

JAKOB MUNK HØJTE

THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE CONCERNING PORTRAIT STATUES OF HADRIAN'S
HEIR L. AELIUS CAESAR

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 127 (1999) 217–238

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE CONCERNING PORTRAIT STATUES OF HADRIAN'S HEIR L. AELIUS CAESAR

L. Aelius Caesar, Hadrian's heir and designated successor, remains one of the more elusive characters in the history of emperors and their families. Had he not been adopted unexpectedly by Hadrian in 136 A.D.,¹ he would probably have figured among the many largely anonymous consuls of the second century known only from a few inscriptions. Since he died before Hadrian, he was never hailed emperor, but he came very close; in *Historia Augusta* a separate chapter is devoted to him, although he never carried the title Augustus. Why Hadrian chose him as his successor before other equally suitable candidates has remained an enigma. One of the more ingenious solutions, advanced by Carcopino, is that he was Hadrian's illegitimate son.² This theory has generally been rejected, because the ancient literary sources make no mention of it, but whether a more satisfactory explanation will ever be given is doubtful. This article deals with a much more down-to-earth theme, that of the bases for statues erected of L. Aelius Caesar and their importance for the understanding of the preserved sculpted portraits.

The Method

The usual point of departure for studies of imperial portraiture in the round is identification from portraits on coins. These have the advantage of being combined with inscriptions identifying the person depicted. Very often the different portrait types found on coins correspond directly to portrait types among the sculpted portraits, and consequently there has been no urgent need to examine other types of evidence in order to identify the extant portraits and establish a chronological sequence of portrait types – the primary aim of most studies of imperial portraiture. However, there are many questions about production and distribution, which cannot be answered by looking at the portraits themselves.

By collecting all the statue bases identifiable through inscriptions relating to portrait statues of L. Aelius Caesar it is possible to examine where the statues originally were set up, who dedicated them, when they did it and for what reason. Furthermore, the inscriptions provide valuable evidence for the chronology of the extant portraits. This approach is not new; in the thirties Meriwether Stuart collected the inscriptions of Claudius,³ and later those of Tiberius, Caligula and Nero⁴ with the specific purpose of accessing the number of statues erected before they became emperors. More recently Jane Fejfer has studied the inscriptions of the women of the Severan dynasty, in particular those of the empress Julia Domna.⁵ Because it has been impossible to establish a direct correlation between the evidence of the inscriptions from the statue bases and the preserved portraits, most scholars working within the field of imperial portraits have largely neglected the often remarkable results of these studies. The problem is that the bases and the portraits represent two rather different excerpts of the original number of statues set up. The preserved portraits are almost exclusively made of marble, many of them belong to busts with no accompanying inscription, and the majority originate from Central Italy. On the other hand, the statue bases for the most part held life-size, bronze statues. For reasons I will describe below, it is possi-

¹ All dates are A.D.

² J. Carcopino, *L'héritité dynastique chez les Antonins*, *REA* 51 (1949) 262–321.

³ M. Stuart, *The Portraiture of Claudius* (New York 1938).

⁴ M. Stuart, *How Were Imperial Portraits Distributed throughout the Empire?*, *AJA* 43 (1939) 601–617. The list of inscriptions for Caligula is updated in D. Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Caligula. Das römische Herrscherbild. I. Abteilung, Band 4* (Berlin 1989).

⁵ J. Fejfer, *The Portraits of the Severan Empress Julia Domna: A New Approach*, *AnalRom* 14 (1985) 129–138, and J. Fejfer, *Official Portraits of Julia Domna. Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato*, *Colloque Rome – CNR* 1984 (1988) 295–301.

ble to prove that the chronological distribution of the portraits is similar to that of the bases, which for the most part can be dated with great accuracy.

The Inscriptions Identification of the Statue Bases

As a guideline for identifying portrait inscriptions Meriwether Stuart set up two criteria: “One, whenever an inscription employs a dative formula in Latin or an accusative formula in Greek and is cut on a stone reliably described as a statue base or as part of an arch or other monumental pedestal, there can be no doubt of the portrait character of the inscription. Two, whenever a description of the stone on which an inscription is cut is not available, the dative case of the imperial name in Latin, or the accusative in Greek, is presumptive proof of the portrait character of the inscription.”⁶ Stuart stresses that this is merely meant as a guideline, and examples of statue bases which do not comply with these criteria are mentioned.

The first criterion should ideally account for the vast majority of the inscriptions, but unfortunately the descriptions of the stones on which the inscriptions are cut are not always reliable. The terms used are often too general or misleading to be of any help in identifying the type of monument involved.⁷ The second criterion, as noted by Stuart, is of course not unfaillingly accurate. In addition, there are inscriptions which do not use the dative formula in Latin or the accusative in Greek, but which nevertheless were associated directly or indirectly with portrait statues.

A more complete set of criteria for identification of statue bases could be worked out, but there would always be exceptions to the rules and in the end each inscription must be evaluated individually. Several features must be taken into account, including the dimensions of the stone, the lay-out of the text, the content of the inscription, and comparison with other inscriptions from the same location.

Below is a list of twenty-one inscriptions that were probably accompanied by some form of three-dimensional representation of L. Aelius Caesar.⁸ Thirteen of them are in Latin (nos. 1–11, 14 and 20) and the remaining eight are in Greek (nos. 12, 13, 15–19 and 21). The dative case is used in all except one of the Latin inscriptions where it is possible to determine the case of the name of L. Aelius Caesar.⁹ In the Greek inscriptions, the accusative case is used invariably. Still, not all the inscriptions are in accordance with the criteria set up by Meriwether Stuart.

Types of Monuments

Eleven inscriptions (nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20) are described as belonging to statue bases and thus comply with Stuart’s first criterion for identification; this is just over half of the total number of inscriptions. Although only five of these bases (nos. 3, 7, 12, 16 and 18) are fully or almost fully preserved, it is reasonable to conclude that they have consistent proportions. Their heights all fall in the narrow range between 1.50 m. and 1.68 m., whereas the width and depth vary somewhat more. Three bases have widths and depths just around 0.70 m., with no. 12 topping the list with 0.90 m. by 0.90 m. This is also the tallest of the bases. No. 16 differs from the rest, as it is described as a cylindrical statue base. In Asia Minor, where this base was found, this type is fairly common.

⁶ M. Stuart, *The Portraiture of Claudius* (New York 1938) 13–14.

⁷ A. S. Benjamin – A. E. Raubitschek, *Arae Augusti*, *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 65–66.

⁸ One further inscription from Ostia (AE 1940, 62) from the reign of Antoninus Pius mentions, among numerous other statues and busts of the Antonine family, a silver bust of L. Aelius Caesar weighing one pound, but since the inscription and the portrait were not directly associated it is not included in the catalogue.

⁹ Due to the use of abbreviations in the name formula or due to the fragmentary state of the inscription, it is impossible to determine whether the dative or the ablative case is used in nos. 2, 5, 7, 9 and 14. No. 11 features the name *Divus Hadrianus* in the dative case, but statues of both Hadrian and L. Aelius Caesar are mentioned in the inscription.

The size of the letters varies according to the language of the text with the Latin inscriptions generally containing the tallest letters. Here the letters in the first line are between 0.065 m. and 0.09 m., followed by lines with smaller letters with sizes in the range 0.04–0.07 m. The letters in the Greek inscriptions are generally smaller than their Latin counterparts, but the size is more consistent within each inscription; letter sizes are between 0.035 m. and 0.05 m.

The inscription no. 8 also meets Stuart's first criterion, since it belongs to an arch, whereas the inscription no. 14 complies with the second criterion; here a reliable description lacks, but the case used for the name is dative in Latin. Unfortunately, the stone is not complete and it is thus not possible to compare it directly with the dimensions of the bases mentioned above, but the size of the remains indicate that identification as a statue base is reasonable.

The rest of the inscriptions do not strictly comply with the criteria of Meriwether Stuart. Still, they can all with some certainty be shown to have been accompanied by portrait statues. Three inscriptions (nos. 4, 5 and 10) are described as being inscribed on slabs of stone. It is highly probable that they belonged to built-up statue bases. This type of base is widely used in Italy, the western provinces and in some cities in the east.¹⁰ No. 4, which was set up by the beneficiaries of the *alimenta* system, can be compared with a similar inscription for Marcus Aurelius,¹¹ which is inscribed on a stone described as a statue base. Although fragmentary no. 5 seems to have been of modest proportions, whereas no. 10 must have belonged to a larger monument, such as an equestrian statue.

The exact nature of the inscription from Mausoleum Hadriani (no. 1) is not known, and unfortunately the inscription is long lost. Comparison with the inscriptions from Mausoleum Augusti, some of which were definitely carved on stones that served as statue bases,¹² indicates that the inscription from the Mausoleum Hadriani could have had a similar function. The inscription no. 19 is incised on a temple; however, it is not as stated a dedication of the temple to L. Aelius Caesar, as dedications of temples normally takes the dative case in Greek and are placed on the architrave. It is more feasible to connect the inscription with a portrait statue of L. Aelius Caesar on or in front of the temple, possibly, as suggested by the editor together with one of Hadrian. No. 11 constitutes a special case, as it does not belong to a statue base for L. Aelius Caesar but to a monument dedicated to Hadrian. However, the inscription mentions a pair of statues – one of Hadrian and one of L. Aelius Caesar; the one of Hadrian most likely stood on the present monument,¹³ and the other must have stood in the near vicinity on a now lost base.

