

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XLV**

HELSINKI 2011

## INDEX

NEIL ADKIN	<i>Virgil's Wooden Horse: Which Wood?</i>	11
MARGHERITA CARUCCI	<i>Domestica Bona on Stage in the Pompeian House: on Viewing and Reading the Story of Pero and Mycon</i>	27
FRANCESCA CERRONE	"... τὸν Πλαυτιανόν, καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦς τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας, ἰσχύσαι..." (Dio 76,14,6): <i>ancora un'iscrizione onoraria per il prefetto del pretorio Plauziano</i>	45
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>]pa-ko-qe (KN Ch 5728): A New Ox Name from Knossos?</i>	59
FABRICE POLI	<i>Deux épitaphes latines conservées à l'abbaye royale de Chaalis (collection Jacquemart-André)</i>	71
ELINA PYY	<i>The Conflict Reconsidered: Cleopatra and the Civil War in the Early Imperial Epic</i>	77
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Observations on the New Decree from Copia Thurii (AE 2008, 441)</i>	103
SAMUEL SCOLNICOV	<i>After Irony: Reading Plato Seriously</i>	123
MORRIS SILVER	<i>Antonine Plague and Deactivation of Spanish Mines</i>	133
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCLXV-CCLXXI</i>	143
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	171
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	287
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	293
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	311

## OBSERVATIONS ON THE NEW DECREE FROM COPIA THURII (*AE* 2008, 441)

OLLI SALOMIES

In *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* 11 (2003), fascicolo 13, p. 71–160, Felice Costabile published a most interesting decree from Copia in Bruttium (modern Calabria), which has been preserved in an unusual way, inasmuch as not the inscription itself, but only its impression has been preserved, for the stone on which the text was inscribed was, perhaps in the 3rd century AD, used upside down for paving a floor in the local baths. The stone was later destroyed, and so now only the impression exists. It goes without saying that reading the impression of an inscription is a pretty complicated business, and a look at any of the photos attached to the *editio princeps* will confirm this. Moreover, the right – from the point of view of the reader – side of the inscription, along with about 5 to 15 letters in each line, is missing.

The inscription was apparently first observed in the early 2000's, and has since then been presented to various scholarly audiences. Taking into account the great difficulties in deciphering the text, especially in the lines in which the letters are small, it is a wonder that Professor Costabile has been able to produce the *editio princeps* so soon, and the scholarly world must be grateful to him for this achievement. On the other hand, one does not have to read many lines of the published text in order to see that there is still work to do.

The text, as published by Costabile (p. 82; also p. 111) and reproduced with minor alterations in *AE* 2008, 441, runs as follows:

*Ti(berio) Claudio Caes[aris] / l(iberto) Idomen[er]o[ ] quoi de ciui[tate] /  
Copienses honoris caussa de s[e]n[ati]s [sen]tentia] / deder[unt] ea quae  
infra scripta s[un]t. /<sup>5</sup> P[ub]lius Blaesius Marianus IIIuir quinq[ue]nnalis  
[iure dic[un]do] / iterum, M[arcus] Minucius M[an]n[i] [sic] f[ilius] Sota  
praef[ectus] Ti[berii] Caesaris Aug[ustus] / cens[oria] potestate, VIII  
k[alendas] Apr[il]is senatum in cur[ia] Vin[uleia] / consuluerunt. Scriben-*

*do [a]dfuerunt: T(itus) Albius Sabin[us] ----- ] / P(ublius) Sumettus Regi-  
 nus, L(ucius) Idumaeus Mela, Q(uintus) Vibul[us] Agrippa, [-----  
 Q(uod)] / <sup>10</sup> [u(erba)] f(acta) sunt de honore Ti(beri) Claudi Caesar(is)  
 l(iberti) Idomen<e>i, q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret) d(e) e(a)  
 r(e) i(ta) censu[ere. Quod Ti(berius)] / C[l]audius Idomeneus ita se ges-  
 serit annis Copiae iis suae uitae cum seruerit in [municipio n(ostro) :]  
 / [in]colis magn[e] pr[ae]cessit summa modestia, iust[it]ia <a>eque  
 p(ublicum) a(rgentum) administrare ex[pertus est] / et deinde liber factus  
 similem se <praestitit> ; pristinae clem[en]tia<e> fouendae placere huic  
 s[plendidissimo] / ordini [A]ugustalem eum in hunc annum exs decre[t]o  
 nostro creare, qui honor de A[ugustalitate] / <sup>15</sup> ante hoc tempus nulli ratus  
 sit, eumque ordinem <n(ostrum)> em[e]rere praeferrique cen[suere, exs  
 K(apite) .. de Aug(ustalitate)] / legis, omnibus quos hoc [a]nno senatus  
 f[ut]uros Augusta[l]es cens(uit), uere quo n[ot]ius [sit in eum studium r(ei)  
 p(ublicae)] / et is modes[t]iae suae praecepisse fructum debitum merito  
 uideatur ; itaq[ue admirantes] / ceteri simili[s] fortunae hominis periti ui-  
 tae forte merit[um], senatus am[plissimum] iudiciorum, imitari eum uelint.*

What one sees immediately is that what we have here is an "honorific" inscription which is followed, from line 5 onwards, by a decree of the of the local *ordo*, calling itself, as is usual, *senatus*. However, one does not have to read many lines before one sees that there are passages in which the reading cannot be correct; in fact, there seem to be passages in which the Latin seems either unintelligible or incorrect or both. This is, of course, not without parallel, for there are also other decrees which include passages which can barely be understood (e.g., Sherk – see n. 5 – no. 21). However, these are texts from the third and the fourth centuries, and thus much later than this one which is from the time of Tiberius (thus Costabile) or, if the honorand is not a freedman of Tiberius (called *Ti. Claudius* until 4 AD) but of Claudius (as suggested as a possibility by M. Corbier in *AE*), from the time of this emperor (although this would require us to accept that *Ti(berius) Caesar Aug[ustus]* in line 6 refers to Claudius and not to Tiberius, as one would *a priori* assume). Be that as it may, this inscription is in any case from a period in which one expects the Latin to be more or less correct. It is also, however, true that this inscription does seem to include some unusual features. In this article, my aim is to suggest some possible emendations to the text, but also to point out passages in which the text seems either odd or even unacceptable. Before going into this, I would like stress my admiration for Professor Costabile's labours in producing a reading of the inscription; if there is still some work to be done, this is due to the great difficulties this particular text offers.

As mentioned above, the text consists of an honorific inscription and of a copy of a decree conferring "honours" on the honorand. In the edition of Costabile, the honorific inscription runs as follows:

*Ti(berio) Claudio Caes[aris] / l(iberto) Idomen<sup>o</sup> quoi de ciui[tate] / Copienses honoris caussa de s[e]n(atus) [sen(tentia)] / deder(unt) ea quae infra scripta s[u]nt.*

This is translated (p. 110) as "al quale, in merito alla cittadinanza, i Copiensi hanno dato quello che è scritto sotto" (this translation seems to omit *honoris caussa*; in the French version in *AE*, "à qui, à propos de la citoyenneté, le peuple de Copia, pour l'honorer, a accordé sur avis du sénat ce qui est écrit ci-dessous"). Before going into more important matters, let me observe that the reading of the cognomen is in fact *Idomeni* (with *I longa* at the end) which is considered as an error by Costabile, but on the one hand, it would be very odd if the stonecutter or the person who formulated the inscription would have made an error in the name of the honorand, and not only once but twice (cf. below). And on the other hand, it seems obvious that, as observed by Costabile himself (p. 92), the form *Idomeni* reflects the Greek dative Ἰδομενεῖ; since there are also other instances of Greek names ending in *-eus* being furnished, in the dative, with the ending *-i*,<sup>1</sup> there is perhaps no good reason for correcting the form to *Idomen<sup>o</sup>*.

