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ABSTRACT

The “games” - scenic representations, chariot races, gladiatorial combats and athletic displays - played a fundamental role in the Roman world. A great deal has been said on the program and cost of such events, on their social function, on the role of the senatorial élite and emperors as providers of games. These issues, however, can be treated almost only with the city of Rome in view; there is very little in the sources that allows for a study along these lines at the level of the several thousands of cities of the Latin part of the Empire.

The main reason for this is easy to identify: ancient authors show very little interest for municipal life and institutions. Our documentation on the production of games at the municipal level happens to be almost entirely composed of inscriptions written in a highly formalized language. This material can be deciphered only by bringing together and studying most or all relevant inscription on a given issue. So far, this has been done mostly according to categories of games; one team of scholars, for example, is presently republishing all inscriptions belonging to the world of the amphitheater: honorary inscriptions recording shows, gladiators’ epitaphs, dedications of amphitheatres, &c. Though this approach is commendable in many respects, it has the disadvantage of concealing features shared by the games in general. Accordingly, this dissertation studies the games as displays of the benevolence of the wealthy towards their community. Two broad objectives are set forth: to improve our understanding of the language of the inscriptions so far as the games are concerned, and to determine under what circumstances a production of games is worthy of an epigraphic commemoration. The second of these two objectives is justified by the surprisingly small number of about five hundred relevant inscriptions from the Latin part of the Empire over a period of more than five centuries.
FOREWORD

Some conventions are used in the text and tables. Bold numbers (1, 2, … 461) refer to the inscriptions in the catalogue at the end of this study. The symbol HS is used for the sestertius, a large bronze coin. Epigraphic conventions are explained in the introduction to the catalogue. Sometimes the material is broken down by period; the abbreviations used are: (R): Republican; (A): Augustan or thereabout; (I): 1st century; (II): 2nd century; &c.; (?): uncertain.

Abbreviations for periodicals are those of L’année philologique. Abbreviations for ancient sources are those of the Oxford Latin Dictionary; those not to be found there should be obvious enough for easy identification.

For the longer and better known inscriptions, abbreviations were preferred to the rather meaningless corpus numbers (thus AesIt for the so-called aes Italice, rather than CIL II 6278 = ILS 5163; but excerpts provided in the catalogue are numbered — in this case 4); the list of all such abbreviations will be found together with other abbreviations at the head of the reference section.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1. General introduction

There are several hundreds of Latin inscriptions which record the production of games (in the sense of "shows" or "spectacles") outside Rome by local magistrates, priests and private benefactors. This material is the subject of this dissertation. In the majority of the inscriptions that are collected in the catalogue at the end of this study, scenic representations, chariot races at the circus, gladiatorial shows, and other categories of games are understood by their providers, and by those to whom they were offered, primarily as gifts of visual entertainment to the community. The religious dimension of ludi, which scholars have studied in some detail, the didactic value attributed by Cicero and others to gladiatorial munera, rarely concerned the decurions or other local notables when they provided for the erection of an honorary or funerary inscription.¹ This is not to deny these and other issues a role altogether. However, records of gifts of games at the municipal level are almost exclusively found in inscriptions, and it was deemed appropriate that a study of this material should take into account what apparently mattered most to those who erected them. This chapter is largely devoted to justifying this view and discussing its meaning in terms of the subject-matter of the next chapters.

A word should first be said about terminology. It is not possible to systematically avoid the Latin terms ludi ("games", i.e. scenic representations and races at the circus), munus ("gladiatorial show"),² uenatio ("hunt" and "display of beasts", often appended to

¹On the religious dimension of ludi, cf. e.g. PIGNIOL 1923. On the didactic value of gladiatorial shows, cf. e.g. Cic., Tusc. 2.41; Plin., Pan. 33; and, for late imperial evidence, VILLE 1960 pp.304–7.
²The term "munus" has several other meanings, on which cf. P. Veyne, RPPh 49, 1975, p.89 n.3; cf. also infra n.58 and pp.54–55.
gladiatorial shows), *certamen* ("contest", often used for athletic displays), and the several other terms which will be introduced and defined in the following chapters. However, "games" and "shows" will be used as much as possible in order not to burden the text with Latin terminology.

A fundamental distinction is that between public and private games. Duoviri and aediles, or similar local magistrates, were required by municipal constitutions to organize *ludi publici*, also known as *ludi sollemnes* ("solemn ludi"). However, the expression "public games" will be avoided, since *munera publica* ("public gladiatorial shows"), where they existed, were generally not required constitutionally from magistrates but entrusted to *curatores munera publica*. To clearly distinguish constitutionally required games from other games, it was deemed preferable to use the expression "statutory games". Still, the public or private nature of the games will often prove to be fundamental for our purposes, but mostly in terms of the source of funding of the games.

2. Scope of this study

Since inscriptions provide almost all our evidence on the *editio* ("gift, production") of municipal games, this will primarily be an epigraphic study. Literary, iconographic and archaeological sources will be called upon mainly to shed light on the epigraphic record. This issue will be discussed once the chronological, geographical, and thematic scopes of this study have been defined.

