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ABSTRACT

In this study, I argue that Latin was used in the inscriptions of Anatolia primarily by certain socially mobile groups within Anatolia in order to lay claim to the social benefits of identifying as a Roman. Unlike in the western Roman provinces, where Latin was unequivocally the language of the Romans, and therefore was regularly used to show one’s Romanitas, such a straightforward Roman-barbarian dichotomy did not exist in the East. Latin was not necessary to display one’s Romanness, especially since Greek had its own status as a language of culture and intellectualism. Residents of Anatolia who were confident in their Romanitas and their social position, such as high level Roman aristocrats and military personnel, were comfortable using the standard Greek as well as, or instead of, Latin, for Greek highlighted their education and connection to the Greek heritage. They did not need to use the Roman language to communicate their inclusion in Roman society. Instead, inscriptions with Latin were particularly coveted by groups that had special relationships with Rome and Roman power. This was particularly the case for Roman soldiers, veterans, and freedmen, whose elevated social statuses were direct results of their connections to Rome and their involvement in core Roman institutions. Much like religious converts, naturalized Roman citizens in the East were the most eager to use Latin, as it allowed them to lay claim to and express their newfound Roman identity instead of, or alongside, their native identity.

Of particular interest in this project are the bilingual texts, for they were particularly effective in exhibiting one’s membership in both Roman and Greek societies. What is more, bilingual texts also delineate the differing cultures and values of these two worlds, as frequently details pertaining more to one’s Roman identity were put into Latin, while those pertaining to their life as a Greek or Anatolian remained in Greek.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIL</td>
<td><em>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</em>, T. Mommsen et al. (Berlin 1863-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IK</td>
<td><em>Inschriften grieschischer Städte aus Kleinasien</em> (Bonn 1972-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMilet</td>
<td><em>Inscriptionen von Milet</em>, P. Herrmann et al. (Berlin 1997-2006).</td>
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<tr>
<td>MAMA</td>
<td><em>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</em> (Manchester 1928-).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$PIR^1$ and $PIR^2$  *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I, II, III*, 1$^\text{st}$ Ed. (Berlin 1897-8) and 2$^\text{nd}$ Ed. (Berlin 1933-).


$RECAM$  *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor* (Oxford 1982-).

$RevPhil$  *Revue de philologie, de litterature et d'histoire anciennes* (Paris 1845-).

$SEG$  *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, vols. 1-25 (Leiden 1923-75), vols. 26- (Amsterdam 1979-).


*Studia Pontica*  J. G. C. Anderson et al., *Studia Pontica* (Brussels 1903-10).

$TAM$  *Tituli Asiae Minoris* (Vienna 1901-).
LIST OF EPIGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS

(abc) An abbreviation expanded by the editor.

[abc] Letters missing because of damage to the writing surface and supplied by the editor.

[[abc]] Letters erased intentionally in antiquity, but restored by the editor.

[.. . .] Letters lost on the stone due to damage or weathering and unable to be restored by the editor. Each dot represents one missing letter.

[ --- ] Letters lost on the stone due to damage or weathering and unable to be restored by the editor. The number of missing letters is uncertain.

<abc> Letters accidentally omitted on the stone but supplied by editor.

abc Letters seen by a previous editor but no longer visible.

ABC Letters are clear but their significance is uncertain.

{abc} Superfluous letters inscribed in error but removed by editor.

v. or vac. Vacat. A letter-space left on the stone. When accompanied with a number (e.g. vac. c. 5), there are that same number of blank spaces.
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INTRODUCTION

In the ninth book of Apuleius’ Metamorphosis (§39), the protagonist Lucius, who has been turned into an ass, tells the tale of an altercation between a gardener, into whose possession he had come, and a Roman legionary soldier. The story goes that as the gardener (hortulanus) was riding along on Lucius’ back, the soldier approached him and began to speak in Latin. Not understanding the language, the gardener attempted to continue on his way. Unfortunately for him, the soldier, whom Lucius describes as haughty (superbus and adrogans), took extreme offense at this and immediately began to beat the gardener. Following this outburst, the soldier ended up repeating his question to the gardener, but this time using Greek.

This tale is frequently cited as evidence for the relationship between soldiers and provincials, as well as for the role of violence and banditry in the daily life of the Roman provinces, but less often is it examined with relation to the power dynamics of language;¹ yet the story is quite telling. Here is a Roman soldier of unknown origin, though likely not from Italy,² who uses Latin in a Greek-speaking province to address man who is clearly of a lower class and therefore unlikely to know Latin. When the gardener cannot respond, the soldier beats him for being insolent and irreverent. What is more, because it is almost certain that Latin was not the soldier’s native tongue either, it is clear that he made conscious choice to use a language filled with more symbolic power than Greek. In

¹ For example, R. Garraffoni, “Robbers and Soldiers: Criminality and Roman Army in Apuleius’ Metamorphosis,” Gerión 22 (2004) 367-77. The only source that I have found that looks at this passage as evidence for the power dynamics of Latin and Greek is J. N. Adams, “Romanitas and the Latin Language,” CQ 53 (2003), 199.
² Apuleius puts grammatical errors into the mouth of the soldier (“ubique ducis asinum istum?”), implying that the soldier was not a native Latin speaker, and therefore not from Italy: L. Callebat, “La Prose des Métamorphoses: génèse et spécificité,” in B.L. Hijmans Jr. and R. Th. van der Paardt (eds.), Aspects of Apuleius’ Golden Ass (Groningen 1978), 173; Sermo Cotidianus dans les Metamorphoses d’Apulée (Caen 1968), 196.
sum, the scene supplies a demonstration of power, as expressed by an agent of the Roman military, through the use of language.

The central role that language can play in establishing one’s identity and communicating it to others cannot be understated. Language is important. It is a defining characteristic that, especially when it deviates from the social norm, can set one apart from others in a community. As the story of the gardener and the soldier suggests, language also serves as a mechanism of power; a form of cultural capital. Bourdieu addressed this matter in several studies, and showed that language is a tool for illustrating to others one’s place and position within society.³ People change, alter, or mask aspects of their speech in order to signify their membership in a particular language group – and by extension, a particular social group. Furthermore, language can be used by the elite to assert their dominance and legitimize their oppression of those who are not participants in that particular linguistic practice. While Bourdieu’s theories are based largely on his first-hand witness to the social inequality of French colonial Algeria, the basic concepts are easily applied to the Roman empire. The incident in Apuleius is dripping with power dynamics between a representative of the occupying political power and a helpless member of the occupied lower classes. The soldier, who is already reminiscent of the braggart soldier-types frequently found in Greek and Roman comedy, chooses to use Latin not because he expects the gardener to understand it, but precisely because he knows he will not. In that one single act of choosing one language over the other, the soldier has not only identified himself with Rome, but has asserted his cultural and political dominance over the gardener as well.

This story is one of many that shows how language could be, and was, used in the Roman provinces as a means of placing oneself within a certain social framework. This was especially true of monuments set up by groups and individuals in order to commemorate for their contemporaries and for posterity the lives and deeds of their fellow citizens or themselves. The inscriptions that were included on tombstones, statue bases, building dedications, and the like were carefully and painstakingly crafted by the dedicator in order to reflect upon him or her as positively as possible. Language had to have been one of the considerations that factored into these decisions, as we see a great deal of linguistic variation contained in these texts. Both Greek and Latin carried certain status markers, the former being the language of culture and intellectualism, the latter being the language of strength and power. The power dynamics between Greek and Latin have received much scholarly attention in reference to the Second Sophistic period, in which Greek scholars attempted to preserve the heritage of Greek literary and intellectual culture by completely rejecting the use of Latin. Inscriptions, by contrast, show how this linguistic dualism played out among a wider variety of the population. The study of epigraphy in the Roman world has long been established as a way to observe segments of the population underrepresented in the literary record, and has provided a way to avoid the frequent political and philosophical biases inherent in the written sources.

That is not to say that inscriptions did not have ideological purposes, for they clearly reveal a concern on the part of the erectors to memorialize for posterity themselves and their accomplishments. MacMullen has suggested that the erection of permanent monuments, however small, reveals that those setting up the inscriptions considered themselves members of “a special civilization,” and viewed their world as one
that would continue to exist for a long time to come. Woolf sees monumentalization more as a symptom of the Roman obsession with time and change. The obsession with erecting relatively permanent monuments, however small, was an indication that people were conscious of how ephemeral life and political power were; nothing lasted, and so one’s accomplishments or existence should be commemorated in a way that allowed for a more permanent legacy. What is more, Woolf argues, inscriptions reveal an awareness among Romans and provincials that “they lived their lives in public, and personae were conceived of largely in terms of publicly validated concepts such as dignitas and aestimatio, honores, and fama.” Even the smallest, simplest funerary inscription reveals an effort to record a person’s existence for future generations in a way that secured that person’s place within and contribution to his contemporaries and descendants. Such motivations are not unlike those lying behind modern day tombstones and monuments, but in the ancient world so little was permanent, public perception was of the utmost importance, and there was little way for one’s legacy to be preserved beyond inscribing it in stone and bearing children to continue that legacy.

The ability of an inscription to announce to the world, “This is who I am,” meant that the erectors of these texts were very intentional in their composition of the texts, so that they might communicate precisely what they wanted others to know or assume about him. This was how to represented oneself to the world. In other words, inscriptions presented a person’s public identity to the general viewer – an identity that was carefully crafted in order to showcase the best possible self. Consequently, the information presented in an inscription was important on its own for showcasing the honored

---

individual, but so also was the manner in which that information was presented. The manner of presentation can include various factors, including what type of stone or monument the inscription is on, what pictorial elements are included and what those might symbolize, how the text is laid out, and even what quality of carving the stone carries. In addition to these factors was the element of language. The mere appearance in an inscription of a language that was not typical for that particular region was striking, as it immediately associated the commemorated individual (and the dedicator) with a different linguistic group. In the East, where Greek was the common language and regularly used in tombstones, honorifics, and dedications, the appearance of Latin could be striking. What is more, it was not only the presence of Latin, but how it was employed on the stone that can be quite telling as well. Bilingual texts that have different types of information in Latin or Greek can reveal how different spheres of life were associated more with one culture or the other; how different details of one’s life might pertain more to political power or to cultural legitimacy. In addition, the physical manner in which Latin was employed on some stones could be telling. For example, the funerary statue base of the soldier S. Vibius Gallus from Amastris, which was set up by his freedman Cocceianus, gives Latin primacy by making the Latin text more than twice the size of the Greek, which in turn seems to be provided more as a postscript for Greek-speaking viewers. The effect of this size differential is best illustrated by supplying the text here, as it appears on the stone:6

---

6 The best edition of this text is in C. Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia und Nord-Galatia (Tübingen, 1993), p. 159 Am. 5; see also Figure 5.15 for a photograph of this stone from Marek (pl. 26 in Marek). The inscription also appears in CIL III 454 = suppl. 6984, 13648, though the original version included by Mommsen did not include the Greek portion, presumably because the stone was partially buried or the tiny Greek letters remained unnoticed. For a discussion on the visual symbolism in inscriptions, including the lettering and layout of the text, see J. Bodel (ed.), Epigraphic
To Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, prefect of the camp of Legion 13 Gemina, who on account of his esteem and manliness was presented with gifts by the commanders: torcs, medallions; ornaments; crowns, three for the walls, two for being the first to scale the ramparts, and one gold one; five unsoiled spears; two banners. Sextus Vibius Cocceianus, to his well-deserving patron.

Even for a reader who may be unable to read Latin or Greek, the symbolic power of Latin is clear in this inscription. The meaning of the words is only one component of the

Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions (London 2001), 25-30. The domination of Latin in Gallus’ inscription is not unique; similar techniques appear in other inscriptions as well, such as the funerary-honorific of C. Stertinius Orpex (IK 17, no. 4123 = 59, no. 24), in which the Latin letters are almost four times the size of the Greek letters.
message. It is what the dedicator, Cocceianus, wishes for the reader to see, and to internalize. If you know nothing about the individual on the stone, you might at least be able to surmise immediately that he had connections to the Roman power, while the tiny Greek translations suggests that though he was probably of Greek origin, this aspect of his identity meant little to him and his self-perceived place in Roman society.

Despite the extensive research that scholars have done on the so-called Roman “epigraphic habit,” examining when and among whom the practice of erecting inscriptions was most popular, less attention has been paid to the use of language within those inscriptions. This is in part due to the fact that most large-scale epigraphic studies have focused on the Roman West, where Latin dominated the epigraphy. As the language of the Romans, and as the language that the western provinces adopted for law, government, and public life, Latin was an obvious choice for indulging in the primarily Roman practice of epigraphy. In the East, by contrast, epigraphy had a much older tradition. The popularity of erecting inscriptions reached its height during the period of Roman rule, but since the practice had existed in the East long before the arrival of the Romans, Greek had already established itself as an acceptable language for inscriptions. When the Romans appeared in Greek-speaking Anatolia at the end of the second century BC, and as their presence in and control over the region increased more and more in the first century BC, there arose a interplay between the two languages in epigraphy. One language belonged to the Roman rulers, the other was the established lingua franca as well as the language of Hellenistic culture, which even the Romans revered. This was

---

7 There are, of course, exceptions to this, particularly Punic inscriptions in northern Africa, as well as the Greek inscriptions in Sicily and southern Italy, though studies have shown that Latin slowly eclipsed these other languages in the epigraphy.
not an active competition, of course, but whereas in the west Latin was the only main language used for inscriptions, in the East both Greek and Latin had a part to play.

Greek was an old and established language in Anatolia, regarded highly not only by native Greek speakers, but also by Romans, who viewed the language in terms of its cultural heritage and its association with literary and intellectual achievement. As much as the Latin authors tried to surpass their Greek counterparts, Greek remained the language of cultural and educational prestige, especially among Romans of the upper classes. Children from senatorial families were educated from a young age by Greek tutors or, if the parents could not afford a tutor, they would educate the children themselves. Roman education included instruction in the traditional corpus of Greek literature, including Homer, Hesiod, the philosophers, and others, an endeavor which of course required learning the Greek language as well. Because of the cultural prestige that Greek held even among Romans, its position as the primary language of the East would hardly be challenged by the newcomer, Latin.

The linguistic situation in Roman Anatolia, then, was quite unique. We are not dealing with a language of conquest dominating the local folk languages, as we see with French and Creole in Haiti, for example. We are not dealing with a language that has purely elite social functions without any practical use in everyday society, as was the case for Latin or French among the early modern European nobility. Nor are we dealing with a language of immigrants, where the invasive language is used by immigrants who are typically of lower social rank, as we see with Spanish in the United States today. The

---

linguistic situation is much closer to that which existed in the Neo-Babylonian empire, where Aramaic continued as the language of diplomacy and administration in the western parts of their empire, rather than the Babylonian rulers trying to impose their own language. Latin held power prestige because of its connection to the Roman empire, and members of the Greek elite certainly aimed to be educated in this imperial language, but Greek held equal prestige as the traditional language of culture, scholarship, and intellectual inquiry. Just as prominent Romans learned Greek from an early age, so also did prominent Greek speakers learn Latin, especially if they wanted to be participants in Roman politics and provincial administration. And while Latin was the language of the Romans, Greek was the default language for local civic administration, and was frequently also used for communication between the Romans and the local communities. As a result, Latin had very little actual purpose in the Greek East, even in imperial matters, and as time progressed, the necessity for using Latin even to address the emperor decreased.

Considering these factors, the purpose of this study is to understand the place that Latin did have in Anatolia by taking a close and focused look at the use of this language in inscriptions. Gaining a better sense of Latin’s presence and frequency in Anatolia can,

---


11 An obvious example of this is the Greek translation of Augustus’ Res Gestae, found throughout Anatolia in Ancyra, Apollonia, and Pisidian Antioch. Other examples will be discussed more fully in Chapter 1, p. 18 and n. 46. Of course, some Romans, such as Cato the Elder refused to use Greek, even when talking with Greek ambassadors who were not fluent in Latin, because he considered doing so as a submission to Greek culture (Plut. Cat. Mai. 4). Even more extreme was C. Marius, who refused to study Greek literature or learn the language thoroughly, contrary to traditional Roman elite educational practice, since he thought it silly to study the thinkers who were from a culture that was subject to the rule of his own Roman empire (Plut. Marius 2.2).
by extension, inform us on how those in the East related not only to local Anatolian culture, but also to the culture of Rome. Much of the modern understanding of Latin’s place and use in the Greek-speaking east is based on assumptions, and to a degree is influenced by the studies that have been done on Latin’s place in the western provinces. Gregg Woolf has most directly addressed this need for a focused study on the epigraphic habit in the east, admitting that though many of the developments in the east were like those in the west – such as urbanization and cosmopolitanism – he admits, “in other respects the picture would need to be nuanced, to take account, for example, of pre-Roman and non-Latin epigraphic cultures in the region, of the slighter importance of manumission, and of the presence in many cities of a Latin-inscribing army.” In recent decades, inquiry into the issue of language in the inscriptions has begun, but there is still much to be done. But as has already been shown, the interaction between Latin and the provincial residents was different in the east, purely because the east already had a long developed culture, including legal and social institutions that the residents of the western provinces had largely lacked before the arrival of the Romans. As a result, in very few situations was Latin actually necessary, so its use in inscriptions was in many instances a reflection of personal choice. The use of Latin was intentional. And whether or not it was
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12 Woolf, “Monumental” 38.
the native language, or if the person commemorated actually knew Latin, was not the point.

By employing these concepts to the analysis of the Latin inscriptions from Roman Anatolia, I argue that Latin did not have the same type of cultural capital in the East that it did in the West, where it was unequivocally the language of the Romans and therefore was regularly used to show one’s Romanitas. Latin was one of the primary partitions between what was Roman and what was “barbarian.” Because of the long heritage of the Greek world and its highly developed culture, no similarly straightforward Roman-barbarian dichotomy existed in the East. In fact, Latin was not the sole way, or even one of the main ways, to display one’s Romanness. Surely, Latin did still elicit a reaction from the viewer, and it did associate the honoree with Roman power, but it did not have the same wide-ranging social benefits for provincials that it did in the East. Rather, Latin was used especially by groups that had special relationships to Rome and Roman power. Meyer attributes the spread of the epigraphic habit in the provinces to the spread of citizenship,¹⁴ and the evidence here complements her argument, showing that Latin epigraphy was most popular among Roman citizens, but only certain groups within that citizenship. In particular, Roman soldiers, veterans and freedmen, all of whom became Roman citizens at the end of their service, used Latin as a way to highlight their special connection to Rome which had boosted their social ranks in ways that they would not have been able to achieve on their own. Much like religious converts, naturalized Roman citizens in the East were the most eager to use Latin, whereas those more confident in
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their Romanitas were more comfortable using Greek as well as, or instead of, Latin, as the occasion demanded.

This study also challenges the general concept of the epigraphic habit proposed by Ramsay MacMullen and developed by scholars such as Woolf and Meyer, not only because of the difficulty of dating inscriptions (a concern pointed out by others, and one that is particularly applicable to the East, where stones have in general been studied less often), but also because of the way in which certain cities dominate, and in fact completely change, our understanding of the epigraphic habit. Mouritsen already highlighted several problems with conceiving of a single epigraphic habit throughout the vast geographic and temporal expanse of the Empire, and this project takes his caution one step further. The way epigraphy was practiced differed greatly through different areas of the empire, and even in a region such as Anatolia, there are different patterns based on characterizing factors such as urban-rural, coastal-inland, and Greek city-colonia. A primary example is Ephesus, a city that is extremely anomalous not only in its number of inscriptions (4000+), but also with regards to its status as a provincial capital and a major trade and transportation center that made it a magnet for anybody who wished to attain recognition for his place in society. As a result, Ephesus dominates the evidence for Latin epigraphy so much (over 30% of the total number of Latin inscriptions) that it is nearly impossible to look at the data as a whole without Ephesus severely skewing the whole picture. Instead, we have to look at different epigraphic
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15 H. Mouritsen, “Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy,” JRS 95 (2005), 38-63. Mouritsen details several studies that have shown the impossibility of using epigraphic data to give us realistic understandings of ancient demographics. For example, he cites L. R. Taylor’s estimation that at least three quarters of the funerary inscriptions in Rome honored former slaves, and that most of the freeborn individuals in the funerary record were first generation ingenui (“Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome,” AJP 82 [1961], 113-32), and compares this to the evidence from other cities in Italy where the freedman representation is much lower.
habits that change across geographical boundaries, temporal boundaries, and social boundaries.

Finally, this project takes a particularly close look at the bilingual inscriptions of Anatolia, ultimately showing that bilingual texts were not only intended to exhibit one’s membership in both Roman as well as Greek society, but that they could also delineate the differences in various aspects of daily life. For example, in some bilinguals details pertaining more to one’s Roman identity might be put into Latin, but those pertaining to their life as a Greek or Anatolian would remain in Greek.\footnote{I acknowledge that the system is more complex than simply Roman versus Greek, as E. Meyer asserts in “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit,” 83: “Provincial epitaphs should, therefore, be seen as indicators not only of status of some ill-defined and generalized sort (say, ‘elite’ vs. ‘other’), but also of status whose value is at least partly derived from its equation with Roman status and its announcement of Roman practice.” – this is true, but it also isn’t “Roman” vs. “other”} In the study of provincial society, such bilinguals can then inform modern scholars on how provincials viewed these various aspects of life, and which ones they associated more with Rome or with local Greek life. Understanding these switches between languages also shows differences in relationships between friends, family members, and groups, since in single inscriptions, some individuals may be commemorated only in Latin and others only in Greek.

Limits to this Study

Because of the wide-ranging application of epigraphic inquiry, it is important to state outright not only what this study is, but also what it is not. First, while a study of the epigraphic habit in the Roman East is certainly needed, I make no claims here to be giving an exhaustive or conclusive analysis of this topic. Such inquiry would require a much more comprehensive study of the Greek texts in the East to complement the data.
provided by the Latin. The findings from this type of study would doubtless be important for furthering our understanding of the place of epigraphy in the East, especially in comparison to the West. Second, this is not a study on Latin literacy in the East. Such a topic has been explored by many, and the topic only has tangential relevance for the current study. The mechanics of how an inscription was produced are widely varied depending on the particular situation, but an individual need not have known Latin, or known how to write it, himself in order to commission a tombstone or dedication in Latin. He only needed to find a stonemason or a middle-man who could translate and inscribe the desired text for him. Such considerations therefore make it difficult to determine whether or not the language choice in an inscription reflects the actual level of familiarity that the erector or honoree had with the language. There are cases where it is clear that the named individual must have known Latin. Such is the case for the equites singualares inscriptions from Anazarbos in Cilicia, since all members of this exclusive cavalry force were from the Latin-speaking region of Batavia.\footnote{IK 56, nos. 63-7, and possibly no. 68.} Examples like this, however, are rare. Many inscriptions contain names of individuals that have the Roman tria nomina, but with a Greek cognomen. Without any indication of whether these individuals actually knew Latin, or whether they had held any positions where we can safely assume they learned it at least minimally, conclusions can only be tentative.\footnote{Take for example the fragmentary tombstone from Perge commemorating several individuals (IK 61, no. 388). Sergia Theopropis' name has both Roman and Greek components, and her sons all have the three-part names typical for a Roman man, and utilize traditional Latin syntax within the text. However, the cognomina of several of them are clearly Greek. It is not likely that these are freedmen, since the praenomina and nomina are not identical between all of the individuals. Further, none of the named individuals are otherwise attested in the literary or epigraphic record. So what we see here is a group of individuals, probably of local origin, who have gained Roman citizenship (or perhaps were born with it), with the result that they have the tria nomina. The questions of whether these people actually knew Latin as the inscription would suggest is essentially unanswerable. Since their cognomina make clear that they have some level of Greek background, they may very likely have}
Again, this point is only minimally important for this study. Regardless of whether they actually knew Latin, or to what degree, we can be sure that they made the conscious decision to use Latin instead of Greek for their funerary commemoration.

Any project that relies largely on epigraphic evidence has to acknowledge some limits for the study, and to work within the bounds that they set. First, epigraphy is a largely urban phenomenon. That is not to say that inscriptions do not appear in rural contexts, but the vast majority of the inscriptions that will be discussed in this project are from urban areas. Ephesus, as already mentioned, is exceptional in its mass of epigraphic data, and so that unique position must be kept in mind at all times. Related to the urban bias of the epigraphic data is also a publication bias. Archaeological excavations and surveys are expensive endeavors, and granting institutions are much more likely to give money to projects that have detectible material. This is a regular problem with archaeology, as it is much easier to excavate a large city than a small homestead. Yet because of this focus on identifiable cities for excavation, certain regions of Anatolia that were less densely urbanized have received less attention from archaeologists, and thus will have much less representation in the data set. Chapter 2 deals with this to a degree, but it is important to remember that the large gaps in the interior and eastern parts of Anatolia that appear on the maps of the archaeological distribution are just as possibly due to a lack of modern excavation and publication on those regions as to an actual dearth of inscriptions in antiquity. Further, modern discoveries of inscriptions are not always
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been natives of Perge or somewhere nearby, which would have automatically made Greek their native language. The Roman name suggests that they had Roman citizenship, but there is little evidence beyond the use of Latin in this inscription whether anyone named would have actually known Latin or been literate in it. The simplest explanation, of course, is that they did know Latin, as reflected by this inscribed text, but it is certainly also likely that they wished to be commemorated in Latin to reflect their citizen status, regardless of whether or not they actually knew the language of the Romans.
reliable testimonies for where the inscription originally lay. Many inscriptions in this study were found as spolia, reused in walls and building foundations from later historical periods. So while I have attributed the stones to the cities which were closest to their find spots, this data must also be taken with a grain of salt. Indeed, some inscriptions are only known because of their location in a modern museum.¹⁹ These inscriptions I will leave out of the mapping portion of this study, since there is no way to know their provenance without appropriate internal information.

The geographical span of this project is admittedly large. I have defined the research area as all of the mainland provinces stretching from the Aegean coast up to the eastern edges of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Cilicia, and I will be using the terms “Anatolia” and “Asia Minor” interchangeably when referring to this region. My selection for these boundaries is a bit arbitrary, but my purpose is to look at the mainland provinces that had a relatively long history in the Roman empire. For this reason, Armenia is not included because of its late entry into the empire. I also leave out the coastal islands of the Aegean and the Mediterranean based on the generalization that island societies functioned a bit differently. The goal in looking at this large region is to identify epigraphic trends throughout the whole of Anatolia, and to see differences in where Latin took hold as an epigraphic language and among whom. Many of the other scholarly works cited in this project look at more circumscribed areas within Anatolia,²⁰ which is helpful for identifying variation in the epigraphic habit, but none of them look just at the Latin. One
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¹⁹ For example, IK 56, no. 68, which currently resides in the archaeological museum in Adana, but whose provenance is unknown.
²⁰ For example, Pilhofer, Romanisierung; Marek, Stadt, Ära, und Territorium; and R. MacMullen, “Frequency of Inscriptions in Roman Lydia,” ZPE 65 (1986), 237-8. Several works are also relatively circumscribed in terms of time period: e.g. R. MacMullen, Romanization in the Time of Augustus (New Haven 2000).
of the goals of this project is to weave these regional differences together into a better understanding of epigraphy in Anatolia as a whole, but also to show how Latin inscriptions followed slightly different patterns.

The temporal scope of this project is less arbitrary. In general, my focus is on the Latin inscriptions from Augustus to the beginning of the Dominate under Diocletian in AD 284. The beginning of this period is limited in part due to the severe lack of Latin epigraphic evidence from the pre-Augustan period. However, the few Latin inscriptions that I have found that date to the Republican period I have included by way of comparison. The end-date of this study rests on the generally accepted notion that the character of the Empire and its society noticeably changed with the shift from Principate to Dominate. That being said, I again have included some inscriptions dating from the first few years of the dominate period, with an absolute limit of AD 312 when Constantine defeated Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge. The inscriptions dating from the accession of Diocletian to 312 are included largely as a comparison to what has come before, but I also have not actively sought them out as I have the Latin inscriptions dating to the Principate period. Because of this, any analysis that I offer relating to these later inscriptions should be regarded as nothing more than speculation.

Finally, in any study on epigraphy, the role of onomastics and prosopography must be addressed. It is well known that these two methods can be useful when studying the social structures and relationships of the ancient world, especially among those who were not as well known in the literary record. However, relying on these methods for dating inscriptions or determining the origin of an individual is flawed, and never should
an argument for somebody’s ethnic origin be based on this evidence alone. At the same time, this study is on public perception, not reality, so prosopography and onomastics can still be useful in showing that someone at least wanted to appear Roman through the use of a Roman name, regardless of whether or not he was actually from Italy. Many of the names encountered in this study, however, modify the traditional Roman name by having a Greek name for the cognomen. This of course would have been standard practice for a naturalized citizen, but it is impossible to determine from the name alone whether someone with a Greek cognomen was naturalized (for example, through manumission or military service) or whether he was born a Roman citizen, but still given a Greek name in order to reflect his Greek heritage. All that we can tell is that he was likely of Greek ancestry.

Project Outline

The layout of this project is intended to facilitate an overview of the Latin epigraphic data of Anatolia, but also to explore specific ways in which we can trace the interaction between language use and identity, with the hope that the findings here will inform us more on how language functioned elsewhere in the Roman empire, and how residents of the Anatolian provinces related to Roman power.
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21 See for example T. F. Carney, “Prosopography: Payoffs and Pitfalls,” *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 156-79; A. J. Graham, “The Limitations of Prosopography in Roman Imperial History with Special Reference to the Severan Period,” in ANRW II.1, 136-57; A. R. Birley, “Nomenclature as a Guide to Origin,” in W. Eck (ed.), *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte* (Köln 1993), 35-50. R. Macmullen discusses this as well, giving an example of the name Fortunatus. Even though the name is thoroughly Roman, it frequently appears in North Africa among the native populations, making it impossible to determine based on names alone who was a Roman from Italy and who was a native. This is especially difficult in cases where Romanization has taken hold and there are no other ways to identify someone as not Roman: “Notes on Romanization,” *BASP* 21 (1984), 168.
In Chapter 1, “Language and Identity,” I explore how linguistics and sociology has viewed language and its relationship with identity. I consider the various ways in which language has been used historically to empower and to oppress groups along linguistic, ethnic, and nationalistic terms. I then turn the discussion to Anatolia during the Roman period, and show that Latin functioned quite differently in the East than it did in the West. This was in part due to the complicated history of the interactions between Romans and Greeks, both politically and culturally. Further, Latin’s status as the language of power was slightly muted because of the long-standing place that the Greek language had in Anatolia. Even for Romans, using Greek had a particular draw, for it was the language of culture, philosophy, and education. For this reason, Latin still symbolized Roman power, but was not necessarily essential for asserting one’s Romanitas. Finally, this chapter turns to a discussion of the utility of epigraphy for a study on identity, and establishes how the persona represented on the stone, which includes not only the information given, but also the language used, reflects the social and cultural values of the Anatolian cities.

Chapter 2, titled “The Latin Inscriptions,” surveys broadly the Latin epigraphic evidence from Anatolia, with a particular focus on the “private” or “personal” inscriptions, which I have defined as inscriptions set up by private individuals or groups rather than by the emperor or one of his agents. These include tombstones, honorifics, building inscriptions, religious dedications, and imperial dedications. The chapter examines the epigraphic evidence in terms of typological, chronological, and geographic distribution, with particular attention paid to regions where Latin appears in extremely high concentrations. The mapping of the inscriptions reveals that there is far less Latin in
certain regions than would be expected, such as in some colonies and military posts, showing that strong connections to Rome did not necessarily mean Latin was the primary language there, nor did it have strong symbolic value.

The following two chapters explore the inscriptions dealing with specific groups that have particularly strong affinities for Latin – members of the Roman military (Chapter 3), and Roman freedmen and slaves (Chapter 4). Both of these groups exhibit a higher frequency of Latin in their inscriptions than any other single, definable group. This suggests that there is something special about their relationship to Rome and the Roman power that makes them more interested in using Latin than other citizen and non-citizen residents of Anatolia. I propose that these groups in particular use Latin because it reflects their connections to the Roman system of power and their place within it. For both soldiers and freedmen, and to a lesser degree slaves, their service to the Roman state and Roman households gave them a higher social status and greater prestige. Without these experiences, they would likely just be an average resident of the Roman empire. With these experiences, however, they are automatically imbued with greater respect and reputation than those born into similar situations. The use of Latin allows these proud, naturalized citizens to exhibit their connections to Rome in a way that was unnecessary for others more secure in their Roman identity, such as freeborn Roman citizens, or the local aristocracy of the Greek cities.

The final chapter focuses on the Latin-Greek bilingual inscriptions in this study, including those discussed in previous chapters, with an aim to show what these texts can tell us about bilingualism in Roman Anatolia, as well as the relationship that Greek and Latin had with each other. Although inscriptions do not necessarily indicate to us how
language was used in daily life, or what languages were actually spoken, the use of more than one language in a tombstone, honorific, or dedication can reveal much about the intended audience of the text, as well as the perceived identities of the dedicators. This is especially true of inscriptions in which the content is not identical between the two languages. In these instances, we see that more often than not, Latin is used to communicate professional and legal information, whereas Greek is reserved for more personal details, curses, and for commemorating individuals that did not have a connection to Roman power.
CHAPTER 1: Language & Identity

The ultimate aim of this study is to show how residents of the Anatolian provinces identified themselves with reference to both their local communities and their Roman rulers, with the hope that this might reveal more about local Anatolian cultures and their relationship with Rome. Understanding how people thought about themselves in a region like Anatolia, where a variety of cultures, languages, religions, and political systems from both the East and the West mixed together, can provide important insight into the daily lives and attitudes of these provincials about whom we know relatively little. There are many different indicators of “identity,” including language, physical appearance, religion, and ethnicity, but rather than look at the intersection of all these indicators within a small region, this current study focuses on only one indicator – language – in order to examine a larger geographic area and understand the broader implications of identity in Anatolia. In this chapter, I employ modern studies in identity and sociolinguistics in order to discuss the importance of language for one’s self-expression and public identity. I then use these models to explore the role of language and identity in the ancient world, taking into consideration the processes of Hellenization and Romanization in Anatolia, and the linguistic changes that those processes brought, in order to illustrate how language is an effective method for understanding Anatolian identity.

Language, Identity & Sociolinguistics

Identity is a complex, multi-layered concept that can apply to individuals, families, communities, or nations. The matter is further complicated by the fact that no individual or group has only one identity, but rather multiple identities based on many
factors, including race, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, social status, religion, and organization membership. Often, these identities are weighted in terms of importance, so that certain identities are deemed to be of greater value than others depending on the social context, though occasionally these identities may suffer a “clash of loyalties.” In other words, a person’s identity is actually, “a network of identities, reflecting the many commitments, allegiances, loyalties, passions, and hatreds everyone tries to handle in ever-varying compromise strategies.” Furthermore, identity is difficult to pinpoint, since any given identifying classifier can be applied to an individual by himself, or by an external party who has labeled him as a member of a certain category. As a result, a person may appear to others to belong to a particular group, though she does not view herself to have membership in that group. Because of this constructed and varying nature of identity, pinning down exactly what “identity” means in an objective and
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22 A. L. Epstein, *Ethos and Identity: Three Studies in Ethnicity* (Chicago 1978) 113. For example, one might view her professional identity as more important than her political or national identity; or another his religious identity as more important than his ethnic or racial identity. But if his religious organization started sponsoring race-based discrimination, he would find himself in a difficult situation of divided loyalties.

23 A. Tabouret-Keller, “Language and Identity,” in F. Columas (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Oxford 1997), 321, emphasis mine. Rather than “network,” Epstein (*Ethos and Identity* 113) uses the term “nested” to describe the mutually reinforcing hierarchy of identities, wherein different aspects are stressed depending on the social context.

24 It is this latter definition of identity used by theorists such as Pierre Bourdieu, who sees identity as something imposed upon somebody by society (often from birth) rather than as a self-defined and self-determined classification: see *Language and Symbolic Power* 120-2. Bourdieu argues that the very meaning of “categorization,” is dependent on its Greek root – *kategoroin* – which he defines as “to accuse publically.”

25 I think here of a student I had in a previous semester who was held in low esteem by her classmates because they perceived her to be from a wealthy, privileged family based on how she spoke, dressed, and interacted with them. After getting to know the student myself, I discovered that this could not be farther from the truth, for she was the child of a single mother and money was so tight each semester that she did not know if she would be able to attend school until only days before the term began. So while she viewed herself as being from a socio-economic class similar to that of the students who criticized her, their external view of her was vastly different. Regardless, this perceived difference between her and the other students, false as it was, created tension between them. On a more geopolitical scale, we can consider the many Kurdish refugees from Iraq who have settled in the United States. Despite the assumptions of many Americans that they are Iraqi that since they are from the political state of Iraq, they assert that they are Kurds from Kurdistan. This fits into discussions of identity and nationality below (pp. 36-7).
concrete way is impossible. However, this does not nullify the important role of identity studies, for as Howgego so succinctly states, “For all that it may be a contingent construct, identity is a powerful driver of action, as we know all too well from our own experience. Identity matters.” So rather than attempting to establish what “identity” means on a larger philosophical plane, it is preferable to define the term as is most useful within the framework of a given study.

I am most interested in “public identity.” Rather than focusing on socially determined and applied identities as discussed by Bourdieu, I look primarily at an individual’s self-imposed identity – their self-representation – as it is presented to others in a public setting – in this case, through inscriptions. As already mentioned, every individual has a plurality of identities that reflect his many experiences and his various roles in society, and these identities can serve different functions. In a public identity, an individual chooses to emphasize those facets of his life that he would consider most beneficial to display to the general population, with the goal that others will identify him in the most optimal way. Greco-Roman society put a strong value on social hierarchy, and knowing each others’ place within the larger society was of utmost importance. This highly stratified culture encouraged individuals to emphasize constantly their statuses, positions, and honors in order to show how they fit into the societal structure, and inscriptions, which often provide such information about the honoree and/or the erector, were the perfect medium to proclaim one’s accomplishments to the greater populace.
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27 See n. 24 above.
28 Although, different types of inscriptions have slightly different purposes and intended audiences, all inscriptions set up in public spaces should be considered public inscriptions – and therefore as representations of public identity – regardless of the intended audience or of how personal the information contained therein was.
Whether these inscriptions were set up by the honorees, their families, or others, it is well established that their purpose was to publicize the biographical information that would maximize the public esteem of the honoree and his family. Hence we see that officers of the Roman legions, for example, tend to highlight in their inscriptions their highest held positions rather than their tenure as a regular foot-soldier; and politicians detailed their highest offices held rather than their entry-level positions. Likewise, members of particular religious sects included symbols or words specific to that cult in order to signify their membership in that group, and provincials who had gained Roman citizenship might use their *tria nomina* rather than their Greek names to reflect that status.

The complex nature and amorphous definition of identity means that quantifying the concept and knowing exactly how to study it is complicated. Studies in identity, as a result, often opt to focus on particular markers of identity – behaviors or other signifiers that possess a certain symbolic or cultural capital. While individuals may express these markers naturally or subconsciously, the cultural capital attached to them means that people often expressed them intentionally, or co-opted them, in order to show externally their association, or perceived association, with a particular group. Such markers can include dress, adornment, speech, and gesture. Thus many modern Christians choose to wear a cross around their necks as evidence of their membership in that faith, while members of street gangs in California and elsewhere don certain colored clothing, or certain tattoos, in order to indicate their affiliation with their chosen gang. For
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29 Though certainly in some cases, the entire résumé of the commemorated individual is included on the stone. For example, the inscription of Celsus in Ephesus *(IK 17, no. 5102-3)*.

30 Cultural or symbolic capital is discussed extensively by Bourdieu in *Distinction* as well as in *Language and Symbolic Power*. 
researchers, juggling all of these intersecting identities and their various signifiers can easily become a messy business, with the result that studies of this type must be limited in some way. Researchers can either limit the size of the group that they are observing, allowing them to understand how the various signifiers and identities are interacting with one another, or they can limit the number of signifiers they look at, thereby allowing them to look at a larger sample size though a single lens. The current study opts for the latter approach, focusing on a singular signifier – language. Linguistic variation and code-switching is regularly used, “to mark group affiliation, to reveal permitted or forbidden boundaries, to exclude or include, etc.”\(^{31}\) and language has historically been an ideal way to establish and display differences in class, education, and privilege.\(^{32}\) Because of this symbolic social function of language, it is an ideal focal point for a study on identity in the greater Anatolian region.

My motivations are due in part to the fact that while there have been several studies that have focused on identity within small regions of Anatolia, there is still a need for a study on how Anatolians on a broader scale identified during the Roman period.\(^{33}\) I also focus this study on language because there is a lack of any focused study on the everyday role of Latin in Roman Anatolia.\(^{34}\)

Just as language is frequently used as a signifier in modern studies on identity, it is also useful for understanding the public identity in the ancient world. In fact, as the
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\(^{34}\) There are several studies which deal with Latin as a literary language in the East, and some that discuss the degree to which Latin was present there, but little work has been done to understand why Latin was used and in what situations. See Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec*, who has surveyed the general position of Latin in the east, both in general and along chronological lines, though limits his study to the use of the language in official contexts.
sociolinguist Jonathan Edwards asserts, “The possession of a given language is well-nigh essential to the maintenance of a group identity.” Studies in the sociology of language, alternatively called sociolinguistics, have explored the role that language can play in an individual’s identity. This area of study developed largely in the last half-decade, with a major burst in the 1970s, as interdisciplinary cooperation between various fields, especially sociology, psychology, and linguists, increased. Sociolinguistic studies strive to understand how language use can inform us about social issues; they are “concerned with the interpenetration between societally patterned variation in language usage and variation in other societally patterned behavior, whether viewed in intra-communal or inter-communal perspective.” The field is large and ranges from asking technical linguistic questions about language shift to seeing broader behavioral and social patterns as a result of language usage. It can focus on how people switch between colloquial and formal vocabulary depending on situations, or on code-switching between different languages or dialects within a single conversation. Such modern sociolinguistic studies tend to rely on talking with subjects, interviewing them, and observing them in social interactions to reveal situational variations in language, vocabulary, and accent. Of course, these types of research methods are difficult for the historian of antiquity since the ancient sources say very little about the everyday use of language – particularly spoken language – throughout the Roman world, and we are forced to rely on informal

36 The precise distinction between these two terms varies. For a general overview of the main figures and arguments in this debate, see J. Edwards, Language, Society, 3-5. In this study, I will use the terms interchangeably.
writings such as graffiti. Perhaps this is the reason that sociolinguists rarely look to the ancient world for alternate understandings of how language and society interact, and why few ancient historians have looked to sociolinguists for new ways to analyze societies in antiquity. And while an analysis of modern sociolinguistic models reveals how ineffectual they are in understanding the complex nature of language in a place like Anatolia, these models and the accompanying terminology can still help provide a reference point for studies on language in antiquity, and modern case studies can serve as comparanda for how language operated in the ancient world.

At the core of sociolinguistic inquiry are issues of identity – of both the individual and the group – in terms of the formation, presentation, and maintenance of language. How a person uses language can suggest (falsely or accurately) his origins, his education, and even his social class. The primary goal of understanding how language fits into a larger societal context, and how it is used to show one’s membership in or separation from a particular group, makes questions of identity a natural byproduct of such studies. Further, since language use “actively symbolizes the social system,” social groups can also use it to actively respond to and restructure that social system. In this way, we often see that natives of Long Island or the American South try to suppress their regional
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40 R. S. Bagnall’s book *Everyday Writing in the Graeco-Roman East* (Berkeley 2011) is indeed illuminating regarding the use of language in both papyri and graffiti of the East, yet he is limited by the nature of the evidence from discussing everyday speech with any depth.


42 M.A.K. Halliday, *Language and Society. Vol. 10 in the Collected Works of M. A. K. Halliday*, ed. by J. J. Webster (London 2007), 251 (essay originally published in 1978). This essay postulates that in a “perfectly homogeneous society” that lacks any social structure, there would be no language or dialectical variation. Halliday bases this hypothesis on his observation that society has hierarchies of dialects, and variation even within a standard language, based on the social structure. Bilingualism is not a passive reflection of social realities, but “the realization of social structure, actively symbolizing it in a process of mutual creativity” (255, emphasis original). These principles are regularly applied to historical studies of social class, as seen in volumes such as P. J. Corfield’s (ed.) *Language, History and Class* (Oxford 1991), which contains twelve essays on the relationship between language and class, including chapters on estates in early-modern England and Spain, colonial and Muslim India, and the intersection of language and power in the United States.
accents outside of their home regions in order to avoid being judged based on prevailing stereotypes associated with those accents regarding class and education in the United States.

Differences in language can be simply dialectical, but they can also appear in circumstances where there are two or more languages at work. In fact, bilingualism is a common factor in discussions on the role of language in a society, and is particularly of interest in our present study on Anatolia, where Greek coexisted with Latin and several native Anatolian languages. The term “bilingualism” can refer to a wide variety of multi-language situations on both an individual or a larger societal level. For modern historians and linguists, understanding such divisions within the category of bilingualism allows them to categorize the level of bilingualism in a given population, and by extension informs them on the place and significance a particular language holds within a given culture.

Individual bilingualism consists of two main categories, based largely on social class. The first category, elite bilingualism, typically includes situations in which members of the aristocracy, as a byproduct of their high birth, are educated in scholarly languages that have little everyday function. This was often the case throughout the history of western Europe, where knowledge of Latin, ancient Greek, and French was an indicator of elite education, and was required for participation in courtly culture and elite politics, even though these languages were useless to all other members of society.43 Folk bilingualism, on the other hand, exists in places where the necessity for second language knowledge extends to members of the lower classes if they live or work in

43 Lewis, "Bilingual Education" 198-200. This appendix in Fishman's book on bilingual education has much to offer on the ancient world and societies from a linguistic perspective.
situations that demand it. Edwards uses the example of the Ptolemaic period in Egypt, where it was necessary for anyone wishing to hold a government post, however minor, to be bilingual in both Greek and Demotic Egyptian in order to maximize their efficacy in domestic service and teaching. As a result, it was not only the Macedonian ruling class in Egypt, but also the low-level native government employees, who could speak both languages.

Beyond individual bilingualism, multi-language knowledge can also be societal or collective. More frequently called diglossia, this form of bilingualism exists in situations where two or more languages coexist in an entire community, with most members having at least a basic command of both. However, diglossia need not refer only to the presence of different languages in a given community; it can also be said of communities where there exists widespread knowledge of different dialects of the same language. In such a situation, one dialect is elevated as the official, formal language and the others as simply the conversational standard. A classic example of this can be found in Arabic-speaking world, where people tend to use the local variety of Arabic for everyday communication, but use Modern Standard Arabic, which is based on the Classical Arabic of the Quran, for writing and all formal speech. The Modern Standard Arabic is intelligible to all educated Arabic speakers, even though the many regional dialects may not be. Germany presents a similar situation with the coexistence of the formal, educated Hochdeutsch and the various regional dialects.

In linguistic terms, languages in a bilingual or diglossic context are often labeled as majority and minority languages. Fishman developed a model for distinguishing these

---

45 Edwards, Multilingualism 83-8. An excellent example of this is Montreal, where residents typically have at least some fluency in both English and French.
roles of the various languages, which he called the high (H) and low (L) language varieties. According to Fishman, the H variety would be the language that dominates in formal and printed contexts, typically dominating political speech and often serving as the religious and literary language as well. The L variety, on the other hand, would serve “more mundane purposes,” such as friendly, informal conversations and correspondences between family members, friends, and social peers. This system of H and L varieties can also be applied in instances where there are three or more languages. In such a case, there may be two H varieties and one L variety, or one H and two L, depending on the status of each of those languages; some sociolinguists instead offer the alternative of having a M (mid) variety. When two H languages are present, one (often the oldest one) is reserved for religious purposes, while the other H takes the role of the administrative and political language.


47 Edwards, Multilingualism 84-5.

48 J. Swann et al., A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics (Tuscaloosa 2004), 82-3, s.v. "diglossia." Examples of this three-language system can be found among the Jewish groups of New York City and the Amish groups of Pennsylvania, New York, and the Midwest. In the case of the former, Hebrew serves primarily religious functions, as it is the language of the sacred texts and the synagogue, and holds a position as an H variety. Yiddish, on the other hand, is the chief language for everyday communication, including trade, but is still used for instruction, literature, and in some religious communities. As such, Yiddish serves both H and L functions. English is without a doubt an L, as it is spoken almost exclusively in interactions with members of the out-group. See J.A. Fishman, “A Decade in the Life of a Two-in-One language: Yiddish in New York City (Secular and Ultra-Orthodox),” in J. A. Fishman (ed.) Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? Reversing Language Shift (Clevedon 2001), 74-100. Likewise, most traditional Old Order Amish communities use an Amish High German, or “Sermon German,” which is a blending of an archaic German with influences from both Pennsylvania Dutch and English, for their church services, hymns, and religious texts (H), and Pennsylvania Dutch (also known as Pennsylvania German) as the primary mode of communication within the Amish communities (L). Again, English is an L language, reserved for conversing with the “English” (i.e. non-Amish). See J. Meindl, “Solving the Preacher’s Dilemma: Communication Strategies in Old Order Amish Sermons,” Yearbook of German-American Studies, Vol. 3 Supplemental Issue
By understanding the relationship that these H and L varieties have with each other within a community, we are not only able to gain knowledge regarding the prestige levels of a particular language, but we can then examine how individuals are interpreting a particular situation, or trying to represent themselves in that situation, based on their use of one language over the other. The danger, of course, is that this could easily turn into a circular argument, and even though the concept of code-switching is based on the belief that there are reliable linguistic signals encoded in the way that a person switches between languages, this is often unconscious and any “rules” of code-switching must be considered theoretical at best. Further, Fishman’s model of language hierarchies is of limited use, as it is not always flexible enough to accurately portray the interrelationship between the languages. For example, he generally classifies Pennsylvania Dutch among both its Amish and non-Amish speakers as an L language, since it is primarily used in the home. Yet he acknowledges that it can act as an H language for economics. Bourdieu was critical of linguistic analysis methods such as those described above, claiming that they focused too much on the mechanics of language and too little on the social context and function of these language hierarchies, though many sociolinguists in more recent decades have attempted to go beyond the technical aspects of language and apply these hierarchies and complex linguistic interactions to actual contexts.

Regardless of the flaws and limits of these sociolinguistic models, however, they are still able to provide a basic framework through which we can understand the interactions and conflicts between the various languages and language communities of

---

(Lawrence, KS, 2010), 123-38. Swann also gives the example of Tunisia, where Arabic serves as the L language, whereas both classical Arabic and French are the H languages, the former serving as the religious language, the latter as the administrative language.

49 See n. 46 above.

Roman Anatolia. Surprisingly, there has been little scholarly application of the terms and theories provided by sociolinguists to the study of the ancient world. The exact extent of the knowledge of Latin in Anatolia is not clear and certainly not everybody knew it, but as the epigraphic evidence will show, it was not only the aristocracy who used Latin, so we are dealing with something much broader than an instance of elite bilingualism.\footnote{It is important to note here, though it will be discussed more fully below, that the use of Latin in an inscription does not automatically imply that the erector or the honoree actually knew or could write Latin. Regardless, its presence on the stone at the very least reveals an attempt by the erector or honoree to appear learned in Latin, whether or not that was actually the case.}

Latin was used primarily for official imperial business, including imperial correspondence and legal documents, and so we can classify it as an H variety. \textit{Koine} Greek, on the other hand, was used in a variety of activities from local governance, business/trade, and communication across the whole of Anatolia, and knowledge of the language was thoroughly widespread. Further, the language was certainly an H variety before the arrival of Latin, and certainly maintained that status at least to some degree on a local level since it remained the language of \textit{polis} administration, even in the colonies in some instances.\footnote{B. Levick, \textit{Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor} (Oxford 1967), 82, 134-5.} The L variety is primarily limited to the many older, local languages that were scattered throughout Anatolia and probably still spoken, especially in less urbanized areas and in the early stages of Roman involvement in the East.\footnote{The linguistic situation in Roman Anatolia is most easily compared to that of Haiti, since in both places language interactions reflect power struggles. In Haiti, French (H) was the language of the conquerors and has historically held the position of the language for government and business. However, the common indigenous language known simply as Haitian Creole (which adopts French lexical items into its own grammatical structure that has been formed through the blending of several African languages, Spanish, Arabic, Taíno, Arawak, and English) remains the non-literary everyday language of the people (L). Only since the 1960s has the indigenous language begun to find official recognition in Haiti, so that now the language is used in several media sources including newspapers and radio, and is gradually finding its way into literature as well. In the Roman West, Latin similarly dominated the local languages, which rarely appeared in written form despite the fact that we know they were spoken well into the fourth or fifth centuries AD, though due to the lack of a common language pre-conquest, this linguistic situation was much more simple than what we see in}
languages, which would have been used almost exclusively in the household and among the local community, include Mysian, Carian, Lycian, Lydian, and Phrygian, and likely also varieties of Cappadocian, Pontic, and Pisidian, or a creole of the earlier Anatolian languages with various Greek dialects that developed in the earliest centuries of Greek colonization.54

Beyond its utility for understanding the hierarchies of the languages, the H/L model can also be expanded further to understand how languages are tied to particular types of cultural activity. As illustrated above, often one H language dominates the civic sphere, while the other dominates the religious sphere. In this way, then, we can observe the use of Latin or Greek in different types of inscriptions (i.e. religious, dedicatory, funerary) to further our knowledge about what spheres were dominated by which languages, and by extension how those spheres were related to Roman or local power and culture.

This cultural application of linguistic hierarchies allows sociolinguists and historians to explore issues of ethnicity and nationalism. Language has traditionally been

---


54 For Mysian, see Str. 12.8.3; Carian, Str. 14.2.3. Phrygian is not mentioned by Strabo, but the language seems to have had a resurgence in the second and third century AD, as evidenced by the discovery of several neo-Phrygian inscriptions: see; W. M. Ramsay, “Neo-Phrygian Inscriptions,” *JÖAI* 8 (1905), 79-120; W. M. Calder, “Corpus Inscriptionum Neo-Phrygiarum,” *JHS* 31 (1911) 161-215; “Corpus Inscriptionum Neo-Phrygiarum II,” *JHS* 33 (1913), 97-104; “Corpus Inscriptionum Neo-Phrygiarum III,” *JHS* 46 (1926), 22-28; A. H. Sayce, “The New Neo-Phrygian Inscriptions,” *JHS* 46 (1926), 29-35. For Cappadocian, see Str. 12.1.2; 12.3.25. Also, the account of Pentecost at Acts 2:5-12, which took place sometime in the second quarter of the first century AD, suggests that a variety of Anatolian languages, including Cappadocian, Pontic, Phrygian, and Pamphylian, were still spoken in the early empire period. The passage tells that during a gathering in Jerusalem of Jews from all over the imperial Roman world all individuals began speaking at once in the language of their own nations, though they were somehow mutually intelligible to each other. Verses 9-10 hint at the various nations present at this meeting, by extension suggesting some of the languages spoken: “... Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντου καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Ἀγιεπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Αἰγύπτου τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, καὶ οἱ ἐπιθημοῦντες Ῥωμαίοι.” Some of these languages, such as Lydian (Str. 13.4.17) had already died out by the first century BC.
one of the most important markers for defining ethnic groups and nations, and as a result it often serves as a unifying factor for groups trying to establish independent statehood, especially in areas such as the Middle East or Europe where other usual markers of nationality – religion or dress, for example – fail to distinguish between groups.55

Language can also serve as a marker of social status, and even be used as a tool for social control, as in the case of Greece, where diglossia became an issue of national identity and class struggle during the Greek struggle for independence against the Ottoman Empire in the nineteenth century.56 A minority language’s increasing presence can even be viewed

55 E. Kedourie, Nationalism (London 1961); Edwards, Language, Society 5-10, 99-117 (on ethnicity); 10-16, 23-46 (on nationalism); D. Storey, Territory: The Claiming of Space (Harlow 2001), 57-8; A. D. Smith, Theories of Nationalism (London 1971), who also points out that language is not always an important marker in places where it has no ties to nationalistic aims. I use here the terms “nation” and “state” as defined by human geographers, wherein states are circumscribed territories with a unifying power over its citizens, while nations are “more nebulous...social collectivities with attachment to a certain territory” (Storey, Territory 21-75, quote on p. 50). We can turn again to the example of Kurdistan (n. 25 above), which is not a political state, but rather a nation that includes portions of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Armenia, and which is united by a common identity markers including the Kurdish language. Likewise, Wales is not an independent political state, though it is a nation, and the Welsh people view their language as a core marker of the preservation of their national identity, and the nationalist movement in modern Ireland has long been trying to recover their national language as a way to separate themselves from their English-speaking former rulers. As P. Kirby argues, “the recovery of the language is an essential element in recapturing national self-esteem” (Has Ireland a Future? [Cork, 1998]).

56 The quest for Greek independence in the early nineteenth century prompted the Greeks to cultivate a new national identity. In this process, they attempted to forge (false) connections to their past to create a more erudite intellectual and historically legitimate culture. One outgrowth of this movement was the development of a classicized dialect of Greek which they called katharevousa. This language took the vernacular Greek – demotiki – which had developed naturally from Ancient Greek over the preceding millennia, and embellished it through the reintroduction of Classical Attic vocabulary, grammar, orthography, and syntax that had fallen out of use centuries before. The artificial nature of katharevousa was one of many attempts among the Greek ruling class to create a strong sense of national identity that could be traced back to their ancient past, although many of their conceptions of the past were purely modern constructions cast as ancient traditions. Nominally, katharevousa was intended to represent the glory of the Greek state, yet it quickly became a tool for consolidating cultural control in the hands of the conservative ruling elite. Fluency in the official, constructed language was required for any participation in civic activities or employment in the government, but only the most wealthy families had the time and resources to learn it. Members of the lower classes who could not afford to learn the new Greek were essentially shut out of any participation in the public sphere or higher education. Not until after the restoration of a democratic Greece in the 1970s did the government finally supported the use of the common demotic dialect, opening up the public sphere to a much broader group of people. A more thorough overview of this movement, along with extensive bibliography, can be found in P. S. Costas, An Outline of the History of the Greek Language, with Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Periods (Chicago
by the majority as a sign of larger cultural threats, as was recently argued in 2004 by a political scientist from Harvard in response to the influx of Spanish-speaking immigrants into the United States.\textsuperscript{57} Even though linguists and other social scientists widely criticized his claims as having no scientific validity and being purely xenophobic,\textsuperscript{58} the fact remains that Huntingdon viewed language, more than any other cultural signifier, as embodying larger threats to the entirety of American culture, and expected his readers to view the situation similarly.

It is impossible to speak of “nationalism” or “patriotism” in antiquity in the same way as historians of the modern period do because the ancient world did not have nation-states or the same emphasis on large group unity that the term “nationalism” implies today. However polis unity and pride that was strong among each individual citizen body in the Greek world exhibits traits similar to those discussed by political scientists and geographers regarding nationalism. As such, just as the above examples have shown that language is often a central focus and rallying point for nationalistic movements and identities, many have argued that Latin was central to the exhibiting of Romanitas, and the efforts of the Second Sophistic movement clearly show that the Greek
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\textsuperscript{57} S. Huntington, "The Hispanic Challenge," \textit{Foreign Policy} 141 (2004): 30-45, in which he argues that the large numbers of Spanish speakers flowing into America is threatening the traditional Anglo-Protestant culture that the country was founded upon, including concepts such as the English language. While certainly his criticisms of the immigrants went far beyond just their language, his reference to them simply as "Spanish speakers" reveals clearly that he viewed their most unifying characteristic as their language, not their nationality. Therefore, in his view, it was not immigrants from a particular nation or state that threatened American culture, but rather the general mass of people from Latin America who have little else in common beyond their language.

language was central to one’s Hellenicity. In the remainder of this chapter, I discuss the socio-political environment of Roman Anatolia, and the subsequent effects that it had on the presence and use of both Latin and Greek in these eastern provinces. Further, I specifically address the usefulness of Latin inscriptional evidence from the region for analyzing the utility of the Roman language, and also to revisit the question of Anatolian identity through that linguistic evidence. But before we look specifically at the evidence for language in Anatolia, it is necessary first to establish what the interactions between the native Anatolian, Greek, and Roman cultures and residents was in these eastern provinces.

*Greeks & Romans in Anatolia*

Because of its strategic location as the main land route between Europe and Asia, and because of its coastlines on both the Mediterranean and Black Seas, Anatolia has always been a site of cultural interaction, and numerous populations have traveled along Anatolia’s trade routes and settled in its coastal cities and on the interior plateau. The Greeks had a strong presence in Anatolia from very early on, especially along the Aegean coast, due in large part to the massive colonization movements that started in the eighth century BC. Their presence became so great that the western coast of Anatolia, usually referred to as ‘Asia’ or ‘Ionia,’ was considered an extension of Greece itself. Because of their long history in Anatolia, Greek culture and religion were easily integrated into native Anatolian traditions, and vice-versa. Many ancient Anatolian towns adopted
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59 See for example, J.N. Adams, *Romanitas*; A. E. Cooley (ed.), *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West* (Portsmouth, 2002). For Greek as a signifier of Hellenicity, particularly from the fifth century onward, see J. M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* 111-7. See also discussion of the Second Sophistic below (pp. 49-52 and passim).
foundation myths that fit into the Greek mythological framework, and there was extensive religious exchange and conflation between the local deities and their Greek counterparts.\textsuperscript{60} In the midst of these long-term interactions, the Greek language spread throughout the region as well, taking root especially in large urban centers of trade and shipping on the western and Black Sea coasts. With the conquest of Asia and the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great in the third quarter of the fourth century BC, and the subsequent parceling of the region among his generals after his death, Greek culture increasingly found its way inland. The Hellenistic period brought large numbers of Greeks eastward as soldiers, mercenaries, traders, and immigrants, all hoping for land. And as all of these Greeks spread throughout Anatolia, so also did their language.

Greek’s diffusion was so extensive that by the time Rome entered the east in the late third century BC, Greek had already become the lingua franca of the entire eastern Mediterranean, from the Balkans to Palestine and Egypt. That is not to say that the native languages were supplanted by Greek – Egyptian still thrived, as did Carian, Phrygian, Lydian, Hebrew, Aramaic, and many others – but Greek became the standard language of business and communication between people of different origins, and certainly dominated the written and inscriptional evidence. Many of the physical traces of the

\textsuperscript{60} The text of Strabo, for example, is filled with examples of Anatolian towns that have adopted Greek mythical foundation stories: for example, 14.3.5 (Pinara in Lycia); 14.4.3 (Pamphylians); 14.5.12 (Tarsus). The conflations and adoptions of deities, of course, went both ways. A standard example of this is the conflation of the ancient Anatolian Great Mother with the Phrygian Cybele, and her identification with the Greek mother goddess Rhea, and possibly also the Hittite goddess Kubaba, though this latter identification is far from secure: see M. Munn, \textit{The Mother of the Gods, Athens, and the Tyranny of Asia: A Study of Sovereignty in Ancient Religion} (Berkeley 2006); L. E. Roller, \textit{In Search of God the Mother: the Cult of Anatolian Cybele} (Berkeley 1999). Likewise, the Cilician god Sandas was frequently associated with the Greek hero Hercules because of his associations with war and the underworld: see A. Mastrocinque, “The Cilician God Sandas and the Greek Chimaera: Features of Near Eastern and Greek Mythology Concerning the Plague,” \textit{Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions} 7 (2007), 197-217; H. Goldman, “Sandon and Herakles,” \textit{Hesperia Supplements} 8 (1949), 164-75 and “The Sandon Monument of Tarsus,” \textit{Journal of the American Oriental Society} 60 (1940), 544-53.
Anatolian languages were then limited to civic coinage, curse tablets, and funerary inscriptions.\(^{61}\)

Roman involvement in the East began in the late third century BC with the outbreak of the First Macedonian War in 214, but it was not until 133, when Attalus III of Pergamum willed his kingdom to Rome, that they had any official holdings in Anatolia. Direct Roman control within Anatolia spread slowly, as Rome preferred to form alliances with local dynasts, many of whom were of questionable legitimacy and had been put into power by Rome. In return for the security of their positions, these dynasts agreed to submit to Rome’s will and act as her agents and eyes in the East.\(^{62}\) For most of the area, it was not until after the Mithridatic Wars and Pompey’s reorganization of the East (67-59 BC) that Rome annexed more provinces, including coastal Cilicia and Bithynia-Pontus. The inland provinces of Anatolia, such as Cappadocia and Galatia, were not

\(^{61}\) These Anatolian languages have been found primarily in physical (i.e. epigraphical) form. No major documentary texts exist for any of them. The latest physical evidence for Lycian and Lydian survives on a couple of hundred stone inscriptions and a few inscriptions from the fifth and fourth centuries BC. Likewise, Sidetic, the language of Side, survives only on six stone inscriptions (most of which are dedicatory) and a few coin monograms, which date from the fifth to the third centuries BC. Carian inscriptions (mostly funerary) and coin captions date from the sixth to the third centuries BC. Evidence of Pisidian and Phrygian, on the other hand, goes as late as the second and third centuries AD. Pisidian survives in a series of tomb inscriptions that record primarily the names of the occupants and their patronyms, whereas Neo-Phrygian (Old Phrygian disappeared sometime around the fourth century BC) survives in a series of inscriptions, most of which are curse formulas appended to Greek tomb inscriptions (see n. 54 above). While many of these languages disappear from the archaeological record by the third century BC, this does not mean that communities were not still speaking them, and the reappearance of Neo-Phrygian in the Roman period attests to the fact that these languages were still in use, even if just for basic household communication and ancient ritualistic purposes. For an overview of these Anatolian languages, as well as further bibliography on them, see H. C. Melchert, “Indo-European Languages of Anatolia,” in J. M. Sasson (ed.), Civilizations of the Ancient Near East, Vol. 3-4 (Peabody, MA 2000) 2151-9.

