

CHAPTER I

*The presence, role and significance of Latin in the epigraphy and culture of the Roman Near East**

Werner Eck

The following story told by Cassius Dio is often repeated. In AD 43, after the emperor Claudius provincialised the territory of the Lycian Koinon on account of internal unrest, an embassy of Lycians appeared before the Senate in Rome. In the course of the discussion it happened that one of the ambassadors did not understand the question posed by Claudius in Latin. In consequence Claudius deprived him of the Roman citizenship, maintaining that no one could be a Roman citizen who did not also understand Rome's language.¹ We may get the impression that command of Latin was required of a Roman citizen, or was a prerequisite in order to become one. In fact nothing of the sort was true under Claudius or any other Roman emperor, as is implied in another story from the same reign preserved by the same author.² Soon after assuming power Claudius saw a theatrical performance of a Pyrrhic dance by young people whom Caligula had brought from Achaia. After the performance Claudius bestowed the Roman citizenship on the troupe and sent it home.³ It is of course unlikely that any of the young men knew any Latin.⁴ Nonetheless the Roman citizenship was given not only to them but also to their relatives: parents, siblings, as well as grandparents and great uncles – as witnessed in the many inscriptions from Achaia which mention the family of T. Statilius Lamprias who died at the age of 18. This young man happened to be one of the dancers whom Claudius rewarded with the Roman citizenship. It need scarcely be said that without exception

* I would like to thank Hannah Cotton for the translation of the German text, and Sarah Bartmann for translating the footnotes.

¹ Cassius Dio, 60.17.4.

² This one example from Claudius' reign can therefore not be generalised, despite attempts to do so, such as Levick *Roman Colonies*: 104, 130.

³ Cassius Dio, 60.7.2.

⁴ And it is indeed quite unlikely that Rome made any effort to check their language skills.

the inscriptions recording the new Roman citizens, which come from the youth's hometown of Epidauros, are written in the Greek language.⁵

By the beginning of the imperial period at the latest, possession of the Roman citizenship and knowledge of Latin no longer had to be two complementary aspects of Romanisation – certainly not in the eastern part of the Empire. Had it been otherwise, we should have found a huge quantity of communications in Latin all over the eastern provinces, in very many forms, including also inscriptions. This is not the case. In the affluent and densely populated city of Kyzikos, with *c.* 550 grave inscriptions – among which, to judge by the names, there were quite a few Roman citizens⁶ – there are only three Latin texts, one of which belongs to a soldier from the Balkans, who was not a citizen of Kyzikos. In Sagalassos, a town in Pisidia with more than 300 known epigraphic documents, the number of Latin texts amounts to a meagre five inscriptions.⁷ Altogether Latin is scarcely present in the epigraphic remains of many other big cities of Asia Minor and the Near East.

It would be wrong of course to assume that the epigraphic remains available today are representative of the original language situation in the various regions of the Imperium Romanum. This is especially true in the case of languages which have not left written records, or at least were not used on monuments which were meant to withstand the ravages of time. The German language left no trace in the thousands of inscriptions from Roman times on the Rhine – if we ignore seven instances in which occasionally the surname of the mother-goddesses is written with a plural dative ending *-ims*.⁸ The native language of the city of Side, in southern Asia Minor, was in common use well into the first or even second century AD, but only a very few, extremely short texts in this language have survived to

⁵ *IG* IV² 82–84; see Eck and Pangerl 2003: 347; 2008: 213; of W. Eck and A. Pangerl (forthcoming) ‘Vater, Mutter, Schwestern, Brüder...’ 3. Akt’, *ZPE* 166.

⁶ *IK* 18 (Kyzikos) nos. 126, 380, 482. No. 424 is again mentioned by Schwertheim himself in *IK* 26 (Kyzikos) no. 116 under the heading of Miletropolis. Perhaps this text was brought from one of the colonies of north-western Asia Minor. The other texts in volume II of the inscriptions of Kyzikos, not yet published, e.g. dedications or public documents such as building inscriptions, so-called *tituli honorarii* etc., amount to nearly 600 testimonia. As E. Schwertheim generously told me, they show the same picture for the languages.

⁷ Four of these texts were found since 2004; the fourth is the edict of Set. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus, *AE* 1976: 653. Cf. now Eck 2008: 113.

⁸ *CIL* XIII 8157; Nesselhauf and Lieb 1959: nos. 232–4; *CIL* XIII 7892, 7861a. One further dative plural ending *-ims* is assumed for the *matronae Saitchamiae*, but this rests solely on a conjecture of *CIL* XIII 7916 (Hoven), where the tradition has *Saitchamimi*. Cf. now also Eck 2004: 287.

this day.⁹ According to Jerome, the Celtic language was spoken in Galatia even in the fourth century, just as in Gaul,¹⁰ but there is no epigraphic evidence for this. Inscriptions in Old Syriac are relatively few (see Brock in this volume), although it was already a written language at the latest with Bardesanes in the second century AD. The languages were there but they have not survived in the inscriptions except in a very insignificant manner, certainly in no way reflecting reality.

The discrepancy between reality and survival in epigraphic texts is not unique to the local languages; it is also true of Greek and Latin, that is, the two languages which in many places ‘competed’ with each other for dominance in the public sphere. One factor, easily grasped and yet not always taken properly into account, was at work everywhere and always: the inscriptions which have survived, with few negligible exceptions, were written on durable materials – almost always on stone, hardly ever on bronze, at least in the eastern part of the Roman Empire. This durable material was selected almost exclusively for an enduring public memorial of events, deeds and people: dedications to divinities on bases and altars, building inscriptions, texts honouring the living or the dead attached to busts, statues, personifications of cities, of virtues and of heroes, and finally the myriad inscriptions attached to small or flamboyant graves. Texts attached to such monuments were more or less all written on stone. Over 90 per cent of all surviving inscriptions are of this kind – the so-called *Memorialinschriften*, to use the German term.

However, there was an infinitely greater number of texts which used other materials altogether: whitewashed wooden tablets or walls on which one could write in paint.¹¹ In Latin one speaks of *tabulae dealbatae*, and in Greek of λευκώματα as a common writing material. But the texts written on such materials were in most cases of a radically different nature from those written on stone. The inscriptions on wood advertised food products and other merchandise, they promoted a candidate in an election campaign, they listed jury members, liturgies and market prices, they gave notice of games, and finally they contained edicts of the emperors or regulations of governors.¹² The difference between the content and purpose of the two categories is clear. Behind the texts written on stone lies the desire to retain a memory of an event or of a person beyond the

⁹ *IK* 43 and 44 (Side); cf. *IK* 44 (Side), appendix 630.

¹⁰ Hieronymus, *Commentarius in Galat.* 2 praef. (PL XXVI 429).

¹¹ Cf. Eck 1998: 203–17; Eck 1999c: 55.

¹² Cf. for example *Lex Irnitana* 85: *magistratus ut in publico habeant album eius, qui provinciam obtinebit exque eo ius dicant.*

present; to keep the memory of an event or of a person for generations to come. The keyword here is *memoria*. No such intention informs the inscriptions on wood. What was at stake here was the need to be understood regarding prescribed action; dire consequences could befall those ignorant of the information such inscriptions contained.¹³ Those responsible for such texts were guided by one consideration only, the need for the language used in them to be easily understood by those reading them. In the Roman east this meant using Greek, the lingua franca of the time, but also Aramaic in its different variants. ‘Understanding’ was not the prime consideration when it came to inscriptions on stone; they achieved their effect even when the formulation was not understood by all and sundry, for such inscriptions were normally attached, as pointed out above, to monuments which were eloquent enough in their own way; the accompanying inscriptions only served to define more closely the message already transmitted by the monument itself. In the case of the ‘memorial epigraphy’ the choice of language was therefore less influenced by the anticipated audience, and far more motivated by personal considerations; its main concern was to ensure that the specific identity of the person(s) associated with the monument received its appropriate and full expression. The different considerations and different aims which characterised the two categories of inscriptions found in the Roman east at the time inevitably influenced the choice of language in each of them.

Our dilemma is that almost the entire corpus of texts whose message and effect were immediate and meant for the here and now were written on perishable materials and so did not survive. Our acquaintance with the text of the trilingual *titulus crucis* described in the Gospel of John is nothing short of an accident.¹⁴ (The alleged fragment of the *titulus* in Santa Croce di Gerusalemme in Rome is a later product.)¹⁵ *P. Yadin* 16, a Greek copy on papyrus of Babatha’s land declaration, is all that survived of the original trilingual text on some perishable material, which was displayed in Rabbat Moab, and in which the declaration itself was written in Greek, the subscription of the guardian, i.e. the oath taken by Babatha, in Jewish Aramaic, and that of the Roman prefect in Latin.¹⁶ Lost however, though not beyond surmise, is the large-scale, even massive epigraphic documentation, which once existed here as elsewhere.

