

Nikos Kokkinos

**THE *TITULUS TIBURTINUS*, SYME’S PISO, SENTIUS SATURNINUS
AND THE PROVINCE OF SYRIA***

Keywords: the *Titulus Tiburtinus*, Roman provincial administration, Roman governors, Syria

Abstract: A previous paper on the *titulus Tiburtinus* re-opened the debate concerning the notorious *ignotus*, then generally thought to be P. Sulpicius Quirinius (*cos.* 12 BC), suggesting instead that he might be identified with C. Senti^{us} Saturninus (*cos.* 19 BC). This suggestion was subsequently challenged in favour of L. Calpurnius Piso (*cos.* 15 BC), who had originally been argued by Sir Ronald Syme. Since the identification of the consular concerned is significant for Augustan prosopography and for the history of Asia, among other provinces such as Syria and Germany, a detailed and wide-ranging restatement of the case for Saturninus is made here. Piso (unlike Quirinius) is really a non-starter, and it is surprising that he would have been supported by formidable Syme. The *rex* of the *titulus* could not have been Rhescuporis I or Rhoemetalces I. The *iterum* would not have referred to the second legateship of Piso (presumably that of Syria) given Piso’s early career. The *binas*, referring to two public thanksgivings, does not inspire confidence in Piso receiving a second *supplicatio*. Piso the Pontifex is not attested as proconsul of Asia, nor is he attested as governor of Syria, and the reconstruction of the *fasti* of this province is much more reasonable than previously thought. By contrast, all points in Saturninus career can be successfully compared with the information in the *titulus*. Origins of the Senti^{us} from an area near Tibur is a bonus, if dispensable. Saturninus could not have been proconsul of Africa at the time inferred from Tertullian (29 BC), and hence Asia is open for him in c. 14/13 BC. His office in Syria (c. 12–8 BC) is well-attested, as it is that in Germany (c. AD 3–6). He was awarded *ornamenta triumphalia* in the company of Tiberius, after ‘two’ victories and no doubt *supplicationes binas*. Finally, a flexible understanding of the word *iterum* can accommodate also the meanings ‘for another time’ and ‘twice’, either of which can work with the career of Saturninus. As for deprived Quirinius, among various problems, no two thanksgivings can be conceived for a war such as that of the Homonadenses, and, most condemingly, a reference to his important office under Gaius will never have been omitted in the *titulus*.

[---] | [r]egem, qua redacta in pot[estatem imp. Caesaris] | Augusti populique Romani senatu[s] dis immortalibus] | *supplicationes binas ob res prosp[ere gestas, et] | ipsi orna-*

* This paper was written in 1996 as a rejoinder to C. Eiler’s reply (1996) to my interpretation of the *Titulus Tiburtinus* (1995), but its inevitable length, together with further elucidations required by the editor, prevented its publication in *ZPE* at that time. While an update of this study could not be undertaken in the intervening years (and unlikely for the near future), given the importance of the issues discussed for the Augustan Near East, and given the kind invitation of the editor of *SJC*, it was thought better to publish in its original form, rather than not publish at all. But of all the new material in the last decade, it is the fundamental study of E. Dąbrowa, *The Governors of Roman Syria from Augustus to Septimius Severus* (Bonn 1998) which I most regret not having considered here!

menta triumph[alia decrevit;] | pro consul. Asiam provinciam op[tinuit; legatus pr. pr.] | divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Ph[oenicen optinuit;] [---]¹

[---] | [k]ing, which (aforementioned tribe?) having been brought into the pow[er of Emperor Caesar] | Augustus and the Roman People, the Senat[e decreed to the immortal gods] | two thanksgivings for success[ful achievements, and] | triumph[al] ornaments to himself; | as proconsul he he[ld] the province of Asia; [as legatus propraetore] | of the Divine Augustus for another time [he held] Syria and Ph[oenicia]; [---]

My article on the *titulus Tiburtinus* re-opened a debate that has now lasted, with intermissions, over two hundred years.² This must only be healthy. If there are points still to be discussed concerning this acephalous inscription, let us discuss them. Further analysis will improve our understanding, and may arrive at a single interpretation as being the most probable. It will be significant for Augustan prosopography and for the history of Asia, among other provinces, to come closer to solving the problem of the notorious *ignotus*.

C. Eilers' reply is admirable.³ He spots a few mistakes and he attempts to expose weaknesses in my hypothesis that the *ignotus* is Saturninus. Though some points will be conceded, I remain unconvinced that my overall conclusion need to be altered radically. At the same time, his restatement of the case for Piso gives me the opportunity to make clearer the reasons why I believe that this candidate should now be dropped from the list. It must be stressed that Eilers adduced no *new* evidence, although he offered fresh interpretations. Since his treatment is probably the best defence of Piso in the present state of knowledge, it is hoped that my refutation here will put the case to rest.

The method followed by Eilers was first to deconstruct my theory, and then to rebuild Syme's.⁴ I shall follow the same in reverse, first deconstructing Syme's theory, and then rebuilding mine. In all fairness, the strongest alternative to Saturninus will also be noted. The discussion necessarily presupposes knowledge of the two original articles.

¹ *CIL* XIV 3613 = *ILS* 918 = *I.Ital.* 4.1, no. 130 = Gordon 1958: 77–78, no. 70.

² See Kokkinos 1995. Up to 100 relevant entries (to 1976) are listed by P. Benoit (1977: 717–720). A more thorough bibliography on Quirinius compiled in 1981 by J. Vardaman (Mississippi; unpublished), has some 250 references. Firpo 1983: 236–244, mentions up to 30 discussions supporting seven different candidates proposed through the years: M. Vipsanius Agrippa (*cos.* 37, 28, 27 BC); M. Titius (*cos. suff.* 31 BC); C. Sentius Saturninus (*cos.* 19 BC); L. Calpurnius Piso (*cos.* 15 BC); P. Quinctilius Varus (*cos.* 13 BC); P. Sulpicius Quirinius (*cos.* 12 BC); and M. Plautius Silvanus (*cos.* 2 BC).

³ See Eilers 1996.

⁴ Eilers (1996: 207, n. 5) assigns the first full treatment of Piso's case to Levick 1967: 208–210, seeing Syme 1939a: 398, n. 8, only as an adumbration. But it will be right to point out that apart from this note, Syme had also dealt with the subject in the 1940s in a book which remained unpublished until now (Syme 1995: 257–269) – his discussion probably being a reworking of an earlier paper of 1934 (see Syme 1973: 594, n. 32) – as well as in an addendum to his paper 'Lentulus and the Origin of Moesia' (Syme 1934a), reprinted in his *Danubian Papers* (1971a: 65–66), written before 1968 (see Preface) but probably after Levick's publication (see 67). Moreover, Syme had been paving the way for Piso already in Syme 1934b: 127–131; 1939b, 332, and then again in 1960: 17 (= Syme 1979a: 505). Of course his later treatments (Syme 1973; 1986: 338–341) remain the fullest and standard expositions of this theory.

Piso: The best or the worst candidate?

For convenience the objections against Piso will be examined in the same order as in the first article (also followed by Eilers), where tabulation of the careers of the *ignotus* and of Piso are included:

(1) Syme believed that the *rex* of the *titulus* was a 'dead king', Rhescuporis I (*PIR*¹ R 41), who had been killed by the Bessi. But an already 'dead king' would not have had a direct connection to Piso, and no convincing reason can be given why he should have been prominently commemorated in Piso's *cursus honorum* over forty years later. Also there is no evidence that the young Rhescuporis had ever officially become a king. Eilers (1996: 216–217) admits this objection, and he opts instead for Rhoemetalces I (*PIR*¹ R 50), the guardian of Rhescuporis. According to him the inscription would refer to Piso installing Rhoemetalces as king of the *gens Thracum*.

But there are many problems with this suggestion too. The word for king is put in the accusative [*r*]egem, being subordinate. This demands a connection between the king and what came before, that is to say (probably) the [tribe] – thus Syme's decision for the tribe's action against the king. A normal reading of the Latin may not support the assumption that it is the senator whose action towards the king is being reported. The senator's action is clear in as far as it is directed against the [*gens*] – on account of the subjugation of which (*qua redacta*) he received his honours. So a *rex* must have existed before the [*gens*] was subjugated, and this cannot be Rhoemetalces, who became king only later (Tac., *Ann.* 2.64; cf. Vell., 2.112.4; Dio 55.30.3; *RPC* 1, nos. 1704–1720). In any case, for the text to have easily been comprehensible, an imposition of a king should have been mentioned after the subjugation of the tribe rather than before. Further, since Piso crushed specifically *one* of the Thracian tribes, the expectation would be (as in Syme's theory) that the [*gens*] was the Bessi (Dio 54.34.6). But Rhoemetalces became the *rex* of all *Thracēs* – and in our context conceivably of the *gentes Thracum* – which would contradict the singular *qua* of the text.⁵

Moreover, Eilers presents Piso's dealings with Rhoemetalces almost as a fact, which is far from being true. Although it is probable that Rhoemetalces became king in the aftermath of Piso's Thracian campaign, there is no evidence as to when precisely this might have happened, or whether Piso had been personally involved in the imposition of the king (an event clearly not attributed to him by Velleius, Tacitus or Dio).⁶ It is possible that Rhoemetalces together with his brother Rhescuporis II (*PIR*¹ R 42) were initially charged to keep the peace for Rome,⁷ until Augustus was to arrive at a firm decision. Rhoemetalces may have emerged as the king some time later (the earliest attestation, *AE* 1912, 213, probably dates to AD 1/2), and Rhescuporis still appears as his collaborator

⁵ Velleius says that Piso fought the *gentes* (2.98.2) in *Thracia* (2.98.1). In AD 26, C. Poppaeus Sabinus (*cos.* AD 9) was voted triumphal decorations *contusis Thraecum gentibus* (Tac., *Ann.* 4.46). Much earlier, in c. 60 BC, Caius Octavius the father of Augustus, had routed *Bessis ac Thracibus* in a great battle (Suet., *Aug.* 3.2).

⁶ Jones 1971: 377, n. 11, penetratingly comments: 'that Rhoemetalces succeeded Rhescuporis' kingdom is merely an inference from his later being king of all Thrace [...] The process of unification must have been gradual, for early in the reign of Augustus many of the tribes of northern Thrace were apparently independent...'

⁷ Bowersock 1965: 59.

in AD 6/7 in the Pannonian-Dalmatian revolt (Dio 55.30.6). An initial stage of divided power in Thrace (detering further local violence – an Augustan plan well-known from Palestine) may have ultimately appealed to Augustus, who, upon Rhoemetalces' death, indeed partitioned the country between his son Cotys (*PIR*² C 1554) and Rhescuporis II (Tac., *Ann.* 2.64). Thus, as with Rhescuporis I, Rhoemetalces I, who died long before Augustus (Tac., *ibid.*),⁸ would have had little direct connection to Piso, certainly not one worth mentioning over forty years later in the latter's *elogium*. Eilers' rescue operation of Syme's theory fails on this point.

(2) According to Syme, the *iterum* of the *titulus* must refer to the second legateship of Piso (presumably that of Syria); his legateship of Galatia being the first. However, an examination of Piso's early career creates some difficulties. Orosius (6.21.22) attests a campaign against the Vindelici, to which 'Piso' was sent conceivably as an imperial legate (*per duces et legatos bella gessit*), and thus the *titulus* should have referred to his Syrian command as *tertium* (not *iterum*). Eilers (1996: 217) does not accept this, because he assumes that Piso waged his campaign against the Vindelici either as proconsul or as legate of a legion.

But this difficulty cannot be bypassed so easily. Piso was consul in 15 BC. He also became, as it appears, proconsul of Italia Transpadana (Suet., *De rhet.* 6), which may have been in 14 BC, since it was only after the conquest of the Alpine lands that the zone had been freed of warfare, as Syme observed.⁹ Of course in 14 BC there would be no reason for a campaign against the Vindelici beyond the Alps, because they had already been subdued in 15 BC by the two Claudii (cf. Vell., 95.2; Suet., *Tib.* 9.2). So Piso's mission must predate 15 BC, and indeed Scheid correctly placed it in 16 BC.¹⁰ In all probability, therefore, Piso, who had been *praetor* in 18 BC,¹¹ was a propraetorian *legatus Augusti* against the Vindelici, presumably for the first time – not a proconsul. Nor could he have been a *legatus legionis*, not only because of the way Orosius presents this war as a special assignment (among other undertaken by famous *legati* of Augustus), but also because in the early Augustan period the *legatus legionis* was usually quaestorian in rank.¹² We would then expect the *titulus*, in Syme's reconstruction, to say that Piso was sent to Syria as legate *tertium*, and in fact that he took over Asia as proconsul *iterum*! Neither of these is true to the text.

Theoretically, Piso's case as the *ignotus* can be worse. He must have left Italia Transpadana by 13 BC, if he was to become *legatus Augusti pro praetore* in Galatia in that year, from where he was to be sent to Thrace by 12 BC (on Syme's date). Now his status in the *triennium* against the Bessi was that of *legatus Caesaris* (Vell., 2.98.2), or in other words, as once admitted by Syme, *legatus Augusti in Thracia*.¹³ One may legitimately

⁸ Apparently some years before, see Sullivan 1979: 200, n. 57.

⁹ Syme 1986: 332.

¹⁰ Scheid 1975: 78. This also agrees with Orosius who notes that Piso returned as victor to greet Augustus at Lugdunum, the first base of the Emperor's mission to the west (cf. Dio 54.19.1). W. Eck (1987: 203–209) argues that the 'Piso' of Orosius is not Lucius, and so not to be connected with the campaign against the Vindelici.

¹¹ Syme 1986: 331.

¹² Syme 1939a: 396, n. 7; 1995: 307.

¹³ Syme 1934b: 130. Levick 1967: 209, may have sensed the problem, when she suggested that Piso's position was that of proconsul of Macedonia (Thomasson 1984: 180, no. 6; cf. Tataki 1988: 187–188, no. 666).

count this as a separate legateship from that of Galatia, a new and special one, deserving an individual mention in the *titulus*. In such a case, Piso's presumed legateship of Syria would have been the fourth in his career (Vindelici – Galatia – Bessi – Syria), and the word *iterum* then should have read *quartum*!

