

D. FISHWICK

L. MUNATIUS HILARIANUS AND THE INSCRIPTION OF THE ARTEMISII

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 76 (1989) 175–183

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

L. MUNATIUS HILARIANUS AND THE INSCRIPTION OF THE ARTEMISII

- Ἐπι[ὶ ὑπάτω]ν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσα(αρος) Λ(ευκίου) Σεπτιμίου
 Σευήρου Π[ε]ρτι(ι)νακός Σεβ(αστοῦ) τὸ β[ῆ] [καὶ Δ(έκμου) Κλωδίου Σεπτιμίου
 Ἀλβίνου Καίσα(αρος)], δημάρχουτος Μ(άρχου) Αὐρηλίου Ἀπολαύστου ν(εωτέρου)
 πρὸ ζ' κλη(ανδῶν) Ἰανου[α]ρίων, γραφομένων παρήσαν Καίλ(ιος) Ἀσιατικός,
 5 Ἰούλ(ιος) Αὐρηλιανός, Ἰούλ(ιος) Καίλιανός, εἰσηγουμένων ἢ γνώμην
 ἀπάντων φρητέρων, περὶ τούτου πράγματος οὕτως ἔδωξεν·
- Ἐπειδὴ(ι) Μουνάτιος Ἰλαριανὸς πολέϊτου δικαίου καὶ φιλοπάτριδος
 γνώμη καὶ διαθέσει χρώμενος, τὴν φρατρίαν ὄρων τὴν ἡμετέραν
 ἀκόσμητον οὖσαν καὶ παλαιάν, φρονήματι λαμπρῶ καὶ μεγαλοψύχῳ χρη-
 10 σάμενος λίθοις ποικίλοις τοῖς ἀρίστοις καὶ σπανιωτάτοις πολυτελεῖα
 κατασκευῆς ἐκόσμησεν τὸν οἶκον καὶ τὴν ὄροφὴν ἐποίησε χρυσοῦ μη-
 δὲν τι δαπάνης χρημάτων φεισάμενος, μηδὲ τῶν εἰς τοῦτο ἀναλωμά-
 των, καὶ τοῖς μὲν Ἀρτεμεισίων φράτορσιν ἐστιατήριον ἐποίησε τῶν ἀλ-
 λων σεμνότερον, τῇ δὲ Ἀρτέμιδι, ἧς ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμος ἡ φρατρία, νεῶν
 15 κατασκεύασεν ἀξίον καὶ τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς εὐσεβείας, δεδόχθαι
 τοῖς Ἀρτεμεισίων φράτορσιν· ἀμείβεσθαι τὴν εὐνοϊκὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν τοσαύτην
 καὶ τὴν φιλοτειμίαν, πρῶτον μὲν τῇ τῆς διαθέσεως καὶ προαιρέ(σε)ως τειμη-
 πάντων οἰκείατατον καὶ προσάτην καὶ πα(τέ)ρα νομίζοντα καὶ βίον εὐ-
 χυμένους αὐτῷ μακρὸν ἐν εὐδαιμονίᾳ, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τειμᾶς αὐτῷ νέμειν, κατὰ
 20 δύναμιν τὴν ἡμετέραν, τὰς προσηγούσας ἀνδριάντων ἀναστάσεις τεσ-
 σάρων ἐν τῇ φρατρίᾳ, δύο μὲν αὐτοῦ Μουνατίου Ἰλαριανοῦ τοῦ φιλοπάτριδος, δύο
 δὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Μαρίου Οὐήρου τοῦ ἥρωος· ἀναθεῖναι δὲ καὶ εἰκόνας ἐν τῇ φρα-
 τρίᾳ μετὰ ἀσπίδειων χρυσοῦν ἀφοτέρων, προσφέρειν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ πεντήκοντα
 25 γῶρας ὀλοκλήρους καὶ κεχληκολογηκότων ἐν τῇ φρατρίᾳ προῖκα,
 ὡς μὴ μόνον κεκοσμηθῆσαι τὴν φρατρίαν ἡμεῖν πολυτελεῖα καὶ
 (καὶ) κάλλει τῆς κατασκευῆς σεμνότητι ἱροπρεπεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πλη-
 θει τῶν νεμόντων εὐξερῆσαι τὴν φρατρίαν Μουνατίου Ἰλαριανοῦ τοῦ
 φιλοπάτριδος τετ(ι)μημένου· ἐπικυροῦντος τὸ ψήφισμα Κανεινίου
 Ἰρακλείδου τοῦ φροντιστοῦ τῆς φρατρίας.
- 30 Μουνάτιος Ἰλαριανὸς Ἀρτεμεισίων φρητορσι χάρειν.
 Ἰὰς τειμᾶς ἧς ἐψηφίσασθέ μοι καὶ τὰς δωρεὰς εἰς ἀμοιβὴν τῆς εὐνοίας
 καὶ τῆς προθυμίας τῆς ἐμῆς ἡδέως ἔλαθον, οὐ διὰ τὸ μέγεθος ὧν ἐπεδεί-
 ξασθε φιλοτειμούμενοι πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἐμὸν ἥρωα τὸν
 ὑμέτερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' αὐτὴν τὴν προαίρεσιν τῶν διδόντων ὅτι χρησ-
 35 τοὺς ὑμᾶς καὶ δικαίους ἐπέγνων ἐκ τῶν ἀμοιβῶν. Ἰὰς μὲν οὖν
 τεσσαράκοντα γῶρας ἧς προετείνατέ μοι παραιτοῦμαι, πέντε καὶ
 δέκα γῶρας ἐκ τούτων ἀρκούμενος, καὶ τῶν εἰκόνων τῶν τεσσάρων καὶ
 τῶν ἀνδριάντων τῶν τεσσάρων ἐμοὶ μὲν ἱκανή(ι) μία γραφή(ι) καὶ χλη-
 κοῦς ἀνδριάς εἷς, ἴσα δὲ τειμᾶ καὶ τῷ μεθεστηκότι. Ἰὰς γὰρ πολλὰς εἰκό-

