

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXVIII

HELSINKI 1994 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

ANNE HELTTULA	<i>Vessels for Mushrooms?</i>	7
MAIJASTINA KAHLOS	<i>Fabia Aconia Paulina and the Death of Praetextatus – Rhetoric and Ideals in Late Antiquity (CIL VI 1779)</i>	13
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Zur Frage der Romanisierung durch das Heer in Germania Inferior am Beispiel Kaiserkult</i>	27
FULVIA MAINARDIS	<i>Sulla genesi di CIL V 1863</i>	39
TIINA PUROLA	<i>P. Cair. Zen. 4.59532 – Two Epitaphs for a Hunting Dog Called Tauron</i>	55
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Observations on the Development of the Style of Latin Honorific Inscriptions during the Empire</i>	63
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLV–CLVIII</i>	107
HOLGER THESLEFF	<i>Notes on Eros in Middle Platonism</i>	115
RAIJA VAINIO	<i>On the Concept of barbarolexis in the Roman Grammarians</i>	129
RISTO VALJUS	<i>Corpus traiectus marmorariorum at Ostia</i>	141
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	145
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	193
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	199

# OBSERVATIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STYLE OF LATIN HONORIFIC INSCRIPTIONS DURING THE EMPIRE

OLLI SALOMIES

The corpus of Latin written in Antiquity consists to a not unimportant degree of inscriptions on stone and on other material. About 200,000 or 300,000 Latin inscriptions may have been published up to this date, a quite respectable number. For those wishing to study the development of Latin it is obviously of some use to keep an eye not only on Latin authors, but also on the epigraphical sources.

In fact, epigraphical Latin has been the object of keen scholarly interest since the 19th century, when epigraphical corpora of some scientific reliability began to be published. Numerous monographs and articles have been devoted to the study of epigraphical Latin.<sup>1</sup> However, if I am not altogether mistaken, these studies seem rather to concentrate on the "unclassical" aspects of Latin inscriptions, the inscriptions being preferably used to illustrate aspects, especially those belonging to the sphere of morphology and phonology, of archaic or, on the other hand, "vulgar" Latin. Of course it is true that Latin inscriptions offer invaluable material for the study of the development of Latin forms and sounds. But a significant number of the Latin inscriptions have been written in a language which hardly offers points of interest to the student of these aspects. Texts of this type, for instance early imperial building inscriptions or honorific inscriptions attached to statues of emperors, are in fact, I think, more often referred to by historians than by philologists.

However, the inscriptions written in a language not including archaic or "vulgar" forms can also be of some interest from a philological (rather than from an historical) point of view. For example, they can be used to illustrate

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. the works listed in A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (1965) p. LXVIII; G.C. Susini, *Epigrafia latina* (1982) 96f.

the development of Latin syntax and style. But although scholars whose interests are not limited to the study of literary Latin have always taken into account also the epigraphical material at our disposal,<sup>2</sup> there is still some work to be done. Let me illustrate this with some examples. In his authoritative exposition of the syntax of Latin cited in n. 1, A. Szantyr says (p. 575) that in "late Latin" (Spätlatein) clauses beginning with explicative or causal *quod* often have the predicate in the subjunctive mood, referring (among other texts) also to three inscriptions, only one of which, from Africa, has a date (AD 276/82). This certainly does not tell the whole truth; in fact, from about the beginning of the second century almost all inscriptions, including solemn ones set up in the capital by the Roman senate and people, which give the reason for the setting up of the accompanying monuments and which use clauses introduced by *quod*, use the verb in the subjunctive.<sup>3</sup> Another example: readers of inscriptions referring to emperors cannot fail to notice that in Augustan and other early texts the fact that an emperor is in the possession of the *tribunicia potestas* is regularly indicated by the use of the ablative of (as it seems) quality, *tribunicia potestate I, II* etc., but that, on the other hand, all kinds of texts, from dedications to milestones, seem to go over to the use of the genitive *tribuniciae potestatis* from about the early second century. But in spite of the fact that this observation obtrudes itself on any reader of inscriptions, I do not seem to find it referred to in expositions dedicated to the history of the Latin *genetivus* and *ablativus qualitatis*.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Inscriptions are quite frequently cited to illustrate syntactical and stylistic phenomena of classical (i.e. neither archaic nor "vulgar") Latin e.g. in the works of Einar Löfstedt, although only a small selection is usually included in the indexes (cf. e.g. *Syntactica* I<sup>2</sup> [1942] 339, II [1933] 111, 123, 130, 138 for inscriptions quoted in the text, but omitted from the *Index locorum*).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ILS 298 (AD 115, on the arch of Trajan in Ancona) *imp. Caesari ... senatus p. q. R., quod accessum Italiae .. tutiorem ... reddiderit*; ILS 1098 (statue base at Rome, c. AD 170) *M. Claudio ... Frontoni cos. ...; huic senatus ..., quod ... pro r(e) p(ublica) fortiter pugnans ceciderit, armatam statuam [poni] .. cen[suit]*. Instances of the use of the indicative in the second century and later are not inexistant, but rare (the prime example is the inscription on the arch of Constantine at Rome, ILS 694, but this is a text the wording of which includes some unusual formulations [cf. Th. Grünwald, *Constantinus Maximus Augustus* (1990) 63ff.]; further examples from the 4th century: ILS 1219; 5698; both the indicative and the subjunctive are used in ILS 1256, as also in ILS 5062 from AD 249)

<sup>4</sup> One may add that, although genitives of quality, especially those used to describe

But the Latin used in inscriptions can, I think, also be of some interest as an independent object of study, and not only as material offering parallels to phenomena found in Latin authors. On one hand, epigraphical Latin, or at least the epigraphical Latin which is used in inscriptions from the late Republic and the earlier Empire, has some syntactical and stylistic features of its own which in themselves are not unworthy of study. On the other hand, anyone familiar with Latin imperial inscriptions is only too aware of the fact that the style of the inscriptions changes quite remarkably between the early and the later empire, this change also being of some interest.

The style of Latin inscriptions of the "classical" period does not seem to have been the object of very many studies,<sup>5</sup> and I do not think that there exists a grammar or a similar work dedicated to them. Those dealing with inscriptions simply have to know what is normal and what is exceptional. For instance, anyone who has had something to do with inscriptions knows that inscriptions enumerating the stages of a career, senatorial or other, do, or at least should do, this asyndetically (and so one rises an eyebrow when one encounters a text like I.Ephesos 660E [c. AD 215], *proc. Aug. n.*

---

honorands in honorific inscriptions, become very common in inscriptions from the 3rd century onwards, epigraphic examples of ablatives of quality are almost nonexistent. In the certain instances I know of, the ablatives are used to define a statue (ILS 1257 of AD 377, *statuam pari splendore*) and a city dedicating an honorific monument (ILS 9408 [IRT 569] from the 4th century, *Lepcis magna, inclita fide, devotione praestans*; note that this seems to be an imitation of Sallust, *Hist.* 2, 64 [cf. below at n. 105]). In IRT 571 (AD 378) one has to restore something in the lacuna after *te[n]aci iustitia*, probably a present participle, so that the words do not describe the man himself, but his activities. On the other hand, observe the new reading of AE 1983, 247 (Luceria, Constantinian) by M. Chelotti and G. Mennella, ZPE 103 (1994) 168, [ ... *et singula*]re (?) *iustitia [Aureli]o Consio Quarto*; however, the reading does not seem absolutely certain.

<sup>5</sup> For some studies on honorific inscriptions see below. – The 18th century work by S.A. Morcelli (on whom see S.A. Morcelli, *Atti del colloquio 1987*, Brescia 1990), *De stilo inscriptionum Latinarum* (1780), is, of course, only of antiquarian interest. Not very much can be gained by reading the sections on language and style in books on Latin epigraphy which are usually quite unimpressive and in some cases, in fact, rather disappointing (see e.g. R. Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine* [1914<sup>4</sup>], e.g. 257ff. on honorific inscriptions; E. Meyer, *Einführung in die lateinische Epigraphik* [1973] 83ff.; I. Calabi Limentani, *Epigrafia latina* (1981<sup>3</sup>) 153; G.C. Susini, *Epigrafia romana* [1982] 88ff.). For an interesting study of the style and formulations used in Latin building inscriptions, see K. Gast, *Die zensorischen Bauberichte bei Livius und die römischen Bauinschriften* (Diss. Göttingen 1965) 40ff.; cf. M. Aberson, *Le formule dell'iscrizione di Petronius Modestus e la datazione del teatro di Trieste*, in: *Il teatro romano di Trieste* (ed. M. Verzár-Bass, Istituto Svizzero di Roma 1991) 146ff.

*provinciae Asiae et a sacris cognitionibus*),<sup>6</sup> *et, ac* and (though not used in quite the same sense) *item* only being used to combine two or more elements coming under the same heading or depending from a single superior concept;<sup>7</sup> but I do not recollect having seen this formulated as a rule. Neither do I believe that it has been often put down in writing that Latin building inscriptions, if mentioning the object at all,<sup>8</sup> normally refrain from using a demonstrative pronoun defining the object.<sup>9</sup> Now this is, in

---

<sup>6</sup> For the interpretation of the career, the man being promoted from the procuratorship of Asia to the position *a sacris cognitionibus*, see H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-empire romain* (1960-61) 768. Cf. AE 1917-18, 51 (Lambaesis, from the time of Severus Alexander), *leg. leg. I Adiut. et leg. Aug. pr. pr. prov. Galatiae*. From a later period: AE 1977, 198 (Puteoli, 330s) ... *comiti Orientis, comiti primi ord[i]nis et proconsuli provinciae Africae*, the proconsulate being the last stage of the career (in later inscriptions one quite often finds asyndetical enumerations ending with an *et* or *ac* between the last two items, cf. e.g. ILS 1284, CIL VI 1735, VIII 5367, IRT 103). Quite remarkable is CIL II 4112 = RIT 155 (Tarraco, 4th cent.) *M. Aur. Vincentio v. [p]. p(raesidi) [p(rovinciae) H(ispaniae)] Tarraconensis ac super omnes reliqu[os] praesides iustissimo*.

<sup>7</sup> On the interpretation of *et* and *item* in career inscriptions see S. Mrozek, *Mélanges P. Lévêque III* (1989) 280ff.; K. Dietz, *Chiron* 19, 1989, 443 n. 173. It is true that *item* can sometimes be used in an enumeration of similar offices even if the main word is repeated, cf. e.g. AE 1950, 66 (Mactar, 130s), *leg. pro pr. [imp. Caes. Traiani Hadriani] Aug. provinciae Cappadociae, item leg. pro pr. [imp. C]aesaris Traiani Hadriani Aug. provinciae Moesiae inferioris*; this is, however, a somewhat special case, though we cannot go into that here (cf. the interpretation of R. Syme, *Roman Papers V* [1988] 573). Special cases are also inscriptions such as AE 1956, 124 (Diana veteranorum, in honour of M. Valerius Maximianus; time of Commodus), in which *item*, though appearing between complete designations of offices (*leg. leg. ..., item leg. leg. ...*), is used to indicate that the commands were simultaneous, not successive.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Gast, *op. cit.* (n. 5) 47; Aberson, *art. cit.* (n. 5) 148f.

<sup>9</sup> The only instance mentioned by Gast (p. 50, along with adjectives and other words defining the object), is *hance aquam*, CIL X 8236 = I<sup>2</sup> 825 = ILS 5742. From the Empire there are some further examples; an early one is ILS 5889 (AD 41/54), *hanc viam*; ILS 3841 (*has aedes imp. Caes. ... et imp. Caes. ... fecerunt*) is from AD 161/169; ILS 6587 (*hanc porticum*) seems to be from the second century. In the fourth century this may have been more common, cf. e.g. ILS 762, 774, 5885. (By this time one also sometimes finds *iste* for *hic*, though not in the accusative defining objects: cf. *istius fabricae munitione* ILS 724; *ibid.* 1203, *istarum aedium conditori*; *ibid.* 5477; CIL XI 2834, *curator r.p. <i>istius civitatis*.) As for *hic*, observe that the use of this pronoun is fairly common in inscriptions referring to someone's possessions or the limitation of land, cf. ILS 5998ff. (and also e.g. CIL V 1001 = *Inscriptiones Aquileiae* 526) with expressions like *cippi hi finiunt hortos* or *in his praediis* or *hic lucus sacer macerie cinctus*.

fact, most interesting, because in Oscan building inscriptions it is, somewhat surprisingly from the point of view of the student of Latin epigraphy, on the contrary absolutely normal to use the equivalent of *hic* to define the object.<sup>10</sup> One observes, at least in this case, very clearly how Latin epigraphy is based on a tradition differing somewhat from the epigraphical tradition among other Italic peoples.

The object of this paper is to study, according to its title, some aspects of the development of the language and the style of a certain category of Latin inscriptions, namely those attached to monuments set up in honour of individuals (emperors, senators and others), known usually, when Latin inscriptions are classified, as honorific inscriptions. The style of honorific inscriptions follows to a large degree certain quite strict rules which are typical only of them, and it is of some importance to keep the honorific inscriptions apart from other kinds of epigraphical texts (but I have not refrained from sometimes citing building inscriptions, the formulations of which, at least in later antiquity, offer interesting parallels). This becomes clear, for instance, if one has a look at inscriptions using a style which is closer to literary Latin, e.g. inscriptions citing different kinds of decrees, letters written by emperors or other officials, *senatus consulta* etc.; even the earliest ones use formulations which would be unheard-of in honorific inscriptions of the same period.<sup>11</sup>

It is of course true that the Latin<sup>12</sup> honorific inscription is a topic on

---

<sup>10</sup> See E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte I* (1953) no. 11, *tríbum ekak* ('domum hanc'); *ibid.* 8, 12, 152, 155; P. Poccetti, *Nuovi documenti italici* (1979) 14, 15, 132, 133, 134.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. e.g. the *decreta Pisana* (ILS 139, 140) from the time of Augustus, in which one finds Augustus defined as *totius orbis terrae praeses* and peoples defeated by the Romans as *bellicosissimae ac maximae gentes*. Observe also the *s.c. de aedificiis* of c. AD 47 and 56 (ILS 6043), the style of which, correctly characterised by R. Frei-Stolba, *MH* 26, 1969, 24, as "barock und schwülstig", has always struck me as reminiscent of a much later period (note e.g. the use of expressions such as *foedus* and *splendere*; and cf. also Å. Fridh, *Terminologie et formules dans les Variae de Cassiodore* [1956] 42f.). The *tabulae patronatus* also offer formulations which become common in honorific inscriptions only much later (for instance, the *patronus* is described as *tantae virtutis vir* in ILS 6106 from c. AD 101).

<sup>12</sup> I am going to concentrate only on inscriptions written in Latin, although, at least in the later period, Greek honorific inscriptions sometimes offer interesting parallels to the Latin ones. The formulations of Greek honorific inscriptions and their evolution differ so much from those used in Latin ones that the two groups cannot really be used to illustrate

which there do exist studies. There is the well-known article by I. Kajanto, *Un'analisi filologico-letteraria delle iscrizioni onorarie*,<sup>13</sup> and the studies by G. Alföldy<sup>14</sup> have also decisively advanced our understanding of Roman honorific inscriptions. On Italian inscriptions referring to *domi nobiles* we now have the useful book by E.P. Forbis, *The Language of Praise in Roman Honorary Inscriptions for Italian Municipals, A.D. 1-300*, Diss. Chapel Hill

---

each other. In the Greek world, the original form of honouring an individual was the honorific decree, the honorific inscription coming into existence only gradually and fairly late. Although the Greek honorific inscriptions are not to be regarded as simple "abbreviations" of honorary decrees (cf. on this the recent admirable article by F. Gschnitzer, *Zwischen Denkmal und Urkunde. Kaiserzeitliche Neuerungen im Formular der Psephismata*, in: *E fontibus haurire. Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*, eds. R. Günther and S. Rebenich [Festschrift H. Chantraine, 1994] 281ff.), they always did preserve some features typical of decrees, which I think is one of the main reasons why they differ so much from Latin ones. Looking at those honouring Romans, and comparing them with contemporary Latin ones, one cannot fail to notice the great stylistic differences. At a time when Latin inscriptions usually define the honorand only by mentioning his (latest) office, Greek inscriptions – often beginning with the dedicator – can be very generous in referring to the merits of the honoured person (for some examples of Greek inscriptions honouring early emperors and including striking formulations see A. Scheithauer, *ZPE* 72, 1988, 155 n. 2). As for the syntax, one finds, for instance, that certain memorable deeds can be specified by the use of (aorist) participles (see e.g. ILS 8770 honouring L. Iulius Caesar, the censor of 89 BC), whereas in Latin inscriptions the use of participles to describe the honorand's merits becomes common only centuries later. Even during the later period, when Latin honorific inscriptions, too, start to become wordy (which I cannot imagine having been much influenced by Greek epigraphical habits [cf., however, n. 64]), one finds notable differences in the tone and the phraseology (Latin inscriptions never call emperors "masters of the land and the sea"). Furthermore, there is the fact that Greek honorific inscriptions for private persons become (unlike Latin ones) scarce in the 4th century, so that at the same time when people who formulated Latin honorific inscriptions displayed remarkable *eloquentiae cura* and *mentis vigor* (to quote expressions used in the 5th-century inscription in honour of Merobaudes the poet, ILS 2950), there is not much parallel material on the Greek side.

