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τι [τι] [τι] [τι] 1[ι] [ι] [ι] 3[ν] 3[ν] 3[ν] [ν] 1[ι] 1[ι] 1[ι] 1[ι] 3[ν] [ν] 3[ν]
5 ιουλίαδιος Λουρηλάνως, ιουλίαδιος Καλλικράτης, εσθηκομενον ἐν γνώμῃ
da[π]ατὸς [θ]ράτους, περὶ τοῦτο πράγματος όυτος ἔδειξεν

5. Tαπεινής Μοναίτου Σελαριάνος πόλεμοι δικαίου καὶ πολιτιστήρες
γνώμῃ καὶ διαθέτεις χρώμαν, τῆν φρατρίαν ἁρόν τῆν ἁμετέραν
ἄκαμπτον ύδας καὶ παλαιάν, φρονομεῖται λαχυστὶ καὶ μεγαλοφύρου χρή-
πάμενος λίθως ποικίλας τῶν ἀριστοῦ καὶ πολλὰμοτοῦ πολυτελεῖ
kατασκευὴς ἐκσκεφήσει τῶν ὕδατός καὶ τῆν ἄρειν ἐποίησε χρυσὸν μη-

10 δὲν τοιαύτας χρήματας ψεπακέμνει, μὴν τῶν εἰς τὸ σφυγμόν ἀναλαμβά-
νων, καὶ τοῖς μὲν Ἀρτεμισείων φράτεροι ἑπιστήκοροι ἐποίησα τῶν ἁλ-
λῶν συμβόλων, τῇ ἁ Ἀρτεμίδη, ἣ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁπατοῦ ἡ φρατρία, καὶ

15 κατασκεύασεν ἄξιον καὶ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐυτελείας, διεξέθη
toῖς Ἀρτεμισείων φράτεροι ἡ ἁμετέρητη τῆς εὐνοιάς αὐτοῦ τῇ ταξικῇ
tῆς ἀρτεμισείας, πρῶτον μὲν τῇ τῆς διαθέσεως καὶ προχεῖροις τειχεὶ
pάνω ἄκαμπτον καὶ πολύθρον συμβόλων καὶ βίον εὐ-
χρημάτων αὐτῷ μακρὸν ἐν εὐωδίαις, ἑσταὶ δὲ καὶ τειχεῖ τοῖς αὐτοῦ νέοις, κατὰ
eκάθως τῆς ἁμετέρας, τῆς προσκεκυπθέντων ἁράκτων ἀναστάσεως τεσ-
σάφων ἐν τῇ φρατρίᾳ, δῶς μὲν κατὰ Μοναίτου Σελαριάνος τοῦ πολιτιστήρα,

20 ἢ ἄρειν ἁμαρτήσει τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς θρονίας, ἐπεξεργάσα πρὸς τοῖς
tοῖς ἁμαρτήσεις καὶ πρὸς τὸν τεσσάρων οἰκογενεῖς, καὶ τῇ τῇ καθάρ-

25 ἡς μή μόνον κατασκεύασθαι τὴν φρατρίαν ἠμεῖν πολυτελεῖ καὶ
ῖκελοι τῆς κατασκευῆς συμβόλων ἐπιτεθείς, ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας
θεσμῶν εὐξηθήθαι τὴν φρατρίαν Μοναίτου Σελαριάνος τοῦ πολιτιστήρα
tῆς ἀρτεμισείων ἐπικινδύνου καὶ κατὰ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς συμβόλων,

30 τῇ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσεις ἑπιτεθέν τῶν ἀριστοῦ καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων οἰκογενεῖς,

35 τῇ τοῖς ἁμαρτήσεις ἑπιτεθέν τῶν ἀριστοῦ καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων οἰκογενεῖς,
A bilingual inscription found at Naples is of interest for the honours bestowed on L. Munatius Hilarianus by the phratry of the Artemisii. Engraved in three columns, the text combines a decree of the phratry with a letter written in Latin by Munatius, thanking the members for the honours they have offered and reducing these to more modest proportions; a translation of the letter into Greek is appended to the decree as a supporting document. A first edition of the text, replete with erroneous readings and false inferences, made a premature appearance in 1911, but was quickly followed two years later by the magisterial commentary of Maiuri, whose analysis remains definitive. To Maiuri is owed in particular the restitution in lines 2f. of the name of Decius Claudius Septimius Albinus Caesar, co-consul with Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax Augustus II, a combination that firmly dates

