

C. EILERS

C. SENTIUS SATURNINUS, PISO PONTIFEX, AND THE TITULUS
TIBURTINUS: A REPLY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 110 (1996) 207–226

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

C. SENTIUS SATURNINUS, PISO PONTIFEX, AND THE TITULUS TIBURTINUS: A REPLY

In an article recently published in this journal, N. Kokkinos has brought to our attention again a much-discussed inscription from Tibur:¹

[- - -] / [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 ornamenta triumph[alia decrevit;] / pro consul(e) Asiam provinciam op-
[tinuit; legatus pr. pr.] / divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Ph[oenicen optinuit] /
[- - -]

The famous *ignotus* of this inscription has been variously identified. For most of the century and a half following the discovery of this inscription in 1764, most scholars identified him as P. Sulpicius Quirinius (cos. 12).² In this century some have continued to argue for Quirinius,³ while others have opted for M. Plautius Silvanus (cos. 2) and M. Titius (suff. 31), only to be refuted,⁴ and L. Calpurnius Piso the Pontifex (cos. 15).⁵ In an argument that is wide-ranging and thought-provoking, Kokkinos has revived the view of Zumpt that the senator whose career is recounted in this inscription is to be identified as C. Senti-
us Saturni-

The following abbreviations have been used in this article: Atkinson = K. M. T. Atkinson, *The governors of the province Asia in the reign of Augustus*, *Historia* 7, 1958, 300–330; Cichorius, RS = C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien: historisches, epigraphisches, literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*, 1922; G.-P. = A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, edd., *The Garland of Philip*, 1968; Kokkinos = N. Kokkinos, *The honorand of the titulus Tiburtinus: C. Senti-
us Saturninus?* *ZPE* 105, 1995, 21–36; Magie = D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, 1950; Mommsen, RG² = T. Mommsen, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, 2nd ed., 1883; MRR = T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 3 vols., 1951–1986; Syme, RP = R. Syme, *Roman Papers*, 7 vols., 1979–1991; Syme, RR = R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, 1939; Thomasson, Laterculi = B. Thomasson, *Laterculi Praesidum*, vol. 1, 1984. Dates are BC, unless otherwise stated.

¹ CIL 14,3613 = ILS 918 = *Inscr. Ital.* 4.1, no. 130 = A. E. Gordon, *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions*, vol. 1, 1958, 77–78 no. 70.

² H. Sanclementius, *de vulgaris aere emendatione*, 1793, 414–426; B. Borghesi, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 8, 1872, 126–128, 493–501; Mommsen, RG², 161–178. For other advocates, see Kokkinos 23 n. 6.

³ H. Braunert, *Der römische Provinzialzensus und der Schätzungsbericht des Lukas-Evangeliums*, *Historia* 6, 1957, 192–214, at 209–211; Atkinson, 314–319.

⁴ For Silvanus, E. Groag, *Prosopographische Beiträge VII: M. Plautius Silvanus*, *JÖAI* 21–22, 1922–24, Beibl. 446–478; *contra*, R. Syme, *Galatia and Pamphylia under Augustus: the governorships of Piso, Quirinius and Silvanus*, *Klio* n.s. 9, 1934, 122–148, at 139ff.; for Titius, L. R. Taylor, *M. Titius and the Syrian command*, *JRS* 26, 1936, 161–173; *contra*, Syme, RR, 398 n. 1; Atkinson, 316 n. 73.

⁵ The case for Piso was first fully made by B. M. Levick, *Roman Colonies in Southern Asia Minor*, 1967, 208–210, though her argument had been adumbrated by Syme (RR 398 n. 8), who later took up the argument fully (*The Titulus Tiburtinus*, in: *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik*, München 1972, *Vestigia* no. 17, 1973, 583–601 = RP 3, 869–884; idem, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 1986, 338–342).

nus (cos. 19).⁶ In this article, I wish to point out weaknesses in the case for Saturninus and to argue that Piso the Pontifex remains a strong candidate.

Problems with Saturninus

Kokkinos' argument in favour of Saturninus as the senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus* can be analysed in four parts, which we shall consider in order: 1) that the Sentii Saturnini had their origins near Tibur; 2) that he held the same governorships as *ignotus*, including a proconsulship of Asia; 3) that the German campaigns in which he was involved in AD 4-6 brought him into contact with king Maroboduus (the *rex* of the *titulus*) and won him *ornamenta triumphalia* and two *supplicationes*; 4) that the order in which Saturninus held his legateships and proconsulship is not inconsistent with the word *iterum* in line 6.

1. The stemma and origins of the Sentii Saturnini

Syme investigated the antecedents of Saturninus in the 1960s, offering a stemma and arguing that the family had its origins in Atina.⁷ Kokkinos (28-30) challenges Syme on several points. The main result of this is that Kokkinos would prefer to identify the family's *patria* as Gabii, which is not many miles from Tibur, which would therefore explain why this inscription was found there. A review of his arguments is justified not only by the need for accuracy when reconstructing a stemma for the family, but also by the opportunity this offers to raise certain methodological issues. It seems clear that Saturninus was descended from C. Sentius C.f. (pr. 94). Syme suggested that this man was Saturninus' great-grandfather; Kokkinos (28), his grandfather. Neither is, strictly speaking, impossible: a consul of 19 would have been born no later than 52, though a date closer to 60, as suggested by Syme, is attractive. The *leges annales* set minimum ages for magistracies and are often our only means for estimating a senator's age. In the Republic, the minimum age for the praetorship was 39.⁸ Thus C. Sentius (pr. 94) will have been born no later than 134, not *c.* 120, as Kokkinos (28) suggests. As a *novus homo*, however, he may well have been older still.⁹ The 75 years or more that separate the estimated births of the praetor of 94 and the consul of 19 would be consistent with the former being either the grandfather or great-grandfather of the latter.

Kokkinos is probably correct to follow Syme in identifying the Sentius Saturninus Vetulo mentioned by Valerius Maximus (7,3,9) with the Saturninus who was an ally of Sex. Pompeius in 35 (App. BC 5,52,139). Velleius (2,77,3) also mentions a Sentius Saturninus. At the conference at Misenum (39 BC), Sex. Pompeius had stipulated that those who had been proscribed and taken refuge with him should be allowed a safe return. Among those who

⁶ A. W. Zumpt, *Commentationum epigraphicarum ad antiquitates Romanas pertinentium volumen*, vol. 2, 1854, 109–125; idem, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi: geschichtlich-chronologische Untersuchungen*, 1869, 72–89.

⁷ R. Syme, *The stemma of the Sentii Saturnini*, *Historia* 12, 1964, 156–166 = RP 2, 605–616.

⁸ A. E. Astin, *The Lex Annalis before Sulla*, 1958, 45–46.

⁹ T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate, 139 BC – AD 14*, 1971, 260, no. 387.

were ‘restored to the state’ were Nero Claudius, M. Silanus (cos. 25), Arruntius (cos. 22), Titius (suff. 31), and a Sentius Saturninus.¹⁰ Syme, noting that Vetulo stayed with Pompeius until 35 (App. loc. cit.), suggested that Velleius is referring to the Augustan consul as a young man.¹¹ Kokkinos (28) rejects this as ‘most unlikely’, arguing that ‘in 39 BC the consul would have been from around thirteen to twenty-one years old, hardly the “restored” *vir clarissimus*, as described by Velleius’. It is always useful, however, to take note of the company in which an author mentions someone. The consul of 19 would not have been much younger than M. Silanus (cos. 25) and Arruntius (cos. 22), who are found with Sentius in this passage.¹² Anyway, given the later importance of the consul and Velleius’ admiration for him (cf. 2,92), his return probably would seem to Velleius a more significant benefit to the state than the return of his little-known father or of some unattested uncle.

The most radical innovation that Kokkinos (29) would make to the family is to include within it a Roman military tribune who appears among the witnesses for two decrees of the consul Lentulus in 49 BC, Γάιος Σέντιος Γαίου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία χιλίαρχος. With the tribe of the Sentii Saturnini thus established, Kokkinos (29, 33) suggests that the family came from Gabii, which he argues belongs to the same tribe, the Aemilia; also, the distance between Gabii and Tibur is not great, which could explain his connection with this town.