\(^{62}\) Str. 12.3.1. Examples of this are Mithridates V of Pontus (App. Mith. 11-12), Nicomedes III of Bithynia (Just. 37.3.5), Deiotarus of Galatia (Cic. Deiot.) and Ariobarzanes I of Cappadocia (Just. 38.2.8, 5.9; Str. 12.2.11 c. 540.), among many others. Beyond Anatolia, we see similar patronizing of local dynasts in Israel, including not only Hyrcanus II (Josephus BJ 1.152, 193), but also Antipater (Josephus, BJ 1.187-189, 193-194) and Herod (Josephus, BJ 1.244, 282-283). See also R. D. Sullivan, Near Eastern Royalty and Rome (Toronto 1989); E. Badian, Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.) (Oxford 1958); M. Smallwood, “Behind the New Testament,” G&R 17 (1970), 83. For an overview of Rome’s rise to power, see E. S. Gruen, The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome (Berkeley 1984).
added until the early empire, and by the death of Domitian in AD 96, the entirety of the Anatolian peninsula was under Roman control.63

Romans flocked to the east for various reasons – trade, land, politics, money-lending, veteran colonies, to name a few. In the earliest years of this emigration during the late Republic and the Augustan period, Romans tended to defer to local customs rather than impose their own ways on the local populations.64 Such assimilation could not have been too difficult since there was a long history of contact between Romans and easterners, and many aspects of Hellenistic culture had already been adopted by the Romans. In particular, prominent Romans already had a firm command of the Greek language, due in large part to centuries of trade and communication with the Greeks of southern Italy as well as Roman activity in the Greek East during the early years of Rome’s overseas expansion. Further, Romans looked upon classical Greek learning and literature with admiration and prided themselves on being lingua doctus utraque, so wealthy families would hire Greeks, or buy Greek slaves, to educate their sons in Greek philosophy and literature.65 In the east, bilingual inscriptions were not uncommon,
especially in the Roman colonies, and Roman officials frequently included Greek in their letters—both public and private.\(^{66}\)

Roman familiarity with Greek culture, however, did not mean that settlement in the East was smooth. Romans met significant resistance in their early years of emigration to Anatolia, as is made especially clear by the Asiatic Vespers of 88 BC, in which supposedly 80,000 Roman settlers were massacred in Asia Province—and many others elsewhere in Anatolia—at the command of Mithridates VI Eupator.\(^{67}\) Because of this, it was not unheard of for Romans who settled in the East to quickly assimilate to local culture. Take for example the Roman C. Sextilius Pollio, who settled in Ephesus sometime around AD 11\(^ {68}\) and subsequently became a prominent player in local politics and a benefactor of the city despite his Roman origin.\(^ {69}\) Even organizations of Romans, such as the collegii and the conventus, were far less common in the cities of the east than


\(^{67}\)Appian, Mith. 22-3, 54, 61-3; Cic. Leg. Man. 7; Dio, fr. 101.1-2.


\(^{69}\)Pollio was a major benefactor of Ephesus during the Augustan and Tiberian periods, sponsoring the building of a major aqueduct (IK 17, no. 3092 = 59, no. 152), a basilica (IK 12, no. 404 = 59, no. 155), a possible heroon (IK 12, no. 405 = 59, no. 114), and a stoa (IK 12, no. 407 = 59, no. 115).
in their counterparts of the west. Of course, the one exception to this assimilation (which will be discussed more fully in Chapter 2) was the colonies, settled primarily by veterans and speculators, who modeled themselves after their Roman and Italian examples in terms of governance, social structure, religion, and culture.

**Romanization & Greek Responses**

Despite the initial attempt of Romans to blend in to the local cultures of the east, aspects of Roman life with time became increasingly apparent. During Augustus’ long reign, the emperor and his adherents sponsored building projects, new cults, colonies, and tax reform in the provinces. Some of these improvements and introductions garnered them favor among the provincials. One is reminded of the famous scene in Monty Python’s *The Life of Brian*, in which the members of the People’s Front of Judea are crafting their plot to kidnap Pilate’s wife and to use her as a tool to dismantle “the entire apparatus of the Roman Imperialist State.” The group’s leader, Reg, laments all that the Romans have taken from the Jews, and asks rhetorically, “And what have they ever given us in return?” To Reg’s surprise, his co-conspirators come up with a long list of improvements that the Romans have brought to Judaea, with the result that Reg must conclude his argument by saying, “All right... all right... but apart from better sanitation...”

---

70 MacMullen, *Romanization* 3; J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l’Orient hellénique* (New York 1975), 282-90. The *conventus* in Delos was quite large due to the island’s trade emporium, but evidence for such organizations on the Anatolian mainland is much more sparse. Inscriptional evidence does, however, attest to the existence of a *conventus* in Ephesus (IK 12, no. 409; 13, no. 658; 17, no. 3019) and Apamea (L&W no. 746). The *conventus* discussed here seems to differ from those discussed by G.P. Burton (“Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire,” JRS 65 [1975] 92-106; “The Curator Rei Publicae: Towards a Reappraisal,” Chiron 9 [1979], 465-87). Rather than the Roman administrative assizes that Burton talks about, those mentioned in the inscriptions of Asia Minor seem to refer instead to an assembly of specifically Roman citizens.

71 MacMullen, *Romanization* 6. The issue of colonies will be discussed more in the following chapter.
and medicine and education and irrigation and public health and roads and a freshwater system and baths and public order... what have the Romans done for us?"72

The point is fair – the Romans introduced all sorts of infrastructure that improved life in the Greek cities, especially in the Augustan period and in the early second century AD. Along with these physical contributions, however, Rome also introduced to the East new cults, new entertainments, and new cultural practices. The degree to which Roman practices infiltrated, or even dominated, local Greek culture – a process called “Romanization” – is a subject of great debate. These changes were not forced upon the provincials in an effort to make them seem more Roman. Rather, “it was spontaneous rather than planned, gradual rather than rapid, and resulted in integration rather than subjugation of the indigenous culture. Romanization was not a goal to be achieved; it was a phenomenon brought about through the fusion of two cultures.”73 Because of this co-existence and blending of cultures, it was possible to remain Greek while still being loyal to the new Roman rulers. Residents of Anatolia had been doing just this for centuries, living as Greeks under the rule of non-Greeks, including the Persians, the Macedonians, and the various native Anatolian rulers. Such was the case for Memnon of Heraclea. In an analysis of his history of his native city in Bithynia, Dueck concludes that though Memnon did not always approve of the Romans’ methods – which he views as cruel and arrogant at times – he never expressed any sentiments that would suggest that he was hostile toward Rome and Roman rule in Asia Minor.74

72 Monty Python’s Life of Brian, directed by Terry Jones (Sony Pictures, released 17 August, 1979).
The exact degree of Hellenization in the East is highly debated by modern scholars. Both Brunt and Millar have asserted that Roman culture made little impact and the only areas where Rome’s presence was obvious were in those where legions were stationed. Woolf, on the other hand, says that it is less that Roman culture did not spread to the East, and more that it was quickly integrated into the Greek way of life: “[Institutions such as] competitive euergetism, civic and cultic monumentality and the enhancement of personal status and identity through the acquisition and display of possessions...were common to west and east, but Greeks used them to remain Greek.” What is more, Woolf claims, the Greeks were able to adopt Roman things without feeling a threat to their identity as Greeks, unlike the Romans who felt their Romanitas was threatened any time they adopted items or customs of Greek origin. He criticizes arguments such as those of Brunt and Millar for claiming that Romanization was largely absent in the Greek East without making any effort to account for the many exceptions to this rule, such as gladiatorial combats, bath-gymnasium complexes, and the more obvious...
presence of Romanization in colonies and major administrative cities. Further, he notes that the sectors of imperial Greek society who were most alienated from Roman society were in fact the same sectors who were most integrated into the Roman political and economic structures. In other words, it was those who were most closely interacting with the Roman world who felt most distanced from Roman culture, and who felt most strongly about preserving Greek culture.

For those who do explore the cultural impact of Romans in the East, the term Romanization can have various implications. It can refer to a practical, passive process, or a symbolic, active process. The former approach looks at the spread of Roman technologies, traditions, cults, and so forth, and how they blended with or remained separate from local traditions. The latter view, which is of more significance for the current study, is that Romanization is most manifest in the attempts of eastern provincials to appear Roman, act Roman, effectively be Roman even though they were not actually of Roman or Italian stock. Acts of adopting Roman symbols of power, such as donning the toga or naming one’s heirs on one’s tombstone, are examples of what Meyer has termed an “index of conscious Romanization.” In other words, Romanization is seen either as a sharing of culture and technology, or as a co-opting of identity. Both types of Romanization are seen clearly in studies of the western provinces of the Roman empire, especially since there is such a stark contrast between the highly urbanized and organized
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77 Woolf, “Becoming Roman” 126. The connection between gladiators and Romanization is also explored by C. Mann, “Um keinen Kranz, um das Leben kämpfen wir!": Gladiatoren im Osten des Römischen Reiches und die Frage der Romanisierung, Studien zur alten Geschichte, Bd. 14 (Berlin 2011).
78 Woolf, “Becoming Roman” 128.
79 Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 91.
cultural, legal, and social system of the Romans and the transient cultures that existed in areas such as Gaul, Germany, and Spain before the Romans arrived.\textsuperscript{80}

Viewing Romanization as a transition to being more Roman is further complicated by the exact definition of what, or who, qualified as ‘Roman.’ In general, at the beginning of the Principate ‘Roman’ could refer to anyone of Italian origin since by this time Italian culture had become relatively uniform throughout the peninsula. There were certainly many Romans of equestrian and senatorial status who relocated to the East during the Principate, and whose descendants remained in the region. But Romans could also be identified by one’s possession of the Roman citizenship. By that definition, many of the Romans who lived in the provinces of Anatolia were not of Italian origin, but had gained freedom in one way or another, whether through a personal grant from a powerful Roman, through service in the military, or through manumission from slavery.\textsuperscript{81} This last category – Roman freedmen – make up a large number of the identifiable Roman citizens in the epigraphic record. Many of these freedmen were not just any freedmen, but rather the freedmen of the emperors or their closest comrades, leaving the former slaves with ample wealth to become benefactors of their new cities.\textsuperscript{82} Yet the ethnic and civic

\textsuperscript{80} Hence G. Bowersock, \textit{Augustus and the Greek World} (Oxford 1965), 72: “Romanization is an unnecessary postulate for eastern colonization of this age. It is chiefly a word which describes what subsequently happened in certain areas of the western empire, and what did not happen in the East.”

\textsuperscript{81} Citizenship is easily detected in the onomastics of the Roman East since all Roman citizens, whether freeborn or freedmen, bore the \textit{tria nomina.} Theoretically, anybody who displayed a \textit{tria nomina} had to be a Roman citizen, according to an edict of Claudius (\textit{Suet. Claud.} 25.3), but as Brunt has pointed out, this ban is “better evidence of the practice [of non-Romans taking Roman names] than of its cessation”: P. A. Brunt, \textit{Italian Manpower: 225 B.C.-A.D.14} (Oxford 1971), 207-8. The \textit{tria nomina} becomes less helpful in identifying citizens after the \textit{Constitutio Antoniniana} of AD 212, when Caracalla granted universal citizenship to all freeborn residents of the empire. From that point on, the \textit{tria nomina} did little to indicate the origin of a particular individual, and since everyone possessed the citizenship, the \textit{tria nomina} lost its prestige and its use in inscriptions declined dramatically, though some still insisted on using their full names for the sake of genealogy.

\textsuperscript{82} The Mithridates-Mazaeus gate on the south side of the Ephesian agora is a perfect example of this, as the two dedicators were likely freedmen of Agrippa (\textit{IK} 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151). See also
diversity of these immigrants should not have an effect on what we view as ‘Roman,’ for as MacMullen so succinctly says:

> What counts... is the fact that, regardless of their origin or civic status [including those of eastern origin who gained citizenship], the immigrants’ behavior was the same. The superiority they asserted had nothing to do with the general style of life they found around them... What they rather reserved to themselves was the pride of power, enjoyed either directly or indirectly.\(^{83}\)

In fact, the variety of immigrants in Anatolia reflects the strong draw of the east among those in Italy and other parts of the empire. One could establish a successful business in trade or shipping, or buy up land and begin farming. Many veterans gained land grants in the east during the first century BC, and for other non-aristocratic Romans, moving to the provinces offered a greater opportunity for social mobility than Rome itself ever could. One might easily become a benefactor and influential citizen of a provincial town, rather than being stuck as a low-level civic employee with no prospects in Rome. Further, many of the social pressures that existed in the city of Rome were absent in provincial culture, with the result that a freedman, for example, could become a leading citizen there, an occurrence which was far less likely to happen in Rome itself.\(^{84}\)

The exact cultural effect of Rome’s presence in the East is difficult to trace, largely because so much of their culture was adapted from the Greeks, and also because there was not a major change from what existed in the pre-Roman East, which was already heavily urbanized and organized. Adoptions of Roman technologies are visible in
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\(^{83}\) MacMullen, *Romanization* 23-4 and n. 86. Freedmen and their presence in the epigraphic record will be discussed more fully in Chapter 4.

\(^{84}\) Trimalchio’s dinner party (Pet. Sat. 57) gives a vivid (though very likely exaggerated) example of the preference to being a freedman rather than a resident of the provinces or tributary kingdoms: *Et ego regis filius. Quare ergo servivisti? Quia ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius* (“And I am the son of a king. Then why was I a slave? Because I gave myself into slavery and preferred to be a Roman citizen rather than a tributary”). See also A. M. Duff, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge 1958), 70-1. Several freedmen with high social status appear in the inscriptions of Anatolia, as will be discussed in Chapter 4.
the archaeological record, but these do not exactly reveal Rome’s cultural influence. Take for example building methods. The Romans had popularized several unique construction techniques, including the use of brick-faced concrete and the arch, which eastern residents learned from the Romans and adopted since the technology was superior and cheaper than the older techniques.\(^\text{85}\) In no way need this use of clearly advantageous technology indicate a desire on the part of the provincials to \emph{be} more Roman; it simply indicates their recognition of an innovative technology that could help improve their lives. There are, however, other instances in which Roman culture was integrated with local traditions, whether passively or actively on the part of the provincials, in a way that does allow us to speak of Romanization.\(^\text{86}\) One example of this is the Greek festivals, which were originally celebrations of Greek identity but quickly became a vehicle for Roman governors and emperors to validate Roman rule through the incorporation of Roman statuary in the marches, and by having them take place on days of importance in the imperial cult.\(^\text{87}\) Here we see an instance of passive Romanization, in which the locals did not change their customs to appear more Roman, but rather the Romans (in this case, provincial governors and emperors) modified local traditions to serve their own purposes. Alternatively, the use of Latin and Roman names by provincials, both those who did and did not possess the citizenship, served as an indicator of the provincials actively co-opting, or imitating, aspects of Roman identity.\(^\text{88}\)
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\(^{85}\) MacMullen \emph{(Romanization 21-2)} discusses the use of Roman architecture in the East at length. Pilhofer also discusses this concept, using the examples of both architecture and pottery styles: \emph{Romanisierung}, 6-7.

\(^{86}\) Pilhofer \emph{(Romanisierung 5-6)} considers Roman names, language, religion, and other practices “inextricably connected with Rome,” such as the Capitoline Triad, to be true evidence of Romanization.

\(^{87}\) Swain, \emph{Hellenism} 68.

\(^{88}\) MacMullen \emph{(Romanization 6)} rejects the use of Roman names as evidence of Romanization since he claims that “the customs, social or political, which accounted for their appearance were entirely
The Greek willingness to accept Roman cultural changes during the early imperial period faded with the death of Augustus in AD 14, so that by the mid-first century Rome had become not only the “political master” of the Greeks, but also a “cultural rival.”

The civil concord and the settling in of the new imperial system allowed Greek identity once more to become more inward looking, and the Greeks began to subvert the incursions of Roman culture. However, this resistance was not an active movement:

“‘Resistance’ to Romanization amongst most of the population need not have been a positive force of any strength. It may in fact have been only negative. It was not (or was not likely to be) anything we could call nationalism, it was no passionate attachment to ancestral traditions nor heroic refusal of the foreign. Rather, among people whose whole experience has taught them that they could not live through an experiment that fails, reluctance in the face of Romanization was a mode of survival.”

Greek culture started thriving again in its own right, as is best evidenced by the Second Sophistic and the Atticising literary movements. These movements, which have been the focus of much of the scholarly work on language and cultural identity in the Roman East, began around AD 50 and provide the majority of the evidence for the resurgence of Hellenistic.

Yet even if the Roman nomenclature became part of Hellenistic custom, that did not mean that they no longer held significance as symbols of Roman citizenship. In fact, when the tria nomina combined a Greek personal name with the Roman naming conventions, this provided a useful way to communicate both one’s membership in the Roman citizenship while still retaining their Greek cultural identity. As such, onomastics are useful to understand not one’s ethnicity, but rather one’s desire to advertise certain aspect(s) of his identity: see Madsen, Eager to be Roman 86-7.

Of course, the interaction between the two cultures (not to mention the native Anatolian cultures) was complex, and could be difficult to navigate even for those living during the time, let alone for modern scholars. see, for example, R. Preston, “Roman Questions, Greek Answers: Plutarch and the Construction of Identity,” in S. Goldhill (ed.) Being Greek under Rome, 86-119.
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89 See Swain, Hellenism, esp. 1-13; 89 (quote).
90 MacMullen, “Notes on Romanization” 177.
91 MacMullen, Romanization 5-6.
92 This movement was not an organized one, nor was it a conscious collaboration between Greek intellectuals with defined goals. Instead, the term “Second Sophistic” and the authors included in this group is purely a modern construction, albeit with some assistance from the second-century scholar, Philostratus, who dubbed the term in Lives of the Sophists 481; cf. Hall, Hellenicity 225; Goldhill, “Rhetoric” 228.
Greek culture and identity. As shown by Swain and others, Atticism was an endeavor among Greek intellectuals to preserve the integrity of the Greek language (and by extension, the Greek cultural legacy) from being ‘barbarized’ by non-Greeks. It was an effort to show that “the Greeks were still special, and hence deserving of privileged treatment, [and it] masked and responded to their progressive incorporation into a world that was increasingly an artefact of Roman power.” Though the Greeks throughout their earlier history had been open to other cultures and the innovations they had to offer, their language was the one thing they held most dearly and conservatively, especially among the educated elite. As a result, the status of the Greek language became a sort of bellwether for the overall preservation of Greek culture in the face of encroaching Roman cultural and intellectual trends.
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94 Woolf, “Becoming Roman” 125-6. Madsen (Eager to be Roman, Ch. 5) discusses several Greek authors from this period, including Dio Chrysostom, Arrian, and Cassius Dio, and surveys their role as Greeks and as friends of Rome, and how they negotiated these two cultures. In fact, he argues that their critiques of Rome derive not so much from their Hellenicity, but rather from their views on politics and social structure. While the Second Sophistic writers endeavored to preserve and maintain Greece’s exceptionalism, they also had a complicated relationship with the past, both in terms of how ideal their past actually was, and in how it applied to their contemporary culture. Goldhill (“Introduction” 8) has argued that in fact the writers of this period tended to view the Greek past a “a complex dynamic of attraction and rupture, affiliation and dismissal... Plutarch’s strikingly expressed dissection of contemporary civic life reveals the tensions within the political and social strategies of self-positioning through the (classical) past.” Cf. S. Goldhill, “Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic,” in E. Gunderson (ed.), The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric (Cambridge 2009), 228-41; E. L. Bowie, “The Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic,” Past and Present 46 (1970), 3-41. Of course, it was this same past that allowed these intellectuals to gain social prominence within the Roman system: G. Bowersock, Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (Oxford 1969); 28-9. Each of these Greek intellectuals have also been the subject of more concentrated studies: Cassius Dio: F. Millar, A Study of Cassius Dio (Oxford 1964). Dio Chrysostom: C. P. Jones, The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom (Cambridge, MA 1978); S. Swain, Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy (Oxford 2002). Arrian: P. A. Stader, Arrian of Nicomedia (Chapel Hill 1980). See also E. Gabba, Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome (Berkeley 1991) and D. Dueck, Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome (London 2000).
95 Swain, Hellenism 17-21.
The desire to ‘atticize’ the koine Greek that was spoken throughout the eastern empire clearly speaks to the intersection of language and identity in the Roman East.\textsuperscript{96} The writers of the movement attempted to re-classicize Greek and create a new intellectual Greek in which there was a conscious avoidance of Latin terms. Such fanatical attempts to keep the Greek language pristine reveals the perception that any influence of Latin on Greek signified a threat to the larger Greek culture and heritage.\textsuperscript{97} It is important to remember, however, that identities are not mutually exclusive. The issue is far more complex than a Greek-Roman dichotomy, and while the Second Sophistic intellectuals tried to protect their Greek language from any Latin influences, they did not all necessarily view the two cultures as in conflict. In fact, many Greek elites and intellectuals were among the most Romanized members of Greek society. Jesper Majbom Madsen (2009) has provided a thorough analyses of several Greek authors from Bithynia-Pontus whose writings reveal precisely this fact.

It must be emphasized that the Second Sophistic was a movement of Greek identity among intellectuals, including Plutarch, Lucian, and Dio, and was not representative of how the general Greek population responded to Roman culture. These non-aristocratic classes had little time in the midst of their hardworking lives to focus on issues such as the pristine preservation of their language and the exclusion of foreign influences. Because these non-elites were less concerned with language purity, they may have been less resistant to use Latin in situations where its use might be appropriate. That

\textsuperscript{96} That language is sometimes constructed to suit a particular identity is also discussed by Costas, \textit{Outline} 130-7 (with regards to the language conflict in modern Greece). For a brief discussion on spoken koine Greek in the Roman period and the changes that the language underwent, see Horrocks, \textit{Greek} 102-27.

\textsuperscript{97} Much work has been done on the attempts of intellectuals to curb Latin’s influence on Greek. In addition to the many sources on the Second Sophistic cited above, see for example Zgusta, “Die Rolle.”
is not to say that the non-elites welcomed the Romans and Roman culture with open arms, but rather that they opted for different, less elite ways to resist Rome. Cicero, for example, reveals in one of his letters that several of the richer cities of Asia, as well as the entirety of Cyprus, paid the Romans money in order to prevent having troops garrisoned in their towns over the winter.98

These attempts to preserve Hellenicity in the face of Romanization, while also trying to contextualize the Roman world in Greek terms (and vice-versa),99 also raises the question of who or what was considered ‘Greek’ in this period. It is noteworthy that aspects of Greek culture, particularly language and intellectual heritage, were the main targets of these men who were hoping to preserve ‘Hellenicity;’ they made no significant attempt to attain Greek political unity or autonomy.100 The term ‘Greek’ referred to cultural identity, especially in contrast to the barbaroi, much more than racial or ethnic identity.101 This is reflected in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ definition of Hellenicity, wherein he identifies its core components as speaking the language, pursuing Greek
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98 ad Att. 5.2.1.1; cf. R. MacMullen, Soldier and Civilian in the Later Roman Empire (Cambridge, MA, 1963) 77-8.
99 Woolf, “Becoming Roman” 125.
100 Some Greek cities did already possess autonomy, others aimed to be granted autonomous status by gaining favor with the Emperor or other powerful Romans. For more on the status of individual cities, see A. H. M. Jones, Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1971) = CERP; “Civitates Liberae et Immunes in the East,” in W. M. Calder and J. Keil (eds.), Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler (Manchester 1939), 103-17.
101 Strabo (1.4.9), in agreement with the Hellenistic mathematician and geographer Eratosthenes, said that even the Romans were barbaroi, though they were certainly more refined than most. While during the Roman period, language and other cultural factors were the primary indicators of Hellenicity, this was not always the case. J.M. Hall has shown in his wonderful monograph on Hellenicity that terms such as ‘Hellas’ and ‘Hellene’ did not always apply to all individuals who spoke the Greek language. Instead, these terms were originally geographically bounded in an area south of Thessaly. Further, Hall shows, the Greeks were not a unified people, and did not have the sense of collective identity that we think of when we think of the ‘Greek World’ in the Bronze Age, or even in the period of colonization in the eighth and seventh centuries. Instead, this self-conscious sense of identity came about in connection with the Delphic Amphictyony, and only beginning in the fifth century did the sense of collective Hellenicity based on broader cultural criteria develop.
customs, acknowledging the Greek gods, and having suitable laws. Greekness was not grounded in political unity – it never really had been – nor was it restricted to a particular geographic area. Even in the Hellenistic period, where vast empires were ruled by Hellenized Macedonians, it was the cultural components – the language, art, literature, religion – that made the eastern lands ‘Hellenized.’ Granted, powerful men including not only the Hellenistic kings, but also Mithridates VI of Pontus and the Romans themselves often tried to pay lip service to a unified Greek race by employing the popular ‘Free the Greeks’ rhetoric in order to justify their imperialistic expansion, but even this manufactured unity had faded by the post-Augustan period. Certainly cities in Anatolia aimed for autonomy, others for the status of municipium, but little efforts were made to actually overthrow Rome’s hold of the region. Instead, the Greeks focused on preserving their cultural traditions. In addition, they developed new institutions, such as the Panhellenion, which despite its association with the cult of Hadrian became a

102 Dion. Hal. 1.89.4: κόσμου τῆς πόλεως νεοχμώσαι εἰκὸς Ἦ- ἐπεὶ ἄλλοι γε συχνοὶ ἐν βαρβάροις ὁμοῦς ὁλίγου χρόνου διελθόντος ὡς μήτε φωνῆν Ἑλλάδα φθέγγεσθαι μήτε ἐπιπλεύσμασιν Ἑλλήνων χρῆσθαι, μήτε θεοῦς τοὺς αὐτοὺς νομίζειν, μήτε νόμους τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς, ὃ μάλιστα διαλλάσσει φύσις Ἑλλάς βαρβάρου, μήτε τὸν ἄλλων συμβολαίων μηδὸν ὁμοῖον. As Hall points out (Hellenicity 224), this list is strikingly different from the definition of Hellenicity provided by Herodotus (8.144.2), which adds to these other factors an element of common blood. See also G. W. Bowersock, Hellenism in Late Antiquity (Ann Arbor 1990), 7, who said Hellenism consisted of flexible cultural and religious components; also Swain, Hellenism 68-9, where he points out that Greek ancestry was a messy business especially on the mainland because of intermarrying and the large numbers of Greeks who had died in the civil wars. Tracing Greek ancestry was probably much easier in the Greek East, especially in western Anatolia, where the lineages are much clearer.

103 For a full discussion of the “Free the Greeks” slogan, see S. Dmitriev, The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece (Oxford 2010), esp. 351-79.

104 Many Greek cities resisted Roman rule early on, especially right after Rome’s acquisition of Asia in 133 with the revolt of Aristonicus. The Mithridatic Wars, followed by the Roman civil wars, allowed cities other opportunities to oppose Rome’s hold in Anatolia, often with detrimental results if the city backed the losing side. But by the accession of Augustus, many cities had been brought under the influence of the new emperor, and enough blood had been shed that the Greek cities welcomed peace and stability.
celebration of Greek culture. Further, they rewrote their past in a more idealized way that would serve their group identity in the face of Roman culture.

The universal Greek identity depended mostly on these common cultural ties. That there was little resistance politically to Rome’s rule from Augustus onward reveals a priority of Greek culture over Greek independence. However, their acquiescence to Roman rule was also a result of how Greeks viewed ideas of rule and government. The Greeks had never been politically unified; there was no such thing as Greek nationalism. Instead, Greek political expression came in the guise of civic pride. Since the rise of the city-state in the Archaic Period, Greeks had been organized into city-states, and it was through this system that they formed their political identity. Even into the Principate, residents of Anatolia viewed themselves as Greeks culturally, but politically as residents of a particular city – Ephesians, Anazarbans, Sideans – and it was through inter-state competition, rather than Panhellenic activity, that they expressed their political voices. As Swain puts it,

Greeks identified with Rome politically because Rome encouraged them and needed them (or their friends and colleagues), because there were solid benefits to be gained from Roman citizenship, and because they appreciated the benevolent regime of the Antonines. But cognitively and spiritually none of this means the Greeks did not remain Greeks, whereas there is an enormous amount of evidence to prove that they did. The second sophistic is the name given to manifestations of this intensified feeling of Greekness... We must read it in political-ideological

106 Swain, Hellenism 78-87.
107 See discussion above, pp. 36-7.
108 Hall (Hellenicity 111-7) shows that it was not until the fifth century BC that Greeks even began conceiving of all speakers of the Greek language as being a unified group, and even at this point there were different levels of Hellenicity. He describes it as a scale on a continuum, with Greek being at one end and Barbarian at the other. Each Greek group had perceptions of where other Greek groups belongs on the Greek-barbarian continuum.
terms too, while shying away from connotations of ‘political’ that are too active.”

In other words, it was not that the Greeks were apolitical, but rather that their politics were not related to the fact that they were Greek. Instead, political activity and conversations revolved around civic politics and criticism of Roman rule, not around the plight of the ‘Greeks’ and their universal needs. The result of this was that as Rome easily integrated the Greek system of city-states into her empire, the Greeks expressed little concern about this larger power so long as they were able to continue in their own local pursuits, vying with their neighbors for commercial profit, divine favor, and imperial approval.

At the same time, it is important to understand why a resident of an Anatolian city would even want to be perceived as Roman in any way. Indeed, Roman citizenship was something coveted by many provincials, as it provided certain tax exemptions, business perks, and the ability to attain public office in the imperial administration. If one was not born with the citizenship, it could be gained in one of several ways, including manumission, grants to a community, or personal grants under the authority of the
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110 Such criticism was not unique to Greek intellectuals, but rather was shared with many Latin writers, indicating that their antagonism to Rome could not have been based in ethnicity: Madsen, *Eager to be Roman* 103.
111 The competition between city states was well-known. Swain (*Hellenism* 76-7) discusses the examples of Abonuteichos on the Black Sea coast who vied for status with neighboring Amastris; also Nysa vs. Magnesia and Tarsus vs. Aegaeae. In Cilicia, there was endless competition between the major cities, including Anazarbus, Aegae, Tarsus, and Adana over land, religious rites, and titles such as “metropolis”; extensive discussion of these and other civic disputes appears in Jones, *CERP* 206-7.
112 For a thorough discussion on Roman citizenship and its development, see A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 2nd revised ed. (Oxford 1980). Questions over the role and frequency of citizenship in the Roman East are debated. While some believe that citizenship had become somewhat widespread, at least among the local elite, by the time of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in AD 212, others disagree with this, claiming that the majority did not gain citizenship until that same law, citing the frequency of the name Aurelius in the inscriptive evidence. For more on this, see S. Follet, *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle: études chronologiques et prosopographiques* (Paris 1976) 63-105.
emperor or a general. Yet possessing citizenship did not necessarily make one ‘Roman’ in a cultural sense, nor did one have to actually be a citizen in order to take on an air of Romanness. Roman-like qualities were most often cultural, as discussed above; adoption of or participation in Roman cults, use of the Latin language, displaying one’s Roman name – all of these could be seen as attempts to appear culturally Roman, presumably with the hope of gaining more respect or power, whether locally or in the eyes of the imperial provincial administrators. Modern scholars have proposed various reasons why provincials would want to appear more Roman. MacMullen admitted that Roman civilization was not necessarily any better than local cultures, but it gained prestige purely because the Romans were the group in power. Levick, focusing on the use of Latin in inscriptions in Asia Minor, rejected this idea of propriety as the chief motivation for adopting Roman cultural traits, claiming that factors such as presence of Latin speakers, economic status, and general prevalence of epigraphy were more deciding factors in the frequency of Latin. And indeed, we see several cases where individuals do not opt to use Latin, even though we know they had the opportunity to do so. Take for example the Mithridates-Mazaeus Gate on the southern end of the Ephesian Agora. The two erectors were freedmen of Marcus Agrippa, and then inherited by Augustus after Agrippa’s death. Yet they do not mention their citizenship, nor do they give their Roman names. So here is a monument, set up by very wealthy and influential freedmen, and

---

113 As the quote from MacMullen above (p. 47) asserts, Romans must have had a natural feeling of superiority over the local provincials.
114 MacMullen, “Notes on Romanization” 174-5. MacMullen also suggests that Romanizing allowed provincials to be more respected by resident Romans – a practice that Tacitus called the *honoris aemulatio* (*Agr.* 21.1). For this reason, MacMullen explains, Britons adopted Latin and the toga. It is difficult to believe this was a major factor in the East, however, where Greek culture already had a prestige status within Roman culture.
115 Levick, “The Latin Inscriptions” 401.
116 *IK* 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151. For further discussion of this inscription, see Chapter 4.
rather than displaying their Roman pedigree in every way possible, they play it down, so that at first glance, the inscription simply seems like an honorific dedication to the emperor and his chief general by some local Greeks.\textsuperscript{117}

This example, along with many others, shows that it was certainly possible to identify as both Greek and Roman, or Ephesian and Roman, because each of these identifying categories encompassed different aspects of life. One did not have to be pro-Roman in all respects in order to support Rome; these identities did not have to be mutually exclusive. Swain argues that the Greek intellectuals covered in his monograph did not put their Roman identity before their Greek one,\textsuperscript{118} and it is the intention of this study to see how the data from inscriptive evidence confirms or contradicts with such claims.

\textit{Latin & Identity}

As the sociolinguistic models and the writings of Pierre Bourdieu that were discussed in the earlier part of this chapter imply, the presence of Latin in Anatolia can provide strong evidence on how Anatolian residents used language to display publicly particular aspects of their identity. In general, the study of literacy or language fluency in the ancient world is made difficult by the lack of ancient sources that deal explicitly with spoken language, but inscriptions and papyri can help fill in to a degree some of these gaps.\textsuperscript{119} While studies on the arrival and influence of Latin in Anatolia are slowly

\textsuperscript{117} For more on this inscription, see Ch. 5 on bilingualism below.
\textsuperscript{118} Hellenism 71-88. Swain also views Arrian, who ascended far in the Roman administration, as the perfect integration of the two identities - politically Roman and culturally Greek (pp. 242-8).
\textsuperscript{119} Adams, Bilingualism 40-67 and passim; W. V. Harris, Ancient Literacy (Cambridge, MA 1989) 10-1, who also discusses (5-8) the difficulty in grappling with the various defitions of "literacy" in the ancient world, which could range from basic functional literacy, wherein an individual could read and
developing, several works address the same topic for the western provinces of the Roman empire. Using primarily epigraphic remains to trace the spread of Latin and Roman culture, works such as Woolf’s *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (1998) and Cooley’s edited volume *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West* (2002) have set the standard in studies of language and provincial identity. As Roman control extended in the west in the last two centuries of the Republic, and as provincials desired increasingly to participate in the imperial sphere, Roman culture was quickly adopted. The readiness to adopt Rome’s ways in the west was largely due to the lack of any other unifying culture, since the west was characterized by tribal cultures without any major urban centers or significant political administration. Rome gave Gauls and Spaniards a way to organize and govern themselves, and many towns and cities modeled their civic governments after Rome’s. Though adoption of Latin was never compulsory, the adoption of Roman-style law led to the importation and widespread adoption of other Roman cultural traits, including Latin. This was especially the case among the provincial elites who sought to gain Roman favor and local power. These families gained Roman citizenship, and by extension the opportunity to climb the imperial administrative ladder, though service as *decuriones* in their local towns. Schools were set up to educate the children of the elite in Latin literature and rhetoric, and to ingrain in the students Roman conceptions of glory, honor, and hard work. Indeed, not all people who learned Latin would have necessarily gained imperial employment, or even possessed the citizenship, but the dominance of Latin in the written record shows

---

write enough to communicate and to keep records, to scholarly literacy, which was possessed by those who were learned in literature, poetry, history, rhetoric, and so forth.

120 Woolf, *Becoming Roman* 72-3; see also Tac. *Agr.* 21. MacMullen ("Notes on Romanization" 170-1) discusses how cultural influences rarely influence everyday objects and, by extension, the lives and homes of the poor. Rather, such influences are typically stronger among leading members of society.
that even the provincial non-elites saw some benefit in adopting the language.\textsuperscript{121} Latin continued to spread even past the initial generations of immigrants, so much so that by Augustus’ time, the region had attained the “critical mass of Latin-speakers” required to make it a language of the people,\textsuperscript{122} and many groups had essentially forgotten their traditional languages.\textsuperscript{123} It quickly became an item with cultural capital that provided to anybody who knew the language opportunities for advancement.\textsuperscript{124}

As Latin spread in the West, so did the Roman practice of epigraphy, arriving in Spain more or less concurrently to the flourishing of the practice in Italy (though to a lesser degree). Just as elsewhere in the empire, the large output of inscriptions began first in the major urban centers and Roman colonies where there were larger numbers of Italian-born residents, and with the assistance of the law and the military spread quickly elsewhere.\textsuperscript{125} Despite the persistence of several local spoken languages, the inscriptions were most often in Latin – an occurrence that Woolf attributes to the fact that inscriptions were a characteristically Roman tradition, and therefore were typically set up in the Roman fashion (i.e. in Latin), even if erected by provincials.\textsuperscript{126} This argument, however, cannot be applied in the eastern provinces, where epigraphic practices pre-dated Roman occupation and Greek had already established itself as an acceptable epigraphic language.

\textsuperscript{121} “In general the adoption of a new language and the disappearance of another reflects people’s perception that this will somehow work to their advantage:” A. Cooley (ed.), introduction to \textit{Becoming Roman, Writing Latin?}; 9; c.f. R. Wardhaugh, \textit{Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity and Decline} (Oxford 1987), 17. The example of colonial India comes to mind, where learning English was not mandated, but was certainly advantageous for anyone wishing to advance socially or in the government.
\textsuperscript{122} MacMullen, \textit{Romanization} 82-4 (quote on 84). On the generational loss of Latin among the immigrant populations in the East, see discussion on colonies in Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{123} Str. 3.2.15.
\textsuperscript{124} See for example the altar of the Aurelii at Aquae Flaviae: M. Kulikowski, \textit{Late Roman Spain and Its Cities} (Baltimore 2004), 30.
\textsuperscript{125} Kulikowski (\textit{Late Roman Spain} 28-9) discusses these small Spanish towns with epigraphic records that provide us with details of small-town life that the written sources lack.
\textsuperscript{126} Woolf, \textit{Becoming Roman} 93-6.
It is not clear whether the adoption of Latin in the provinces was actively (though unofficially) imposed by the Romans, or if the process was more passive, meaning that Latin would have just naturally disseminated throughout the culture without any actual effort to make it do so. In truth, the methods and motivations for Latin acquisition probably varied vastly from person to person. Regardless, the exact levels of Latin knowledge among the Greeks in Anatolia are not well understood by modern scholars, probably due in part to the elite intellectual bias of the written evidence, which maintained the use of Greek quite stalwartly. The geographer Strabo, who was from Amasia in Pontus, must have had at least a basic knowledge of Latin after spending much time in Rome during his travels in the second half of the first century BC, yet he gives little to no sign of this in his extensive geographic work. He hardly ever cites any Latin authors as sources, and he is rather frank in his belief in the superiority of the Greeks over all barbarians. The writers of the Second Sophistic were similarly hesitant to use Latin, despite the fact that they most certainly knew the language. But why would Greeks have any motivation to learn Latin when even Italian immigrants who moved to the east and settled in colonies tended to lose their Latin within the next generation or two?

127 MacMullen (Romanization 12-13) tells two anecdotes about prominent Greeks – one a judge (Suet. Claud. 16.2) the other a Lycian envoy (Cassius Dio 60.17.4) – who were stripped of their positions (and in the case of the envoy, his citizenship) by the Emperor Claudius for being unable to speak Latin. It is unknown, however, how common this was outside Claudius’ reign. Valerius Maximus (2.2.2) also tells of the governor of Galatia, S. Sotidius Strabo Libuscidianus, who refused to speak Greek when touring his province, in an effort to maintain the elite status of Latin, and there were even some governors in the Greek-speaking provinces who supposedly did not know Greek at all (cf. Phil. Vit. Ap. 5.36).

128 Dueck, Strabo 88-95.

129 Swain, Hellenism 12-13. Compare this to a similar bilingual situation in Roman Sicily, as discussed by Korhonen, where Latin persisted in the Roman colonies and, in some areas, caused a decline in Greek; there does not seem to have been the strong resistance to Latin that we see in the Greek East: K. Korhonen, “Language and Identity in the Roman Colonies of Sicily,” in R. J. Sweetman (ed.), Roman Colonies in the First Century of their Foundation (Oxford 2011), esp. 18-21; cf. K. Lomas, “The Polis in Italy,” in R. Brock and S. Hodkinson (eds.), Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece (Oxford 2000), 167-85, and “Between Greece and Italy,” in C. Smith
The same went for veteran colonies, even though most soldiers would have had at least a rudimentary knowledge of Latin, and many would have originally come from the Latin-speaking West.  

These examples help show that Latin really did not have any practical application in the culture of the East, even for native Latin speakers, unless one hoped to hold a place in the imperial administration. Despite that fact, Latin does appear throughout Anatolia in various contexts, including the (re)naming of places, voting tribes, and cities, as well as in captions and abbreviations on civic coinage and in many inscriptions. While these all certainly attest to the influence of Roman culture on the local traditions, the place names and coins vary from the inscriptions in one key way: they reflect a Romanizing effect on a civic level, not a personal level. Unlike the private inscriptions, which were set up by individuals hoping to represent themselves, place names and coinage reflect a broader, civic representation with an underlying political current. The appearance of Latin in these official matters suggests that cities may have found it beneficial to incorporate Latin into their public image to show their allegiance to Rome and gain more favor than their neighboring cities. What it does not suggest is any acceptance of Latin within the private sphere. The personal inscriptions, on the other hand, do. These texts, which were set up by people of various social classes, are ideal


130 MacMullen, *Romanization* 13 and n. 34 for further discussion; Latin similarly vanished elsewhere in the East; only in Beirut and southern Macedonia did it really seem to survive.


133 Levick, *Roman Colonies* 131.
examples of Romanization, as they reveal members of the local population identifying with the ruling Roman culture through the use of language.\textsuperscript{134}

\textit{Inscriptions & Identity}

As the preceding sections show, Greeks were relatively steadfast and protective of their culture – especially their language. Latin on the other hand symbolized Romanness,\textsuperscript{135} and so the appearance of Latin in the inscriptions of Anatolia is quite curious. If language is one of the most signifying aspects of identity, then the initial impression of these inscriptions is that the use of Latin allowed Anatolians to appear Roman in a cultural sense, not just a political one. Through an in-depth analysis of precisely who was using Latin in their inscriptions, and in what context, we can gain a better understanding of how residents of Anatolia were identifying culturally, and if that identity depended on the context of or motivation for the inscription.

Inscriptions are optimal evidence for these types of issues, and thus are the focus of this study. This is in part because the surviving literary sources, as products of elite culture, rarely reveal much about everyday people, especially those living in the provinces. Also, many Greek authors during the empire had an anti-Roman tone, though it is possible that such sentiments were more rhetorical, and had little presence in the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{134} Woolf ("Monumental" 30) compares these private and personal inscriptions to larger scale, public monuments, such as Stonehenge or the Pyramids. Whereas the former can say a lot about the erector and the individual commemorated, such larger public inscriptions (which could also include any monuments set up by Roman emperors) lack any sign of how individuals related to their culture(s).}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{135} Levick, \textit{Roman Colonies} 398. In colonies such as Cremna, which had been settled by Romans, Latin remained the official language of the city, but often this was true for public inscriptions and coinage only; Greek quickly became the language of everyday communication: S. Mitchell, \textit{Cremna in Pisidia: An Ancient City in Peace and in War} (London 1995), 4.}
actual daily life of Romans or provincials. That is not to say that written sources completely fail to reflect society and the role of language in society. Some genres – namely novels and satires – did attempt to represent everyday life and dialogue. Petronius’ *Satyricon*, for example, which portrays a dinner party among several wealthy freedmen, reveals through its satirical dialogue and speeches much about the characters and their place in society, though these caricatures are clearly exaggerated for comedic effect. Yet even with these glances into the daily life of Rome and the provinces, there is little evidence for how the non-elites and non-intellectuals viewed the clash between Latin and Greek, if they even viewed it as a clash at all. The ancient literature does not make clear to what degree the views of the Second Sophistic trickled down to the general population. This is where the utility of inscriptions becomes apparent, because they are at least slightly more representative of the whole population. Granted, there would still be those who could not afford tombstones (or any other types of inscriptions), and thus remain silent in the epigraphic record, but inscriptions do represent a much wider demographic than the ancient literature. By recognizing this, we can focus on inscriptions to give a better understanding of how non-elite Greek attitudes toward Hellenicity and Romanization compare to the attitudes of the upper classes. Indeed, it cannot be argued

---

136 Swain (*Hellenism* 12) rejects the idea that all of the literary evidence just boils down to rhetoric, for if this is the case, he claims, using them for any sort of historical research is futile. While his point is well intended, Swain overlooks the fact that rhetoric need not have any reflection of actual situations in order to inform us about ancient attitudes. In other words, as the Greek literature of the Second Sophistic staunchly preserves Greek in its (pseudo-)classical form, this does not necessarily indicate that everyday life also exhibited a staunch resistance to Roman influence on the culture or the language.


139 G. Woolf (“Monumental” 26) asserts that there was little symbolic difference between a funerary inscription and any other kind of inscription.
that inscriptions evidence reflects cultural realities completely accurately either. The permanent and public nature of inscriptions meant that they were intended to idealize the legacy of the commemorated individual, not to represent him as he actually was. This is no different than the use of epigraphy today. Rarely do we find tombstones or honorific plaques acknowledging one’s flaws as well as one successes. Because we know that such exaggeration and idealization is likely to occur in inscriptions, by no means can we assume that the use of Latin in an inscription mean that the erector or honoree actually spoke the language, let alone was literate in it. At the same time, inscriptions are a very conscious representation of an individual for all of those who might pass by the monument, whether a tombstone, a building, or a statue base. This is not a collective identity, nor one imposed by society; this is how a particular individual, or those commemorating him, wished to be remembered. It is the social persona. These were public monuments, meant to be seen by anyone who would pass by, and therefore they memorialized in aeterum the individuals in their best possible light – they were the legacies of their honorees. Therefore, the way in which an individual represented himself in an inscription, or was represented by those honoring him, was very deliberate. It was a constructed, public identity, reflecting the way in which these private individuals wished to be perceived by others.

The question of audience is essential here, because monumentalization in any culture is as much about commemorating a person or event as it is about communicating

---

140 Woolf, “Monumental” 32: “On the one hand, Romans struggled to surpass others and differentiate themselves from their peers and rivals, yet they were also acutely aware of the dangers that in doing so they might transgress the norms of what was appropriate to their social or cultural identity. Epigraphy, with its highly formulaic presentation of social personae standardized yet at the same time individualized, offered a partial remedy to the problem of how to surpass and conform at the same time.”
that to a particular audience. Horace (*Odes* 3.30.1-9) shows that Romans viewed monumentalization as a way to make more permanent one’s memory after death and, by extension, grant a sort of eternal existence. MacMullen and Woolf have both addressed this issue in their works on epigraphy and the epigraphic habit. Monuments of course could fulfill their function with or without the use of language, since other visual symbols were frequently included in these memorials as well, but language is still important for those monuments that do include texts. Just like pictorial symbols, language had a symbolic function that need not even necessarily be understood by the audience, and Adams has shown that audience seems to have been a significant consideration for soldiers’ dedications at pilgrimage sites. Many residents of Anatolia may not have been able to read Latin, but would probably be able to recognize that a particular inscription was in Latin. In fact, it could be argued that Latin was most symbolic to those who could not read it, since in such situations it carried a purely symbolic meaning, established a sense of inclusion or exclusion for the viewer, depending on his or her ability to read the language. Indeed, for those who could not read the Latin, it is not a stretch to think that they may have felt like they were left out, that there was something that they did not know, with the natural effect of making them feel inferior.

In the ancient world, self-representation was everything, as it established an individual’s place in the very hierarchical world of Roman society and administration. Status within that social structure was of utmost importance to Romans and those in the provinces interested in participating in the Roman system. Tombstones, memorials, and

---

142 Adams, “Romanitas” 200-1, where he argues that soldiers were much more likely to use Latin in their dedications if the pilgrimage site was well known to be frequented by powerful Romans.
other private inscriptions were ideal ways for an individual to represent this status to the larger world. Because of their preoccupation with social status and the tendency for individuals to emphasize only the information they considered most advantageous in their communities, certain aspects of their background may be unclear. For example, a freedman may choose to name his patron, or instead choose simply to state his newly acquired Roman name without explicitly revealing from whom he gained his citizenship, or whether he was freed or freeborn. Based on his Roman name, others would be able to assume from whom his citizenship had originated. Recognizing these inclusions and omissions can inform us on exactly what aspects of one’s identity were and were not being emphasized. Bilingual inscriptions, which will be discussed in Chapter 5, are particularly helpful here as well, for often there is information given in one language that is left out in the other, indicating perhaps that particular parts of that individual’s identity were of more interest to one group or the other. Many of the people who were erecting Latin in the East are likely to have had Greek as their primary language, or at least had a moderate competency in it for the sake of business. In these cases it seems that their use of Latin in their inscriptions may reflect a desire to gain some sort of prestige. Other individuals in the inscriptions were of western origins and had moved east for business or land, or as soldiers in the legions or auxiliaries. The use of Latin among these groups is not surprising, as it was probably their primary tongue, although as stated above, Latin among these groups tended to give way to Greek within a generation or two. These individuals may have also been at least somewhat competent in spoken Greek, and possibly even literate, depending on how long they had been in the East, and how much

144 Prosopographical studies and reference volumes are very helpful in this process, as they help fill in these blanks for some individuals by comparing the inscriptions in question with other inscriptional or textual attestations of those same individuals.
they had endeavored to learn. In either case, individuals who only knew Latin or Greek could have also hired a translator to compose their inscription in the other language if he felt the need. What the general epigraphic evidence suggests, however, is that even in cases where the erector was very familiar with Latin, the use of the imperial language was not automatic, but rather more calculated. Romans in the east more often than not chose to erect their inscriptions in Greek, which as the primary language of business and communication made the inscription legible to a much larger group of people.\textsuperscript{145} Not even prominent provincials who had gained high status in the Roman administration necessarily used Latin. Take for example Herodes Atticus, a prominent Athenian who was born into a senatorial family and rose high in the ranks of the Roman administration as a prefect of Asia and the tutor of two emperors, who did not set up inscriptions in Latin in Greece or Asia.\textsuperscript{146}

There are some important cautions, however, to using inscriptional evidence for a study on identity. First, with every individual inscription, one must consider who was responsible for the language choice, and who benefitted from it. Some people erected stones for themselves (\textit{sua pecunia fecit} or \textit{sibi fecit}), others were honored by friends, family members, clients, or colleagues. However, the stones do not always specify who set up the stone, especially in epitaphs where, like many modern tombstones, the

\textsuperscript{145} Such deference to local custom has parallels in southern Italy, where despite the fact that a large percentage of the population there was Greek, Latin dominates current epigraphic finds: K. Lomas, \textit{Rome and the Western Greeks, 250 BC-AD 200} (London 1993), 27-28.

\textsuperscript{146} Swain, \textit{Hellenism} 80. See also R. R. R. Smith’s discussion of the monuments of prominent provincials, including Herodes Atticus’ fountain in Olympia, the Library of Celsus in Ephesus, and the tomb of Philopappus in Athens, which he sees as physical representations of the overlapping Roman and Greek identities of these men: “Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century AD.” \textit{JRS} 88 (1998), 56-93. Bowersock, \textit{Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire} 27-8. Herodes’ benefactions can be found in Philostratus \textit{Vitae Sophistarum} 549-51; See also P. Graindor, \textit{Un Milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille} (Caire 1930) 179-230, on his buildings.
deceased is named without any indication of who wrote the epitaph or paid for the stone. Occasionally when the erector is named, it is tricky to decipher whether the language choice is supposed to benefit the erector, the honoree, or both. But in most cases, we can assume that the language choice, along with the other symbols contained on the stone, was meant to honor any individuals explicitly named on the stone, as well as their families. In cases where the honoree and the erector are one and the same, we see an instance of self-representation. When friends or family members set up honors for a loved one, certainly they would have expected to capitalize on any social benefit that the commemoration bestowed upon the recipient. Occasionally the intent of the inscription is quite clear, as seen in the Ephesian inscription of Iunius Maximus\textsuperscript{147}, wherein the Roman senator honoree is commemorated in Latin, while the dedicator, a locally prominent man, is named in Greek. But this inscription is more of the exception than the rule.\textsuperscript{148} Rarely is it the case that the linguistic difference between honoree and erector is so clearly defined. In most instances where the dedicator is named, there is no language variation, and internal evidence on the stone does not necessarily give a compelling argument to help clarify this question. For this reason, most inscriptions must be considered on a case-by-case basis since motivations for language choice will be easier or harder to decipher depending on the particular circumstances.

The second caution regarding the use of inscriptions for a study on identity is to remember that while inscriptions can inform us well on topics of identity and language, they are not evidence for literacy in the Roman world. Anybody who could afford it was

\textsuperscript{147} IK 13, no. 811 = 59, no. 128
\textsuperscript{148} Loose assumptions can also be made for inscriptions in which a subordinate (slave, freedman, etc.) dedicates to his superior, for presumably they are attempting to glorify the honoree in every way possible. However, that is not to say that the use of Latin would not provide a benefit for the low-class dedicator as well.
able to purchase an inscription. One did not have to be literate or write down the text to
give to the stonemason (lapicida) – the cutter could just take the customer’s dictation, or
write the text down himself. Further, if somebody, a soldier say, really wanted his
tombstone inscribed in Latin, but did not know the language well enough himself, he
could always hire somebody else, whether it be the stonemason or a third party, to
translate it for him. We do know from epigraphic evidence that some lapicidae were able
to inscribe in either Latin or Greek, though that does not necessarily mean that they were
able to translate the texts as well.

Finally, while matters of grammar, syntax, spelling and so forth are not of primary
interest in this study, they will arise from time to time. Such errors can sometimes
indicate a dialect or an incomplete literacy, yet again it is impossible to know whether
these errors originate with the lapicida, the translator (if there was one) or the customer
who gave him the text. As such, these errors will not be used to indicate either
person’s level of literacy or fluency in Latin or Greek. Regardless, in most cases the use

---

149 There is evidence that the texts were often written down in advance, however, as is seen in a
papyrus from Oxyrhynchus which contains a dedication to the emperors Diocletian and Maximian.
Based on the formulaic text, it is most likely a draft for the stonemason to work from: see G. M.
Browne et al., The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. 41 (London 1972), no. 2950, with pl. 3. See L. Keppie,
Understanding Roman Inscriptions (Baltimore 1991) 142, ch. 2 n. 2 for an alternate interpretation.
For other articles on the link between epigraphy and literacy, see W. V. Harris, Ancient Literacy

150 CIL X 7296 = ILS 7680; IG XIV 297: Στήλαι | ἐνθάδε | τυποῦνται καὶ | χαράσσονται | γαοῦς ιεροῖς |
σῶν ἕνεργείας | δημοσίαις || Tituli | heic | ordinantur et | sculptur | adibus | sacres | cum operum | publicorum. The most comprehensive introduction to the actual process of inscribing stones is G. C.
Susini, The Roman Stonecutter: An Introduction to Latin Epigraphy (Oxford 1973); see also Keppie,

151 See for example IK 17 no. 3862 = 59, no. 88, in which the phrasing and lack of abbreviations shows
unfamiliarity with Latin and epigraphic conventions. For discussions of borrowings and loan words
between Latin and Greek in Roman Anatolia, see Kearsley, IK 59, p. 151. These matters, as well as
grammatical and syntactical code-switching and language interference, are frequently discussed in
commentaries of the inscriptions, especially in volumes published in more recent decades. See also
Adams, Bilingualism, esp. Chapters 3 and 4 (pp. 297-527).
of Latin, even if imperfect, only emphasizes the symbolic benefit that the language afforded, as even some who could not claim full, or even partial, fluency still wanted to use Latin as a means to communicate their public identity to others. Beyond causing general grammatical and syntactical errors, incomplete fluency may also help explain bilingual inscriptions such as the epitaph of Nestor and Maximus\textsuperscript{152}, in which the only Latin is the name of the legion in which they served, while the rest of the text remains in Greek.

\textit{Conclusions}

Part of the purpose of this study is to establish the role that Latin – and by extension, Greek – played within Roman Anatolia. Modern sociolinguists gives us a framework through which we can understand how different languages interact with each other and reveal social attitudes, but both Latin and Greek carried prestige, so the exact relationship between them in Roman Anatolia is actually much more complex. While these sociolinguistic models are useful as an analytical tool and for understanding the role of language in identity expression, they are insufficient on their own for understanding this network of languages and how it related to Anatolian identity.

As the following chapters will show, Latin did not have the monopoly on the lives of individuals who may have been native Latin speakers. While some inscriptions certainly indicate that the use of Latin in an inscription could possibly give the erector or honoree a level of social clout, there were many instances where Greek was the preferred language, and as seen in the inscription of Iunius Maximus above, sometimes the separation between the two languages could reveal much more about the cultural attitudes

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{RECAM} IV 90. This inscription will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3.
of easterners. Further, different population groups used the languages differently. As we shall see, Latin was most commonly used by those whose social positions were more mobile, and who had worked hard to gain a place in Roman society. We see this especially among soldiers and freedmen, both of whom had Rome to thank for their improved social status, thereby using Latin to advertise this new-found status and prestige. However, it is important to qualify such statements by saying that even within these groups for whom the use of Latin had the greatest social benefit, Greek was in no way rejected. In fact, as we shall see, Greek continues to be the language of choice for a large number of provincials who we would expect to opt for the more advantageous Latin.
CHAPTER 2: The Inscriptions

The primary focus of this study is the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia.\(^{153}\) Nowhere before has anyone attempted to gather together the Latin inscriptions of these eastern provinces. Instead, most epigraphic corpora dealing with Anatolia contain inscriptions from only particular cities or regions, and the Greek inscriptions by far outnumber their Latin counterparts. The lack of focus on these Latin inscriptions, then, means that language use is considered only in the context of other epigraphic inquiries rather than as its own topic of study,\(^{154}\) and it is difficult to know beyond general observation how Latin is being used, by whom, in what places, and during what times or situations. By looking at the Latin epigraphic corpus from Anatolia, I explore the precise role of the language in the Anatolian peninsula, as well as how the socio-cultural usefulness of Latin varied by region and time. I also examine the people associated with the Latin inscriptions since the use of the Roman language would have affected the reputations of both the honoree and the dedicator. This chapter, looking at the overall data instead of particular subsets (as we will have in Chapters 3 and 4), shows that the conditions under which Latin was used were complex, and that the pattern of Latin, while mostly consistent with MacMullen’s ‘epigraphic habit’ model, has some very surprising and important divergences.

\(^{153}\) I am utilizing only published inscriptions, gathered from a number of major corpora, including the CIL, TAM, IK, AE, and RECAM, as well as several smaller works. While I make no claim that I have included every single Latin inscription ever found in Anatolia, the corpus is extensive and thorough, incorporating over 1100 Latin inscriptions, and serves sufficiently as a representative sample of our current epigraphic knowledge of Roman Asia Minor.

\(^{154}\) For example, various important works on Roman freedmen, including Duff’s Freedmen and P. R. C. Weaver’s Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor’s Freedmen and Slaves (Cambridge 1972), frequently make reference to the epitaphs, which are essential for the study of this social group. Yet language is often only a supplementary consideration, and never the primary focus of these studies.
Selection of Inscriptions

In total, this project has gathered 1116 Latin inscriptions from the various regions of Anatolia, from the Aegean coast as far east as Pontus, Cappadocia, and Cilicia. I have made an effort to collect as many inscriptions as possible that date up to the reign of Constantine the Great, who I have established as a terminus ante quem since the nature of the Roman empire and the role of the provinces shifts especially from his reign onward. I have classified the inscriptions in two ways, based on the usefulness of the inscription for determining issues of language and identity. This division is indicated by referring to them as the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ Latin inscriptions. The public inscriptions as defined here include those texts that were written for some public purpose, whether as legal documents (edicts, testaments, treaties) or as an expression of Roman rule in the provinces (for example, milestones and boundary stones for imperial estates, or building projects sponsored by the emperor). There are 312 inscriptions that fall into the ‘public’ category. While these inscriptions can be telling with regards to how Roman emperors used Latin and Greek as expressions of power, they tell us little of how the residents of Anatolia used language to negotiate their own position within society. That is why the private inscriptions are so valuable. This group of inscriptions, numbering at 804, including funerary texts, honorific texts, religious dedications, dedications to the Roman emperor, and a handful of inscribed instrumenta, reflects how language was used by private individuals or groups to present their public identity, as defined in Chapter 1. It is worth reiterating here that the inscriptions themselves are not private (with perhaps the exception of those on instrumenta). Even funerary inscriptions, which some have
classified as ‘private’ because of their intimate connection to familial ties, still serve quite a public function, preserving the memory of the deceased for those coming after.

**Types of Inscriptions**

I have divided the private inscriptions into five major categories: funerary, honorific, religious, imperial, religious and imperial, and other (which includes the *instrumenta*) (see Fig. 2.1). While each of these categories is unique and has its own set of conventions, they all represent a conscious choice by the commemorator or dedicator to choose Latin as the language in which they left their legacy to posterity.

![Figure 2.1: Number of Private Inscriptions, by Type. Total number of Private Inscriptions = 804. Funerary inscriptions make up the largest percentage of the private inscriptions by far – over fifty percent.](image)

---

155 There is a total of 415 funerary texts, 129 of which are bilingual.
dominate epigraphy not only in Anatolia, but throughout the whole Roman empire.\textsuperscript{156}

This type of text is frequently identifiable by the information given, whether it just be a simple stone giving the name and patronymic of the deceased,\textsuperscript{157} or can include various other types of information, including the name of the individual who set up the stone or monument (usually a family member or an heir, though sometimes a slave, freedman, or friend\textsuperscript{158}), the age at which the deceased passed away, and even the career path of the deceased, where such existed. Funerary inscriptions are also easily identified by the epigraphic abbreviations or formulae often employed in them, including \textit{dis manibus} (‘to the divine shades,’ often abbreviated as \textit{DM}), \textit{memoriae causa} (‘for the sake of his/her memory,’ often abbreviated as \textit{MC}), and several others.