---

2 A. Maiuri, La nuova iscrizione della fratria napoletana degli Artemisi, StudRom 1,1913,21-36 with tav. IV-V. The inscription is now in the Museo Nazionale, Naples.
the inscription to A.D. 194. Otherwise Maiuri's main concern was with points of textual criticism, along with matters arising from the body of the inscription which bear upon the physical circumstances of the phratry, its officials, and the apparent relation of the Artemisii to the municipality of Neaplis. Beyond a translation, he offers no interpretation of the exceptional honours accorded L. Munatius Hilarianus, the central topic to be considered in the present paper.

The gist of the decree and the accompanying letter can quickly be summarized. Observing that the phratry was old and lacking in decoration, Munatius had generously adorned the "house" with the finest multi-colored stones and a golden roof, sparing no expense; the banqueting hall for the members he had made particularly stately, and he had constructed a shrine of Artemis in keeping with the piety of the members to their eponymous deity. In return for his goodwill the Artemisii in the first place affectionately consider Munatius their dearest patron and father and wish him a long and happy life. They then offer him appropriate honours as best they can: the erection of four adriantes in the phratry, two of Munatius himself and two of his son Marius Verus, "the hero", likewise the deposit in the phratry of eikones with golden shields, evidently two each of both father and son, also the offer of a gift of fifty whole chorai (the meaning of which remains uncertain). In his reply to the Artemisii, Munatius states that he gratefully accepts the honours and gifts as a token of gratitude and goodwill on the part of the phretores. However, he states that he is content with fifteen out of the fifty chorai they have offered; likewise one statue and one imago instead of four of each is sufficient for himself, as also is one statue in honour of his son: he has more images and statues set within their hearts. The Artemisii can in fact expect further generosity from him, such is his inclination and goodwill in regard to honouring and thanking them. Curiously, the Greek translation of the letter erroneously gives the original offer as forty rather than fifty chorai. What is more important, it expressly states that of the four eikones and four andriantes one graphé and one bronze andrias will suffice for Munatius, along with equal honours (a statue and a bust?) for his son. Otherwise the Greek reproduces the rather clumsy Latin of Munatius almost word for word in a literal translation. As Maiuri points out, a Greek version is required in order to put beyond doubt the fact that Munatius had reduced the number - and consequent expense - of the honours offered him by the phratry.

One or two points in the text call for comment as relevant to the present discussion. Evidently L. Munatius Hilarianus was the son of a freedman since his name recurs in a modest funerary inscription (to all appearances of the same period) which he set up to his

---

3 A. Degrassi, I Fasti consolari dell'Impero romano, Rome 1952, 54.  
4 O. C. 26, noting the comparable letter of Sextus Fadius Secundus Musa written to the fabri subaediani at Narbo and reproduced on the inscription honouring him (CIL 12, 4393). On the significance of this text see D. Fishwick, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West (EPRO 108), I 2, 1987, 249-254.
brother C.Insteius Maximus. The different names of the two brothers suggest that each had been adopted by different families (Munatia and Insteia), a point that also applies to Munatius' son, Marius Verus. The qualification "hero" presumably means that Verus was simply deceased, without necessarily implying the existence of a particular hero-cult. As for the buildings Munatius had embellished, ἐκτιωτήριον is certainly the banqueting hall and the text makes clear that νεώς can only be the shrine of the phratry, which it will have maintained within its premises, like all clubs and colleges. That the νεώς "worthy of the goddess and the piety of the association" replaced an existing, more modest structure is not stated but conceivable. The word οἶκος is vaguer but the fact that Munatius lavished most of his attention on the building, adorning it with precious marble and decorating the roof with gold, strongly supports Maiuri's view that this was in fact the οἶκος ιερός, the sanctuary where the funds of the phratry were kept. The use of φρατρία in ll. 8,21ff. is also of interest. Clearly the term has here a concrete, physical connotation and refers to the complex of administrative and cult buildings on common property, the temenos as a whole where the phratry had its seat. By contrast the reference in ll. 14 and 29 is rather to the phratry abstractly, as an association of individual members.