As for the rest, it must be first noted that the inscription has a structure out of the ordinary inasmuch as it says nothing about the *honores* of the honorand of whom just the name is given, the reader being referred, in the matter of the *honores* "given" to Idomeneus, to the decree that is cited below. In fact, the whole phrase *cui* (here replaced by archaic *quoi*) ... (subject) ... *dedit/dederunt* (or in the passive *datum est*, etc.) is unusual, although not unparalleled.<sup>2</sup> The formulation

<sup>1</sup> H. Solin, *ZPE* 28 (1978) 80f.; add *Longinio Basili CIL VI 27849* (I wish to thank Professor Solin for this reference).

<sup>2</sup> Cf., e.g., *AE* 1927, 124 cf. 2005, 324 (Formiae) *C. Clodio Hilario biselliario, cui ordo conscript(orum) ornamenta decur(ionalia) dedit*; *CIL X 1081 = ILS 6446* (Nuceria) *M. Virtio M. f. Men(enia) Cerauno aedili, Iivir(o) iure dicundo ..., cui decuriones ob munificentiam eius ... duumviratum gratuitum dederunt Nuceriae*; *AE* 1984, 188 (Forum Popilii) *C. Messio ... Scaev(ae) Iivir(o) tert(ium), cui lege Flavia datum est, primus sententiam sui ordinis interrogaretur cuique post mortem publice funus locusque sepulturae decretus est, Scaeva f(ilius)*; *CIL III 1193 = ILS 2746 = IDR III 5, 2, 542* (Apulum) *C. Iul(io) .... Corinthiano ... cui ob virtute(m) sua(m) sacratissimi Imper(atores) coronam muralem etc. ... dederunt*; cf. *CIL XIII 1684. 1821. 1954 = ILS 1441. 4952a. 7030*. Other verbs used in relative phrases introduced by *cui* are, e.g., *deferre* (*CIL IX 5856 = ILS 6574, [cui] primo equiti Romano ...*

*dederunt ea, quae infra scripta sunt* is, in contrast, as far as I can see altogether without parallels (but the reading is not in doubt). But these are certainly not the only unusual details here. As always in similar cases, it is the *senatus* which is offering the *honores* to Idomeneus, but the text as restored implies that it is the *Copienses* who are acting here *de senatus sententia*. Perhaps this is acceptable, as the *ordo* could possibly be seen as representing the whole of the population, but what I certainly cannot find acceptable is the reading *de civi[tate]* and its rendering as "in merito alla cittadinanza", i.e., more or less "as to the citizenship" (rendered in French in the *AE* as "à propos de la citoyenneté"). First of all, "to whom, as to (or: in reference to) his (or: the) citizenship, the people of Copia ... gave what is written below" does not seem to mean anything, and the contents of the decree, as far as one can make any sense of it, do not seem to have much to do with questions connected with one's citizenship (I am not sure this can be explained away by what is said on pp. 154–6); in fact, a mention of citizenship seems quite out of the place here. Moreover, I cannot see how the phrase "dare aliquid de aliquo" could mean anything other than "to give something from something", the *de* + ablative indicating the provenance of a donation, as in expressions such as *dare de suo*, *de sua pecunia*, "to give from one's own money", "to give at one's own expense".

But is the reading of the inscription in line 2 even *de civi[ --- ]*? What one sees in fact is *DECV* followed by a vertical stroke which is identified with an *I* by Costabile but which could also be the left part of letter such as *B*, *D*, *E*, *F*, *H*, *K*, *L*, etc. The first *I* in *civi[ --- ]* is reconstructed on the basis of an uncertain trace inside the *C*, which seems to have the form of a double *T*, with a short horizontal stroke at the top and at the bottom (cf. fig. 4 on p. 75); but taking into account the fact that what we have here is not the inscription but its impression, and that the surface is most uneven, it seems better to see this just as another trace due to chance, to be ignored in the reading of the inscription. Support for this view can be based on the fact that, at least in the legible parts of the inscription, there do not seem to be other instances of ligatures or of letters having been inscribed inside other letters in this inscription.<sup>3</sup>

---

*patrocinium delatum est*), *mandare* (*CIL* V 1874 = *ILS* 1118; *CIL* XI 387 = *ILS* 6660), *conferre* (*CIL* III 8203 = *ILS* 7177 = *IMS* VI 62), *decernere* (e.g., *CIL* XIV 362 = *ILS* 6135).

<sup>3</sup> It must, however, be admitted that in the reconstruction of the middle part of line 11 on p. 95, it is suggested that the *O* of the (alleged) reading *Copiae* was at least in part inscribed within the *C*, but to me everything here seems uncertain and in the facsimile on p. 106, the *O* is placed to the right of the *C*.

Taking all this into consideration, I suggest that we should read not *de civi[tate]* but *decur[iones]*, followed by *Copienses* in line 3. One could object that it would be strange if the *decur[iones]* *Copienses* gave something *de s[e]n(atus) [sen(tentia)]*, read at the end of line 3, but to be honest, one does not see much in the photos after *de*, and certainly not a trace which could be identified with certainty as an *S*, not to mention a trace which could be seen as representing the *N* in *s[e]n(atus)* (that the editor here thought of reading *s[e]n(atus)* no doubt was influenced by the fact that the *ordo* of Copia is referred to as *senatus* in line 7). In view of this, and of the fact that at least in the facsimile on p. 106, the trace indicated as existing after *de* could also be interpreted as a *C*, I suggest that, instead of *de s[e]n(atus) [sen(tentia)]*, the reading should be *dec[reto suo]* (or *dec[ret(o)]* or *s(uo)*). I must confess that I have not been able to locate an exact parallel to the phrase *decuriones ... decreto suo* followed by a verb, but a *decretum* is, of course, what the *decuriones* are expected to produce, and there are instances of the expression *ordo* (consisting of the *decuriones*) ... (*ex*) *decreto suo* followed by a verb; e.g., *CIL* V 337 = *Inscr. It.* X 2, 19 = *ILS* 6679, *huic ordo pientissimus decr(eto) suo funus pub(licum) et res pub(lica) ... censuerunt*.<sup>4</sup>

To recapitulate, I suggest that the reading of the "honorific" part of the inscription should be as follows: *Ti. Claudio Caes[aris] / l. Idomeni, quoi decur[iones] / Copienses honoris caussa dec[reto suo] / deder(unt) ea, quae infra scripta s[u]nt*.

This part is followed by the decree of the *senatus* (lines 5ff.). This begins in the normal way with the names of the magistrates who convened the *ordo*, the date (*VIII K(alendas) Apr(iles)*) and the place (*in cur[i]a Vin[u]leia*). In many decrees, the year and the name of the city are also added, but there are also parallels for the omission of these items.<sup>5</sup> In this particular case, the identity of the city can be inferred from the mention earlier of the *Copienses*, and there are also other instances in which the city in which the decree was drawn up is not mentioned *expressis verbis* but can be inferred on the basis of an adjective referring to its

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *ILS* 1116. 6274. 6810; *AE* 1989, 420; 1999, 470; *IRT* 566.