¹³ The question of literacy will not be considered here. ¹⁴ John 19:19–20.

¹⁵ Heseemann 2002 should be ignored. The author did not apply even the most fundamental epigraphic methods.

¹⁶ *P. Yadin* 16. See Cotton 1996: 29.

There were thus two categories of epigraphic texts. Their distinct characters were determined by purpose and function; yet at the same time the ephemeral category has suffered total extinction. This means that we have to ask very seriously how representative the surviving epigraphic evidence can really be.

There is no good reason to believe, and in fact there is good reason to doubt, that the surviving epigraphic evidence reflects the relative occurrence of the various languages in the entire corpus which once existed. It is impossible to determine the extent of the distortion caused by the vicissitudes of transmission, and the extent to which our own perception of the linguistic situation has also suffered as a result. Our confidence that epigraphic documentation on perishable material once existed does not make up for our inability to reconstruct its precise form. All we can do is remain aware of the problem, while resigning ourselves to the fact that our evidence can only be partial.

These general considerations are relevant and should be applied to our inquiry about the true significance of the use of Latin on inscriptions in the eastern provinces of the Imperium Romanum.

It is impossible to know precisely the total number of Latin inscriptions from the eastern part of the Roman Empire, by which I mean the area extending from the western coast of Asia Minor to the Syrian Desert, and including Egypt and Cyrenaica as well. This huge territory (twelve provinces in the second century AD) yielded *c.* 1500 Latin inscriptions when the last supplement to Volume III of the *CIL* was published in 1902. By way of comparison we may note that the total number of Latin texts from all the other provinces included in the same *CIL* volume – Thracia, Achaia and Macedonia, the two Moesiae, the three Daciae, Pannonia Superior and Inferior, Noricum and Raetia – reaches at least 14,000 – ten times as many as in our region.¹⁷ *CIL* III went to press before intensive scholarly attention and extensive excavation in the east reached their peak. Consequently we cannot determine the precise number of Latin texts recovered in the intervening hundred years, but a few examples may give us an idea of relative magnitudes. The Caesarean and Augustan colonia Alexandria Troas displays 70 Latin inscriptions in the corpus published by Marijana Riel in 1997; 30 of these had appeared already in *CIL* III, and 40 since.¹⁸ The colonia Heliopolis and its territory display more than 200

¹⁷ The last number of *CIL* III is 15202, 1–4. Because of its many sub-numbers the exact total of inscriptions is hard to tell. In any case it is of no great relevance for our purposes.

¹⁸ Riel 1997.

Latin inscriptions in *IGLS VI* published in 1967; only 75 were recorded in *CIL III*; the large remainder has been added since 1902, and more have turned up since 1967.¹⁹ A third example may suffice: Caesarea Maritima, the capital of Judaea/Syria Palaestina, yielded only 3 Latin documents in 1902, when the last part of *CIL III* appeared in print.²⁰ The corpus published by Lehmann and Holum, which includes all inscriptions known down to 1992, has 82 Latin texts, including milestones.²¹ Since then at least 80 more Latin texts, perhaps even more, have cropped up in the course of major excavations conducted on the site.²² Looking back we discover that the entire territory of the Roman province of Judaea/Syria Palaestina contributed 67 Latin inscriptions to the *CIL III*; 29 of these are milestones and 8 short texts belong to what is known as *instrumentum domesticum*.²³ Today, as Ben Isaac and Israel Roll tell me, we know of at least 150 milestones with Latin texts on them. In addition to the milestones and the inscriptions from Caesarea, we have today around 200 Latin inscriptions from the entire territory covered by the *CIIP*, which is more or less coterminous with the Roman province of Judaea/Syria Palaestina.

The increase in the number of Latin inscriptions since the beginning of the twentieth century varies greatly from place to place; nevertheless the same tendency apparent elsewhere in the regions covered in the *CIL* shows itself also for the eastern provinces with which we are concerned here, namely the doubling and sometimes tripling of the number of Latin inscriptions since 1902. Thus we have to reckon with at least 4,000 Latin texts from this area, probably even more, as compared with *c.* 1,500 known a hundred years ago.

The estimate of the number of Latin inscriptions says little of course about their significance and the role played by the Latin language within the epigraphic documentation as a whole. This task is far harder. For the Greek texts we have nothing like the *CIL* after 1877 when the *CIG* was concluded – not that the *CIG* could ever compare with the *CIL*! Therefore, I can do no more than try to learn from a few isolated examples about the concrete relationship between the Latin and Greek epigraphic testimonies.²⁴ The other languages must remain outside our consideration in the absence of multilingual corpora like the *CIIP*, currently in

¹⁹ See e.g. *AE* 1994: 1772; *AE* 1995: 1572 = *AE* 1997: 1544; *AE* 1997: 1543; *AE* 1998: 1435–7.

²⁰ On this see Eck 1999c: esp. 238. ²¹ Lehmann and Holum 2000.

²² Various inscriptions have been published in the meantime, others are in preparation. See below, notes 113 and 115.

²³ Eck 1999c: 238. ²⁴ Cf. with similar thoughts and examples Levick 1995: 393.

progress. No multilingual corpus exists for example for Dura-Europos, where Latin, Greek and various Semitic languages are attested.²⁵

For Ephesus, the largest Greek city in Asia Minor and the *caput provinciae* of the Roman province of Asia, some 3,800 Greek and Latin inscriptions are collected in the eight volumes so far published.²⁶ At least two hundred of these belong to the period before the coming of Rome and another 200, probably more, belong to late antiquity, that is to the fifth century onwards – in other words, these 400 belong to periods in which Latin could not be expected. Of the remaining roughly 3,400 texts there are *c.* 275 Latin and bilingual (i.e. Latin and Greek) documents – less than 10 per cent of the whole.²⁷ For Smyrna, another big polis on the western coast of Asia Minor, we have *c.* 690 inscriptions datable roughly between the first century BC and the fourth century AD, as against at most 30 Latin and bilingual inscriptions.²⁸ Pergamon, the former Attalid capital, can boast of altogether 16 Latin inscriptions in the Roman period as against 533 in Greek, at least in the volumes of Pergamon VIII, 2 and 3.²⁹ Prusa ad Olympum in Bithynia is represented by altogether 210 inscriptions, only 9 of which are in Latin or bilingual.³⁰ Philadelphia in Lydia displays an even sharper disproportion: 500 Greek texts as against 8 in Latin.³¹ Side, on the southern coast of Turkey, an important station on the seaway between East and West with visitors from regions where a variety of languages was spoken, exhibits 7 Latin texts out of a total of 356.³² According to Calder the relationship of Latin to Greek in western and central Phrygia is 3 to 100.³³

So far I have considered only Greek poleis with their old traditions and unique political and cultural self-awareness. For comparison I should like to mention a few cities which had already existed as communities but in the Augustan period or later went through a profound transformation as a result of receiving the status of a colony and a dose of new

²⁵ Cf. Millar 1995: 403. ²⁶ *IK* II–17.2 (Ephesos).

²⁷ It is not easy to calculate the exact figure of published texts in *IK* II–17.2. At least 1,434 numbers have been left out, so that the last number in the corpus, 5115, is of limited relevance. (This last number led Levick 1995: 394, n. 3 to a wrong estimate of the relation between Roman and Greek inscriptions.) Some, but not all, of the numbers are subdivided into a, b and c, so that the real number of inscriptions is greater. Conversely, some inscriptions are published under two numbers, for example in vol. Ia and in vol. VII, reducing the final total of texts. All in all, the sum of 3,800 seems realistic.

²⁸ *IK* 23–4.2 (Smyrna).

²⁹ *Altertümer von Pergamon*, VIII 2, 1890; *Altertümer von Pergamon*, VIII 3, 1969.

³⁰ *IK* 39 (Prusa).

³¹ Cf. Petzl 2007.

³² *IK* 43 and 44 (Side). ³³ *MAMA* VII 30 n. 1; cf. Levick *Roman Colonies*: 133, n. 2.

settlers.³⁴ We may start with Heliopolis which from the Augustan period either was part of the Roman *colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Berytus* or, as has long been believed, was a colony in its own right.³⁵ There we find 201 Latin inscriptions and only 143 in Greek³⁶ – a striking contrast to what we have witnessed so far in Asia Minor. In Parium, likewise a Roman colony in the north-west of the province of Asia, among 67 texts only 19 are written in Latin; at least some of the Greek texts go back to the pre-Roman period, which tilts the ratio only a bit against Latin.³⁷ A similar phenomenon occurs in the Roman colony of Apamea in Bithynia: only 11 out of 62 inscriptions are in Latin.³⁸ By contrast: of the 173 imperial texts found in the colony of Alexandria Troas, mentioned above, 70 are composed in Latin; and not a few of the Greek are to be dated later than the fourth century AD.³⁹ The status of a city as a Roman colony had therefore an effect – albeit in different degrees in different colonies – on the epigraphic use of Greek or Latin. I shall come back to this later.