(3) The *titulus* refers to two (*binas*) public thanksgivings. This means that on two different occasions during the campaigning period, a day (or more) of prayer was decreed in Rome, giving the opportunity for general adoration of the gods. Although a *supplicatio* was not always *triumphi praerogativa* (Cic., *Ad fam.* 15.5.2), and Tiberius had been voted one *non bello superato[s]* (*Res Gest.* 32), based on the available evidence the double case recorded in the *titulus* is unique for a commander who was not an Emperor or a relative. Gordon rightly termed it 'striking'.¹⁴ We may safely assume that the occasion had to do not only with a protracted war (in fact a series of campaigns), but also one that very likely involved a member of the imperial family, close to whom fought our commander. It is difficult to imagine Piso's mission in Thrace having deserved the voting of *supplications* twice, and clearly there is no evidence for it.

Eilers (1996: 218) says it would not have been impossible, and he attempts to split Dio's narrative of the campaign (54.34.6–7) into two halves, in an effort to create two different, and presumably equally 'important', phases. However, to imagine that the crushing of a pocket of resistance (Dio 54.34.7), after the major defeat of the Thracian tribes had been accomplished, should have been counted as another war for which another *supplicatio* was required by Rome is unconvincing in the extreme. Eilers is also unaware of the serious chronological problem. Syme had trouble with the allocation in time of the presumed two thanksgivings. According to him the 'first' *supplicatio* will have occurred in 11 BC, when Piso was awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* (which, one may note, did not add an imperatorial salutation to the Princeps' total). For the 'second' *supplicatio* Syme had to argue *a priori* that it came as a result of celebrating the pacification of Thrace in 10 BC!¹⁵ Thus his resort to dating the *triennium* of Piso's war (Vell., 2.98.2) between 12 and 10 BC. But Livy (*Per.* 115) place the final victory in Thrace in 11 BC (also evidently Dio, 12/11 BC), and it would only be natural for us to have to accept that the *triennium* actually occurred between 13 and 11 BC, as rightly stated by Woodman.¹⁶ Nothing inspires confidence for a second *supplicatio* in the case of Piso.

(4) Piso the Pontifex is not attested as proconsul of Asia. Three inscriptions, from Mytilene (*ILS* 8814), Pergamum (*IGRR* IV 410) and Stratonicea (*IK* 22.1010), are logically attributed to Piso the Augur (*cos.* 1 BC), as accepted by Eilers (1996: 220–221).¹⁷

But this could not be so (Syme, *loc. cit.*), and although a proconsulship may have helped the legateships in terms of the *iterum* in our text, it does not help the Asian proconsulship. For the meaning of *legatus Caesaris* in the context of a public province, see Bowersock 1964: 208–209.

¹⁴ Gordon 1952: 309.

¹⁵ Syme 1973: 595.

¹⁶ Woodman 1977: 115.

¹⁷ The fact that in the text from Mytilene the augurate is given as part of the name, may or may not imply that there was a *local* need for differentiation between the two contemporary Pisones (cf. Syme 1980: 337 = Syme 1984: 1229) – surely one named 'Augur' in Rome could randomly be referred to as such anywhere in the Empire. But it can certainly *not* imply that an older Piso had also governed Asia (Eilers 1996: 221) – Piso the Pontifex was famous enough in the general area (from his legateship of Galatia and his Thracian war), and his last official position of *praefectus urbis* from AD 12/13 (Tac., *Ann.* 6.10–1), was important enough not to have escaped notice in this part of the Roman Empire.

As for two other inscriptions, from Samos and Pergamum,¹⁸ which mention a Lucius Calpurnius Piso and his wife Statilia the daughter of Taurus, the less said the better. Eilers (1996: 221) accepts that they are ambiguous, and the assumptions he makes about them (following Habicht) cannot stand scrutiny, as was shown by Syme.¹⁹ Taurus' daughter Statilia does not have to be identical with Statilia (born between 58 and 45 BC inclusively – not 59 and 46 BC as per Eilers) mentioned by Pliny (*N.H.* 7.158); but even if she were, it would still be possible for her to have been the wife of the Augur, who could have been born earlier than Eilers allows (i.e. in the late 40s BC – remember that he died in AD 24, Tac., *Ann.* 4.21). The name of the Augur may well have been erased from the Samian stone as being the brother of the hated Cn. Piso, as Kajava pointed out.²⁰ As to by what criteria the Samians would have been able to distinguish between a reference to the Augur and the Pontifex (Eilers 1996: 222–223), the simple answer is by the fact that the Augur, unlike the Pontifex, had been a proconsul of Asia, and that his wife (whose name was also erased) was known to be Statilia.

The only piece of information produced by Syme which may be worth a reconsideration, Eilers (1996: 218–219) attempts to reinterpret but without sufficient attention (following Cichorius). This is an epigram of Antipater of Thessalonica (*Anth. Pal.* 10.25), praying for favourable seas 'towards Asis' (πρὸς Ἀσίδα, rather than πρὸς Ἀσίαν) in order to follow Piso. The description is vague, and it cannot be forced to mean the Roman *provincia Asia* itself, let alone Piso's proconsulship of it! A general reference to the continent of Asia (Asis) or 'Asia Minor', towards which one would sail to get to Galatia, the province of Piso, is all that one can claim for.

Yet, Eilers is determined to draw a more complicated picture. He presents this epigram as *postdating* the Thracian war, and thus as indicating a new Asian command for Piso (i.e. after Galatia). For supporting evidence he points to another epigram of Antipater, which praises Piso's Thracian war (*Anth. Pal.* 9.428), and which he sees as attesting to the fact that Antipater had not met Piso earlier. A key phrase, according to Eilers, implies that Antipater's description of Piso's war is taken 'from the accounts of others', since he himself had yet to join Piso. But unfortunately for Eilers, his understanding is based on a translation which is not the only one, and certainly not the best. The key phrase says:

ἀείδω δ' ὑπὸ σοὶ δεδμημένον ἼΑρεα Βεσσῶν
ὅσσ' ἐδάην πολέμου πάντ' ἀναλεξάμενος

The translation provided by Eilers (1996: 219) is:

I put together all I learnt of the war, and my song is of the Bessian fighting-men subdued beneath you.²¹

Paton (in the *Greek Anthology* of the Loeb edition) translates:

I sing thy conquest of the martial Bessi,
collecting all that I learnt about the war.

¹⁸ Herrmann 1960: 130–134, no. 30; Habicht 1969: 39–41, no. 19.

¹⁹ Syme 1986: 376–377.

²⁰ Kajava 1990: 92.

²¹ See Gow/Page 1968, I: 13, no. 1.

Braund translated it thus:

I sing of Bessian Ares made subject to you; I have brought to bear all I know of the warfare.²²

A more literal (and I believe more accurate) translation would be as follows:

I sing of the conquest by you of the Bessian Ares,
retelling²³ all the things of the war which I experienced.²⁴

If there is any implication here about Antipater's acquaintance with Piso, is the exact opposite from that thought by Eilers. Antipater not only was already in the service of Piso, but he must have followed him in the war against the Thracians.²⁵ Other epigrams may suggest that Piso indeed had become the patron and friend of the poet from an earlier time. Just before the Thracian war, a Macedonian broad-brimmed hat and an iron sword were presented to Piso to bring him luck, which Antipater inscribed with epigrams, probably on the very occasion (*Anth. Pal.* 6.335; 9.552). Earlier still, when Piso arrived in Galatia, a helmet was presented to him by Pylaemenes, evidently the son of late King Amyntas, and this was also inscribed by Antipater (*Anth. Pal.* 6.241), indicating that the poet would have moved to Galatia with Piso.²⁶ While in the province and under the influence of the poet, Piso himself may have experimented with metrical writing, as can be seen by an epigram mentioning Galatia and attributed to a Piso (*Anth. Pal.* 11.424). So the epigram in which Antipater prays to follow Piso to 'Asia Minor', does not postdate but *predate* the Thracian war, and has to be connected with the journey towards Galatia. No hidden meanings for a proconsulship of Asia are to be found in this sort of information, and Atkinson was absolutely right to reject it.²⁷

According to Eilers (1996: 220), if a senator is attested as present in Africa or Asia, acting in an official capacity, we would not go far wrong in supposing that he was proconsul there.²⁸ But such evidence of course is lacking for Piso. Nevertheless, Eilers also says that 'every ex-consul (or almost every ex-consul) would eventually have to go' to

²² Braund 1985: 130, no. 377.

²³ ἀναλεξάμενος from the verb ἀναλέγω, which means not only 'I pick up' or 'I select', but also 'I reread', 'I retell', 'I restate', or, as ἀναδιηγέομαι, 'I renarrate' (cf. Dorbarakes 1974: 73). Had Antipater wanted to say 'I put together' or 'I collect', a more appropriate word would have been συλλέγω – and in his context πάντα συλλεξάμενος, instead of πάντα ἀναλεξάμενος.

²⁴ ἐδάην from the verb δάω, which is translated not only into 'I learn', but also 'I know' or 'I possess knowledge of' – thus δαήμων (or εἰδήμων from the verb εἶδω), which can be rendered as 'he who knows', 'he who is experienced', or 'the expert' (cf. Dorbarakes 1974: 207, 256).

²⁵ Gow/Page 1968, II: 19, n. 3, answering to the 'insecure' premise of Cichorius (1922: 326–328) about the first time Piso and Antipater met, noted: 'Macedonia had been a Roman province since 146 B.C. and Thessalonica was its chief town. A[ntipater] might have had the occasion to go to Rome some time before Piso went to Macedonia.'; cf. Bowersock 1965: 125, who, although following Cichorius, observes that 'it was due precisely to Actium that several Greek writers happened to be in Rome in the early twenties.'

²⁶ Syme wisely avoided the argument that Piso became the patron of Antipater after the Thracian War. He may himself have implied (Syme 1986: 379) that they would have met earlier.

²⁷ Atkinson 1958: 323–324.

²⁸ This is a dangerous argument, for while it might occasionally be proved correct, sometimes can be wrong. For example, P. Sulpicius Quirinius (*cos.* 12 BC), is officially attested as acting in Africa (*Flor.*, 2.31), but he was not proconsul there, and he most probably became proconsul of Asia (*Tac., Ann.* 3.48; see Atkinson 1958: 317–318). Further, we must not forget that senators were more often present in Africa or Asia as *legati proconsulis*.

Africa or Asia anyway, presumably meaning that the chance for Piso to become a proconsul of one or the other would not be far from 100%. Syme was even so optimistic for Asia alone: ‘No matter. There is a high probability that the Pontifex held this post.’²⁹ There is a question here that needs to be answered with a statistical illustration. What are really the probabilities of Piso having gone to Asia as a proconsul, or to either Asia or Africa?

In Syme’s view (guided by the *titulus*), Piso, consul in 15 BC, would have gone first to Asia and then to Syria. The norm of waiting five years (partly attested in the middle years of Augustus) before a proconsulship of either Asia or Africa, should have set his appointment at 10/9 BC. But Asia is not available in this year, only Africa is. Assuming that Piso for some reason avoided Africa, and that only later happened to be sent to Asia, how much later can that be? Following Syme’s decision to appoint Piso in Syria between 4 and 1 BC, Asia had to be held by 5/4 at the latest. So Piso would be placed there in one of the following years: 9/8 (Syme’s wish), 8/7 (allowed by Eilers), 7/6, 6/5 or 5/4. However, 9/8 is appropriate for P. Cornelius Scipio (*cos.* 16 BC),³⁰ as is 7/6 for P. Sulpicius Quirinius (*cos.* 12 BC),³¹ and 6/5 is definitely occupied by C. Asinius Gallus (*cos.* 8 BC).³² Further, as argued by Atkinson, Iullus Antonius (*cos.* 10 BC), whose normal term would have been 5/4 BC, could have preceded his time – not so much due to family connections, but because his *praenomen* is already in use in Asia at the beginning of 5 BC.³³ Thus, he may have to be placed before Gallus and Quirinius, i.e. in 8/7 BC. We are left only with 5/4 as potentially possible for Piso.

But even this year cannot be claimed for Piso alone. If the known example of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus (*cos.* 14 BC), who held Asia in 2/1 BC (i.e. twelve years after consulship),³⁴ represents a maximum delay for this period, extrapolating this time-lag back from 5/4 BC (i.e. to 17 BC), we can count *seven* consuls with unknown major proconsulship (had they achieved one), who could legitimately claim this position (cf. table below): C. Furnius (*cos.* 17); L. Tarius Rufus (*cos. suff.* 16); M. Livius Drusus Libo (*cos.* 15); C. Valgius Rufus (*cos. suff.* 12); Q. Aelius Tubero (*cos.* 11); T. Quinctius Crispinus (*cos.* 9); and D. Laelius Balbus (*cos.* 6). Of course there are gaps to fill in both Asia and Africa in this period, but there are also earlier consuls who might be added to the list, and yet to be avoided. One consul, however, who must be included here is C. Marcus Censorinus (*cos.* 8 BC). It is certain that he governed Asia, and although his normal time would have been 3/2 BC, an earlier opportunity (i.e. 5/4) is not beyond possibility³⁵ – remember Paullus Fabius Maximus (*cos.* 11 BC), who went to Asia within a year of his consulship.³⁶ On the basis of such considerations, therefore, Piso’s chances of having

²⁹ Syme 1973: 597.

³⁰ Thomasson 1984: 207, no. 9. Scipio had already missed the years 11/10 and 10/9 BC (see table below).

³¹ Atkinson 1958: 314, tentatively placed Quirinius around 1 BC/AD 1, but as stressed by Syme (1995: 266), if Quirinius governed Asia is not likely to have been later than 6 BC – that is to say normally five years after consulship (see table below).

³² Thomasson 1984: 207, no. 11.

³³ Atkinson 1958: 327.

³⁴ Thomasson 1984: 207, no. 12.

³⁵ Atkinson (1958: 326) had no real basis for placing him (as praetorian proconsul) back to 13/12 BC, neither had Thomasson (1984: 209, no. 21) to post c. 2 BC, nor Bowersock (1964: 208) to about AD 2/3. The right vein was struck by Syme (1995: 306): ‘not later than 3 B.C.’

³⁶ Thomasson 1984: 206, no. 8.

gone to Asia in 5/4 BC are only 1 in 9, or let us say that he may be given an 11% chance. This is not 'high probability', as thought by Syme, but low. It may also be more natural to suppose that *Piso* went to Africa in 10/9 BC (a vacant position in his normal time).