<sup>13</sup> *Epigraphica* 33, 1971, 3-19.

<sup>14</sup> *Die Rolle des Einzelnen in der Gesellschaft des römischen Kaiserreiches*, in: *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil. - hist. Kl.* 1980, vol. 8; *Individualität und Kollektivnorm in der Epigraphik des römischen Senatorenstandes*, *Tituli* 4, 1982, 37-53 (one will find both studies in the author's *Die römische Gesellschaft* [1986], pp. 334-377 and 378-394). Observe also the same author's *Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation. Die Geburt der imperialen Epigraphik*, *Gymnasium* 98, 1991, 289-324, especially the section on honorific inscriptions, p. 305ff.



1988. Many further points of importance have been illustrated in other studies.<sup>15</sup> In spite of this, I cannot help thinking that there is still some work to be done, for the majority of the studies cited in the preceding notes mostly concentrate on studying *what* the Latin honorific inscriptions say, which is, of course, most important, but one might also try to find out *how* this is being expressed. Also, although it is by now well known that inscriptions honouring provincial governors start to use adulatory expressions during the second century, or that fourth-century honorific

---

<sup>15</sup> On the evolution of the use of laudatory epithets applied to Roman emperors see R. Frei-Stolba, *Inoffizielle Kaisertitulaturen im 1. und 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, MH 26, 1969, 18ff. (for individual emperors see the material listed e.g. in A. Mastino, *Le titolature di Caracalla e Geta attraverso le iscrizioni* [1981], esp. p. 125ff.; G. Sotgiu, *Studi sull'epigrafia di Aureliano* [1961] 26ff.; T. Grünwald, *Constantinus Maximus Augustus* [1990] 274ff. ["Panegyrische Formeln"]; cf. also A. Magioncalda, *Lo sviluppo della titolatura imperiale da Augusto a Giustiniano* [1991; mainly for students, and using almost exclusively material in Dessau's ILS] and M. Peachin, *Roman Imperial Titulature and Chronology, A.D. 235-284* [1990; the emphasis is on the official rather than on the "inofficial" titulature]; on the use of *beatus* etc. see A. Arnaldi, *Epigraphica* 43, 1981, 165ff., on *pius* see E. Van't Dack, *CE* 68, 1993, 234ff., on the phrase *super omnes retro principes gloriosissimo* and the like see A. Scheithauer, *ZPE* 72, 1988, 155ff., and on the "eternity" of emperors see G. Di Vita-Evrard, in: *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.* [Coll. École française de Rome 159, 1992], 229ff.). On the evolution of titles such as *c(larissimus) v(ir)* etc. see now above all H.-G. Pflaum, *Titulature et rang social sous le Haut-empire*, in: *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'antiquité classique* (1970) 159ff.; on the use of laudatory epithets in inscriptions honouring Roman officials and others see e.g. M. Christol, *Hommages publics à Lepcis Magna à l'époque de Dioclétien: choix de vocabulaire et qualité du destinataire*, *RHD* 61, 1983, 331ff.; id., *Les hommages publics à Volubilis*, in: *L'Africa romana III* (1986) 83ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: *L'Africa romana VI* (1989) 158f. n. 66 (governors honoured at Lambaesis); G. Alföldy, *Chiron* 11, 1981, 177 n. 44 = id., *Die römische Gesellschaft* (1986) 170 n. 44 (equestrian officials). On the phraseology found in the epigraphy of the later Roman empire one can find much of interest in the volume *Atti del convegno "La terza età dell'epigrafia"* (ed. A. Donati, 1988), e.g. A. Chastagnol, *Le formulaire de l'épigraphie latine officielle dans l'antiquité tardive* (p. 11ff.). Furthermore, observe V. Neri, *L'elogio della cultura e l'elogio delle virtù politiche nell'epigrafia latina del IV secolo d.C.*, *Epigraphica* 43, 1981, 175ff. On funerary inscriptions see e.g. M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, *Les qualificatifs réservés aux défunts dans les inscriptions ... d'Ostie et de Portus*, *ZPE* 43, 1981, 57ff.; J.-F. Berthet - B. Pagnon, *Le vocabulaire moral des inscriptions de Lyon et de Vienne*, in: *La langue des inscriptions latines de la Gaule* (Coll. centre d'études romaines et galloromaines n. s. 7, 1989) 43ff.; H. Desaye, *Les épithètes laudatives et affectives dans les épitaphes de la moyenne vallée du Rhone*, *ibid.* 59ff.

inscriptions generally use a bombastic style which often makes one think that those who planned the wording must have done their best to surpass the limits of human imagination, the evolution of all this still does not seem to have been set out in a way which would take proper account of the different stages and which would try to distinguish between different ways of expressing things. Of course, it is not my aim to try to accomplish something like this in this paper; I only wish to point out some interesting aspects of the development of Latin honorific inscriptions which seem to obtrude themselves upon the reader.

At the beginning of the history of the Latin honorific inscription in its definite form, with the name of the honoured person in the dative (this type being attested from the early 1st century B.C. onwards),<sup>16</sup> the structure of the text is generally quite simple. The formulation of the earliest attested honorific inscription with the name in the dative (of 91 BC, Kajanto 9), from Delos, is as follows: *C. Iulio C.f. Caesar[i] pro cos. olearei* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 705 = ID 1712 = ILS 7172), i.e. the name is followed by a definition, the office currently held; the text finishes off with the dedicator; the predicate is omitted. Approximately the same pattern is followed in the inscriptions in honour of Sulla (ILS 870ff.) and in many other texts (including those dedicated to Caesar and Augustus) until the early empire (e.g. ILS 896 [Augustan] from Herculaneum, *M. Nonio M.f. Balbo pr. pro cos. Herculanenses*), although one finds that sometimes more than one office is mentioned (usually a choice of the highest offices held, or possibly a priesthood in addition to the highest office is given). In many inscriptions of this period even the dedicator is omitted.<sup>17</sup>

After the early Empire one only rarely finds texts of this simple and "lapidary" structure. Revolutionary in many other respects, the establish-

---

<sup>16</sup> For the prehistory of the honorific inscription see Kajanto, art. cit. (n. 13) 7ff.

<sup>17</sup> For a somewhat exceptional inscription, note CIL XI 4213 = I<sup>2</sup> 2510 = ILS 6629 from Interamna Nahars, *A. Pompeio A.f. Clu. q., patrono ..., quod eius opera universum municipium ex summis periculis et diffultatibus expeditum et conservatum est, ex testamento L. Licini T.f. statua statuta est* (observe the *amplificatio* in the mention of the problems which the city had faced and the use of two verbs which seem to have about the same meaning). Scholars used to date this inscription to the time of Sulla (C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien* [1922] 185ff., followed by A. Degraffi in ILLRP 364), but it seems now that this date is too early and that the inscription must, in fact, date from the early Augustan period (see Degraffi's addenda to ILLRP 364, vol. II p. 385, and to CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2510, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2, 4, p. 941). However, despite the new dating the formulations remain remarkable.

ment of the rule of Augustus and the beginning of Empire also coincides with a decisive change in the epigraphic culture at Rome. The setting up of all kinds of monuments accompanied by inscriptions suddenly became extremely common.<sup>18</sup> Of course, this "epigraphic revolution" affected not only the numbers of inscriptions being set up, but quite soon also their structure and contents. On the whole one can say that all types of inscriptions tend to become more and more detailed and informative, although one must note that the two aspects go hand in hand only until about the third century; during and after this time inscriptions, or at least the more public ones (the development of funerary inscriptions is quite another story), still become more and more detailed and wordy, whereas the actual information useful to the historian given in them becomes more and more rare, the general impression one gets being that of extreme vagueness.

To describe the evolution of the style of honorific inscriptions, it would be a good idea to choose a single expression covering, if possible, all the aspects of the evolution, and I wish to suggest here that the term *amplificatio* borrowed from the technical language of rhetoric<sup>19</sup> could be quite suitable. Although we shall obviously not be dealing with quite the same thing that Cicero or Quintilian had in mind, I think that the term *amplificatio* can, *mutatis mutandis*, be applied to all the aspects of the evolution, for in a way it is question of more or less the same phenomenon: in imperial inscriptions, a very simple narrative structure is "amplified" with more and more details, some of them meaningful, some of them not, to produce a text which (I suspect) would have seemed to the contemporary Roman to be more in line with the taste of the new, Imperial Rome, contrasted with the simple taste of earlier times.

In formulating imperial honorific inscriptions, any part of the structure of the original type could be "amplified"; i.e., one could give more information, often eloquently formulated, on the honoured person, on his status and career, and on the dedicator. But in addition to that, information not usually present in the primitive type, such as a specific reason for the setting up of the honorific monument, could be added. In the beginning, the *amplificatio* consists mainly of elements which can be thought of as being

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. for all this, G. Alföldy, art. cit. (in *Gymnasium* 98, 1991, see n. 14) 291ff. (Id., *Studi sull'epigrafia Augustea e Tiberiana di Roma* [Vetera 8, 1992] concentrates on details rather than on the overall evolution.)

<sup>19</sup> Cf. e.g. M. Erren, *Einführung in die römische Kunstprosa* (1983) 12ff.

objective; with time, the elements tend to become more subjective, their addition seemingly meant to add colour to the whole rather than to give precise extra information. For instance, one starts to find descriptive, but not necessarily very meaningful, adjectives, often in the superlative, being added, not only to define the honoured person, but to define any expression appearing in the text. The emperor, if mentioned in a text honouring a private person, acquired an adjective such as *sacratissimus*, the Roman senate was labeled as *amplissimus*, Rome as *sacra* (and later *aeterna*),<sup>20</sup> a local senate, a city or a province as *splendidissima*,<sup>21</sup> military campaigns as *felicissimae*,<sup>22</sup> defeated peoples as *bellicosissimae gentes*.<sup>23</sup> In exactly the same way imperial building inscriptions referring to restoration began to describe the reasons which lead to the destruction of the building being restored;<sup>24</sup> later also the state in which a building was found<sup>25</sup> and the quality of the work may be specified.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> *Sacra*: e.g. ILS 98, 1128 (Severan); *aeterna* (common in the 4th century) in the time of Severus Alexander: ILS 3926.

<sup>21</sup> *Splendidissimus ordo* (thus usually in the third century, later more often *ordo splendidissimus*) is of course most common in Severan and later times (e.g. ILS 1138). Cities defined as *splendidissimae*: e.g. ILS 4052 (AD 169, *splendi<di>ssimae civitati Gortyniorum*), 1140 (Severan, *civitatis splendidissimae Nicomedensium*), 6815 (Carthage, earlier 3rd cent.). One also finds *splendida* (ILS 1216, Carthage; 1273, Alexandria) and other adjectives (e.g. ILS 1235, 6809). Provinces being designated as *splendidissimae* in honorific inscriptions: ILS 1168 and 9488 from the early third century (in the *s.c. sumptibus ludorum* of AD 177/80, ILS 5163, one finds *fidelissimarum Galliarum vestrarum* and *splendidissimarum Galliarum*). *Splendidissimus* can be applied also to an office, cf. ILS 1420, *exornato sacerdotio splendidissimo pontif(icatus) minor(is)* (180/192; cf. ILS 3049, 8918).

<sup>22</sup> E.g. AE 1957, 123 (Lambaesis, c. 202/205), *secunda Par[t]hica felicissima expedi[tio]ne*.

<sup>23</sup> ILS 374, set up in honour of Marcus Aurelius by the senate and the people in 176 (cf. above n. 11 for the use of *bellicosissimae gentes* in a different context in the time of Augustus).

<sup>24</sup> E.g. ILS 245 (AD 71/2; in fact an honorific inscription) *vias urbis neglegentia superior(um) tempor(um) corruptas*; 336 (AD 139) *opus ... vi maris conlapsum*.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. ILS 2943 *plateam ... [omni] lapide spoliata* (early 4th cent.); CIL VI 1728a *nymphium sordium squalore foedatum* (a popular expression in this period) *et marmorum nuditate deforme* (391).

<sup>26</sup> E.g. ILS 774 *ad summam manum perfectionis* (late 4th cent.); 5557 *ad omnem splendorem* (368/70); AE 1955, 52 *pretorium pulcherrimum* (368/70). (The habit of saying that a building was restored *ad pristinam faciem*, *ad pristinum statum* etc. is

Giving more detailed information on the career of an honoured senator is a kind of *amplificatio* which appears early in honorific inscriptions. We have seen that in late Republican inscriptions a senator's status was usually defined by mentioning only the office currently held, more detailed descriptions of careers (which are not very common) being restricted to funerary inscriptions of a private nature. In the time of Augustus, however, one suddenly starts to find also honorific inscriptions in which the career is set out in full, from the beginning to the latest office; the earliest datable instances seem to be the inscriptions from Athens and Corinth (ILS 928; Corinth VIII 2, 54) in honour of the proconsul of Achaëa, L. Aquillius Florus Turcianus Gallus from about 3 BC.<sup>27</sup> This was a most important development, for from now on "career inscriptions", often most detailed and thus extremely useful to the student of senatorial offices during the Empire, make up an important part in the corpus of inscriptions referring to senators.

Another important kind of *amplificatio* is that applied to the honoured person. First of all, from the time of Augustus onwards, honorific inscriptions begin to be more precise in the rendering of the nomenclature of the honorand. In Republican inscriptions, the tribe was not normally mentioned (and in early Augustan texts even the filiation is sometimes omitted); but from now on the nomenclature used of honorands tends to be as complete as possible, including the tribe, so that the nomenclature now, in fact, becomes a copy of the official name form used of Romans in census lists. This is, of course, most useful information. But with time honorands also start to be described in a somewhat more subjective manner, their moral and other qualities being referred to, so as to make the dedication of the honorific monument seem even more justified. This could be done in two ways. One possibility was to define the honorand by the use of an abstract noun, e.g. *pietas* or *benevolentia*, and to refer such a noun to the honorand by the use of a preposition, usually *ob*.<sup>28</sup> The other possibility was to attach an attribute to the name of the honorand to describe him more closely, i.e. an adjective, usually in the superlative, a verbal form (present

---

attested earlier, cf. ILS 406 etc.)

<sup>27</sup> On all this, see the remarkable exposition by W. Eck, Senatorial Self-representation: Developments in the Augustan Period, in: Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects (eds. F. Millar & E. Segal, 1984), 129-169, esp. 149ff.