This argument is vulnerable on several points. The name of the military tribune of 49 is found in two consular decrees included by Josephus in his *Antiquities*. The final two witnesses listed in the first document are (AJ 14,229):

Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου Ουετωρία Γάλλος, Γάιος Σέντιος Γαίου υἱὸς
Σαβατίνα

This is to be compared with the list at AJ 14,238 (underlining what is identical with 14,229):

Πόπλιος Κλούσιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Ουετωρία Γάλλος, Γάιος Τεύτιος
Γαίου Αἰμιλία χιλίαρχος, Σέξτος Ἄτιλιος Σέξτου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία
Σέρρανος, Γάιος Πομπήιος Γαίου υἱὸς Σαβατίνα

Clearly the two lists of witnesses had originally been largely identical and, as has been long recognized, ‘Sentius’ of 14,229 and ‘Teutius’ of 14,238 are very probably the same individual.¹³ The difference in names is yet another illustration of how corrupt is the text of the *Antiquities*. Also to be noted are the textual variants Σερούλιος for Σέντιος at 14,229 and Τέπτιος for Τεύτιος at 14,238. Was the military tribune a Sentius, Servilius, Teutius, or Tettius? ‘Teutius’ is not otherwise attested as a *gentilicium*,¹⁴ and so should probably be excluded; ‘Tutius’, however, is not impossible.¹⁵ In the mid-50s there was a moneyer named

¹⁰ Vell. 2,77,3: *id unum tantummodo salutare adventu suo patriae attulit, quod omnibus proscriptis aliisque, qui ad eum ex diversis causis fugerant, reditum salutemque pactus est: quae res et alios clarissimos viros et Neronem Claudium et M. Silanum Sentiumque Saturninum et Arruntium ac Titium restituit rei publicae.*

¹¹ R. Syme, *Historia* 12, 1964, 162 = RP 2, 611–612.

¹² For their identities, see F. Hinard, *Les proscriptions de la Rome républicaine*, 1985, nos. 20, 68; A.J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus, The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93)*, 1983, 190.

¹³ Cf. R. Syme, *Historia* 12, 1964, 163 = RP 2, 611.

¹⁴ It is not in H. Solin and O. Salomies, *Reportorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, 1988.

¹⁵ E. Badian, *Notes on Roman Senators of the Republic*, *Historia* 12, 1963, 141.

‘C. Serveil(ius) C.f.’,¹⁶ who could conceivably have been a military tribune in 49.¹⁷ It is worth noting how few Italian cities are attested as belonging to tribe Aemilia.¹⁸ At one of these cities, Mevania, we find a IIIvir named Q. Tettius C.f. (CIL 11,5055), which might lend slight support for the name ‘Tettius’, if we were to imagine that he came from Mevania. Of course, ‘Sentius’ cannot be ruled out either. But even if this were his correct name, it would be difficult to suppose he was related to the senatorial Sentii Saturnini. The consul’s other contemporary relatives all have the *cognomen* ‘Saturninus’. The military tribune did not have a *cognomen* at all, at least to judge from these two documents, which include *cognomina* for other witnesses who had them, but none for the military tribune. Moreover, a specific place in the stemma cannot be found for him. A military tribune of 49 would be too old to be identical with the consul of 19, but too young to be his father. Since he has the same *praenomen* as the consul, they cannot have been brothers.¹⁹ They also have the same filiation and therefore cannot have been cousins, since this would mean that their fathers had the same *praenomina* and thus could not be brothers. By the same token, because the military tribune is ‘C.f.’ and Saturninus is ‘C.n.’, he cannot have been the cousin of Saturninus’ father.

Kokkinos proposes that the military tribune came from Gabii, arguing that he, like Gabii, belonged to the tribe Aemilia. Given the difficulties in relating the military tribune to the senatorial Sentii Saturnini, this hardly matters. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that even for this Sentius, the connection with Gabii is highly uncertain. An argument based on coincidental tribes would be far from conclusive, even if the tribe of Gabii were firmly attested as the Aemilia, which it is not. Indeed, the tribe is not epigraphically attested there.²⁰ As it is, however, the argument should be abandoned and whatever the military tribune’s name and origin there is no justification for including him in any reconstruction of the stemma of the Sentii Saturnini.

¹⁶ M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 1974, no. 423 (dating his coinage to 57 BC); cf. C. Hersh and A. Walker (ANSMN 29, 1984, 103–134), who date his coinage to 53.

¹⁷ I. Kajanto, *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period: a Study on Social Structure*, 1955, 29–33.

¹⁸ J. W. Kubitschek (*Imperium Romanum tributim discriptum*, 1889) lists only Formiae, Fundi, Suessa Aurunca, Copia Thurii, Vibo Valentia and Mevania as belonging to Aemilia. For Gabii, see below, n. 20.

¹⁹ Kokkinos’ speculative suggestion (30) that Josephus wrote Γάιος instead of Γναῖος, ‘wrongly expanding the Latin abbreviation of Cn.’, thus allowing the military tribune to be an older brother of the consul, is methodologically hazardous. In any case, it should not be assumed that Josephus had Latin versions of these documents (see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. ed. by G. Vermes and F. Millar, vol. 1, 52 n.19). Γναῖος for Γάιος or ‘Cn.’ for ‘C.’ would not, of course, be an impossible scribal error (as the examples collected by Kokkinos show), but the odds are very much against the identical error being made twice (both at AJ 14,229 and again at 14,238).

²⁰ L. R. Taylor (*The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: the Thirty-five Urban and Rural Tribes*, 1960, 44–45, 192) was willing to recognize it as possible that Gabii had belonged to the old rural tribe Aemilia, though she thought it more likely that the Menenia incorporated this region. But this is probably not relevant to the present discussion, given the extensive reorganization of tribes following the Social War (cf. *ibid.* 106). The best evidence of tribal affiliation is a tribe consistently attested among the local citizenry. In a second century inscription (CIL 14,2795), two IIIviri of Gabii are attested from the Claudia and Palatina; CIL 14,2820 shows a private citizen belonging to Falerna.

This conclusion undoes the only valid reason for questioning Syme's inference that this family came from Atina.²¹ Syme's argument is attractive. In the *pro Plancio* (27) Cicero mentioned a Cn. Saturninus from Atina. His father had been the first man from Atina to acquire a curule office in Rome and even reached the praetorship (Cic. *Planc.* 19). The praetor of 94 was also a *novus homo* who reached the praetorship. These two praetors will have been active at about the same time, at least to judge from the age of Cn. Saturninus, who had served under Q. Metellus in 68 or 67 (Cic. *Planc.* 27), probably as military tribune or quaestor. This would make him about the right age to be a son of C. Sentius (pr. 94). Moreover, the Sentii are the only senatorial family from this period who are known to have used the *cognomen* 'Saturninus'²² and the only other Saturninus attested from Atina is a young *speculator* of the praetorian guard named Cn. Sentius Saturninus.²³ The accumulation of coincidences argues for the identification of C. Sentius (pr. 94) as the father of the Cn. Saturninus of Cicero's *pro Plancina*. No evidence contradicts it. Whatever the correctness of the connection with Atina, however, the revisions that Kokkinos proposes for this family cannot be sustained and the stemma of the Sentii Saturnini must be left more or less as Syme arranged it three decades ago.²⁴ There is no good reason either to believe that Saturninus came from Gabii or had any special connection with neighbouring Tibur.

2. Saturninus' proconsular province

The senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus* was proconsul of Asia. There is no evidence, however, that Saturninus held this post. Kokkinos (34) tentatively proposes the possibility that the following inscription is evidence of an Asian proconsulship for Saturninus in AD 1/2:²⁵

[ἔτους Π]Β τῆς Αὐτοκράτορος | [Σεβαστοῦ νίκης, ἐπὶ] | [] μηνὸς
 Ἐ[κατομβαιῶνος?] | [.. πρὸς ἑπτὰ εἰδῶν Ἰουλίῳν?] | [Γ(αίῳ) Σευτίῳ
 Σατ[ορνίνῳ] ὑπάτῳ] | [Αὐτοκρά]τωρ Καίσαρ Σεβαστός].