A broader sample may help to quantify the problem. If, for instance, we take the period from 27 BC, when provincial administration was reformed by Augustus, to 3 BC, after which, as stated by Eilers (1996: 220), the system of *suffect* consulships become regular, there would have been a need for roughly 48 consuls to fill the *proconsulships* of Asia and Africa. As it happened, fewer *proconsuls* were actually appointed, since we know that there had been double terms in Asia, for example one by Sex. Appuleius (*cos.* 29 BC), apparently in 23/21 BC, another by Potitus Valerius Messala (*cos. suff.* 29 BC), sometime between 28 and 20 BC,³⁷ and yet another mentioned by Dio (54.30.3) in 12/10 BC. Even a triple term may not be totally unthinkable, if only because it occurred later at the time of C. Vibius Postumus (*cos. suff.* AD 5).³⁸ Also in the early part of this period praetors had been appointed to these *proconsulships*, such as C. Junius Silanus and L. Cornelius Balbus, the former in Asia the latter in Africa, both in the late 20s BC.³⁹ Thus a round number of 40 consuls filling the positions in Asia and Africa from 27 to 3 BC may not be far off the truth. From that same period we know of 50 eligible consuls (see table below), but of course there were more available – for example, resurrected consuls from the past who became major *proconsuls*, such as C. Norbanus Flaccus (*cos.* 38 BC), L. Sempronius Atratinus (*cos. suff.* 34 BC), M. Herennius Picens (*cos.* 34 BC), *et al.* Thus a round number of 60 consuls available to be sent to Asia or Africa between 27 and 3 BC may also not be far off the truth.

If this assessment is reasonable, that is to say there were 40 positions for 60 consuls, then approximately 20 consuls were never appointed to a *proconsulship*. This represents a ratio of 1 in 3 for that period. In other words, for any consul between 27 and 3 BC there was a chance of about 33% not to reach either Asia or Africa. Any leap of faith in assigning a *proconsulship* to a consul, on the basis that there might be indirect evidence connecting him to either province, should not have a better chance than 66% on being correct. This is a handicap rather than a happy situation as presented by Eilers (1996: 220). So, aside from the fact that there is no clear, indirect evidence for connecting *Piso* with Asia, we can presently allow him only an 11% chance for such *proconsulship*, while (in view of the broader statistical exercise) he may be assigned a 66% chance to have ultimately gone to either Asia or Africa. These are surely not grounds upon which to build a serious argument.

Consuls Eligible for the *Proconsulships* of Asia and Africa in the Period 27–3 BC

(Excluded are Augustus, Ti. Claudius Nero and Nero Claudius Drusus, as well as people known to have died in office, such as M. Valerius Messala Barbatus Appianus and C. Caninius Rebilus, not to mention died before the term began, as in the case of A. Terentius Varro Murena.)

³⁷ Thomasson 1984: 205, no. 4; 206, no. 6.

³⁸ Thomasson 1984: 209, no. 24.

³⁹ Thomasson 1984: 206, no. 5; 371, no. 4.

	<i>cos.</i>	(expected <i>procos.</i>)	<i>procos.</i>
1. M. Vipsanius Agrippa	27 BC	(22/21)	Asia 23/21?
2. T. Statilius Taurus	26	(21/20)	
3. M. Junius Silanus	25	(20/19)	
4. C. Norbanus Flaccus	24	(19/18)	Asia 19–10?
5. L. Sestius Quirinalis	23	(18/17)	
6. Cn. Calpurnius Piso	23	(18/17)	
7. M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus	22	(17/16)	
8. L. Arruntius	22	(17/16)	
9. M. Lollius	21	(16/15)	
10. Q. Aemilius Lepidus	21	(16/15)	Asia 16–10?
11. M. Appuleius	20	(15/14)	
12. P. Silius Nerva	20	(15/14)	
13. C. Sentius Saturninus	19	(14/13)	
14. Q. Lucretius Vespillo	19	(14/13)	
15. M. Vinicius	19	(14/13)	Asia
16. P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus	18	(13/12)	
17. Cn. Cornelius Lentulus	18	(13/12)	
18. C. Furnius	17	(12/11)	
19. C. Junius Silanus	17	(12/11)	<i>praet.</i> Asia 23/21?
20. L. Domitius Ahenobarbus	16	(11/10)	Africa 12
21. P. Cornelius Scipio	16	(11/10)	Asia 9–3?
22. L. Tarius Rufus	16	(11/10)	
23. M. Livius Drusus Libo	15	(10/9)	
24. L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (Pontifex)	15	(10/9)	
25. M. Licinius Crassus	14	(9/8)	----- Africa 9/8
26. Cn. Cornelius Lentulus (Augur)	14	(9/8)	Asia 2/1
27. P. Quinctilius Varus	13	(8/7)	----- Africa 8/7?
28. P. Sulpicius Quirinius	12	(7/6)	
29. C. Valgius Rufus	12	(7/6)	
30. L. Volusius Saturninus	12	(7/6)	----- Africa 7/6?
31. Q. Aelius Tubero	11	(6/5)	
32. Paullus Fabius Maximus	11	(6/5)	Asia 10/9
33. Africanus Fabius Maximus	10	(5/4)	Africa 6/5?
34. Iullus Antonius	10	(5/4)	Asia 9–3?
35. T. Quinctius Crispinus Sulpicianus	9	(4/3)	
36. C. Marcius Censorinus	8	(3/2)	Asia
37. C. Asinius Gallus	8	(3/2)	Asia 6/5
38. Cn. Calpurnius Piso	7	(2/1)	Africa 4–AD?
39. D. Laelius Balbus	6	(1/AD 1)	
40. C. Antistius Vetus	6	(1/AD 1)	Asia AD 1–3?
41. L. Cornelius Sulla	5	(1/2)	
42. L. Vinicius	5	(1/2)	

43. Q. Haterius	5	(1/2)	
44. C. Sulpicius Galba	5	(1/2)	
45. C. Calvisius Sabinus	4	(2/3)	
46. L. Passienus Rufus	4	(2/3)	Africa AD
47. C. Caelius	4	(2/3)	
48. Galus Sulpicius	4	(2/3)	
49. L. Cornelius Lentulus	3	(3/4)	Africa AD
50. M. Valerius Messala Messalinus	3	(3/4)	

(5) *Piso* the Pontifex is not attested as governor of Syria, and the condition of the *fasti* of this province is reasonable to the extent of rendering it extremely improbable for him to have been one. Josephus' wide interest in Jewish culture has provided us with an outstanding and inexhaustible source for the history of the area. In fact, the only available histories of Palestine, Jordan, Syria and many neighbouring Semitic lands, have been reconstructed primarily on the basis of Josephus.⁴⁰ To discover the senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus*, one indeed *must* begin with Josephus, whose list of Syrian governors is a potential 'index' of their suitability as candidates for the position of *ignotus*. Silence on the part of the Jewish historian should, at least provisionally, be regarded as a serious problem for any interpretation. Eilers (1996: 223) imagines a substantial gap in our knowledge of the *fasti* of Syria under Augustus, and thinks that any reference to Josephus (who lacks certain years in his narrative) is an argument from silence. But Josephus is supplemented by other sources, particularly coins and inscriptions, and, above all, common sense. For the period concerned only a *brief gap* may be assumed to exist, which, however, is most probably illusory (see below).

According to Syme, *Piso* would have governed Syria 'c. 4–1 B.C.'⁴¹ and according to Eilers (1996: 225) 'between c. 3 BC and c. AD 3'. These dates, as stated, reveal a superficial understanding of local history. The year 4 BC is out of the question. Varus the legate, who had been busy at least until August 4 BC (with the revolt in Judaea *post mortem Herodis*), could not have left Syria safely before the return of Herod's sons from Rome in the spring of 3 BC.⁴² But there is no evidence for Varus departing in 3 BC, and had he done so it would have been in the early summer of this year, as Syme finally had to accept.⁴³ Now, in 12 May 2 BC⁴⁴ Gaius, the grandson of Augustus, was granted proconsular *imperium* (Dio 55.10.19) and sent to Syria. His precise position is variously given in our sources, but Suetonius (*Aug.* 67.2) clearly calls Syria 'his province', and Orosius (7.3.4) refers to Gaius specifically as being in charge of Syria. Whether Gaius' official appointment in 2 BC, meant that he would eventually replace in person the existing governor of

⁴⁰ See Millar 1993: 5, 30.

⁴¹ Syme 1973: 598.

⁴² See Hoehner 1972: 33–39; cf. Paltiel 1981: 107–108; Kokkinos 1993: 177.

⁴³ Syme 1986: 324.

⁴⁴ Romer 1978: 187–188; 1979: 199–200; cf. Syme 1995: 317–334. I do not subscribe to the interpretation of the *Fasti Praenestini* by P. Herz (1980: 285–286); the itinerary and chronology of Gaius' Eastern mission needs further work – some epigraphical and numismatic sources have not been looked at carefully.

Syria, need not be gone into here. Suffice it to say, in full agreement with Syme,⁴⁵ that Lollius, the *rector* of Gaius (Suet., *Tib.* 12.2), would have acted in his stead as governor until he died in AD 1/2 (Vell., 2.102.1), to be replaced either by Quirinius, the new *rector* (Tac., *Ann.* 3.48), until Gaius' own death in AD 4, or better by the next governor Volusius Saturninus (see table below). Quirinius must have accompanied Gaius in his Armenian campaign, and since later he became governor of Syria, it is to be avoided that he held this post 'twice' (ironically to the *iterum* of the *titulus*).⁴⁶ So, if there is a gap to be conceded here, it can only have lasted *strictly* speaking from the summer of 3 to that of 2 BC, and hardly enough time for a new governor (let alone the unattested Piso). But, although a brief interregnum may not be excluded, it is much preferable to assume that Varus left Syria in c. 2 BC, and thus no need for an illusory gap. A longer tenure for Varus will make better sense of Velleius' remark (2.117.2) that 'he entered the rich province a poor man, but left it a rich man and the province poor.'

Since by mentioning the *ornamenta triumphalia*, the *titulus Tiburtinus* provides a *terminus post quem* of 12 BC (according to Syme), and less likely 20 BC (according to Taylor and Maxfield),⁴⁷ all governors of Syria before 20 BC can safely be excluded.⁴⁸ A fresh reconstruction of the *fasti* of Syrian legates to the death of Augustus may now be appended, followed by a brief commentary.⁴⁹ It is worth noting that the length of tenure for provincial commands was supposed to be not less than three or more than five years (Dio 52.23.2), though, as Taylor correctly noted, the available evidence tends to show 'rather that the maximum was exceeded than that the minimum was not reached.'⁵⁰

The Governors of Syria from c. 20 BC to the Death of Augustus

[Potitus Valerius Messala (<i>cos. suff.</i> 29 BC)	= 21?–17?]
M. Titius (<i>cos. suff.</i> 31 BC)	= 17?–12
C. Sentius Saturninus (<i>cos.</i> 19 BC)	= 12–8/7
P. Quinctilius Varus (<i>cos.</i> 13 BC)	= 7–3/2
C. Iulius Caesar (<i>cos.</i> AD 1)	= 2 BC–AD 4
[M. Lollius (<i>cos.</i> 21 BC)	= 2 BC–AD 1–2]
L. Volusius Saturninus (<i>cos. suff.</i> 12 BC)	= 1/2?–6
P. Sulpicius Quirinius (<i>cos.</i> 12 BC)	= 6–10?
[C. Marcus Censorinus (<i>cos.</i> 8 BC)	= 10?–12]
Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus Silanus (<i>cos.</i> AD 7)	= 12–17

⁴⁵ Syme 1973: 601.

⁴⁶ See Kokkinos 1995: 26, n. 19.

⁴⁷ Syme 1973: 586; Taylor 1939: 168–170; Maxfield 1981: 105–106.

⁴⁸ Of the governors before 20 BC, only [M. Terentius?] Varro (24?–23 BC; Thomasson 1984: 303, no. 4) could have raised a curiosity for investigation in connection to the *titulus*, on the basis of his subjugation of the Salassi (Strabo 4.6.7; Dio 53.25.3), but he is excluded by the dating of the *ornamenta triumphalia*, and he has never been proposed. Also excluded is M. Vipsanius Agrippa (23–21? BC; Thomasson 1984: 303–304, no. 5), who was considered erroneously by P.E. Huschke in 1840 and 1847 (see Firpo 1983: 238).

⁴⁹ Cf. Schürer 1973: 256–260; Rey-Coquais 1978: 62–63; Thomasson 1984: 303–305.

⁵⁰ Taylor 1933: 123–124, n. 10.

The evidence for Messalla is based on a restoration (*ILS* 8964), which although reasonable is not certain.⁵¹ If this restoration were to be proved wrong, the time allocated here to Messalla (perhaps also some of Titius' time) may otherwise be filled by Agrippa's general status in the East.⁵² The precise dating links between Titius and Saturninus, and between the latter and Varus, require a lengthy discussion, which is not essential to the argument here; suffice it to say that they leave no gap. Under Gaius, apart from his *rectores* Lollius and Quirinius, other notables are known to have accompanied him as advisers,⁵³ and presumably residing in Syria for a while – possibly among them a well-known consular who had received *ornamenta triumphalia*: L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (*cos.* 16 BC).⁵⁴ It goes without saying that there is no mention of Piso anywhere. On the contrary there are indications that Piso will have remained in Rome, from where he bade young Gaius farewell, if this is what the two epigrams by his poet Antipater (*Anth. Pal.* 9.59, 297), dated to 2 BC, ought to mean.

Volusius is attested in Syria by the coins struck in AD 4/5 (*RPC* 1, no. 4262), and since Gaius died in AD 4, it has been a natural assumption to place Volusius' arrival in that year.⁵⁵ However, after the death of Lollius in AD 1/2, Gaius had been away on his fatal campaign, and some authority may have been left behind (given that Quirinius would have followed the young prince). Further, there is no rule as to when a governor strikes coins in a province, or which of his issues ultimately become known to us. Volusius could well have arrived a year or two before his only surviving numismatic commemoration. This suggestion may agree with the fact that in AD 6 he was replaced by Quirinius – a slightly longer term (between 1/2 and 6, instead of 4 and 6) would seem desirable.

We do not know when Quirinius' famous term ended, but it is unlikely to have been much later than AD 10. This means that until the next *legatus*, Silanus, is known to be present in AD 12 (*RPC* 1, nos. 4268–71; 4330–2; 4541–4),⁵⁶ there may, theoretically, exist a brief interval for another governor – but apparently only one who died in office, thus a short term.⁵⁷ Indeed, a potential governor has long been waiting to take his place in the *fasti*: Censorinus (*PIR*² M 222). Velleius (2.102.1) tells us that the death of Lollius in Syria in AD 1/2 brought joy to the people, in contrast to the sorrow later felt here on the occasion of the death of Censorinus.⁵⁸ How much later? Without committing an

⁵¹ Gordon 1954: 40–43, 50–51; cf. Syme 1955: 159–160 (= Syme 1979a: 267–270); Thomasson 1984: 304, no. 6.

