TOWARDS THE DATING OF THE INSCRIPTIONS OF FOREIGN JUDGES AT MYLASA*

One of the highlights of the epigraphy of imperial Mylasa is the series of dedications made by foreign judges hailing from the provinces of Asia and (even more often) Lycia-Pamphylia at the temple of Zeus Osogo.¹

The significance of this group of texts both for the legal history of Roman Asia Minor and for the regional history of the conuentus of Mylasa and the province of Lycia-Pamphylia in the high imperial period is obvious. The re-emergence of foreign judges in the epigraphic record is one of the crucial pieces of evidence for the survival of Greek judicial institutions into the High Empire.² It is, however, not entirely clear whether we are dealing with an antiquarian revival (perhaps merely at the terminological level) or with a direct continuation of the practices of the late Republic, which was for a while obscured in the epigraphic record. Furthermore, the activities of Lycian foreign judges are relevant to the ongoing discussion about the status of the Lycian League, in many ways a unique institution in the Roman world, and its μετάπεμπτα δικαστήρια. This makes the establishment of a more precise chronology all the more important.

With the exception of I.Mylasa I 364 and 365, dated by the mention of the proconsuls of Asia L. Iunius Caesennius Paetus and Cornelius Tacitus to (on the most likely reconstruction of the provincial fasti) AD 93/4 and 112/3 respectively, Wolfgang Blümel in his standard edition of these texts does not attempt to offer an exact date and just places them on palaeographic grounds approximately 'um das Ende des 1. und den Beginn des 2. Jh.s n. Chr.'³

---

* I am grateful to Charles Crowther for allowing me to use his unpublished material and for his comments and encouragement, to Matt Gibbs and Emma Rix for commenting on earlier drafts of this article, and to Wolfgang Blümel for his editorial suggestions. Needless to say, they bear no responsibility for my conclusions.


Most of the texts fall in three groups: I 364 and 374 are inscribed on the same stone, together with no. 316, a dedication to the victory of Zeus Osogo; I 365–372 (together with victory acclama-
tions nos. 545/546) are all inscribed on the same column; I 363, 375 and 376 are inscribed
together on another. A case may be made for putting I 368, a dedication made by the same judge
and secretary pair from Erythrae as no. 365 (L. Gavius Labeo and L. Gavius Labeo νέος), in
the year of Tacitus’s proconsulship as well (as accepted by H. Engelmann / R. Merkelbach, I.Erythrae
I 125), but the inference seems unsafe: the same judges could visit the city more than once. The
first text refers to the judges being sent by the [Ἀ]σιανοὶ Ἴωνες (I.Mylasa I 365, l. 1) and lists
three further members of the judicial delegation (ll. 6–8), while the second is a dedication from
the two Labeos only, referring to them just as Ἐρυθραῖοι. Both a separate dedication from the
father and son on the same occasion as the group dedication by the whole delegation and a re-
turn performance may be posited. While no texts can thus be with certainty connected directly
with the two dated ones, it will be argued in this article that some modest further progress can
nonetheless be made, on the basis of city titles in the inscriptions and of the relative situation
of the inscriptions on the stone.

Of the Lycian cities that sent judges to Mylasa, three acquired metropolitan status during
the period in which the inscriptions at the temple of Zeus Osogo were made: Xanthos, Tlos, and
Patare. The change of status is duly reflected in the Mylasan inscriptions. Judges from Xanthos
are styled Λύκιοι Ξάνθιοι μητροπολεῖται in I.Mylasa I 361, ll. 1/2; 369, ll. 1–4; 370, ll. 1/2 (Λύκιοι
Ξάνθιοι | οἱ μητροπολεῖται), while in I 362 l. 1 the restoration Λύκιοι Ξάνθιοι μητροπολεῖται,
printed by Blümel (Λύκιοι Ξάνθιοι, LBW 352), might be prejudging the issue. The Tloan judges
are introduced as Λυκίοι | Τλωεῖς | μητροπολεῖ|ται in I.Mylasa I 366, ll. 1–4, but simply as Λυκίοι |
Τλωεῖς in 372, ll. 1/2. Only the bare Παταρεῖς from the heading remains from what should have
been a list of Pataran judges (I.Mylasa I 367, l. 9), so the discussion below will concentrate on
Xanthos and Tlos.