The chronological limits of this study are conveniently set by the most ancient and recent extant inscriptions. No. 218 from Falerii Novi can be dated generically to the second century B.C. and is probably our earliest document; however, it is difficult to understand and highly idiosyncratic, and will hardly be discussed at all in this dissertation. Nos. 53a and 54a from Capua both date from 108 B.C. and belong to a group of inscriptions recording *ludi* organized locally by boards of *magistri*. Our latest inscription seems to be no.
from Ammaedara, which has been dated to the sixth century. Only one other inscription is possibly later than the fourth century, no. 254 from the *ciuitas Conuenarum* in Aquitania, which may belong to the fifth century.

A very large proportion of the inscriptions belongs to the first three centuries of the Empire. Accordingly, this study will focus mainly on that period. Republican and late imperial inscriptions will for the most part be used to set the imperial evidence in its proper chronological context. A detailed study of Republican and late imperial games would take us away from our objective. The attention given to the literary sources – more prominent than inscriptions towards each end of the continuum – would be increased significantly and relegate the epigraphic study to the background.3 For the earlier stages, one would also need to look closely at the influential rôle of the center of the Empire, Rome, for which we have so much more information.

There are, however, several reasons to study municipal games as much as possible independently from Roman games, and therefore to exclude the Urbs from this investigation, except to shed light on the municipal evidence. Rome’s system of public entertainments was unique by its scale and complexity and, during the Empire, by the emperor’s virtual monopoly over the provision of non-statutory games. Two aspects will be briefly discussed here.

(1) The number of days in the year when statutory games4 were celebrated was infinitely greater in Rome than in any Italian or provincial community. At the beginning of the Empire, Rome had eight main celebrations of *ludi*, all entrusted to the praetors: the *ludi Magni, Plebei, Apollinares, Ceriales, Megalenses, Florales, Victoriae Sullanae* and *Victoriae Caesaris*. These *ludi* accounted for a total of seventy-seven days in the year, and

---

3A detailed study of the games in the Late Empire would also require that legal *codices* be given more attention than they will receive in this study.

4For sake of clarity and consistency I will refer to Rome’s *ludi publici* as “statutory games”, but the expressions “solemn games” or “public games” would be more appropriate.
there were still others which were organized by other magistrates or priests, such as two
days each of circus games to celebrate the Consualia and Equirria. Emperors added many
more days of *ludi* to the calendar so that, in spite of occasional purges, there were 165 days
of solemn *ludi* (101 of *ludi scaenici* and 64 of *circenses*) when the calendar from Filocalus
was composed some time in the fourth century; there were also ten days assigned to *munera,*
which the quaestors produced annually in December.\(^5\) We learn from the *fasti Antiates* that
in Julio-Claudian times, HS760,000 were assigned by the State for the *ludi Romani* and
HS600,000 for the *ludi Plebei.*\(^6\) By comparison, the charter of the Roman colony of Urso in
Baetica required from the local top magistrates (duoviri and aediles) a total of sixteen days
of statutory games (2 §§ LXX–LXXI). In Julio-Claudian times, when the extant copy of that
law was engraved, together these magistrates were required to spend at least HS8000 of their
own money, and were entitled to as much as HS6000 of public money for their games. We
shall see in chapter VIII that these prices are likely to have been in use in many other
communities as well. There is therefore no common measure in terms of frequency or
splendor between Roman and municipal statutory games.

(2) The booty and prisoners acquired during the conquest of Dacia allowed Trajan to give in
108–109 a *munus* which lasted 117 days and at which almost 5000 pairs of gladiators
fought.\(^7\) But local notables did not have this virtually unlimited access to prisoners of war
for their shows. L. Fadius Pierus is honoured in Allifae, probably in the first half of the
second century, for having produced thirty pairs of gladiators and a *uenatio* (162); this
show, extremely modest compared to Trajan’s, is among the very large *munera* that are
known to us from a municipal context. But size is not all. The same notable gave another
*munus* a few months later, but his inscription specifies that he had received a subvention of

\(^5\) Cf. WISSOWA 1912 pp.466–67; Degrassi, *Inst* XIII\(^2\) p.534; Polverini in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA

\(^6\) For these and other figures, WISSOWA 1912 p.451 n.7; CAVALLO 1984 pp.132–33.

\(^7\) Fasti Ostienses, *Inst* XIII\(^1\) 5 fr. XXII = VIDMAN 1982 fr. J = EAOR IV 10A.
HS13,000 from the city. A year passed and he produced scenic games, but this time entirely at his own expense (*sua pecunia*). As we shall see, when both public and private funds are involved, municipal inscriptions are careful to distinguish between them, unless the private expense is alone recorded. This public–private distinction does not have the same significance in Italy and the provinces as in Rome. Throughout the Empire, we find notables producing gladiatorial *munera* on their own for a variety of occasions: more commonly, to fulfill a promise of such a show made in times of elections. In Rome, during the High Empire (at the same time when municipal inscriptions are most plentiful), the emperor has a virtual monopoly over the production of private gladiatorial *munera*. In 22 B.C. Augustus had severely regulated the production of such shows: a senatorial sanction was now required; no more than two *munera* could be given within a year; and 120 gladiators at most could be displayed in any show.\(^8\) But Augustus himself, in his name or that of a son or grandson, gave eight *munera* at which about 10,000 gladiators fought.\(^9\) He was obviously not bound by his own regulations (or if technically he was, the Senate could be expected to tacitly grant him a derogation), and kept for himself and his successors, but away from potential rivals, a powerful means of gaining popular support. The emperors’ *munera* show again that Rome is different from the rest of the Empire in terms of the production of games,\(^10\) and that the municipal evidence can legitimately be studied separately. It is worth adding that our no. 4, a *senatus consultum* from 176/177, regulates the price of gladiators throughout the Empire except in Rome.\(^11\)

Yet another reason to exclude Rome’s games from this investigation is the fact that considerably more research has been done on them. This is largely attributable to the

---

\(^8\) Dio 54.2.3–4; cf. Ville 1981 pp.121–23 on this ambiguous passage and on what follows; cf. also Wiedemann 1992 pp.132–33; Edmondson 1996 pp.79–81.

