

POST-HERULIAN ATHENS

Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens
A.D. 267–529

Edited by
Paavo Castrén

HELSINKI 1994

Erkki Sironen

Life and Administration of Late Roman Attica in the Light of Public Inscriptions¹

I. Introduction

During the past hundred years or so archaeological discoveries have filled out the picture of Late Roman Athens obtained from the meagre literary references. Of these finds, inscriptions have been used increasingly in the following three important works on the subject published during the past 50 years.

¹ I wish to thank the Greek archaeological and ecclesiastical authorities and museums for the permission to study and republish most of the inscriptions included in this paper. Thanks go to the Louvre (inscription 1.) and the British Museum (inscription 28.) for the same reason. I am very grateful to the former Director of the Epigraphical Museum, Dr Dina Peppas-Delmouzou, and Mrs Chara Karapa-Molisani for their help. I have benefited from conversations with Professors Kevin Clinton, Stephen Tracy and Ron Stroud in Athens, with Ms Alison Frantz, Professors Homer Thompson and Christian Habicht in Princeton, and Professors Luigi Moretti and Guglielmo Cavallo in Rome, in an early phase of my work. Dr Denis Feissel has given me advice *per litteras*. My Finnish supervisors, Professors Maarit Kaimio and Paavo Castrén (who suggested this work to me), have continuously given me support and guidance with this project from its very beginning. To them and Professor Jaakko Frösén I owe very much in many respects. I thank Mrs Julia Burman and Ms Arja Karivieri for numerous conversations concerning my paper, as well as Mr Mika Hakkarainen for valuable help. Dr Charles Williams, Director of the Corinth excavations, has furthered this project greatly by letting me work with parallel material in Corinth from 1988 on. Professor John Camp has also supported my studies through a longer period, and I have benefited from his and Dr Judith Binder's remarks on a draft of this paper. Finally, in February 1993 a trip to Oxford and London influenced considerably the presentation of this paper: I read a paper in Professor John Matthews' Late Roman Seminar in the Queen's College; I had also advantageous conversations with Professors David Lewis and Fergus Millar. Last, but not least, I am indebted to Dr Charlotte Roueché for a fundamental discussion about my projects and very useful remarks on a draft of this paper. Any faults, of course, are totally my responsibility.

The first of the scholars, John Day, attempted to reconstruct an economic history of Athens.² Even though the author was able to use fresh archaeological evidence from the Agora excavations, he was primarily dependent upon the literary evidence in studying the Late Roman period.

Homer Thompson, former Field Director of the Agora excavations, wrote a paper in 1959 which referred to the meagre epigraphical evidence.³ He stressed the importance of the Herulian raid in A.D. 267 belittled by Wachsmuth and Judeich.⁴ Thompson thought that the Agora lay almost entirely desolate from A.D. 267 until around A.D. 400. To achieve a coherent narrative he cited Synesius' negative report on Athens from around A.D. 400.⁵ Thompson said that Alaric and his Goths "left no visible mark in the area of the Agora".⁶ In this respect Thompson's authority may have influenced some American scholars working under him. At the beginning of the fifth century considerable building activity is reported by Thompson to have occurred in "the long-desolate area of the ancient Agora", with the interpretation that this was due to rich people moving into the city, caused by Alaric's devastation of the countryside of Attica.⁷ Thompson's article concerns itself mainly with the Agora and is selective in using inscriptions, probably due to limited space. Thompson republished his article in 1972 with only minor revisions.⁸

Alison Frantz' recent book on the Late Roman Agora (1988), which presents as full a picture as possible of the Agora and its surroundings in Late Antiquity, is better balanced than the above-mentioned articles by Thompson.⁹ Her book rightfully casts doubt on a tendency to assign repairs of pagan sanctuaries and monuments in Athens to Julian the Apostate and to date the repairs accordingly. More importantly, Frantz has revised estimates of wholesale damage previously attributed to the Heruli by showing that more attention must be paid to the destruction wrought by Alaric and his Goths.¹⁰ Frantz reminds the reader that little account has been taken of movable finds of Late Antiquity from the Agora excavations; obviously due to reasons of space available, Frantz has been unable to present all the inscriptions in her study. This paper and the projected *corpus* will provide a complement to the publications mentioned above; a look at the footnotes, however, will show how dependent I am on the work of Frantz and other archaeologists, although I have not always been able to be in agreement with them.¹¹

The scope of this paper is limited to a presentation of the historically more important public texts, abridged from my thesis submitted for the Grade of Licentiate of Philosophy

² See Day (1942), especially 262–270; Day himself describes these pages as a "meager sketch".

³ Thompson (1959), aptly titled "Athenian Twilight: A.D. 267–600".

⁴ *Id.*, 62, note 7.

⁵ The letter has been dated in A.D. 410 by Alan Cameron (1992), 422–423.

⁶ Thompson (1959), 66, with note 29 on Synesius' letter; the letter could be as early as A.D. 395, according to Frantz (1988), 53, note 227, and p. 55, note 239.

⁷ Thompson (1959), 66–67.

⁸ With, for example, the information that in the second half of the fourth and in the fifth century Athens was again an educational centre, see Thompson (1972), 210 with note 12.

⁹ Compare especially the chapters on the Herulian raid, the survival of the boule, the Panathenaic festival and the institution of the archons, as well as the slow advance of Christianity, in Frantz (1988), 1–9, 12, and 18–20.

¹⁰ *Id.*, 23 with note 69 and p. 53–56.

¹¹ The study of Late Roman Athens has continued in several reviews of Frantz' *magnum opus*: Fowden (1990), being a review article; a shorter review can be found in Ward-Perkins (1990); see Castrén (1991) for a more recent review. Furthermore, Rügler (1990), 277–278, discusses Cerameicus and Alaric's siege of Athens and gives a synopsis of early scholarship. On p. 287–291 Rügler comes to the conclusion that Alaric is not to be blamed for destruction in the Agora area.

at the University of Helsinki.¹² The public inscriptions have been frequently studied, but until now they have not been studied as a group by a single scholar working with the stones themselves; this means that considerations of script and so on become more important.

The material for this study is limited to the public dedications and honorary inscriptions together with (non-Christian) building inscriptions, including milestones, of Attica between A.D. 267, the date of the Herulian raid of Athens, and A.D. 529, the date of the closing of the philosophical schools of Athens by the Emperor Justinian. Our treatment of this period begins with the late third century after the Herulian raid on Athens in A.D. 267, followed by the fourth century proper until A.D. 395, concluding with the period following the Visigothic raid of Athens in A.D. 396.

II. The Late Third Century Inscriptions

This chapter presents the public inscriptions datable after the Herulian raid on Athens in A.D. 267 until the end of the third century.

1. *IG II/III²*, no. 3669: Honours to Publius Herennius Dexippus (A.D. 270 or later)

κατὰ τὸ ἐπερώτημα τῆς ἐξ Ἀρίου πάγου βουλῆς καὶ
τῆς βουλῆς τῶν ὙΠΝ(καὶ τοῦ δήμου τοῦ Ἀθηναίων τὸν
ἄρξαντα τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως ἐν θεσμοθέταις ἀρχὴν καὶ
ἄρξαντα τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἀρχὴν καὶ πανηγυριαρχήσαντα
καὶ ἀγωνοθετήσαντα τῶν μεγάλων Παναθηναίων οἴκο- 5
θεν ἱερέα παναγῆ Πό(πλιον) Ἐρέν(νιον) Δέξιππον Πτολεμαίου
Ἑρμειον τὸν ῥήτορα καὶ συγγραφέα ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα οἱ παῖδε[ς].

vacat

ἀλκῆ καὶ μύθοισι καὶ ἐν βουλαῖσι κρατίστους
ἄνδρας ἀγακλείτους γείνατο Κεκροπίη,
ὦν ἓνα καὶ Δέξιππον, ὃς ἱστορίην ἐσαθρήσας 10
αἰῶνος δολιχὴν ἀτρεκέως ἔφρασεν
καὶ τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἐσεῖδε, τὰ δ' ἐκ βύβλων ἀναλέξας
εὔρατο παντοίην ἱστορίας ἀτραπόν.
ἦ μέγα κλεινὸς ἀνὴρ, ὃς νοῦ ἄπο μυρίον ὄμμα

¹² The Licentiate thesis (March 1992) is a part of an unfinished doctoral dissertation in progress. As the original thesis was from the very first beginning heavily dependent on the arrangement of Kirchner's *IG II/III²* (*editio minor*), it is natural that the geographical limits of my study coincide with those of Kirchner and his predecessors: Megaris and some northern areas of the modern νομὸς Ἀττικῆς are excluded. The dissertation will include the entire *corpus* with more than 300 inscriptions and it will see the light of day after this paper has already been published. As the *corpus* in its final form will be more epigraphical, including all of the necessary technical descriptions and details, it is self-evident that the nature of this presentation will be somewhat different. I have excluded *dipinti* and graffiti, along with texts on lamps, from the projected *corpus*.

ἐκτείνας χρονίους πρήξιας ἐξέμαθεν.
 φήμη μὲν περίβωτος ἀν' Ἑλλάδα, τὴν ὁ νεανθῆς
 αἴνος Δεξίπῳ δῶκεν ἐφ' ἱστορίῃ.
 τοῦνεκα δ(ῆ) καὶ παῖδες ἀγάκλειτον γενετῆρα
 μορφάεντα λίθου θῆκαν ἀμειβόμενοι.

15

“Upon the approval granted by the Council of Areopagus and by the Council of the 750 members and by the people of Athens, the children (erected the statue for their father) Publius Herennius Dexippus, son of Ptolemaios, from the deme of Hermos, the rhetor and historian, and the sacrosanct priest, because of his merits in having held the office of *basileus* among the *thesmothetai* and having held the office of the eponymous archon and having served as the president of the *panegyris*-festival and having been the *agonothetes* of the Great Panathenaic Games at his own expense.”

“The land of Cecrops has brought forth men excelling in courage, in speech and in counsel; one of them is Dexippus, who observed the age-long history and wrote it exactly. Some of the events he witnessed himself, some he gathered from books, and thus made his way to the manifold path of history. O most famous man, who, spreading out his boundless insight, closely examined the doings of times long gone by! His fame is much talked of all around Greece, the fame which was given to Dexippus by the new-blown praise on account of his *History*. And this is the reason why (his) children have repaid their famous father by erecting a statue formed of stone.”

Cut on a reused statue base (H. 0.545, W. 0.74, T. 0.025–0.04, LH. 0.008–0.017), where also *IG II/III*², no. 3625 was cut; found in Athens, removed to the Louvre.

This is the main inscription of Dexippus (traditionally dated between A.D. 267–269), giving the fullest account of his posts and functions.¹³ The prose introduction of the inscription includes two important pieces of information: the number of the members of the council has been increased to include 750 members, as is attested only in this inscription.¹⁴ The other important thing is that Dexippus was not necessarily honoured for his bravery against the Heruli at all: in line 8 the word ἀλκή has been thought to refer to the victory over the Heruli.¹⁵ This seems to be wrong, as can be shown by two comparable epigrams, one of which is for Aratus and the other for Philopoemen.¹⁶ Dexippus has been honoured for his literary achievements and eloquence. The finishing

¹³ Other inscriptions are *IG II/III*², nos. 2931, 3198, 3667, 3670, and 3671.

¹⁴ According to Geagan (1979), 409, this occurred around A.D. 230, at around the same time when prytany lists ceased to be cut on stone and when the number of *epheboi* increased. See also Meritt and Traill (1974), 22, with note 79; Frantz (1988), 12, with note 8, dates this in around A.D. 270 and claims it is unexplained. This has been thought to indicate a change from annual to permanent membership and to suggest financial stringency and a need for the burden of the membership to be spread more widely: see Millar (1969), 21, with note 96, obtained from the discussion in Geagan (1967), 74–75.

¹⁵ Kapetanopoulos (1972), 135, note 7.

¹⁶ Hiller von Gaertringen (1926), no. 99, lines 1–2. and no. 110, lines 1–2.

and publishing of Dexippus' *Χρονικά* sometime in the 270's¹⁷ seems to have occupied a prominent place in the epigram: μῦθοι (line 8), ἱστορίη (lines 10, 13, and 17), ἐκ βύβλων ἀναλέξας (line 12), culminating in lines 16 with φήμη..., τὴν ὁ νεανθῆς αἴνος given to Dexippus for his *History*. Furthermore, it may be concluded from the wording of line 12 that the contents of Dexippus' *History* related both contemporary and remote incidents, thus excluding the possibility that *Τὰ μετὰ Ἀλέξανδρον* and *Σκυθικά* are being referred to.

2. *IG II/III*², no. 3689: Honours to the Proconsul Claudius Illyrius (around A.D. 270's/280's)

τὸν λαμπρότατον ἀνθύπατον
 Κλαύδιον Ἰλλυριόν, ἔγγονον Λεον-
 τικοῦ τοῦ ἀνθυπατεύσαντος,
 παῖδ[α] Τή[ρ]εντος τοῦ τὴν ἐπώ[νυ]-
 μον ἀρχὴν ἄρξαντος, τὸν] 5
 ἀνθύπατον καὶ Ἀρεο[παγεί]-
 την καὶ εὐεργέ[τ]η[ν] ἢ [πόλις],
 ἐπιμελουμένου Μάρκου Ἰουνί]-
 ου Μηνο[υκλιανοῦ]. *vacat*

“The city (of Athens set up this statue of) *vir clarissimus*, the Proconsul (of Achaëa) Claudius Illyrius – grandson of Leonticus the former proconsul, son of Terens the former holder of the office of eponymous archon – proconsul, member of Areopagus, and a benefactor; Marcus Iunius Minucianus took charge (of the erection of the statue).”

Cut on a reused rectangular statue base (preserved H. 0.95, W. 0.455, T. 0.56, LH. 0.012–0.017), found broken on the Acropolis, excluded from the map in Fig. 2 b.

The honorand has been additionally delineated by his ancestors: the Proconsul Leonticus was his grandfather¹⁸ and the eponymous archon Terens was his father.¹⁹ This ancestry and the traditional identification with the builder of a Late Roman wall, *signo* Ἰλλυριός, who built the wall for Athens,²⁰ have caused him to be regarded as an Athenian. A further clue for establishing a date for this inscription is available in the name of the *epimeletes* Marcus Iunius Minucianus.

The general problem of dating these persons arose when the fortification wall, previously called the Valerian Wall, was dated later than A.D. 267 and accordingly renamed the Post-Herulian Wall. Already acknowledged by Millar in 1969,²¹ these

¹⁷ Dexippus' historical works are mentioned by Millar (1969), 21–26. *Χρονικά* cannot have been completed earlier than a couple of years after the repulse of the Heruli, *id.*, 24. I would take this to mean the beginning of the 270's.

¹⁸ See references given by Christol (1986), 177, note 1.

¹⁹ Terens has been usually dated in the second quarter of the third century; see the references given by Christol (1986), 178, note 3.

²⁰ See 4. below.

²¹ Millar (1969), 17. This will be dealt with in detail in 4.

problems were first discussed at length by Christol. He proposed a complex theory, according to which the builder of the wall was son of the proconsul with an identical *signum*.²² A more plausible explanation for the variable dates of Illyrius was proposed by Frantz in 1988.²³ According to her we have to re-establish the date for Marcus Iunius Minucianus to around A.D. 255–295, setting aside an earlier date provided by *Suda*.²⁴ This can be deduced from the activities of Minucianus' son, Nicagoras the Younger, who accompanied Constantine to Egypt in A.D. 326. The new date would accord with a date in the late 270's/early 280's for the fortification wall. Claudius Illyrius' father Terens served as an archon sometime between A.D. 239–261,²⁵ but he had been previously moved back to the second quarter of the third century, for no reason at all. The new dating gives a more realistic period of 65–75 years for the careers of grandfather, father, and (grand)son.

3. *IG* II/III², no. 3690: Honours to the Proconsul Claudius Illyrius (around A.D. 270's/280's)

[τὸν λαμπρότα-
 [τον ἀνθύπατον
 [Κλαύδιον Ἰλ]λυριόυ,
 [ἔγγονον Λε]ον[τι]-
 [κοῦ το]ῦ ἀνθυπα- 5
 [τε]ύσαντος, παῖδα
 [Τή]ρεντος τοῦ
 [τή]ν ἐπώνυμον
 ἀρχὴν ἄρξαντος,
 τὸν ἀνθύπατον 10
 καὶ Ἀρεοπαγεῖτη[ν]
 καὶ εὐεργέτην
 ἢ πόλις, ἐπιμε-
 λουμένου Μάρ-
 κου Ἰουνίου 15
 Μινουκιανοῦ.
 vacat

²² Christol (1986), 181, with notes 21–23.

²³ Frantz (1988), 8–9, notes 58–63.

²⁴ *Suda*, M 1087: Μινουκιανός, Νικαγόρου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ, Ἀθηναῖος, σοφιστής, γεγονός ἐπὶ Γαληνοῦ. He is also present in a letter of the Emperor Gallienus to the Athenians: see Clinton (1989), 1535.

²⁵ Graindor (1922), 262–263.

For translation and commentary, see 2. above.

Cut on a rectangular statue base (H. 1.43, W. 0.53, T. 0.42, LH. 0.015–0.043), found west of the Erechtheum; presently in a trench next to the northern wall of the Acropolis. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

Kapetanopoulos' new reading²⁶ [ἀνθύπατο]ν Γάτιον in line 2 is epigraphically impossible: the traces on the marble do not allow this. Neither is the superfluous *praenomen* present in the other copy of this text, see 2. above.

4. *IG II/III*², no. 5199: The Post-Herulian Wall, built probably by the Proconsul Claudius Illyrius (around A.D. 270's/280's)

Ἀμφ[ίων] μούσαις κιθάρης ἔσ[τησεν Θήβης]
 ὕτειξα· νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἐμᾶς πατ[ρίδος Ἰλλυριός]
 ἀδύλογον μούσαν μεθέπων· [τῶ και δοκέουσι]
 ἄκμητες ῥέζειν πείρατα [πάντα τέχνας.]

“Amphion put up the walls of Thebes by the music of his cithara; now Illyrius (put up the walls) in my home city, following the sweet-voiced muse. Thus, untiringly (the workmen) seem to achieve all of the limits of their craft.”

Cut on a fragment of a block (preserved H. 0.38, preserved W. 1.32, T. 0.31, LH. 0.041–0.05) from the Post-Herulian Wall, found at the site of the church of Agios Demetrios Katephores, now (only partly preserved) in the Diogeneion lot. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

Probably, the poet at work here is not referring to himself in line 2, but to another person Illyrius (see below). The name was preserved on the stone until the nineteenth century. At any rate, the poet seems to have stumbled towards the end of his efforts, since the last sentence is strikingly elaborate and obscure.