- 40 νας καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀνδριάντας ἐν ταῖς ὑμετέραις ψυχαῖς ἔχομεν κα-
 θιδρυμένους· γὰρ δὲ ὑμεῖς, ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ καὶ φράτορες ἐμοί, μὴ ταῦτα
 μόνον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἔχειν, τὴν φρητριάν καὶ τὸν εἰς ταύτην κόσ-
 μον καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα ὑμεῖς ἐλπίζειν παρ' ἐμοῦ·
 τὸ γὰρ τῆς εὐνοίας τῆς ἐμῆς αἰεὶ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐγείρει τὴν προθυμίαν
- 45 τὴν ἐμὴν εἰς τὴν πρὸς ὑμεῖς τειμὴν καὶ χάριν.

L. Munatius Hilarianus Phretoribus Artemisis salutem.

Honores quos decrevistis mihi, item dona at re-
munerandum animum meum et pronam volun-
tatem grate accepi, non pro magnitudine eorum

- 50 *quae ostendistis tribuentes mihi et filio meo*
heroi vestro, set maxime propositi vestri gratia
qui decrevistis, quod vos et bonos et justos intel-
lexi ex his quae remuneratis. Et quidem quinquaginta
choras quas mihi obtulistis excuso, quindecim
 55 *contentus, item de imaginibus quattuor et de*
statuis quattuor; mihi enim sufficit statua una
et una imago, set et in honorem filii mei sufficet
statua una; plures enim imagines et statuas in
vestris animis habemus constitutas. Oportet
 60 *autem vos, optimi viri et conphretores, non*
solum haec ante oculos habere, phretriam et
cultum eius et lautitiam (sed etiam alia) sperare de me; dispositio
animi mei magis hortatur voluntatem meam in vestrum honorem et gratiam.

65

Valete.

(AE 1913,134)

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,¹ 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.² 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

¹ D. Mallardo, Nuova epigrafe greco-latina della fratria napoletana degli Artemisi, Atti della Reale Accad. di Lett., Arch. e Belle Arti Napoli 2, 1911, 150-175.