The last two inscriptions (nos. 13 and 21) are described as a stele and an altar respectively. In both instances, the case used for the name is accusative in Greek, which is very unusual for these types of monuments. On altars the dative case for the name of the honored is the norm as seen on the many contemporaneous altars for Hadrian.¹⁴ One may assume, therefore, that they both belonged to some sort of bases for portrait statues. No. 21 could easily have served as a statue base, even if somewhat low, whereas the nature of no. 13 is obscure due to its fragmentary state.

To summarize:

- 16 inscriptions belong to statue bases for approximately life-size standing statues.
- 3 inscriptions belong to statue bases for statues of other formats (colossal, equestrian, statues on an arch etc.).
- 2 inscriptions belong to monuments of indeterminable type.

¹⁰ More examples in G. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen* (Heidelberg 1984) 25–26. In the east different traditions are found. In Corinth most dedications were inscribed on slabs of marble, whereas in Athens complete blocks were generally used.

¹¹ CIL XIV, 4003. CIL VI, 40497; CIL IX, 5700; CIL XI, 5956; CIL XI, 5957 were also set up by the boys and girls, who received *alimenta*, but all of these are described as slabs of stone or lack reliable description.

¹² CIL VI, 40371; CIL VI, 40375; CIL VI, 40376.

¹³ Although not described as such, this inscription most probably belongs to a statue base.

¹⁴ A. S. Benjamin, *The Altars of Hadrian in Athens and Hadrian's Panhellenic Program*, *Hesperia* 32 (1963) 57–86.

The Material Used for the Statues

It can often be determined whether a statue was made of metal (usually bronze, but sometimes precious metals) or marble by studying the traces on the upper surface of the statue base; unfortunately the publications very seldom convey this type of information. Therefore, it is necessary to reexamine the bases, which is an impossibility when studying a group of statue bases distributed throughout the entire Roman empire. This type of investigation is better suited to regional studies such as those completed by K. Tuchelt, G. Alföldy and K. Höghammar.¹⁵ These studies unanimously show that bronze was the most commonly used material for honorary statues.¹⁶ Information about the material used for the statues of L. Aelius Caesar is very scanty. The base in Ostia (no. 3) certainly carried a bronze statue, and the one from Thamugadi (no. 7) probably did likewise.¹⁷ The rest remain uncertain until further examination is possible, but I find no reason to doubt that bronze predominates. This is important to have in mind when considering the relationship between the statue bases and the extant portraits, which are all made of marble.

Chronology of the Inscriptions

All inscriptions relating to statues of L. Aelius Caesar are later than his adoption by Hadrian, as he invariably is referred to as L. Aelius Caesar.¹⁸ Unfortunately the exact date of the event is unknown. L. Aelius Caesar was consul ordinarius in 136, and he appears under the name L. Ceionius Commodus in an inscription from Rome (CIL VI, 10242) dated 19 June 136, thus providing a terminus post quem for the adoption. A single Alexandrian issue bearing the legend ἔτους γ´¹⁹ and the name and portrait of L. Aelius Caesar could be interpreted as a terminus ante quem. Since the Alexandrian year started on 29 August, L. Aelius Caesar should have been adopted before this date in 136 in order to start his third year on this same date in 137. This is not very solid evidence since die cutters far from the capital were not always as meticulous as their colleagues in Rome. A date later in the year is preferable. One argument is that the adoption must have taken place on 10 December or shortly thereafter because L. Aelius Caesar

¹⁵ G. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen* (Heidelberg 1984) 37; K. Tuchelt, *Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien. Teil I, Roma und Promagistrate*, *IstMitt Beiheft* 23 (1979) 74–79; K. Höghammar, *Sculpture and society. A study of the connection between the free-standing sculpture and society on Kos in the Hellenistic and Augustan periods*, *Boreas. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations* 23 (Uppsala 1993) 68–70.

¹⁶ Höghammar found that on Kos in the Hellenistic age 12 out of 32 bases carried marble statues and 20 statues of bronze. Of the 12 marble statues only 5 depicted humans, the rest being representations of gods, whereas 17 or 18 of the 20 bronze statues depicted humans. That means, there were three to four bronze statues of humans for each one of marble. The ratio presented by Tuchelt for the promagistrates and their families in the province of Asia down to the Augustan period is even higher. Here 26 out of 30 statue bases investigated showed signs related to fastening of bronze statues. The ratio between bronze and marble statues of members of the imperial family was lower in the Latin west in Roman imperial times. This can be deduced from the fact that the ratio between statue bases and extant portraits is lower in the west than in the east, indicating that the less perishable marble statues were more frequent in the west. This tendency is to some extent confirmed by the figures in Alföldy's study, although he states that "für Ehrenstatuen der ranghöchsten Persönlichkeiten häufiger Bronze als Marmor verwendet wurde".

¹⁷ The adjoining upper profile of the base from Thamugadi is lost, as they are on five out of six bases from the Basilica at the Forum. The last one, a base for Antoninus Pius, carried a bronze statue, G. Zimmer, *Locus datus decreto decurionum. Zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumslagen im römischen Afrika*, *SBMünchen*, Heft 102 (1989) 82–83, nos. T 42–47. The marble statue of L. Aelius Caesar found in Thamugadi does not necessarily belong with this base. A. Ballu – R. Cagnat, *Musée de Timgad* (1903) 14–15, pl. 3,3. P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption der Selbstdarstellung des Princeps*, *AbhMünchen* 90 (1983) 32.

¹⁸ His name before the adoption, L. Ceionius Commodus, occurs on a statue base in Ephesos (IGSK 12, 280 a), but because Hadrian is mentioned in the filiation, the honorand must be L. Aelius Caesar's son, the future emperor Lucius Verus.

¹⁹ T. E. Mionnet, *Description de médailles antiques, grecques et tomaines* VI (Paris 1813) 207, no. 1380.

never appears in inscriptions or on coins as holding tribunician power for the second time.²⁰ This, however, presupposes that tribunician power was granted L. Aelius Caesar at the adoption and that Hadrian had his tribunician power renewed on the traditional date 10 December – questions that are not beyond dispute.²¹ Finally it has been suggested that the adoption took place as late as in 137,²² but it seems difficult to believe that he should have been given the exceptional honour of a second consulship, and even two years in a row, had he not already been adopted.

None of the inscriptions from the statue bases can be ascribed with certainty to 136. Six inscriptions (nos. 2, 5, 9, 13, 19 and 21) could possibly date to 136 as they make no mention of the second consulate beginning 1 January 137, but the first three inscriptions are too fragmentary to determine whether L. Aelius Caesar is just consul or consul twice, providing dates in either 136 or 137; the last three, all in Greek, only features his name without mentioning any of his titles. This is quite a normal phenomenon in Greek imperial inscriptions, not least in late Hadrianic times, and it does not necessarily indicate an early date. Whenever the title consul and the following text is fully intelligible, consul is always followed by the number two, which also supports the argument that the adoption took place relatively late in 136.

A further difficulty in dating the inscriptions arises from the fact that L. Aelius Caesar was not deified after his death. When an emperor was deified, his imperial titles were substituted with *Divus*, but since L. Aelius Caesar was not deified, his name formula remained unchanged. Thus, posthumous inscriptions cannot be identified by his name formula alone. This is most clearly seen in the inscription from Thamugadi (no. 7), where he is titled *L. Aelius Caesar cos. 2*, even though it is specified that Hadrian is dead and deified. The inscription must therefore be at least half a year later than the death of L. Aelius Caesar. The same is the case with the inscription from Mausoleum Hadriani (no. 1), but here it is not as conspicuous, because none of the emperors actually appear as *divi* in their funerary inscriptions.²³ At this point, they still retain their earthly titles.

The number of consulates and the renewals of tribunician power, which usually provide rather precise dates for imperial inscriptions, are therefore of little avail when dating the inscriptions of L. Aelius Caesar. Still, most of the inscriptions can be dated, because Hadrian appears as the father of L. Aelius Caesar in all but two of the inscriptions, and his name formula supplies better dating criteria. Fifteen inscriptions can with certainty be dated to the lifetime of Hadrian. Four of these (nos. 3, 4, 10 and 20) are further clarified by Hadrian holding tribunician power for the 21st time. Although the issue of when Hadrian had his tribunician powers renewed is not completely settled, one may assume that for the period in question it took place on 10 December.²⁴ Therefore these four inscriptions were with certainty set up before the death of L. Aelius Caesar, since Hadrian was granted tribunician power for the 22nd time on 10 December 137 and L. Aelius Caesar died 1 January 138. The remaining eleven could likewise have been set up before this time, but they could just as well have been set up in the

²⁰ M. Hammond, *The Tribunician Day during the Early Empire*, MAAR 15 (1938) 45, and R. Syme, *Antonine Relatives: Ceionii and Vettuleni*, *Athenaeum* 35 (1957) 306–315.