<sup>5</sup> The date is given, but the year is omitted in, e.g., *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 3173 = R. K. Sherk, *Municipal Decrees of the Roman West* (1970; quoted in the following as "Sherk") no. 15 (late Republican); *CIL* X 1453 = *ILS* 5616 = Sherk no. 27 (Augustan or even Triumviral, as proposed by E. Bispham, *From Asculum to Actium* (2007) 384f., 505f. no. D5; *CIL* XI 1420 = *ILS* 139 = Sherk no. 47 (AD 2/3); etc. As for the omission of the city in inscriptions mentioning the place where the *ordo* or some other body convened, note, e.g., *CIL* V 2856 = Sherk no. 4; *CIL* X 1453 = *ILS* 5616 = Sherk no. 27; and all decrees of the *ordo* of Puteoli (e.g., *AE* 2008, 372).

inhabitants. However, it must be admitted that these instances are much later and do not seem to appear in municipal decrees, but in decrees of other bodies.<sup>6</sup>

From a formal point of view, this decree belongs to that group of municipal decrees in which the magistrates, who are apparently normally identical with the *relatores*, are already mentioned in the prescript, and not again in the *relatio*;<sup>7</sup> in these cases, the *relatio* has normally the passive form *quod (...) verba facta sunt*. Exact parallels for the expression *senatum consuluerunt* at this point can be found in a fragmentary early decree from Venusia (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 402 = IX 439 = Sherk no. 17) and, abbreviated *s. c.*, in decrees from Ferentinum (*AE* 1982, 307 = *Suppl.It.* I Ferentinum 5; *CIL* VI 1492 = *ILS* 6106 = Sherk no. 9) and Aquileia (*CIL* V 875 = *ILS* 1374 = *I. Aquileia* 495 = Sherk no. 2); the expression *decu[ri]ones consuluerunt* in *CIL* V 2856 = Sherk no. 4.<sup>8</sup>

The list of the witnesses begins in the normal way with *scribendo [a]dfuerunt* followed by the names. If the original width of the inscription has been calculated correctly – and it seems so, cf. p. 71 and the reconstruction on p. 106 – there does not seem to be enough space for the name of another person after Ti. Albius Sabin[us] in line 8, and so it is surely preferable to assume with Costabile (p. 82 in the Apparatus criticus) that this man had two cognomina. As for the first two names in line 9, we are offered the reading *P. Sumettus Reginus, L. Idumaeus Mela*, but both *nomina* are otherwise unattested and – to be honest – not very plausible (the same view is taken in the commentary in the *AE*). As for *Idumaeus*, there is apparently nothing one can do with this name (I also find it odd that one would encounter the name for the first time in an inscription honouring a certain Idomeneus), although one could observe that, if at least the reading *-maeus* is correct (this seems to be indicated in the facsimile), the repertory of *nomina* otherwise attested ending in *-maeus* and thus coming into question here

<sup>6</sup> I mean here instances of the type *CIL* XI 970 = *ILS* 7216 (AD 190), *in templo collegi fabrum et centonariorum Regiensium*; *CIL* XI 2702 = *ILS* 7217 (AD 224), *in schola collegi fabrum civitatis Volsiniensium*.

<sup>7</sup> But in *senatus consulta*, the convening magistrate(s) could be mentioned both in the prescript and in the *relatio* (e.g., *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 588 = VI 40890 – the *s. c. de Asclepiade Clazomenio et aliis* – of 78 BC, *Q. Lutatius Q. f. Catulus cos. senatum consuluit a. d. XI K. Iun. in comitio; scribundo adfuerunt ... ; quod Q. Lutatius Q. f. Catulus cos. verba fecit* etc.).

<sup>8</sup> But the passive form is also used in those decrees in which the *relatores* are mentioned within the *relatio* in an ablative absolute (e.g., *EE* VIII 371 = S. L. Tuck, *Latin Inscriptions in The Kelsey Museum* [2005] no. 10 [Puteoli], *[qu]od universis postulan[tibus] --- v. f. sunt*]; *AE* 1991, 713 [Fidentia], *quod referentib(us) C. Annio Primitivo et Q. Sertorio Felicissimo curatorib(us) verba f(acta) s(unt)*; etc.



is fairly limited.<sup>9</sup> As for *Sumettus*, I am a bit sceptical about what is said on this name on pp. 130–3, where this name is said to be that of a *gens* of Arcadian origin. On the basis of what one seems to see in the photo on p. 93 one could perhaps suggest the possibility of reading *Suavitius* or *Suavetius*, which *nomen*, although rare, at least has the advantage of also existing outside this particular text;<sup>10</sup> in this case, one would have to assume that the right stroke of the *V* is almost vertical, which in fact seems to be the case in a number of instances of this letter in this inscription.

The section dealing with the subject of the decree is introduced in lines 9f. with the normal phrase [*q(uod) / v(erba)*] *f(acta) sunt* with the mention of the subject following. In most decrees, this is expressed either by the use of a clause formulated as an *accusativus cum infinitivo*,<sup>11</sup> or the subject is mentioned in the ablative dependent on the preposition *de*. The latter is used here: [*q(uod) / v(erba)*] *f(acta) sunt de honore Ti. Claudii Caesar(is) l(iberti) Idomen(e)i*. Now this is interesting, for the solemn style of decrees from the municipal sphere seems to have required that the ablatives following *de* include a gerundive, as for instance in *CIL* XI 1420 = *ILS* 139 = Sherk no. 47 (Pisae, 2/3 AD), *de augendis honoribus L. Caesaris* or in *CIL* IX 47 cf. *AE* 2003, 352 = Sherk no. 13 (Brundisium), *de honoranda morte L. Cassi Flaviani*;<sup>12</sup> in these instances, the verb in the gerun-

<sup>9</sup> The reverse index in H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum* (1988, <sup>2</sup>1994) p. 222 produces *Ammaeus Calmaeus Cammaeus Carmaeus Ptolemaeus Romaesus*, but there are also *Calsameus* (L. Sensi, *RPAA* 57 [1984/5] 16, Fanum) and *Mammaeus* (M. Della Corte, *PP* 6 [1951] 227 no. 8, Herculaneum; *AE* 2007, 1611a, the cognomen *Mammaianus* in Berytus). All of these names are very rare and in many cases, the attestations seem most uncertain.

<sup>10</sup> *Suavitius* and its variants are attested in Rome (*CIL* VI 2591. 10350, cf. *AE* 2001, 433), Capua (*CIL* X 3972) and Salerno (*CIL* X 640 = *Inscr. It.* I 1, 88). The pretorian in *CIL* VI 2591 has the same *praenomen* as the man in the beginning of line 9, *P(ublius)*.

<sup>11</sup> E.g., *AE* 1947, 53 = Sherk no. 28 = *AE* 1976, 144, [*quod*] *M. Ofillius Celer Iivir iter(um) v(erba) f(ecit) pertinere at municipi dignitatem meritis M. Noni Balbi respondere*, etc.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. *AE* 1956, 20 = 2007, 373 (Herculaneum; no doubt *de] statua Pomp[on]n[io] --- ponenda ad] honorand[am] [eius memoriam]*); *AE* 1974, 256 = S. L. Tuck, *Latin Inscriptions in The Kelsey Museum* (2005) no. 11 (Puteoli; surely [*de honoranda memor]ia Iuli Iuliani*); *AE* 2008, 372 (Puteoli), *de decernendis ornamentis decurionalibus Pompeio Euphrosyno*; *AE* 1910, 203 cf. 2003, 352 = Sherk no. 14 (Brundisium), *de honoranda morte Clodiae Anthianillae*; *CIL* X 1782 = Sherk no. 33 (Puteoli), *de confirmanda auctoritate memoriae honorand(ae) statuaq(ue) ponenda Annio Modesto*; *AE* 1999, 453 (Puteoli), *de loco dando Augustalib(us)*; *CIL* X 1784 = *ILS* 6334 = Sherk no. 35 (Puteoli, AD 187), *de decernendo funere publico*; *CIL* X 3698 = *ILS* 4175 = Sherk no. 42 (Cumae, AD 289) *de sacerdote faciendo*; etc. As for *consulta* of

dive already gives an indication of what the *relatores* are suggesting. It is true, though, that ablatives without gerundives are also found, although only rarely; in *CIL* X 1787 = Sherk no. 36 (Puteoli), we have *de sepultura Cn. Tett[i ---]*; and there is also *CIL* X 1783 = *ILS* 5919 = Sherk no. 34 from Puteoli with *de desiderio Laeli Atimeti optimi civis* (the exact nature of the *desiderium* being described in the explanatory part of the decree).<sup>13</sup> However, the formulation *de honore* (the reading is here quite clear) followed by the name of the honorand in the genitive is, as far as I can see, without parallels.<sup>14</sup> As for the reading *Idomen(e)i*, I think that here, too (cf. above on the dative *Idomeni*), we do not necessarily have to assume an error, and that the genitive *Idomeni* could be accepted as such, although the genitive *Achilli* is perhaps not a very good parallel, as the nominative of this name is *Achilles* rather than *Achilleus*.