⁵² It is possible that Agrippa was reckoned to be the governor of Syria (partly *in absentia*) for most of the period 23–13 BC (Schürer 1973: 256); but Titius was *legatus* by 13 BC anyway (Kokkinos 1993: 427–428). For a new text which can be interpreted to show that Titius was in his post in 15 BC, see Kokkinos 2013.

⁵³ Romer 1979: 202, n. 11; Syme 1995: 322, n. 35.

⁵⁴ Suetonius (*Nero* 5.1) is confused referring to Cn. Domitius (*cos.* AD 32) as being on the staff of Gaius, and therefore his father (cf. Suet., *Nero* 4) would be meant (*contra* Bradley 1978: 42, who sees Cnaeus following Germanicus instead). L. Domitius, being in the age group of Lollius, could have acted as his adviser (though Suetonius does not specify), and indeed both consulars are attested in Athens presumably in Gaius' company (*JG* II² 4139–40, 4144). Syme (1986: 155–156) prefers to create an unknown brother of Cn. Domitius, named after their father Lucius, who would also be seen on the *Ara Pacis*. An older brother may still be rather young to follow Gaius, but other young men are known to have done so: e.g. Aelius Sejanus (*Tac.*, *Ann.* 4.1).

⁵⁵ Thomasson 1984: 304, no. 11.

⁵⁶ Schürer 1973: 259–260; cf. Thomasson 1984: 305, no. 15.

⁵⁷ Cf. Syme 1981: 125–126 (= Syme 1984: 1376–1377).

⁵⁸ *Sed quam hunc decessisse laetati homines, tam paulo post obiisse Censorinum in iisdem provinciis graviter tulit civitas...* There are two questions in the translation of this passage. First, how much later did

injustice to Volusius (that is to say by taking away AD 1/2–4 from his term), we may venture to place him in the only conceivable space, after Quirinius and before Silanus (i.e. AD 10?–12). A later date for Censorinus may also fit better with the question of his age at death – being consul in 8 BC, he would have been born as late as 41 BC.

So far, so good. There should be little doubt that the *ignotus* of the *titulus Tiburtinus* is named in this very list above: in other words he should be one of the eleven consulars mentioned (to include Domitius). Now, by the method of elimination we can be certain that the majority of them are excluded. There is space to mention only few of the reasons for excluding each individual:

Messalla	= dating of the <i>ornamenta triumphalia</i> ; proconsul of Asia <i>bis</i> . ⁵⁹
Titius	= dating of the <i>ornamenta triumphalia</i> ; probably died before Augustus.
Varus	= died before Augustus; proconsul of Africa. ⁶⁰
Gaius	= obvious reasons
Lollius	= died before Augustus; many commands before Syria unsuitable for the <i>titulus</i> . ⁶¹
Domitius	= proconsul of Africa. ⁶²
Volusius	= proconsul of Africa. ⁶³
Censorinus	= died before Augustus.
Silanus	= appointment in Syria overlapped reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, not mentioned on the <i>titulus</i> .

If this assessment is reasonable, we are left with Saturninus and Quirinius (both recipients of triumphal honours) as the only valid candidates for the position of *ignotus*. We shall come back later to decide which one of the two is the best!

Meanwhile, even if it has become evident that Piso has no place in Syria, there is a final piece of alleged evidence (Eilers 1996: 224–225) that needs to be disposed off – the inscription from Hierapolis Castabala (*AE* 1920, 71):

Ὁ Δῆμος ὁ Ἱεροπολιτῶν | Λεύκιον Κ[α]λπόρριον Πείσωνα | πρεσβευτὴν καὶ
ἀντιστράτηγον | τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ πάτρωνα τῆς | πόλεως ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας
| τῆς εἰς αὐτόν.

Censorinus die? Most scholars have allowed a very little time, dating his death to AD 2/3 (Bowersock 1964: 208; Syme 1995: 304). However, *paulo post* seems to mean ‘somewhat later’ – in fact the Loeb edition has ‘long afterwards’! Velleius may well have brought together two events separated by some years, as long as his context was served by the contrast of characters. Writing three decades later, the precise date of the second death was not as important to him as the fact that it occurred in the same part of the world, during the last phase of Augustus’ rule, and it could be used to blacken Lollius. Velleius may also have hinted at Horace (4.8–9), who had devoted two successive, and similar, odes to Censorinus and Lollius. Second, why *in iisdem provinciis*? The plural used may reflect the fact that Censorinus’ death was felt much wider in the East than just in Syria. After all, he had earned appointments in Bithynia-Pontus, Asia and, one may guess, in Armenia with Gaius. Be that as it may, Censorinus at his death could only have been governor of Syria or Galatia (Atkinson 1958: 326; Sherk 1980: 1036–1037; Syme 1995: 306). The first appears to be the most natural.

⁵⁹ Thomasson 1984: 206, no. 6.

⁶⁰ Thomasson 1984: 372, no. 8.

⁶¹ Sherk 1980: 963–964.

⁶² Thomasson 1984: 371–372, no. 6.

⁶³ Thomasson 1984: 372, no. 9.

The shortest route to a decisive reply would be to show that this text does not refer to the Pontifex and leave it at that. But it raises a number of issues, and for the sake of clarity a brief discussion of the area in which it was found and Syme's view of it need to be gone into here.

From an early time Syme was converted to the long-established belief⁶⁴ that under Augustus Plain Cilicia was attached to the province of Syria. So according to him this inscription showed that Piso the Pontifex was governor of the latter, at a suggested date c. 4–1 BC.⁶⁵ When later the royal status of a large part of Plain Cilicia (with Castabala as its centre) under Augustus had been manifest (particularly through the work of Jones), Syme began to adjust his view. Although still holding that the rest of this area continued to be part of Syria,⁶⁶ and even if he appeared to require more convincing about Castabala,⁶⁷ he was forced to question whether the inscription showed that Piso was governing Syria in c. 4–1 BC, or Galatia-Pamphylia in c. 13 BC, or whether the *legatus* mentioned was another Piso of a later date.⁶⁸ Later still (after the publication of the works of Magie and Robert), Syme begrudgingly had to repeat his, by now frail, position, but inevitably accepting the royal status of the city of Castabala.⁶⁹ In his most recent attempt, Syme curiously seemed to backtrack, even resorting to a perfectly circular argument:

At Hierapolis Castabala in Cilicia Pedias a Lucius Calpurnius Piso received a dedication, styling him 'legatus pro praetore'. The region belonged to Syria. [*sic*] Hence the hypothesis that the Pontifex was Caesar's legate in Syria, perhaps from 4 to 1 [...] A candid exposition will add that Piso's governorship is subject to caution [...] Before the Pontifex is accepted beyond cavil, it would be expedient to have some kind of extraneous confirmation [...] Such is to hand, at least on one interpretation of the famous fragment found near Tibur.⁷⁰ [*sic*]

This of course will not do. Castabala was the centre of a client kingdom, covering most of Eastern Plain Cilicia, from 20 BC to at least AD 17.⁷¹ Western Plain Cilicia,

⁶⁴ It goes back to Baronius (1588) as explained by Bickerman 1947: 356.

⁶⁵ Syme 1934b: 128: 'It has always been assumed that Cilicia Campestris was attached to Syria at this time [c. 4–1 BC according to Syme's dating of the Castabala inscription], and there is nothing to shake this assumption.'

⁶⁶ Syme 1939b: 327: 'the extent and character of Syria under the Principate may easily be discovered – it is simply the Antonian province of Syria [...] It will not be forgotten, however, that the principality of Tarcondimotus in Pedias around Hierapolis-Castabala was soon revived [...] Cilicia Pedias [i.e. without Castabala] remained a part of the province of Syria until the beginning of the reign of Vespasian.'

⁶⁷ Syme 1995: 163: 'As for Castabala, the only question is whether it might not have been liberated from regal control even before the death of the last king.'

⁶⁸ Syme 1995: 163–164; cf. Syme 1939a: 398, n. 8: 'The dedication from Hierapolis-Castabala [...] would not be sufficient or secure support, for it may belong to another L. Piso at a slightly later date; and Castabala was the capital of a native principality.'

⁶⁹ Syme 1973: 597–598: 'Since in the early Principate Cilicia Pedias was attached to the province of Syria, it was permissible to infer that this Piso was the imperial legate governing Syria [...] Hesitations might be expressed [...] Castabala (otherwise Hierapolis) was in the dominion of a native dynasty, so it appears, and may not have been added to the province of Syria before [...] A.D. 17 [...] the Piso of the inscription might be a praetorian legate at a later date...'

⁷⁰ Syme 1986: 337–338.

⁷¹ For Castabala and the Tarcondimotid dynasty, see Jones 1971: 201–205, 437–438; Magie 1950: 377, 475, 1237–1238, 1240–1241; Dupont-Sommer/Robert 1964: 45; Dagron/Feissel 1987: 67–71; Hild/Hellenkemper 1990: 293–294; cf. Sullivan 1990: 191–192; Desideri 1991: 302–304; Syme 1995: 161–165. Various indications suggest that the kingdom will have continued to function to the time of Vespasian, though its size

which was comprised of a few autonomous or quasi-autonomous cities (basically Tarsus, Zephyrium and Soli Pompeiopolis),⁷² may, or may not, have been under the jurisdiction of a neighbouring Roman province, but it will not have been Syria. With the possible exception of the special circumstances in the turbulent years under Caesar and Antonius,⁷³ no part of Cilicia was attached to Syria, before, during or after Augustus (*contra* Eilers 1996: 224).⁷⁴ Had there been a need for a supervising Roman province, the choice at that time would clearly have been Galatia-Pamphylia or perhaps Cyprus.⁷⁵ A greater choice was of course available from the time of Claudius, with the creation of the provinces of Cappadocia and Lycia-Pamphylia. Indeed at the beginning of Nero's reign, Coastal Plain Cilicia, clearly separate from Syria (Tac., *Ann.* 13.8; cf. Pomp. Mela, *De Chron.* 1.11.62–3), together with Central Plain Cilicia, had been placed under the jurisdiction of the procurator of Cappadocia, as evidenced by *AE* 1914, 128: *proc. Nero[nis Cl]audi Ca[esaris] Aug. Germa[nici pr]ovincia[rum] [Capp]adociae et Ciliciae*.⁷⁶

gradually contracted. Tacitus (*Ann.* 2.78, 80) refers to the *reguli Cilicum* late in AD 19, which is unlikely to mean only the kings of Rugged Cilicia and Olba. Strabo's remark τὴν διαδοχὴν τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν παρέδωκε (14.5.18) would seem to imply more than one succession in the family of Tarcondimotus I. The children of Tarcondimotus II (Julius Strato and Julia II) were alive possibly to the time of Claudius (Dagron/Feissel 1987: *loc. cit.*). But the city of Augusta, reckoning its era from AD 20 (*RPC* 1, nos. 4006–11), seems to have been severed from the kingdom, to be joined in the early 30s by Mallus, Aegeae, Mopsuestia, and Epiphanea, all of which began issuing imperial coins (*RPC* 1, nos. 4015–6, 4030–1, 4047–50, 4066–7). The part of Cilicia presented to [C. Iulius] Polemo II of Pontus by Claudius in AD 41 (Dio 60.8.2), can only have been the remaining of this kingdom in Upper Plain Cilicia. The city of Anazarbus next turned imperial in AD 48/9 (*RPC* 1, nos. 4059–61), contracting the kingdom even further, effectively leaving only Castabala, two north-eastern towns of uncertain location (but see Hild/Hellenkemper 1990: 245–248, 378–379) – Neronias and future Flaviae – and possibly a passage south to the sea at Issus and Alexandria as Issum; cf. Shapur I's trilingual inscription referring to this area (Maricq 1958: 313, lines 27–30).

⁷² In fact under Augustus only Tarsus issued imperial coins (*RPC* 1, no. 4004), to be followed under Nero by Soli Pompeiopolis (*RPC* 1, no. 4003). Pliny (*N.H.* 5.91–2) blurringly refers to three free cities: Tarsus, Aegeae and Mopsuestia.

⁷³ The only clear evidence refers to the period 38–37 BC under C. Sosius (Dio 49.22.3). Syme (1939b, 136–44) has proposed also the periods 46, 44(?) and 43 onwards.

⁷⁴ As discussed by Bickerman (1947), who allowed for such unity only in a period from AD 18/35 to 54, but the evidence he cites even for this period cannot stand scrutiny, and it is best for this claim to be rejected altogether (regardless of the question of precise boundaries – Taeuber 1991: 201–210). Whether united or divided, dependent or independent, Cilicia always abode to the laws of natural geography and culture. Syme himself (1939b: 122–123) envisaged the greater extent of the Republican province of Cilicia under Pompeius to have reached northwards to *Bithynia* and *Pontus*. Octavian added Rugged Cilicia to the *Galatian* kingdom of Amyntas, to be transferred later by the now named Augustus to the *Cappadocian* territory of Archelaus (Strabo 14.5.6; cf. 12.1.4). Castabala of Upper Plain Cilicia appears twice in the lists of Pliny – once among Cilician (*N.H.* 5.93), and once among *Cappadocian*, *Pontic* and Cilician cities (*N.H.* 6.8). Rugged Cilicia and Western Coastal Cilicia were presented to Antiochus IV, king of *Commagene* by Caligula and again Claudius (Dio 59.8.2; 60.8.1; cf. Jos., *Ant.* 19.276). Eastern Plain Cilicia was bestowed by Claudius to [C. Iulius] Polemo of *Pontus* (see above note 71).

⁷⁵ Following this understanding I had previously allowed as possible that *if* the Castabala inscription was to refer to Piso the Pontifex, it would have referred to him as governor of Galatia-Pamphylia (Kokkinos 1995: 25). This was shared by S. Mitchell (1993, I: 78), who, in reference to an unpublished inscription of Piso from Oenoanda, says that it is possible that his operations as governor of Galatia 'extended from Oenoanda in the west to the Cilician city of Hierapolis-Castabala in the east, a distance even as the crow flies of more than 500 kilometres...' The case for Cyprus (Gwatkin 1930: 52–53; cf. Magie 1950: 1419–1420, n. 68) may now be re-examined, since a new inscription from the general area of Castabala (Dagron/Feissel 1987: no. 120) suggests the adoption of names of two proconsuls of Cyprus by a local family under Tiberius – but cf. Salomies 1993: 119–120.

⁷⁶ Cf. Dagron/Feissel 1987: no. 28 from Tarsus.

