

ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE « VASILE PÂRVAN »

D A C I A

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE
ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

NOUVELLE SÉRIE

LXI

2017



EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNE

RÉDACTION

Rédacteur en chef :

EUGEN NICOLAE

Rédacteur en chef adjoint :

LIANA OȚA

Collège de rédaction :

MARIA ALEXANDRESCU VIANU (București), ALEXANDRU AVRAM (Le Mans), DOUGLASS W. BAILEY (San Francisco), MIHAI BĂRBULESCU (Cluj-Napoca), PIERRE DUPONT (Lyon), SVEND HANSEN (Berlin), ANTHONY HARDING (Exeter), RADU HARHOIU (București), ATTILA LÁSZLÓ (Iași), SILVIA MARINESCU-BÎLCU (București), MONICA MĂRGINEANU-CÂRSTOIU (București), VIRGIL MIHAILESCU-BÎRLIBA (Iași), JEAN-PAUL MOREL (Aix-en-Provence), CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU (București), IOAN PISO (Cluj-Napoca), CLAUDE RAPIN (Paris), WOLFRAM SCHIER (Berlin), VICTOR SPINEI (Iași), GOCHA TSETSKHLADZE (Llandrindod Wells)

Comité de rédaction :

IRINA ACHIM, CRISTINA-GEORGETA ALEXANDRESCU, IULIAN BÎRZESCU, ADINA BORONEANȚ, DANIELA MARCU-ISTRATE, ANDREI MĂGUREANU, ALEXANDRU NICULESCU, ADRIANA PANAITTE, ANCA-DIANA POPESCU, DANIEL SPÂNU, AUREL VÎLCU

Secrétaire de rédaction : RALUCA KOGĂLNICEANU

Rédaction éditoriale : MONICA STANCIU

Informatique éditoriale : OFELIA COȘMAN

Toute commande sera adressée à :

EDITURA ACADEMIEI ROMÂNÊ, Calea 13 Septembrie nr. 13, sector 5, 050711, București, România ;
Tél. 4021-318 8146, 4021-318 8106, Fax 4021-318 2444, E-mail : edacad@ear.ro

ORION PRESS IMPEX 2000 S.R.L., P. O. Box 77-19, sector 3, București, România ; Tél./Fax : 4021-610 6765,
4021-210 6787, Tél. 0311 044 668, E-mail : office@orionpress.ro

S.C. MANPRESS DISTRIBUTION S.R.L., Piața Presei Libere, nr. 1, Corp B, Etaj 3, Cam. 301-302, sector 1,
București, Tel.: 4021 314 63 39, fax: 4021 314 63 39, E-mail: abonamente@manpress.ro, office@manpress.ro,
www.manpress.ro

SORIRORI SOLUTIONS, Tel.: 0040765262077, 0040765166433; Internet: <http://www.sorirori.ro>; E-mail:
sorin.costreie@sorirori.ro, rosana.guta@sorirori.ro

Les manuscrits, ainsi que toute correspondance les concernant, seront adressés à la Rédaction :
Institut d'Archéologie « Vasile Pârvan », 11, rue Henri Coandă, 010667 Bucarest, Roumanie,
E-mail : redactie@iabvp.ro.

Toute correspondance concernant les périodiques proposés en échange sera adressée à la
Bibliothèque : Institut d'Archéologie « Vasile Pârvan », 11, rue Henri Coandă, 010667 Bucarest,
Roumanie, Tél./Fax 4021 212 88 62, E-mail : biblioteca.iabvp@gmail.com.



ACADÉMIE ROUMAINE
INSTITUT D'ARCHÉOLOGIE «VASILE PÂRVAN»

DACIA LXI, 2017

REVUE D'ARCHÉOLOGIE ET D'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE
JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ANCIENT HISTORY
ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR ARCHÄOLOGIE UND GESCHICHTE DES ALTERTUMS
ЖУРНАЛ АРХЕОЛОГИИ И ДРЕВНЕЙ ИСТОРИИ

SOMMAIRE
CONTENTS
I N H A L T

ÉTUDES

CRISTIAN EDUARD ȘTEFAN, Miniature vessels from Șoimuș – <i>La Avicola (Ferma 2)</i> , Hunedoara County. A case study	7
GERGANA KABAKCHIEVA, The results of the archaeological research at <i>Ulpia Oescus</i> between 2013 and 2018 ...	71
MIRCEA VICTOR ANGELESCU, VALENTIN BOTTEZ, IRINA ACHIM, Histria. New research on the Early Christian basilicas in the southern part of the acropolis	103
ISTVÁN BOTÁR, Village and church. The relation between the ecclesiastical topography and the medieval settlement system in Csík-seat (East-Transylvania, Romania)	155

NOTES ET DISCUSSIONS

AUREL RUSTOIU, Silver jewellery in the Early La Tène cemeteries from Banat. The hybridization of bodily ornaments	183
DANIEL SPÂNU, Der Vogelreiter von Surcea. Hintergründe eines keltischen Mythos im spätlatènezeitlichen Dakien	207
VALENTIN BOTTEZ, The <i>Gerusia</i> of Istros revisited	223
CONSTANTIN C. PETOLESCU, Notes prosopographiques (IX)	241

COMPTE RENDUS

Agnieszka Tomas, <i>Inter Moesos et Thracas. The rural hinterland of Novae in Lower Moesia (1st – 6th centuries AD)</i> , Archaeopress, 2016, Roman Archaeology 14 (<i>Adriana Panaite</i>).....	247
--	-----

IN MEMORIAM

Zoe Petre (23 août 1940 - 1 septembre 2017) (<i>Alexandra Lițu</i>).....	253
--	-----

<i>ABRÉVIATIONS</i>	261
---------------------------	-----

THE *GERUSIA* OF ISTROS REVISITED

VALENTIN BOTTEZ*

Keywords: Istros, Black Sea, *gerusia*, imperial cult, Greek institutions

Abstract: The present paper focuses on the *gerusia* attested in Istros by three inscriptions. Our analysis covers the structure and role of the institution (with a special mention of its connection with the imperial cult), including the significance of the list of benefactors itself. We also approached the issue of its chronology and its relation to the second foundation of the city.

Cuvinte-cheie: Istros, Marea Neagră, *gerusia*, cult imperial, instituții grecești

Rezumat: Articolul de față tratează subiectul *gerusiei* atestată la Istros de trei inscripții. Analiza noastră se referă la structura și rolul instituției (cu o mențiune specială referitoare la legătura ei cu cultul imperial), inclusiv semnificația în sine a listei de binefăcători. De asemenea, am abordat problema cronologiei și a legăturii cu cea de a doua întemeiere a cetății.

The present paper deals with an important issue related to the public life in the Greek city of Istros (Moesia Inferior) in Roman times, namely its *gerusia*. Many contributions by different authors have analysed this topic from an epigraphic, historical and archaeological perspective and especially through its connection with the city's second foundation. Given the complicated situation of the analysis of the *gerusia* in Istros, in the following pages we are going to present the monuments connected to the Istrian *gerusia*, the general historical context of Istros in the Roman province, the state of the research on the above-mentioned inscriptions, followed by our own analysis (including the connection with the imperial cult). As the monuments concerning this institution are dated to the 1st and 2nd century AD, our analysis will focus solely on that specific period.

MONUMENTS CONCERNING THE *GERUSIA* IN ISTROS¹

1. Marble stele with pediment (3.80 × 0.87 × 0.25/0.32 m), discovered in 1916 in the main gate of the Late Roman defence wall. The drawing was published by the first editor, and was later modified by D.M. Pippidi (fig. 1), as the stone was damaged and parts of the initial text have disappeared. Pârvan 1916, p. 596, no. 20 (= SEG I, 330); ISM I, 193; Mihailov 1984, p. 87; Musielak 1993a, p. 100-105; Avram, Marcu 1999, p. 76; Avram 2007, no. 193; Bottez 2009, cat. no. 125; Maurer 2014, *passim*. Date: AD 138.

Ἀγαθῆ τύχη.

Ἦπερ τῆς τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος Τραιανοῦ
Ἄδριανοῦ καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Τίτου Αἰλίου Καί-
σαρος Ἀντωνεῖνου υἰείας καὶ σωτηρίας
καὶ τοῦ σύνπαντος οἴκου αὐτῶν αἰδίου δια-

5

* Faculty of History, University of Bucharest; e-mail: valentin.bottez@istorie.unibuc.ro.

¹ Due to the dimensions of the first two texts, we chose to present here only the fragments that we will use in our analysis.

- μονῆς καὶ νείκης αὐτῶν.
 Γερουσίας φιλότειμοι οἱ μετὰ τὴν δευτέραν κτίσιν·
 Καλλίστρατος Δημητρίου, συναγωγεὺς,
 Ἀρτεμίδωρος Εὐξενίδου, συναγωγεὺς,
 10 Ἡρόδωρος Διονυσίου, συναγωγεὺς.

col. I

-
 15 Ἀριστό[λ]αιος Θεοφίλου

 23 Διονύσιος Ἡρο[δῶρο]υ

 31 Φλάουιος Μεν[ίσκος]

 36 [Φλάουιος] Εὐ[ξέν]ιδης
 Ἰπλόλοχος [Εὐξέν]ιδου]
 38 Μ(ἄρκος) · Οὐλλπιος Δημήτριος υἱ[ὸς
 Ἀρτεμῆ]

 40 Κάρπος Ἀρτεμίδωρου
 76 Μ(ἄρκος) Οὐλλπ[ιος] Ἀρτεμίδωρος
 Εὐξενίδου

col. II

- Ἔδοξε γερουσιασταῖς τοῖς πε-
 [ρι Ἀρ]τεμίδωρον Ἡροδῶρου·
 [ἐπ]εὶ ὁ συναγωγεὺς ἡμῶν Ἀρτεμί-
 [δ]ωρος Ἡ[ρο]δῶρου πολλάκι καὶ
 τάχει-
 5 ὄν εὐεργετήσας τὴν γερουσίαν καὶ
 φυλάξας τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων ἡμῶν
 πίστιν καὶ τὰ νῦν ὑπὲρ τε ἑαυτοῦ καὶ
 τοῦ υἱοῦ Κάρπου ἐπιδίδωσι εἰς ῥο-
 δισμὸν δηνάρια χειλία, δεδόχθαι
 10 τὴν ἡμέραν ἄγεσθαι κατ' ἔτος ἐκ τῶν
 τόκων καὶ στεφανωθῆναι αὐτοὺς
 ἐν τῷ ῥοδισμῷ ἀναγορευόντος
 τοῦ κήρυκος· οἱ γερουσιασταὶ στεφα-
 νοῦσιν Ἀρτεμίδωρον Ἡροδῶρου,
 15 τὸν συναγωγέα καὶ εὐεργέτην
 καὶ φιλότειμον, καὶ Κάρπον Ἀρ-
 τεμίδωρου, τὸν φιλότειμον
 καὶ εὐεργέτην, εὐνοίας χάριν.
 Στεφανωθῆναι δὲ καὶ τὸν συν-
 20 αγωγέα ἡμῶν Ἀρτεμίδωρον
 Ἡροδῶρου μετὰ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ
 τοὺς αὐτοκράτορας καὶ ἀνα-
 γραφῆναι τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς τελα-
 μῶνα.