The *relatio* ends (in line 10) with the normal phrase *q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) censu[ere]*. I cannot say I can see much of this in the photo, but this is what one naturally expects. We now move on to the decree. In some cases, the decree proper, introduced normally with *placere* and formulated as an indirect *accusativus cum infinitivo* clause, already begins at this very point; in these instances, the motivation of the decree has already been dealt with in what precedes, normally in the *relatio*,<sup>15</sup> but as in this inscription, it is

---

the Roman senate, note, e.g., *AE* 1984, 508 (the *tabula Siarensis*), *de memoria honoranda Germanici Caesaris*; *Frontin. aq.* 100, *de eis, qui curatores nominati essent, ornandis*; *ibid.* 125, *de rivis ... reficiendis*.

<sup>13</sup> In *CIL* X 5670 = Sherk no. 46 = *ILMN* 582 (Sora), something clearly went seriously wrong with the syntax, for the mention of the subject starts with *de Ilviro quinquenn(ali) in prox(imum) annum*, but where one would expect *faciendo*, we read in fact *feri* (sic). For an ablative without a gerundive in a decree of the senate in Rome cf., e.g., *Frontin. aq.* 104, *de numero publicorum salientium*; *CIL* X 1401 = *ILS* 6043, *de postulatione necessari[orum] Alliatoriae Celsillae*.

<sup>14</sup> Costabile (p. 90) mentions as parallels *quod v(erba) f(acta) s(unt) in ho[n]orem C. Minici Itali* in *CIL* V 875 = *ILS* 1374 = Sherk no. 2 and *in honorem Curti Crispini* in *CIL* X 1784 = *ILS* 6334 = Sherk no. 35, but in these cases, we are not dealing with the introduction of the subject of the decrees. Something a bit similar to the formulation *de honore* can be found in Greek inscriptions, as, e.g., in the inscription from Beroea, *I. Beroia* 2 (late Hellenistic), where we read (lines 33ff.), ἐπεὶ ... ὁ δῆμος ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ τὸ βουλευτήριον τὴν πλείστην πρόνοιαν ἐποιήσατο περὶ τῆς τιμῆς αὐτοῦ (of a certain Harpalus), ἔδοξεν κτλ.

<sup>15</sup> Thus, e.g., in *CIL* VI 1492 = *ILS* 6106 = Sherk no. 9 (Ferentinum, AD 101/2); *CIL* XIV 2795 = *ILS* 272 = Sherk no. 55 (Gabii, AD 140), where the *relatio* is very detailed; *AE* 1956, 20 = 2007, 373 (Herculaneum); etc. In a decree of AD 255 of the *centonarii* in Luna, the decree proper introduced with *placere* comes immediately after the *relatio*, but its motivation, beginning with *praesertim cum*, is later inserted (*placere cunctis ... consentiri, praesertim cum*

much more common to begin the decree with a section setting out the motives for what is being decreed. This can be done with a clause formulated, at least in the beginning, as an *accusativus cum infinitivo*,<sup>16</sup> but it is much more common to begin the motivation with a causal conjunction. In editing this inscription, the editor has opted for *quod*: [*Quod Ti.*] / *C[l]audius Idomeneus ita se gesserit* etc. (lines 10ff.), and for this there seems to be a parallel, namely a decree of AD 261 of the *centonarii* of Sentinum (*CIL* XI 5749 = *ILS* 7221), where the decree (not formulated with great care) begins with *quod in praeteritum Coreti Fusci ... beneficia praestita susceperimus, nunc etiam in futurum ... speramus* etc. (note the change from the subjunctive to the indicative).<sup>17</sup> But the fact is that the normal conjunction is *cum* followed by verbs in the perfect subjunctive if referring to the past or in the present subjunctive if referring to existing conditions. This is the case in the inscription Sherk no. 6 cited by Costabile on p. 90, and the other parallels are too numerous to be quoted here.<sup>18</sup> It thus seems obvious to me that what we must read here is not [*quod*] but [*cum Ti.*] / *C[l]audius Idomeneus ita se gesserit* etc.

The explanatory part of the decree extends from line 10 to line 13, where the decree proper begins, as it should, with *placere*. Between lines 11 and 17, the letters are less than 2 cm high, and although the photographs are as good as they can be, and although there are many words and even groups of words which one can read with ease (e.g., *factus* in line 13), the fact is that much must remain uncertain, as Costabile's edition of the text makes perfectly clear. In this edition, this section – i.e., lines 10–13 – reads (with the correction of *quod* to *cum*) as follows (I have underlined those parts in which the reading seems fairly certain to me; cf. below):

---

*sit et dignitate accumulatus) et ..., petendumque) etc.).*

<sup>16</sup> *IAM* II 307 = Sherk no. 64 (Sala in Mauretania, AD 144: *omnia a Sulpicio Felice optumiorarissimoque) praefecto Salenses habere* etc.); *CIL* X 1784 = *ILS* 6334 = Sherk no. 35 (Puteoli, AD 187: *optasse quidem singulos universosque ... Marcianae ... vivae potius honoris (= -res) conferre quam ad huius modi decretum prosilire* etc.). In *CIL* X 4643 = Sherk no. 44 (Cales), the presentation of the motives begins with an *AcI* phrase (*ordinem iam pr[idem] intellexisse* etc.), but then moves on to phrases introduced by *cum*.

<sup>17</sup> But some reasons for the decree had already been given (with *cum*) in the *relatio*.

<sup>18</sup> For some instances of decrees introduced by explanatory phrases beginning with *cum*, note, e.g., Sherk no. 15 (Brundisium, Republican); Sherk no. 28 (Herculaneum, about Augustan); Sherk no. 43 (Capua, Tiberian?); *AE* 1978, 100 cf. 1987, 241 (Interamna Lirenas, about AD 100); *AE* 2008, 372 (Puteoli, AD 129); Sherk no. 14 (Brundisium, AD 144); etc.

[cum Ti.] / C[l]audius Idomeneus<sup>19</sup> ita se gesserit annis Copiae iis suae vitae cum servierit in [municipio n(ostro) :] / 'in`colis<sup>20</sup> magn[e] pr[ae]cessit summa modestia, iust[itu]tia <a>eque p(ublicum) a(rgentum) administrare ex[pertus est] / et deinde liber factus similem se <praestitit> ; pristinae clem[en]tia<e> fovendae placere (etc.).

This is translated (p. 110) as "Poichè Ti(berio) Claudio Idomeneo si è comportato nel modo seguente negli anni (trascorsi) a Copia, quelli della sua vita quando serviva [nel n(ostro) municipio]: ha superato di gran lunga quanti hanno qui domicilio per somma modestia, [si è] im[pegnato] con giustizia nell'amministrare equamente il p(ubblico) d(anaro) e, reso quindi libero, <ha dato> egual <prova> di sé; volendo accrescere la (propria) tradizionale magnanimità, (i senatori) hanno deliberato che (etc.)".<sup>21</sup>

To be honest, the original Latin version does not seem to me to make much sense and, more seriously, at places does not seem to be at all the correct Latin of the type one would and should expect in an early first-century AD decree from Italy. The problem is, however, that because of the state of the preservation of the original inscription, there is not much one can do about it. In spite of that, let me offer an observation or two and start by saying that, if the text has been formulated more or less in the same way as all similar texts, and I think that assuming this is a correct starting point, the decree proper must start with *placere*, the motivation of the decree proper ending not with what comes before *pristinae*, but immediately before *placere*. It is true that there is a decree from Interamna Lirenas not later than about AD 100, in which *placere* is preceded by *itaque* and a few words of additional information ([*ita*]que in honorem eorum – the father and brothers of Fadia – *placere* etc., *AE* 1978, 100 cf. 1987, 241),<sup>22</sup> but I am not sure

<sup>19</sup> At least here the *I* is an *I longa*, and there are examples of *I longae* also elsewhere, *Idomeni* and *quoí* in line 2, *scripta* in line 4. There does not seem to be a list of them in this edition.