\(^9\) RGD4 22.1

\(^10\) It is true that emperors at times gave games in the cities they visited, but this was an exceptional occurrence for any given city; some examples are cited infra pp.21–23.

\(^11\) Mommsen 1892 p.396.
nature and quantity of the extant evidence, particularly the literary sources. Specialists of Roman games are in a way placing the same emphasis on Rome as ancient writers. A detailed study of the ancient testimonia, literary and others, on the games is beyond the scope of this study, but the evidence provided by two historians, the Roman Tacitus and Greek Dio, is illuminating and shall serve as illustration.

Some scholars have noticed that Tacitus shows little interest for the games. In this matter he has been contrasted for example with Suetonius, for whom the games given by the Caesares is an important and positive aspect of their administration. Tacitus belonged to the senatorial order, which perhaps explains his attitude, but even though references to the games in the Annals and Histories are usually much less detailed than in Suetonius, or Dio for that matter, they are still numerous enough to get a sense of Tacitus’ main motives in having them at all. A few examples will suffice to illustrate.

In 47, eight hundred years after Rome’s foundation, Claudius gave Secular Games. Tacitus himself had been on the college of fifteen (the quindecemviri sacris faciundis) assigned by tradition the duty of organizing these games, forty-one years later, under Domitian in 88 (Ann. 11.11). Augustus, we are reminded, had also given Secular games, only sixty-four years before Claudius, in 17 B.C. To explain the computation used by each emperor, Tacitus refers to a part now lost of his Historiae. As for the games of 47, we learn of Claudius’ presence in the circus during the lusus Troiae, an obscure equestrian

---

12Cf. e.g. VEYNE 1976 p.487 (omitted from the English translation).
13In BRADLEY’s words, 1981 p.132: “whether Suetonius’ final opinion of a given emperor is favorable or unfavorable, the spectacles which he records always appear in a context which is positive, that is, a context in which (in Suetonius’ judgement) the commendable items of a given reign are being listed”. Cf. also J. Gascou, Suétone historien, Paris 1984 pp.654–59.
14The few instances when Tacitus deals with games outside Rome will be discussed in some details below in section 3. These will only provide further reasons to exclude Rome from this study and use a mainly epigraphic approach to study municipal games.
15One would expect a space of either 100 or 110 years (each being a possible duration for the saeculum) between each celebration. Cf. PIGHI 1965; Id., DizEp IV s.v. “Ludi saeculares”; more recently F. Coarelli, “Note sui ludi Saeculares”, in Spectacles sportifs et scéniques dans le monde étrusco-italique (CEFR 172), Rome 1993, pp.211–45 with references.
display performed by the noble youth. Among them were Britannicus, natural son of the emperor, and L. Domitius, who not long afterwards was adopted by Claudius and given the surname Nero. We are told by Tacitus that young Domitius received greater popular enthusiasm than Britannicus, which was perceived as a presage of things to come. But on the cost or programme of these games, on their magnificence, nothing is said.

In 51, circus games were given by Claudius to win popular favor for the young prince Nero. For the procession, Britannicus wore the *toga praetexta* of boys and Nero, the *triumphal robe* (*vestis triumphalis*), so that the people anticipated their respective destiny (*Ann. 12.41*). The incident is strangely similar to that which had occurred four years earlier at the Secular Games, and shows again what matters to Tacitus. In both examples, as in most other instances where *editiones* of games are recorded in the *Annals* and *Histories*, very little, if anything, is said about program and costs. *Ludi* and *munera* provide settings where the emperor and his family are seen in action. The image of the games that one gets from Tacitus is quite removed from that which the producers of municipal games wanted to imprint on the mind of future generations. We shall see throughout this dissertation how in their inscriptions the latter or those who honored them considered the games first and foremost as benefactions for which one should be thanked or praised.

At times, too, Tacitus presents the games as not much more than a means of keeping the urban mob contented. Thus, while the orders were rejoicing and the better part of the people had high hopes after Nero’s death, the low plebs, frequenters of the circus and theaters (*plebs sordida et circa ac theatris sueta*), were among those most saddened by it (*Hist. 1.4*).

I now turn to Dio, who included many references to the games in his *Roman History*. A study of this evidence published some years ago shows that one of Dio’s main

---

concerns is with the conduct of the emperor during the games.\textsuperscript{17} We learn for example about emperors who have themselves participated in the games, or about their attire at the games. There are also some passages in which Dio expresses his opinions. Again, in most cases, his focus is on the emperor. Thus Gaius is blamed for his vulgarity when he himself participates in the games (59.10.3), or for his cruelty when he throws spectators to the beasts (59.13.2–3). His and Nero’s throwing of missilia at games are judged irresponsible and extravagant (59.9.6; 61.18.1–2). It is worth noting that in most of the cases emperors mentioned are the villains of the historical tradition: Gaius, Nero, Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla, whom Dio had come to know personally and hate deeply. The games provided Dio with a plethora of details about these emperors’ despicable conduct.\textsuperscript{18} The audience is also blamed at times for its behavior towards the emperor: servility to Commodus (74.2.3–4) is a typical example.

