buonocore 1984 (who translates "grandiosi *munera*"; a translation of *civitati n(ostrae)* seems to have been omitted). Goddard correctly translates "à notre très splendide cité".

think is the fact that we find another *quas* for *quae* in l. 21 (*thermas, quas ... disperierant*). For the ablative *lacis* instead of *lacubus* cf. *porticis* in l. 22.⁷⁹

Achievement no. 4 follows in l. 21-5. This longer section says that Sofronius had at his own expense (*inpendiis*) and with his own money⁸⁰ rebuilt the baths, adding porticoes and all kind of decoration (*omni ornamento*) and also statues,⁸¹ this resulting in the *pulcri<tu>do* of the edifice. Furthermore, Sofronius had dedicated the baths "in the name of Constantius Caesar" on November 13, said to be the *natalis* of the same Constantius, to celebrate which occasion he had offered two days of theatrical performances and ten performances (*spec-taculis* having by a curious mistake been engraved instead of *spectacula*) of *Iuvenalia* in the presence of Claudius Uranius, "our" *corrector*, i.e. *corrector* of Flaminia and Picenum (*PLRE* I Uranius 4, apparently also mentioned in *CIL* IX 4517). This is a notable passage which certainly merits some annotation. For *quas* instead of *quae* cf. above; as for the verb *disperierant*, according to the Clauss-Slaby database, this is the only certain instance of *disperire* in the whole corpus of Latin inscriptions.⁸² But what seems even more notable is that in the whole corpus of Latin in general, or at least of pre-medieval Latin, there is not a single other instance of *disperire* being applied to buildings, for the assertion in the *Thesaurus*, under the heading "*de rebus corporeis*" (*TLL* V 1, 1405, 57ff.), that Cassiodorus uses the verb *disperire* of *aedificia*, is based on a curious misunderstanding.⁸³ As for the time when the baths had "perished", it is defined by

⁷⁹ For *lacubus* in inscriptions dealing with aqueducts, cf. *ILS* 5764, 5777, for *lacibus* see *Suppl. It.* 4 Albingaunum 7. For further instances of second-declination forms of *porticus*, see *TLL* X 2, 1 (1980) 24, 45ff.

⁸⁰ For the reading *pecunia sua* (rather than *sua pecunia*), see n. 21.

⁸¹ In the text as we have it, the statues are mentioned only after the *pulcri<tu>do* which one would assume to have been meant as a description of the final result, including the statues. I thus wonder whether the intended original wording could not have been *omni ornamento statuisque decoravit*; this would furnish a verb also for *omni ornamento*.

⁸² It is true that *male dispereat* is read in the *defixiones* *CIL* I² 2520abcde = A. Kropp, *Defixiones* (Speyer 2008), no. 1.4.4/8-1.4.4/12, but only as the result of the correction of *disperdat* to *dispereat*.

⁸³ The passage cited in the *Thesaurus*, in *psalm.* 128,6, runs as follows (see the edition of M. Adriaen in *Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina* vol. XCVIII [1958] p. 1184): *Solent aedificia deserta in cacuminibus caduca fena producere, quae ante tempus collectionis arefacta dispereunt, quia nulla firmissima radice vigerunt*. It should, of course, be obvious that *disperire* is here applied to *fena*, not to *aedificia*.

the adverbs *iam olim* and *antiquitus*, placed before and after the verb. There does not seem to be a single parallel for this combination of these adverbs.

The baths are said to have been dedicated *nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes(aris)*. This can hardly mean "in the name of Constantius Caesar", at least if this formulation is taken to imply that Sofronius had dedicated the baths meant to have been dedicated by Constantius Caesar himself. Instead, this expression probably rather means that the baths now bore Constantius' name, i.e., that they were now called, in the same way as bathing establishments in Limisa in Africa and Ephesus,⁸⁴ *thermae Constantianae*; this would also explain the fact that no name is given for the baths in l. 21, when they are first mentioned.