<sup>20</sup> The reading is said to be *nicolis*.

<sup>21</sup> This, again, is rendered in French in the *AE* as "Attendu que Tiberius Claudius Idomeneus s'est conduit de la façon suivante à Copia lors des années de sa vie où il a été au service de notre municipes : il l'a emporté de beaucoup sur les habitants (*incolae*) par sa très grande honnêteté, il s'est appliqué également à gérer avec droiture l'argent public, et ensuite, devenu affranchi, il a manifesté la même conduite ; afin de se conformer à la bonté qui fut la sienne dans le passé, il a plu (...)".

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *ideo placet* Sherck no. 11 (of uncertain origin and date); *placet itaque* *AE* 1998, 282 (Lavinium, AD 228); *CIL* IX 10 = *ILS* 6113 = Sherck no. 12 (Neretum, AD 341); *placet igitur* *CIL* IX 259 = *ILS* 6115 = Sherck no. 16 (Genusia, AD 395).

this inscription can be used as a parallel, as *itaque* in this text clearly marks the transition to the decree proper. Therefore, I would very much prefer to see all that precedes *placere* in line 13, whatever its original wording, as the explanatory introduction of the decree, beginning at the end of line 10.

The important question is, of course, what is said in this explanatory introduction. As mentioned above, what we read now can only reflect some parts of the original text, the main reason being that, due to the circumstances of the survival of this inscription and the smallish size of the letters in this part of it, much of the text seems illegible. It is true that we are offered a reading – in my opinion not necessarily everywhere making a sense – of practically all of it, but I must confess that at least a reader who has only the photos at her or his disposal will be able to confirm only parts of the text as published. Having had a close look at the photos (especially those on p. 87, 93 and 112f.), I think that the reading in those parts of the text which I underlined above seems fairly certain (the text is more easily readable on the left side), and I am willing to accept the reading also in some other parts of the text, although only on the basis of what we are told the reading is and of the facsimile (p. 106), which, however, in places seems to be an interpretation rather than an exact rendering, of the inscribed text. Since at least the formulations [*cum Ti.*] *C[l]audius Idomeneus ita se gesserit* (lines 10f.) and *et deinde liber factus similem se* (line 13) seem pretty certain, one can say that the general sense of the passage seems to emerge: a positive evaluation of Idomeneus' activities both when still an imperial slave and after his manumission is given here.

There are, though, also long stretches of the text as published which I do not find acceptable.<sup>23</sup> It would be more than surprising if the *senatus* of Copia had really defined the people of Copia – it is obvious that the whole population of the city is meant – simply as *incolae*, as this term is used to refer not to *all* inhabitants of a city, but only to a special group of people within a particular city.<sup>24</sup> That is

<sup>23</sup> For some small details, note that in line 12, the letter following on *sum* where the reading is said to be *summa* does not seem to be an *M*, as the left stroke is vertical with a 90° angle (an *N* would be more plausible). In line 17, the letter following on *is*, after which the reading is said to be *modes[t]iae*, is not (I think) likely to be an *M* for the same reason. In line 14, where the reading is said to be *qui honor de*, I cannot see a trace of anything after *NOR* (cf. n. 31).

<sup>24</sup> On the definition of *incola* cf., e.g., Pomponius, *dig.* 50, 16, 239,2 and some of the contributions in R. Compatangelo – C.-G. Schwentzel (eds.), *Étrangers dans la cité romaine* (2007), especially those of E. Hermon (p. 25ff.) and O. Licandro (p. 43ff.). Note also the bibliography cited by G. Bandelli – M. Chiabà in C. Berrendonner et al. (eds.), *Le quotidien municipal dans l'occident romain* (2008) 28 n. 49.

why we often find the population of a city defined as *municipes* and *incolae* (e.g., *ILS* 2666. 2637. 3752. 6271). Moreover, for "*p(ublicum) a(rgentum)*", translated as "*p(ubblico) d(anaro)*", for something which is called *pecunia publica* in thousands of inscriptions, there is not a single epigraphical parallel (there is a reference on p. 84 to "*nummi I saeculi a.Ch.n. cum legenda ex arg(ento) pub(lico)*", but I do not think that this parallel is of any use in this context). But it is also the Latin that worries me. To say nothing of minor details – I am here thinking of turns of phrase certainly not reminiscent of epigraphical diction such as *annis Copiae iis suae vitae*, etc. – shouldn't there be (as observed in the commentary in the *AE*) an *ut* phrase corresponding to *ita*? Of course I understand that the editor assumes that *ita* is here used in the sense "in this way" and that it is accordingly followed by a list of the honorand's activities with verbs in the indicative perfect, but I am quite sure that the style of texts like this one requires that the honorand's activities are presented in consecutive *ut* clauses. And what about *magn[e]*? According to the *TLL* (VIII 150, line 25ff.), this adverb is attested only from the 4th century onwards, thus making it most unlikely that we would find it in an inscription from the 1st century AD. I also find the use of *<a>eque* in the sense "equamente" disturbing, as the normal meaning of *aeque* is "to an equal degree" (*OLD*).<sup>25</sup> Furthermore, in my view it is quite impossible to assume that *experior* which normally means something like "to try" or "to have experience of, undergo" (*OLD*) could be used in the meaning "impegnarsi" ("to engage oneself") in the phrase "*p(ublicum) a(rgentum) administrare exp[ertus est]*", rendered as "[si è] im[pegnato] ... nell'amministrare ... il p(ubblico) d(anaro)". And finally, I cannot possibly see how *pristinae clem[en]tia<e> fovendae* (sic) could mean "volendo accrescere la (propria) tradizionale magnanimità".<sup>26</sup> Something could be done about this by adding (e.g.) *<causa>*, but the problem is that the verb *fovere*, which is by no means a rare expression in inscriptions belonging to a similar context and especially in inscriptions dedicated to patrons and in *tabulae patronatus*, is used to refer to something the honorand or a patron is either doing or expected to do, not to what the dedicators do.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, this term seems to

<sup>25</sup> But it must be admitted that there are a few instances of *aeque* used in the positive (for *aequius* and *aequissime* are quite different things) also in the meaning "justly" (*TLL* I 1046, lines 21ff.).

<sup>26</sup> In the French translation in the *AE*, "afin de se conformer à la bonté qui fut la sienne dans le passé".

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Costabile p. 108f. Note, e.g., *AE* 2000, 344 (Misenum, AD 148/149), *Nymphidia Monime ... obsequentissime reverenterque nos fovere perseverans*; *CIL* XI 6335 = *ILS* 7218

make its first appearance in epigraphical language only in the second century AD.

The problem is that although I am able to point out expressions and phrases which in my view do not seem acceptable here, I cannot suggest an alternative version of the text of this passage as so much of the text is virtually illegible and as the presence here and there of apparently legible words and phrases does not seem to permit a secure reconstruction of this passage. But, as mentioned above, the apparently legible passages [*cum*] ... *Ídomeneus ita se gesserit* (line 11) and *deinde liber factus similem se pristinae* (line 13) roughly indicate the contents of this paragraph. Although the rest must, in my opinion, remain more or less obscure, let me finish this section by observing that instead of *annis* (here one seems to be able to read at least the letters *an*) *Copiae iis suae vitae*, one could think of something like *annis [---]tis* (the genitive of a feminine noun) *suae, ut [---]*, and that, if the reading *in`colis* (or perhaps rather simply *incolis*) is correct (which, according to the photos, might even be possible), one should restore *municipibus et* in the lacuna at the end of line 11.