Such comments, however, are of little use to understand the gifts of games in Italian and provincial communities. More useful are those passages in Dio’s work about the audience’s demands at games and the nature of these demands, even though his focus is always on events taking place in Rome. The games provided the best opportunity for the people to voice their concerns, demands and objections to the emperor.\textsuperscript{19} That is what the knights did in A.D. 9 at the triumphal games for Tiberius Caesar, when they vigorously (but unsuccessfully) sought from Augustus the repeal of the law concerning the unmarried and childless (56.1.2). The audience at large – in other words, the people – could also formulate demands on the emperor. Typical are those by which they wished to reward deserving performers or trainers with manumission (57.11.6 and 72.29.4: asked from Tiberius and M.

\textsuperscript{17}NEWBOLD 1975, esp. pp.590–95 for what is to follow. See also H. Smilda’s useful index (vol. IV of Boissevain’s edition) s.vv. ‘agon’, ‘gladiatores’, ‘ludi’, ‘naumachia’, ‘venatio’. The present discussion is limited to the imperial period (Dio’s books 51 and following).

\textsuperscript{18}The tendency in Dio is quite the opposite from that in Suetonius: cf. supra n.13.

Aurelius respectively). Incidents such as these allow us to get some sense of the function of the games beside the obvious one, found in several ancient writers, of entertaining the unruly populace of Rome (on which cf. infra).

The literary evidence provides several reasons to think that it is desirable to study municipal games independently from games in Rome, at least until we get to a better understanding of the mass of relevant municipal inscriptions. Rome contrasts sharply with the rest of the Empire in the abundance of literary sources that focus upon it. These sources generally offer a different and more varied perspective on the games than the inscriptions (a problem which will be discussed in the following chapters), and the historian’s approach, the kind of questions he can ask of his material, are usually very different for Rome and for elsewhere.

Still, the Roman evidence will occasionally prove valuable and shed light on municipal games. This is especially true when ancient authors allow us to have a glimpse – partial and biased as it may be – at the social function of the games, as we have seen with Tacitus and Dio. Particularly relevant are details about the nature of the relationship between the producer and the audience. There may not have been in Italy or the provinces anything comparable to the level of expectations of Rome’s population towards the emperor at the games, and a positive or negative answer to demands may not have had in any way the same impact on history when it came from a local notable or the emperor, but it is legitimate to ask whether the games had come to function in Italy and the provinces, as in Rome, as a channel for expressing satisfaction and approval, for voicing concerns and releasing social tensions.

Even the inscriptions recording games held in Rome show striking differences overall from the Italian and provincial inscriptions in our catalogue. Very few belong to the categories of honorific and dedicatory inscriptions, which are our main source of knowledge for the production of games elsewhere. The proceedings of the Arval Brethren, of which we
have extensive remains inscribed on stone, record holdings of *ludi circenses*,20 but in an annalistic manner, and as part of their rituals; they are not intended to be perceived as benefactions. Likewise, the *commentarii* of the Augustan and Severan Secular Games, remarkable and instructive as they may be, record these events in terms that are rarely found in municipal inscriptions, since they are presented as religious events first and foremost. That, they undoubtedly were, but from the perspective adopted in this study, Augustus’ bare mention of his Secular Games in the *Res Gestae* (22.2) is more meaningful, as it belongs to the context of his *impensa* (on which cf. infra). The surviving portions of the *Fasti Ostienses* mention several *munera* held in Rome by the emperors; they provide a closer parallel to the inscriptions in our catalogue but, as we have seen above, imperial and municipal events should be treated separately.

Also excluded from this study are Greek *agones* and their organizers or curators, the *agonothetae*. By “Greek *agones*” are meant especially the sacred athletic, equestrian and musical contests still created in imperial times, with the emperor’s authorization, on the model of the great Greek sacred *agones* (Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia). Such contests were periodic, usually repeated every second or fourth year, and entrusted by the city to an *agonotheta*; winners were rewarded with a crown, never with money. Fine examples in the Latin part of the Empire are the Eusebeia founded by Pius in Puteoli and the Pythia instituted in Carthage probably by Severus.21 As for non-sacred contests, at which winners were rewarded with a sum of money or a prize with monetary value (in Greek terms, “chrematitic” contests, from χρήμα, “money”), they have been included in this study when

20 Some of the relevant fragments are C VI 2042, 2065 and 2067 (= ILS 230, 5037 and 5040 respectively); cf. J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères* (BEFAR 275), Rome 1990, esp. pp.636–39, 663–64.
organized and financed in the same way as other municipal games in the Latin part of the Empire. Most of the time, contests of this kind were provided for with returns from a private bequest to the community (cf. chapter IV).

It is important to establish whether the category of “games” is relevant in Roman terms. In other words, is it legitimate to bring together ludi, munera, athletic displays and other shows as this study intends to do? Terms such as spectaculum (“show, spectacle”), which appeared comparatively late in municipal inscriptions, will be discussed in chapter VI; but it should be useful at this point to determine what the literary sources have to say on this question.