If the client kingdom of Eastern Plain Cilicia was indeed suppressed between AD 17 and 41 (which is unlikely though unclear), the status of its cities could either have reverted to autonomy,⁷⁷ or have begun to share the dependent status of the cities of the rest of Plain Cilicia (if they had meanwhile been supervised by Galatia-Pamphylia or Cyprus),⁷⁸ or even been given a temporary, independent command. Compare the contemporary (AD 18) situation in the kingdoms of Cappadocia and Commagene. At the death of their kings, Archelaus I and Antiochus IV, they were in the first instance put under the control of Roman senators, Quintus Veranius and Quintus Servaeus respectively (Tac., *Ann.* 2.56.2). Cappadocia was soon to emerge as a 'procuratorial' province until the time of Nero (Dio 57.17.7). Commagene was later restored to its royal status (Dio 59.8.2; 60.8.1).⁷⁹ Thus if the kingdom of Eastern Plain Cilicia was put under the charge of a Roman senator, we would have expected to find here a *legatus* (either independent or subordinate to the *legatus* of Galatia-Pamphylia or perhaps the *proconsul* of Cyprus) like, for example, the *Piso* mentioned in the Castabala inscription – if it is to be dated after AD 17. Such a Roman senator may also be found in the non-royal Plain Cilicia, if the Tiberian coin of Aegeae (*RPC* 1, no. 4030) does indeed refer to Quintus Terentius Culleo (*cos. suff.* AD 40).

With this complex perspective in mind, how does one interpret the inscription from Castabala? First of all, since it is a dedication evidently by an independent *dēmos*, it must postdate AD 17. This immediately disqualifies *Piso* the Pontifex. *Piso* who then? Two other *Lucii Pisones* are known under Tiberius, but they would rather be excluded by Syme.⁸⁰ Also, as we saw, it is not clear that the kingdom had totally folded before the time of Vespasian.⁸¹ Yet, a case may be made for L. Calpurnius *Piso* (*cos.* AD 57), grandson of Cn. *Piso* the antagonist of Germanicus. In his consular year, 'the Cilicians' (apparently of non-royal Plain Cilicia) found it appropriate to lay a charge against Cosutianus Capito (Tac., *Ann.* 13.33), who had committed extortion, either during an independent command there (*legatus Caesaris*), or as a subordinate (*legatus legati* or *legatus proconsulis*), or even, though unlikely, as a *legatus* or *proconsul* himself, from a nearby province responsible for this part of Cilicia.⁸² If *Piso* of the inscription is identified with the consul of AD 57, who must then have had a similar command in this area in the past,

⁷⁷ Jones 1940: 72: 'On the suppression of the Tarcondimotid dynasty Anazarbus and Hierapolis assumed control of their territories...'

⁷⁸ Syria, of course, is again excluded – there is clear evidence that Western Plain Cilicia was separate in AD 18 (Tac., *Ann.* 2.58).

⁷⁹ Even with Commagene, the political connection with Syria of which is strong, it is unclear whether between AD 18 and 37 had actually been incorporated into the Syrian province. Millar (1993: 53) says that it 'seems to have come under the *legatus* of Syria', but he cites no evidence.

⁸⁰ Syme 1986: 338; 1995: 164–165; cf. Syme 1970: 56–57.

⁸¹ Even after Vespasian, who certainly made a province out of a part of Rugged and much of Plain Cilicia (Suet., *Vesp.* 8.4; Thomasson 1984: 289–290), a part of Rugged, and/or the coast around Elaoussa, remained in royal hands until Domitian (Kokkinos 1993: 203–204). As for the kingdom of Eastern Plain Cilicia (cf. above note 71), if Castabala turned independent under Nero (its imperial coins begin only under Nerva – see Dupont-Sommer/Robert 1964: 72–73, no. 22), it would have restricted the potential royal land basically around Neronias (the new capital? – cf. with caution Honigmann 1950), Flavias (which issued imperial coins under Domitian – see Head 1911: 720), and possibly down to Alexandria ad Issum (with imperial coins from Trajan – see Head 1911: 716).

⁸² Cf. Castritius 1971.

there would be reason to understand the action of the Cilicians at a time when a friendly ear was available in the Roman Senate.

Following this identification, what would L. Calpurnius Piso's command in Cilicia in the early or mid-50s have been, given that in his case the Castabala inscription mentions him as *legatus pro praetore*? Was he a major legate of an imperial province? We know that such a legate, whether an ex-praetor or an ex-consul, is not always named in inscriptions fully as *legatus Augusti pro praetore provinciae...*, for example the *pr. pr.* is sometimes dropped, as in Cn. Sentius *leg. Caesaris Augusti* (IGLS 1 164). We also know that the *Aug.* sometimes is left out, but when this happens the province is regularly named, or is clear from the context, for example *leg. pro pr. provinciae Aquitanicae* (ILS 979), *legat. propraet. Moesiae* (ILS 986), *leg. pro pr. provinc. Delmatiae* (ILS 1005). So the omission of *Aug.* in the Castabala text probably shows that we are dealing with a subordinate officer, one depended on a *legatus* (or even a *proconsul*) of a nearby province – and at this time conceivably Lycia-Pamphylia (Dio 60.17.3).⁸³

Summing up, the only point in Piso the Pontifex's career which could be compared with the information in the *titulus Tiburtinus*, is his subjugation of a tribe for which he earned *ornamenta triumphalia*. But this is inadequate, since under Augustus more than thirty consulars were invested with this distinction (Suet., *Aug.* 38.1). The *rex* of the *titulus* cannot comfortably be identified with a Thracian king, who was connected to a tribe, or against whom a tribe had acted, before the arrival of Piso. The exceptional *binas* requires thanksgivings on two different occasions, which cannot conform to the chronology or importance of the Thracian war. The *iterum* presupposes two legateships (including that of Syria), but Piso would have been appointed more times. There is no valid evidence that Piso had become a proconsul of Asia, and his chances statistically to have been one are not as great as has been thought. Finally, there is no valid evidence that Piso was ever a legate of Syria, and there is simply no normal 'three to five years' – hardly even one year – room available in the *fasti* of this province as reconstructed here.⁸⁴ It has to be concluded that Piso the Pontifex is not the best but the worst candidate for the position of the *ignotus*, and to think otherwise is to place faith on Syme's formidable reputation rather than on the strength of the evidence.

Saturninus: safely rejected or safely accepted?

The *fasti* of Syria, in the suggested reconstruction above, and the reasons which exclude from the position of *ignotus* most of the legates there listed, leave little doubt that the only real candidates are Saturninus and Quirinus. The first is favoured by various arguments already put forward in my original paper. However, most of these were criti-

⁸³ See Thomasson 1984: 275–276; other available provinces are: Galatia, Cyprus, and by now possibly 'praetorian' Cappadocia; even at this late date, as we saw, excluded is Syria (Tac., *Ann.* 13.8).

⁸⁴ But even the single year 3/2 BC, which could have been appropriate for a governor dying in office, would not fit the unattested Piso, for whom, as we saw, there are indications that he probably was in Italy in 2 BC, and who died there in AD 32 (Tac., *Ann.* 6.10; cf. Vell., 2.98). Moreover, the latest theory about the precise date of Herod's death (to which, however, I do not subscribe), move all events a year later (Kushnir-Stein 1995: 73–74), leaving effectively no gap for our discussion.

cised by Eilers, and it is thus proper to take account of his objections here, defending or revising my position accordingly. Eilers (1996: 208) has grouped my arguments into four parts: 1) the Sentii Saturnini had their origins near Tibur; 2) Saturninus was not proconsul of Africa but of Asia; 3) his German campaigns brought him into contact with a king and won him *ornamenta triumphalia* and twice *supplications*; 4) the *iterum* of our text should not determine the order of appointments. I shall follow the same grouping for convenience:

(1) It must be made clear that whether the Sentii Saturnini had their origins near Tibur, is not vital to the question of candidacy. Neither Quirinius nor Piso can enter such an argument. Yet since the claim has already been made for Saturninus the following discussion cannot be avoided.

In regard to the stemma of the Sentii, Syme proposed that the 'Sentius Saturninus' among the proscribed who were allowed a safe return in 39 BC (Vell., 2.77.3), was the consul of 19 BC as a young man.⁸⁵ This is most unlikely. In 39 BC the consul must have been thirteen years old, or possibly a few years older, but hardly the *vir clarissimus* referred to by Velleius. Eilers (1996: 209) points out that one should note the company in which this Saturninus appears, but the company tends to confirm rather than dispel doubts – 'Nero Claudius, Marcus Silanus [...] Arruntius and Titius [...]'. Two of these individuals are easily recognisable, Tiberius Claudius Nero (*pr.* 42 BC – *MRR* 2, 359, 547) and M. Titius (*cos. suff.* 31 BC – *PIR*¹ T 196), clearly belonging to an older (and appropriate) age group. The other two are difficult to identify, and it is a mistake to see in them homonymous people of a younger generation. Eilers (following Hinard) assumes that the first is M. Junius Silanus (*cos.* 25 BC), and the second L. Arruntius (*cos.* 22 BC), creating a chronological inconsistency within the company. But we must surely be dealing with older relatives.

A Marcus Silanus was *legatus proconsulis* in Gaul in 54 BC (Caesar, *BG* 6.1.1), and another was with M. Lepidus in 43 BC (Dio 46.38.6). None can be identified with the consul of 25 BC, as realised by Syme.⁸⁶ The Arruntii – never mind of L. Arruntius being a *novus homo* – were opulent and respectable (like other families of *novi homines*), furnishing one of the Vestal Virgins at the end of the Republic (Macrob., 3.13.11.). Velleius' 'Arruntius' may well be the father of the consul of 22 BC, and similarly, therefore, 'Sentius Saturninus' the father of the consul of 19 BC. It is significant that when the latter two consuls appear together in another list, that of the *Acta* of the *Ludi Saeculares*, they are grouped separately from the *quindecimviri* of the earlier generation, and Hoffman acutely sees them as 'descendants of the proscribed'.⁸⁷ So, my revised stemma of the Sentii stands better at this point.

Syme theorised that the senatorial Sentii were from the town of Atina of the Teretina tribe.⁸⁸ But a Sentius of the Aemilian tribe (and thus possibly from Gabii near Tibur), mentioned by Josephus as a 'military tribune' in 49 BC, spoils this theory. Eilers takes it as a 'most radical innovation' (1996: 209), and one which would have been a 'valid

⁸⁵ Syme 1964b: 162, no. 8.

⁸⁶ Syme 1986: 190.

⁸⁷ Hoffman 1952: 293; cf. Wiseman 1971: 171–173; Syme 1986: 48.

⁸⁸ Syme 1964b: 157–158; cf. Syme 1964a: 121–122 (= Syme 1979a: 600–601).

reason for questioning Syme's inference' (1996: 211), but finds it unjustifiable and thus unworkable. However, his objections are deceiving.

Eilers first attempts to throw doubt to the readings of Josephus: 'Was the military tribute a Sentius, Servilius, Teutius, or Tettius?' (1996: 209). This is to underestimate the decisions taken in the *editio princeps* (1544) and especially the *editio major* (1885–95). In *Ant.* 14.229 the accepted reading, based on all MSS, is Γάϊος Σέντιος Γαΐου. Only Codex Palatinus (10th century) has Σερούλιος instead, which is a clear dittography from the previous line listing a Γάϊος Σερουΐλιος Γαΐου, and thus merely relegated to the *apparatus criticus*. In *Ant.* 14.238 the accepted reading is Γάϊος Τεύτιος Γαΐου. Only the late Codex Laurentianus (14th century) has Τέττιος, which is evidently a corrective (as noted in the *editio major*), simply because 'Teutius' does not exist as a *gentilicium*. So Teutius inevitably was kept in the main text of all editions, already from the time of the *editio princeps*. However, a careful comparison of the names in the two copies of the decree of L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus (*cos.* 49 BC) under discussion – in fact three fragmentary copies (*Ant.* 14.228–9; 234; 237–40) – make it almost certain that the reading must be restored as Γάϊος Σέντιος Γαΐου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία χιλίαρχος, as accepted by Syme.⁸⁹

In order to visualise what has happened to the text, it will be best to display the complete list of names in a parallel table, only reverting them to their Latin form and order:⁹⁰

Jos., *Ant.* 14.238–239

Jos., *Ant.* 14.229

Pr.	Nomen	Affil.	Trib.	Cognom.	Pr.	Nomen	Affil.	Trib.	Cognom.
T.	Ampius	T.f.	Hor.	Balbus	T.	Ampius	T.f.	Hor.	Balbus
T.	Tongius		Cru.		T.	Tongius	T.f.	Cru.	
Q.	Caesius	Q.f.			Q.	Caesius	Q.f.		
T.	Pompeius	T.f.	Cor.	Longinus	T.	Pompeius	T.f.		Longinus
C.	Servilius	C.f.	Ter.	Braccus	C.	Servilius	C.f.	Ter.	
P.	Clusius	P.f.	Vet.	Gallus	P.	Clusius	P.f.	Vet.	
C.	Teutius	C.f.	Aem.		C.	Sentius	C....	
Sex.	Atilius	Sex.f.	Aem.	Serranus	
C.	Pompeius	C.f.	Sab.	f...	Sab.		
T.	Ampius	T.f.		Menander				
P.	Servilius	P.f.		Strabo				
L.	Paccius	L.f.	Col.	Capito				
A.	Furius	A.f.		Tertius				
Ap.				Menas				

⁸⁹ Syme 1964b: 161–162; *contra* Taylor 1960: 253, 259; cf. *MRR* 3, 191.

⁹⁰ Most of the Republican documents cited by Josephus will have gone through several stages of translation and copying (both before they reached Josephus and before they reached us), and thus variously corrupted. But it cannot be excluded that Josephus may have come across the odd Latin original in Rome. According to Pucci Ben Zeev (1994: 51–52), in one case it seems likely that he personally consulted a document on the Capitol.

This table is illuminating, not only for the restoration of Sentius as the seventh individual listed, but also for the process of copying. Eilers (1996: 210) notes that Sentius 'did not have a *cognomen*'. But it is conceivable that *cognomina* would have been lost in the copying, as evidently were affiliations and tribes, and apparently even a *nomen* (Ap. Claudius? Menas – if Appius here was indeed a *praenomen*). In two cases this is demonstrable: T. Tongius lost his affiliation in 238, while T. Pompeius his tribe in 229.