The text now moves on to the decree proper. As edited, this begins with *placere huic s[plendidissimo] / ordini* (lines 13–4), where at least *placere*, the *H* of *huic*, and *ordini* seem fairly certain. Although a simple *placere* at this point is perhaps the rule, the formulation *placere huic ordini* is also well attested, as, e.g., in Sherk no. 27 (Herculaneum, Augustan or a bit later);<sup>28</sup> one also observes formulations such as *placere decurionibus*, *placere conscriptis*, *placere nobis*

---

(Pisaurum, AD 256), *ut ... ornare et fovere nos dignetur*; Sherk no. 23 (Paestum, AD 337), *quod et nos et patriam nostram in omnibus foveat ... in omnibus nos patriamque nostram fovere*; Sherk no. 25 (Paestum, AD 344), *speramus, quod ... nos fovere dignetur*; Sherk no. 24 (Paestum, AD 347), *speramus fore, quod et nos et patriamque (sic) nostram in o<m>nibus foveat*; Sherk no. 16 (Genusia, AD 395), *quod ... singulos u[ni]bersosque tueatur et foveat*; and cf. Sherk no. 1 (Tergeste, AD 138–161), *rem p(ublicam) n(ostram) cum fomentis ampliavit*. For *tabulae patronatus*, cf., e.g., *Suppl. It. 2 Histonium 3 (fovere, diligere [sic])*. Cf. also, e.g., *ILS 1180 (Tarquinii), quod rem p. foverit*; *ILS 6611 (Clusium), quod ... cives ... humanitate foverit*; *CIL IX 4208 = AE 1992, 360 (Amiternum), [quod] ... cives [officiis om]nibus fovere non desinat*; *CIL VIII 15880, in fovendis etiam rei p[ub]l(icae) nostrae opibus*; *ILS 1219 (Praeneste), universus ordo fotus adq(ue) adiutus beneficiis eius* (for *fotus* cf. also *ILS 8978, alimentis annuis foti*; *CIL VI 41228, clientes foti semper eius auxilis*). It is only in Sherk no. 22 (Amiternum, AD 335) that *refovere* (an ancient patron's *benignum honorem*, etc.) seems to be something that the *ordo* (of Amiternum) is doing; but *refovere* is, of course, not the same thing as *fovere* but a response to it.

<sup>28</sup> Cf., e.g., Sherk nos. 2, 35, 37, 39; *AE* 1956, 20 = 2007, 373; 1986, 139 = 1987, 239; 1990, 141; 1999, 453; 2008, 372. In a decree of the Roman senate: Frontin., *aq.* 100.

and, from about the middle of the second century onwards, *placere universis*.<sup>29</sup> Whereas there is nothing wrong with *huic ordini*, one cannot help wondering about *s[plendidissimo]*. Let me start by observing that, in the decrees known to me, there is not a single instance of *ordini* being defined somehow when used at this point in the phrase *huic ordini*, but here it seems obvious that some attribute of *ordo* must be restored at the end of line 13. We are told that the word to be restored begins with an *S*, and, taking into account the fact that *splendidissimus ordo* is a formulation known from many inscriptions, the restoration *s[plendidissimo]* seems to offer itself as the natural solution. The problem is, however, that *splendid(issim)us* is an attribute which seems to have become common only after the first century; applied to *ordo*, *colonia* and similar expressions in inscriptions, this attribute seems to become more common only in about the time of Hadrian and Pius.<sup>30</sup> However, it must be admitted that there are some epigraphical instances of *splendid(issim)us* applied to cities also from the first century. In the edict of Claudius of AD 46, *CIL* V 5050 = *ILS* 206, Tridentum is referred to *splendi. (sic) municipium*, and in the edict of the legate of Galatia in c. 90–93, L. Antistius Rusticus, *AE* 1925, 126 = 1997, 1482, Pisidian Antioch is referred to as *splendidissim(a) col(onia) Ant(iochensis)*. One also wonders whether *CIL* II 1184 = *CILA* II 1, 33 with *ordo splendidissimus Romulensium* might not be from the first century, as the two M. Helvii Agrippae must in some way be connected with L. Helvius Agrippa, proconsul of Sardinia in AD 68–9 (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 64).

This being the case, and apparently no better alternative offering itself, it seems that we must settle for the restoration *s[plendidissimo]*. However, it should be stressed that this must be the earliest instance by far of this expression in this particular context.

The decree proper now follows (lines 14–19), formulated in the normal way as an *accusativus cum infinitivo* clause (again, I have underlined those parts in which the reading, in my view, seems to be confirmed by the photos):

<sup>29</sup> *decurionibus*: e.g., Sherk no. 28; *conscriptis*: e.g., Sherk no. 43; *nobis*: e.g., *AE* 1978, 100 cf. 1987, 241; *universis*: Sherk no. 55 (140; the earliest dated instance known to me).

<sup>30</sup> E.g., *AE* 2008, 372 (Puteoli, AD 129); *CILA* III 1, 84 (Castulo, AD 155). For some observations on *splendidus* and *splendidissimus* cf. S. Demougin, "Splendidus eques Romanus", *Epigraphica* 37 (1975) 174–87. As the earliest occurrence of *splendidus* applied to individual equestrians – as groups, both senators and knights are referred to as *splendidi viri* in a letter of Domitian of AD 82, *CIL* IX 5420 – in *inscriptions* (as contrasted to literary sources) the author mentions (p. 180) the decree from Brundisium of AD 144, Sherk no. 14. However, there is now, as noted in the addenda on p. 187, also the decree *AE* 1974, 256 of AD 113 from Puteoli, with *[Iulius] Iulianus splendidus adulescens* (one could perhaps read *[splendidi]ssimum virum* in the decree of AD 105 from Aquileia concerning the prefect of Egypt, C. Minicius Italus, Sherk no. 2).



[A]ugustalem eum in hunc annum exs decre[t]o nostro creare, qui honor de<sup>31</sup> A[ugustalitate] / <sup>15</sup> ante hoc tempus nulli ratus sit, eumque ordinem <n(ostrum)> em[er]ere praeferrique censuere, exs K(apite) .. de Aug(ustalitate)] / <sup>16</sup> legis, omnibus quos hoc [a]nno senatus f[ut]uros Augusta[l]es cens(uit), vere quo n[ot]ius [sit in eum studium r(ei) p(ublicae)] / <sup>17</sup> et is modes[t]iae<sup>32</sup> suae praecepisse fructum debitum merito videatur; itaq[ue] admirantes] / <sup>18</sup> ceteri simili[s] fortunae hominis periti vitae forte merit[um], senatus am[plissimum]<sup>33</sup> / <sup>19</sup> iudiciorum, imitari eum velint.

This is translated (p. 110) as "crearlo Augustale nell'anno in corso con nostro decreto – onore che, per quanto riguarda l'A[ugustalità], non è stato ratificato per alcuno prima di questo momento – e che egli è benemerito del <n(ostrum)> Ordine e che sia anteposto, [ai sensi del capitoli *tot*] della legge [sull'Aug(ustalità)],<sup>34</sup> a tutti coloro che il senato ha deliberato diverranno Augustali quest'anno, perchè [sia] ancor meglio nota [la sollecitudine verso di lui della p(ubblica) a(mministrazione)] e sia evidente che meritatamente egli ha colto in anticipo il dovuto frutto della sua modestia; sic[chè] tutti gli altri, [ammirando] il forte riconoscimento – la più al[ta] delle ricompense del senato – alla vita di un uomo che ha sperimentato una simile fortuna, vogliono imitarlo".<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> As already observed in n. 23, there is absolutely nothing to be seen in the photos after *NOR*, not even uncertain traces of letters.

<sup>32</sup> In my view, the letter following on *IS* cannot be an *M* (as in *modes[t]iae*).