The most important newly established fact in recent research literature is the new date for the Post-Herulian Wall, formerly known under several misnomers, the most misleading of which has been “The Valerian Wall”. As early as 1905 Judeich distinguished this wall from the one that was supposedly under repair in the reign of Valerian.²⁷ The excavations in the Agora in the thirties established the date in the last quarter of the third century,²⁸ but more recently a slightly later date for the wall has been suggested.²⁹ The antiquated date still lingers on in some publications.³⁰

The builder of the wall has been plausibly identified with the Proconsul Claudius Illyrius featured in 2. and 3., dated in the 270's or 280's. Our inscription was found in the north-eastern part of the enceinte, and it was probably in a very conspicuous place, surely near a gate.³¹ On the basis of a corresponding inscription (see 5. below) found in

²⁶ Kapetanopoulos (1974), 62, no. 4, lines 1–6, taken up by *BEpigr* 1976, no. 210.

²⁷ Judeich (1905), 103, note 5 with references.

²⁸ Day (1942), 259–260 with note 36; Thompson (1959), 65, notes 21 and 22; *id.* (1972), 209, note 9.

²⁹ Frantz (1988), 6, note 40: a single coin of Maximian (A.D. 286–305).

³⁰ Geagan (1979), 410, and Thomasson (1984), 196, no. 51.

³¹ Travlos (1988b), 140, in the detailed description of the wall.

the west flank, it may be asked whether Illyrius is responsible only for the construction of the east flank³² or whether he may also be credited with the west flank or maybe even the whole wall.³³ This question must remain unanswered until the name of the restorer is found in some other part of the wall.

5. *IG II/III*², no. 5200: Further epigrams on the Post-Herulian Wall (around A.D. 270's/280's)

A.: οὐ τὰδε θελξιμελής Ἀμφιονίς ἤρα[ρε φόρμιγξ]
 ὀὐδὲ Κυκλωπεία[ς χειρὸ]ς ἔδ[ειμε βία].

B.: [-----π]ειθῶδες
 [-----ἀ]ρετῆ[ς?].

“This (wall) was not put together by Amphion’s sweet-sounding lyre. Neither did the powerful hands of the Cyclops build (this wall).”

“[---] of obedience. [---] of virtue (?)”

Cut on fragments of two different blocks (A.: H. 0.30, preserved W. 1.80, T. 0.765, LH. 0.05–0.06; B.: H. 0.28, preserved W. 0.41 and 0.64, preserved T. 0.55 and 1.12, LH. 0.06), both found broken (B. without even a join) in the church of Panagia Pyrgiotissa near the west flank of the Post-Herulian Wall. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

A close parallel to the work of Cyclopean hands can be found in the *Greek Anthology*:

Κυκλώπων τὰδε χεῖρες ἐνιδρύσαντο θαλάσση
 τείχεα· μέχρι πόσου, Γαῖα, βιαζόμεθα;³⁴

Unfortunately the meaning of epigram B. remains obscure. It may have contained the name of the builder of the wall.

In view of this evidence and especially of the significance of the topographical information relevant in this case, it is very probable that this is a pendant to 4., which refers to the contemporary building of the Post-Herulian Wall.

Was Illyrius responsible also for this section of the wall? Frantz attributes this section of the wall with likelihood and the whole wall with probability to Illyrius.³⁵ I would be more cautious, as no name has here survived to indicate the builder. Maybe we have to be content with a vague date for this inscription, as the fortification probably was a time-consuming project, possibly completed within years before or after the east flank was furnished with 4., that is, from around A.D. 270's until late 280's.

³² See Thompson (1959), 64, and *id.* (1972), 209.

³³ Frantz (1988), 9, attributes the whole wall probably to Illyrius.

³⁴ *AP* 7.379, lines 3–4, which is a dialogue between Dicaearchia (Puteoli) and the Sea about the mole constructed in the sea.

³⁵ Frantz (1988), 9.

6. CIL III, no. 6103: Dedication to the Emperor Diocletian (A.D. 285/286?)

Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) <G>(aio) Val(erio) Diocletiano p(io) <f>(elici)

^v *invicto Augusto fortiss(imo)*

^v *<atqu>e super omnes retro prin-*

^v *cipes piissimo Augusto*

^{vv} *L(ucius) Turr(anius) Gratianus v(ir) c(larissimus), corr(ector)* 5

^{vv} *prov(inciae) Achaiae devotus*

^{vv} *numini maiestatiq(ue) eius.*

“Lucius Turranius Gratianus, *vir clarissimus* and *corrector* of the province of Achaea, (dedicates this) to the Emperor *Caesar* Gaius Valerius Diocletianus, the pious, lucky, unvanquished *Augustus*, the most brave and, above all of the preceding rulers, the most pious *Augustus*, in loyalty to his divine power.”

The inscription was found between the Library of Hadrian and the Gate of the Agora (see map in Fig. 2 b), but was later lost.

The text of this dedication requires no special comments here. The career of Lucius Turranius Gratianus has been elucidated by Groag.³⁶ According to him Gratianus was appointed to the highest senatorial rank of *praefectus urbi* in A.D. 290. There may have been a short period between his being the *corrector* of Achaea and the prefect of Rome. As Geagan has shown, *correctores* continue to be attested at Athens, but the scarcity of documentation limits the amount of evidence regarding them.³⁷ The absence of the *gentilicium* Aurelius and the presence of *fortissimus* in Diocletian’s title perhaps means that Carinus had already died. This dedication has evidently been set up before the adoption of the coregency, which occurred on the 1st of April in A.D. 286.

7. IG II/III², no. 3421: Dedication to the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (A.D. 286–305)

αὐτοκράτ(ο)ρ[σι] Καίσαρσ(ι)ν

Διοκλιτιανῶ καὶ Μαξιμι-^v

ανῶ Σεβαστο(ῖ)ς ὁ κράτιστος

[-----].

“The *kratistos* [---] (dedicates this) to the Emperors and *Caesars* Diocletian and Maximian, Augusts.”

³⁶ Groag (1946), 14–15, with notes. Further information is available in Barbieri (1952), 335, no. 1930 and in *PLRE* 1, s.v. Gratianus 3.

³⁷ Geagan (1979), 410. See also Follet (1976), 38, for an example of an earlier *corrector*.

The inscription was found in Athens, but was later lost.

The dedicant of this inscription remains unknown except for his rank. This dedication is less verbose than 6., but a more remarkable fact is that this is the only known imperial dedication from Late Roman Central Achaëa³⁸ in Greek prose that mentions the dedicant as a singular masculine person. Most Late Roman imperial dedications were cut in Greek, with the dedicant being ἡ πόλις, whereas the few Latin ones are almost exclusively dedicated by imperial officials. The inscription could be dated precisely between the years A.D. 286–292/3 in view of the significant fact that Galerius – as the sovereign of Illyricum with Greece and Macedonia – would hardly have been left unmentioned in the text. Another argument in favour of this hypothesis could be adduced: the possibility that senatorial rank (still then in vogue) is indicated by the word ὁ κράτιστος. This would also be in accordance with the earlier date because the province of Achaëa was degraded by Diocletian into the lowest rank of provinces, administered between A.D. 293–305 by a *praeses* of equestrian rank.³⁹ It must be borne in mind, however, that neither of these arguments could be called stringent or decisive.

8. *IG II/III*², no. 3422: Dedication to the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (A.D. 286–305)

[-----? Διοκλήτ]ιανὸν [-----]
 [-----? αὐτοκρά]τορα Μα[ξιμιανόν-----?]
 [-----] ΟΣΤΟ [-----]
 [-----?].

“[---] Diocletian [---] The Emperor Maximian [---].”

Cut on a (possibly reused) slab (preserved H. 0.35, preserved W. 0.50, T. 0.14, LH. 0.028–0.049), found in Eleusis.

The textual form of this inscription has so far raised no controversy despite the fact that the restored text (as we have it) does not conform with the usual stock of formulae attained from the Late Roman imperial dedications of Achaëa. The word αὐτοκράτορα normally precedes the name of the first emperor, but not the name of the coregents as would seem to be the case here. Furthermore, nobody has ever restored the beginning of the first line with αὐτοκράτορα. This would seem to be impossible in light of the estimated space available at left. Despite these difficulties I regard this inscription as an imperial dedication to the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian because of the rather large letters, the lettering (see Appendix on scripts), and the quality of the work, along with the likelihood here that the word αὐτοκράτορα is followed by the name of the coregent Maximian, although the name is fragmentary.

³⁸ This refers to parallel material – around 900 texts – collected by me from the Late Roman inscriptions of Peloponnesus (with several adjacent islands), Megaris, Boeotia, Phocis, Locris, Acarnania, Doris, Aetolia and Euboea. The parallel material could be utilised more consistently in my thesis.

³⁹ Groag (1946), 13. His hypothesis, according to which the offices of the proconsul and *corrector* of the free cities of Achaëa might have been combined during this period of transition, is based on similar examples found already in the earlier period (see *ibid.*, note 3).

9. *IG II/III*², no. 5202: Milestone under the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (A.D. 286–305)

αὐτοκράτωρ

Καῖσαρ ^{vvvv}

Διοκλ[η]τιαν(ὸ)[ς]

καὶ Μαξ(ι)μ(ι)αν[ός]

^{vvvv} ἸΒ *vacat*

5

^{vv} [ἐ]ξ ἄστ- ^{vvvv}

^{vvv} [ε]ως. ^{vvv}

“The Emperor *Caesar* Diocletian, and Maximian. 12 miles from the city (of Athens).”

Cut on a headless fragment of a herm, originally probably set up on the Sacred Way from Athens to Eleusis, found near Aspropyrgos north of the Sacred Way between Daphni and Eleusis; now lost.

It should be noted that αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ is in the singular instead of the plural for the two emperors.

It has been claimed that the milestones of Greece and Asia Minor were the principal monuments of Roman imperial art of the decades from the death of Severus Alexander to the advent of the Tetrarchy.⁴⁰ Attica is represented with five different milestones (9. and 22.–25.) in the Late Roman period.⁴¹ They can be assumed to reflect repair works undertaken by the government during this period.⁴²

Tabula Imperii Byzantini states that the road system of Attica facilitated travel from Cithaeron to Corinth and other destinations in the Peloponnesus via Megara.⁴³ Athens was served by a road which passed from Eleusis along the coast to Daphni, which lies in the valley between Mt. Aigaleos and Stephanobouni. It followed the route of the Sacred Way, ἱερὰ ὁδός.⁴⁴

III. The Fourth Century Inscriptions

This chapter studies the public⁴⁵ inscriptions datable between A.D. 300 and A.D. 395: the fourth century before the incursion of Alaric in A.D. 396.

⁴⁰ Vermeule (1968), 7.

⁴¹ The rest of the milestones, although two of them (22. and 23.) date partly already to the third and fourth century proper, are published in the beginning of Chapter IV.

⁴² This was assumed by Travlos (1988a), 177.

⁴³ *TIB*, 98.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* The length of the Sacred Way is given as 20.5 kilometres, which would be approximately 12 Roman miles; the milestones from around Daphni – according to *TIB*, 141 – are at a distance of nine kilometres, equal to six Roman miles (see 23., 24. and possibly also 25.).

⁴⁵ I omit here two fragments of regulations from the central government: *IG II/III*², no. 1120 (The Edict of Diocletian on Prices, from A.D. 301), and *IG II/III*², no. 1121 (a constitution on the *Caesariani*, from A.D. 305), for not being especially relevant to the topic of this paper. Another omission of a virtually public text from this study concerns *IG II/III*², no. 2342, a genealogical catalogue of priests reaching up to the beginning of the fourth century.

10. *IG II/III*², no. 3200: An epistyle with the name of the Emperor Constantine or Constans (A.D. 316–350?)

vacat Κωνστα[ντίνω?]

Cut on an epistyle (preserved H. 0.53, preserved W. 1.57, T. 0.52, LH. 0.16–0.19), provenience unknown.

It may be presumed that the person mentioned is probably an emperor because the text evidently covered the central part of the block⁴⁶ in huge letters; that there is no *Flavius* before the name should not worry us either.⁴⁷ Thus, the person mentioned could be Constantius Chlorus, Constans or one of those carrying the name Constantius, or Constantine I or II.

There seems to be more evidence in favour of Constantine the Great than for Constans: the former had a great concern for Athens,⁴⁸ he was also honoured with a statue containing an inscription for having acted as a *strategos*, taking care of the *cura annonae*.⁴⁹ Additional support for this view may be found in the fact that the elevation in the status of the province of Achaëa was probably due to Constantine's administrative reforms.⁵⁰ Compared to this, Constans could only boast of having given several grain-producing islands to Athens, in response to a request made by the sophist Prohaeresius.⁵¹

In conclusion, the building was probably dedicated to Constantine the Great, but Constans remains a possibility.

11. *IG II/III*², no. 3692: Honours to the archon Hegias (first half of the fourth century)

τὸν λαμπρότατον Ⓟ
 Ἑγείαν τὸν Τιμοκράτους
 ἄρξαντα τὴν ἐπώνυμον
 ἀρχὴν φιλοτειμότεα ὕ
 καὶ πανηγυριαρχήσαντα 5
 περιφανέστατα ἢ πόλις
 σύνπασα τὸν ἑαυτῆς ὕ

⁴⁶ With the unscripted field of at least 0.80 m. at left, I estimate the original width of the block at around 3.20 m.


⁴⁷ See Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), no. 2, for another example of this.

⁴⁸ See Julian, *Oratio* 1.6 (ed. Bidez (1932)), which is a panegyric to Constantius II.

⁴⁹ *ibid.*: βασιλεὺς γὰρ ὢν καὶ κύριος πάντων, στρατηγὸς ἐκείνων ἡξίου καλεῖσθαι καὶ τοιαύτης εἰκόνας τυγχάνων μετ' ἐπιγράμματος.

⁵⁰ Groag (1946), 15–16 and 22. This could possibly be linked with Constantine's keenness to show favour to the established pagan aristocracy of Athens, seen, for example, in Constantine sending Nicagoras, the *daduch* of Eleusis, on a trip to Egypt: see Millar (1969), 17 with notes 56–58, and Fowden (1987) with details.

⁵¹ Eunapius, *VS* X.7.5–8 has a considerably detailed account of this incident.

εὐεργέτην τειμῶσα^{vv}
^{vv} ἀνέστησεν.  ^{vvvv}

“With veneration the entire city (of Athens) has dedicated (this statue of) her own benefactor, the *lamprotatos* Hegias, son of Timocrates, who very generously held the office of eponymous archon and very conspicuously held the office of president of the *panegyris*-festival.”

Cut on the left side of a reused rectangular statue base (H. 0.61, W. 0.59, T. 0.67, LH. 0.015–0.036); first use for *IG II/III*², no. 3701, third use for *IG II/III*², no. 3818 (=29.); found in the wall of the church of Agia Kyra Kandeli (later demolished) in Plaka. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

In the *IG II/III*² this inscription is evidently misdated in the mid-third century due to a misprint; the correct date, A.D. 300–350, had been printed four years earlier.⁵² Earlier scholars had dated the text either in A.D. 422⁵³ or in the mid-third century.⁵⁴ Graindor was the first scholar to establish an acceptable date for this inscription.⁵⁵ He rejected Dittenberger’s identification of Hegias, son of Timocrates, with another Hegias, whose father and deme are unknown.⁵⁶ I agree with Graindor’s analysis of the lettering of the inscription, which could be as late as the fifth century (see Appendix on scripts). If Hegias were later than Plutarchus the Sophist (*floruit* around A.D. 410) recorded on the third inscription (29.) on the same base, he should be dated before A.D. 423, when the Emperor Theodosius II issued a decree forbidding pagan rites.⁵⁷ Finally, the statue of Plutarchus could hardly have been used for Hegias, so Graindor dated Hegias in early fourth century, midway between Marcus Ulpius Flavius Tisamenus of the first inscription and Plutarchus of the last reuse of the base.⁵⁸

There are some other things that could corroborate the later date. This public inscription has three striking examples of εἰ for ι (lines 2, 4, and 8) and words not attested in any other similar inscriptions.⁵⁹ Dedication by ἡ πόλις σύνπασσα is very rare,⁶⁰ but this cannot be shown to reflect a change in the structure of post-Herulian civic life at Athens. That Hegias was honoured by the entire city has been interpreted as the greatest honour.⁶¹ Without a doubt we have here a stylistically aberrant inscription, where the *demoticon* and *gentilicium* may have been left out on purpose.

There were several wealthy families in third-century Athens, and fewer in the fifth century, who dominated the local offices and willingly spent their money for public purposes,⁶² but we have practically no knowledge of this phenomenon in the fourth

⁵² This was in 1931 in *Archontum Tabulae*, 796 (in *IG II/III*², *pars altera*.)

⁵³ Dumont (1874), 63; around A.D. 422, evidently due to Theodosius’ decree forbidding pagan festivities (*CTh XVI.10.22*, ed. Pharr (1952)).

⁵⁴ Dittenberger (1878), no. 709, Kirchner in *IG II/III*², no. 3692, and Barbieri (1952), 391, no. 2241.

⁵⁵ Graindor (1922), 287–289, no. 208 and p. 300.

⁵⁶ See *IG II/III*², no. 2342, lines 16 and 34.

⁵⁷ See line 5 of our inscription: πανηγυριαρχήσαντα.

⁵⁸ This has been accepted by Oliver (1942), 89, in his archon list, but not by Geagan (1967), 146.

⁵⁹ Two of the rare words are φιλοτειμώτατα and περιφανέστατα.

⁶⁰ Curiously enough, it occurs in an inscription dated in the early third century: *IG II/III*², no. 3699, lines 8–12. See also *IG II/III*², no. 3945, lines 5–8.

⁶¹ Keil (1919), 31.

⁶² Day (1942), 257 (third century); Keil (1919), 90, thinks that Athens depended on very few rich families around A.D. 400; for the later fifth century, when, among others, Hegias (son of Theagenes) flourished, see Powden (1990), 495.

century.⁶³ Perhaps Hegias has to be included in the local wealthy class, with possible links to Eleusis (*panegyriarchos*) and other priestly ties.⁶⁴

12. *IG* II/III², no. 5206: Gateway on the Acropolis, built by Flavius Septimius Marcellinus (around the second quarter of the fourth century)

vacat Φλ(άβιος) Σεπτίμιος Μαρκελ[λείνος ὁ λαμ(πρότατος) καὶ ἀπὸ
ἀγωνοθετ]ῶν *vacat*
vacat ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τοῦ[ς] πυλῶνας τῆ πόλει]. *vacat*

“Flavius Septimius Marcellinus, the *lamprotatos* and *ex-agonothete* (built) the Gateway to the Acropolis from his own resources.”

Cut on a large block (preserved H. 0.39, preserved W. 1.59, T. 0.375–0.385, LH. 0.048–0.064, excepting *phi*), found in the second gate of the Turkish outworks on the Acropolis (see map in Fig. 2 b); presently near the south-western corner of the Parthenon.