Eilers (1996: 210) says that the military tribune of 49 BC is too young to be the father of the consul of 19 BC. This is probably so. As already proposed, it is better to assume that he would have been his brother, since we know that Saturninus had one (Jos., *Ant.* 17.7). Eilers (1996: 210) says that the same *praenomen* (Caius) excludes such relationship, but given the degree of corruption of names in Josephus' Republican documents, and the wider examples which were produced to show how easily the names 'C.' and 'Cn.' were confused, this reason is not condemning enough. A stronger and more focused illustration is also to hand. While some twenty individuals with the name 'Caius' are mentioned by Josephus in his entire *opera*,⁹¹ surprisingly not a single 'Cnaeus' is to be encountered! This cannot be right. Indeed, several people known to have had the latter *praenomen* (including the grandson of our Saturninus) are present in Josephus, but always shrouded in distorted readings: two as Νέος (*Ant.* 19.166; *War* 7.58); one as Πενναῖος or Πεννέος (*Ant.* 13.260), and in the case of Cnaeus Domitius Calvinus (*cos.* 40 BC) strikingly as Γάϊος (*Ant.* 14.389). Under the circumstances one must not expect a 'Cnaeus' to be found in Josephus, particularly in the most corrupted area of *Antiquities* 14. Hence, it is perfectly justifiable to suggest that Sentius the military tribune of 49 BC may have been a 'Cnaeus', and if so, probably the brother of Saturninus the consul of 19 BC. My revised stemma of the Sentii stands possible on this point too.

Since the Aemilian tribe of the senatorial Sentii (as the case of the young senator in Josephus indicates) throws into doubt Syme's theory of the Teretina, and since there is evidence that another senatorial family of the Aemilian tribe (the Antistii) originated in Gabii,⁹² it is reasonable to connect Saturninus with the area between Gabii and Tibur. It may thus not be coincidental that people who carried the *gentilicium* 'Sentius' are known from Tibur (*CIL* XIV 3808 = *I.Ital.* 4.1, 142–3, no. 400). But it will be stressed again that even if my stemma of the Sentii were shown to be insecure, or if Saturninus was proved to have originated elsewhere, his candidacy for the position of *ignotus* is not affected.

(2) Saturninus was for a long time reckoned to be a proconsul of Africa in c. 14/13 BC,⁹³ but this has been shown to be based on insufficient evidence. Tertullian (*De pallio* 1.2) connects him to Carthage by way of the ceremony of the inauguration (*enarravit*), to

⁹¹ Schalit 1968: 31.

⁹² The Antistii claimed descent from a Gabine house (Dionys., 4.57), and indeed not only the inscription of L. Antistius Vetus (*cos. suff.* AD 28? – *PIR*² A 775) from Gabii (*ILS* 948), but also the denarii struck in 16 BC by C. Antistius Vetus (*cos.* 6 BC – *PIR*² A 771) as *triumvir monetalis*, celebrating the *Foedus P. R. qum* (or *cum*) *Gabinis*, are consistent with this claim (*BMCRE* 1, Aug. nos. 96–7; cf. no. 118, an aureus of 13 BC? struck by another *triumvir monetalis*, C. Antistius Reginus). The tribe of the Antistii from Gabii is clearly mentioned as Aemilian (*CIL* XIV 2849) in connection to L. Antistius Vetus the consul of AD 55 (*PIR*² A 776). Taylor (1960: 44–45), rightly allowed Gabii as a home of the Aemilian tribe.

⁹³ Thomasson 1984: 371, no. 5.

which he presided over. The only known, and highly significant, Carthaginian inauguration during the Early Principate, is that of the *colonia* in 29 BC (Dio 52.43; cf. 43.50). In that year Saturninus must have been twenty-three years old, or a few years older, and he could not have been a proconsul – not as an ex-praetor (after c. 22 BC), or as an ex-consul (after 19 BC). The suggestion was thus made that he may have held an *ad hoc* Octavian command, or have been a special *flamen*,⁹⁴ which seems to accord with the discussion of Tertullian about the priestly *pallium* at Carthage.

Eilers (1996: 212) complained that my statement ‘whatever Saturninus’ position at Carthage..., he was certainly not proconsul’, goes beyond the evidence. But does it? The only way to show that Saturninus *was* proconsul of Africa, in the context of Tertullian, is to prove that a later Carthaginian ‘inauguration’, took place around 14/13 BC (preferably), or around 21/20 BC, or even a few years earlier. But this is not possible. To believe that Saturninus *was* proconsul of Africa is to go beyond the evidence! So nothing prevents Saturninus from governing Asia instead, and if such a position was to be demanded of him by the *titulus Tiburtinus*, we could readily accept it. The fact that he had been active in Africa is not a reason to deny him the proconsulship elsewhere. As we saw (above note 28), Quirinius had also been active in Africa, but he most probably governed Asia, as accepted by Atkinson and Syme.⁹⁵

(3) As with his service in Syria, Saturninus’ appointment in Germany is well attested. His campaigns, under the general leadership of Tiberius, brought him into contact with many tribes, and added prestige to his name by the earning of *ornamenta triumphalia*.⁹⁶ As already stated, the *supplicationes binas* of the *titulus* are unique for a commander who was not an emperor or a relative (see above objection no. 3 against Piso). It is highly likely that they imply two different military operations, and the *ob res prospere gestas* for which they were decreed, emphasise the plurality of contributions on his part – not necessarily only in the subjugation of the specific tribe for which he was decorated (*contra* Eilers 1996: 214). The *triennium* of operations in Germany, as summed up by Velleius (2.122.2), with the first two seasons engaged in different wars, and the direct involvement of the closest relative of Augustus, does precisely suggest that Saturninus would have had a unique opportunity to enjoy more than one supplication in his *cursus honorum*. Dio (55.28.5-6) also points out (even though confusingly – see below) that the German achievement had two phases of success. Saturninus’ career provides us with the best available example to fit the *titulus* on these points.

Thanks to Velleius (2.105) we know that in AD 4 the united forces of Tiberius and Saturninus reached the Weser, defeating a number of tribes and subjugating the Cherusci. Most of the successes are credited to Tiberius, but this we must take with a pinch of salt, for it is to be expected from a writer rhapsodically eulogising the Emperor. Saturninus’ contribution, both on the basis of his local command and his senior experience (otherwise praised by Velleius), can only have been substantial – thus the gaining of the *ornamenta triumphalia*, mentioned by Dio and actually omitted by Velleius. In AD 5 the Roman forces reached the Elbe, defeating many more tribes and subjugating the

⁹⁴ Kokkinos 1995: 31.

⁹⁵ Atkinson 1958: 317–318; Syme 1995: 266; cf. Thomasson 1984: 209, no. 23.

⁹⁶ Kokkinos 1995: 32–33.

Cauchi (Vell., 2.106). In AD 6 Tiberius from Carnuntum and Saturninus from Moguntiacum set from opposite directions (with twelve legions!) to invade Bohemia of king Maroboduus, but the plan ended in a peace treaty due to the massive Pannonian-Dalmatian Revolt (Vell., 2.109.5–110.3).

Dio's narrative of these events, under the single year of AD 6, is abridged, confusing and faulty, as assessed by Syme.⁹⁷ In 55.28.5 Dio recognises two successive military advances, one to the Weser (presumably AD 4) and another to the Elbe (presumably AD 5). He says that although nothing significant was accomplished, Augustus and Tiberius received salutations, and Saturninus decorations. The reason (55.28.6) for these 'undeserved' honours, was that out of fear of them the Germans concluded a treaty (φοβηθέντες αὐτοῦς, ἐσπέισαντο), not only once but twice (μὴ μόνον ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον). Up to this point Dio gives the impression that the operations of AD 4 and 5 were not really about winning wars, but about concluding two treaties (presumably with two different tribes) – the honours evidently being received after the second treaty in AD 5. Eilers (1996: 213, n. 33), and partly Syme, fell for this.

What follows, however, radically changes this impression. In 55.28.7 Dio explains that what made the second treaty necessary (αἴτια δὲ τοῦ [...] τὴν εἰρήνην δοθῆναι), in spite of the fact that the first had been broken by the Germans so soon (καίπερ παρασπονδήσασί σφισι δι' ὀλίγου αὐθις), were the events created by the Dalmatians and the Pannonians (τὰ τε τῶν Δελματῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν Παννονίων [...] ἐγένετο.) In 55.29.1 Dio is even more specific in placing the outbreak of the Pannonian Revolt, during the time of Tiberius' *second* campaign against the Germans (ὡς δ'ὸ τε Τιβέριος ἐπὶ τοὺς Κελτοὺς τὸ δεύτερον ἐστράτευσε). It is thus clear that Dio dates the second advance into Germany, and therefore the second treaty and the salutations and honours that went with it, to AD 6 when the revolt began. This is consistent with the historian's decision to include these events in the consular year of Aemilius Lepidus and Lucius Arruntius (55.25.1). It is also now clear that Dio's second treaty, which was concluded under the pressure of the Pannonian revolt of AD 6, must have been that with Maroboduus related by Velleius and other sources.

It is difficult to know how much to trust in Dio's narrative condensed as it is. Conceivably new imperial salutations were registered for Bohemia in AD 6. But another problem, which has passed undetected, is now facing us. If Dio inevitably refers to the treaty with the Marcomanni, and if this was the 'second' treaty, which one was the first? Since the first had been broken after a short period of time (evidently within two years), it must also have been concluded with the Marcomanni – not with another German tribe – either in AD 4 or 5. So according to Dio, two treaties with the Marcomanni, the second in AD 6, were the mere successes of Tiberius and Saturninus in Germany.⁹⁸ Is it then possible that when the Roman advance began beyond the Weser, the Marcomanni found it expedient to secure peace, which, however, they observed unwillingly? Perhaps this explains Velleius' statement (2.109.2) that the embassies sent by Maroboduus sometime commended him as a suppliant and sometimes as an equal. Arminius of the Cherusci is

⁹⁷ Syme 1979b: 316 (= Syme 1984: 1205–1206).

⁹⁸ About multiple treaties involving Tiberius there is nothing unusual. He once boasted that he had affected more by policy than by force, 'Policy had procured the Sugambrian surrender [8 BC]. Policy had bound the Suebi and King Maroboduus [AD 5 and 6?] to observe the peace.' (Tac., *Ann.* 2.26).

said to have described Maroboduus as ‘the fugitive who, without one stricken field, had lain safe in the coverts of the Hercynian Forest and then sued for a *treaty* with gifts and embassies...’ (Tac., *Ann.* 2.45). Dobiáš saw this treaty possibly as that of AD 6.⁹⁹ But it most probably refers to the earlier treaty that Dio mentions, since the one of AD 6 was proposed by a desperate Tiberius (*necessaria gloriosis praeposita* – Vell., 2.110.3), not by Maroboduus.¹⁰⁰

A word on the chronology of the imperatorial salutations between AD 3 and 9 is now pertinent. At the one end, since acclamation XV of Augustus is dated from July 2 BC at the very earliest (*CIL* XII 5668) to June AD 3 at the very latest (*CIL* X 3827), his XVIth can be firmly pegged to September AD 3, representing Gaius’ Armenian campaign (Dio 54.10a.7). At the other end, since acclamation XX of Augustus (= Tib. VI) is attested in AD 11/12 (*BMCRE* 1, Aug. nos. 275–6), and it cannot have occurred before AD 11 because acclamation V of Tiberius (= Aug. XIX) is still valid in AD 10/11 (*BMCRE* 1, Aug. nos. 271–4), the latter almost certainly represents the final victory in the Balkans in AD 9. Hence we are left with Augustus’ acclamations XVII (= Tib. III) and XVIII (= Tib. IV), which we must place in the period AD 4 to 8.

Eilers (1996: 213) wonders whether two of the salutations are to be attributed to Germany and one to Illyricum, or *vice versa*. But it is not hard to see that the success of the first season of campaign which brought the Romans to the Weser, after the defeat of many tribes including the important Cherusci, combined with the occasion of the return of Tiberius to Rome at the end of AD 4 (Vell., 2.105.3), after his first assignment as the newly adopted-son of Augustus, should have earned him an acclamation. If this did not happen, then surely the conclusion of the conquest of the entire Germany in AD 5, which brought the Romans to the Elbe, combined with the second return of Tiberius to Rome (Vell., 2.107.3), would have produced the expected acclamation (if not another to match that of the previous year).¹⁰¹ Remember that Tiberius did not return to Rome in the winter of AD 6 (Dio 55.30.4; Vell., 2.111.2), and not until the spring of AD 9 (Dio 56.1.1–2), soon to leave for the field again (Dio 56.12.1), and to be decreed his respective acclamation only at the final victory on [3 August] AD 9 (Dio 56.17.1; *I.Ital.* 13.1, 328). The only reason that one might have doubted whether the pacification of Maroboduus in AD 6 acquired another salutation, is perhaps because it run into the Pannonian Revolt, without a return of Tiberius to Rome in that year. But the analysis of Dio above seems to evaporate such a doubt, and we should rather be compelled to associate the voting of the various honours with AD 6, as also proposed by Brunt.¹⁰²

⁹⁹ Dobiáš 1960: 159, n. 1.

¹⁰⁰ An even earlier treaty, at the time when the Marcomanni were transferred by Maroboduus from the Main valley to Bohemia (c. 9/8 BC), may not be contemplated, because Dio’s ‘first’ treaty is said to have been ephemeral, and will not have been achieved by Tiberius in the present circumstances (AD 4–6). But an early treaty may have existed, if only because Maroboduus had been educated in Rome (Strabo 7.1.3), presumably as a royal ‘hostage’ (cf. Dobiáš 1960: 155–156; Pitts 1989: 46–47). Also a king of the Marcomanni and Suebi named ‘[...] ποϋς’ is said to have taken refuge with Augustus, necessarily before, or at the very beginning, of Maroboduus’ reign (*Res Gest.* 32). The generic name Suebi embraced a number of tribes, the one closest to the Marcomanni being the Quadi. If the latter tribe is implied here, one could suggest that the king’s name may have been [Τουδ]ποϋς. Tacitus (*Germ.* 42) says that *Marcomanis Quadisque usque ad nostram memoriam reges manserunt ex gente ipsorum, nobile Marobodui et Tudri genus...*

¹⁰¹ Syme 1984: 1206, accepts an acclamation in AD 5.

¹⁰² Brunt 1974: 177.