<sup>33</sup> On p. 110, it is said that C. M. Lucarini of Pisa has suggested adding *uti* at the end of line 18 (the infinitive of *utor*, rather than the variant of *ut*, apparently being meant if I am correct in assuming that *uti* is meant to correspond to "ottiene" in the translation), offering a modified translation. But the new translation, too, leaves one with mixed feelings. I certainly cannot see how *admirantes ceteri simili[s] fortunae hominis* could be translated "sicchè tutti gli altri, ammirando una simile fortuna dell'uomo" or *periti vitae forte merit[um], senatus am[plissimum]* – or rather *am[plissimo] ? – uti] iudiciorum* with "ben sapendo che un forte merito della vita ottiene il più alto dei giudizi del senato" (but I am not sure these passages can be translated at all).

<sup>34</sup> Another possible translation is also offered, "[per beneficio] della legge [sull'Augustalità]".

<sup>35</sup> In the French translation in the *AE*, "il a plu à notre très noble ordre de le nommer Augustal pour cette année (this seems to be more correct than "nell'anno in corso" of the Italian translation) en vertu de notre décret – honneur relatif à l'augustalité qui avant le moment présent n'a été accordé à personne – ; il a décidé que cet homme mérite bien de notre ordre et qu'il doit être placé, en vertu du chapitre [---] de la loi sur l'augustalité, avant tous ceux que le sénat a destinés à être Augustaux cette année, afin que véritablement on fasse mieux connaître l'affection qu'éprouve pour lui la république et qu'il apparaisse comme ayant à juste titre recueilli le fruit que mérite son

The Italian version is perhaps nice prose, but the Latin strikes me again as very odd, and, to be honest, I cannot think this published text comes even close to what the decree originally said, assuming of course again the original Latin to have been of about the same type that one finds in other inscriptions of the same type and period. Once more, the problem is that only some parts of the text seem to be readable with some certainty and that the rest seems to be based on intuition rather than on a faithful rendering of what the inscription actually says. It follows that, although the general sense seems to be clear, the original text of this passage can, in my view, no longer be restored, although some observations can be made. In the commentary in the *Année épigraphique* it was already pointed out that the reading in line 15 must be *datus* (not *ratus*) *sit*;<sup>36</sup> this passage clearly deals with the *honor* being awarded, for which *dare* is (along with *decernere*, *obferre*, etc.) a suitable expression,<sup>37</sup> not with the *honor* being "ratified". Moreover, as *ratus est* (from *reor*) normally means "(someone) has supposed", the participle (or adjective) *ratus* meaning "having legal validity" (*OLD*) seems to be used preferably in contexts in which it cannot be confused with forms of *reor*, and thus in formulations of the type *aliquid ratum esto* or *aliquid ratum habere*, etc. (thus also in the parallels offered on p. 91); inscriptions, accordingly, do not seem to offer a single instance of the masculine form *ratus*.

Another detail to which I would like to draw attention is the infinitive *creare*. In the great majority of the cases, the infinitive expressing the contents of the decree in decrees introduced by *placere* is a passive infinitive.<sup>38</sup> It is only rarely that one finds an active infinitive being used; in fact, before the 4th century, there seems to be only *CIL X 1786* of AD 196 from Puteoli with *placere ...*

---

honnêteté ; et qu'ainsi tous les autres qui connaissent la même condition, admirant la récompense éclatante accordée à la vie d'un homme d'expérience – la plus magnifique des décisions du sénat –, veulent l'imiter."

<sup>36</sup> The use of the subjunctive *sit* is obviously due to "attraction", as the relative clause is placed within indirect speech.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. formulations such as *locum dare* (in *locus datus decurionum decreto*), *statuam dare* (e.g., *CIL II<sup>2</sup> 5, 789, huic cives et incolae ... statuam ex aere conlato dederunt*), *funus etc. dare* (e.g., *CIL XI 1600, huic publice ... funus locusque sepulturae datus*). For *honorem dare* cf., e.g., *CIL X 1026 = ILS 6372, huic ob munificent(iam) decurionum decreto et populi conse(n)su bisellii honor datus est*; *CIL II 4611 = IRC II 60, huic ordo Barcinonensium honorem decurionatus dedit*.

<sup>38</sup> E.g., Sherk no. 3 and no. 28, *placere ... statuam ... poni*; Sherk no. 43, *placere ... [memoriam] ... decorari*; Sherk no. 44, *placere ... gratias agi*; *AE 1956, 20 = 2007, 373, placere ... statuam ei decerni*; *AE 2008, 372, placere ... ornamenta ... decerni*; etc.

*inscriptionem ... dare* (cf. earlier *de forma inscriptioni danda*).<sup>39</sup> One thus wonders whether the passive form *creari* might not be preferable here; and the photos (especially fig. 30b on p. 113) in fact clearly indicate that the reading is *creari* rather than *creare*, for what one sees with certainty is just a vertical stroke at the end of the word.

This is where I must finish with observations meant to improve the text, for the rest is too obscure to be subject to elucidation. However, before concluding, let me point out some expressions and phrases which I think are unacceptable in a Latin text such as this, although I am unable to offer better solutions. First, the structure. In a normal decree, *placere* is followed by a clause or clauses in the form of an *accusativus cum infinitivo*, with possibly relative, final, consecutive and other clauses being interspersed; in some cases, decrees proper at the end may turn to the use of subjunctives.<sup>40</sup> Here, though, the structure is most peculiar, as we start with *placere* but then face in line 15 *cen[suere]* which is not at all what one expects, and then seem to have arrived at the end of the exposition with *videatur* followed by a semicolon – but not preceded anywhere by the necessary *ut* (*quo* in line 16 cannot, in my opinion, be taken as a substitute for the missing *ut*); at the end, there is a clause again missing the *ut* and being introduced by a somewhat unexpected *itaque*.<sup>41</sup> But there are odd things also in the details. First of all, I do not think that the reading in line 14 could possibly be *honor de A[ugustalitate]*,<sup>42</sup> but even if it could, that this could be translated with "per quanto riguarda l'A[ugustalità]" or "honneur relatif à l'augustalité"; I am quite sure that the only possibility of combining *honor* and *Augustalitas* would be to say *honor Augustalitis*. To continue, although *eumque ordinem <n(ostrum)> em[e]rere* (where I can read only *eumqu* in the photo) may be correct Latin, it is

<sup>39</sup> The 4th-century instances (both with *placet* instead of *placere*) are Sherk no. 21 (AD 325) and no. 12 (AD 341).

<sup>40</sup> E.g., Sherk no. 44, *placer(e) ... gratias agi ... pe[rmit]tiq(ue) e(i) ... ampliare, quoq(ue) manifestio[r sit] ... liberalit(as) eius, ex[emplar] epist(ulae) IIIIvir(i) ... [pro]ponend(um) curent* (the change from *curari* to *curent* may well be motivated by the fact that it was important to name the magistrates responsible in this case). Cf. also, e.g., the decree of the senate at Frontin., *aq.* 100, where the decree starts with *eos qui aquis publicis praeessent ... habere ... lictoribus uti*, but then moves to instructions introduced with *ut: utique ... deferrent* etc.

<sup>41</sup> As far as I can see, there is – in addition to the formulation *itaque placere* (above n. 22) – no attestation of *itaque* within a decree proper. The *uti*, the addition of which C. M. Lucarini suggests at the end of line 18, is (unless I am mistaken) the infinitive of *utor*, not a variant of *ut* (n. 33).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. n. 31.

in no way possible that it could be translated with "e che egli è benemerito del <n(ostro)> Ordine" or "que cet homme mérite bien de notre ordre" (that would be *de ordine nostro bene mereri*), for although *emereri* (not *emerere*) can sometimes mean approximately the same as *bene mereri* (*TLL* V 2, 472, 83ff.), it is attested in this meaning mainly as the participle *emeritus* and cannot not be used as a transitive verb in this sense. Moreover – if this passage dealt with Idomeneus' merits – one would prefer a verb in the perfect, not in the present, as decrees tend to refer either to past or to future merits (in the latter instance, verbs like *spero* often being used). The most serious objection to an interpretation of this passage as referring to Idomeneus' merits at all is, however, the fact that this is not the correct place to deal with this topic: the honorand's merits were the subject of the passage beginning with *cum Ti.] C[l]audius Idomeneus ita se gesserit* and ending before *placere* (lines 10–13), and we are now in the section meant to set out the contents of the decree proper.