Even more important than finding out exact numbers is to know why people had recourse to a particular language in the public life of a city, and more specifically to know who used it. Finally it is vital to find out the relative use of Latin and Greek in texts of similar content and function; for the exclusive use of one language or the other in a particular context calls for an entirely different sort of explanation from the indifferent use of both languages in one and the same context.

Space does not permit a review of the evidence from the entire area, nor does the present state of publication allow it. I shall restrict myself to four cities situated in different areas and in different cultural contexts, which enjoyed different legal status and economic conditions. Perhaps on the basis of these few, yet not untypical, examples we may make some progress and tentatively outline some general conclusions.

1. Ephesus, the large harbour on the western shore of the province of Asia with a great Hellenistic tradition, the seat of the Roman governor and of the equestrian procurator in charge of the imperial properties, the *patrimonium*, in the province. Perhaps also other procurators, for example for the *vicesima hereditatum*, had a permanent seat there.

³⁴ For the epigraphic analysis of a Roman colony in the east, cf. Levick *Roman Colonies*: 133.

³⁵ See the introduction by J.-P. Rey-Coquais to *IGLS VI* 35 and Millar 1990: 10.

³⁶ The numbers in *IGLS VI* go from 2711 to 3017. But there are quite a few *bis*-numbers. And under certain numbers more than one fragment is sometimes reported; for example under number 3002 there are at least twenty-five recognisable fragments in Latin and at least two in Greek. Each fragment represents a discrete inscription.

³⁷ *IK* 25 (Parion). ³⁸ *IK* 32 (Apameia). ³⁹ See Riel 1997.

2. Perge, on the southern shore of Turkey, most probably the *caput provinciae Lyciae et Pamphyliae*, and hence like Ephesus the seat of the senatorial governor and the fiscal procurator of the province.
3. The colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Heliopolis in the province of Syria, later Syria Phoenice. The settlement and its territory had the status of a colony from the Augustan age, either as an independent colony or as part of Berytus, becoming independent of it only under Septimius Severus.⁴⁰
4. The colonia Prima Flavia Augusta Caesariensium in Judaea, a Roman colony since the time of Vespasian and since then the seat of the senatorial governor and the fiscal procurator.

EPHESUS

No other Greek polis in the eastern provinces boasts of as many Latin or bilingual (Latin and Greek) inscriptions as Ephesus: 275 altogether. This number has the advantage that single examples cannot so easily distort the overall impression. Instead, we have to assume that the preserved texts mirror relatively faithfully the situation in the Roman period – of course only for inscriptions on stone.

A polis was an autonomous community. Nevertheless, whenever local conflicts exceeded the capacity of the local authorities, Rome as the dominant power would lay down the law. These rules were issued by emperors and proconsuls in the form of edicts, letters and rescripts. Imperial and proconsular edicts and letters found in Ephesus outnumber those of any other city in the provinces. This is partly owing to its being the seat of the proconsul of the province of Asia. Nearly forty imperial letters and more than thirty edicts issued by proconsuls and other officials are completely or partly preserved. Of these, only eleven were issued in Latin: nine stem directly from the emperors and of these one is a bilingual copy.⁴¹ Only six Latin texts are securely dated: two copies of the *sacrae litterae* of Septimius Severus and Caracalla,⁴² three edicts issued between 344 and 372/8,⁴³ and another late text. A few texts with no date could also be late, i.e. from the fourth century AD.⁴⁴ Only one proconsular edict, issued by Paullus Fabius Persicus, regulating the financial administration of the Artemision,

⁴⁰ Millar 1990; for a summary see the introduction of J.-P. Rey-Coquais to *IGLS VI* 34.

⁴¹ *IK II* (Ephesos) 41, 42, 43; *IK 12* (Ephesos) 207, 208, 224; *IK 14* (Ephesos) 1328; *IK 17* (Ephesos) 4136, 4137 (emperors); *IK II* (Ephesos) 19 A/B (governors).

⁴² *IK 12* (Ephesos) 207f.; on this cf. Drew-Bear, Eck and Herrmann 1977: 355.

⁴³ *IK II* (Ephesos) 41–3. ⁴⁴ *IK 14* (Ephesos) 1328.

was issued in Latin in Ephesus; however, a Greek translation of this edict is known as well,⁴⁵ which confirms the general rule: the great majority of all imperial and proconsular documents found in Ephesus, c. 60 examples, are all in Greek.⁴⁶ This conforms perfectly to the data from Egypt, where all imperial edicts and letters, without exception, became known to the wider public through a Greek medium.⁴⁷ Obviously, the main consideration at work was the desire to make them readily comprehensible.

This purpose is particularly evident in one Latin text, the *sacrae litterae* of Septimius Severus and Caracalla, sent to Asia in 204. The text states that the recipient of the letter⁴⁸ should have been aware of the law that Roman senators, even when residing in the provinces, are exempt from the obligation of billeting in their houses.⁴⁹ The large number of copies of this imperial letter known from various cities in the province of Asia and elsewhere shows that this abundance of copies was not created by the original recipient of the imperial letter, but rather by those who benefited from the privilege, namely, the provincial senators, many of whom hailed from Ephesus.⁵⁰ In acting thus, they wished to protect their property from the hateful billeting. The obvious explanation for the publication and reproduction (by resident senators) of the imperial letter in Latin in the Greek context of Ephesus is that it was the language of the senatorial class. Nonetheless, we also possess Greek versions of the same text from Paros, Ancyra and Alexandria Troas, though we can safely assume that in all these places⁵¹ there existed at one time in public an original Latin version, just as in Satala, the Phrygian Pentapolis and in Antiocheia ad Pisidiam, where only a Latin text was found.⁵²

It seems to me that the great number of copies of this imperial letter shows that there was a concrete purpose for its frequent display in public, and particularly in Latin. The target of these displays was the Roman officials in the provinces, from the proconsul of Asia and his senatorial entourage and numerous procurators to soldiers travelling on official

⁴⁵ *IK II* (Ephesos) Ia 17–19.

⁴⁶ It is not necessary to refer to the individual inscriptions here. These texts can easily be found in the different volumes of *IK II–17.2* (Ephesos).

⁴⁷ See Katzoff 1980: 807–44; Purpura 1992: 485.

⁴⁸ See Jones 1984: 93, who – unnecessarily – considers the possibility of a municipal magistrate.

⁴⁹ Above nn. 42 and 48.

⁵⁰ For senators from Ephesus see Halfmann 1982: 627; in the near future F. Kirbihler will publish a new list of Roman senators from Ephesus.

⁵¹ Of the inscription from Alexandria Troas only the Greek version has come down to us, in very fragmentary form. Because of the large number of Latin inscriptions from this colony (cf. above n. 18) we may conclude that the Latin version was lost.

⁵² For a list of the inscriptions see Jones 1984: 93.

business in the provinces. All these groups begrudged the resident senators in the provinces of Asia Minor their privilege which was in conflict with their own prerogative of claiming free board and sleeping quarters – and the language of these officials was predominantly Latin. Hence the need arose to protect their property, in an apotropaic manner, in the language which would be best understood by those threatening it.

Not that *understanding* was always the prime consideration in deciding the language of an inscription in Ephesus – at least not for the entire text. On the *attica* of the door leading to the lower *agora* stands a dedication in Latin to Augustus, Livia, Agrippa and Iulia. The door was dedicated by two freedmen of Agrippa who were transferred to Augustus' hands after their patron's death. Like many other imperial freedmen in Ephesus between the first and the third centuries AD wishing to honour their master or patron with a statue and an inscription,⁵³ Mazaeus and Mithridates chose to engrave the dedication to their patrons in Latin,⁵⁴ and they added their own names in Latin as well: *Mazaeus et Mithridates patronis*. In the middle part of the *attica*, however, comes a short sentence in Greek: Μαζαίος καὶ Μιθριδάτης [τοῖς] πα[τ]ρῶσιν καὶ τῶι δῆ[μῳι]; that means that in the part of the text which stressed that this gate was also made in honour of the people of Ephesus, the two *liberti* inscribed their names once more, this time in Greek. Thus every (literate) inhabitant of Ephesus, even those without knowledge of the Latin language, passing through the gate and looking at the *attica* comprehended immediately who was to be thanked for the impressive door. In this way Mazaeus and Mithridates communicated with the people of Ephesus while doing their duty by their Roman patrons.

In addressing their patrons the two freedmen used their patron's own language; nothing less was possible at least in the early part of the Principate. However, in the city of Ephesus as a whole, honorific dedications to the emperors are hardly ever cast in Latin. Above all the city itself, the Council and People of Ephesus, never use Latin, but always their own Greek language, when erecting a statue to an emperor or dedicating a building to Artemis and an emperor. There is a huge number of such texts – all in Greek. It is thus all the more worthy of notice when an exception is found. Matidia, sister of Sabina and aunt of the

⁵³ The two are similar to the later *liberti Augustorum* only in this single aspect. In the poleis, the latter could not honour their masters (and present themselves!) in this monumental way any longer. This special form is rather to be regarded as typical for the time of the civil wars and immediately afterwards, when many of the traditional social norms had temporarily lost their force.