More uncertainty surrounds the offer to Munatius of fifty chorai (l. 24), apparently a hapax in the sense it seems to have here. Weise and Saalfeld, neither of whom Maiuri cites, refer to CIL 5, 7870 (= Orelli 3342), where chora (χώρα) clearly means regio; this scarcely fits the context of the Naples inscription, discovered itself after the publication of these hand-books. The Oxford Latin Dictionary, referring only to AE, 1913,134, tentatively proposes "a site for a monument", which again is improbable, as the discussion will show. In inscriptions χώρα can sometimes mean an interior section of a building. A text from Tralles, for example, relevant to the restoration of a stoa by Alexander, son of Nikias, refers to a covered portico divided into eight χώραι by interior walls, while in the well-known inscription from Piraeus that concerns the arsenal of Philon the word seems to denote the space between pillars (IG 2 1668, 1.77: 347-6 B.C.). It is difficult to think that Munatius was given fifteen whole (ὁλοκλήρους) sections of some building of the phratry (the

---

8 Oxford Latin Dictionary 311 s.v.
9 E.Bey, Fouilles de Tralles (1902-1903), BCH 28,1904,54-92 at 78.
10 P.Foucart, L'Arsenal de Philon, BCH 6,1882,540-555.
éxtiátríyov?), but confirmation that chora can mean a division tells in favour of Maiuri's original conjecture that chora is a technical word denoting a {square} measure of land - significantly, it is simply transliterated in the Latin text of the letter, presumably because of the lack of a Latin equivalent. In that case the Artemisii will have offered Munatius free and complete possession of a parcel of land of fifty whole 'sections' from the common domain of the association, the foundation property and principal source of revenue by letting.\footnote{Poland, Vereinswesen 453; Maiuri, o.c. 29f. with n.4, noting the formation choragri in Gromatici, p.369,1, "dove la parola equivale à predi rustici".}

If Maiuri's view is correct, such a grant would be most unusual in the acts of Greek and Roman associations. It is particularly regrettable that no help is provided by the following phrase ...καὶ κεχαλκολογηκότων ..." of those who hold the office of chalcologi (= money collectors)", which seems untranslatable, the lapicide having apparently created a lacuna in the text by jumping a line. Maiuri suggests that what has dropped out is a reference to the participation of all the members in honouring Munatius, a passage later taken up by ll. 26-27: ... ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλήθει τῶν νεμόντων ...

By contrast, the significance of the statues and busts, accepted by Munatius but in reduced number, has now become clearer in the light of recent research. Whereas andrias (= statues) denotes the sculptured representation of a man 'en pied', usually life-size, eikon (= imago) came to have the specialized meaning of a man 'à mi-corsps', often a bust though the reference can also be to a statue, a painted portrait, or a tondo such as the bronze medallions mentioned in the Tabula Hebana.\footnote{S.R.F.Price, Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor, Cambridge 1984,176f.: T.Pekáry, Das römische Kaiserbildnis in Staat, Kult und Gesellschaft (Das römische Herrscherbild; Abt. 3, 5), Berlin 1985,60f.; D.Fishwick, Liturgy and Ceremonial, in The Imperial Cult in the Latin West, Vol. II, forthcoming.}

In the present case the decree explicitly associates the eikones with golden shields (l. 23: μετὰ ἄπιθειόν κρυωῦν), so there can be no doubt that what was offered Munatius took the form of imagines clipeatae, that is shields bearing a portrait in relief. This interpretation looks to be confirmed by the term graphé for imago in the Greek version of the letter (l. 38). Precisely such a likeness is known from the inscriptions of the corpus triaectus Rusticeli at Ostia, recording that imperial images took the form of a kneeling Atlas holding over his head a shield on which was engraved the emperor's portrait (CIL 14,4554-56).\footnote{P.Herz, Kaiserbilder aus Ostia, BCAR 87,1980-81,145-157, especially 149-151.}