No considerations of similar substance can be made for two salutations in the Balkan uprising. We may not agree with Barnes, that 'two wars should imply two separate victories'.¹⁰³ The victory at Pannonia was only locally conclusive, and the same war continued dangerously in Dalmatia into the next year (Vell., 2.114.4). An early acclamation before the final victory of AD 9 would have been unthoughtfully premature, and indeed when Tiberius returned to Rome in the spring of AD 9, no such thing is recorded by Dio.¹⁰⁴ So, either the campaign to the Weser in AD 4, or that to the Elbe in AD 5, would have produced an acclamation, followed by another at the pacification of Bohemia in AD 6. The quelling of the Pannonian-Dalmatian revolt in AD 9 produced a third. A summary table will be useful here:

Augustus		Tiberius	
XVI	= ---	AD 3	Armenia
XVII	= III	AD 4/5	Germany
XVIII	= IV	AD 6	Bohemia
XIX	= V	AD 9	Pannonia-Dalmatia

This table, based on broad considerations, is verified by an inscription from Saepinum which acknowledges that by AD 6 Tiberius had received salutation IV.¹⁰⁵ This conclusion makes *ILS* 107.4, which has Tiberius still imperator *ter.*, in a year corrected to AD 7/8, aberrant.¹⁰⁶ Eilers (1996: 213, n. 34) remarks that 'an error of fact [...] is methodologically less attractive', but unfortunately errors of fact abound in epigraphy. *CIL* II 2422 registers Gaius as 'augur', but Gaius was of course 'pontifex' (*CIL* II 3828; VI 897; IX 3343; XI 1421 etc.). *CIL* II 2703 has Augustus IMP. XX in AD 9/10, but this salutation cannot have been acquired before AD 11 (see above). *CIL* X 7226 has Tiberius IMP. VIII in AD 18/19, but coins from Commagene of AD 19/20 and 20/21 (*RPC* 1, nos. 3868–70) continue with IMP. VII. Even more strikingly, three inscriptions from three different sites (*CIL* III 6974; 14401^a; 14401^c), agree to be totally wrong in referring to Augustus IMP. XV in 6 BC, whereas we know that IMP. XIV was still valid in 2/1 BC (see above). Examples can be multiplied.

As regards the precise wording of the *titulus* in the part that has not been preserved, that is to say before the word *rex*, we can only be tentative. Eilers (1996: 214) legitimately asks, 'what [...] was the connection between Maroboduus [...] and the tribe that Saturninus had supposedly subjected?' I admit that the connection with Maroboduus is not very clear, not so much because the achievement of the treaty would have belonged to Tiberius (Saturninus, after all, participated in the campaign, perhaps receiving his second thanksgiving for this occasion), but because the Marcomanni may not easily be said

¹⁰³ Barnes 1974: 24; cf. Schumacher 1985: 222.

¹⁰⁴ For a convenient summary of the events in the Pannonian-Dalmatian Revolt, see Wilkes 1969: 69–70.

¹⁰⁵ Gaggiotti 1978: 147–148, no. 4.

¹⁰⁶ *ILS* 107.1–10 is known to us only from a 15th century codex, where the inscriptions have in many ways been copied imperfectly. 107.4 erroneously reads for Tiberius *cos. ter., imp. ter... tribuniciae pot. VIII*, and is corrected to *cos. [i]ter, imp. ter... tribuniciae pot. VIII[I]*. One could equally suggest *cos. [i]ter, imp. ter [...] tribuniciae pot. VII[I]*, dating to AD 5. If so, *ILS* 107.5 referring to Augustus, may be corrected to *cos. XIII, imp. XVII, tribunic. potest. XX[II]X*, also dating to AD 5.

to have been subjugated. Yet, under the circumstances, the treaty of AD 6 was received as a great victory in Rome,¹⁰⁷ and Dio speaks of two treaties, inevitably with the Marcomanni, as the only achievements of Tiberius and Saturninus. So perhaps it is possible that it could have been said that the tribe had rebelled at the instigation of their king, before, in a way, it was brought under submission.

It would, however, be necessary to suggest alternatives. A connection between Maroboduus and another tribe, the Cherusci, may be found, but it is difficult to reconstruct the missing words of the *titulus* in a convincing way. More appropriately, since we have a series of wars against tribes which were being defeated, we could, for the sake of argument, imagine another king behind our *rex* – for example that of the Cherusci in AD 4, or of the Cauchi in AD 5. Both of these tribes are said to have been subdued ‘again’ (*recepti*, Vell., 2.105.1; *receptae*, Vell., 2.106.1), which means that they had freed themselves from a previous arrangement. This could also have been done at the instigation of their king. The inscription then, in whichever case, may have said that Saturninus

[waged war against the tribe of the [...] – which had revolted under the leadership of... its k]ing
– which having being brought into the pow[er of Imperator Casesar]
Augustus and the Roman people [...]

[*bellum gessit adversus gentem [...] – quae rebellaverat sub ducem [...] suum r]egem –
qua redacta in pot[estatem imp. Caesaris] Augusti populique Romani [...]*

If Maroboduus and the Marcomanni were to be dropped in favour of a king of the Cherusci or the Cauchi, the question would then be whether we know of any. Of the Cauchi, for this period in time, we seem not to, but there may well have existed. Tacitus in general acknowledges the existence of numerous German ‘kings’, that is to say as the Romans would call them (e.g. *Germ.* 1; 7; 11; 12; 42). *Res Gestae* (32) refers by name to a German king other than that of the Marcomanni: Maelo of the Sugambri. Arminius of the Cherusci, as Velleius attests (2.118.2), was a man of noble birth (*genere nobilis*), a prince of that tribe (*princeps gentis*), who had been granted Roman citizenship (*civitatis Romanae*) and equestrian rank (*equestris consecutus gradus*), but who appears to have ruled for twelve years only from AD 9 (Tac., *Ann.* 2.88).¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless his father, Sigimer (Vell., *loc. cit.*), may qualify as the royal figure of the time we are concerned, and Tacitus (*loc. cit.*) anyway seems to refer to other kings (*alii reges*) before Arminius. It must be noted that in AD 47 the Cherusci applied to Rome for a king (*Cheruscorum gens regem Roma petivit*), because their royal house (*regia*) could be revived by its last member living in Rome, Italicus the nephew of Arminius (Tac., *Ann.* 11.16). Therefore, whether Maroboduus, Sigimer, an unknown king of the Cauchi, or even an unknown king of another tribe, a reconstruction of the *titulus* is perfectly feasible for the deeds of Saturninus.

The way Eilers (1996: 214–215) minimises the significance of Saturninus’ contribution to the German campaigns, makes one wonder why should he have been awarded

¹⁰⁷ See Kokkinos 1995: 33. Even in the case of the Cherusci, who had been ‘subjugated’ in AD 4, and who rose their arms under Arminius to cause the disaster of Varus in AD 9, they are said to have broken a treaty. Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.58) in a speech he puts in the mouth of Segestes, refers to Arminius as the *violatorem foederis*. Violator of what treaty?

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Timpe 1970: 27–30; Braund 1984: 40, 47, n. 8.

ornamenta triumphalia at all? But Eilers' approach is simply forced. The significance and extent of the wars during the German *triennium* cannot be understood from Dio, but from Velleius – from whom one must be careful not to assign all importance to Tiberius. Two imperatorial acclamations, two thanksgivings, and a triumphal decoration are fully in order with the overall account. But even from Dio, we cannot escape the final impression: he is talking about two treaties, translated into two victories. There is clearly plenty of scope for Saturninus, and the *binas* of our *titulus* suits him considerably more than anybody else.

(4) Concerning the meaning of *iterum* in our text, Groag explained that the anonymous senator cannot have been 'legatus of Syria' twice, but 'legatus twice' – that is to say once in Syria and once elsewhere. This had already been pointed out by 19th-century scholars, such as Strauss, Zumpt and later Dessau.¹⁰⁹ Syme, unlike Groag, believed that there is another implication in the word *iterum*: the order in time of the three posts must be from top to bottom.¹¹⁰ Eilers (1996: 215) says that Groag could not be expected to anticipate Syme's argument of a decade after he wrote. But the idea that the *iterum* may be used to indicate an ascending order of appointments was not new to Syme and had been aired before Groag.¹¹¹

Gordon may give some credit to Syme on this point, but he does not care to follow the consequences, and certainly he does not adopt Syme's identification of *Piso* as the *ignotus*.¹¹² Eilers (1996: 215) also says that Magie does not address the issue, but at least it is clear that Magie also consciously ignored *Piso*.¹¹³ Syme admitted that Gordon and Magie were unconvinced by his theory,¹¹⁴ which was evidently based on a preconceived order rather than on the substance of the individual posts. So, Syme's interpretation of the *iterum* did not have a cataclysmic effect, and his general argument for *Piso* was never really caught on.¹¹⁵

As I have stressed in the original publication, careers on inscriptions are set out in ascending, descending or mixed order. Thus with fragmentary texts it is imperative not to take dogmatic decisions. Further, while the word *iterum* sometimes means 'for a second time' or 'again' – that is to say implying direction or chronology (as shown by Eilers) – other times only means 'for two years' (e.g. *ILS* 942–4) or 'twice' (see below). Eilers missed my call to avoid rigidity. The case of the career of C. Antius Aulus Iulius Quadratus (*cos. suff.* AD 94, *cos.* II AD 105), of which several incompatible copies survive, should serve as a warning. Sherk had this to say concerning Quadratus:

When more than one copy of a senator's *cursus honorum* is preserved for us, it becomes possible not only to refine our knowledge of his public service, but also to observe the vagaries and peculiarities in the publication of such documents on stone in the ancient world. A rigid

¹⁰⁹ Groag 1922/24: 473–474; cf. Strauss 1865: 70–71; Zumpt 1869: 76; Dessau 1930: 612, n. 4.

¹¹⁰ Syme 1973: 593.

¹¹¹ Thomas 1900: 120–121. Judging from his entry in *PIR*² C 289, dated to 1936, Groag did not seem to have changed his mind radically even after Syme's publication of 1934.

¹¹² Gordon 1952: 314–315, no. 19.

¹¹³ Magie 1950: 1305, 1581; cf. Atkinson 1958: 315; Firpo 1983: 239.

¹¹⁴ Syme 1973: 877, n. 29; cf. Syme 1971: 35 (addendum).

¹¹⁵ See Kokkinos 1995: 23, n. 9; and add Bowersock 1965: 25, n. 1, who says 'may be'.

and uncompromising attitude toward their interpretation can sometimes result in error of judgment, especially when only one copy of a document [imagine if fragmentary!] is known to us.¹¹⁶

In my effort to rationalise the meaning of *iterum*, I have presented the example of Q. Varius Geminus' career (*ILS* 932), which, in a *mixed* order of appointments, contains what I took as a numerical equivalent ('II') to this word. Eilers (1996: 215–216, ns. 43–44) disagreed, and doubted whether 'II' abbreviates *iterum*. It is necessary to list here the posts held by Geminus as given in the text:

leg. divi Aug. II

procos.

pr.

tr. pl.

q.

quaesit. iudic.

praef. frum. dand.

Xvir. stl. iudic.

curatori. aedium sacr. monumentor. que public. tuendorum

Even if the last mentioned office was municipal (as per Eilers based on Eck), for the order to be wholly descending, Geminus had to become *praefectus frumenti dandi* and *quaesitor iudicii [publici]* before he was quaestor! This is almost impossible, and therefore it is preferable to see his curatorship as being senatorial, and at the same time accept that the order is mixed. Also both of his legateships do not have to have been taken up after proconsulship, despite the presence of the 'II' which binds them together. As to whether 'II' can be the numerical equivalent of *iterum*, an inscription from North Africa shows it: *Asiae iterum et Africae IIII procos.*¹¹⁷

So despite Eilers, it must be accepted that *iterum* can also mean 'twice', and a further example is the career of L. Munatius Plancus: *imp. iter.* (*ILS* 886). One could then consider this alternative meaning for the *titulus Tiburtinus*. The inscription was certainly longer (perhaps much longer), as accepted by Eilers (1996: 225, n. 88), and thus – only for the sake of argument – it may have read at the bottom: [*legatus pr. pr.*] *divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Ph[oenicem] quoque Germaniam optinuit...*

However, it appears much safer to maintain my initial interpretation. I have suggested an ascending order in the *titulus*, but only after the important achievements at the head of the list (cf. basically *ILS* 972) – so *iterum* would equal 'for *another* time' without specifying which one came first.¹¹⁸ It must be noted that the text does not describe the *ignotus* as *legatus* in the preserved upper part. This is merely an assumption. Thus, the series '*legatus [...]* *legatus iterum*' cannot be proved by Eilers (1996: 216). But even if this assumption is correct, the meaning 'for the *second* time' can be accepted only if we were sure that the order is ascending. In any other order, it could only have meant 'for *another* time' (since *legatus* would inevitably have been mentioned before), thus without obli-

¹¹⁶ Sherk 1980: 1007.

¹¹⁷ See Cagnat *et al.* 1923: 133, no. 456.

¹¹⁸ Kokkinos 1995: 26–27.

gation to chronology. My understanding is proved by the career of M. Julius Romulus (*AE* 1925, 85), which includes the word *iterum* in a *descending* order of appointments!¹¹⁹ Here is how they appear in the text:

*proc[os.] extr[a sort]em prov[inciae M]acedon[iae]
legat[o pro p]r. provin[ciae Cy]pro
praef. frumen[ti da]ndi ex s.c.
[le]gato pro p[r.] iterum [provi]nciae As[iae]
praetori
legato d[ivi C]laudii leg. [X]V Apollinar.
adlecto [trib. p]lebis a di[v]o Claudi[o]
seviro eq[uitum] Romano[r.] equi p[ubl.]...
trib. [mil]itu[m]...*

In sum, all points in Saturninus career can be successfully compared with the information in the *titulus Tiburtinus*. The possible origins of the Sentii from an area near Tibur is a bonus, if dispensable. Saturninus could not have been proconsul of Africa at the time inferred from Tertullian (i.e. 29 BC), and hence Asia is open for him in c. 14/13 BC. His office in Syria (c. 12–8 BC) is well-attested, as it is that in Germany (c. AD 3–6). He was awarded *ornamenta triumphalia* in the company of Tiberius, at the end of a *triennium* which included ‘two’ victories and no doubt *supplicationes binas*. Finally, a flexible understanding of the word *iterum* can accommodate also the meanings ‘for another time’ and ‘twice’, either of which can work with the career of Saturninus.