⁵⁴ *IK* 17 (Ephesos) 1: 3006 = Kearsley 2001: no. 151.

emperor Antoninus Pius, was honoured by *bule et civitas Efesiorum* with a statue on whose base a Latin dedication appears.⁵⁵ Nothing in the laconic text which describes only the family relationship gives away the occasion and indirectly the motive for using Latin. The solution may be quite simple though. The end of the text reads: *c(uram) a(gente) Successo lib(erto) proc(uratore)*. Presumably Successus was one of Matidia's many freedmen procurators, who administered the possessions she had all over the Roman Empire. Successus, who was responsible for Matidia's property in Asia, may have taken care of the erection of the statue decreed by the Council and People of Ephesus; he may also have taken over its costs. He translated the original Greek apparent in the formula *bule et civitas Efesiorum*⁵⁶ into Latin, the language spoken by freedmen to their Roman patrons. Thus nothing relevant to the use of language in Ephesus emerges from this example.

Until well into the third century Latin inscriptions on the bases of statues to emperors in the city of Ephesus are exceedingly rare. A change came about in the late third and first half of the fourth century AD, when there is a significant rise in the number of such Latin texts. The emperors Tacitus, Diocletian with the co-regents of the Tetrarchy, Diocletian with Galerius, Maximinus Daia, Constantine and Julian – all make an appearance in Latin in Ephesus; this series concludes with Theodosius and Honorius at the end of the fourth century.⁵⁷ In all these cases an imperial official is the dedicator; above all the proconsul, but also *procuratores* and one *rationalis* are found as dedicators. The strengthening of Latin in dedications to the emperors at this period is not unique to Ephesus, but is common in other places as well: in Perge,⁵⁸ in Salamis in Cyprus,⁵⁹ in Gerasa,⁶⁰ and finally in Caesarea Maritima, with six statue bases on which Latin is used.⁶¹

In general we may see here a reflection of the Romanisation of the Illyrian and Balkan provinces, the provenance of most of the emperors

⁵⁵ *IK* 12 (Ephesos) 283: *Matidiae / divae Marcianae / [A]ug. nepti, divae / Matidiae Aug. f., divae / Sabinae Aug. sorori, / imp. Antonini Aug. Pii / materterae / bule et civitas / Efesiorum / c(uram) a(gente) Successo lib. proc.*

⁵⁶ Otherwise one would expect *ordo et res publica Efesiorum*.

⁵⁷ *IK* 12 (Ephesos) 305–13, 313A, 316; *IK* 17 (Ephesos) 1, 3020–1.

⁵⁸ Neuer Pauly 12.2, 1191 s.v. Ulpianus 14. ⁵⁹ *I. Salamis* 130, 131.

⁶⁰ Welles 'The Inscriptions': nos. 105 and 106.

⁶¹ Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 6, 9 (for the date see Eck 2006: 253), 13, 14, 16, 17. The much higher number of Latin inscriptions in honour of the emperor in this late period compared with the earlier period cannot be explained by the disappearance of earlier texts. Nearly all the cities mentioned have numerous inscriptions honouring the emperor in Greek that can be dated to earlier than the late third century.

at that time as well as of many of the men who were sent to govern and administer the provinces. For these emperors, but also for their subordinates, Latin was their own tongue, the language which expressed Rome's greatness and will to survive. They used it in the public sphere of the cities of the eastern provinces under their command, whenever it seemed worthwhile to assert Rome's power and make it plastically present, in a manner quite different from what was common before. It is probably not wrong to think that for any of them, given their cultural background, the Greek language was quite foreign, in contrast to the earlier emperors and their personnel who had belonged to the educated urban classes.⁶²

This need to stress the Latin language as a means of expressing identity was not present in Ephesus until the middle of the third century, not even in the case of the representatives of Rome, the governors or the proconsular legates, nor in that of senators who originated from Ephesus. We possess no fewer than 140 inscriptions in which senators from Ephesus are mentioned either as objects of a dedication in their honour or because they found their last repose in Ephesus. Around 140 texts on statue bases presented to the public in Ephesus the members of the imperial aristocracy intimately associated with Rome. And yet despite the fact that they were honoured precisely because of their close association with Rome's political power, as her representatives par excellence, 120 of the inscriptions were written in Greek and only a small minority of 20 texts in Latin.

The dedicators in the case of this small group of Latin inscriptions, in so far as they are known, were *publicani*, Italians who traded in Ephesus, and soldiers who belonged to the proconsul's *officium*.⁶³ They all came from a Latin-speaking environment and used Latin as a matter of course; the same is true of grave inscriptions of senators who died in Ephesus while serving as Rome's officials.⁶⁴ The majority of private people, as also the *Boule* and *Demos* of Ephesus, used Greek; almost fifty inscriptions involve the city of Ephesus or other provincial cities. Thus for example Pompeius Falco, the former governor of Judaea, is honoured in Greek by the city Flavia Neapolis (Nablus) in Ephesus during his proconsulate.⁶⁵ Neither the cities nor the honorands themselves saw any need or felt any

⁶² This observation harmonises with the observations of Adams *Bilingualism*: 635, that there was no administrative reform of Diocletian introducing Latin as the official language; rather what we see is the consequence of social changes. For the importance of Latin in the east during the late Roman period, see the convincing remarks of Feissel 2001: esp. 40.

⁶³ See for example *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 659a, 706, 715, 817.

⁶⁴ *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 631, 654, 683; *IK* 17 (Ephesos) 2, 4355.

⁶⁵ *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 713. On the specific reason for this unusual honour see Eck 1999a: 67.

pressure to use the language of the ruling power to honour their representatives.

It is therefore all the more striking when something like this does happen. A very young senator, Iunius Maximus, who in the year 166 brought the news of victory against the Parthians to Rome, was exceptionally awarded the quaestorship, which he served out in Asia. The text, written on a base on which his statue once stood, survived in Ephesus.⁶⁶ The name and career of the young senator are in Latin, in the accusative case instead of the dative common in Latin, which gives away the Greek context. The name of whoever had the statue erected is lost, but in all likelihood this was the *Boule* and *Demos* of Ephesus, since none other than T. Flavius Damianus was responsible for the execution of the dedication. He was one of the most widely known sophists alive at the time. Quite remarkably his share in carrying out the project is attested in Greek, as also must have been the lost part attesting the Council and People of Ephesus as the dedicator. There must have been a good reason for this unusual use of Latin, but it did not go so far as to make the self-assured sophist Flavius Damianus give up using his own language in favour of Latin.

Similarly striking is the honouring of one Ti. Claudius Secundus, a *viator tribunicius*, *accensus velatus* and *lictor curiatus* of a proconsul, whose function, albeit not unimportant, was still of a subservient nature.⁶⁷ On the base under his statue, which was commissioned by the Gerusia of Ephesus, the dedication stands first in Latin and is then repeated in Greek. It is hard to know whether the honorand or the dedicators were behind the use of Latin. As it happens our man received a statue from the Italian slave traders in Ephesus; in this case the use of Latin is hardly a cause for surprise. Nor is the use of Greek by a freedman of Secundus, one Ti. Claudius Hermias, who dedicated a statue to his patron, carrying out the decree of the city.⁶⁸ To go back to the striking use of Latin by the Gerusia: whatever the reason, it could not have been the express wish of the *lictor curiatus*, for his own freedman would have been the first one to comply with it and carry it out in his own dedication.

This example demonstrates that there were no hard and fast rules, but in each case different factors operated. To discover them is not always possible. There were no norms governing the use of one language or another, at least not in the sense of a set of fixed rules which one had to observe,

⁶⁶ *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 811 = Kearsley 2001: no. 128.

⁶⁷ *IK* 15 (Ephesos) 1544 = Kearsley 2001: no. 123.

⁶⁸ *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 646; *IK* 15 (Ephesos) 1545.

but rather guidelines to be followed in certain contexts. And again this is easily perceived when we look at Ephesus.

Ephesus was not only the seat of the governor, the proconsul, but also that of the patrimonial procurator of the province of Asia. Whenever he or other equestrian officials were honoured with statues by the city or by private people, this was done in Greek, just as in the case of the senatorial governors. On the other hand there is a large number of dedications by their own subordinate personnel, imperial slaves, or *liberti*, or *cornicularii* or other *officiales*. These texts, *c.* fifteen in total, are all in Latin.⁶⁹ The city is never mentioned as participating in any way in these dedications (e.g. by assigning a place for them). It stands to reason therefore that these statues stood inside the administrative precinct of the procurators themselves, in a self-contained Latin enclave where it was natural to use the language employed by the administration in its daily functions. These norms applied to the personnel alone; the city and citizens of Ephesus were not in the least affected by them.