Although the genitive *d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti* already depends on one ablative, namely *nomine*, it clearly also depends – in a most awkward way – on another ablative, *natale*; surely it would have been preferable to say, e.g., *nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti ... (die) natali eiusdem*. The expression *natale* is taken by all commentators of this inscription from Annibaldi onwards to refer not to Constantius' birthday but to the anniversary of his nomination to Caesar in 324 AD,⁸⁵ and perhaps there is no other possible interpretation, for Constantius, one of the sons of Constantine, is said to have been born on August 7,⁸⁶ whereas his nomination to Caesar is in our sources given as November 8, AD 324.⁸⁷ As our inscription speaks of November 13, the only question remaining would then be which of our sources has the correct date.⁸⁸ However, the fact

⁸⁴ *AE* 2004, 1681; *CIL* III 14195, 28 = *ILS* 5704 = *I. Ephesos* 1314.

⁸⁵ Annibaldi p. 103, Buonocore 1984, p. 240 and Segenni p. 89: "nel giorno della sua nomina a Cesare" (all with the same words); Goddard 1031: "Le jour de son avènement". The same view is taken by W. Seston, *REA* 39 (1937) 197 (referred to by Segenni) and in *PLRE* Constantius 8.

⁸⁶ Thus in the *fasti* of Philocalus, *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, p. 253 and in those of Polemius Silvius, *ibid.* p. 271 (cf. A. Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, 492).

⁸⁷ Thus the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Th. Mommsen, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Auctores antiquissimi* IX p. 232 (cf. also *ibid.* the *Chronicon Paschale* on AD 325); the *fasti* of Philocalus, *Inscr. It.* XIII 2, p. 259 (speaking of *natalis*); *Amm.* 14,5,1 (dealing with AD 353), where *Octobres* must be corrected to *Novembres (diem sextum Idus Octobres, qui imperii eius annum vicesimum terminabat)*.

⁸⁸ Seston (n. 85) and Segenni p. 89 accept the testimony of our inscription (and Seston in n. 1 adds that the date November 8 is an error). But other scholars seem to stick to the traditional date, thus assuming that the date mentioned in our inscription is wrong (thus Degrassi (above n. 86) 529; *PLRE*

is that *natalis* normally means "birthday", and this obviously raises the question whether *natalis* can have also had the meaning "anniversary". As this question does not seem to have been addressed in the earlier studies dealing with this inscription, it may be of some use if I quote some parallels taken from the fairly recent lemma "natalis" in the *TLL* (IX 1, 122ff.) which do seem to show that *natalis* could also have this meaning, although it must be said that the instances are rare.⁸⁹ This having been settled, we may conclude this section by observing that since the dedication of the restored baths took place on November 13 and the meeting of the decurions was held in December 7, the meeting took place not very many weeks after the dedication.

The fifth and final reason for the bestowal of the patronate is given in the following form (l. 25f.): *cives et ordinem n(ostrum) aepulis ex suis viribus confrequentavit*. As seen by Buonocore,⁹⁰ this must be a continuation of what was said under the previous heading, as the festivities mentioned there must have been concluded by a banquet. As for the formulations of this clause, the expression *ex suis viribus* must mean the same as *pecunia sua*, i.e. "from his own means" (perhaps the writer of the text, who had used *pecunia sua* in l. 21, aimed at some variation). There do not seem to be many parallels for the term *vires* being used in the sense of "means"; however, cf. *ILAlg.* II 7949/7950 from Cuicul, *qui ... suis virib(us) propria(ue) pecunia instituit perfecit et ... dedicavit* (the object of this building operation is unknown).⁹¹ To continue, both the expression

I Constantius 8, adding "not Nov. 13, as *AE* 1937, 119"; B. Bleckmann, in *Der Neue Pauly* 3 (1997) 146; D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, (Darmstadt 52011) 314.

⁸⁹ In Cic. *Att.* 3,20,1 of 58 BC, Cicero writes *natalem reditus mei cura, ut ... agam tecum et cum meis; natalis reditus mei* here obviously cannot be translated otherwise than as "the anniversary of my return (i.e., from exile)". Further instances: *Paneg.* 6(7),2,3, *quamvis ... ille felicissimus dies proxima religione celebratus imperii tui* (of Constantine) *natalis habeatur*; *Hist. Aug. Hadr.* 4,6 *Quintum iduum August(arum) diem legatus Suriae litteras adoptionis accepit, quando et natalem adoptionis celebrari iussit*; *ibid.* § 7 *Tertium iduum earundem, quando et natalem imperii statuit celebrandum, excessus ei Traiani nuntiatus est*; *Hist. Aug. Pert.* 15,5 *Circenses et imperii* (of Pertinax) *natalis additi, qui a Severo postea sublatis sunt*; *Pol. Silv. fast.* Oct. 23 (*Inscr. It.* XIII 2, p. 273) *natalis Valentiniani purpurae* ("the anniversary of Valentinian's purple", i.e. of his becoming emperor in AD 424). Cf. also the Christian instances of the type *natalis martyrii* in *TLL* IX 1, 125, 47ff.