This inscription has to be dated into the period after around A.D. 325, when the name Flavius gained in popularity, for example in Egypt, among the most prominent decurions.⁶⁵ Our Marcellinus is unfortunately missing from *PLRE*, but there are several Flavii Septimii in *PLRE* I and one Flavius Marcellinus in *PLRE* II. More illustrative than these, however, is the Φλ. Σεπ[τίμιος?] recorded on a series of panels for a possible benefactor at Aphrodisias dated in the fourth century by Roueché.⁶⁶ The correct reading ὁ λαμ(πρότατος) instead of φλαμ(ινάλιος) or φλάμ(ην) was established as late as in 1960 by Bodnar.⁶⁷ This invalidates all of the speculations concerning Marcellinus’ high-priesthood. The newly established reading may be seen to be further corroborated by the additional rank of ἀπὸ ἀγωνοθετῶν (albeit without exactly identical parallels), to which one may compare **13.**, lines 10–11: τοῦ διασημοτάτου καὶ / ἀπὸ κομίτων.

A date in the fourth century, based on the study of the Beulé Gate published by Graindor in 1914,⁶⁸ has been adopted by most of the later scholars.⁶⁹ In recent years, however, the connection of the inscription with the Beulé Gate has been called into question: Frantz states that until it is exhaustively studied, the gate has to be considered

⁶³ See **12.** and **16.** studied below.

⁶⁴ Hegias’ designation of rank is λαμπρότατος; the rest of the inscription reveals Hegias’ generosity and, at the same time, his stature.

⁶⁵ See Keenan (1973 and 1974), especially the summary in *id.* (1974), 301–302, concerning Egypt, mainly based on the evidence of papyri.

⁶⁶ Roueché (1989), no. 35. He is an imperial official or a local citizen, either honorand or dedicant. I do not claim that they are identical; the possible connection had escaped Roueché’s attention.

⁶⁷ Bodnar (1960), 177.

⁶⁸ The date of this inscription has been a controversial issue. Third century dates have been proposed by Wachsmuth (1874), 704, Judeich (1905), 100 with note 3, and Viale (1921), 28. In more recent scholarship only Travlos (see Travlos (1966), 351, on Beulé Gate, and *id.* (1971), 483) has favoured a date in the mid-third century. Graindor’s principal arguments (Graindor (1914), 288–291) touch upon architectural, palaeographical, linguistic and historical aspects. Graindor thought that Alaric’s epoch was the reason behind the fortification of the Acropolis.

⁶⁹ For example Judeich (1931), 105, with note 4; Day (1942), 260, note 35; Oliver (1950), 88; Bodnar (1960), 177.

apart from the inscription.⁷⁰ Frantz establishes a more general date for the inscription on basis of the continuous fear of invasions in the fourth century, not only the Visigothic threat in the 390's, so strongly emphasised by Graindor.⁷¹ I agree with her on these points, because we have no means of establishing a more precise date for the text than mid-fourth century after Christ.

13. *IG* II/III², no. 4222: Honours to the Proconsul Rufius Festus (after A.D. 372)

vacat [ἀ]γαθῆ[ι τύχη *vacat*]
 τὸν λαμπρότατον ἀνθύπατον
 τῆς Ἑλλάδος Ῥούφιον Φῆστον
 καὶ Ἀρεοπαγεῖτην ἡ ἐξ Ἀρίου
 πάγου βουλή καὶ ἡ βουλή τῶν 5
 τριακοσίων καὶ ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθη-
 ναίων εὐνοίας ἕνεκα κ(α)ὶ εὐερ-
 γεσίας τῆς περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἀνέ-
 στησεν προνοία Φλαβίου Πομ()
 δαδούχου τοῦ διασημοτάτου καὶ 10
^{vvv} ἀπὸ κομίτων. *vacat*

“For Good Luck: The Council of Areopagus and the Council of the 300 members and the people of Athens set up (this statue of) *vir clarissimus*, the Proconsul of Achaea and member of the Council of Areopagus, Rufius Festus, for his favour and beneficence towards the city (of Athens). The *daduch* Flavius Pom(), the *perfectissimus* and *ex comitibus*, was in charge (of the erection of the statue).”

Cut on a reused round statue base first used for *IG* II/III², no. 4217 (H. 0.87, diameter 0.505, LH. 0.013–0.021, excepting *phi*), found between the Erechtheum and the Propylaea (see map in Fig. 2 b) on the Acropolis. (For the variant reading in line 7, see Dittenberger (1878), no. 635.)

Only Rufius Festus and Claudius Ilyrius (see 2. and 3.) are known to have been *Areopagites* besides being proconsuls of Achaea.⁷² It has been proposed that the proconsul appointed the members of the Areopagus in the fourth century.⁷³ Be that as it may, the formula used in our inscription (lines 4–7) belongs to the best-documented type,⁷⁴ although it should be added that the quota of the members in the council was cut down to 300.⁷⁵ There are also literary sources for the continuation of the council⁷⁶ and

⁷⁰ Frantz (1982), 35–36, especially 36 with note 13. It is remarkable that Frantz ignored this inscription in her monograph (*ead.* (1988)) on Late Roman Athens.

⁷¹ *Ead.* (1982), 36, with notes 11–12.

⁷² Geagan (1967), 55, note 90.

⁷³ Keil (1919), 81, based on Himerius' speech for Scylacius, *Oratio* XXV.

⁷⁴ Geagan (1967), 139–143.

⁷⁵ *Id.*, 74; Frantz (1988), 12, note 8 (ignoring *IG* II/III², no. 3716, 18. in this study).

⁷⁶ Julian, *Oratio* V (ed. Bidez (1932)): τῆ βουλῆ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ.

the Council of Areopagus.⁷⁷ As for how to resolve in line 9 the abbreviated name Flavius Pom(), who remains to be the last known *daduchs* of the Eleusinian mysteries, Clinton has suggested that it is a second *gentilicium* rather than a *cognomen*.⁷⁸

The career of Rufius Festus has been studied by Groag in a very thorough and authoritative manner.⁷⁹ He identifies Rufus with the son of the poet Rufius Festus Avienus.⁸⁰ Following Groag's theory we get the *terminus post quem* for Festus, a former *magister memoriae* of Valens, in A.D. 372. Groag's somewhat confused account of the identification of Festus ends in the mention that his forefather Musonius Rufus and father Avienus had visited Greece.⁸¹ The date of Festus' proconsulate, however, cannot be regarded as sure.

14. *IG* II/III², no. 4226: Honours to the Praetorian Prefect Probus (A.D. 375/376 or A.D. 382–384?)

εἰκόνι χαλκείῃ σε Πρόβον *vacat*
 ὡν τὸν ὑπαρχον Ἀθήναις *vacat*
 Ἀντόλιος σ(τῆ)εν Ἑλλάδος ἀνθύπατος.

“The Proconsul of Achaea Anatolius set you up, Prefect Probus, at Athens in a statue made of bronze.”

Cut on a round statue base, found in the lot of Gaspar north of the Tower of the Winds (see map in Fig. 2 b) in Plaka, but now lost.

Generally the raising up of a bronze statue for any high-ranking official from the mid-fourth century on would require authorisation by an emperor.⁸² But this consideration is naturally dispensible with regard to such a brief, matter-of-fact distich as this.

The historical persons behind this inscription had been dated in A.D. 440, but later on Robert⁸³ established the date in the mid 370's through prosopographical identification with Sextus Claudius Petronius Probus⁸⁴ and the Proconsul of Achaea Anatolius, honoured at Sparta at about the same time.⁸⁵ Although *PLRE* has accepted the date suggested by Robert (A.D. 375/376) Groag's arguments for a later date should be considered.⁸⁶ Groag starts from the four different periods of Probus as praetorian prefect: 1) from A.D. 367 until 376, 2) from A.D. 379/380 until 381, 3) from A.D. 382/383 until 384, and 4) from A.D. 386/387 until his death after 389. Groag speaks for

⁷⁷ Himerius, *Oratio* VII addresses the Council of Areopagus.

⁷⁸ Clinton (1974), 66–67. There are several *daduchs* with the name Pompeius in *IG* II/III², nos. 1773, 1775, 1776, 1781, and 1789 from around A.D. 170. – See also *PLRE* I, s.v. Pom(?pei(an)us) 5, which is just another conjecture for the name.

⁷⁹ Groag (1946), 49–51.

⁸⁰ See also *PLRE* I, s.v. Festus 12, dated vaguely into mid/late fourth century.

⁸¹ Further references on this controversial issue can be found in von Haehling (1978), 429–430.

⁸² See Feissel (1984), 545–558, especially 550 with note 30.

⁸³ Robert (1948), 54–55, followed by *PLRE* I (see note 84 below).

⁸⁴ *PLRE* I, s.v. Probus 5, with lengthy references on his career.

⁸⁵ *Id.*, s.v. Anatolius 8. Woodward (1925–1926), 245–247, provided the *editio princeps* of the honorary inscription, later on assessed by Robert (1948), 63, and Feissel in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), no. 26 (with full bibliography).

⁸⁶ Groag (1946), 57–58.

the third term of office, because the first term would be too early for the Proconsul Anatolius to have rebuilt Sparta after the disaster referred to in the Spartan epigram.⁸⁷ The earthquake provides a *terminus post quem* in A.D. 375/6,⁸⁸ with an addition of several years for the reconstruction of Sparta to be accomplished. Thus the first term of office is practically out of the question, and the second term is implausible because then only the Pannonian diocese belonging to the prefecture of Illyricum was under Probus' rule. This means that the third term of office, A.D. 382/383 until 384, would be the most probable date for this inscription.

15. *IG II/III*², no. 4223: Honours to the Proconsul Theodorus (A.D. 379–395)

ἀρχὸν ἐμὲ Θεόδωρον Ἀχαιῶν εἰκόνι τῆδε
 στήσῃσε Θεμιστοκλέης νεύματι Κεκροπίη(ι)ς.
 ἀρχὸν ὄρῳς Θεόδωρον, ὃς εὐδικήσ' ἀγανῆσι
 σῶσε Πανελλήνων σώματα καὶ πόλιας.
 τοῦνεκά μιν κατὰ ἄστῃ Θεμιστοκλέης ἀνέθηκε 5
 εἰκόνι λαϊνέῃ· τῶς (γ)ὰρ ἄνω(γ)ε πόλις.
 εὐχόμενος μετέπιτα θεῶ γεννήτορι πάντων
 καὶ χαλκοῦ στήσιν νεύματι Θεοδοσίου.

“Themistocles put up this statue of me, Theodorus, the ruler of the people of Achaea, with the consent of Athens.”

“You see the leader Theodorus, who saved all the Greeks and their cities with (his) well and gently administered law. This is why Themistocles dedicated a stone statue of him in the city; for such was the decree of the city. Thereafter he prayed to the god, creator of all things, (in order) to set up also a bronze statue with the consent of Theodosius.”

Cut on a reused round statue base (H. 0.79, diameter 0.73, LH. 0.012–0.028), used as an altar support in the church of Agia Aikaterine in Plaka. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

In line 1 ἀρχὸν stands for proconsul.⁸⁹ This will be understood when the words εὐδικήσ' ἀγανῆσι | σῶσε Πανελλήνων σώματα καὶ πόλιας (lines 3–4) are interpreted within the framework of Late Roman epigrammatic phraseology: εὐδικίη/εὐνομίη is very frequently used in honorary epigrams for proconsuls and prefects, especially in praising their activities;⁹⁰ line 4 is especially important in this respect because it does not refer to any warlike operations but only praises the flourishing of

⁸⁷ References to the epigram can be found in note 85 above. The relevant parts of the text include: ὡς ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ἐὼν πάντων ἀπὸ κῆρας ἐρύκει | Σπάρτην τ' εὐάνδρον τεύξεν ἐρειπομένην.

⁸⁸ As reported, for example, in Zosimus IV.18.2.

⁸⁹ Theodorus has been identified as a proconsul after von Premerstein reconsidered his opinion on the alleged *dux Achivorum*, see von Premerstein (1923), 76; the fact of the matter is that already Kaibel (1878), commentary on no. 915 had professed his suspicions that we have here a proconsul.

⁹⁰ Robert (1948), 22–24, 36–37, 91, 94, 97–98 and 103 give ample testimony to this. For the concept, see *id.*, 18–27.

Achaea as a result of Theodorus' prudent administration of the laws.⁹¹ There are a couple of close parallels for this at Aphrodisias, the first of which deserves to be quoted: Ἀνθέμιε, [σ]ώζων γὰρ ὁμοῦ δήμους τε πόλεις τε... Βερονικιανός... ἤνωγεν τεύχειν εἰκόνα μαρμαρέη[v].⁹²

One of the most striking features of our inscription is the explicit indication that there was a need for an imperial authorisation for a bronze statue, whereas a stone statue could be erected with the consent of the city alone (see lines 7–8 as opposed to line 6).⁹³

Theodorus is a common name, which makes identifications dubious.⁹⁴ Presently our Theodorus is being kept apart from two other persons with the identical name, but who could be identified with him.⁹⁵ The first of them is Theodorus 17 in *PLRE* I, who had been a friend of Libanius at Antioch. He was well educated and influential at Constantinople from A.D. 388 until 390 and again in A.D. 393. It is this person that Groag speaks for, and consequently he suggests a date between A.D. 393 and 395.⁹⁶ The other possibility could be Theodorus 18 in *PLRE* I, who might be identical with Theodorus 17. He was the Prefect of Constantinople in A.D. 385 or 387.

Theodorus' identity remains unsolved, but no scholar has yet proposed that the name Theodosius could refer to the Emperor Theodosius II instead of Theodosius I, which would then set the identification of the Proconsul Theodorus in a totally different light. The later date seems unlikely, evidently due to the dearth of inscriptions in Achaea connected with the later emperor.

16. Raubitschek (1964), 64 (Agora inv. no. I 3542), taken up by *SEG* 38, no. 184: Honours to Iamblichus (the early 390's)

τοῦτον καὶ μετὰ πότμον ἄθωπευτοῖς γλυφίδεσσ[ι]
ὁ στεγανὸς τίσεν πάγος Ἄρεος οὐνεκα πύργους
τείχεος ἔρκος ἔτευξεν Ἰάμβλιχος ὄλβον ὀπάσσας.

vacat

καὶ σοφίη κόσμησεν Ἰάμβλιχος οὗτος Ἀθήνας
[καὶ Κρανα]ῆ κρατερὸν τε[ίχος ἐπ]ῆρε πόλει. 5
[-----?]

“The silent hill of Areopagus honoured this man even after his death with carvings which cannot flatter him, Iamblichus, because he built the towers, the defence wall, giving it for the (common) weal.”

⁹¹ This has perceptively been pointed out by Groag (1946), 63. See also Roueché (1989), no. 41 and *SEG* 16, no. 261 = Feissel in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), no. 28 for additional evidence.

⁹² Roueché (1989), no. 36 for the Praetorian Prefect Anthemius. Another example is provided by the following no. 37 (both fifth century).

⁹³ Wachsmuth (1874), 713–714; von Premerstein (1912b), 215–216; Feissel (1984), 545–558, especially 550 with note 30.

⁹⁴ A possible candidate could be seen in Kent (1966), no. 517 = Feissel in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), 364, no. 51*.

⁹⁵ *PLRE* I, s.v. Theodorus 16.

⁹⁶ Groag (1946), 64, with notes 1 and 2.

“This Iamblichus adorned Athens through his wisdom and also raised a mighty wall for the city of Kranaos. [---?]”

Two epigrams – the second obviously by another hand – cut on a fragment of a reused herm (preserved H. 0.505, W. 0.292, T. 0.238, LH. 0.003–0.027), found in the area of Stoa of Attalus in the Agora. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

This inscription definitely belongs to the end of the fourth century; the lettering of the epigrams favours this hypothesis strongly (see Appendix on scripts). The ancestry of Iamblichus as presented by Raubitschek has been corrected by Alan Cameron.⁹⁷ Iamblichus was a native of Apamea, son of Himerius and pupil of Libanius, but not the grandson of the great philosopher Iamblichus, who was also originally from Apamea.⁹⁸

Before attempting to identify what kind of wall was fortified by Iamblichus, two issues deserve brief comment. Firstly, in line 2 the Areopagus is mentioned. The Council of Areopagus is addressed in Himerius⁹⁹ and the council in Julian’s *Oratio V*;¹⁰⁰ this means they were still functioning in the fourth century. Secondly, it also seems that the intellectual pursuits of the honorand mentioned in the beginning of the second epigram are secondary reasons for the honours bestowed upon him.

After the construction of the Post-Herulian Wall there was a hiatus of around 100 years before another effort was undertaken for the protection of Athens. Probable reconstruction of the city wall near the Pnyx, in the time of Julian, was mentioned by Day.¹⁰¹ Frantz reports¹⁰² that by the end of the fourth century the settlement outside the Post-Herulian Wall was substantial enough to warrant restoring the Themistoclean circuit wall, which had fallen into disrepair after its restoration under Valerian and after the attack of A.D. 267. Frantz goes on to link the erection of the wall and the associated towers built by Iamblichus to the danger posed in the 390’s by the invasion of the Visigoths under Alaric.¹⁰³ This circumstance, in fact, provides us with a date for the inscription: after Iamblichus’ death (in A.D. 391?) but before the raid of 396.¹⁰⁴ Raubitschek’s theory about the occasion and the place of the erection or dedication of the herm in the House of Julian remains purely hypothetical.¹⁰⁵

17. IG II/III², no. 3674: Honours to the hierophant Erotius (fourth century)

Δηοῦς καὶ κούρης θεοῖκελον ἱεροφάντην
 ὡν κυδαίνων πατέρα στήσε δόμοις Κλέαδας,
 [Κ]εκροπίης σοφὸν ἔρνος Ἐρώτιον· ὦι ῥα καὶ αὐτός

⁹⁷ See Cameron (1967), 146–153 for details.

⁹⁸ See further in *PLRE I*, s.v. Iamblichus 2.

⁹⁹ See note 77 above.

¹⁰⁰ See note 76 above; compare also 13. and 18.

¹⁰¹ Day (1942), 265; the archaeological report was published in Thompson (1936), 200, where he chose Julian instead of Justinian from the ancient literary references.

¹⁰² Frantz (1988), 14–15, without referring to Iamblichus.

¹⁰³ *Id.*, 51.

¹⁰⁴ *Ead.* (1965), 192, suggests a date of about A.D. 400, but Zosimus, *Historia nova* V.5 relates that Alaric thought Athens was an easy target because her walls were too long to be defended by the Athenians.

¹⁰⁵ Raubitschek (1964), 68.

ῥ Λερναίων ἀδύτων ἴσον ἔδεκτο γέρας.



vacat

“Cleadas erected (this statue of) his father in the temple of Demeter and Persephone, thus honouring him as the god-like hierophant of Demeter and Persephone, as the wise off-spring of the land of Cecrops, Erotius by name. Thus he himself also received the same dignity of (being the priest in) the innermost sanctuary of Lerna.”

Cut on a slab (H. 0.30, W. 0.31, LH. 0.014), found in the area of the modern Metropolis church (see map in Fig. 2 b), removed to Oxford, but nowadays lost.