Line 16, it is suggested, might read [ἀνθυπάτῳ] rather than [ὑπάτῳ], if we were willing to read [Λ]Β (AD 1/2) rather than [Π]Β (19 BC) in line 12. This suggestion must be firmly rejected – these lines provide a dating formula for the decree of Augustus that follows. Consequently we find a year (according to the Actian era) with a date by the Samian calendar, then a date by the Julian calendar and a consular year. 19 BC was the year of Saturninus' consulship, and (it must be noted) while there is no room for another consul's name – consular dates require two names – the year 19 began with only one consul. Saturninus' name, then, appears in this inscription only as a consular date. For a consul's name to appear here is completely normal; a proconsul's name would be bizarre. The date of 19 for this

²¹ R. Syme, *Historia* 13, 1964, 121–122 = RP 2, 600–601.

²² The families that Kokkinos (29) lists are either not senatorial or belong to other periods; no Appuleii with the *cognomen* are known after the notorious tribune of 100.

²³ CIL 6,2722: Cn. Sentius / Cn.f. Ter. / Saturninus / Atine spec(ulator) / coh(ortis) VIII pr(aetoriae) / (centuria) Severi / mil(itavit) ann. VIII / vix(it) ann(or)um XXVII.

²⁴ Syme, *Historia* 12, 1964, 158 = RP 2, 608.

²⁵ P. Herrmann, *AM* 75, 1960, 84–90 no. 4, lines 12–17.

document is therefore beyond doubt and this inscription can provide no support for the suggestion that Saturninus was proconsul of Asia.

A lack of evidence that a senator was proconsul of Asia, of course, cannot disprove that he was. The only way to do that would be either to have a completely full *fasti* of Asia (which we clearly do not have) or to demonstrate that Saturninus was a proconsul of Africa, since this would deprive him of the opportunity of entering the lottery for the other public province for consulars.²⁶ Saturninus is usually included among the governors of Africa,²⁷ which, if correct, would prevent his identification as our *ignotus*, who governed Asia. The case for Saturninus' African proconsulship, however, has never been especially strong. In listing a series of landmarks in the history of Rome's involvement with Carthage, Tertullian mentions that Saturninus had performed certain ceremonies there.²⁸ No office is mentioned, nor is it clear over what kind of ceremony Saturninus was presiding. Some have supposed that he presided over the inauguration of the *colonia*, which according to Dio took place in 29 BC,²⁹ or perhaps after some delay.³⁰ Others have supposed that he presided over the dedication of the walls that Statilius Taurus had begun constructing while governor there in the 30s.³¹ If the latter, Taurus' position as proconsul when he began the work would at least make it conceivable that Saturninus was proconsul when the ceremonies were performed. But this is all rather uncertain and little can be said with confidence. Thus, although a question mark should hang over any inclusion of Saturninus in the *fasti* of Africa, Kokkinos' (31) assertion that 'whatever Saturninus' position at Carthage ..., he was certainly not proconsul' states a negative conclusion that goes beyond the evidence. We cannot be sure what his position was there. But Saturninus is at least attested as active in Africa, which is more than can be said of Asia. Perhaps the future will provide clearer evidence one way or the other.

3. Saturninus' achievements in Germany

In the years AD 4-6, Tiberius undertook a series of campaigns along the Rhine frontier, where Saturninus was Augustus' legate. It is his achievements in this office that would be mentioned in the first extant lines of our inscription. Like the anonymous senator, Saturninus was awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia*. The *titulus* also mentions two official thanksgivings (*supplicationes*) offered to the gods on account of his successes. There is no direct

²⁶ For the process, R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, 1984, 349.

²⁷ B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischer Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus*, 1960, 12; idem, *Laterculi*, 371; E. Groag, *RE* 2A, 1923, 1515; A. C. Pallu de Lessert, *Fastes des provinces africaines (Proconsulaire, Numidie, Maurétaines) sous la domination romaine*, vol. 1, République et haut empire, 1896, 75-76; Mommsen, *RG*², 168.

²⁸ Tertullian, de Pall. 1,2: *ubi moenia Statilius Taurus imposuit, sollemnia Sentius Saturninus enarravit*.

²⁹ Dio 52.43.1. Kokkinos, 31; S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*, vol. 8, 1928, 198 and n. 2.

³⁰ T.D. Barnes (*Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study*, 1971, 86 n. 4) points out that ancient chronicles place the refoundation in 28 BC (*Mon. Germ. Hist.*, *Auct. Ant.* 9,217. 276) and suggests that Saturninus was a praetorian proconsul in 28/27, succeeding L. Autronius Paetus (*Thomasson, Laterculi*, 371).

³¹ Thomasson, *Statthalter*, 12; E. Groag, *RE* 2A, 1923, 1515 s.v. Sentius no. 9.

attestation of any *supplicationes* resulting from Saturninus' German legateship. Kokkinos finds indirect evidence for them. First, he would connect them with imperial salutations of these years. This needs reconsideration. The campaigns of Tiberius in Germany and Illyricum together resulted in three imperial salutations, accounting for Augustus' seventeenth through nineteenth and Tiberius' third through fifth salutation. The question is whether the German campaigns produced two and Illyricum one, or *vice versa*. The issue is complicated and has received attention from several scholars.³² Kokkinos strongly favours the first alternative – identifying the two salutations as resulting from the campaign to the Elbe in AD 5 and from the settlement with Maroboduus in AD 6.³³ It is more probably the case that two salutations are for Illyricum and one for the German campaigns.³⁴ Still, this would not affect the larger argument, since the imperial salutation(s) of these years derived from the successes of Tiberius, not Saturninus, while the *supplicationes binae* mentioned by the *titulus Tiburtinus* would be for the honorand's own accomplishments. Anyway, Augustus was hailed as *imperator* 21 times in the course of his life, as compared to the 55 *supplicationes* that were decreed for victories won either by himself or under his auspices (RG 4,2). Therefore not every *supplicatio* had an imperial salutation to go with it.

What about the *supplicationes binae*, then? Kokkinos (33) would also find indirect evidence for them in our historical narrative of the German campaigns: “Dio is clear on the ‘double’ nature of Tiberius’ and Saturninus’ German achievement: μὴ μόνον ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον.” The apparent parallel, however, is not very strong. The text is not about two victories, but about two treaties: ‘the Germans, because of their fear of the Romans, made a treaty, not merely once but also a second time’.³⁵ It is, of course, possible that the senate would decree a thanksgiving to the gods following the two successful campaigns first to the Weser and then to the Elbe. Still, this is not a close match to what is found in the *titulus Tiburtinus*. The German campaigns involved action against many tribes, as can be seen in the text of Velleius (2.105-106), who names many of them. By contrast, on the most natural

³² L. Schumacher, Die imperatorischen Akklamationen der Triumvirn und die auspicia des Augustus, *Historia* 34, 1985, 216–218; R. Syme, Some imperial salutations, *Phoenix* 33, 1979, 308–329 = RP 3, 1198–1219; T.D. Barnes, The victories of Augustus, *JRS* 64, 1974, 21–26; P.A. Brunt, *ZPE* 13, 1974, 177; Mommsen *RG*², 16.

³³ As Brunt had already proposed (*ZPE* 13, 1974, 177). Kokkinos (33) is probably mistaken, however, to take Dio 55,28,6 as referring to the supposed second German salutation. Dio clearly connects it with Tiberius' advance to the Elbe, which belongs to AD 5. Dio has included events of several years in his narrative of AD 6, as he often does with foreign affairs.

³⁴ Three inscriptions need consideration: in ILS 107 § 4, Tiberius is *imp. ter. ... tribuniciae pot. VIII[I]* (AD 7/8); in ILS 107, § 5, Augustus is *imp. XVII, tribunic. potest. XXX* (AD 7/8); in an inscription from Saepinum (*Athenaeum* 56, 1978, 147), however, Tiberius is *[imp.] III, trib. pot. / VII* (AD 5/6). The evidence of ILS 107 should probably be preferred over that of the inscription from Saepinum. Supposing a simple dittography on the part of the lapicide of the Saepinum inscription and reading ‘*[imp.] III {I}*’ would bring all the evidence into line, as Syme saw (*Phoenix* 33, 1979, 316 = RP 3, 1206). The two inscriptions of ILS 107 are consistent with one another and 107 § 5 writes out the number of Tiberius' salutation (‘*ter*’), which makes an orthographical error unlikely. This requires us to suppose that whoever set them up made an error of fact, which is methodologically less attractive.