<sup>28</sup> For these and other expressions see Forbis, op. cit. (above at n. 15).

participle etc.) or a noun with a concrete and active meaning. Since it is not useful to separate the former type from those cases in which a specific reason for the setting up of a honorific monument is announced, a phrase like *ob benevolentiam* obviously being on the same level as e.g. *ob dedicationem thermarum*, we shall come back to these expressions later. Instead, let us have a look at attributes used to describe honorands (although, as will be observed below, attributes also sometimes refer to something very concrete and are in fact often used to explain the reason for the honorific monument, *restitutori rei publicae* [CIL VI 1146] conveying of course the same meaning as *ob rem publicam restitutam* [ILS 425]).<sup>29</sup> In inscriptions honouring emperors, one seems to find the honorands being defined by the use of nouns and adjectives beginning in the time of Tiberius, in whose case expressions such as *iustissimus*, *optimus* and *conservator patriae* are attested, although one must note that these texts are not necessarily representative of their age.<sup>30</sup> For the later history of the adjectives see the exposition of Frei-Stolba (n. 30);<sup>31</sup> since the author only

---

<sup>29</sup> It could be of some profit to compare inscriptions honouring emperors and others with inscriptions honouring deities, i.e. votive inscriptions, for one observes many similarities, at least in the vocabulary, between the two classes of inscriptions. Reading e.g. the votive inscriptions in Dessau's ILS (2957ff., esp. 2996ff.), one finds that, during the Empire, deities are more and more often characterised by nouns and adjectives in the superlative (but note also *Herculi victori pollenti potenti* in ILS 3434 from AD 81), and that these are in many cases identical with expressions attested in honorary inscriptions for emperors and others (e.g. *conservator*, *defensor*, *rector*, *restitutor*, *victor*; *excellentissimus*, *exsuperantissimus*, *praestantissimus*; on the other hand, e.g. *tutator* [ILS 3021, 3027] and, understandably, *exauditor* [ILS 3002] seem to be attested only in votive inscriptions).

<sup>30</sup> See R. Frei-Stolba, MH 26, 1969, 22ff., who notes (p. 22) that one finds in inscriptions referring to Tiberius many formulations which remind one of later times (cf. ILS 157 from Interamna Nahars, *nati ad aeternitatem Romani nominis*); not unreasonably, the author connects the phenomenon with the events of AD 31. In an inscription on an epistyle from Aegae in Mysia Tiberius is designated (in the nominative) as *conditor uno tempore XII civitatum terrae motu vexatarum* (CIL III 7096), this, of course, being a translation of a Greek formulation (which in fact survives in ILS 8785 = IGR IV 1351; cf. on this text W. Kuhoff, *Felicio Augusto, melior Traiano. Aspekte der Selbstdarstellung der römischen Kaiser während der Prinzipatszeit* [1993] 212).

<sup>31</sup> Let me only add that *sacratissimus*, referring, it is true, not to the emperor himself, but to his birthday, is now attested in an inscription of AD 28, AE 1969/70, 110 (Cales, *sacratissimo die natali divi Augusti*).

treats the first two centuries, one could perhaps add that adjectives used in the positive seem to appear only in Severan and later inscriptions; at least *magnus* and *inclitus* (both expressions later becoming most popular, *magnus*, often combined with *invictus*,<sup>32</sup> already in the 3rd century, and *inclitus* in the time of Valentinian I) are attested for Caracalla,<sup>33</sup> and before Diocletian one finds in addition also *inlustris* and *perpetuus*.<sup>34</sup> As for nouns, it is of some use to distinguish between other nouns and those ending in *-tor* (or *-sor*) formed from verbs, for the nouns of the former category, not very common, tend to be more abstract and vague,<sup>35</sup> whereas nouns ending in *-tor* during the earlier Empire often refer to something very precise and are in many cases used to give a reason for the erection for the monument. Moreover, this class of nouns is most interesting because it becomes, with time, very common in honorific inscriptions (and not only in those honouring emperors), so that, by the fourth century, one finds a marvellous variety in the repertory of these nouns, the suffix *-tor* in late antiquity obviously having become extremely productive.<sup>36</sup> After the early instance under Tiberius (see above), the next example of a noun ending in *-tor* is the

---

<sup>32</sup> Severus and Caracalla are described (in the ablative) as *invicti* in an inscription of c. 202/205 from Lambaesis (AE 1957, 123). For Caracalla see also Mastino, op. cit. (n. 15) 128. For Philip see IRT 880.

<sup>33</sup> See Mastino, op. cit. (n. 15) 128, 134.

<sup>34</sup> ILS 597; Sotgiu, op. cit. (n. 15) 29f. In the 4th century, one finds many more, sometimes quite picturesque, expressions, e.g. *venerabilis* (ILS 707), *strenuus* (*bellis*, ILS 768), *caelestis* (IRT 57. 472), not to mention *divus* and *divinus* being used of living emperors (e.g. ILS 707, 760; in inscriptions other than honorific: ILS 5358, 5520; observe that in a *decree* one finds Antoninus Pius designated as *divinus princeps*: ILS 6680; cf. CIL X 1558, cited by Frei-Stolba p. 38, where the restorations are, however, not certain).

<sup>35</sup> Thus one finds *vind(ici) lib(ertatis)* in an inscription (containing unusual formulations) in honour of Claudius from Cyzicus (ILS 217; *vindex et conditor Romanae disciplinae* referring to Septimius Severus in an inscription in honour of Caracalla: ILS 446; in 4th-century texts: ILS 8938, CIL VI 13734; in inscriptions for *privati*: ILS 1247/8; IRT 571); *fortissimo duci* in an inscription from Capena honouring Pertinax (ILS 409; *dux* - not used as an official title - also appears in private inscriptions from the 2nd century onwards, e.g. ILS 1097, 1354, 2771); quite extravagantly *numini praesenti* in an inscription of 199 honouring Caracalla (ILS 453, Tusculum). Of course one also often finds *princeps* (defined by an adjective); for *dominus noster* see Chastagnol, art. cit. (n. 15) 12ff.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. e.g. G. Haverling, *Studies on Symmachus' Language and Style* (1988) 54ff.; and below at n. 110.

inscription in honour of Claudius cited in n. 35, where one must no doubt read *devi[ctori regum XI] Britanniae*;<sup>37</sup> which is interesting because – unlike the somewhat vague *conservator patriae* – the noun refers to a precise accomplishment of the emperor. This is the case also in ILS 252, set up in Rome in 77/8 by the *sodales Titii* in honour of Vespasian, *restitutori aedium sacrarum* (but he is also more generally defined as *conservatori caerimoniarum publicarum*).<sup>38</sup> Although already attested in the first century, nouns in *-tor* seem to become more common in the second; inscriptions in honour of Trajan and later emperors offer quite a few examples. Although often rather general in tone,<sup>39</sup> one also encounters pleasant instances in which the nouns refer to something very specific.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to adjectives and nouns, honoured emperors could be characterised also by the use of nonfinite forms of verbs, i.e. with present, past and future participles and with gerundives. Except for past participles, which are not a very interesting category,<sup>41</sup> these forms are all attested only during the later Empire. Especially the use of present participles<sup>42</sup> became eventually quite popular,<sup>43</sup> although evidently not as popular as in in-

<sup>37</sup> One could of course also think of restoring *devi[ctis regibus]* (and earlier *vind(icata) lib(ertate)*), but in early imperial inscriptions the noun appears regularly at the beginning of ablative absolutes. (On the other hand, this is an inscription from Cyzicus, and one with somewhat unusual formulations.)

<sup>38</sup> Titus is called *conser[va]tor Pacis Aug.* in ILS 259 from Valentia.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. CIL VI 958 (Trajan), *propagatori orbis terrarum, locupletatori civium* (the point of view is narrower in ILS 321 from Gabii for Hadrian and Sabina, *locupletatoribus municipii*); ILS 304 (Trajan) from Baetica, *conservatori generis humani*, which could in fact be a suitable designation for a 4th-century emperor. (On Septimius Severus as *propagator imperii* in African inscriptions see J.-L. Desnier, MEFRA 105 [1993] 561.)

<sup>40</sup> E.g. ILS 315 (Hadrian), from Athens, *restitutori coloniae suae Troadenses*; I. Parion 7 - 9 (Hadrian), *conditori col(oniae)*; ILS 340 (Pius in 142), *constitutori sacri certaminis iselastici*; ILS 2155 (Severus in 207), *restitutori castrorum Ostiensium*.

<sup>41</sup> Trajan is *optime de re p. merito* in ILS 292 (AD 112). In the fourth century one finds expressions such as *diis auctoribus procreato* (ILS 665), *patre, avo imperatoribus nato* (ILS 721), *pietate praedito* (IRT 471), and of course the popular *bono rei publicae nato* (on which see Chastagnol, art. cit. [n. 15] 17, cf. 25f.). Already Tiberius appears in the genitive as *nati ad aeternitatem Romani nominis* in an inscription set up by a *sevir Augustalis* after the Sejanus affair, cf. above n. 30.

<sup>42</sup> For gerundives, cf. ILS 751 (*venerando principi*: Julian), 758; ILTun. 814 (used in the nominative in a building inscription: ILS 703). For a future participle, cf. ILS 721 (*semper orbi taerre profuturo*).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. e.g. ILS 689, 726, 734, 752, 8947; CIL VIII 1179. Note, by the way, that there



scriptions honouring private persons. The same can be said of genitives of quality. Attested, as far as I can see, for the first time in an inscription in honour of Pertinax (ILS 409: *omnium virtu[t]uum [sic] principi*), one finds more instances in 4th-century inscriptions,<sup>44</sup> but not in quite the same numbers as in inscriptions referring to *privati*; those wishing to define an emperor not only by the use of the official titles, but also by the use of other expressions – and there were many such people in later antiquity – normally preferred adjectives and nouns ending in *-tor*.

As for inscriptions honouring private persons, one observes much the same evolution. Of course, one has to remember that, as a class, inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors by nature differ somewhat from those in honour of emperors, for instance, in that one has to distinguish between the more private ones, e.g. those set up by relatives and dependants, usually in private locations (to these one may add many funerary inscriptions, in the case of senators and others representing the upper classes not always easy to be kept apart from honorific inscriptions), and those meant for public display. In inscriptions of a more private nature, one finds laudatory epithets of various kinds from the earliest empire, just as one finds adjectives such as *pientissimus* or *incomparabilis* in the normal type of funerary inscriptions set up in memory of deceased representing the *plebs*. One thus finds expressions such as *sanctissimo et iustissimo ... patrono semper de se merito* (ILS 962 [Pergamon], from the time of Claudius) and *[op]timo constantissimo* (ILS 1102 [Cirta], from the time of Marcus Aurelius);<sup>45</sup> or *amico optimo et praesidio suo* (CIL VI 1625a, c. AD 140). In the more public honorific inscriptions, laudatory epithets are extremely rare before the later second century. The earliest provincial governor to whom a superlative is applied is to my knowledge T. Caesernius Macedo, procurator of Mauretania Caesariensis in AD 107, who is called *innocentissimo praesidi* in ILS 9008. However, this instance is clearly an

---

may be an interesting early example of the use of a present participle, namely the extremely fragmentary inscription ILS 145 from Centumcellae, set up in honour of Tiberius when he was still the colleague of Augustus; the text is restored by Mommen as follows: *[consilia adiuvan]ti [optimi maximique pri]ncipis*.

<sup>44</sup> ILS 758; VI 31381. 31394a.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. ILS 990/991, 1064, 1095 etc. In a funerary inscription of a IVvir of Volcei from the period between AD 14 and 42 the man is described as *optimo et indulgentissimo viro* (ILS 9390).

exception,<sup>46</sup> for provincial governors normally begin to be provided with laudatory superlatives only in the period of last Antonines.<sup>47</sup> As for other types of epithets, the rare adjectives used in the positive are, at least before the 4th century, rather uninspiring;<sup>48</sup> nouns ending in *-tor* (and *-sor*) seem, unlike in the case of emperors, to be rare before the late third century,<sup>49</sup> after which time they become extremely common.<sup>50</sup> Of the use of present participles, also common in, and typical of, the fourth century, there are some not very interesting examples from the second century and the Severan period,<sup>51</sup> the earliest instance clearly representing the type common

---

<sup>46</sup> ILS 6173 from Ostia (with *patrono et defensori V corporum ... dignissimo atque abstinentissimo viro*, and some more formulations in the same style) is also at least seemingly fairly early, for it is dated to AD 147; however, many features of the inscription make me suspect that this monument may in fact be later, for there are quite a few examples of reused monuments in which the original date (inscribed not on the front, but on the side) was left untouched (cf. e.g. CIL VI 1119, 1173, 1659, 1662 [= ILS 5357], 31128, 33856, 36954 [= ILS 726]; CIL X 1814, 3344 = ILS 5902).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. G. Alföldy, *Die römische Gesellschaft* (n. 14) 388ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: *L'Africa romana* 6 (1989) 158f. n. 6 (Lambaesis). Superlatives in inscriptions honouring *domi nobiles* datable (more or less certainly) to the Severan period: e.g. ILS 6263, 6449, 6504, 6656, 6744; AE 1975, 872. Observe that in CIL IX 4206 a man holding only municipal offices and obviously not of equestrian rank is characterised as *splendidissimo viro*.

<sup>48</sup> E.g. *patrono incomparabili* ILS 1161 (Severan; in a more private context ILS 1083 and 1190, *amico incomparabili*); *viro bono* ILS 5076 (c. Severan, referred to a municipal man; *bono viro* ILS 6817; in an inscription of 208/210 honouring the daughters of a legate of Numidia the legate himself is mentioned in the genitive as *hominis boni, praesidis clementissimi*): ILS 9488. There is somewhat more inspiration in ILS 1357 from Auzia (in Mauretania), in which the Severan governor Octavius Pudens is honoured (in the accusative) as *praesidem incomparabilem, innocentia praecipuum omniumque virtutum virum* (for the genitive of quality see below at n. 52). Note also CIL VIII 18268 (in honour of the Numidian legate – in the 240s – Cominius Cassianus, to whose inscriptions we shall be referring also in the following), *claro et inlustr(i) v(iro)*. In the fourth century, one encounters expressions such as ILS 1254, *pleno aequitatis ac fidei*; ILS 5511, *castitate conspicuo*.

<sup>49</sup> ILS 5076 (from Africa, significantly), with *bono viro amatori munic.* may be about Severan.

<sup>50</sup> E.g. ILS 1247, 1248 (and 5341), 1263, 1276, 2937, 5509, 5511 (with seven nouns ending in *-tor*, including five instances of *reparator*), 5692, 6349, 5697, 6186, 6611; CIL VI 1706; CIL X 3844; AE 1972, 75b.

<sup>51</sup> ILS 6264, *exemplis munificentiae suae optime merenti* (rather lame, *merenti* being borrowed from the language of common funerary inscriptions; cf. *optime de re publica*

to late antiquity being from the time of Philip, ILS 1154 from Lambaesis, in which the legate of Numidia, Cominius Cassianus (to whose inscriptions we shall return), is described as *omnibus virtutibus abundantis viro*. At about the same time, genitives of quality also start to become common. There are a few unobtrusive examples from the second century,<sup>52</sup> but the more spectacular use of genitives of quality seems to begin with the Mauretanian inscriptions honouring procurators of Severan date, ILS 1357 (Octavius Pudens), already quoted in n. 48, and CIL VIII 9359 (Aelius Peregrinus), which both have a formulation which was to become extremely popular, *omnium virtutum viro* (*virum* in ILS 1357); many further instances of similar character appear in other inscriptions from the third century,<sup>53</sup> not to speak of later texts. In most instances the well-known rule that the genitive of quality must depend on an expression such as *viro* is followed, but this is not always the case; cf. e.g. ILS 1443 (from Dalmatia, 3rd cent.), *mi[r]ae inte[g]ritatis [e]t bonitatis*; ILS 6325 (probably from Puteoli, dated to AD 241),<sup>54</sup> *mirabilis munificentiae*, or (the genitive of quality coming before the name) ILS 1228 (Africa, Constantinian), *mirae iustitiae atq. eximiae*

---

*merito* ILS 1071 from the time of Pius; for ILS 962 see above at n. 45). AE 1954, 168 (Capena) with e.g. *ludos edenti* (i.e. the man is honoured *inter alia* because he had arranged *ludi*) is dated to AD 172, but almost everything in the text seems to point to a later date, and so we may in fact be dealing with a case similar to that referred to in n. 46. In a funerary inscription of a senator from the time of Pius one notes the somewhat striking expression *habenti quoque salutation(em) secundam imp. ... Pii* (ILS 1078).

<sup>52</sup> ILS 1061 (Tibur, from the time of Pius), *quinquennali maximi exempli* (a senator; cf. 1071, from the same period and also from Tibur); for later instances of the use of *exempli* see e.g. ILS 1333; CIL VIII 8327 (in funerary inscriptions, one encounters earlier examples, cf. e.g. CIL VI 10515, *uxori sanctissimae et rarissimi exempli* [this inscription is dated to ca. AD 125-135 by D.E.E. Kleiner, *Roman Imperial Funerary Altars with Portraits* (1987) 227f. no.92]). In ILS 6334 of AD 187 from Puteoli a woman is honoured as *honestae et incomparabilis sectae matron(ae)*. Observe, incidentally, that one starts to find (usually abbreviated) titles of the type *bonae memoriae vir* about the same period.