Although this inscription has been dated in the second or third century¹⁰⁶ or third century,¹⁰⁷ there are some features of this text and especially of another epigram closely related to it that could allow a date even in the later fourth century. As Cleadas is said to have received the priesthood not at Eleusis, but at Lerna, it is only natural that we identify him as the builder of a gate in Argos, commemorated in the *Greek Anthology* 9.688:

Τήνδε πύλην λάεσσιν ἐϋξέστοις ἀραρυῖαν,
ἀμφοτέρων κόσμον τε πάτρι καὶ θάμβος ὀδίταις,
τεῦξε Κλέης Κλεάδας ἀγανῆς πόσις εὐπατερείης,
Λερναίων ἀδύτων περιώσιος ὀργιοφάντης,
τερπόμενος δώροισιν ἀγασθενέων βασιλῆων.

The fourth line of this epigram establishes the identity, while the fifth line probably refers to Late Roman emperors. Lerna and Eleusis figure also in *IG II/III*², no. 4841 (a taurobolic altar datable in the later fourth century) in a similar way as in our present inscription.

Finally, Follet has also suggested that this inscription could be of a late date, even though it cannot be dated more precisely.¹⁰⁸ In any case, it should be pointed out that this text possibly proves that the Eleusinian cult was still alive in Late Roman Athens, evidently with a temple.

18. *IG II/III*², no. 3716: Honours to [---]les of Melite (fourth century?)

ἡ ἐξ Ἀρείου πά-^{vvvv}
γου βουλῆ καὶ ἡ βου-
ῆ λῆ τῶν τριακοσίων
[---]λη Μελιτέα *vacat*
ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν.^{vvv}

5

“The Council of Areopagus and the Council of the 300 members (honour) [---]les from the deme of Melite, for his merits.”

¹⁰⁶ Kaibel (1878), no. 866 on the basis of the letter forms, followed by Kirchner in *IG II/III*², albeit without argumentation.

¹⁰⁷ Dittenberger (1878), no. 719, does not explain his reasons for this date.

¹⁰⁸ Follet (1976), 273, leaves the question more or less open.

Cut on a herm, found near Aglaurion on the northern slope of the Acropolis (see map in Fig. 2 b), but later lost. For its text we have to rely on two copies published by (the not always reliable) Pittakes, which are at variance with each other.¹⁰⁹

There is nothing to indicate a late date except for the mention of the Council with 300 members, attested also in 13., dated after A.D. 372.¹¹⁰ It is remarkable that the *demoticon* is still being used in contrast to the Hegias inscription (11. above). It is difficult to say why the number of the boule dropped so heavily in the fourth century. It is equally difficult to know about the honorand and the circumstances under which he was honoured by the two councils.

19. *IG II/III*², no. 4227: Honours to a proconsul (fourth century?)

[-----]
 [-----άν]θυπάτου
 [-----]νησιν ἐγείρας
 [-----]ν ὀφειλομένην.

vacat

“[---] of a proconsul [---] having raised with [---] that is due.”

Cut on a fragment of a reused statue base (preserved measurements: H. 0.19, W. 0.175, T. 0.220, LH. 0.022–0.027, excepting *phi*), found near the “Palace of the Giants” (near Odeum of Agrippa) in the Agora. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

The interpretation is very difficult due to the fragmentary state of the inscription, but the object itself is probably a fragment of a reused monument, evidently a statue base. On basis of this and the use of the verb ἐγείρω I am convinced that this is an honorary inscription rather than an epitaph.¹¹¹ Of the 37 active forms of this verb in the *Greek Anthology*, no more than four have anything to do with raising a grave monument,¹¹² whereas there are at least four examples of raising a statue,¹¹³ and twice a city has been repaired.¹¹⁴ It is difficult to decide between a statue and a building, perhaps, but a tombstone is certainly out of the question.¹¹⁵ I think that the weak point in Peek’s

¹⁰⁹ Pittakes (1835), 158 and 495.

¹¹⁰ See note 75 for references.

¹¹¹ Peek (1942), 48, no. 70, edited this text as an epitaph: [--- άν]θυπάτου | [σορὸν δ’ ὀδύ]νησιν ἐγείρας | [κάτθετο τὴν θανάτω μηδέ]ν ὀφειλομένην. This has been rejected by Robert in *BEpigr* 1952, no. 54, comment on Peek’s no. 70, although Robert himself had ignored this text in his monograph (Robert (1948)) on Late Roman epigrams.

¹¹² *AP* 7.605; 8.189, 219, and 231.

¹¹³ *Id.* 9.809; 16.335, 360, and 361. All of these are mid-fifth century or Justinianic, being the statues of Pindar and of the charioteer Porphyrius.

¹¹⁴ *Id.* 9.696, dated in A.D. 399, when Theodorus raised Constantinople τετραπόροις ἀψῖσι during his consulship; *id.* 16.42 is an honorary statue base for the Proconsul Theodosius, probably fifth century: Τὸν μέγαν ἐν βουλαῖς Θεοδοσίον, Ἀσίδος ἀρχόν, | εἰκόνι μαρμαρέῃ στήσαμεν ἀνθύπατον, | οὐνεκα Σμύρναν ἔγειρε καὶ ἤγαγεν ἐς φάος αὐτίς | ἔργοις θαυμασίοις πολλὸν ἀειδομένην. Add to these *AP* 9.811 referring probably to an area (ἐμὲ χῶρον ἐγείρει) established by the Emperor Justinian, evidently with buildings.

¹¹⁵ The thickness of the monument may be used as an argument; Peek is unwilling to see any parallels between this text and *IG II/III*², nos. 4224–4226, simply because they are honours to prefects, not

interpretation of the text as an epitaph is his choice of the vaguest word ἐγείρω for interpreting the whole.

With this in mind I adduce further parallels: Roueché (1989), nos. 39 and 40, both dated in the mid-fifth century, concern themselves with the restoration and remodelling of the East Agora Gate by a *praeses* and a σχολαστικός καὶ πατήρ (τῆς πόλεως). On the basis of these and AP 16.281, line 6: τεῦξέ μιν (a bath is referred to) οἰκείους χρήμασι καὶ δαπάναις, I would be ready to suggest a restoration [ιδίαις δαπά]νησιν ἐγείρας in line 2. It is difficult to know whether the masculine participle refers to the building activity of the proconsul or to the body of citizens (δῆμος *vel simile*) responsible for erecting the statue of the proconsul. The last line, with its almost totally lost trochaic word in the accusative connected to the passive participle ὀφειλομένην, would make a strong case for a statue. Without wanting to follow in Peek's footsteps by restoring too much, I would be inclined to see a word for statue (εἰκόνα *vel simile*) in line 1 depending on the word [ἀν]θυπάτου. In this case the possible reasons for erecting a statue would have been reported in the line(s) missing above, whereas the details of its erection – or possibly further reasons – were given in the last two lines.¹¹⁶

As this is an apparent surface find, it would indeed be very hypothetical to bring this inscription in connection with either the building of the “Palace of the Giants”¹¹⁷ or the massive rectangular base for a statue of very considerable size, around 45 metres north of the entrance to the “Palace of the Giants”.¹¹⁸

20. von Premerstein (1912a), 30–31, taken up by SEG 38, no. 196: Labels pertaining to philosophical schools (fourth century?)

A.	B.	C.
<i>vacat</i> Στωϊκῶν <i>vacat</i>	<i>vacat</i> Κυνικῶν <i>vacat</i>	[<i>vacat</i> ? Ἐπικουρε]ίων. <i>vacat</i>

“Of the Stoics”; “Of the Cynics”; “Of the Epicureans.”

Cut on two reused door jambs (A.: H. 0.28–0.30, preserved W. 3, T. 0.41–0.43, LH. 0.165–0.18; C.: H. 0.29–0.30, preserved W. 1.27, T. 0.42, LH. 0.155–0.165) and one reused lintel (B.: H. 0.26, W. 2.57, T. 0.48) connected with each other, found in the church of Agia Dynamis on Metropoleos Street (A.), and near the church of Agios Seraphim on the northern (B., now lost) slope and near the Asklepieion on the southern (C.) slope of the Acropolis. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

Although the lettering of these inscriptions is identical, it is extremely difficult to propose more than a very vague date: from around the later third to the fourth century.

to proconsuls. Peek erred similarly in interpreting the epigram for the Empress Eudocia as a funerary epigram, rather than as an honorary inscription: see 33. below.

¹¹⁶ The trebling of the intermediate interlinear space at the bottom of the text proves that there were no more lines to this epigram. Another epigram below the broken edge is a possibility not to be ignored.

¹¹⁷ The date suggested by Frantz (1988), 65, note 51, for the building of the Palace between A.D. 410–425 would not destroy the hypothesis, but judging by the letter forms – we really do not have anything else to judge by – the connection would seem improbable.

¹¹⁸ This theory is proposed in the commentary of the honorary inscription for the Empress Eudocia, see 33. below. There the problem is the alleged date of the base – sometime in the fourth century *pace* Frantz (1988), 60 – and here the problem is the fact that the base itself carried no inscription, but probably supported a columnar pedestal for a statue, as is conjectured *id.*, 109, which necessitates further study of the plan and purpose of the “Round Building” and other nearby buildings, see *id.*, 109–110.

It is equally difficult to explain the function of these blocks with certainty. Until recently, the blocks were thought to be epistyles belonging to different philosophical schools.¹¹⁹ They were then connected with the building activities of the Proconsul Cervonius, mentioned in Himerius' speech.¹²⁰ The date was then established in the third¹²¹ or rather in the fourth century,¹²² but not accepted by Kirchner.¹²³ Von Premerstein was audacious enough to suggest a theory that the inscriptions belonged to one of the *gymnasia* in the northern side of town.¹²⁴

More recently, Frantz has studied these objects thoroughly. It appears that they were originally door jambs and a lintel, reused for texts between the second century and Late Antiquity, used in some way in one single building devoted to intellectual pursuits.¹²⁵

21. Frantz (1979), 203 (Epigraphical Museum inv. no. EM 1861), taken up by *SEG* 29, no. 200: A dedication to emperors on an epistyle (fourth century?)

[-----θει]οτάτων δεσ[ποτῶν-----].

“[---] of the most divine Emperors... [---]”

Cut on a fragment of an epistyle block (H. 0.43, preserved W. 2.65, T. 0.24, LH. 0.15–0.17), found in Plaka. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

As the text mentions emperors in the genitive case, it very probably is a part of a dedicatory formula from a building inscription.

The words *θειότατοι δεσπόται* probably refer to emperors of the fourth or the fifth century.¹²⁶ There is no other clue to a more precise date for this building. In any case, the building that this inscription belonged to cannot be identical with that mentioned in 10. or 26. in this study.

IV. Inscriptions Postdating A.D. 396

This chapter brings together the public¹²⁷ inscriptions from the period after the incursion of Alaric and his Visigoths in A.D. 396. The omission of public Christian texts is due to a change in the categories “public” and “private” in Christian epigraphic culture.

¹¹⁹ Judeich (1905), 100 with note 4; von Premerstein (1912a), 30–32; Judeich (1931), 105, with note 5; Day (1942), 265, note 11.

¹²⁰ Himerius, *Oratio* XXXVIII (ed. Colonna (1951)), quoted quite extensively by Wachsmuth (1874), 712, note 1.

¹²¹ Judeich (1905), 100, note 4, has doubts about a later date.

¹²² von Premerstein (1912a), 31 convinced Judeich (1931), 105, note 5, to revise his view. Day followed both of them (Day (1942), 265, note 11).

¹²³ Without giving a reason, Kirchner suggested a date in the first or the second century in his edition of *Κυριακῶν* in *IG II/III*², no. 5184.

¹²⁴ von Premerstein (1912a), 32, suggests Ptolemaion or Diogeneion.

¹²⁵ Frantz (1988), 62–63.

¹²⁶ The word *δεσπότης* gained in popularity in the beginning of the fourth century, compare Hagedorn (1980), 176, who dates the change from *κύριος* to *δεσπότης* in Egypt between the years A.D. 298 and 308, with some exceptions.

¹²⁷ The following seven characteristically Early Christian votive, dedicatory and building inscriptions have been omitted from this paper:

22. *IG II/III²*, no. 5203: A milestone from Mandra with seven texts (Severan period until A.D. 397)

<p>A. <ἀ>πὸ Μ ε - γάρων ^{vv} IB ^{vv}</p>	<p>B. Αὐγούστοις ANME[---]EIC[---] ^{vvv} ΚΛΔΜΙ[-]ΑΕΙCΑΝ[---]ΕΣ CΤΡΕΨΑC ^{vacat}</p>	<p>F. <i>[d(omini) n(ostri duo)]</i> <i>[--]I Arcadiu[s]</i> <i>[et Ho]n<or>ius</i> ^{vv} <i>[s]ub v(iro) c(larissimo)</i> ^{vv} <i>[e]t <s>pec<t>a[b]i<l>i</i> 5 ^{vv} <i>proc(onsule)</i> ^{vv} <i>Eysebio</i> ^{vv} ἀν<θ>υ[π(άτω?)]</p>
<p>C. <Φ>λα<ου>ίου (?) ^{vv} Κωσταντίου καὶ <Γ>αλ<ε>[ρίου] Μαξιμιανού τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις 5 ^{vvvv} Καίσαρ[σι]ν</p>	<p>G. τοῖς δε<σπ>ό[ταις ἡμῶν] [καὶ] <αἰ>ων<ί>οις Αὐ[γ]ούσ[τοις] Βαλλεντινιαν[ῶ κα]ὶ Β[άλ]ε[ν] [τι] ^{vvvv} IB ^{vacat}</p>	
<p>D. <τ>οῖς κ<ό>σμο[ν] [σωτῆρσιν?] ^{vvvv} NE[---] καὶ [Κωσ]ταντεῖν<ω> [τ]οῖς Σεβαστοῖς 5 [-----] ^{vvvv} NOTAN</p>	<p>E. καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ξ[-----] CΕΡΒΑΤΙΟΥΛΑΑΥΓ<Ε> μητέρα κάστρων ^{vacat} IB ^{vacat} 5</p>	

A.: "From Megara 12 miles."

B.: "To the *Augusti* [---]"

C.: "To the most renowned *Caesares* Flavius (?) Constantius and Galerius Maximianus."

+ ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς Ἀρτεμισίου καὶ παν[τοσ]τὸς τοῦ οἴκο(ν) αὐτοῦ edited in Lenormant (1862), 379; [τ]ὸν ἅγιον Ἀνδρέαν, studied in Creaghan and Raubitschek (1947), 29, no. XI; τῆς Θ[ε]λοτόκου, taken up by *BEpigr* 1963, no. 88; [ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς (?) -----]ωνίου καὶ (αἰ) Στρατονίκου taken up by *SEG* 15, no. 140; [ὑπὲρ εὐχῆς οὐδ' ὁ <Θ>(εὸς) οἶδεν τὸ [ὄνομα] καὶ τὸν ἀριφρόν ἐκαλιέργησεν (= *SEG* 15, no. 141): αὐτ[η] ἢ πύλη τοῦ λυτρ(ω)τοῦ, δῆ[κα]ιοι | ἡσελεύσοντε ἐν αὐτῇ edited in *IG II/III²*, no. 5207; [-----]καὶ πάντων τῶν πρ[-----] | [-----] τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον ἐ[πεσκευάσε?] edited in *IG II/III²*, no. 5215.

- D.: "To the Saviours of the World [---] and Constantine, the *Augusti* [---]"
 E.: "[---?---] and of our Master [---] *mater castrorum*. 12 miles."
 F.: "Our two Masters [---?] Arcadius and Honorius, during the proconsulship of the *vir clarissimus et spectabilis* Eusebius, the proconsul."
 G.: "To our Masters and eternal *Augusti* Valentinian and Valens. 12 miles."

Cut on a columnar milestone (H. 1.15, diameter 0.37–0.43, LH. 0.015–0.018), found near Eleusis, but now lost.

As the two editions¹²⁸ prior to *IG II/III*², no. 5203, are at variance with each other, I have decided to make use of all of the available information in them; the position of the various inscriptions on the stone has been taken from the *CIL*, although the copy is often at variance with the edition of the text and does not seem to be as reliable as Milchhöfer.

Three of these texts indicate a distance of 12 miles, A. from Megara, E. and G. equally possibly from Athens. Texts B. and E. remain virtually undeciphered, whereas the texts C., D., F., and G. can reasonably well be attributed (chronologically) to the reigns of the Emperors Constantine, Valentinian, Valens, Arcadius and Honorius, as well as of the *Caesares* Constantius and Galerius.

Some major issues concerning each of the texts may be mentioned in passing. Text A. shows the importance of Megara in the Late Roman network of roads in Achaea. Text B. is in Greek; the word Ἀγούστοις in the first line is paralleled in another, otherwise Latin milestone found near Eleusis (see 25.). Text C. can be dated between A.D. 305 and 306, when Constantius Chlorus and Galerius were in power. There are some difficulties in the reading of Constantius' name. Note the change from the genitive case into the dative case. Text D. could date from the very beginning of Constantine's career as an emperor, because he is mentioned as the second regent. Text E. seems to belong to the Severan period, as it has the phrases κύριος ἡμῶν and μητέρα κάστρων. It is, however, exceptional to have an empress in a milestone, and even more perplexing to see it in the accusative case, common in imperial dedications. Text F. is one of the four almost identical Latin milestones preserved in Attica (see 23.C.–25.). The new high rank of *clarissimus et spectabilis* is here attested at a very early date, between A.D. 396 and 401.¹²⁹ Eusebius was the Proconsul of Achaea, possibly in A.D. 397, as has been suggested by Molisani.¹³⁰ He is also recorded in a fifth milestone (at Patrae, *CIL* III, no. 573), providing strong evidence for repairs undertaken during this time on the road from Patrae to Athens. Text G. brings us back to the reign of Valentinian and Valens between A.D. 364 and 375. Note that Βαλλεντινιανός is usually spelled with a *beta* and two *lambdas*, at least in Greece, and Valens is spelled in most cases with *εντ-* in the oblique cases.¹³¹

This milestone has been excessively reused, but there are numerous examples of two or three different uses for a milestone, and often the inscriptions have been carved

¹²⁸ Milchhöfer (1887), 328–329, no. 488, being virtually nothing but a copy, and *CIL* III, no. 7308.

¹²⁹ Groag (1946), 71, note 1.

¹³⁰ Molisani (1977), 307–312: supposing Eusebius was Stilicho's favorite, he must have been a proconsul before Stilicho was announced a *hostis publicus* in the East in late A.D. 397. The restoration of the road became a necessity after the devastation wrought by Alaric in Greece between A.D. 396 and 397, prior to his expulsion from Greece in A.D. 397.

¹³¹ For Valentinian, see the next milestone and Feissel in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), nos. 5–7. *Id.*, no. 8 Βαλεντινιανού is just a copy of Cyriacus of Ancona. For an exception in the case of Valens, see *id.*, no. 5: Βάλητα.

without regard to previous ones.¹³² This usually results in ambiguities in reading and interpreting the different texts, as is the case here.