³⁵ Dio 55,28,6: ἐπειδὴ μὴ μόνον ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ καὶ δεύτερον, φοβηθέντες αὐτοῦς, ἐσπέισαντο.

interpretation of the first surviving lines of the *titulus*, the two *supplicationes* and the *ornamenta triumphalia* were decreed by the senate, not for a series of achievements, but for *ignotus*' success in subjugating some single tribe or nation: *qua redacta in pot[estatem] ... senatu[s] dis immortalibus] / supplicationes binas ... [et] ipsi ornamenta triumph[alia] decrevit* ('because it was subjugated ... the senate decreed two thanksgivings to the immortal gods and triumphal decorations to him').

There are other problems with this interpretation. In order to explain the double thanksgiving and triumphal ornaments, the *titulus Tiburtinus* mentions a king and the subjugation of some tribe: *[r]egem, qua redacta in pot[estatem] Imp. Caesaris] / Augusti populique Romani*. The *[gens]*, Kokkinos (35) suggests, are the 'Cherusci et al.' It should be noted, however, that the *titulus* will have mentioned only one *gens* or *natio*, since *qua* in line 1 is singular – thus ruling out at least the plurality of his 'et al.'. Moreover, Velleius explicitly credits Tiberius with the subjugation of the Cherusci and several other tribes, stating that he took upon himself every part of the war while Saturninus had been put in charge of affairs of a less critical nature.³⁶ Let that pass. Saturninus may have participated in the subjugation of some other tribe during these years – he was, after all, awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia*. But the *titulus* has another implication that is difficult to square with the events of these years. The words *[r]egem, qua redacta* obviously require that there was some interaction between our anonymous senator and some tribe on the one hand (i.e., he conquered them) and (probably, but perhaps not necessarily) between him and the *rex* on the other. More problematic is that these words also require that the *rex* had something to do with the tribe, since the grammatical antecedent of *qua* must have appeared the preceding clause along with *[r]egem*. Thus Mommsen's advocacy for Quirinius involved him subduing the Homonadenses, who had killed king Amyntas; Taylor in her case for M. Titius (suff. 31) noted that he imposed a king, Ariobarzanes, on the *gens Medorum*;³⁷ Groag, arguing for Plautius Silvanus, had the *natio Breucorum* killing their king, Bato.³⁸ What, however, was the connection between Maroboduus, whom Kokkinos would identify as the *rex* of our inscription, and the tribe that Saturninus had supposedly subjected? And why would it be considered relevant to an account of Saturninus' career?

This raises another objection to Saturninus. The tribes that were subjugated in Germany were (as far as we can tell) conquered by Tiberius; the settlement that was reached with Maroboduus was made by Tiberius – we know that he later claimed it was his own skill that had eliminated the threat of Maroboduus (Tac. Ann. 2,63,4). If Saturninus were *ignotus*, the *titulus Tiburtinus* would be giving the credit for these successes to Saturninus. We can, of course, assume that whoever composed the text of the *titulus* will have interpreted the events of his career in the way that most magnified our senator's importance. But to attribute

³⁶ Vell. 2,105,1: *cum omnem partem asperrimi et periculosissimi belli Caesar vindicaret sibi, in iis quae minoris erant discriminis, Sentium Saturninum ... praefecisset*. Kokkinos (32) takes this to mean that 'the less dangerous battles' were entrusted to Saturninus. Should not the implication of *omnem partem ... belli Caesar vindicaret sibi*, however, be that at least in this year Saturninus' role was primarily non-combative?

³⁷ L. Ross Taylor, JRS 26, 1936, 172.

³⁸ Groag, JÖAI 1922/4, 476–478.

Tiberius' achievements to someone else would have not only insensitive and impolitic, but dangerous. And although official sanction would not be needed for such a text, those involved in its composition would be careful to avoid writing anything that could even potentially offend the *princeps*. It is therefore difficult to believe that Tiberius' achievements could have been attributed to Saturninus in this way.

4. The meaning of *iterum*

Both *ignotus* and Saturninus held the post of governor of Syria. The honorand of the *titulus* is said to have acquired the position of legate 'again' (*iterum*), an expression that has attracted much attention. As Groag saw, the point is not that the anonymous senator had been legate of Syria twice, as many scholars had assumed, but that he had been *legatus Augusti* twice, once in Syria and once somewhere else.³⁹ There is, however, another implication. As Syme recognized, 'the word *iterum* ... proves that the order in time of the three posts is from top to bottom, not the reverse.'⁴⁰ Kokkinos (26) argues against this inference. First, he makes an appeal to authority: 'neither Groag ... nor Magie or Gordon ... were of that opinion.' But Groag could hardly be expected to anticipate Syme's argument of a decade after he wrote; Gordon in fact accepts Syme's point;⁴¹ Magie does not address the issue.⁴² Kokkinos then points out that inscriptions can set out careers in ascending or descending order, or 'with no order at all' (or rather, ordered according to other principles) and that in any of these we might find *iterum*. For Kokkinos, *iterum* shows only that *ignotus* was *legatus* twice, 'without necessarily implying direction or chronology' (26). Good method requires parallels. Kokkinos cites two inscriptions to illustrate this usage of *iterum*. One reviews the career of Q. Varius Geminus (CIL 9,5306 = ILS 932):

Q. Vario Q.f. / Gemino / leg. divi Aug. II, / procos., pr., tr. pl., / q., quaesit. iudic., / praef. frum. dand., / Xvir. stl. iudic., / curator aedium sacr. / monumentor(um)que public. / tuendorum.

Another inscription gives the cursus of Q. Caerellius (CIL 6,1364 = ILS 943):

Q. Caerellius Q.f. / Qui., IIIvir. cap., quae. / pro pr., tr. pl., legato / pro pr. ter, pr., praef. / frum. ex s.c. {s.}, / leg. Ti. Caesaris Aug., / procos., / ex testamento.

These texts, however, are not analogous to what we find in the *titulus Tiburtinus*. They do not use the word *iterum* or a grammatical equivalent.⁴³ More importantly, they are stylistically unlike that of the *titulus*, which does not merely list magistracies, but contains an

³⁹ Groag, JÖAI 1922/4, 473–474.

⁴⁰ Syme, RP 3, 877.

⁴¹ A.E. Gordon, Quintus Veranius, Consul AD 49, University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology no. 2, 1952, 315: '[Syme] gives good reasons for believing that, if this inscription belongs to Plautius Silvanus, it cannot be interpreted, in respect to the positions he held, as Groag interprets it.'

⁴² In his list of proconsuls of Asia, Magie (Roman Rule, 1581) includes Plautius Silvanus and cites (with a query) the *titulus Tiburninus*, referring to Groag's article.

⁴³ In ILS 932, 'II' probably abbreviates *bis*, not *iterum*: Geminus was *legatus* 'twice', not 'again'. In the ILS 943, *ter* ('thrice') does not abbreviate *tertium* (pace Kokkinos, 26).

elogium in Latin prose. The way they use numerical adverbs is different. ILS 932 states that Geminus had been *legatus Augusti* twice (i.e., of two provinces or two legions) following his proconsulship;⁴⁴ ILS 943, that Caerellius had been *legatus pro praetore* ‘three times’ (*ter*) between his tribunate of the plebs and praetorship. By contrast, what survives of the *titulus Tiburtinus* begins in the middle of its report of some consular command. The text will have started, like the reports of his other provinces, by identifying his province and position there. Although the province in which *ignotus* won the *ornamenta triumphalia* has been much debated, there is no room for doubt about his office there. He was clearly *legatus Augusti pro praetore*, as all commentators have recognized and as is guaranteed in any case by *iterum*. This means, however, that *ignotus* is said to have been a *legatus Augusti* ‘again’ (*iterum*) only one line after a long description of what he had achieved elsewhere as legate. A series such as [*legatus*] ... *proconsul* ... *legatus iterum* can only imply sequence.⁴⁵ Therefore the legateship in which our anonymous senator won the *ornamenta triumphalia* must have come before his legateship of Syria. This, however, is completely incompatible with Saturninus’ career, since his post in Germany came a decade after he governed Syria. Consequently, *iterum* is fatal to the argument for Saturninus. Even by itself, it is enough to disqualify him.