²¹ For a discussion of the problem see M. Hammond, *The Tribunician Day during the Early Empire*, MAAR 15 (1938) 43–45, and H. Mattingly, *Tribunicia Potestate*, JRS 20 (1930) 81–82. The problem is whether Hadrian retained his *dies imperii* (11 August) for the renewal of his tribunician power or changed it to the traditional date 10 December or to some other day. Two important inscriptions for this discussion are the statue bases CIL VI, 968 set up by the Arval brethren and CIL VI, 984 from Mausoleum Hadriani. The first one indicates that the tribunician day was later than 10 December, perhaps his *dies imperii* 11 August, because he is consul for the third time but is only holding tribunician powers for the second time. On the other hand is Hadrian holding tribunician power for the 22nd time at the time of his death, according to the inscription from the mausoleum. As a consequence the renewal at the end of his reign probably took place on 10 December or at least on a date prior to his death 10 July. Unfortunately both bases have disappeared.

²² M. Wegner, *Bildnis des Aelius Verus*, *ÖJh* 58 (1988) 63.

²³ Tiberius: CIL VI, 40371; Vespasian: CIL VI, 40375; Nerva: CIL VI, 40376; Hadrian: CIL VI, 984; Antoninus Pius: CIL VI, 986; Lucius Verus: CIL VI, 991; Commodus: CIL VI, 992.

²⁴ See note 20.

interval between the deaths of L. Aelius Verus and Hadrian. As we know for a fact that posthumous statues of L. Aelius Caesar did exist (see below) this is not entirely impossible. This brings to mind the passage in *Historia Augusta*,²⁵ that Hadrian should have ordered colossal statues of L. Aelius Caesar to be set up all over the world. However, none of the inscriptions reflect this imperial wish, and none of the bases that could possibly be posthumous seem to have carried statues of colossal size. The statement was included to exemplify that Hadrian mourned his dead son, which does not, however, rule out the possibility that statues of him in fact were erected by others during this period. Heirs apparent dying before they reached the throne is mostly a phenomenon of the early principate, with Gaius and Lucius Caesar as the best-known examples.²⁶ They certainly received posthumous honors, but whether statues of them were erected immediately following their deaths is impossible to say. The uncertainty concerning the date of the inscriptions arising from the lack of deification presented here, is very much the same with regard to the inscriptions of Gaius and Lucius Caesar.²⁷

This brings us to the four statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar, which certainly were set up posthumously as Hadrian is called *Divus* in the inscriptions (nos. 1, 6, 7 and 11). Of these only one inscription (no. 11) can be dated more precisely. Here Antoninus Pius is mentioned as holding tribunician power for the ninth time providing a date in 146, which is a surprisingly long time after his death.²⁸

Two further inscriptions hold internal criteria for dating. One, the arch in Avitta Bibba (no. 8), carried, in addition to the statue of L. Aelius Caesar, ones of Hadrian and Sabina. The exact date of the death of Sabina is not known, but she certainly died before L. Aelius Caesar, thus providing a date for the arch in late 136 or 137. The other inscription (no. 21) ends with the ambiguous ἔτος ργ. Rémy argues that the year 103 of the local calendar roughly corresponds to the year 137, but this is too imprecise to determine whether the statue was set up before or after his death.

To summarize, four inscriptions or about 20% are definitely posthumous. Six inscriptions are certainly from his lifetime, whereas the rest can only be dated within the longer period between the adoption and the death of Hadrian.

Inscription no.:	Date (d-m-y):	Criteria for dating:
8	?-?-136 – ?-?-137	In the lifetime of Sabina.
2, 5, 9, 13, 14	?-?-136 – 10-7-138	In the life time of Hadrian.
3, 4, 10, 20	1-1-137 – 9-12-137	Consul twice and Hadrian holding tribunician power for the 21st time.
12, 13, 16, 17, 18	1-1-137 – 10-7-138	Consul twice and in the lifetime of Hadrian.
1, 6, 7	10-7-138 –	After the death of Hadrian.
11	10-12-145 – 9-12-146	Antoninus Pius trib. pot. 9.
21	137?	Local calendar (year 103).
19	?-?-136 –	None.

²⁵ *Hist. Aug. V. Ael. VII, 1: Statuas sane Helio Vero per totum orbem colossas poni iussit, templa etiam in nonnullis urbibus fieri.*

²⁶ C. Hanson – F. P. Johnson, *On certain Portrait Inscriptions*, *AJA* 50 (1946) 389–400.

²⁷ C. Hanson – F. P. Johnson, *On certain Portrait Inscriptions*, *AJA* 50 (1946) 396.

²⁸ Posthumous statues were usually erected in the years immediately following the death of the emperor, and I know of no other inscriptions from statue bases from the second century, where the time span with certainty is more than eight years. Statues, on the other hand, set up more than ten years after the death of the emperor are known. From the 2nd century for example Hadrian from the Nymphaeum of Herodes Atticus in Olympia, see R. Bol, *Das Statuenprogramm des Herodes-Atticus-Nymphäums*, *Olympische Forschungen XV* (Berlin 1984).

Geographical Distribution

Twenty-one inscriptions represent too small a sample to draw any conclusions from about the geographical distribution in antiquity of the portrait statues of L. Aelius Caesar. Still, it is worthwhile to compare the distribution pattern with those of the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius,²⁹ because the distribution pattern is an indicator for the randomness of the sample. If the distribution patterns of the statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar vary from the others, it means either that the distribution pattern originally was different, or that the material is not a random sample. If, on the other hand, the distribution patterns are alike, then the extant bases for L. Aelius Caesar are likely to constitute an equally random sample as those for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius.

Distribution of the statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar by region:

Asia Minor	6 inscriptions	28% of the total
Italy	5 inscriptions (Rome 2)	24% of the total
Western North-Africa	5 inscriptions	24% of the total
Northern provinces	3 inscriptions	14% of the total
Greece	2 inscriptions	10% of the total

Asia Minor has the most inscriptions with 28% of the total. For both Hadrian and Antoninus this area likewise accounts for just about one fourth of the total number of bases. Italy and North-Africa come in second, each having 24% of the total. The percentage for Italy is slightly higher than it is for both Hadrian and Antoninus Pius with just under 20% of the bases originating from this area. In Africa imperial statue bases appear only sporadically until the time of Trajan, but from then on the number increases until the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. The statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar reflect this change very well, as the percentage is higher than that for Hadrian but lower than that for Antoninus Pius. The percentage of bases coming from Greece is meager compared to that of Hadrian, for whom there is an exceptional amount (especially in Athens),³⁰ but fits very well with the figure for Antoninus Pius. The northern provinces show the largest discrepancy; for both Hadrian and Antoninus Pius this region account for less than 10%, but for L. Aelius Caesar it is 14%. Spain, the Levant and Eastern North Africa lack completely from the list. These regions altogether only make up 10% of the total number of bases for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, so it is not entirely surprising that no statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar have been found here, although one or two would have been expected. Thus, the distribution pattern of the statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar is, as shown, on a regional level generally in accordance with that of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius.

Another point where the distribution pattern of the statue bases can contribute to our understanding of how imperial portraits were distributed throughout the empire, is with regard to the composition of locations with statue bases. Stuart has shown that under the Julio-Claudian emperors any new administration was unconcerned about the speedy or widespread distribution of the imperial portrait, because portraits were erected in most cities of the empire already before their accession.³¹ Presumably, no portraits existed of L. Aelius Caesar outside of Rome before he was adopted by Hadrian, and a different distribution pattern would therefore be expected.

Twenty cities are represented in the material. From Rome two dedications survive, from the rest only one. That there was more than one statue of L. Aelius Caesar in Rome is hardly surprising, but two

²⁹ I am presently preparing a catalogue of all the imperial statue bases from Augustus to Commodus. In the following all figures concerning these emperors originate from this unpublished catalogue unless otherwise noted.

³⁰ A. S. Benjamin – A. E. Raubitschek, *Arae Augusti*, *Hesperia* 28 (1959) 83–86.

³¹ M. Stuart, *How Were Imperial Portraits Distributed throughout the Empire?*, *AJA* 43 (1939) 603–607.

statue bases from cities in Moesia inferior seem odd. One explanation could be that L. Aelius Caesar was present in the area as governor of the two Pannonias, and consequently the cities felt encouraged or obliged to set up statues. The unusual phrasing of inscription no. 13 could even be interpreted as alluding to his presence. Unfortunately no statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar are found in Pannonia itself, where he must have spent most of his time, to back the argument that imperial visits caused erections of statues.³²

The composition of the cities is somewhat surprising. Rome, Ostia, Pergamon and Lepcis Magna of course had many imperial statues; from the rest of the cities, many of them inferior places not just with regard to inscriptional evidence, relatively few imperial statue bases are known. In six of the cities (Tifernum Mataurense, Avitta Bibba, Suturnuca, Byllis, Selge, Iconium and Comana Pontica) no imperial bases earlier than the one for L. Aelius Verus are attested (in three of these the statue was set up together with one of Hadrian). On the other hand, notable cities such as Athens and Ephesos³³ with many imperial statue bases from all periods are lacking from the list. Although striking, it does not necessarily indicate that statues of L. Aelius Caesar were distributed in another way or for other reasons than those for previous emperors and caesars. During the reign of Hadrian the number of sites where imperial statue bases have been found is simply much larger than it had been before.