<sup>53</sup> E.g. ILS 1411 (*singularis integritatis viro*). 6836 (*omnium virtutum viro*); CIL VIII 8327 (*praesidi exempli [rarissimi]*); CIL VIII 11105 (*omnium virtutum [et t]otius iustitia[e] viro*); AE 1916, 107 = 1917-18, 114 (*unicae bonitatis viro*). In AE 1939, 38, in honour of Cominius Cassianus (cf. above), *viro* is replaced most remarkably by *genio*. Observe that these inscriptions all come from Africa. For genitives of quality appearing before the nomenclature see below; and for *virtutum omnium vir* cf. e.g. Symm. Rel. 10,1; 11.

<sup>54</sup> But I think that this inscription is in fact later (*Die römischen Vornamen* [1987] 399 n. 139). Cf. the case above in n. 46.

*moderationis* and ILS 1249 (Rome, c. 350), *singularis integritatis et bonitatis exsimiae*. However, in such cases the omission of *viro* in connection with the genitives may have been influenced by the fact that *viro* appears in the texts earlier (or later), as part of the titulature.<sup>55</sup>

An important development in the formulation of honorary inscriptions is the introduction of the use of laudatory epithets which precede the name.<sup>56</sup> In inscriptions honouring emperors, the earliest examples seem to date from the reign of Caracalla (Chastagnol, art. cit. [n. 15] 19, dates the appearance of this type too late); often one finds only laudatory expressions (thus ILS 452 [AD 214] from Rome, *magno et invicto ac super omnes principes fortissimo felicissimoque imp. Caes. etc.*),<sup>57</sup> but in some cases these are preceded by *domino nostro* (thus CIL VI 1066, AD 213, *domino nostro invictissimo [et] omnium principum v[irtute] benivolentia indulgentia exsuperantissimo imp. Caes. etc.*).<sup>58</sup> In the beginning, the epithets consist mainly of adjectives, but gradually nouns ending in *-tor* were also intro-

---

<sup>55</sup> Thus in the inscriptions cited above, ILS 1443 leading off with *viro ex equestribus turmis egregio*, ILS 6325 with *c.v.*, ILS 1228 and 1249 continuing after the name of the honorand with *v. c.* or *c. v.* Cf. e.g. IRT 576 (*singularis integritatis et moderationis* being preceded by *omnium virtutum viro* - appearing before the name - and *v. p.*), AE 1972, 79 (Puteoli, c. 340), ILS 5011 (the genitives of quality appearing before the name perhaps depending on *v(irgini)* in the title *v(irgini) V(estali)*). In IRT 577 the genitive of quality *singularis aequitatis et beniboli vigoris* is preceded by *v.p.* and followed by *omnium virtutum viro*. The only exceptions I can find in inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors are IRT 570 and CIL VI 1755 (AD 395), *Aniciae Faltoniae Probae fidei, nobilitatis antiquae* (for inscriptions in honour of emperors cf. CIL VI 31381 and 31394a, although one might assume that the genitives were thought to depend on *domino*). ILS 1236 (340s, from Cirta) is an interesting, although of course not unparalleled (cf. A. Szantyr, op. cit. [n. 1] 70) case, for the genitives have no attribute (*v.c. et consulari, continentiae integritatis patientiae aequitatis adque honorificentiae singulari ac praecipuo viro*; cited by E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica I*<sup>2</sup> [1942] 282n.); but the genitives obviously depend on the adjectives *singulari ac praecipuo* (cf. ILS 1235 in honour of the same man, *eximio ac singulari virtutum omnium*).

<sup>56</sup> Usually this does not mean that there are no epithets after the name; on the contrary, it is quite normal that the characterisation goes on after the name of the honorand (e.g. ILS 5697 of AD 341 from Ocriculum, *bonae originis suboli et sinceritate praecipua praedito M. Caesolio Saturnino ... laudabili viro, restauratori thermarum etc.*).

<sup>57</sup> Also e.g. CIL VI 1067 (214); ILS 506 (Philippus in 244); RIU 1144 (Gallus in 252); ILS 542. 547 (Gallienus).

<sup>58</sup> Also e.g. ILS 2158 (Gordian in 239), 8934 (Maxentius), 692 (Constantine). In the genitive: ILS 485; CIL VIII 8781 (Severus Alexander).

duced (e.g. CIL XI 3089 [Gallienus], *rectori orbis et domino terr[arum ac redin]tegratori col. Faliscorum imp. etc.*),<sup>59</sup> and by the time of Diocletian one also finds genitives of quality (CIL VI 31381 [Diocletian in AD 294], *mirae virtutis et [ ... ] pietatis fortissimo [d.n. etc.; cf. 31394a [Maxentius]]*);<sup>60</sup> in this period it seems to have been more usual to begin an honorific inscription with a characterisation of the emperor than with the simple *imp. Caes.* or *d. n.* followed by the name.<sup>61</sup>

In inscriptions honouring persons other than emperors, one seems to find epithets preceding the name<sup>62</sup> somewhat later; in sharp contrast to inscriptions in honour of emperors, those honouring senators and others start by using genitives of quality and go over to other formulations only later. The earliest instances I know of are from the reign of Gordian and Philip, all from Africa and set up in honour of legates of Numidia.<sup>63</sup> CIL VIII 2393 from Thamugadi, with *virtutum omnium viro* coming in front of the nomenclature *T. Iulio Tertullo Antiocho* (legate in 242), seems to belong to a more or less private sphere, because the legate is not given any title and because the dedicator calls himself *cliens eius*. But in the dedications for M. Aurelius Cominius Cassianus (legate under Philip), the formulations of whose inscriptions have already been noted (above n. 48; at n. 52; n. 53), we are obviously dealing with public honours. Interestingly, already in these rather early instances the style can be remarkably florid. Note especially AE 1917-18, 72 (Lambaesis), *insignis patientiae et admirabilis integritatis ac summarum virtutum viro M. Aurelio Cominio Cassiano etc.*<sup>64</sup> From the

<sup>59</sup> Also e.g. ILS 579 (Aurelian in 274, from Brixia) *magno Augusto, principi max(imo), imp(eratori) fortissimo, conservatori orbis L. Domitio etc.* (remarkable for the use of several nouns all meaning 'emperor'; observe the *variatio* and that the name is introduced without an attribute).

<sup>60</sup> Most striking is the Spanish inscription in honour of Probus, ILS 579, which in addition to quite colourful laudation also has the appellations *Gothi]co* and *Germanico*, both strikingly accompanied by the adjective *vero* (cf. G. Alföldy, *Die römische Gesellschaft* [above n. 14] 341), before the beginning of the nomenclature.

<sup>61</sup> But cf. e.g. ILS 615, 639, 649, 650a, 654, 655, 678.

<sup>62</sup> With 'name' I mean the name appearing in the dative, not the *signum* (ending usually in *-i(i)* - which I think is normally meant to be a genitive [cf. CIL X 4863, 5200]) which one finds at the beginning of many honorific inscriptions in later antiquity.

<sup>63</sup> For the details on these legates (and on other governors) see B.E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum I* (1984).

<sup>64</sup> Cf. AE 1917-18, 73 (fragmentary in the beginning). CIL VIII 7033 = ILaIlg. II 617 (Cirta), no doubt in honour of the same legate, begins with *totius [bonitatis viro(?)]*, and

third century there are also other examples of genitives of quality preceding the name;<sup>65</sup> other types of laudatory epithets, nouns, adjectives, present participles, gerundives<sup>66</sup> and others, do not seem to appear before the time of Diocletian,<sup>67</sup> during and after which they (as well as genitives of quality) become extremely common, the inscriptions offering marvellous variation in the choice of expressions. In African inscriptions of the fourth century, one notes the tendency to add other kinds of details in the section coming before the name of the honorand; one finds the date being defined,<sup>68</sup> the merits of the honorand being referred to by the use of clauses beginning with *ob*,<sup>69</sup> or the emperors being named as the inspiration for the setting up of the monument.<sup>70</sup> In a not very well known 4th-century inscription from Comum, the local *schola iuvenum seu caplatorum*, setting up a monument in honour of a certain Iucundus Faustianus *v. p.*, names itself at the beginning of the text.<sup>71</sup>

An important aspect of the *amplificatio* in the formulation of honorific inscriptions is the addition of a reason for the erection of the monument. In Latin Republican inscriptions a specific reason is not usually

---

so we find the use of *totus* defining an abstract noun (reminding no doubt many of the Greek  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ), so typical of genitives of quality in later honorific inscriptions, already in this early instance. Observe, by the way, that there are also Numidian inscriptions in honour of this legate which begin with the name (ILS 1154; AE 1917-18, 71 and 74)

<sup>65</sup> E.g. CIL VIII 10988; ILS 5361. In the series of the dedications to Vestal Virgins from the Forum in Rome the earliest instance in which the epithets precede the name is CIL VI 2142 of AD 301 (*mirae sanctitatis adque in cerimoniis antistiti deorum Terentiae* etc.).

<sup>66</sup> CIL X 4863, *aequitate magnifico, benivolentia colendo, abstinentia continentiaq. mirando, virtute constantiaque conspicuo* etc.

<sup>67</sup> E.g. CIL VI 1696 (AD 307/308), (*inlu]stri viro et omnium retro praefecto[rum] industriam supergresso Attio Insteio Tertullo* etc.

<sup>68</sup> IRT 571 (the consular date AD 378); somewhat more colourfully IRT 480 (*florentissimis saeculis dd. nn. Honori et Theodosii* etc.).

<sup>69</sup> IRT 568, 574; cf. 567.

<sup>70</sup> ILS 1235-6 (Cirta). In ILS 738 from Cyprus, Constantius and Gallus, ordering the erection of an honorific monument, appear (in the nominative) at the beginning of the inscription, possibly following the Greek practice; similarly in ILS 1273 from Alexandria (Theodosius and Arcadius).

<sup>71</sup> A. Sartori, *Le iscrizioni romane. Guida all'esposizione*, Como, Musei Civici (1994) p. 38 (with references to earlier publications by G. Baserga in *RAComo* 46, 1902 and A. Sartori, *ACeSDR* 4, 1972-73): *Schola iuvenum seu caplatorum bene merenti Iucundo Faustiano v. p. cur. quondam civitatis Comensium* etc.

given, and where one is mentioned, this happens usually in inscriptions either coming from the Greek part of the Empire or set up by Greeks, and the formulations, normally very discreet, are for the most part borrowed from, or at least influenced by, the phraseology of Greek inscriptions. One thus finds expressions like *virtutis* or *benefici ergo*,<sup>72</sup> or *honoris causa*.<sup>73</sup> During the Empire, it became much more common to specify the reasons for the erection of honorific monuments, although one gets the impression that this was especially common in inscriptions from the municipal sphere. I. Kajanto, in his article mentioned above (n. 13), distinguishes (p. 11f.) six different ways of expressing a motivation for an inscription: one could use the preposition *ob*; one could use clauses introduced by *quod*; one could use an ablative absolute (which of course has a causal touch); one could use an epithet (e.g. *conservatori*); one could use a relative clause (example given: ILS 6045, *plebs urbana quae frumentum publicum accipit*); or one could use a construction with a participle (example given: CIL VI 972 [= CIL XIV 95], *colonia Ostia conservata et aucta omni indulgentia eius*; cf. below n. 80). These are, in fact, the most usual types,<sup>74</sup> although one could perhaps

---

<sup>72</sup> ILS 30ff., 37 (this inscription, set up at Nemus Dianae in honour of C. Salluvius Naso by *Musei* and other peoples in Asia Minor, also has a clause introduced by *quod*); CIL I<sup>2</sup> 718.

<sup>73</sup> ILS 864, 891. For later instances, see Forbis, op. cit. (above at n. 15) 116 n. 2 (add her no. 103 = AE 1959, 97 from Velia). Also in ILS 1095 (Ephesus), 1102 (Cirta, set up in honour of P. Iulius Geminus Marcianus by his *strator* when he was legate in Arabia), 2648.

<sup>74</sup> For *ob* - quite often used with the ablative - one could sometimes substitute *propter* (e.g. ILS 1361 2934 [cf. CIL VI 1512], 6530) or *pro* (e.g. ILS 6459; combined with *ob*: CIL VIII 9046). Sections introduced by *ob* are often used to give a very specific reason for the erection of the monument (the formulations are then most often of the type *ob dedicationem thermarum* [ILS 406] or *ob rem publicam restitutam* [ILS 425]), but rather vague and general references to the honorand's virtues (of the type *ob innocentiam et laborem* [ILS 1118; the inscription in fact has *labori*], *ob eximium amorem in patriam* [ILS 1347]) are also quite common (cf. above at n. 28). Note that motivations expressed by the use of ablative absolutes seem to concentrate in the early principate (cf. ILS 81, 84, 926, 6614, from the Augustan period; IAM 369, set up by the city of Volubilis in honour of Claudius in 44, with the formulation *impetrata c. R. et conubio et oneribus remissis*); ILS 289 (cited by Kajanto, p. 12) is from the time of Trajan. The latest examples known to me are ILS 6449 (about Severan, from Paestum: a *nutritor* formulates his reasons for having the honorific monument erected with the words *multis largitionibus in se conlatis*) and CIL VI 2134 and 32419 (set up in 247 in honour of a Vestal Virgin by a certain Veturius Memphius *v.e.*, *plurimis in se conlatis beneficiis*); cf.

say more on relative clauses and add the clauses beginning with a demonstrative pronoun (usually *hic*). In fact, the example of a relative clause given by Kajanto is possibly not very representative, for normally relative clauses appearing in honorific inscriptions have a more complex structure, and refer to the honorand, not to the dedicator (as in the example above).<sup>75</sup> It is true that one finds rather simple relative clauses such as *qui ... annonae difficultates (sic) iuvit* (ILS 1118 from Concordia, period of Marcus Aurelius; cf. e.g. ILS 1262, 6949, 6988); but normally relative pronouns, more often in cases other than the nominative, introduce rather elaborate sections in which the style may often come closer to that of *elogia* rather than to that of honorific inscriptions. For an example, cf. e.g. ILS 5054 (about Severan, in the National Museum in Naples): *qui cum privilegio ... munitus potuisset ... excusari, praeposito amore patriae et honorem ... laudabiliter administravit* etc.; or ILS 6726 (Severan or possibly somewhat later, from Bergomum), *cuius eximia liberalitas post multas largitiones hucusque enituit ut* etc. Much the same thing can be said of explanations given with the use of a demonstrative pronoun, which is normally *hic*.<sup>76</sup> As in the sections introduced by relative pronouns, those beginning with *hic* usually depart from the strict style of honorific inscriptions and use a style resembling that of *elogia*. But whereas relative clauses, despite their style, tend to give, and to specify, the reasons which have caused the dedication of the monument in question, clauses beginning with *hic*, especially those in which *hic* is in the nominative, very often seem rather to give eint outside the scope of normal honorific inscriptions or to refer to additional merits of the honorand whose right to be honoured by a statue has already been made clear; moreover, sections introduced by *hic* usually appear at the end of epigraphical texts. Observe, e.g., ILS 1401 (c. Severan, apparently from

---

also the fragmentary inscription CIL V 8269 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 448 for an uncertain example of Constantinian date. A votive inscription from Apulum of probably Severan date with the formulation *redditis sibi luminibus*: ILS 3847.

<sup>75</sup> For a parallel from the third century, observe CIL VIII 2734, another inscription in honour of the legate Cominius Cassianus, in which the dedicators describe themselves as follows: *qui iu[dicia] eius for[i iustitiamque] tot[ies admirati sunt]* (thus the restorations in the corpus).

<sup>76</sup> Sometimes one also finds *is*; e.g. ILS 932 (Superaequum, earliest empire) *is primus omnium Paelign(or)um senator factus est et eos honores gessit* (observe the strikingly elliptical wording); cf. ILS 5062, 6225; CIL IX 4686. In the votive inscription ILS 3001 *is* refers to Jupiter.