The significance of language and self-representation in funerary epitaphs expands far beyond simple Roman and provincial epigraphic practice. Anthropologists have often viewed burial practices as “a medium for the competitive expression of status and status aspirations,”\textsuperscript{159} and Meyer’s analysis of tombstones has argued that in the provinces the naming of one’s heirs on a tombstone – a practice that is thoroughly Roman - is evidence that provincials desired to appear Roman on tombstones by using this Roman practice,

\textsuperscript{156} R. Saller and B. Shaw estimated that epitaphs make up between 170,000 and 190,000 of the extant inscriptions (which number around approximately 250,000): see “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves,” \textit{JRS} 74 (1984), 124-56.
\textsuperscript{157} In standard Latin funerary texts, the honored deceased is named in the dative case, or occasionally in the genitive, with the dedicator (if included) in the nominative. However, Greek epigraphic conventions often creep into the Latin inscriptions in the East, so that we occasionally see the deceased named in the nominative. See J. E. Sandys, \textit{Latin Epigraphy I: An Intro to Latin Inscriptions}. 2nd ed. (Chicago 1927) 60-3; Adams, \textit{Bilingualism} 36-9. Epitaphs with simply the name of the deceased and his or her patronymic without any mention of the person responsible for setting up the stone is typical of the Greek epitaph. Because this study focuses on the Latin inscriptions, rarely do we see these more austere epitaphs, though they are not unheard of. See for example \textit{CIL} III.277 from Ancyra; \textit{IK} 23, no. 478 = 59, no. 42 from Smyrna.
\textsuperscript{158} The relationship between those commemorated in tombstones and those who erected the stones is addressed in several epigraphic studies, including Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones,” and E. Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit.”
\textsuperscript{159} A. Cannon, “The Historical Dimension in Mortuary Expressions of Status and Sentiment,” \textit{Current Anthropology} 30 (1989), 437.
even if the individuals did not actually have any claim to Roman citizenship or culture. Further, she sees provincial epitaphs as moving beyond a simple dichotomy of ‘elite’ and ‘non-elite,’ but also taking into consideration the important factor of one’s Roman status. The preponderance of funerary inscriptions in Anatolia suggests that funerary texts were a way in which to assert one’s position within the society, yet the issue was more complex than ‘elite’ or ‘Roman’ versus ‘others.’ Indeed, many individuals who were erecting in Latin bore the *tria nomina*, and therefore presumably had Roman citizenship, but a large number of these had Greek *cognomina*, suggesting that they were not of Italian origin but rather of eastern stock. These individuals may well have been born with the citizenship, or may have been naturalized, but their retention of Greek naming practices – especially in the successive generations – shows that they did not immediately eschew their cultural and ethnic heritage for their Roman legal status.

Honorable inscriptions were quite similar to the funerary ones in form and function. Both typically named the commemorated individual as well as the agent of the commemoration, with little syntactical difference between the two types, though honorifics are often easily distinguished by phrases such as *honoris causa* (‘for the sake of his/her honor,’ often abbreviated *HC*), *bona fortuna* (‘good fortune,’ abbreviated as *BF*), or *decreto decurionum* (‘by the decree of the decurions,’ abbreviated as *DD*). In

---

160 Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 78-9, 83.
161 For more on the naming practices of Greek Romans, see W. M. Ramsay, *The Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor* (Amsterdam 1967), 6-11.
162 Like epitaphs, honorific inscriptions often name the honoree in the dative and the commemorator in the nominative, though sometimes the honoree can be named in the accusative or the nominative instead. Because of the similarities between honorifics and epitaphs, distinguishing between the two categories of stones can be a difficult task, especially in cases where the stone is broken and any abbreviations or epigraphic formulae that may indicate the stone’s function are missing. See for example the inscription of Asprena, the gymasiarch, from Pisidian Antioch (67, no. 211: L. He--- [As-|prena | gymnas[archae] | [---] ord[inis]], in which the use of the nominative, and the fragmentary nature otherwise, makes it difficult to say for sure that this is an honorific rather than a funerary text.
terms of function, honorific inscriptions (like epitaphs) regularly provide details about the
commemorated individual’s life and career, with an aim to publicize his memory and
accomplishments. In some cases, larger-scale funerary monuments can serve just as much
of an honorific role as they do a funerary role, and have been categorized as such. In
general, though, honorific inscriptions are mostly characterized by their more
comprehensive account of the honoree’s positions held, honors won or earned as a result
of service to the city, achievements in the military, and so forth. Honorific inscriptions
can be set up by a wide variety of agents, from members of the commemorated person’s
family, to colleagues or even whole communities.

The Latin honorific inscriptions contained in this study are quite varied. Some
honor individuals of local importance, but more often than not they honor Romans who
have served their city. Many of these individuals were Roman freedmen who had settled
in the East or were there as procurators in the imperial service. For the purposes of this
study, my classification of ‘honorific’ includes not only the standard honorific statue
bases, altars, and stelae, but also building inscriptions. Of course, this latter category is of
a slightly different nature than the others, especially since building inscriptions often
honor the person paying for the construction or reconstruction himself, whereas typical

In addition to this inscription, there are a few others also included in this study that do not clearly
belong to one typological category or the other, often because only the names of the honoree and the
commemorator survive. In these situations, I have simply added these inscriptions to the
‘unknown/other’ category.

See for example, the inscription of C. Stertinius Orpex of Ephesus (IK 17, no. 4123 = 59, no. 24),
which clearly functioned as a tombstone for not only himself, but also members of his family.
However, the Greek portion of this fragmentary marble slab devotes much space to detailing the
generous donations that Orpex and his daughter dedicated to the cit of Ephesus. Because of this
obvious attempt to honor himself and his family, I have classified this inscription as an honorific
rather than funerary text.

E.g. the honorific inscription of Lucius Marius (IK 59, no. 37 = 2, no. 43) in Erythrai, who was
honored not only by the βουλή and the δήμος, but also by the Romans of the city, and the γερουσία of
various surrounding cities.
honorific inscriptions have one party honoring another. However, in both cases the individual named – whether by himself or by another – is intended to be acknowledged, and indeed praised, for his donation to the city and the people. Whether that public display of one’s munificence was due to one’s own boastful claims on his building or due to a public degree from the βουλή, in both cases the honoree as represented in the text will be idealized, and the language choice will be consciously constructed.

The other two major categories of inscriptions – religious and imperial dedications – are slightly different in intent from the funerary and honorific texts because they are directed toward not a general audience, but instead toward a very particular deity or emperor, and in some cases to both. Nevertheless, the identity presented is still a public one, as the erectors are conscious of how not only the named god or emperor will receive the text, but also how his or her fellow citizens will interpret it. So even in these inscriptions, which are frequently labeled as “private” due to their role as a marker of human-divine interactions, we can still look for traces of Romanitas and hellenicity in the language usage.165

When examined together, the religious and imperial dedications suggest a level of language-specificity in the cult practices of Anatolia.166 Whereas there are a significant number of Latin dedications to Roman emperors (109), and only a few that are bilingual (15), there is a much smaller number of dedications to deities (16 in Latin; 11 bilinguals). It is true that religious dedications are typically a small percentage of any epigraphic record, but the extremely small number of religious dedications specifically with Latin

165 Kulikowski, *Late Roman Spain* 30.
166 This question is addressed by S. B. Matheson, who sees the bilingual Greek-Aramaic dedications to Zeus-Baalshamin at Dura as a confirmation of “the dual nature of the deities” as both Hellenistic and eastern deities; see “The Goddess Tyche,” in S. B. Matheson (ed.), *An Obsession with Fortune: Tyche in Greek and Roman Art* (New Haven 1994), 23.
(not even four percent) is quite striking. The deities that are most frequently honored (though still in very few inscriptions) in Latin are Jupiter, Fortuna/Tyche, and Diana/Artemis, all gods that have major significance in Roman religion. Jupiter, of course, was one of the patron deities of Rome and as Jupiter Optimus Maximus had a temple on the Capitolium, though neither the two bilinguals nor the two Latin inscriptions dedicated to this king of the gods came from Roman colonies, where one would most expect to find a temple to Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The three inscriptions to Tyche (all of which are bilingual), reflect the importance that Chance played in the lives of Hellenistic and Roman provincials, though as we see in the examples here, she could also be seen as an embodiment of the city’s genius or a noblewoman’s genius. Diana/Artemis was an important goddess in Anatolia, especially in the cities of Ephesus and Perge where there were major temples to her, and Romans would frequently travel to these religious sites and offer dedications. Yet despite this, there is not even one dedication to Artemis Ephesia in Latin, and only three to Artemis Pergaia, showing that even at these important cult centers, Romans were using Greek more than Latin for

---

167 Compare this, for example, the number of Latin inscriptions to Diana Pergaia to the number of Greek dedications, which is over thirty. Three are dedicated to the Capitoline deity, Jupiter Optimus Maximus (AE 1972, 636; IK 10, no. 1141, with the epithet Tutor; IK 19, no. 36). The fourth (Marek, Stadt, Ära und Territorium 185-6, Am. 111-2) is dedicated to Jupiter Sarsus, who is not otherwise attested in the ancient literary or epigraphic record. The epithet is puzzling and impossible to explain with any certainty. I have found no trace of any Anatolian deities or places with similar names, so Sarsus may not have been a local Anatolian deity, but rather one that the erector, a primipilaris named S. Vibius Gallus, brought from his homeland. The Vibii Gallii have origins in central Italy, it seems (see PIR1 V 376, 382, 383), possibly having some Etruscan blood in their line. This may offer a clue regarding “Sarsus,” since the root sar-/sa appears in Etruscan in a variety of forms: as a toponym (the Sarno Valley in Campania); as a numeral (sar, sa = 4; sometimes, maybe, 6) and various apparent derivatives: sarve, for example. Alternatively, “Sarsus” may be a toponym having ties to the Sars River in Hispania Tarraconensis or the Umbrian town of Sarsina (s.v. “Sars” and “Sarsina,” RE2a, 50-1). The Sars River is only mentioned once, in the first century geography of Pompeonius Mela (3.11). My thanks to Prof. Paul Harvey, Jr. for his assistance on this etymological matter.

168 IK 10.1, no. 1142 (a bilingual to Fortuna Regina/Τύχη Βασιλίσση); 54, no. 90 (to Genio Civitatis/Τύχη τῆς πόλεως); 59, no. 142 (to Juno Atratina/Τύχη Άτραττείνα), respectively.

169 IK 54, nos. 89, 134, and 239.
their dedications to the goddess. The remainder of the dedications are vowed to a hodgepodge of deities, including Apollo, Hercules, Mercury, and even one to the Thracian deity, Maron, as well as several inscriptions that do not name the deity in question. Over forty percent of these religious dedications are bilingual.

In terms of audience, the religious dedications aimed to gain favors from the deity in question, but that does not mean erectors were not also aware of their contemporaries as being a secondary audience, and these dedications were certainly a way to publicize one’s piety. Both of these considerations are likely to have been a factor when selecting which language was optimal for dedicating to a particular deity. As it turns out, the number of religious dedications using Latin, whether on its own or alongside Greek, is shockingly small. This presents a major challenge to the idea that Latin provided a concrete social benefit, for if that were the case, more people would be concerned with incorporating the imperial language into their dedications. Instead, it seems that Latin had a very limited relevance to Anatolian cultic practices. The cults were in Greek-speaking lands, and likely they deities were accustomed to being honored in Greek, so having Greek (or at least bilingual) dedications was clearly preferable. But the lack of even bilingual texts, which could supply Greek for honoring the deity and Latin for displaying social status, shows that the language’s connection to power was not important enough for it to have a place in religious life. Even Romans visiting the cities of the East opted for Greek in their dedications to the local deities.

171 CIL III suppl. 6976 (Apollo); 13, no. 860 (Hercules); IK 55, no. 134 and 57, no. 5 (Mercury); RECAM III 140 (Maron).
172 IK 9, no. 368; 12, no. 296 = 59, no. 141; 15, no. 1564 = 59, no. 140; 31, no. 11; 64, no. 125; 67, no. 209; LeBas & Waddington 746.
The apparent reasons for the limited use of Latin in religious dedications in Anatolia also explain the popularity of Latin in the imperial dedications. Whereas Greek was preferred for dedications to local deities, who presumably spoke Greek, Latin appears regularly in dedications to the emperor and other members of the imperial cult. In fact, the appropriateness of Latin is emphasized by the rare occurrence of a bilingual dedication among these inscriptions. Clearly, just as Latin was not appropriate for dedications to Anatolian/Greek deities, Greek was not appropriate for dedications addressed to the emperor, at least for those who had the means and resources to use Latin instead. Simon Price has argued that the imperial cult was a way to legitimize Roman rule in the East and to introduce Romano-centric cults worshipped in a more traditionally eastern way. The prevalence of Latin in these inscriptions confirms this argument, for not only is the imperial cult clearly focused on the Roman rulers, but it also encourages pious provincials to use the appropriate language to address the recipient was traditional in ancient cultic practice.  

In both the imperial and the religious dedications, if a worshipper did not know the language of the deity, the use of their own native tongue was certainly acceptable – something was better than nothing – but dedicating in the correct language ensured that the devotee used proper terminology and names in the dedication, thereby minimizing the risk of offending the deity, or the emperor.  

The imperial dedications are far more common in cities that had imperial temples (neokoroi), though this is not exclusive. Interestingly, although Latin was clearly the

174 We see this in many famous religious dedications, such as the golden tablets from Pyrgi in Etruria, which honors the Phoenician goddess Astarte in both Phoenicio-Punic and Etruscan. Thefarie Velianas, who was the king of Caere in Etruria, made sure to honor the goddess in both her native Semitic language, as well as in his own native Etruscan, ensuring that not only would the goddess understand his purpose, but so also would the people of Caere who were worshipping at their temple to her.
preferred language with which to address the emperor and other members of the imperial
cult, any references to the imperial temples in the city resorted back to Greek. The right
to built an imperial temple had to be granted to a city by the emperor himself, and the
title of neokoros was one cherished by the Greek cities. It was a way to exhibit a city’s
favor with the emperor, and to brag about this prestigious to neighboring cities that did
not gain similar honors. In the inscriptions dealing with neokorate status, Greek is
clearly the language of choice, showing the intimate connection that the Greek cities had
to this title, and also emphasizing that these titles were of far greater value for the Greek
 provincials themselves than for any Romans visiting the cities. Even in inscriptions that
are otherwise in Latin, the neokoros and associated titles (such as metropolis) are written
in Greek. Because of the language specificity of these cults – both imperial and non-
imperial – we can easily understand the group of bilingual mixed-religious inscriptions,
which combine a dedication to a deity with a dedication to an emperor or the city.
Clearly, bilingual texts were optimal in this situation so that the text could easily honor
all parties, and also be comprehensible to both Greeks and Romans.

---

175 For more on the neokoroi cities, see B. Burrell, Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors (Brill
2004); Jones, CERP 206-7.
176 See for example, IK 232-43, all of which record the title neokoros in Ephesus.
177 This is most overt in the inscription from Ephesus honoring A. Iunius Pastor L. Caesennius Sospes
(IK 15, no. 1543 = IK 59 no. 127), which will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5: splendidissimae |
civitatis Ephesiorum | τῆς πρώτης καὶ μεγίστης | μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσίας | καὶ β' νεωκόρου τῶν
Σεβαστῶν | A. Iunium P.f. Fabia | Pastorem L. Caesennium | Sospitem, leg. pr.pr. provinciae | Asiae,
praetorem designatum, tr. | pleb., quaestorem Aug., tribunum | militum leg. XIII Geminae, trium- |
virum aere auro flando | feriundo, seviro turmae equitum | Romanorum, rarissimo viro | Sex.
Iunius Philetus | et M. Antonius Carpus | honoris causa | H(onoris) C(ausa).
178 These religious and imperial dedications are primarily from two inscription groups. The first
group, from Ephesus (IK 11, nos. 28-35), consists of eight bilinguals, set up by C. Vibius Salutaris, to
Artemis and to the various phylai of the city, on the eve of Artemis’ birthday celebration. As will be
shown in Chapter 3, Salutaris’ status as a veteran made Latin an ideal language for him to
communicate his Roman citizenship, yet the Greek allowed his benefactions to be known and
understood by the residents and travelers in Ephesus as well. For more on Salutaris and his other
benefactions (which included a total of 31 statues of Artemis, Trajan, and other members of the
imperial household), see G. M. Rogers, The Sacred Identity of Ephesos: Foundation Myths of a Roman
The remaining private inscriptions, classified as “other/unknown” in Figure 2.1, consist of fragments, inscriptions of questionable typology, and three instrumenta\textsuperscript{179} – a ceramic patera, a clay lamp, and an ivory tessera.\textsuperscript{180} The inscriptions on instrumenta tend to be more private than other inscribed texts since they are small and usually on an object possessed by a single individual. Because of their small and generally personal nature, instrumenta had much less of a public function as inscriptions on stones set up throughout a city, therefore limiting the social function that they served. Rarely would anybody outside of the family see such an inscription unless attending a social function at the house, and even then the guest would have to have a close interaction with the object. Both the patera and the lamp are relatively unassuming in appearance, however, suggesting that they remained for private family use only. And while the owners could have bought these objects with the inscription already present in order to give themselves some sort of cultural caché, the overall lack of Latin inscriptions on private, everyday objects suggests that there was no public benefit to the display of Latin on these objects, even in an average Greek-speaking household. Therefore, the Latin on these objects most likely reflects the native languages of the owners rather than an attempt to use language to display social status. As for the tessera, which served as a certification seal on a money

\textit{City} (London 1991), esp. 80-126. The other major group of religious-mixed inscriptions are the eleven inscriptions set up in Perge by a local noblewoman named Plancia Magna (\textit{IK} 54, 89-99). While each of these individually is a dedication to a deity or imperial figure, the group as a whole functions as a mixed religious-imperial dedication on behalf of the city, which again justifies the use of both Latin and Greek. For more on Plancia Magna, see below (p. 232). These two groups alone make up about two-thirds of the religious-mixed category of inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{179} I have generally named this category ‘instrumenta’ even though the tessera can not necessarily be considered a tool, because these are small, moveable objects rather than large, heavy, relatively permanent stones that all other inscriptions in this study appear on. Several of the epigraphic volumes that I consulted to gather my data did include lists of names found on ceramics and other objects. I have not included those in my project, but the names do in general seem to be written in the language with which they are associated.

\textsuperscript{180} \textit{Patera, IK} 53, no. 201 (Alex Troas); lamp, \textit{CIL} 3.230 (Tarsus); ivory tessera, \textit{IK} 12 no. 562 (Ephesus).
sack from the banking house of an Italian Roman named Autronius, there is no reason to assume anything other than that Latin was the natural language of the banking house.\(^{181}\)

The categories just surveyed – the funerary, honorific, religious, and *instrumenta* inscriptions – do not include the 310 inscriptions which I have categorized as ‘public/other’ because the majority of them served some sort of official public function, whether as declarations of the emperor, or as legal edicts (see Figure 2.2). These inscriptions are mostly excluded from my analysis because they do little to inform us of how private individuals used language to assert their identities, though they do still contribute to our overall understanding of language and its uses in the region, particularly emphasizing the differences in language use between the public and the private inscriptions. The most numerous type of ‘public’ inscription is the mile and boundary markers (N = 142), whose use of Latin reflects the imperial patrons of these stones, but there are also a number of legal texts (44), fragments (84) and texts of a later date (40). Latin is the natural choice for imperially-sponsored stones, as well as for legal documents, since it was the official language of Roman rule. As we will see below (Figure 2.3), Latin’s presence in the Anatolian provinces varied from region to region, with some having a stronger presence of public inscriptions, others private. In the interior in particular, the public inscriptions make up a significant portion of Latin epigraphy, especially in the form of milestones along the major highways and boundary stones denoting the emperor’s many rural estates. In the coastal cities, however, private inscriptions are much more common. The inclusion of the fragments is essential here, because though they may not be able to provide us with much specific information about

\(^{181}\) See *IK* 12, p. 232. The banking house of Autronius (*PIR*² A 1680) is also attested in another ivory tessera from the year 33 BC (*RE* 17, 1427 no. 74).
who was using Latin and why, they can show where Latin was present, even if just in a single inscription. The inscriptions of a late date (post-313) are far from comprehensive, but they reflect a trend of the fourth and fifth centuries that epigraphy, especially Latin epigraphy, becomes almost exclusively a practice for the imperial bureaucracy.

![Graph showing number of public/other inscriptions by type. Total number = 310.]

**Figure 2.2: Number of Public/Other Inscriptions, by Type.** Total number = 310.

Milestones and boundary stones are of particular interest here, for they can show how Latin did not always have to be read to be understood. These texts are easily identifiable by the mileage and city names that are typically included at the end of the text, as well as by the titulature of the reigning emperor, always in the nominative case, at the beginning. Boundary stones and stelae announcing some sort of infrastructure built or restored by the emperor are of a similar, though slightly modified, formula. Typical milestones had line after line of extensive titles following the name of the reigning emperor.

---

182 Bodel (Epigraphic Evidence 19-30) addresses the symbolic function of inscriptions, but he focuses his discussion on especially religious texts and images, overlooking the symbolic function that the simple use of a particular language could serve. The Roman milestones of Asia Minor have been collected by D. H. French in his Roman Roads and Milestones of Asia Minor (Oxford 1981-).
emperor, all in Latin. Whether or not a traveler could read the Latin titles of the emperor at the beginning of the stone did not matter - a large stone with impressive (though incomprehensible) Roman lettering would be enough to communicate to him the greatness of the emperor and Rome. This was the symbolic power of Latin that we saw also in the tombstone of S. Vebius Gallus. Typically the last line of the milestones had the functional information – the mileage and the closest city. About half of the milestones contain even the mileage in Latin alone, but often the mileage also appears in Greek instead of or alongside the Latin, as is the case in the following milestone from the joint reign of Trebonius Gallus and his son, Volusianus:183

B(ona) F(ortuna)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) [Au]g(usto) Vibio
Trebon[io G]allo et
G(aio) Vibio [A]f[ino Gallo]
Veld[u]mniano
Vo[l]ssiano p(io) f(elici) Aug(usto)
A Ci[o] mil(es) Ἀπὸ Κίου α’

It was clearly recognized Anatolians would not be able to read Latin, but since half of the milestones are not bilingual, there was clearly an expectation that provincials learn basic uses of Latin – Roman numerals, if nothing else – in order to pass successfully along the roads. The fact that the functional information was frequently in Greek or bilingual, however, confirms that is was probably not the case. The mileage was important to travelers, traders, and troops, and this part needed to be understood not only on a symbolic level, but also on a real level, and therefore was usually written in the more familiar Greek. As we shall see in Chapter 5, similar tactics were used in private

183 From Cius in Bithynia: AE 2000, no. 1362: “Good Fortune. Emperor Caesar Augustus Vebius Trebonius Gallus and Gaius Vebius Afinius Gallus Veldumnianus Volusianus, the Pious and the Happy Emperor. One mile from Cius. (Greek) One mile from Cius.”
inscriptions – though less conspicuously – suggesting that in many situations, the functional trumped, or at least equaled, the symbolic.

**Geographical Distribution**

It is widely accepted that the erection of inscriptions was a largely urban practice. For these monuments that were set up to publicize the accomplishments of the commemorated, urban centers guaranteed a much larger audience than small towns and rural highways. Further, while the practice of epigraphy in the Mediterranean certainly dates back long before the arrival of Rome, large-scale epigraphic production remains a characteristic of the Roman Empire much more so than in the preceding periods. Since Romans were more likely to settle in cities and along coasts, epigraphic output in the rural and inland regions of Anatolia was less intense (see Fig. 2.3).

The biases of modern archaeological and epigraphic research make the urban-rural and coastal-inland divides even more stark, since historically scholars of Roman Anatolia have focused predominantly on the western third of the peninsula, in the areas

---


185 In Athens, tombstones were very common for centuries before the arrival of Rome. These tombstones were far more austere with typically only the name of the honoree and his or her patronymic. See E. Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 75, and graph on 92. In Asia Minor, on the other hand, epitaphs are far more varied in style and content; cf. H. Stemler, *Die griechischen Grabschriften Kleinasiens* (Halle 1909) 10-16, 27-8; A. Mócsy, “Die Unkenntnis des Lebensalters in römischen Reich,” *ActAntHung* 14 (1966), 406-8; see also Ery, “Investigations” 56, which showed that because Romans were more concerned than Greeks with commemorating the deaths of young people under the age of 30, there would be correspondingly greater epigraphic production in the Roman style than in the Greek style in order to account for the large number of people who died young in the ancient world. MacMullen develops this theory in his analysis of the inscriptions of Roman Egypt, which show that the epigraphic habit was stronger among Romans than among Greeks or natives (“Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 239). While these broad studies of epigraphic trends in Asia Minor are invaluable, they focus exclusively on the Greek inscriptions from these provinces.
known as Asia, Lycia, and Bithynia. This bias is reflected in collections such as the

*Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* or the *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, where the vast

![Figure 2.3: Geographic distribution of private Latin inscriptions in Asia Minor.](image-url)
majority of the cities or regions surveyed are in the western parts of Anatolia. Of course this western bias is rooted in a historical reality, for Romans settled in the cities of the west more than anywhere else, which would of course mean that the epigraphic record would be strongest in these Hellenized/Romanized urban centers. Unfortunately, this western urban bias is exaggerated by modern scholarship, which has prioritized the cities of the Aegean coast over most others, since they had very active roles in Anatolian history beyond simply the Roman period. These long-standing histories make cities such as Ephesus, Sardis, and the Troad of great interest to archaeologists working in other historical periods as well. Such cities tend to be the focus of archaeological excavation projects, which naturally provides a greater number of epigraphic finds, and therefore more fodder for authors and publishers in comparison the more scattered epigraphic remains of the interior and eastern Anatolia. However, it cannot be assumed that the concentration of all epigraphy in certain areas matches the distribution of Latin inscriptions, and as the evidence for Asia Minor shows, there is a significant variance in numbers of inscriptions in the various cities of the region (See Table 2.1). On average, Latin makes up around fifteen percent of the total number of inscriptions in any given city of Anatolia. That means that even in cities with large epigraphic outputs and a strong Roman presence, Latin inscriptions were still a relatively rare occurrence. Even in colonies where the percentage of Latin was much higher (around twenty-three percent on average), Greek was still the dominant, unchallenged language of epigraphy.

---

186 The TAM, on the other hand, only consists of five volumes, but they focus almost exclusively on western and southwestern Anatolia in the regions of Lydia, Lycia, and Pisidia. Only the fourth volume diverges from this, looking instead at the inscription of Bithynia. There have since been supplements to this series by the same publisher, expanding their coverage to areas such as Isauria and Lycaonia, but these have been slow to appear and many have focused on individual towns or on only the Greek inscriptions.
Table 2.1: Top Cities Ordered According to Total Number of Latin Inscriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Name</th>
<th>Total inscriptions (Greek, Latin &amp; Bilingual)</th>
<th>Total inscriptions containing Latin</th>
<th>% of total inscriptions containing Latin</th>
<th>Private Latin</th>
<th>Private Bilingual</th>
<th>Private Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‡Ephesus (Asia)</td>
<td>4306</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7.59%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Antioch (Pisid)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34.02%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡Ancyra (Gal)</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡Perge (Pamph)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cremona (Pisid)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.46%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sinope (Pont)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.18%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Alexandria Troas (Asia)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.28%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna (Asia)</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaea (Bith)</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Parion (Asia)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28.36%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicomedia (Bith)</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.49%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anazarbos (Cilic)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Tyana (Capp)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyzicus (Asia)</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Apamea (Bith)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.74%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion (Bith)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patara (Lycia)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Iconium (Gal)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side (Pamph)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Germe (Gal)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleucia Calycadnus (Cil)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.96%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmaneli (Lefke) (Bith)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laodicea ad Lycum (Asia)</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes a Roman colony. ‡ Denotes a Roman provincial capital.

¹⁸⁷ Numbers for Laodicea also include 27 Greek-Phrygian bilinguals and 18 Phrygian-only inscriptions (though the Phrygian is written with Greek letters). See D. H. French, “R.E.C.A. Notes and Studies No. 4: Latin Inscritions from Ladik and Sinop,” AS 28 (1978), 176-7.
With over 4300 inscriptions, Ephesus by far has the best overall epigraphic record in Anatolia, as well as the highest number of Latin inscriptions. The important Roman administrative city was extremely unique in its proliferation of inscriptions, having more than four times as many inscriptions as any other Anatolia city. Such large numbers are due in part to the city’s long history of excavation, but Ephesus was also an extremely important city of Anatolia, especially beginning in the third century BC when the Macedonian general Lysimachus re-founded it closer to the Aegean coast, away from the shrine to Artemis. By the time Ephesus came under Roman rule in 133 through the bequest of Attalus III, it had become thoroughly Hellenized, and its major role as the center of administration for the province of Asia ensured that it would remain an important and cosmopolitan city. None of the other provincial capitals of the Anatolian provinces ever gained the same level of importance and activity as did Ephesus. The location of Ephesus further bolstered its importance, for it was located right on the coast, on the mouth of the Cayster River, which provided one of the most traversable

---

188 The city was first excavated by John Turtle Wood and the British Museum starting in the 1860s, but the project was taken over by the Austrian Archaeological Institute in 1895 and has continued uninterrupted to the present day. An overview of this excavation history, along with bibliography and photos, can be found on the Austrian Archaeological Institute's website: http://www.oeai.at/index.php/excavation-history.html (accessed 2/26/2013).

189 Strabo 14.1.21 claims that Lysimachus purposefully flooded the streets in order to force the people to relocate to his new foundation; cf. D. Knibbe, “Via Sacra Ephesiaca: New Aspects of the Cult of Artemis Ephesia,” in H. Koester (ed.), Ephesos, Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture (Valley Forge 1995), 144-5. Evidence of the silting up of the bay from the Cayster and other smaller rivers confirms that the older city would have been highly prone to flooding, and it seems that when the Temple of Artemis was rebuilt after a fire in AD 356, it was built 2.7 m higher than the temple of Croesus’ time: P. Scherrer, “The Historical Topography of Ephesus” in D. Parrish (ed.), Urbanism in Western Asia Minor: New Studies on Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Hierapolis, Pergamon, Perge and Xanthos, JRA Supplement 45 (Portsmouth 2001), 61. Lysimachus also made attempts to rename the city Arsinoeia after his wife, but the name does not seem to have stuck. Coins hailing from that period, however, proclaim the city’s new, if not temporary, name: see B. V. Head, Historia Numorum, 2nd Ed. (Oxford 1967), 574; Jones, CERP 42 for a further discussion on the foundation and renaming of the city. The original settlement of the Ephesus occurred on the Ayasoluk hill sometime in the Late Calcolithic period, and persisted into the Bronze and early Iron Ages: see Strabo 11.5.4; 12.3.21; 14.1.2-4, 20-6; see Scherrer 58 n. 4 for an overview of the preliminary excavation reports concerning the Ayasoluk hill.
passageways into the Anatolian interior. This afforded the city immense commercial importance as well, and even those with destinations further east would often stop at Ephesus before embarking upon the next leg of their journey. Further, the temple to Artemis Ephesia, which drew large numbers of pilgrims from throughout the Mediterranean for festivals and to offer sacrifices, rose up just east of the city. All of these factors made Ephesus an active, cosmopolitan city, deeply entrenched in Greek traditions, but also heavily influenced by the regular presence of Roman dignitaries, officials, and businessmen. This unique status as the metropolis of Asia seems to have affected the epigraphic output of the city as well, for the numbers are anomalous, and no other city in Anatolia is able to even slightly rival Ephesus’ epigraphic culture. And while the capital city has the highest number of Latin inscriptions in Anatolia as well, they make up less than eight percent of the epigraphic remains there. The large number of Latin inscriptions is clearly more of a reflection of the abundance of epigraphy in general in the city, rather than a reflection of the strong presence of Latin.

Of the remaining top ten cities with Latin inscriptions, all of them had close ties to Rome, serving as administrative centers or housing Roman colonies. Surprisingly, although the density of urban areas along the Aegean coast is echoed by a high number of inscriptions, with the exception of Ephesus and Alexandria Troas, the numbers are actually quite small city-to-city. In fact, most of the cities with high numbers of Latin inscriptions are not in this heavily urbanized western portion of Asia Minor, nor are they focused around the coasts. The second highest number of Latin inscriptions comes from the colony of Pisidian Antioch, an inland city that was scarcely Hellenized before being

---

190 The site was likely originally part of the precinct of Kybele, remnants of which were still active in the Roman period: Knibbe, “Via Sacra Ephesiaca” 142-4.
made a colony by Augustus. Before it received Roman troops in the early Augustan period, Antioch was of little consequence to the Romans, for it did not lie along any major trade routes. However, the city was well placed for maintaining peace and order in the difficult terrain of Pisidia and Isauria, and so this became a strategic fortress both during the reign of the Roman client king, Amyntas, and as the site of Augustus’ first colony in the area. Yet because this city had few Hellenistic connections and little epigraphic past, it quickly became a thoroughly Roman city. This perhaps explains the overwhelming number of Latin inscriptions in the remote city, the lack of bilingual inscriptions, and the proportionally low number of Greek inscriptions. In contrast, Sinope, which also became a colony early in Augustus’ reign, had ties to Greek culture dating back to the seventh century BC, when it was established as a Milesian colony, and its stronger Hellenic nature is reflected also in its epigraphic remains. While Sinope does have the sixth highest number of Latin inscriptions, they make up only about fifteen percent of the total epigraphic corpus from the city.

Other cities displaying large numbers of Latin inscriptions include the colonies of Cremna, Alexandria Troas, and Parium, though in the latter two Latin has a smaller proportional presence than in Cremna or Antioch. Administrative centers such as Ancyra, Perge, Smyrna, and Nicaea also show a high number of Latin texts, though in these cities they are dwarfed by the use of Greek, which on average makes up about ninety-six percent.

---


192 The exact date of the colony’s establishment is unknown, though it is certainly early in Augustus’ reign. See Ramsay, “Colonia Caesarea” 84-6. The Latin gravestones in particular date mostly to the Augustan or early imperial period, suggesting that the period right after its foundation was also the period of the most conscious efforts to reflect Roman practice: Mitchell and Waelkens, *Pisidian Antioch* 3.

percent of the epigraphic data. Just as was the case in Ephesus, Latin had an extremely minor place in the epigraphy of other important Roman administrative cities, despite the higher number of Romans who would visit such cities. Some of the provincial capitals, such as Caesarea in Cappadocia or Tarsus in Cilicia, have so few Latin inscriptions that they are not even included in Table 2.1. More minor administrative cities that served as assize (or conventus) centers for the purpose of imperial justice within the heavily Hellenized province of Asia – including Miletus, Smyrna, and Tralles\textsuperscript{194} – had only a small percentage of the inscriptions that Ephesus did. Smyrna alone has over 900 inscriptions, not an insignificant amount when compared to most cities in Anatolia, but only about three percent of them contain Latin. What this shows is that with only a few exceptions, Roman administrative cities (whether provincial capitals or assize centers) had no greater occurrence of Latin in their inscriptions than the cities of Anatolia that had no official connection to Rome.

While epigraphy was predominantly an urban phenomenon, it was not exclusively so. As Woolf has noted, large epigraphic corpora have been tabulated from areas of the empire that were under-urbanized, yet highly militarized, such as Numidia or the Rhineland.\textsuperscript{195} In such areas, it was not the densely populated city, but rather the “economically privileged locales, within which a significant number of individuals lived well above subsistence levels” that explains the prominence of epigraphy.\textsuperscript{196} Further, Woolf points out that both cities and militarized areas had high-ranking individuals,

\textsuperscript{194} Asia was divided into twelve assizes, each named after its administrative center: Adramyttium, Pergamum, Smyrna, Sardis, Ephesus, Tralles, Miletus, Mylasa, Alabanda, Laodicea ad Locus, Apamea, and Synnada (Jones \textit{CERP} 61-91). These cities would have hosted the proconsul on his circuits through the province for the purpose of administering justice to Roman citizens and provincials. For more on this, see Burton, “Proconsuls, Assizes and Administration.”

\textsuperscript{195} “Monumental” 23-4.

\textsuperscript{196} “Monumental” 37.
networks of communication, mobile populations, and a broad range of social statuses. All of these factors put great emphasis on social mobility and encouraged the participation in Roman epigraphic culture as a way to display one’s place in and contribution to society.

The body of inscriptions from militarized zones differs from those found in civic contexts. In particular, as we would expect, they have a higher incidence of soldier epitaphs, but fewer honorific inscriptions. Also, the militarized areas have greater numbers of milestones, boundary markers, and other official records of infrastructural projects completed by the troops than are found in cities, where these types of tasks were typically managed by the local officials or civic benefactors instead of the military. Woolf’s argument regarding militarized zones is based primarily on evidence from the Latin provinces of the west, so it is worth examining the evidence from Anatolia to see in what ways this pattern is echoed in the Greek East. A large number of the inscriptions from the less urbanized areas of central and eastern Anatolia are actually products of the imperial presence there, especially in the form of milestones. This may not necessarily indicate heavy militarization in the way that we see along the Rhine in the west, but it certainly shows the presence of imperial troops along strategic roads and highways of Anatolia.

At the same time, the private inscriptions from the same less-urbanized regions do not appear to have connections to the Roman military except in cities such as Trapezus, Tyana, and Satala in the farthest eastern reaches of Anatolia – all of which were urban oases in otherwise sparsely populated landscapes. Tyana was located right on the major highway passing through the Cilician Gates, and served as a major commercial and
transit center for traders as well as Roman troops and provincials. Trapezus was likewise an important trading city along major eastward-heading highways, but also under Nero became the home of the *Classis Pontica*, which patrolled the southeastern portions of the Black Sea. Satala started out as a legionary camp sometime in the first half of the second century AD, and was later granted city status, and possibly also colonial status. Beyond these three cities, the epigraphic evidence in the eastern parts of Anatolia has no overt connection to the military. For example, the two surviving Latin inscriptions from Melitene in Cappadocia are tombstones set up by Roman families for their deceased children. Melitene housed legions under Vespasian and was granted municipal status under Trajan, and so it could be assumed that the children’s fathers were Roman soldiers, but if this is the case, it is not made clear in the text. Whether the Roman parents were soldiers, businessmen, traders, or low-level Roman officials, their presence in the city was probably related to the presence of a military population, yet there was

---

197 Tyana was a very ancient city, dating all the way back to the Hittite period in the second millennium B.C. and later continuing to thrive under the Persian empire (called Dana; *Xen. Anab.* 1.2.20) and as an independent Greek city under Ariarathes IV or V. According to Strabo (12.2.7), Tyana, which in his view was one of only two cities in Cappadocia, controlled quite fertile lands in the surrounding country, which combined with the city’s position on the great high road through the Cilician gates, made it a prosperous city. See A. H. Sayce, “The Early Geography of South-Eastern Asia Minor,” *JHS* 43 (1923), 45; Jones (*CERP* 177-8) argues that although the city is often called a Greek city (*Philostratus, Vit. Apoll.* 1.4), “it is highly improbable that [it] contained many citizens of Greek blood.” In the Roman period, Tyana and Mazaca were the only Cappadocian cities to mint imperial coinage (see Head, *Hist. Num.* "Gen. Col." 2 p. 753).

198 The city was originally founded by Milesian colonists as one of several Milesian emporia in the Black Sea region. After housing the Pontic fleet of Mithridates VI Eupator, the city became part of the kingdom granted to the Roman-friendly Deiotarus, tetrarch of the Tolistobogii (Str. 12.3.1, 12.3.13), and then was added to the kingdom of Polemo under the authority of Antony (Cassius Dio 49.33.2; Jones *CERP* 169-70) before being annexed to the province of Galatia in 64-5.

199 Satala had been a legionary camp, housing legion XV Apollinaris after it was moved to the Euphrates frontier by Trajan, though the exact date of this action is unknown. For a detailed discussion, see Jones, *CERP* 428, n. 46; *Proc. Aed.* 3.4; Arrian, *Exp. cont. Alanos* 5. Satala also was the site of a court under Trajan in AD 113 (Cassius Dio 68.18, 19). The city may have become a colony at some point as well: V. W. Yorke, “Inscriptions from Eastern Asia Minor,” *JHS* 18 (1898), 323 no. 41: “Gen. Col.”

200 *AE* 1990, 983-4. Both of these inscriptions can be dated only very loosely to the second century, but no internal information allows any more specific date to be determined.
clearly no need to specify that connection in the tombstones of children. Other types of cities such as Zela and Comana Pontica, which served as emporia or as temple centers, show some minor presence of Latin as well. Though the density of Latin in the central and eastern parts of Anatolia is low, the cities that do have Latin epigraphic remains were all cities of transition, where travelers, soldiers, and pilgrims spent portions of time, but rarely settled.

What is notable, and will be discussed more fully in chapters 3 and 4, is that a large number of the inscriptions from the Anatolian interior were set up not by soldiers as one might expect, but rather by Roman slaves and freedmen, many of whom had been or were still associated with the imperial household. Citizenship from manumission, as Woolf has pointed out, was much more common in the East than in the western provinces, where citizenship was more often gained through communal grants. Some of these freedmen were originally from cities in Anatolia and may have settled back at home upon the acquisition of their freedom, whereas others seem to have settled in these cities while still in the service of their former masters.

---

201 Woolf, “Monumental” 38.
202 For example, C. Julius Zoilos, who left a strong epigraphic and monumental legacy in his hometown of Aphrodisias. Interestingly, none of his inscriptions were in Latin, despite his close ties to Caesar and Augustus. There is a Latin funerary inscription in Aphrodisias dedicated to Ti. Julius Pappus, son of Zoilos, who may be the son of Zoilos, but is more likely just “another distinguished member of the family,” as Weinstock saw it. See R. R. R. Smith, Aphrodisias. I. The Monument of C. Julius Zoilos (Mainz 1993) 11-3; S. Weinstock, Divus Julius (Oxford 1971), 140; that Pappas was a relative, though not direct descendant, of Zoilos is further argued by J. Reynolds, Aphrodisias and Rome: Documents from the Excavation of the Theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with Some Related Texts (London 1982), Doc. 40. Other freedmen who did erect Latin inscriptions are most likely from Anatolia based on onomastic evidence as well as services to the cities of Anatolia, but there is no explicit written evidence to confirm these assumptions. Such is the case with Mithridates, the freedman of Agrippa. His name is Persian, but by the Roman period was very common in Anatolia, and he left behind two inscriptions in Ephesus – a tombstone (IK 13, no. 851 = 59, no. 19) and a monumental gate (IK 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151), which he built along with his co-freedman Mazaeus, who also bore a Persian name with common presence in Anatolia.
By observing the nature of the cities in which Latin inscriptions were found, as well as what groups of people were setting up inscriptions, it becomes immediately clear that memorialization through inscriptions was a practice particularly of interest to socially and physically mobile groups in Anatolia – in particular, Roman soldiers and freedmen – often trying to assert their position among populations with whom they were probably not very familiar, or in the case of those returning to their hometowns, to illustrate their newly acquired status as Roman citizens or soldiers. Overall, epigraphy in the interior does remain a primarily urban phenomenon, just like in the coastal regions of Anatolia, but it is not limited to large metropoleis, nor is the practice adopted by the general populace such as we see in cities like Ephesus, where the demographics of those erecting in Latin are much more varied. These geographic trends do not differ vastly from what others have shown for the epigraphic culture in the western provinces, but the concentration of military and freedman inscriptions is quite unique. Further, these trends show that the penetration of epigraphy, but especially of Latin as an epigraphic language, in the interior of Anatolia was far weaker than in its western and coastal regions.

Roman Colonies

There is a clear correlation between the use of Latin and colonial status of a city, for almost half of the top twenty cities in Table 2.1 were Roman colonies. Whether the

203 Only a few colonies in Anatolia have received focused scholarly attention – in particular the colonies of Pisidia: see Mitchell & Waelkens, Pisidian Antioch; Mitchell, Cremna; B. Levick, Roman Colonies. The extensive analysis of the textual evidence for these cities, along with the use of inscriptions, coins, and physical remains, has provided historians with a better understanding of the way in which these colonies operated in Asia Minor and interacted with their native inhabitants and neighbors. The distribution of first-century-BC Latin gravestones in the region surrounding Antioch, for example, reveals the settlement patterns of the veterans who were settled in the area by Augustus as a new population of small-scale Roman farmers, and by extension suggests a possible explanation for the appearance of Latin in the countryside outside of these colonies. These veterans were
colony was attached to a Greek city, or was established relatively independently of any Greek city, the number of Greek inscriptions still outnumbered those in Latin; the primary difference was that Latin typically made up a much larger percentage of the city’s overall epigraphic material. On average, the epigraphic remains for Roman colonies comprised about 23.4 percent of the total epigraphic record, as opposed to in non-colonies, where the average was a mere 6.4 percent. It may seem surprising that despite the Roman origins of these colonial cities, the presence of Latin in the epigraphic culture was still less than Greek. However, it should be kept in mind that, as MacMullen pointed out, the East already had five hundred cities or more, all of which had traditions that were woven into the fabric of their culture and identity. The establishment of colonies was not going to challenge that tradition in any dramatic way, and the colonies would by extension never serve as replicas of Rome:

> From the start, there was bilingualism and intermarriage; little Hellenistic touches show up in every sort of institution or artifact; the immigrants forget their own names, or accept Hellenizing distortions, even give their own children Greek or

primarily from the poor regions of Italy, and their farming would end up being “the engine of economic growth and the basis of the urban wealth which was advertised by the city’s fine buildings” (Mitchell, Antioch 3). See also T. Drew-Bear & M. Christol, “Les Sergii Paulii et Antioche,” in Actes du 1er Congrès International sur Antioche de Pisidie (Paris 2002), 177-91.

204 Studies in the epigraphic habit of north Africa have suggested that the epigraphic curve rose when a town’s status changed, especially if it became a *colonia*, though this is not always the case, as we see with Carthage, which became a colony long before its own spike in epigraphic production; see Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 83-5. To a degree, one could argue that we see a similar pattern in Anatolia. However, many of the colonies were founded by Caesar or Augustus, and therefore their founding coincided with the initial boom in epigraphic production in the east. Many of the colonies of later foundations, such as Faustiniana (under Marcus Aurelius) were either new foundations or established in cities that were essentially backwaters before the arrival of the Romans. This is not always the case – for example, Tyana (founded by Caracalla) had been an important trade city long before the arrival of the Romans – but it is the case often enough to make Meyer’s claim seem overstated. Further, many of the inscriptions are dated so generally that it is impossible to be sure whether they were set up before or after the city was granted colonial status, and even those general dates may very well be influenced by the scholar’s biased knowledge of when the colony was established.
Greek-sounding names. Gradually the east transforms these colonies. It makes them and their manners and customs a part of itself; it digests them.\(^{205}\)

MacMullen’s point is reflected in the epigraphic remains of a city like Antioch, which was really only developed after being made a colony, as opposed to Sinope, where the Hellenistic traditions went back to the city’s origins in the eighth century BC. As noted above, the history of these two cities was borne out in the epigraphic evidence, as Latin makes up a much smaller percentage of the epigraphic remains in Sinope than it does in Antioch.

Particularly striking is the paucity of bilingual texts in the colonies (see Table 2.1). Most of the colonies have no more than a couple of bilingual inscriptions, with Sinope being the one exception with four bilinguals. Both languages were clearly present in these cities, for they all have a significant Greek representation in the inscriptions, but this bilingualism is rarely reflected on individual stones. People opted for one language or another. Furthermore, almost all of the bilingual inscriptions that come from Roman colonies are tombstones.\(^{206}\) As will be shown in Chapter 5 (‘‘Bilingualism’’), several of the bilingual texts that are not exact translations of one another tend to divide up the text between the two languages according to which language is most pertinent to certain pieces of information.\(^{207}\) That Latin was strongly preferred over the dual-language option in colonies is likely a reflection of linguistic loyalties. In colonies, where Latin was part

\(^{205}\) MacMullen, *Romanization* 8-9; 29 (quote). Scholars have shown the tempered influence that Roman colonization had in other provinces as well: e.g. K. Korhonen, "Language and Identity" 8-10; A. Cooley, "The Survival of Oscan in Roman Pompeii," in Cooley (ed.) *Becoming Roman*, 77-86.

\(^{206}\) The one exception to this is the dice-oracle from Cremna in Pisidia (IK 57, no. 5). The Roman sponsors of the oracle are named in the first few lines in Latin, but the oracle itself is recorded in Greek, which of course would have been the language in which it was delivered.

\(^{207}\) For example, the tombstone of Aurelius Nestor and Aurelius Maximus from Iconium in Galatia (*RECAM IV* 90), where the names of the deceased men and their wives, who were presumably of eastern origin, are in Greek, but the name of the Roman legion in which the two men served is in Latin.
of the city’s heritage (even if it was not the language used in daily life), a Latin inscription could be considered as an homage to the Roman culture of the city. If there was occasion to use Latin, it was acceptable to use just Latin, rather than feel the need to translate it into Greek as well. A Greek inscription, on the other hand, would do little to reflect the colonial nature of the city in question. At the same time, we do not see the same “functional” language division as Korhonen proposed for Roman Syracuse and that we see in some of the non-colonial inscriptions from Asia Minor, in which Latin was used primarily in public documents, as well as several epitaphs of Romans, while Greek was used in epitaphs of non-Romans and in “the contexts of spectacles, religion, and monuments commemorating the past.”

In the colonies, there is no obvious motivation for the preference for one language over the other.

We must be careful not to generalize too much about the Roman colonies, since each one operated independently. These were not casts of Rome – each colony had its own history and connection to both Hellenism and Romanization, both of which heavily influenced not only the colony’s development but also its relationship with Roman culture. Such variation is similarly reflected in the Latin epigraphy. The Latin inscriptions from Germe largely consist of imperial and honorific dedications set up on the initiative of the colony itself or the decurions who ran it, whereas the inscriptions from Iconium are primarily tombstones honoring largely veterans and non-freeborn individuals (both freedmen and slaves). Cremna and Antioch have a much wider variety of inscribed stones which were set up by people from various walks of life – city officials, Roman.

\[208 \text{“Colonies of Sicily,” 9. Ricl notes a similar pattern in the inscriptions of the Roman colony Alexandria Troas in the province of Asia: M. Ricl, } \textit{The Inscriptions of Alexandria Troas} \textit{(Bonn 1997), 14-5.}\]

\[209 \text{The variation between the different colonies is a topic that is regularly discussed in Levick, } \textit{Roman Colonies}.\]
themselves, and so forth. So while it is easy to note the exceptionally strong presence of Latin in these cities as compared to non-colonies, it is clear that even among this group of cities, the function of Latin was widely varied.

Chronological Distribution

Discussing chronological distribution of the Anatolian Latin inscriptions is trickier than exploring the geographical patterns, in large part due to the difficulty in dating stones with much accuracy. One of the most influential articles discussing the chronological landscape of epigraphy is Ramsay MacMullen’s 1982 study which coined the term ‘epigraphic habit’ and really started the dialogue on when and why people of the Roman empire inscribed on stone. MacMullen, working from other studies including those of Rémondon, Mocsy, Ery, and Lassère, and depending primarily on epigraphic evidence from the western Latin-speaking provinces, particularly North Africa, showed that there was a steady increase in epigraphy output starting from the reign of Augustus, and that production progressively increased with only a couple minor dips, with particular growth occurring over the course of the second century. The apex appears during the reign of Septimius Severus, after whom the numbers then drop off somewhat drastically, and even more so following the reign of Gordian III (see Figure 2.4 below).

---

210 Levick (Roman Colonies 134–5) points out that in Antioch, the inscriptions set up by the colony were predominantly in Latin, private honorific dedications, tombstones, and religious dedications were more often in Greek. All dedications to the Roman emperors are in Latin only.
211 MacMullen’s table on the frequency of the Latin inscriptions of the Empire, included here as is taken from S. Mrozek, Epigraphica 25 (1973), 115. See also R. Rémondon, “L’Égypte au vᵉ siècle de notre ère. Les sources papyrologiques et leurs problèmes,” in Atti dell’ XI Congresso internazionale di papirologia, Milano 2-8 settembre 1965 (Milano 1966), 149, Table 1; A. Mócsy, “Die Unkenntnis des Lebensalters,” esp. 407, 419-20; Ery, “Investigations”; J.-M. Lassère, “Recherches sur la chronologie des épitaphes païennes de l’Afrique,” Antiquités africaines 7 (1973), 133-51. This general epigraphic pattern has been echoed in more recent discussions of epigraphy in the West: c.f. Woolf, “Monumental” 38 and n. 1; Kulikowski, Late Roman Spain 32.
Figure 2.4: Table of Frequency of Latin Inscriptions of the Empire. Originally published in Mrozek, but reproduced by MacMullen (see n. 213 below).

Generally, work on the Greek East assumes spikes similar to those in the Latin West, although no exhaustive study focusing on the eastern provinces has yet been done.

MacMullen did publish a short analysis of the inscriptions from Lydia after the publication of TAM 5.1, which revealed a similar curve, though with the peak in the
second-half of the second century AD, about 25 to 50 years earlier than in the West,\textsuperscript{212} and Kubinska noted that at least among epitaphs, the inscriptions from Asia Minor are primarily clustered in the second and third centuries AD.\textsuperscript{213}

Many others have used MacMullen’s data as a starting point to explore the reasons why the popularity of inscriptions increased dramatically in the second century, and then quickly declined in the mid-third century. Meyer, unsatisfied with MacMullen’s failure to explain the spike, looked specifically at the epitaphs of North Africa and connected the rise in epigraphy to an increased awareness of Romanization, and by extension the spread of Roman citizenship.\textsuperscript{214} Her view is in part influenced by her focus on Roman epitaphs, which she argues were important primarily for asserting one’s legal testamentary privileges – privileges which would have been reserved only for those possessing the Roman citizenship. She further cites anthropological data that reveals the cyclical nature of mortuary practices, and the frequent role that funerary behavior has in the display of one’s status.\textsuperscript{215} Since she sees the second century AD in particular as being a period of increased awareness of and desire for Roman citizenship, she states, “Such status-based motivations for erecting an epitaph help to explain not only the chronological distribution of epitaphs but also the differences in the type and distribution

\textsuperscript{212} R. MacMullen, “Frequency of Inscriptions” 237-8. This study is exceptional, however, because of the unique tendency in Lydia to include dating formulae in their tombstones. In most other regions of Anatolia, securely dating the inscriptions is much more of a challenge.

\textsuperscript{213} J. Kubinska, Les Monuments funéraires dans les inscriptions grecques de l’Asie Mineure (Warszawa 1968), 11. Interestingly, it is also in the second and third centuries that we see the reappearance of Phrygian in the epigraphic record (see Ch. 1 n. 54), which may have contributed to the increased numbers during this period.

\textsuperscript{214} Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 74-96. Meyer cites as possible secondary reasons for increased epigraphic output increases in both the wealth and the population (and by extension, deaths) of a particular region (87), but she also reasons that some of the spikes and drops – some as short as a thirty-year time-span – are too rapid a change to be a response to either of these factors.

\textsuperscript{215} Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 89.
of epitaphs in the western and eastern halves of the empire.”

It is because of this function of epitaphs as an assertion of one’s citizenship, Meyer reasons, that the frequency of inscriptions falls off in the second quarter of the third century AD, following Caracalla’s grant of universal citizenship in 212 through the Constitutio Antoninana. Once every free-born person possessed the citizenship, citizen-status no longer had the same cultural capital, and thus people no longer needed to brag about this status through epitaphs.

Woolf, on the other hand, rejected Meyer’s claim that inscriptions were connected to citizenship, and instead argued that epigraphic culture surged in times of insecurity, and particularly in regions where we see the highest degrees of social and/or geographic mobility. Just as Meyer attributed to the second century a growing awareness of the Roman citizenship, Woolf sees that same period as showing a strong increase in practices such as astrology and dream-interpretation, in an effort by the Romans and provincials to control the future and alleviate fears about the role of fortune in their lives. It is within this context, then, that he places the surge in epigraphic output. Woolf has more difficulty

---

216 Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit” 88, 74 (quote); c.f. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones” page?

217 Meyer claims that further evidence of the Constitutio Antoniniana altering the perception of citizenship in the empire is the sudden surge, and equally sudden decline, of the nomen Aurelius/-a in the early and mid-third century in the epitaphs of the East, where the universal citizenship grant had its greatest effect. Woolf (“Monumental,” 38) objects to the claim that Caracalla’s citizenship grant had any significant effect on the decline of epigraphic culture, making the same argument that Meyer used against the ideas of increased wealth and population, that its decline is far too sudden to be explained by the Constitutio Antoniniana, though he himself provides no alternative explanation for this decline. A further objection I would add to Meyer’s thesis is that while it is true that the grant of citizenship to all freeborn, male residents of the Empire decreased the value of such a status, this only meant that new social divisions began to develop, such as the honestiores and the humiliores. However, we do not see epigraphy rising again as people strove to attain a higher status in this system.

218 “Monumental,” 30-2. Cherry likewise criticizes Meyer’s over-simplified thesis that increased desire for citizenship led to increased inscriptions, stating that there is no reason to think that provincials were not prevented from setting up Roman-style commemorations just because they did not possess the citizenship. In fact, he argues, “Neither Roman-style names nor a Roman-style patronymic are proof of possession of the Roman citizenship – Roman names could be, and were, usurped by non-Romans”: “Re-Figuring the Roman Epigraphic Habit,” AHB 9 (1995), 145.
explaining the decline of monumental writing in the third century, especially since this the political unrest during this period made it an age of extreme anxiety, though he does reasonably suggest that the reason for decline need not be the same as the reason for rise. 219

Woolf’s attribution of epigraphic culture to places and individuals who participated in highly mobile cultures – the military, trade, urban society – is certainly confirmed by the geographic distribution of the Latin inscriptions in Anatolia. However, his claim that Roman anxieties about the future were particularly acute in the second century is unconvincing, especially since he himself acknowledges that neither the astrological and other mystical practices that he sees as a symptom of these anxieties, nor the social mobility that he considers a contributing factor to these anxieties, ceased in the third century. 220 Rather, they actually increased. Likewise, while Meyer’s correlation between the spread of citizenship in the provinces and the rise in epigraphic output is certainly part of the puzzle, this alone cannot account for the spike in the late second century either, especially since the spike also occurred in areas such as Italy where the citizenship had been attained much earlier. In addition, as Woolf pointed out, by limiting herself to epitaphs only that give the name of the heir-commemorator, Meyer’s suggestion fails to explain the rise of epigraphic culture as a whole. 221

All of these previous studies have given reasonable suggestions for the spike in epigraphy in the late second-century, though the methodologies behind this dating is

219 “Monumental” 38-9.
220 “Monumental” 38.
221 “Monumental,” 23-4, where he also notes that the funerary focus of Meyer’s data leaves out the role of epigraphy in provinces such as Britain, where epigraphy was used far more often for votive dedications than for funerary purposes: see M. Biró, “The Inscriptions of Roman Britain,” Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungariae 27 (1975), 13-58, who estimated this ratio at three-to-one based on RIB. Woolf (23 n. 3) suggests this discrepancy, “probably reflects differences between military and civilian rather than between peripheral and central epigraphies.”
quite problematic for two main reasons. First, studies such as that of Meyer and MacMullen’s Lydian study are too narrowly focused, examining only one type of inscription, or one location, with the result that while it may explain funerary trends, it fails to explain trends within the overall epigraphic culture. The second, and more important, flaw in this type of chronological analysis is the misplaced confidence in modern dating methods. As Cherry has thoroughly discussed, attempts to date and graph inscriptions reveals more about modern dating methods than the actual distribution of inscriptions over time, though I would add to this that the patterns reveal much about ancient dating methods and practices as well. Cherry focuses his criticism on the methods of MacMullen and Meyer, who took all of the inscriptions that were not datable to any specific 25-year period and averaged them over 25-year periods, with the idea that this would then give a fair representation of the average of these inscriptions. Such a method is problematic, however, because it gives a false sense of certainty about the chronologic curve of the inscriptions, and it may be critically skewed. The results do indeed give us a glimpse into how epigraphic culture may have been practiced over time, but it must always be acknowledged that such conclusions are highly tenuous and could easily look quite different, and that our explanations for it are, at best, likewise tenuous due to these dating uncertainties.

Keeping these matters in mind, we can chart the chronological trends for the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia. Figure 2.5 illustrates the frequency of inscriptions over time, from the Republic up to the consolidation of power by Constantine I in AD 312, with a particular focus on the period from the rise of Augustus in 31 BC to the accession of Diocletian in AD 284. In order to minimize the misleading nature of chronological
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222 Cherry, "Re-Figuring," 143-56.
graphing, only the inscriptions that can be solidly dated to a particular 50-year period are included in Figure 2.5. The remaining inscriptions – those that can be dated only generally – have not been graphed as they were in the studies of MacMullen and Meyer.

As Figure 2.5 shows, the frequency of Latin inscriptions in Anatolia differs greatly from the chart compiled by Mrozek, with more defined peaks and valleys, especially in the second century. Latin spiked during the early halves of the first, second, and third centuries, with a fourth spike during the Tetrarchic period. The largest spike belongs to the early second century, particularly the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, which suggests that this was the period in which Latin inscriptions were most popular. Nearly every category of inscription spiked during this period (see Figure 2.6 below). The precise reasons for this are, of course, arguable. One explanation could be the relative stability and prosperity throughout the Roman Empire during the very end of the first century and the early second century, following the cruel reign of Domitian and the resulting period of intrigue and upheaval. Of course, such a supposition does not
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223 The one exception to this is the end of the third-century, in which I have made a conscious split at the accession of Diocletian in 284. My reason for this is to illustrate more clearly the stark contrast (in number, style, and content) between the epigraphic culture under Diocletian and that during the fifty years preceding his reign, which will be discussed more fully below.

224 Many of the inscriptions that offer no indication of a specific date from within the text or from their archaeological contexts have been dated by me or other scholars based on factors such as style, terminology used within the text, letter forms, epigraphic formulae, as well as other indicators – all of which can sometimes give a terminus ante/post quem. But many others have not been dated as closely in previous scholarship, and it is not my purpose here to fill in these gaps, though such an analysis in the future would be of great value. Any effort to graph these inscriptions, then, would be misleading not only because of the tenuoussness of such general dates, but also because of the high volume of inscriptions that have not been dated and could potentially vastly alter the picture.

225 The view that this period was one of stability and prosperity is an old one. Niccolò Macchiavelli, in his work *Discourses on the First Decade of Titus Livy*, I.10 (1503), called it the period of the Five Good Emperors (in which he included Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius), and attributed its success to the use of adoption as a means of determining succession, rather than bloodlines. Gibbon likewise upheld this period as the one in which, “the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous” (The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Vol. 1
Figure 2.5: Distribution of Inscriptions over 50-Year Periods. The top line indicates the total number of inscriptions (N = 281) that could be dated to a specific 50-year period. The bottom accounts for duplicate inscriptions set up by the same individual, so that one prolific individual (such as Plancia Magna, who was responsible for 13 of the Latin inscriptions in Perge) does not completely skew the numbers.

agree with Woolf’s suggestion that inscriptions were most popular during times of uncertainty, but the Latin epigraphic data shows that it is indeed the case. Further, the reigning emperors, particularly Trajan and Hadrian, were immensely popular and spent much time in the East, the former having campaigned against the Parthians and the latter spending much time touring through the cities of Anatolia, after which he founded the Panhellenion in 131/132.\footnote{Hadrian also promoted an active building campaign in the East as well, so the popularity of Latin in inscriptions during this period is not at all}

\footnote{Though the precise reason for the success of these rulers is now highly debated, scholars generally agree that the period from AD 96-180 was among the best for the Principate. While this institution did not last much beyond Hadrian’s death, it is certainly reasonable to imagine that the establishment of this institution would have ingratiated the Emperor to eastern Greeks. For more on the Panhellenion, see M. T. Boatwright, Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire (Princeton 2003), Chapter 7, esp. 145-50.}
surprising, and frequently Hadrian and members of his household were the intended recipients of the inscriptions.