The earliest mention of the grant of metropolitan status to Xanthos comes from a statue base
for Nerva from the Letoon, from Ξανθίων ἡ τοῦ Λυκίων | ἔθνους μητρόπολις (F.Xanthos
VII 29, ll. 4/5).4 The title, as noted by Balland and Bowersock, has been inscribed in a different hand, start-
ing over an erasure in line 4; the argument that this was an alteration following a recent grant of
the title (whether under Nerva himself or in the early years of Trajan) appears convincing.5 This
should provide a firm terminus post for the missions of the judge Tlepolemos IV , great-grandson
of Eudemos, and the secretary Artemon, s. of Artemon, also known as Pidenenis (I.Mylasa I 361),
and of the judge Iason, s. of Hermonax, and the secretary Apollonios, s. of Ptolemaios (I 369 and
370).6

Prosopographic data throw additional light on the first of these judicial missions, but unfor-
tunately do not help to secure any firmer dating. Tlepolemos IV is no doubt related to the family
of Veranii Eudemi and Veranii Tlepolemi, which produced five high priests of the imperial cult
in Lycia in the Antonine period, the earliest of whom, Q. Veranius Eudemos, should have served

4 Cf. G. W. Bowersock, Hadrian and metropolis, in Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1982/83 (Bonn 1985), 82.
Compare F.Xanthos VII 30, ll. 3/4 (statue base to Trajan, between AD 98–102); VII 31, ll. 8–10 (statue base to Mar-
ciana, between AD 105–112).
5 For the suggestion that the addition could have been made after the end of Nerva’s reign, B. Burrell, Neor
koroi: Greek cities and Roman emperors (Leiden 2004), 254.
6 An Iason, s. of Hermonax, is also attested in an unpublished imperial period inscription from Xanthos, cf.
LGPN V.B s.v. Ἑρμῶναξ 45.
mid-way through the principate of Hadrian (his son Q. Veranius Tlepolemos is securely attested for AD 149).\(^7\) It is, however, unclear how much weight we should attach to the absence of the Roman gentilicium in the inscription from Mylasa (the gentilicia are used elsewhere in this group of inscriptions, but, perhaps significantly, not by any judges from Lycia, cf. I.Mylasa I 365; 367; 368; 371; 374).

The case of Tlos is more complex: it first appears as a metropolis in two inscriptions in honour of Opramoas, dated by the mention of his federal high priesthood to AD 136 at the earliest (TAM II 578, ll. 1/2; 579, ll. 1/2).\(^8\) The hypothesis of G.W. Bowersock that multiple metropoleis within a single province first appear in the reign of Hadrian has been cast into doubt for the empire as a whole, with recent contributions to the subject emphasizing the role of the koina and putting some of the changes in the age of Trajan.\(^9\) However, since Lycia was united in a single and powerful koinon, there is little reason to suppose that Tlos (or any other Lycian city except Xanthos) received its metropolis status prior to Hadrian’s visit(s) to the region during his grand tour of the eastern provinces in AD 129–131.\(^10\) If so, this would provide a terminus post for I 366 and terminus ante for I 372 and perhaps also for I 367 l. 9, which seems to mention Patara without a reference to its metropolitian status.

These conclusions can be reinforced by the relative arrangement of inscriptions in the largest group on a same column (I.Mylasa I 365–372). The excellent drawing provided in Richard Meister’s 1932 edition supports a late date for I.Mylasa I 366 in relation to other texts on that column. It should clearly be placed later than either I 365 (of AD 112/3, see above) or I 367 (with the exception of its l. 9, belonging to a separate text of which only this line survives), between which it is awkwardly squeezed, cutting across the neat frame of the latter in lines 4 and 5.\(^11\) On the contrary, I.Mylasa I 372 is written in considerably larger letters and arranged on the stone

---

\(^7\) A. Balland, F.Xanthos VII 90–93, with discussion of the family tree at pp. 282–4 (stemma at p. 282); D. Reitzenstein, Die lykischen Bundespriester: Repräsentation der kaiserzeitlichen Elite Lykiens (Berlin 2011), 188–9 no. 37; 203–4 no. 53; 209–10 nos. 62.1 and 63, with stemma at p. 245. Neither notes the probable connexion with I.Mylasa I 361. For possible Hellenistic ancestors of Tlepolemos, cf. Chr. Habicht, ap. I.Mylasa II, p. 4.

\(^8\) Cf. B. Puech, Des cités-mères aux métropoles, in S. Follet (ed.), L’Hellénisme d’époque Romaine: nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches ("Ier s. a.C. - IIIe s. p.C.") (Paris 2004), 361 n. 20. For the date of Opramoas’ federal priesthood, see most recently D. Reitzenstein, Die lykischen Bundespriester (n. 7 above), 192–5 no. 43.

\(^9\) G. W. Bowersock, Hadrian and metropolis (n. 4 above), 75–88, restated more briefly in id., Martyrdom and Rome (Cambridge 1995), 90; followed by M. T. Boatwright, Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire (Princeton 2000), 105. See contra B. Puech, Des cités-mères aux métropoles (n. 8 above), 357–404, esp. at pp. 358–70 and 381–5; É. Guerber, Les cités grecques dans l’Empire romain: Les privilèges et les titres des cités de l’orient hellénophone d’Octave Auguste à Dioclétien (Rennes 2009), 116–20. Bowersock’s re-dating of TAM II 421 (the earliest attestation of the metropolitan status of Patara, in the governorship of a Mettius Modestus) to the reign of Hadrian remains persuasive, cf. also Syme, Roman Papers VI (Oxford 1991), 352; C. Marek, Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike (Munich 2010), 844; see A. Birley, Hadrian: The Restless Emperor (London 1997), 251, for another possible piece of evidence for the Hadrianic Mettius Modestus. For a different view, B. Burrell, Neokoroi (n. 5 above), 254. It would, at any rate, be implausible that Tlos received its metropolitan status any earlier than Xanthos or even in the immediate aftermath of that grant.