2. Fragmentary marble stele (0.97 × 0.45 × 0.05 m) with pediment containing the image of the Mother of Gods enthroned, discovered in 1952 in the *Domus* Sector (*Domus I*). Height of letters: 0.01 m. Popescu 1960, p. 273-290 (= SEG XXIV, 1112; XXV, 793); BÉ 1956, no. 189, p. 144-145; BÉ 1958, no. 336, p. 282; BÉ 1962, no. 239, p. 190-191; ISM I, 57; Avram 2007, no. 57; Bottez 2009, cat. no. 112. Date: second half of the 2nd century AD.

- 1 Ἀγαθῆι τύχηι.
 Ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ Οὐλλπιος Δημή-
 τριος εἶπεν, ἐπισηφιζομένου Διογένους Θεο-
 δῶρου ἐπειδὴ Ἄβα Ἐκαταίου τοῦ Εὐξενίδου
 5 θυγάτηρ γυνὴ δὲ Ἡράκοντος Ἀριστομάχου

 22 μήσασθαι σπουδάσασα· πρῶτον μὲν εὐθὺς τὰς πρώτας
 προσόδους καὶ θυσίας καὶ εὐχὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ποιου-
 μένη τὴν τοῦ ἔτους ἀρχὴν μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ εὐ-
 25 ωχίας μεγαλοπρεποῦς ἐποιήσατο τοῖς μὲν γὰρ
 βουλευταῖς πᾶσιν καὶ γερουσιασταῖς καὶ Ταυ-
 ριασταῖς καὶ ἱατροῖς καὶ παιδευταῖς καὶ τοῖς ἰδίᾳ

καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος καλουμένοις ἐκ δύο κατ' ἄνδρα
 δηναρ[ί]ων διανο[μ]ήν, ἦν οὐπω τις ἄλλη πρότερον,

3. Marble sarcophagus discovered in 1957 in Noviodunum (modern Isaccea). Inscription in a *tabula ansata*. Bujor, Simion 1960; Popescu 1970a, p. 323-326, no. 26; Popescu 1970b; BÉ 1971, no. 444, 466; ISM V, 280 = ISM I, 275; Mihailov 1984, p. 88; Mihailov, SEG 28, no. 611; Avram 2007, no. 275; Bottez 2009, cat. no. 131. Date: 2nd century AD.

Θ(εοῖς) καταχθονίοις)
 Ἀλεσάνδρα
 Ἀλεσάνδρω Ἡ-
 ρακλέωνος, τ-
 5 ᾧ πατρὶ Νεικαῖ

γερουσιαστῆ,
 τὴν σορὸν ἔθ-
 ηκε. Χέρε.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN GREEK CITIES AND ROME IN THE AREA

Istros, an Archaic Milesian colony on the western shore of the Black Sea, entered – along with the other Greek cities on the Western Black Sea shore – the Roman sphere of influence in the second half of the 1st century BC². The 1st century BC was a tumultuous one for Istros, as the Greek cities on the western Black Sea shore were involved in the war between King Mithridates VI and Rome³, then were subjected to the rule of the Getian King Burebista and were finally caught in the Roman civil conflict, as they came first under the rule of Marcus Antonius and then under that of his victor, Octavianus. At a certain moment during the 1st century AD they might have been organized in an administrative unit called by scholars the *praefectura orae maritimae*, which is not clearly attested by sources though, or perhaps in a *praefectura ciuitatum*⁴. Later on, all these cities became part of province Moesia⁵ and then of Moesia Inferior during the reign of Domitian. Finally, Trajan⁶ reorganized the entire region in the context of the Dacian wars, when he also founded Nicopolis ad Istrum to celebrate his victory⁷.

As far as the status of Istros is concerned⁸, following the discovery of a remarkable new inscription⁹, we now know with a high degree of certitude that at the beginning of the Roman domination, Istros was a *ciuitas libera et immuna*. The Roman garrisons attested in the city during the reigns of Marcus Aurelius and Septimius Severus¹⁰, as well as the fact that throughout the second half of the 1st century AD the Istrians

² In 29 BC, after Crassus' campaigns, according to Suceveanu, Barnea 1991, p. 25, or more likely after the campaign of P. Vinicius in 3/2 BC, according to Avram 1998b.

³ Avram, Bounegru 1997 brings new information resulting from the spectacular discovery of two new fragments of an already published decree; after the war, in 62-61 BC, the cities revolted against the abuses of Antonius Hybrida, the governor of Macedonia. For the domination of Burebista, see Daicoviciu 1972, p. 71-76.

⁴ ISM III, p. 55 and bibliography; Matei-Popescu 2013, p. 204; Matei-Popescu 2014, p. 463.

⁵ During the reign of Claudius (AD 46), when *ripa Thraciae* was annexed to Moesia, ISM III, p. 54-60; Avram 1998a, p. 307; or, less likely, during that of Vespasian, when the presence of military units along the Danube suggests a *post quem* date for the annexation of all territories up to the seashore, Suceveanu 1971, p. 118-120.

⁶ For Trajan's policy in the Lower Danube area, see Petolescu 2007, p. 84-91.

⁷ The city became part of Moesia Inferior only from the reign of Septimius Severus onwards though.

⁸ Matei-Popescu 2013 with bibliography. An upcoming article by Alexandru Avram in the volume dedicated to Jan Bouzek treats the entire problem of the status of the Greek cities on the western Black Sea shore during the age of Augustus and considers that Istros received the status of *ciuitas libera et immuna* during his reign. I would like to thank Alexandru Avram for providing me the unpublished text of this article as well as several others I used in this paper.

⁹ Bărbulescu, Buzoianu 2014; Avram 2015-2016, no. 17, p. 433-434; Jones 2016; Kantor 2017.

¹⁰ Suceveanu 1977, p. 234.

had to ask Roman governors for the reconfirmation of their territory and privileges over and over again (ISM I, 67 and 68)¹¹, indicate that, in time, this status could have been modified or that its privileges were not respected by the Romans. Imperial interest in this community – as well as in other cities in the area – is obvious, as they in fact constituted, until the beginning of the 2nd century AD, the only cities in the area to have old trade relations and to be capable of supplying with merchandise and maybe coin in a predominantly military area. From this perspective the implementation of the imperial cult in order to secure the locals' loyalty was definitely desirable and we can suppose that Roman authorities at least supported, if not even encouraged this phenomenon.

It is not surprising therefore that a *gerusia* existed at Istros, another was founded in Kallatis, and later on a third one is attested at Nicopolis ad Istrum¹², as they were necessary in the context of an active public life and, given the development of the imperial cult, of a renewed religious life.

STATE OF THE RESEARCH

The first scholar to approach the issue of the Istrian *gerusia* was V. Pârvan¹³. Concerning its foundation date, the Romanian historian considered the inscription he discovered (ISM I, 193, which he dated to AD 138 based on the mention of future emperor Antoninus Pius as associated to imperial power) to be the member list of a **second** *gerusia*, the first one having been disbanded because of unfavourable circumstances. V. Pârvan dates the foundation of the first¹⁴, as well as that of the second institution to the reign of Emperor Hadrian and connects the former to the emperor's visit in AD 124. As far as the presidents of the *gerusia* are concerned, Pârvan considered that the institution was ruled by a council of *συναγωγεῖς*, one of which acted as president for a certain period of time – in this case Artemidoros. He considered the *gerusia* a kind of private and autonomous council that dealt with every public aspect not directly connected to politics and administration (education, religion, feasts, processions, public representations, benefactions, imperial cult, etc.).

D.M. Pippidi was the first to notice that the list of the *gerusia* refers in fact to the city's, not the *gerusia*'s second foundation¹⁵ and connected this important event to the support Augustus offered the Greek cities on the western shore of the Black Sea after the destructions caused by King Burebista. He also connected the list of the *gerusia* from AD 138 with another *album*, that of the Boreis tribe (ISM I, 191), set up after the city's second foundation, which Pippidi dated to the end of the 1st century BC - beginning of the 1st century AD based on palaeographic and historical arguments, among which the presence of Greek names only. The assembly's attributions were to organize imperial cult festivities during which statues of the gods and emperors were crowned (*dies imperii*, *natalis Caesaris* and others)¹⁶. During the celebrations, imperial busts – not statues – were carried in processions as objects of the highest religious importance. Also, from a structural point of view, the main positions in the *gerusia* were controlled by a small number of local aristocratic families (such a family is that of Artemidoros, son of Herodoros)¹⁷ which thus increased their prestige from generation to generation¹⁸.

¹¹ Suceveanu, Barnea 1991, p. 27.

¹² ISM III, 31 in Kallatis; IGB II, 692 and IGB V, 5217 in Nicopolis ad Istrum. We have to list here a Mesambrian inscription (IGB I², 348; 1st-3rd centuries AD), which could mention a [γερουσι]αστής, the Roman citizen Aurelius Iulius Is[---]. But, as we are dealing with a restoration and as there is no other mention of a *gerusia* at Mesambria, for now we are not convinced of the existence of such an institution in this *polis*.

¹³ Pârvan 1916, p. 596-611.

¹⁴ The mention of the first foundation in a document dated during the second *gerusia* would not have made sense unless the two events were close in time.

¹⁵ Pippidi 1967, p. 545-546.

¹⁶ Pippidi 1967, p. 329-337.

¹⁷ Whom he identified with M. Ulpius Artemidoros (ISM I, 137, 207 and 208) in another paper; Pippidi 1967, p. 394-397. As Musielak 1993b shows, Artemidoros, son of Herodoros, would have surely used its full Roman name in ISM I, 193, as others did. The M. Ulpius Artemidoros in the inscriptions mentioned above is probably the same with M. Ulpius Artemidoros, son of Euxenides, from col. I, l. 76 of ISM I, 193.

¹⁸ Pippidi 1967, p. 386-400.

J.A. van Rossum¹⁹, the first scholar to undertake a general analysis of this type of institution after Oliver²⁰, saw the *album* of Istros as a periodic update of a list of persons with a certain role in connection to the *gerusia*, as the text was clearly inscribed by several hands. He presented two explanations for the list: it either mentioned members of the *gerusia* that were declared public benefactors by the city council, or members of the *gerusia* in general – and he considers the second possibility more plausible (even if it is not necessarily mandatory – “Ook is het niet dwingend aan te nemen dat al deze personen lid waren van de *gerousia*”), as some could be just well-doers. After identifying 14 *gerusiasts* from both columns with notables mentioned in another Istrian *album* dated between AD 140-160, he concludes this group lived in the first half of the 2nd century AD, which undermines the theory that the second foundation of the city and creation of the *gerusia* occurred during the reign of Augustus²¹. It also contradicts a chronological organization of the names in the inscription. The mention of the three persons bearing the title *συναγωγεὺς* at the beginning of the list would indicate a hierarchical order of the names, but this interpretation has one shortcoming though: the fourth *συναγωγεὺς*, Artemidoros, son of Herodoros, in office at the moment the inscription was set up (and mentioned in col. II, l. 14), is also mentioned in column I only at l. 34 of the list, which is illogical.