Conclusion

Piso is really a non-starter. The evidence collected here has shown that only Saturninus and Quirinius qualify for the position of *ignotus*. If, in the light of the examples given, it is accepted that *iterum* does not necessarily require a specific order of posts – that is to say ascending from beginning to end – then the best candidate is indeed Saturninus. In all fairness, the lurking question may briefly be addressed. If *iterum* is taken uncompromisingly (and unwisely as evidence to the contrary exists) to mean a complete ascending order, then what? Obviously the alternative will have to be Quirinius. But how far can he fulfil the requirements of the *titulus*? Consul in 12 BC, Quirinius became *legatus Augusti pro praetore* in Galatia-Pamphylia most probably c. 11–8 BC,¹²⁰ from which capacity he fought the Homonadenses, earning his *ornamenta triumphalia* (Tac., *Ann.* 3.48). Probably proconsul of Asia in 7/6 BC (discussed above), he became ‘again’ *legatus Augusti* in Syria from AD 6 to c. 10. So far, so good. But there are many problems. The origins of Quirinius were from Lanuvium (Tac., *loc. cit.*). He had gone to a mission in Africa (Flor., 2.31). *Rex Amyntas* was long dead before the Homonadensian War.¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Cf. Vitucci 1947: 252–253.

¹²⁰ Allowed by Levick 1967: 213.

¹²¹ The main objection of Syme 1973: 594; for other references, see Kokkinos 1995: 23, n. 8.

Double *supplicationes* are not attested. Quirinius had served significantly as a *rector* to Gaius the grandson of Augustus (Tac., *loc. cit.*).

Some of these problems may superficially be explained away. Origin from Tibur is not a vital requirement – for example Syme did not claim such an ancestral connection for Piso. Quirinius' involvement in Africa may be dated after his appointment in Syria, and thus not in the *titulus*.¹²² *Rex Amyntas* may still have been remembered after more than twenty years, because his death had not been avenged. However, no two thanksgivings can be conceived for a war such as that of the Homonadenses, and, most condemningly, a reference to Quirinius' important office under Gaius will have never been left out.

So, Saturninus has to be preferred. Ultimately, of course, only *new* evidence can prove or disprove this conclusion, but whatever the outcome might be, one thing is now clear: Syme's 'dark horse',¹²³ Piso, has dropped out of the race.

ABBREVIATIONS

AE – *L'Année Epigraphique*, Paris 1888–

BMCRE – H. Mattingly et al., *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum*, London 1923–

CIL – *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*

IG – *Inscriptiones Graecae*

IGLS – L. Jalabert, R. Mouterde et al., *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Beyrouth–Paris 1929–

IGRR – R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*, Paris 1906–1927

ILS – H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, Berlin 1892–1916

I.Ital. – *Inscriptiones Italiae*

MRR – T.R.S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vols. 3, New York 1951–1986

*PIR*¹ – E. Klebs, P. Von Rhoden, H. Dessau, *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I. II. III*, editio prima, vols. 3, Berlin 1892–1898

*PIR*² – A. Stein, E. Groag, L. Petersen et al., *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saec. I. II. III*, editio altera, Berlin 1933–

RPC – A. Burnett, M. Amandry, P. Ripollès, *Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. 1: *From the Death of Caesar to the Death of Vitellius*, London–Paris 1992

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkinson, K.M.T. (1958): The Governors of the Province Asia in the Reign of Augustus, *Historia* 7: 300–330.

Barnes, T.D. (1974): The Victories of Augustus, *JRS* 64: 21–26.

Benoit, P. (1977): '(Recensement de) Quirinius', in: H. Cazelles, A. Feuillet (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, vol. 9, Paris: 693–720.

Bickerman, E.J. (1947): Syria and Cilicia, *AJP* 68: 353–362.

¹²² Quirinius' war against the Marmaridae and the Garamantes has long been thought to have occurred early in his career (e.g. Taylor 1933: 122), but it is possible to have taken place after his Syrian governorship. Florus places it in context with and after the Gaetulian war (AD 6). More recently, it has been argued that Quirinius would have operated in Africa during the time he was governor of Syria (Desanges 1969: 208–212), which does not seem to be likely.

¹²³ Syme 1973: 594.

- Bowersock, G.W. (1964): C. Marcius Censorinus, *legatus Caesaris*, *HSCP* 68: 207–210.
- Bowersock, G.W. (1965): *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford.
- Bradley, K.R. (1978): *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary*, Brussels.
- Braund, D.C. (1984): *Rome and the Friendly King. The Character of Client Kingship*, London–Canberra–New York.
- Braund, D.C. (1985): *Augustus to Nero: A Sourcebook on Roman History: 31 BC – AD 68*, London–Sydney.
- Brunt, P.A. (1974): C. Fabricius Tuscus and an Augustan *dilectus*, *ZPE* 13: 161–185.
- Cagnat, R. et al. (1923): *Inscriptions Latines d'Afrique*, Paris.
- Castritius, H. (1971): Ein bisher unbekannter Statthalter Kilikiens?, *Historia* 20: 80–83.
- Cichorius, C. (1922): *Römische Studien. Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literaturgeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, Berlin.
- Dagron, G., Feissel, D. (1987): *Inscriptions de Cilicie*, Paris.
- Desanges, J. (1969): Un drame africain sous Auguste: Le meurtre du proconsul L. Cornelius Lentulus par les Nasamons, in: J. Bibauw (ed.), *Hommages à Marcel Renard*, vol. 2, Bruxelles: 197–213.
- Desideri, P. (1991): Strabo's Cilicians, in: J. Courtills et al. (eds.), *De Anatolia Antiqua* 1, Paris: 299–304.
- Dessau, H. (1930): *Geschichte der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, vol. 2, Berlin.
- Dobiáš, J. (1960): King Maroboduus as a Politician, *Klio* 38: 155–166.
- Dorbarakes, Ch. (1974): *Epitomon Lexikon tēs Archaías Hellēnikēs Glōssēs*, Athens.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., Robert, L. (1964): *La Déesse de Hiéropolis Castabala (Cilicie)*, Paris.
- Eck, W. (1987): Senatorische Amtsträger und Rätien unter Augustus, *ZPE* 70: 203–209.
- Eilers, C. (1996): C. Sentius Saturninus, Piso Pontifex, and the Titulus Tiburtinus: A Reply, *ZPE* 110: 207–226.
- Firpo, G. (1983): *Il problema cronologico della nascita di Gesù*, Brescia.
- Gaggiotti, M. (1978): Le iscrizioni della basilica di Saepinum e i rectores della provincia del Samnium, *Athenaeum* 56: 145–169.
- Gordon, A.E. (1952): Quintus Veranius Consul A.D. 49: a Study based upon his recently identified sepulchral Inscription, *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* 2: 231–341.
- Gordon, A.E. (1954): Potitus Valerius Messalla Consul Suffect 29 B.C., *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology* 3: 31–64.
- Gordon, A.E. (1958): *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*, vol. 1, Berkeley–Los Angeles.
- Gow, A.S., Page, D.L. (eds.) (1968): *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip*, 2 vols., Cambridge.
- Groag, E. (1922/24): Prosopographische Beiträge: VII. M. Plautius Silvanus, *JOEAI* 21/2 (1922/4), Beibl.: 425–478.
- Gwatkin, W.E. (1930): *Cappadocia as a Roman Procuratorial Province*, Columbia, MO–Princeton, NJ.
- Habicht, Ch. (1969): *Die Inschriften des Asklepieion* (Altertümer von Pergamon 8.3), Berlin.
- Head, B.V. (1911): *Historia Numorum*, 2nd ed., Oxford.
- Herrmann, P. (1960): Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos, *MDAI* (Ath. Abt.) 75: 68–183.
- Herz, P. (1980): Der Aufbruch des Gaius Caesar in den Osten, *ZPE* 39: 285–290.
- Hild, F., Hellenkemper, H. (1990): *Kilikien und Isaurien (Tabula Imperii Byzantini 5.1)*, Wien.
- Hoehner, H.W. (1972): *Herod Antipas*, Cambridge.
- Hoffman, M.W. (1952): The College of *Quindecimviri (Sacris Faciundis)* in 17 B.C., *AJP* 73: 289–294.
- Honigmann, E. (1950): Neronias-Irenopolis in Eastern Cilicia', *Byzantion* 20: 39–61.
- Jones, A.H.M. (1940): *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford.
- Jones, A.H.M. (1971): *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (2nd ed.), Oxford.
- Kajava, M. (1990): Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East: Epigraphic Evidence from the Republican and Augustan Period, in: H. Solin, M. Kajava (eds.), *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History. Proceedings of a Colloquium at Tvärminne, 2–3 October 1987*, Helsinki: 59–124.

- Kokkinos, N. (1993/1998): *The Herodian Dynasty: Origins, Role in Society and Eclipse*, Sheffield (= Ph.D. thesis Oxon 1993).
- Kokkinos, N. (1995): The Honorand of the Titulus Tiburtinus: C. Sentius Saturninus?, *ZPE* 105: 21–36.
- Kokkinos, N. (2013): Aspects of Jerusalem under Herod, *Eretz-Israel* 31: forthcoming.
- Kushnir-Stein, A. (1995): Another Look at Josephus' Evidence for the Date of Herod's Death, *SCI* 14: 73–86.
- Levick, B. (1967): *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, Oxford.
- Magie, D. (1950): *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the 3rd Century after Christ*, 2 vols., Princeton, NJ.
- Maricq, A. (1958): *Res Gestae Divi Saporis*, *Syria* 35: 245–360.
- Maxfield, V.A. (1981): *The Military Decorations of the Roman Army*, London.
- Millar, F. (1993): *The Roman Near East, 31 BC – AD 337*, Cambridge, MA–London.
- Mitchell, S. (1993): *Anatolia: Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, vol. 1, Oxford.
- Paltiel, E. (1981): War in Judaea – after Herod's Death, *RBPh* 59/60: 107–136.
- Pitts, L.F. (1989): Relations between Rome and the German 'Kings' on the Middle Danube in the First to Fourth Centuries A.D., *JRS* 79: 45–58.
- Pucci Ben Zeev, M. (1994): Greek and Roman Documents from the Republican Times in the *Antiquities*: What Was Josephus' Source?, *SCI* 13: 46–59.
- Rey-Coquais, J.-P. (1978): Syrie Romaine, de Pompée à Dioclétien, *JRS* 68: 44–73.
- Romer, F.E. (1978): A Numismatic Date for the Departure of C. Caesar?, *TAPA* 108: 187–202.
- Romer, F.E. (1979): Gaius Caesar's Military Diplomacy in the East, *TAPA* 109: 199–214.
- Salomies, O. (1993): Römische Amtsträger und Römisches Bürgerrecht in der Kaiserzeit: Die Aussagekraft der Onomastik (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der kleinasiatischen Provinzen), in: W. Eck (ed.), *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie, Kolloquium Köln 24. – 26. November 1991*, Köln–Wien–Weimar: 119–145.
- Schalit, A. (1968): *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*, Leiden.
- Scheid, J. (1975): *Les Frères Arvales. Recrutement et origine sociale sous les empereurs julio-claudiens*, Paris.
- Schumacher, L. (1985): Die imperatorischen Akklamationen der Triumphvorn und die *auspicia* des Augustus, *Historia* 34: 191–222.
- Schürer, E. (1973): *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 1 (rev. by F. Millar and G. Vermes), Edinburgh.
- Sherk, R.K. (1980): Roman Galatia: The Governors from 25 B.C. to A.D. 114, *ANRW* II.7.2: 954–1054.
- Strauss, D.F. (1865): *Die Halben und die Ganzen*, Berlin.
- Sullivan, R.D. (1979): Thrace in the Eastern Dynastic Network, *ANRW* II.7.1: 186–211.
- Sullivan, R.D. (1990): *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100–30 B.C.*, Toronto, Ont.
- Syme, R. (1934a): Lentulus and the Origin of Moesia, *JRS* 24: 113–137.
- Syme, R. (1934b): Galatia and Pamphylia under Augustus: the Governorships of Piso, Quirinius and Silvanus, *Klio* 27: 122–148.
- Syme, R. (1939a): *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1939b): Observations on the Province of Cilicia, in: W.M. Calder, J. Keil (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, 299–332 (= Syme 1979a: 120–148).
- Syme, R. (1955): Review: Gordon 1954, *JRS* 45: 155–160.
- Syme, R. (1960): Piso Frugi and Crassus Frugi, *JRS* 50: 12–20.
- Syme, R. (1964a): Senators, Tribes and Towns, *Historia* 13: 105–125 (= Syme 1979a: 582–604).
- Syme, R. (1964b): The *Stemma* of the Sentii Saturnini, *Historia* 12: 156–166 (= Syme 1979a: 605–616).
- Syme, R. (1970): Some Pisones in Tacitus, in: R. Syme, *Ten Studies in Tacitus*, Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1971a): *Danubian Papers*, Bucarest.
- Syme, R. (1971b): M. Vinicius (cos. 19 BC), in: Syme 1971: 35 (addendum).

- Syme, R. (1973): The *Titulus Tiburtinus*, in: *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972* (Vestigia 17), München: 585–601 (= Syme 1984: 869–884).
- Syme, R. (1979a), *Roman Papers*, vol. I–II, ed. by E. Badian, Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1979b): Some Imperial Salutations, *Phoenix* 33: 308–329.
- Syme, R. (1980): The Sons of Piso the Pontifex, *AJP* 101: 333–341.
- Syme, R. (1981): Governors Dying in Syria, *ZPE* 41: 125–144.
- Syme, R. (1984): *Roman Papers*, vol. III, ed. by A.R. Birley, Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1986): *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford.
- Syme, R. (1995): *Anatolica. Studies in Strabo*, ed. by A.R. Birley, Oxford.
- Tataki, A. (1988): *Ancient Beroea: Prosopography and Society*, Athens.
- Taeuber, H. (1991): Die syrisch-kilikische Grenze während der Prinzipatszeit, *Tyche* 6: 201–210.
- Taylor, L.R. (1933): Quirinius and the Census of Judaea, *AJP* 54: 129–133.
- Taylor, L.R. (1939): M. Titius and the Syrian Command, *JRS* 26: 161–173.
- Taylor, L.R. (1960): *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, Rome.
- Thomas, J. (1900): *Our Records of the Nativity and Modern Historical Research*, London.
- Thomasson, B.E. (1984): *Laterculi Praesidum*, vol. 1, Göteborg.
- Timpe, D. (1970): *Arminius-Studien*, Heidelberg.
- Vitucci, G. (1947): Note al 'Cursus Honorum' di M. Iulius Romulus, *praefectus frumenti dandi ex S.C.*, *RFC* 25: 252–253.
- Wilkes, J.J. (1969): *Dalmatia*, London.
- Wiseman, T.P. (1971): *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C.–A.D. 14*, Oxford.
- Woodman, A.J. (1977): *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative (2.94–131)*, Cambridge.
- Zumpt, A.W. (1869): *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, Leipzig.