The Case for Piso Pontifex

Saturninus can be safely rejected then. But what of the case for Piso the Pontifex? Kokkinos makes six objections against connecting him with the *titulus Tiburtinus*. These will be considered in order.

1. Piso and the *rex*

The first extant word on our inscription is [*r*]egem, with whose submission, pacification or restoration the honorand was presumably involved. It may, however, be necessary for us to re-identify him. Syme had suggested that the reference was to Rhescuporis (PIR¹ R 41), who was killed in the revolt of the Bessi in c.12 BC (Dio 54,34,6), which Piso ultimately crushed as Caesar’s legate in Thrace.⁴⁶ Kokkinos (28) makes two objections. First, there is no evidence that explicitly calls Rhescuporis ‘king’. This, of course, could be due merely to

⁴⁴ This inscription is not, as Kokkinos suggests (26), ‘with no order at all’, but in descending order of rank, as the curatorship was probably a municipal rather than a senatorial post (W. Eck, RE Supp. 14, 1974, 827 s.v. Varius no. 22).

⁴⁵ Parallels for this usage are provided by the senatorial career of P. Paquius Scaeva (CIL 9,2845/6 = ILS 915): *pro consule provinciam Cyprum optinuit ... procos. iterum extra sortem auctoritate Aug. Caesaris et s.c. miss<us> ad componendum statum in reliquum provinciae Cypri*; by the equestrian career of Decius Saturninus (CIL 10,5393 = ILS 6286): *Ilvir i.d., Ilvir iter. quinq., praef. quinq. Ti. Caesaris Augusti, iter. Drusi Caesaris Ti.f., tertio Neronis Caesaris Germanici f.*; and by the military career of C. Baebius Atticus (CIL 5,1838 = ILS 1349): *primopil. leg.V. Macedon ... primopil. iter(um)*.

⁴⁶ Syme, RP 3, 878–879.

the shortness of his reign.⁴⁷ Second, Kokkinos points out that there is no obvious reason for Rhescuporis to be mentioned in any case, since he had been killed at the beginning of the rebellion, before Piso's transfer from Galatia, and some forty years before the text of the *titulus* would have been composed. The point is not without merit, although it is not so much an argument against Piso as against Rhescuporis. The reference could be to another *rex* with whom Piso probably had dealings, Rhescuporis' uncle, Rhoemetalces (PIR¹ R 50). He had been guardian of the young Rhescuporis and his brothers from the teens BC, and during the rebellion he had been driven out of Thrace (Dio 54,34,5). At some point after his nephew's death, Rhoemetalces became king himself, presumably in the aftermath of Piso's Thracian campaigns.⁴⁸ Indeed, it may have been Piso who imposed Rhoemetalces on the *gens Thracum* as their king. This will have been a fact worth mentioning in a review of Piso's career, since Rhoemetalces' reign lasted two decades and he would have been well-known to the Roman public because of his important contribution to Rome's security during the Pannonian revolt.⁴⁹ Be that as it may, the important point for us is that Piso's career, like that of *ignotus*, brought him into contact with a king and is therefore consistent with the *titulus Tiburtinus*.

2. Piso and the Vindelici

Kokkinos also notes that Orosius (6,21,22) mentions a campaign of Piso against the Vindelici shortly before or after his consulship in 15 BC. On Syme's reconstruction, Piso's legateship of Syria is described as being held *iterum* ('for a second time'), since it followed his command in Thrace. But the command against the Vindelici, which preceded the Thracian War, would require (according to Kokkinos) that Syria be described as being held *tertium*. The objection does not present a problem. As we have seen, *iterum* reveals Piso's tenure of an imperial legateship 'again'. If Orosius is indeed referring to Piso Pontifex,⁵⁰ and if his report is to be trusted – Syme has marshalled good arguments against it⁵¹ – we need to remember what his position was. Some have supposed that the campaign was waged while Piso held an extraordinary proconsulship in Gallia Transpadana;⁵² others, that he was *legatus* of a legion.⁵³ In neither case, however, would this have affected the numbering of the offices mentioned in the *titulus Tiburtinus*, where it is imperial legateships that are being counted. The Vindelici are therefore not a problem.

⁴⁷ Ibid.; Augustan Aristocracy, 340.

⁴⁸ Tac. Ann. 2,64,2; R. D. Sullivan, Thrace in the Eastern dynastic network, ANRW 2.7.1, 1979, 198–200. Rhoemetalces is already attested as king in AE 1912.213 (prob. AD 1/2), only a decade after Piso's campaigns.

⁴⁹ Dio 55.29–30, Vell. 2.112.

⁵⁰ Orosius refers to him merely as 'Piso', without reporting a *praenomen*. Groag (PIR² C 289) thought it possible that either Piso Pontifex or Cn. Piso (cos. 7) was meant.

⁵¹ Syme, Augustan Aristocracy, 335–336.

⁵² So H. G. Pflaum, *Essai sur les procurateurs équestres sous le Haut-Empire*, 1950, 122–123; J. Scheid, *Les Frères Arvales: recrutement et origine sociale sous les empereurs julio-claudiens*, 1975, 76–78, citing Suet. Rhet. 6.

⁵³ C. M. Wells, *The German Policy of Augustus*, 1972, 66 n.4.

3. *Supplicationes binae* and Piso's Thracian War

“Why ‘two’ *supplicationes* for Piso?” asks Kokkinos (24). Several points need to be made here. The *supplicatio* was a religious observance decreed by the senate to thank the gods for Roman successes on the battlefield. A *supplicatio*, however, did not (like the grant of a triumph) necessarily mark the end of a war – Caesar’s campaigns in Gaul in the 50s, for example, resulted in three *supplicationes*, in 57, 55, and 52.⁵⁴ Consequently, any war that lasted over several campaign seasons could result in multiple *supplicationes*. A specific *supplicatio* would be the result of a report of martial success, presumably sent by a victorious general at the end of a year’s campaigning. Since we know that Piso the Pontifex was active for three seasons in Thrace (Velleius 2,98,2), two *supplicationes* would not be impossible. Indeed, it seems quite attractive. Dio writes that after an initial setback, Piso subjugated the Bessi and their allies.⁵⁵ This is precisely the sort of achievement that would warrant a *supplicatio* being decreed by the senate *ob res prospere gestas*. Dio then informs us, however, that certain tribes rebelled again and had to be enslaved.⁵⁶ The senate could easily have voted a second thanksgiving when Piso had extinguished this new rebellion. Thus we would have *supplicationes binae* for the subjugation of a single *gens*, as the *titulus Tiburtinus* requires. Indeed, Dio (54,34,7) uses the plural ἱερομηνίαι when he reports the thanksgivings, which could reflect the *supplicationes binae* of the *titulus*.⁵⁷ And, like *ignotus*, Piso was awarded the *ornamenta triumphalia* for his victories. Consequently, what we know about the honours which Piso won as a result of his Thracian War fits well with his identification as the senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus*.

4. Piso's proconsulship of Asia

Ignotus was proconsul of Asia. Arguments for a proconsulship of Asia for Piso the Pontifex become complicated. One positive piece of evidence comes from Antipater of Thessalonica, who prayed to Apollo:⁵⁸

Φοῖβε Κεφαλλήνων λιμενοσκόπε θίνα Πανόρμου
ναίων τρηχέϊης ἀντιπέρην Ἰθάκης,
δός με δι' εὐπλώτοιο πρὸς Ἀσίδα κύματος ἔλθειν

⁵⁴ Caes. BG 2,35. 4,38. 7,90.

⁵⁵ Dio 54,34,6–7: καὶ ἡττηθεὶς τὸ πρῶτον ἀντεπεκράτησε, καὶ ἐκείνην τε καὶ τὴν τῶν προσχωρῶν τῶν συνεπαναστάντων σφίσιν ἐπόρθησε. καὶ τότε τοὺς μὲν ἐθελοντὰς προσθέμενος τοὺς δ' ἄκοντας ἐκπλήξας, τοῖς δὲ καὶ ἐκ παρατάξεως συνενεχθεὶς, πάντα αὐτοὺς ὑπηγάγετο ('Although defeated at first, he then vanquished them and plundered both their land and the land of their neighbours who had rebelled with them. He subjugated them all at that time: winning over the willing, terrorizing the unwilling, and coming to terms with some on the battlefield').