Compared to the Julio-Claudian emperors the distribution is indeed very wide, and the rate at which the statues were set up was much higher. There are more bases for statues of L. Aelius Caesar known from the one year period when he was heir to the throne than from the first year of any of the Julio-Claudian emperors. Stuart was able to compare the number of bases from the first year of the reign with the following years, and showed that the first year did not produce more statues. Of course, this is excluded in the case of L. Aelius Caesar. We can, however, make comparisons with the number of bases set up for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius to get an impression of the scale involved. In the last half of Hadrian's reign more statues of the reigning emperor were set up than in any other period of the principate. This was primarily because an extraordinary large number of Greek cities decided to honor him. The number of surviving bases from this period is in excess of 20 per year, and for the first three to four years of the reign of Antoninus Pius the figure is correspondingly high. In this light the number of bases for L. Aelius Caesar is not conspicuous; furthermore many of the statues were set up with statues of Hadrian. Since there is no apparent rise in the number of statues of Hadrian in 136 and 137, we can conclude that in many instances individuals or cities, who were already inclined to set up a statue of Hadrian, extended the dedication to include one of L. Aelius Caesar as well.

In one respect the distribution pattern of an heir to the throne usually differs from that of a reigning emperor; caesars were never as popular in the east as they were in the west. What really interested the Greek speaking part of the empire was the reigning emperor. This is clearly seen in the difference in the geographical distribution of the statue bases for Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus before and after they became emperors, and the same holds true for Titus and Domitian, though not to the same degree. In all instances statue bases from the time before they became emperors are far more numerous in the west than in the east, while upon their accessions relatively more statues were erected in the east. More bases for L. Aelius Caesar have indeed been found in the west, but included among these are the four posthumous inscriptions, so that the ratio for the statues from his lifetime is approximately even. Hadrian's great popularity in the east at this time may have been a contributing factor for this abnormality.

³² The connection between imperial visits and the erection of portrait statues is usually taken for granted. Examples of this do exist, but when verified against a large body of epigraphical evidence, it becomes clear that the chance of a statue being set up in a year, when an emperor visited a city, is not significantly larger than in years when he did not.

³³ If inscription IGSK 12, 280a belonged to a dynastic group of portraits, of which more examples from Ephesos are known, a portrait of L. Aelius Caesar would certainly have been included, although the base is not extant.

Context

Unfortunately, statue bases are not always found in their original context. Because of their size and regular shape they were a sought-after building material both in antiquity and in more recent times. Compared with the surviving portrait statues, however, which rarely have a reliable provenience, the bases give a good impression of where the statues were placed in antiquity.

In nine instances, or almost half of the bases, the original context can be determined. Not surprisingly, public squares are the most favoured location for a statue. Four bases (nos. 2, 7, 9 and 14) are reported at or in the immediate vicinity of a forum/ager. Three further bases were set up in public space. Two (nos. 18 and 19) come from sanctuaries, the one from Selge actually being inscribed on a temple, and the third (no. 8) comes from an arch. The remaining two inscriptions (nos. 1 and 3) were found in semi-private contexts, where the statues would not be seen by the general public on a regular basis. One of these (no. 1) comes from the tomb of the imperial family, whereas the other (no. 3) was found in the *augusteum* in the fire station in Ostia. Contrary to the portraits, no bases have been found in private houses since inscriptions in this context generally were unnecessary.

Dynastic Groups

In the Julio-Claudian period the composition of dynastic statue groups often reflect the ever troublesome question of succession.³⁴ Since the death of Vespasian in 79 the question had either not been of immediate importance or there had been too little time for the heir to be included in any sculptural programs. Hadrian had long been the obvious choice for an heir to Trajan, but it was never made official, and remarkably few statue bases are known from the period before he became emperor in 117.³⁵ In addition, none of them mention his ties with the imperial family. The situation for L. Aelius Caesar was different. He was adopted and thus designated heir, and Hadrian would, because of his illness, clearly not live very long. His relation to Hadrian could therefore be expected to constitute an important element in the dedications.

Three statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar were certainly part of dynastic statue groups; all members of Hadrian's family were to have their portraits set up in Hadrian's Mausoleum (no. 1), although not at the same time. With regard to the two inscriptions where the names of Hadrian and L. Aelius Caesar appear together on the same monument (nos. 8 and 11), there can likewise be no doubt that statues of both were set up. In at least four further cases the connection with a statue of Hadrian is likely. The base for L. Aelius Caesar in the fire station in Ostia (no. 3) is actually the earliest one preserved there. It looks somewhat unfinished, and is not of the same high quality as the other bases. Perhaps the fire station was finished in 137, and images of the emperor and his heir were hurriedly installed in the *augusteum*. The base for Hadrian is not preserved, but undoubtedly there was one once; it is also clear from the layout of the *augusteum* that statues of future emperors were planned. No. 7 from Thamugadi was found in the basilica at the forum with two bases for Antoninus Pius, two for Marcus Aurelius and one for a Victoria Augustae. Apart from the Victoria and one of the statues of Antoninus Pius they were probably set up at the same time between 138 and 140. In addition, a base for Diva Sabina was found outside the curia that, on account of its similarity, must have belonged with the others.³⁶ Surely a statue of Hadrian was also included in the group.

³⁴ This was not necessarily the result of the imperial administration's direct involvement in the erection of statues, since the donors could have formulated compositional schemes based on their perception of the reigning emperor's attitude toward his family, see C. B. Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* (Cambridge 1997) 51–53.

³⁵ CIL III, 550; IG VII, 2879.

³⁶ G. Zimmer, *Locus datus decreto decurionum. Zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumslagen im römischen Afrika*, SBMünchen, Heft 102 (1989) nos. T29, T42, T43, T44, T46.

The inscription from Selge (no. 19) is thought by the editor to have been accompanied by a now lost inscription for Hadrian, and from Nicopolis ad Istrum (no. 12) an inscription from a base for Hadrian with almost identical phrasing and measurements is known.³⁷ Whether this last base was put up in 136 or in 137 – like the one for L. Aelius Caesar – is impossible to determine with absolute certainty, but the connection between the two seems obvious. Whether there is a connection between the base from the Asclepieion in Pergamon (no. 18) and any of the bases for Hadrian found there is less certain.

Naturally, it is impossible to prove that statues of L. Aelius Caesar were not set up alongside ones of Hadrian, but positive evidence for statue groups in at least seven out of twenty-one statue bases gives reason to conclude that statues of L. Aelius Caesar were frequently accompanied by those of Hadrian. Compared with the statue bases for Titus during the reign of Vespasian a relatively large proportion of the bases for L. Aelius Caesar belong to dynastic groups, whereas the proportion seems to be somewhat lower than for Gaius and Lucius Caesar.³⁸

Among the statue bases belonging to statue groups there is an unusual frequency of posthumous bases; in fact three out of four posthumous bases belong to statue groups. Clearly the dead heir was not considered important enough to deserve a statue in his own right.

Apart from the base in Ephesos mentioned above, which could have been part of an imperial statue group set up in 137, there is no epigraphic evidence for statue groups with L. Aelius Caesar set up with his son Lucius Verus. During the reign of Antoninus Pius such a composition could have been considered inappropriate, and when Lucius Verus became emperor in 161 more than 20 years had passed since the then seven year old boy had been adopted by Antoninus Pius.³⁹

Dedicators

Only two of the twenty-one inscriptions intentionally contain no information about who was responsible for the erection of the monument. One is the inscription from Mausoleum Hadriani (no. 1), and the other is the inscription from the fire station in Ostia (no. 3). In the last instance it may have been intended that the base should have carried the name of the donor, as most of the other inscriptions from bases in the fire station inform us that the *cohors VII vigilum* was responsible for the erection. Seven further inscriptions are too fragmentary to determine who the dedicator was, if indeed there was one.

Among the remaining thirteen inscriptions with dedicators local administrative bodies account for the majority. Three Latin inscriptions (nos. 7, 10 and 14) were set up by decree of the *decurions* and one (no. 20) by a *colonia*, whereas three Greek inscriptions (nos. 12, 15 and 19) name the council and the people (*ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος*) as the donor, and one (no. 21) the city (*ἡ πόλις*). The inscription from Kibyra (no. 17) contains more detailed information, as it states that the dedication was decided by the city, but that the magistrates carried out the actual erection of the monument. Whether they also paid for it is not specified in the inscription, but it seems reasonable to assume so.⁴⁰

³⁷ IGBulg II, 601.

³⁸ C. Hanson – F. P. Johnson, *On certain Portrait Inscriptions*, *AJA* 50 (1946) 389–400.