23. *IG II/III*², no. 5204: A milestone from Daphni with three texts (from the third century until A.D. 397)

A.	B.	C.
αὐτοκράτορι	[-----?]	<i>d(omini) n(ostri duo) I[-]</i>
Κ(α)ίσαρι [---ca. 6---]	Σεβ[^{vacat}]-	<i>Arcadiu[s]</i>
[-----ca. 13-----]	στοίς Βαλλ[εν]-	<i>[e]t Honor[us]</i>
εὐσεβεῖ εὐτυχεῖ[ι]	τινιανῶ ^v	^{vv} <i>sub v(iro) c(larissimo)</i>
Σεβαστῶι ^{vacat} 5	καὶ Βάλεν-	<i>[e]t spectab[ili]</i> 5
[ἐ]ξ ἄστεως ^{vvv}	^{vvvv} τι ^{vvv} 5	^{vv} <i>proc(onsule)</i> ^{vvv}
Ϝ		<i>Eusebio</i> ^{vv}
		<i>vacat</i>
		^{vvv} <i>s(ex milia passuum)</i> ^{vvv}
		+

A.: “To the Emperor *Caesar* [name deleted] *pius felix Augustus*. From the city (of Athens) six (miles).”

B.: “[---?] to the *Augusti* Valentinian and Valens.”

C.: “Our two Masters [---?] Arcadius and Honorius, during the proconsulship of the *vir clarissimus et spectabilis* Eusebius. Six (miles).”

Cut on a quadrangular pillar (H. 1.48, W. 0.28–0.29, T. 0.23, LH.(A) 0.019–0.027, LH.(B) 0.015–0.045, LH.(C) 0.023–0.055), found in Daphni between Eleusis and Athens beside the ancient Sacred Way.

There are a couple of clues for dating inscription A.: in inscriptions of Central Achaea the Greek equivalent to *imperator Caesar* was used in front of the *cognomen* of the emperor from the times of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus until at least Constans I, and *pius felix* became a feature in the imperial titulature from the reign of Commodus on, transforming in the fourth century into *pius felix invictus*. Taking into account the erasure of around 19 letter spaces in lines 2 and 3 makes the restoring of the following names of emperors with *damnatio memoriae* possible: Elagabalus, Severus Alexander, Maximinus I, Gordian III, Maximian I and Constans I, all with 20 to 22 letters, if restored in the dative case. In conclusion, this text could date from the early third until the mid-fourth century, Constans I being a possibility.¹³³ Inscription C. has several textual problems. In line 1 the trace of a vertical stroke seems to be superfluous, because the space available will not permit the reading *Augusti*, not even *AGG*.¹³⁴ In line 3 the name of the Emperor Honorius cannot have been written in full, due to lack of space.

¹³² Compare, for example, *IG VII*, no. 2451, and *IG X 2,1*, no. 1009.

¹³³ *AEpigr* 1984, no. 819, opts for a date in the second or the fourth century, although without justification, when summing up the article by Molisani (1977), mentioned in note 130 above.

¹³⁴ There is no evidence for the existence of *Augusti* in the Attic companion pieces to this inscription. The text from Patrae (*CIL III*, no. 573), transmitted only by a copyist, has the letters *AVGG*, but this is in the middle of the text, in line 4.

24. The lower part of *IG II/III*², no. 2987: A milestone from Daphni under the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius (A.D. 397)

^{vv} *d(omini) n(ostri duo)* ^{vv}
Arcadius ^v
et Honorius
^{vvv} *su[b v(iro) c(larissimo)]*
et [s]pec[tabili?] 5
[proc(onsule)]
Eus[ebio]
[-----?].


Cut in the lower part of a reused stele (H. 1.67, W. 0.55–0.575, T. 0.40–0.405, LH. 0.026–0.047), found in the monastery of Daphni. Later on, a large cross was carved to cover the area of the inscription.

See the previous companion pieces **22.F.** and **23.C.** for the contents and translation of this inscription.

Perdrizet suggested in his *editio princeps* that the number of miles was expressed by the sign H;¹³⁵ this seems to be wrong, since it denotes the number eight in the Greek system. The previous companion piece would rather recommend S to be restored here for *S(ex milia passuum)*.

The proconsul Eusebius was very probably a pagan.¹³⁶ The misconception of his Christianity has probably come about due to the cross printed in Mommsen's edition of the text in *CIL III Suppl.* 14203, 27, subsequently taken into a collection of Early Christian Latin inscriptions.¹³⁷ This has all been a result of insufficient knowledge of the monument itself. It is not uncommon to see different kind of crosses added in later, even modern times, on inscriptions. Our case may be seen as a way to express that the object was being reused.

25. Peek (1942), 157, no. 331 (Eleusis inv. no. E 712): A milestone from Eleusis (?) under the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius (A.D. 397)

Ἀὐγοῦστοις
d(omini) n(ostri duo) Arcadius
et Honorius
sub v(iro) c(larissimo) et spe-
cta[y]b(ili) procons(ule) 5
Eusebio 
^{vacat} *s(ex milia passuum?).* ^{vvv}

¹³⁵ Perdrizet (1897), 572.

¹³⁶ von Haehling (1978), 173–174. *PLRE II*, s.v. Eusebius 7, still dates the proconsulship between A.D. 395 and 402, obviously without knowledge of Molisani's contribution.

¹³⁷ Diehl (1925), no. 17, evidently taken over from *CIL*.

Cut on a reused slab (preserved H. 0.83, preserved W. 0.41, T. 0.14–0.185, LH. 0.012–0.036), reported to have been found in Eleusis.

A very important question is whether this inscription is to be regarded as a dedication, as proposed by Sasel Kos,¹³⁸ or a milestone, as is generally accepted. Sasel Kos thinks that the dative case would indicate that this is a dedication, on which point I disagree.¹³⁹ The second argument concerns the monument, which in Sasel Kos' mind is probably not a milestone. But with the previous text we have seen that drastic reuses in case of milestones are not impossible. The third objection raised by Sasel Kos refers to the last line of the text: the stone must have been brought from another place if *S* is to be resolved in *s(ex milia passuum)*. Sasel Kos speaks for *s(acrum)*. This is the most difficult argument to challenge: either we have to suppose a transfer of the stone or accept the reading *s(acrum)*. But on the other hand, a dedication is an implausible interpretation in view of the four other inscriptions carved on evident milestones with a similar phrasing.¹⁴⁰ I cannot see how such crude pieces could be reused for imperial dedications – and in the nominative case, which is altogether implausible for an imperial dedication – and be scattered in Daphni, Mandra, Eleusis (and Patrae in the Peloponnesus), all along the Patrae-Athens road.

26. *IG* II/III², no. 5205: The Diogeneion (?), rebuilt by the Proconsul (Flavius?) Severus Aëtius (A.D. 396–401)

[ὕ]περ νίκης καὶ σωτηρίας καὶ ἀθανάτου δια[μο]νῆς τῶν δεσποτῶν τῆς οἰκουμῆς
[νης ^{vacat}]
Φλ(αβίου) Ἀρκαδίου καὶ Φλ(αβίου) Ὀνωρίου τῶν ἀηττήτων [ν Ἀγού]στων ^{vvv}
ὁ λαμ(πρότατος) ἀνθ(ύπατος) τῆς Ἑλλάδος ^{vacat}
[Φλ(άβιος)?] Σεούηρος Ἀέτιος κατεσκεύασεν ἐκ θεμελίων τὸ Δ[ιογένειον] (?)
μετὰ τῶν πρ[ο]πουλαίων. ^{vacat}

“For the victory, safety, and immortal endurance of the Masters of the Universe, Flavius Arcadius and Flavius Honorius the unvanquished *Augusti, vir clarissimus*, the Proconsul of Achaea, (Flavius?) Severus Aëtius rebuilt from the foundations the Diogeneion (?) with its porches.”

Cut on a reused epistyle block broken in two (H. 0.64–0.67, preserved W. 2.67 and 2.25, T. 0.64, LH. 0.044–0.095), found south of the church of Agios Eleutherios. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

The text itself presents very few striking features among inscriptions of this kind. In line 1 the regnal formula does not follow the more typical wording καὶ αἰωνίου διαμονῆς τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν. In line 2 the word Ἑλλάδος seems to be rare in this

¹³⁸ Sasel Kos (1979), 57, no. 127 presents all of the arguments.

¹³⁹ There are innumerable milestones in the dative case: compare the excessively reused 22.B. (first line Ἀγούστοις).C.D.G., 23.A.B., and *IG* V 2, p. 5, lines 127–139, *IG* VII, no. 2451 (the former text), *IG* X 2.1, no. 1009 and *IG* XII 9, no. 146A.

¹⁴⁰ See 22.F., 23.C., 24. above, and *CIL* III, no. 573 from Patrae.

connection.¹⁴¹ It must be noted that κατασκευάζειν ἐκ θεμελίων might suggest the rebuilding of a structure that had been destroyed down to its foundations.¹⁴²

The date is established between A.D. 396 and 401 on the basis of the reigns of the two emperors before Theodosius II was proclaimed Augustus in A.D. 402; A.D. 395 is occupied by the proconsul Antiochus. The identity (and even the full name) of our proconsul has received various opinions, of which nowadays none is regarded as being certain.

A more important issue is the construction of such a large building – as it would seem – in Athens at such a late date by a proconsul. Frantz suggests that the building would be the Diogeneion, the abode of the epebes.¹⁴³ She proposes one objection to her own theory: the accepted belief (based on the lack of epebic inscriptions with dates later than A.D. 267) that the *ephebia* ceased to exist after the Herulian invasion and was never revived.¹⁴⁴ She also suggests a solution for this: the Diogeneion could have continued in use as a simple gymnasium,¹⁴⁵ or perhaps the institution had died away slowly.

27. *IG II/III*², no. 5021: The bema of the theatre of Dionysus, built by the archon Phaedrus (the later fourth/early fifth century)

σοὶ τόδε καλὸν ἔτευξε, φιλόργιε, βῆμα θεήτρου
Φαῖδρος Ζωΐλου βιοδώτορος Ἀτθίδος ἀρχός.

“For you, lover of passionate rites, this beautiful stage has been built by Phaedrus, son of Zoilus, archon of the livelihood-giving land of Attica.”

Cut on a geison (H. 0.235–0.245, W. 0.955, T. 1.83, LH. 0.014–0.033, excepting *phi*), being the top step of a little flight of stairs leading from the orchestra to the stage in the Theatre of Dionysus. *In situ*. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

The text carries two hexameters recording the dedication of a newly built bema for the Theatre of Dionysus by the archon Phaedrus.

The vocabulary of the epigram is rather full of rare poetic words: φιλόργιος,¹⁴⁶ βιοδώτωρ,¹⁴⁷ Ἀτθίς,¹⁴⁸ and ἀρχός.¹⁴⁹ βιοδώτωρ Ἀτθίς refers to the fertile Attica, implying that ἀρχός is here the local authority, not the Roman proconsul as was the case in 15. studied above.

Probably no other Late Roman inscription of Achaëa has caused such a wide-spread disagreement as the date for the reconstruction of the bema of Phaedrus. This is not the place to enumerate all the various dates proposed by the earlier scholars studying this

¹⁴¹ The word is present in 13. and 14., but absent from four identical Latin milestones from A.D. 397 (22.F., 23.C., 24., and 25.).

¹⁴² Frantz (1979b), 199. Compare also similar texts in Roueché (1989), nos. 19–20.

¹⁴³ For details, see Frantz (1979b), 199–203.

¹⁴⁴ *Id.*, 203.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁶ This word has been commented upon by Bowersock in *ead.* (1982), 34, note 2.

¹⁴⁷ Attested both epigraphically and in the *Greek Anthology*: *AP* 14.72.

¹⁴⁸ Compare *id.* 7.573, line 1: ἔτρεφεν Ἀτθίς ἄρουρα, to which the use in the restricted meaning ‘Athens’ should be contrasted: *AP* 2.84. Thus, in our case it would have been historically more correct to translate here: “...archon of (...) Athens.”

¹⁴⁹ This word has already been commented upon in 15.

inscription. The proposed dates were in the beginning as early as the second century after Christ. I propose to defend a date around A.D. 400, following Graindor, who first proposed a date in the late fourth to early fifth century,¹⁵⁰ the generally accepted date.¹⁵¹

Arguments used for the proposed dates may be grouped in three classes: 1) considerations of script, 2) archaeological or architectural or art historical, and 3) historical. Here it is impossible to go into the details of the numerous arguments; some of the scholars were even diligent enough to recur to more than one argument.¹⁵² The following will concentrate on Frantz,¹⁵³ at the same time disagreeing with some of her points.

After having dismissed not only the archaeological aspects, but also considerations of script as unreliable, Frantz turns to literary and historical points of view. She claims that the assembly place was always referred to in Eunapius by the word τὸ θέατρον, supposing that one of the real theatres was being meant.¹⁵⁴ This should be corrected, as several examples of the loose meaning 'audience' in Eunapius can be found.¹⁵⁵ Be that as it may, Frantz advances a theory according to which the Theatre of Dionysus functioned as the seat of the assembly, restored between A.D. 300 and 345 after fairly extensive repairs necessitated by the alleged Herulian raid in this area.¹⁵⁶ She gets the *terminus ante quem* from a story in Eunapius recalling the visit of the Praetorian Prefect Anatolius in Athens in A.D. 345/346.¹⁵⁷ This theory has been doubted by Rügler, who sees no evidence for a revitalised Athens in the fourth century: only small repairs were undertaken and, more importantly in our case, Rügler claims that there was no need for a whole bema to be constructed for the visit of Anatolius because the speaker could have stood on a provisory wooden platform.¹⁵⁸ I would like to raise another doubt: is it not strange that the Athenians would have lived for more than a quarter of a century (A.D. 267 until around 300) without an assembly place? Maybe the question of the date of the destruction – whether in A.D. 267 or in A.D. 396 – of the southern slope of Acropolis should be left open with the data presently available. This is all the more apposite as the archaeologist Rügler has shown that the existence of an evidently restricted area ravaged in the Cerameicus does not allow us to suppose that also lower Athens suffered at the hands of Alaric.¹⁵⁹ The evidence for a later raid (by Alaric) should be studied all around

¹⁵⁰ Graindor (1922), 269–271 in no. 187, and *id.* (1924), 75 in no. 111.

¹⁵¹ See *Archontum Tabulae*, 796 (in *IG II/III², pars altera*, edited by Kirchner), Kirchner's edition of *IG II/III²*, no. 5021 four years later in 1935, *id.* (1938), and *id.* (1948), no. 150. Others include Day (1942), 259, note 35, and p. 265, note 11; Frantz (1965), 191 and 196 (later on she preferred an earlier date); Travlos (1971), 538; Maass (1972), 45; Samuel (1972), 237; Sturgeon (1977), 44; Castrén (1989), 46; Rügler (1990), 280–281.

¹⁵² Dittenberger (1878) uses the first two arguments in his commentary on no. 239, followed by Roberts and Gardner (1905), no. 246. Graindor (1922), 269–271 has taken advantage of all three groups of argumentation. Frantz (1982) and *ead.* (1988), 25, has looked at the problem from many points of view, but she regards only the historical argumentation as significant. Castrén (1989), 46, and Rügler (1990), 280–281, have considered both archaeological and historical issues.

¹⁵³ The more detailed argumentation in Frantz (1982) will be taken under consideration instead of the later assertion (*ead.* (1988), 25), which is based on some references to the earlier in-depth study.

¹⁵⁴ *Ead.* (1982), 36–37.

¹⁵⁵ Eunapius, *VS* X.4.8; X.5.2–4; X.6.10. Private lecture halls are referred to in *id.* IX.1.5–6. A real theatre is probably meant in *id.* X.4.10; X.5.5; X.7.7.

¹⁵⁶ Frantz (1982), 37–38.

¹⁵⁷ The quotations *id.*, 37, notes 18–19, are represented by Eunapius, *VS* X.5.5 and X.7.7 (ed. Giangrande (1956)).

¹⁵⁸ Rügler (1990), 280–281.

¹⁵⁹ *Id.*, 289–290.

the Acropolis. Rügler leaves a momentous question hanging in the air as to the cause of the rapid increase in construction work during the early fifth century.¹⁶⁰

One further point emphasised by Frantz in favour of an earlier date for the bema must be examined. She thinks that such a pagan monument as the bema of Phaedrus would fit in better with the more tolerant attitude of Constantine than with that of his successors.¹⁶¹ I doubt whether a monument with a reused frieze could be regarded as distinctively pagan in flavour at Athens, especially in the traditional environment of the Theatre of Dionysus. I think we should not suppose Christian resistance in Athens in such matters before the middle of the fifth century.¹⁶²

Even though Frantz has claimed that the long-accepted date of around A.D. 400 has no solid basis, I point to the problems inherent in Frantz' own argumentation, presented above. I have approached the question from an epigraphical point of view, stressing especially the script itself. The execution of the letters on the marble is careless, giving the text a clumsy overall appearance. The lettering is comparable to that of the Iamblichus inscription (16. above) with the addition of one further, even later feature, the droplike omicron (see Appendix on scripts). This is all the more remarkable as we are dealing with a monumental building inscription in such a prominent place, dedicated by an archon. I think this is roughly contemporary with – or later than – the Iamblichus inscription, dated in the early 390's.

We know very little about Phaedrus, the person behind the dedication. He is one of the only five archons known from the post-Herulian period.¹⁶³ He must have been quite well-off, even though neither this nor the text of the sundial of Phaedrus (identified with this Phaedrus and studied in 28. below) explicitly says that he was rich. On the other hand, neither of the inscriptions probably had this in view, the bema inscription being nothing more than a straightforward dedicatory epigram, and the other even more plain in its intent. An earlier archon, Hegias, was expressly honoured for his generosity in office-holding, but his was a more traditional and more verbose inscription (see 11.). We may be entitled to regard Phaedrus as a member of a prominent family. This could be argued on the basis of his status as archon, as well as by the filiation as the son of Zoïlus, expressed in both inscriptions. Filiation is rare in Late Roman inscriptions of Attica,¹⁶⁴ as it is also at Aphrodisias.¹⁶⁵ The lack of evidence here makes me doubt whether we may make too far-reaching conclusions about Phaedrus' role in the society of Late Roman Athens. We know nothing certain about the forces behind the building of this bema.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*, 291.

¹⁶¹ Frantz (1982), 38, and *ead.* (1988), 19 and 25.

¹⁶² Even though we know no certain date for the epigram on a restored theatre in Ephesus presented by Kaibel (1878), no. 1050, as being of the fourth century or later, we do have a prosaic διατόπωσις from Sparta in Feissel (in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985)), no. 24, recording the restoration of a theatre in A.D. 359 under the Proconsul Ampelius, mentioned also by Frantz (1988), 21, and another inscription (*SEG* 32, no. 400) on an epistyle block from the last building period (probably A.D. 402–408) of the same theatre, with the names of the Emperors Honorius and Theodosius II.

¹⁶³ Hegias (see 11. above) in the early fourth century, Hermogenes in A.D. 386/7 (*IG* II/III², no. 4842), Theagenes in the middle of the fifth century, as presented by *Suda*, Θ 78: Θεαγένης, and Nicagoras the Younger in A.D. 484/5 according to Marinus 36 are the only known archons in addition to Phaedrus in this period.

¹⁶⁴ If we look outside the later third century (Dexippus and Claudius Illyrius in 1.–3.), we have Hegias, the son of Timocrates (11.), dated in the fourth century.