Maria Musielak²² resumed the analysis of the inscription containing the list of the Istrian *gerusia* and, based on palaeographic arguments, divided the text into two sections, written by different persons. The first section (A) contains a preamble (l. 1-7), dated to AD 138, the left column (I) down to l. 101 inclusively, and the decree of the *gerusia* during the presidency of Artemidoros, son of Herodoros (col. II, l. 11-34). Section B contains the texts added later: l. 102-108 of column I (7 names) and column II (from l. 35 onwards: 56 names).

The Polish epigraphist showed that Artemidoros, son of Herodoros, *synagogeus* at the moment the decree was passed, also appears on l. 34 as the 27th name²³. Therefore the 94 persons in this section represent the members ordered chronologically between the foundation date and the year 138, when the Artemidoros in col. I, l. 34 became president and was mentioned as such. Another issue is that in the first group all the 23 names are Greek, except for the presence of two Flavii (col. I, l. 31 and 36); also, president Kallistratos, son of Demetrios (l. 8), is identified with one of the Istrian ambassadors that were part of a diplomatic mission to governor Ti. Plautius Aelianus in AD 60-67²⁴ (ISM I, 67 and 68, l. 41-42). Therefore, the foundation of the Istrian *gerusia* should be dated somewhere around the middle of the 1st century AD, its *terminus ante quem* being the Moesian legation of Ti. Plautius Aelianus.

A fundamental result of Musielak's analysis of the list of the *gerusia* is the family tree for two Istrian dynasties of notables, namely those of Euxenides and that of Dionysios, which apparently stretched for four and five generations respectively²⁵.

A. Avram, accepting part of Maria Musielak's theory, analysed in parallel the information concerning both the Istrian *gerusia* and that in Kallatis²⁶. He connected (based on palaeographic and onomastic arguments, as well as on the significance of the letters of the Roman governors in ISM I, 67 and 68) their creation and that of the Western Black Sea *koinon* to the annexation of the *ripa Thraciae* to the province Moesia by Emperor Claudius in AD 46. The second foundation of Istros is in turn connected to that of Kallatis and dated to the reign of Augustus. A. Avram relates the *album* of the Boreis tribe of Istros (ISM I, 191) to section A of the *gerusia* of AD 138 based on onomastic and prosopographic grounds. And since these names were attributed by Maria Musielak to the period after the integration of the Greek cities in the area into the province Moesia, the author established AD 46 as a *terminus ante quem* for the *album* of the Boreis tribe. Regarding the attributions of a *gerusia*, A. Avram mentioned that these institutions were in charge of the celebration of the imperial cult, which meant organizing festivities and religious ceremonies; the assembly of the high priests,

¹⁹ van Rossum 1988, p. 118-121.

²⁰ Oliver 1941.

²¹ As does Pippidi 1967, p. 534-546, based on the list of members of the Boreis tribe, ISM I, 191, dated by him to the reign of Augustus.

²² Musielak 1993a.

²³ Musielak 1993a, p. 101. This hypothesis implies that the president in office is mentioned again, among the simple members; in the same logic the other three presidents should also appear in the list of simple members, which is not the case. In our opinion therefore the two Artemidoros are two different persons.

²⁴ Musielak 1993a, p. 102.

²⁵ Musielak 1993a, p. 113-114.

²⁶ ISM III, p. 61-65 and Avram 1998a, p. 307.

mentioned by the Kallatian inscription, was also part of the imperial cult activities in the Megarian colony, which were organized either by the *gerusia* or by the Western Black Sea *koinon*.

A. Suceveanu²⁷ re-opened the dossier of the second foundation of Istros and that of its *gerusia*, asserting that the purely Greek onomastic structure in the decree of the Boreis tribe after the city's second foundation (ISM I, 191) can be justified by the fact that the people responsible for setting up the monument were part of a traditional Greek tribe and that the Roman citizens had their own tribe. Therefore, the absence of Roman names is normal and the scholar contests the early chronology of this document based solely on palaeographic arguments. Also – based on historical logic – he opposes the theory according to which the second foundation of Istros took place during the reign of Augustus, as this would have meant that the *gerusia* defined its identity in the year AD 138 function of an event that had taken place almost 150 before²⁸. Against the idea that Augustus was the founder or re-founder *par excellence* and therefore that he must have been responsible for Istros' second foundation (Pippidi), A. Suceveanu mentions the case of Emperor Tiberius as the founder of the new defence wall of Odessos, the fact that Tyras started a new calendar in AD 56/7 and that in Apollonia Pontica there was an unknown person who re-founded the city after the destruction caused by the Costoboci. These arguments prove, according to Suceveanu, that there were several motives and moments for re-founding a city. After raising the problem of a possible presidential college that headed the *gerusia*, A. Suceveanu rejects the identification of its president Kallistratos, son of Demetrios, with the ambassador mentioned in the Istrian *horothesia* (ISM I, 67 and 68) in AD 60-67, since that person would have been around 100 years old in AD 138. Finally, he presents all the archaeological arguments (the construction of a new defence wall and of a second complex of baths, as well as a second phase to the first complex of baths) that indicate the major changes Istros underwent during the age of Hadrian, to which he dates both the city's second foundation, as well as that of the *gerusia* – the latter being an event he connects to the emperor's philhellene policy.

In the latest monograph on the *gerusia*, N. Giannakopoulos mentions the involvement of the Istrian *gerusia* in the celebration of the *Rosalia* and places this situation in the larger context of its role as guardian of the memory of the deceased and especially of that of the former and present members. Also, concerning the crowning of the statues of gods and emperors, N. Giannakopoulos mentions that these statues must have been those inside the compound of their own *synedrion*²⁹.

In his article on the legal status of Istros during the Roman period³⁰, F. Matei-Popescu also approaches the issue of the Istrian *gerusia* and connects it with that of the second foundation, considering that the list of benefactors of the *gerusia* could refer to the second foundation of the institution, and not of the city, which was Pârvan's initial theory.

L. Ruscu³¹ dedicated part of a recent article to the social aspect of the *gerusia*, analysing especially the role it played in the promotion of the wealthy elite in the local public life.

ANALYSIS OF THE MONUMENTS CONNECTED TO THE ISTRIAN *GERUSIA*

The first – chronologically – and most important monument connected the Istrian *gerusia* is the inscription that caused so many controversies, namely the list of the *gerusia* during the reign of Emperor Hadrian (ISM I, 193; AD 138). A second document is the already-mentioned decree honouring Aba (ISM I, 57; AD 150-200), daughter of Hekataios, which mentions the donations made to the members of the *gerusia* among others. The third and last document concerning the Istrian *gerusia* is the funerary stele of a gerusiast – Alexandros, son of Herakleon – set up by his daughter, Alexandra (ISM I, 275 = ISM V, 280; 2nd century AD). There is no further information concerning his career in the Istrian inscriptions and it is not even sure that this inscription comes from Istros. A Herakleon, son of Tertius, appears only in one inscription from the Roman period in Istros, namely on the list of the *gerusia* from AD 138 (col. I, l. 53); if this was indeed Alexandros' father, the son could have continued in his father's footsteps by also being admitted into the *gerusia*.

²⁷ Suceveanu 2004.

²⁸ Same argument by Pârvan 1916, p. 602, but in connection with the first *gerusia*.

²⁹ Giannakopoulos 2008, p. 310-312, 457-458, 582 and 590-591.

³⁰ Matei-Popescu 2013, p. 209-212.

³¹ Ruscu 2014, p. 480-483.

The honorary decree for Aba and the funerary stele for Alexandros are secondary sources for our topic. The only monument generated by the *gerusia* itself is the list from AD 138 (ISM I, 193). The monument in itself is highly interesting: it stands 3.80 m tall, by far the largest epigraphic monument discovered at Istros until now. Even when fixed into the ground, it measured over 3 m. It is logical therefore then to see it as a strong statement of the issuing institution, which thereby wanted to publicly promote its actions and, above all, its members.

The text³² is, as it has already been established, divided into two sections: section A (made up of the preamble, col. I from l. 11 to 101 and the honorary decree on col. II, l. 1-24) and B (col. II, l. 102-108 and col. II, l. 25-80). While section A was clearly written at the same moment (the size and shape of the letters confirm that it was written by the same person), namely in AD 138, section B was added on the stone at a later date.

But the latter clearly presents significant differences between the different lines. The segment on col. I, l. 102-108 (fig. 2, segment k), seems to have been written by the same person at the same time, as suggested by the size and form of the letters. The next segment of section B, on col. II, l. 25-38, contains 14 names (fig. 2, segments a, b and c), followed by an empty space (3 cm); the names seem to have been written by several hands, as proven by the different sizes of the lines (the names on l. 25 and 33 are double in size compared to some of the others) and the shapes of the letters Α, Ω, Υ, and Σ. Only l. 35-38 look similar and could have been written at the same time. Therefore, we identify at least 11 moments (fig. 2) when this segment of the list of names was updated.

L. 39-43 (fig. 2, segment d) were written at a distance of approximately 3 cm from one another, and could have been written by two hands at two different moments, as is suggested by the different shape of the letter Ο. L. 44 could also belong to this group.

The next clear segment contains l. 44/45-53 (fig. 2, segment e) and is followed by a blank space of 3.5 cm. Again, we have significant size and shape differences between the letters (especially for the letters Ω, Υ, Σ, and Ο), which suggest that each name was written by a different hand at 10 different moments.

L. 54-57 (fig. 2, segment f), separated from l. 58-67 (fig. 2, segment g) by a 3 cm blank space, seem to have been written by the same hand at the same moment, even though there are slight differences (slightly different shapes of the letters Ω and Υ).

The following segment (l. 68-73) also seems to have one author that wrote all the names at the same moment (fig. 2, segment i). It is separated from the last segment by a 2.5 cm blank space.

The final segment (l. 74-80) seems to have been written by the same hand, but at two separate moments, as the first name in the list is written at a perfectly horizontal position, while the other 6 names are written at a descending angle, due probably to the difficulty of adding new names to a stele that was still standing (fig. 2, segment j).

First question that arises is what was the purpose of the inscription? It is clearly a list – but of what exactly? Is it a list of members, like most scholars assumed in general, or is it a list of benefactors of the *gerusia* (not necessarily members), as van Rossum supposed?