³⁹ The silver bust mentioned in the inscription from Ostia (AE 1940, 62) clearly did not belong with the acrolith statue of Lucius Verus, which was part of a group with Marcus Aurelius and a Victory. The figure behind Hadrian in the adoption scene on a relief from the so-called Parthian monument from Ephesos now in Vienna could theoretically represent L. Aelius Caesar, but it bears no resemblance to any of the other known portraits of him. See M. Wegner, *Bildnis des Aelius Verus*, *ÖJh* 58 (1988) 63, fig. 1–2, who believes it represents L. Aelius Caesar. In the basilica in Thamugadi a statue of Lucius Verus could have been included, but the composition was more likely: Hadrian, Sabina, L. Aelius Caesar / Antoninus Pius, Faustina, Marcus Aurelius. The statues of L. Aelius Caesar and Lucius Verus now in Timgad Mus. probably belonged together, see P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption der Selbstdarstellung des Princeps*, *AbhMünchen* 90 (1983) 32. Whether these should be dated before or after the death of L. Aelius Caesar is unknown.

⁴⁰ Very few inscriptions of this type actually contain information about the financing of the statue, and the meagre evidence can be interpreted both ways, see for example O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander* (Berlin 1900) 127, no. 175, and M. Homolle, *BCH* 20 (1896) 723–724. In comparable Latin inscriptions from North-Africa public bodies

The remaining four inscriptions were set up by private individuals alone or in groups. The boys and girls of the alimenta system in Tifernum Mataurense (no. 4) set up a statue, as was quite common judging from a number of similar inscriptions for emperors from the second century found throughout Italy.⁴¹ Individuals include Attinas, son of Glykos, who was strategos (no. 16), and Fl. Temon (no. 18), who was high priest at the temple in Pergamon. Germanus Suturnucus (no. 11) had held no public office, but considering the additional donation he made at the dedication of the statue he must have been quite well off.

Why exactly these cities and private individuals chose to honor L. Aelius Caesar is difficult to answer, since the inscriptions contain very little information about their reasons for doing so. Of course, the boys and girls from Tifernum Mataurense (no. 4) had every reason to be grateful towards the emperor, but why this should extend to his heir is unclear. The citizens of Avitta Bibba (no. 8) also had good reason to erect a statue of Hadrian; if he indeed was the founder of the city or had changed its status to a municipium, as it appears from the inscription, but there is no other indication that the arch was to commemorate this specific event. In two inscriptions (nos. 17 and 18) the donors call L. Aelius Caesar their benefactor. He could have helped Fl. Temon in becoming high priest, and he could possibly have done some service to the city of Kibyra, but more likely it should be understood as benefactor in more general terms.

The most revealing inscription is the one from Suturnuca (no. 11). Here the statues of the deified Hadrian and L. Aelius Caesar were set up to commemorate that the daughter of the dedicator had been chosen as priestess. Thus the event that prompted the dedication was related solely to the dedicator and not to the honorands, who were long dead at the time. The base set up by Attinas (no. 16) could have resulted from similar motives. The only information given, apart from the names of the honorand and the name of the dedicator, is that Attinas was strategos at the time. Perhaps his primary reason for erecting the statue was to publicize his own merits.

The cities of the empire were, for obvious reasons, eager to show their loyalty to the reigning emperor, and this eagerness is generally assumed to be the motivating factor for the erection of portrait statues as well.⁴² If, however, statues played an important role in the interaction between emperor and city, then every city would have had an interest in erecting a statue immediately after the accession of a new emperor. That this was not done, is apparent from the epigraphic evidence which for most emperors shows no large concentration of statue bases in the first years of their reign.⁴³ It is true that generally more statues were erected in the first half of a reign than in the second, but there is no evidence to support the notion that there was a rush to have statues of the emperor set up all over the empire. Perhaps private interests and local circumstances were far more prevalent in determining when imperial statues were erected than has been recognized.

The Portraits Identification of the Extant Portraits

Identifying the sculpted portraits of L. Aelius Caesar has proven surprisingly difficult, and scholars have disagreed strongly about the actual number of extant portraits,⁴⁴ which is unusual for a member of the

clearly only served as authorizers of private dedications.

⁴¹ CIL VI, 40497; CIL IX, 5700; CIL XI, 5956; CIL XI, 5957; CIL XIV, 4003.

⁴² G. Alföldy, *Römische Statuen in Venetia et Histria. Epigraphische Quellen* (Heidelberg 1984) 56.

⁴³ For Trajan and Hadrian there are fewer statue bases from the beginning of their reigns than later on. Statue bases for Antoninus Pius are more frequent in the first three years than in the following, yet it represents a decline in numbers from the last years of the reign of Hadrian. Although there must have been statues of Marcus Aurelius in most places before 161, his accession prompted many cities to erect new statues.

⁴⁴ The most important catalogues of the portraits of L. Aelius Caesar are: J. J. Bernoulli, *Römische Ikonographie* II,2 (Berlin 1891) 134–139. R. West, *Römische Porträt-Plastik* II (München 1941) 142–144. N. Hannestad, *The Portraits of*

imperial family. As the present purpose is an investigation of the inscriptions from the statue bases, whose evidence in relation to this problem is of a more general nature, it is unnecessary to go into detail about which portraits do and which do not represent a likeness of L. Aelius Caesar. Still, a brief outline is in order.

The coins of L. Aelius Caesar,⁴⁵ which serve as the starting point for the identification of the sculpted portraits, present us with a clear, unambiguous and fairly uniform iconography.⁴⁶ All were probably minted in 137, although the legends do not rule out that some of them could be posthumous as argued above for the inscriptions from the statue bases. Easily identifiable from the coins are two portraits, one from the full-length statue in the Louvre (Inv. MA 1167) and the other a head on a modern bust in Florence, Uffizi Gallery (Inv. 1914, no. 154). All scholars have agreed that these represent L. Aelius Caesar and that they show such similarities that they can be considered replicas.⁴⁷ Belonging to this group, though further removed from the original, are two more portraits: a head on a modern bust in Petworth House, Sussex (Inv. no. 33) and a head in Museo Vaticano (Magazzino 681 Inv. 4106).⁴⁸ Here consensus ends. Wegner is of the opinion that these four portraits along with the figure behind Hadrian on the relief from the Parthian monument from Ephesos are the only ones to be identified as L. Aelius Caesar. In contrast to this minimalist view there are six portraits in Bernoulli's study from the last century, ten in West's and Hannestad enumerates eighteen portraits, which he divides into two sub-groups.⁴⁹ The basic problem behind this large discrepancy is how uniform imperial portraits are to be expected in the early stages of mass production. Some infer that there was ample room for variations in locally produced copies, while others believe that the authorities kept tight control with production. The solution, as is evident from the widely diverse results reached by different scholars, is not necessarily found by looking at the portraits alone.

The evidence of the inscriptions applied

By using the evidence of the inscriptions from the statue bases it is possible to estimate the approximate number of extant portraits to be expected independently of the portraits themselves. The reason being that the number of extant portraits is closely related to the number of extant statue bases.

The extant portraits and statue bases represent two very different excerpts of the entire body of statues originally in existence. The portraits under discussion are exclusively made of marble, whereas most of the statue bases carried bronze statues which invariably have been melted down. Therefore, any connection between the two groups of evidence is not necessarily to be taken for granted. Still, it can be shown that the ratio between them is relatively constant for most emperors throughout the first and second centuries. This is true regardless of the length of the reign and, thus, it can be concluded that chronology was not a factor in determining which portraits and statue bases were preserved. It follows

Aelius Caesar, *AnalRom* 7 (1974) 67–100. M. Wegner, *Bildnis des Aelius Verus*, *ÖJh* 58 (1988) 63–71. Portraits not discussed in the catalogues: P. Zanker, *Provinzielle Kaiserporträts. Zur Rezeption der Selbstdarstellung des Princeps*, *AbhMünchen* 90 (1983) 32, pl. 17,1–2. K. Fittschen – P. Zanker, *Katalog der römischen Porträts in den Kapitولينischen Museen und den anderen kommunalen Sammlungen der Stadt Rom. Band 1 (Mainz am Rhein 1985) 62–63, no. 58 (with a reference to the still unpublished K. Fittschen, *Die Prinzenbildnisse antoninischer Zeit*).*

⁴⁵ H. Mattingly – E. A. Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage II* (1926) 319, 327, 338, 391 seqq. H. Mattingly, *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum III* (1936) CLXXV, CLXXXI seqq. P. L. Strack, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Reichsprägung des 2. Jahrhunderts II* (1937) 147, 166–174.

⁴⁶ N. Hannestad, *The Portraits of Aelius Caesar*, *AnalRom* 7 (1974) 70.

⁴⁷ N. Hannestad, *The Portraits of Aelius Caesar*, *AnalRom* 7 (1974) 72 and M. Wegner, *Bildnis des Aelius Verus*, *ÖJh* 58 (1988) 65.

⁴⁸ M. Wegner, *Bildnis des Aelius Verus*, *ÖJh* 58 (1988) 71. Wegner expresses doubt as to the authenticity of the head from Petworth. The second one was not known to Bernoulli and West.

⁴⁹ This sub-division was further supported by the publication of a head in the Astros Museum (Inv. no. 176). A. Stauridis, *Porträts aus dem Museum von Astros*, *RM* 92 (1985) 339–341.

that the chronological distribution of the portraits within an emperor's reign must be approximately that of the statue bases.