As for the fact that Munatius' representation was of gold, the material of which statues and images were made is frequently mentioned in inscriptions, often with the precise weights.\footnote{Pekáry, o.c. 66-80.} At one end of the scale the use of precious metal is associated especially with imperial likenesses, gold in particular being valued for its relative scarcity and intrinsic value. At the other extreme statues are often of stone or marble, alternatively of painted wood with flesh parts of stone or marble (statua acrolitha); but bronze, though considered a sign of modesty in relation to the emperor's statue or bust...
(Pliny, Paneg. 52,3), was expensive enough in itself and frequently furnished the material of images deposited by rich men in temples. In the chapels of the principia, in particular, the emperor's likeness was usually of bronze.\(^\text{15}\) Quite clearly then, in offering Munatius statues of bronze or golden imagines clipeatae the Artemisii were proposing honours that in another context would have been appropriate to the emperor himself, a point hardly dimished by Munatius' modesty in reducing their number from four to one each. In Rome the use of solid gold seems to have been a prerogative of the emperor or members of the domus imperatoria (at least post mortem: Suet., Titus 2),\(^\text{16}\) though in the provinces private individuals could certainly have statues of solid silver after death if not already in their lifetime.\(^\text{17}\) Against this background and given the straitened financial circumstances of the phratry it seems unlikely that the Artemisii will have offered Munatius imagines clipeatae of solid gold. One should probably understand gilded likenesses, which any ordinary person was at liberty to have or to receive.

The purpose and significance of the statuae and imagines clipeatae can be judged in the context of a practice familiar throughout the Greco-Roman world and evidently imitated here by the phretores Artemisii.\(^\text{18}\) Already in the Hellenistic period it was customary to place statues of living or dead rulers - not intended as cult idols - within the temple of a deity, and in the same tradition statues of Republican governors are frequently recorded in the shrines and cult places of Greece and Asia Minor. As the literary and epigraphical sources make abundantly clear, the same treatment was accorded the likeness of the Roman emperor; but other members of the imperial house were similarly honoured with statues in temples and, what is of particular interest for present purposes, so also were private individuals - priests, priestesses and benefactors in general.\(^\text{19}\) To give just one instance out of hundreds G.Vibius Salutaris was given eikones in the temple at Ephesus, as well as at the most conspicuous parts of the city, in recognition of his bequests in A.D. 104.\(^\text{20}\) Exactly the same practice occurs in the Roman world, where already under the Republic imagines clipeatae of illustrious ancestors were set in the temples (Pliny, NH 35,12). In the Imperial period single or multiple images of the emperor were commonly deposited in temples, as also were representations of private individuals outside the imperial family. Thus when L. Volusius Saturninus, the former consul of A.D. 3, died in A.D. 56 at the age of 93, the senate decreed

\(^{15}\) G.Gamer, Kaiserliche Bronzestatuen aus den Kastellen und Legionslagern an Rhein-und Donaugrenze des römischen Imperiums (Diss. München), Bonn 1969.

\(^{16}\) The golden likenesses of Sejanus are an exception that proves the rule (Suet., Tib. 65,1).

\(^{17}\) Pekáry, o.c. 70ff., citing IRT 607; CIL 12,5864 ( = ILS 6999).

\(^{18}\) On statues deposited as offerings in temples see Pekáry, o.c. 55-65; Fishwick (above, note 12) forthcoming.

\(^{19}\) A.D.Nock, Quo vadis, Θεός, HSCP 41,1930,1-62 at 53,56 ( = id., Essays in Religion and the Ancient World [ed., Z.Stewart], Oxford 1972,244,246); Pekáry, o.c. 57ff.