In the Pro Sestio, Cicero claims that the people’s opinion on public affairs can best be expressed in three sorts of contexts: at the public meetings known as the contiones, at the comitia, and at ludi and gladiatorial combats: etenim tribus locis significari maxime populi Romani iudicium ac uoluntas potest: contione, comitiis, ludorum gladiatorumque consessu (Sest. 106). This passage is at times cited to show that ludi and munera (here gladiatores) were two distinct things. But at the same time, in Cicero’s mind ludi and munera constitute together the third context where public opinions could be expressed. Of course, Cicero is not concerned here with the nature of the games, and one could argue that it is rather superficially that ludi and munera share something in this passage. But the rapprochement is significant considering that, in Cicero’s days, the solemnity of ludi contrasted sharply with the private (and funerary) character of munera (cf. chapter III).

A century and a half after Cicero, Tacitus deplored the fact that the noble youth of the day were devoting all their attention to the games (Dial. 29.3):

iam uero propria et peculliaria huius urbis uita paene in utero matris concipi mihi uidentur, histrionalis fauor et gladiatorum equorumque studia: quibus occupatus et obsessus
This excerpt, like Cicero's, says something about the audience, but also about the performers. No distinction is drawn between them: actors, gladiators, horses, they all take the mind away from the "worthy attainments". From the moral point of view, the games are all corrupting. The piece is not aimed at being a (technical) explanation of the games, and obviously someone as learned as Tacitus knew the difference between ludi and munera. But in a way, this is what makes his words valuable. Incidentally, the noble youth, the author's subject here, seem not to have cared much for the religious aspect of the games – at least not as much as for their faction or favorite gladiator's armatura; but the religious aspect is given much attention by scholars who want to emphasize the differences between ludi and munera; these differences no doubt existed, but the passage quoted suggests that they had lost much of their significance when Tacitus was writing in the later first century.

Suetonius is valuable for the present purpose. In his biographies, this author often refers to an emperor's games collectively as spectacula; just as in the inscriptions collected at the end of this study, these games are benefactions23 – in this case, of generous emperors towards their people. It should be added that Suetonius was a specialist of the games, since he published two studies about them (one each on Greek and Latin games) now lost except for a few fragments;24 moreover he wrote his Caesares in the early second century, which is at about the middle of the period to which the bulk of our inscriptions belongs.

---

22"Really I think that the characteristic and peculiar vices of this city, a liking for actors and a passion for gladiators and horses, are all but conceived in the mother's womb. When these occupy and possess the mind, how little room is left for worthy attainments!" (transl. J.R. Church & W.J. Brodribb in M. Hadas ed., Complete Works of Tacitus, New York 1942).


24The fragments of these and other works of Suetonius on the games (including children's games) are collected by A. Reifferscheid, C. Suetonius Tranquillus. Praeter Caesarem libros reliquiae, Leipzig 1860 (repr. 1971), pp.322–46.
In his biography of Caesar, Suetonius provides what amounts to a definition of *spectaculum: edidit* (Caesar) *spectacula uarii generis: munus gladiatorium, ludos etiam regionatim urbe tota et quidem per omnium linguarum histriones, item circenses, athletas, naumachiam* (Iul. 39.1). These are the funerary *munus* that Caesar gave in 46 and the games by which he celebrated his Spanish triumph in 45. Suetonius goes on with details about each of the events. At the circus games, beside the regular chariot races and a *Troia, uenationes* were presented for five days (39.4). With regard to the *munus*, Suetonius had said earlier that Caesar had promised it, together with a banquet (*epulum*), in memory of his daughter Julia who had died in 54 (26.3). And now, when the *munus* is actually offered (39.2), there is no allusion to its funerary character, nor to that of the banquet (38.4). One scholar said that “ce silence s’explique apparemment par le désir d’éviter une redite, et parce que le caractère funéraire du *munus* et de l’*epulum* dut s’estomper dans l’aura triomphale où baignèrent les autres largesses et les autres spectacles.” But Suetonius makes it clear that even when the promise was being made these were generosities (*largiitones*) which were to help Caesar in achieving his higher ambitions (26.3).

Suetonius presents the *spectacula* in a similar way – that is, a general introductory statement followed by a detailing of each item – in other lives as well. There is no need to go through each example, but his *Nero* offers a close parallel to the passage quoted above: *spectaculorum plurima et uaria genera edidit: iuuenales, circenses, scaenicos ludos,*

---

25“He produced games of different kinds: a gladiatorial show, scenic games in every ward of the city and, what is more, with actors speaking all languages, circus games, athletic contests and a mock sea battle.”
26On all these cf. VILLE 1981 pp.68–71.
27They were at that time generally part of the program of the *ludi circenses*, which explains why they are missing from the introductory statement.
28VILLE 1981 p.69. The funerary character of the *munus* is attested elsewhere, particularly in Dio; cf. VILLE ad loc.
29See esp. Aug. 43; Cal. 18–20; Claud. 21; Dom. 4. The emperors who failed in their attempt to succeed Nero – Galba, Otho, Vitellius – did not rule long enough to be remembered for their games; cf. BRADLEY 1981 pp.131–32.
gladiatorium munus (11.1).³⁰ In this and in the passage from the life of Caesar, and in the other lives generally, spectacula are benefactions to the people for which the emperors are praised.³¹ One notorious exception is Tiberius, who disliked the games and kept them to a minimum. Suetonius’ “implied criticism”³² is aimed at this and, in the same stroke of the pen, at the emperor’s unimpressive record for another type of benefaction, building activity, since he did not even complete his only two such undertakings, the erection of the temple of Augustus and restoration of Pompey’s theater (Tib. 47.1).