The ratios between statue bases and portraits published to date are those of Caligula (1:1.5)⁵⁰, Claudius (2.7:1)⁵¹, Hadrian (2.4:1)⁵² and Julia Domna (2.4:1)⁵³. The preliminary results for the period between Vespasian and Marcus Aurelius are as follows:

Vespasian, Titus and Domitian	1.8:1
Nerva, Trajan and Antoninus Pius	2.6:1
Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius:	1.4:1

Evidently, Caligula, of whom there more portraits than statue bases preserved, is an exception to the rule – if indeed the figure is correct.⁵⁴ The overwhelming evidence points to an average ratio of two or just over two statue bases for each portrait. Of particular importance for the question of the number of portraits of L. Aelius Caesar is that the figure for Nerva does not deviate from the others, although he was emperor only just over one year, a time-span comparable to the period in which L. Aelius Caesar was the designated heir to Hadrian. With 21 known statue bases for L. Aelius Caesar, we should expect the number of extant portraits to be in the vicinity of ten, perhaps 8–12. Two or three of these are likely to have been produced posthumously, the rest belong to the brief period, when he was Hadrian's heir.

Conclusion

Twenty-one inscriptions from statue bases is a very small sample to draw any definite conclusions regarding where portrait statues of L. Aelius Caesar were set up, who dedicated them and when they did so. A comparison with the much larger samples of statue bases for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius both with regard to geographical distribution and composition of the donors indicates, however, that the sample probably is as representative as these.

The distribution pattern shows that in the second century dissemination of imperial portraits or models from which copies could be made locally was rapid and wide. Even in cities which were not directly on the main trade and communication routes portrait statues of the new member of the imperial family could be set up within a very short period of time. Still, there is no sign of active involvement in promoting the new heir by the imperial administration. The number of dedications for L. Aelius Caesar is not excessive compared to the rate at which statues of Hadrian were being set up, and from what can be deduced from the inscriptions the donors had purely personal reasons for erecting a statue at that specific time. This of course only applies to public dedications which normally included a statue base with an inscription. Statues and busts set up in private houses and villas without inscriptions, which probably account for several of the preserved portraits, could naturally have had another distribution pattern and could have been set up for completely different reasons.

One area where the evidence of the inscriptions can be applied directly to the preserved portraits is with regard to chronology. The inscriptions prove that statues of L. Aelius Caesar were erected after his death, and that these account for at least one fifth of the total number and possibly more. The posthumous portrait statues were set up in the early part of the reign of Antoninus Pius and consequently they will be difficult if not impossible to discern from the portraits from his lifetime on purely stylistic grounds. There is no reason to believe that portrait statues of L. Aelius Caesar were set up during the

⁵⁰ D. Boschung, *Die Bildnisse des Caligula. Das römische Herrscherbild. I. Abteilung, Band 4* (Berlin 1989). Counting only statue bases and portraits of approximately life-size (not miniature portraits).

⁵¹ M. Stuart, *The Portraiture of Claudius* (New York 1938).

⁵² C. Evers, *Les portraits d'Hadrien. Typologie et ateliers* (Bruxelles 1994).

⁵³ J. Fejfer, *The Portraits of the Severan Empress Julia Domna. A New Approach*, *AnalRom* 14 (1985) 129–138.

⁵⁴ See R. R. R. Smith, *JRS* 82 (1992) 272–273. The “*damnatio memoriae*” could of course have had a stronger effect on the inscriptions than on the portraits, but apparently the ratio for Domitian does not differ from those of the other emperors of the Flavian dynasty.

reign of Lucius Verus and Marcus Aurelius. His association with Hadrian and not with Lucius Verus was clearly the reason behind the posthumous dedications known from inscriptions.

CATALOGUE

1)

Provenience: Italia, Roma.
 References: CIL VI, 985; CIL VI, 31220; Ch. Hülsen, Jahresbericht über Topographie der Stadt Rom, RM 6 (1891) 142.
 Description: CIL: Titulos mausolei Hadriani.
 Type of monument: Unknown.
 Dimensions: Unknown.
 Context: In Mausoleum Hadriani.
 Date: Shortly after 138 (divi filius).
 Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio Caesari | Divi Hadriani Aug(usti) | filio co(n)s(uli) II
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of the deified Hadrianus Augustus, twice consul.

2)

Provenience: Italia, Roma.
 References: CIL VI, 36969; CIL VI, 40527.
 Description: CIL: Lapis marmoreus i.e. fortasse basis statuæ undique fracta. Rep. in foro Romano in Regia immissus muro aetatis sequioris. Extat in Lap. For. in repositis (inv. n. 12.510).
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: Unknown.
 Context: Forum Romanum?
 Date: 136–138 (in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: [S(enatus)] p(opulus)q(ue) [R(omanus)] | [Lucio] Aelio [Caesari] | [Imp(eratoris) Ca]esar[is Traiani] | [Hadri]ani [Aug(usti) filio | ... | ...
 Translation: The Senat and the Roman People (set up the statue of) Lucius Aelius Caesar, son of Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, ...

3)

Provenience: Italia, Latium et Campania (Regio I), Ostia.
 References: CIL XIV, 4356; AE 1889, 128; L. Lanciani, Nuovi rinvenimenti nella caserma dei vigili, NSc (1889) 73, no. 6.
 Description: CIL: Basis lapidis calcarii.
 Lanciani: Sul lato destro dell'aula, a poca distanza dall'ultimo gradino della scaletta dell'altare, a addossato contro la parete, sta un piedistallo di statua, scolpito in travertino ed inciso da mano inesperta.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: 1.56 x 0.77 x 0.68 m.; letter size: 0.04–0.068 m.
 Context: In the augusteum in Caserma dei Vigili.
 Date: 137 (cos 2 / Hadrian trib. pot. 21).
 Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio Caesari | Imp(eratoris) Traiani Haldriani Aug(usti) pont(ifici) | max(imi) trib(uniciae) potest(atis) | xxi imp(eratoris) ii co(n)s(ulis) iii p(atris) p(atriciae) | filio Divi Traiani | Parthici n(epoti) Divi Nerlvae pron(epoti) trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) | co(n)s(uli) ii

- Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the 21st time, consul three times, father of his country, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, twice consul.
- 4)
- Provenience: Italia, Umbria (Regio VI), Tifernum Mataurense.
- References: CIL XI, 5989.
- Description: CIL: Tabula marmorea. In Sancto Angelo in Vado in ecclesia maiori.
- Type of monument: Slab.
- Dimensions: Unknown.
- Context: Unknown.
- Date: 137 (cos 2 / Hadrian trib. pot. 21).
- Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio Caesari | Hadriani Aug(usti) pont(ificis) | max(imi) trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) xxi | imp(eratoris) ii co(n)s(ulis) iii p(atris) p(atriciae) filio | Divi Traiani Parthici | nepoti Divi Nerva[e] | pronepoti trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) | co(n)s(uli) ii pueri et puellae | [alimentari]
- Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the 21st time, emperor twice, consul three times, father of his country, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, consul twice (set up by) the boys and girls of the alimenta system.
- 5)
- Provenience: Italia, Etruria (Regio VII), Ferentinum.
- References: AE 1956, 151; A. Bartoli, Ferentino: Ricerche epigrafiche e topografiche, Rendiconti. Atti dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, serie 8, vol. 9 (1954) 495, no. 5; H. Solin, Supplementa Italica 1 (1981) 39–40, no. 3.
- Description: Bartoli: Frammento di lastra scorniciata di marmo bianco.
AE: Un fragment de marbre blanc, trouvé en démolissant l'autel de l'église de S. Lucia.
- Type of monument: Slab.
- Dimensions: 0.435 x 0.472 x 0.085 m.; letter size: 0.05–0.065 m.
- Context: Unknown.
- Date: 136–138 (in the lifetime of Hadrian).
- Inscription: Luci[o Aelio] | Caes[ari] | Imp(eratoris) Tra[iani] | Hadri[ani Aug(usti)] | pontific[is max(imi)] | [trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) ...] | [imp(eratoris) ii co(n)s(ulis) iii p(atris) p(atriciae)] | [filio] | [...]
- Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the ?th time, emperor twice, consul three times, father of his country ...
- 6)
- Provenience: Noricum, Virunum.
- References: AE 1974, 468; G. Piccottini, Epigraphische Neufunde aus dem Stadtbereiche von Virunum, Römisches Österreich 2 (1974) 39–43.
- Description: Piccottini: Bruchstück einer Statuenbasis mit Inschrift. Das Fragment entstammt der rechten oberen Hälfte einer beschrifteten Statuenbasis. ... das verwendete Material ist weißer, feinkörniger, einheimischer Marmor.
AE: Fragment d'une base de statue en marbre blanc. La restitution s'inspire de

l'inscription de Rome: CIL VI, 985, érigée également apres la mort d'Hadrien.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: 0.40 x 0.50 x 0.39 m.; letter size: 0.07–0.09 m.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: After 138 (divi filius).
 Inscription: [L(ucio) A]elio | [C]aesari | Divi [Hadriani] | [Aug(usti) f(ilio) co(n)s(uli) ii] | [Virunenses] | [d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ublice)]
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of the deified Hadrianus Augustus ...