¹⁶⁵ Roueché (1989), xx.

¹⁶⁶ Frantz (1982), 39 suggests the Proconsul Cervonius as a possibly conceivable benefactor (praised by Himerius), but this remains pure conjecture.

28. *IG II/III*², no. 5208: The sundial of Phaedrus (the later fourth/early fifth century)

Φαῖδρος Ζοΐλου
 Παιανιεὺς ἐποίη[ι].

“Phaedrus, son of Zoïlus, from the deme of Paeania, had (this sundial) made.”

Cut on a sundial (H. 0.49, W. 1.00, T. 0.40, LH. 0.028–0.042, excluding *phi*), on the extreme left of its four deviating vertical disks; the object was found in the church of Agios Eleutherios (see map in Fig. 2 b) and removed to the British Museum.

It is indeed very rare to indicate the filiation and the deme in a Late Roman inscription.¹⁶⁷ But this has been no obstacle in assigning this text to a date around the turn of the fourth into the fifth century.¹⁶⁸ Earlier it had been dated into the Antonine or the Severan period but generally identified with the dedicant of the bema after it was found in 1862.¹⁶⁹ For further references on Phaedrus, see the end of commentary on **27.**, the bema inscription.

29. *IG II/III*², no. 3818: Honours to the sophist Plutarchus (the later fourth/early fifth century)

δῆμος (Ἐ)ρεχθῆος βασιλῆ(α) λόγων ἀνέθηκεν
 Πλούταρχον σταθερῆς ἔρμα σαοφροσύνης·
 ὃς καὶ τρὶς ποτὶ νηὸν Ἀθηναίης ἐπέλασεν
 ναῦν ἐλάσας ἱερῆν, πλοῦτον ὄλον προχέας.

“The people of Erechtheus dedicated (this statue of) Plutarchus, the king of words, the mainstay of firm prudence, who rowed the Sacred Ship three times in all near to the temple of Athena, spending all his wealth.”

Cut on the right side of a reused rectangular statue base (see **11.** for the measurements, provenience and reuses of the stone); LH. 0.015–0.021.

The text tells us how the people of Athens dedicated a statue in honour of Plutarchus for his generosity involving the Panathenaic procession. The most important historical aspect of this document is its evidence for the continuation of this procession probably into the fifth century. We do not know whether there was a break in the immediate years after the Herulian raid and a revival of the festival in the fourth century.¹⁷⁰ In any case

¹⁶⁷ For the filiation, see notes 164 and 165 above. As for the *demoticon*, we have only one example (**18.**), possibly from the fourth century.

¹⁶⁸ Most notably in Kirchner’s edition of *IG II/III*², no. 5208.

¹⁶⁹ A striking exception in this respect is Graindor, who regards the dedicant of the sundial as an ancestor to the dedicant of the bema, especially on the basis of the lettering: Graindor (1922), 270.

¹⁷⁰ See Frantz (1988), 20, 23, 26, and Himerius’ account of the procession in *Oratio* XLVII.12–13 (ed. Colonna (1951)).

the evidence for any kind of contests in Athens after the middle of the third century is very scanty. It is all the more striking that our inscription records the Panathenaic ship procession as taking place three times in the early fifth (or in the last decade of the fourth) century; this could imply regular celebration of the festival. A few notes may be added before turning to the question of the identity of Plutarchus. The word ἀνέθηκε is not as rare in Late Roman inscriptions as has been previously thought.¹⁷¹ The last three words of the epigram need not be anything but a pun, so popular in Late Roman epigrams, on the name Plutarchus.¹⁷²

It has long been debated whether the Plutarchus in this epigram is identical with the founder of the Neoplatonic School or just a contemporary sophist of the same name. He has been regarded as a sophist without explicit argumentation by Graindor and Castrén,¹⁷³ whereas Keil comes to the same conclusion by virtue of the title βασιλεὺς λόγων,¹⁷⁴ which has often been used as an argument for his being a sophist. Another approach is to refer to another contemporary inscription (31.), which records a dedication to the Praetorian Prefect Herculius (around A.D. 408–410) by a certain Plutarchus, characterised as μύθων ταμίης σοφιστής. Pittakes, Dittenberger, Curtius, Robert, Millar and *PLRE* identify these two sophists.¹⁷⁵

Support for an identification with the Neoplatonist philosopher Plutarchus, however, continues in publications by Kaibel, Groag, Creaghan (with Raubitschek), Frantz (in the sixties), Blumenthal, Nagy and Fowden.¹⁷⁶ Blumenthal's and Fowden's points are unconvincing. Blumenthal freely identifies the two persons.¹⁷⁷ He thinks the "wealthy man" who financed the journey of the Sacred Ship is the scholar. He also connects 31. with him and says that σοφιστής has been used, because φιλόσοφος is impossible in verse; the scholar's definition of rhetoric in his commentary on *Gorgias* is an equally weak argument in my opinion. Neither does the fact that σοφιστής had lost its pejorative connotations corroborate his identification. Fowden's arguments are no better: Damascius' fragmentary *Vita Isidori* fr. 273 (ed. Zintzen (1967)) says nothing explicit about Neoplatonist support for the Panathenaea.¹⁷⁸ More recently Fowden supports his view by citing Synesius' unclear allusion in *Epistolae* 136 (ed. Hercher (1873)): ξυνωρὶς τῶν σοφιστῶν τῶν Πλουταρχείων.¹⁷⁹ It is difficult to understand how this passage could refer to the followers of the philosopher Plutarchus, as Fowden assumes. That the

¹⁷¹ In contradiction to Robert (1948), 106, note 6, see 15.; see also *id.*, 103, 115, 117, and Roueché (1989), nos. 11, 12, 28, 62 and 65.

¹⁷² This pun may well have been repeated in the next inscription, line 8, which I think is an honorary inscription to the Neoplatonist philosopher of the same name. Compare also Roueché (1989), no. 39.

¹⁷³ Graindor (1924), 76, no. 114, and Castrén (1989), 47.

¹⁷⁴ See Keil (1859), 493. The words βασιλεὺς λόγων and similar expressions have been shown by Robert (Robert (1948), 95–96, with notes 8–9 and 1–4) to expand their popularity from the second century on until the fifth, including Philostratus, Lucian, Gregory of Nazianzus and Himerius. I shall cite only Eunapius, *VS X.7.4* (ed. Giangrande (1956)): ἡ βασιλεύουσα ᾿Ρώμη τῶν βασιλεύοντα τῶν λόγων, an alleged inscription on a statue base dedicated to the sophist Prohaeresius.

¹⁷⁵ Pittakes (1854), 1168, no. 2257; Dittenberger (1878), no. 776; Curtius (1891), 277; Robert (1948), 95–102; Millar (1969), 17, note 64, and *PLRE* II, s.v. Plutarchus 2.

¹⁷⁶ Kaibel (1878), 376, in his commentary on no. 910: "*Plutarchum recte Wilamowitz intellegit Nestorii filium Atheniensem, Proculi Lycii praeceptorem*"; Groag (1946), 60, no. IV; Creaghan and Raubitschek (1947), 27, no. VI; Frantz (1965), 192, note 28 and *ead.* (1969), 528 (confused); Blumenthal (1978), 373; Nagy (1980), 109; Fowden (1982), 51 and *id.* (1990), 499.

¹⁷⁷ Blumenthal (1978), 373.

¹⁷⁸ Fowden (1982), 51, note 147, is of the opposite conviction.

¹⁷⁹ *Id.* (1990), 499, note 30.

name σοφιστής was applied generally to oriental sages such as the Gymnosophists, as Fowden claims, seems to be out of place in trying to identify an Athenian person of culture recorded in a witty Athenian epigram.

As Frantz has prudently observed, the question is: can the two epigraphically attested (that is, **29.** and **31.**, but not **30.**) persons named Plutarchus be equated with the founder of the Neoplatonic School?¹⁸⁰ Frantz wants to see overtones of Platonic philosophy in μύθων ταμίης in **31.**, which is unfounded, as I shall try to prove *ad locum*. She says βασιλεὺς λόγων in the present inscription presumably refers to a sophist but is not incompatible with “philosopher”.¹⁸¹ Frantz clearly speaks for the case of Plutarchus the Neoplatonist, but in the final analysis she leaves the question open and insoluble, lacking of further evidence.¹⁸² My opinion is that Plutarchus the sophist should be distinguished from the Neoplatonist philosopher until it can be shown that only philosophers could be wealthy enough to defray the costs of transporting the Panathenaic ship up to the temple of Athena or other similar undertakings.

The date of this text is established through another inscription (**31.**), dated between A.D. 408–410,¹⁸³ where the identical Plutarchus honours the Praetorian Prefect Herculus. But the present inscription could even predate Alaric’s incursion and, on the other hand, be posterior to Herculus’ tenure by a decade or even more.

30. Mitsos (1971), 65 no. 7¹⁸⁴ (EM 4878 + 4713 + 8572) = *SEG* 31, no. 246: Honours to the Neoplatonist philosopher Plutarchus (the early fifth century)

<p style="margin: 0;"><i>b</i></p> <p>[----- ἀριδεί]κετον ἔρνος</p> <p>[----- Κε]κροπίης</p> <p>[-----]ς Ἀθηνέων</p> <p>[-----]τι πειθόμενος</p> <p>[-----]ος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς 5</p> <p>[-----]ι ὕμνοπόλω.</p>	<p style="margin: 0;"><i>a</i></p> <p style="margin: 0; text-align: center;"><i>vacat</i></p> <p>[--]ΥΣΑΠ[-----]σμα Πλάτωνο[ς]</p> <p>[πλο]ῦτος[-----]μενος</p> <p>[Π]λουτα[ρχ----- Τελε]σφόρε, λεύσσας</p> <p>[ῆ] ἱερεῖ γέρ[ας-----]νος τεμένει. 10</p> <p style="margin: 0; text-align: center;"><i>vacat</i></p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

“[---] famous off-spring [---] of Cecropian [---] of Athens [---] complying with [---] the far-seeing Zeus [---] minstrel.”

¹⁸⁰ Frantz (1988), 63.

¹⁸¹ *Id.*, 64.

¹⁸² *Ibid.* She expects the donor to have been considerably wealthy, a man of distinction and influence, saying that Plutarchus the Neoplatonist at age sixty would fit all these specifications. That no sophist of the same name is known does not prove anything.

¹⁸³ See *PLRE* II, s.v. Herculus 2.

¹⁸⁴ See also Peek (1974), 202–204.

“[---] of Plato [---] the wealth [---] Plutarchus [---] having seen, o Telesphorus [---] indeed, a gift of honour [---] to the precincts of a temple.”

Cut on two fragments possibly belonging to an altar or a statue base (preserved measurements: *a*: H. 0.46, W. 0.10, T. 0.155, LH. 0.007–0.019; *b*: H. 0.545, W. 0.235, T. 0.14, LH. 0.006–0.015, excepting *phi*), the latter of which is known to come from the Lyceum excavation in the National Garden.

Our text has several difficulties of interpretation, mostly due to its fragmentary state of preservation. Werner Peek was the first scholar venturesome enough to suggest that this inscription referred to the Neoplatonist philosopher Plutarchus. I agree with him, but not with his arbitrary restorations.

Lines 2–4 possibly included the authorisation of the honorary statue by the city of Athens.¹⁸⁵ Another alternative could be a reference to the honorand's place of birth in Attica (line 2) and some other kind of authorisation. The second elegiac poem (lines 7–10) begins with a reference to Plato, and possibly to the School (κτίσμα?) founded by him. Because the restoration is uncertain,¹⁸⁶ I have not adopted this variant reading into my text. The restored πλοῦτος in line 8 may be compared to the puns in 29., lines 2 and 4 (Πλούταρχον... πλοῦτον ὄλον προχέας), 31., lines 1 and 2 (τὸν θεσμῶν ταμίην... Πλούταρχος μύθων ταμίης), and 32., lines 1 and 4 (τὸν θεσμῶν πρόμαχον... προμάχῳ Παλλάδι Κεκροπίης). All of this evidence cannot be dismissed as a mere coincidence of sophistic virtuosity because these texts could well have been carved within a time span of a few years.

There is more to be read in line 9 than previous editors have seen: Mitsos read ΛΟΙΤΑ, and Peek read [Π]λούτ[αρχ]. Frantz rejects the identification of the honorand with the Neoplatonist scholar Plutarchus on the basis of nothing more than a drawing in Peek's edition.¹⁸⁷ I would instead attach great importance to a reference to the name of a deity connected with Asclepius (Τελεσφόρε, partly restored) at the end of this same line.¹⁸⁸ The epigrams evidently ended in line 10, which includes two religious words (ιερεύς, τέμενος¹⁸⁹) and probably γέρας, which could refer to a reward or privileges conferred upon the honorand.¹⁹⁰

This interpretation regarding the priestly connections in this fragmentary inscription leads directly to an interpretation of the whole as an honorary inscription to Plutarchus, the scholar of the Neoplatonic School in the later fourth and early fifth century.¹⁹¹ For generations his family was linked to the priesthood of Asclepius. This is borne out by an inscription of another Plutarchus, probably the grandfather of our Plutarchus, found in Epidaurus.¹⁹² The Attic high-priest was active in Epidaurus as a priest of both Dionysus

¹⁸⁵ See the inscription for Theodorus (15.), lines 2, 6 and 8: νεύματι Κεκροπίης... τὼς γὰρ ἄνωγε πόλις... νεύματι Θεοδοσίου.

¹⁸⁶ Tod (1957), 135, note 44, claims that κτίσμα is not the only one of the 700 words ending in -σμα, which would suit the context.

¹⁸⁷ Frantz (1988), 64, note 48.

¹⁸⁸ See below on the priestly contacts of Plutarchus' family.

¹⁸⁹ The latter, of course, does not imply a priestly connection because, for example, in *IG* VII, no. 95, an honorary statue was collocated by the Megarians ἀμφὶ Δίκης τέμενει, as was shown by Robert (1948), 94.

¹⁹⁰ Compare Roueché (1989), nos. 31 and 53.

¹⁹¹ See *PLRE* I, s.v. Plutarchus 5 (= *PLRE* II, s.v. Plutarchus 1).

¹⁹² *IG* IV 1, no. 436 (and its couplet 437) from A.D. 308.

and Asclepius.¹⁹³ It has been established for a long time that our Plutarchus cannot be identified with two other persons of the same name.¹⁹⁴

It is a seemingly impossible task to try to reconstruct the specific circumstances behind the carving of such a poorly preserved honorary inscription. I regard the proposed date in the early fifth century as very probable also on the strength of its lettering (see Appendix on scripts).

31. *IG II/III*², no. 4224: Honours to the Praetorian Prefect Herculus (A.D. 408–410)

τὸν θεσμῶν ταμίην Ἐρκούλιον, ἀγνὸν ὑπαρχον
Ἵ Πλούταρχος μύθων ταμίης ἔστησε σοφιστῆς.

“Plutarchus, the treasurer (and dispenser) of speech(es) and sophist, set up (the statue of) Herculus, the treasurer of laws, the upright prefect.”

Cut on a block (H. 0.57, W. 1.53, LH. 0.035–0.045) on the left side of the entrance to the Library of Hadrian, above the original statue since lost. *In situ*. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

The highly sophisticated epigram characterises the Praetorian Prefect of Illyricum, Herculus¹⁹⁵ with a pun-like coinage θεσμῶν ταμίης. The word θεσμός is often used in connection with other words for extolling high-ranking Roman officials.¹⁹⁶

We know Herculus from two other inscriptions: **32.**, a dedication by the sophist Apronianus, and another from Megara, dedicated to Herculus for his building activities.¹⁹⁷ The extent of his building activities, treated as extensive by Frantz,¹⁹⁸ are the subject of much controversy. We should be careful in drawing conclusions even in cases like this, where an inscription above a statue of very considerable proportions is *in situ* at a conspicuous place in Athens.

As for the identity of Plutarchus in this inscription, I identify him with the sophist **29**. This is because he signs himself here explicitly as a sophist. The words μύθων ταμίης are a nice sophistic pun, which serves as the counterpart to θεσμῶν ταμίην, but

¹⁹³ The contacts have been pointed out by Oliver (1950), 84, and elaborated by Castrén (1989), 47 with Table I on p. 49.

¹⁹⁴ *PLRE I*, s.v. Plutarchus 3, the proconsul of Achaëa and *PLRE I*, s.v. Plutarchus 4, possibly a *praeses insularum* under Julian and son to the former; both are clearly out of the question here.

¹⁹⁵ *PLRE II*, s.v. Herculus 2; his office was during A.D. 408–410.

¹⁹⁶ See Robert (1948), 90, ἐπιμάρτυρα θεσμῶν, *AP* 9.812 θεῖον Ἰουστίνων καθαρὸν φρουρήτορα θεσμῶν and the following inscription in this study (also dedicated to Herculus), line 1 πρόμαχον θεσμῶν.

¹⁹⁷ *IG VII*, no. 93: construction of city walls and an aqueduct.

¹⁹⁸ Frantz (1966), 380, and *ead.* (1988), 63, attributes to Herculus the restoration of the Library of Hadrian; she also sees in him the rebuildler of the Parthenon, compare *ead.* (1979), 400–401, and also the builder of the “Palace of the Giants”, compare *ead.* (1988), 65, with note 52. Graindor (1934), 241, was so careful that he even doubted whether Herculus had any connection with the Library of Hadrian. The first scholar to speak for an intimate relation between Herculus and the Library of Hadrian was a colleague of Frantz, John Travlos (see Travlos (1950), 44). There is no concrete evidence for a connection; the tetraconch building inside the Library has been suggested to be the work of the Empress Eudocia or someone else towards the second quarter of the fifth century, compare Fowden (1990), 499 (see also note 224 below). Even the account of the fate of the Library of Hadrian in Frantz’ book is contradictory: contrast Frantz (1988), 5 and 63 with Travlos (1988b), 136, claiming it was in very good condition during the construction of the Post-Herulian Wall.

this does not help very much in defining the identity of the man. I strongly believe he is a sophist, and I reject Frantz' ideas of Platonism (Frantz (1988), 64): μῦθος is often attested in the meaning 'speech' or 'eloquence' both in Gregory of Nazianzus¹⁹⁹ and in the *Greek Anthology*.²⁰⁰

32. *IG II/III*², no. 4225: Honours to the Praetorian Prefect Herculius (A.D. 408–410)

τὸν πρόμαχον θεσμῶν Ἐ[ρκ]ούλιο[ν ἴσο]ν ἅπασιν
 ἐζόμενον θώκων ὑψόθεν αἰπυτάτων
 δεινὸς Ἀθηναίων Ἀπρωνιανὸς σε σοφ[ι]στής
 στήσε παρὰ προμάχῳ Παλλάδι Κεκροπίη[ς].

“Apronianus, the skillful sophist at Athens, put up (a statue of) you, Herculius, the defender of laws and equitable to all, you, who sit above the highest seats (of office), beside (the statue of) Pallas, the defender of Athens.”