⁵⁶ Dio 54,34,7: καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο νεοχμώσαντάς τινας αὐτῶν αὐθις κατεδουλώσατο ('After this, when some of them revolted, he again enslaved them').

⁵⁷ Dio can use the plural ἱερομηνίαι for what we might regard as a single *supplicatio*, but normally such cases refer to thanksgivings lasting longer than one day (39,53,2. 43,42,3. 46,39,3).

⁵⁸ Anth.Pal. 10,25 = 40 G.-P.

Πείσωνος δολιχῆι νηὶ συνεσπόμενον,
καὶ τὸν ἔμδον βασιλῆα τὸν ἄλκιμον εὖ μὲν ἐκείνῳ
ἴλαον εὖ δ' ὕμνοις ἄρτισον ἡμετέροις.

‘Phoebus, guardian of the harbour of the Cephallenians, dwelling on the beach of Panormus, opposite rough Ithaca, grant that I might go through favourable seas to Asia, following Piso's long ship. And prepare my king, the mighty one, to be gracious towards him, and gracious also to my songs.’

It was Cichorius who first noted that this epigram provides evidence of Piso's Asian proconsulship.⁵⁹ The inference was rejected by Atkinson (followed by Kokkinos), who argued that πρὸς Ἀσίδα refers to Piso's governorship of Galatia/Pamphylia, and that Ἀσίς is mentioned because Pamphylia is metrically impossible in elegiacs.⁶⁰ This argument is highly misleading – Antipater could have used the name of any Pamphylian city, if he had wanted to refer to Pamphylia. It should also be noted that the only other place where Ἀσίς appears in Antipater's poetry is a reference to a city within the province of Asia.⁶¹ More importantly, Antipater and Piso were not acquainted with each other before Piso's Thracian campaigns, as seems clear from yet another epigram:⁶²

σοὶ με, Θρηϊκίης σκυληφόρε, Θεσσαλονίκη
μήτηρ ἢ πάσης πέμψε Μακεδονίης,
αἰίδω δ' ὑπὸ σοὶ δεδμημένον Ἄρεα Βεσσῶν
ὅσσ' ἐδάην πολέμου πάντ' ἀναλεξάμενος.
ἀλλὰ μοι ὡς θεὸς ἔσσο κατήκοος, εὐχομένου δέ
κλῦθι. τίς ἐς Μούσας οὐατος ἀσχολίη;

‘Thessalonica, the mother of all Macedonia, has sent me to you, the bearer of the spoils of Thrace. I put together all I learnt of the war, and my song is of the Bessian fighting-men subdued beneath you. Listen to me, as a god may, and hear my prayer; how can the ear lack leisure for the Muses?’

Here, Antipater is sent as an ambassador of his home city, Thessalonica. He offers a poem celebrating Piso's victories over the Bessi, perhaps in the second year of Piso's command. Antipater had not been in Piso's company for the campaign, since he implies that his description of Piso's conquest of Thrace is taken from the accounts of others. Apparently Piso was pleased with what he heard, since Antipater joined Piso's circle of friends and wrote other poems mentioning him.⁶³ The important point is that Antipater's prayer to follow Piso to Asia could only come after his Thracian command, and therefore it cannot refer to his legateship in Galatia and Pamphylia as Atkinson suggested.⁶⁴ Clearly Piso went to Asia sometime after c.10. But in what capacity?

⁵⁹ Cichorius, RS, 325–332.

⁶⁰ Atkinson, 323–324.

⁶¹ Anth. Pal. 7,692 = 107 G.-P.: Γλύκων, τὸ Περγαμητὸν Ἀσίδι κλέος.

⁶² Anth. Pal. 9,428 = 1 G.-P.

⁶³ Anth. Pal. 9,92 (2 G.-P.), 9,93 (31 G.-P.), 6,335 (41 G.-P.), 9,552 (42 G.-P.), 6,241 (43 G.-P.), 9,541 (44 G.-P.), 6,249 (45 G.-P.), Anth. Planudea 184 (30 G.-P.). See especially Cichorius, RS, 325–332.

⁶⁴ The point was made by Cichorius, RS, 326–328, but missed or ignored by Atkinson.

Under the Augustan principate there were two public provinces for ex-consuls every year, Africa and Asia. Before the introduction of regular suffect consulships (perhaps from 2 BC), there were only two consuls per year. For the system of consular provinces to be sustained, every ex-consul (or almost every ex-consul) would eventually have to go to one province or the other. From the perspective of those trying to reconstruct the *fasti* of these provinces, this allows a significant advantage. If a senator is attested as present in Africa or Asia, and seems to be acting in an official capacity, we would not go far wrong to suppose (with due caution) that he was there as proconsul, even if the proconsulship itself is not explicitly attested. So, for example, P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (cos. 18 BC) is honoured as *patronus* of Stratoniceia in an inscription of that city (IStratonikeia 2.2 [IK 22.2] 1321 = SEG 38, 1077):

ὁ δῆμος ἐτίμησεν | Πόπλιον Κορινθίον | Ποπλίου υἱὸν Λέντολον |
 Μαρκελλῖνον τὸν πάτρωνα | καὶ εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα | χρυσῶι στε-
 φάνωι ἀριστείωι | καὶ εἰκῶι χρυσῆι | ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας | τῆς
 εἰς ἑαυτὸν

The system of proconsular provinces would require that this Augustan consular eventually govern either Africa or Asia anyway; he is honoured as *πάτρων*, and attested patrons of cities are largely drawn from governors and other officials; the *fasti* for Asia for these years is largely unfilled.⁶⁵ Given these considerations, we should probably make a leap of faith and include P. Marcellinus (with a query) among the proconsuls of Asia, perhaps *c.* 13/12 BC, even though this particular inscription (like many others honouring governors) does not explicitly refer to him as *ἀνθύπατος*. Perhaps it was erected after he left his province. The same principle – that when a consular is attested in one of the consular public provinces we must consider the possibility that he was governor there – might be invoked for Piso the Pontifex. Thus Antipater’s prayer, which reveals that Piso went to Asia sometime after his command in Thrace, is relevant evidence and suggests a proconsulship of Asia for Piso the Pontifex.

This conclusion is supported by evidence from inscriptions. Here, however, the waters are muddied by the fact that L. Piso the Augur (cos. 1 BC), a younger homonymous contemporary of Piso the Pontifex, was also proconsul of Asia. His proconsulship is attested in an inscription from Mytilene:⁶⁶

ὁ δᾶμος | Λεύκιον Καλπούριον | Πείσωνα Αὔγουρα, | τὸν ἀνθύπατον
 καὶ | διὰ πρόγονων εὐεργέταν τᾶς πόλιος

This inscription, however, may have an unexpected implication. Homonyms presented contemporary Romans with a challenge: how to make clear which man was meant in any given circumstance. One way in which this was done was to use a nickname, perhaps based on some distinguishing feature, as is the case of M. Valerius Messala Niger (cos. 61) and

⁶⁵ Thomasson (Laterculi, 206) registers only a single proconsul of Asia for the years 20–11, Q. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 21).

⁶⁶ IG 12,2,219 = OGIS 467 = ILS 8814.

M. Valerius Messala Rufus (cos. 53).⁶⁷ Alternatively, if one or both held a priesthood, this too could be used to provide a distinctive marker, as is the case with Piso the Augur and Piso the Pontifex. In this context, it is worth noting that whoever composed the text from Mytilene felt it necessary to include Piso's augurate, a detail that is not normally included in this kind of inscription at this period. The purpose of referring to his augurate was, as Dessau recognized, to distinguish him from other Pisones.⁶⁸ This would make especially good sense if Piso the Pontifex had also been proconsul – the augurate is mentioned because someone felt it necessary to make clear that the honorand was the consul of 1 BC, who was proconsul of Asia in c. AD 6, and not his older contemporary, who had been governor ten or fifteen years earlier.