The introductory l. 7 states clearly that the following names are those of the φιλότιμοι, and the topic of the formula indicates that the benefactors were all members. Another argument for this theory is the fact that the *gerusia* was a private institution, whose only condition for admission was to pay a certain entrance fee, and once a member one had to continue financing its activities. In return one received visible recognition of one's merits which translated into public prestige. It is therefore unlikely that no distinction was made between full- and would-be members. Therefore, we consider that all the people mentioned in the inscription were members.

But were they all simple members? Terms related to that of φιλότιμος are present in the inscriptions of Istros. Around 200 BC a decree was set up to honour a person that proved himself benevolent and full of zeal (Avram 2007, no. 4, l.11: ἐκτενῆ καὶ φιλότιμον). In l. 2 of a very fragmentary 2nd century BC inscription we read [τ]ὴν φιλοτιμία[v] (ISM I, 29, l. 2). Another contemporary decree honours a person that proved himself consistently munificent (... ὁμῶς [δὲ θέλων ἀκόλου]θος φαίνεσθαι τῆι ἐξ ἀρχῆς φιλοτιμίαι ...) towards the νέοι (ISM I, 59, l. 7-9 and 15-16). Also, l. 7 of the the above-mentioned decree for Aba (ISM I, 57) mentions that the priestess never avoided φιλοτιμίαν ἢ λειτουργίαν (which are later described in the text and for which she received the highest honour – the crown). The expression φιλοτιμότερος γενέσθαι, “achieving glory”, is

³² For illustrating the inscription, we chose the initial drawing by D. Pecurariu, published in *Histria IV*, modified by Pippidi for ISM I following the damage caused to the inscription by its transport to the museum of Istros.

also used in ISM I, 1, l. 22 (mid-3rd century BC), ISM I, 19, l. 24 (3rd century BC) and ISM I, 21, l. 10 (3rd-2nd century BC). A φιλότιμος is mentioned among priests in a catalogue from the 2nd century AD (ISM I, 195, l. 9), two others are mentioned in a list (ISM I, 223; 3rd century AD) before a gymnasiarch, while the last two attested (ISM I, 223; 3rd century AD) are mentioned after the priest of an association and before the simple members. Even though the φιλοτιμία is a complicated matter and it represented different things at different times, the examples presented above convey the idea that the φιλοτιμία was seen at Istros as representing an extraordinary level of prestige achieved following a special public munificence and translated usually the crowning of the honoured individual.

Returning to the issue of the list – the fact remains that two different terms are used in the same inscription when describing the members: φιλότιμοι (l. 7, Col. II l. 16) and γερουσιασταί (Col. II l. 1 and 13). Also, we must not forget that Alexandros, son of Herakleon (ISM I, 275) is also called *gerusiast* in his epitaph, and not *philotimos*. We therefore believe that the former clearly indicates the simple membership in the institution, while the latter describes a member that offered a special benefaction³³.

This explains why the φιλότιμοι in Section B were added gradually, in the beginning even one at a time. It is difficult to estimate how many of them existed each year (maybe as little as one or two, given the special character of their benefaction), but what seems to be clear is that even if at the beginning each benefactor name was inscribed immediately – which resulted in important differences in size and letter shape between the lines –, later on several names were written at the same time and by the same lapicide. So, column II of Section B seems to cover significant time span, maybe even several decades. This implies that Section A also covers a long-time range, as it is highly unlikely to have such a large number of special benefactors at one moment. This concurs with the mention of four, even five generations of benefactors from the same family identified by M. Musielak in the list.

Among the φιλότιμοι there are also four συναγωγεῖς: Kallistratos, son of Demetrios, Artemidoros, son of Euxenides, Herodoros, son of Dionysios, followed in the decree by Artemidoros, son of Herodoros (probably the son of the 3rd president). The term συναγωγεὺς is unique in the terminology of the *gerusia* in the Greek world. Other terms used for presidents of the institution are γερουσιάρχης³⁴, ἀρχιγερουσιαστής³⁵, ἄρχων³⁶ or even γυμνασίαρχος³⁷, which emphasize the prominent character of this position, while the Istrian inscription uses a term that makes reference to the president's role as the convener of a σύστημα.

Another issue concerning the presidents is why four of them are mentioned in the same list. Either the *gerusia* was governed by a council of συναγωγεῖς (as V. Pârvan and A. Suceveanu suppose – but there is no analogy for such a situation) or these are all the presidents that became φιλότιμοι since the *gerusia* was founded (as M. Musielak supposes). This second theory is more likely, but why then is not the founder of the *gerusia* / first gerusiarch mentioned as such, as it is in Kallatis (ISM III, 31: [καταστ]άσαντα τὰν γερουσίαν)? This could be explained by the fact that the inscription's purpose is only to mention the φιλότιμοι, or maybe – as we are going to see – the list mentions just benefactors after the second foundation, and not previous ones. Nevertheless, this brings us to another problem: since we only have four presidents mentioned, how long was their term in office?

IG V, 1. 32 and 34 from Lakonike mention two persons that became gerusiasts a second time (γερουσίας τὸ β), 3-4 years after their first appointment. Therefore, even if there must have existed meetings at least once a year to discuss general problems, admittance to the assembly was possible only once every several years.

But it is not clear if this was also the case for the presidents. Section A starts the list with the mention of the three former presidents. Section B though contains no mention of a συναγωγεὺς. Even if we consider that each segment of Section B was written in a different year (which is highly unlikely as this would mean there existed years with over 10 *philotimoi*), it would still mean that for over eight years no new president of the *gerusia* was appointed. We therefore conclude that the office of συναγωγεὺς was probably bestowed for life.

³³ Another term for benefactor, used in connection with president Artemidoros, is εὐεργέτης (col. II, l. 15), which yet again suggests a superior level of benefaction.

³⁴ Oliver 1941, nos. 56 and 57 in Thessalonica; ISM III, 31 in Kallatis; IGB V, 5217 in Nicopolis ad Istrum; IGB IV, 1906 in Serdica and IGLSyr 4, 1319 in Apamea.

³⁵ Prusias ad Hypium – I. Prusias von Hypium, 25.

³⁶ Oliver 1941, no. 24.

³⁷ Sidyma (TAM II, 175); Myra (IGR II, 714); Kos (Iscr. di Cos EV, 216); Ephesus (SEG XLIII/1993, 764-765); Miletus (I. Didyma, 264, 269-271 and 286-287). The use of this term for the president of the *gerusia* clearly indicates a very important connection in those cities between the *gerusia* and the gymnasium – Giannakopoulos 2008, p. 57-73. For the use of the term γυμνασίαρχος τῆς γερουσίας also Zimmermann 2007.

This supports the theory that the inscription contains the list of benefactors over a long period of time, which also explains the presence in Section A of two persons attested by texts at a much earlier date: president Kallistratos, son of Demetrios (l. 8 and ISM I, 67 and 68, l. 38) – as already indicated by Musielak –, as well as Aristolaïos, son of Theophilus (in col. I, l. 15), to be found in the sensibly earlier catalogue of the Boreis tribe (ISM I, 191 B 20).

The *gerusia* had a very high public profile, which explains easily why all the benefactors would be made known to the public through such a monumental inscription³⁸. But why would one go through all the trouble of listing past benefactors, a lot of which were undoubtedly dead at the moment the monument was set up? The answer could lie in a detail of the text, namely in the honorary decree: col. II l. 6-7 mention the fact that, before the presidency, Artemidoros, son of Herodoros held the office of γραμματεύς. The effort of compiling the list of *philotimoi* could therefore represent the pinnacle of his activity as a secretary in charge of the archive. Also, we must not forget that, as stressed by Giannakopoulos, this type of institution played an important role as guardian of memory, which would very well explain the mention of former members.

Then again there is the question why the institution's archive was brought to date at that precise moment. This effort seems to fit very well in the local general context of the reign of Hadrian. The local public life clearly became more intense, as can be seen in the decree for Aba, daughter of Hekataios (ISM I, 57), priestess of the Mother of Gods, and later on high priestess of the imperial cult³⁹; for all her outstanding public activities she was awarded a gold crown, which represented the highest honour for a priestess⁴⁰.

Important public construction works are also attested. The inscriptions inform us on several public buildings⁴¹ (some dedicated to the emperors) built or repaired by local authorities. A new defensive wall was also built during Hadrian's reign and repaired around AD 170-180⁴²; this was a monument which reorganized the city's entire urban layout and was definitely one of its most important defining topographic elements. Another important addition was a second bath complex in the vicinity of the new defensive wall; after its construction, in the first decades of the century, this area of the site (previously at least partly uninhabited, as the baths were built directly on a layer of sand) was turned into a fully functional urban district. In the meantime, the old bath complex was repaired⁴³ and new public buildings were raised (sometimes inside older complexes)⁴⁴ in what it seems became the new, or at least renewed official district and in which public buildings continued to be raised up to the Late Roman period.

Finally, the Istrian mint⁴⁵, which had stopped its activity at the middle of the 1st century BC, resumed a low level of activity during the reign of Augustus (one coin type)⁴⁶, but stopped emitting up to the reign

³⁸ Another list of members from the reign of Commodus was discovered at Sidyma (TAM II, 176). But the context of that inscription is different, as it represents the list of the first *gerusia*, discovered along with the decree mentioning the election of the *gerusia*'s first gymnasiarch.

³⁹ Only one other high priestess of the imperial cult is attested; Suceveanu 2007, p. 149, no. 6, pl. 61.6. Actually, Aba's name and patronym could very well fit in the space where the priestess' name was mentioned in this second document, but unless certain proof is discovered, this will remain only a remote possibility.

⁴⁰ Connelly 2007, p. 204-205. For the significance of Aba's positions in the history of women and Greek civic life, see van Bremen 1996, especially the Introduction and Conclusions.

⁴¹ ISM I, 147 and 148. There is also a dedication by Emperor Trajan on what seems to be an element of a public monument, discovered in 2011 and which will be published by the author in Dacia.

⁴² Florescu, Cantacuzino 1954, p. 285-293.

⁴³ Suceveanu 1982, p. 19-21.

⁴⁴ Damian, Bâltac 2003-2005, p. 143-144. In this area, located at the foot of the so-called *acropolis*, there is a crossroads around which no less than 3 civilian basilicas were built, one dated to the Severan period and two to the 4th-6th centuries AD (although Rizos 2013, p. 673-674, n. 45-46 considers that the Severan structure is in fact a *horreum* – I would like to thank Irina Achim for suggesting this perspective). Given the fact that the three basilicas, as well as other large (official?) buildings were all raised on the street that led to the first bath complex, the entire area could have played the role of an official district between the 2nd-6th centuries.

⁴⁵ Varbanov 2005, nos. 593-694.

