

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 *μετάπειπτα 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* I am grateful to Charles Crowther for allowing me to use his unpublished material and for his comments and encouragement, to Matt Gibbs and Emma Rix for commenting on earlier drafts of this article, and to Wolfgang Blümel for his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.

1 W. Blümel, *I.Mylasa* I 361–376, with ‘Addenda und Corrigenda zu *IK* 34/35’, *EA* 47 (2014), 80 and 90 (in SEG LIV 1103 Chaniotis’s restoration of the god’s name in ll. 8/9 fits the lacuna well and suggests origin from the same temple); see also C. V. Crowther, *Foreign Judges from Priene: Studies in Hellenistic Epigraphy*, unpubl. Ph. D. thesis (King’s College, London 1990), vol. 1, 321–33 nos. 192–207. For their characterisation as ‘actes de *proscynème* en l’honneur de Zeus Osogos’, see LBW, p. 107, followed by Blümel. On the sanctuary, A. Laumonier, *Les cultes indigènes en Carie* (Paris 1958), 101–26, remains fundamental (see pp. 110–111 for this group of texts); see now also P. Debord, *Sur quelques Zeus Cariens: Religion et politique*, *Studi ellenistici* 13 (2001), 21–4; for the spelling of the god’s name, W. Blümel, *EA* 47 (2014), 75 n. 2, with further references, superseding earlier scholarship. On the slave ἀκόλουθοι listed with the judges, L. Robert, *Notes d’épigraphie hellénistique* XXXVI, *BCH* 54 (1930), 322 n. 1; A. Weiß, *Sklave der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Sklaverei in den Städten des Römischen Reiches* (Stuttgart 2004), 35.

2 For the most recent treatment of this group of texts from the point of view of legal history, J. Fournier, *Entre toutelle romaine et autonomie civique* (Athens 2010), 226–8 (with a checklist at pp. 608–9). I offer some more general observations on the evidence for foreign judges in the High Empire in ‘Greek Law under the Romans’, in M. Canevaro and E. Harris (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law* (forthcoming), preview at <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199599257.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199599257-e-25>. For the most recent discussion of the Lycian *μετάπειπτα δικαστήρια*, see R. Behrwald, *The Lycian League*, in H. Beck and P. Funke (eds.), *Federalism in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge 2015), 410, denying the connexion with foreign judges, perhaps not entirely conclusively.

3 *I.Mylasa* I, p. 141. On the date of Tacitus’ proconsulship, see R. Syme, *Tacitus* (Oxford 1958), vol. 2, 664–5. On Caesennius Paetus, *PIR*² C 174, and W. Eck, *Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der senatorischen Statthalter von 69/70 bis 138/139*, *Chiron* 12 (1982), 321.

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 acclamations 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 [A]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 return 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 Patara. The change of status is duly reflected in the Mylasan inscriptions. Judges from Xanthos are styled Λύκιοι Ἐάνθιοι μητροπολεῖται in *I.Mylasa* I 361, ll. 1/2; 369, ll. 1–4; 370, ll. 1/2 (Λύκιοι Ἐάνθιοι | οἱ μητροπολεῖται), while in I 362 l. 1 the restoration Λύκιοι Ἐάνθιοι μητροπολίται], printed by Blümel (Λύκιοι Ἐάνθιοι], LBW 352), might be prejudging the issue. The Tloian judges are introduced as Λυκίοι | Τλωεῖς | μητροπολεῖται 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 Ἐανθίων 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, starting 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 unfortunately 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 Marciana, between AD 105–112).

5 For the suggestion that the addition could have been made after the end of Nerva's reign, B. Burrell, *Neokoroi: 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. Ἐρμῶναξ 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 metropolitan 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 (I^{er} s. a.C. – III^e 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 Kleinasien 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.

10 For a visit in AD 131, D. Blackman, *The inscriptions*, in J. Schäfer (ed.), *Phaselis: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt und ihrer Häfen* (Tübingen 1981), 151–4; H. Halfmann, *Itinera principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich* (Stuttgart 1986), 131; 194; 208. For the possibility of a detour into Lycia in the summer of AD 129, C. P. Jones, *A Petition to Hadrian of 129 CE*, *Chiron* 39 (2009), 457–8.

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

Inscription	Absolute date	Relative date
I 364 ^A	AD 93/4 (proconsulship of Caesennius Paetus)	
I 374 ^A	Ca. AD 93/4?	Same internal date as I 373.
I 373	Ca. AD 93/4 (depending on the date of I 374)?	Same internal date as I 374. ¹³
I 363 ^B	Late- or post-Flavian. ¹⁴	
I 375 ^B		Close in date to I 363?
I 376 ^B		Close in date to I 363? ¹⁵
I 367, lines 1–8 ^C		Earlier than I 366. Earlier or similar date I 367, line 9.
I 367, line 9 ^C	Before AD 129–131 (absence of metropolitan status)?	Later or similar date as I 367.
I 371 ^C		Earlier than I 369.
I 372 ^C	Before AD 129–131 (absence of metropolitan status)?	
I 361	After AD 96 (metropolitan status).	
I 365 ^C	AD 112/3 (proconsulship of Cornelius Tacitus).	

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. Kriekhaus, *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 β' Φλ. Θεμίσιωνος (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 mémoires de délégations du sanctuaire oraculaire de Claros I* (Paris 2014), 51–53. See *contra* J. Nollé, *ISide* I TEp 13, who suggests reading Λύκιος β' (τοῦ) Θεμίσιωνος 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, *IAph2007*, 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.

I 368 ^c	AD 112/113?	Same date as I 365 (same judge and secretary) or I 367 (frame similarity)? ¹⁶ Earlier than I 369.
I 369 ^c	After AD 96 (metropolitan status). After AD 112/3 (I 368)?	After I 368, 371 and 372.
I 370 ^c	After AD 96 (metropolitan status). After AD 112/3 (I 368)?	Same year as I 369 (same judge and secretary)? ¹⁷
I 366 ^c	After AD 112/3 (I 365). After AD 129–131 (metropolitan status)?	Later than I 365 and 367. ¹⁸

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.

St John's College, Oxford

Georgy Kantor

Özet

Makalenin yazarı Milas = Mylasa Zeus Osogo kutsal alanında bulunmuş olan yabancı hakimlere ilişkin imparatorluk dönemi yazıtlarının daha dar bir zaman diliminde tarihlenmesinin mümkün olduğunu belirtmektedir. *I.Mylasa* I 361–376; SEG LI 1526; LIV 1103 numaralar ile yayınlanmış olan bu yazıtların daha dar bir zaman dilimine tarihlenebilmelerine imkan veren en önemli gerekçeler hem Xanthos ve Tlos şehir devletlerinin Metropolis statüsünden bahsedilmesi ya da bahsedilmemesi ile yazıtların sütunlar üzerinde işlendikleri yerlerin konumudur. Bu hususlar dikkate alındığında söz konusu yazıtlar milattan sonraki 90'lı yıllar ile Hadrian'ın Likya'da M. S. 129 ile 131 yılları arasında yaptığı gezinin artçı etkilerinin görüldüğü dönem arasındaki zaman dilimine tarihlenmelidir.

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.