⁹⁰ This becomes clear from his translation, which begins with "a conclusione delle celebrazioni imbandi a sue spese banchetti".

⁹¹ Cf. *CIL* VIII 4766 = 18700 (Macomades in Numidia, AD 293/305), *aquae ductum ... lacum viribus*

epulis confrequentare and the verb *confrequentare* itself are also of some interest. This verb, in general a rare word but used in our document also in l. 35, is in epigraphical Latin according to the definitions of the *OLD* used in the sense "to visit frequently or in large numbers" and "to celebrate, keep (a festival, etc.); to keep in mind, maintain (the memory of the dead)"; it is in the first sense that it is used below in l. 35 (cf. below at n. 106). But in most epigraphical instances the use of *confrequentare* is either somehow related to graves and to yearly festivities such as the *rosalia* celebrated in memory of dead relatives, or to celebrations recurring each year such as birthdays, also after the death of the person whose birthday is celebrated.⁹² As objects of this verb we find *natale/natalis*, *sacrificium*, *memoria quiescentium*, *rosalia*, *sollemnes dies*, *locus (aediculae)*, *templa deorum* and perhaps also *sepulcrum* (see n. 92). But here we find this verb most strikingly used with *cives et ordinem n(ostrum)* as its object and defined by the instrumental ablative *aepulis* (this must mean something like "he provided the citizens etc. in a lavish way with banquets"). Possibly the writer of the text had the verb *frequentare* in mind, as this verb is also, as pointed out in *TLL* VI 1, 1309,23ff., used "de animantibus", sometimes accompanied by an instrumental or other ablative.⁹³ However, even with this verb it does not seem possible to find a parallel for the phrase used in our inscription.

rei p(ublicae) ... Val(erius) Ant(onianus) v(ir) p(erfectissimus) p(raeses) p(rovinciae) N(umidia) ...]: it appears that the governor Antoninus had arranged for the reparation of the aqueduct, but that the work was paid for by the municipality (*viribus rei p(ublicae)*).

⁹² See the instances cited in *TLL* IV 254, 33-40. For celebrations at someone's grave note *CIL* VI 23363a, *rogo vos, ut eo loco post me sacrificium confrequentetis*; *CIL* X 2015 = *ILS* 8235 *ad confrequentandam memoriam quiescentium*; *CIL* III 7526 = *ISM* II 371 *rosalia confrequentavimus* (the author of this *TLL* article also suggests that the reading of *CIL* X 3147 = *ILS* 8268 should be *hoc sepulcr[um] confrequentent* instead of *frequentent*). Instances in which *confrequentare* is used in the sense "to celebrate (a birthday)": *CIL* X 107 = *ILS* 6466 (Croto) *ut ex usuris eorum quodquod annis [i.e., quotannis] VII Idus Apriles natale filiae meae epulantes confrequentetis*; *CIL* X 451 = *AE* 1989, 187 (Eburum), *ut quodannis natalis eius die III Iduum Decembr(ium) confrequentu[r]*; cf. *CIL* XI 2650 (Saturnia), *ex cuius usuris die VII Kal(endas) Martias natali eius ... confreq(uentatione) et spor(tulatione) [ff]ungan[t]ur*. Celebration of other festivities: *CIL* XIV 4570, *Locus ... ad sollemnes dies confrequentandos*. In two cases the verb is used with an object indicating a place or a building of a religious nature: *CIL* VI 10234 = *ILS* 7213, *locum (aediculae) of the cult of the collegium Aesculapi et Hygiae*; *CIL* VI 35769, *templa deorum*.

⁹³ E.g. Tac. *ann.* 5,10 *iuvenis iam iuventutis concursu, iam publicis studiis frequentabatur*; *ibid.* 13,18 *ne coetu salutantium frequentaretur*; Suet. *Tib.* 12,2 *vitans ... praeternavigantium officia quibus frequentabatur assidue*.