⁴⁶ RPC Suppl. I, no. S-1841A; the reverse type is a sign of civic pride and autonomy, as it depicts the traditional Istrian motif of the sea-eagle attacking the dolphin; the obverse, on the other hand, conveys the acceptance of Roman domination, as it bears – according to the editors of RPC – the laureate portrait of Augustus and the legend [...]JOY KAISAPOΣ [...]. Also, see forthcoming article by V. Bottez and G. Talmaçhi in the proceedings of the 6th International Black Sea Congress (Constanța 2017) for the coin minted by Istros during the reign of Augustus.

of Hadrian (one coin type), when it slowly resumed its activity. As we very well know, a local mint was an important element in the construction of a city's public standing and identity⁴⁷.

THE *GERUSIA* AND THE IMPERIAL CULT

Another important factor in the local public life during the reign of Hadrian was the imperial cult. The implementation of Roman rule in the Empire's Greek East brought a series of changes in the local public life, the most obvious of which was precisely the introduction of the Roman imperial cult,⁴⁸ a religious phenomenon that impregnated almost every one of its aspects and did so at all social levels. The emperor's religion did not aim to radically change the religious life of the Greek communities, but only to obtain a high-profile position by associating itself with the latter's most prestigious manifestations in order to ensure the loyalty of Greeks in the provinces. Or, in M. Sartre's words⁴⁹,

...faire taire, dans la commune louange de Rome et de sa majesté impériale, les querelles minuscules et éternelles qui les opposaient.

This process was not a violent one, as it supposed a continuous ritual exchange between the communities that were usually the first to decide the establishment of divine honours for the emperor and the latter, who in turn bestowed benefactions and privileges on the Greek cities⁵⁰. This involvement resulted in a flourishing development of the public life in Greek *poleis*, which in turn led to the creation or revivals of a series of institutions responsible for this aspect. One of the most successful among such institutions was the *gerusia*, the ancient Greek institution re-created with the approval of Roman authorities with the precise objective of concentrating local Greek tensions in a competition aimed at proving the subjects' fidelity to Rome⁵¹.

In Istros, the first imperial temple⁵² and statue were dedicated to Augustus during his lifetime by Papas, son of Theopompos (ISM I, 146). Even though Istros was not yet part of a Roman province, this is not surprising, as there are several examples of imperial cults in areas outside the Roman provinces, such as those founded by King Juba II of Mauretania or King Herod of Judea⁵³. But one does not need to look that far: at Kallatis and Tomis imperial cults were dedicated to Augustus. Unlike Istros, in Kallatis it was the People that dedicated the place of worship⁵⁴, making it an official initiative. In Tomis the situation is much more complicated, as the information concerning the beginning of the imperial cult is given by Ovid⁵⁵. If indeed the information provided by Ovid is true, then he conducted games dedicated to the birthday of Augustus⁵⁶; he composed a poem in the Getic language (which he presented at what seems to have been a public meeting/festivity) in which he explained the divine essence of the (by then dead) emperor and the transfer of power from him to his son Tiberius who, as the son of a god, gained an intermediary position between gods

⁴⁷ For the process of identity-building through coins, see Howgego, Heuchert and Burnett 2005, especially the analyses by Chr. Howgego, S. Kremydi-Sicilianou, U. Peter and S. Price. Another part of the identity-building process and which is directly connected to our analysis was precisely the setting up of monumental inscriptions honouring specific citizens for their actions; Woolf 1996.

⁴⁸ Harter-Uibopuu 2003, p. 209.

⁴⁹ Sartre 1991, p. 116.

⁵⁰ Price 1984, p. 65-77.

⁵¹ The main works on this subject remain Oliver 1941; Oliver 1958; Oliver 1967; van Rossum 1988 and Giannakopoulos 2008.

⁵² For a full analysis of the imperial cult in *Moesia Inferior*, see Bottez 2009, also Maurer 2014 and Bottez 2015; for the Istrian temple of Augustus see Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu 2013. For the beginnings of the imperial cult in Istros see the above-mentioned article by V. Bottez and G. Talmațchi (n. 45).

⁵³ Pippidi 1998, p. 191-193; Fishwick 1987, p. 104; Ma'Oz 1994-1999, p. 91.

⁵⁴ ISM III, 58; Avram, Ionescu 2016, no. 1, p. 451-454.

⁵⁵ There are theories according to which Ovid was never actually exiled to Tomis, and his exile was only a literary one; Ezquerro 1997, especially p. 13-20. These theories seem to be dismantled by the inscription published by Bărbulescu and Buzoianu in 2014, which attests two characters mentioned by Ovid.

⁵⁶ Ov. *Pont.*, 4. 9. 116.

and mortals⁵⁷. He also had a domestic cult-place⁵⁸. Therefore, in all three cities we can see an effort to adjust the communities – through the imperial cult – to the new political master, who probably returned the favour by bestowing certain privileges or advantages on them⁵⁹. In the case of Istros, these privileges are now clearly attested by the inscriptions published by Maria Bărbulescu and Livia Buzoianu in 2014. This must have resulted in the progress these communities registered on several levels at that time: they resumed coin production, games were organized in Tomis, which probably became the province's capital later on⁶⁰, and public life flourished at Kallatis⁶¹.

At Istros, however, after this initial élan, all trace of an active public life disappeared, including any proof of the cult of Augustus. The next pieces of information concerning the imperial cult in Istros come exclusively from the 2nd century AD: the first information, given precisely by the list of benefactors of the *gerusia*, concerns religious ceremonies in which imperial busts were involved; then there is the mention of an imperial high priest in mid-2nd century AD (ISM I, 78) and of two high priestesses (Aba in ISM I, 57 and another unidentified in Suceveanu 2007, 149, no. 6, l. 2). Another fundamental development of the imperial cult during the 2nd century AD is the creation of the *koinon* of the Western Black Sea Shore⁶², probably during the reign of Hadrian⁶³. All these inscriptions indicate that the imperial cult in Istros, after an initial development during the reign of Augustus, followed by a – for now – blank period during the 1st century AD, received a new boost in the 2nd century AD, starting with the reign of Hadrian.

The connection between the *gerusia* of Istros and the imperial cult is clear. ISM I, 193 mentions in col. B, l. 19-22 that one of the *gerusia*'s roles was to raise funds (from donations such as that made by Artemidoros, son of Herodoros) to support feasts during which gods, emperors and benefactors of the *gerusia* were honoured.

As far as the crowning of imperial busts and statues is concerned, this seems to have been a specific attribute of the institution, as is attested by sources in Ephesus and Athens⁶⁴. The importance of these cult objects and their role in public ceremonies is shown by Emperor Marcus Aurelius' refusal to melt down old imperial busts damaged in the course of time in order to recover the precious material they were made of⁶⁵.

As far as public feasts are concerned, even if only the Feast of the Roses is mentioned by the inscriptions (and this is a good example of the way the imperial cult managed to insert itself within popular traditional feasts)⁶⁶, we know from other sources that the *gerusiasts* also took part in other religious celebrations, some maybe purely imperial cult celebrations. This role is attested for most such assemblies during the Roman period⁶⁷, whose members had a very clearly established social position – in Ephesus the members of the Council and those of the *gerusia* had reserved places at public spectacles⁶⁸. Strong ties must have existed between the *gerusia* and the imperial cult in Istros, since Artemidoros, son of Herodoros (col. II, l. 2), and M. Ulpius Artemidoros (col. I, l. 76) and Karpos, son of Artemidoros, later became pontarchs (ISM I, 137, 179-80 and 207)⁶⁹.

⁵⁷ Ov. *Pont.*, 4. 13. 19-38. On the emperor's position between gods and mortals, see also Fishwick 1987, p. 21-36.

⁵⁸ Ov. *Pont.*, 2. 8. 1-8.

⁵⁹ These events must be seen as part of Augustus' effort to secure the Lower Danube area through war, diplomacy or transfers of populations; Vulpe, Barnea 1968, p. 40-44.

⁶⁰ Haensch 1997, p. 332.

⁶¹ ISM III, 31-2, p. 40-6, 57, etc.

⁶² There are at least 26 pontarchs attested in inscriptions from five cities and at least four of them are from Istros: three from the 2nd century AD – ISM I, 137, 178-80 and 207 – and ISM I, 143 from the 3rd century AD

⁶³ ISM II, 52 (AD 130-138), set up by the Argadeis tribe in honour of the pontarch T. Flavius Poseidonios, high priest of the *Hexapolis* and son of the pontarch Phaidros, which must have held his position somewhere during the reign of Hadrian, if not earlier. And as Phaidros does not bear the prestigious title of *πρῶτος ποντάρχης*, attested both in Istros (ISM I, 207) and Kallatis (ISM III, 99 and 100), there must have existed at least one other pontarch before him.

⁶⁴ Oliver 1958, p. 475-476.

⁶⁵ Pippidi 1967, p. 333; Oliver 1958, p. 475. At Istros a case of recuperation of a monument depicting the emperor's image is the base of Emperor Domitian's statue that suffered *damnatio memoriae* and was reused for a statue of Emperor Nerva; ISM I, 177, AD 98-99.

⁶⁶ L. 19-22; Pippidi 1967, p. 331.

⁶⁷ Oliver 1941, *passim*.

⁶⁸ Kolendo 1981, p. 311.

⁶⁹ Bottez 2009, p. 109-113; Maurer 2014, p. 167-169.

The *gerusia* was connected to other public events, too. The decree in honour of Aba and the list of the benefactors indicate that its members were involved in at least two religious feasts, namely that at the beginning of the year and the Feast of the Roses. The first document mentions the members of the *gerusia* immediately after those of the *boulē*, which confirms their highly prestigious status in the city. This also makes us think that maybe the “non-political” *gerusia* – through the moral weight of its important members (many of which hold different important offices at a later date) – could have played a certain political role as mediator, as is attested in the case of Tarsus⁷⁰. But this idea will have to be supported by future epigraphic discoveries.

These elements confirm that during the reign of Hadrian all aspects of the local public life developed at a level unprecedented for the Roman period, to be connected to the philo-Hellene policies of the emperor. It is in this context that the *gerusia* reaffirmed itself through the list of 138 AD, which intends to prove the power and prestige of its members.

CHRONOLOGY

The most important issue still to be cleared up is the institution’s chronology, starting with the date of its creation. As we have seen, the scholars that approached this problem usually connect the date of creation with the city’s second foundation mentioned in ISM I, 193, for which three dates were proposed: the reign of Hadrian, that of Claudius or that of Augustus.

A. Suceveanu affirmed that the visual impact of the monument itself coincides with the other proofs of a high level of activity for other institutions in that period, suggesting the reign of Hadrian as the moment of the city’s second foundation, an event that in its turn determined the creation of the *gerusia*. The logic of the text’s content, which we have amply debated above, indicates that the list of special benefactors in col. I of ISM I, 193 covers at least several decades before the reign of Hadrian.