PERGE

Like Ephesus, Perge was a Greek polis, and likewise the seat of the governor and the financial procurator of the province of Lycia-Pamphylia. It is in the comparison with Ephesus on the one hand and with Caesarea on the other that the true significance of the epigraphic finds in Perge emerges. The two volumes of the city's inscriptions, edited by Sencer Şahin,⁷⁰ comprise *c.* 475 Greek inscriptions from the Roman period up to the end of the third century AD, and 39 Latin or bilingual (Greek and Latin) texts. At first glance the number of Latin and bilingual texts seems relatively identical to the ratio in Ephesus. However, amid this latter group a series of ten bilingual texts can be singled out: they all concern a single act, and therefore cannot be counted as ten different inscriptions, but should rather be seen as one.⁷¹ Hence the proportion of Latin versus Greek inscriptions in Perge deviates considerably from the one seen in Ephesus.

This is not true of the contents of the epigraphic texts in Perge, which follow a pattern not dissimilar to what we have seen in Ephesus. The polis itself, whenever it stirs itself to action, uses its own language, Greek,

⁶⁹ *IK* 13 (Ephesos) 647, 651, 652, 660E, 666, 680, 684B, 696A/B, 820, 861; *IK* 17 (Ephesos) 1, 3043/4, 3045.

⁷⁰ *IK* 54 and 61 (Perge).

⁷¹ *IK* 54 (Perge): 89–94, 96–9. Cf. for the preceding arguments Eck 2000c: 64f.

as is known from monuments set up to honour several governors. On the other hand it is only to be expected that the *collegium tabulariorum*, the secretaries working in the office of the financial procurator, should have put up an inscription in Latin above the entrance of a small temple dedicated to the *Numen Augustorum*.⁷² Nor is it very surprising if a governor is honoured by an officer promoted at his behest in Latin,⁷³ or a *procurator Augusti* by an officer who belonged to his *officium*, again in Latin.⁷⁴

Only one text diverges from the normal patterns outlined before. The base of a statue dedicated to Q. Voconius Saxa Fidus, an imperial legate in the first years of Antoninus Pius, displays a text written entirely in Latin. The name of the governor and his career appear in the honorific accusative, as was normal in Greek *tituli honorarii*, and the text opens with the formula: *Curia et [po]pulus / Q. Voconium Saxam Fidum*.⁷⁵ These and other details point to an original Greek text which was subsequently rendered in Latin, without, however, retouching the Greek formulae to fit them to the Latin mould, i.e. without replacing the honorific accusative with the dative and removing the name of the dedicating city to the end. Was the conversion from Greek to Latin a freak occurrence, or occasioned by the wish of the honorand? However this may be, the formulation is exceedingly striking, especially if one takes into account that there are only two other dedications to a governor in Latin from the whole province of Lycia-Pamphylia, where a total of fifty-six honorific inscriptions dedicated to senatorial governors is directly attested (and ten more are indirectly attested); all but three are written in Greek.⁷⁶ The two other texts in Latin are dedications to a governor by his military subordinates, a *decurio* of the cohorts I Flavia Numidarum and a *strator officii*.⁷⁷ There is nothing remarkable about these two dedications – which makes the one by the *Curia et populus* of Perge to the legate Voconius Saxa all the more peculiar.

Otherwise it would seem that the polis of Perge and its official representatives did not feel compelled or even encouraged by the presence of the governor and procurator in their city to replace their own language with Latin in the public sphere, any more than did Ephesus. Only on one occasion of honouring the emperor was there a departure from this

⁷² *IK* 54 (Perge) 211. ⁷³ *IK* 54 (Perge) 156 = Eck 2000b: 251. ⁷⁴ *IK* 54 (Perge) 202.

⁷⁵ *IK* 54 (Perge) 154; cf. Eck 2000c: 645.

⁷⁶ Cf. the documents in Thomasson 1984: 275; Thomasson 1990: 34 and addenda: www.radius.nu/LP.Addenda.IV.html.

⁷⁷ See *IK* 54 and 61 (Perge).

practice on the part of the city. The following text is found under an equestrian statue of Vespasian:⁷⁸

*Imp(eratori) T(ito) Fl(avio)
Vespasiano
Caesari Aug(usto)
ci(ves) R(omani) et ordo
et res publica
Pergensium.*

‘For Emperor Titus Flavius Vespasianus Caesar Augustus, the Roman citizens, the council and the people of Perge’.

The dedication, with *Titus Flavius* in Vespasian’s name, makes clear that it belongs to the very first months of his rule, before Vespasian’s titulature had become fixed. Thus, the choice of Latin was dictated by political circumstances at a time when the need to make political loyalties apparent was of primary concern. Perge, like other cities, had to make its position clear after the troops of Egypt, Judaea and Syria acclaimed Vespasian as emperor. The order of dedicators – *cives Romani* followed by *ordo* and *res publica* – makes it clear that on this occasion it was the influential Roman citizens in Perge who took the initiative and induced the *ordo* and the *res publica* of the Pergeans to back Vespasian. These were not newly made *cives Romani*, but in all likelihood there were among all the others two Pergeans who sat in the Roman Senate: M. Plancius Varus and C. Iulius Cornutus Tertullus. This group deemed it appropriate to make its political loyalties visible in a twofold way: through the public dedication of the equestrian statue to Vespasian, and through the use of Latin.⁷⁹

Perge exhibits yet another striking feature in its use of Latin. One Plancia Magna, daughter of the Neronian–Flavian senator M. Plancius Varus and wife of C. Iulius Cornutus Tertullus, suffect consul together with Pliny the Younger in AD 100, i.e. the two senators who had played a decisive role in Perge as early as AD 69, became, probably after her husband’s death, a great benefactress – *euergetes* – of the city. Of two surviving series of statues, one was definitely commissioned by her, and the other most probably was. The latter series, which represents the city’s current and ancient *ktistai*, is inscribed in Greek throughout, thus falling in line with the other monuments of its kind in the polis.⁸⁰ The first series, definitely inspired and paid for by the senator’s wife, contains

⁷⁸ *IK* 54 (Perge) 54.

⁷⁹ Eck 2000c: no. 654.

⁸⁰ *IK* 54 (Perge) 101–9.

statues of Diana Pergensis, the Genius civitatis, divus Augustus, divus Nerva, divus Traianus, diva Marciana, diva Matidia, Plotina, Hadrian and Sabina, and is inscribed in both Latin and Greek – with Latin always in the first place.⁸¹ In addition Plancia Magna inscribed her own name in both languages. The texts do not divulge the motive behind the choice of language. It is in the juxtaposition of the two series, the local one and the imperial one, that a key to the true understanding of Plancia Magna's split allegiance is to be found: Perge was her home and also her husband's, and she belonged to the city; on the other hand she was related to the Roman imperial aristocracy twice over; its centre was the Senate, she was the wife of a Roman senator, *senator populi Romani*, as formulated in the *sacrae litterae*.⁸² All these factors seem to have been decisive in her choice of language. No doubt she spent many years in Rome herself. The Latin language was part and parcel of an existence like hers; it could not be set aside even in her own home town, when she erected statues to living and deified emperors.

HELIOPOLIS

As opposed to the two Greek poleis Ephesus and Perge, Heliopolis had the status of a Roman colony from the Augustan age, either as an independent colony or as part of Berytus, becoming independent of it only under Septimius Severus.⁸³ Whether it was an independent colony or part of Berytus is of little consequence for the discussion of the languages used there; either way, Heliopolis enjoyed colonial status from Augustan times, and, like Berytus, received settled veterans of the legio V Macedonica and the legio VIII Augusta, from whose ranks the colony's leading class was probably recruited. *IGLS VI* contains altogether 344 inscriptions, including all the fragments for Heliopolis and its territory. Of these 201 are written in Latin as opposed to 143 in Greek.⁸⁴ The great sanctuary of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Heliopolitanus left a deep mark, inter alia, on the shape of the city's epigraphic documentation.⁸⁵ The spread of Christianity from the fourth century onwards, which led to the sanctuary's losing its importance and its grip on the city, coincided therefore with a marked decrease in the number of inscriptions; there are hardly

⁸¹ *IK* 54 (Perge) 96–9. ⁸² Above nn. 42 and 48.

⁸³ Cf. Millar 1990; cf., in addition, the summary by J.-P. Rey-Coquais to *IGLS VI* 34.

⁸⁴ See above n. 36. ⁸⁵ Millar *Roman Near East*: 36, 124, 281; Millar 1990: 11, 32.

any dated to late antiquity in Heliopolis,⁸⁶ when, as we shall see in the example of the colony of Caesarea, the Greek language enjoyed a new spell of life in the colonies of the Roman east. Thus the low percentage of Greek inscriptions in the Heliopolis corpus is fully accounted for by the absence there of inscriptions from late antiquity.