But it is in the fictional speech Dio attributes to Maecenas that we get one of the most clearly articulated views on the meaning and purpose of the games, not only in Rome but also in the cities throughout the Empire (52.30.1–2, 3–4):

τὸ μὲν ἄστρον τούτο καὶ κατακόσμη ἑαμι πάση πολυτελεία καὶ ἐπιλάμπρως παντὶ ἐδει πανηγύρεων προσήκει τε γὰρ ἡμι πολλῶν ἄρχοντας ἐν πάσι πάντων ύπερέχειν, καὶ φέρει ποι καὶ τὰ τολάντα πρὸς τε τοὺς συμμάχους αἰδὼ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους κατάπληξιν. ... ἐπειτα δὲ μὴν οἰκοδομίας πλήθειν ἤ καὶ μεγέθειν ύπὲρ τὰναγκαία κρῆσθωσαν, μὴν ἄγων ἔξω υπολογίας καὶ παντοδαπῶν ἀναλώμασι δαπανᾶσθωσαν, ἵνα μὴν σπουδαῖς ματαίαις ἐκτράχωται μὴν διὰ καθημερίαν ἀλόγως πολεμἱόταται. ἔχεται λέγει καὶ γὰρ καὶ πανηγύρεως καὶ θεώρεις τοῦδε, χωρὶς τῆς ἰπποδρομίας τῆς παρ’ ἡμῖν πολουμένης, μὴν μέντοι ὦστε καὶ τὸ δημόσιον ἤ καὶ τοὺς ἱδίους οἴκους λυμαλεσθῇ, χένοις τε τοια μανακάζεσαν παρ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὀποίων ἀναλιπτέων, καὶ σίθειν ἀδίαντων πάσιν ἀπόλος τοῖς ἄγων τίνα γείσασθαι δίδοσθαι.³³

³⁰“He produced a great number and variety of shows: Iuuenalia, circus games, scenic representations, and a gladiatorial show.” Cf. VILLE 1981 pp.142–43.
³¹Cf. supra n.13.
³²The word is BRADLEY’s, 1981 p.133. On the consequences of Tiberius’ stinginess, cf. e.g. SLATER 1994 pp.122-25 on pantomime riots.
³³“Make this capital beautiful, spare no expense in doing so, and enhance its magnificence with festivals of every kind. It is right for us who rule over so many peoples to excel all others in every field of endeavor, and even display of this kind tends to implant respect for us in our allies and to strike terror into our enemies. [...] Secondly the cities should limit themselves in erecting public buildings to what is strictly necessary both as regard their number and their size, nor should they waste their resources in providing a large quantity or variety of public games: otherwise they risk dissipating their energies in futile enterprises and falling into quarrels as a result of senseless rivalries. Certainly they should hold a number of festivals and spectacles, with the exception of the horse-racing we have here in Rome, but not on such a scale that the public treasury should be impoverished, or the estates of private citizens ruined, or that any stranger resident should be compelled to contribute to their expense, or that every victor in every contest should be granted free subsistence for life.” (Transl. I. Scott-Kilvert: Cassius Dio, The Roman History: the Reign of Augustus (Penguin Classics), London 1987, ad loc.).
He goes on to say that the well-to-do should not be forced to spend their money outside their homeland; nor should athletes receive an allowance except those who win at Olympia, Nemea, or Rome, so that no city will suffer burdensome expenses, and no athlete will train who has no chance of winning (30.5–6). Dio then has this more to say about the horse-races (30.7–8):

τὰς δὲ ἱπποδρομίας τὰς ἀνευ τῶν γυμνικῶν ἀγώνων ἐπιστελουμένας οὐχ ἡγούμαι δεῖν ἄλλη τινὶ πόλει ποιεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν, ὅπως μήτε χρήματα παμπληθῇ εἰκῇ παραπολλύμεθαι μηδὲ οἱ ἀνθρώποι κακῶς ἐκμαίνωμεται, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, οὐ οἱ στρατευόμενοι τοῖς ἁριστοῖς ἑπειροῖς ἀδύναμος χρήσθαι ἔχωσιν, τούτῳ μὲν δὴ διὰ ταύτ' ἀπαγορεῦει παντάπασι μηδαμόθε ἄλλῳ πλὴν ἐνταῦθα γίγνεσθαι ....

He adds that the other games (τὰ λοιπά), as he had just said (30.3 quoted above), should be kept within reasonable limits; thus communities will live with greater moderation and avoid factious strife.

Although the debate between Maecenas and Agrippa, which takes almost the whole of Book 52, purports to be a commentary on the state of the Empire in 29 B.C. and an exposé of the options open to Octavian at this juncture, it has been shown that its true aim was to provide guidelines for the administration of the Empire in Dio’s own days. We therefore have the views of one of the most prominent senators of the Severan age about the administration of the Empire. But the interpretation of these views is delicate since Dio was not entirely free, in the autocratic regime of the day, to say or write what he really thought.