\(^{20}\) J.H.Oliver, The Sacred Gerusia (Hesperia Suppl. 6), Baltimore 1941, p.55, no.3 ( = IEphesus 1a 27) ll. 86-88.
on the motion of Nero himself that no less than nine statues should be raised to him including two in the temple of Divus Augustus and one in the temple of Divus Iulius (AE 1972, No. 174). Likewise at Mt. Eryx the verses of L.Apronius Cassianus, consul in A.D. 39, reveal that he dedicated an effigy of his father along with one of Tiberius in the temple of Venus Erycina (CIL 10, 7257 = ILS 939).

As a rule such statues or busts were kept in the entrance porch (pronaos, vestibulum) of the temple (cf. CIL 14, 2867 = ILS 3687 bis) but occasionally the statue of a ruler or benefactor could be set in the cela as a mark of special honour; even the statue of a relative of the benefactor could be allowed there. The highest honour, one so advanced that it was unacceptable to "constitutional" emperors such as Tiberius or Trajan (Suet., Tib. 26,1; Pliny, Paneg. 52,3) was to have one's statue placed beside the cult simulacrum, as in the case of Augustus' physician (Suet., Aug. 59). Such a practice did not deify an individual but to have one's image in the cela clearly implied exalted status by association with the divine, the more so if the representation was of precious metal like the cult statue. In theory a statue or bust placed in the porch or cela of a temple was intended as an offering to the deity "dedicated in accordance with ancient custom for vows or pious reasons". The motivation explains the phenomenon of multiple images of the emperor or other honoree, which is clearly in line with the rite of placing in a temple multiple representations either of the deity to whom the temple belonged or of some other deity. But in practice the custom became a standard way of honouring an individual in a fashion which usage made conventional - often, one suspects, with little understanding of its theoretical basis.

What one would infer from the decree of the Artemisii, then, is that the offer of statues and imagines clipeatae in honour of Munatius is closely related to this conventional procedure. The term used in connection with the andriantes is ἀναπτάεις and the location is stated as ἐν τῇ φρατρίᾳ, so it is not entirely certain that these were all to be placed in a temple; some may have been meant as honorific statues to be set up elsewhere within the temenos. But in the case of the eikones with golden shields the verb is ἀναθείναι, which, even if it means simply to set up, still has the connotation of a dedicatory offering (ἀνάθημα). Again the decree simply says that these were to be placed in the phratry but the background sketched above strongly suggests that the intention will have been to put the imagines in the νεόκ of Artemis. Other considerations aside, the circumstance that the imagines were of gold (or gilded) called for their safe-keeping in the temple, and given that

---

21 W.Eck, Die Familie der Volusii Saturnini in neuen Inschriften aus Lucus Feroniae, Hermes 100,1972,461-484 at 463, 469-71; cf. Pekáry, o.c. 49, 58, 62, 86, 91, 97, 145.
22 A.Alföldi, Gnomon 47,1975,165 ad S.Weinstock, Divus Julius, Oxford 1971,186-188, overlooks this possibility.
23 Nock (above, note 19) 53 n.1 with refs. Cf. the custom of grouping additional statues of a priest's relatives on the same pedestal with his own statue - as at Lugdunum, for example; Fishwick (above, note 4) o.c. 136, n.267.
24 P.Oxy. 12,1449 (= A.S.Hunt and C.C.Edgar, Select Papyri, London 1934, 2, no.405) ll. 11f.
Munatius had built an Artemisium for the phratry with his own funds, there would have been ample justification for placing his images (and statues?) in the new temple - one would suspect in the actual cella. It is also very much in line with standard procedure that his deceased son should receive a statue too, perhaps again to be placed in the cella. The decree, which is entirely concerned with honours for Munatius, makes no mention of images of the emperor, but the epigraphical record certainly gives the impression that such were commonly in the possession of colleges and associations of every sort and description; in some cases, of course, colleges were created solely for the purpose of honouring the imperial image. If the Artemisii conformed to the norm, therefore, it is likely enough that the likenesses of Munatius and his son within the Artemisium were placed in the company of statues of the emperor. Whether this speculation is correct or not, there can be no question that these were signal honours paid by the Artemisii to their benefactor and his son.