This leaves us two other moments that changed the history of Istros as possible choices: the reign of Claudius, when the *horothesia* of Istros (ISM I, 67 and 68) indicates possible changes in the status of Istros, probably following its integration in the Roman province of Moesia, or the reign of Augustus, when the city entered the Roman sphere of influence. Usually the search for the date of the second foundation guided scholars in establishing the date of creation for the *gerusia*. But actually, it is the list of benefactors of the *gerusia* that helps us establish the date when the institution started to function. The relatively small number of benefactors (31) in col. I, up to the first Marcus Ulpius, suggests the reign of Claudius as the moment the benefactors started to be listed, which is confirmed by the mention of Kallistratos, son of Demetrios, as the first president in the list. This would connect the start of the *gerusia*’s activities to the policies of Claudius. On the other hand, public activity during the first half of the 1st century AD was rather slow, which could explain the mention of few benefactors over a longer period of time, and Kallistratos could have also become president at an earlier date than his participation in the embassy mentioned in ISM, 67 and 68.

In the light of the new discoveries mentioned above (inscription mentioning privileges bestowed by Augustus, in connection to the dedication of the first imperial cult temple in Istros, building activities and minting of new coins), the second foundation is most likely to have taken place during the reign of Augustus, a date supported by D.M. Pippidi and A. Avram. The second foundation of Istros⁷¹ would then correspond to that of Kallatis and suggest a favourable imperial policy in the area⁷².

Here arises another issue: should we connect **the creation** of the *gerusia* to the second foundation? The text of ISM I, 193 clearly stipulates that it is the list of benefactors *after* the second foundation, and no mention of its founder⁷³ is made in it. Was the *gerusia* then created before this? Given the chronology established for the second foundation, this would place the foundation of the *gerusia* prior to the Roman domination, even though there is no other source to confirm it for now. The lack of evidence does not necessarily deny it, as even Artemidoros published only the names of benefactors after the second foundation, which means that before that either there were no such archives, they were already lost or that there was another inscription mentioning

⁷⁰ van Rossum 1988, p. 4 for Tarsus and p. 217-225 on other aspects of political involvement.

⁷¹ ISM III, 44 and commentary by A. Avram at p. 52-54.

⁷² See Kantor 2017 for the mission of prefects such as Vestalis in the area, who were responsible with the Greek cities.

⁷³ As in ISM III, 31 from Kallatis.

them. Not to mention that there are very few epigraphical sources for the 1st century in general, which leaves us with a very sketchy image of the Istrian public life of the period.

There remains the problem with our hypothesis, namely that of the distance in time between the second foundation and the first names that appear in the list of benefactors of the *gerusia*, during the reign of Claudius. As we have (for now) no documents concerning the *gerusia* of Istros before Augustus and during the first half of the 1st century AD, it is possible that this institution did not function anymore at that time, and only when a new status was negotiated during the reign of Claudius was it revived in a different role, namely to support public feasts and especially those which involved the imperial cult. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that it is during the same period that we have attested the *gerusia* of Kallatis (ISM III, 31).

And if there is no connection between the creation of the *gerusia* and the second foundation, then why is the latter mentioned in it? The explanation for this must be the wish to transfer or better establish the image of a private institution in the community's collective memory by associating it to an event that shaped its history. Such a procedure brings us to another aspect of the problem, namely the connection to the imperial cult.

The *gerusia* reached a new and spectacular phase of its development during the reign of Hadrian, as proven by the impressive monument that is the list⁷⁴, and appears to us as an essential element in a well-developed and articulated public life. It is mainly because of ISM I, 193 that we have any information on the role of the *gerusia*. Headed by presidents elected (probably) for life, it funded religious ceremonies, notably those of an ever more important imperial cult, and its members held a position second only to that of the *bouleutai* (ISM I, 57). This unprecedented development of the *gerusia* and of the imperial cult should definitely be connected to the period of prosperity inaugurated by the reign of Trajan and successfully continued by that of Hadrian, as proven by the numerous archaeological discoveries. It is maybe through the prism of this connection that we should consider the issue of why a monument with such a powerful visual impact was created at that moment. By associating itself with all the changes that took place in the city, operated under the auspices of an emperor, an institution connected to the imperial cult gained a higher prestige, as did the members listed as special benefactors.

The end of the *gerusia*'s existence remains even more eluding than its beginnings. The other two monuments presented (ISM I, 57 and 275) in connection with this institution are dated to the second half of the 2nd century AD, which gives us a *terminus post quem* for its disappearance. This remains to be proven, as this seems to have been (apart from a distinct and special moment during Hadrian's reign, marked by the publishing of the list of benefactors) a very "quiet" institution as far as public monuments go. This situation could, again, be explained by its connection with the phenomenon that provided part of the object of its activities, namely the imperial cult. After the list of AD 138, the information concerned the activity of the *gerusia* is extremely scarce, as the centre stage of the local and regional public life was taken by another institution that quickly became the main political battleground for the local aristocracy starting with the Antonines and up to the 3rd century AD, namely the Western Black Sea *koinon*. The development of such a prestigious and costly structure probably made other institutions, such as the *gerusia*, less interesting and therefore underfunded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avram 1998a – A. Avram, *Review of L. MROZEWICZ and K. ILSKI (eds.), Prosopographica, 1993*, SCIVA 49, 1998, p. 305-307.
- Avram 1998b – A. Avram, *P. Vinicius und Kallatis. Zum Beginn der römischen Kontrolle der griechischen Städte an der Westküste des Pontos Euxeinos*, in G. Tsetschladze (ed.), *The Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area: Historical Interpretation of Archaeology*, Oxford, 1998, p. 115-129.
- Avram 2007 – A. Avram, *Le Corpus des inscriptions d'Istros revisité*, Dacia N.S. 51, 2007, p. 79-132.
- Avram, Bounegru 1997 – A. Avram, O. Bounegru, *Mithridates al VI-lea Eupator și coasta de vest a Pontului Euxin. În jurul unui decret inedit de la Histria*, Pontica 30, 1997, p. 155-165.
- Avram 2015-2016 – A. Avram, *Notes épigraphiques V*, Pontica 48-49, 2015-2016, p. 429-437.

⁷⁴ Possibly drawn up, as mentioned before, by Artemidoros, son of Herodoros, during his term in office as secretary of the institution.

- Avram, Ionescu 2016 – A. Avram, M. Ionescu, *Nouvelles inscriptions de Callatis*, in A. Robu, I. Bîrzescu, with the collaboration of D. Knoepfler and A. Avram (eds.), *Mégarika. Nouvelles recherches sur Mégare et les cités de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin. Archéologie, épigraphie, histoire, Actes du colloque de Mangalia (8–12 juillet 2012)*, De l'archéologie à l'histoire 62, Paris, 2016, p. 451-466.
- Avram, Marcu 1999 – A. Avram, M. Marcu, *Monument epigrafic inedit de la Histria*, SCIVA 50, 1999, 1-2, p. 71-77.
- Bărbulescu, Buzoianu 2014 – M. Bărbulescu, L. Buzoianu, *L'espace ouest-pontique sous l'empereur Tibère à la lumière d'un décret inédit découvert en Dobroudja*, in V. Cojocar, A. Coşkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman periods*, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, p. 415-433.
- Bottez 2009 – V. Bottez, *Cultul imperial în provincia Moesia Inferior (sec. I-III p.Chr.)*, Bucharest, 2009.
- Bottez 2015 – V. Bottez, *Implementing Roman rule in Greek cities on the western Black Sea coast. The role of the imperial cult*, *Classica et Christiana* 10, 2015, p. 51-66.
- van Bremen 1996 – R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation. Women and civic life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Amsterdam, 1996.
- Bujor, Simion 1960 – E. Bujor, G. Simion, *Săpăturile de salvare din cimitirul roman de la Isaccea (r. Tulcea, reg. Constanța)*, MCA 7, 1960, p. 391-399.
- Connelly 2007 – J.B. Connelly, *Portrait of a Priestess. Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*, Oxford (N.J.), 2007.
- Daicoviciu 1972 – H. Daicoviciu, *Dacia de la Burebista la cucerirea romană*, Cluj-Napoca, 1972.
- Damian, Băltăc 2003-2005 – P. Damian, A. Băltăc, *Histria. Sectorul extra muros, Poarta Mare – Turnul Mare (2000-2004)*, SCIVA 54-56, 2003-2005, p. 131-147.
- Ezquerro 1997 – A.A. Ezquerro, *Exilio y elegía latina entre la Antigüedad y el Renacimiento*, Huelva, 1997.
- Fishwick 1987 – D. Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, Volume I.2, Leiden, 1987.
- Florescu, Cantacuzino 1954 – G. Florescu, G. Cantacuzino, *Zidul-incintă de pe platoul din Vestul cetății*, in E. Condurachi (ed.), *Histria. Monografie arheologică*, Vol. I, Bucharest, 1954, p. 285-292.
- Giannakopoulos 2008 – N. Giannakopoulos, *Ο θεσμός της Γερουσίας των ελληνικών πόλεων κατά τους ρωμαϊκούς χρόνους*, Thessalonica, 2008.
- Haensch 1997 – R. Haensch, *Capita Prouinciarum. Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz am Rhein, 1997.
- Harter-Uibopuu 2003 – K. Harter-Uibopuu, *Kaiserkult und Kaiserverehrung in den Koina des griechischen Mutterlandes*, in H. Cancik, K. Hitzl (eds.), *Der Praxis der Herrscherverehrung in Rom und seinen Provinzen*, Tübingen, 2003, p. 209-231.
- Howgego, Heuchert, Burnett 2005 – Chr. Howgego, V. Heuchert, A. Burnett (eds.), *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 2005.
- Jones 2016 – Chr. Jones, *An Inscription from Istros and Ovid's Last Poems*, ZPE 200, 2016, p. 122-132.
- Kantor 2017 – G. Kantor, *The Date and Circumstances of Quintus Iulius Vestalis*, ZPE 203, 2017, p. 85-91.
- Kolendo 1981 – J. Kolendo, *La Répartition des places aux spectacles et la stratification sociale dans l'Empire romain*, *Ktêma* 6, 1981, p. 301-315.
- Ma'Oz 1994-1999 – Z.U. Ma'Oz, *Coin and Temple – The Case of Caesarea Philippi–Paneas*, *Israel Numismatic Journal* 13, 1994-1999, p. 90-102.
- Matei-Popescu 2013 – F. Matei-Popescu, *Statutul juridic și teritoriul Histriei în epoca romană*, in F. Panait Bîrzescu, I. Bîrzescu, F. Matei-Popescu, A. Robu (eds.), *Poleis în Marea Neagră. Relații interpontice și producții locale*, Pontica et Mediterranea I, Bucharest, 2013, p. 203-233.
- Matei-Popescu 2014 – F. Matei-Popescu, *The Horothesia of Dionysopolis and the Integration of the Western Pontic Greek Cities in the Roman Empire*, in V. Cojocar, A. Coşkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Pontica et Mediterranea III, Bucharest, 2014, p. 457-471.
- Maurer 2014 – K. Maurer, *Der Pontarch des Westpontischen Koinons*, *Dacia N.S.* 58, 2014, p. 141-188.
- Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu 2013 – M. Mărgineanu-Cârstoiu, *Le Temple de culte impérial d'Auguste à Histria*, *Caiete ARA* 4, 2013, p. 97-114.
- Mihailov 1984 – G. Mihailov, *[Compte rendu de ISM I]*, *LB* 27, 1984, 3, p. 83-89.
- Musielak 1993a – M. Musielak, *Histria, Tomis und Callatis: Möglichkeiten der prosopographischen Forschung: Kataloge*, in L. Mrozewicz, K. Iłski (eds.), *Prosopographica*, Poznan, 1993, p. 97-108.
- Musielak 1993b – M. Musielak, *Prosopographia Histriaca im 2. Jh.: Artemidoros, der Sohn des Herodoros und M. Ulpius Artemidoros, der Pontarch*, in L. Mrozewicz, K. Iłski (eds.), *Prosopographica*, Poznan, 1993, p. 109-114.
- Oliver 1941 – J.H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia*, *Hesperia*, Supp. 6, 1941.
- Oliver 1958 – J.H. Oliver, *Gerusiae and Augustales*, *Historia* 7, 1958, p. 473-496.
- Oliver 1967 – J.H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerusia and the Emperor's Concilium*, *Hesperia* 36, 1967, p. 329-335.
- Pârvan 1916 – V. Pârvan, *Histria IV. Inscricții găsite în 1914 și 1915*, AARMSI, seria II, 38, 1916.