Whatever the correctness of this inference, there are other inscriptions to be considered. Unfortunately they are not so easy to assign to one Piso or the other. Since Piso the Augur was benefactor διὰ προγόνων of Mytilene, there is some justification for attributing to him two other inscriptions mentioning ancestral titles.⁶⁹ Other inscriptions are less easy to place. It is, of course, possible that they belong to Piso the Augur. But since there is reason to believe that the Pontifex was also proconsul, each inscription must be considered separately. A reasonable case can be made for supposing that two of these inscriptions honour Piso the Pontifex.⁷⁰ One of these is from Samos (AM 75, 1960, 130 no. 30):

ὁ δῆμος | [Στατιλίαν Ταύρου θυγατέρα] | τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀνθυπάτου |
Λευκίου [Καλπουρνίου Πείσωνος] | Ἡρη

The second is from Pergamum (Alt. v. Perg. 8.3 no. 19):

[οἶ] ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἕλληνες ἐτείμησαν Λεύκιον Καλπούρμιον Πείσωνα
τὸν ἀνθύπατον] | [καὶ Στατειλίαν Ταύρου θυγατέρα, τὴν γυναῖκα
αὐτοῦ, e.g. ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν τῆς εἰς ἑαυτοῦς]

According to Pliny, a Statilia died in the reign of Claudius, aged 99.⁷¹ She was born therefore between 59 and 46 BC. If she and Piso's wife are identical, it would be better to identify her husband as Piso the Pontifex (cos. 15). He was 79 when he died in AD 32 (Tac. Ann. 6,10,4), and so was born in 48 – therefore roughly the same age as Statilia, if she was born towards the end of the period possible for her. Piso the Augur (cos. 1), however, would have been born in the mid-30s, and thus would have been her junior by over a decade. Syme objected that Pliny's Statilia could be either the sister of Statilius Taurus (cos. II 26) or his

⁶⁷ Cf. the remarks of Syme at JRS 45, 1955, 157 = RP 1, 263, and his subtle treatment of the Calpurnii Pisones in Some Pisones in Tacitus, JRS 46, 1956, 17–21 = Ten Studies in Tacitus, 1970, 50–57.

⁶⁸ H. Dessau, ILS at no. 8814, n.1: *Augur dictus ut ab aliis distingueretur*.

⁶⁹ As was tentatively suggested by C. Habicht, *Altertümer von Pergamon* 8.3, 1969, 40–41, with respect to IStratonikeia (IK 22) 1010 = BCH 5 (1881) 183 no. 5 and IPergamon 425 = IGR 4,410. The 'ancestral' connection, however, should not come from the L. Piso found in IPriene 121, as Habicht suggested, but from Cn. Piso (later cos. 23): see IG 7,268 and 305 with M. Kajava, *Roman Senatorial Women and the Greek East: epigraphic evidence from the Republican and Augustan Period*, in: *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History*, 1990, 83–84; Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 368.

⁷⁰ I follow here the point made by Habicht, *Alt. v. Perg.* 8.3, 39–41.

⁷¹ NH 7,158: *Statilia Claudio principe ex nobili domo LXXXIX*.

daughter.⁷² But if she was his sister, Pliny could hardly have described her as *ex nobili domo*, since Statilius Taurus was a *novus homo*. His children might well be described as *nobilis*, but not his siblings. Taurus would have been born *c.* 76,⁷³ which also makes him old enough to be her father, again if she was born near the end of the period implied by Pliny.

Syme, however, argued against identifying the husband of Statilia with Piso the Pontifex: in the inscription from Samos their names have been erased, which Syme would attribute to the fall of Piso the Augur in AD 24.⁷⁴ The argument is initially attractive, but there is room for doubt. According to Tacitus, the death of Piso the Augur prevented his trial from being completed.⁷⁵ No mention is made of Piso's wife (whose name is also excised from the Samian stone). The name of Piso the Augur was deleted, but this was not necessarily at the direction of the senate: his trial was left unfinished and his name is extant on many other inscriptions. The erasure still might have resulted from popular action, as seems to have been the case with his brother, Cn. Piso (cos. 7 BC).⁷⁶ In the case of Cn. Piso, there was real public anger following the premature and suspicious death of Germanicus, anger that will have been encouraged by the publication of a *senatus consultum* throughout the empire reviling him even after his death.⁷⁷ By contrast, for the Samians to take such initiative against Piso the Augur would be peculiar: will they have even heard of his death, much less have known about a trial which (to judge from Tacitus) did not get beyond the preliminary stages? Tacitus' knowledge of uncompleted trials and of senatorial proposals that were later abandoned are evidence of his use of the *acta senatus*;⁷⁸ the Samians would not have had such good sources of information. Further, even if they did know of the indictment of Piso the Augur, there was no reason for the high feelings that had inspired the erasure of the name of Cn. Piso from monuments in Rome and Spain. Indeed, in this connection it should be noted that Piso's *praenomen* is not deleted, which perhaps raises the possibility that L. Piso's name was erased by mistake, and the real target was Cn. Piso. Whatever the correctness of this hypothesis (which I put forward merely as a guess), not too much should be made of this erasure. Even if someone had heard of the trial and suicide of Piso the Augur and had set out to demonstrate his loyalty to the Emperor by erasing his name, by what criteria would he have been able to distinguish between a reference to Piso the Augur

⁷² Augustan Aristocracy, 376–377.

⁷³ *ibid.*

⁷⁴ *ibid.*; cf. also P. Herrmann, *AM* 75, 1960, 130.

⁷⁵ Tac. Ann. 4,21,2: *receptus est reus neque peractus ob mortem opportunam.*

⁷⁶ CIL 6,315 (cf. 6,30751) = ILS 95; CIL 2,2703 (with Syme, *Epigraphische Studien* 8, 1969, 125–133 = RP 2, 732–741). The *SC de Cn. Pisone patre* requires Piso's name to be erased from a statue of Germanicus in the campus Martius, but there was clearly no measure requiring the general erasure of his name (W. Eck, *Das s.c. de Cn. Pisone patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica*, *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 4, 1993, 189–208, at 197). According to Tacitus (Ann. 3,17,8), it was also proposed that his name be removed from the consular *fasti*.

⁷⁷ The *SC de Pisone patre* (Eck, *op. cit.*, 202) was to be set up in the centre of the busiest city of each province.

⁷⁸ R. Syme, *How Tacitus wrote Annals I–III*, *Historiographia Antiqua. Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans*, 1977, 249 = RP 3, 1029.

and his homonym, Piso the Pontifex? Observe that the name of M. Antonius (cos. 99) was erased when he was mistaken for his homonymous grandson (ILLRP 342). Consequently, the erasure of Piso's name from this inscription should probably not be used in arguments about his identity. The identity of Statilia's husband should rest on prosopographical considerations centring on Statilia, which on balance make it better to suppose that she was married to Piso the Pontifex.

To summarize the argument of this long digression, a good case can be made for supposing that Piso the Pontifex was proconsul of Asia. We know from Antipater of Thessalonica that he went to the province as a consular sometime after *c.* 10 BC and several inscriptions from Asia should probably be connected with him rather than to the Augur. A date is not difficult to find in these years, given the number of vacancies in the proconsular *fasti* of Asia for this period. Syme suggested *c.* 9/8 or 8/7, and this should not be too far off the mark.⁷⁹ Therefore the proconsulship of Asia mentioned in the *titulus Tiburtinus* is not an obstacle to identifying its honorand as Piso the Pontifex.

5. Piso and Syria

The senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus* was an imperial legate in Syria, Kokkinos (25) challenges the idea that Piso ever held this post: 'Piso is not attested as having been in charge of Syria – a major problem, as our knowledge of the administration of this province under Augustus, in comparison with other provinces, is very reasonable. Given the existence of Josephus' work and the evident importance of the consular in our *titulus*, it is much more likely for the *ignotus* to be a known, rather than an unknown, *legatus* of Syria.' This is, of course, an argument from silence, and as such has intrinsic weaknesses. This one is especially weak. Josephus does provide valuable information about the governors of Syria. In this case, however, his silence is probably not significant. *Ignotus* was governor of Syria, as we have seen, after having been legate in some other province and then governor of Asia. If Piso is being considered, this means Thrace in *c.* 12-10 and Asia perhaps in 9/8 or 8/7. Any legateship in Syria would have to come after that, and since Quinctilius Varus (cos. 13) was governor of Syria from *c.* 7 down to *c.* 3 BC, it could only come thereafter. It is, however, precisely these years about which an argument from silence should not be made. Josephus' narrative skips over these years almost entirely,⁸⁰ presumably because his main source for this period, Nicolaus of Damascus, ended his history with the death of Herod. Whoever the governor or governors of Syria were in these years, they are not to be found in Josephus. Whether one of them was Piso the Pontifex is a question that must be decided on its own merits.