We have now arrived at the proposal, discussed above, to elect Sofronius as patron as presented to the decurions (l. 26f.): *ergo merito consen{se}tiri nos et ... Pompeianum patronum pr(a)eficiamus*. The proposal is followed, as in some other *tabulae*, by a remark of the *principales*, who suggest that the election may well result in further benefits, this suggestion surely being addressed to Sofronius himself no less than to the decurions:⁹⁴ *cuius defensionis* (sic) *auxilia concurrentibus bene{ne}ficiis pluria in nos conferrī speremus* (l. 28f.).⁹⁵ The expression *defensionis auxilia* seems unique to the two *tabulae* from Amiternum (for that from AD 335 see n. 95), but *defensio* and *defensus* often appear in similar contexts, and one can also produce parallels for *auxilium*.⁹⁶

In l. 29 we have what Sherk (*Municipal Decrees* p. 68) calls "formula of transition" (i.e. from the "theme" to the decree proper), for the most part abbreviated, as was usual: *q(uid) d(e) ea r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), universi i(ta)*

⁹⁴ Cf. above at n. 45. For instances in similar contexts of references to expectations as to what will follow from someone's election to patron, cf., e.g., *CIL VI 1492 = ILS 6106* (c. AD 101), *futurumque ut tantae virtutis vir auxilio sit futurus municipio nostro*; *CIL IX 3429 = ILS 6110* (Peltuinum, AD 242), *patrona ... quo magis magisque ... dignatione benignitatis eius gloriosi et in omnibus tuti ac defensi esse possimus*; *CIL XI 1354 = F. Frasson, Le epigrafi di Luni romana I* (2013) 105-11 (AD ?255), *unde credim<u>s grandi cumulo repleti num(erum) n(ostrum), si eum nobis patron(um) cooptem<u>s*; *CIL XI 5749 = ILS 7221 = AE 1992, 562* (Sentinum, AD 261), *quod in praeteritum ... beneficia praestita susceperimus, nunc etiam in futurum non dissimilia, quae nunc sentimus, perpetuo ex domu{m} eorum processura pari adfectione{m} speramus*; *CIL X 476 = ILS 6112* (Paestum, AD 337), *tabula patronatus ..., quam cum suscipere fuerit dignatus, speramus for{t} e, quod et nos et patriam nostram in omnibus foveat*; *CIL X 478 = ILS 6114* (Paestum, AD 344), *... patronatum offeramus; credimus, quod in omnibus nos patriamque nostram fovere dignetur*. Cf. also, e.g., *CIL X 477* and *AE 1990, 211* cf. *AE 1995, 74* (both from Paestum, AD 347); and C. Badel – P. Le Roux in M. Corbier – J.-P. Guilhembet (eds.), *L'écriture dans la maison romaine*, Paris 2011, 179.

⁹⁵ In the *tabula* of AD 335 from Amiternum pertaining to Sofronius' son, the same suggestion appears in a similar form: *unde spes magna et deffens{i<o>nis auxilia beneficiis concurrentibus pluria [in nos] conferrī speremus*. The expression *beneficia concurrentia* is attested only in these two *tabulae*.

⁹⁶ For *defensus*, *defensio* etc. ,cf., e.g., *CIL V 532 = ILS 6680 = Inscr. It. X 4, 31 = AE 1975, 423* (Tergeste, AD 138-161) *uti patriam su[am] ... ab omnib[us] iniuriis tutam defensamque praestaret*; *AE 1991, 713* (Fidentia, AD 206); *CIL IX 3429 = ILS 6110* (Peltuinum, AD 242), *in omnibus tuti ac defensi*; *CIL IX 10 = ILS 6113* (Neretum, AD 341), *tutos defensusq(ue)*. For *auxilium*, see *CIL VI 1492 = ILS 6106* (n. 94); and cf. the honorific inscription of the third century, *CIL VI 41228 ... Archelao c(larissimo) v(iro) ... Valerii ... foti semper eius auxiliis* (*fovere* is a verb which is often used to describe the activities of patrons; cf. above n. 94).

c(ensuerunt). In most decrees, *de ea re* is repeated after *placeret* (*quid de ea re fieri placeret, de ea re ita censuerunt ...*), but this shorter version is also attested.⁹⁷