Puteoli), in which the listing of the offices of the honorand (which include the patronate and the curatorship) and the motivation *ob rem publ. bene ac fideliter gestam* is followed by extra information, beginning with *hic*, on gladiatorial games arranged in a novel fashion by the honorand; or CIL XIV 376 (Ostia, 2nd century), where a long list of local offices, fully justifying the erection of a statue, is followed by a list of special achievements, introduced by *hic* (which is followed by several instances of *idem*).<sup>77</sup> On the other hand, clauses beginning with the dative *huic*, stylistically resembling those beginning with the nominative form, and often including an *ob* or a *quod* clause, are usually used to refer to special honours earned by the honorand.<sup>78</sup>

We have so far had a look at quite a few ways of "amplifying" the bare structure of the original type of honorific inscriptions during the Empire. One could add the fact that, whereas earlier inscriptions are usually syntactically incomplete in that they leave the verb unexpressed, later inscriptions, especially those from about the middle of the fourth century onwards, tend to finish off the text with a predicate (often, but not always, accompanied by an object, usually *statuam*), *conlocare* being the most common verb; e.g. ILS 1229 (Rome, AD 346), *L. Turcio Aproniano v.c. ... statuam ... ordo Spoletinorum ... conlocavit*.<sup>79</sup> But, although the addition of

---

<sup>77</sup> Cf. e.g. ILS 1011, 1048, 5502, 6271, 6587. In ILS 6228 and 6584, the section beginning with *hic* has been inscribed on the side of the statue base, not on the front which has the main inscription.

<sup>78</sup> In inscriptions in honour of senators, usually describing a special honour decreed by the senate (a statue, *triumphalia ornamenta* or the like), often adding a reason (e.g. *ob res ... prospere ge[st]as* ILS 1956): e.g. ILS 921, 984, 985, 1022, 1056, 1098, 1100 (+ 1094), 1112 (in 4th-century inscriptions: ILS 1240, 1250). In municipal inscriptions which also add a motivation: ILS 5062, 6296 (*huic* followed by *quod*); ILS 6313, 6372, 6655 (*huic* followed by expressions such as *ob merita*).

<sup>79</sup> (In this case the text in fact continues with additional information, but this does not form a part of the main honorific inscription.) One also finds, especially in inscriptions set up by emperors (for in late antiquity, emperors at least formally often appear as dedicators of honorific statues; cf. Symm. Rel. 12, 2), *conlocari iussit* or *iusserunt*. Another possibility is a formulation of the type *ponendam censuerunt* (thus in the relatively early, about Severan, instances ILS 1390 [Lugdunum] and ILS 1909 [Anagnia]; ILS 6780, with *ponendam censuit*, though not datable, may be even earlier; for further examples cf. ILS 1244, 1250, 1278, 5698, 6505; CIL X 5200; AE 1976, 141). Besides *conloco*, one finds also verbs such as *loco* (e.g. ILS 1221, 1234), *pono* (cf. above and e.g. ILS 1226, 1231, 1235f.), *constituo* (e.g. ILS 809, 5363; IRT 558, 562), or simply *dare* (ILS 1230). Among the inscriptions cited above, the object (*statuam*) is omitted e.g.

a predicate (and an object) can also be classified as "amplification", let us turn to somewhat more striking aspects of this phenomenon. We could go on for a long time, for the imagination of those who formulated honorific inscriptions during the later Empire seems to have had no limits. Over time, dedicators, initially content to mention possibly an office or a relationship, start to characterise more closely not only the honorand, but also themselves<sup>80</sup> and, somewhat later, the splendor of the honorific monument;<sup>81</sup> one also starts to find references to the happiness of the

---

in ILS 1226, 1231, 1235, 6505, 6780. An early, but somewhat exceptional, example of the use of a predicate is ILS 6629 (cf. above n. 17), where the verb is, however, used passively (*statua statuta est*).

<sup>80</sup> Thus one starts to find, in inscriptions honouring emperors, formulations of the type *devotus, devotus numini* etc. (sometimes *dicatissimus; dicatissime devoti* ILS 6888 from Mauretania, AD 238/244), for which see H. Gundel, *Epigraphica* 15, 1953, 128ff., Kajanto, art. cit. (n. 13) 13ff., Chastagnol, art. cit. (n. 15) 355ff., who, however, concentrate on those cases in which *devotus* appears combined with the dative *numini* and soon also with *maiestati*. These phrases appear in texts of the Severan period (ILS 421 of AD 198/202 is noted as an early instance by Kajanto 14). But it would perhaps be useful to have a look at the earlier history of the expression *devotus* (not yet combined with *numini*) referring to emperors. Observe e.g. AE 1950, 58 of AD 126 from Gemellae in Numidia in honour of Hadrian, *coh. I ... devotissima ipsi*; and cf. ILS 7155 from Sarmizegetusa, set up in honour not of an emperor, but of the legate Furius Saturninus in ca. 161 by the *n(omini) felicissim(o) et praecipuis virtutib. eiu[s] obstricta simul et devota provincia*. Quite another thing is the use of past participles in order to indicate special reasons for the erection of honorific monuments, a habit which is attested fairly early (cf. above at n. 74; and also e.g. ILS 9399 *caelesti beneficio ... auctus* [168]; 371 *colonia ... ancipiti periculo ... restituta* [169/177]; 456 *beneficia ... consecutus* [202/204]; 1438 *amore ... et dignatione protecti* [209/211]), but which is also found in the fourth century and later, the verb in this period often being *foveo* (typical, by the way, of *tabulae patronatus*), which is attested from the earlier 3rd century onwards (e.g. ILS 8978, time of Severus Alexander; AE 1916, 107; cf. *refoti* ILS 452, AD 214). For adjectives defining dedicators, also sometimes used to indicate a reason for a honorific monument, cf. e.g. ILS 946 (Pola, from the time of Claudius), *Sex. Palpellio ... Histro ... C. Precius Felix ... memor benefici* (*memor* also in ILS 6504; IRT 566); in later times, one finds more picturesque adjectives such as *laetus* (ILS 794 for Arcadius and Honorius, *s.p.q.R. vindicata rebellione et Africae restitutione laetus*), *cliens* used as an adjective (ILAlg. I 4011, *cliens ordo Madaurensium*), *fidelis et innocens* (*ordo*, IRT 475).

<sup>81</sup> E.g. ILS 1284 *statuam auro fulgentem*, AE 1934, 159 *statuam sub auro*, ILS 1275 *statuam sub auro fulgentem* (the material of the monument introduced with the preposition *sub* also e.g. in ILS 1244, 1255, CIL VI 1739); ILS 1257 *auro inlustrem statuam*, ILS 1221 *statuam ... auro superfusam*, CIL VI 1696 *statuam aere insignem*.

times;<sup>82</sup> moreover, one finds that the definition of the honorand's merits, in earlier times often simply enumerated, is given more and more thorough and eloquent attention e.g. by the addition of descriptive adverbs.<sup>83</sup> An interesting, although not very common, aspect of *amplificatio* is that which consists of adding some colour to the enumeration of offices and titles (the latter, of course, in many cases originally having been laudative epithets).

---

Sometimes those who formulated the descriptions of the monuments, possibly people not averse to philosophy, kept an eye on the future rather than on the present (e.g. ILS 809 *statuam, meritorum perenne monumentum*; ILS 1237 *monumentum perennis memoriae*).

<sup>82</sup> Thus *felicissi[mis tem]poribus* I. Novae 28 (AD 208); *felicissimo saeculo* ILS 4424 (Severan); cf. L. Mrozewicz, *Archeologia* 31 (1980) 108ff.; M. Christol - A. Magioncalda, in: *L'Africa Romana VII* (1990) 918f. Later formulations of this type become much more common and varied; at the same time it becomes common to express the idea by putting the times (*tempora, saeculum*) in the genitive, this genitive being governed by a descriptive noun (most common is *beatitudo*, but one also finds *felicitas, magnificentia* [ILS 5554] and the like). Of course, these expressions are more typical of building inscriptions than of honorific texts (and note that in other contexts one encounters references to the happiness of the times much earlier; e.g. in the *senatus consulta de aedificiis* of c. AD 47 and 56 [cf. above n. 11], which include expressions such as *felicitas saeculi instantis* and the like; cf. also e.g. the edict of Nerva cited by Pliny, *epist.* 10, 58, 7 on which cf. Fridh, *op. cit.* [n. 11] 44), with *felicitas temporum*, to be compared with the rather more discreet formulation of Trajan in the famous letter, *epist.* 10, 97, 2, *nam et pessimi exempli nec nostri saeculi est*).

<sup>83</sup> Of this, there are some fairly early instances, but in these cases the merits are referred to in clauses beginning with *quod* or relative pronouns and are defined by the use of adverbs or ablative absolutes (e.g. AE 1925, 126 [Domitianic] *quod industrie prospexit annon(ae)*; AE 1962, 153 [from the time of Commodus?] *quod adhibita moderatione et r.p. statum foverit et universos consuluerit*; ILS 5054 [Severan] *qui ... honorem ... laudabiliter administravit* etc.). From the third century onwards adverbs and adjectives are sometimes inserted into the enumeration of the offices (e.g. ILS 6630 [AD 240] *omnibus honoribus honeste functo* [*honeste* also e.g. in AE 1983, 196]; ILS 1239 *corr(ectori) ... memorabili*). For other formulations cf. e.g. ILS 1272 *in actu publico fideli exercitatione versato*; CIL VI 1747 [*sine fr*] *audae provinciarum rem sibi iniunctam ... fideliter egit*. But those who formulated honorific inscriptions could go even further, for instance, by pointing out that the honorand's merits do demand a reward in the form of a monument (e.g. ILS 1234 *provocantibus eius meritis*; AE 1934, 159 *statuam ... quam ... iamdudum meruerat*; ILS 6459 *honorem devitum* [sic]; ILS 1244) or that they are of a kind that can hardly be described (ILS 6348, *cuius facta enarari* [sic] *non possunt*; CIL X 520, *cuius si universa refoveamus* [this must mean something like "recall"] *dies non sufficit*; cf. e.g. ILS 1237, CIL X 5200, IRT 562 for adjectives such as *innumerabilis, immensus* and *infinitus* referring to merits); or that the meritorious acts, in some cases known to absolutely everybody (ILS 4932, 4936), have been performed both in the public and in the private sphere (e.g. ILS 1221, 1243, 1258, 2939).

For instance, setting up a monument in honour of Caracalla, the people of Lavinium, instead of saying what was normal, *imp. Caesari M. Aurelio Antonino Pio Felici Augusto* (*Pius* and *Felix* now belonging to the official titulature), had the idea of adding *optimo sanctissimoque* between the name and the titles (CIL VI 1066);<sup>84</sup> similarly, in an African inscription what is usually formulated as *praetor candidatus Augusti* (*Augustorum*) is rendered as *candidato Auggg. et eis devotissimo praetori* (ILS 1147, Severan). In the later third and in the fourth century, titles such as *vir clarissimus* and *vir eminentissimus* are sometimes supplemented by additional information, this leading to striking combinations of a title and a description, for instance *v(iro) c(larissimo) eloquentissimoque* (ILS 1282).<sup>85</sup>

Another pleasant way of adding some force and colour to the enumeration of the merits of the honorand was to differentiate the list of merits by pointing out activities of the honorand of especial interest. This effect was most often produced by inserting *etiam, quoque, sed et(iam), non solum ... sed etiam* and the like in the enumeration; for instance, *abundantissimi muneris, sed et praecipuae laetitiae theatralis editori* (ILS 6623 from Hispellum, from the time of Constantine). There are some early instances which foreshadow the future (e.g. ILS 298 on the arch of Trajan in Ancona, AD 115 *quod accessum Italiae, hoc etiam addito ex pecunia sua portu, tutiorem ... reddiderit*, more reminiscent of formulations found in the third century and later: ILS 7155 [c. 161, from Sarmizegetusa], *quod ... singulos universosque benignitate tractarit, oneribus etiam relevaverit*),<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> Cf. CIL VIII 2438 (AD 197) in honour of Severus, where *[f]ortissimoque principi* is added between *Aug. Pio Fe[l.]* (observe the order) and *Arabi[co] Adiabenco* (somewhat similarly in AE 1911, 106 from Cuicul), and also those cases in which superlatives are added between the formula *dominus noster* and the name of the emperor (above n. 58). In AE 1958, 100 (Hippo Regius, 198/9) *fellicissimo* may possibly define some word to be restored in the lacuna rather than the following expression *principi iuventutis* (i.e., Caracalla).

<sup>85</sup> Cf. ILS 1281, *v(iro) c(larissimo) et omnibus meritis inlustri*; ILS 1333, *eminentissim(o) et singularis exempli viro*; ILS 6501, *perfectissimo) et praestantissimo viro*; ILS 9357, *amplissimi et c(larissimi) v(iri)*. Cf. ILS 1443, *viro ex equestribus turmis egregio*.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. also ILS 6209 (Gabii, 138/161), *quod post inpensas ... factas ob sacerdotium opus porticus ... refecturam se promiserit populo* etc. (cf. the building inscription ILS 5570A [Cilli, probably 3rd cent.], with *post alia arcum quoque*); the same idea is expressed by *super* in ILS 6780 (Gigthis, 2nd cent.?), *quod super multa ... merita et amplissimum munificentiae studium, legationem ... ad Latium ... petendum ... suscepit*.

but the great majority of the examples one encounters belong to the Severan period and the third and fourth centuries. As in the examples cited above, the effect produced by the use of *etiam* etc. is most common in references to special acts,<sup>87</sup> although in the case of emperors these tend to be rather vague and general in tone (e.g. ILS 692 [Constantine, from Rome], *d.n. restitutori humani generis, propagatori imperii dicionisque Romanae, fundatori etiam securitatis aeternae*), but one observes the use of this device sometimes also in descriptions of careers, as e.g. in ILS 1440, *procuratori ... fun[c]to etiam partibus ducenari* (Segermes [Africa], 3rd cent.).<sup>88</sup>

But there is still another important aspect in the *amplificatio* of the formulations of honorific inscriptions, namely that belonging more closely to the sphere of language and style, to which we shall now turn. As we have seen, with the evolution of the honorific inscription, more and more details were added to the original structure, the honorific inscriptions accordingly becoming increasingly wordy. Especially the addition of details of a more subjective nature, of course, meant that the wording of the honorific inscriptions, which originally obeyed strict rules, became more and more varied, and in the end the honorific inscriptions, which during the early Empire with their recurring identical expressions make extremely dull reading, exhibit remarkable individuality. This individuality is apparent not only in the phrasing, but also in the structure, for whereas earlier honorific inscriptions generally stick to a business-like enumeration of what was to be enumerated (though sometimes lapsing, especially in sections beginning with demonstrative pronouns, into more informal diction), one observes that many late antique inscriptions in places altogether abandon the sternly

---

<sup>87</sup> Also e.g. ILS 5784 (Ausculum, 3rd cent.), *patrono civitatis Auscul., qui cum multa et maxima in rem p. saepius praestiterit, fontem quoque novum ... induxit* etc.; ILS 6252 (Praeneste, perhaps Severan), *quot is ... plurima contulerit, ludum etiam gladiatorium ... optulerit*; ILS 5698 (Interamna Lirenas, 3rd [or 4th ?] cent., *quod opera thermarum ... restituit exornavitque, porticos etiam ... constituit*; I. Paestum 91 (about Severan), *adiectis (to gladiatorial munera) etiam ursis mirae magnitudinis, set et noxeo* etc. Cf. CIL X 5426, *huic ... populus ... tabulam aeneam patronatus ... sed et statuam perpetuabilem ... censuer. constituendam*. For building inscriptions introducing activities of especial interest cf. e.g. ILS 5518 (326/333, from Africa: *aedem sive curiam, sed et sexsagonem*); 5633.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. also e.g. CIL VI 1747, *Cam(?)]paniae set et Siciliae* (Constantinian); CIL IX 3667 (Marruvium, 3rd cent. [?]), *cur. r[ei] p. ... civita[tis] Mars. Marr., eodem [t]empore et cur. viar(um)* etc. Cf. ILS 1274 (Rome, AD 399), *consulari Aemiliae, addita praedictae provinciae ... etiam Ravennatium civitate*.

enumerative structure and turn to a highly rhetorical descriptive style embellished e.g. by the use of final and consecutive clauses. The result is that more and more honorific inscriptions from the third century, and the majority of those from the fourth<sup>89</sup> – not to speak of those from the fifth – leave the impression of being unique in their expressions, although it is true that one could borrow a nice phrase if one happened come upon one<sup>90</sup> or use the same phrase, if thought well put by the dedicator, in inscriptions set up at different times<sup>91</sup> or at different places.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>89</sup> For exceptions, observe e.g. the inscriptions honouring Egnatius Lollianus cos. 333, ILS 1223ff., AE 1977, 198, with a remarkably simple and matter-of-fact style.