That the stability of the empire and the popularity of the ruler influenced the frequency of Latin inscriptions is emphasized by the other, smaller peaks in Figure 2.5 as well. The first half of the first century AD shows one peak, with most of the inscriptions concentrated in the reign of Augustus and the first half of Tiberius’ reign – like the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, the reign of Augustus was characterized by extensive building in the East and a general fondness for the emperor among the Anatolian population. The third-century peak, which is marked by yet another period of new-found stability under Septimius Severus following the revolt of Pertinax and the chaotic ‘Year of the Five Emperors’ (193), is likewise a period of newly established stability. It should be noted that while this graph only represents time in 50-year increments, the inscriptions for this period in particular are very much concentrated in the earliest years of the third century, during the reigns of Septimius Severus and his sons, Caracalla and Geta. Only four can be firmly dated to the reigns of Elagabalus or Severus Alexander, whereas eighteen are certain to belong to the reigns of Severus and his sons. This once again suggests that the inscriptions thrived in periods of relative political stability, since it was only after Severus had regained control of the empire that we see this small spike again.

The declines are in general more difficult to understand, although the decline in the third century is hardly surprising. Only sixteen Latin inscriptions date to the period of crisis from AD 235-285, and half of those belong to the earliest rulers of this “crisis” period, but this closely echoes the lagging epigraphic output found throughout the entire
Roman world during this time. The economic health of the empire was failing, there had been a string of ineffective emperors, and the borders were becoming increasingly vulnerable – there was little time and few resources for monumental writing in this period. Other drops in numbers happened during the late first century, probably because of the unpopularity of rulers such as Nero and Domitian, as well as the civil wars of 68-9 and the Jewish Revolt under Vespasian and Titus.

The decline of Latin inscriptions in Anatolia in the later half of the second century, however, is more puzzling. Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius were highly favored rulers, and the imperial borders were relatively secure during their reigns. The peaks and the dips in Figure 2.5 may have been tied not to times of uncertainty and instability, as Woolf suggested, but to the periods of new-found stability that came in the wake of events such as imperial intrigue, civil war, or external threats. Though it is true that causes of the peaks need not be the same as the causes of the declines, the relatively consistent rise and fall in Figure 2.5 suggests that the periods of low epigraphic production coincided with periods of established stability. The excitement of Romans and pro-Roman provincials immediately following periods of war and crisis resulted in them producing commemorative materials in celebration of their new-found stability, but within a generation or two, that excitement became less acute – more complacent – and therefore we see a decline in the need or desire to set up more Roman-looking inscriptions.

What is also noticeable throughout the period of study is the shift in types of Latin inscriptions over time (see Figure 2.6). Though dedications to members of the imperial household increasingly outnumber other types of inscriptions in the corpus of Latin

inscriptions,\textsuperscript{228} so that by the reign of Diocletian and the Tetrarchs, the vast majority (88\%) of the datable inscriptions were dedications to the Augusti or Caesars, almost all of which were sponsored by middle-to-high-level government officials.\textsuperscript{229} Of course, this overall trend is most easily explained by the ease in which imperial dedications can be dated as compared to all other types of inscriptions due to the inclusion of imperial titulature. The spike in imperial dedications also shifts our understanding of Figure 2.1, revealing that the large number of epitaphs and the modest number of imperial dedications vary greatly by period and reign (see also Figure 2.7), with honors to the

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure26.png}
\caption{Frequency of Inscriptions by Type. This shows the distribution of types of inscription over time, utilizing only the inscriptions dateable to a 50-year period. *The ‘other’ category includes \textit{instrumenta}, fragments, and inscriptions that are unable to be categorized.}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{228} From approximately AD 100-150, forty of the seventy-six dateable inscriptions (53\%) are dedications to the emperor. Eighteen of these imperial dedications also include a dedication to a deity.
\item \textsuperscript{229} Only 4 of the 34 Latin inscriptions from the period of 285-312 are not imperial dedications: two are tombstones, one is an honorific inscription, and the last a religious dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus.
\end{itemize}
emperors being the most popular use of Latin by the end of the study period. This fact is
most noticeable in the late-third and early-fourth centuries when, during the creation of
the Dominate, Diocletian and his supporters redefined what it meant to be an emperor,

and by extension, what it meant to be a resident of the Roman empire. The state ideology
no longer represented the emperors as first among equals, as the former title *princeps*
denoted, but rather the ideology switched to calling the emperor *dominus* (“master”), in
recognition of the reality of his power. Further, the role of Latin in general had shrunk
dramatically at this point, so that not even the emperors always had a complete command
of the language. Latin increasingly became a tool of the ruling class alone as a way to
advance one’s bureaucratic career, and Greek eclipsed Latin in all other uses among
general residents of Anatolia.\(^{231}\) The erectors of these imperial dedications were


\(^{231}\) Woof, “Monumental,” 22; see also Swain, *Hellenism* 5. This happens elsewhere in the empire as well, where standard Latin became highly varied as it was combined with local languages – a change
frequently unnamed, but those that do name their erectors show that they were generally set up by Romans of equestrian or senatorial rank who held positions as imperial procurators and proconsuls. This is much different from the inscriptions of earlier periods, which show a higher number of freedmen, slaves, soldiers, and private individuals alongside officials in the imperial service. In essence, the linguistic situation shifted from one of folk bilingualism to one of elite bilingualism. This fact is emphasized in the marked paucity of Latin tombstones that are able to be dated to the late-third and early-fourth centuries. By the late third and early fourth century, the epigraphic culture was shrinking in comparison to the Severan period, but the majority of the private inscriptions that were produced tended to be written in Greek; epigraphic Latin was limited in use to a very small percentage of the population.\footnote{This is particularly noteworthy for the Christian inscriptions, which slowly begin to appear at the end of the period in question in this study. While Christian inscriptions do generally fall beyond the chronological scope of this project, it should be noted that only a startlingly small number of those that I have encountered in the process (around 4) have been written in Latin.}

In contrast to the increasingly limited use of Latin to imperial dedications, tombstones show an overall decline over the first three centuries AD. It should be noted that tombstones are among the most difficult inscriptions to date, since most private individuals are not otherwise attested in the historic record and many epitaphs do little beyond giving the name of the deceased and the commemorator. Though many inscriptions can be dated to general periods or centuries based on stylistic or historical
evidence, less than twenty percent of the Latin epitaphs are datable to a specific quarter-century, let alone a specific year.\(^{233}\) It is quite difficult to rely on such a small sample size as representatives of ancient funerary and epigraphic practices, especially since the decrease in datable inscriptions is less of a reflection of the actual epigraphic habit, and more a reflection of the significant changes among epigraphic conventions that occurred within the decades after the death of Augustus, with the result that inscriptions from the very earliest imperial periods can be easier to date based on formulae, names, and so forth than they can from the later periods. Thus, the decline of funerary Latin in Figure 2.6 is likely misleading, as it shows simply the decrease in our ability to date these inscriptions.

Figure 2.6 also indicates a virtual absence of religious dedications of any type beyond the early second century. The religious category shows the starkest contrast between the Latin and Greek inscriptions of Anatolia. Certainly religious dedications were much more common throughout the Principate than Figures 2.1 and 2.5 would suggest. In Ephesus alone, there survive many Greek inscriptions to Artemis, yet still only nineteen in Latin, all of which seem to have been part of large-scale inscriptions, and the religious dedication combined with a dedication to either a Roman emperor or the local citizenry. Beyond these nineteen inscription, Ephesus only has three other Latin religious inscriptions: one is dedicated to an unspecified deity on behalf of the

\(^{233}\) The tombstones that are more specifically dateable are those that either include the name of an attested individual whose dates are known; contain references to events that can be dated; or use terms or formulae that belong to (or outside of) specific periods. This includes text that name legions, which depending on their nicknames and deployments can sometimes be narrowed down to a specific period. This also includes the use of specific terms; e.g. the title \textit{vir egregius}, which gives a \textit{terminus post quem} of AD 161 since the title first came into use during the reign of Marcus Aurelius: e.g. \textit{IK} 14, no. 707b. Another example is the lack of a cognomen in a name (cf. \textit{IK} 53 no. 105), which may indicate an early imperial date.
emperor, a second to an unspecified deity by an imperial freedman; and the other of which was set up by a slave to Hercules. Instead, we see that religious dedications in Latin were largely unpopular, except in the period during which Latin epigraphy was at its height, and by extension it seems that Greek remained the primary language of religion.

Returning to our general understanding of the epigraphic habit in the Roman empire, some interesting differences between the inscriptions of the West and the Latin inscriptions of the East begin to emerge. The biggest difference is the point at which epigraphic culture reaches its height. In MacMullen’s study, and several of those that followed, the peak was at the very end of the second century and into the third century, before a dramatic drop sometime around AD 230. In contrast, the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia show their highest peak almost a century earlier; a much smaller peak corresponds with MacMullen’s data in the late-second and early-third centuries. There remains a need to explore the chronological distribution of the Greek inscriptions in Anatolia in order to understand fully the epigraphic patterns in these eastern provinces, and it is my hope that such a project will be undertaken, but clearly trends for Latin in the East differed from those in the West. MacMullen’s more focused analysis of the epigraphic habit within the province of Lydia, utilizing the inscriptions gathered in the first part of TAM’s fifth volume, shows a still different pattern. Lydia is unique because it was the local custom to include the date in the first line of an epitaph or, to a lesser degree, in a votive. Since the majority of the approximately 850 inscriptions contained in
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234 IK 12, no. 296 = 59, no. 141.
235 IK 15, no. 1564 = 59, no. 140.
236 IK 13, no. 860.
this *TAM* volume happen to be epitaphs, MacMullen was able to date many (405) quite accurately. The results show a curve almost identical to that identified in the western provinces, with the highest peak in the late-second and early-third century, yet of these 850 inscriptions, only four are in Latin – two milestones, one imperial rescript, and one tombstone. These five private Latin inscriptions are obviously only a minuscule fraction of the overall epigraphic picture in Roman Lydia (both parts of *TAM* V have a total of 1414 inscriptions), and therefore it is difficult to make any sweeping generalizations about the chronology of the Latin epigraphy, but it is not insignificant that despite the overall epigraphic curve of the Lydian inscriptions peaking in the late second and early third centuries, the Latin inscriptions are concentrated about a century earlier in the same way that Figure 2.5 shows.

Assuming the overall epigraphic habit in Anatolia followed similar patterns to those exhibited in the west and in the inscriptions of Lydia, the question remains as to why the Latin inscriptions would peak at a different time than the Greek inscriptions. This is an important question not only for our understanding of Latin in Anatolia, but also for our understanding of why epigraphy peaked in the early third century empire-wide. Indeed, it reveals that both of these indicators of Romanization – epigraphy and Latin – operated independently. Clearly the rise in the practice of epigraphy as a whole did not automatically align with the use of Latin in epigraphy.

One explanation for the earlier peak of Latin than the general epigraphic peak could be related to issues of Hellenism and Greek identity. The Second Sophistic, which has generally been understood as an intellectual movement among members of the
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238 *TAM* 5.1, no. 745 (late second c.). If the second volume of *TAM* V is included, there are four additional Latin inscriptions, all private, and mostly dating to the first or early second centuries: 5.2, nos. 1133 (late first c. BC-early first c. AD), and 1099, 1119, 1319 (late first - early second c. AD).
literary communities in the Greek East, began in the mid-first century AD and fully blossomed in the second century. It has generally been believed that this movement had little bearing on the general residents of the East, but this evidence shows that a similar trend was occurring among the non-intellectuals, wherein Greek was being reclaimed as a perfectly appropriate language for inscriptions, so that by the mid-second century, the desire to erect an inscription in the language of the conquerors had been severely muted among provincials and replaced by the more natural and traditional use of Greek. Also around this time, especially under the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, Rome’s hold of the East settled fully into place, and all of Anatolia was securely part of the Roman empire. This new-found peace in the region facilitated this return to Greek culture, and it seems it also facilitated the integration of the Roman-style epigraphic habit into the fabric of native Anatolian culture as well. As a result, the erection of an inscription was no longer a “Roman” behavior, thereby meaning that inscriptions no longer needed the Roman language for legitimacy, since they were now part of the Greek practice. By co-opting such behavior and making it one’s own, the choice of Greek over Latin removed the symbolic function of the inscription as an illustration of the erector’s ‘Romanness,’ and rather just reflected the other, more general functions of an inscription as an indication of one’s accomplishments and a response to social and physical mobility.

Whatever the reason for the spike in Latin epigraphy in the first half of the second century, it is important to keep in mind that the spike need not have been caused by the same factor that led to the overall growth of epigraphic culture, which spiked a century later. The two events are certainly related, but they also have independent variables. Both Trajan and Hadrian spent significant time in the Anatolian provinces during their reigns,
and they became quite popular among the native population. But this still does not explain the increased preference of Latin during this period, for Hadrian in particular was a philhellene, and the use of Greek during his reign would have been very appropriate.

The correlation between the spikes in Latin epigraphic output and periods of new-found stability suggests that Latin was most common in the wake of periods of instability, possibly due to a renewed feeling of loyalty to Rome and excitement to be a part of the Roman power structure.

**Dedicators**

Much of the previous discussion has illuminated for us issues related to how Asia Minor and Latin inscriptions fit into the larger epigraphic habit of the Roman Empire. With a better understanding of when and where epigraphy, especially Latin epigraphy, was present in this area, we can now turn to the deeper questions of who and why. Exploring what types of people used Latin in their epigraphy, and understanding whether this choice reflected simply the person’s primary language or instead his/her employment of the imperial language for some socially beneficial function, can help us understand better the role of Latin and Greek as indicators for the cultural or political identity of Anatolian residents.

Like many areas of the Roman empire, the populations of the Anatolian provinces were quite diverse, especially in the urban centers. Not only were there local inhabitants, who could be descended from Anatolians, Greeks, Gauls, Persians, or any number of other groups who had occupied the region in previous centuries – these local inhabitants themselves running the gamut of social class from local administrative or religious
officials to simple farmers – but there were also traders of various nationalities, Roman imperial administrators, soldiers and veterans from across the empire, freedmen and slaves (many of whom may have been of eastern origin themselves), and numerous other groups. Nor were these groups mutually exclusive. Several of the veterans who settled in the colonies and cities of Asia Minor could become integrated into the local civic life, holding priesthoods and serving as *duovires* or decurions.²³⁹ Provincials could become citizens, and even senators.²⁴⁰ By looking at who was erecting inscriptions in Latin and determining what we can about their social position and personal background, we get a clearer picture of what position Latin had among these populations.

Roman citizenship was not uncommon in the East, although it was far less widespread than in the western provinces, and also held in lower esteem than in the West.²⁴¹ Meyer’s thesis, which connects the rise of epigraphy throughout all the provinces to the spread of citizenship and the social status which accompanied it, is an important point, and hints toward the reality of the epigraphic situation in Anatolia.²⁴² However, her explanation is not without its flaws, as has been shown by Woolf, who points out that a desire for citizenship does not explain the epigraphic habit in older provinces such as Sicily, where natives already had, and that the masses may have been

²³⁹ *IK* 53, nos. 106, 136.
²⁴⁰ Most notably M. Arruntius Claudianus (13, no. 620 = 59, no. 119) and Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus (*IK* 17 no. 5102-3).
²⁴² Meyer, “Explaning the Epigraphic Habit” 79-80. Meyer continues by asserting that citizenship was less common in the first century and fewer people were interested in it, so there was less of a need to display it through the erection of inscriptions. As the demand for citizenship increased in the second century, so also did the desire to publicize one’s citizenship, thus explaining the increased frequency of inscriptions through the second century. For more on Roman citizenship in the provinces, see A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford 1973), esp. 257-8, 418; W. M. Ramsay, *Social Basis of Roman Power in Asia Minor* (Amsterdam 1967), esp. 1-47.
much more indifferent to grants of citizenship than Meyer’s argument would suggest.\textsuperscript{243}

In addition, assuming every inscription that gives a Roman name for its erector was set up by a Roman citizen can be misleading, so for this study the presence of the *tria nomina* suggests Roman citizenship, but we must be open to the possibility that this public identity was a false one.\textsuperscript{244} The prevalence of Roman names, however, also makes it difficult to categorize individuals without any other definable office or background and to know whether they were born or naturalized citizens. Such individuals I have placed in a generalized “Roman” category,\textsuperscript{245} but if any other identifiable information is present, that trumps the simple “Roman name” categorization.

There is certainly a correlation in the inscriptions between citizenship and Latin, as the majority of Latin inscriptions whose dedicators have survived intact were set up by individuals with Roman names. However, many Romans also set up inscriptions in Greek,\textsuperscript{246} and certainly many easterners who had been granted the citizenship probably knew very limited amounts of Latin. There are entire towns whose epigraphic record testifies to the presence of Roman citizens (or people with Roman names), yet no Latin inscriptions survive.\textsuperscript{247} Clearly Latin was not necessarily the default language for

\textsuperscript{243}Woolf’s objections are discussed above, p. 105. Cf. MacMullen, “Notes on Romanization” 167.

\textsuperscript{244}Cherry (“Refiguring” 144) pointed out that determining the citizenship status of individuals in inscriptions is tricky in and of itself. Theoretically, anybody who displayed a *tria nomina* had to be a Roman citizen, according to an edict of Claudius (Suet. Claud. 25.3), but as Brunt has argued (Italian Manpower 208), this ban is “better evidence of the practice [of non-Romans taking Roman names] than of its cessation.”

\textsuperscript{245}For example, Roman auxiliaries were granted citizenship on discharge, but in this study are categorized according to the former label rather than the later, with the assumption that the reader will understand that they were both soldiers and citizens.

\textsuperscript{246}The examples are too numerous to list, but the Greek epigraphic corpus is rich with Roman *tria nomina*. One specific example should suffice, such as the veteran tombstone from Arykanda in Lycia (*IK* 48, no. 138): Γαίῳ Ιουλίῳ Φρον- | τόνι αὐτῶν ἤτο | ροῦ ἀνέστησε τὸν | βομβὸν Γαμικὴ [ἡ] | θρεπτή αὐτοῦ με[ν]- | χαριστικὰς καὶ φ[ι]- | ανδρίας ἐν[ε]κε (To Gaius Julius Fronto, veteran, hero. Gamike, his house-born, set up the base on account of her gratitude and love for her husband).

\textsuperscript{247}For example, the towns outside of Apamea, such as Triglia and Palatari (*IK* 32, nos. 33-62), had several Roman names attested in their few dozen inscriptions, but none of them use Latin. There is
everyone who possessed the citizenship, nor by citizens whose employment suggests they might have known at least some Latin (e.g. duovirs, soldiers), as Greek inscriptions from such people abound in addition to the Latin ones. Roman names and citizenship did not necessarily indicate an actual connection to Rome; such individuals may have simply been provincial residents who were born with citizenship that went back generations, or they may have gained it through communal grants.

Of course, there need not be only one explanation for why people would use Latin in an inscription, and there is certainly a variety of explanations for why people opted for certain languages. For some, it was symbolic; for others, it was functional; and for some, it was driven by no other intention than that it was the person’s native language. It is far more productive, instead, to survey the use of Latin among more specific groups of individuals. Of the identifiable groups within this survey, two groups stand out more than any others: Roman freedmen and slaves, and Roman soldiers. These two groups, both of which had a special relationship with Rome and Roman power, appear in the Latin inscriptions. This suggests that Latin was particularly desirable to those whose social status was in large part dependent on their place within the Roman social system, for many freedmen and soldiers likely came from rather humble origins, yet were able to find prestige and wealth through their service to the Roman state. They, more than any other group, including local elite, seem to have used Latin to highlight their connection to Rome, though the frequency of bilingual texts among these groups shows that they were not attempting to appear wholly Roman, but rather recognizing their connection to both

certainly opportunity and need for further research on the linguistic shifts between the major urban centers, where public life was very active and Latin seems to have had a strong presence, and their suburbs, where public space was much smaller and, presumably, Latin had little function.
the Roman citizenship and the local Greek culture. These two groups will be explored more fully in the following two chapters.

Other identifiable groups include local residents, most of whom held major offices within their own cities. Although thirty texts belong to this group, they do not represent thirty separate erectors since there are a few individuals who were responsible for several inscriptions, and several other local office-holders had also served in the military, and so will be discussed in Chapter 3. These inscriptions run the gamut of types and dates, though they are largely focused in the period up to the mid-second century. Almost all of these dedications come from cities that were either colonies (Alexandria Troas, Cremna, Antioch, Apamea) or important urban centers for Roman administration (Ephesus) or religious worship (Perge). Despite the fact that local administrators in other cities and colonies surely must have set up inscriptions as well, it seems that Latin was not the usual method. However, as noted above, a large number of the people with Roman names but no other identifiable information may also have been members of the provincial elite, who were the most likely to have acquired Roman citizenship.

The most curious inscriptions are those set up by Greeks who, at least based on the text given, have no clear reason for choosing Latin as their language. They make no mention of being slaves or freedmen; they hold no public offices; they do not seem to have served in the military. Certainly, there is a possibility that some of these explanations do apply, but the commemorated individual chose not to emphasize these parts of the identity in the inscription. It is impossible to know whether Greeks such as Euporus and Zosarin in Apamea, or Menophon and Calliclea in Philomelion, Phrygia,

---

248 Thirteen inscriptions by Plancia Magna of Perge (IK 54, nos. 86, 89-99, 127); three by L. Fabricius Longus and his wife, Vibia Tatia, and daughter, Fabricia Lucilla in Cremna (IK 57, nos. 4-6).
chose not to acknowledge the Roman citizenship or connections that they had, or they simply did not have any, but chose to use Latin nonetheless.\textsuperscript{249} Euporus and Zosarin lived in a Roman colony, so perhaps they were Romanized Greeks or felt the social pressure to use Latin, but Menophon and Calliclea were in Philomelion, a city of Hellenistic foundation whose closest connection to Rome was as one of the \textit{conventus} centers of Asia, and Latin was far from commonplace there.\textsuperscript{250} Because of the rarity of inscriptions such as these, it is most likely that they represent Greeks who were connected to Rome, whether as slaves or freedmen, citizens, imperial administrators, or something else, but simply left these details out of their stones. The failure to specify this connection to Rome is particularly curious since frequently locals used Latin specifically for this purpose, and reserved Greek for more personal commemorations (see Chapter 5). Regardless, stones like these are the exception, and in most cases, at least some basic explanation for the use of Latin can be provided. There are also a few groups whose near absence from the Latin epigraphic record is noticeable, including independent professionals\textsuperscript{251} and Jews.\textsuperscript{252}

\textsuperscript{249} \textit{CIL} III 338 (Euporus and Zosarin); \textit{IK} 62, no. 37 (Menophon and Calliclea). See also the tombstones of Asclepiodorus (\textit{IK} 9, no. 371), Pannychus and his family (\textit{IK} 15 no. 1632 = 59, no. 23), and Thamyrus (\textit{IK} 16, no. 2312a).

\textsuperscript{250} Pliny, \textit{NH} 5.95; Jones, \textit{CERP} 48, 64-5 and 391 n. 55. Philomelion has only one other Latin inscription, a bilingual tombstone set up by a Roman man for his wife (\textit{IK} 59, no. 59 = 62, no. 36).

\textsuperscript{251} The only profession that appears in all of the Latin inscriptions is a doctor at Cremna in Pisidia (\textit{IK} 57, no. 49). It is also the only profession attested in both the Greek and the Latin epigraphy of Cremna. Horsley and Mitchell (\textit{IK} 57, no. 49) suggested that he was probably a native of the colony rather than a visiting doctor since he was buried by his sister. Also attested is a Roman tutor, who was buried with his two pupils after what seems to have been some natural event that took all three lives: \textit{IK} 59, no. 91. Teachers are rarely attested in the epigraphic record of the Roman empire; cf. C. Laes, "School Teachers in the Roman Empire: A Survey of the Epigraphical Evidence," \textit{Acta Classica} 50 (2007), 109-27.

\textsuperscript{252} \textit{IK} 59, no. 107, which has been dated to the third or fourth century, is the only Jewish text I have come across in this study despite the large numbers of Jews in Anatolian cities such as Ephesus, Sardis, and Tarsus. For more on the Jews in these cities, see J. Reynolds and R. Tannenbaum, \textit{Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias} (Cambridge 1987); M. P. Bonz, "The Jewish Community of Ancient Sardis: A Reassessment of Its Rise to Prominence," \textit{Harv. Stud.} 93 (1990), 343-59. For conventions in Jewish epitaphs, see P. W. van der Horst, \textit{Ancient Jewish Epitaphs} (Leiden 1991).
Conclusions

This chapter has looked at the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia from a variety of angles, including their distribution in terms of geography and chronology, as well as the various types that have survived, and the individuals who are responsible for their erection. From all of these, it is clear that the presence of Latin in Anatolia is widely varied and cannot simply be explained by an overarching theme.

In terms of geography, epigraphy was primarily an urban phenomenon, as other studies have shown. Cities allowed individuals who set up their permanent memorials to guarantee a larger readership and by extension, to gain a better and more widespread reputation. Latin was most concentrated in Roman administrative cities, Roman colonies, and cities that were located along major trade routes, especially inland. Such a pattern supports Woolf’s argument that inscriptions were most popular among mobile populations. Cities along trade routes had constantly fluctuating populations, and even those who stayed were constantly navigating the social ladders of both Roman and provincial political and public life. Erecting inscriptions, then, could help to establish your place within a city and remind others of your existence and your place in society. But regardless of the number of Latin inscriptions in any given city, rarely do they come anywhere near outnumbering the number of Greek inscriptions, and when they do, it is usually because there are less than a handful of inscriptions total. Even in Roman colonies, Greek remains the primary epigraphic language.

From what we can tell from the epigraphic evidence, the frequency of Latin over time did not match the frequency of the overall epigraphic habit throughout the Empire. Whereas other studies have shown that epigraphic culture reached its height in the late-
second and early-third centuries AD, the Latin epigraphy of Anatolia has its peak in the first half of the second-century, under the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian. The precise reasons for the earlier peak and decline in Anatolia is difficult to determine, but it is likely to be related to issues of identity. In the late-first and early second-centuries AD, Greek intellectual culture had began distancing itself from the Romans and reasserting its Classical (or often pseudo-Classical) traditions. Language played a major part in that movement, and their aversion to Latin may have gradually seeped down to the non-intellectuals. Further, by the reign of Hadrian the position of Rome in the eastern provinces had been secured – there was no question that Rome was the dominant power in the Greek East – and the residents of the Greek world settled back into their own way of life. Further, it is possible that the practice of epigraphy, as it became more common, was adopted into Greek culture in a way that liberated the practice from its former ties to Rome, so that erecting inscriptions in Greek was commonplace and acceptable. The increase in epigraphic output further meant that the practice was becoming popular among a greater variety of people, including those who did not know Latin, nor saw any need to pretend that they did. Epigraphic culture had become a habit of their own, not of the Romans. This becomes most notable in the period of the Dominate, where epigraphy becomes quite popular once again, but variety of dedicators in Latin plummets, with the result that the language of the Romans almost exclusively used by Roman bureaucrats dedicating to the emperor. Latin had no use or benefit among the general Greek population.

The vast majority of people who chose to inscribe their stones in Latin had Roman names, and many of them were likely members of the provincial elite or born
with the citizenship, though the lack of biographical details for many with the *tria nomina* makes it difficult to make any conclusive arguments regarding their background or motivations for using Latin. The language may have been a way for them to assert their citizenship, to curry favor with the Romans within their own communities, or in the case of bilinguals, to improve the readership of their stones. There are certainly several Latin inscriptions that are easily identifiable as commemorating members of the urban elite, but these are fewer than one would expect if Latin was simply a prestige language, used to curry favor with visiting Romans. Socially mobile groups – soldiers, freedmen, slaves, businessmen – appear frequently, using the language to identify and connect with one another, and to feel like part of a larger community in spite of their transient status. But most interesting are the two most represented groups, soldiers and freedmen/slaves, who seem to be using Latin not only to claim a higher social status, but also to denote proudly their service to Rome which allowed them that higher status. It is these two groups that will be the focus of the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3: Latin and Roman Soldiers

In the previous chapter, we saw the ways in which Latin was distributed throughout Anatolia as a whole, both chronologically and geographically. The overall data make abundantly clear that Latin possessed some sort of social benefit to those who chose to express themselves epigraphically in the language of the Romans, but for the most part Latin was most commonly used in contexts related to Rome and Roman institutions.

The following three chapters attempt to look more closely at the role that Latin played amongst residents of Roman Anatolia by examining particular groups of inscriptions more extensively. These chapters not only give a better picture of how Latin functioned within the social confines of Roman Anatolia, but they also open up further avenues for study and inquiry into other groups using Latin in the otherwise Greek-speaking provinces of the Roman empire.

The Roman Military in Anatolia

The present chapter examines the role of Latin in the inscriptions of Roman legionary and auxiliary soldiers. As agents of Roman power and culture, soldiers had a special relationship with Rome. This was especially true of general muster legionary soldiers, who were often poorer Roman citizens without wealth or prestige, as well as auxiliary soldiers, who were drafted from the provinces and, upon completion of service, gained Roman citizenship. Service in the Roman military system provided these men not only with a stable income, but also with elevated social status in the provinces. For

---

253 P. A. Holder, Studies in the Auxilia of the Roman Army from Augustus to Trajan (Oxord 1980), 46-56. Citizenship could also be granted to individuals or units in rare cases as an award for bravery and valor: 29-35.
this reason, it is worth looking more closely at this group of inscriptions, especially since
the military inscriptions are one of the largest definable groups in the Anatolian Latin
inscriptions. Looking at language in these texts helps us to understand how their
relationship with Rome and Roman power as well as their own native backgrounds
translated into the epigraphic practices of the military in the East.

The presence of the Roman military in the Anatolian provinces has received
relatively little attention by scholars. The most extensive explorations of the Roman army
in Anatolia have been given by Mitchell and Kennedy, though both of these edited
volumes present only a piecemeal picture of the military presence in Anatolia, and there
remains a need for a more comprehensive exposition on the subject. Much of our
understanding of the presence of troops in the East depends on the epigraphic record, and
Speidel’s survey of the epigraphic discoveries in Asia Minor is perhaps the closest
attempt at a comprehensive study of the military in Anatolia, though he himself notes that
the publications on this subject lag significantly behind the epigraphic discoveries
attesting to military presence in the East. The reliance on epigraphic data can be
problematic because it is impossible to know whether a certain legion appears in an
inscription in a particular place because the legion was based there, was passing through,
or simply because a soldier settled there following his service. Rarely does more than one
inscription attest to the same unit in the same place. As a result, though epigraphic

254 S. Mitchell (ed.), Armies and Frontiers in Roman and Byzantine Anatolia. Proceedings of a
Colloquium held at University College, Swansea, in April 1981 (Oxford 1983); D. L. Kennedy (ed.), The
Roman Army in the East. JRA Supplementary Series, no. 18. (Ann Arbor, MI, 1996). B. H. Isaac’s The
Limits of Empire: The Roman Army in the East (Oxford 1990) is also useful for understanding the role
of the army in imperial operations, though its focus on the province of Judaea and greater
implications of empire limits its usefulness for understanding military movements in Anatolia, or the
more personal identities of soldiers in the East.
255 M. P. Speidel, “The Roman Army in Asia Minor, Recent Epigraphical Discoveries and Research,” in
S. Mitchell (ed.), Armies and Frontiers, 7-34.
evidence is essential for understanding the movements and stationing of troops along the frontiers and in the provinces, it does not always provide conclusive evidence on these subjects.

The army in the East had a total of nine legions, making it the second strongest force in the entire empire after the Danube. Most of Anatolia was securely located within the borders of the Roman Empire, so only two of the eastern legions were permanently stationed in Anatolia, specifically on the Cappadocian frontier. The Legio XII Fulminata was stationed in Melitene, and Legio XVI Flavia Firma in Satala. Both legions seem to have been established in their respective cities during Vespasian’s reign, though under Hadrian the legion at Satala was replaced by legio XV Apollinaris.

The lack of legions elsewhere in Anatolia does not mean the region was wholly unarmed. At any given time, every province had at least one cohort (often auxiliary cohorts, though they could be legionary detachments as well) as a garrison, and there was the classis Pontica based in Trapezus, charged with patrolling the southern coast of

---

256 See Suet. Vesp. 8 for its move to Cappadocia under Vespasian, where it more or less remained until the fifth century, though it does seem to have gone eastward for short periods during the Second or Third Jewish War. For more on this legion, see C. J. Howego, “The XII Fulminata: Countermarks, Emblems and Movements under Trajan or Hadrian” in Mitchell, Armies and Frontiers 40-46. Detachments of the legion also participated in road repairs from Apamea to Eumeneia in Phrygia: see IK 67, no. 192; T. Drew-Bear and W. Eck, “Kaiser-, Militä- und Steinbruchinschriften aus Phrygien,” Chiron 6 (1976), 294-6. For the persistence of the legion in Cappadocia in the fifth century, see Not. Dig. [or.] 38.

257 Syme was the first to identify Legio XVI Flavia Firma as the legion based in Satala when it was first formed under Vespasian. Though the legion is only attested once in the epigraphy of Satala (AE 1975, 817), there is no other attestation for it anywhere else until its move to Samosata in Syria during Trajan’s Parthian War; cf. R. Syme, “Flavian Wars & Frontiers,” in CAH XI (1936), esp. 141; cf. S. Mitchell, “The Balkans, Anatolia, and Roman Armies across Asia Minor,” in S. Michell (ed.) Armies and Frontiers, 132; Speidel, “The Roman Army” 8; T. B. Mitford, “Some Inscriptions from the Cappadocian Limes,” JRSc 64 (1974) 164-6.

258 Suet. Vesp. 8.4. A third legion (legio VIIIHispana) seems to have been transferred to Cappadocia by Antoninus Pius (AD 138-161), but it was wiped out in 161; cf. M. A. Speidel, “The Development of the Roman Forces in Northeastern Anatolia: new Evidence for the History of the Exercitus Cappadocicus,” in M. A. Speidel (ed.), Heer und Herrschaft im Römischen Reich der Hohen Kaiserzeit (Stuttgart 2009), 601.

259 Speidel, “The Roman Army” 12. For references to the lack of military presence in the provinces of Asia Minor, see Josephus, BJ 2.364-87; Tac. Hist. 1.11.
the Black Sea.\textsuperscript{260} Many of these units were based in particular towns or cities, sometimes permanently,\textsuperscript{261} sometimes just for a short time while completing temporary projects;\textsuperscript{262} other units passed through on the roads heading eastward to the armed provinces, especially during times of war against the Parthians, or in response to the Jewish Wars in Syria. Speidel provides the most concentrated survey of the constantly shifting presence of these smaller units, which are widely attested in the epigraphic record, though it is worth providing a basic survey here.\textsuperscript{263} Within the armed provinces of Cappadocia and Galatia, Melitene had an additional cohort at some point in the second century AD, possibly under Antoninus Pius.\textsuperscript{264} Galatia had several cohorts which made up for the lack of a legionary presence before and after legio XVI Flavia Firma had been stationed in Satala. These included in the mid-first century cohors I Bosporanorum and cohors I Hispanorum; in the second or third centuries cohors I Flavia Augusta Cyrenaica, which was stationed possibly at Ankara or Iconium; and cohors ... Maximiana and cohors I Augusta Cyrenaica in the second quarter of the third century AD; it also may have been the base of legio VII Claudia for a short time under Augustus’ reign.\textsuperscript{265} In the unarmed

\textsuperscript{260} The fleet had been formed out of the Pontic royal fleet after the annexation of Pontus as a province in AD 64/5. It is attested in only three Latin inscriptions, two from Sinope (IK 64, no. 102 & 126) and one from Vasada in eastern Pisidia: see A. S. Hall, “Notes and Inscriptions from Eastern Pisidia,” AS 18 (1968), 87 no. 49.

\textsuperscript{261} For Asia: Roxan no. 100. For Lycia-Pamphylia: Roxan 1978, no. 67; 1994, no. 161; CIL XVI 128; see Kennedy 1996 for more discussion. E.g. cohors I Flavia Numidarum in Lycia-Pamphylia from sometime after AD 142 until at least AD 238.

\textsuperscript{262} For example, legio I Pontica, which carved out part of a mountain near Kolybrassos in Cilicia during the reign of Diocletian (AE 1972, 636) before moving to Side and then Cappadocia; also the detachment of legio XI Claudia in Aulutrene/Apamea discussed above.

\textsuperscript{263} In the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia alone, there is mention of thirty-four different legions, twenty-seven cohorts, seven alae, seven classes, and several elite and specialized forces, including the Praetorian Guard, the Batavian equites singulares, and the vexillationes equitum.

\textsuperscript{264} Speidel postulates that the cohort moved there after it had served in Asia and Lycia-Pamphylia under Augustus. The exact position of this cohors Apula civium Romanorum is unknown: M. P. Speidel, “Citizen Cohorts in the Roman Imperial Army. New Data on the Cohorts Apula, Campana, and III Campestris,” TAPhA 106 (1976), 340-1.

\textsuperscript{265} Speidel, “The Roman Army” 10.
provinces, we know of at least five cohorts in Asia during various times, as well as one in Bithynia-Pontus, four in Lycia-Pamphydia. Cilicia is a bit of a mystery, and so far only shows evidence for an ala based there in the reign of Tiberius, and the presence of the eques singulares in Anazarbos in the earlier Severan period.\footnote{IK 56, nos. 63-7; Speidel, “The Roman Army” 14.}

Even with epigraphic attestations, it is sometimes hard to know why a particular unit is attested in a given town or location, especially if that location was not right along the major roads. For example, a few soldiers’ inscriptions have been found in Aulutrene in Phrygia; most of them are in Greek, but one is a Greek-Latin bilingual. All of these soldiers were from legio III Flavia, so Speidel suggests that these soldiers were not simply passing through Aulutrene, which was not right on the road, but rather that they were part of a detachment from the legion that came from the Danube region to perform a specific task in that area, “perhaps to chase robbers or to supervise the nearby mines.”\footnote{Speidel, “The Roman Army” 11; Kearsley, IK 59, no. 53, p. 38-9.}

Many of the colonies established in Anatolia, especially those founded by Caesar or Augustus were intended primarily for military use. Olbasa in Phrygia, and Cremna and Antioch in Pisidia were all settled by Roman veterans with an aim to secure the rough hinterland of Pisidia and Isauria.\footnote{Cremna: Str. 12.6.4-5; Mitchell, Cremna 1. Antioch: Mitchell, Pisidian Antioch 3. Olbasa: Jones, CERP 134. In total, there seem to have been seventeen colonies scattered throughout Anatolia from Caesar up to the reign of Diocletian (though the one founded by Caesar at Heraclea died out very quickly during the civil wars of the late Republic). It is difficult to tell in some cases whether they were founded specifically as military colonies, though all of these must have been intended to serve a military function at least somewhat. I have found no Latin inscriptions at all from the colony at Parlais or Archelais, and only one from Comana Pontica. In some of these more remote regions Latin milestones have been found, but they usually date to the Dominate period; e.g. on the road bewteen Archelais and Olbasa, where eight milestones were found, dating to the reigns of Valens and Valentinianus in the later fourth century: French, “R.E.C.A.M. Notes” 176-7.} Some colonies were established next to rather than in existing Greek cities, and there were also several cities with large numbers of veterans
but without a formal colony. However, as time progressed the populations of these colonies changed, for usually the families of the original settlers stayed there, and a new population of native residents grew. Colonies also had a representative non-Roman population – Greeks who had lived in the city before the establishment of the colony, or who emigrated to the city with an aim to improve business or possibly even to gain Roman citizenship.

An excellent example of these military colonies is Alexandria Troas, which was only identified as a colony in the 1970s, but whose epigraphic remains have been analyzed by Ricl, providing a model for how to look at the political and cultural elements of these cities:

In the Imperial period, the foundation of a veteran colony introduced a distinctively Roman element into the existing Greek environment. Roman veterans and their descendants assumed a leading position in the colony, simultaneously absorbing the best elements of the Greek community. ... The strong Latin character of Alexandria Troas in the Imperial age is reflected by the high number of Latin inscriptions set up in the city itself and by Alexandreians living outside their native city.

Ricl notes the high percentage of Latin in the colony (forty percent of the epigraphic remains), most of which were official and honorary texts from the first two centuries of the colony’s existence; Greek on the other hand appeared most often in votives and funerary texts, and was used by soldiers and native colonists as well as the large Greek population in the city. Of the eighty Latin inscriptions from Alexandria Troas, only

269 Cities with adjoining colonies included Iconium and Ninica; cities with a high number of veterans, but no colony, included Attaleia, Isaura, Neapolis, and Apollonia. Cf. Speidel, “The Roman Army” 20; S. Mitchell, “Iconium and Ninica: Two Double Communities in Roman Asia Minor,” Historia 28 (1979), 438.
270 In the inscriptions of Alexandria Troas, Ricl (Alexandria Troas 14-5) could identify at least twenty-three free-born foreigners, as well as fifteen Roman citizens with Greek cognomens, which she interpreted as an indicator of their freed status.
271 For the identification as a colony, see Mitchell, “Iconium and Ninica” 438. For a thorough discussion of the city’s history, see M. Ricl, Alexandria Troas, esp. 1-15; quote on 13-4.
twelve of them (fifteen percent) are clearly linked to members of the Roman military, so even in these so-called military colonies with rich Latin epigraphy, the use of Latin cannot be attributed exclusively to those serving in the military.

The Latin Inscriptions

There are a total of 161 private Latin inscriptions relating to members of the Roman military. This group makes up about twenty percent of the total number of private Latin inscriptions, and includes texts dedicated both to and by soldiers or veterans. The individuals range from prominent commanders whose service in the legions was only a part of their wider political career, to simple soldiers of the muster who probably enlisted in hopes of receiving land or citizenship. Some are clearly of Italian origin, others from the Danubian provinces, and yet others from the East. The one thing that this wide variety of men had in common was their tie to one of the most central of Roman institutions – the army.

An analysis of the presence and use of Latin in military inscriptions is apposite, largely because of the important (perhaps even central) role in “Romanization” that is typically attributed to the Roman army in modern scholarship. In particular, Ramsay MacMullen saw solders as having the most influence of “Rome” over the native groups that they encountered. This is most clearly seen in the western provinces, where there was greater need for a “civilizing process,” as already discussed in Chapter 1. The arrival and presence of the Roman army in such areas not only lent order to the society by introducing laws and government institutions, but it also provided the locals themselves a

272 MacMullen, “Notes on Romanization” 163-4; Soldier and Civilian (162-7).
way to gain citizenship and education by enlisting in the auxiliaries. Such a process is illustrated in Strabo’s (3.3.8) description of the tribes in Iberia:

\[ \text{The areas are collectively hard to tame and wild, not only from war, but also on account of migration, for also the voyage around them is lengthy, as are the roads, and being thus unsuitable for social interaction they reject that which is held in common and that which is humane. They now suffer this less on account of the peace and the residence of the Romans. Whenever they experience this [peace and Roman presence] less, they are more difficult and more wild. This exists for them also on account of the wretchedness of the lands and of the mountains, as they increase in intensity this same uncouthness. But at this time, as I said, they have ceased making any wars. For Augustus Caesar subdued those up until now who were engaging in most wicked banditry, the Cantabrians and those bordering on them, and instead of plundering the allies of the Romans they are now soldiers under the Romans, both the Coniaci and those living near the sources of the Ebro the Plentoyisi. And Tiberius, succeeding him, establishing the military affairs of three regiments for these places, which had been set out by Augustus Caesar, he established completely not only peace, but also a certain civic order in them.} \]
more cohesive and concentrated groups, and typically had a strong knowledge of Roman institutions, even if they had not themselves been born in Italy. They were the ideal agents for the spread of Roman culture and attitudes. It follows then that soldiers are also an ideal focus for exploring the role that the army played in the spread of Latin in the East. Such a discussion is certainly not new – the topic has been explored by many, including Adams, Bagnall, and MacMullen, but rarely is the question asked with reference to the Anatolian provinces. Roman soldiers, especially those recruited from the provinces, were proud of their military status and their “acquired Roman identity.”

Using Latin was one surefire way for a soldier to announce his status as a Roman to those with whom he interacted. The pride with which a Roman soldier might assert such an identity is famously satirized by Apuleius, as shown in my introduction. This scene reveals both the soldier’s pride in possessing knowledge of the language, and Lucius’ (and very likely the gardener’s as well) disdain for the soldier’s clearly arrogant and belittling intent behind his language choice, since certainly he could not have expected a Greek gardener to know Latin, and could have easily spoken in Greek to him on the first time around.

While Apuleius’ story certainly reveals attitudes toward Latin among both soldiers and residents of the Greek East, it also raises questions about the circumstances of the soldier’s Latin knowledge. Based on the grammatical errors that Apuleius puts in the soldier’s mouth, it is likely that he was not a native Latin speaker, and therefore not of Italian origin. One wonders how representative he was of the average Roman soldier. Of course, Apuleius’ work is a novel, and a satirical one at that, and the depiction of the

274 Adams, “*Romanitas*” 199.
braggart soldier echoes the ridiculousness of Plautus’ *Miles Gloriosus*. But satire does not work if it does not ring at least a little bit true for the reader, so whether or not the soldier’s use of Latin reflected an actuality in the eastern provinces, something about this interaction would have appealed to a Roman audience. Whether they would have picked up on the implicit linguistic power dynamics consciously, Apuleius must have chosen to use language as the pretext for the violence with the expectation that his audience would be able to relate to it. Indeed, the passage suggests both the normative use of Latin by Roman soldiers, and the social value associated with such usage.

Language has often been discussed in the context of the army as a whole, and while Latin is generally stated to have been as the “official” language of the Roman army, the reality is a bit more complex:276

While it is true that service in the army gave recruits, if they were not Latin speakers, the opportunity to acquire the language, and although there might have been pressure on them to do so, in that training in the skills of Latin literacy seems to have been provided, some excessively sweeping generalisations have been made about the role of Latin as the official language of the army.

Adams claims that the term “official” can only be discussed in a very circumscribed way, referring to contexts such as official military records, the transmission of orders, applications or grants of leave, and official correspondences, but even in these contexts Latin is frequently eclipsed by the Greek. In many parts of the eastern empire, official government documents preserved on papyrus were frequently written in Greek – the language of the Ptolemaic kingdom that preceded Rome – rather than Latin. In Roman Egypt, for example, Greek was far more common than Latin in receipts, showing that the

276 Adams, *Bilingualism* 599.
Romanization of the troops did not always extend to one’s daily language. The Roman military diploma seems to be the only official document that was consistently written in Latin. These texts, which were issued to auxiliary soldiers upon the completion of their service to confirm their newly acquired citizenship, were always written in Latin, no matter the place of origin of the soldier or where in the empire the diploma was issued. As copies of official records stored on the Capitoline in Rome, the use of Latin in these documents reflects their close connection to the city of Rome itself.

Through official documents, we see that though Latin was nominally the language of the army, it was not always used in official texts, let alone in unofficial ones. Thus, the use of Latin in private military texts, such as epitaphs or honorific inscriptions, cannot be explained away simply by saying that it reflects the army’s official language. However, it does not necessarily follow that the use of a particular language in some inscriptions is unrelated to Roman influence through the army either. The soldier in Apuleius uses Latin

---

277 R. O. Fink, *Roman Military Records on Papyrus* (Cleveland 1971), 284. In a study of a collection of military documents from Egypt, Adams showed that often the language used within a particular unit may have depended greatly on the language preferences of the scribes or bookkeepers. In one Egyptian town, there was an “invariable selection of Greek” within the documentation, suggesting that the record keeper Julius Serenus enforced a Greek-only policy for such documents, presumably because that was the language with which he was more comfortable. That Greek was not necessarily the first language of all those submitting receipts is made clear in the individual receipts to Serenus, where Latin keeps creeping into the Greek, including using the letter “h” before an aspirated word, or using Latin inflections. This continues into the Dominate, as seen in the archive of Flavius Abinnaeus, a *praefectus alae* in Dionysia, Egypt in the mid-fourth century. The archive holds many “official” documents, yet only two of them are written in Latin, both of which deal with the appointment or dismissal of a unit commander. Adams even mentions some bilingual texts, in which Latin is used to list the names of the individuals on the receipt, while the entire body of the letter is in Greek. At least some of the men submitting these receipts, Adams reasons, were clearly more used to writing in Latin, but must have been compelled to submit these official documents in Greek: “One may deduce that the writer was accustomed to using Latin in the camp in quasi-official documents, and for that reason wrote both lists of names in that language. But Greek must have been the appropriate language for addressing the outside official, either because it was known to be his preferred language, or because of a feeling that Greek was the language of civilian administration. The text hints at the special place of Latin within the army. But though Latin was clearly often used for record keeping and the like, there was no fixed policy at the everyday level. The overall impression given by these various documents is of linguistic flexibility in the conduct of army business;” Adams, *Bilingualism* 600-6 (quote on 605-6).
not because he is compelled to as a member of the Roman legions, but rather because he
wants to use language as a way to communicate quickly and clearly his association with
that same institution. The soldier is superbus, and Lucius describes him as such in the
context of his use of Latin, implying that the language was one of the ways in which he
was asserting his position over the humble gardener. Clearly Apuleius is showing that
Latin was a status marker, carrying with it not only implications of Roman citizenship,
but also of participation in the Roman state. Using Latin straight away was the soldier’s
way of letting that poor gardener know that he was his social superior. The principles
implicit in this brief encounter in Apuleius must have reflected the social reality of the
Roman East; otherwise, the scene would make little sense to its Roman audience. There
is no way to know to what degree or how frequently encounters like this may have
occurred in Roman Anatolia, but they must have occurred.

It is difficult to know to what degree members of the Roman legions and
auxiliaries would have been exposed to Latin, and therefore what their levels of fluency
would have been. Some soldiers were from Latin-speaking provinces, and so their use of
the language was practical as well as symbolic. In units that were composed of non-
Latin-speaking soldiers, there would have been some basic Latin commands that would
have been regularly used and, therefore, would have been intelligible by the troops,
but that does not necessarily mean soldiers were able to conduct conversations or set up long
dedications in Latin without assistance from others. At the same time, the significant

278 For example, the collection of inscriptions set up by the eques singulares Batavium in Anazarbus: IK 56, nos. 63-7.
number of Latin inscriptions dedicated to or by Roman soldiers shows that, regardless of their actual knowledge of the language, Latin was a desirable and prestigious way for them to memorialize their deeds for posterity. Several of the soldier epitaphs actually show imperfect Latin, revealing their desire to erect in the imperial language, even if their fluency or literacy was imperfect. For example, the epitaph of the veteran M. Lucretius Proclus, wherein several Greek letters creep into the Latin:

\[
\begin{align*}
M \text{ Lucretivs Proclus vetranus} \\
\text{lecionis A\text{"o}ivtri pluslevs} \\
vix annos LII
\end{align*}
\]

\textit{Marcus Lucretii Proclus, veteran of the legion Adiutrix,\textsuperscript{281} from Prusa}

\textit{He lived 52 years.}

This stone reveals the best efforts of this soldier (possibly a centurion\textsuperscript{282}) or his family to create a memorial that could reflect his affiliation with Rome through his military service, even though the Latin is rife with orthographical and spelling errors. And this is not unique – several other epitaphs belonging to soldiers and others show similar errors in the

\textsuperscript{280} IK 39, no. 172; Corsten suggests that the last word of line 2 is meant to read “\textit{Prusa aus},” stating the confusion between \textit{r} and \textit{l} is not rare. If his reading is correct, then we can be certain that Proclus was a native Greek speaker, and had returned to his hometown of Prusa in Bithynia following his retirement.

\textsuperscript{281} Proclus could have been in either \textit{legio I Adiutrix} or \textit{legio II Adiutrix}, both of which are otherwise attested epigraphically in Anatolia. The omission of a legion number suggests that he was likely a member of \textit{legio I Adiutrix}, especially since that legion is thought to have accompanied Trajan from Dacia during his Parthian campaigns. Three other inscriptions attest to the same unit, two from Ephesus (\textit{IK} 13, no. 680 = 59, no. 124; 16, no. 2244), and one from Ankara (\textit{CIL} III 265, which names two members of the same unit). All three of these inscriptions likely date to the earlier empire, and one (\textit{IK} 13, no. 680) has actually been dated by both Engelmann and Kearsley to the reign of Trajan, and so it seems possible that these could have been the memorials of some of Proclus’ comrades. Two soldiers from \textit{legio II Adiutrix} are mentioned in another Bithynian inscription from Byzantium (\textit{IK} 58, no. 123), though it has been dated to about a century after the tombstone of Proclus.

\textsuperscript{282} Speidel suggests this based on the relief on the stone, in which the soldier holds a sword in his right hand: see M. P. Speidel, \textit{“A Pannonian optio vexillationis Buried at Stratonikeia,” EA} 6 (1985), 75-8.
orthography, syntax, and spelling of the Latin. But soldiers did not use Latin in all epigraphic contexts, as will be seen below; Latin was much more common in funerary texts than in any other type of inscription, likely because tombstones were the primary medium through which soldiers could memorialize their existence, and Latin emphasized their connection to the army as much as the words themselves did. Further, there are very few Latin inscriptions that specify the soldier’s Anatolian origins like Proclus’ does, so it is rarely possible to know firmly whether an epitaph represented a soldier’s return to his homeland.

It should also be noted, as was discussed in Chapter 2, that the lack of epigraphic sources in Cappadocia is in part a result of the lack of extensive modern archaeological exploration in that region. Because the region’s urban areas were few and far between, and possibly also because those towns and cities held little perceived importance in major historical events, archaeologists have been slow to turn their attention to the harsh barren lands of the eastern Anatolian province.

Geographical Distribution

The geographic distribution of the military inscriptions mirrors that of the overall collection of Latin epigraphs in Asia Minor, with the largest concentration found in cities

---

283 For example, the tombstone of Octavia Secunda, wife of a Roman soldier (IK 41, no. 452), which has several spelling, orthographic, and grammatical errors; another for M. Aurelius Victurus (sic), whose very brief epitaph is rife with errors (IK 60, no. 137).

284 The units drafted in Anatolia and stationed elsewhere include the legio XIII Gemina at Apulum, ala VII Phrygum, which served in Syria, three cohorts of Ulpia Galatarum that served in Palestine and Egypt, three cohorts of Ulpia Paflagonum in Syria, cohorts I Cilikum which was based in Moesia Inferior, cohorts III Cilikum and cohorts I Flavia Cilikum equitata also in Egypt, and very probably ala I Augusta Colonorum, which may have been stationed in Galatia. There was probably a cohorts II Cilikum based on the existence of I and III, though the third may also be the cohorts Cypria mentioned in AE 1904, 163. Cf. Speidel, “The Roman Army” 18-20. See also G. L. Cheesman, The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army (Oxford 1914), Appendix II, esp. 179-80.
that were either important administrative centers or Roman colonies, though this is more due to the higher numbers of Latin inscriptions in general in these cities. In the less urbanized, less cosmopolitan eastern provinces, there are very small numbers of inscriptions, and just as Latin tends to make up a larger percentage of the epigraphy that does appear there, so also do military inscriptions.

Administrative cities of unarmed senatorial provinces (e.g. Ephesus in Asia or Ancyra in Galatia) would not have had permanent legions, so the soldiers recorded in the Latin inscriptions of such cities may have been there on temporary military assignment; such was probably the case for Iulius Gemellinus, centurion of *legio II Traiana Fortis* whose tombstone was set up in Iconium. Other inscriptions seem to attest men who had moved on from military service to civil service, which brought them to Asia. This latter situation is best exemplified in the many inscriptions set up in Ephesus by one of the city’s benefactors, C. Vibius Salutaris, who following his service as a tribune in the Roman legions, went on to serve as *subprocurator* in Mauretania Tingitana and Belgica, as *promagister frumenti mancipalis*, and as *promagister portuum proviniae Siciliae*. For Salutaris, his military career was an important step in his social ascent; although it was in the past, it still brought him honor, just as did his current status as a Roman administrator and a benefactor of the city.

---

285 *RECAM IV 233 = AE 1912, 271*. Laminger-Pascher (*Beiträge zu den griechischen Inschriften Lykaonien* [Wien 1984], 51 no. 69) argues that the stone should date from the time of Trajan’s eastern campaigns, but Hall (*RECAM IV 233*) agrees with Ritterling that it could also reflect a detachment of the legion, or just the centurion and staff, on a brief errand to Asia Minor: E. Ritterling, s.v. “legio,” *RE* 12.2, 1485-90, esp. 1489 for this particular inscription.

286 Vibius Salutaris served as a military tribune of *legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis*, probably in Germany Superior, and prefect of *cohors Asturum et Callaecorum* (which would have placed him in either Mauretania or Pannonia, depending on which unit he commanded). In Ephesus, he dedicated 8 inscriptions to various groups of the city, including to the voting tribes, *boule, gerousia*, and the ephebes (*IK* 11.1, nos. 28-35); he also set up an honorific dedicated to a friend, another military man turned Roman official named M. Arruntius Claudianus (*IK* 13, no. 620), and he was the recipient of a dedication from the city itself (*IK* 11.1, no. 37).
Table 3.2: Number of Latin military inscriptions in non-colonies; listed in order of total number of Latin inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Latin/ bilingual texts</th>
<th>Total Military Texts</th>
<th>% Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ephesus</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancyra</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smyrna</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaea</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicomedia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anazarbos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyzicus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patara</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar inscriptions can be found of other low-level Roman administrators who began as military officers as well. 287 The military inscriptions in administrative cities also provide

---

287 For example, Ti. Claudius Serenus, who had served as a tribune of cohors VI c. R. and prefect of cohors II Hispanorum, but who then became the procurator of Caesar's estate in Asia, Phrygia, and Caria (IK 13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129 [Kearsley]). Serenus clearly gained prominence through his service as commander in the auxiliaries and a citizen cohort, and then managed to gain a low-level post in the eastern provinces. Up through the second century, prefects of the auxiliaries tended to be from Italy, but Serenus’ inscription, dated by Kearsley to AD 176-80 based on the neokorate titulature, may be just late enough to make such an assumption a bit insecure. His service as a tribune in a citizen cohort also suggests he was likely a citizen from Italy. Speidel has shown that at least in some cases, the cohort title civium Romanorum did not always indicate that the unit was made up of citizens (Speidel "Citizen cohorts", 344-5), plus in later periods non-citizens were recruited to fill the ranks (Cheesman, Auxilia 65), so even this does not secure him as an Italian citizen. The cohors VI c. R. was most likely a voluntary unit since it was commanded by a tribune instead of a prefect, though this again may not have applied by the time of Serenus’ service. Based on his Latin cognomen, Serenus was very likely born a Roman, though without any social status. The use of Latin in this honorific inscription, therefore, is probably a reflection of Serenus’ own origins. The Latin also names the dedicator as an imperial slave (a verna) named Severus, who seems to have been in Serenus’ service at the imperial estates. Latin is the typical language used by such slaves in their dedications to other members of the imperial administration. What is more curious here is the Greek introduction at the top of the stone. This will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5. Other soldiers-turned-administrators include Ti. Iulius Cornelius Alexander Capito (IK 13, no. 684a-b), Q. Iulius Cordinus C. Rutilius Gallicus (IK 13, no. 715).
evidence for soldiers who settled – or perhaps even died – in these provinces, whether during their service or afterwards.\textsuperscript{288}

As is expected, the largest raw number of Latin military inscriptions comes from Ephesus; they make up just under twenty percent of the total Latin inscriptions for the city.\textsuperscript{289} In Ancyra, on the other hand, nearly a third of its Latin inscriptions are related to the Roman military. The other cities with large raw numbers of military inscriptions are Roman colonies, though their percentages range widely. Further east, where the overall epigraphic finds are very minimal, the inscriptions tend more often to be in Latin, and military inscriptions dominate, both in Latin and in Greek. This reflects a major shift in local culture, especially as is related to urbanism and Hellenism. In the more rugged and rural provinces of Cappadocia, Galatia, and eastern Pontus, epigraphy had never become part of local culture in the same way that it had in the heavily Hellenized cities along the Aegean coast.\textsuperscript{290} The inscriptions show that people who were erecting these stones were primarily those in the Roman service, and who were passing through on a temporary mission or to join the larger armies of Syria and Armenia. The rare areas in the Anatolian interior such as Ancyra, where there is a higher concentration of Latin soldier inscriptions, can probably be attributed to the city’s important position as a thoroughfare for Roman troops headed eastward to Cappadocia, Armenia, and Commagene. Ancyra

\textsuperscript{288} For example, Roman citizen [L.?] Cornelius Menodorus (\textit{AE} 1998, 1436 = 1993, 1479) who settled in Asia; C. Reius Priscus, originally from Carthage (explaining his command of Latin) but who was buried in Tralles (\textit{IK} 36, no. 217).

\textsuperscript{289} This calculation is based on the number of Latin inscriptions denoting different individuals (38 inscriptions) rather than the total number of Latin military inscriptions (46), because 9 inscriptions record the same individual, C. Vibius Salutaris.

\textsuperscript{290} We saw a similar occurrence in the discussion of Roman colonies in Chapter 2, wherein areas that were less Hellenized before the Roman period seem to have never adopted epigraphy or Latin at the same rate as more Hellenized areas.
was along the main highway and therefore would have been a natural place for troops to rest and restock before continuing on across the rugged Anatolian plateau. As an

Table 3.3: Number of Latin military inscriptions in the colonies; listed according to number of military texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Total Latin/bilingual texts</th>
<th>Total Military Texts</th>
<th>% Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinope</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconium</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apamea</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cremna</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

administrative city, it also would have an already-existent practice of epigraphy brought by the Roman officials stations there, though clearly epigraphic culture was much smaller than in Ephesus. The already existent epigraphic culture in Ancyra, combined with the frequent passing-through traders and businessmen, would have encouraged soldiers to erect inscriptions more than in smaller cities where epigraphy was less popular.