The decree follows in l. 30-35. Whereas decrees are more commonly formulated as indirect speech and thus normally begin with *placere*, here the decree appears as a quote from the "speech" from the decurions and thus as direct speech introduced by *placet* followed by the *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction *consentiri nos* (for the infinitive, cf. above at n. 68). There are several parallels for this.⁹⁸ This is another section characterised both by striking expressions and by striking errors. As for the former, *allegatio* in the sense of *relatio* ("proposal"), which is, of course, the standard expression, is without any parallel,⁹⁹ and the use of this particular expression is all the more striking when one considers that the writer of the text uses the appropriate verb *referre* in the next line and is thus, when he so wishes, perfectly aware of the correct vocabulary. (One wonders whether a possible explanation could not be that the writer, aiming at variation, wanted to avoid the repetition of words derived from the same root.) As for the *allegatio* being described here as *iusta* (and cf. the presenting of the proposal being described as having been done *recte*), there are some instances of a *relatio* being characterised by an adjective.¹⁰⁰

In what follows (*placet ... allegationi ... principalium referentibus consentiri nos*), *referentibus*, pertaining to the two *principales*, is of course a mistake for the genitive; perhaps the writer had forgotten that he had written *allegationi* (... *consentiri*) followed by the names of the *principales* in the genitive, and was now under the impression that he was using the construction *principalibus referentibus consentiri*. As in the proposal of the *principales* in l. 21f., the writer

⁹⁷ E.g., *AE* 1966, 607 = *IAM* II 307 (Sala in Mauretania) *quit de ea re fieri placeret, secundum sententiam Q. Cor(neli) Capellae c(uncti) c(ensuerunt)*; *CIL* XI 2702 = *ILS* 7217 (Volsinii, AD 224), *q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), u(niversi) i(ta) c(ensuerunt)*.

⁹⁸ E.g., *AE* 1998, 282 (Lavinium, AD 228), *placet itaq(ue) universis ...*; *CIL* VI 29682, *ideo placet cuncto ordini n(ostro) ...*; *CIL* IX 10 = *ILS* 6113 (Neretum, AD 341), *placet itaque universo populo ...*; with perfect *placuit*: *AE* 1961, 156 = 1963, 155 = *ILN* 2 Digne 3 (AD 187); *AE* 1991, 713 (Fidentia, AD 206), *placuit universis*; *CIL* X 3698 = *ILS* 4175 (Cumae, AD 289), *placuit universis*.

⁹⁹ According to the Claus-Slaby database, the only other epigraphical attestation of *allegatio* is in a Christian inscription of AD 534, *ICVR* 4116a (where it is used in its normal meaning).

¹⁰⁰ In *CIL* XI 970 = *ILS* 7216 (AD 190) we find *honesta*, in *CIL* XI 1354 (AD 255) *salubris*, in *CIL* XI 5748 = *ILS* 7220 (AD 260) *gloriosa*. Goddard translates *iusta* here as "pertinent".

now moves on to the hortative subjunctive *praeficiamus*, thus abandoning the *AcI* construction *placet ... consentiri nos*. In a notable way, the man who in l. 22 is called *C. Sallius Pompeianus* is now called *C. Sallius Sofronius* (but of course he did have both *cognomina*). The decree is rounded off by an articulation of the hope of the decurions that Sofronius accept the honour that is being offered to him (*hunc honorem obblatum a {no}nobis ... patronatus*),¹⁰¹ formulated with a hortative subjunctive (*qui ... suscipiat*, l. 33f.), with a short reference to Sofronius' merits inserted: *meritus ex origine dignus*. One can, of course, understand the meaning of this, but one wonders if something – e.g., an *<et>* after *meritus* but perhaps even more – could be missing, for *meritus* ("well-deserving") seems singularly lame in this context (although it can of course be argued that Sofronius' merits have already been set out in detail). In any case, although *meritus* is common in the dative, accompanied by *bene* (or *optime*), its use in the nominative is (perhaps understandably) rare; in fact, the Claus-Slaby database offers only 17 instances of *meritus* without *bene*, many of them either Christian or metric or both; and adding *bene* (22 instances) does not really change the picture. As for *ex origine dignus*, where *origo* stands for "ancestry", see above n. 50.