⁷⁹ RP 3, 880; Augustan Aristocracy, 340, 405.

⁸⁰ Josephus moves directly from the Archelaus' acceptance of his ethnarchy in 4 BC to the tenth year of his rule in AD 6 (AJ 17,339–342; BJ 2,114–118).

One piece of evidence that is inevitably discussed in this connection is an inscription from Hierapolis Castabala in Cilicia Pedias:⁸¹

ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἱεροπολιτῶν | Λεύκιον Κ[α]λπόριον Πείσωνα | πρεσβευτὴν
καὶ ἀντιστράτηγον | τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ πάτρωνα τῆς | πόλεως ἀρετῆς
ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας | τῆς εἰς αὐτόν

The honorand is very probably Piso the Pontifex (as Kokkinos allows). He was *legatus pro praetore*, but of what province? It is worth considering what is going on here, since this inscription illustrates an interesting practice, not often commented on. As Kokkinos reminds us, Cilicia Pedias was not part of any province from 20 BC, when the region was given to Tarcondimotus. From that point until (probably) AD 17 it remained a client kingdom.⁸² Why the inscription honouring a Roman governor, then? We know from Pliny the Younger that Byzantium, although in the province of Bithynia-Pontus, sent ambassadors annually to the governor of Moesia to pay its respects.⁸³ It was similar with cities that were within Rome's sphere of influence, but not actually part of any Roman province. They too had an interest in cultivating relations with Roman officialdom, and several inscriptions illustrate this. An unpublished inscription from Oenoanda in Lycia honours Piso the Pontifex when he was governor of nearby Galatia-Pamphylia in c. 12 BC;⁸⁴ similarly, another Lycian city, Myra, erected a statue in Ephesus in honour of their Roman patron, who was probably proconsul of Asia of the time.⁸⁵ Oenoanda and Myra, however, did not come under direct rule from Rome until the time of Claudius, when Lycia was made a province. These inscriptions, then, reveal more about diplomacy than about governmental authority.

If the inscription from Castabala is interpreted in this context, as I think it must be, Piso could, in theory, have been governor of any province. Kokkinos (25) suggests that he was governor of Galatia at the time, and that as such he had limited influence over Cilicia Pedias. But Castabala lay in the shadow of the Amanus, and Syria was very close. The journey south to Antioch, through the Syrian gates, was only 70 Roman miles. This would have made the governor of that province more accessible than any other.⁸⁶ Galatia, by contrast, was several hundred mountainous miles away. It was no doubt for this reason that, when the time came for Cilicia Pedias to be incorporated into a Roman province, it was added to Syria, not Galatia. The connections that a governor of Syria might develop with cities in this region are in any case illustrated by an inscription from nearby Adana, which perhaps

⁸¹ JÖAI 18, 1915, Beibl. 51 = AE 1920,71 = K. Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien*, 1979, 149.

⁸² For a concise overview of its history in this period, R. D. Sullivan, *Near Eastern Royalty and Rome, 100–30 BC*, 1990, 191–192.

⁸³ Plin. Ep. 10,43–44.

⁸⁴ The inscription is mentioned by S. Mitchell, *op.cit.*, vol. 1, 78 n. 81.

⁸⁵ I will argue elsewhere (Tyche 10, 1995, forthcoming) that SEG 30,1315 = IEph. 3902 dates from AD 28/29 and honours M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. AD 6).

⁸⁶ The unpublished inscription from Oenoanda honouring Piso the Pontifex as legate in Galatia and Pamphylia (see above n. 84) illustrates this same principle: Lycia is adjacent to Pamphylia. It is also worth remembering that Oenoanda had links with Termessus in Pisidia (J. J. Coulton, *Termessians at Oinoanda*, AS 32, 1982, 115–131).

honours Messala Corvinus (cos. 31), governor of Syria in the early 20s BC.⁸⁷ Whatever the identity of the legate honoured in Hierapolis, his province will have been Syria. Since the honorand is probably Piso the Pontifex, a legateship of Syria remains a good possibility. The case for this legateship is admittedly not airtight. Still, it is not negligible and the best explanation of the inscription from Hierapolis Castabala. We do not know the identities of the governors of Syria for the years between *c.* 3 BC and *c.* AD 3. Nothing prevents us from placing Piso in Syria in these years and we have yet another reason to connect the *titulus Tiburtinus* with Piso the Pontifex.

6. Piso, Tiberius and Tibur

Kokkinos' sixth objection resolves itself into two issues. First, 'should not Piso's epitaph, which would have been inscribed at his death in AD 32, have alluded to Tiberius so late in his reign?' (Kokkinos 25). We do not know, however, that such an allusion was not made, since much of the text is lost. It is uncertain how many lines are missing from the beginning of the inscription or from its end.⁸⁸ Since the achievements of *ignotus* are (as we have seen) listed chronologically anything notable done under Tiberius will have been mentioned after the last extant line.

Second, 'why should it be set up anywhere near Tibur, if there is reason to assume that Piso's main residence may have been in Veleia?' (Kokkinos, 25). But the evidence for Piso's supposed residence at Veleia is merely a statue from that city's *basilica*,⁸⁹ which does not – indeed, cannot – show anything of the kind. Statues of prominent senators were erected in many Italian cities, as the inscriptions surviving on their bases abundantly show. They need not imply origin or residence. In any case, Piso the Pontifex (or possibly his father) appears in another inscription from Tibur,⁹⁰ which is (as Levick has pointed out) another argument in favour of identifying Piso the Pontifex as the senator of the *titulus*.⁹¹ Whatever his city of origin, he seems to have had some connection with Tibur.

In conclusion, Saturninus cannot have been the senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus*. To credit him with the subjugation of Germanic tribes and the settlement with Maroboduus magnifies his achievements in that province at the expense of Tiberius, which would be politically unthinkable for whoever composed this text. The two thanksgivings to the gods that the senate voted because of the senator's achievements have no obvious place in Saturninus' German legateship. He is not attested as governor of Asia and there is no reason to suppose

⁸⁷ IGR 3,888: [- -] Οὐαλέριον Μάρκου υἱὸν | [- -] | [Μαλλω]τῶν ὁ δῆμος τὸν εὐεργέτην | [καὶ σωτῆρα καὶ] π[ά]τρων[α] τῆς [π]ό[λ]εως]. For his position, see Syme, *Augustan Aristocracy*, 209–210; for his acquaintance with Cilicia Pedias, *Tibullus* 1.7.13–20.

⁸⁸ A. E. Gordon, *Album*, 77. Observe also that a longer text is in any case to be inferred from the paragraphing indicated by the extension of line 5 beyond the other lines (see the photograph at Kokkinos, 36).

⁸⁹ C. Saletti, *Il ciclo statuario della Basilica di Velleia*, 1968, 63–64, pls. 1–2; the inscription on the base is published at CIL 11,1182 = ILS 900: *L. Calpurnio / L.f. Pisoni / pontif(ici) cos.*

⁹⁰ CIL 14,3591/2 = *Inscr. Ital.* 4.1, no. 5: *L. Calpurnius L.f. P[iso]*.

⁹¹ Levick, *Roman Colonies*, 209.

that he had any connection with Tibur. Most importantly, he did not hold his legateships in Syria and Germany in the required order. On the other hand, the case for Piso Pontifex remains strong. Piso's Thracian War will have inevitably meant some interaction with a *rex*, Rhoemetalces. His campaigns are known to have led to the *ornamenta triumphalia* and *supplicationes*, which (to judge from Dio's narrative) could have been decreed twice. A good case for a proconsulship in Asia can be made, and a legateship of Syria is the most reasonable explanation for his relationship with Hierapolis Castabala. It seems that Piso held these posts in the correct order. He (or his father) is attested in another inscription from Tibur. Unless or until new evidence arises, Piso the Pontifex remains a very good candidate for identification as the anonymous senator of the *titulus Tiburtinus*.⁹²

Hamilton, Canada

C. Eilers

⁹² I would like to thank to Prof. W. Eck, Dr. B.M. Levick, Mr. G. Rowe, and Dr. N. Kokkinos for their comments and suggestions.