Since Roman colonies were established primarily to assert Roman control in more hostile regions, and secondarily to provide land to Romans and veterans who had served the state, colonies naturally had a large number of soldiers and veterans amongst their populations, especially within the first generation of their existence, so it is not strange that the Latin inscriptions from colonies frequently include soldiers as well as their family members.\(^{291}\) We often see tombstones of a wife or child that display the name and

\(^{291}\) Levick, *Roman Colonies* 1-6.
unit of the soldier as well. Yet surprisingly, colonies do not have higher numbers of military inscriptions than most of the other epigraphically rich cities in Anatolia, nor do the soldier inscriptions make up a significantly larger number of the inscriptions within that colony. Of course, it must be remembered that since the colonies were military residences rather than posts, there would have been a larger number of civilians (wives, parents, children) than in a strictly military post like the legionary base Satala in Cappadocia, so the proportion of soldier inscriptions to civilian inscriptions will be smaller. Further, since the colonies were residential, the successive generations descended from the founding soldier-colonists would not necessarily be soldiers as well. Certainly, there was still a strong representation of military officials in subsequent generations, but an increase in non-military progeny changes the social and linguistic makeup of these cities.293

Instead, the cities with the largest percentages of military inscriptions were those that had very few inscriptions at all. In smaller, more rural towns such as Balçikhisar and Basri in Galatia, Tyana in Cappadocia, Calchedon on the Propontis, and Stratoniciae in Caria, the only inscriptions found at all are Latin military inscriptions, and almost all of them are funerary in type.295 In the military stations of the eastern frontier, including Trapezus and Satala, there are also sparse epigraphic finds, but here also the few that do

---

292 See for example *IK* 18, no. 482; 41, no. 451-2; 59, no. 94.
293 Levick, *Roman Colonies* 144; Mitchell, *Cremna* 4. The effect of successive generations on the use of Latin in inscriptions will be discussed further in Chapter 5.
294 Tyana also became a colony under Caracalla, named *Antoniana colonia Tyana*, and under Valens in late fourth century became the capital and metropolis of the newly formed province of Cappadocia Secunda: Jones, *CERP* 181. Clearly becoming a colony at such a late period did little to boost the epigraphic output of the city.
295 Balçikhisar: *RECAM* II 289; Basri: *RECAM* II 225; Tyana: *IK* 55, nos. 53-55, 128; Calchedon: *IK* 20, nos. 54-56; Stratoniciae: *IK* 22, nos. 1224a, 1239. Other towns with small numbers of epigraphic remains, all of which are Latin military inscriptions, include Kolybrassos and Syedra in Cilicia; Cide and Comana Pontica in Bithynia-Pontus; Knidos in Caria; Amorium, Dionysopolis, and Ilyas in Phrygia; Vasada in Pisidia; Eleçik in Galatia.
exist are chiefly Latin military texts, and almost all of them funerary. Melitene, despite its housing one of the Roman legions, has only two Latin inscriptions, neither of which explicitly indicate a connection to the Roman army. Overall, the provinces of Asia and Lycia-Pamphylia have the lowest average percentages of military inscriptions, and though interesting, it is also unsurprising since these areas would have had a wider variety of people settling in and visiting their cities. Further, they have among the largest epigraphic record, which by nature makes the epigraphic body more varied. Most surprising is Cremna, which ranks fifth in terms of Latin inscriptions, but has no identifiably military inscriptions. What is more, the lack of military inscriptions in these cities of Asia and Lycia-Pamphylia does not apply to the Latin inscriptions alone, but rather to the entire epigraphic body. This pattern challenges current scholarly assumptions that the spread of epigraphy – and the spread of Latin – was due in large part to the Roman military. In the eastern reaches of Anatolia, where fewer Romans traveled and where fewer cities thrived, soldiers were the primary representatives of Rome and Romanitas. The lack of an epigraphic culture in these regions limited the number of

296 All three military inscriptions from Satala are funerary; there is also a fourth Latin epitaph from the legionary base that makes no explicit mention of the army: D. H. French and J. R. Summerly, “Four Latin Inscriptions from Satala,” AS 37 (1987), 17-22. The only Latin inscription from Trapezus (CIL III 236) is a dedication by legio I Pontica to Diocletian and the rest of the tetrarchs. 297 AE 1990, 983-984. 298 E.g. In Perge, only three of thirty-two Latin inscriptions (8.8%) record men who had served in the military, despite the fact that as the capital of Pamphylia and the site of a major temple to Artemis, Perge exhibits the fourth largest number of Latin inscriptions (see Table 2.1). Even in the Pisidian colony Antioch, the military inscriptions make up just around twelve percent of its Latin epigraphic body. 299 The lack of military inscriptions cannot be attributed to a general absense of Roman troops, as both provinces had their fair share of cohorts. Among the units stationed in Lycia-Pamphylia were coh. Apula (early first c. AD), coh. IV Raetorum (under Trajan and Hadrian), coh. Musulamiorum (possibly under Trajan), and coh. I Flavia Numidarum (from sometime after AD 142 until at least AD 238); Asia had the coh. Apula (under Augustus), coh. I Lepidiana eq. c. R. (under Trajan), coh. I Claudia Sugambrorum (under Hadrian), coh. I Retorum (under Hadrian or Antonius Pius). There was also possibly a unit closer to the city of Ephesus, but the identity of the unit is unknown. Cf. Speidel, “The Roman Army” 13.
inscriptions, but the texts that were produced were largely set up by soldiers, and in Latin. These inscriptions were symbols of the extent of Roman power, and the presence of the Roman army. Still, it is a stretch to say that these soldiers were spreading Roman culture, for it is abundantly clear that it was only the soldiers who were engaging in these Latin epigraphic practices, and even amongst them, the practice was not widespread. In the western regions of Anatolia, however, the social function of epigraphy was different, as it was more a tool of social distinction than of simple power. Even within the colonies, which had in general greater numbers of Latin inscriptions, the percentage of military inscriptions was widely varied, and in some cases absent. Romans were far more common, and many of them were not soldiers. Even though large numbers of soldiers served in these provinces as well, setting up inscriptions here was less about asserting Roman power, and more about situating oneself within the complex, established social structures of urban Asia Minor. Because of the elevated social status that soldiers enjoyed, claiming association with the Roman military and using Latin was an optimal way to do that. In these western cities, there was also a higher incidence of mobility, both in terms of populations passing through and in terms of social advancement among provincials, Roman immigrants, and Roman administrators. The greater amount of epigraphy in general, but also the greater variety in who was erecting inscriptions, reflects this fact.

---

300 This is by no means always the case – there are plenty of towns where the one or two surviving Latin inscriptions have nothing to do with the military. In these cases, the inscriptions are most often set up by Roman freedmen. For example, Synnada in Phrygia has only two Latin inscriptions, one of which is the epitaph for the wife and daughter of an imperial slave (IK 59, no. 61), and the other of which marked the tomb of a family, several of whom were probably freedmen (IK 59, no. 60). This dominance of freedmen in the Latin inscriptions will be the focus of Chapter 4.

301 See Cremna, Parion, and Germa in Table 3.3.

302 See also Woolf, “Monumental,” esp. 31-2, for other arguments about the connection between epigraphic output and mobility.
**Chronological Distribution**

Dating inscriptions of soldiers is sometimes easier than dating general private inscriptions, particularly if the stations of the soldier’s unit are well understood. That being said, there are still only about thirty-eight percent of the military inscriptions that can be dated to a 50-year period with any certainty (see Figure 3.8). This chart follows the same general chronological trend from the overall Latin epigraphic corpus discussed in Chapter 2, though with slight deviations. There remains a major peak in Latin inscriptions in the first half of the second century, especially during the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian, but the slopes on either side of this peak are much smoother than the overall Latin inscriptions, with no discernible spike in Latin inscriptions during the Julio-Claudian period, and only a slight tick in the early third century. Among those dated more generally to a century (N=44), thirty-two of them seem to be from the first or second centuries AD.

![Figure 3.8: Chronological Distribution of Inscriptions Mentioning Roman Soldiers. †The inscriptions dating to AD 100-150 are twenty-five in number, though only eighteen of those inscriptions were set up by individual soldiers; eight of them belong to C. Vibius Salutaris, a benefactor of Ephesus.](image-url)
Roman legions were most active in the eastern Anatolian frontier during the wars against Parthia. The campaigns of Trajan (113-116) saw a marked increase in soldiers moving through the eastern cities on their way to battle, and which is reflected in the increased number of soldiers memorializing themselves or being memorialized by family or friends during this time. When Trajan died, Hadrian re-established the Euphrates as the boundary between Rome and Parthia and transferred many of the troops back to the Danube, where greater forces were needed, which may explain the drop in soldier inscriptions in the second half of the second century. The other spike in military inscriptions in the early third century must coincide with the campaigns of Septimius Severus and Caracalla against the Parthians. The drop in the second half of the third century appears in just about every chronological study of inscriptions empire-wide, and although there are various theories regarding this drop, including the general chaos and political upheaval of the larger part of the third century as discussed in the previous chapter, it is clear that it was something that affected epigraphic culture everywhere, and we are reminded that the epigraphy of Anatolia did not exist in a microcosm. Further, the late third century finds the Latin epigraphy being increasingly concentrated in the hands of the imperial elite, particularly official representatives of the emperor in the east, such as legates and procurators, who seem to have reserved their Latin for dedications to the emperor. The newly established popularity of Latin epigraphy only among the new imperial bureaucratic class meant that there was a far smaller population utilizing the language, few of whom had done much military service, so any mention of military service in these inscriptions is rare.
It is easy to say that a surge in military inscriptions occurs in times of significant military activity in the East, but this may be an oversimplification of the picture, especially since the trends in general track the overall chronological distribution of Latin inscriptions in Anatolia. The Romans had wars against the Parthians and Armenians somewhat regularly from the Julio-Claudians on, and starting in the third century, against the Sassanid Persians, yet we do not see an increase in Latin military inscriptions during each conflict. Valerian and Aurelian undertook major campaigns against the Parthians in the second half of the third century, but this is hardly reflected in the Latin military inscriptions. The spikes in military Latin inscriptions could be a reflection of the actual popularity of military expeditions, for promoting one’s place in society and connection to popular campaigns through an inscription could serve as a social boon, but it is more likely that the spike we see in the second century is tied, more than anything else, to the general popularity of epigraphy and urban development during that period.

*Types of Inscriptions*

The Latin inscriptions relating to the Roman military are much less varied in type than the overall Latin epigraphic corpus in Anatolia (see Figure 3.9). Whereas just over half of the total Latin inscriptions are funerary, over two-thirds of the military inscriptions are epitaphs. For soldiers, particularly those of the general muster, funerary honors were an optimal way to commemorate permanently one’s service and one’s social advancement. Honorific inscriptions are rarer (about twenty percent) and typically commemorate soldiers of officer rank, especially centurions, tribunes, and legates. The honorific inscriptions were primarily found in Ephesus, which as a large center or trade,
travel, and administration became a major hub for all sorts of epigraphic honors for those wishing to gain social recognition and to honor the emperor and the gods. In fact, in Ephesus soldiers set up more honorific inscriptions than epitaphs.\textsuperscript{303}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Military Inscriptions by Type.}
\end{figure}

In a large city like Ephesus, epigraphy was well established and was part of the social fabric; it was an ideal place to broadcast one’s accomplishments and benefactions since people were constantly visiting and passing through the city. This made the epigraphic landscape in Ephesus quite varied, even among soldiers. Ephesus is unique, though, since even in Ancyra, which had the second highest number of military inscriptions, ten of the thirteen inscriptions were funerary. In the more remote regions of Anatolia, funerary texts dominated even more, since epigraphy was much less common and the lack of a large or influential audience made the erection of honorific texts and imperial dedications very rare. The military inscriptions outside of the large urban centers, then, are almost

\textsuperscript{303} Ephesus has 20 honorific, 15 funerary, 8 religious-mixed, 1 imperial, and 2 unknown inscriptions related to members of the Roman army. Some of the honorifics may have also served funerary functions, but the context of the inscriptions in this category clearly serve a primarily honorific function.
exclusively funerary, whether the city be a Roman colony, a military base, or simply a small town.304

Although the majority of the soldier inscriptions are funerary, the inverse is not true. In terms of all of the Latin epitaphs in this study, soldier inscriptions only make up about a quarter of the total funerary inscriptions. This number is much lower than what would be expected based on MacMullen’s research in the West.305 Latin epitaphs represent a much more diverse demographic in the East. This can be attributed largely to the historical precedent of funerary inscriptions in the East – Greeks had already been setting up epitaphs before the Roman arrival, and so the practice was more established among a larger group of people. Another potential factor could be the smaller number of citizen legions stationed in Anatolia as compared to the West, where such as Mainz and Carnuntum had permanent legions for long periods of time. One might also consider language a factor, since the option to use Greek in the East may have reduced the number of soldiers erecting Latin inscriptions.306 Yet while there are examples of soldiers’ epitaphs in Greek as well, they are quite small in number and do not significantly increase the number of soldier epitaphs in the East.307 Such a preference for Latin has

304 For example, the colonies at Pisidian Antioch and Sinope had primarily funerary texts, though there were a couple of honorifics in each and, in Sinope, one religious text. The colonies of Alexandria Troas and Tyana, on the other hand, only have epitaphs. In the various small towns in n. 295 above, almost all of the inscriptions were funerary.
305 MacMullen ("Epigraphic Habit," 238-9) estimated that as many as three-fourths of the epitaphs in large cities such as the Mainz and Carnuntum, both of which were major military bases, belonged to soldiers, veterans, and their kin. See also MacMullen, Paganism in the Roman Empire (New Haven 1981), 200 n. 13 and 201 n. 16, which shows similar patterns of frequency in other regions of the Empire as well.
306 See for example the inscriptions of Tyana (IK 55), which include four epitaphs to soldiers, three of which are in Latin (nos. 53-55), one of which is in Greek (no. 56). The one in Greek, dated by Berges and Nolle to AD 151-4, is dedicated to one Claudius Torquatus, a beneficiarius of cohors I, by the office of Cassius Apollinarius.
307 Greek military inscriptions are actually more often honorific in nature, usually set up by cities to honor centurions who have done good things for the population or region. In such cases, the use of Greek was understandably more appropriate since eastern cities most often published their own
been noted before by Adams, who sees this as a strong indication that language choice was often determined by the epigraphic context. Since epitaphs “fossilised” identity for posterity, aligning oneself with Rome through the use of Latin seemed optimal for soldiers, many of whom would have been from rather humble backgrounds. In contrast, for religious dedications or inscriptions set up at pilgrimage sites, soldiers often eschewed Latin in favor of the local language – in this case, Greek.

Bilingual texts are less frequent among the soldier inscriptions than the general collection of Latin inscriptions of Anatolia; about a third of the overall epigraphic corpus is bilingual, yet the military inscriptions are almost half that. Of course, some members of the military would have come from Italy or the western provinces, and thus would have been native Latin speakers and have little need to use Greek. But based on onomastics, many of the soldiers seem to have eastern origins, yet still privileged Latin over Greek. This group of men – and their families who honored them – used Latin as a way to hold...
fast to their identity as Roman soldiers, for their service in the army was often their main (or only) ticket to higher social status, greater respect, expanded rights, and increased wealth. The inscriptions show a desire among soldiers to associate themselves with both Roman and eastern culture, rather than to maximize readership with a bilingual text. Even in cases where the inscriptions are bilingual, Latin is still given preference, sometimes strikingly so, as see in the tombstone of Sex. Vibius Gallus, where the size of the Latin lettering is nearly double the size of the Greek translation at the very bottom. There is a noticeable difference in the amount bilingualism between the funerary texts (eighteen percent) and the honorific texts (thirty-three percent). Just as with the overall Latin corpus, it is clear that honorific texts were much more important in terms of the content of the text, and so were more often translated. Tombstones, on the other hand, often served as a visual symbol as much as anything, so the simple use of Latin was enough to communicate the soldier’s connection to Rome, regardless of whether one could actually read what the Latin said. If one’s Latin knowledge was incomplete, he could even put up a predominantly Greek inscription with just enough Latin to gain social capital still. Such is likely the case in the epitaph of the veterans Aurelius Nestor and Aurelius Maximus:

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Νέστωρ παλαιστρ(α)τιώτης ἐαυτῷ καὶ Ἰοθ(λί)ά Σατορνεῖνη γυναικὶ τὰς ἓξ κλείνας
καὶ Αὐρ(ήλιος) Μάξιμος παλαιστρ(α)τιώτης ἐαυτῷ καὶ Αὐρ(ήλια) Δημητρίῳ
gυναικὶ τὰς ἐν ἀριστερᾷ τρεῖς κλείνας κατεσκεύασαν.

Vet(erani) Leg(ionis) XIII <G>(e)m(inae)

(Greek) Aurelius Nestor, veteran, made the six funeral couches for himself and for Iu(li)a Saturnina, his wife; and Aurelius Maximus, veteran, made the three funeral couches on the left for himself, and for Aur. Demetria, his wife. (Latin) Veterans of Legion 13 Gemina.

---

310 See Introduction, p. 6.
311 RECAM IV 90.
Here, we see that the names of the deceased and their wives, as well as the description of the burial couches included in the tomb, are all in Greek. The only Latin portion of the text is the last line, which simply gives the name of the legion in which both of the men served. Such a blatant switch between the two languages may be a reflection of the men’s identities – as private citizens, they are Greeks, but when it comes to their military service, they are thoroughly Roman, though it is also likely that Nestor and Maximus were not very capable in Latin. As soldiers, they may have learned the standard words and phrases necessary for service in the legions, including the name of their legions, but that does not mean they were comfortable enough with Latin to know the proper conventions for commemorating themselves and their wives on stone. The language differential between funerary and honorific texts may also have to do with who was setting up the inscriptions. Whereas epitaphs were most often dedicated by individuals known to the deceased, such as family members or fellow soldiers, most of the honorific military inscriptions were dedicated by representative bodies, including citizens of a city or entire military units, as well as by people in the service of the honored individual, whose primary language may not have been Latin. In these cases, we may

---

312 A similar inscription survives from Zora in Syria (CIL III 125 = CIG 4566), where the middle portion of the text, which records the name of the legion, switches temporarily to Latin: Κλ. Κλαυδίανος ρω(μανός) θεοφάνου leg(atus) p(ro) p(raetore) ex leg(ione) III K(yrenaica) ἔποιησεν τὴν στήλην ἱδιαὶς αὐτοῦ δαπάναις. The difficulty in interpreting this inscription is addressed by Adams (Bilingualism 299 n. 9).

313 For example, Hagel & Tomaschitz, Sye. 22 a&b (from the town of Syedra); IK 32, no. 2 (from Colonia Apamea); IK 67, no. 173 (from a vicus of Antioch); IK 13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129 (from the boule and the deme of Ephesus, as well as an imperial slave); IK 59, no. 135 (the people of Prymnnessos and the local Roman businessmen).

314 For example, IK 64, no. 102 (from the veterans of the fleet of the Pontic shore).

315 For example, CIL 3.454 = suppl. 6984, 13648 (from his freedman and client); W. M. Ramsay, “Studies in the Roman Province Galatia. VI. – Some Inscriptions of Colonia Caesarea Aniochea,” JRS 14 (1924), 191, no. 12 (from his freedman); IK 13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129 (from the boule and the deme of Ephesus, as well as an imperial slave).
also see the two languages representing the interests of the dedicator and the honoree, one of whom may have been Greek, and the other a Roman soldier.

Soldiers were responsible for few religious inscriptions and even fewer imperial dedications in Latin. As mentioned above (n. 56), the scant number of religious texts can be attributed in part to the general preference for dedicating to deities in their customary language, which, in a place like Anatolia, would rarely have been Latin.\footnote{Eight of the religious dedications were mixed religious texts, all set up by the same person as offerings to both Artemis Ephesia and the various tribes of the city. See \textit{IK} 11, nos. 28-35. An inscription from Hadrianoi in Mysia (\textit{IK} 33, no. 1 = 59, no. 139) records a veteran dedicating to Zeus Kersullos in Greek alone, showing the preference for Greek in religious contexts, even among soldiers. The language choice, however, does not reduce the fact that this inscription is quite Roman, not only because of the various Roman military-style gifts that Menianus offers, but because of the transliteration of the word “toga” rather than the more typical Greek word, τῆβεννος; cf. Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 114.}

Eight of the religious dedications were set up by C. Vibius Salutaris, a man with dual identities as both a member of the local Greek elite and also a Roman equestrian. Salutaris was of eastern origin – probably from Ephesus itself – yet every word in his dedications drip with Romanophilia. It is therefore no surprise that he would utilize Latin in his dedications to Artemis and the city, though he also includes Greek translations for most of his texts in what seems to be an effort to communicate to his fellow citizens the benefactions he has made on their behalf. Of the five other religious inscriptions, all but one were also set up by officers in the army, specifically centurions; the fifth was dedicated by an entire legion.\footnote{These votives are dedicated to a variety of deities, including Jupiter (Marek, Am. 111 & Am. 112 to Jupiter Sarsus; \textit{AE} 1972, 636 to Jupiter Optimus Maximus; \textit{Victoria} (\textit{IK} 59, no. 145); Sol Asklepius and Hygeia (\textit{CIL} III 242), and an unnamed deity (\textit{IK} 64, no. 125). The dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus was set up by the First Pontic Legion in Cilicia.}

Based on current epigraphic finds, none of the soldiers who served in minor offices, as specialized soldiers, or simply as general muster infantry or navy seem to have set up any Latin religious texts.
Dedications to members of the imperial cult, which would much more appropriately be in Latin, make up an even smaller number of the overall military inscriptions. This project has only four imperial dedications from soldiers, all from quite different periods of the Principate and regions in Anatolia. These dedications are interesting in their uniqueness, especially when compared to conflicting epigraphic evidence elsewhere in the empire that suggests soldiers frequently dedicated to the emperor. I have found no evidence in Anatolia of a soldier dedicating to an emperor in Greek, either, so these four inscriptions really seem to be it. These four texts then confirm Adams’ assertion that, “There is an analogy between the use of Latin by a Greek-speaking Roman soldier in addressing the emperor, and the use of Latin in Egypt by soldiers making dedications to the emperor.” Adams goes on, arguing that although

---

318 The first (IK 17, no. 3019), dedicated to Germanicus around AD 43, was set up in Ephesus by the assembly of Roman citizens who do business there (conventus cívium Romanorum qui in Asia negotiantur), under the agency of T. Camurius Iustus, a military tribune of the 13th legion Gemina, and L. Manlius Maritus. For the date of this inscription, see E. Weber, “Zu den lateinischen Inschriften von Ephesos,” in H. Friesinger et al. (eds.), 100 Jahre Österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos: Akten des Symposions Wien 1995 (Wien 1999) 139-46. The next two imperial dedications date to the second quarter of the third century, one (RECAM II 225, dated to 235) of which was dedicated to Verus Maximus, the son of the emperor Maximinus Thrax was set up by cohors ... Maximiana, found in Basri in northern Galatia. The unit (which may be the same as cohors I Augusta Cyrenaica) was stationed in Galatia from AD 235-238. Because of the rather remote find spot, far from any place of Roman import, the stone was previously thought to be a milestone. However, Mitchell (RECAM II p. 189) convincingly rejects this: "Even if we admit that an auxiliary unit could add its title to a milestone inscription, a milestone dedicated to the Caesar Maximus would be unparallel. The inscription has too many unusual features for it to be a milestone, and should simply be taken as a dedication to the Caesar by an auxiliary cohort. If so, it is extremely unlikely that it should originally have been erected at Basri, where there was no Roman site of any importance. It is much more likely to have been carried from a more important centre, most probably Ancyra itself, about 70 kilometers away." From the same period is an inscription dedicated to Gordian (IK 43, no. 42, dated to c. 238), which was set up by cohors I Flavia Numidarum in Side in Pamphylia. The inscription to Gordian is particularly interesting in its failure to abbreviate the emperor’s praenomen (II, 1-2: [Marc]o An[tonio Gordiano] / nobilissimo [Caesari Aug]), which reveals influences from Greek. The last of these imperials (CIL III 236) was dedicated to the tetrarchs Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius and Maximianus, by the legio I Pontica, in the legion’s base at Trapezus.

319 Bilingualism 6 14-5. Adams uses F. Kayser’s collection of inscriptions from Alexandria to discuss what he calls an “influence of domination,” meaning an interaction between addressee, dedicator, and document type: Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines (non funéraires) d’Alexandrie imp.earia [1er – IIIe s. apr. J.-C. (Cairo 1994). According to Adams, a Roman soldier (regardless of actual origin and language preference) dedicating to a Roman emperor, would of course use the
most inscriptions in Egypt are in Greek, those that are classified as military are almost all in Latin, and most of those are dedications to an emperor. This is not at all true of the epigraphic picture in Anatolia, for even though the majority of military inscriptions are in Latin, there is a weak correlation between Latin and imperial dedications and an even weaker correlation between military and imperial dedications.

*The Soldiers*

As is already clear, the Latin military inscriptions attest to soldiers of all ranks (185 in number), though the more specialized (i.e. non-funerary) texts are more often set up by or for officers or whole units. Indeed, the higher a rank that a soldier attained, the more likely he would have been to know at least some Latin. Officers of the highest ranks, namely legates and senatorial tribunes, would have been born into the highest classes of the Roman citizenry, and therefore would have been educated in Latin from a young age if it was not already their primary language. Such would have been the case for Iunius Maximus, the *tribunus laticlavius* in *legio III Gallica* under Antoninus Pius and Verus, who was honored by the Ephesians for his military prowess and his subsequent administrative offices. Almost half of the soldiers in these Latin

---

*Roman language, i.e. Latin:* "In their relationship to the emperor it would seem that soldiers felt impelled to adopt a Latin-speaking persona. There must have been pressure to symbolise the Romanness of the institution to which they belonged when addressing the supreme Roman authority." Adams continues to drive home the point of this trifecta of influence on the following page (616): "It was not exclusively the fact that the dedicators were Roman soldiers which determined the choice of Latin; after all, there are numerous inscriptions in Greek by soldiers, as we have seen. Nor was it exclusively the fact that the dedicatees were Roman emperors; there was no reason for run-of-the-mill Greeks to use Latin in inscriptions to emperors....It was the concatenation of topic, addressee, and dedicatory which established the language chosen in these inscriptions. The addressees are Roman emperors, the dedicators members of the Roman army, and the nature of the dedication formal and public."

320 *IK* 13, no. 811 = 59, no. 128. Another senatorial tribune by the name of C. Flavonius Paullinus Lollianus is attested at Pisidian Antioch (*IK* 67, no. 173).
inscriptions (N=89) had attained the highest offices, including *legatus legionis, tribunus* (both *laticlavius* and *angusticlavius*), *centurio*, and *navarchus*. This would be expected as these men would have spent a long time in military service, and holding ranks as high as these would have required a sufficient command of Latin and, often, ties to the emperor or other powerful men in his service. A large number of them came from less aristocratic lineages, working their way up in the ranks through promotion; only the two senatorial tribunes just mentioned – Iunius Maximus and C. Flavonius Paullinus Lollianus, are clearly of high birth. The number of low-level officers with Latin inscriptions is much lower – only twenty-four individuals. These men were never from aristocratic backgrounds. They had started from the ground up, beginning as enlisted soldiers and gaining prominence through exemplary service. The final two groups of soldiers consist of enlisted soldiers, some of whom held specialized functions. The current study has collected inscriptions with twenty-seven specialized soldiers and forty-five general muster soldiers (including veterans), making them the second largest group represented in the Latin military inscriptions.

The inscriptions set up for or by high-level officials are about double those of the ordinary soldiers, which is expected because of their positions of power, but it is a little more surprising that there is such a strong representation among a group which was largely made up of poor citizens and provincials who were forced into service by

---

321 These men held offices such as *sesquiplicarius, aquilifer, duplicarius, and praefectus* of a detachment.
322 These men served functions such as *beneficiarius evocatus, accensus, frumentarius, and tubicinus*, though beyond this there was really very little difference between them and the soldiers without any title.
323 In this category I have included any individual who is identified on the stone as a soldier or a veteran, but without any other description of his place within the ranks. Never in this body of inscriptions does a man who identifies himself as a veteran give also a military title. It seems that if one was a veteran, his status within the ranks no longer mattered once he had retired, unless his departure from the legions had led to him holding other non-military offices.
circumstance. Low-level officials (some of whom would one day rise to the position of centurion and possibly even tribune) made up only thirteen percent of the named individuals. The general muster held little prestige, and many who enlisted in the legions or the auxiliaries did so out of necessity, often desperate for an income and the possibility of gaining land someday, and in the case of provincials, eager to gain Roman citizenship and the social and commercial benefits that accompanied that status. Many of these men would have been uneducated, and yet they outnumber all other groups of soldiers in the Latin inscriptions, besides the officers. Of course, general muster soldiers would have far outnumbered the number of officers, but there is also a possibility that the large number of soldiers simply identified as “miles” may have held a rank, but omitted it from their stone, a practice which was common before the second century. The popularity of Latin among not only the Roman military officers, but also among the average soldiers, shows that regardless of native language, Latin both signaled your belonging to a group, and also revealed one’s physical power and moralistic values of honor and virtus.

Since only thirty-five of the 185 named individuals are known to have gone on to hold non-military posts as imperial administrators, it would be wrong to conclude that knowledge of Latin was directly related to civil service. Indeed, it may have been the case that some of these men hoped to advance but failed to do so due to lack of success or a premature death, and it is also very possible that some of them did advance, but that we have no epigraphic evidence to document these later phases of their lives. Regardless, what we can see from the texts at hand is that more than three-quarters of the individuals referenced in these inscriptions are affiliated with Latin primarily through their military

325 E.g. IK 13, no. 715; 26, no. 26 = 59, no. 111.
service. Few are known elsewhere in the historical record, and those that are known from other material or literary evidence typically fall into the group of thirty-five who held other notable non-military posts. Notable are the soldiers who were from the provinces, yet after their service in the Roman army gained extreme prominence both at home and at Rome itself. This includes Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus of Sardis and M. Arruntius Claudianus from somewhere in Lycia, who were among the lucky few in the East to be elevated to senatorial rank. The former served in the eastern legions, where he first helped to proclaim Vespasian emperor, an act for which the emperor later rewarded him by granting him senatorial status, thus allowing him to later hold the suffect consulship and the governorship of Asia. The latter was the first ever Lycian to be elevated to the senate, having served under Domitian as prefect of an ala and, later, Praetorian Prefect.

Conclusions

The general picture provided by the Latin military inscriptions from Anatolia reveals that there was a Latin presence among the soldiers in the legions and auxiliaries, whether or not the soldiers actually knew the language themselves. The imperial language would have been used to some degree in the everyday operations of the military, especially with technical terminology relating to military affairs, though this did not necessarily mean that soldiers were learning conversational Latin or that they could speak (or read) it with much fluency. Latin was the “official” language of the army, but as Adams’ research has shown, this meant little in terms of the daily operations of the legions, and in the Greek East, uses of Latin and Greek often depended on the abilities of

the soldiers and the personal preferences of the officers. At the same time, knowing any amount of Latin must have been beneficial, as it served to reinforce the soldiers’ identities as members of and participants in the Roman power, and some soldiers likely learned Latin even if it was not necessary for their job. Regardless of the degree of their Latin fluency, displaying the language in their inscriptions allowed these soldiers to use not only words, but also language, to display the record of their service and their place in the imperial power structure.

As expected, Latin appears most in the inscriptions of military officers. The highest levels of command – namely the legates, but also the senatorial tribunes – would have been occupied by men of senatorial rank, who during the periods in question would have been trained in Latin from a young age if it was not already their first language. Yet very few of these men show up in the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia. Less than a handful of texts attest to a legatus legionis or a tribunus laticlavius. More often, the officers in these inscriptions held the non-aristocratic and non-senatorial military offices, including the tribunus angusticlavius, the praefectus castrorum, and the primipilares. Some of these men would have been from the Roman equestrian class, but many were provincials, potentially of humble birth, who had worked their way up the ranks of the army to become centurions, prefects, and even primipilares. For these men, knowledge of Latin was essential for career advancement, and so presumably by the time they had reached these highest levels of legionary command, their knowledge of the “official” language of the army was extensive. The lack of officers at the highest level must be due in large part to the small number of these officers in the army period, especially since Anatolia only had two legions at any given time. However, the lack of Roman senatorial military
officers in the inscriptions echoes what we see in the more general epigraphic corpus as discussed in Chapter 2. Romans of the senatorial class very rarely set up Latin inscriptions in Anatolia, even though we know they were there as governors, army officers, and even travelers and businessmen. Rather, Latin was more often used by lower level officers, who had attained high rank not through birth or wealth, but through hard work and life-long military service. Latin served as a medium through which they could easily communicate their associations with Rome, and assert their own power as representatives of the empire.

Members of the lower ranks should not be disregarded, though. The use of Latin among low-level officers and the general muster soldiers was certainly not insignificant, and one must assume that showing knowledge of Latin would have been equally, if not more, advantageous for these plebeian men who had no position in Roman society, than for those who already laid claim to social importance as part of the Roman or provincial elite. Latin was a ticket for many – a way to assert their Romanitas, and by extension their social power, to the average Anatolian resident. Setting up Latin inscriptions gave these soldiers a way to stand out among their peers, especially since Latin inscriptions stood out against the much more numerous Greek inscriptions. Some soldiers identified most strongly with this Roman part of their identity, saying nothing of their origins. The fact that most of the soldiers chose only to communicate their military career without any other biographical information reveals their devotion to this aspect of their identities for the purpose of posterity, for this was their permanent record. However, some soldiers did record their places of origin, and others chose to use both Greek and Latin, so for some it
is clear that while their role as soldier was extremely important, they also wanted to pay their respects to their origins and their families, perhaps

Latin epigraphic production among members of the Roman military seems to have been loosely associated with the eastern campaigns in Parthia and Armenia. That this was the case can be seen through the peaks in the chronological distribution during the first half of the second century and the first half of the third century. There also was a strong preference among these people to use Latin for tombstones rather than any other inscriptions. Most of the soldiers are not otherwise noteworthy, so their epitaphs were their one permanent legacy of their existence and service to Rome. The honorifics are almost exclusively centered in the city of Epehsus, where honorific epigraphic culture was most popular, and where these stones heralding one’s accomplishments would have the largest audience. Very few soldiers used Latin to set up religious inscriptions or dedications to the emperor, despite being in his employ. The few examples that do exist show that imperial dedications were mostly offered by whole units rather than by individual soldiers.

Military inscriptions also have a varied presence in the cities of Anatolia. They are generally few in number in cities with large epigraphic corpora, particularly in the provinces of Asia and Lycia. Even colonial cities in these western and southern areas of Anatolia, which would have been colonized with large numbers of Roman soldiers, had proportionally small numbers of military inscriptions. In contrast, the Latin epigraphy of the cities along the major highways of the plateau, which would have been used for troop movements eastwards, is dominated by military inscriptions. This tells us that while many soldiers used their inscriptions as a way to explicitly exhibit their position as an
agent of Roman power, and therefore their position of social influence, many did not. The lack of any overwhelming number of military inscriptions in the colonies may suggest that when at home, soldiers felt less compelled to broadcast their military affiliations, but it may also simply show that there were plenty of soldiers willing to omit these details from their stones, whether in Latin or Greek.

The most striking message given by these inscriptions is that Latin inscriptions in Anatolia were not overwhelmingly associated with the military. Soldiers are one of the most identifiable groups in epigraphy, and in Anatolia they are in fact one of the largest of these identifiable groups in the Latin inscriptions. As a group, they stick out as a strong presence. Yet the raw number of the military inscriptions is much smaller than in other parts of the empire, where in some places soldier epitaphs made up more than three-quarters of the funerary inscriptions. In Anatolia, only about a quarter of the Latin epitaphs of Anatolia are explicitly associated with the military. Indeed, the presence of soldiers in the provinces of Anatolia was small compared to highly militarized provinces such as Syria or Dacia, but if Latin epigraphy in the eastern provinces truly was closely tied to the military, we would expect to see a much stronger domination of the military inscriptions. This just is not the case. Not only were Romans – both as private citizens and as Roman officials - setting up inscriptions, but so also were the local people. So while the small percentage of military inscriptions could be explained simply by the small number of Roman troops present as compared to other regions, this is in part a product of the large number of travelers, businessmen, and immigrants present in Anatolia, all of whom also set up inscriptions. The East drew a lot of people to it, and especially cities such as Ephesus had been popular pilgrimage sites even before Rome
officially controlled them. The smaller ratio of military inscriptions in Anatolia is simply a reflection of the increased diversity of people wishing and able to memorialize themselves in Latin. This diversity in the inscriptions also means, though, that military texts are still one of the largest collective groups within the evidence.

One final observation about the frequency and location of the military inscriptions is that they seem to have augmented cultural practices that were already present in a particular area, rather than introduce new, “Roman” practices. Cappadocia was not a highly urbanized area, and since inscriptions were a largely urban phenomenon, the province had a much smaller epigraphic density than provinces such as Asia or Lycia-Pamphylia. In addition, the province’s only major city, Tyana, owed its prominence primarily to its function as a military colony; it lacked the older, more developed culture of other Anatolian cities, having never Hellenized fully in the centuries before the arrival of the Romans. As a result, epigraphic culture was never developed there in the way that it was in Asia and Lycia, so the military presence within the epigraphy there was much stronger.
CHAPTER 4: Roman Slaves and Freedmen

As agents of Roman power, soldiers in the legions and auxiliaries had a special relationship with Rome and its presence in the provinces. So also did another group of provincial residents – freedmen and slaves (*liberti et servi*). Like soldiers, the social status of these people depended in a large part on their freed status and newly acquired citizenship. Freed men and women took some pride in their freed status, especially if they had served in prominent households, as is evident in the regular inclusion of that status, and their patron’s name, in their inscriptions. This epigraphic convention makes it easy to identify freedmen, with the result that they make up the second largest quantifiable group in this study. Freed men and women were involved in the erection of one hundred Latin inscriptions in Anatolia, honoring not only themselves, but also their children, their colleagues, and their former masters. This chapter also addresses Roman slaves, for although slaves were still under the yoke of their masters, many of those that appear in the inscriptions were highly ranked, very active in their master’s service, and virtually indistinguishable from freedmen who were still in their patrons’ services. Further, some people claiming “freedman” status on their inscriptions may only have been freed on their deathbeds, or only shortly before,\(^{327}\) so while there may have been little difference between them and the slaves in life, they took advantage of their newfound freed status in their funerary displays.

*Freedmen & Epigraphy*

Throughout the Roman empire, freedmen are well attested in the epigraphic record, and most of the foundational works on this class of Romans, such as those by

---

\(^{327}\) As we see in Tac. *Hist.* 1.13.
Weaver and Duff, rely in large part on inscriptions set up by or for freedmen.\textsuperscript{328} Other scholars such as Taylor, Meyer, MacMullen, and Woolf have explored freedmen in the context of the so-called epigraphic habit. It has been estimated that a significant portion of the epitaphs in Rome and Italy record as their dedicators or honorees freedmen and the children of freedmen. Taylor estimated that for every freeborn resident of Rome, there was at minimum two, and often three or more, freedmen attested epigraphically, though she explained this less as a representation of the demographics of Rome and more as evidence of cultural values, namely that epitaphs in particular were a habit dominated by the freed to record their achievements.\textsuperscript{329} More recently, Mouritsen, who prefers talking about multiple “epigraphic habits,” confirms the prevalence of freedmen in the funerary inscriptions of Rome and Italy, though he argues that this is more a reflection of social practice than of demographic realities. He reasons that epitaphs were an easy way for freedmen to display their social status and achievements, while wealthier, freeborn Romans and provincials preferred to commemorate their achievements in more prestigious, more public honorific inscriptions and civic dedications.\textsuperscript{330}

\textsuperscript{328} Weaver, \textit{Familia Caesaris}; Duff, \textit{Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire}.

\textsuperscript{329} Taylor, “Freedmen and Freeborn,” esp. 129-32. The debate over how to identify freedmen and their progeny in the epigraph is a longstanding one. Tenney Frank was the first to argue that the Greek \textit{cognomina} in the inscriptions of the city of Rome indicated men and women of servile stock, predominantly originating in the eastern parts of the empire: “Race Mixture in the Roman Empire,” \textit{AHR} 21 (1916), 689-708; \textit{Economic History of Rome}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Baltimore 1927), 155-64. His thesis was widely criticized in the next few decades, but later gained much support by Thylander (\textit{Étude sur l'épigraphie latine: date des inscriptions, noms et dénomination latine, noms et origine des personnes} [Lund 1952], 134-85) and Taylor. Brunt made similar estimates that in “Roman communities,” the majority of residents were probably descended from freedmen (\textit{Italian Manpower} 207), and Ramsay MacMullen has also tentatively adopted this claim (\textit{Romanization} 5).

\textsuperscript{330} Mouritsen, “Freedmen and Decurions” 38-40; see also Introduction, p. 11-12, for his criticism of the concept of a “Roman epigraphic habit.”
Most of these demographic studies on freedmen have focused on the inscriptions of Rome or Italy, but there were also a large number of freedmen in the eastern provinces. Woolf has shown that citizenship from manumission was much more common in the East than in the western provinces, where citizenship was more often gained through communal grants. Therefore, it is likely that many of the Roman citizens who lived in the provinces of Anatolia were either freedmen, most of whom would have been of eastern origin, or their descendants. Some of them even returned to their hometowns, such as C. Julius Zoilos, who returned to his home of Aphrodisias after gaining his freedom from either Julius Caesar or Augustus. In a sense, many of the freedmen were immigrants in their own land, returning east to settle after having spent years in the service of a Roman household. There was a difference, however, between Greek or Anatolian freedmen and their fellow *ingenui* countrymen, for even though they had been enslaved, the freedmen’s connections to Roman culture – as shown through dress, speech, religious practice, and so forth – and their newly acquired Roman citizenship automatically placed them in a higher social category. Roman citizens of any sort, regardless of their origins and birth, had a certain social prestige. The provinces were especially attractive to freedmen, for they lacked the same the social pressures that existed in the city of Rome, thereby providing a greater opportunity for social mobility than Rome itself would ever offer; in some cases, freedmen were even of a higher status

---

331 See also R. Saller’s discussion of status and freedmen in inscriptions: “The Family and Society,” in J. Bodel (ed.), *Epigraphic Evidence* 107-111.
332 Woolf, “Monumental” 38 (quoted above, p. 10).
333 Precisely who freed Zoilos, and when, is a matter of debate: see Smith, *C. Julius Zoilos* 4-6.
than the *ingenui* of the provinces. Freedmen could choose to continue working for their patrons, or could take up an industry for themselves. Some slaves would have accumulated a decent amount of money during their periods of service, and so manumission might allow them to buy land, start a business, or in extreme circumstances, even become benefactors of their city. This was especially the case for freedmen of influential Roman families and, even more, the imperial freedmen, whose service in the household of the Augusti lent them maximum prestige and wealth.

Inscriptions provided freedmen with a way to communicate this separate status to others. In a way, freedmen were the ultimate representation of the physical and social mobility possible in the Roman world, and setting up an inscription allowed a freed person to announce and assert his social advantages within his community. Successful freedmen used epigraphy especially to publicize their munificence, as was the case for many imperial freedmen who have already been discussed, such as Mazaeus and Mithridates in Ephesus, or C. Julius Zoilos in Aphrodisias, as well as others such as Ti. Claudius Trypho in Laodicea ad Lycum. Non-imperial freedmen did this as well, though often their benefactions were less grandiose. Occasionally, a freedman’s

---

335 Trimalchio’s dinner party (Pet. Sat. 57) gives a vivid (though very likely exaggerated) example of the preference to being a freedman rather than a freeborn resident of the provinces or tributary kingdoms: *Et ego regis filius. Quare ergo servivisti? Quia ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius* (“And I am the son of a king. Then why was I a slave? Because I gave myself into slavery and preferred to be a Roman citizen rather than a tributary”). See also Duff, *Freedmen* 70-1.

336 For example, Mithridates and Mazaeus, two freedmen of Agrippa and, following his death, of Augustus himself (IK 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151); cf. MacMullen *Romanization* 23-4 and n. 86; Weaver, *Familia Caesaris* 2.

337 *IK* 49, no. 24 = 59, no. 170, a bilingual inscription on one of the city gates, in which the name of the proconsul sponsoring the inscription is included in the Latin, but the name of the Greek freedman who actually oversaw its construction is in Greek. For more on this, see below (p. 194-5).

338 In Ephesus, the freedman Ti. Claudius Hermes and his son gave a statue to the city (IK 13, no. 857 = 59, no. 161); P. Veturius Rodus seems to have made a gift relating to wine storage to a collegium (IK 16, no. 2074); and C. Stertinius Orpex and his family donated a large amount of money to various bodies in the city, including the *boule*, the priests, and the *gerousia* (IK 17, no. 4123 = 59, no. 24).
prominence might be so great that the city actually set up an inscription in honor of him, as was the case for Ti. Claudius Classicus in Ephesus. Clearly, freedmen could be valuable members of civic society, and not only because of their own personal wealth. They could even use their Roman connections for the benefit of their cities. Zoilos used his position as a former slave of Caesar and Augustus to gain various privileges and monetary grants for the city to monumentalize the city; for these deeds, the city set up at least two honorific portrait statues of him, and appointed him priest of Aphrodite for life.

Some freedmen are easily identifiable in the epigraphic record, for it was conventional to indicate servile status by including the name of one’s patron; others are harder to identify, but based on certain positions or jobs that they held can be assumed to be of freed status. Occasionally, other factors hint at a freed status, including the type of funerary monument, or the inclusion of a long list of men and women, all of whom have the same praenomen and nomen. These methods are not foolproof, and there are

339 IK 13, no. 852 = 59, no. 122.
340 Reynolds, Aphrodisias and Rome Doc. 33, 38; Smith, C. Julius Zoilos 6-7; L. Robert, “Inscriptions d’Aphrodisias,” L’Antiquité Classique 35 (1966) 414, where he was also the first to address in depth the significance of Zoilos for the history of the city. Before the Julio-Claudian period, Aphrodisias was a minor settlement, known primarily for its connection to the Sanctuary of Aphrodite. Raja credits the city’s growth in the early empire not only to the patronage of Zoilos, but also due to the city’s own high esteem in the eyes of Caesar and Octavian for remaining loyal to Rome during the Mithridatic Wars: R. Raja, Urban Development and Regional Identity in the Eastern Roman Provinces, 50 BC-AD 250: Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Athens, Gerasa (Copenhagen 2012), 194.
341 For example, IK 15, no. 1665 = 59, no. 32, which commemorates a man with a Greek name and the title nomenclator. Cf. T. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht P 359 Anm. 2. Cf. AE 1990, 922, in which the exactor Trophimus sets up a tombstone for Flavia Elpis. Trophimus was likely still a slave since he uses the term coniunx instead of uxor to label his relationship with the citizen (and probably freedwoman) Elpis, and since he does not include a praenomen or nomen for himself, though he does for her.
343 IK 64, no. 134, which lists several names, including Cn. Servilius Apollonides, Servilia Anthos, Cn. Servilius Caepio, and Servilia Tertula. Though there is also a possibility that all of these individuals were siblings and freeborn, tombs of siblings are rarely found without mention of parents. Further,
likely to be freedmen who set up inscriptions without any indication of their freed status. Such would have been the case for P. Cornelius Nicephorus if he had not specified his profession. The Latin epigraphic evidence from Anatolia has many Roman citizens with Greek cognomina without any other identifying information, and while some may have been freeborn Greeks who acquired citizenship, a significant number of these Romans may have actually been freedmen or descendants of freedmen. However, even though manumission was a major cause of the spread of citizenship in the east, there were other ways to attain citizenship as well, including community grants, service in the auxiliaries, or even personal grants from the emperor. Further, the descendants of freedmen would have all had citizenship; while some may have opted to give their children more Roman cognomens to reflect their citizenship, many continued to give them Greek names. As a result, there is a large body of Roman citizen inscriptions from Anatolia in which it is impossible to distinguish ingenui from liberti. Inversely, some freedmen seem to have omitted their full Roman name from their inscriptions, choosing instead to give only their personal Greek name. In these cases, we can only identify the Greek individual as a freedman if he gives the name of his patron, or specifies a rank or position that was typically occupied by members of the freed class. Since this study is

the Greek cognomens and the lack of any filiation makes an identification of freedmen much more likely. These four individuals were all freed by somebody named Cn. Servilius, and very well may have been two couples who may or may not have married following their manumission. Cf. *IK* 16, no. 2280 a = 59, no. 27.

344 *IK* 15, no. 1665 = 69, no. 32. Even more tricky are instances in which the slave rids himself of his Greek cognomen altogether, and instead takes a wholly new Roman name. Tacitus (*Hist.* 1.13) tells us of such a freedmen, originally named Icelus, who was freed by Ser. Sulpicius Galba. Rather than adding his personal name to the first two names of his master and going by Ser. Sulpicius Icelus, as would be expected, he took on a Roman cognomen, Marcianus, which may have implied that before his service to Galba, he had been in the service of a man named Marcius; cf. Sandys, *Latin Epigraphy* 220-2.

345 For example, Mithridates and Mazaeus: see n. 82 above, as well as Mithridates' epitaph (13, no. 851 = 59, no. 19).
most concerned with public identity the number of freedmen who did not specify their freed status on their inscriptions is only a tangential concern, for clearly they did not want to present that as part of their public persona. As a result, I focus exclusively on the inscriptions naming individuals who can be securely identified as freedmen or slaves.

Slaves & Freedmen in the Latin Inscriptions

The corpus of Latin inscriptions from Anatolia records 113 texts containing freedmen as either dedicator or honoree; an additional sixteen inscriptions record slaves. This makes freedmen and slaves the second largest identifiable group represented in the Latin inscriptions, following soldiers. Just a little over half of these inscriptions (N=68) belonged to imperial freedmen or slaves, and almost half of them were bilingual (N=52). Both the Latin and the bilingual texts outnumber the Greek texts that make explicit reference to freedmen, though not significantly so.

Likely, Latin was not the first language for most, if not all, of these freedmen and freedwomen. Outside of those that were verna, these people came primarily from the East. Freedmen put up inscriptions in Greek as well as Latin, and scholars have

---

346 For this chapter, I do not include inscriptions that make mention of freedmen if they clearly had nothing to do with the erection of the inscription. This restriction mostly applies to family tombs, where frequently the head of the family dedicates the space to himself, his spouse, his descendants and his freedmen (libertis et libertais). Such epitaphs are formulaic, and it is clear that the inscription and associated tomb are intended primarily for the erectors’ kin, not for his freedmen. This is especially the case after the second century, as Duff has shown, when the phrase becomes a meaningless formula and cannot be taken as an indication that freedmen were actually allowed to be buried with their patrons. However, in cases where the family tomb specifies a freed person by name, the inscription is included, for it is clear that that particular freedman was highly regarded and likely included in the tomb.

347 In a preliminary analysis of the Greek freedman inscriptions, conducted by surveying exclusively the IK volumes, there numbered about forty Greek inscriptions with freedmen as their erectors or honorees. It is likely that there is actually a much higher number of Greek inscriptions as well, if other smaller and more scattered corpora are examined.

348 Based on onomastics, the majority of the freedmen encountered in this study seem to be of Greek origin. Several scholars have showed that Greek cognomina were also given to slaves from the
supposed that Latin was the dominant language in the inscriptions of freedmen, and in Anatolia, possibly even more popular among freedmen than average provincials. This would be especially true of imperial freedmen, since their service in the imperial household certainly must have mandated knowledge of Latin, and they had the highest prestige of all the freed classes. Latin would have been desirable as a way to set freedmen apart from the non-citizen, Greek-speaking residents of the Anatolian cities, especially if the freedman was of Greek or Anatolian origin himself. Latin was a strong symbol of Romanitas, and the large number of Latin inscriptions set up by freedmen suggests that some wished to display their newly-acquired Roman status and citizenship through language as well as their Roman name. The more signs of Romanitas the better.

Indeed, Latin was used not only to commemorate freedmen in epitaphs and in honorifics, but it was also used by freedmen to commemorate others, or to dedicate to deities and emperors. It is possible that the choice of Latin instead of Greek may have been motivated in part by the presence of freeborn Roman citizens in the text, such as a master setting up an epitaph for his freedman, or a freedmen sponsoring honors for his Roman master. In this way, the Romanness of these citizens would be emphasized. While this may have been a consideration, there are plenty of instances of Greek being used in these same situations, so this explanation is incomplete at best. Further, even if a text was intended by a freedman to honor a freeborn Roman, using Latin allowed the dedicator to align himself as well with this Roman language and identity. This was his

western provinces, most notably M. L. Gordon, “The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire,” JRS 14 (1924), 93-111; Gordon’s thesis was later adopted by other scholars of Roman freedmen, including Duff (Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire 1-11) and W. L. Westermann, , s.v. “Sklaverei,” RE Suppl. 6, 1003-5, and The Slave Systems of Greek and Roman Antiquity (Philadelphia 1955), 92-102. However, Thylander’s study (see n. 329 above) actually showed that most men in Rome with Greek names, as well as many with Latin names, were of eastern origin or sons of freedmen of eastern origin, so in fact relying on Greek names to indicate eastern origins actually underestimates the number of freedmen from the east; cf. Taylor, “Freedmen and Freeborn” 115.
choice. A prime example is a bilingual honorific inscription from late-second century Ephesus, in which an imperial freedman named Spectatus honored a Roman equestrian:

[Tib(erio) Claudio Vibiano Tertullo]
ab epistulis Graecis
et a rationibus Augg(ustorum)
et praef(ecto) vigilum,
Spectatus Augg(ustorum) n(ostorum) 5
lib(ertus) adiut(or) tabul(ariorum) ob me-
rita eius.
Τι(βέριον) Κλ(αύδιον) Οὐεβιανὸν
Τέρτυλλον τὸν
ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν 10
ἐπίστολῶν καὶ τῶν
καθόλου λόγων τῶν
μεγίστων αὐτοκρατό-
ρων καὶ ἔπαρχοι οὐ-
γούλων
Σπεκτάτος Σεββ(αστῶν)
ἀπελεύ-
θερος βοηθὸς ταβλαρίων
τὸν ἰδίον εὐργέτην.

(Latin) To Tiberius Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus, (clerk of) the Greek correspondences and of the accounts of the Augusti and of the prefects of the watch. Spectatus, house-born slave of the Augusti, freedman, assistant record-keeper (dedicated this) on account of his merit.

(Greek) Tiberius Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus, for the presence of the Greek correspondences and of the general accounts of the greatest emperors and of the prefect of the watch. Spektatos, freedman of the Augusti, assitant book-keeper (honors?) his benefactor

Spectatus’ use of Latin was clearly intentional, with an aim to honor himself as much as Tertyllus. This is especially clear since in the Latin portion, his own name was carved in significantly larger letters than that of the equestrian officer whom he was honoring.

Further, Spectatus’ choice of Latin could not have been mandated by the equestrian rank.

---

349 IK 59, no. 130, as pointed out by Kearsley on p. 152.
of Tertyllus, for two other honorifics to him have been found in Selge and Pergamum, both of which were written in Greek.\textsuperscript{350} Clearly, Spectatus’ choice of Latin was more in the interest of his own personal benefit than in the interest of properly honoring the equestrian officer.

Several of the freedmen in the Latin inscriptions were still in the service of their patrons, as evidenced by the tombstones of several \textit{equites singulares} in Anazarbos, which were set up by their freedmen who seem to have accompanied them on their campaigns.\textsuperscript{351} This is especially true of the imperial freedmen, who often continued their service to the emperor by holding positions as procurators or tax-collectors in the eastern provinces. Continued service to freeborn Romans does not explain the prevalence of Latin among these freedmen, however, since plenty of others seem to have returned to their hometowns,\textsuperscript{352} or perhaps just settled in new towns upon manumission. The freedman’s connections to his patron appears to have had no significant bearing on whether he chose to set up inscriptions in Greek, Latin, or both. In fact, freedmen honored not only their patrons and other freeborn Romans in Latin, but they also used Latin to commemorate one another. The Latin funerary inscriptions that commemorated freedmen were frequently set up by spouses, children, or other freedmen from the same \textit{familia}, though on occasion a patron would set up an epitaph for a beloved slave or freedman.\textsuperscript{353} For those born into slavery, Latin could have been their native language alongside, or instead of, the native language of their parents.

\textsuperscript{350} Selge: \textit{IK} 37, no. 13. Pergamon: \textit{IPergamon} 3.28.
\textsuperscript{351} \textit{IK} 56, nos. 65 and 67.
\textsuperscript{352} We know that Mithridates and Mazaesus, for example, were probably of Anatolian origin based on their names.
\textsuperscript{353} From patron to freedman: \textit{IK} 55, no. 55; 59, no. 55. From master to slave: \textit{TAM} 4.1, no. 147. In the second two inscriptions, the slave/freedman was labeled as \textit{verna}, meaning he had been born into his
Quite surprisingly, language choice differed minimally between imperial and non-imperial freedmen. For both groups, Latin-only inscriptions appear in roughly the same proportions as bilingual inscriptions, and the number of Greek inscriptions does not trail too far behind, so neither does Latin dominate the inscriptions of the freed classes, nor is it dwarfed by the Greek epigraphy in the same way that the larger epigraphic evidence is (see Figure 4.10). The Latin and bilingual texts together make up about three quarters of the freedman inscriptions, but the Greek-only inscriptions have a strong representation. They include texts set up both by and for Roman freedmen, though the Greek is mostly isolated to funerary and honorific contexts. The analysis of the Greek texts for this project has been relatively cursory, so it is likely that the Greek numbers would grow

---

354 There are a few instances in which the use of Greek is particularly striking, for they are imperial freedmen setting up inscriptions to honor the emperor. Because both erector and honoree are part of the Roman in-group, and one, it seems to me that Latin would be the more expected choice. For example, an Ephesian dedication to Trajan set up by the procurator of the Egyptian mines, written solely in Greek (IK 13, no. 856). Similarly, a Flavian freedman named Helius made a dedication to Zeus Bennios and the Roman theoi patrioi on behalf of the emperors Vespasian and Titus, but also chose to use Greek instead of Latin (IK 59, no. 144a).
with a more exhaustive survey of the Greek inscriptions of Anatolia. And unlike estimates that in the west the large majority of inscriptions were set up by freedmen or their children, these Latin freedman inscriptions only make up about fifteen percent of the entire Latin corpus. The small number of Greek freedman texts suggests that in a wider analysis of both Greek and Latin inscriptions in Anatolia, freedmen and slaves would still make up a small, though not insignificant, percentage of the epigraphy.

Geographical Distribution of Freedman Inscriptions

Exploring the geographical distribution of the freedman inscriptions provides an interesting perspective on the challenges and pitfalls of epigraphic studies. In particular, Kearsley has claimed that imperial *liberti* outnumbered private *liberti* in the epigraphic record. She attributes this fact to the high level of wealth and influence that imperial freedmen enjoyed in the East, as well as the large number of them serving the emperor in the East as administrators, members of gubernatorial entourages, and so forth. However, when the study area is expanded beyond Asia to include the less-urbanized interior and eastern provinces of Anatolia, the picture shifts significantly. In fact, non-imperial freedmen appear slightly more frequently than the imperial freedmen outside of Asia Province, with fifty-six percent of the surveyed inscriptions being set up by or for persons freed from regular households.

The discrepancy between this study and that of Kearsley, who looked exclusively at the inscriptions of Asia, can be attributed to the anomalous abundance of inscriptions in Ephesus (see Figure 4.11). Ephesus alone has over 4,300 Greek, Latin, and bilingual inscriptions, surpassing all other Anatolian cities by at least 400 percent. The freedman

---

Figure 4.11. Geographic distribution of Freedman Inscriptions.
Figure 4.12. Geographic Distribution of Inscriptions without Evidence from Ephesus.
inscriptions are only a tiny percent of the Ephesian corpus, but even so the city has a
disproportionate number of freedmen inscriptions as compared to other cities in Anatolia—fifty-four freedmen, and five slaves. The city with the next largest number of freedmen inscriptions—Ancyra in Galatia—has only five; all other cities have four or fewer inscriptions set up by or for freedmen (see Figure 4.12). As the capital of Asia, Ephesus was a major commercial and administrative city, and Asia itself had a large number of imperial estates that had freedmen of the imperial house as their procurators and administrators, so clearly the province required a large number of imperial freedmen. The imperial freedmen make up more than half of the freedman inscriptions in Ephesus, but there are a large number of non-imperial freedmen as well. Adding in the Greek evidence does not balance this out either, for Ephesus still has more than five times as many freedman inscriptions than any other city.

In the cities of the interior, not only does the number of freedmen change drastically, but so also does the imperial-private distinction, for the occurrence of imperial freedmen becomes significantly lower. Cities like Nicaea and Smyrna, which like Ephesus served important administrative functions and have produced over 900 published inscriptions, have no Latin epigraphic attestation of imperial freedmen at all. Most of the imperial freedmen found outside of Ephesus are either found in isolation, attesting to freedmen stationed as guardians and procurators of imperial estates, or in major cities, when the freedmen are traveling in the service of Roman administrators. Private freedmen, on the other hand, appear far more often outside of Ephesus, frequently in the company of their patrons. So while Ephesus is an important source for epigraphy,
its domination of the practice dramatically skews the picture of the presence of freedmen elsewhere in Anatolia.

Types of Inscriptions

Overall, the freedman inscriptions reveal that both imperial and non-imperial freedmen were active sponsors of inscriptions, but they also appear as the honorees in them. Imperial freedmen more often are recorded as erectors than as honorees, whereas the non-imperial freedmen appear equally in both, showing that it was not only those associated with the *familia Caesaris* who had the money and the resources to set up inscriptions for their loved ones. As recipients of funerary or honorific inscriptions, imperial freedmen occur less often, so it seems that the strong presence of imperial freedmen in the epigraphic record is largely due to their own donations to others.

![Bar chart showing the types of inscriptions set up by members of the *familia Caesaris* and non-imperial freedmen.](image)

**Figure 4.13. Imperial and Non-imperial Freedmen Inscriptions.**

The types of inscriptions set up by members of the *familia Caesaris* are much more varied than those set up by non-imperial freedmen, who appear almost exclusively in epitaphs. Whereas eighty percent of the non-imperial freedmen inscriptions were funerary, only fifty-four percent were so among their imperial counterparts. Both groups
are similarly present in honorific inscriptions, although the imperial freedmen appear as honorees far more often than the regular freedmen. While the latter are typically found setting up honors for their patrons or themselves, the imperial freedmen, who would provide valuable services to the cities during their employment in the imperial service, often received honors from local communities.356

The main reason for the greater variety among the imperial freedmen inscriptions is that several dedications were set up to the emperors and deities in addition to the usual funerary inscriptions. Among the imperial freedmen, there are seven dedications to the imperial house, four to deities, and three to a combination of the two. From non-imperial freedmen, however, only one religious dedication survives - from a man named Sextus Pontius Seneca, given to the River Scamander. Yet even this inscription – from second century Alexandria Troas – was clearly set up at the request of Seneca’s patron, Pontius Auctus, and is not a reflection of the freedman’s own piety. The evidence of imperial freedmen dedicating to the emperors is not surprising, and in fact I would have expected to see more, not only because they had been in the service of the emperor, but also because most of them were still working as the emperor’s administrators or assistants to administrators. The apparent lack of religious or imperial dedications among the non-imperial freedmen is striking as well, albeit less so. This suggests that while freedmen hoped to navigate their dual-identities to attain local prominence through language choice

356 Among the Greek freedman inscriptions, funerary texts also dominate among both imperial and private freedmen. Further, imperial freedmen have more honorific and dedicatory texts than the private freedmen, but in general the variety in the latter group is larger than what we see in the Latin inscriptions of private freedmen. In the Greek, imperial dedications appear among both imperial and private freedmen, suggesting that for members of the domus Augusti, use of Latin was not necessarily automatic or necessary. However, this group of inscriptions was incredibly small in number, so no firm conclusions can be made at this time.
and public benefactions, they may not have found participation in the imperial cult as advantageous on a local level.

Again, the number of religious dedications in total in this study is only twenty-seven, so the small number of religious texts from freedmen is less striking in this context. Kearsley already has shown that the language conservatism inherent in religious inscriptions in general\textsuperscript{357} extends even to those “who are associated with bilingualism in other domains such as imperial freedmen.” \textsuperscript{358} But among the freedmen in even the select Greek inscriptions surveyed here, religious texts are sparse. In fact, only one has any religious affiliation – a dedication to Zeus Bennios and the “ancestral gods” from an imperial freedman on behalf of Vespasian, Titus, and his own family.\textsuperscript{359} This freedman, Helius, was a guard on an imperial state in Phrygia, near the sanctuary of Zeus Bennios at Appia, but also seems to have been born somewhere nearby. Kearsely has suggested that the phrase \textit{θεοὶ πατρίοις} was a reference to the Roman Penates and the Lares Augusti, but the phrasing of the text, and the order in which the gods are presented, and the use of Greek suggests that he was instead offering sacrifices to his own local, ancestral gods.\textsuperscript{360}

\textsuperscript{357} As discussed by Adams; see Chapter 2.
\textsuperscript{358} Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{359} \textit{IK} 59, no. 144a. His wife, an \textit{ingenua}, also set up a similar dedication, also in Greek (no. 144b).
\textsuperscript{360} Kearsley (\textit{IK} 59, p. 119) cites other examples of the Roman deities being referenced with the phrase \textit{θεοὶ πατρίοι}, but in these instances the gods are typically mentioned alongside an emperor (e.g. \textit{TAM} V.1, 694: \textit{θείοις καὶ Καίσαρι Μ. [Αὐρηλίῳ Κομμόδῳ Λατονείνα...}). She does note other examples where the phrase applies to local deities as well: cf. L. Robert, “Trois oracles de la théosophie,” \textit{CRAI} 112 (1968), 583 no. 5 = \textit{OMSV} (1989), 599 no. 5. Because this inscription was set up by a freeborn Roman citizen and a member of the imperial household, then based on the evidence in this study we would expect that they would opt for Latin, or at least a bilingual text, to dedicate to Roman deities. This would especially be the case since the ancestral deities are mentioned right after the dedication to Zeus Bennios “τῆς ἵπποι πατρίδος Λιγρεστεων καὶ Ζβουρηας” (of his fatherland Agrostea and Zbourea).
Bilingualism among Freedmen

Freedmen were probably among the most bilingual groups in Anatolia. This is reflected in the large number of bilinguals set up by both imperial and non-imperial freedmen, which show that this group of men and women did not necessarily prioritize one identity over the other. While making clear his own freed status could be a boon to a freedman’s local reputation, for it suggested things about his wealth, connections, and citizenship status, that did not require him to neglect his eastern origins or his native language. Bilingual inscriptions allowed for maximum readership, but they also allowed freedmen to present their epitaphs or honors in a way to show their belonging to both groups. This was not always the case, and there are some freedmen known to have completely avoided broadcasting their freed status, but the freedmen who are known to appear in the Latin and Greek inscriptions of Anatolia were not ashamed of their servile origins, and at the same time they were interested and excited to be active and productive citizens within their new communities.