7)

Provenience: Numidia, Thamugadi.
 References: AE 1888, 138; CIL VIII, 17848; A. Poulle, Inscriptions diverses de la Numidie et de la Mauritanie Sétifienne, Recueil des Notices et Mémoires de la Société de Constantine (1886–87) 151–152, no. 9; G. Zimmer, Locus datus decreto decurionum. Zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumslagen im römischen Afrika, SBMünchen, Heft 102 (1989) 82, no. T 44.

Description: CIL: In basi alta m. 1,22, lata 0,91, litt. 0,065–0,045; rep. Timghad in basilica fori.

Poulle: Dé d'autel encadré de moulures avec base, trouvé dans la basilique du forum, à 1m 50 de son piédestal resté en place.

Zimmer: Forumsbasilika. Die Deckplatte ist verloren. Gesamthöhe: 150 cm; Block: 121 x 60 x 63 cm. Bereits die Bearbeiter des CIL vermuteten, daß die Statue zusammen mit der für Hadrians Gattin Sabina (CIL VIII, 17847) errichtet wurde.

Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: 1.50 x 0.60 x 0.63 m.; letter size: 0.045–0.065 m.
 Context: In the basilica at the forum.
 Date: After 138 (divi filius).
 Inscription: L(ucio) A[e]lio | Caes(ari) | Divi Ha | driani | Aug(usti) fil(io) | co(n)s(uli) ii | d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublice)
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of the deified Hadrianus Augustus, twice consul (set up) by decree of the decurions for public money.

8)

Provenience: Africa Proconsularis, Avitta Bibba.
 References: CIL VIII, 799; H. Kähler, RE VII a1 (1939) 432, no. V, 18.
 Description: CIL: Hr. Bu Ftis in fragmentis epistylis arcus triumphalis, quae postea absumpta sunt in murum iuxta ipsum arcus factum.

Kähler: Ein eintoriger Bogen, von dem Blöcke in einer späteren Mauer verbaut sind.

Type of monument: Arch.
 Dimensions: Letter size: 0.14–0.20 m.
 Context: On an arch together with statues of Hadrian and Sabina.
 Date: 136–137 (in the lifetime of Sabina).
 Inscription: [Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) Divi T]raiani [Parthici] f(ilio) Divi [Ner]||[vae nep(oti) Traia]no Hadri [ano Aug(usto)] pont(ifici) m[ax(imo)] | [trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) xxi imp(eratori)] ii co(n)s(uli) iii p(atri) p(atriciae) [condito]ri munic[ipi]
 Translation: L(ucio) Aelio C[aesari] Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) Traiani Hadrian[i] Aug(usti)

- f(ilio) [trib(uniciae) pot(estatis) co(n)s(uli) ii]
 [Vibiae Matidiae Au]g(usti) f(iliae) Sabin[ae Augustae Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) Traiani Ha]driani [Aug(usti)]
- Translation: Emperor Caesar, son of the deified Traianus Parthicus, grandson of the deified Nerva, Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the 21st time, emperor twice, consul three times, father of his country, founder of the municipium.
 L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, holding tribunician power, twice consul.
 Vibia Matidia, daughter of Augusta, Sabina Augusta, (wife of) Emperor Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus.
- 9)
- Provenience: Africa Proconsularis, Leptis Magna.
 References: AE 1957, 234; J. M. Reynolds, *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania: A Supplement*, Papers of the British School at Rome 23 (1955) 129; J. M. Reynolds – J. B. Ward-Perkins, *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (London 1952) 110, no. 367.
 Description: Reynolds: Fragment from the left-hand side of a marble base inscribed within a marble panel (0,13x0,25). Found in the Forum Severianum. The text given in IRT was read from a drawing and is wrong.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: 0.18 x 0.265 x 0.28 m.; letter size: 0.04–0.07 m.
 Context: In the Forum Severianum.
 Date: 136–138 (in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio C[aesari] | Aug(usti) f(ilio) [...]
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Augustus ...
- 10)
- Provenience: Africa Proconsularis, Mactaris.
 References: AE 1951, 44; G. Picard, *BAParis. Procès-verbaux des séances* (1949), juin, XV.
 Description: Picard: Plaque de calcaire longue de 1m 80, haute de 1m 20, épaisse de 0m 13. AE: Près d'une pile ruinée de l'aqueduc.
 Type of monument: Slab.
 Dimensions: 1.20 x 1.80 x 0.13 m.; letter size: 0.105–0.14 m.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 137 (Hadrian trib. pot. 21).
 Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio Caesari [I]mp(eratoris) Caes[aris Tra]liani Hadriani Aug(usti) pont(ificis) [m(aximi) trib(uniciae) pot(estatis)] | xxi co(n)s(ulis) p(atris) p(atriciae) f(ilio) Divi Traiani Part[hici ne] | poti Divi Nervae pronepoti tri[b(uniciae) pot(estatis)] | d[ecreto] d(ecurionum)
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the 21st time, consul, father of his country, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power (set up) by decree of the decurions.
- 11)
- Provenience: Africa Proconsularis, Sturnuca.
 References: AE 1910, 154; R. Cagnat, *Inscriptiones latines d'Afrique* (Paris 1923) 88–89,

- no. 300.
- Description: Merlin: Elle est gravée sur un dé parallélépipédique.
Cagnat: Auj. au Musée Alaoui.
AE: Au kilom. 32 de la route de Tunis à Pont du Fahs.
- Type of monument: Unknown.
- Dimensions: 0.87 x 0.59 x 0.51 m.; letter size: 0.04–0.09 m.
- Context: Unknown.
- Date: 146 (Antoninus Pius trib. pot. 9).
- Inscription: Divo Hadriano patri | Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) T(iti) Aeli Hadr(iani) Antonini | Aug(usti) Pii pontif(icis) max(imi) trib(uniciae) | potest(atis) viiii co(n)s(ulis) iiii p(atris) p(atriciae) | Germanus Passi Germani f(ilius) | Sturnuc(us?) ob honorem flam(oni) perp(etui) | Quintae f(iliae) suae ex (sestertium) IIII mil(ibus) num(mum) legitim(um) | statuam Divi Hadriani et L(ucii) Aeli Caes(aris) | adiectis a se hs ∞ dxxv n(ummum) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecit) et | ob dedicationem viscerationem et | gymnasium populo dedit
- Translation: The deified Hadrian, father of Emperor Caesar T. Aelius Antoninus Augustus Pius, pontifex maximus, holding tribunician power for the ninth time, consul four times, father of his country. By decree of the decurions Germanus Sturnucus?, son of Passus Germanus, made the statues of the deified Hadrian and L. Aelius Caesar out of his own money in honor of his daughter's perpetual priesthood at the required amount of 4000 sesterti adding to this 1525 sesterti, and for the dedication he gave a sacrificial feast and a gymnasium to the people.

12)

- Provenience: Moesia inferior, Nicopolis ad Istrum.
- References: IGBulg II, 602; IGRR I, 569; AE 1902, 107. V. Dobrusky, Sbornik zu narodni umotvorenia, nauka i kniznina t. 18 (Sofia 1901) 716, no. 1.
- Description: IGBulg: Nicopolis ad Istrum reperta, nunc in Museo Serdicensi conservatur (inv. 2100). Basis calcaria.
- Type of monument: Base.
- Dimensions: 1.68 x 0.90 x 0.90 m.; letter size: 0.035–0.04 m.
- Context: Unknown.
- Date: 137–138 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
- Inscription: Ἀγαθῆι Τύχηι | Λούκιον Αἴλιον Καίσαρα Ἀυτοκράτορος Τραιανουῦ Ἀδριανουῦ Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν | Θεοῦ Τραιανουῦ Παρθικοῦ υἱωνὸν Θεοῦ Νέρουα ἔκγονον δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας ὑπατον | τὸ β' ἢ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος Οὐλπίας Νεικοπόλεως τῆς πρὸς Ἴστρωι
- Translation: Good fortune. L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Hadrianus Caesar Augustus, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, twice consul (set up by) the Council and the People of Ulpia Nicopolis on the Istros.

13)

- Provenience: Moesia inferior, Istros.
- References: SEG 32, 692; D. M. Pippidi, StCercIstorV 33 (1982) 39, no. 10. D. M. Pippidi, Inscriptiones Dacicae et Scythiae Minoris antiquae. Series altera: Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris Graecae et Latinae, vol. I: Inscriptiones Histriae et vicinia (Bucharest 1983) no. 73.
- Description: SEG: Fragment of a marble stele; now in the museum of Histria inv. 294.

Type of monument: Stele?
 Dimensions: 0.29 x 0.21 x 0.07 m.; letter size: 0.015 m.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 136–138 (in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: [Λ(ούκιον) Αἴλιον] Καίσαρα τὸν ἐνφανέ[στατον] Ἀυτοκρά[τορος] Καί-
 [σαρος] Τραιαν[οῦ] Ἰδριανοῦ | [υἱὸν ὑπὲρ νείκης τύ]χης τε καὶ αἰ[ωνίου]
 διαμονῆς ...]
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, the most visible, son of Emperor Caesar Traianus Hadrianus
 (set up) on account of victory, fortune and eternal ...