Public inscriptions were written in Latin until the beginning of the fourth century; the last emperors to be mentioned are Diocletian and Galerius (the latter as *nobilissimus Caesar*).⁸⁷ Whenever governors or equestrian officials appear in the city's inscriptions, the texts are written in Latin; the dedicators are normally members of the Roman military.⁸⁸ The decurions of the *colonia* figure too in honorary inscriptions or in dedications to the gods in Latin,⁸⁹ but also *seviri*,⁹⁰ a *plumbarius*, i.e. a manufacturer of lead pipes,⁹¹ and people whose social status can not be identified.⁹² Of the deities it was not only the colony's main deity, Iuppiter Heliopolitanus, whose priesthood was held exclusively by members of the decurionate,⁹³ who was invoked in Latin, but also the local god Hadaranes.⁹⁴ Furthermore, teams of workers in charge of one section of a building operation mark the conclusion of their assignment in Latin.⁹⁵ Greek was certainly banished to a second place in the public sphere, even outside the centre, a fact which can only be accounted for by the settlement of substantial numbers of speakers of Latin in the city during the Augustan period, thus causing a decisive change in the language situation. The leading class of the new colony, together with other elements, who carried out this linguistic transformation, had to be numerically strong enough to uphold the position of Latin against Greek and the other indigenous tongues used by other groups of the population which no doubt continued to live on the colony's territory well after its foundation. Citizens of the colony who returned to the colony at the conclusion of their service in the Roman legions abroad, as well as veterans of the garrison of Syria who settled here, enhanced and reinforced the Latin-speaking element in the city.⁹⁶ Such repatriates and new settlers are attested as former officers; but there are also simple veterans. In this way Heliopolis was able to preserve its Latin character – though not fully untainted – through the centuries.

⁸⁶ *IGLS VI* 2832–5. ⁸⁷ *IGLS VI* 2771, 2772. ⁸⁸ *IGLS VI* 2775–9, 2781–7, 2795–6.

⁸⁹ *IGLS VI* 2791, 2793–4, 2716, 2743. ⁹⁰ *IGLS VI* 2794; cf. 2793.

⁹¹ *IGLS VI* 2723 mentioned as such in a dedication to Jupiter.

⁹² *IGLS VI* 2717–22, 2737–9, 2745, 2748–55. ⁹³ *IGLS VI* 2790–2. ⁹⁴ *IGLS VI* 2908.

⁹⁵ See *IGLS VI* 2827–40. ⁹⁶ *IGLS VI* 2711–2, 2714, 2781–3, 2785–9, 2796, 2798.

CAESAREA MARITIMA

The *caput provinciae Iudaeae/Syriae Palaestinae* existed as a big settlement when Vespasian established a Roman colony there, a hundred years after the foundation of Heliopolis.⁹⁷ This city, transformed into a Roman colony – the first to be created in this province⁹⁸ – did not receive especially favourable conditions from Vespasian, apart from an exemption from the poll tax; but his son Titus added an exemption from the land tax, thereby endowing it with a clearly privileged status,⁹⁹ almost the status of *ius Italicum*. Unlike Heliopolis, Caesarea was a big city by ancient standards, fitted out by Herod with many urban institutions and structures. During the first Jewish revolt the many Jews who lived in Caesarea were either murdered or fled to join the rebels. It is unlikely that they returned to Caesarea once the revolt was over. Consequently Caesarea became partly depopulated – an excellent precondition for founding a colony there, since it was traditionally necessary for the majority of colonists to possess living quarters inside the city walls, especially in the case of the decurionate class (fragments of a newly discovered city law from Spain show this once again very clearly),¹⁰⁰ while the land outside the city centre served to guarantee the economic stability of the colony. Again we may safely assume that such lands had become available through the flight or death of Caesarea's Jewish residents, as was to happen later in the Peraea, for example, after the Bar Kokhba revolt.¹⁰¹ Some dispute the idea that Vespasian settled colonists in his new colony.¹⁰² However, if one were to interpret the description by Pliny, the emperor's contemporary, of the foundation of a colony in Caesarea – *colonia prima Flavia a Vespasiano deducta* – as this phrase is commonly understood in other cases, new colonists must have been settled there.¹⁰³ Others remark on the absence of names of military units or legionary emblems on the later coins minted by the colony as an objection against the settlement of veterans there.¹⁰⁴ However, such legends appeared on a colony's coinage only when soldiers of only one or two legions had been settled in it, as happened in the case of the Augustan colony of Heliopolis or when a legion

⁹⁷ Cf. the comprehensive study of this aspect for Caesarea by Isaac 1980–81: 31.

⁹⁸ Ptolemais, a colony founded by Claudius, which will be included in the *CIIP*, should be ignored, since it was situated in the province of Syria.

⁹⁹ *Dig.* 50.15.8.7. ¹⁰⁰ Caballos Rufino 2006. ¹⁰¹ Eck 2000a: 139.

¹⁰² See Isaac 1980–81: 39 and Millar 1990: 26.

¹⁰³ Pl. *NH* 5.69. One cannot use Josephus' observation in *BJ* 7.216 that Vespasian did not found any new city in Judaea to counter the assumption that new colonists were settled in Caesarea; settling colonists is not the same as founding a new city. Of course Caesarea could not be a new foundation.

¹⁰⁴ Isaac 1980–81: 40; Millar 1990: 26.

was stationed nearby, as in the case of Aelia Capitolina. But the massive discharge and settlement of an entire legion or of the majority of its soldiers, characteristic of the period of the civil wars and immediately after, had become a thing of the past in the course of the first century, when soldiers were discharged after twenty-five or more years of service and settled. A colony like Cologne (Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium) on the Rhine or Camulodunum (Colchester) in Britain, both created in AD 50, had required the settlement of veterans of several legions – as many as four or even six in the case of Cologne.¹⁰⁵ No legions were disbanded after the conclusion of the Jewish revolt, but after the lengthy campaigns many soldiers were discharged on the grounds of old age or as *causarii* and settled. This is what Vespasian did in Pannonia, for example, when *causarii* from different units found new homes in colonies.¹⁰⁶ The same can be supposed in Judaea. Why then not settle these veterans in Caesarea? The settlement of people with Roman and Latin backgrounds is crucial, even indispensable, to the administration of municipal life in a Roman colony. In addition to Roman magistrates and a Roman-type city council composed of decurions, a new constitution enshrined in a *lex coloniae* reformed the city's internal structure, as happened in the Spanish municipalities under Vespasian himself, even if we have only the later Domitianic municipal charters to prove this: the *lex Salpensana*, Malacitana, Iritana and a *lex* for an unknown city.¹⁰⁷ In these Latin – not even Roman – municipalities the use of Roman private law and Roman legal forms in court procedures was taken for granted and the use of Latin treated as a matter of course. As late as the reign of Marcus Aurelius (at a time when some believe that the term *colonia* was but an honorary title), when the city of Troesmis in Moesia Inferior received the status of a Roman *municipium*, a special city law was enacted and published on bronze tablets for this community, introducing the principles of Roman law, which assumed an acquaintance with Roman norms and above all, knowledge of Latin, by magistrates and the council members in order to understand the *lex municipii*, to hold trials, conduct discussions, and formulate and carry out resolutions.¹⁰⁸ I can see no reason to suppose that Vespasian conducted himself any differently in the case of Caesarea. The onus of proof is on those who suggest that Vespasian, a conservative Roman hailing from the Sabine country, would be the *first* one to create a titular colony, in other words the *first* colony where no Romans would be

¹⁰⁵ Eck 2004: 137. ¹⁰⁶ *CIL* XVI 10; *RMD* IV 205; V 323.

¹⁰⁷ For this new law see Caballos Rufino 2006.

¹⁰⁸ The text of the fragments of the *lex municipii* will be published in the near future.

settled and where even the ruling class did not master the Latin language. This seems to me unlikely in the extreme.

It is my opinion therefore that a considerable number of Latin speakers found a home in Caesarea; only such people could make a Roman colony function as such, especially in a place where a large part of the population spoke a Semitic language or Greek. Josephus calls them Syrians.¹⁰⁹ How the old inhabitants were integrated into the new foundation, especially the former leading families, and whether all of them held the Roman citizenship, must remain an open question at present; the same happened, for example, in the Colonia Claudia Ara Agrippinensium (modern Cologne). Only a part of the Ubians were given Roman citizenship in 50 AD, others later or never.¹¹⁰ But does the epigraphic documentation of Caesarea Maritima bear out the theoretical considerations outlined above?