When looking just at the bilingual inscriptions of Anatolia, freedmen and slaves represent the largest percentage of these texts – just over twenty-five percent (N=56). That freedmen should be the largest group represented in the bilingual data echoes Kearsley’s assertions that freedmen who settled or spent significant time in the East were an essential component of linguistic and cultural interactions between Romans and the local inhabitants of Asia.

The repeated use of code-switching in epitaphs erected and possibly even created by wives of members of the imperial familia leads to the conclusion that the

361 See n. 344 above.
362 There are a total of 218 bilingual texts in this study; fifty-one belong to freedmen, and another five to slaves.
363 Kearsley, IK 59, p. 156.
families formed by imperial slaves and freedmen with women of local families led to the exchange of features of language and culture at a domestic level.

In her study of the bilinguals from the province of Asia alone, Kearsley found that imperial freedmen were more common than individuals freed from private Roman households;\textsuperscript{364} this does not remain true for the greater Anatolian region – only twenty-six of the fifty-six bilinguals belonged to members of the \textit{familia Caesaris}. There is actually very little difference in language preference between imperial and non-imperial freedmen in Anatolia as a whole. The province of Asia was unique in its high number of posts available to imperial freedmen as compared to the other Anatolian provinces. They could serve as administrators of the province or imperial estates,\textsuperscript{365} or as benefactors of the Asian cities.\textsuperscript{366} As a result, Asia, and Ephesus in particular, had a much denser concentration of imperial freedmen. Outside of Asia, however, larger numbers of non-imperial freedmen are found. Many of them were further east because they were traveling with their patrons in the Roman legions. Since high percentages of soldiers are found in the central and eastern provinces of Anatolia as opposed to the “unarmed” western province of Asia, these accompanying freedmen outnumbered their imperial counterparts.

The inscriptions of the imperial freedmen do reveal much about the experiences of these freedmen both within the imperial household and in the provinces. Many of the freedmen seem to have married imperial freedwomen or slaves (though of course slaves

\textsuperscript{364} This was likewise claimed by MacMullen, \textit{Romanization} 23-4.

\textsuperscript{365} For example, Euactus who is the earliest known procurator of the provinces of Asia and Lycia under Vespasian (\textit{IK} 12, no. 262 = 59, no. 117); Weaver, \textit{Familia Caesaris} 276-7. See \textit{AE} 1973, 533 = \textit{IK} 59, no. 110 for a freedman who served as the procurator of the imperial estates of Ipsina in Moetana in the Porsuk Valley.

\textsuperscript{366} Benefactors included Mazaes and Mithridates of Ephesus (\textit{IK} 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151) and Ti. Claudius Trypho of Laodicea-ad-Lycus (\textit{IK} 49, no. 24 = 59, no. 170), who are discussed below. For other freedmen benefactors, see \textit{IK} 36, no. 148 from Tralles.
could not legally marry), often having children by them as well.\textsuperscript{367} There is also ample
evidence of these freedmen marrying into families of \textit{ingenui}, whether local or Roman.\textsuperscript{368}
The bilingual inscriptions set up by these men and women clearly reflect the complex
nature of their identities. Many of them would have been from Greek backgrounds before
entering the imperial household as slaves, and many went back to the Greek world upon
their manumission, whether as an attempt to settle there or as someone still in the employ
of the emperor. We know that such freedmen could become prominent members of their
own communities, as seen through the extensive monuments to C. Julius Zoilos in
Aphrodisias,\textsuperscript{369} especially since they could serve as an advocate for the city to the
emperor. Whether these imperial freedmen typically settled in the cities from which they
came or in new cities is not always clear,\textsuperscript{370} but that does not seem to have necessarily
determined their prominence there.

Bilingual inscriptions would naturally have been the best way for these imperial
freedmen to display their connection to both Roman imperial and Greek provincial
cultures to which they belonged, though bilinguals are not always used. Several Latin-

\textsuperscript{367} See \textit{CIL} III.422 = \textit{IK} 59, no. 47, where it seems that freedwoman Claudia has dedicated an
inscription to her husband Laetus, who is still a slave of Caesar. As Kearsley states, “If restoration is
correct, Claudia joins the small proportion of imperial \textit{libertae} who are attested as wives of imperial
slaves” (\textit{IK} 59, p. 35). See also \textit{RECAM} II, no. 459, in which the imperial freedman T. Aelius Carpus is
honored by his wife – presumably also an imperial freedwoman – Aelia Cale.
\textsuperscript{368} For example, T. Flavius Epagathus (\textit{IK} 13, no. 858 = 59, no. 160), whose wife Manlia Procula was
probably related to L. Manlius Maritus, a member of the \textit{conventus} of Roman citizens in Ephesus (\textit{IK}
17, no. 3019). Weaver (\textit{Familia Caesaris} 112-36; 179-95) discusses in depth the marriage practices of
freedmen and slaves both within and outside of the imperial household. Rawson has also used a
study of the lower-class epitaphs from Rome to examine the frequency of marriage between different
social classes, including the slaves, the freed, and the freeborn: see B. Rawson, “Family Life among the
Lower classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire,” \textit{CP} 61 (1966), 71-83.
\textsuperscript{369} Smith, C. Julius Zoilos.
\textsuperscript{370} Zoilos was definitely a native of Aphrodisias, as Octavian clearly wrote in his letter to Stephanos at
Laodicea-ad-Lycum, which was later inscribed on the Archive Wall in the theater at Aphrodisias:
“... ὡς Ζώλιον τὸν ἐμὸν φίλον ἐπίστασα· τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ ἐλευθέρωσα καὶ ἀντωνίῳ συνέστησα...”
(Reynolds, \textit{Aphrodisias and Rome} Doc. 10).
only inscriptions survive for these people, as do Greek-only inscriptions, but it seems that in most cases, the language choice here depends on the context of the text. For example, one inscription from Tricoma in Phrygia (CIL III.348) commemorates an imperial freedman who held various procuratorships in two different provinces. He was being honored exclusively in Latin by another imperial freedman – his collib(ertus).

Because of the honorific nature of this inscription, as well as the association that both the dedicator and the honoree had with Roman power, the choice of Latin seems relatively natural. The same goes for a Latin text from Ephesus in which an imperial freedman honors the procurator of Asia (among various other positions). Again, the text is honorific, and both men mentioned in the inscription are in close association with Roman power.

Compare these, for example, to the funerary epitaph of the imperial freedman M. Aurelius Victorinus, which was set up in Latin by his own freedman. However, there is a Greek postscript attached to the inscription, presumably added on soon after the stone was set up, stating that the sarcophagus had been placed in the tomb legally. The Greek makes clear that the tomb was owned by a man named T. Stasius Niger, and that Niger had given Victorinus permission to have his remains placed here on account of their friendship:

---

371 For example, IK 58, no. 385; CIL III 348; IK 13, no. 684b.
372 IK 59, nos. 83, 96
373 IK 13, no. 666. The honoree, though unnamed in the surviving inscription, has been assumed to be Valerius Eudaimon (see H-G Pflaum, Les carrières procuratorienes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain I (Paris 1960) 264, no. 110; G. B. Townsend, “The Post of AB Epistulis in the Second Century,” Historia 10 [1961], 375-81). The slave, Hermes, is mentioned in Weaver, Familia Caesaris 231-3, 280.
374 AE 1973, 533 = IK 59, no. 110.
D(is) M(anibus)
M(arcus) Aur(elius) Victorinus
Augustorum libertus
tabularius regionaris
Ipsina et Moeteanae
M(arcus) Aur(elius) Icius
li(bertus) patrono v(otum?)
fecit aream tantum
Τ(ίτος) Στάσιος Νίγερ συνεχώρησα τὴν σοφὸν ἐπιτεθῆναι φιλίας χάριν.

(Latin) To the divine spirits. Marcus Aurelius Victorinus, freedman of the Augusti, regional tabularius at Ipsina and Moeteana. Marcus Aurelius Icius, his freedman, made this plot only as an offering to his patron.

(Greek) Titus Stasius Niger agreed that the sarcophagus be placed on it, on account of their friendship.

It could be argued that the two inscriptions do not actually belong together, that the Greek was added on later, but there are many examples of inscriptions where the personal information of the deceased individual is in a language different from the message to the readers, the latter of which is precisely how the Greek line here is functioning. The deceased and the dedicator, both of whom are freedmen, are commemorated in Latin, yet the owner of the tomb, Niger, was likely a man of local prominence and the Greek portion of the inscription was intended for him or any of his family or community members who might think that the sarcophagus had been placed in the tomb without permission.

Other bilingual inscriptions similarly show a difference between the role of Latin and the role of Greek in the monuments of imperial freedmen. The honorific inscription of Ti. Claudius Classicus, who held various procuratorships under both Titus and Nerva, reveals some interesting variances in the Greek and the Latin.\textsuperscript{376} The Latin portion of the text simply gives the freedman’s name and various titles and positions held over the

\textsuperscript{375} The reading of this line in \textit{AE} 1973 takes the name of the dedicating freedman to be Mauricius, but Kearsley’s reconstruction of this name into \textit{a tria nomina} must be correct, since the freedman certainly would have taken on his patron’s \textit{praenomen} and \textit{nomen}.

\textsuperscript{376} \textit{IK} 13, no. 852 = 59, no. 122
course of his career, followed by a simple “ob merita eius” (“on account of his merits”). The Greek gives a very similar text, including all of the components in the Latin, but it also includes an introduction that attributes the inscription to the assembly and populace of Ephesus (ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐτεμήσαν). In addition, the Greek version gives the name of Classicus’ assistant who was responsible for setting up the monument. While these differences will be discussed more fully below, it is noteworthy that while the imperial freedman is commemorated in Latin, his assistant, a member of a prominent Ephesian family, records his role in the monument only in the Greek translation. There are also many examples in this study of simple bilingual epitaphs of imperial freedmen, in which the translations of the Latin into the Greek are essentially verbatim.

Most of the inscriptions set up by imperial freedmen are epitaphs, though there are a few that are honorific or dedications to a deity or an emperor. This is in contrast to the Latin-only inscriptions of the imperial freedmen, which are more varied, especially in terms of honorific inscriptions, although epitaphs still make up the majority of the inscriptions. The two most impressive honorific bilingual inscriptions, however, are city gates put up by these wealthy freedmen in various cities. The first of these gates was set up by two freedmen by the names of Mithridates and Mazaeus on the southern side of the Ephesian Agora in 4/3 BC. From another inscription, we know that Mithridates was originally the freedman of Agrippa, but he must have passed into the familia of Augustus.

---

377 As Kearsley notes (Romans and Greeks 94), the dedicator C. Julius Photinus Celer may have been related to another C. Julius Photinus, who appears in two other inscriptions from Ephesus (nos. 690.4; 981). Photinus was from a prominent Ephesian family that probably had achieved equestrian rank and is well documented as serving as benefactors for the city.

378 For example, TAM V.2.1319 = IK 59, no. 92; RECAM II 459.

379 IK 17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151.
after Agrippa’s death; nothing is known of Mazaeus beyond this inscription. The gate bears an inscription above the three arches which visitors would see as they entered the Agora from the direction of the Celsus Library and the State Agora. The inscription, which spans the space above all three of the doorways, serves as a dedication to the imperial quad of Augustus, Agrippa, Livia, and Julia:

*imp(eratori) Caesari Divi f(ilio) Augusto pontifici maximo co(n)s(ul) XII tribunic(ia) potest(ate) XX et Liviae Caesaris Augusti Mazaeus et*

*Middle*  
Μαζαύς καὶ Μιθριδάτης τοῖς πάτροις καὶ τοῖς δήμοις  
(Middle) Mazaeus and Mithridates to their patrons and the citizenry [of Ephesus].

As this inscription shows very clearly, the imperial freedmen have appropriately chosen to honor their former masters and patrons in Latin, but they opted not to translate this

---

380 *IK* 13, no. 851 = 59, no. 19, where Kearsley reckons that the planning for the monument likely started before Agrippa’s death, hence the reference to him as the husband of Julia despite his death about nine years earlier. The passing on of one’s freedman to another, especially in the case of Augustus, is well documented. See also the example of C. Julius Zoilos from Aphrodisias (n. 333 above).

381 Text reads *imb. for imperator*. Kearsley notes the uniqueness of this inscription in the use of this title for Agrippa, which was very uncommon, and appears only here and at Nemausus (*CRAI* 1919, 332): see R. Syme, “Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature,” in *Roman Papers* (Oxford 1979), 371.
portion into Greek, for it was perfectly sufficient to give imperial titles in Latin. Mithridates and Mazaeus then name themselves as the donors in both Latin and Greek, as is befitting since the gate is a gift to the Greek speaking Ephesians, but more overtly a dedication to the Latin-speaking emperor and his closest relatives. But there is a slight difference between the short Greek text and its Latin counterpart, in that the Greek includes the word δῆµος, while the Latin does not. These two men who were of Greek origin (maybe even from Ephesus itself, though there is no way to know) chose only to honor the city in the Greek text, not in the Latin. Indeed, this slight variation reveals much about the varied role that Latin and Greek could serve, especially for someone like an imperial freedman who would have identified as a Greek by birth, but also as a loyal servant of the Roman state. For those who would be reading the Latin text, the dedication of this gate to the people of Ephesus would likely have mattered little to them, but it would have mattered a great deal to the locals who would be reading the Greek, and on whom this monumental gate would have the greatest impact.

One last thing to note about the gate is the placement of the various languages in relation to each other and the viewer. Whereas the Latin portions sit above the left and the right doorways, the Greek crowns the recessed, central doorway. Beyond the simple symmetry of this presentation, it seems significant that the Greek occupies the central position on the monument because, after all, this Agora was at its core a commercial and political center for the residents of Ephesus. The Latin has a prominent position, too, but the Greek dedication which addresses the Ephesians in addition to the “patrons” was what funneled them into this important center.
In Lycia, another imperial freedman who served under Claudius, erected a bilingual gate for Domitian during the proconsulship of Sex. Julius Frontinus. The gate has a long history of scholarship surrounding it, largely because of the fragmentary nature of the inscriptions, but general consensus has now agreed that the fragments belong to the so-called “Syrian Gate” of the city, and that there were inscriptions on either side of the gate, facing both the city and the country. One of these inscriptions seems to have been exclusively in Greek, whereas the second was bilingual. Of course, the fact that these epigraphic fragments were discovered in disarray makes it impossible to know which inscription faces which side, but it is likely that the text facing inwards toward the city was that which contained the Latin, for it was inside the city where Latin-speaking Romans would see and read the text. This idea, then, that there were two texts, one aimed toward both the Romans visiting the city and the local citizens, and the other appealing exclusively to the Greek-speaking citizens and neighbors dwelling outside of the city, reveals in a different manner the sentiments implied in the omission of démós from the Latin portion of the Mithridates-Mazaeus Gate discussed above.

An additional divergence is found between the Greek and Latin texts; the Latin dedicates the gate exclusively to the emperor Domitian, while the Greek dedicates it to Domitian and Zeus Soter. The mention of the deity here only in the Greek is certainly telling. For members of the imperial administration, who were presumably the intended audience of the Latin text, the names of the imperial honoree and the erector would have been the chief interest. Yet for the local residents, who would have been more fluent and literate in Greek than Latin, the aforementioned names are supplemented with details of local interest – the Greek deity and the imperial freedman who was no doubt the local
representative of the provincial governor. That Zeus was the main civic deity is reflected in one of the city’s original names, Diospolis (“city of Zeus”), and therefore he has importance to the local residents, although perhaps not to the imperial powers. Trypho illustrates his familiarity with the imperial cult by using Latin in addition to the Greek to honor Domitian, but he also shows awareness that for the worship of locally important deities, such as Zeus Soter, Greek is far more appropriate.

Among the inscriptions set up by non-imperial freedmen, epitaphs dominate the group. Only a handful of the non-imperial freedman bilinguals are not epitaphs. This proportion is not significant, especially because of the small numbers of inscriptions we are dealing with, but also because the non-imperial freedmen generally occupied a lower social stratum than their imperial counterparts. Imperial freedmen were of high social status in the Greek cities of the east, both because of their connections to the emperor as well as the wealth that many of them acquired during their tenure in the imperial service. Most of the inscriptions considered in this study – both the bilingual and the Latin texts – reflect this elevated status. For the non-imperial freedmen, not every one of them was fortunate enough to have a wealthy or prominent citizen as their master. For this reason, honorific dedications would have been less common.

This is not to say that only freedmen from the imperial house held any prominence in the cities of Anatolia. There are several instances of the exact opposite. Notable is C. Stertinius Orpex, whose benefactions to the city of Ephesus probably

---

382 Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 5.105; Steph. Byz., s.v. Λαοδίκεια (2). The city was renamed by Antiochus II Theos (261-253 BC) after his wife Laodice.

383 For other inscriptions of Zeus Soter in Laodicea, see *IK* 49, nos. 21 and 62, both of which are in Greek.
played a role in his daughter holding the priesthood of Artemis.\footnote{IK 17, no. 4123 = 59, no. 24. See also Kearsley’s comments on Orpex’ career (IK 59, p. 20-1).} Orpex was able to make something of himself despite his slave background, having attained apparitorial rank, but this is surely due in part to his service in a consular household, as well as Orpex’ high rank within that household.\footnote{His patron was C. Stertinius Maximus (cos. AD 23). Orpex’ wife was a freedman of the same family, and while the exact connection that Maximus had with Ephesus (if any) is unknown, another inscription from Ephesus for one Stertinius Maximus Eutyches (\textit{IK} 59, no. 117), of equestrian rank, confirms that Orpex’ descendants maintained this high status acquired by the \textit{apparitor}.} He had many of the advantages of imperial freedmen: money and resources to serve as a civic benefactor upon his liberation. Because of his indebtedness to his service in a Roman household, Orpex naturally chooses Latin as the most appropriate language with which to commemorate himself, his freedwoman wife, and his citizen children. Yet Orpex also makes sure to publicize his benefactions to the city, and for this he switches to Greek so that his generous gifts to his fellow citizens would have been known to a larger number Ephesians.

Various other freedmen seem to prefer Latin to record their names, while Greek is used to communicate the more intimate details of their lives. For example, a wealthy freedwoman by the name of Hellenia Meroe set up a tombstone for herself and her husband, who was probably an \textit{ingenuus}.\footnote{IK 16, no. 2266 = 59, no. 36. Her husband’s freeborn status is assumed since he is not described as a \textit{libertus} like she is. He does not have any filiation, so it may be that he is a first generation \textit{ingenuus}, but he may also simply be a freeborn local. The Castricius \textit{gens} was prominent among Roman businessmen in the East during late Republic, and several Castricii served as office holders in Ephesus during the Principate (Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 29). If Castricius was freeborn, then he was likely to be culturally Greek, despite his descent from a Roman \textit{gens}.} The epitaph begins with a short Latin inscription which simply names her and her husband, P. Castricius Valens. This is followed by a much longer Greek inscription that repeats the names of Hellenia and Castricius, but also includes the names of several other individuals, possibly children or
freedmen of the couple.\textsuperscript{387} The Greek then concludes with the legal disclaimer, “τούτο τὸ μνημείον | κληρονόμοις οὐκ ἅκολουθήσει – τούτου τὸ μνημείον ἡ γερουσία κήδεται,” followed by a Latin subscript also specifying that the tomb is not to be occupied by later heirs: \textit{h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur)}.\textsuperscript{388} Set up by a Roman freedwoman, the use of Latin reflects her erudition and association with a Roman household. It is interesting, then, that she switches to Greek to commemorate the other individuals named, and it seems likely that this was a overt way of communicating to the reader that these others, unlike her, had no connection to Rome, and consequently reemphasized her own connections.

The large numbers of freedmen represented in the bilingual texts show clearly that many in the freed classes used their acquired knowledge of Latin to communicate and make explicit their affiliation with Roman culture in perpetuity. Slaves used Latin as well, though there are very few attestations of them in the epigraphic record. Only sixteen inscriptions in the entire corpus seem to have been set up by or for Roman slaves; nine of

\textsuperscript{387} The majority of the names listed bear the \textit{nomen} Castricius/-\textit{a}, and are likely the children of Hellenia and Castricius. However, two Greek names (Bassos and loukoundos) are listed without and \textit{praenomen} or \textit{cognomen}, suggesting that perhaps these were slaves. Since these slaves are named before the various other \textit{Castricii}, it is possible that all of these individuals were of servile or freed status, since it is not typical for members of the \textit{familia} to be listed before children. The last individual, named Sex. Hellenius Agathopus, was likely a freedman from the same family as Hellenia, and possibly even a relative of hers.

\textsuperscript{388} Greek translation: “This memorial shall not pass to the heirs; the gerousia protects this memorial.” Latin translation: “This monument shall not pass to the heir.” In a similar vein is another epitaph from Ephesus, of the freedman P. Vedius Nicephoros, his wife, and their daughter: \textit{IK} 16, no. 2324 = 59, no. 18. This epitaph contains the names of the deceased in Latin only, as well as a Latin postscript containing the prohibition from placing other deceased there. Yet the stone also contains a brief Greek phrase that is broken off, but seems to indicate that the tomb is guarded by somebody (possibly the \textit{gerousia}). Like the tomb of Hellenia and her family, this epitaph records the names of freedmen in Latin, as well as the legal prohibitions, while switching to the local language to indicate the local protecting body for the tomb. Nicephoros’ freed status is not explicit on the stone, but implied due to the omission of any filiation, though he may also be a first-generation \textit{ingenuus} like Castricius above (n. 386); the same goes for his wife, although she seems to be from a different household. Their daughter, however, does have a filiation associated with her, and so was seemingly born after Nicephoros’ manumission.
these were set up by imperial slaves. Unlike freedmen, slaves could not own property in
their own right, so they would have had little flexibility in terms of buying and
sponsoring the erection of tombstones, yet those who held prominent enough positions in
their households seem to have had more liberties in this sense. This small group of
inscriptions is dominated by epitaphs, most of which were set up by the spouses or
children of the erecting slave, though a couple record dedications from a slave to another
in the same familia. In addition to the epitaphs, there are four honorific inscriptions, all
from Ephesus, that were set up by imperial slaves to honor important Roman equestrian
officials.\footnote{IK 13, nos. 647, 652, 844 and 861.} The last slave inscription, also from Ephesus, records the dedication of a
private slave to the god Hercules.\footnote{IK 13, no. 860.} It is clear that the circumstances under which slaves
– even those of the imperial household – set up inscriptions were quite limited. The few
honorific inscriptions were most likely set up at state or civic expense, and the slave was
simply the imperial representative. But the funerary epitaphs, and even the dedication to
Hercules, are quite personal and make little mention of the masters beyond the requisite
formulaic mention of them. At the same time, because of the legal restrictions of slaves, it
is hard to imagine them setting up these stones without the consent and financial support
of their masters. It is impossible to determine to what degree slaves had control over the
language choice in the texts, especially since my cursory survey of the Greek inscriptions
has produced similarly small numbers of Greek-language slave texts.

At the same time, a couple of the funerary texts are bilingual, which suggests that
there was at least a degree of consciousness regarding language choice in these texts.\footnote{Non-imperial: IK 59, no. 38 (from Magnesia on the Menander); imperial: IK 29, no. 46 (Cius, Bithynia); IK 59, no. 89 (Iulia Gordus, Lydia); IK 59, no. 61 (Synnada, Phrygia).}
Most of the bilingual texts are imperial slaves setting up honors for a family member, though there is also one set up by the slave of a *legatus Augusi*, commemorating a freedman of the same *familia*. In these rare cases, it is clear that even when still in the service of a Roman household, even the emperor’s household, there was a desire among some to acknowledge their Greek heritage as well as their service to a Roman family. It seems significant that none of these bilinguals are from Ephesus, but rather from more remote towns throughout Asia Minor, where the inclusion of Greek would be far more important due to the weaker presence of Latin outside of Ephesus and Asia Province. If this was the motivation, however, it clearly was not standard, for none of the other slave inscriptions set up outside of Asia were bilingual.

An interesting example of the interaction between the two languages among slaves is seen in the epitaph of Felix, the *vicarius* of Primio. Here, the Latin text names the deceased slave as well as his master and his master’s titles. The Greek text translates the Latin, and then adds on the name of another slave, named Tyrannis, who was responsible for the erection of the altar and monument. The text implies that Primio, who administered the harbor tax in Miletus, probably as a servile agent for his master, who would have been a *publicanus*. This position, along with his charge over two other slaves, indicates Primio was a high-ranked slave. His use of Latin reflects this, as well as serving a practical function since he was engaging in the Roman taxation system.

Tyrannis and Felix, the other hand, were lower ranking slaves under Primio’s authority. The inclusion of both the *vicarius* and the deceased in Latin, while omitting Tyrannis, suggests a rank difference between them. Tyrannis may have been a grunt of Primio, with

---

392 *IK* 59, no. 40.
no claim to Roman culture, whereas Latin was appropriate for honoring Felix, who more directly helped Primio with the collection of taxes.

Conclusions

The inscriptions that attest to the Roman freedmen in Anatolia reveal that this is one of the largest identifiable groups using Latin in the eastern provinces. At the same time, freedmen still only make up a small percentage of the total Latin epigraphic evidence. This means that the Latin epigraphic practices in the East cannot be attributed solely to freedmen, or at least not to freedmen who identify themselves as such on their inscriptions, as other scholars have suggested. It would be misguided to assume that the 129 inscriptions of freedmen and slaves are the only Latin inscriptions that any freedmen set up in the whole of Anatolia. Surely upon acquisition of freedom, some freedmen preferred not to publicize their slave background, but in the inscriptions surveyed in this chapter, it is clear that these freedmen chose to communicate their freed status proudly.

Secondly, there is little difference between the number of imperial and private freedmen who are attested in the epigraphic record. Imperial freedmen did not outnumber their private counterparts as Kearsley has suggested, although there is a higher concentration of them in the city of Ephesus than anywhere else. Nor was the use of Latin higher among either group. In fact, both imperial and non-imperial freedmen seem to have chosen their languages at almost identical rates, with around forty percent being in Latin, thirty percent in both Latin and Greek, and a little over a quarter in Greek. Through this, we can see that there was little difference between how the two different classes of freedmen used language to represent themselves, and shows that in terms of loyalty to
Rome, imperial freedmen did not necessarily identify as “Roman” any more than those who had been freed from private Roman households. The only way in which we see a closer tie among imperial freedmen is through the erection of dedications to the emperor, of which we have none from private freedmen. At the same time, imperial dedications from imperial freedmen do not have quite the same effect as one from an eastern provincial, for example, since as members of the imperial household, imperial dedications from members of the *familia Caesaris* come off as personal dedications to their patrons as much as sycophantic dedications to the emperor.

The prevalence of epitaphs among the Latin and bilingual texts is consistent with freedman inscriptions throughout the empire. As members of the non-elite, freedmen used funerary texts more than any other to attest to their existence, their familial connections, and their freed status. This remains the case in Anatolia regardless of the language freedmen chose for these inscriptions. The vast majority of the freedmen attested in Anatolia were of eastern origin and therefore native Greek speakers. For this reason, the prominence of Latin in their inscriptions is significant, for unlike freedmen erecting epitaphs in Rome or Italy, Greek was a perfectly acceptable epigraphic language in Anatolia, and did not necessarily indicate that someone was of a lower social class, as it would in the Latin West. Despite this, a large number of men and women who had served in Roman households chose to continue that association through the use of Latin instead of, or in addition to, their native Greek. Not only would this indicate to their fellow Greeks that they were partially Roman now, having taken on Roman citizenship as well as aspects of Roman culture; the use of Latin would also allow them to place themselves within the Roman social structure, and possibly gain greater recognition from
any Romans that may pass through, than they might otherwise if they set up their inscriptions only in Greek. In other words, the use of Latin lent them prominence and respect among their local communities, but it also verified and validated their place within Roman society.

Unlike the military inscriptions discussed in the previous chapter, it is difficult to date a large number of the freedman inscriptions with any specificity. Most imperial inscriptions can only be dated to general periods, based on the *nomen* of the freedman, which would have been taken from the emperor who freed him. Private inscriptions are even more difficult, and typically are dated based on stylistic grounds if there is nothing in the text itself that is datable. Overall, however, the vast majority of the inscriptions seem to date to the first or second centuries of the empire, with the strongest periods being the Julio-Claudian and earlier Antonine periods. There are a few that date to the reign of Septimius Severus or Caracalla, but hardly any after that. Of course, these patterns are largely mandated by the wider chronological distribution of the inscriptions, as discussed in Chapter 2, but there is a near absence of freedman inscriptions from the Severan period, despite the small spike in the overall Latin inscriptions at that time. 

Soldier inscriptions were also quite small in number during the Severan period. Even after the grant of universal citizenship in AD 212, slaves were still being set free, but it seems that the excitement of this freedom was muted from this point on. No longer did a freedman have that special status within the provinces. All non-slaves had the citizenship, so there was a decreased need to set up inscriptions attesting to this newly acquired status.
Sometime during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, an Ephesian by the name T. Flavius Damianus, set up an honorific inscription to Junius Maximus, a Roman senator and military tribune.\(^{393}\)

---

Armeniacis Medi[cis] Parthicis max[imis ob ex-] peditionem [P]arthi[cam] feliciessim[a]m don[is mi-]
litribus corona mura-
li et vallari hastis puris vexillo item donativo extraordinario, quaes-
tor. extr[a] s[e]n[t]entias des[i] gnatus, suscipien[tem] 15
munus laureatar[um] victoriae Parthicae quaestor pro pra[etore]
provinciae Asiae ἀναστήσαντος 20
τὴν τεμήν
ἐκ τοῦ ἱδίου
Τ. Φλ. Δαμιανὸ
τοῦ γραμματέως τοῦ ὅμου καὶ πα-
νηγυρίαρχον τῶν 25
μεγάλων Ἑφεσήων

(Latin) -[Iunius Maximus?]--senatorial tribune for Legion III Gallica, presented with military decorations by the best and greatest emperors Antoninus and Verus Augusti Armeniaci Medici Parthici Maximi on account of his most fortunate Parthian expedition:

---

(the decorations awarded were) the crown of the wall and of the rampart, unsoiled spears, a banner and also an extraordinary donative. Designated quaestor extra sententias, having undertaken the public duty of the laureled report for the Parthian victory; quaestor pro praetore of the Province Asia. (Greek) Having restored the honor from his own resources, Titus Flavius Damianos, secretary of the demos and archon of the feasts of the mighty Ephesians.

Damianus was quite prominent among local Epehsians, having served in the city as both grammateus and panegyriarch. He also sponsored the building of stoas to link the city with the Artemision outside of the city, and provided grain for the Roman legions for thirteen months after the Parthian campaign. In sum, Damianus was a benefactor of Ephesus, and wished for his munificence to be well known to his fellow citizens, which would be best done in Greek, the language of Ephesus. However, this stone was honoring Junius Maximus, as a Roman of senatorial rank who had recently gained imperial honors for his successful campaign against the Parthian enemies in the East, so Damianus wanted the inscription to honor the Roman leader in the most appropriate way, would normally include the use of the Roman language, Latin, which was the official language of the empire and the military. Ultimately, Damianus decided to achieve both ends – both the glorification of Maximus and the advertising of his benefaction – by splitting the text into two languages: a Latin portion to honor respectfully the Roman military officer, and a Greek portion to exhibit proudly his good deed to his fellow citizens.

The preceding two chapters have looked at the body of epigraphic evidence through the lens of particular groups, arguing that Latin was particularly useful for people
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394 The phrase extra sententias is puzzling and may be a corruption, though Talbert has suggested it is an error or misunderstanding on the part of the Greek author: R. J. A. Talbert, The Senate of Imperial Rome (Princeton 1984), 515-6.

395 Several long inscriptions from Ephesus – these also in Greek - detail Damianos’ career: IK 13, no. 672; 17, no. 3080.
whose elevated social status depended exclusively on their connection to Roman culture. This present chapter builds upon this by exploring the ways in which the bilingual inscriptions like the one above reveal the varied functions that Latin and Greek served in Roman Anatolia. A close examination of the bilinguals shows that the use of Latin was often limited to contexts directly related to Rome and Roman imperial power, and was frequently avoided in contexts that pertained primarily to local Anatolian civic and social matters. Through this analysis, we will be able to understand better the broader epigraphic picture in Anatolia, as well as the motivations behind language choice for those erecting inscriptions, with the hope that this will allow us to create a model for understanding language usage in other inscriptions where the motivation behind the language choice is less clear.

In a sense, the bilingual inscriptions are most telling when exploring issues of identity since the switches between languages and the differences between the two texts are often very blatant. The bilingual inscriptions are highly varied. In some, the Greek and Latin texts are exact translations of one another, and in others the translations are partial or inexact. The most interesting group of bilinguals, however, are those in which the Greek text is quite distinct from the Latin, with little or no overlap. These variations in language choice would have been intentional, sometimes to emphasize the meaning and importance of the texts in each of those languages, other times to give the appearance of fluency in both languages. In this way, language variation allowed Anatolian residents to communicate separate aspects of their identity and appeal to various audiences of readership.

396 Most of these inscriptions present the Latin text first, but this is not always the case, and occasionally there are multiple switches between Greek and Latin.
Kearsley, who has done much work on the inscriptions and bilinguals of the province of Asia, has already acknowledged the importance of bilinguals for studying the role of language in Asia: “Each of the above variations [in language choice] is potentially of interest for the study of bilingualism in Asia as differences in language attitude are strongly implied by them.”\(^{397}\) Kearsley also sees mixed language inscriptions appearing most commonly in realms related to commerce or administration, such as the civic and commercial agoras, while areas that tend to be more conservative, such as religious sites, show preference for the monolingual tradition.\(^{398}\) Even individuals who had a higher likelihood of erecting bilingual inscriptions, such as freedmen or soldiers, seem to have avoided multi-language inscriptions in these more conservative realms. Kearsley’s observations here are generally true, though they are a bit simplistic. It is true that religious texts are more often monolingual, but more specifically, they are almost always in Greek. The number of Latin religious texts in this study is incredibly small, and it is clear that Greek was the preferred language for religious dedications, unless the deity in question was a Roman deity or a deity very popular among Roman populations. The one exception to the monolingual votive trend is the “religious-mixed” inscriptions, which are dedicated to civic bodies or the Roman emperor in addition to a deity;\(^{399}\) these religious-mixed inscriptions are almost always bilingual.

Kearsley’s study, however, is limited to the mixed-language texts from the province of Asia, and focuses on what they suggest about Greek-Roman interactions and cross-influences rather than on the symbolic function of these languages as indicators of public identity. Further, although Kearsley views the bilingual inscriptions as useful for

\(^{397}\) Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 152.

\(^{398}\) Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 155-6.

\(^{399}\) E.g. the inscriptions of C. Vibius Salutaris in Ephesus, or of Plancia Magna in Perge.
the study of bilingualism in the province, she says that it is not possible to identify the motives behind language choice. Her point should certainly be considered seriously, and there are indeed facts that we cannot glean from the bilingual texts. However, to say in any absolute manner that, “it is not possible to identify the reasons underlying the language choices made,” is simply not true, for inferences can certainly be drawn from the body of bilingual inscriptions which, when viewed as a whole, certainly has something to say about the role of each of the languages in Asian (and Anatolian) societies.

It is important to remember here the symbolic function of inscriptions as well as the sociolinguistic tenets of language as an indication of group membership. Even inscriptions that were meant for more private purposes, such as dedications to gods or funerary epitaphs, were set up publically and thus had a public function. Language choice may have reflected native language, or it may have presented some social ideology, but either way switches between language could not have been unconscious in the way that they sometimes are in spoken conversations. These switches were motivated by some external rationale, and presumably were reflections of and reactions to the role of language in wider social and cultural structures and values. Of course, it is impossible to determine the actual bilingualism of a community simply from the epigraphic remains, but that matters little since the purpose here is to examine how language was used in the inscriptions themselves, irrespective of the bilingualism of the community, to display or suppress certain aspects of the individuals’ identities.

The degree of bilingualism in the inscriptions varied from town to town. Overtly, Latin seems to have been the high language, dominating official imperial business and

400 Kearsley, _IK_ 59, p. 152.
communication (though it definitely did not dominate religion in Anatolia, like most high languages in the sociolinguistic models tend to do), while Greek was the everyday vernacular for the vast majority of Anatolian residents, used in trade, local government, and informal correspondences. The epigraphic evidence suggests, however, that the role of each language varied greatly from city to city. Over a quarter of the Latin and bilingual inscriptions in all of Anatolia come from Ephesus alone, and while within the city itself, they were far less numerous than Greek inscriptions (only seven percent of the total epigraphic corpus), they significantly outweighed the presence of Latin and bilinguals in all other cities and towns of Anatolia. This suggests that Latin itself had a greater role in the daily activities of Ephesus than it did elsewhere, and of course this agrees with most assumptions, for Ephesus had a unique position as the epicenter of cultural exchange, trade, and imperial business for all of Anatolia. In cities where Latin had little to no practical function, we also would expect to see lower levels of Latin in the inscriptions.

As this chapter will show, the hierarchy of Latin and Greek differed greatly depending on who was using each of these languages, and depending on the context of the inscription. For inscriptions that were related to Roman affairs, or that were set up by or in honor of a prominent Roman, Latin was typically the language of choice. This is why we see Latin being used frequently in dedications to members of the imperial household, or to commemorate a Roman legate, but much less often for dedications to local deities or to commemorate civic benefactors. Latin certainly had preference in all matters pertaining to Rome, and in that context can be viewed as the H variety, but when matters and people of local importance or significance were commemorated, Greek was often (though not always) treated as the H language. An example of this can be seen in
the bilingual inscription honoring the Roman legate A. Junius Pastor Lucius Caesennius Sospes.\footnote{IK 15, no. 1543 = IK 59 no. 127.}

(Latin) Of the most splendid citizenship of the Ephesians,
(Greek) Of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia and the two neokoroi of Augustus.
(Latin) Aulus Iunium Pastor, son of Publius, of the Fabian tribe, L. Caesennius Sospes, propraetorian legate of the province Asia, praetor designate, tribune of the plebs, quaestor of Augustus, military tribune in the Legion XIII Gemina, triumvir for casting and striking bronze, silver and gold coins, sevir for a troop of Roman equites, a very rare man. Sextus Iunius Philetus and Marcus Antonius Carpus established this on account of his honor.

This inscription is striking for the switch between languages. The majority of the inscription is in Latin – an appropriate choice since the honoree is a prominent Roman who is in Ephesus on official business as a propraetorian legate of the whole province. However, lines 3-5, which record the official titles of the city of Ephesus, switch to Greek.\footnote{In her book on these neokoroi cities, Burrell (Neokoroi 372-3) has shown that these imperial temples benefitted the city politically and socially, as they were used to compete with other cities in}
and *neokoros* were official titles of the city, granted by the Roman emperor, and were a matter of core civic pride. The centrality of these titles to Ephesian identity is the primary factor for the brief switch to Greek in this text, and it is emphasized elsewhere in the epigraphic record, for there is only one of these titles appearing in Latin, not only in Ephesos, but also in all other Anatolian cities bearing these titles.\(^{403}\) Even the necessity of using Latin to honor the province’s chief magistrate was not enough to subordinate this locally important honor to Latin. As a *neokoros* and *metropolis*, the city and residents of Ephesos guarded its status as its own, and advertised them exclusively in the city’s chief language, even if Latin remained the dominant feature of this honorific.

*The Bilingual Inscriptions*

When looking at the entire Latin epigraphic corpus that I have assembled, 317 of the 1115 total inscriptions (about 28.4 percent) are bilingual. This group includes the many milestones gathered in the course of the study, as well as the fragments that are of little analytical use here, and while this number may be distorted because of the highly fragmentary nature of many of these inscriptions, it turns out that the ratio remains almost the same when we zero in on the more useable, private inscriptions of this study – 218 of 804 inscriptions (27.1 percent). Included in the 218 inscriptions are a few inscriptions in which it is unclear whether the Greek texts and Latin texts were originally part of the
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terms of imperial favor and religious superiority, both of which would have also boosted economic prosperity. The title could be granted for a number of reasons, whether by the request of the city or province, or as a decision of the Roman authorities or emperor; cf. Jones, *CERP* 206-7. For other inscriptions that use Greek to give the official titles of the city, while delivering most of the rest of the text in Latin, see: *IK* 13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129; 13, no. 857 = 59, no. 160-1; 59, nos. 127, 131, 158.\(^{403}\) *IK* 59 no. 159, from second century Ephesos. See also Harl, *Civic Coins* 21 for the use of these titles in civic coinage.
same inscription or inscribed at different times. Those that are clearly from two different dates I have omitted, but the remainder of those in question I have maintained in this category. In the same vein, I also include inscriptions which are found on two separate stones, but which are clearly meant to be read together since these can still provide us with insight into the role of language and bilingualism in the identities of such people.

**Geographical Distribution of Bilinguals**

In general, the distribution of bilingual inscriptions across Anatolia is proportional to the general distribution of Latin inscriptions. There is a strong concentration of bilinguals in the western regions of Anatolia, especially in Ephesus, which of course is largely because of the overall higher frequency of Latin epigraphy there. However, there is a strong representation of these inscriptions in the interior as well, especially in Lydia.
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404 For example, *IK* 59, no. 16: Felici Caristani Frontonis / Γάιος Καροστάνιος Κέρδων [Latin: To Felix, (slave?) of Caristanus Fronto. Greek: Gaius Carustanius Cerdo]. These two names may have been inscribed at the same time, with each language reflecting the identity of the commemorated individual. However, as Kearsley points out (p. 14), this could be two separate inscriptions, with Cerdo being a freeborn or freed son of Fronto, adding his name to his father’s epitaph before his own death. But despite Kearsley’s assertions that it is rare for two names from the same inscription to be listed in different languages, this is not unheard off. For example, the inscription set up by Laivia Pallas to several other freedmen and women from the same *familia* (*IK* 16, no. 2280α = 59, no. 27): [hoc monumentum] est / [Laevi S]ecundi v(ivit) / Laeviae Callityche v(ivit) / L]aevi Felicis v(ivit) / Laev]iae Diabule v(ivit) / laeiiae Philetis / Laevi]ae Speratae / Laev]iae Oecumenes / [Λαιουία Παλλάς ζῆ]. [Latin: This is the monument of Lævius Secundus, Lævia Callityche, Lavius Felix, Lævia Diabules, all living; of Lævia Philetis, Vaevia Sperata, and Lævia Oecumenes (deceased). Greek: Laivia Pallas, living (erected this).] This inscription was clearly erected all at once based on the consistent lettering, yet the erector chose to commemorate herself in Greek despite that Latin was used for all the other commemorated individuals. For another inscriptions that may or may not have actually been one inscription, see *IK* 64, no. 145.

405 *IK* 13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129. The reasons for this being considered two separate inscriptions is discussed fully by Kearsley (*IK* 59, p. 104).

406 The best example of this are the two inscriptions of Ti. Claudius Celsus Polemmaeaus from the Celsus Library of Ephesus. The two inscriptions are practically identical other than the language used, and carved into bases which flank the stairs leading to the library “saloon.” For another bilingual inscription that is generally accepted as one inscription despite its occurring on two separate stones, see *IK* 23, no. 381 = 59, no. 43.
and Phrygia, as well as in the southern coastal areas of Lycia and Pamphylia. The pattern in these regions is due in large part to the many small towns that only have one or two Latin inscriptions. In several cases, these singular inscriptions are the only representation of Latin epigraphic culture within that area, and therefore may give a false impression of a widespread presence of bilingualism in a region were Latin probably had little function.\textsuperscript{407} In the province of Phrygia in particular, the highest number of Latin inscriptions in any given place is six, in the region of Kibyra,\textsuperscript{408} followed by four Latin inscriptions at Apamea. Yet despite the low numbers of inscriptions in Phrygia (N=40), half of those are bilinguals. Several small towns in the province only have one or two Latin inscriptions at all, and these are frequently bilingual.\textsuperscript{409} In comparison, the distribution of bilinguals in Pisidia, for example, only three bilinguals survive, one each from the cities of Antioch, Cremna, and Termessus. This, despite the fact that the province had several major Roman colonies and produced ninety-seven Latin inscriptions. It seems that frequency of bilingualism was related to the general Latin presence in an area. Cities and regions where Latin had never made significant inroads tended to opt for bilingual texts, for this allowed them to show their Roman connections while also being able to actually communicate the message of the text to the local, Greek-speaking people. In Pisidia, on the other hand, large numbers of Roman colonists meant that Latin had a much more regular presence, and so erecting an inscription in Latin did

\textsuperscript{407} Some examples include Didyma (\textit{IK} 59, no. 11), Termessos (\textit{TAM} III.942), Thyateira (\textit{IK} 59, no. 52 = \textit{TAM} V.2.1133), and Dionysopolis (\textit{IK} 59, no. 93 = \textit{CIL} III suppl. 7051).

\textsuperscript{408} The region of Kibyra is loosely defined here, as many of the inscriptions associated with Kibyra were actually found in rural areas along the road between the city and the Roman colony at Olbasa.

\textsuperscript{409} For example, Prymnessos has three inscriptions, all bilingual (\textit{IK} 59, nos. 98, 110, 135); Eumeneia has two inscriptions, both of which are bilingual (\textit{IK} 59, nos. 55, 94); Hierapolis, Lounda, Acmonia, and Blaundos each have only one inscription, but they are each bilingual (\textit{IK} 59, nos. 169, 58, 167, and 168, respectively).
not necessarily require a Greek translation, for it was expected that at least the most important people would be able to read the Latin text.

Among the cities with large numbers of Latin inscriptions, over half of them have less than twenty percent bilingual inscriptions (see Table 2.1). These cities vary in type, though all had large numbers of Romans from Italy and the west, for whom Latin would have been a more natural choice. Some cities were colonies, and other major administrative cities, such as Nicomedia, the metropolis and capital of Bithynia, in which only fourteen percent of the Latin inscriptions are bilingual. The low representation of bilingual inscriptions is also seen in some important trade cities, such as Byzantium, or Seleucia Calycadnus in Cilicia, and even in Ancyra, the capital of Galatia, despite the large numbers of inscriptions from that city. Again, this is perhaps explained by the more regular presence of Romans in these cities, which may have allowed people to set up Latin inscriptions without worrying about having an audience who could understand them. We see a very close correlation between Roman presence and Latin monolingualism in Anazarbos in Cilicia, where all of the Latin inscriptions are associated strictly with the Roman military. Four are soldier epitaphs; two imperial dedications; and five of them were set up by a band of *equites singulares Augusti* in the Severan period. Only two of the Latin inscriptions were bilingual, both by *equites singulares*. The preference for Latin among the Roman military is not surprising, especially if the texts were intended primarily to be viewed by fellow soldiers; the choice of a bilingual text is
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410 Nicomedia reached its apex under the reign of Septimius Severus, whom the city backed in the civil war. The city's full title was, “twice temple-ward, metropolis, first city of Pontus and Bithynia” (Mitchell, “The Balkans” 138).

411 The *equites singulares Augusti* were chiefly from Batavia and regions around the Danube, so they would have been Latin-speaking. For more on this group of soldiers and its recruitment patterns, see M. Speidel, *Riding for Caesar: The Roman Emperors’ Horse Guards* (Cambridge, MA 1994), 81-7.
more curious. It may represent an attempt on the part of those two soldiers to appeal to the local populace, with whom they may have had close contacts after a long period of residence, as was suggested by Sayar, though it may also reflect more on the heirs who set up the epitaphs, perhaps with an aim to gain their own prominence among the local populace, or to pay lip service to their own ethnic background, which may have been Greek.

What is most striking about the cities with small numbers of bilingual inscriptions is that they include most of the Roman colonies of Anatolia. The only colony that has a high percentage of bilinguals (50 percent) is Faustinopolis in Cappadocia, but this impressive ratio is highly misleading, for the city only has two surviving Latin inscriptions. The remainder of the colonies have much higher numbers of Latin inscriptions, yet significantly fewer than twenty-percent of those texts are bilingual. In fact, the more Latin inscriptions a colony has, the smaller the bilingual representation becomes, so that while in Apamea in Bithynia two of the eleven Latin inscriptions are bilingual, only one of the sixty-six Latin inscriptions in Pisidian Antioch are bilingual. Moreover, several Roman colonies have no surviving bilingual inscriptions at all, despite their significant Latin epigraphic remains. The most noticeable absence is Alexandria Troas, which has the sixth highest number of Latin inscriptions in all of Anatolia, yet none of them are bilingual. Other colonies lacking bilingual inscriptions include Parion, Iconium, and Adana, though it should be noted that the latter two have

---

412 M. H. Sayar, *Inschriften von Anazarbos und Umgebung* (=IK 56) p. 61, referring to nos. 63 and 64.
413 IK 55, no. 118 (Latin imperial dedication) and 124 (bilingual epitaph).
414 Cremna likewise has only about three percent bilinguals (1 of 29), Germa only thirteen percent (1 of 13), and Sinope only fifteen percent (4 of 27).
fewer than ten Latin inscriptions total, so the small sample size may explain the lack of any bilinguals.

The paucity of bilingual inscriptions in the Roman colonies would be less striking if these cities’ epigraphic remains were predominantly Latin, for this would suggest that Latin dominated the epigraphic habit and there would then be no need for Greek. Yet despite the connection between the cities’ foundations and Rome, colonies did not use Latin exclusively, and in fact Levick has shown that Greek became increasingly common in the colonies with every successive generation, as ties to Rome and Roman culture were increasingly overshadowed by local cultures. Over seventy-five percent of the inscriptions in Roman colonies are in Greek, so if the lack of bilingual inscriptions in the Roman colonies cannot be attributed to a lack of Greek in those same cities, something else must explain the preference for single-language inscription in the colonies. The colonial bilinguals are overwhelmingly funerary, with the only exceptions being an honorific from Germe, set up to honor a Roman aedile, and the dice oracle from Cremna. The bilingual funerary monuments in the Bithynian colonies of Apamea and Sinope date primarily to the first century of the Principate, which could suggest that the first generation or two of colonists were more interested in displaying these dual identities of both Roman and Greek, especially since the populations of the earliest colonies would have been a mixture of Roman settlers and the Greek population already residing there, and Latin would have had legal and testamentary value. Yet this chronological explanation is less useful when looking farther east, where the small numbers of bilingual inscriptions in colonies often date to the late second or third

---

415 Germe: *RECAM* II 91. Cremna: *IK* 57, no. 5. The bilingual text of this dice oracle is easily understood, for the Latin names the sponsors of the oracle and text, but the Greek delivers the oracle itself just as it would have been delivered to the sponsors.
centuries. A few of these bilingual epitaphs from the colonies also commemorate Roman soldiers or members of their family, so the production of mixed-language inscriptions in colonies may be the influence of the Roman military, which grafted a newly acquired Roman identity on the pre-existing Greek identity of many of its enlisted men. However, this could also simply be a reflection of the stronger Latin characteristic of the epigraphic habit in these regions farther east, where Greek never had been well established as the epigraphic language.

The cities that do show a higher incidence of bilinguals (the numbers hover between 42 to 66 percent) are unsurprisingly the cities of some importance for Roman administration. In fact, nine of the top twenty cities with Latin inscriptions have significant representation of bilinguals as well (see Table 2.1). These cities include Nicaea, the metropolis of Bithynia, and several major Asian cities such as Smyrna and Cyzicus (the former of which was also one of the Asian conventus cities in which the governor would hold a Roman law court). Indeed, with the mixed populations of these towns, bilingual inscriptions would certainly have had a more practical function, for the potential readership was more diverse than in some of the smaller towns that did not have large populations of Romans. It also gave residents a chance to display their accomplishments for both the resident Greek speakers and the regular Latin-speaking visitors. This benefit of bilingualism different from other cities, such as the colonies, which had a more uniform culture (despite the varied backgrounds of their inhabitants) simply because they were modeled after Rome in terms of administration, religion, and social structure. A curiosity is the paucity of bilingual inscriptions in Ancyra, the provincial capital of Galatia, where only four of the forty-one inscriptions (about ten
percent) are bilingual. Though Ancyra was a provincial city, it did not have the same level of cosmopolitanism as did the cities on the western coast, where Roman travelers were more likely to visit; nor did the city have as long of a history with Roman administration as did the western cities.  Further, while Ancyra was an important city along the trade routes of the Anatolian plateau, it was not the destination for traders in the same way that a city like Ephesus was, so the need to appeal to Latin-reading Romans was less severe than in other Eastern cities. Ephesus is also problematic, for although it has a strong presence of bilingual inscriptions (thirty-two percent of the Latin inscriptions), this number pales in comparison to the other cities with large numbers of bilinguals, whose numbers are mostly over forty-five percent. This suggests that practical concerns cannot have been the only motivations for bilingual texts, for Ephesus had probably the most diverse population in all of Anatolia. At the same time, Ephesus has already been shown to be a horse of a different color, and rarely do the patterns of language occurrence in Ephesus carry over to the other Anatolian cities, no matter how large or small. Ephesus was cosmopolitan, but perhaps it was so cosmopolitan that the need for bilingual texts was actually decreased, for Latin could appeal to a wide enough audience that there was little need for the Greek translation.

Chronology of the Bilinguals

The chronological distribution of the bilinguals varies quite a bit from the general trend of Latin inscriptions in Anatolia, exhibiting a strong presence in the first two centuries of the empire, up until the middle of the Antonine Period when the numbers

\[416\] Ancyra was brought under the Roman aegis by Augustus in 25 BC, whereas Ephesus had joined the Roman empire over one hundred years earlier, though it too was not made a provincial capital until the reign of Augustus in 27 BC.
drop severely after that. This decrease in bilinguals begins to appear after the reign of Hadrian, and continues during the reigns of the remaining Antonine emperors. There is no secondary peak during the Severan Period, or the early Tetrarchy, as we have seen in the whole collection of Latin epigraphy. In fact, the drop in bilinguals is stark (Fig. 5.13).

![Graph showing distribution of bilinguals over time, by century.](image)

**Figure 5.14: Distribution of Bilinguals Over Time, by Century**

The impressive number of inscriptions that can be generally dated to the period from Augustus to Hadrian dwarfs the inscriptions from the late Antonine period to the Tetrarchy. As has been the case throughout this study, many of the inscriptions from the first half of the second century were erected by the same dedicators (namely Vibius Salutaris and Plancia Magna), but even if we take that fact into account, the overwhelming concentration of bilinguals in the early parts of the Principate is clear. As will be demonstrated later in this chapter, this temporal shift from bilinguals to single-language inscriptions may be tied to the acquisition of citizenship, as in many cases bilinguals were strongly preferred among first-generation Romans (namely freedmen and soldiers). As the imperial period progressed, an increasing number of Anatolian residents were born with the citizenship and, after 212, the status was granted to all freeborn
people, and the excitement and complexity of being both Roman and Greek was muted. Such a decline in the bilingual inscriptions also ties into the shift in demographics of those using Latin in their inscriptions that was discussed in Chapter 2. Especially in the years following the reign of Septimius Severus, Latin became increasingly a tool of the upper class cronies of the emperor; use of the imperial language among average citizens was much less common. In addition, these elites were primarily concerned with sycophantic dedications to their emperors, and in this context there was little reason to incorporate Greek into a Latin inscription, for the dedication was intended to glorify Rome and its ruler, and as the evidence shows repeatedly throughout this chapter, Greek had no status recognition among the Roman ruling class.

Typology of Bilinguals

It should not come as any surprise at this point in the study that the vast majority of the bilingual texts are funerary in nature. Of the 218 bilinguals, 129 (almost sixty percent) are epitaphs. The large number of bilingual epitaphs is particularly useful since it is through epitaphs more than any other type of inscription that we gain a view into not only the upper classes of Roman and provincial society, but also into lower classes, including those of freed or servile status. We also see instances where the bilingual text may reflect family circumstances that would lead to a bilingual household, such as the epitaph of Hellenia Meroe, discussed in the previous chapter, who seems to have married a freeborn Roman despite her Greek origins and servile background. Epitaphs show great variety also in their content, with some simply giving the names of the deceased,

417 Kearsley, Greeks and Roman 155.
418 IK 16, no. 2266 = 59, no. 36
and others including more details, such as legal provisions, career overviews, and personal addresses to the deceased. In the bilingual texts, the different pieces of information that are expressed in a particular language reveals much about the intentions and identities of those contained in the text.

The second largest group of bilinguals is honorific inscriptions, again as would be expected. At thirty-seven inscriptions, these make up only about seventeen percent of the bilingual inscriptions. As is typical for honorifics, the vast majority of these bilinguals honor members of the upper Roman and provincial classes, including senators and equestrians, though there are also some very prominent imperial freedmen with local connections who appear in these inscriptions. Because of the narrower groups of people who are attested in the honorific evidence, and because of the general tendency of these individuals to be engaged in either military or political affairs, the honorific inscriptions are quite illuminating about the role that Latin played in the official business of the local areas of Anatolia. Kearsley rightly sees this group of inscriptions as being particularly informative about the role of language in the public domain, and by analyzing the ways in which both Greek and Latin are employed, we can gain a better sense of whether Latin had in practice the “official” status that it at least held in theory. However, Kearsley’s suggestion that the language choice in monumental dedications was determined by social and political factors more than in their funerary counterparts is misguided.419 While social and political factors tended to be the primary consideration for honorific monuments, epitaphs served to commemorate the deceased, and to provide a record of his life and, if applicable, his service to the city. This function hardly insulates funerary inscriptions from the same social and political factors that we see in the honorifics,

419 *IK* 59, p. 155 (public domain); 151 (social and political factors).
especially since it was the chief medium of identity expression for those with limited resources. Even for wealthier, elite families, funerary inscriptions gave them additional opportunities to reap as much social and political capital as possible. Large, family tombs were public monuments, put on prominent display no less than honorific texts set up in the agora of the city. Funerary inscriptions were found all over the city, and allowed language exchange to extend beyond the usual civic and commercial centers where the honorific texts stood.

Large-scale monumental building was extremely popular in the Anatolian provinces during the Julio-Claudian period, and so a large number of the honorifics date to this period. There is another surge of honorific bilinguals in the early parts of the second century, particularly during the reign of Trajan, though these are typically in the form of statues on bases than large-scale building projects. Most interesting among the monumental bilinguals are the two gates discussed in Chapter 4 from Ephesus and Laodicea. These two gates show clearly, though in different ways, the manner in which public benefactors used language choice to affiliate themselves with both the local Greek society and broader Roman culture. They also show how each language was used very intentionally in terms of location to emphasize those connections.

One-third of the religious dedications are bilingual, often in circumstances where a locally prominent Greek was dedicating to a Roman deity, or a Roman was dedicating to a local Greek deity. Only about fourteen percent of the dedications to Roman emperors
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420 For example, the group of statues dedicated by Vibius Salutaris for the celebration of Artemis' birthday (IK 11, no. 28-35); the statue of T. Flavius Epagathus (IK 59, no. 180); and that of A. A[nic?]ius Crispinus (IK 12, no. 517 = IK 59 no. 158). Kearsley (IK 59, p. 155) notes the decrease in public donation honorific inscriptions, saying "None are so far attested after the mid-second century and from this it appears that the influence of the monumental bilingual epigraphic tradition introduced in the Augustan period gradually weakened and disappeared about that time. This aspect of the chronology of the public donations forms a contrast to that of inscriptions in other sections of this collection."
are bilingual. However, all twenty-two of the “religious-mixed” inscriptions that are jointly dedicated to a deity and an emperor are bilingual. This variation between the different types of dedicatory inscriptions reflects the idea of “linguistic conservatism” addressed by Kearsley, Adams and others, meaning that people tended to offer religious dedications in the traditional language of that deity’s cult. Bilingual inscriptions suggest that the dedicator was either unsure of the proper language to use, or was aware of the proper language, but also wanted the text to be written in his own language for the sake of social prestige. In most cases observed in this study, the second explanation is far superior to the first, for many of these inscriptions were set up conspicuously in the public areas of the city, sometimes even bearing statues above them. These were not humble, personal pleas to deities; these bilinguals were intended to augment the reputation of the donors as pious to both the native deities and the Roman gods. In other words, they were to emphasize the dual-identities of these men and women.

Dedicators

As with all of the inscriptions surveyed in this study, there was a wide range of people erecting inscriptions with varying degrees of bilingualism, from Romans of senatorial rank to local residents and slaves. It becomes quickly apparent that bilingual texts were far more popular among certain types of Anatolians. Only about fourteen of the bilinguals are so fragmentary or simple that absolutely nothing is known of those
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421 Kearsley, *IK* 59, p. 153; Adams, *Bilingualism* 578 n. 109; “Romanitas” 200-1, where Adams shows that soldiers were much more likely to utilize Latin in pilgrimages to the Colossus of Memnon because of the site’s popularity among upper class Romans, including emperors. However, when visiting other pilgrimage sites, such as Dakka and Kalabcha, soldiers typically reverted to Greek: see also Adams, “The Poets of Bu Njem” 128-9.
responsible for their erection.\textsuperscript{422} I have divided up the remainder of the inscriptions according to dedicator, classifying each person with his or her most prominent or pertinent social label. For example, a Roman senator may have served as a tribune early in his career before attaining the magistracies, and while he could be classified as both a soldier and a Roman senator, I have included him in the latter category since that was the most elevated aspect of his identity. Likewise, an imperial freedman may have held various prestigious posts as the emperor’s procurator, but it is his role as an imperial freedmen that is of interest here, since all of his prominence is tied to his service to the emperor.

The largest group of inscriptions, over a quarter of the bilinguals, which I have classified as nondescript “Romans,” is the most difficult to use for identifying the role of language in identity. The “Romans” group this includes text from anyone bearing the \textit{tria nomina} or a thoroughly Roman name, but without any other identifying information. Based on names, these individuals would have at least possessed Roman citizenship, though not even that can be assumed with any security since there certainly must have been incidences of non-citizens illegally taking Roman names.\textsuperscript{423} Regardless, bearing a Roman name did not necessarily indicate that such people were from Italy or other Latin-speaking regions, nor that they were “Roman” in any manner other than by name. The failure of the text to give any other details about the erector’s social position or background makes it virtually impossible to determine much about this group’s knowledge of Latin. Some of these men would have certainly been genuine businessmen.

\textsuperscript{422} For example, an inscription from Acmonia in Greater Phrygia, which is highly fragmentary, so that no names survive.
\textsuperscript{423} See Chapter 2.
or settlers, and so their utilization of both languages in the inscriptions was without the same sort of symbolic value that a local landowner might hope for.

More easily to trace are groups such as freedmen, soldiers, and local officials. These first two groups have already been discussed at length in previous chapters.

Freedmen actually make up the largest identifiable group in the bilingual texts, just around half of all their Latin inscriptions. They show themselves to use language in an adaptive manner, often selecting Latin to commemorate their service in Roman households, and Greek to offer more personal details about the individual’s life, familial connections, and service to his community. Since the majority of the freedmen would have been of eastern origins, Greek was their native tongue, and so frequently we see Greek texts appended to Latin texts with the purpose to remind the local Greek population that this freedman was in fact one of them as well, regardless of his Roman citizenship. Further, freedmen seem to have married other imperial freedmen or slaves, as well as ingenui, whether local or Roman, which explains the bilingual nature of some of the joint honors and epitaphs, in which the two members of the couple did not speak the same native language. Freedmen were more likely to set up Latin-only inscriptions if both the honoree and the erector were Roman freedmen or officials.