<sup>90</sup> This becomes clear if one has a look at the third-century dedications for Vestal virgins from the Forum in Rome (CIL VI 2131ff., 32403ff.; ILS 4925ff.), which stylistically form a most remarkable group of texts, presenting many features which make one think of the fourth or the fifth rather than of the third century. From those in honour of Campia Severina (in the 240s) onwards there are so many striking words and phrases common to two or more texts that the conclusion seems inevitable that people who formulated the later texts must have had a look at, and found some inspiration in, the earlier, already existing dedications. Observe, for instance, the explicatory relative clauses beginning with *cuius*, present in so many of the texts; or phrases and expressions such as *cumulare laude* (ILS 4928, 4934), *per omnes gradus sacerdotii* (ILS 4930, 4931, in honour of the same woman, but by different dedicators and with an interval of 10 years; cf. ILS 4934), *pervigil administratio* (ILS 4934; CIL VI 2133; *laudabilis administratio* ILS 4930), *sanctissimae ac religiosissimae* (ILS 4931, 4936; CIL VI 32417, 32421), *super omnes retro* followed by a superlative (ILS 4936; CIL VI 2134, 32419), *cuius* (object) *numen quoque Vestae comprobavit* (CIL VI 2134, 2136, 32419; cf. ILS 4935), *antistes* (ILS 4935, CIL VI 2142), *opera*, *operor* and *operatio*, referring to the duties imposed by the priesthood (ILS 4930, 4932, 4937; CIL VI 2136); *sincerus* (ILS 4928; CIL VI 32441). For another instance, note how the inscriptions in honour of the two Turcii at Rome, ILS 1229 (AD 346) for Apronianus, set up by the *ordo Spoletinorum*, and ILS 1230 for the latter's brother Secundus, set up by the *ordo ... Amiterninae civitatis*, strike one as including phrases which one seems to have borrowed from the other (*omni virtute praestanti* 1229 ≈ *in omni denique virtute perfecto* 1230; *ad memoriam perpetui nominis* 1229 ≈ *ad perpetui nominis gloriam* 1230).

<sup>91</sup> Observe that one finds the agreeable, but unique phrase *benevoli vigoris* in two 4th-century inscriptions at Lepcis, one set up in honour of a certain Flavius Victorinus, the other honouring Valerius Vibianus (IRT 570, 577).

<sup>92</sup> Thus Antonius Dracontius *v.c.* who, in setting up statues of Valentinian and Valens both at Sabratha and at Lepcis in the 360s, used the unique phrase *iustitia pariter ac pietate caelestis adq(ue) Romanae felicitatis perpetuus fundator* (name of emperor to be inserted here) *victoriosissimus (princeps added here in the texts from Lepcis) ac totius orbis Aug(ustus)* (IRT 57, 58; 472, 473). Dracontius must have been pleased with his choice of words (although he used other formulations in ILS 758). *Augustus* is, by the

Now, since those who formulated honorific (and other types of) inscriptions in later antiquity did not any longer feel very much restricted by conventions which had to be followed in earlier times, but being instead able to apply all the methods of *inventio* they could think of to the planning of the wording of the texts, one observes that epigraphical texts start to have more and more features resembling those of texts of the same period belonging to the sphere of administration. From the second century onwards (although one can find earlier examples)<sup>93</sup> the language, both Latin and Greek, used by Roman administrators underwent a development which resulted, in the fourth century, in a style (to be found e.g. in imperial constitutions and, to a somewhat lesser degree, in works such as those of Symmachus and Cassiodorus) which strikes one as being extremely florid and long-winded. R. MacMullen, in his admirable study on "Roman Bureaucratese" (in: id., *Changes in the Roman Empire* [1990] 67ff.), characterises (p. 71) the style as follows: "Its dominant feature is obscurity. That it prefers two words where one will do, or a long one where a short one would be clearer; that it avoids, wherever possible, the *mot juste*, or envelops its meaning in synonyms, baroque fancies, archaisms, superlatives, and analogies; that it introduces perfectly unnecessary *loci communes*, or moralizes, or rants." (One could, in fact, go on, for MacMullen's list is by no means exhaustive: there is also for, instance, the tendency to use abstract nouns instead of concrete ones and the striving for certain rhythmical clausulae.)

This "höherer Kanzleistil" soon also influenced the language written outside the imperial chancellery. As H. Zilliacus (art. cit. [n. 93] 161) puts it, it "wirkte sich nach unten aus". One thus finds all of its features present – in addition to administrative documents on a lower level known especially

---

way, used with the genitive also in ILS 763 from the same period (actually mentioning Dracontius, but set up by the *ordo Furnitanus*). One also finds *triumphator* followed by a genitive in inscriptions of this period (ILS 688, 752; cf. Min. Fel., Octavius 40, 2).

<sup>93</sup> Cf. e.g. the *senatus consulta* of Claudian date cited in n. 11. For the style used in administrative documents in late antiquity cf., in addition to the paper of R. MacMullen (cf. below) and the literature cited there, e.g. R. Macpherson, "The Language of Roman Authority", in id., *Rome in Involution. Cassiodorus' Variae in their Literary and Historical Setting* (Poznan 1989) 155ff. For the bibliography of H. Zilliacus, of prime importance for the Greek used in late antique administration, see H. Solin, *Arctos* 5 (1967) 177ff. (note e.g. the concise paper covering all aspects, "Zum Stil und Wortschatz der byzantinischen Urkunden und Briefe", in: *Akten des VIII. intern. Kongresses für Papyrologie* (1955 [1956]) 157 - 165); add the study cited below at n. 98.

from papyri – also in honorific inscriptions from later Antiquity. Let us have a look at some of these features.

As in "Roman Bureaucratese", features which one can class as "obscurity" are not altogether alien to honorific inscriptions from about the middle of the 3rd century onwards, the impression of obscurity arising above all from the tendency to a certain vagueness, caused apparently in many cases by an urge for *variatio* and for rhetorical embellishment. Military units may be designated simply as *manus*,<sup>94</sup> and cities of any status (*colonia*, *municipium* etc.) may be termed untechnically as *civitates* or *urbes*,<sup>95</sup> which may at least in part be attributed to the wish to attain rhythmical clausulae (*civitas*, used in oblique cases, being a ditrochee useful at the end of certain Ciceronian clausulae, cf. below nn. 142, 145). Moreover, one observes a tendency to vagueness in descriptions of careers; instead of giving all the details, many inscriptions from late antiquity, although describing often at length the personality of the honorand,<sup>96</sup> dismiss individual stages of the career by using phrases such as *per omnes honorum gradus ... provecto* (ILS 1273); *per gradus clarissimae militiae ad columen gloriae ... evecto* (ILS 1277); *exercitiis militaribus effecto* (ILS 2937); or *castrensi experientia claro* (ILS 2950).<sup>97</sup> The exact number of urban prefectures held by the honorand apparently seemed of little importance to the people who set up ILS 2948 (Rome, AD 435: *praef. urbi saepius*).

Besides giving ample information on the personality and the *mores* of

---

<sup>94</sup> E.g. (the Philippi) *circuitum muri manu militari ... fecerunt* (ILS 510, Romula); *fabricatus est burgus ... mano* (sic) *devotissimorum equitum VIII Dalm.* (ILS 773 of AD 371, from Arabia).

<sup>95</sup> *Civitas*: ILS 1230 (Amiternum), 1236 (Constantina [i.e., Cirta]; but Milev is referred to as *colonia* in the same text), 1239 (Beneventum; also 6501), 1274 (Ravenna), 1909 (Anagnia, later second century or Severan), 5701 (Segusio). *Urbs*: ILS 5508 (Beneventum).

<sup>96</sup> Cf. the observations of G. Alföldy (Tituli 4 [1982] 48 = id., *Die römische Gesellschaft* [1986] 389) on the inscription from Rome in honour of Petronius Probus, ILS 1265 (AD 378), which is quite eloquent in describing the personality, but rather defective in describing the career of the honorand.

<sup>97</sup> Something like this is, of course, also attested earlier, namely in inscriptions referring to municipal notables, which from the second century onwards quite often condense a municipal career into a phrase like *omnibus honoribus functus* (on which see L. Wierschowski, ZPE 64 [1986] 287ff.). But municipal careers usually follow a regular pattern and include only a small number of offices, so that the enumeration of the individual stages would have been quite unnecessary in most cases.



the honorand, late honorific and other inscriptions also tend to compensate for the vagueness in factual information by a certain verbal abundance. As in "bureaucratese", both Latin and Greek (for the latter, cf. H. Zilliacus, *Zur Abundanz der spätgriechischen Gebrauchssprache* [1967], with interesting observations on p. 11ff. on "Vielwörterei als allgemeines Phänomen"), things for which there was one word tend to be expressed with two or more words. The easiest way to achieve the desired effect of profusion was to use several words with about the same meaning together; for instance, instead of saying *beneficia quibus provinciam sublevavit*, which, I think, would have been clear enough, one could get the idea of saying *beneficia quibus provinciam compendiis remediis et virtutibus fovit sublevabit erexit* (IRT 103, AD 378); and instead of saying *victis Gothis* one could say *victis superatisque Gothis* (ILS 770, from the time of Valentinian).<sup>98</sup> This phenomenon is especially common in building inscriptions, in which one finds restored objects being defined by two expressions with similar meaning at least from the Severans onwards (e.g. ILS 424 of AD 201, *arcus ... conlapsos et corruptos*; ILS 488 of AD 237, *viam corruptam adque dilapsam*); on the other hand, one notes some profusion in the use of verbs describing the activities of those who built or restored something already from the turn of the first and second century (ILS 4051 [Trajan, AD 98/102], *viam ... instituit consummavit dedicavit*; AE 1955, 137 [Severus in 198], *opus amphitheatri refecit exornavitque*; ILS 2619 [AD 222], *baselicam ... aedificavit consummavitque*). Of course it is true that the verbs do not mean exactly the same thing, but earlier building inscriptions seem to be content with the use of lapidary expressions such as *fecit* (and *refecit*) or *faciendum curavit*, with the possible addition of the not at all meaningless *probavit*.<sup>99</sup>

Some abundance of expression can, however, be achieved not only by using two or more synonyms, but also by not using a significant noun alone, but making it depend on another noun with a more general meaning; for instance, instead of saying *statuam* some preferred to say *statae monumentum* (ILS 1251 from Rome, c. 350) or *ornamenta statae* (AE 1976, 141

---

<sup>98</sup> Also e.g. ILS 618, *rectori orbis ac domino* (Diocletian; note that late inscriptions like to collocate a genitive on which two expressions depend between the first of the two expressions and the copula, cf. also e.g. ILS 1277 *consiliis eius et provisione*; ILS 1219, 1438 [AD 209/211]; contrast, however, the following inscription); ILS 1257, *meritorum ordinem ac seriem*; a little differently ILS 756, *pro beatitudine felicitum temporum*.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Gast, op. cit. (above n. 5) 59ff.

from Puteoli, c. 380);<sup>100</sup> or one could say *ob insignia remediorum genera* where *ob insignia remedia* would have been enough (ILS 1265, from the time of Valentinian).<sup>101</sup>

It is important to note that in many cases the abundance of expression is not caused simply by some urge for profusion, but also by the wish to apply certain stylistic devices to the formulation of the texts. For instance, the addition of *dicionisque* in the inscription from Rome in honour of the emperor Constantine, ILS 692, *restitutori humani generis, propagatori imperii dicionisque Romanae*, may possibly be explained by a desire to follow the "law of increasing members".<sup>102</sup> Furthermore, the use of two verbs connected by *-que* at the end of honorary and building inscriptions so often produces popular clausulae (cf. phrases such as *constitui locarique iusserunt* [ILS 1255] or *faciendam exaedificandamque curavit* [ILS 5535]) that one cannot help suspecting that it is the clausula rather than the abundance of expression in general that was sought after (on all this, cf. below).

Another striking feature of late antique inscriptions – again one which they share with "bureaucratese" – is the propensity to use archaic, poetic or unusual and *recherché* phrases and words in general.<sup>103</sup> One could think of turning to a poet or a better-known writer for a nice turn of expression; for instance, *dis genitus* (in inscriptions honouring tetrachic emperors and Constantine) comes no doubt from the Aeneid (9, 642),<sup>104</sup> *inclita fide*, a

---

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Symm. Rel. 12, 2, *ut virum ... mirabilem statuarum diuturnitas tradat oculis posterorum*; and CIL X 5426, *statuam ... cum pictura{m} similitudinis eius*. Note that saying *ornamenta statuae* instead of *statuam* allows the author of AE 1976, 141 to finish off with *erigenda decrevit*, which produces a most popular clausula (cf. below).

<sup>101</sup> Cf. *litus ad labem ruinae labefactatum* ILS 489 (AD 238); *thermarum speciem* (= *thermas*) ILS 5702; *edomitis ... barbarorum gentium populis* ILS 8938. Observe, however, that the use of *opus* defined by a genitive (e.g. *opus amphitheatri*, = *amphitheatrum*) is attested already in the 2nd century (ILS 6218 from the time of Pius, *quod ... opus porticus ... refecturam se promiserit*; AE 1934, 40 [183/185]; AE 1955, 137 [AD 194]). In the fourth century one finds also the plural *opera* (ILS 5698, *opera thermarum restituit*).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. below n. 126.

<sup>103</sup> On the use of archaisms and poetical expressions in this period cf. e.g. F. del Chicca, Q. Aureli Symmachi v.c. laudatio in Valentinianum seniore Augustum prior (1984), Index p. 264 s.v. arcaismi; vocaboli prevalentemente poetici; Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 112ff.; on poetic words in late Greek "Gebrauchssprache" see Zilliacus, op. cit. (above at n. 98) 71ff.

<sup>104</sup> ILS 629; AE 1940, 182; AE 1984, 367; cf. the editor's note on the latter inscription

description of the city of Lepcis Magna (ILS 9408 = IRT 569) is (as observed by Dessau) surely an adaptation of Sallust, Hist. 2, 64.<sup>105</sup> Further study could easily produce even more examples.<sup>106</sup> Then, there is the great number of archaic or poetic words, many of which may also have been found in ancient authors. Although it is possible to convey here only the faintest idea of the richness of the vocabulary found in late antique inscriptions, perhaps even a few examples may be of some interest. For nouns mainly typical of poetry or of an elevated style, observe e.g. *fluentum* (used in the plural for 'water': ILS 5520, 5730),<sup>107</sup> *luctamen* (ILS 1272; cf. TLL VII 2, 1726f.; Haverling, op. cit. [n. 36] 74), *munimen* (ILS 724; cf. TLL VIII 1654; Haverling 73f.), and the not uncommon *prosapia*.<sup>108</sup> In some cases one observes quite normal words being given a novel or unusual meaning, no doubt in search of variation and colour; for example, *oratio* seems to be used in the sense of 'inscription' in ILS 1257 (Rome, AD 377),<sup>109</sup> and *series*, attested, it is true, as referring to the passing of time in phrases such as *series annorum* or *saeculorum*, is used somewhat strikingly in ILS 5554 (Thamugadi, AD 364/367), *porticus ... seriae (sic) vetustatis absumptas*.

On the other hand, the urge for variation and novel expressions and, in addition, the propensity to use nouns ending in *-tor* to describe honorands, is reflected by the appearance of a significant number of words unknown to early or classical Latin. Some words one encounters seem to be

---

(from Saepinum, honouring Constantine).

<sup>105</sup> Cf. above n. 4.