The corpus of inscriptions from Caesarea published by Lehmann and Holum¹¹¹ contains altogether 333 Greek texts as against 82 in Latin, favouring, in contrast to what we saw in the case of the colony of Heliopolis, the Greek language – at least at first sight. However, conclusions drawn from the mechanical comparison of absolute numbers may well distort the overall picture in this case. In contrast to Heliopolis, Caesarea continued to play an important role in late antiquity; it may even have gained in importance in the transition from the high Empire. It survived the Diocletianic reforms as the seat of a governor and remained so down to the Arab conquest. The great majority of inscriptions in Greek, many bearing a public character, are to be dated to the later period, that is from the fourth century onwards,¹¹² even if the great bulk of grave inscriptions cannot be dated precisely. Thus the gap between Latin and Greek inscriptions for the first three centuries is far less striking than appears at first glance – and the new unpublished inscriptions only strengthen this conclusion¹¹³ (with the proviso that I am more acquainted with the new Latin texts). But the majority of the Greek inscriptions belong to the late antique period. In sum: the number of Latin and Greek inscriptions in the first three centuries must have been more or less the same.

What kind of city do the inscriptions depict?¹¹⁴ We have to leave aside all texts dedicated by high Roman officials to the emperors under the

¹⁰⁹ Jos *BJ* 2.266; cf. 458, 461. ¹¹⁰ Eck 2004: 159. ¹¹¹ Lehmann and Holum 2000.

¹¹² For example Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 25, 39, 55, 57–9, 85–93.

¹¹³ Cf. Cotton and Eck 2001: 215.

¹¹⁴ It must not be overlooked that the excavations took place in those parts of the city in which the Roman government presented itself with two *praetoria*. That Latin inscriptions were found in this

statues dedicated to them, i.e. the statues of Probus, Diocletian and Maximian, as well as of Galerius and Constantius.¹¹⁵ Similarly we may ignore the dedications to governors or financial procurators by their own personnel, e.g. by the *centurio* Mevius Romanus to the *procurator provinciae Syriae Palaestinae* Valerius Valerianus, or by the *centurio strator* Aurelius Iustinus to the *procurator Augusti* C. Furius Timesitheus.¹¹⁶ We may *not* however leave out the dedications to governors or procurators by members of the leading class, the city elite.¹¹⁷ A certain Cornelius Quintianus, son of the ex-magistrate (*duumviralis*) Cornelius Taurinus, honours c. 157 the governor, D. Seius Seneca, with a statue; the text on the base is in Latin.¹¹⁸ The *duumvir coloniae* and former military tribune L. Valerius Martialis does the same for the governor C. Iulius Commodus Orfitianus in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.¹¹⁹ Aurelius Theophilus, an *eques Romanus* and *decurio* of the colony, honours with a statue Valerius Calpurnianus, *praefectus Mesopotamiae et Osrhoenae*, who himself in all likelihood hailed from Caesarea, sometime after 222 AD.¹²⁰ The decurionate city council itself dedicated a statue to Aelius Iulianus, a procurator of the province.¹²¹ At least four more such dedications by city councillors (*decuriones*) or the city council as a whole are known to us. In Maiumas (Shuni), situated in the city territory of Caesarea, a member of the elite is honoured by the city council with a monument;¹²² more Latin fragments from Maiumas have yet to be studied. Several inscriptions exhibit what is commonly described as acts of euergetism by members of the ruling class; these too are in Latin,¹²³ as are the measurements of a building.¹²⁴ It is precisely the ruling class which emerges in the inscriptions of Caesarea exclusively in Latin, and as in the colony of Heliopolis, but in stark contrast to the practice in the poleis of Ephesus or Perge, this is so also in dedications honouring Roman officials. This use of Latin has nothing whatsoever to

area is therefore not surprising. But we also know of numerous inscriptions from outside this area. Thus it is unlikely that our impressions are distorted by the special situation of the excavations. Of greater relevance is the fact that only a very small number of votive inscriptions has been found so far. They will be of great significance for a final assessment of the situation.

¹¹⁵ Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 17. Cotton and Eck 2004: 48 published an inscription with a dedication to Divus Aurelianus; this text does not belong to Caesarea Maritima, as was supposed; it comes from Italy (information from Sven Ahrens).

¹¹⁶ Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 3, 4, 7.

¹¹⁷ All the testimonials are listed in Cotton and Eck 2002: 375.

¹¹⁸ Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 15. The date of Seius Seneca's governorship is now assigned to 155–7: Eck and Pangerl 2006.

¹¹⁹ Cotton and Eck 2001: 226. ¹²⁰ Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 10.

¹²¹ Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 11. ¹²² Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 3.

¹²³ Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 44.

¹²⁴ Lehmann and Holum 2000: no. 62; on this Eck 2002b: 543.

do with Caesarea being the seat of the two high Roman authorities in the province – for this was true of Ephesus and Perge as well; but it is rather inextricably connected with life in a Roman colony at least at the level of the decurionate class and its use as a normal means of communication well into the third century.¹²⁵ Even in documents written for their own kith and kin, Latin is used almost exclusively, as argued and demonstrated in detail in ‘A New Inscription from Caesarea Maritima and the Local Elite of Caesarea Maritima’; the argument thus need not be given here.¹²⁶ By contrast, Greek is hardly used in the public sphere in the first three centuries. The very absence of Greek constitutes an argument for the dominance of the Latin language in the case of those groups which are attested in the inscriptions, as in Heliopolis. Furthermore, they used it precisely in order to assert and vindicate their social and political superiority – which is not tantamount to saying that this was a prestige language never used except for such occasions.¹²⁷ There is no recognisable difference between Caesarea and Heliopolis. Here too, even outside the ruling classes Latin seems to have been taken for granted as demonstrated in the modest graves of women and *liberti*, not all yet fully published.¹²⁸

If one takes these findings seriously, then the conclusion that the colony was settled by Vespasian with a large number of Latin speakers seems inescapable, which does not mean that he founded there a veteran colony in the same sense as was done in Heliopolis under Augustus. This veteran element was strengthened by the arrival of new Latin speakers, once more especially of veterans of the local garrison who settled here at the conclusion of their military service.¹²⁹ The Latin character of the colony and its leading families was retained well into the third century. Of course the inscriptions do not (and cannot) tell us what proportion of the whole population spoke languages other than Latin in its daily intercourse. But the dominance of Latin in the inscriptions of the important and permanent part of the population suggests that elsewhere, too, it played an important, if not a dominant role.

¹²⁵ Cf. Levick *Roman Colonies*: 136 for the situation in Roman colonies in the provinces of southern Asia Minor on the difference between Latin used as an official language and Greek as a language in daily life: ‘How soon the decurions found themselves debating in a language they would not use at home is impossible to say.’

¹²⁶ Cotton and Eck 2002: 375.

¹²⁷ It has thus to be considered whether the question of language gained relevance in the wake of economic crisis and because of the necessity to recruit new families for the decurionate in the later third century. This should be the case especially if the new decurions came from sections of society in which the influence of Latin was limited.

¹²⁸ Cf. Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 122, 160–4 and unpublished texts.

¹²⁹ Lehmann and Holum 2000: nos. 32, 119, 146, 148; Cotton and Eck 2001: 226.

How should one formulate a provisional outcome of these findings? Latin was the language of the dominant power, but it was very far from being the dominant language in the Roman east. There is nothing new in this. More important seems to be the fact that Rome and its representatives in the eastern provinces never sought to impose the use of Latin. This is clearly to be concluded from the example of Ephesus and Perge. The mere, but constant, presence of the governor or the financial procurator in a specific city seems never and nowhere to have induced the residents, not even the ambitious and the powerful, who had frequent intercourse with the powers that be, to resort more often to the use of Latin in the types of inscriptions preserved for posterity. When residents of a city, including members of its elite, raised monuments to honour the Roman emperors or Rome's highest representatives, this was done almost without exception in Greek. The rare occasions on which Latin is used are signals for us to look for special reasons. Only within the immediate circle of the administration itself, among the *officiales* of the procurators and the subalterns of the governors, is Latin the norm. And even here the reason is that Latin was the language they used in any case. This is precisely what happened in colonies like Heliopolis, Caesarea, Antiochia in Pisidia or Alexandria Troas.¹³⁰ The leading classes, but not only these, lived with and in this language; and this fact is documented for us in the epigraphic records.

The social status of languages varies. Not everyone held Greek in equal esteem to Latin. In bilingual texts Latin almost always takes precedence over Greek and appears in the first place, leaving Greek in the second rank. Whenever necessary, Latin could vindicate itself as the language of power.¹³¹ This is the reason why milestones were inscribed almost exclusively in Latin down to the third century, even in the east, once the practical bit of information, namely the distance in miles from a specific city, was given in Greek. Last but not least, there is the gigantic arch erected in Tel Shalem to proclaim Rome's victory over the Jews, who had rebelled for the second time in fewer than seventy years under Bar Kokhba; this arch proclaimed its message in Latin letters whose size eclipses that of all other inscriptions known from this province as well as from the rest of the Empire, rivalling only those in Rome.¹³² However, when times

¹³⁰ The following example is symptomatic: the Roman colony of Alexandria Troas erected a statue for Hadrian in Athens. The inscription was written in Latin. Only at the end the name of the townsfolk appears again – in Greek (*ILS* 315). It seems that for a Roman colony the standard language was Latin – even in Athens, the centre of Greek culture.