What follows in l. 34, *aere inciso tabula hospiti*, must be meant to explain that the *honor* consisted not only of the patronate but also of the bronze *tabula*. One way of making sense of this is to assume that this phrase is meant as an ablative absolute, where *inciso* is a mistake for the expected feminine form *incisa*, perhaps influenced by the preceding word *aere*; on the other hand, two fourth-century *tabulae* from Paestum also have the reading (*aere inciso* where one would expect the participle *incisus* to have been furnished with a feminine ending in order to have it accord with the feminine noun *tabula*).¹⁰² I thus wonder whether it could not be assumed that *aere inciso*, which leaves the impression of being an ablative absolute, had by the fourth century somehow become a "fossilized" expression with the meaning "in bronze", which did not have to be adjusted to the syntax of the clause it was used in. As for *hospiti*, the expression *tabula hospiti(i)* (clearly to be understood as meaning the same as *tabula patronatus*) certainly seems acceptable, but the *tabula* from AD 335 speaks of a

¹⁰¹ *patronatus* is surely a genitive and must define *honorem* (cf. "honneur du patronat", Goddard), not *tabula* (l. 34), which is defined by *hospiti*.

¹⁰² *CIL X 476 = ILS 6112, ut tabula(m) patronatus aere inciso ... offeramus; CIL X 477, ut tabulam patronatus ere inciso ... offerimus.*

tabula hospitalis, so that there is possibility that the reading of this inscription should also be *tabula hospit<al>i* (thus the text of Goddard).¹⁰³

The text ends with another item familiar from *tabulae patronatus*, namely with an observation on the future location of the *tabula*. Normally, it is the *domus* of the patron that is mentioned as the place where the *tabula* will be hung up;¹⁰⁴ in a *tabula* of AD 206 from Fidentia it is said that the patron may himself choose the exact location of the *tabula* within his *domus*.¹⁰⁵ But the formulation here, *qui ... ubi iusserit confrequentari praecipiat*, must mean something like "whom we ask to indicate where he orders [the *tabula*] to be frequented (or: visited frequently)", and this formulation seems to imply that the *tabula* was meant to be kept not in the *domus* of Sofronius but in a public space. As apparently for the first time observed by P. Sabbatini Tumolesi in 1990,¹⁰⁶ an observation which was developed by E. Cimarosti in 2012,¹⁰⁷ the *tabulae* as we have them, or least those issued by municipalities (as contrasted with *collegia*, etc.), must be divided into two groups: those meant to decorate the *domus* of the patron (the "copia domestica" in the terminology of Cimarosti) and those, not necessarily identical in wording with those of the former group but making the same point, meant to be kept on display in a public place (the "copia curiale"). Our *tabula* clearly belongs to the latter group. As its exact future location is left for Sofronius the patron to decide, it seems that we must conclude that there were several possible spaces in Amiternum in which a public document of this type could be displayed.

What is one to make of the Latin used in this *tabula*? On the one hand, it seems pretty clear that we may conclude that the person who drafted the text must have had serious difficulties in formulating his thoughts in understandable Latin, and thus we may see this text as documenting in an interesting way the

¹⁰³ Badel – Le Roux (above n. 94) 182, no. 5 read *hospitali* without brackets.

¹⁰⁴ See Badel – Le Roux (above n. 94) 167-88, esp. 172-74.

¹⁰⁵ *AE* 1991, 713, *placuit universis tabulam aeneam patrocinal(em) ei poni in parte domus eius, qua permiserit*.

¹⁰⁶ P. Sabbatini Tumolesi, *MGR* 15 (1990) 249f. In this article, the author was publishing a *tabula* (*AE* 1990, 211) from Paestum of August 1, AD 347 conferring the patronate to a certain Aquilius Nestorius, the same man to whom the patronate had been conferred on the very same day according to the *tabula*, also from Paestum, already published as *CIL* X 477.

¹⁰⁷ Cimarosti (above n. 1) 287-308.