In what follows, there is also much that seems disturbing. *Praeferri* (in line 15) is certainly not an expression that one would expect in this context, but it seems that it can be read in the photo; however, I would be more than surprised if it really meant "to give precedence to" (cf. "che sia anteposto"). To say that someone should be "preferred" to others of the same status – I would like to know what exactly that is supposed to mean – would (I think) be without parallel in a context such as this. It seems more probable that *praeferre* is here used in some other sense, e.g., "to exhibit", "to display", "to put forward", etc. (a wide range of meanings is on offer in the *OLD*). In what follows, we now read [*de Aug(ustalitate)*] / *legis* (lines 15f.), but "legge [sull'Aug(ustalità)]" should of course be *lex Augustalitis* (in this order); as for *legis*, I can read only *gis* which may well represent a dative/ablative plural of a word ending in *-gus -ga -g(i)um* (e.g., *pagus collega collegium*) and going with *omnibus*. In line 16, we are offered the reading *vere quo n[o]tius [sit]*<sup>43</sup> where *vere* cannot have been read correctly, for *vere* simply does not have the same meaning as *verum*. As for the formulation *quo n[o]tius [sit in eum studium r(ei) p(ublicae)]* in the restored passage at the end of line 16, translated as "perchè [sia] ancor meglio nota [la sollecitudine verso di lui della p(ubblica) a(mministrazione)]", the problem with this restoration is that *studium* is normally something displayed not by those who are

<sup>43</sup> Cf. p. 91 and *AE* 1998, 282, *et quo notius sit ista voluptas*; Sherk no. 44, *quoq(ue) manifestio[r sit] ... liberalit(as) eius*; Sherk no. 33, *quo testatior sit erga eum adfectus rei p(ublicae) nostrae*; Sherk no. 2, *quo testatiu[s sit]* etc.; *AE* 1991, 713, *quo plenius voluptas n(ostra) erga eum eluceat*.

honouring someone but by the honorands themselves, as, e.g., in Sherk no. 44, *ordinem iam pr[idem] intellexisse L. Vitrasii Silvestris [erga] communem patriam et studium et [vo]luntatem*.<sup>44</sup> In *modes[t]iae suae praecepisse fructum* (line 17), one wonders not only about *modes[t]iae* (I do not see the first letter as an *M*, cf. n. 23) but also about *praecepisse*, for I do not think that *praecipere* can be taken to mean the same as *percipere* that one would expect here. As for *admirantes*, restored at the end of line 17, this participle seems quite out of the place here for many reasons and because the expressions *admiror*, *admirandus*, *admirabilis*, etc. do not seem to make their appearance in decrees and honorific inscriptions before the later second century.<sup>45</sup>

At the end we are offered the reading (*itaq[ue] admirantes*) / *ceteri simili[s] fortunae hominis*<sup>46</sup> *periti vitae forte merit[u]m, senatus am[plissimum] / iudiciorum, imitari eum velint*, the letters which seem legible in the photos being underlined. This is translated as "sic[chè] tutti gli altri, [ammirando] il forte riconoscimento – la più al[ta] delle ricompense del senato – alla vita di un uomo che ha sperimentato una simile fortuna, vogliono imitarlo". To say nothing of the missing *ut*, I am puzzled about *periti* being allegedly used in the sense "che ha sperimentato", for the correct expression is of course *experti*; I also find the word order *simili[s] fortunae hominis periti* most awkward (*similem fortunam hominis experti* would also be awkward). Moreover, I find it hard to believe that *meritum* could have been described with the adjective *fortis*,<sup>47</sup> and even harder to believe that *meritum* could have been used in the sense "riconoscimento" ("récompense" in the French translation), as a *meritum* is (as I am quite sure I do not have to

<sup>44</sup> Cf., e.g., Sherk no. 1, *cuius opera studioq[ue] et ornatio[res] et tutiores in dies nos magis magisque sentiamus*; Sherk no. 36, *[stu]dium et amorem*. For honorific inscriptions, note, e.g., CIL X 1120, *pro merito laborum, studiorum suorum*; CIL VIII 22737 = ILS 6780, *amplissimum munificentiae studium*. (But it is true that in Sherk no. 64, *studium* is that of the dedicators: *testi[mon]ium ... manifestiore iudicio quam studio esse perhibendum*).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Sherk no. 35 (AD 187), *ob ... admirabilem cas[us]at[em]*; in honorific inscriptions: in the third century AE 1917/18, 72 (Africa, *admirabilis integritatis ... viro*); AE 1949, 108 (Africa, *[ob] ... admirabilem benevolentiam*); in the fourth century: ILS 1237. 1266. 1270. 5511. AE 1968, 115 (*iudici admirando*). 2003, 1917.

<sup>46</sup> Perhaps one could as far as to say that the whole of *hominis* is legible. One would, however, like to have a more straight vertical stroke where the left stroke of a *N* should be (now the first impression is that of an *C*, *G* or *O*). The reading *homines* does not seem possible.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. TLL VI 1, 1159, 18ff., *fortis* being used "de vi et efficacia rerum incorporalium (actionum, statuum), i. q. validus, firmus, efficax, magnus", where the repertory of nouns associated with *fortis* does not suggest that *meritum forte* would have been a likely combination.

stress) something which characterizes honorands and not something offered by those wishing to honour someone; and although the *TLL* adduces a few passages in which *meritum* seems to have the meaning *praemium* (*TLL* VIII 819, 46ff., citing, e.g., Suet. *Nero* 3,1, *Cn. Domitius ... classem ... M. Antonio sponte et ingentis meriti loco tradidit*),<sup>48</sup> I cannot possibly believe that it could have been used in the sense "acknowledgement" or "reward" in an epigraphical text of this nature and date. I also wonder about *senatus am[plissimum] iudiciorum*, for this does not at all seem an idiomatic way of expressing "la più al[ta] delle ricompense del senato", for which one would expect *senatus amplissimum iudicium* or perhaps, if one wished to strike a more polished note, *senatus iudiciorum amplissimum*. Perhaps, though, the original text was in fact quite different from the text as published: on the photos, only *iudiciorum* seems legible, and there do not seem to be any parallels for *iudicium* being described as *amplissimum*.

To conclude, I hope to have been able to show that the "honorific" part of the inscription in question can, and should, be modified a bit (above at n. 4), but that the decree proper, which consists of a part explaining why the honorand was thought worthy of being honoured by the city of Copia, and of a part which sets out the exact contents of the honours being accorded, can have been originally formulated in the way it has been published only in those passages in which the reading can be controlled with the help of the photos. In passages the reading of which is apparently based more or less on the editor's intuition, the text as presented by the editor can in many cases not be regarded as representing the kind of Latin one must expect from a text like this and the reconstruction of the text of these passages by the editor can accordingly not be accepted. However, the passages in which the text seems more or less certain do give us a fair idea of the contents of the decree; we can see that Idomeneus had been active – the exact nature of his activities escaping us – in Copia as an imperial slave, leaving a favourable impression of himself; having been manumitted, he continued with the same activities, also meeting with approval as an imperial freedman. For this, the *ordo* of Copia honoured him by appointing him an *Augustalis* and by according him some other honours which, however, must remain uncertain. At the end of the decree, what can still be read clearly indicates that the *ordo*, by conferring honours on Idomeneus, invited others to emulate his conduct.

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>48</sup> Translated as "ce qui compta pour un service éminent" by H. Ailloud (in the Budé edition).