One further point may be raised in this connection, though again it is an inference unsupported by direct evidence. A practice with roots reaching back into the Hellenistic period and earlier was the transportation of images, whether of gods or rulers, in colourful processions marking important occasions. The rite is well attested with cults of various kinds in Egypt (where it is part of an indigenous tradition), Asia Minor, Greece and in the Roman period in Italy and in the western provinces. Evidence that colleges also practiced this custom is very slight, and we have no knowledge of whether the Artemisii at Naples held processions to commemorate special occasions of their patron goddess or, say, Imperial anniversaries, notably the emperor's birthday. What we do have is explicit testimony from Ephesus in connection with the bequest of G.Vibius Salutaris (above, p.180), who had donated 31 statuettes of Artemis, members of the Imperial family, the Roman Senate, the Council and Demos of the Ephesians, and other abstractions. A decree of the Council of Ephesus refers to the carrying of type-statues of the goddess (apeikonismata) and images (eikones) - including images of Trajan, Plotina, and Divus Augustus - from the temple of Artemis to the theatre on assembly days and various occasions of the liturgical year. The cortège itself is vividly described in the second-century novel of Xenophon of Ephesus, who lists the members of the procession including the bearers of various sacred objects.

25 The Greek translation of constitutas (l. 59) is κοβδορμηύνος (ll. 40f). Some form of exactly this word is commonly used elsewhere when a statue is set in a temple; cf. Appian B.C. 5, 132; Dio 53, 27, 3; Josephus, Bell. Iud. 2, 194. If it not sheer coincidence, could the use of κοβδορμηύνος here echo the fact that Munatius' imago clipeata was in fact to be set in the shrine of Artemis, perhaps even beside the cult image?
26 Pekáry, o.c. 123; Fishwick (above, note 12) forthcoming.
27 Price (above, note 12) 189f., cf. 110-112; Pekáry, o.c. 121f.; Fishwick, o.c. forthcoming.
28 Herz (above, note 13) 154, cites an inscription at Aquincum (CIL 3, 3438 = ILS 7254) recording that the patron and prefect of a collegium fabrum led the members in ambulativis on 28th July (a date of unknown significance); cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary, 116 s.v.
29 Above, note 20.
30 Price, o.c. 102, note 4, 110 with refs.
Nothing on this scale could be expected of the Artemisii at Naples, of course, but it would be strange, in view of the prevalence of the custom, if the phratry did not stage similar processions itself on special occasions. If such events did take place, one could expect them to have featured the transportation of representations of Artemis, with whom no doubt will have been included likenesses of the Roman emperor and very possibly the eikones (and statuae?) of L.Munatius Hilarianus, the great benefactor of the college.

One final point arises from the letter of Munatius to the phretores Artemisii. In reducing the number of the honours they have offered he remarks that one statue and one image of himself will suffice with one statue of his son: plures enim imagines et statuas in vestris animis habemus constitutas (ll. 58f.), a phrase translated verbatim into Greek. In his commentary Maiuri remarks in passing that this is a passage "di schietto sapore letterario". In fact the expression is a commonplace that can be traced back in one form or another as far as Pericles' Funeral Oration in Thucydides 2,43,3 and recurs elsewhere, notably in Plutarch Cato Maior 19,5, Tacitus, Ann. 4,38 and Pliny, Panegyricus 55,10. Of particular interest is that Dio, presumably writing in the first quarter of the third century, uses exactly the same expression in the fictious speech he puts in the mouth of Maecenas (52,35,3-6), a circumstance which says something of the way he composed his history. Where L.Munatius Hilarianus had picked up the expression we do not know but, if the phrase was a literary commonplace, its use tells something of Munatius' level of literacy, despite the awkward prose style of someone possibly more at home in Greek than in Latin. Or was the expression so well known that it had become a commonplace of polite conversation? At all events the fact that the son of a freedman could use an expression otherwise known only in the writings of the great literary figures of antiquity casts interesting light on the social milieu of the Artemisii and their benefactor.

Edmonton

D.Fishwick

---

31 Above, note 2, 25.
34 See further D.Fishwick, Dio and Maecenas, forthcoming.