34"As for those horse-races which are not associated with gymnastic contests, I consider that no city other than Rome should be permitted to hold them. The purpose of this regulation is, first, to prevent huge sums of money from being thrown away to no purpose; secondly to discourage the public from becoming demoralized by its obsession with this sport: and above all to keep those who are serving in the army supplied with the best horses. It is with these factors in mind that I would prohibit outright the holding of such races anywhere other than in Rome." (Transl. Scott-Kilvert, ibid.).

on all issues; his criticisms of imperial policies and practices are necessarily veiled. The games provide a good illustration of this problem. Dio contrasts quite sharply Rome with the rest of the Empire. The imperial capital should be beautiful and no expense should be spared in making it so; it should also provide festivals of all kinds to increase its magnificence. Other cities should show moderation in all these matters, and no city beside Rome should hold the expensive *ludi circenses*. What to make of the exception made of Rome? It has been claimed that Dio is making "a concession not only to the importance of the imperial capital as the world's image of grandeur, but also to the vast expenditures the Severan dynasty lavished on the city." But this does not seem to go far enough. In the rest of his work Dio is concerned almost exclusively with the games in Rome, and his criticisms for lavish spending are directed against the emperors and the games they give in that very city. Therefore, I am inclined to agree that "the passage is disingenuous and is inconsistent with attitudes revealed throughout the rest of his [Dio's] work. ... By concentrating his criticism on the excesses of provincial cities, Dio restricts himself to an oblique attack on excesses at Rome." Therefore, without denying that Dio is worried by the heavy contribution asked from the rich for the provision of games in the cities, it is also the burden on imperial finances caused by the emperors' spending on games that concerns him. It is significant that the passage quoted above follows a discussion of the finances of the Empire (52.28–29). Dio, just like Suetonius, shows a lot of interest in the games, and in particular in the games provided by the emperors. In view of the economic context in which each of them lived, it is perhaps not surprising that he is much more critical of this kind of spending than Suetonius. But it is significant that Dio's discussion of finances and spending

---

36 That is what must be meant by the periphrasis at 30.7 (quoted above).
37 Reinhold, ibid., ad 30.1.
38 And we shall see that in the rare instances when he shows interest for events held elsewhere, the emperor is usually involved in some way.
provides a context in which the games, *ludi*, *munera* and athletic displays, share important features in spite of their basic differences.

The examples quoted are but a few which highlight one of the fundamental functions of the games at Rome during the Empire, that of being a gift of the emperor to his people. We shall see in the following chapters, especially in chapter IX, that this function found its way into the municipal context, though the shows were produced on an infinitely more modest scale and not by the emperor but local notables. For Rome, at least, it is possible to get a sense of how things had evolved since late republican times. As we saw, Cicero could perceive the games as a venue to express public opinions, but in his days, he could not have gone so far as Juvenal did in some of his most famous lines:

```

nam qui dabat olim  
imperium fasces legiones omnia, nunc se  
continet atque duas tantum res anxius optat,  
panem et circenses.40
```

Less than half a century later, Fronto said with less imagery a truth of the same kind, that “the Roman people is kept under control by two things above all, the corn-dole and the spectacles” (*Princ. Hist.* 17: *populum Romanum duabus praecipue rebus, annona et spectaculis, teneri*).41

In giving games the emperors are praised or criticized for great spending; rarely, if ever, is their devotion to the gods an issue. But the religious dimension of the games, particularly *ludi*, is not altogether missing from the literature of the Empire. Ironically,

---

40Juven. 10.78–81: “the people that once bestowed commands, consulships, legions and all else, now meddles no more and longs eagerly for just two things – Bread and Games” (transl. G.G. Ramsay, Loeb). Cf. also 3.223; 6.87; 8.117–118; 11.52–53, 195–201. For the record, note that VEYNE 1976 pp.84–94 (omitted from the English translation) rejects Juvenal’s view, which implies that the people had exchanged its freedom and political rights for bread and games; however, a full discussion of this issue, which concerns mainly the imperial capital, is outside the scope of the present study.

41One should not read too much into these passages and conclude that the capital was in a general state of idleness; on this cf. BALSDON 1969; ID. 1974 pp.267–68.
though, much of the evidence came down to us thanks to the Christian writers’ denunciation of pagan rituals and morals. One of the most prominent in their numbers was Tertullian, who wrote in about A.D. 197 his *De spectaculis* – one of the very few Latin works specifically about the games which is still extant.\(^{42}\) This is a violent denunciation of the four kinds of *spectacula* singled out by the author, the *ludi* of the circus and theater, the athletic *agones*, and gladiatorial *munera*, presented (first at 3.2) and discussed (7–12; 16–19) in that order. Tertullian’s main purpose is to tell Christians that they should forbid themselves from going to the games. All have their origin in pagan beliefs; they and the buildings where they take place are dedicated to pagan gods; the arts of the charioteers, actors, athletes and gladiators were originally taught to men by pagan gods. Tertullian goes to a lot of trouble to show that *munera*, introduced to Rome originally as offerings to the dead, were similar in their rituals to *ludi*, dedicated to gods and kings. But the impression left at reading Tertullian’s demonstration is rather that, in his days, *munera* had retained little if any of their original religious function. His account also proves the opposite of what he intended, since it shows that *ludi circenses* and *scaenici* shared features which, from the religious perspective, marked them apart from the other categories, particularly the opening procession (*pompa*) which left from the temples and altars and ended where the show was to take place (7.2; 10.2). Tertullian’s diatribe is addressed to fellow Christians, both new converts and those well acquainted with the faith (1.1). Obviously, a sizeable number of them did attend the games,\(^{43}\) and they seem not to have seen any problem in this for their faith. Tertullian’s very need to expose the superstitions of the games to his intended readership, and the length to which he goes (5–12), are indicative that the religious dimension of the games was not even obvious to many of them, or else, at the very least,


\(^{43}\) Cf. Ville 1960 p.294; Turcan, ibid. pp.43–44.
that religion was not an issue in their attending the games. For all his trouble Tertullian only shows what he himself says from the very outset, that the games were first and foremost “pleasures” in the eyes of those who attended them (uoluptates: 1.1 and passim).