¹³¹ Eck 2001: 47; Eck 2002a: 29.; Eck 2003b: 125.

¹³² Eck and Foerster 1999: 294; also Eck 2003a: esp. 157.

were normal, Rome could let pass such demonstrations of its dominance through the use of its own language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altertümer von Pergamon* vol. VIII, 2, ed. M. Fränkel. Berlin, 1890.
- Altertümer von Pergamon* vol. VIII, 3: Die Inschriften des Asklepieions, ed. C. Habicht. Berlin, 1969.
- Caballos Rufino, A. (2006) *El nuevo bronce de Osuna y la política colonizadora romana*. Seville.
- Cotton, H. M. (1996) 'Subscriptions and Signatures in the Papyri from the Judaean Desert: The ΧΕΙΡΟΧΡΗΣΤΗΣ', *JJP* 25: 29–40.
- Cotton, H. M. and Eck, W. (2001) 'Governors and their Personnel on Latin Inscriptions from Caesarea Maritima', in *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* vol. VII, no. 7. Jerusalem: 215–38.
- (2002) 'A New Inscription from Caesarea Maritima and the Local Elite of Caesarea Maritima', in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster*, ed. L.V. Rutgers, Louvain: 375–91.
- (2004) 'Lateinische Inschriften aus der Ustinov Collection in Oslo und ein Opistograph mit der damnatio memoriae des Kaisers Probus', in *Orbis Antiquus. Studia in Honorem Ioannis Pisonis*, ed. C. Gazdac, Cluj-Napoca: 47–57.
- Drew-Bear, Th., Eck, W. and Herrmann, P. (1977) 'Sacrae Litterae', *Chiron* 7: 355–83.
- Eck, W. (1998) 'Inschriften auf Holz. Ein unterschätztes Phänomen der epigraphischen Kultur Roms', in *Imperium Romanum. Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption, Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Kneissl and V. Losemann. Stuttgart: 203–17.
- (1999a) 'Flavius Iuncus, Bürger von Flavia Neapolis und kaiserlicher Prokurator, Gedenkschrift zu Ehren von U. Vogel-Weidemann', *AClass* 42: 67–75.
- (1999b) 'Öffentlichkeit, Monument und Inschrift', in *Akten des II. Intern. Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik Rom 1997*, ed. S. Panciera. Rome: 55–75.
- (1999c) 'Rom und die Provinz Iudaea/Syria Palaestina: Der Beitrag der Epigraphik', in *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit. Wege der Forschung: Vom alten zum neuen Schürer*, ed. A. Oppenheimer. München: 237–63.
- (2000a) 'Der Bar Kochba Aufstand, der kaiserliche Fiscus und die Veteranenversorgung', *SCI* 19: 139–48.
- (2000b) 'M. Gavius Crispus Numisius Iunior, als Prokonsul von Lycia-Pamphylia in einer Inschrift aus Perge', *ZPE* 131: 251–7.
- (2000c) 'Latein als Sprache politischer Kommunikation in Städten der östlichen Provinzen', *Chiron* 30: 641–60.
- (2001) 'Ein Spiegel der Macht: Lateinische Inschriften römischer Zeit in Iudaea/Syria Palaestina'. *ZDPV* 117: 47–63.

- (2002a) 'Die Inschriften Judäas im 1. und frühen 2. Jh. n. Chr. als Zeugnisse der römischen Herrschaft', in *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies, Utrecht 7.–9. August 2000*, ed. M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg. Tübingen: 29–50.
- (2002b) 'Review of Lehmann, C.M. and Holum, K.G. (2000) *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima, American Schools of Oriental Research*. The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima. Excavation Reports Series V. Boston', *Topoi* 10: 527–54.
- (2003a) 'Hadrian, the Bar Kokhba Revolt, and the Epigraphic Transmission', in *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered. New Perspectives on the Second Jewish Revolt against Rome, Conference on the Bar Kokhba War November 11–13, 2001 Princeton*, ed. P. Schäfer. Princeton: 153–70.
- (2003b) 'The Language of Power: Latin in the Inscriptions of Iudaea/Syria Palaestina', *Semitic Papyrology in Context: A Climate of Creativity: Papers from a New York University Conference Marking the Retirement of Baruch A. Levine*, ed. L. H. Schiffman. Leiden and Boston: 123–44.
- (2004) *Köln in römischer Zeit. Geschichte einer Stadt im Rahmen des Imperium Romanum*. Cologne.
- (2006) 'Prosopographische Klärungen zu Statthaltern von Syria Palaestina', *ZPE* 155: 253–6.
- (2008) 'Epigraphische Texte auf Bronze aus dem Osten des Imperium Romanum: Zwei neue lateinische Inschriftenfragmente aus Sagalassos in Pisidien', in *Homenaje al Dr. Armin U. Stylow, Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología* 47: 113–19.
- Eck, W. and Foerster, G. (1999) 'Ein Triumphbogen für Hadrian im Tal von Beth Shean bei Tal Shalem', *JRA* 12: 294–313.
- Eck, W. and Pangerl, A. (2003) 'Vater, Mutter, Schwestern, Brüder... Zu einer außergewöhnlichen Bürgerrechtsverleihung in einer Konstitution des Jahres 121 n. Chr.', *Chiron* 33: 347–64.
- (2006) 'Eine Konstitution für die Truppen von Syria Palaestina aus dem Jahr 158', *ZPE* 157: 185–91.
- (2008) 'Nochmals: "Vater, Mutter, Schwestern, Brüder..."', *ZPE* 165: 213–18.
- Feissel, D. (2001) *Sources documentaires et histoire administrative de l'Orient romain tardif (IIIe–VIIe siècle) Conférence d'ouverture de M. Denis Feissel directeur d'études, 8 février 2000, École pratique des Hautes Études, Section des sciences historiques et philologiques*. Paris.
- Halfmann, H. (1982) 'Die Senatoren aus den kleinasiatischen Provinzen', in *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* vol. II, ed. S. Panciera. Rome: 603–50.
- Hesemann M. (2002) *Die Jesus-Tafel. Die Entdeckung der Kreuz-Inschrift*. Freiburg.
- Isaac, B. (1980–81) 'Roman Colonies in Judaea: The Foundation of Aelia Capitolina', *Talanta* 12–13: 31–53; reprinted with a postscript in Isaac *Near East*: 87–111.

- Jones, C. P. (1984) 'The Sacrae Litterae of 204: Two Colonial Copies', *Chiron* 14: 93–9.
- Katzoff, R. (1980) 'Sources of Law in Roman Egypt: The Role of the Prefect', *ANRW* II.13: 807–44.
- Kearsley, R. A. (2001) *Greeks and Romans in Imperial Asia*. Bonn.
- Lehmann, C. M. and Holum, K. G. (2000) *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima*. Boston, Mass.
- Levick, B. (1995) 'The Latin Inscriptions of Asia Minor', in *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. Sept. 1991 habiti*, ed. H. Solin, O. Salomies and U.-M. Liertz. Helsinki: 393–402.
- Millar, F. (1990) 'The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: A Study of Cultural Relations', in *Roman Eastern Policy and other Studies in Roman History: Proceedings of a Colloquium at Tvärminne 2–3 October 1987*, ed. H. Solin and M. Kajava. Helsinki: 7–58 (= Cotton, H. M. and Rogers, G. M. (eds.) (2006) *Rome, the Greek World, and the East* vol. III: *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*. Chapel Hill, NC: 164–222).
- (1995) 'Latin in the Epigraphy of the Roman Near East', in *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3.–6. Sept. 1991 habiti*, eds. H. Solin, O. Salomies and U.-M. Liertz. Helsinki: 403–14 = *Rome, the Greek World, and the East*. vol. III. *The Greek World, the Jews, and the East*, ed. H. M. Cotton and G. M. Rogers, Chapel Hill, NC, 2006: 165–222.
- Nesselhauf, H. and Lieb, H. (1959) 'Dritter Nachtrag zu CIL XIII. Inschriften aus den germanischen Provinzen und dem Treverergebiet', *Bericht der Römisch Germanischen Kommission* 40: 120–229.
- Petzl, G. (2007) *Tituli Lydiae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti: Philadelpheia et Ager Philadelphenus*. Vienna= *TAM* V 3.
- Purpura, G. (1992) 'Gli editti dei prefetti d'Egitto, I sec. a.C.-I sec. d.C.', *ASGP* 42: 485–535.
- Ricl, M. (1997) *The Inscriptions of Alexandria Troas*. Bonn.
- Thomasson, B. E. (1984) *Laterculi praesidum*. Vol. I. Göteborg.
- (1990) *Laterculi praesidum*. Vol. III. Göteborg (and addenda: www.radius.nu/LPAddenda.IV.html).