\(^11\) R. Meister, Die Tacitusinschrift von Mylasa, JÖAI 27 (1932), 237–8 fig. 117.
more freely, which could be a sign of an earlier date. It might also be argued from the relative arrangement of these texts that I 369 was inscribed after I 368, 371 and 372.

If the above suggestions are correct, the following very rough chronological indications emerge (I indicate texts inscribed on the same stone as I 364 by superscript A, those inscribed on the same column as I 363 by superscript B, and those inscribed on the same column as I 365 by superscript C):12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription</th>
<th>Absolute date</th>
<th>Relative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 364&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AD 93/4 (proconsulship of Caesennius Paetus)</td>
<td>Same internal date as I 373.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 374&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ca. AD 93/4?</td>
<td>Same internal date as I 374.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 373</td>
<td>Ca. AD 93/4 (depending on the date of I 374)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 363&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Late- or post-Flavian.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 375&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Close in date to I 363?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 376&lt;sup&gt;B&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Close in date to I 363?15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 367, lines 1–8&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier than I 366. Earlier or similar date I 367, line 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 367, line 9&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Before AD 129–131 (absence of metropolitan status)?</td>
<td>Later or similar date as I 367.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 371&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Earlier than I 369.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 372&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Before AD 129–131 (absence of metropolitan status)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 361</td>
<td>After AD 96 (metropolitan status).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 365&lt;sup&gt;C&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>AD 112/3 (proconsulship of Cornelius Tacitus).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 There does not seem to be any way at present to situate *I.Mylasa* I 362 or *SEG* LI 1526 and LIV 1103 (both found out of context) more precisely within the series.

13 Both dated by the local eponymous priest Menandros, s. of Philargyros, and στεφανηφόρος Menippos, s. of Eirenaios (I 373, ll. 1/2; 374, ll. 2–4). The mention of a Ti. Claudius Leon in 374 l. 5 provides a (not entirely useful) terminus post; of more interest is the mention of a C. Suetonius Hermas (374 ll. 5/6) – this seems to be the only appearance of this gentilicium in Asia Minor and his citizenship ought to be due to the Neronian general C. Suetonius Paullinus (A. Krieckhaus, *PIR*² S 957), or rather his son, cos. ord. in 66 (*PIR*² S 958), who could perhaps have served as a proconsul of Asia under Vespasian. For our incomplete knowledge of the proconsular fasti of Asia under Vespasian, see the convenient table in C. Marek, *Geschichte Kleinasiens* (n. 9 above), 835–6.

14 If Blümel’s text is correct, any earlier date is precluded by the name of the Aphrodisian judge Λύκιος βʹ Φλ. Θεμίσωνος (l. 2), whose father seems to be a son of a Flavius Themison born outside a iustum matrimonium: for the onomastic pattern, cf. J.-L. Ferrary, *Les mémoriaux de délégations du sanctuaire oraculaire de Claros I* (Paris 2014), 51–53. See contra J. Nollé, *I.Side I TEp* 13, who suggests reading Λύκιος βʹ (τοῦ) Θεμίσωνος in l. 2: his grounds for rejecting the reading Φλ cannot stand in the light of Ferrary’s onomastic observations, however. For the only other Themison attested at Aphrodisias in this (or slightly later) period, *IAph*2007, no. 13.102; no grounds for assuming a connexion.

15 For their relative position on the stone, see the drawing in *I.Mylasa* I, p. 142.
It will be of immediate interest that no text seems to pre-date the proconsulship of Caesennius Paetus in AD 93/4 by any considerable margin and that, if the argument above regarding the metropolitan status of Tlos is valid, the series of dedications continued for at least four decades into the 130s (and in particular the series of nos. 365–372 extended over at least two decades, rather than was clustered around AD 112/3). This will need to be taken into consideration in further discussions of the re-emergence of foreign judges in the epigraphic record in the high imperial period.
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16 The drawing of Meister, Die Tacitusinschrift (n. 11 above), 237–8 fig. 117, shows remarkable similarity of its frame to that of no. 367 (for another frame of the similar type, see Blümel’s drawing of I.Mylasa I 363, at p. 142); for the discussion of its relation to no. 365, see above.

17 For arguments in favour of this being the same mission, Crowther, Foreign Judges from Priene (n. 1 above), 328. See above for similar problems presented by I 365 and 368.

18 See n. 11 above.