<sup>106</sup> Observe e.g. *reb(us) arduis* in ILS 1258 (Rome, AD 384), which makes one think of Horace, *carm.* 2, 3, 1; or *aeternum robur* in CIL VI 1696 (c. 307), which could have been formulated with an eye on Verg., *Aen.* 7, 609f. Note also *laborum quos in praefectura emensus est* in ILS 738 (from Cyprus, an inscription set up by the emperors in 351/4 in honour of a high official), for which cf. Seneca, *Med.* 611; Silius 4, 54. For "dichterische Reminiszenzen" in late Greek "Gebrauchssprache" see Zilliacus, op. cit. (above at n. 98) 68ff.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. TLL VI 1, 949ff.; observe that the word is defined by the adjective *piger* (*aquae pigra fluente* ILS 5730) also in Apul., *Met.* 6, 18.

<sup>108</sup> E.g. ILS 711, 1262, 8950; CIL VI 1706; AE 1972, 79. In a letter of Constantine: AE 1934, 158. An earlier attestation, but in a *tabula patronatus*: ILS 7217 (AD 224). Cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 43f.

<sup>109</sup> (...) *auro inlustrem statuam ... idem ... principes ... constitui adposita oratione iusserunt, quae meritorum eius ordinem ac seriem contineret*. For other senses in which *oratio* can be used in Late Latin, cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 36f.

without parallel; thus at least *benedicentia, maximatus, redonator*.<sup>110</sup> Then there are words which are also attested in other late texts, some of them only in inscriptions (thus perhaps *restaurator* and *subventor*),<sup>111</sup> some also in post-classical authors. In the latter group, one is struck by the number of nouns attested (according to the dictionaries) in Latin for the first time in Tertullian – another reminder of the important role of Tertullian in the history of Latin.<sup>112</sup> Of course, many of these nouns are those which end in *-tor* (*institutor, recreator, redintegrator, remunerator*),<sup>113</sup> but there are also others (e.g. *exaltatio*, and *operatio* used of an office "in cultu religionis").<sup>114</sup> In addition to these, one finds of course many other late words, some attested for the first time in the second century (e.g. *compendium* meaning something like *auxilium, triumphator*, expressions appearing for the first time in Apuleius),<sup>115</sup> some in the third century (e.g. *iussio*),<sup>116</sup> some only in the fourth or later (e.g. *consularitas, inlustrator, instaurator, primaevitas, provector*).<sup>117</sup>

In addition, in the choice of verbs in later Antiquity one observes a

---

<sup>110</sup> *Benedicentia*: IRT 108 (AD 378, the last in a list of eight virtues, beginning with *integritas moderatio iustitia*, attributed to the *praeses* Fl. Vivius Benedictus); *maximatus*: ILS 4937 (c. 286, in honour of a *Virgo Vestalis maxima*; only this instance in TLL VIII 520); *redonator* (*viae populi*): ILS 6349 (Nola 4th cent.; only this instance in Georges).

<sup>111</sup> The dictionary of Georges mentions only epigraphical attestations of these nouns (as for *restaurator*, add AE 1967, 494; 1969/70, 631).

<sup>112</sup> Cf. G. Devoto, *Geschichte der Sprache Roms* (1968) 266ff.

<sup>113</sup> Epigraphical attestations for these expressions: *institutor*: ILS 5509; *recreator*: ILS 6349; AE 1969/70, 631; *redintegrator*: ILS 1276; CIL XI 3089 (Gallienus); *remunerator*: ILS 809.

<sup>114</sup> For *exaltatio*, see CIL II 1972 (a fragmentary 4th-century inscription from Malaca in which it is used among other nouns such as *bonitas, prudentia* and *eloquentia* to describe the honorand; cf. TLL V 2, 1156f.); for *operatio* (cf. *operor, opera*) describing the activities of Vestal Virgins see above n. 90. Cf. TLL IX 1, 672, 36ff.

<sup>115</sup> For *compendium* see IRT 103 and TLL III 2039, 72ff.; *triumphator* (for which see also above n. 92) is, of course, one of the most common attributes of emperors in the fourth century.

<sup>116</sup> E.g. in ILS 774. 1236. 1254. 1422. 5699. 5964; cf. TLL VII 1, 1975.

<sup>117</sup> *Consularitas*: CIL VI 1722 (cf. TLL III 573); *inlustrator*: CIL VI 1706 (TLL VII 1, 304); *instaurator*: e.g. ILS 1248. 9408; CIL X 5200; IRT 562 (cf. TLL VII 1, 1975); *primaevitas*: ILS 1272 (AD 389; for a literary attestation of the expression from about the same period see Georges); *provector*: AE 1972, 75b (Capua, Constantinian [for the interpretation see G.A. Cecconi, *Governo imperiale e élites dirigenti nell'Italia tardoantica* (1994) 73]; attested also in a letter of the pope Gelasius, 14, 23).

notable predilection for the poetic and the unusual. In Augustan Rome, one would, I think, hardly have had the idea of using the past participle of *convellere* to describe a theatre which had to be repaired (ILS 793); and *consurgere* referring to building (in ILS 762, *muros consurgere imperarunt*) is definitely a poeticism (cf. TLL IV 621, 33ff.). Observe also e.g. the use, hardly imaginable in earlier times, of verbs such as *desudo* (ILS 1275, *pace belloque in re publica desudanti*) or *pubesco* (IRT 475, *pubescente Romani nominis gloria*). *Sublimitare* (in ILS 1283 from Aricia [5th cent.], *tertio praefecto urbi utriusque imperii iudicii<s> sublimitato*) is unique (and seems to be registered only in the dictionary of Forcellini). Fullness of diction, but, of course, also an agreeable clausula, seems to have been sought after by the (somewhat pleonastic, it would seem) use of *videri* in inscriptions such as ILS 1274 (*Ravennatium civitate quae antea Piceni caput provinciae videbatur*) or ILS 5520 (*curia ... feda[ta] iacuisse [v]idebatur*).<sup>118</sup> As for adjectives and adverbs, observe the appearance in epigraphical Latin of expressions such as *adfatum* (AE 1969/70, 21, *[an]nona ... adfatim submini[strata]*), *iugis* (ILS 1275; IRT 577; cf. TLL VII 2, 629), *perpes* (ILS 727),<sup>119</sup> *pervigil* (ILS 4934; CIL VI 2133), *sublimis* (ILS 1237), *sublimiter* (I. Paestum 91)<sup>120</sup> and, to give an example of a new coinage, *perpetuabilis* (CIL X 5426; not otherwise attested). In the choice of pronouns and prepositions, one could hardly simply use one's imagination, but at least one could turn to archaisms such as *fl(amen) p(er)p(etuus)*

---

<sup>118</sup> Cf. CIL X 5200, *cuius immensis beneficiis patria cognoscitur cumulata*.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Haverling, op. cit. (n. 36) 50f.

<sup>120</sup> Observe also, from a somewhat earlier period, the most remarkable inscription ILS 4424 (AD 206/209) from the quarries of Syene in Egypt, set up in honour of *I. O. M.* and other deities by an *ala*, the reason being *quod primitus sub imperio p. R., felicissimo saeculo dd. nn. etc. iuxta Philas novae lapicaedinae adinventae (sunt) etc.*; the adverb *primitus* seems to be known only from Pomponius, the author of *Atellanae*, and this text. Note also the "etymologizing" orthography *lapicaedinae* (cf. TLL VII 2, 941, 25ff.), the most uncommon *adinvenio* (attested otherwise from Irenaeus onwards, cf. TLL I 698, 21ff.), and the description of the Roman *imperium* as belonging simply (as in much earlier times) to the Roman people (*imperium populi Romani* also e.g. in R.K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* [1969] no. 23 [73 BC], 49 [τῆς ἡγεμονίας τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ῥωμαίων]; Augustus, RG 27. 30; cf. Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht III* [1888] 1257f. It is true that this formulation also appears in the inscription on the arch of Severus in Rome [ILS 425], but this is a very peculiar inscription). The fellow who planned the wording of this text from Syene clearly did not represent the normal type of man one would expect to find in these parts.

*huiusce civitatis* (ILS 9043 from Missua [Africa]; cf. Haverling, op. cit. [n. 36] 114), the preposition *propter* meaning 'near', 'close to' (ILS 9408 [IRT 569, from Lepcis], *Lepcis magna ... statuam ... se propter* ["scil. in curia vel ante curiam" Dessau] *constituit*), or *ergo* for 'ob' or 'causa' (ILS 2948 from Rome, AD 431, *virtutis ... ergo*).<sup>121</sup> On the other hand, observe the late Latin use of *iuxta* in the sense of 'erga' (ILS 1233; AE 1962, 184; cf. TLL VII 2, 753, 46ff.).

The above observations give only a very limited idea of what people formulating inscriptions could think of in the third century and later. One could continue almost indefinitely, noting, for instance, the tendency to use abstract nouns instead of concrete ones,<sup>122</sup> to use adjectives as nouns and the like,<sup>123</sup> or to variation (often producing a desirable clausula) effected by

---

<sup>121</sup> Note, by the way, that some inscriptions seem to offer instances of *erga* (collocated before the main word) used in the meaning 'ob' or 'propter'; cf. ILS 1909, *erga amorem patriae et civium* (cf. OLD s.v. no. 3, "expressing vaguer relationships ... 'in consideration of'"); ILS 3737, *erga suorum sanitatem* (cf. TLL V 2, 755, 77ff.: "i. q. causa").

<sup>122</sup> This begins, in fact, quite early in the case of emperors being referred to; cf. e.g. *vicani ... consecuti ab indulgentia ... imp. ... Pii ... beneficia* ILS 2735 (138/161); *providentia maximorum imperat. missus* ILS 1118 (from the time of Marcus Aurelius). Note that in the earlier instances (and in most of the later ones) the abstract noun does not appear in the nominative as the subject of a clause, this type being (as it seems) attested only from about the time of Diocletian (e.g. *cuius [Diocletian] providentia ... iussit* ILS 613 [Nicomedia]; *cuius providentia adque civilitas et integritas ... providit* [sic] ILS 1220 [Rome, AD 334]; *castellum ... dispositio dedit et usui tradidit* ILS 5791 [Rome, AD 365/6]). For further instances, cf. e.g. *ad ... praefecturam iudicio Aguste (sic) remunerationis evectus* ILS 5904; *statuam nobilitati eius (= ei) erigendam* CIL X 681; *meritorum ... ab eius praesentia (= ab eo) conlatorum* IRT 566. Note also e.g. *ad celebritatem thermarum* for *in thermas* (ILS 5478; cf. above at n. 101) and *laetitia theatralis* for 'theatrical performance' (ILS 6623; cf. *curules ac scaenicas voluptates* Symm. Rel. 6, 2). Some interesting parallels e.g. in Fridh, op. cit. (n. 11) 170 n. 1 (*sub iudicis integritate* etc.).

<sup>123</sup> Adjectives referring to people: e.g. *v(irgini) V(estali) max(imae) ... super omnes retro maximas religiosissimae* ILS 4936 (AD 286); *ad perpetuam laudabilis (scil. viri) memoriam* AE 1934, 159 (AD 364/367); *per clarissimos Alexandrinae civitatis* ILS 1273 (late 4th cent.); adjectives etc. referring to something else: e.g. *ob insignia eius unibersa* ILS 1276 (c. AD 400); *ob insignia meritorum* IRT 480 (AD 408/425; cf. *inter praecipua negotiorum* Symm. Rel. 5, 1); *facere laudanda ... praecipuo* ILS 2950 (AD 435; note that this is the only instance given in TLL X 2, 475, 83f. of *praecipuus* followed by an infinitive).

the reversal of a more or less established word order;<sup>124</sup> or one could go on citing less easily classifiable formulations such as *burgum milites ad summam manum perduxerunt perfectionis* (ILS 774; cf. below n. 142 on the clausula) or *monumentum statuali veneratione dicaverunt* (ILS 1237). But it should be observed that in addition to inscriptions offering a few striking or unique expressions there are many texts, mainly from the later fourth and the fifth century,<sup>125</sup> of which it would be quite useless to cite only a part, there being hardly any passage which could not be described as being extremely *recherché*. Observe e.g. texts such as ILS 1262, 1272, 1275, 2937, 2950, 2951, 9408, and, among inscriptions other than honorific, e.g. ILS 3132, 5520, 5596. Since it does not seem to be practical to cite any of these texts at length in this paper, let us conclude by touching upon, rather in passing, the embellishment of late Latin inscriptions by the use of various stylistic devices and rhythmical clausulae.

Since, as we have seen, honorific and other inscriptions in late Antiquity in many cases did not any longer follow the strict rules observed in the past, but were, apparently, often rather conceived of as rhetorical exercises, authors formulating epigraphical texts could turn to the use not only of striking expressions and phrases thought to elevate the tone of the texts, but also of devices more closely belonging to the sphere of rhetoric and stylistics. Any reader of Tetrarchic and later inscriptions will note the

---

<sup>124</sup> This is, in fact, most common in late inscriptions (but note ILS 157 from the time of Tiberius [cf. below] and *Romanae disciplinae* in ILS 446 of AD 197). Especially *Romanus* tends to be collocated before the concept it defines (e.g. *Romanum imperium* ILS 699, CIL VI 36947; *Romanum nomen* ILS 157 (Tiberian!), 734, IRT 475; *Romana res* ILS 741; *Romanus orbis* AE 1969/70, 631; *Romana religio* ILS 752; *Romana securitas* ILS 8938; *Romana felicitas* IRT 57), but the same goes also for *publicus* in phrases such as *publica libertas* (ILS 648, 674, 789, 792). Another common type is, in many cases caused by the wish to attain a good clausula (cf. above at n. 95, below nn. 142, 145), *Amiternina civitas* (ILS 1230; cf. 804, 1236, 1239, 1273, 5508, 5701, 5777, 6501; note that there is, in fact, an Augustan example of this, but referring to, and possibly coming from, the Greek part of the Empire: ILS 2683, *censum egi Apamena civitatis*). One also finds the type *Saenensium* or *Lepcimagnensis ordo* (CIL VI 1793, IRT 475; cf. IRT 480. 558). For further instances, cf. e.g. *devota Venetia* (ILS 760), *togata statua* (ILS 1281f.), *Africani tribunalis orator* (ILS 4152) and, for concepts defined by expressions in the genitive, *populi Romani necessario usui* (ILS 702), *Gratiani triumphalis principis pontem* (ILS 772; note the Ciceronian clausula effected by this order), *iuventutis principi* (ZPE 99, 1993, 290).

<sup>125</sup> But observe the 3rd-century dedications to Vestal Virgins from the Forum (above n. 90).

abundant use of different techniques familiar from rhetorical theory. We have already noted the possibility that in an inscription in honour of Constantine the enumeration of the emperor's virtues has been drawn up according to the "law of increasing members" (cf. above at n. 102 on ILS 692), but there are many further instances; see e.g. ILS 687 (Ostia), *restitutori publicae libertatis, defensori urbis Romae, communis omnium salutis auctori* (Constantine); or ILS 1237 (Rome, AD 347), *singulari auctoritatis splendore pollenti, admirabilisque eloquentiae benevolentiae (sic) felicitate glorioso, cunctarumque dignitatum fastigia favorabili (sic) moderatione iustitiae supergresso Vulcacio Rufino v. c. etc.*<sup>126</sup> Another device appearing in enumerations of virtues and on other occasions is the chiasmic collocation of nouns defined by adjectives (or vice versa); for instance, instead of *bellis strenuo consiliisque optimo* some preferred *bellis strenuo optimoque consiliis* (thus ILS 768 [from Africa] in honour of Valens). In inscriptions in honour of senators, one observes phrases such as *singularis integritatis et bonitatis eximiae* (ILS 1249 from Rome, c. 350) or *fidem iunxit (sic) ingenio, prudentiae miscuit libertatem* (ILS 1272 from Rome, AD 389).<sup>127</sup> On the other hand, it is true that the majority of inscriptions stick to parallelism of the type *censoe veteris pietatisque singularis* (CIL VI 31394a; Maxentius).<sup>128</sup> Some inscriptions, again, combine the two, using both the chiasmic and the parallel collocation of nouns defined by adjectives, no doubt to produce a nice contrast (and often also a desirable clausula); observe for instance the inscription from Ostia honouring Constantine cited above, ILS 687, *restitutori publicae libertatis, defensori urbis Romae, communis omnium salutis auctori* (— ∪ — — —); or ILS 765 (in honour of Valentinian, from Rome), *legum domino Romanarum, iustitiae aequitatisque rectori, domitori gentium barbararum, conservatori liberta-*

<sup>126</sup> Cf. ILS 648, 674, 742, 751, 752, 758; CIL X 4863; IRT 471. On this "law", cf. e.g. L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden Latin Artistry* (1963) 175ff.; Szantyr, *op. cit.* (n. 1) 722ff.; T. Habinek, *The Colometry of Latin Prose* (1985) 175ff. (I borrow the expression from Wilkinson; "law of increasing magnitude" in L. R. Palmer, *The Latin Language* [1952] 87, cf. 93, whereas Habinek 17, 175 leaves the German "Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder" untranslated, and J.D. Denniston, *Greek Prose Style* [1952] 68 only describes the phenomenon without giving it a name).