"decay" of Latin, and even of the Latin that was used in a public document, in the fourth century. On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the author of this text did know at least the basic characteristics of the type of document he was trying to draft, for we find here many traces of the normal structure of a *tabula patronatus* including a reference to a decree and much of the normal vocabulary and also many of the normal abbreviations (*v(erba) f(ecerunt)*, *q(uid) d(e) ea r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret)*, etc.). More interestingly, the person who wrote the text does seem to display higher ambitions in his use of Latin and must have been surprisingly keen on choosing unusual and *recherché* expressions, for otherwise it seems difficult to explain his choice of expressions such as *obvenire* for *convenire* (l. 3), *floridus* to describe *honor* (l. 6), *consensum accire* (l. 8), *perportare* (l. 13), *disperire* "to be ruined" applied to a building (l. 21), *aliquem patronum praeficere* (l. 27 and 32f.), *concurrentia beneficia* (l. 28), *epulis confrequentare* (l. 26). Moreover, the writer of the text seems at places to try to aim at variation; at least this ambition may be indicated by the fact that, after having said *confidemus* in l. 7, he says *fidi sumus* in l. 8; or that he wrote, in l. 26, *ex suis viribus* which must mean the same as *pecunia sua*, an expression he had used in l. 21. Possibly he had chosen to use the term *allegatio* instead of *relatio* in l. 30, as he was going to use the verb *referre*, from which *relatio* is of course derived, in the next line (and cf. perhaps also *delabor* in line 19, where one would prefer *collabor*). Perhaps we may thus conclude that the man who drafted the text was a person of some modest literary ambitions; however, these are obscured by the fact that Lucentius the engraver (who re-emerges in the tablet from AD 335, but surprisingly as the *proc(urator)* of the vicani Forulani) seems to have been more or less unqualified for his job.

I conclude by presenting a text in which I have incorporated, indicated in bold, the suggestions made above. The text is followed by a very tentative translation which is purposely vague in many details.

*Paulino et Iuliano co(n)ss(ulibus) VII Idus Dec(embres). / Amiterni in curia Septimiana Augustea ann **i** die freq<u>entissimo, / cum frequentes numerus decurionum obvenissent ordinis (h)abendi / causa{usa}, scribundo adfuit Avidius Iovianus principalis, ibi / ⁽⁵⁾ Atrius Arrenianus et Vergilianus Albinus sen(atores)¹⁰⁸ principale<s> v(erba) f(ecerunt): /*

¹⁰⁸ Or perhaps *sen(ior)*, see above n. 9.

{ob} honorem floridum ordinis n(ostri) et dignitatem patriae civium/q(ue) sp<l>endorem atcrevisse confidemus, d(omini) c(onscripti), quod aetiam vestrum / consensum acc'i're fidi sumus{umus}, <si> pro humanitatis et laborum {adque} industriam / similem ex origine prisca < **Sofronium patronum**> cooptemus, quod quidem nos olim fecisse oportet / ⁽¹⁰⁾tuerat; **itaque**¹⁰⁹ omnes rogemus, <ut> hunc (h)onorem nostrum conprobare / dignetur C. Sallius Pompeianus Sofronius, pronepos Salli Procu/li pat(roni), fil(ius) Sal(li) Proculi patroni, **pat(ronus)**¹¹⁰ ord(inis) Aveia{ia}tium Vest(inorum); <**Pompeianum igitur Sofronium** (?)> patronum co{h}optemus, si modo de eius dignatione testimonium perportemus; quis / etenim <**non gaudeat** (?),> immo 'exultet', 'cum'¹¹¹ suam proferat voluptatem. Ideo igitur, domini co(n)s⁽¹⁵⁾cripti, quod ex origine prisca genus eiusdem **patronatu{s}**¹¹² olim pro/cesserint et labores quantos [[et quantos]] et quales in nos [[contulit]] / et patriam nostram contulit; quiq(ue) ex suis laboribus munera patro/natus dena et sena magg(istratibus) filiorum suorum sple<n>didissimae civita/ti n(ostrae) cum favore ededit; Aquas Arentani, quas (sic) iam delaps(a) fuerant, / ⁽²⁰⁾civitati n(ostrae) additis lacis castellisq(ue) salientes restituit; / thermas, quas (sic) iam olim disperierant antiquitus inpendiis et pecunia 'sua' / cum porticis novis factis et omni ornamento at pulcri<tu>dinem restauravit / statusque decoravit et nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes(aris) nata/le Idibus Nob(embribus) dedicavit, quarum dedicatione biduum t(h)eatrum et dena Iuve-/⁽²⁵⁾naliorum spectaculis (sic) exs(h)ibuit sub pr(a)esentia Cl(audi) Urani v(iri) p(erfectissimi) corr(ectoris) n(ostri); cives et or/dinem n(ostrum) aepulis ex suis viribus confrequentavit; ergo merito consen|{se}-tiri nos et C. Sallium Pompeianum patronum pr(a)eficiamus, / cuius defens{u}ionis auxilia concur'r'entibus benefe{u}ficiis pluria / in nos conferri speremus. Q(uid) d(e) ea r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), universi i(ta) c(ensuerunt): / ⁽³⁰⁾ placet ius[[ius]]tae allegationi Atri Arreni`ani' et Verg(ilian) Albini principa/lium ordinis n(ostri) recte at ordinem

¹⁰⁹ Cf. above at n. 55.