14)

Provenience: Macedonia, Byllis.
 References: AE 1985, 773; H. Freis, Zwei lateinische Inschriften aus Albanien, ZPE 61
 (1985) 226–228, no. 2; P. R. Franke, Albanien im Altertum, Sonderhefte Antike
 Welt 4 (1983) 26.
 Description: AE: Fragment d'un bloc retrouvé sur le forum.
 Type of monument: Unknown.
 Dimensions: 0.90 x 0.40 x ? m.; letter size: 0.06–0.09 m.
 Context: In the forum.
 Date: 137–138 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: [L(ucio) Aeli]o C[aesa]r[i] | [Imp(eratoris) Hadrian]i Aug(usti) p(atris) p(atriciae)
 f(ilio) | [Divi Trai]ani Par | [thici n(epoti) Di]vi Nervae | [pron(epoti)
 trib(uniciae)] pot(estatis) co(n)s(uli) ii | [publ(ice)] ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Hadrianus Augustus, father of his country,
 grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva,
 holding tribunician power, twice consul (set up) by decree of the decurions.

15)

Provenience: Achaea, Thisbe.
 References: IG VII, 2238.
 Description: IG: Basis lapidis calcarii leucophaei; superficies tabulae imponendae accommo-
 data, cui rursus ipsa statua imposita erat.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: Unknown.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 137–138 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: [Λ(ούκιον) Αἴλιον] Καίσαρα Ἀυτοκράτορος | [Ἰδριανοῦ] Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν |
 [Θε]οῦ Τραιανοῦ υἱωνὸν | [Θε]οῦ Νέρουα ἔκγονον | δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας |
 ὑπατον τὸ β' ἢ βουλῆ | καὶ ὁ δῆμος
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Hadrianus Augustus, grandson of the
 deified Traianus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power,
 twice consul (set up by) the Council and the People.

16)

Provenience: Asia, Hadriani.
 References: IGSK 33, 43; IGRR IV, 240; IGRR III, 35; BCH 17 (1893) 637–638.
 Description: IGSK: Rundbasis. Orhanli (Beyce) – nahe der Moschee. Um die Mitte des letz-
 ten Jahrhunderts am Fundort gesehen, seitdem verschollen. Aufgrund einer
 mangelhaften Lesung gerade auch der 1. Zeile bezogen Radet und nach ihm

auch IGRR die Inschrift auf Antoninus Pius.

Type of monument: Round base.
 Dimensions: 1.50 x ? x ? m.; letter size 0.05 m.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 137–138 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: Λ(ούκιον) Αἴλιον Καίσαρα | Αὐτοκράτορος Ἰαδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν | Θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ υἱωνὸν | Θεοῦ Νέρουα ἔκγονον | δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας | ὕπατον τὸ β' Ἀττινᾶς | Γλύκωνος στρατηγῶν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων | ἀνέστησεν

Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Hadrianus Augustus, grandson of the deified Traianus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, twice consul; Attinas, son of Glykos, set it up out of his own funds while strate-

17)

Provenience: Asia, Kibyra Maior.
 References: IGRR IV, 900; CIG 4380 b1.
 Description: CIG: Cibyrae in basi.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: Unknown.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 137 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: Λούκιον Αἴλιον Καίσαρα Αὐτοκράτορος | Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ | Ἰαδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱὸν Θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ Παρθικοῦ υἱωνὸν Θεοῦ Νέρουα | προέγγονον δημαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας ὕπατον τὸ δεύτερον | ἡ Καισαρέων Κιβυρατῶν | πόλις τὸν ἴδιον εὐεργέτην ἐπιμεληθέντων τῆς | ἀνάστασεως τῶν περὶ | Μ Κλαύδιον Φλαουιανὸν ἀρχόντων καὶ τοῦ | γραμματέως Ποπλίου Αἰλίου Ὁρέστου

Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, twice consul. The city of Caesarea Kibyra (decided to set up) their benefactor, and the magistrates lead by M. Claudius Flavianus and Puplius Aelius Orestus the secretary carried out the erection.

18)

Provenience: Asia, Pergamon.
 References: AE 1933, 278; Th. Wiegand, Zweiter Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Pergamon 1928–32: Das Asklepieion, Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil. hist. Klasse Nr. 5 (1932) 51, Nr. 3; C. Habicht, Altertümer von Pergamon VIII, 3, Die Inschriften des Asklepieions (Berlin 1969) 30, Nr. 7.
 Description: Wiegand: Mittelteil einer Ehrenbasis aus weißem Marmor, oben ein Dübelloch, unten gerade. Fuß- und Deckprofil fehlen. Gefunden vor der Mitte der Nordhalle. Inv. Perg. 1932 Nr. 26.
 Habicht: Basis aus weißem Marmor, Fuß- und Deckprofil gesondert gearbeitet, das Deckprofil stark zerschlagen.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: 1.185 x 0.74 x 0.675 m.; letter size: 0.041 m.
 Context: In the Asclepieion.
 Date: 137–138 (cos 2 / in the lifetime of Hadrian).
 Inscription: Λούκιον Αἴλιον | Καίσαρα | Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος | Τραιανοῦ

Ἀδριανοῦ | Σεβαστοῦ Ὀλυμπίου | Πανελληνίου τοῦ κατὰ πάντα τῆς
 ἰδίας οἰκουμένης σωτήρος | καὶ εὐεργέτου υἱὸν Θεοῦ Τραιανοῦ υἱωνὸν
 Θεοῦ Νέρουα προυιωνὸν | δημοαρχικῆς ἐξουσίας | ὑπάτον τὸ β' | τὸν
 ἑαυτοῦ εὐεργέτην | Φλ Τέμων ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας | ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Caesar Traianus Hadrianus Augustus
 Olympius Panhellenius, savior and benefactor of the whole world, grandson of
 the deified Traianus, great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician
 power, twice consul; Fl. Temon high priest at the temple of Asia in Pergamon
 (set up) his benefactor.

19)

Provenience: Lycia et Pamphylia, Selge.
 References: SEG 41, 1250; IGSK 37, 8.
 Description: IGSK: Auf der Vorderfläche der rechten Seitenwange des Podiumstempels. Der
 Tempel in Selge war wahrscheinlich nicht L. Aelius Caesar alleine geweiht,
 sondern auch dem Hadrian, dessen Namen wir auf der Vorderfläche der anderen
 Seitenwange vermuten.
 Type of monument: Temple.
 Dimensions: 1.16 x ? x 1.24 m.; letter size: 0.05–0.062 m.
 Context: On a temple.
 Date: 136–.
 Inscription: Λούκιον | Αἰλίον | Καίσαρα | ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος]
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar (set up by) the Council and the People.

20)

Provenience: Galatia, Iconium.
 References: CIL III, 12136; AE 1902, 170; AE 1903, 257; G. Mendel, Le musée de Konia,
 BCH 26 (1902) 214, no. 5.
 Description: Mendel: Dans le jardin. Provenance: Konia. Base de calcaire bleu.
 CIL: Konia nuper rep. in fundamentis aedium privatarum.
 Type of monument: Base.
 Dimensions: Unknown.
 Context: Unknown.
 Date: 137 (cos 2 / Hadrian trib pot 21).
 Inscription: L(ucio) Aelio Caesari | Imp(eratoris) Traiani Hadr[i] | ani Aug(usti) Pontifi | cis
 maximi trib(uniciae) | pot(estatis) xxi imp(eratoris) ii co(n)s(ulis) | iii p(atris)
 p(atriciae) fil(io) Divi Traialni Parthici nepolti Divi Nervae pronepoti trib(uniciae)
 potest(atis) | co(n)s(uli) ii Col(onia) Aelia Haldriana Aug(usta)
 Translation: L. Aelius Caesar, son of Emperor Traianus Hadrianus Augustus, pontifex
 maximus, holding tribunician power for the 21st time, emperor twice, consul
 three times, father of his country, grandson of the deified Traianus Parthicus,
 great grandson of the deified Nerva, holding tribunician power, twice consul (set
 up by) Colonia Aelia Hadriana Augusta.

21)

Provenience: Cappadocia, Comana Pontica.
 References: AE 1991, 1493; IGRR III, 105; B. Rémy, Deux inscriptions du Pont en
 l'honneur de L. Aelius Caesar, Pontica 1 (Istanbul 1992) 104–107.
 Description: Rémy: Autel de marbre mouluré.

Type of monument:	Altar?
Dimensions:	0.80 x 0.60 x ? m.
Context:	Unknown.
Date:	137 (ἔτος ργ).
Inscription:	[Αἶλιον Καίσαρα ἡ Ἱεροκαισαρέων Κομανέων πόλις ἔτους ργ'
Translation:	Aelius Caesar (set up by) the city of Hierocaesarea Comana in the year 103.

List of abbreviations

CIG = A. Böckh, *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum* (Berlin 1828–1877).

CIL = *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* (Berlin 1863–).

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin 1877–).

IGBulg = G. Mihailov, *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae* (Sofia 1958–1970).

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

IGSK = *Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* (Bonn 1972–).

SEG = *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum* (Leiden/Amsterdam 1923–).

Other abbreviations are those commonly accepted.