<sup>127</sup> Cf. ILS 648, 739, 2950 (*non verbena vilis nec otiosa hedera; seu in castris probatos seu optimos vatum*), 5511, 5777 (*felicis saeculi providentia et instinctu Mercurii potentis*), 6817; IRT 562. From the 3rd century: ILS 533 (AD 254), 6826.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. e.g. ILS 674, 688, 1228, 1236, 1277; AE 1955, 150.



tis.<sup>129</sup>

Furthermore, one observes carefully chosen antitheses (e.g. ILS 688 [Constantine, from Circa], *qui libertatem tenebris servitutis oppressam sua felici victoria nova luce inluminavit*),<sup>130</sup> the use of figures such as the litotes<sup>131</sup> and the hyperbaton,<sup>132</sup> and, in general, the search for variation both in the choice of words<sup>133</sup> and of syntactical constructions.<sup>134</sup>

The fact that the hyperbaton is often used to produce sought-after clausulae allows us to finish this paper by touching upon the tendency (already referred to in many places in the preceding exposition), discernible in later antiquity (in fact, in many cases at least from the second century onwards) not only in "bureaucratise",<sup>135</sup> but also in many inscriptions, to follow the principles concerning rhythm laid down in the

---

<sup>129</sup> Also e.g. in ILS 751, 5511, 6349. In the famous inscription on the arch of Constantine in Rome (ILS 694) the chiasmic *instinctu divinitatis, mentis magnitudine* is contrasted by *liberatori urbis, fundatori quietis*.

<sup>130</sup> Noted by Kajanto, art. cit. 17. Cf. also e.g. ILS 1262 (*in ipso flore iuvenilis aetatis frugem maturae auctoritatis*), 2950 (*inter arma litteris militabat ... in viro antiquae nobilitatis, novae gloriae*).

<sup>131</sup> ILS 4152, *causarum non ignobilis orator*; AE 1930, 120, *tribunal quod minus exornatum repperit*.

<sup>132</sup> This is very common, and I have already cited ILS 765, *legum domino Romanarum* (cf. above). In addition to that, e.g. ILS 740, *ad perpetuam quietis firmitatem*; ILS 809, *intra vicesimum quintum adsecutus aetatis annum*; ILS 1234, *ad hos eum dignitatum apices*. In most cases the desired effect is no doubt that of a pleasing rhythm (in ILS 4944 a hiatus is avoided by inserting *nimis* between *longa* and *aetate neglectas*).

<sup>133</sup> Both *omnis* and *universus* are used to avoid repetition in ILS 688 (Constantinian, from Circa). Note also ILS 724 (with both *munitio* and *munimen*), ILS 1272 (*iuncxit [sic] ingenio, prudentiae miscuit*), ILS 2767 (*in cives amorem ... erga patriam adfectionem*). On the other hand, some authors of epigraphical texts did not have a large repertory of interchangeable expressions at their disposal; in ILS 613, *providentia* is one of the subjects of the clause which ends with *providit*; in ILS 1278, *adfinitatis* is soon followed by *adfini etiam*; in ILS 1284 *censura* is used twice to describe the honorand. Cf. ILS 5511, which has *reparatori* (referring to different activities of the honorand) five times, only once inserting *restitutori*.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. e.g. ILS 794, *s.p.q.R. vindicata rebellione et Africae restitutione laetus*; ILS 795, *[o]b squ[alore]s ac pernicious[em] extendendo*; ILS 1237, *singulari auctoritatis splendore ... admirabilisque eloquentiae ... felicitate*. Cf. ILS 1265, with an interesting variation of nouns of the second and those of the third declension, some defined by one word in the genitive, some by two.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. P. Collinet, REL 5, 1927, 250ff.; R. MacMullen, art. cit. (above at n. 93) 299 n. 33; and in general Szantyr, op. cit. (above n. 1) 715ff.

rhetorical tradition. Since we are not studying a single author, but hundreds of variously educated writers of epigraphical texts all around the Roman Empire, it is obviously not easy to say much of pertinence, and anything one says is bound to be based largely on subjective impressions. The subject could, however, possibly merit a closer study than the few rather superficial observations which follow.

First of all, as in imperial prose in general, one seems to note in later inscriptions a clear tendency to avoid hiatus. This is achieved in many ways. One may use a word in the plural instead of the singular. For instance, saying *administrationibus egregio* when *virtute mirifico* follows (where the plural might also have been possible)<sup>136</sup> may perhaps be attributed to the above-mentioned tendency (AE 1955, 150 from Hippo, 4th cent.). Another possibility is to change the word order: for instance, *est (h)abita* at the end of ILS 1218 (Mutina, Constantinian; cf. ILS 1274. 5785); and using the order *vetera civitatis insignia* in a text which also includes the expression *ornamenta liberta(tis)* eliminates the hiatus threatening if the order were *insignia civitatis* (ILS 5570B, from Cilli in Africa, c. 319; of course the order actually used also produces a nice chiasm). But hiatus can also be avoided by either adding a word beginning and ending with a consonant (thus perhaps ILS 4944 [Rome, 4th cent.], *longa nimis aetate neglectas*) or omitting a word beginning with a vowel; it is typical of late inscriptions to omit the infinitive *esse* in formulations of the type *statuam conlocandam censuit* (ILS 1250),<sup>137</sup> and a possible explanation may in many cases be, in fact, the ensuing avoidance of hiatus (on the other hand, in some of the cases in which *esse* is used one observes that this produces a popular clausula, so that some people seem to have thought the clausula to be of more importance than the avoidance of hiatus).<sup>138</sup>

As for the clausulae themselves, it is, as noted above, not easy to say

---

<sup>136</sup> For *virtus* used in the plural cf. e.g. ILS 371, 425, 1154, 1239, 1243, 7155; CIL V 5127 = AE 1984, 455; IRT 103.

<sup>137</sup> Also e.g. ILS 1236, 1244, 1250, 1272, 1278, 5698, 6505; CIL X 5200; IRT 562; AE 1976, 141 (from an earlier period: ILS 1390, 6218, 6726, 6780).

<sup>138</sup> ILS 5508 (Beneventum, 4th cent.), *statuam ponendam esse duxerunt*. Similarly in IRT 558 at the end of a colon. Cf. ILS 1256, where *statuam ... postulandam esse credidit* leads to a clausula which, though not one of the most popular, is not unknown to Cicero (cf. e.g. Wilkinson, op. cit. [n. 126] 141, 156). Of course, one can also find many further instances of a hiatus not being avoided; a notable one is AE 1972, 79 (Puteoli, c. 340?), *statuam ponendam sollicitate adcurarunt*.

much of interest or value on their use in inscriptions. In spite of this, let me offer a few observations which seem to obtrude themselves upon the reader. Let us start with ILS 1265, the inscription set up in Rome in AD 378 in honour of Petronius Probus by *Histri peculiaries eius*. The text leads off with a lengthy series of commata describing the honorand (*nobilitatis culmini, litterarum et eloquentiae lumini, auctoritatis exemplo* etc.), all of them without exception ending in Ciceronian (and also later favoured) clausulae, these including two instances each of  $- \cup - - x$ ,  $- \cup - - \cup x$  and  $- \cup - - \cup - x$ . I think that this can hardly be called a coincidence, and so this inscription may serve as an introduction to the following observations. Let us go on with the favoured clausula  $- \cup - - x$ , which, by the way, also appears in other commata of the above type (e.g. *communis omnium salutis auctori* ILS 687 [Constantine]).<sup>139</sup> We have already seen that the use of two passive infinitives connected by *-que* (*statuam constitui conlocarique iusserunt* etc.), not uncommon in late inscriptions, may have, at least in part, been caused not only by a certain general urge for pleonasm, but also by the clausula produced above at n. 102), and the same goes for the use of two gerundives connected by *-que* and followed by *curavit* (e.g. ILS 1261 [Rome, 4th cent.], *statuam faciendam conlocandamque curavit*).<sup>140</sup> It was also observed above that saying *ornamenta statuae ... erigenda decrevit* instead of *statuam ... erigendam decrevit* has the same effect (n. 100). However, often this clausula was attained simply by choosing convenient expressions to be collocated in a suitable word order. Thus, for instance, ILS 1284 (Rome, 440s) not only finishes off with *erigi conlocarique iusserunt*, but also has cola ending in *censura servaret* and *legatione mandata*. Sometimes, it is true, there had to be some manipulation of the word order (cf. above n. 124 on *Gratiani triumphalis principis pontem* in ILS 772). Of this, there is, in fact, a quite early instance, ILS 309, an inscription set up in Rome in honour of Hadrian in 118: it seems more than likely that the formulation *qui ... non praesentes tantum cives sed et posteros eorum praestitit hac liberalitate securos* had been chosen because of the clausula.

<sup>139</sup> (Cf. above at n. 129 for this text.) In CIL VI 1755 (AD 395), we find three successive commata ending with this clausula (*castitatis exemplo, consulum proli, consulum matri*). Also e.g. IRT 562 (*moderatione perpenso*). For instances where the clausula is produced by the use of *-que*, cf. ILS 765 (Valentinian) *iustitiae aequitatisque rectori*; CIL X 4863 (Venafrum, 4th cent., *abstinentia constantiaque mirando*; AE 1972, 75b and 76 (Capua).

<sup>140</sup> Also e.g. in ILS 5510, 5535.

More usual were, however, lighter manipulations, such as moving a finite verb from the end to some other collocation (e.g. ILS 2951 [Rome, 5th cent.], *possit aequari*; on the other hand, cf. *esse laetantur* in CIL VI 1706 [AD 400]) or the reversal of the order of a noun and an adjective (e.g. ILS 4152 [Rome, AD 376], *Africani tribunalis orator*). A further possibility was to use short perfect forms; for instance, *aeternitate signarunt* at the end of ILS 6836 (Sufetula, c. Diocletianic?) or *benig<ni>tate tractarit* (in spite of *relevaverit*) at the end of a colon in ILS 7155 (Sarmizegetusa, c. 161). In any case, one seems to recognize the use of this clausula in a large number of epigraphical texts, and this only confirms what is known of its popularity in literary (and subliterary) texts.<sup>141</sup>

An interesting case is the inscriptions of AD 377 from Rome referring to the setting up of statues in (probably) the *basilica Aemilia* by the urban prefect Probianus. CIL VI 1658b (known only from early descriptions) has the text *statuam ... quae ornamento esse poossit* (sic?) *basilicae inlustr(i)*, which has a hiatus in two places and a not very Ciceronian clausula, whereas CIL VI 1658a and AE 1984, 33 have the same text, but the order *basilicae esse posset inlustri*, which eliminates one hiatus and ends with the favoured clausula. If the reading in 1658b was actually *poossit*, one might think of the possibility that this statue base (found, it is true, in S. Adriano, i.e. in what is now known as the *curia*) was rejected and that, when new ones were being produced, the clausula was also emended.

Let me finish with a quick glance at two other Ciceronian (and also later popular) clausulae, leaving the rest of the work to others,<sup>142</sup> namely

---

<sup>141</sup> Cf. also e.g. ILS 1278 (*adfinitatis evecto*), 2950 (*eloquentiae cura*), 4931 (AD 257, *aetate pervenit*), 5505 (*munitione sublaturum*). In building inscriptions: e.g. ILS 4944, 5522, 5523, 5635, 5715. For contracted perfect forms used with a view of attaining clausulae cf. e.g. Å. Fridh, *Études critiques et syntaxiques sur les Variae de Cassiodore* (1950) 16.

<sup>142</sup> In spite of this, let me point out a few cases in which other Ciceronian clausulae seem to have been used; for  $- \cup - - \cup x$ , cf. e.g. ILS 8985 (Neapolis, 4th cent.), *provido semper et strenuo*; CIL VI 1793 (AD 394), *cuius meatum series temporum vetustasque consumpserat* (in CIL VIII 5367 = 17496 = ILAlg. I 288, *accedente auctoritate proconsulum*, the clausula may be accidental). For  $- - - \cup - x$ , cf. e.g. ILS 774 (Pannonia, late 4th cent.), *ad summam manum perduxerunt perfectionis*; ILS 1230, 1236, 6501 (*Amiterninae*, *Constantinae* and *Beneventanae* being followed by *civitatis*); CIL X 5200 (Casinum, c. Diocletianic?), *therm(a)e ... nobis in usu sunt restitutae*. This clausula is also attained if one formulates the conclusion of a honorific inscription as (*statuam*) *ponendam censuerunt* (e.g. ILS 5698, CIL XIV 4449, CIL X 520).

the famous *esse videatur* type – ∪ ∪ ∪ – x and the cretic + ditrochee type – ∪ – – ∪ – x. Though possibly not as popular as the clausula discussed above, both are found in quite a few epigraphical texts. That these clausulae have been expressly sought after is clear in cases such as ILS 5694 (Ostia, 375/378), in which the use of the short perfect form *decorarunt*, preceded by *curante*, leads to the former, and in the inscriptions of Petronius Probus (ILS 1267 and 1268) and his wife Faltonia Proba (CIL VI 1755 [AD 395]), set up by their children, in which the use of *dedicarunt*, preceded by *filii* (3 syllables) in ILS 1267 and CIL VI 1755, and by *debitum* in 1268, leads to the latter.<sup>143</sup> As for the former, other cases do not seem to be as clear, although there can not be much doubt about examples such as ILS 809 (Rome, 5th cent.), *statuam, meritorum perenne monumentum*, or ILS 5505 (Sicca, 4th cent.), *patrono fido amore posuerunt, amor* ascribed to the dedicators (and not to the honorand) not being common in honorific inscriptions. The most unusual conclusion of ILS 6726 (Bergomum, possibly as early as Severan) with a clause beginning with *ut* (but this not the only striking feature in this inscription), *huius ....beneficia ita remuneranda censuerunt, ut effigiem illius perpetua veneratione celebrarent* also makes one think that the *esse videatur* clausula is not accidental.<sup>144</sup> As for the latter clausula (cretic + ditrochee), in addition to the instances noted above, it seems more than probable that this clausula has been deliberately inserted in the inscription from Beneventum notable for its use of rhetorical ornamentation, ILS 5511 (4th or 5th cent.), in which one finds the formulation *ac totius prope civitatis [post h]ostile incendium conditori*. This clausula can also be produced by the reversal of the word order in some of the phrases of the type *conlocandam censuit*, and since this is, in fact, rather rare, one suspects that at least in some of the instances of the reversed order (e.g. *censuit conlocandam* in ILS 6505 [Beneventum, 4th cent.]) the reason may have been the attainment of this popular clausula. Furthermore, a suitable cretic word preceding a verb of the structure of *conlocavit* also has the same effect, and this may well be the reason for the formulation

<sup>143</sup> ILS 1269, another inscription in honour of Faltonia Proba set up by her children, also ends with *dedicarunt*, but here the clausula is ∪ ∪ – – ∪ – x (*maternis meritis dedicarunt*).

<sup>144</sup> Observe also e.g. ILS 724 (Moesia, AD 337/340, *latrunculorum ... impetum perennis muniminis dispositione tenuerunt*); ILS 6810 (Ammaedara, 3rd or 4th cent., *statuae honore cumulavit*); ILaI.g. I 4011 and 4012 (Madauros, 330s, *liberalitate posuerunt*).

*thermarum ... gratiam* in ILS 5716 (Rome, 4th or 5th cent.) and for the addition of *votis omnibus* (a not at all common phrase) in IRT 475 (Lepcis, 375/378), collocated in both instances before the concluding *conlocavit*.<sup>145</sup>

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>145</sup> Also e.g. in the building inscription ILS 5701 (Segusio, 375/378) the word order *thermas ... usui Segusinae reddidit civit[atis]* seems to suggest that the author of the text had the clausula in mind.