Cut on a reused rectangular statue base (H. 1.055, W. 0.60, T. 0.72, LH. 0.012–0.025), originally set up beside the statue of Athena Promachus on the Acropolis (see map in Fig. 2 b) but reported to have been found in or near the Stoa of Attalus.

In this epigram the pun on ταμίης (see 31.) is based on πρόμαχος in lines 1 and 4, but here the flattery is even more efficient, as the Praetorian Prefect Herculius is connected to Athena Promachus. In line 2 αἰπύτατοι θῶκοι refer to thrones, not places of residence, as has been pointed out by Robert.²⁰¹ In line 3 Apronianus is called a sophist residing at Athens.²⁰² Nothing else is known about him.²⁰³ The epigram ends in a (very rare) reference to the place where the dedicated statue was erected.²⁰⁴ We know from literary sources that in A.D. 372 the statue of Athena Promachus was seen by Jerome.²⁰⁵ Later it was removed to Constantinople.²⁰⁶ To illustrate the placing of honorary statues, there are several examples of inscriptions referring to statues placed in

¹⁹⁹ Quoted in Robert (1948), 17, and commented *id.*, 24, note 6.

²⁰⁰ Compare *AP* 2.84 and 16.36, lines 1–2. On the other hand, of those who think the Plutarchus in 29. is the Neoplatonist philosopher, at least Kaibel (1878), commentary on no. 911, Groag (1946), 73, Creaghan and Raubitschek (1947), 27, no. VI, Frantz in her earlier work (Frantz (1965), 192 with note 30), Blumenthal (1978), 737 with note 28, and Fowden (1990), 499 with note 30, think that also this dedicant Plutarchus is the same person.

²⁰¹ Robert (1948), 150, note 1. For evidence for the use of this word in Late Roman honorary epigrams see *id.*, 17, 35, 47, and 149–150.

²⁰² Inexplicably Frantz (1965), 192, with note 31, calls him a philosopher.

²⁰³ *PLRE* II, s.v. Apronianus 1, with inexplicable errors of “Stoa of Hadrian” (as the place of provenience) and totally outdated reading [κλ]εινός to boot. Groag supposes Apronianus was the predecessor of Leontius in the sophistic chair at Athens, compare Groag (1946), 73, with note 6.

²⁰⁴ For a parallel, see line 5 in 15. above.

²⁰⁵ Jerome in *Zachariam* III.12.3. (ed. Adriaen (1970), 862, lines 58–59).

²⁰⁶ Frantz (1988), 77, note 143, suggests a date at about A.D. 465–470.

or near the court houses²⁰⁷ and Ζεὺς ἰθὺδικός²⁰⁸ and the legendary Λυκούργος in Sparta.²⁰⁹

Do we have to suppose that Plutarchus and Apronianus had a special reason to be grateful towards Hercules? This question is answered positively by *inter alios* Wachsmuth and Thompson.²¹⁰ Fowden is satisfied with the assertion that Hercules admired and was admired by these learned men of Athens.²¹¹ We may admit that Hercules must have been a man of letters, and it could also be possible that he really had paid particular attention to the needs of higher education. These dedications accompanied by statues in such conspicuous places at Athens seem to favour this hypothesis, but only the date (A.D. 408–410) is sure.

33. Sironen (1990), 372 (Agora inv. no. I 3558); taken up by *SEG* 40, no. 184: Honours to the Empress Eudocia (soon after A.D. 421?)

<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>
ε[ίνε]κα Φ[---ca. 7---] βασιληίδος Εὐδ[οκίης τε?]	
Θευδόσι[ος βασιλε]ῦς στῆσεν ἄγαλ[μα τόδε]	
πιστοτα[τ---ca. 9---]ΕΘΘ[?]Ν̄ θεραποντ[-----]	
Θευδοσι[ο---ca. 9---]ΟΛΑ[---]ΕΧΟΝΤ[-----].	

“Because of the [---] and (?) of the Empress Eudocia Theodosius the Emperor put up this statue. The most loyal [---] servant [---] Theodosius [---] having (?) [---].”

Cut inside a *tabula ansata* on two fragments of a column (preserved H. 0.475 (*a*) and 0.285 (*b*); estimated diameter 0.62, LH. 0.011–0.021), reused as a statue base, found in the area of Stoa of Attalus and north of the “Palace of the Giants”. (See map in Fig. 2 b)

Leaving aside the critical apparatus, I see here a fragmentary epigram in two distichs describing the erecting of a statue by a person designated in the singular, most probably Theodosius, as can be seen from the almost self-evident restoration of line 2. In the first line an empress – Eud(ocia?) – is named in the genitive, probably a reference to the person depicted in the statue. Lines 3 and 4 of the epigram are more difficult to interpret, but there is a chance that the words “the most loyal” and “servant”, the numbers of which are unknown, could refer to the subordinates of the Theodosius in the last line, obviously then of the same emperor, possibly to those who were responsible for setting up the statue.

The text itself still has its uncertainties. In line 1 the word beginning with an uncertain *phi* cannot be an adjective or a participle in the genitive of the feminine singular qualifying the Empress Eudocia, if we restore τε in the end of the line.²¹² In line 3 the words

²⁰⁷ Robert (1948), 15 and 90 (Crete), and 94 (Megara); compare, for example, *AP* 9.812 and 813 for literary evidence.

²⁰⁸ Ζηνί παρ' ἰθυδίκῳ in Olympia: Feissel in Feissel and Philippidis-Braat (1985), 373, no. 153*.

²⁰⁹ κατὰ πτόλιν ἄγχι Λυκούργου *id.*, no. 36, line 5.

²¹⁰ Wachsmuth (1874), 717; Thompson (1959), 68, with note 45.

²¹¹ Fowden (1990), 499.

²¹² I thank Dr Charlotte Roueché for suggesting this new restoration to me.

πιστότατος and θεράπων might belong together as in AP 15.15, line 4: καὶ πιστὸν θεράποντα σκηπτούχοιο Λέοντος. Separately these fragmentary words could mean several other things. The superlative πιστότατος is probably not applicable to Christian phraseology;²¹³ the word θεράπων is possibly Christian,²¹⁴ but it is improbable that this word is Christian in this context.

Because of its small diameter of around 0.62 m. it is probable that the monument is a columnar statue base for one figure. It was obviously a statue base of the Empress Eudocia because it would be implausible for the Emperor Theodosius II to be identified through his wife.²¹⁵ This interpretation admittedly takes for granted that the Theodosius in line 2 is the Emperor Theodosius II. It could be someone else with the same name, but the restored [βασιλε]ύς and the likelihood that it is his wife who is mentioned in the opening line make a strong case for Theodosius II. It is possible, but by no means certain, that the Theodosius in the last line is the same person.²¹⁶

The Agora inscription is remarkable in two respects. First, this kind of imperial statue base in verse has so far not been attested in Late Roman Central Achaia.²¹⁷ Second, there has been no concrete proof until now of Eudocia's contacts with Athens.

Although Eudocia is traditionally considered to be benefactress of Athens, even her Athenian origin has been doubted.²¹⁸ We can only speculate about the reasons behind the erection of this statue.²¹⁹ Could it have commemorated Eudocia's marriage to Theodosius II on June 7, A.D. 421 in Constantinople? Did Eudocia possibly give money? Or could Eudocia have built something in Athens? A good candidate would be the "Palace of the Giants":²²⁰ the smaller fragments of the inscription were found squarely in front of the façade of the "Palace of the Giants". The statue of Eudocia may have stood on a base, found west of the Panathenaic Way, which Frantz has described and dated in the fourth century. Despite this dating, the lack of hard evidence does allow a fifth century dating.²²¹ Frantz thinks that the statue stood through most of the fifth century but might have been one of the casualties of a Vandal invasion in A.D. 467. Most

²¹³ Rösch (1978), 63, claims that from the fifth century on it was usual for an emperor to be named πιστότατος, but our poetic text can hardly belong even to the class "*Fremdbezeichnungen halb-offiziellen Charakters*" (p. 21). The emperor is probably not referred to by πιστότατος; Kaibel (1878), no. 441, line 4, provides us with an example of the Prefect Maiorinus: πιστοτάτου [βασι]λεῦσιν ἀμωμήτοιο τ' ἐ[πά]ρχ[ου].

²¹⁴ See AP 1.4; 1.8; 1.10, lines 33 and 37; 1.11; 1.101; 9.705 and many more. I wish to thank Dr Vappu Pyykkö and Professor Gunnar af Hällström, members of our team, for their help in elucidating the Christian usage of the words πιστότατος and θεράπων.

²¹⁵ There is, however, a rare example of this in AP 1.2, line 1, in which the Emperor Justin II is characterised as the spouse of Sophia: θεῖος Ἰουστίνος, Σοφίης πόσις.

²¹⁶ The double occurrence of the name of an emperor seems to be rare, but there is one example in AP (16.69) of the Emperor Zeno and his wife Ariadne. This two-line epigram, however, tends to favour parallel constructions in its choice of words.

²¹⁷ None of the 55 imperial dedications in the parallel material of Late Roman Central Achaia is later than this (I exclude an unedited *fragmentum incertum* from Corinth) and none of them is metrical. All of this suggests a very special occasion for inscribing the present epigram.

²¹⁸ See the article "The Athenian Empress Eudocia" by Mrs Julia Burman in this publication.

²¹⁹ Evagrius' *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.20 mentions Eudocia in Antioch and an honorary statue for her, but there are no clues relating to a statue in Athens.

²²⁰ Thompson (1988), especially 110–114. For further details of this hypothesis, see Sironen (1990), 374, note 11. – In contrast to all this, Castrén (1991), 476, suggests that the "Palace of the Giants" is rather a Roman "suburban villa". See also Castrén's further thoughts on p. 10–12 in this volume.

²²¹ Frantz (1988), 60, pl. 46 d. The date is based on the fact that the foundations were sunk in a fill of the third and fourth centuries.

interestingly she argues that the size of the base and the prominence of its position make it probable that it was an emperor who stood on top, perhaps on another column.²²²

All in all, it seems likely that the inscription dates from the time soon after the imperial marriage in A.D. 421; as this is an epigram, the apparent absence of the title *Αὔγουστα* or *Σεβαστή* does not exclude the period after Eudocia was granted this title.²²³ From the 430's on she was more or less involved in religious disputes and monasticism in Jerusalem, so that it would seem almost impossible to date this honorary inscription in the later period.²²⁴

V. Conclusion

Although it has been undertaken to assess only part of the classes of inscriptions, this study has shown that public dedications, honorary inscriptions and building inscriptions as well as milestones are represented by only a handful of Attic texts. Moreover, some of the sub-classes cease to be recorded on stone during the fourth century: dedications of public buildings as well as honours to local magistrates²²⁵ or priests (see **10.**, **1.**, **11.** and **17.** and **18.**). The evidence for these types is as thin in the rest of Central Achaëa as it is in Thessalonica.²²⁶ On the other hand, Aphrodisias has many dedications of public buildings until the later fourth century²²⁷ and several honorary epigrams for civic officials until the fifth and sixth centuries.²²⁸

The remainder of Attic sub-classes survive in the form of inscriptions until the early fifth century. The first of these comprises honours to emperors (see **6.**–**8.** and **33.**), a class that ceases to exist in the later fourth century in the rest of Central Achaëa.²²⁹ Thessalonica has no examples, but Aphrodisias has eight documents from the Tetrarchy until Justinian, all typically in prose.²³⁰

The second class of Attic inscriptions extending into the early fifth century comprises honours to proconsuls and praetorian prefects (see **2.**, **3.**, **13.**–**15.**, **19.**, **31.** and **32.**). Five (**13.**–**15.**, **31.** and **32.**) of the eight inscriptions (of which five are metric) were cut within a relatively short period of around forty years: between A.D. 372–410. The rest of Central Achaëa has proportionally the same amount of evidence, 21 inscriptions, documented from the early fourth into the early fifth century with a variety of Roman nobility as honorands. The single city of Aphrodisias is furnished with the same amount of texts (21 altogether) from the late third until the sixth century, albeit with

²²² For an epigram depicting an emperor on top of a column, see, for example, the epigram from the baths of Miletus cited in Robert (1948), 81, note 3: κίων ὑψιτενῆς ὄχρον βασιληΐδα μορφῆν; for a contemporary statue of the Emperor Arcadius dedicated by Theodosius II in Constantinople, see *Chronicon Paschale, sub anno* 421 (ed. Dindorf (1832), 579, lines 15–16) and Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon, sub anno* 421.2. Naturally there must have been innumerable other imperial statues on columns in the East.

²²³ See *PLRE II, s.v. Aelia Eudocia* (Athenais) 2.

²²⁴ See the contributions of Mrs Julia Burman and Ms Arja Karivieri elsewhere in this book for other possible Athenian activities of the Empress Eudocia.

²²⁵ Note that an Attic sub-class that persisted into the early fifth century are honours to philosophers and sophists (see **16.**, **29.**, and **30.**).

²²⁶ Feissel (1983), nos. 81–206, includes none.

²²⁷ Roueché (1989), nos. 11–13 and 28–30.

²²⁸ *Id.*, nos. 53, 55–56, 73, 82, 85–87 and 89.

²²⁹ This serves to show how exceptional **33.** is in its poetical form and late for being cut in Greece.

²³⁰ Roueché (1989), nos. 9, 20–21, 23, 25–27 and 81.

a smaller number of metric texts.²³¹ Once again, Thessalonica is poorly represented with only one epigram from the *Greek Anthology*.²³²

The eight building inscriptions in Attica (see **4.**, **5.**, **12.**, **20.**, **21.** and **26.–28.**) constitute the third class of texts that survived until the early fifth century. They have an even chronological distribution from the 270's until the early fifth century. The rest of Central Achaëa has proportionally less texts (altogether 11), most of them in prose, but with some later dates. Thessalonica has four rather late texts, from the fourth century until A.D. 512, the earliest one in Latin and two of them epigrams.²³³ The most numerous texts come from Aphrodisias (altogether 15), mainly in prose, from the middle of the fourth until the fifth or the sixth century.²³⁴

Attic milestones (five stones, see **9.** and **22.–25.**) are relatively numerous due to several copies of the latest milestone from A.D. 397. The Attic milestones are not as evenly distributed chronologically as the parallel material (seven texts) in the rest of Central Achaëa, ranging from the reign of Florianus until the reign of Arcadius and Honorius, with Diocletian and Constantine having the most numerous (three each).

*

*

*

It remains to recapitulate the results of this study affecting the Late Roman history of Athens and Attica.

The end of the third century after the Herulian raid in A.D. 267 is reflected in nine inscriptions (**1.–9.**), mostly in connection with the restoration of the city: the Post-Herulian Wall is being put up by Claudius Illyrius and possibly by someone else, too²³⁵ (**4.** and **5.**); the influential personalities Dexippus – an historian and civic leader – and Claudius Illyrius, a member of the Areopagus and proconsul, are being honoured with statue bases (**1.–3.**). In addition to these, there are honorary inscriptions to the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (**6.–8.**); only one of them (**6.**) preserves the name of the dedicant: *corrector* Lucius Turranius Gratianus. A milestone mentioning the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (**9.**) rounds off this particular period, about which very little information is available.

The fourth century prior to Alaric's incursion in A.D. 396 is characterised by 12 inscriptions (**10.–21.**) probably datable into this period,²³⁶ giving an impression of security and continual philanthropy under such benefactors as the generous archon and *panegyriarchos* Hegias (**11.**), the hierophant Cleadas (**17.**) and the obviously wealthy Flavius Septimius Marcellinus (**12.**). There is a continuation of pagan priests such as hierophant (**17.**), *daduch* (**13.**) and *panegyriarchos* (**11.**), all connected with the Eleusinian festival. There are also some less informative texts, including an epistyle probably with the name of Constantine the Great (**10.**) and two rather routine²³⁷

²³¹ *Id.*, nos. 7, 8 (an epigram in Latin!), 14–18, 22, 24, 31–32, 36–37, 41, 56–58 and 62–65.

²³² *AP* 9.686 = Feissel (1983), no. 87.

²³³ *Id.*, nos. 86 and 88–90.

²³⁴ Rouché (1989), nos. 19, 39–40, 42–44, 46–52, 67 and 72.

²³⁵ This depends on the problematic nature of the identity of the person who built the west flank of the Post-Herulian Wall, see notes 32 and 33 above.

²³⁶ The only insecurely datable inscriptions from this period (**18.–21.**) have been left at the end of Chapter III. For obvious reasons I am unwilling to use them in this syllabus. – Two milestones reused several times between the third and the later fourth century (**22.**, and **23.**) have been placed at the beginning of Chapter IV.

²³⁷ These texts have almost always suffered from neglect; in my opinion, however, they are valuable proof that fourth-century Athens must have continued to be a normally functioning society. It may

epigrams for the Praetorian Prefect Probus (14.) and for the Proconsul Theodorus (15.). I would like to emphasise the importance of the honorary inscription to the wealthy archon and *panegyriarchos*, generous benefactor Hegias (11.) with its re-established date and the equally neglected and evidently misdated inscription of Cleadas and Erotius (17.), implying the continuation of the Eleusinian mysteries.²³⁸ The third priestly office-holder, the *daduch* Flavius Pom(peius?), is commemorated in an honorary prose inscription to the Proconsul Rufius Festus (13.).²³⁹ With regard to the building activities of the fourth century, it must be emphasised that the Gateway on the Acropolis was built by an evidently rich man, Flavius Septimius Marcellinus (12.). The fear of a Gothic invasion, however, became more serious at the end of the century, and Iamblichus – the only epigraphically attested sophist or philosopher from the fourth century proper – built a wall in Athens from his own resources, as we are informed in a fragmentary honorary inscription (16.). The Patrae-Athens road was also probably being worked upon.²⁴⁰

The last period from A.D. 396 on is quite well documented by altogether 12 inscriptions (22.–33.) until the second quarter of the fifth century. On the one hand restoration and building activity is documented in seven inscriptions (22.F., 23.C. and 24.–28.), on the other hand sophists and philosophers are present in four honorary texts (29.–32.)²⁴¹ and, last but not least, an emperor (or rather an empress), is being honoured (33.) – after a hiatus of more than a hundred years. Regarding the first of these groups, it is remarkable that so much was under construction in the years immediately after the Visigothic raid: the Patrae-Athens road in A.D. 397 (22.F., 23.C., 24. and 25.), possibly the Diogeneion (26.), the bema of the Theatre of Dionysus (27.) and the sundial of Phaedrus (28.). As to the sophists, we are very well served by the important inscriptions mentioning Plutarchus (31.) and Apronianus (32.) during the office of the Praetorian Prefect Herculius between A.D. 408 and 410. Did they praise the Prefect Herculius for their (possible) positions as official sophists at Athens? At least the sophist Plutarchus seems to have been openhanded in supporting the Panathenaic procession (29.), which could mean he was wealthy. The fragmentary inscription for the Neoplatonist philosopher Plutarchus (30.), which mentions various pagan gods and includes priestly words, may be seen as a proof of the perseverance of the pagan cult. This is also corroborated by the mention of Dionysus and the statue of Pallas Athena in the bema inscription (27.) and in the statue base inscription by the sophist Apronianus (32.) in honour of the Prefect Herculius, both of them relevant for the fifth-century topography of Athens. Nevertheless, I would like to claim that the most important new discovery for the Late Roman history of Athens is the epigram of the Emperor Theodosius II for his wife Eudocia (33.), although it is not entirely clear, due to its fragmentary state of preservation.

even have been rather well-off, as is suggested by the continuing testimony of public honorary inscriptions.