- Petolescu 2007 – C.C. Petolescu, *Contribuții la istoria Daciei romane. I*, Bucharest, 2007.
- Pippidi 1967 – D.M. Pippidi, *Contribuții la istoria veche a României*, Bucharest, 1967².
- Pippidi 1998 – D.M. Pippidi, *Un templu al lui Augustus în Dobrogea*, in D.M. Pippidi, *Studii de istorie a religiilor antice*, 1998², p. 189-195.
- Popescu 1960 – E. Popescu, *The Histrian decree for Aba (2nd century of our era)*, *Dacia N.S.* 4, 1960, p. 273-296.
- Popescu 1970a – E. Popescu, *Commentaire épigraphique*, *RÉSEE* 8, 1970, 2, p. 319-328.
- Popescu 1970b – E. Popescu, *Inscription grecque de Noviodunum (Scythie Mineure)*, *Klio* 52, 1970, p. 373-378.
- Price 1984 – S.R.F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge, 1984.
- Rizos 2013 – E. Rizos, *Centres of the Late Roman military supply network in the Balkans: a survey of horrea*, *JRGZM* 60, 2013, p. 659-696.
- van Rossum 1988 – J.A. van Rossum, *De gerousia in de Griekse steden van het Romeinse Rijk*, Leiden, 1988.
- Ruscu 2014 – L. Ruscu, *Becoming Roman? Shifting identities in the Western Pontic Greek cities*, in V. Cojocaru, A. Coşkun, M. Dana (eds.), *Interconnectivity in the Mediterranean and Pontic World during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, *Pontica et Mediterranea III*, Bucharest, 2014, p. 473-488.
- Sartre 1991 – M. Sartre, *L'Orient romain : provinces et sociétés provinciales en Méditerranée orientale d'Auguste aux Sévères : 31 avant J.-C. - 235 après J.-C.*, Paris, 1991.
- Suceveanu 1971 – A. Suceveanu, *În legătură cu data anexării Dobrogei de către romani*, *Pontica* 4, 1971, p. 105-123.
- Suceveanu 1977 – A. Suceveanu, *Viața economică în Dobrogea romană, secolele I-III e.n.*, Bucharest, 1977.
- Suceveanu 1982 – A. Suceveanu, *Histria VI. Les Thermes romains*, Bucharest, 1982.
- Suceveanu 2004 – A. Suceveanu, *A doua fondare a cetății Histria*, in *Studia historica et archaeologica in honorem magistrae Doina Benea*, *Bibliotheca Historica et Archaeologica Universitatis Timisiensis* 6, Timișoara, 2004, p. 361-372.
- Suceveanu 2007 – A. Suceveanu, *Histria XIII. La basilique épiscopale. Les résultats des fouilles*, Bucharest, 2007.
- Suceveanu, Barnea 1991 – A. Suceveanu, A. Barnea, *La Dobroudja romaine*, Bucharest, 1991.
- Varbanov 2005 – I. Varbanov, *Greek Imperial Coins and their Values. The Local Coinages of the Roman Empire. Vol. 1. Dacia, Moesia Superior and Moesia Inferior*, Burgas, 2005.
- Vulpe, Barnea 1968 – R. Vulpe, I. Barnea, *Din istoria Dobrogei. Vol. II. Romanii la Dunărea de Jos*, Bucharest, 1968.
- Woolf 1996 – G. Woolf, *Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire*, *JRS* 86, 1996, p. 22-39.
- Zimmermann 2007 – K. Zimmermann, *Les origines de la gérusie de l'époque impériale*, in M. Mayer i Olivé, G. Baratta, A. Guzmán (eds.), *Acta XII Congressus internationalis epigraphiae graecae et latinae*, Barcelona, 2007, p. 1523-1528.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΜΩΝΑ	
ΦΛΑΟΥΙΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ	ΓΕΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΚΑΣΤΟΣ	
ΙΠΠΟΛΟΧΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΟΥ		
ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ	ΔΑΔΑΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΥ	
ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΩΝΟΣ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ	a
ΚΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΟΙΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ	
ΑΙΛΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ	ΠΡΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ	
ΚΡΑΤΗΣΙΠΠΟΣ ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΥ	ΑΡΧΕΛΛΙΟΣ ΕΝΟΧΑΡΟΥΣ	
ΙΠΠΟΣ ΘΕΝΗΣ ΗΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΣ ΘΕΝΗΣ	
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΟΥΣΙΟΥ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΣ	
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΑΧΟΣ ΗΡΑΚΛΩΝΤΟΣ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΣ	
ΜΕΙΔΙΑΣ ΘΕΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΣ	
ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΔΙΩΝΟΣ	ΠΡΩΤΑΣ ΧΡΗΣΙΟΥ	b
ΚΛΕΟΥΓΕΝΗΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ	ΚΑΡΤΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ	
ΠΤΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΝΕΙΚΗΡΑΤΟΣ	
ΣΙΔΗΡΟΣ ΣΙΔΗΡΟΥ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΦΑΙΔΡΟΥ	c
ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΟΥΣΙΟΥ	ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΒΙΑΝΩΡΕΚΑΤΑΙΟΥ	
ΗΡΑΚΛΕΩΝΤΕΡΤΙΟΥ		
ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΛΗΝ	
ΗΓΗΣΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΥ		
ΔΗΜΟΧΑΡΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΟΥ	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ ΠΛΗΝ	
ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΠΟΥΛΑΙΝΕΤΟΥ		
ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΠΟΥΛΑΙΝΕΤΟΣ ΠΟΥΛΑΙΝΕΤΟΥ	d
ΑΝΤΙΓΕΝΗΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΜΟΝΙΜΟΥ	
ΚΥΙΝΤΟΣ ΣΕΤΙΟΣ ΟΥΑΛΕΡΙΟΣ	ΗΡΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ ΜΗΝΙΟΥ	
ΣΑΡΑΤΤΩΝ ΣΑΡΑΤΤΩΝΟΣ	ΗΡΑΤΙΔΗΣ ΜΟΝΙΜΟΥ	
ΙΠΠΟΛΟΧΟΣ ΧΑΡΜΙΔΟΥ		
ΑΡΤΕΜΑΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΟΥ	ΗΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ	
ΦΛΑΟΥΙΟΣ ΓΑΛΛΟΣ	ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ	
ΦΛΑΟΥΙΟΣ ΚΟΥΑΡΤΟΣ	ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΠΡΑΙΣΗΣ	
ΝΙΝΟΣ ΝΕΙΚΙΟΥ	ΓΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΚΥΗΤΟΣ	
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΤΑΙΜΙΟΣ ΤΑΥΚΟΣ	e
ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΣ ΜΟΙΡΟΔΩΡΟΥ	ΘΕΑΔΩΝ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ	
ΦΑΝΟΚΛΗΣ ΜΕΙΔΙΟΥ	ΙΕΡΩΝΥΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΥ	
ΜΟΝΙΜΟΣ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ	ΜΚΟΚΚΗΙΟΣ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΩΝ	
ΖΩΙΛΩΝ ΝΕΙΚΑΝΔΡΟΥ	ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ	
ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ	ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΧΑΙΡΕΟΥ	
ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ		
ΑΙΛΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΥ		
ΙΠΠΟΣ ΘΕΝΗΣ ΣΑΡΑΤΤΩΝΟΣ		
ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΑΡΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΟΥ	ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΙΑΝΟΥΑΡΙΟΣ	
ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ	f
ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΑΡΧΕΛΛΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	
ΠΙΣΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΒΑΣΥΛΛΟΣ ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ	
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΥ		
ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΣ ΣΑΡΑΤΤΩΝΟΣ	ΜΕΝΕΧΑΡΜΟΣ ΣΩΣΙΟΥ	
ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΗΓΗΜΟΝΟΣ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΟΥ	
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ ΕΣΤΙΑΙΟΥ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ	
ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΤΙΠΑΤΡΟΥ	ΟΥΑΛΕΡΙΟΣ ΜΟΝΤΑΝΟΣ	
ΣΠΕΔΙΟΣ ΑΣΙΑΤΙΚΟΣ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΦΛΑΒΟΣ	g
ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ	ΜΟΥΛΠΙΟΣ ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ	
ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΟΥ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ	
ΘΕΟΓΝΗΤΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΩΡΟΣ ΓΡΗΓΟΡΟΥ	
ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΠΡΩΤΑΣ	ΘΕΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΟΥ	
ΔΗΜΟΦΙΛΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΔΟΥΣ	ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΣ	
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΛΑΙΟΣ ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΥ		
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΣ ΘΕΟΤΕΙΜΟΥ	ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΣ ΔΙΟΣΚΟΥΡΙΔΟΥ	
ΠΤΟΛΕΜΩΝ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ ΤΟΥ Β	ΚΑΣΤΟΣ ΖΑΛΕΖΑΝΔΡΟΥ	
ΠΡΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΙΟΣ ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΟΥ	ΥΟΔΟΣ ΘΕΟΠΟΜΠΟΥ	
ΒΑΡΒΑΡΙΩΝΤΙ ΤΟΑΣ	ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ	h
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ ΑΤΥΡΙΩΝΟΣ	
ΦΑΙΔΡΙΑΣ ΜΕΝΙΣΚΟΥ	ΦΙΛΩΝ ΑΡΤΕΜΑ	
ΡΟΥΦΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ		
ΝΕΙΚΙΑΣ ΝΙΝΝΟΥ	ΤΦΛΣΑΛΛΟΥΣΤΙΣ	i
ΜΟΝΙΜΟΣ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ	ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΕΙΚΟΥ	
ΑΡΤΕΜΑΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ	ΧΑΙΡΗΜΩΝ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ ΔΩΡΟΥ	
ΑΙΛΙΟΣ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ	ΚΛΕΙΤΟΦΩΝ ΕΡΜΟΔΩΡΟΥ	j
ΜΙΟΥΛΙΟΣ ΜΟΣΧΟΣ Β	ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΟΔΗΜΟΥ	
ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΗΣ ΝΟΥΜΗΝΙΟΥ	ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝ ΜΑΡΚΟΥ	
ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ ΦΙΛΩΝΟΣ	ΜΟΙΡΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΕΥΖΕΝΙΔΟΥ	
ΑΠΟΛΛΟΔΩΡΟΣ ΗΡΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ		
ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΔΟΥ		
ΣΑΤΥΡΙΩΝ ΑΙΣΧΡΙΩΝΟΣ		

Fig. 2. ISM I, 193 (detail of added names).