---

424 See CIL III.422 = IK 59, no. 47, where it seems that the freedwoman Claudia has dedicated an inscription to her husband Laetus, who is still a slave of Caesar. As Kearsley states, “If restoration is correct, Claudia joins the small proportion of imperial libertae who are attested as wives of imperial slaves” (IK 59, p. 148). See also RECAM II 459, in which the imperial freedman T. Aelius Carpus is honored by his wife – presumably also an imperial freedwoman – Aelia Cale.

425 For example, T. Flavius Epagathus (IK 13, no. 858 = 59, no. 160), whose wife Manlia Procula was probably related to L. Manlius Maritus, a member of the conventus of Roman citizens in Ephesus (IK 17, no. 3019).

426 For example, a stone from Tricomia in Phrygia (CIL III.348) commemorates an imperial freedman who has held various procuratorships in a couple of different provinces. He is being honored exclusively in Latin by another imperial freedman – his collib(ertus). Because of the honorific nature of this inscription, as well as the association that both the dedicator and the honoree had with Roman power, the choice of Latin seems relatively natural. We see this also in a Latin text from Ephesus (IK 13, no. 666) in which an imperial freedman honors the procurator of Asia (among various other
Full translations of the Latin into Greek were not standard among these texts – there is much language variation, as we saw above in the inscription of Damianus to Junius Maximus as well as the inscription of Ti. Claudius Classicus discussed in the previous chapter.\textsuperscript{427} Soldiers, on the other hand, produced far fewer bilingual texts, only about a quarter of their Latin inscriptions. This is surely due to the fact that at least some of the soldiers surveyed in this project were from Italy or the western provinces, and so would have naturally chosen Latin not only as the language of power, but also as their native language. Even soldiers of eastern origin, however, had Latin in their inscriptions. Unlike the freedmen texts, when family members of soldiers appear in the Latin inscriptions, they are rarely bilingual, which suggests that either soldiers were bringing along their Latin-speaking wives and children, or that their wives were adopting the military language, and by extension the military identity, as well. The bilingual texts among soldiers were far more common in honorific contexts than funerary, suggesting that there was more interest in communicating the content of honorific texts to the local populace. Epitaphs of course had symbolic function as well, but since they rarely addressed specific accomplishments in the text, here the Latin language was sufficient for communicating a soldier’s citizenship and connection to Rome.

The language variation in the soldier texts reveals a linguistic distinction between military service and home life, as we have seen in other bilingual groups. The clearest example of this is the epitaph of the two Aurelii and their wives, which I already discussed at length in Chapter 3. The use of Greek exclusively for the naming of the positions). Again, the text is honorific, and both men mentioned in the inscription are in close association with Roman power. The honoree, though unnamed in the surviving inscription, is probably Valerius Eudaimon (see Pflaum I 264, no. 110; Townsend, “The Post of AB Epistulis” 375-81). The slave, Hermes, is mentioned in Weaver, \textit{Familia Caesaris} 231-3, 280.\textsuperscript{427} See pp. 204-5 and 191-2, respectively.
deceased individuals and the contents of their graves, and the use of Latin exclusively for the naming of the legion in which Nestor and Maximus served, makes very clear the way language was used to exhibit division between civilian and military affairs. While it is possible that the switch to Latin was a reflection of the inability on the part of the Aurelii to translate accurately their service information into Greek, other examples of bilingual inscription from much more prominent military officials show a similar division of the military and the civilian through language.428

The number of Roman office holders in the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia is quite small, and this group may even include senators and equestrians of eastern origin who integrated into the upper levels of Roman society. Though those of eastern origin could also be classified as “local elite,” I have placed them instead in with the other Roman office holders, since as members of the imperial administrative structure, they had a vested interest – or maybe even a sole interest – in their identity as prominent Romans. As such, we can consider their use of Latin as a slightly more natural choice, and by extension their use of Greek as the optional addition. Only twenty-four inscriptions can be affiliated with any certainty to members of the Roman senatorial (N=9) or equestrian (N=15) ordines. The small number of senators erecting bilingual inscriptions is directly tied to the overall paucity of these men in the entire Latin epigraphic record, though they do appear in Greek more often. They were secure in their status as a Roman already, and the use of Latin on their epitaphs or honorifics was just icing on the cake, but many prominent Romans seem to have been comfortable erecting just in the local Greek

428 See in particular an inscription from Cyrene (CIL III.125), commemorating the service of a military legate named Claudius Claudianus: Κλ. Κλαυδιανός ούετερανός θεοφάνους λ(egat)us p(ro) p(raetore) ex leg(ione) III Κ(yrenaica) ἐποίησεν τὴν στήλην ἴδιαις αὐτοῦ δαπάναις: [(Greek) Claudius Claudianos, veteran, son of Theophanos; (Latin) legate pro praetore from the Legion III Cyrenaica; (Greek) He made this stele from his own funds].
language, which among the Roman elite had its own status as the language of education and erudition. However, the two senators known to be of eastern origin, M. Arruntius Claudianus and Ti. Iulius Celsus Polemaeanus, both have grand inscriptions set up in prominent commercial and social areas of Ephesus. Both are bilingual, showing that these two men wanted to exhibit not only their role as citizens of the Greek East, but also members of the highest class of Roman.

These inscriptions of Celsus appear on a Library in the center of Ephesus, set up in his honor by his son, Ti. Iulius Aquila Polemaeanus. Though there are many inscriptions in this structure honoring Celsus, Aquila, and members of their family, Latin appears only in one spot, on an equestrian statue base next to the staircase leading into the building. A nearly identical Greek inscription flanks the other side of the staircase, so that anyone approaching the building would see massive equestrian statues with Celsus’ honors recorded below in both Latin and Greek. So while these are technically two separate inscriptions, Smith has called this an “emphatically and evenhandedly bilingual” display, with only minor differences between the shorter texts on the narrow front sides of the bases. Whereas the Greek names Celsus in full Roman fashion, including his tribe, and states his top government and military offices over the course of his career, the Latin surprisingly omits Celsus’s tribe and military title, including instead the name of his son

---

429 For a discussion of Celsus and Claudianus from Lycia, see Habicht, “Zwei römische Senatoren” 1-6. Celsus was originally from Sardis, and was among the first four men from Asia to enter the Roman senate. He had an illustrious career in both the military – serving as both a tribune and a legate – and in the government, having held the consulship (AD 92) and the governorship of Asia (AD 106). The Library, which also served as a heroon for this great man, has many inscriptions throughout the structure in the form of foundation inscriptions, statue bases, letters from the emperor, and so forth. For this structure as a heroon, see Smith, “Cultural Choice” 73. The inscriptions from Celsus’ library, set up by himself as well as his son, his daughter, and his son’s heirs, are collected in Die Inschriften von Ephesos (IK 17, nos. 5101-5115). All but two of the inscriptions are exclusively in Greek.
431 IK 17, no. 5102 (Greek) and 5103 (Latin).
432 Smith, “Cultural Choice” 73.
who erected the base. The details omitted in the short Latin inscription, however, are
reincorporated on the longer inscription that is carved on the left side of the base, and this
inscription is otherwise identical in content to the long Greek inscription on the right side
of the opposite base. In other words, Celsus is indeed represented evenhandedly in both
languages, neither showing preference for certain honors over others.

Smith has shown that the choice of displaying bilingual texts at the entryway to
the library was only one of several ways in which Celsus’ dual-identity was expressed
through this monument. It is likely that the two equestrian statues mounted on top of
these bases were dressed in different costumes, each of which would reflect the Greek or
Roman and civilian or military aspects of Celsus’ career. Further, the statues in the four
niches at the top of the stairs represented the personification through Celsus of virtues –
*Sophia, Aretē, Epistêmē, and Ennoia* – that were not only part of traditional Hellenic
values, but also which represented “the typical expectations of a high Roman official.”

Even the details of the architectural decoration around the doorways show a blending of
Greek and Roman symbols, containing not only the Hellenistic style rinceaux, but also
representations of the Roman fasces. Much has been made about the significance of
Celsus’ choice to create his benefaction in the form of a library, which was not only the
symbol of Hellenism and the *paideia*, but also Roman elite culture incorporating
elements of Greek culture into their own. Celsus was thus represented as an admirable
example of the ideal Greek-Roman aristocrat who had achieved greatness in the eyes of
the Roman emperor, but who had also remained loyal to his Greek ties and values, as

---

433 Smith, “Cultural Choice” 73-5.
435 It is not unreasonable to assume that the literary contents of the library likewise reflected the
traditions of Hellenism and Roman elite culture by containing Latin as well as Greek texts, though
this is purely speculative.
evidenced through his moral uprightness and his extensive service to Ephesus. The use of bilingual texts in this monument was not alone in communicating this message to the Ephesians.

That Latin was used in the equestrian inscriptions to emphasize Celsus’ status as a Roman official is further exhibited by the lack of any other Latin in the extensive epigraphic texts of the monument. Several more inscriptions appear throughout the structure, honoring Celsus as well as his son and other family members, but none of the rest of these individuals are commemorated in Latin. Of course, they would have held Roman citizenship since their father did, and Aquila even followed in Celsus’ footsteps by achieving the consulship for the year AD 110. Something must have changed in the perception of Latin as an appropriate or beneficial exhibition of one’s Romanness in the time between the careers of these two men. I propose that the function of Latin among social climbers such as Celsus was one of status, showing that they had attained Romanness – and Latinity – within their own lifetime. For someone like Aquila, though, who had been born into this status, using language to proclaim his Romanness was unnecessary, and possibly even redundant. His family was already of senatorial rank, and this was well known throughout Asia; there was no need to conspicuously display that fact.

The other highly prominent Asian recorded in the epigraphic record is M. Arruntius Claudianus, who was the first man from Lycia to be adlected to the senate. Arruntius himself did not erect any Latin inscriptions, though he did set up a few Greek

436 H. Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.* (Göttingen 1979) 133 no. 37.
437 *IK* 13, no. 620 = 59, no. 119. For Arruntius’ career, see Devijver, *Prosop. mil. equ.* A 166; Halfmann, *Die Senatoren* 125 no. 28.
ones in his home city of Xanthos. The only Latin inscription in his honor was set up by his good friend, C. Vibius Salutaris, who has already been discussed at length. Salutaris most likely would have chosen to use Latin regardless of Arruntius’ status, since he himself found Latin to be an optimal medium through which to communicate his high rank in the Roman military, but certainly his choice to honor a Roman senator—regardless of his Lycian roots—influenced this language choice as well. We see here a variance between the epigraphic culture of Ephesus, where not only inscriptions seem to have been a very popular method for personal promotion, but the use of Latin was considered desirable because of the frequent presence of Latin speakers, and Xanthos, a much less cosmopolitan city in which the epigraphic culture was much less extensive and where Latin seems to be essentially absent from the epigraphic record.

Whereas Celsus and Arruntius seem to have been exceptional in their use of bilingual texts among the Roman senatorial order, non-senatorial Romans more frequently erected inscriptions in Latin or in both Latin and Greek. This must be in part due to the larger numbers of folks from this order in the eastern provinces, since for every senatorial legate or proconsul, there would have been a large contingent of lower level officers from the equestrians to fill out his entourage. However, the higher preference for Latin among the apparitorial ranks suggests that it provided a greater benefit to these lower level officials and private citizens than it was to the highest level government officials who would visit the East. This class of Roman equestrian inscriptions includes nine that were erected by the same individual, C. Vibius Salutaris, who has been discussed extensively in the previous chapters. While the equestrian status of some is

---

438 For Arruntius’ inscriptions in Xanthos, TAM II 282, 361, 394. See also AE 1969, 595a; 1972, 572; 1981, 799; ILS 8821.
explicitly stated in their epitaphs, for others the status is implied based on the positions they held. For example, A. A[ni?]cius Crispinus served as the chief representative for two equestrian tax organizations, one of which contracted the port taxes in Asia, the other the manumission tax; the same goes for P. Celerius, who was a procurator under both Claudius and Nero. Vibius Salutaris makes clear his equestrian status repeatedly on his eight donations to the city, through his various posts as subprocurator as well as his service as military tribune. Indeed, several of those included in the “military” category could be lumped in with these equestrians as well, since many of those who occupied the mid-to-high level commands were of equestrian status.

While the largest groups of people utilizing bilingual inscriptions were those having associations with Roman institutions, especially as either slaves or soldiers, there are also locals who opted to include the imperial language on their stones as well. Just as with the other groups, locals probably set up more bilinguals than the numbers here show, but the evidence for them is obscured by the large proportion of stones that contain little biographical information about their erectors. The inscriptions that can be identified as belonging to natives are divided into two groups: those of the local elite, most of whom would have had Roman names and citizenship (N=32), and those of individuals with only Greek names (N=9). These categories are largely subjective, but they do help break down

---

439 For example, the two Phrygian epitaphs, *IK* 59, nos. 94 & 109, both of which simply give the abbreviation *eq.* in the Latin texts. No. 94 also gives the Greek equivalent, ἑπεύς, in the Greek translation. See also *IK* 16, no. 2204 a = 59, no. 103 from Ephesus.


441 *AE* 1990, 935; 1996, 1466c; see also *IK* 59, no. 156. The labeling of Celerius as an equestrian is speculative, but very likely.

442 *IK* 11, no. 28-35.
the data to reveal any differences between those proclaiming their citizenship status, and those whose public monuments show no onomastic connection to Rome.

Among those who were from families of some prominence in the cities of Anatolia, Plancia Magna is perhaps the most well known as well as the most prolific in terms of epigraphic output, having set up thirteen inscriptions throughout the city. As already discussed in Chapter 4, the Plancii were a prominent family in Perge. Plancia was the daughter of M. Plancius Varus, who achieved the rank of *quaestor pro praetore* under the Flavians. The family was clearly of senatorial rank thanks to Marcus’ successful career, but they were still concerned greatly with the affairs of their native city in Pamphylia, and Plancia’s donations reveal a desire to cast herself as the city’s benefactress. All of the inscriptions that she set up are bilingual, emphasizing not only her place within the local citizenship, but also her connections to Roman citizenship and status.

It is important to note, however, that Latin-Greek bilinguals were erected not only by the local elite. Many others who show none of the typical indicators of elite status appear in bilinguals as well.\textsuperscript{443} Individuals with both Roman and Greek names appear in many of the inscriptions, though their connection to Roman power (and by extension, to the Latin language) is unclear. Further, the towns themselves were responsible for the erection of inscriptions to local residents, visitors, and the emperors, reemphasizing the fact that bilingualism was employed by local government bodies as well as Roman officials.\textsuperscript{444}

\textsuperscript{443} For example, *IK* 59, no. 91.
\textsuperscript{444} See, for example, *IK* 15, no. 1544; 44, no. 91; 59, no. 52; Hagel & Tomaschitz, Sye 22a-b.
Functional Bilingualism

The bilingual inscriptions that make up this study show that bilingual texts could serve various different functions, emphasizing or deemphasizing particular pieces of information, particular aspects of identity, according to the erector’s needs. In some situations, bilingualism served simply practical purposes, but often it is clear that the switch between languages was strategic, serving a purpose beyond pure functionality.

That said, we should not overlook the presence and significance of purely functional bilingualism. The best example of a bilingual text whose purpose was mainly pragmatic rather than symbolic is the bilingual milestones found throughout Anatolia. Fifty percent of the milestones analyzed in the course of this study are bilingual, so it is clear that the presence of Greek on the stones to varying degrees was not uncommon. If we look at specific examples of these stones, the most common type of bilingual was that which recorded the name of the emperor or the sponsoring magistrate, with full titulature, in Latin, and then recorded the mileage either in both languages, or simply in Greek. Take for example this milestone from Cius from the brief reign of Trebonius Gallus in the mid-third century:

B(ona) F(ortuna)
Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) [Au]g(usto) Vibio
Trebon[i]o G[allo et]
G(aio) Vibio [A]fino Gallo
Veld[u]mniano
Vo[lu]ssiano p(io) f(elici) Aug(usto)
A Cio Mil(ia) I
Ἀπὸ Κίου α´

445 71 of the 142 milestones collected. This is by no means meant to be an analysis of the entire body of evidence for mile markers, but rather a representative sample. Since milestones are not the primary focus of this study, the collection of this data was merely a byproduct of my attempts to gather the private Latin inscriptions of Anatolia.

446 AE 2000, no. 1362.
(Latin) Good fortune. To Emperor Caesar Augustus Vibius Trebonius Gallus and to Gaius Vibius Afinus Gallus Veldumnianus Volussianus Pius Felix Augustus. One mile from Cius. (Greek) One mile from Cius.

In this inscription we see that although Latin is the standard language for the names of the emperors, the functional information of the mileage is available to both the Latin- and Greek-speaking readers, since directions were not the privilege of one group over another. In some extreme cases, the only Greek would be in the actual number of miles, with the city name being only in Latin, or simply being implied.  

Some dedications opted to include translations of the entire text, or just portions of it, in order to communicate practical, useful, or sometimes very important information to a wider audience. The most basic example of this is a simple, straightforward full translation of a text into a second language. Indeed, the mere presence of both languages could have had a symbolic function as well, showing the dedicator’s or honoree’s connections to both Roman and Greek culture, separating him or her from fellow citizens who may only be competent in Greek. Nevertheless, these basic translations reveal little beyond this basic display of and appropriating of dual identities, as well as a perceived benefit in displaying this duality. The honorific epitaph of Sex. Vibius Gallus from Bithynia is an excellent example of this. As an accomplished soldier, Gallus clearly considered Latin to be the most suitable and advantageous language with which to proclaim his honors. The Latin letters are large and take up the majority of the stone, yet the very bottom of the stone contains a full Greek translation of the text in letters that are less than a third of the size of the Latin (see Figure 5.15). The Greek is so

---

447 For example, IK 39, no. 11 from outside of Prusa.
448 See for example, IK 59. 73, 120, 125, 130, 133, 135, all of which have essentially identical Latin and Greek texts.
small, in fact, that it is hardly discernible in the photos of the inscription.\footnote{For photos, see Marek, \textit{Stadt, Ära, und Territorium} Am. no. 5, pl. 26.} The choice of Gallus to include Greek, but in such a small postscript, shows that he saw value in including a Greek version, possibly for the benefit of those not literate in Latin, yet he considered it not important enough to be of equal size. Latin was the impressive language, and so was given the prime space on the stone.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure5_15.png}
\caption{Honorific of Sex. Vibius Gallus. Latin dominates this stone, though there is a Greek translation at the bottom.}
\end{figure}

There are other instances of what I am calling “functional” bilingualism, in which there are slight changes between the Latin and the Greek text for the sake of clarification. This in particular happens in the Greek translations of Latin texts, when Roman terminology is unfamiliar. Take for example an honorific inscription from Prymnnessos, in which the honored man, L. Arruntius Scribonianus, lists among his offices \textit{praef(ectus) urb(i)} (urban prefect) in the Latin.\footnote{IK 59, no. 135.} This is an office that is probably unfamiliar to many of the Greeks who might be reading this stone, and so the Greek translation clarifies the
nature of the office by stating “ἕπαρχος Ῥώμης” (prefect of Rome). Some of these minor differences would have just been convention according to the language in question, and others may show a better familiarity with or affinity for one language over another, but in general such minor differences provide little evidence of the way language was used to emphasize or detract from certain aspects of one’s identity.

**Symbolic Bilingualism**

The second major category of the bilingual texts, as I have divided them, are those whose choice of using both Latin and Greek in an inscription reveal something more specific – and frankly more interesting – than the simple conclusion that the person wanted to be seen as a member of and participant in both Roman and local culture. The inscriptions discussed in this section will show how the intentional code-switching between Greek and Latin reveals ancient attitudes toward various aspects of the world around them. In the following sections, I will trace the many ways that those erecting inscriptions in Anatolia were doing this, with full knowledge that these categories are fluid and, in many cases, there may be more than one possible explanation for the use of the two languages.

**Render unto Caesar what is Caesar’s**

One of the overarching tendencies in the use of multiple languages in a single inscription is that in many cases, information that may have only had value within one language community is often omitted from the text of the other language. In other words, sections of the texts that pertain to imperial matters or are connected to the imperial
identities of the people in the inscription appear in Latin, but the language switches to
Greek for matters pertaining primarily to local affairs. We see this most plainly in the
inclusion or omission of a citizen’s tribe, or of freed status. Some of these markers, such
as tribal affiliation had less power in the East, and eventually fell out of style altogether,
while others had much greater social functions. Certainly, having the Roman citizenship
or being associated with a powerful family as a freedman could certainly increase one’s
reputation in the eastern cities, but it is not uncommon to see bilingual texts that omit
these labels in the Greek while retaining them in the Latin, suggesting that for some, the
prestige of this status was enjoyed primarily among Romans, not native Anatolians. That
is not to say that these items never appear in the Greek, because they do. In many cases,
the status of freedman, or the name of one’s tribe, seems to be retained as a matter of
pride, especially since some freedmen found great success in small Asian communities,
but the evidence makes clear that these pieces of information are more optional and far
less standard in the Greek than in the Latin. 451

If certain identifiers that held significance within Roman society, but exercised
little or no influence in the cities of the Roman East, were not necessarily included in the
Greek texts regardless of their inclusion in the Latin, we can see a similar variance in the
ways that the titles of honored individuals are truncated in the Greek. Kearsley observes
these differences as well, as sees them as either evidence that there was a lack of
knowledge of how to interpret these titles within the Greek context, or alternatively, that
these details which pertained almost exclusively to Roman perceptions of social

451 For example, IK 59, no. 58 retains the tribal affiliation in the Greek. See also IK 13, no. 857-8 and
16, no. 2266. The first two of these inscriptions are clearly intended to publicize the benefactions of
the imperial freedman, Ti. Claudius Hermes, to the city of Ephesus. The retention of freed status is
especially notable among the imperial freedmen, whom the epigraphic evidence clearly shows often
enjoyed an elevated status in the cities of the eastern provinces.
organization carried little relevance for the local populations. Of course, these two options need not be mutually exclusive, and certainly may encourage one another. Clearly, if certain information is deemed irrelevant in the local context, any motivations that one might have to seek out its proper interpretation into the Greek may be severely depleted. In this way, C. Vibius Salutaris saw fit in his dedication to his friend, M. Arruntius Claudianus, to relay all of his military positions and honors in the Latin, but omitted such titles in the Greek since they had little consequence or merit within the local community. However, this selectivity goes both ways. In the same inscription, the Latin names Claudianus simply as Salutaris’ friend, but the Greek adds in the word ἐλεφρύγητης (“benefactor”), revealing that the connection between these men was more than the Latin would suggest. At a more average level of Anatolian society, we see these differences in terms of family relationships, where the specification of the relationships between those sharing a tombstone is specified in one language, but not in the other. As will be discussed later in this chapter, there are several other inscriptions similar to this where it seems that Greek was the language of choice for more personal, intimate details of the inscription, whereas Latin served a primarily official and public function.

What is far more interesting than these inscriptions, where the omissions can primarily be attributed to the lack of cultural relevance, is the inscriptions in which

452 Kearsley, IK 59, p. 73. An example of truncated Greek titles can be seen in IK 59, no. 125.
453 IK 59, no. 119; See also Ephesus’ dedication to Salutaris (IK 59, no. 120), in which they gave him the epithet “lover of Caesar” in Latin, but omitted from the Greek since it was of little local consequence, and since the Greek would have been of little imperial consequence.
454 The omission of one’s title of benefactor is not isolated to this inscription. See also the gate of Mithridates and Mazaeus (discussed above on p. 191-3): IK 13, no. 651 = 59, no. 130 from Ephesus, which records the dedication from an imperial slave named Specatus to his overseer, Ti. Claudius Vibianus Tertullus.
455 See for example IK 18, no. 433 = 59, no. 6, where the female is specified as uxor in the Latin, but has no relationship noted in the Greek. A similar example can be seen in IK 32, no. 18.
switching between Latin and Greek appears to be an intentional and conscious choice of one language over another. We have seen innumerable examples of this in the inscriptions above, and in most cases these inscriptions can be seen as representations of the dual identities with which the erectors or honorees are grappling. The division between matters pertinent to the city and matters pertinent to a wider readership, including Romans, is seen honorific inscriptions of Ti. Claudius Classicus or Caesennius Sospes, or the Mazaeus-Mithridates Gate. While the Roman citizens and imperial titles are contained in Latin, or Latin and Greek, frequently the name of the local Greek dedicator, as well as any recognition βουλή and the δήμος, appear in Greek alone. However, such a division between civic interest and Roman interest is not limited to Ephesus. The funerary honors for M. Sestius Philemon, a Greek man who was likely a freedman, record his name and the name of his dedicating freedman in Latin as well as Greek.456

M. Sestio Philemoni Sacco liber[tus]
oi Ἰωμαῖοι Μάρκῳ Σηστίῳ Φιλῆμονι Σάκκῳ ἀπελεύ[θερος]

(Latin) For M. Sestius Philemo. Sacco his freedman.
(Greek) The Romans (honored him). For M. Sestius Philemo. Sacco his freedman. The demos (honored him).

However, the Greek also includes a note that Philemon was, like Classicus, honored by the δήμος of his city of Laodicea,457 as well as by “the Romans”, presumably those residing in the city. Unlike Classicus or Felix, Philemon was not a man of much importance in terms of Roman administration or society, as far as we can tell. He held no

456 IK 49, no. 48 = 59, no. 56.
457 The exact origin of the stone is actually unclear. The stone was first seen and copied in the train station in Appa (east of Laodikeia between Denizli and Dinar) by Corsten, but had supposedly been found in Laodikeia. It is therefore unclear whether it originated from Laodicea or Appa.
offices, and cannot be traced with the available evidence to any prominent Roman businessman or magistrate in the area. Clearly he attracted attention somehow, enough that the Romans of the city joined in honoring him, but the failure to include this fact in the Latin portion of the text, according to the conventions that have been shown in this chapter, this suggests that the inclusion of the Romans was more in the interest of illustrating – and probably exaggerating – his importance to his fellow townspeople. Perhaps the Latin was in this instance purely for the show of it all, and not intended to ingratiate him to Romans in the city.

The separation between Latin and Greek often seems to correspond with the identities of the various individuals contained within the inscription. We already saw this above in the honorific inscription to Iunius Maximus, which was written entirely in Latin up until the end, where the text switched to Greek to give the name and station of the local dedicator. Such a switch also appears in an inscription to an imperial slave by his wife. The slave is commemorated in Latin, as was fitting for a member of familia Caesaris, but the text switches to Greek for the commemoration of his wife and children, as well as an apparent note that Crescens was a handsome man. It is not clear whether Episteme was also a slave in the imperial household, or simply a Greek ingenuus with whom Crescens had started a family, but the use of Greek to commemorate her and her children while Crescens is in Latin suggests that she may have had no ties to the imperial household. An epitaph from Nicomedia shows a variation on this type of bilingual, wherein both a husband and wife who seem to be of different cultural backgrounds are commemorated in both languages. The husband, named Socrates, lacks not only the tria

---

458 IK 59, no. 89. Because slaves could not legally be married, Episteme refers to Crescens as sumbios rather than andros, but for the sake of clarity here I will use the terms “husband” and “wife.”
nomina, but also any other indication of Roman citizenship, such as a Roman gens or a public office, so we can assume that he was probably an ingenuus, likely from Nicomedia itself.\textsuperscript{459} His wife in contrast was clearly a Roman based on her name – Aelia Marita – although she fails to give any filiation, so it is unclear whether she was born to parents who possessed the citizenship, or whether she herself was a freedwoman. There would surely have been a large population of Roman immigrants in Bithynia, especially from the late second century onward, when the city ultimately superseded its rival Nicaea, as the metropolis and first city of Bithynia-Pontus.\textsuperscript{460} The divergence between their two names in striking in this short, concise epitaph, but the inclusion of both a Latin and Greek version of the text helps to emphasize that these people had connections to both the Latin- and Greek-speaking communities. This bilingualism, combined with the culturally divided names, suggests then that both languages were included to reflect and appeal to their divergent cultural backgrounds. Such a conclusion may also be reached regarding the epitaph of the freedwoman Hellenia Meroe and her husband, the freeborn P. Castricius Valens. Certainly Meroe’s service in a Roman household would have made her more inclined to include Latin in her epitaphs regardless of whether she were married to a freeborn Roman, but the likelihood that Castricius was culturally Greek makes the assumption that the use of Latin was tied to Meroe’s status much more convincing. Their children are mentioned in the epitaph as well, although only in the Greek portion, which may reveal a certain shift in language preference over the course of subsequent

\textsuperscript{459} TAM 4.1, no. 153.

\textsuperscript{460} Mitchell, ”The Balkans” 138.
generations, as these children would have been brought up primarily in a culturally Greek household, despite the status of both of the parents.\footnote{461 A similar set of inscriptions survives from Caesarea Mazaca in Cappadocia (\textit{AE} 1984, 893), in which a Roman soldier received a Latin tombstone from his wife and son, while the wife and son received Greek tombstones from the surviving daughter and sister. For more discussion, see Adams, \textit{Bilingualism} 262; Levick, “The Latin Inscriptions,” 400.}

There are other ways that we can see individuals using the division of Latin and Greek to aim particular portions of the text to different readerships. As we saw with the gate of Mithridates and Mazaeus, only the Greek text dedicated the gate to the city as well as to their patrons, because of course those reading the Latin would in theory be more concerned with imperial matters than with local ones. A similar motivation explains the bilingual honorific of the freedman Orpex, discussed earlier in this chapter. While Orpex employed Latin to list the names of those involved in his benefactions and buried in the tomb, including his wife and his children, the long list of the gifts that he made to the city is given only in Greek, for his chief interest was ensuring that the citizens of Ephesus knew about the family’s donations to the various institutions of the city, thereby allowing the reputation and glory of the family to continue beyond the grave. Similarly, the high priest of Asia, Ti. Claudius Menander, born into a prominent family of Ephesus, used Latin simply for giving his name, filiation, and tribal affiliation, but switched to Greek for the relaying of his civic title (\textit{ἀρχιερέως Ἀσίας [ναὸν τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ]) and of his gift of gladiatorial spectacles to the city.\footnote{462 IK 17, no. 4354 = 59, no. 76. Menander was descended from a long line of prominent Ephesians, including his grandfather, who shared not only the name of our Menander, but also the priestly rank, as he served as asiarch: see \textit{IK} 13, no. 926a; 14, no. 1024.3. For the father of our Menander, named Ti. Claudius Prorosius Phretorianus, see \textit{IK} 11, no. 27.426 (AD 104); 14, nos. 1024.3 and 1025.2.} Indeed, he was connected to the imperial cult, but his position was one of significance primarily to the residents of Asia, not to the imperial administration, and his emphasis on the games which he sponsored were certainly only of any real interest to those living in Asia.
One last example of how language served to mark a distinction between local and imperial affairs is the early imperial honorific inscription from Erythrai of Lucius Marius, who was a prominent Roman businessman originally from Gaeta in Latium. The middle portion of the tripartite inscription gives the full name of Marius, along with his filiation, tribe, and origin, in both Latin and Greek. However, the two side texts give the names of the various groups who contributed to this monument, including groups from several of the Ionian League cities. It also includes the Romans of Smyrna among the list of contributors. Clearly, despite the businessman’s Roman status, his contribution to Ionia was primarily of value to the local communities, and thus there was little need to list all of their names in Latin as well. What is most interesting here is the inclusion of the Romans in Greek only. While this is not standard, it also is not unheard of, and may indicate either that the Romans involved in the dedication of this monument had little input into how the dedication was presented, or may indicate that these businessmen identified more closely with the local population than with their native Roman identity, or more simply, that Greek sufficed for recording local benefactions. It may also simply show that, like the many inscriptions discussed previously, Marius’ contributions were defined so strictly by local concerns that naming the Romans in Latin could have been superfluous, or even viewed as an effort for the Romans to elevate their role and importance above that of the other dedicating bodies, which included the gerousiai, boulai, and demos of several cities.

---

463 *IK* 59, no. 37 = 2, no. 430.
464 See for example the several inscriptions from Ephesus in which the businessmen erected inscriptions either in Latin or in both languages: *IK* 12, no. 409; 17, no. 3019 *AE* 1990, 938.
465 *IK* 49, no. 48 = 59, no. 56.
Civic Pride

The relationship between the dedicator or dedicatee and the language used goes beyond issues of citizenship and social status. The power dynamic extends also to whole groups of people, which explains inscriptions such as the dedication to Diocletian and his fellow tetrarchs by the city of Termessos, in which the emperors are all named in Latin, but the Termessans name themselves only in their local Greek language.466 The use of language to express power dynamics is particularly visible in the inscriptions that include the honorific titles of a city, especially from Ephesus. An example of this is in Ti. Claudius Hermes’ dedication to Diana Ephesia, Emperor Trajan, and the body of Ephesian citizens.467 In the Greek text, which follows the Latin, the people of Ephesus are not simply called the δήμος of the city in an imitation of the Latin’s “civitati Ephesiorum.” Instead, the Greek reads τῶι νεωκόρωι Ἐφεσίων δήμωι, in this way emphasizing the city’s status as a neokoros city and therefore the special status that the citizens have within Asia.

The importance of Ephesus’ titles of neokoros appears in other inscriptions as well. Two other inscriptions honoring prominent Romans are in Latin alone, except for the lines containing the titles of the city. The first of these, already discussed above, honors A. Iunius Pastor L. Caesennius Sospes, the propraetorian legate of the province of Asia; the second honors S. Sentius Proculus, who was a quaestor in Asia.468 Both of these inscriptions were set up by subordinates to the Romans, likely locals, though little else is

466 TAM III.1, no. 942.
467 IK 13, no. 857 = 59, no. 161.
468 IK 15, no. 1543 = 59 no. 127; 13, no. 718 = 59, no. 131
known of these erectors. In these two inscriptions, the text opens with a statement attributing the stone to the Ephesian citizenship, then followed by a few lines of Greek mentioning the titles of the city within the greater region of Asia: τῆς πρωτῆς καὶ μεγίστης μητροπολέως τῆς Α’ σίας καὶ δίς νεωκόρου τῶν Σεβαστῶν.\(^{469}\) The remainder of both dedications, including the names of the honoree as well as the dedicator, return to Latin. Through these two honorifics we see a language switch similar to that in the inscription of Hermes above, where clearly the titles of the city seem to be deemed of greater importance locally than the other information through the fact that they are written in Greek. It has been proposed that this intentional language switch reflects attitudes in the city toward the ideology and language of the imperial cult, which was most often expressed in Greek.\(^{470}\) While this view certainly has its merits, Chapter 4 showed that Latin was a perfectly acceptable language for participation in the imperial cult, regardless of the eastern origins and focus of these practices. Instead, I propose that the choice of Greek reflects issues of civic pride, especially as it is seen in comparison and opposition to other great cities of Asia. It is well documented that cities used titles such as *neokoros* and *metropolis* as a way to compete amongst one another for primacy within their particular province. Ephesus was the first city in Asia to have a temple to Augustus, and the chief city of Asia from the establishment of the province. There is no reason to doubt that this was a point of great pride for the people of Ephesus, and it certainly would have been of greater interest to them and other Greeks visiting the city.

\(^{469}\) “Of the first and greatest metropolis of Asia, and two-times neokoros of Augustus.” This is the text as is stated in the inscription of Proculus. The other inscription is nearly identical, except for opting for the numeral (β’) instead of spelling out the number.

\(^{470}\) Kearsley, *IK* 59, p. 155.
than it would have been to visiting (or even resident) Romans, who had little stake in the inter-city rivalries of Anatolia.

*Public vs. Personal Identities*

Just as the evidence shows that Latin and Greek served different functions in terms of communicating affairs of either local or imperial importance, so also did they vary in terms of presenting personal identity as opposed to official, public identity. This representation of dual identities is typically illustrated in one of two ways, either through the use of Latin for generic identification information and Greek for more personal, emotional addresses, or through the use of Greek for most of the standard information (and other personal information if included), but the switch to Latin for any text which might bear any official or legal weight. Because of the nature of this type of information, it is mostly contained in epitaphs, since these tended to bring out both personal sentiments and legal provisions more than honorifics or religious dedications.

It is clear that many residents of Asia Minor opted to use Latin, if possible, when including any legally binding clauses in their epitaphs or civic donations. A very clear example of this is the tombstone set up by Philoumene for her husband, Marcellus, an imperial freedmen, and their seven-year-old son. The stone begins with seventeen lines of Greek, all of which name the deceased and communicate the grief of Philoumene through a description of the funerary gifts and honors paid to them. There is a brief switch to Latin, wherein there is a warning of a hefty fine to anyone who would try to alter the tomb, which is protected by a *collegium* of *tabularii*. The stone ends with a

---

471 *IK* 16, no. 2103 = 59, no. 75. Kearsley suggests that the name of both of the deceased was actually Marcellus, and the diminutive form was used by Philoumene for both father and son as an indication of their intimate relationship.
second, short Greek sentence specifying Philoumene’s use of her own funds for the erection of the monument. This could also be the explanation for the tombstone of P. Helvius Megas, whose name is in Greek, but is followed by several lines of Latin specifying that the tomb is for not only himself, but also for his wife, his son, and his son’s progeny.472 Another example is the tombstone of Hellenia Meroe, which uses Latin to name the freedwoman and her husband, then switches to Greek for the listing of their children included in the dedication. The Greek also mentions that the local gerousia had been charged with overseeing the grave. The final line of the text, however, switches back to a legal formula, \textit{h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur)}, which says little about personality due to its standard use in Latin funerary inscriptions. The use of Latin for “official” purposes does not just apply to statements regarding the protection of the grave, but also to other matters of particular interest to the Roman state, such as the military, as discussed above.473 In contrast, the epitaph of an old man from Sinope shows that if threats to would-be tomb robbers or tomb squatters were phrased as curses rather than in legal terminology, Greek was a perfectly acceptable and necessary language.474

While Latin often fulfilled imperial and legal functions, there are several examples of inscriptions in which it is very clear that the Greek texts are far more

---

472 Hagel & Tomaszczitz, ELS 22a, b; also see L. Robert, \textit{Les Gladiateurs dans l'Orient Grec} (Paris 1940), 125-6, no. 72: Πούβ(λιος) Ἐλουίος Μ[έ]γας πάλος | ἀπολ[υθείς] | ν(ίνους) \textit{f(eci) per se me et u-} | xorem meam et | filium meum et | filii mei nasce- | ntes et quos ν(ίνοι) | mancipia | j[j][b]- | era[r][u]n[t] (Greek: \textit{Publius Helvius Megas having been freed by lot. Latin: I made this while living for myself and my wife and my son and those being born of my children, and those whom the living ones freed from possession.})

473 For example, \textit{IK 59}, no. 119, in which the military entourage appears only in Latin since the prominence that this entourage represented bore its significance primarily among the Roman community. This may also explain the variance in the Latin and Greek portions of C. Iulius’ epitaph, which mentions his status as a discharged soldier in the Latin, but in the Greek simply calls him ἱπέυς (sic) and names his legion (\textit{RECAM III} 152).

474 \textit{IK} 64, no. 152. The Greek reads Εἰς δὲ σορόν ταύτην ὡς ἄν | ἀλλον νεκρόν ἐνέ(γ)εκ | αὐτὸς ἀντίμπειτος κορέσαι | κόνας ἢδ’ οἰωνοῦς (“He who brings another body into this tomb will satiate dogs and birds, unburied”).
personal and intimate than the Latin counterparts. We could see this as the explanation for inscriptions such as the honorific of Q. Lollius Philetaerus from the δῆμος at Assos, where the Roman citizen is named in Latin, but all of the specifics of the dedication are limited to the Greek text.\textsuperscript{475} Epitaphs show this personal use of Greek much more clearly. For example, several epitaphs from Nicaea, in which all the names of the commemorated are listed in both Latin and Greek, but the specifications of the burial are in Greek:\textsuperscript{476}

\begin{itemize}
  \item no. 122) P. Clodio Antho f. et liberis eius
    \begin{alltt}
    Π. Κλωδίου Ανθώ αιδί και τοῖς τέκνοις
    σκάφη α´
    \end{alltt}
    \begin{description}
      \item[(Latin)] To P. Clodius Antho son (of Publius?), and his children.
      \item[(Greek)] To P. Clodius Antho son (of Publius?), and his children. One bowl.
    \end{description}
  \item no. 123) Clodiae Calliste cum Prima matre
    \begin{alltt}
    Κλωδίαι Καλλίστηι σὺν Πρεῖμαι τῇ μητρί
    σκάφη α´
    \end{alltt}
    \begin{description}
      \item[(Latin)] To Clodia Callistes with her mother Prima
      \item[(Greek)] To Clodia Callistes with her mother Prima. One bowl.
    \end{description}
\end{itemize}

The use of Greek for personal information also makes us recall the tomb of the veterans Nestor and Maximus, discussed above, in which the men give their own names, their wives’ names, and the specifications of their tombs in Greek, but switch to Latin for the record of their military service,\textsuperscript{477} as well as the epitaph of the soldier C. Iulius Crescens,

\textsuperscript{475} IK 4, no. 18 = 59, no. 2. This could also be seen as an example of the local Greek-speaking assembly preferring to honor local people in their native tongue, yet using Latin to name the honorand as a reflection of his Roman citizenship.

\textsuperscript{476} IK 9, nos. 122-3.

\textsuperscript{477} RECAM IV 90.
set up by his brother. As soldiers, the names of both men, as well as Crescens’ military record, appear in Latin, as do references to Crescens’ will, which had apparently ordered his brother to set up this inscription. But the last line contains a single farewell, ἐυτυχεῖτε, in Greek. Such salutations occurred in Latin inscriptions, but were far more common in Greek epitaphs, so the use of Greek here could simply be a reversion to epigraphic convention. However, since both brothers were clearly of Greek origin based on their names, the inclusion of the Greek greeting reveals the Greek identity lurking behind the façade of a Roman imperial soldier, whether or not it was epigraphic convention. An even more personal message from family members appears at the end of the epitaph for Iulius Marinus, a commander of the Hemeseni, where his dedicating brothers augment the typical Latin epitaph of a soldier with a sweet Greek message: Θάρϲι Μαρεῖνε | οὐδὲϲί ἀθάνατος | χέροιτε παροδε[ι-] | [τ]α[ι - - - ], “Take courage, Marinus. Nobody is immortal. Fare well, passers-by!”.

Conclusions

The preceding analysis of the bilingual inscriptions of Anatolia reveals that while the ways in which bilingualism was applied within these texts is varied, inclusion of both languages, and switches between them, were not only intentional, but culturally and historically significant. These stones do not simply represent a mixture of cultures, or interference between the languages, though these are certainly valid occurrences on their

478 For similar such inscriptions see: IK 59, no. 53. See also IK 16, no. 2240a (=59, no. 31), where the deceased in named in Latin only, but the text ends with a Greek addition that the deceased was very loved.
own accounts. Rather, the bilingual inscriptions of Anatolia show that the cultural interaction between Rome and Anatolia was often played out through language, and that these interactions were highly complex.

According to established definitions of language hierarchies, as well as traditional understandings of the spread of Latin in the provinces, one might expect that Latin, as the language of the rulers, would be the highest register in Anatolia, especially since epigraphy is viewed chiefly as a Roman practice. This is far from the case. As the bilingual evidence makes abundantly clear, Greek maintained its cultural prestige among not only the average Greek-speaking residents of Anatolia, but also among Greek and Latin elites, so that in many situations Greek was actually the ideal epigraphic language. In sociolinguistic terms, this means that both Latin and Greek served as high register languages within their own particular contexts, and so the mixture of the two in the epigraphy of Anatolia reflects the mixture of cultures within the Roman East. We have seen this in several inscriptions already, but also in epitaphs such as that set up by Laevia Pallas for herself and several others (likely fellow freedmen), in which Laevia commemorates herself in Greek, but names all of the others in Latin.\textsuperscript{480} Kearsley suggests that inscriptions such as these show that not only was Greek on an equal footing with Latin in terms of register, but may actually have been higher than Latin, “since only by reading the Greek text would a passer-by have been fully informed of those epitaphs’ contents.”\textsuperscript{481} This may certainly have been the case for Laevia, but since the Greek text was not exhaustive either, nor was the Greek information necessarily of greater import.

\textsuperscript{480} IK 16, no. 2280a = 59, no. 27
\textsuperscript{481} Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 150.
than that in the Latin, we again see a division of interest. The primacy of language choice all depended on the perspective of the erector as well as the audience.

We are accustomed to thinking of the Roman world in very hierarchical terms, especially since the Romans themselves were obsessed with rank and status (especially among the elites). But the bilingual inscriptions show, far more than any single-language inscription, that Latin and Greek did not have a rigid hierarchical relationship. Different types of information were more amenable to certain languages, depending on the audience for which the information was primarily intended. Indeed, we can hardly believe that the Latin inscription of Aurelius Admetus was of less importance than the second Greek inscription that is referenced within the Latin.482

[Aur?]elius Admetus hoc m[o-]
[n]imentum fecit sibi et Baebi[e]
Sementine uxori et natis
[vi]vis et quibus in altero ti-
[t]ulo Graece inscripsi, ali-
[i] nulli. si quis alius posue-
[ri]t, aer(ario) in(peratoris) n(ostri) dabit X(denarii) mil[le]

Aurelius Admetus made this monument for himself and for Baebie Sementine, his wife, for their children while living, for whomever I have inscribed in the other Greek caption, and for no others. If anyone else should place (someone) here he will owe to the imperial treasury 1000 denarii.

The Greek text alluded to in the above Latin must have contained the names of other members of the familia whom Admetus did not see fit to honor with a Latin inscription.

But it would be misguided to assume, as Kearsley suggests, that those who could read Greek rather than Latin would be better or worse informed in the case of this inscription. More than likely, the information that was important for Greek speakers to know was written in Greek; and for Latin speakers, in Latin. In this way, we can see that residents

482 *IK* 17, no. 3862 = 59, no. 88.
of Anatolia communicated their own nested identities through intentional use of, and switching between, the chief epigraphic languages. Kearsley certainly touches on the significance of this possibility, but does not pursue it.\textsuperscript{483} The implications of this language study mean that we can create a model for analyzing other single- and multi-language texts that do not have enough internal evidence to inform us about the background and identity(s) of the individuals mentioned.

Another consideration that must be remembered is that there were not set rules for when one should and should not use Latin or Greek. By extension, that means that there is not one set interpretation that we can apply to inscriptions that are puzzling in their language use. Still, the epigraphic data do provide several alternate possibilities of interpretation which can help us analyze these texts and their cultural significance more fully.

In general, we see that bilingual texts are most popular among individuals who were proud of their dual identities as both Romans and Greeks. This group includes Roman soldiers, freedmen, and local elite, all of whom would have been from a Greek cultural background, but through their years of service in Roman institutions, much of their wealth and social position was dependent on Roman cultural values and hierarchies. At the same time, the bilinguals show unequivocally that participation in these Roman institutions, and pride in one’s station that resulted from that, did not always supersede one’s Greek heritage and loyalty to their local communities. For many, Greek remained the personal, intimate language, and in some cases, also carried more gravitas than Latin.

\textsuperscript{483} Kearsley, \textit{IK} 59, p. 150.
Latin was not the ultimate goal, and did not automatically trump Greek for those who had the option to use either. Indeed, bilingual inscriptions had the added bonus of reaching a wider viewership, as literate people who might not know Latin could still be able to read the Greek portions of the texts, but it is an oversimplification to cite this as the primary motivation for bilinguals, especially since so many of them show varying levels of divergence between the Greek and Latin texts, with the extreme examples having two completely separate texts in each of the languages.

The appeal to both Greek and Latin speakers was most common in the major commercial and administrative centers of Roman Anatolia, where populations were much more diverse and fluctuating than in the interior. In fact, it seems that single-language inscriptions were more common in places where the difference between Roman and non-Roman was more dramatic, such as in the military outposts of Cappadocia, or the Roman colonies in Pisidia.

One of the most striking trends that appears in the analysis of these inscriptions is the generational shift in language preference over time. Such a proposition is not new, as Levick has already shown that Latin faded in the colonies over the course of time, but though the fading of Latin is conspicuous in colonies due to the initially high concentration of Latin in the first generation, it was by no means confined to the colonial settlements. Time and again in the bilingual inscriptions surveyed in this chapter, there were instances in which the dedicating parent represents him or herself in Latin, or in both Latin and Greek, but the subsequent children on the stone, or in other inscriptions, appear increasingly often in Greek. We see this, for example, in the epitaph of the

---

484 For example, the preference for Greek in the relaying of civic titles, or benefactions to one's local community.
freedman Hermes, who records himself in both Latin and a Greek translation, but includes his wife and his son in the Greek;\textsuperscript{486} or the Latin epitaph of the slave Felix, dedicated by his son in Greek;\textsuperscript{487} or even the fragmentary epitaph of Titinius, which records only the deceased father in Latin, switching to Greek to give the name of the dedicating daughter.\textsuperscript{488} This trend is even evident in the monumental library of Celsus in Ephesus, where Celsus himself is the only one who is commemorated in Latin, despite the Roman citizenship and senatorial rank of his son. Aquila, who appears in several Greek inscriptions in the Library, is mentioned in Latin on the one inscription that addresses Celsus himself in Latin, but never does he appear in the imperial language on his own.

As most of the stated examples suggest, Latin was most commonly used by people who were active participants in Roman institutions and, in many cases, were the first in their families to gain citizenship or office. Their children, who were born with citizenship and with the status, felt more free to revert back to their ancestral Greek, even if they themselves were active participants in the same Roman institutions, since Greek was a perfectly acceptable, and sometimes preferred, epigraphic language. Such a generational change in convention is paralleled elsewhere in Latin epigraphy, namely through the inclusion of tribes. Freedmen did not typically include their tribal affiliation in their inscriptions, despite the fact that they certainly would have had one, yet their heirs regularly included this information on their own stones. The abandoning of Latin for the more useful Greek among the children of first-generation Romans may follow a

\textsuperscript{486} IK 13, no. 857 = 59, no. 161
\textsuperscript{487} IK 59, no. 16. See also 15, no. 1639 = 59, no. 15, the two parts of which may have been inscribed at different times, but still shows the change from Latin to Greek in successive generations.
\textsuperscript{488} IK 23, no. 381 = 59, no. 43. Granted, the fragmentary nature of this inscription makes it difficult to draw any firm conclusions based solely on this evidence.
similar pattern. And indeed, sociolinguists have studied many instances in which the languages of immigrant parents fade in successive generations, so that by the third generation the children have almost completely lost the mother tongue in favor of the new country.\textsuperscript{489} This process of Latin decline among second- and third-generation Romans could also help to explain the gradual decline of Latin over the course of the Principate, with major ticks in production happening in periods where large numbers of people were being granted citizenship (e.g. Trajan’s and Severus’ Parthian campaigns). The generational decline of Latin also explains why in the late Principate and early Dominate, Latin became a tool almost exclusively for dedications to the emperors by their high level officials, for by this point Latin had lost its relevance in regular Anatolian society. Instead, it gained status as a language of greatest prestige, possessed only by those in the upper echelons of society and in the closest contact with the emperor, and generally useless for others. In other words, the linguistic situation in Anatolia had come around full circle, so that what had formerly been an instance of folk bilingualism in the first centuries of the Empire reverted back to a state of elite bilingualism among the imperial court.

CONCLUSIONS

The role of Latin in the establishing and asserting of a public identity in Roman Anatolia is a complex one. The evidence of inscriptions gives us particular insight into this topic, for epigraphic evidence represents a larger segment of society than literary evidence, and the public function of inscriptions – even “private” inscriptions like epitaphs – allows us to interpret the inscribed texts as intentional presentations of one’s identity, insofar as he wished others to perceive him. Because of this social function that inscriptions served, every aspect of an inscription can be seen as intentional, whether that be the physical appearance of the stone, its location, its language, and the text itself. This study focuses on the use of Latin in the Greek-speaking provinces of Anatolia as an indicator of identity, and shows that Latin was not a language of the elite – whether imperial or provincial – but rather was chiefly beneficial to socially mobile groups for whom the use of Latin reflected their newfound elevated status as Roman citizens, Roman soldiers, and lower-level Roman administrators. Rather than using Latin as a way to appear part of a higher status, Latin lent legitimacy to their newly acquired social ranks, and communicated clearly to the audience that they were now a part of the “Latin-speaking” club. This popularity of Latin among social climbers, however, did not necessarily overshadow or negate their own civic and cultural heritage or pride. Over a quarter of the inscriptions that use Latin also include Greek to some degree.

This is the first study that has considered specifically the Latin inscriptions from the whole region of Anatolia. Most similar studies have relied either on more localized evidence – either a single city or a province – and few have focused on the use of language in these texts. The purpose of this study, however, is to look at language on a
much wider scale, to understand how Latin infiltrated the epigraphic habit of Anatolia, and for what reasons. Without looking at a larger geographical and temporal body of evidence, the conclusions become much narrower in scope, as we see, for example, in the study of Kearsley on the mixed-language texts of the province of Asia. Her research is thorough and well argued, but its implications tell us little of the linguistic picture elsewhere in Anatolia. The survey of all the Latin inscriptions of Anatolia has shown the great variety that is inherent in the “epigraphic habit” of the Roman empire, and confirms Mouritsen’s assertions that there is a need for an understanding of multiple “habits.”

There is much still to be done in the realm of language in Anatolia, including a more thorough analysis of the Greek inscriptions, as well as a fuller consideration of what I have dubbed “public” inscriptions, such as legal documents, mile markers, and inscriptions sponsored by the imperial administration. But the hope here is that this survey of Latin in the inscriptions will provide a jumping off point for further inquiries on language and identity in Anatolia. Further, the continued effort to publish regional epigraphic catalogues, especially for the less studies regions of central and eastern Anatolia, will provide a constantly shifting view of how the epigraphic habit was practiced in a variety of regions within Anatolia.

As is the case elsewhere in the empire, the private Latin inscriptions are concentrated mainly in the urban centers of Anatolia. Ephesus has an especially high concentration of Latin, which is explained in part due to the very large body of epigraphy throughout the city, but also because of the frequency in which Roman emperors, administrators, and businessmen visited the city. While some of the Latin inscriptions

490 The epigraphic corpus of Ephesus is more than four times the size of the epigraphic remains in the cities with the second largest epigraphic corpora, and it overshadows some of the less epigraphically rich cities so much as to render them insignificant in comparison.
were set up by people who were in Ephesus temporarily on business, they are in the minority. In fact, the majority of the Ephesian Latin texts were instead erected by prominent Anatolian residents, many of whom were from elsewhere in Anatolia and had gained Roman citizenship themselves, as well as by lower-ranking Romans who were in the service of the emperors, administrators, and businessmen. Ephesus had over a quarter of the inscriptions set up by or for Roman soldiers, despite the lack of any permanent legion in the area. Some of these soldiers may have been members of the various cohorts stationed in the city over time, but many passed through on their way to or from campaigns further East, setting up Latin texts along the way. Ephesus also is the source for almost half of the inscriptions set up by slaves or freedmen, many of whom were in Ephesus in continued service to their patrons, who were businessmen or administrators in the city. The number of inscriptions set up in this city that was not only the official metropolis of Asia, but also the de facto metropolis of all of Anatolia, clearly highlights its significant place as the center of culture – both Greek and Roman, in Anatolia. It was as if to say that Ephesus was the edge of the more civilized Roman world, the limes of culture, and the best place to set up a permanent record of oneself, even if you were in the city for only a short time.

The cosmopolitan nature of Ephesus extended well into its epigraphic corpus. The large number inscriptions there also lend it the greatest variety of texts in which Latin was used, including not only funerary and honorific texts, but also imperial dedications and religious texts. Even cities with large epigraphic corpora, such as Nicea or Smyrna, have nowhere the number or variety of Latin texts that we find in Ephesus, so it is clear that even though Latin was most often used among Romans and Anatolians who had
advanced up the social ladder, it was really chiefly useful in areas where there was a large Roman presence to read the Latin texts. Of course, the Latin inscriptions are still only a small fraction of the overall Ephesian corpus – about seven and a half percent – so although Ephesus was the most popular place to erect Latin inscriptions, Latin was nowhere near a significant proportion of the epigraphy in the city.

Outside of Ephesus, the representation of Latin is different, and it appears primarily in an inverse relationship with Hellenization, by which I mean that in cities that had already been heavily Hellenized, and therefore already had a well-established Greek epigraphic habit before the arrival of the Romans, Latin was far less prevalent than in areas where the practice of epigraphy was begun roughly in conjunction with the arrival of the Romans. This fact is most obvious in the colonies, which naturally had a higher occurrence of Latin than most other cities because of their strong connections to Rome and the large number of Roman citizens – many of whom would have been native Latin speakers – who initially settled the colony. But the more Hellenized a city was prior to its being named a colony, the harder it was for Latin to dominate the epigraphic habit. For example, Cremna had been little other than a mountain fortress of Amyntas, the King of Galatia under Antony and Octavian, so when it became a colony after Amyntas’ death in 25 BC, the Roman language found strong foothold in the epigraphy, making up over forty percent of the epigraphic remains; bilinguals were relatively rare. In contrast is Pisidian Antioch, located in the same area as Cremna, but as a Seleucid foundation in the third century BC much more heavily influenced by Hellenistic culture. This is reflected in the epigraphy of Antioch, where Latin still has a stronger presence than in most Anatolian cities, but a weaker presence than in less Hellenized colonies. The inverse correlation
between Latin and Hellenization is even more apparent in the colonies of Alexandria Troas (seventeen percent Latin), Sinope (fifteen percent), and Tyana (nine percent), where it seems their strong Greek heritages prevented Latin from becoming a dominant epigraphic language.

Although the colonies had a strong Latin representation, its epigraphic frequency was often still dwarfed by the Greek inscriptions of the city. In smaller towns and less urbanized areas, especially in eastern Anatolia, the epigraphic habit was never as widespread or as popular as in the more urbanized western regions of Anatolia, so Latin had a much stronger presence in the more remote areas. Often, these towns had only a handful of inscriptions, but those that they did have were heavily Latin, and often closely associated with either the Roman military or Roman administration (usually in the form of imperial freedmen stationed as procurators). Out here, Latin seemed to have a much different function, for it was not fitting within a larger Latin epigraphic presence, as in Latin or the colonies, but often it was the sole reminder of Roman power in these regions. As such, the texts are far less often bilingual, and it is likely that they did more for elevating the status of the individual named in the Latin than they did in regions where Latin was more popular. In other words, where Latin was more common, on the one hand, use of the language in an inscription signified that the erector or commemorated individual was part of that group. Where Latin was rare, on the other hand, its use on a stone had a much stronger assertion of Romanitas, and signified that the erector or commemorated individual was not part of a local group, but rather was an outsider, and a representative of Roman power.
This fact is most illustrated in the rarity of bilingual texts in the regions where epigraphy was sparse. The texts were not necessarily intended for maximum readership, but had a more symbolic function. Elsewhere, where inscriptions and Latin were more common, bilingual texts were also more common. In some cases, especially where the Greek was simply a translation of the Latin, the presence of both languages appears to have served a largely practical function of maximizing readership, making the epigraph accessible to both Latin and Greek speakers. Of course, this did not always mean that there was parity between the two languages. Texts such as the epitaph of Sex. Vibius Gallus emphasized the Latin visually by having it inscribed in letters four times the size of the Greek text below it. Similarly, some bilingual texts privileged the Greek by putting it before the Latin – a practice that was rare enough that the simple reordering of the languages packed a punch. However, many of the bilingual inscriptions surveyed here show that the two languages were not always used in the same way, and in fact there was regularly a difference in tone between the Latin and the Greek. This was especially true among soldiers and freedmen, many of whom were ethnically Greek but who identified in part as members of the Roman citizenship. In these bilinguals, Latin was used to communicate more official details of the text, including the individual’s connection to Rome (i.e. the name of his patron, his post, his legionary or auxiliary unit, etc.). Greek, on the other hand, contained many of the more personal details, including not only the person’s familial ties, but also pointed appeals for popular favor by detailing their favors to the local civic bodies and structures. Hence we see Mithridates and Mazaeus using Greek to dedicate their gate not only to their imperial patrons, as the Latin does, but also to the Ephesian populace. Likewise, the freedman C. Stertinius Orpex lists the names of
himself and his family members in Latin, but uses Greek to detail the benefactions that he has made on the behalf of the local populace. In cities with lower numbers of bilingual texts, we see a similar division between Latin and Greek, where one language was opted for over the other depending on the type of inscription. Riel pointed this out in her analysis of the inscriptions from the colony at Alexandria Troas, stating that the Latin epigraphy is dominated by official imperial texts and honorific inscriptions, whereas the Greek was mostly used for religious dedications and funerary texts. 491

An excellent set of inscriptions to explore this “division of labor” between Latin and Greek are the four dedications to Jupiter from the Latin corpus. The first two texts are in Latin only, and have strong connections to Roman imperial power; they are also both set up by collective bodies, the first by a citizen body, the second by a Roman legion.

a) \textit{IK} 19, no. 36, from Chersonesus
\[J(ovi) O(pti)m(o) [M(aximo)] [C]herso[nesitae]^{492}\]

\textit{To Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the Chersonesitans.}

b) \textit{AE} 1972, 636 = H&T, Aya. 29, from Kolybrassos
\[I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) leg(io) pr(ima) Pont(ica) Dio-cl(etiani) et Maximiani caeso monte Ancesi (?) camp(um) fecer(unt) sub cura Aur(elii) Victoris pr(aefecti) leg(ionis) a(ni) d(iem) viii kal(endas) Iun(ias) d(ominio) n(ostro) Max(imiano) Aug(usto) ii et Ianu(ar)iano co(n)s(ulibus)\]

\textit{To Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The first Pontic legion of Diocletian and Maximian. After cutting the mountain of Ancesus, they made camp under the care of Aurelius Victor, prefect of the legion, on the eighth day before the

\footnote{491 \textit{IK} 53, 13-4.}
\footnote{492 Strabo (12.3.6) describes Chersonesus as one of the towns that had an early Roman colony that was subsequently destroyed during the civil wars of the late Republic; cf. Jones, \textit{CERP} 162.}
kalends of June, in the second consulship of our lord Maximianus Augustus, and of Januarianus.

The other two dedications to Jupiter are bilingual, and they also seem to be more personal, as they were set up by individuals rather than collectives.

c)  *IK* 10, no. 1141, from Nicaea

(Latin)  
To Jupiter Optimus Maximus Tutor.  
Titus Marcius Gamus gave this vow in this place where also he was born.

(Greek)  
To Zeus Krastistos Megistos Phrontistes.  
Titus Marcius Gamus gave this vow in this place where he was also born.

d)  Marek, Am. 111-112, from Cide

(Latin)  
To Jupiter Sarsus. Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, prefect of the camp, in Legion XIII Gemina, was presented with gifts by the commanders on account of his dignity and manliness. (The gifts being) torcs, bangles, (and) medals; crowns: three for the walls, two for being the first to scale the ramparts, and one gold one; five unsoiled spears; two standards. He made this (dedication) with his own money.

(Greek)  
To Jupiter Sarsus. Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, leader of the camp, in Legion XIII Gemina, having been honored with gifts by the Emperors on account of his uprightness and manliness; ...unsoiled .... three tower [wreathes]...
For the collective units, especially when dedicating to a thoroughly Roman deity such as Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Latin seems to have been the preference. The fact that both groups had ties to Rome outside of these inscriptions probably further influenced the decision to set the inscription up in Latin. The individual dedications, however, were set up by the volition of the two Romans. Even though the Greek texts are simply translations of the Latin, the variation between these bilinguals and their Latin-only counterparts is noticeable.