¹¹⁰ Cf. above at n. 58.

¹¹¹ Cf. above at n. 65.

¹¹² Cf. above at n. 72.

n(ostrum) referentibus (sic) consentiri nos, / et C. Sallium Sofronium patronum ordinis et patriae n(ostrae) praeficia/mus, qui meritus <et?>ex origine dignus hunc honorem obblatum (sic) a {no} / nobis {su}suscipiat patronatus aere incis^a 113 tabula hospiti et / ubi iusserit confrequentari praecipiat. / Scul(psit) Ant(istius) Lucentius.

During the consulship of Paulinus and Iulianus, on the 7th day of the Ides of December; when, on the most frequented day of the year, at Amiternum in the *curia Septimiana Augustea* an abundant number of decurions had gathered in order to have a meeting, the secretary¹¹⁴ being Avidius Iovianus the *principalis*, the *principales* Atrius Arrenianus and Vergilianus Albinus senior proposed the following motion: "We are confident, gentlemen fellow decurions, that the glorious honour of our order, the dignity of our city and the splendour of our citizens will increase, and we are sure that we will obtain your approval for this, if, because of his diligence in exercising his humanity and industry, similar to that of his ancestors of ancient origins, we coopt Sofronius as patron, something which we ought to have done a long time ago; therefore let us all request that C. Sallius Pompeianus Sofronius, great-grandson of Sallius Proculus our patron, son of Sallius Proculus our patron, patron of the senate of Aveia of the Vestini, deign to approve of this honour conferred by us. Let us thus coopt Pompeianus Sofronius as patron, if only we could receive from him an assurance of his compliance (with our wish). Who would not be pleased, or rather rejoice, when he pronounces his assent? Therefore, gentlemen fellow decurions, because his family has provided patrons going back to a distant past and has conferred so many and so great benefactions on us and on our city; and who has from his own resources to great applause offered to our splendid city sixteen gladiatorial shows apposite to a patron in each case at the occasion of the terms of office of his sons;

¹¹³ Cf. above at n. 102, where, however, I also observe that *aere inciso tabula* could possibly be correct.

¹¹⁴ Normally *scribundo adesse*, of course, means "to act as witness"; and Buonocore accordingly translates "fu presente in qualità di testimone". However, the fact that we find here just one person, whereas earlier documents of this type normally mention several witnesses, seems to favour Goddard's interpretation, who translates this passage as "siégea en tant que secrétaire" (p. 1030).

(and because) he has restored for our city the aqueduct, with water running in it, of Arentanum (?) which had already fallen into ruins, adding cisterns and reservoirs;

(and because) he has from his own resources and with his own money restored, achieving a beautiful result, the baths which had perished a long time ago, adding new porticoes and every kind of ornamentation, and then decorated them with statues, and dedicated them, giving them the name of our master Constantius the most blissful Caesar, on his (Constantius') birthday on the Ides of November, at the dedication of which he exhibited two days of theatrical performances and ten spectacles of *Iuvenalia* in the presence of Claudius Uranius, *vir perfectissimus*, our *corrector*;

(and because) he has from his own means entertained our citizens and our order with banquets,

let us thus with good reason agree to coopt C. Sallius Pompeianus as patron, hoping that he will lend us even more assistance, accompanied by other benefactions, by acting as our defender."

As to what should be done about this matter, the position of everyone was as follows: "It is our decision to agree with the justified proposition of Atrius Arrenianus and Vergilianus Albinus, *principales* of our order, who are correct in having introduced this matter to our order, and let us coopt C. Sallius Sofronius as patron of our order and of our city. Let him, who is both well-deserving and because of his ancestry worthy (of this honour), accept this honour of the patronate conferred by us, the document of the hospitality (agreement) having been inscribed on bronze, and (let him) give instructions as to where he orders (the document) to be publicly exposed." Engraved by Antistius Lucentius.

University of Helsinki