ABRÉVIATIONS

- (AAI)TerraAntBalc – (Acta Associationis Internationalis) Terra Antiqua Balcanica, International Association Terra Antiqua Balcanica, Sofia
- (A)ARMSI – Analele Academiei Române. Memoriile Secțiunii Istorice, București
- ACMI – Anuarul Comisiunii Monumentelor Istorice, București
- ActaArchCarp – Acta Archaeologica Carpatica, Kraków
- ActaAnthung – Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
- ActaArchHung – Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Budapest
- ActaMN – Acta Musei Napocensis, Muzeul Național de Istorie a Transilvaniei, Cluj-Napoca
- ActaMP – Acta Musei Porolissensis, Muzeul Județean de Istorie și Artă, Zalău
- AÉ – L'Année Épigraphique, Paris
- Aetas – Aetas. Történettudományi folyóirat, Szeged
- American Antiquity – American Antiquity, Society for American Archaeology, Washington
- AMSMG – Atti e Memorie della Società Magna Grecia, Roma
- AnB (S.N.) – Analele Banatului (Serie Nouă), Muzeul Banatului, Timișoara
- Antiquity – Antiquity. A Review of World Archaeology, Durham, UK
- AnUBucurești – Analele Universității din București
- AOR ... – Arheologičeski otkritija i razkopki prez ... g.
- ArchBulg – Archaeologia Bulgarica, Sofia
- ArchClass – Archeologia Classica, Roma
- ArchéologiaParis – Archéologia, Paris
- ArchÉrt – Archeológiai Értesítő, Budapest
- ArchKorr – Archäologisches Korrespondenzblatt, Mainz
- ArchRozhledy – Archeologické Rozhledy, Praha
- Argesis – Argesis, Muzeul Județean Argeș, Pitești
- ArhMed – Arheologia Medievală, Asociația arheologilor medievști din România
- ArhVestnik – Arheološki vestnik, Ljubljana
- BARIntSer – British Archaeological Reports. International Series, Oxford
- BARSuppSer – British Archaeological Reports. Supplementary Series, Oxford
- BÉ – Bulletin Épigraphique, Paris
- BerRGK – Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- BICS – Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London
- BMJTAG – Buletinul Muzeului Județean „Teohari Antonescu”, Giurgiu
- Brukenthal Acta Musei – Brukenthal Acta Musei, Muzeul Național Brukenthal, Sibiu
- BSNR – Buletinul Societății Numismatice Române, București
- CA – Cercetări Arheologice, Muzeul Național de Istorie a României, București
- Caiete ARA – Caiete ARA. Arhitectură, Restaurare, Arheologie, Asociația ARA, București
- CCA. Campania – Cronică Cercetărilor Arheologice din România, București
- CCDJ – Cultură și Civilizație la Dunărea de Jos, Muzeul Dunării de Jos, Călărași
- CCGG – Cahiers du Centre Gustav-Glotz, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris
- CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin
- Classica et Christiana – Classica et Christiana, Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine al Facultății de Istorie a Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași
- CRAI – Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris
- Crisia – Crisia, Muzeul Țării Crișurilor, Oradea
- CsSzMÉ – A Csíki Székely Múzeum Évkönyve, Miercurea Ciuc
- Dacia N.S. – Dacia (Nouvelle Série). Revue d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne, Académie Roumaine, Institut d'archéologie « Vasile Pârvan », București

- DissPann – Dissertationes Pannonicae. Ex Instituto Numismatico et Archaeologico Universitatis de Petro Pázmány nominatae Budapestensis provenientis, Budapest
- Documenta Praehistorica – Documenta Praehistorica, University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts, Department of Archaeology
- DolgCluj – Dolgozatok az Erdélyi Múzeum Érem- és Régiségtárából, Kolozsvár
- DossHistArch – Dossiers historiques et archéologiques, Berck (Pas-de Calais)
- EphemNap – Ephemeris Napocensis, Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie și Istoria Artei, Cluj-Napoca
- FolArch – Folia Archaeologica, Budapest
- Gallia – Gallia. Fouilles et monuments archéologiques en France métropolitaine
- Germania – Germania. Anzeiger der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Frankfurt am Main
- GRBS – Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, Duke University
- HelvA – Helvetia Archaeologica, Basel
- Hesperia – Hesperia. The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens
- Historia – Historia. Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart
- I.Didyma – D.F. McCabe, *Didyma Inscriptions. Texts and List*. «The Princeton Project on the Inscriptions of Anatolia», The Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton (1985), Packard Humanities Institute CD # 6, 1991
- IDR – *Inscriptiile Daciei romane*, București
- IDRE – C.C. Petolescu, *Inscriptiones Daciae Romanae. Inscriptions externes concernant l'histoire de la Dacie*, I-II, București, 1996-2000
- IGB – G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, 5 vol., Sofia, 1958-2001
- IGLSyr – *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Paris, 1929-
- IGR – *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes*, Paris
- ILD – C.C. Petolescu, *Inscriptiile latine din Dacia*, București, 2005
- ILS – H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin, I (1892), II (1902), III (1916)
- Il Mar Nero – Il Mar Nero : annali di archeologia e storia, Roma
- IRT – J.M. Reynolds, J.B. Ward-Perkins, *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, Roma, 1952
- Iscr. di Cos – M. Segre, *Iscrizioni di Cos*, Monografie della Scuola Archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni Italiane in Oriente 6, Rome, 1993; 6.2, Rome, 2007
- ISM – *Inscriptiile din Scythia Minor*, București, I (1983), II (1987), III (1999), V (1980)
- Istros – Istros, Muzeul Brăilei
- IzvestijaSofia – Izvestija na Arheologičeskija Institut (1947-2012), Izvestija na Nacionalnija arheologičeskij institut (2012-), Sofia
- IzvestijaVelikoTárnovo – Izvestija na Okrašnja Istoričeski Muzej, Veliko Tárnovo
- JAnthrR – Journal of Anthropological Research, University of Chicago
- JArchR – Journal of Archaeological Research, Springer
- JRGZM – Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums Mainz
- JRS – Journal of Roman Studies, London
- Klio – Klio. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, Berlin
- Ktèma – Ktèma. Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques. Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg
- LB – Linguistique Balkanique. Institute for Bulgarian Language
- MCA – Materiale și Cercetări Arheologice, Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- NC – The Numismatic Chronicle, London
- NÉH – Nouvelles Études d'Histoire, București
- Novensia – Novensia. Osfodek Badań nad Antykiem. Europy Południowo-Wschodniej, Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa
- OpArchZagreb – Opuscula Archaeologica. Zavod za arheologiju, Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu
- Pallas – Pallas. Revue d'Études Antiques, Université de Toulouse le Mirail, Toulouse
- PBF – Prähistorische Bronzefunde, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Seminar für Vor- und Frühgeschichte der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Abteilung für Ur- und

Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie des Historischen Seminars der Westfälischen Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

- Peuce S.N. – Peuce (Serie Nouă). Studii și Cercetări de Istorie și Arheologie, Institutul de Cercetări Eco-Muzeale „Simion Gavrilă”, Tulcea
- PIR – *Prosopographia Imperii Romani, saec. I-III*, ed. II, Berlin – Leipzig
- PLRE – *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, Cambridge University Press, 3 vol., 1971, 1980, 1992
- Pontica – Pontica, Muzeul de Istorie Națională și Arheologie, Constanța
- PPS – Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society, Cambridge University Press
- PSAS – Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland
- PZ – *Praehistorische Zeitschrift*, Freie Universität, Institut für Prähistorische Archäologie, Berlin
- QuadCat – Quaderni Catanesi di studi classici e medievali, Catania
- RANarb – Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise, Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée
- RAParis – Revue archéologique, Paris
- RE – *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaften*, Stuttgart, 1893-
- RÉSEE – Revue des Études Sud-Est Européennes, Academia Română, Institutul de Studii Sud-Est Europeene, București
- RevMuz – Revista Muzeelor, București
- RI – Revista Istorică, Academia Română, Institutul de Istorie „Nicolae Iorga”, București
- RIC – *Roman Imperial Coinage*, London
- RMD – M.M. Roxan, P. Holder, *Roman Military Diplomas*, 5 vol., London, 1978-2006
- RMV – Rad Muzeja Vojvodine, Novi Sad
- RPC – *Roman Provincial Coinage*
- RRH – Revue Roumaine d’Histoire, Academia Română, București
- SA – Sovetskaja arheologija, Institut arheologii Akademii nauk SSSR, Moskva
- SCIV(A) – Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche (și Arheologie), Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- SCN – Studii și Cercetări de Numismatică, Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- SEG – *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923-1971, Alphen aan den Rijn 1979-1980, Amsterdam 1979-2005, Boston 2006-
- SlovArch – Slovenská Archeológia, Nitra
- SP – Studii de Preistorie, București
- Starinar – Starinar. Naučni časopis Arheološkog instituta u Beogradu
- StCl – Studii Clasice, București
- StUCluj-hist – Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Seria Studia Historica, Cluj-Napoca
- TAM – *Tituli Asiae Minoris*, Wien, 1901-
- Thraco-Dacica – Thraco-Dacica, Academia Română, Institutul de Arheologie „Vasile Pârvan”, București
- TMA – Tijdschrift voor Mediterrane Archeologie, Groningen
- Transylvanian Review – Transylvanian Review, Centrul de Studii Transilvane, Cluj-Napoca
- VAH – *Varia Archaeologica Hungarica*
- ZfN – Zeitschrift für Numismatik der Numismatischen Gesellschaft Berlin
- Ziridava – Ziridava. Studia Archaeologica, Muzeul Județean Arad
- ZPE – Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Bonn
- ZSAK – Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Archäologie und Kunstgeschichte, Zürich