²³⁸ See 11. and 17.

²³⁹ There the proconsul is an honorary member of the Areopagus and a benefactor of the city, and the erection of the statue is overseen by a person with priestly ties to Eleusis, exactly as around 90 years earlier in the case of Claudius Illyrius and Marcus Iunius Minucianus (see 2. and 3.).

²⁴⁰ The relevant texts have been placed in Chapter IV: 22.C.D.G. and 23.B.

²⁴¹ See also Olympiodorus' fr. 31 (ed. Blockley (1983)), mentioning a statue erected in honour of Philtatus for his philological merits.

It will be clear from the preceding that no more public inscriptions were cut after the first half of the fifth century, unless they were characteristically Christian.²⁴² After this period the epigraphical culture continued in Attica mainly in the form of numerous Early Christian tombstones of the type κοιμητήριον τοῦ δεῖνα κτλ. Although very rarely datable, these texts are generally believed to have become common by the fifth century. Their number is very high, especially at Corinth, and generally in Central Achaëa.²⁴³

Appendix on Scripts

The following owes a great deal to Roueché's Appendix III:²⁴⁴ not only the exposition, but also her remarks on the problems inherent in the Late Roman period.

The Attic material analysed here consists only of the public texts in Greek studied above. The Latin texts (6., 22.F., 23C., 24. and 25., lines 2–7) are excluded. Lost inscriptions (7., 9., 14., 17., 18. and 22.), studied on the basis of earlier editions, have always been referred to with the precaution "also possibly" at the end of examples.²⁴⁵

The reduction in the quantity of inscriptions from the later third century on is without a doubt more dramatic at Athens than, for example, at Aphrodisias. The number of examples at Aphrodisias is 89 public texts in Greek, whereas there are only 37 different texts²⁴⁶ in the whole of Attica. The period of study at Aphrodisias covers more than 350 years after A.D. 250, but in Attica only a little more than 150 years after A.D. 267. This will certainly affect the present analysis of the scripts.

In order to avoid the danger of circular arguments, I shall at first discuss letter forms in texts for which there is some evidence of date apart from the script (1.–5., 7.–18., 22.C.D.G., 23.B., 25., 26., 29. and 31.–33.); the other texts (19.–21., 22.A.B.E., 23.A., 27., 28., and 30.) will be assessed more thoroughly in the synopsis at the end of this Appendix. On the basis of the data extracted from the securely dated texts and the overall look of a given inscription with a more or less uncertain date (especially texts 27., 28. and 30.), an estimated date may be provided.

A: With disregard to use of serifs and elongated forms three major variants may be distinguished: straight bar (2., 4., 5., 13., 15., also possibly 14. and 18.); the dropped bar (12., 26., also possibly 7. and 9.); the cursive variant (3., 8., 11., 29., 31.–33., also possibly 17.). Almost all of these forms continue to be used throughout the period under study: the cursive form with its slanted bar²⁴⁷ seems to prevail towards the later period. It must be noted that several texts are inconsistent as regards the three forms (1., 16., 23.B., also possibly 22.C.D.G.).

B: There are some special features that do not, however, appear to be related to date: forms with the bowls touching the main stem (1., 16., 29., also possibly 7., 9., 14.,

²⁴² See, however, note 127 for the seven Early Christian dedications and building inscriptions omitted from this paper.

²⁴³ I have counted 373 texts in Corinth; other parts of Central Achaëa (including Attica) with 306 texts.

²⁴⁴ See Roueché (1989), 331–334.

²⁴⁵ In Dittenberger's *IG III* the use of serifs and especially the letters *alpha* and *omega* are not always reliably presented; in other respects its letter fonts are remarkably representative.

²⁴⁶ Add to these the three texts mentioned above in note 45.

²⁴⁷ This form has been attested as early as between 27/6–18/7 B.C. in *IG II/III*², no. 2338, and at the end of the first century A.D. in *IG II/III*², no. 1998.

18. and **22.D.G.**); forms with an outline of the two bowls not touching the stem (inconsistently in **13.**, **16.** and **23.B.**); the upper bowl sometimes appears to be larger (inconsistently in **23.B.**) or smaller than the lower bowl (inconsistently in **1.**).

Γ: Apart from the use of serifs *gamma* offers no remarkable features.

Δ: The chief variants from the standard form are represented in the variable use of serifs and elongated forms, all of which are used throughout the period.

Ε: The two major variants are between a squared (**1.**, **2.**, **4.**, **5.**, **12.**, **26.**, also possibly **7.**, **14.**, **18.** and **22.D.**) or a lunate form²⁴⁸ (**3.**, **11.**, **13.**, **16.**, **23.B.**, **29.**, **31.**–**33.**, also possibly **17.**) This would seem to indicate that the lunate form prevailed in the later period. There is a very small amount of inconsistency between the squared and lunate forms (**15.** starts with a lunate form, but goes over to the squared variant on line 2, probably in harmony with its squared *sigmas*, also possibly in **22.C.G.**) Note that in two texts (**13.** and **16.**) the central horizontal stroke is detached from the curve.

Z does not offer any significant variants.

H has an older variant, common in the second and third centuries, with the cross-bar detached from the sides (**4.** and **5.**), but all the other examples show the cross-bar attached to the sides.

Θ most commonly appears in a simple form, with a straight and attached cross-bar (**3.**, **15.**, **16.**, **29.**, **31.**–**33.**, also possibly **17.**); sometimes the cross-bar is detached (**4.**, **5.**, **13.**, also possibly **14.**). Inconsistencies do occur (**1.**, **26.**, also possibly **22.D.**). A more remarkable variant in the later period is the smaller form in the upper part of the line (in the first epigram in **16.** and inconsistently in **32.**), both belonging to the two decades around A.D. 400.

I does not offer any significant variants.

K: Forms where the arms end below and above the extent of the upright are rare and often relatively late (**15.**, **29.**, **31.**, **33.**, also possibly **22.D.**) when compared with the more common form, where they extend to the full depth of the upright (**2.**–**5.**, **10.**–**13.**, **16.**, **23.B.**, **26.**, **32.**, also possibly **7.**, **9.**, **14.**, **17.**, **18.** and **22.C.**). The arms are sometimes detached from the upright (**16.**, **29.**, **31.** and **33.**), whereas the arms more often touch the upright (**4.**, **5.**, **10.**, **12.**, **23.B.**, also possibly **7.**, **9.**, **14.**, **17.**, **18.** and **22.C.D.**). Inconsistency in this latter feature is more common (**1.**–**3.**, **11.**, **13.**, **15.**, **26.** and **32.**) than in the extension of the arms below or at the level of the upright (**1.**). Note that in two texts assigned to the 390's (**16.** and **26.**) the arms and the upright have been cut as three detached strokes.

Λ: Besides the use of serifs and elongated forms there are virtually no significant developments.

²⁴⁸ The lunate forms of *epsilon*, *sigma* and *omega* are attested already between 27/6–18/7 B.C. in *IG* II/III², no. 2338; before A.D. 37 in *IG* II/III², no. 3264; and around A.D. 45/6 in *IG* II/III², no. 1972.

M: In addition to the standard form (1.–5., 8., 11.–13., 15., 29., also possibly 9., 17., 18. and 22.C.D.G.) there is a form with the slanting elements extending fairly deep combined with a slight slanting of the uprights as if it would form the lower part of an *alpha* with a dropped bar (in the second epigram in 16. and in 32., also possibly 7.) Other developments include the rare variants where the slanting elements start some way down the uprights (an inconsistency in the first epigram in 16. and in 26., the latter consisting of four detached strokes, compare the end of notes on *kappa*) and the fully cursive form with three curves (31.). The cursive form cannot, however, be regarded as a late feature, because it appears already in A.D. 301 in *IG II/III*², no. 1120 (Edict of Diocletian) and even earlier.

N: The chief variation is between the standard form where the oblique goes from the top of one upright to the bottom of the second (1.–3., 5., 8., 10., 12., 13., 26., 31.–33., also possibly 7., 9., 14., 17., 18. and 22.C.D.G.) and those forms where the oblique starts some way down the uprights (an inconsistency in 11., 16. and 29.), sometimes only finishing some way up the right upright (an inconsistency in 11., 15. and 23.B.). The letter has occasionally been cut so that the oblique is detached from the left upright (an inconsistency in 15.). This would seem to indicate that the deviations from the standard form appear in the fourth century.

Ξ: There are many forms, none of which appear to be related to date. The standard form with three horizontal strokes (1., possibly also 7., 9., 18. and 22.C.) co-exists with a form where an upright runs through the horizontal strokes (5., but inconsistently in 1., also possibly in 9.). Two totally different forms exist: a stylised double *zeta* (3.) and a form where the central horizontal stroke of the standard form is replaced by a hook upside down (11. and 13.) or by a double hook in the identical position (16.).

O is comparable with *theta* because the smaller form in the upper part of the line prevails in the same late texts (16. and 32.) and in two other later texts also somewhat smaller than *theta* (33., also possibly 17.). On the other hand, it must be noted with caution that three texts (26., 29. and 31.) with virtually identical dates do not share this feature.

Π: Apart from elongated forms and use of serifs this letter shows no significant developments.

P: The standard form has the bowl attached to the upright at the top (1.–5., 8., 11., 15., 26., 29., 31.–33., also possibly 7., 9., 14., 17., 18. and 22.C.). Sometimes the bottom of the bowl is left open (13.) combined with the feature where the upright extends above the bowl (16. and 26.). Occasionally the top of the bowl is left open when the upright extends above the bowl (an inconsistency in 16.). The bowl may be detached from the upright (12.), also when the upright extends above the bowl (an inconsistency in 13. and 26.). The bowl attached to an upright which extends above it is attested only once, as an inconsistent variant (15.).

Σ: the standard form continued in use occasionally until the end of the fourth century (1., 4., 5., 25. (a mere title), also possibly 7., 14., 18. and 22.C.), but the square form (1. (one attestation), 2., 10., 12., 15., 26., also possibly inconsistently in 9.)

and especially the lunate form (3., 8., 11., 13., 16., 23.B., 29., 31.–33., also possibly 17., 22.G., and inconsistently in 22.D.) came to prevail in the later period. Generally the traditional standard *sigma* (or the square *sigma*) goes together with a square *epsilon* and a traditional or a square *omega*; the only exception is 15., where *omega* is curved.

T shows no significant variations.

Y: Forms with straight arms (2.–5., 11., 15., 25., 26., 29., 32., also possibly 7., 9., 14., 18. and 22.C.G.) or curved arms (31. and 33.) vary. Both forms are occasionally attested (1., 3., 13., 16., also possibly 17.). No relevance as to the date can be proved.

Φ , *X* and Ψ show no significant variants.

Ω : The traditional form continued in use sporadically until the fourth century (1., 5., 12., also possibly 7., 9., 18., and 22.C.) as did the traditional forms of *epsilon* and *sigma*. The cursive form prevails in the later period. It can be classified in four different forms: a) the flat-bottomed (10. and 26.), b) the two Us (16. and 32.; 15. cut as two detached Us), c) the more curved form with a straight central upright as high as the curved ones (3., 13., 23.B., 29., and 31.), and d) the more curved form with a lower central upright (11., also possibly 17. and 22.G.).

Abbreviations are comparatively rare because the latest text in prose (28.) is no later than the fourth century. The first of the abbreviations in this study (1., line 6) is indicated by a straight oblique stroke behind the last letter above the line. This follows the usage of earlier times. In contrast to it, the rest of the abbreviations (12., line 1, 13., line 9, and 26., line 2, all fourth century in date) are designated by the late Roman mark resembling the Latin *S*.

An evaluation of the scripts with notes on the use of elongated forms and serifs follows. Inscriptions 1., 4., and 5. may be regarded as traditional scripts from the preceding period with their square lettering and rather consistent use of serifs and rare elongated forms. Inscription 1. shows many elongated forms and has pronounced serifs. It belongs to a transition period: its intruding square *sigma* (attested only once) among the numerous attestations in the more traditional form connects it with the less traditional square script of 2., a contemporary text with a less consistent use of (small) serifs. The whole picture is blurred by a cursive copy (3.) of the same text with elongated forms and virtually no serifs, which is based on round letter forms and cursive *alpha*. This style was to become more and more prevalent. The two contemporary epigrams 4. and 5. share more than their topic: no elongated forms, consistent use of pronounced serifs and a very traditional script with square *epsilon* and traditional *sigma* and *omega*. Two lost texts from the end of the third century (7. and 9.) are both cut in a traditional square script, 7. possibly without elongated forms and serifs, *alpha* with a dropped bar, 9. possibly with very rarely elongated forms and no serifs. In contrast to this, 8. evidently has elongated forms but only an occasional serif (on top of cursive *alphas*); the script is based on round, cursive letter forms, and it may be regarded as fairly untraditional in the context of a half-monumental imperial dedication.

Scripts of the fourth century use more consistently elongated forms and are based on a round lettering. One exception to this is **10.**, evidently with no elongated forms but with an almost consistent use of serifs, based on a square, semi-traditional script with square *sigma* and *alpha*. The misdated dedication **11.** shows elongated forms throughout but virtually no serifs; it is based on round, cursive lettering with additional features of cursive *alpha*, smaller *omicron* and *omega*. The work seems helpless: unsure hand, variable letter height, vacillating lining etc. All of this could indicate a rather late date or perhaps at least an ebb in the epigraphical culture. Inscription **12.** also has elongated forms but shows consistent use of small, sharp serifs in a comparatively traditional square lettering (*alpha* with a dropped bar, square *epsilon* and *sigma*, traditional *omega*). The work, with its slight slanting of lines, seems to reflect an ambitious attempt to reach back to a script of previous centuries. Inscription **13.** shows elongated forms with virtually no serifs, a round script without cursive *alpha* or other possibly late features. In contrast to this, another contemporary dedication (**14.**, lost) possibly had no elongated forms and serifs, but it shows an exceptionally traditional lettering with square *epsilon* and *sigma* with four bars. Inscription **15.** presents elongated forms with only occasional serifs and a curious mix of square and round letters (square and round *epsilon*, square *sigma*, round *omega*). Its overall appearance is helpless due to fluctuating lining and variable letter height. The letters *nu* and *omega* are often cut detached. The two epigrams by two different hands in **16.** feature elongated forms with fairly consistent use of serifs, round and cursive lettering with some detached forms (*alpha*, *beta*, *delta* and *epsilon*). The letters *theta* and *omicron* are small, further enhanced by packing the letters to each other, especially in the first epigram (see also **32.**), which is typical of late texts; the second epigram is more moderate in variation of letter height (see also **29.**, **31.** and **33.**) and other features characteristic of this script, which seems to be typical of the last decade of the fourth and first decades of the fifth century.

A short note on some vaguely dated inscriptions of possibly third and mostly fourth century before going into inscriptions postdating A.D. 396. Text **17.** (lost) has possibly elongated forms with an almost consistent use of serifs. It is a round, cursive script with cursive *alpha* and possibly small *omicron*, thus being comparable with **11.**, another fourth century text. Text **18.** (lost) has possibly no elongated forms and serifs, and it has a traditional square lettering. It is not certain whether it has been documented in a trustworthy way. More probably a fourth century text is the fragmentary **19.** with its elongated forms and moderate use of serifs. It is based on a round, nearly oval lettering of good workmanship, featuring a drop-like *theta*. It is, however, too featureless to be dated precisely. Texts **20.** and **21.** are too short and monumental to date. The first of them has pronounced, hook-like serifs and well-formed round letters, the latter of them is based on square letters (see **10.**, **23.A.**, and **26.**), but it has elongated forms and serif only in *delta*. The lost milestone **22.** has several texts, the earliest ones of which (E., possibly also A. and B.) probably belong to the third century. They show an inconsistent use of elongated forms (excepting B.) and no serifs; the letters are a mixture of square and round ones, but for the most part they are traditional. The texts **22.C.D.** (early fourth century) also mainly follow this script: no elongated forms or serifs and basically traditional lettering with an occasional lunate form (a variant in **22.D.**). In the later fourth century (**22.G.**) lunate forms prevail with occasional elongated forms, but no serifs. The milestone **23.** is similar: the earlier text (A.) is in traditional square lettering with inconsistency in elongated forms and serifs, whereas the later text (B.) has mostly round letters (also a cursive *alpha* as a variant) and occasional elongated forms and serifs. It must be added that the work is very crude.

After the Visigothic raid the first securely dated inscriptions are the milestones of A.D. 397. Only one of them (25., line 1) has Greek letters. Its traditional square lettering and absence of elongated forms and serifs is striking for such a late period, but the work is haphazard, and it thus may be regarded as a title only. Another almost as strikingly traditional script is used in 26., which is in prose. Elongated forms and small serifs are used almost consistently. The whole is based on square letters, as in 12. (the only exception being the flat-bottomed *omega* in this later text). It also features occasional examples of detached letters as variants (*alpha*, *eta*, *kappa*, *lambda*, *mu*, *rho*, and *tau*). Another almost as monumental building inscription in a prominent place is the bema of Phaedrus (27.) in hexameters. Its lettering is reminiscent of the round lettering with small *omicrons* and *thetas* (compare 16., 30. and 32.). Elongated forms are consistent but serifs irregular. Here *theta* and *omicron* sometimes are drop-like, another generally late development. The clumsy overall appearance and execution strongly indicates a date around A.D. 400. The contemporary 28. has elongated forms, further emphasised by the ovality and lankiness of *epsilon*, *omicron* and *sigma*, all of which are based on round forms. In contrast, serifs are used fairly consistently. Other special features are detached forms of *nu* and *omega* (see 15. and 26.) and the drop-like *omicron*, smaller than regular size (see 33., possibly also 17.). On the other hand, neither one of the Phaedrus inscriptions show cursive *alpha*. In 29. elongated forms are pretty consistent, serifs occasional. The lettering is round with the additional feature of cursive *alpha*. The overall appearance is that of an amateur stone-cutter having difficulties in alignment; two letters in line 1 are unfinished and single letters are leaning against each other. Consistently elongated forms and almost consistent use of serifs are featured in 30., another honorary epigram probably of the early fifth century. In addition, it has round lettering and cursive *alpha*, but further small variants of *theta* and *omicron*. The last three epigrams have a securely established date around A.D. 410 (31.-32.) and in the 420's (33.). All of them have elongated forms; serifs are regular in 32. and 33., but inconsistent in 31. All of them are based on round letter forms with cursive *alpha*, but there are some minor characteristic features. Inscription 31. (good work) has a cursive *mu*, but no small variants of *theta* and *omicron*. Text 32. has vacillating lines suggesting a lower standard of work than in 31. and 33. The epigram for Eudocia is consistently of very high quality and the serifs are sharp.