There is also evidence that language choice was determined not only by certain epigraphic contexts and types, but also by factors such as where it was erected and who was erecting it. For example, the equestrian official named Tiberius Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus was honored in an Ephesian bilingual text by an imperial slave who served as his assistant bookkeeper. The exact same man was honored elsewhere in Anatolia as well, first by the βουλή and citizens of Selge, and also by the βουλή, δῆµος, and fellow cult attendees in Pergamum, though in both of these texts only Greek is used. Clearly, Latin was more common in Ephesus, whereas it was relatively rare in both Selge and Pergamum, so this explains the language choice in part. In addition, the difference in sponsors of the texts likely had an influence, for as an imperial slave dedicating a text to his superior, who was a Roman official, Latin was apropos. In the other cities, however, the texts were sponsored by the civic bodies, and were set up to honor him for his benefactions to the local city, so Greek was more acceptable.

In his discussions of Latin and the Roman military, Adams had suggested that the use of Latin was determined largely by what he called the “influence of domination”,

---

493 IK 13, no. 651 = 59, no. 130.
meaning that the more ways in which an inscription was connected to Roman power, the more likely it was to be in Latin. The Latin evidence in Anatolia shows a similar tendency, not only in the military inscriptions but throughout the whole collection of evidence. If a text relating to Rome was set up by someone connected to Roman power, honoring someone else connected to Roman power, then it was likely that the text would be in Latin, or at the very least bilingual. Hence the Ephesian dedication to the imperial officer Tertullus by the imperial slave Spectatus, on account of his excellence (presumably his excellence in his employment) is in Latin, but the other two texts, in which only Tertullus has the imperial connection, do not. This rule is not hard and fast, and there are certainly exceptions to it, but as a general principle it helps predict the likelihood of Latin in certain contexts.

Overall, the presence of Latin in Anatolia up until the reign of Diocletian was not one of elite bilingualism, but rather of folk bilingualism, where the language served functions beyond simply granting elite status to those who knew it. That does not mean that Latin was used casually in Anatolian inscriptions. The rarity of the language suggests that its inclusion in a text was thought-out and with a purpose, though this purpose must have varied depending on where the text was set up. As already shown, in cities where Latin had a stronger presence the inclusion of it on an inscription allowed the dedicator or honoree to associate himself within the larger, Latin-speaking community, typically implying citizenship, and often implying connections to Roman society in one way or another, whether as a freedman, a soldier, a civil servant, or a businessman. In more rural areas where the Roman language was seldom seen, Latin’s function must have been closer to what sociolinguists would call an elite bilingualism, for it automatically showed

495 Adams, Bilingualism 614-5.
that the honoree or erector was an outsider, and most likely was a member of the emperor’s staff or armies.

This all changes, however, starting in the Severan period and especially after the accession of Diocletian. From this point on, Latin suggests something more specific than simply “Roman,” for there were masses of Roman citizens in the provinces who knew no Latin at all. Rather, Latin gradually becomes more and more associated exclusively with the imperial power and, under Diocletian, the highly organized imperial bureaucracy. Though there is a spike in Latin during this period, it is clearly with a different aim. These texts are rarely bilingual, so there is clearly a decreased interest in functionality, but more importantly, these texts are set up almost exclusively by imperial officials, chiefly proconsuls (provincial governors), a class that is noticeably small in the Latin inscriptions of earlier periods, and almost exclusively for the purpose of honoring the emperors. It is at this point that Latin becomes a language of the imperial elite; a language exclusively intended for imperial purposes. Latin changes from being an indication of meritocracy to an indication of aristocracy and bureaucracy.
APPENDIX: The Inscriptions

**Inscriptions are listed according to how they are cited in the above text, which is usually based on the most recent published edition of the text.**

**AE**

1972, 636 = H&T, Aya. 29. Dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

I(ovi) O(ptimo) M(aximo) / leg(io) pr(ima) Pont(ica) Dio- / cl(etiani) et Maximiani / caeso monte Ancesi (?) / camp(um) fecer(unt) sub cura / Aur(eli) Victoris pr(aefecti) leg(ionis) a(n) / d(iem) / Ianuari(u) / ca(n) /

To Jupiter Optimus Maximus. The first Pontic legion of Diocletian and Maximian. With the mountain of Ancesus having been cut down, they made camp under the care of Aurelius Victor, prefect of the legion, on the eighth day before the kalends of June, in the second consulship of our lord Maximianus Augustus, and of Januarianus.


(Latin) To the divine spirits. Marcus Aurelius Victorinus, freedman of the Augusti, regional tabularius at Ipsina and Moeteana. Marcus Aurelius Icius, his freedman, made this plot only as an offering to his patron.

(Greek) Titus Stasius Niger agreed that the sarcophagus be placed on it, on account of their friendship.


D(is) M(anibus) / L(ucio) Cornelio Galli- / cano et Claudiae / Nusiae, fili(i)s pientis- / simis, m(e)moriae causa / fecerunt L(ucius) Corne- / lius Melito pa- / ter et Attia Ma / mater / meren[ibus]

To the divine shades of Lucius Cornelius Gallicanus and Claudia Nusia, most pious children, for the sake of their memory. Lucius Cornelius Melitus, their father, and Attia Ma, their mother, (made this) for their well-deserving (children).


(Latin) Good fortune. Emperor Caesar Augustus Vibius Trebonius Gallus and Gaius Vibius Afrimus Gallus Veldumnianus Volussianus Pius Felix Augustus. One mile from Cius. (Greek) One mile from Cius.

CIL

III 230. Lamp of Furius and Strobius

a) Furius
b) Strob(ius)

III 236. Dedication to Diocletian, Maximian, Constantius and Maximianus


To Emperor Caesar Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus Pius Felix Invictus Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, holder of the tribunician power, father of the fatherland, proconsul; and to Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maximianus Pius Felix Invictus Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, holder of the tribunician power, father of the fatherland, proconsul; and to Flavius Valerius Constantius and to Gaius Valerius Maximianus, our noble caesars. Legion I Parthica dedicated this by the prefect, Tromudus (?).

III 277. Epitaph of C. Salivus Caen[--]

C(aius) Salvius Gal(eria tribus) Caen[... / Λ(εύκιος) Σαλουίος ᾃ Ουάλης Ἑπ[...]

Gaius Salvius Caen[--], Galeria tribe / Lucius Salvius Vales Ep[---]

III 338. Epitaph of Trofimus

Euporus et Zosarin / Trofimo f(ilo) suo ann(o) XX / M(emoriae) C(ausa)

Euporus and Zosarin (dedicated this) to Trofimus their son (who lived) for twenty years.
For the sake of his memory.

III 6976 = Studia Pontica III 17a

L(ucius) Casperius Aelianus / Apolloni d(onom) d(edit). / Λ(εύκιος) Κασπέριος Αἰλιανὸς / Απόλλωνι Διὸ[νομεί(?)] εὖχεν.

(Both Latin and Greek) Lucius Casperius Aelianus gave this gift to Apollo.

no. 1. Epitaph for T. Flavius Mansuetus, beneficiarius.

D(is) M(anibus) / T(itus) Flav(ius) T(ititi) (filius) Cl(audia tribus) / Mansuetus / Vir(uno) beneficiarius l(egati) / stip(endiorum) XVIII / [vix(it) ann(is) ] ΛXXV / T(tita) Iulia / sor(or) frat(ro) / pientissim(o) / f(aciendum) c(uravit)

To the divine shades. Titus Flavius Mansuetus, son of Titus, of the Claudia tribe, from Virunum, a beneficiarius of the legate, served in the legion for eighteen years, lived thirty-five years. Tita Julia, his sister, took care to make this for her most pious brother.

no. 3. Epitaph for Publius Turrnius Severus, centurion.

D(is) M(anibus) / P(ublio) Turranio / P(ublii) f(ilio) Papir(ia tribus) Be / lluno Severo / (centurioni) leg(ionis) XV Apol(linaris) / VI h(astato) pr(iori) et leg(ionis) / IIII Fl(aviae) V pr(incipi) pos(teriori) / vix(it) ann(os) XLI / ex heredum / cur(ante) Turranio / Epaphrodito / lib(erto) eius

To the divine shades. For Publius Turranius Severus, son of Publius, of the Papiria tribe, from Belunum. Centurion hastatus prior of VI cohort of the Legio XV Apollinaris, and princeps posterior of the V cohort of Legio IIII Flavia. He lived 41 years. (This was erected) from the care of his heirs, by Turranius Epaphroditus, his freedman.

IK

9, no. 122-123 = CIL III 6990 = IGR III 46. Epitaphs of P. Clodius Anthus and Clodia Callistes

a) P(ublio) Clodio Antho f(ilio) / et liberis eius / Ποπλίωι Κλωδίωι Ἀνωεί υἱῶι καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις / σκάφη α´

(Latin) To P. Clodius Antho son (of Publius?), and his children.
(Greek) To P. Clodius Antho son (of Publius?), and his children. One bowl.

b) Clodiae Calliste / cum Prima matre / Κλωδίαι Καλλίστηι / σὺν Πρείµα τῇ μητρί / σκάφη α´

(Latin) To Clodia Callistes with her mother Prima
(Greek) To Clodia Callistes with her mother Prima. One bowl.

9, no. 371 = CIL III 12225 = IGR III 45. Epitaph of Asclepiodorus.

[Asclepiodore / c]are salve / [Ἀσκληπι]πούδορε / [φιλε] χαῖρε

(Both Latin and Greek) Dear Asclepiodorus, farewell!
10, no. 1141 = ILS III 9238. Dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus

Iovi Optumo Ma- / ximo Tutori / T(itus) Marcius Gamus / votum reddedit eo / loco quo et natus est / Δι Κρατάσιο Μεγάστο / Φροντιστή Τίτος Μάρκιος / Γάμος εὐχήν ἀπέδωκεν / τοῦτο τῷ τόπῳ ὡς καὶ ἐγέννηθε

(Latin) To Jupiter Optimus Maximus Tutor. Titus Marcius Gamus gave this vow in this place where also he was born.

(Greek) To Zeus Kрастистοs Megistοs Phrantistεs. Titus Marcius Gamus gave this vow in this place where he was also born.

11, no. 29 = 59, no. 157 = CIL III suppl. 14195.6 = AE 1899, 64 = ILS II 1.7194. Dedication to Ephesian tribe by C. Vibius Salutaris.

Te[i[o]v / Dianae Ephesiae / et phyle Teion / C(adius) Vibius, C(aio) f(ilius) Vof(tinia tribus) Salutaris promag(ister) / portum provinc(iae) Siciliae / item promag(ister) fru- / menti mancipalis, praef(ectus) cohori(tis) Asturum et Callaco- / rum, trib( unus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XXII Primigeniae P(iae) F(idelis), subprocura- / tor provinc(iae) Mauretaniae Tingitanae, item provinc(iae) Belgi- / cae, Dianam argenteam, item imagines argenteas duas, / [unam Lysimachi et aliam phylēs, sua pecunia fecit ita, ut / o]mmi ecclesiae supra bases ponerentur; ob quorum dedication- / nem in sortitionem sex phylaes consecravit IIS / XXXIII CCCXXXII[IIS]


(Greek) Of Teion (tribe of Ephesus) (Latin) To Diana Ephesia and the Teion tribe. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, son of Gaius, of the Voltinia tribe, promagister of the ports of the province of Sicily, likewise promagister of the public grain, prefect of the cohort of the Astures and Gallaeci, military tribe of Legion 22 Primigenia Pia Fidelis, subprocurator of the province Mauretaniae Tingitanae, likewise of the province Belgica. He made a Silver Diana, likewise two silver statues, one of Lysimachus, and the other of the tribe from his own money, so that they might be placed on bases with the whole assembly; on account of which dedications he consecrated in the casting of lots among the six tribes 333,333 ½ sesterces.

(Greek) To Artemis Ephesia and to the Teion tribe. Gaius Vibius Salutaris, son of Gaius, Vofentina (tribe), promagister of the ports of the province of Sicily, and promagister of grain of the Roman people, prefect of the cohort of the Astures and the Gallaeci, military tribe of legion 22 Primigenia Pia Fidelis, subprocurator of the province Mauretaniae Tingitana and also of the province Belgica. He made a silver Artemis and two silver

---

496 This is one of eight inscriptions set up by Salutaris; the other seven (IK 11, nos. 28, 30-35) are dedicated to the other tribes of Ephesus, as well as the councils of the neopoioi, the chrysophoroi, and the kouretes, the youth of the city, the epheseds, and the gerousia.
statues, one of Lysimachus and another of the tribe from his own money. Which things he dedicated in order that they would be set up on bases in front of the assembly in the theater, as his arrangement set out. He also dedicated for a lottery among the six tribes 8333 denarii, 6 asses. In the proconsulship of Gaius Aquilius Proclus, grammateus Tiberius Claudius Julianus, loyal to Augustus and to his fatherland. The second (statue).

12, no. 562. Ivory Tessera from the Banking House of Autronius

Calyx / Autroni / sp(ectavit) K(alendis) Apr(ilibus) / L(ucio) Pas(sieno) C(aio) Cal(visio) co(n)s(ulibus)

Calyx of (the banking house of) Autronius observed this on the Kalends of April, in the consulship of Lucius Passienus and Gaius Calvisius.


Μ(άρκον) Ἀρροῦντιον Κλαυδιανόν / ἐπαρχον σπείρης δὶς χειλία[ρχον] / δὶς ἐπαρχον εὐλιξ ἐπίτροπον ἐν / Ὁρμῆ ἐπὶ τοῦ σείτου ἐπαρχον τοῦ / ἐν Μοισίας· στόλῳ καὶ τῆς ὀχῆς / καταλεγμένον εἰς σύνκλητον / ἐν τοῖς ἄγορανομικοῖς στρατηγοῖς / ἡμῶν Ῥωμαίων προσβευτῆν καὶ ἕν[-] / τιστράτηγον ἐπαρχεῖσαν · Ἀχαιας / Ἀσίας δὶς / Γ(αίως) Οὐείβιος Σαλουτάρις φίλοι / καὶ εὐεργέτη ἰδίοι

(Latin) Marcus Arruntius Claudianus, son of Marcus, of the tribe Teretina. Prefect of the cohort, tribune twice, prefect of the ala and of a detachment of Praetorians, presented with military decorations: the unsoiled spear, silver banners, a gold crown, and a ... crown, .... procurator in Rome for providing the grain, likewise prefect of the Moesian fleet, and of the Danubian bank, adlected into the highest order among the ex-aediles, praetor of the Roman people, legate of the propraetorian provinces Achaia and Asia twice. Gaius Vibius Salutaris (dedicated this) to his friend.

(Greek) Marcus Arruntius Claudianus, prefect of the cohort twice, tribune twice, prefect of the ala, procurator in Rome for grain, prefect of the fleet in Moesia and of the bank. Having been adlected into the legislative body (i.e. the senate) among ex-aediles, praetor of the Roman people, legate and propraetor of the provinces of Achaia and Asia twice. G. Vibius Salutaris for his friend and benefactor.
13, no. 647 = 59, no. 129. Honorific of Ti. Claudius Serenus.


(Greek) Good fortune. By the vote of the most excellent boule and the most divine populus, the first of all, and the greatest, and most esteemed, and the metropolis of Asia and the neokoros of [[Artemis and the neokoros of the three Augusti?]].

(Latin) To Tiberius Claudius Serenus, procurator of the private ration (of Caesar’s estate) in Asia, Phrygia and Caria; tribune of the cohort VI of Roman citizens, praefect of the second cohort of Spain. Severus, house-born slave of the noble Augusti, tax collector, to his most just overseer.

13, no. 651 = 59, no. 130 = CIL 6574; 7126 = ILS 1344. Honorific of Ti. Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus.


(Latin) To Tiberius Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus, (clerk of) the Greek correspondences and of the accounts of the Augusti and of the prefects of the watch. Spectatus, house-born slave of the Augusti, freedman, assistant record-keeper (dedicated this) on account of his merit.

(Greek) Tiberius Claudius Vibianus Tertyllus, for the presence of the Greek correspondences and of the general accounts of the greatest emperors and of the prefect of the watch. Spektatos, freedman of the Augusti, assitant book-keeper (honors?) his benefactor

13, no. 666 = CIL III 431; 13674 = L&W 176. Honorific to an imperial procurator.

[—] proc(uratori) / [Imp(eratoris)] Caesaris Tr<ai>ani Hadriani / [—]e ad dioecesin Alexandr(iae), / [pr]oc(uratori) bibliothecar(um) Graec(ae) et / Latin(ae), ab epist(ulis) Graec(isc(is), proc(uratori) Lyc(iae) / Pamp(hyliae), Galat(iae), Paphlagoniae), Pisid(iae), Pont(i), / proc(uratori) heredit(atium) et proc(uratori) pro[vin]- / ciae Asiae, proc(uratori) Syriae, / Hermes Aug(usti) lib(ertus) adiut(or) / eius / ἡ(onoris) c(ausa).

To the procurator of Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus at the diocese of Alexandria, to the procurator of the Greek and Latin libraries from the Greek letters, to the procurator of Lycaia, Pamphylia, Galatia, Paphlagonia, Pisidia and Pontus, to the procurator of the inheritance and the procurator of the province of Asia, procurator of Syria. Hermes, freedman of Augustus, his assistant consecrated this.

T(iberius) Iulius C(aii) [f(ilius)] / Corn(elia tribus) Ale[xan-] / drum C[apitonem] / trib(unus) / m[i][l(itum) leg(ionis) III Cy-] / renaic[ae, praefe-] / ctum eq[u(itum) alae] / Aug(usti), pr[oc(urator) Imp(eratoris) Ner- / vae Tr[aiani Caesa-] / ris Aug(usti) / [Germanici] / provin[ciae Acha-] / iae, item [provinciae] / Asiae / M(arcus) Ulpius / Aug(usti) lib(ertus)] / Repenti[nus qui dis-] / pensavit in provin[-] / cia Asia [ob meri-] / ta [eius] / h(onoris) [c(ausa)]

Tiberius Iulius Cornelius Alexander Capito, son of Caius, of the Cornelia tribe. Military tribune of Legion III Cyrenaica; prefect of the cavalry of Augustus, procurator for Emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Augustus Germanicus of the province of Achaia, again to the province of Asia. Marcus Ulpius Repentinus [freedman of Augustus?], who dispensed in the province of Asia (dedicated this) on account of his merits. For the sake of his honor.


C(aius) Rutilii C(aii) fil(ii) / Stell[atina] Gallico / trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XIII / Geminae, quaestor, curile aedile, / legato divi Claudii leg(ionis) XV / Apollinaris, pr(aetorii) legato / provinciae Galatiae / sodali Augusti / Aemilius M(arci) f(ilius) Pal(atina tribus) / Pius praef(ectus) coh(ortis) I Bosp(orae) / et coh(ortis) I Hisp(anae) legato
to Gaius Rutilius Gallicus, son of Caius, of the tribe Stellatina. Military tribune of Legion XIII Gemina, quaestor, curile aedile, legate of the Divine Claudius of Legion XV Apollinaris, praetor, legate to province Galatia, companion of Augustus, consul designate. M. Aemilius Pius, son of Marcus, of the tribe Palatina, prefect of the cohort I Bosphorus, and the cohort I Hispania to his legate.

13, no. 851 = 59, no. 19. Epitaph of Mithridates.

Mithridates Agrippae l(ibertus) / Μιθραδάτης Ἀγρίππα / ἀπελευθέρως [[ζῆ]]

(Both Latin and Greek) Mithridates, freedman of Agrippa.


(Latin) To Ti. Claudius Classicus, freedman of Augustus, procurator of the bedroom and the camp of the Divine Titus, procurator for pleasures and for the morning ludi of Emperor Nerva Trajan Caesar Augustus Germanicus Dacus, and procurator of Alexandria. Gaius Julius Photinus Celer, deputy in his procuratorship of Alexandria (erected this) on account of his merits.


(Latin) To Diana Ephesia and to Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajan Augustus Germanicus Dacus and to the citizenship of the Ephesians. Tiberius Claudius Hermes, freedman of Secundus, with Hermias his son, gave as a gift this Athamantan statue of Zeus Dionysus, which the populace of the Ephesians, Tiberius Claudius Hermes, freedman of Secundus, with Hermias his son, set up the statue-group of Athamantus with a base in the proconsulship Valerius Asiaticus, when Tiberius Claudius Capito Antipater was secretary.

13, no. 811 = 59, no. 128 = AE 1972, 576. Honorific of [Iunius Maximus]


(Latin) -[Iunius Maximus]--senatorial tribune for Legion III Gallica, presented with military decorations by the best and greatest emperors Antoninus and Verus Augusti Armeniaci Medici Parthici Maximi on account of his most fortunate Parthian expedition: (the decorations awarded were) the crown of the wall and of the rampart, unsoiled spears, a banner and also an extraordinary donative. Designated quaestor extra sententias, having undertaken the public duty of the laureled report for the Parthian victory; quaestor pro praetore of the Province Asia.

(Greek) Having restored the honor from his own resources, Titus Flavius Damianos, secretary of the demos and archon of the feasts of the mighty Ephesians.
15, no. 1543 = 59, no. 127 = CIL III 6076, 12253. Honorific of A. Iunius Pastor L. Caesennius Sospes

splendidissimae / civitatis Ephesiorum / τῆς πρωτῆς καὶ μεγίστης / μητροπολῶς τῆς Ἀσίας / καὶ β' νεωκοροῦ τῶν Σεβαστῶν / A(ulum) Iunium P(ublilii) f(ilium) Fabia / Pastorem L(ucium) Caessennium / Sospitem, leg(atum) pr(o)pr(aetorem) provinciarum / Asiae, praetorem designatun, tr(ibunum) / p(leb)is, quaestorem Aug(usti) tribunum / militum leg(ionis) XIII Geminae, triumviro / virum aure argento aure / ferundo, seviro turmae equitum / Romanorum, rarissimo viro / Sex(tus) Iunius Philetus / et M(arcus) Antonius Carpus / honoris causa / H(onoris) C(ausa)

(Latin) Of the most splendid citizenship of the Ephesians.

(Greek) Παννυχος καὶ Πυθάνη / ἀνδρὶ καὶ θυγατρὶ Πυθάνη

(Both Latin and Greek) Pannychus (set this up) for himself and for his wife Pithane and for his daughter Pithane.

15, no. 1632 = 59, no. 23. Epitaph of Pannychus and Pithane.

Pannonus ἐν χρυσῷ καὶ χαλκῷ / Pithan <e> in oro et argento / et filia / Pithane / Πάννυχος ἀνδρὸς καὶ Πυθάνη γυναῖ this is not clear / υἱὸς / καὶ θυγατέρι Πυθάνη

(Both Latin and Greek) Pannychus (set this up) for himself and for his wife Pithane and for his daughter Pithane.

15, no. 1665 = 69, no. 32 = CIL III 6080. Epitaph of P. Cornelius Nicephorus, nomenclator.

P(ublilia) Cornelii Nicphorii nomenclatoris / Π(ομπλίου) Κορνηλίου Νεκτηφόρου νομενκλατορός.

(Both Latin and Greek) Of Publius Cornelius Nicephorus, name-announcer.

16, no. 2266 = 59, no. 36. Epitaph of Hellenia Meroe and P. Castricius Valens.

ν(ivit) Hellenia Sex(ti) l(iberta) Meroe sibi et / P(ublilia) Castricio Valenti viro suo / Ἐλληνια Σέξτου ἀπελευθέρα Μέροε / ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ Πούπλιῳ Καστρίκιῳ Οὐδέλεντι / ἀνδρὶ ιδίῳ καὶ Βάσσῳ καὶ Ιουκυσσίῳ / καὶ Πούπλιῳ Καστρίκιῳ Ἐρμα / ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ / Καστρίκιῳ Τυχίκῃ καὶ / Πούπλιῳ Καστρίκιῳ Νυμφόδοτο / ζητεῖ καὶ Κασ- / τρικία / Τραγίκα / ζητεῖ καὶ Πούπλιῳ Καστρίκιῳ Στε- / φανῷ / καὶ [Καστ] ἐν Πουπλίῳ Καστρίκιῳ Στε- / Ελληνικῷ Ἀγαθόπολι / ζητεῖ / καὶ τοῖς τούτων ἐγγόνοις / τοῦτο τὸ μνημείον / κληρονόμος οὐκ / ἀκολουθῆσαι / τούτου τοῦ / μνημείου ἡ γεροσοία κηδεῖται / h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur).

(Latin) Hellenia Meroe, freedwoman of Sextus living (built this) for herself and for her husband P. Castricius Valens.

(Greek) Hellenia Meroe, freedwoman of Sextus, (built this) while living for herself and Publius Castricius Valens her own husband and for Iusius and Iucundus and Publius Castricius Hermes, living, and for Castricia Tychice and Publius Castricius
Nymphodotus, living, and Castricia Trallis, living, and Publius Castricius Stephanus, living, and Sextus Hellenius Agathopus, living, and all their descendants. This tomb does not pass to the heir. The gerousia guards this monument.

(Latin) This monument will not follow to the heir.

16, no. 2280 = 59, no. 27. Epitaph of the Laevii.

[hoc monumentum]m est / [ - - - - Laevi S]ecundi v(ivit) / [ - - - - Laevia]e Callityche v(ivit) / [ - - - - - - - Laevi Felicis v(ivit) / [ - - - - Laevi]ae Diabule v(ivit) / [ - - - - Lae]viae Philetex / [ - - - - Laevi]ae Speratae / [ - - - - Laevi]ae Oecumenes / [ - - - - Λαεουία Πα]λλάς ζη.

(Latin) This is the monument ... of Laevius Secundus, living; ... of Laevia Callityche, living; ... of Laevius Felix, living; ... of Laevia Diabule, living; ... of Laeva Phileta; ... of Laevia Sperata; ... of Laevia Oecumene; ...

(Greek) of Laevia Pallas, living.

16, no. 2312a. Epitaph of Thamyrus.

Dis Ma(n)i(bu)s Thamyri

To the divine shades of Thamyrus.

17, no. 3006 = 59, no. 151 = AE 1903, 98; 1924, 68. Gate of Mazaeus and Mithridates.

(left)

Imp(eratori) Caesari Divi f(ilio) Augusto pontifici / maximo co(n)s(ul) XII / tribunic(ia) potest(ate) XX et / Liviae Caesaris Augusti
Mazaeus et (continuing on to right inscription)

(right)

M. Agrippae L(ucri) f(ilio) co(n)s(ul) tert(ia) imp(erator)\textsuperscript{497} (sic) tribunic(ia) / potest(ate) VI et / Iuliae Caesaris Augusti filiae
(continued from left inscription) Mithridates patronis

(middle)

Maζ[αιο]ς και Μιθριδάτης / [τοῖς] πά[τροις καὶ τῶι δή[μοι]

(Latin) To Emperor Augustus, son of the divine Caesar, pontifex maximus, consul for the twelfth time, holder of the tribunician power for the twentieth time, and to Livia Caesar, wife of Caesar Augustus. To Marcus Agrippa, son of Lucius. Consul for the third time, imperator, holder of the tribunician power for the sixth time, and to Julia, daughter of Caesar Augustus. Mazaeus and Mithridates to their patrons.

(Greek) Mazaeus and Mithridates to their patrons and the citizenry [of Ephesus].

\textsuperscript{497} Text reads \textit{imb.} for \textit{imperator}. Kearsley notes the uniqueness of this inscription in the use of this title for Agrippa, which was very uncommon, and appears only here and at Nemausus (\textit{CRAI} 1919, 332): see R. Syme, “Imperator Caesar: A Study in Nomenclature,” in \textit{Roman Papers} (Oxford 1979), 371.
Deaneae Ephesiae et Imp(eratori) Caesari Aug(usto) et Ti(berio) Caesari Aug(usti) f(ilio) et civitati Ephesiae C(aius) Sextilius P(ublii) f(ilius) Voi(uria tribus) Pollio cum Ofilia A(uli) f(ilia) Bassa uxore sua et C(aio) Offilio Proculo f(ilio) suo cetereisque leibereis suaes pontem de sua pecunia faciundum curavit.

Αρτέμιδι Έφεσσά τι δαιστροφής Καίσαρι Σεβαστόι διὰ τιμής τῶν Ἐφησων. Γάιος Σεξτῖλιος Ποπλίου νόμῳ Οὐκομύρια Πολλίων σύν Ὀφελλίων Αὔλῳ θυγατρὶ Βάσιση τῇ ἑατοῦ γυναικὶ καὶ Γάιῳ Ὀφελιῷ λίων Πρόκλωι τῷ ἐατοῦ νόμῳ καὶ τοῖς λυποῖς τέκνοις τὴν γέφυραν ἐκ τῶν ἱδίων ἁνέθηκεν.

(Both Latin and Greek) To Diana Ephesia and Emperor Caesar Augustus and Tiberius Caesar, son of Augustus, and the citizenship of Ephesus. Gaius Sextilius Pollio, son of Publius, of the tribe Voturia, along with his wife Ofilia Bassa, daughter of Aulus, his wife, and with Gaius Offilius Proculus his son, and their other children, took care to make this bridge with his own money.

Aurelius Admetus made this monument for himself and for Baebia Sementine, his wife, for their children while living, for whomever I have inscribed in the other Greek caption, and for no others. If anyone else should place (someone) here he will owe to the imperial treasury 1000 denarii.

Aurelius Admetus, of the tribe Voturia, along with his wife Ofilia Bassa, and their children, took care to make this bridge with his own money.

C(aius) Stertinius C(aii) Stertinius Maximus consularis / l(ibertus) Orpex quondam scriba librarius hic situs est et / Stertiniia C(aii) l(iberta) Quieta / C(aius) Stertinius C(aiii) f(ilius) Marinus v(ivit) a(nnos) VIII / C(aius) Stertinius C(aiii) f(ilius) Asiaticus v(ivit) a(nnos) III / Stertiniia C(aiii) f(ilia) Priscia v(ivit) a(nnos) VIII

Οὔτος μετὰ Μαρείνης της θυγατρὸς διὰ τοῦ γνησίους ἀνέθηκεν Ἀσκληπιὸν σὺν Ὃγια καὶ Ὀψίνις / σὺν παντὶ αὐτὸν κόσμῳ καθέρωσαν δὲ καὶ τῇ Ἐφεσίων βουλῇ καὶ ἔφεσιν / *παντακασχείλα ἵνα πρὸς ταῖς τεμαῖς αὐτὸν ταῖς ἐν τῇ τετετραγώνῳ ἱγορᾶ / *παντακασχείλα ἵνα παντακασχείλα ἵνα λαμβάνοντες διανομήν οἱ παρὸντες ἀνὰ δραχμάς ἱσομοίρας καὶ τῇ γερουσία *διασφείλα παντακάσπο τὸν λαμβάνοντα διανομήν καὶ ένιαυτόν ἐκαστόν / ἀνὰ δηνάρια β΄ ὀμίλως καθέρωσαν τῇ αὐτῇ γερουσίᾳ ἄλλα *χείλια παντακάσπο ὅπως / ἐκ τῆς προσόδου αὐτῶν κατένιαυτόν ἐκαστόν οἱ κληροθέντες ἄνθρωποι λαμβάνον- / σιν ἐπί τοῖς τόποις εἰς εὐωχίαι ἐκαστος *τρία καὶ...

(Latin) Gaius Stertinius Orpex, freedman of Gaius Stertinius Maximus (a man) of consular rank, formerly a book scribe, is placed here; and Stertiniia Quieta, freedwoman of Gaius; Gaius Stertinius Marinus, son of Gaius, lived 8 years; Gaius Stertinius Asiaticus, son of Gaius, lived 3 years; Stertiniia Priscia, daughter of Gaius, lived 8 years.

(Greek) Himself along with Marina (his) daughter... set up in the gymnasium Asklepius with Hygeia and Hypnos with every ornament of them, and they dedicated to the boule of Ephesus and to the priests 5,000 denarii, in order that in addition to their honors in the
Tetragonos Agora... and those being present each receive a distribution of equal drachmas; and to the gerousia 2500 denarii, so that they receive a distribution of two denarii every year; similarly they dedicated to the same gerousia another 1500 denarii in order that, from their revenue each year those men selected by lot might receive three denarii at that moment for feasting...

17, no. 4354 = 59, no. 76. Epitaph of Ti. Claudius Menander.

[aec] arca est Ti(berii) Claudi Prorosi f(ili) Quir(ina tribus) Men[andri]
[αὐτῇ ἡ σορός ἔστιν Ti(βερίου) Ἐπιτάφιον Πρωσσίου υἱὸν Κυρείνη Μενάνδρου
ἀρχερέως Ασίας [ - - - ] / [ - - - ] σαντος μὲν ἄνιαλογοῦντος τῆς τοῦ γένους ἀεία ἐν
ἐκάστη πόλει[ - - - ] / [ - - - - - - ] ΑΑ[ - - - ] ρυσιν μονομαχάν ποιήσαντα ζευγόν ἐς'
άμα τε καὶ θε[ωρίας - - - ]

(Latin) This sarcophagus is of Tiberius Claudius Menander, son of Prorosus, of the tribe Quirina.
(Greek) This sargophagus is of Tiberius Claudius Menandros, son of Prorosius, of the tribe Quirina, high priest of Asia... calculatingly according to the repupation of his family in each city... providing a gladiatorial combat of sixteen pairs with spectacles.


a) 5102
Ti(βερίου) Ἰουλίου Ti(βερίου) υἱὸν Κορνηλία / Κέλσον Πολεμαίνον / ὕπατον
ἀνθύπατον Ασίας / χελιάρχον λεγείνον γ’ / Κυρνημαίης, καὶ ἀγορινόμοι καταλεγέντα
ὑπὸ θεοῦ Οὐσπασιανοῦ, / στρατηγῷ δήμῳ Ρωμαίων, πρεσβευτὴν θεοῦ Οὐσπασιανοῦ
καὶ θεοῦ / Τίτου ἐπαρχίων Καππαδοκίας Γαλατίας Πόντου Πισίδιας Παφλαγονίας /
Ἀμενίας, πρεσβευτὴν θεοῦ Τίτου καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Σεβαστοῦ λεγείνον δ’ / Σκυθικῆς,
ἀνθύπατον Πόντου καὶ Βαθυνίας, ἑπαρχον αἰαρίῳ στρατιωτικοῦ, / πρεσβευτὴν
Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ ἐπαρχίας Κιλικίας, γενόμενον δὲ καὶ / ἐπὶ ἑρ副县长
δημοσίων τον ὕπῳ Ὄρμη, Ti(βερίου) Ἰουλίου Ἀκύλας Πολεμαίνον ὕπατος τὸν ἐαυτὸ
πατὲρα, ἀπαρεσάντων τὸν κληρονόμον Ἀκύλα.

Tiberius Julius Celsus Polemaeanus, son of Tiberius, of the Cornelia tribe. Consul, proconsul of Asia, tribune of Legion III Cyrenaica, and having been selected to the aediles by Divine Vespasian, praetor of the Roman people, legate of the Divine Vespasian and the Divine Titus of the provinces Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus, Pisidia, Paphlagonia, Armenia, legate of the Divine Titus and Emperor Augustus of legion III Scythica, proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, prefect of the military money, legate of Emperor Caesar Augustus of the province Cilicia, and being also in the matters of the state property in Rome. Tiberius Julius Aquila Polemaeanus, consul (honored) his father, with the heirs of Aquila completing it.

a) 5103
front small side:
Ti(berii) Iulio Ti(berii) f(ilio) Celso / Polemaeno, co(n)s(uli) / proco(n)s(uli) Asiae, 
Ti(berii) Iulius / Aquila co(n)s(ul) f(ilius)

Left long side:
Ti(berii) Iulio Ti(berii) f(ilio) Cor(nelia tribus) Celso Polemaeno, co(n)s(uli), 
proco(n)s(uli) Asiae, trib(uno) legionis III / Cyrenaicae, adlecto inter aedilicios ab Divo
Vespasianus, pr(aetori) p(opuli) R(omani), leg(ato) Aug(ustorum) / divorum Vespasiani et Titi provinciae Cappadociae et Galatiae Ponti / Pisidiae Paphlagoniae Armeniae Minoris, leg(ato) divi Titi leg(ionis) III Scythicae, proco(n)s(uli) / Ponti et Bithyniae, praef(ecto) aerari militaris, leg(ato) Aug(usti) pro pr(aetore) provinciae Ciliciae, XVviro s(acris) f(actiundis), cur(ator) / aedium sacrarum et operum locorumque publicorum populi Romani, Ti(berius) Julius Aquila Polaeacenus co(n)s(uli) / patrem suum, consummaverunt heredes Aquilae

(Front) To Tiberius Julius Celsus Polemaecanus, son of Tiberius, consul, proconsul of Asia. Tiberius Julius Aquila, consul, his son (erected this)

(Side) To Tiberius Julius Celsus Polemaecanus, son of Tiberius, from the Cornelia tribe. Consul, proconsul of Asia, tribune of Legion III Cyrenaica, adlected among the ex-aediles by the Divine Vespasian, praetor of the Roman people, legate of the Augusti the Divine Vespasian and the Divine Titus of the province of Cappadocia and Galatia, Pontus, Pisidia, Paphlagonia, Armenia Minor; legate of the Divine Titus of the legion III Scythica, proconsul of Pontus and Bithynia, prefect of the military money, legate propraetore of Augustus of the province Cilicia, member of a board of fifteen men for doing sacred things, curator of the sacred temples and of the public works and places of the Roman people. Tiberius Julius Aquila Polaeacenus, consul (honored) his father. The heirs of Aquila completed it.

19, no. 36, from Chersonesus. Dedication to Jupiter Optimus Maximus.

To Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the Chersonesitans.

23, no. 381 = 59, no. 43. Epitaph of the Lucii Titini.

To Lucius Titinius, son of the son of Lucius, of the Falerna Tribe...

(Latin) To Lucius Titinius, son of the son of Lucius, of the Falernia Tribe...

(Greek) Titinia, daughter of Lucius (made this) for Lucius Titinius, son of the son of Lucius, of the Falerna tribe, her father, and for Lucius Titinius son of Lucius, of the Falerna tribe, her grandfather


Pompeia Cn(aei) f(ilia) / Magna / Πομπεία Μάγνα

(Latin) Pompeia Magna, daughter of Cnaeus.

(Greek) Pompeia Magna.

29, no. 46 = CIL III 333; 13649a = CIG 3738. Epitaph of Flavia Sophene.

Dis manibus. / Flaviae Sophene / [Ge]nealis, Caesaris Aug(usti) / [se]rvos verna, dispens(ator) / [ad] frumentum, carae / coniugi et amanti / benemerenti fecit. / [vix(it)]
Lycus.

49, no. 24 = 59, no. 170 = 41, no. 452 = 39, no. 172 = Ἄκλαυδιός Σεβαστὸν ἈΔι

(Latin) To the divine shades. For Flavia Sophe. Genialis, house-born slave of Caesar Augustus, steward for the grain, made this for his dear and loving partner (coniugi), well deserving. She lived for thirty-two years and seven months.

(Greek) For Flavia Sophe. Genialis, house-born slave of Caesar Augustus, steward for the grain, (made this for her), living beautifully for thirty-two years and seven months.

Farewell.


M(arcus) L(ucetius) Proclus vetranus / lecionis Αὐτων plušlevs / vix annos LII

Marcus Lucretius Proclus, veteran of the legion Adiutrix, from Prusa. He lived 52 years.

41, no. 452 = CIL III suppl. 6092. Epitaph of Octavia Secunda.

Dis Manibus / Octaviae C(aii) f(iliae) / Arnetis Secunda / kar(issim)e (sic) v(ivit) anis (sic) XXVIII / bene merenti C(aius) Iulius Rest[i]- / tutus mil(es) leg(ionis) II T(raianae/ tory / h. [s]epulta] est

To the divine shades. For Octavia Secunda, daughter of Gaius, of the Arniensis tribe, most dear. She lived for 28 years, well deserving. C. Iulius Restitutus, a soldier of Legion II Traiana Forta. This is the tomb of his wife


a) (with Latin text)
[Imp(erator) [[Domitianus]] ] Caesa[ri Aug(usto) [[Germ(anicus)]] ] dedicante Sex(to) / [Iulio Frontino] pro[cto]s(ne) / [Δι Μεγίστου Σωτηρὶ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι [[Δομιτιανοῦ]]] Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ Γερμανικῷ], ἀρχιερεῖ μεγίστοι, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ δ', ὕπατοι τὸ ἰβ', πατρὶ πατρίδος / [Σεβαστῷ Ἀπελευθέρος Άπω Τρόφων] τοὺς πύργους καὶ τὸ τρίπυλον σὺν [...]...[...] Ἰου [ὐ]ν[ὠθηκέν].

(Latin) To Emperor Domitian Caesar Augustus Germanicus, with Sextus Julius Frontinus, proconsul, dedicating (this).

(Greek) To Zeus Megistos Soter and to Emperor Domitian Caesar Augustus Germanicus, pontifex maximus, having tribunician power for the fourth time, consul for the twelfth time, father of the fatherland. Tiberius Claudius Trypho, freedman of Augustus, set up the towers and the triple gateway with...

b) (Gk text only)
Δι Μεγίστου Σωτηρὶ καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι [[Δομιτιανοῦ]]] Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ Γερμανικῷ, ἀρχιερεῖ μεγίστοι, δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας τὸ δ', ὕπατοι τὸ ἰβ', πατρὶ πατρίδος / Τιβέριου Κλαύδιος Σεβαστῷ Ἀπελευθέρος Τρόφων τοὺς πύργοις καὶ τὸ τρίπυλον ἀνέθηκεν, Σέξτος Ιούλιος Φροντίνος ἀνθύπατος τὸ σύμπαν ἐ[ργά]νοι καθε[ρ]ο[σεν].
To Zeus Megistos Soter and to Emperor Domitian Caesar Augustus Germanicus, pontifex maximus, having tribunician power for the fourth time, consul for the twelfth time, father of the fatherland. Tiberius Claudius Trypho, freedman of Augustus, set up the towers and the triple gateway. Sextus Julius Frontinus, proconsul dedicated this entire work.

49, no. 48 = 59, no. 56. Honorable of M. Sestius Philemo.

M(arco) Sestio Philemoni Sacco liber[tus] / οὶ Ῥωμαῖοι / Μάρκω Σηστίῳ Φιλήμονι Σάκκων ἀπελεύ[θερος] / ὁ δήμος

(Latin) For M. Sestius Philemo. Sacco his freedman.
(Greek) The Romans (honored him). For M. Sestius Philemo. Sacco his freedman. The demos (honored him.)

53, no. 77. Dedication to the River Scamander.

[..?Pon]tius Auctus [S]camandro votum solvit curator e(ffecit) per Sex(tum) Pontium Senecam

Pontius Auctus loosed this vow. He the overseer did this through Sextus Pontius Seneca.

53, no. 106. Tombstone of C. Cannutius.

C(aio) Cannutio / C(aii) f(ilio) Ani(ensis tribus) leg(ionis) / XXX Clas(sica) / decurioni

To Gaius Cannutius, son of Gaius, of the Aniensis tribe. (Soldier) of Legion III Classica, decurion.

53, no. 144. Epitaph of a soldier.


To... of Legion VII Claudia Pia Fidelis. Prefect (of the cohort/camp?)... from judgement.

53, no. 201. Patera of L. Fastidius.

L(ucii) Fastidi. Of Lucius Fastidius.

54, no. 86. Monumental Gate of Plancia Magna.

a) (country-side)
[Plancia Marci f(ilia)] Magna / [pat]riae [o

Plancia Magna, daughter of Marcus, to her homeland...

b) (city-side)
Πλα[νκία Μάγνα] θυγάτηρ Μ(αρκοῦ) / Πλα[νκίου Οὐάρο]υ τῇ πατρίδι

Plancia Magna, daughter of Marcus Plancius Varus, to her homeland.
54, no. 89 = *AE* 1958, 76. Dedication to Artemis Pergaia from Plancia Magna.\(^{498}\)

Dianae Pergensi / Plancia M(arcii) f(ilia) Magna / Ἀρτέμιδι Περγαίᾳ / Πλανκία Μάγνα

*(Latin)* To Diana Pergensis. Plancia Magna, daughter of Marcus.

*(Greek)* To Artemis Pergaia. Plancia Magna.

54, no. 94. Dedication to Emperor Hadrian from Plancia Magna.


*(Greek)* To Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian Augustus, son of the Divine Trajan Parthicus, grandson of the Divine Nerva. Pontifex Maximus, with the tribunician power for the fifth time, consul for the third time. Plancia Magna (erected this).

55, no. 55 = *AE* 1941, 161. Epitaph of Marcus Aurelius Saturninus, verna and libertus.

D(is) M(anibus) / M(arco) Aur(elio) Satur-n[o] annor(um) / XXX domo / Siscia ex / Pannonia / Superiore, / M(arcus) Aurelius / Lucius (centurion) leg(ionis) / XIII Geminae / vernae et / liberto incom- / parabili

To the divine shades. For Marcus Aurelius Saturninus, 30 years old, from the home Siscia from Pannonia Superior. Marcus Aruelius Lusius, centurion of Legion XIII Gemina to his house-born slave and incomparable freedman.

55, no. 118 = *AE* 1964, 3. Imperial dedication to Gordian.

Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) M(arco) Anto-nio Gordiano / pio fel(ici) invicto Aug(usto) / pontif(ici) max(imo) trib(unicia) po-test(ate) co(n)s(uli) proco(n)s(uli) p(atri) p(atr[iae]) / IIvir(es) et dec(uriones) et cive[s] / Col(oniae) Faustinopolit[a-] / norum.

Emperor Caesar Marcus Antonius Gordian Pius Felix Invictus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holder of the tribunician power, consul, proconsul, father of the father land. The board of two men and the decurions and the citizens of the colony of the Faustinopolitans (dedicate this).

---

\(^{498}\) Plancia Magna set up several other dedications, nearly identical to this one, to *Genius civitatis*/Τύχη τῶς πόλεως, Divus Augustus, Divus Nerva, Divus Traianus, Diva Marciana, Plotina Augustus, Diva Maditia, and Sabina Augusta; see *IK* 54, nos. 90-93, 96-99.
Dedication to Mercury.

Mercury, with the power of the scepter, Slayer of Argus, messenger of the gods, send away the cloud of locusts from this place, with your sacrosanct rod. For your likeness stands in this place, about to be set up for prosperous fruits and as a remedy for the safety of these places and nations. May you be well-disposed and placated by all men and may you give bringing forth fruits of all things.

Epitaph of Flacius Septiminus, eques singularis.

To all divine shades. Flacius Septiminus, equites singularis of our lord emperors. He was a soldier for thirteen years, he lived for thirty. Julius Simplex, duplicarius, and Audacius Victor, his heirs, took care (of this monument).

Epitaph of L. Inidus Sollianus.

To the divine shades. for Lucius Indius Sollianus, keeper of the arms, from the band of the equites singulares. He was a soldier for seventeen years, he lived for thirty-seven. Julinus, keeper of the arms, his --- and Atereus his freedman set this up.

Epitaph by the order of L. Fabricius

With respect to the command of Lucius Fabricius Longus, Vibia Tatia his wife and Fabricia Lucilla his daughter and his heir restored (this).
57, no. 49 = CIL III suppl. 6879. Epitaph of [---] Naso, doctor.

[---] / no Nasoni [- -] / medico Iunia [ - ] / Secunda fra[tri] / suo

To ---- Naso, doctor. Junia .. Secunda (erected this) for her brother.

59, no. 11 = BCH 18 (1894) 19 no. 5 = IDidyma 525 = Robert, RevPhil 1939, 174. Epitaph of Ambeivius Eucleratus.

Ἀµβείουιος / Εὐκλήρατος / Σ̣(έξτε) ῶΡωσκιαν Ἰηµήτριε, / ἠρως χρηστέ, χαϊρε

(Latin) Ambivius Eucleratus;
(Greek) Ambivius Eucleratus. Sextus Roscianus Demetrius, valiant hero, farewell.


Felici Caristani Frontonis / Γάϊος Καρθστάνιος Κέρδων.

(Latin) To Felix Caristanius Fronto.
(Greek) To Gaius Caristanius Cerdo.

59, no. 37 = 2, no. 430. Honorific of L. Marius.

L(ucius) Marius M(arci) f(ilius)

ο̣ δ̣ῆ- ο̣ι̣ Ρο- ἑ̣ γερου- Ζυμρ̣- γερουσία [Κλαζο]- Τηίνω Λεβ- δίων

Αεμ(ilia) Caịţa Ζυμ- μενί- Λούκους Μάρτος ναίων ον

Μάρκου ύλος

Κολοφω- Έφ[ε]- Μαγνή- Κυμαι- νίων [τ]ο̣ν ἀπ- [ὁ̣] Σιπύλ- ου

Ἀσίας οἰκον(όμου) Μυρεί- ναίων (−) (−) (−)

CENTER: (Latin and Greek) Lucius Marius, son of Marcus, Aemilia (tribe), from Gaieta.
LEFT: (Greek) The demos, the Romans, the gerousia, of the Smyrnians, of the Kolophonians, of the Ephesians, of the Magnesians on the Sipylos, of the Kymians (honored him)
RIGHT: (Greek) The Gerousia of the Smyrnians, of the Klazomenians, of the Teians, of the Lebedians, of the Myrinians (honored him).

59, no. 40 = CIL 447 = ILS 1862 = IMilet II 645.

Felici Primioni<s>, <XXXX> port(uum?) Asiae / <vi>lic(i) Mil(ei), se<(vo). / Φήλικι Πρεμιώνος, κοιν(ονόν) μ’ λιμέν(ον) / Ασίας οικον(όμου) Μελήτ(η), δούλω. / Τυραννίς Φήληκι τὸν βομίν καί / τὸ μνημείον.

(Latin) For Felix, the slave of Primio (of the company) of the fortieth tax of the harbours of Asia, the overseer in Miletos
(Greek) For Felix, the slave of Primio of the company of the fortieth tax of the harbours of Asia, the overseer in Miletos. Tyrannis (erected) the altar and monument for Felix.
59, no. 47 = CIL 422. Epitaph of Claudia, freedwoman of Augustus.

Claudia Aug(usti) l(iberta?) / monumen[tum fecit] / Laeto Caes(ari) [ser(vo?) --] / Κλαύδια Σεβαστοῦ [-- --]

Claudia (freedwoman) of Augustus made this monument for Laetus, (slave?) of Caesar.

59, no. 61 = MAMA IV 53. Epitaph of Arruntia Attice.


(Latin) For Arruntia Attice, daughter of Lucius, his companion and to Q. Arruntius Iustus, his dearest son. Hyacinthus (slave) of Nero Caesar Augustus, tabularius, made it from his own money.

(Greek) For Arruntia Attice, daughter of Lucius, his wife and to Q. Arruntius Iustus, his dearest son. Hyacinthus (slave) of Nero Caesar Augustus, tabularius, made it from his own money.

59, no. 89 = CIL III 7102 = TAM V.1 745 = IGRR IV 1296. Epitaph of Crescens, verna.


(Latin) To the divine shades. For Crescens, house-born slave of Augustus. He lived for fifty-four years.

(Greek) Episteme with their children (dedicated this) to Crescens her partner on account of his memory. Supervised by Publius Claudius Euphemus.

59, no. 91 = TAM V.2 1119.

Ξένωνι ἐτ(ῶν) [, , ] / καὶ Πρείµῳ ἐτ(ῶν) ἐ' / τοῖς τέκνοις / καὶ Οὐαλερίῳ Οὐα- / λερίου γραµµατικῷ / Ῥωµαι[κῷ ἐτ(ῶν) κγшедш.] / vota supervacua fletusque et numina divum / naturae leges fatorumque ar<g>uit ordo. / sprevisi patrem matremque, miserrime nate, / Elysios campos habitans et praeta veatum

(Greek) For Xenon ... years old and for Preimos five years old, their children - and for Valerius (son of) Valerius, the Roman teacher, twenty-three years old.

(Latin) The laws of nature and the order of the fates convict unnecessary vows and lamenting and spirits of the gods. You have scorned your father and your mother, most wretched child, living in the Elysian fields and the meadows of the blessed ones.

59, no. 92 = CIL III suppl. 14192.15 = TAM V.2 1319. Epitaph of M. Ulpius Horimus.

M(arco) Ulpio Horimo / [P]арthenius, Aug(usti) lib(ertus), a(diutor) p(rocuratoris), / fratri dulcissimo. / Μ. Οὐλπίῳ Ὑρίμῳ / Παρθένιος, Σεβαστοῦ ἀπελ(εύθερος), / βοηθ(ὸς) ἐπιτρόπ(ου), / ἀδελφὸς γλυκυτάτῳ.
(Both Latin and Greek) For Marcus Ulpius Horimus. Parthenius, freedman of the emperor, adiutor of the procurator, for his very sweet brother


Getiores / Menan(dri ?499) Eb(raea) / Γητιωρῆς / ἡ Μεν(άνδρου) Ἑβρέ- / α

(Both Latin and Greek) Getiores, (?) of Menander, a Hebrew woman.

59, no. 109 = *AE* 1887, 943. Epitaph of Julius Marinus.


(Latin) For Julius Marinus, magister of the Hemeseni. We, Julius Monimus and Julius Bassus, equestrians, set up this memorial and made this inscription for our sweetest brother.

(Greek) Be courageous, Marinus, nobody is immortal. May you fare well, passers-by!

59, no. 135 = *CIL* III suppl. 7043 = *IGRR* IV 675. Honorific of L. Arruntius Scribonianus.

[L(ucii) Arruṇṭị L(ucii) f(ilii), S[crioniano/ Pompei Magni aḅ[an(epotis) / Ani(ensis tribus) praef(ecti) urb(is), a[ur[is), quaest(oris)?], / Prymness(ii) et c(ives) R(omani) [qui (ibi) nego]- / tiantur, curαm [agentе] / C. Caecilio L(ucii) f(ilio) M[— — —]. / ὁ δῆμος καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦν- / τες Ῥωμαίοι Ἀρρην- / τινον, Λευκίου, Γναίου / Πομπηίου Μ[άγνου, ἀπόγο]- / ονον, Σκριβωνίαν, ἐπαρ- / χοι Ρώμης, Αγ[

(Latin) For Lucius Arruntius Scribonianus, son of Lucius, descendant of Pompeius Magnus, Aniensis (tribe), prefect of Rome, augur ...

(Greek) The demos and the Romans living in the area (honored) L. Arruntius Scribonianus, son of Lucius, Aniensis (tribe), descendant of Pompeius Magnus, prefect of Rome, augur ...


(Latin and Greek) ... Arnesis (tribe), procurator of the Divine Claudius and of Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, son of the Divine Claudius, took care to make the base and the statues of this monument with his own money, and he dedicated them.

499 Getiores may have been the wife, daughter, freedwoman or slave of Menander.
60, no. 137. Epitaph of M. Aurelius Victor, *aquilifer*.

D(is) M(anibus) M(arci) / Aureli / Victuri / aquilifiri / lig(ionis) VIII / Aug(ustae) (*sic*)

*To the divine shades of Marcus Aurelius Victor, standard bearer of legion VIII Augusta.*

61, no. 388 = *CIL* III 6736. Epitaph of Sergia Theopropis and family.

[..]us et Sergia Theopropis uxor Vibi[i / ?pe]tierint et P(ublio) Sergio Candido et Quin[to

...*us and Sergia Theopropis, the wife of Vibius, desired, and also Publius Sergius Candidus and Quintus...*


D(edit) L(ocus) Menopho et / Calliclea salvete / les[- - - - -]

*This place was given by Menophus and Calliclea. Farewell.*


Dindiae M(arci) f(ilia) uxori L(ucius) Timinius L(ucii) f(ilius) Ter(etina tribus) / Δινδίαι, Μάρκου θυγατρί, γυναικὶ Λεύκιος / Τιμίος, Λευκίου υἱός.

(Latin) *To Dindia, daughter of Marcus. Lucius Timinius, son of Lucius, of the tribe Teretina, (dedicated this) to his wife.*

(Greek) *To Dindia, daughter of Marcus. Lucius Timinius, son of Lucius (dedicated this) to his wife.*

64, no. 125 = *CIL* 144402b = *AE* 1902, 99. Dedication of Olcinius Macrinus to unnamed deity.

Olcinius / Macrinus / (centurion) [le]g(ionis) XXII Pri-/ mig(enia) p(idelis) / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito)

*Olcinius Macrinus, centurion of legion XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis. He paid his vow willingly and rightly.*

64, no. 134. Epitaph of several freedmen.

Cn(aeus) Servilius / Apollonides / Servilia Anthos / Cn(aeus) Servilius Caepio / Servilia Tertulla / (hic) siti (sunt)

*Cnaeus Servilius Apollonides. Servilia Anthos. Cnaeus Servilius Caepio. Servilia Tertulla. They have been placed here.*
L&W

746. Dedication of Apamean businessmen.

Qui Apameae / Negotiantur / H(ic) C(onsecraverunt)

Those who conduct business at Apamea consecrated this.

Marek

Am. 5 = CIL III 454 = suppl. 6984, 13648. Epitaph of Sex. Vibius Gallus.

[S]ex(to) Vibio Gallo tri(-)/[ce]nario primipila(-)/ri prae(fecto) kastor[um] leg(ionis)/XIII Gem(ina) donis dona(-)/[t]o ab imperatorib[u[s]/honoris virtutisq[ue]/causa
tor(qibus) arm[i]-/lis phaleris coronis/muralibus III vall[ar[i]-/bus II, aurea I, hastis/[p]juris V, vexillis II / Sex(tus) Vibius Cocce-/[i]anus patrono / benemeren[i]
Σεξ(τος)/Οὐείβιος Γάλλος τρεκιναρίος πρειπέλαιος / [σ]πρατοπ(ε)δάρχη λεγ(εινός) ιγ',
teimai τετειμημ[ι]να(μος)/[υ]πο τόν Σεβασ(-)/[τ]ον άρετής καὶ άνδρείας χάριν στρεπτος,
[φαλάριοι], / στεφάνοις πυργωτος γ', τειχωτος β', χρυσω α', δόροις / καθαροῖς ε',
ουηξίλλοις β', Σεξ(τος)/Οὐείβιος Κοκκειανός τῷ πάτρῳ]

(Latin) To Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, prefect of the camp of Legion 13 Gemina, who on account of his esteem and manliness was presented with gifts by the commanders: torcs, medallions; ornaments; crowns, three for the walls, two for being the first to scale the ramparts, and one gold one: five unsoiled spears; two standards. Sextus Vibius Cocceianus, to his well-deserving patron.

(Greek) To Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, leader of the camp, of Legion 13, rewarded with honors by the Augusti on account of his uprightness and manliness: torques; medallions; crowns, three for storming a tower, two for storming a wall, one golden; five unspoil[ed spears; two banners. Sextus Vibius Cocceianus [erected this] for his patron.


(Latin) To Jupiter Sarsus. Sextus Vibius Gallus, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, prefect of the camp, of Legion 13 Gemina, who was presented with gifts by the commanders on account of his esteem and manliness: torcs, bangles, medals; crowns, three for the walls, two for being the first to scale the ramparts, and one gold; five unsoiled spears; two standards. He made this from his own money.

(Greek) To Jupiter Sarsus. Sextus Vibius Gallos, senior centurion of the Praetorian guard, chief centurion of the legion, leader of the camp, of Legion 13 Gemina, having
been honored with gifts by the Augusti on account of his uprightness and manliness;
...unsoiled ...3 tower [wreathes]

RECAM

II 225 = CIL III 6770 = Bosch no. 277. Imperial dedication to Verus Maximus.

d(omini) n(ostr) I[uli veri] / Maximini[P(ii) F(elicis)] / A[ugusti] / [m]ilites coh[ortis ...]
/ [Max]imin[ani]ae

The soldiers of the cohort ... Maximiniana to Gaius Julius Verus Maximus, most noble
Caesar, prince of the youth, son of our master Julius Verus Maximinus Pius Felix
Augustus

II 289. Epitaph for the parents of Gaius Julius Akylas, soldier.

Ἰούλιος / Ἀκύλας στρ- / ατιώτης ληγ- / ὄνος τρεις- / καιδεκάτης / Διδύμης ἀνέ<s>τησέν
/ γονέσσιν μνήμην- / χάριν.

(Latin) .... set this up for his well deserving parents.
(Greek) Gaius Iulius Akylas, soldier of Legion XIII Gemina set this up for his parents, on
account of their memory.

III 140 = CIL 6888 = IGRR III.410. Dedication of Aurelius Nikon to Maron.

Aurel(ius) Nico du[vir col(oniae) sta]- / τuam dei Maronis [dul]- / cissimae pa[tria de
so]. / Αὐρήλιος Νίκον διαν[δρι]- / κός τής κολ(ονίας) τὸν ἀνδρι- / ἀντα τοῦ Μάρωνος
τῇ γλυ- / κυτατῇ πατρίδι ἐκ τῶν / ἱδίων.

(Both Latin and Greek) Aurelius Nikon duovir of the colony (set up) the statue of the god
Maron for his sweetest fatherland from his own money.

IV 90. Epitaph of Aurelius Nestor and Aurelius Maximus.

Αὐρήλιος Νέστωρ παλαιστρ(ατιώτης) ἐαυτῷ καὶ Ἰοθ(λί)η Σατορνεινὴ
goνάκι τάς ἐς κλείνας / καὶ Αὐρήλιος Μάξιμος παλαιστρ(ατιώτης) ἐαυτῷ καὶ
Αὐρήλιος Δημητρία / γονάκι τάς ἐν ἀριστερά τρεῖς κλείνας κατεσκεύασαν. / Vet(eران)Leg(ionis) XIII <G>(e)m(inae)

(Greek) Aurelius Nestor, veteran, made the six funeral couches for himself and for Iu(li)a
Saturnina, his wife; and Aurelius Maximus, veteran, made the three funeral couches on
the left for himself, and for Aur. Demetria, his wife. (Latin) Veterans of Legion 13
Gemina.
IV 233 = *AE* 1912, 271 = *SEG* 34.1319. Epitaph of Callistus, *servus*.

\[
\text{D(is) } M(\text{anibus}) / \text{Callisto } s\text{ervo} / l\text{ul} (\text{ii}) \text{Gemelli-} / \text{n} i \text{ c(enturionis) } l\text{eg(ionis) II} \\
\text{Tr(aianae) } F(\text{ortis}) / \text{vixit } a\text{nn(os) XX} / o(p\text{time) } m(\text{erito}) / \text{Vitalis } c\text{on-} / s\text{ervos}
\]

*To the divine shades. For Callistus, slave of Julius Gemellinus, centurion of Legion II Traiana Forti. He lived for twenty years with greatest merit. Vitalis, his fellow slave (set this up).*

*TAM*

III.1 no. 942. Dedication to the Tetrarchy from Termessus.

\[
\text{Imp(eratoribus) } C[a]i\text{o } A\text{urelio} / \text{Galerio Diocletiano, } / \text{Marco Valerio} / \text{Maximiano, } p\text{<p}(iis) f\text{<f}(icibus) / \text{invictis } A\text{ug<stis>}}, \text{et } F\text{la-} / \text{vio Valerio} \\
\text{Constantio / et Galerio Valerio / Maximiano, nobilis- / simis } C[a]\text{s<aribus>}(aribus) / \text{ἡ } \lambda\mu\pi\rho\alpha / \text{Τερ-} \\
\text{µησσ}εων / [τὸν } \muειζöl]- / [νων } \pi\text{όλις]}
\]

(Latin) *To Emperors Caesars Gaius Aurelius Galerius Diocletian, Marcus Valerius Maximianus, (both called) Pius Felix Invictis Augustus, and to Flavius Valerius Constantius and to Galerius Valerius Maximianus, most noble caesars.*

(Greek) *The illustrious city of the greatest Termessans.*

IV.1 no. 153 = *CIL* III 330; suppl. 13649. Epitaph of Socrates and Aelia Marita.

\[
S\text{ocrates } v\text{iv<s>si} / \text{bi et } A\text{eliae } M\text{ar-} / \text{itae monumentum } f\text{ecit. } / Σωκράτης } ζ\text{ων } \dot{\epsilon}\text{αυτ}\dot{ο} / \text{Αιλία } \text{Μαρ-} / \text{i}\text{tai } το\text{ῦτo } \mu\text{n}\text{ημε}ιον } \kappa\text{ατεσκεδασ}ε\text{ςεν.}
\]

(Both Latin and Greek) *Socrates while living made this monument for himself and for Aelia Marita.*
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