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. 194.³ 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 Neapolis. 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 *andriantes* 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.⁴

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.⁵ 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.⁶ As for the buildings Munatius had embellished, ἐκτιατῆριον 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 ἱερός, 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;⁷ 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.⁸ 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,⁹ while in the well-known inscription from Piraeus that concerns the arsenal of Philon the word seems to denote the space between pillars (IG 2² 1668, 1.77: 347-6 B.C.).¹⁰ It is difficult to think that Munatius was given fifteen whole (ὀλοκλήρου) sections of some building of the phratry (the

⁵ So Maiuri citing: EE 8, p.93, no.344: D(is) M(anibus) | C.Insteio | Maximo | vixit ann(os) (decem) | mens(es) (novem) | Munatius Hilarianus fratri mer(enti). On adoption of freedmen see Aulus Gellius, NA 5,19,11-14; A.Watson, *The Law of Persons in the Later Roman Republic*, Oxford 1967,90-98. See further in general G.Fabre, *Libertus. Recherches sur les rapports patron-affranchi à la fin de la République romaine* (Coll. École franç. de Rome 50), Rome 1981,37-39. See further in general P.R.C.Weaver, *Familia Caesaris*, Cambridge 1972,158,254 (re Imperial freedmen).

⁶ See in general F.Poland, *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig 1909 (1967) 228-230; M.P.Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*³ (Handb. d. Altertumswiss. 5,2), Munich 1974,143 with n.8.

⁷ O.Weise, *Die Griechischen Wörter im Latein*, Leipzig 1882 (1964) 381 s.v.; G.A.E.A.Saalfeld, *Tensaurus Italograecus*, Vienna 1884 (1964) 283 s.v.

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.

ἔτσιατήριον?), 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.¹¹ 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 κεχαλκολογηκόντων ..." 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 τῷ 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* (= *statua*) 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-corps', 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*.¹² In the present case the decree explicitly associates the *eikones* with golden shields (l. 23: μετὰ ἀκτιδείων χρυσῶν), 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 traiectus 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).¹³ 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.¹⁴ 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

¹¹ Poland, *Vereinswesen* 453; Maiuri, o.c. 29f. with n.4, noting the formation *choragri* in *Gromatici*, p.369,1, "dove la parole equivale à *predi rustici*".

¹² 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.

¹³ P.Herz, *Kaiserbilder aus Ostia*, *BCAR* 87,1980-81,145-157, especially 149-151.

¹⁴ Pekáry, o.c. 66-80.

(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.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 diminished 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),¹⁶ though in the provinces private individuals could certainly have statues of solid silver after death if not already in their lifetime.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.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.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. 104.²⁰ 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. 70f., 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, *Κόιντος 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. 57f.

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).²¹ Likewise at Mt. Eryx the verses of L.Apronius Cassianus, consul in A.D. 39, reveal that he dedicated an effigies 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 cella as a mark of special honour;²² even the statue of a relative of the benefactor could be allowed there.²³ 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 cella 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 cella of a temple was intended as an offering to the deity "dedicated in accordance with ancient custom for vows or pious reasons".²⁴ 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 ἀνατάειν 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 ἀναθεῖναι, 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 νεώς 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.²⁵ 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.²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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,²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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.³⁰

²⁵ The Greek translation of *constitutas* (l. 59) is *καθιδρυμένους* (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 *καθιδρυμένους* 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 *ambulatibus* 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".³¹ 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 55,10.³² Of particular interest is that Dio, presumably writing in the first quarter of the third century,³³ uses exactly the same expression in the fictitious speech he puts in the mouth of Maecenas (52,35,3-6), a circumstance which says something of the way he composed his history.³⁴ 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.

³² G.W.Bowersock, *Greek Intellectuals and the Imperial Cult in the Second Century A.D.*, in W. den Boer (ed.) *Le Culte des Souverains dans l'Empire romain* (Fondation Hardt Entretiens 19), Vandoeuvres - Geneva 1972, 203f.; Price (above, note 12), 199, n.152, noting that the idea recurs in John Chrysostom, PG 49,216. See further Cod.Theod. 15,4,1, cited by Bowersock, *The Imperial Cult: Perceptions and Persistence*, in B.F.Meyer and E.P.Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition III*, Philadelphia, 1983, 180.

³³ For the date of Dio's composition see G.W.Bowersock, *Gnomon* 37, 1965, 471-3 ad F.Miller, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964, 30.

³⁴ See further D.Fishwick, *Dio and Maecenas*, forthcoming.