In a useful epigraphic survey of ludi, it is stated that “l’uso antico – così degli scrittori come nelle epigrafi – distinse sempre nettamente i l[udi] circenses e i l[udi] scaenici da tutti gli altri spettacoli”. But this forceful statement needs to be qualified. For one thing, there are several instances in the Latin literature where ludi is said of Greek agones. More importantly, from the very end of the second century, but never before so far as we can tell, the term ludi starts being applied to gladiatorial shows. The earliest example is found in Tertullian’s De spectaculis (12.7), and there are enough instances in the following centuries to indicate that the traditional distinction between ludi and munera was eroding. However, all instances are literary; no epigraphic example has come to light yet. Still, we shall see in chapter VI and elsewhere that new terms appeared in the inscriptions from the end of the first century that, so to speak, transcended the traditional categories: spectaculum, editio, uoluptates. This is attested also in the literary sources, and some examples from Suetonius have been given above.

There took place yet another important linguistic change, which is attested in the literary and epigraphic sources, but has not received all the attention it deserves. The semantic link between the games of the theatre and circus – these two categories and no other being ludi – came to lose much of its significance as time went on. The term ludi was increasingly used to mean ludi scaenici, the term circenses, to mean ludi circenses (chapter

44L. Polverini, in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 p.2022. FRIEDLÄNDER 1885 p.494 had said the same thing in his essay on the games for Marquardt and Mommsen’s Handbuch: “Auch in der Kaiserzeit sind diese Schauspiele [i.e. Gladiatorenkämpfe], denen sich Thierhetzen anschlossen, von den ludi im eigentlichen Sinne stets als munera unterschieden worden.”
45E.g. Plaut. Stich. 306, Cic. Nat.deor. 2.6 (Olympics); Liv. 27.31.3, Flor. Epit. 1.23 [2.7].14 (Nemea); Plin. Nat. 4.18 (Isthmia).
46E.g. Min.Fel. 37.1; August. Conf. 6.8.13; HAHadr 9.9; HAGall. 3.7; Isid. Etym. 18.16.3.
II. Meanwhile uenationes, integrated by Augustus into the program of gladiatorial munera, seem to have always retained some sort of independence from the latter; this is shown by the inscriptions (chapter III) and by the fact that they survived even after the demise of the gladiatorial establishment in the early fifth century. Therefore, beside the distribution of the most important Roman games into the traditional categories of ludi and munera, there is another, simpler approach that places all the games on the same plane, while they together can be categorized as spectacula. The passages from Suetonius quoted above are evidence that this process had already started by the early second century at the latest. The inscriptions presented in the following chapters will show that it had started even earlier.\footnote{With regard to the literary sources, a detailed study of this question would be useful. L&S s.v. “ludus” provides the possible meaning of ludi = ludi scaenici; the OLD does not; nor does Kuhlmann in his long entry, TLL VII s.v.}

The distribution ludi, circenses, munus, uenatio tells us in yet another way what the games really meant to those who gave or attended them, or stayed away from them, for it puts emphasis on the specificity of each program and minimizes the historical factors that had brought together scenic and circus games and, more recently, gladiatorial shows and uenationes.

Much of what has been said so far about the concept of spectaculum is epitomized in Augustus' Res Gestae.\footnote{See GAGÉ 1977, esp. pp.13–15 for the structure, and the commentary ad loc.; BRUNT & MOORE 1967 ad loc.; R.W. Fortuin, Der Sport im augusteischen Rom, Stuttgart 1996 pp.78–83.} One can identify three distinctive parts to this elogium written by Augustus about himself: the honores granted to him (§§ 1–14), his spending (15–24), and his res gestae as such (25–35); an appendix, certainly not original to him, recalls some of the expenditures. Two chapters are devoted to the games, and they are to be found in the section on expenditures. Chapter 22 records, respectively, his gladiatorial munera, athletic shows (athletarum spectacula), ludi, with particular reference to his ludi saeculares and ludi Martiales, and uenationes; chapter 23, a mock sea-battle (naualis proeli
It is worthy of notice that the Secular Games, "the greatest religious festival of Augustus' reign", appear in this section rather than in the context provided by chapters 6–11, where not only the religious honors granted to him, but also some of his major moral and religious achievements (§ 8) are recalled. Moreover, events that are made to stand out are those for which Augustus could take more credit in terms of expenses, not religion. Chapter 22 opens and closes with his munera and uenationes, which, unlike the ludi, he had to finance entirely on his own; in chapter 23 is singled out the sea-battle of 2 B.C. which had been given on the same occasion as the ludi Martiales, for the dedication of the temple of Mars Ultor.

3. Sources for the study of municipal games

So far, much has been said about the sources, but this section is more specifically about the topic of this dissertation. It is necessary to go back once again to the literary sources, and only then say something about the documentary value of the inscriptions. As for iconographic and archaeological sources, they will be discussed as they are called upon in the coming chapters to shed light on the epigraphic record.

We have already seen that literary sources provide much evidence on the games at Rome, but at times they also mention events that took place elsewhere. Again, Tacitus and Dio will serve as illustration of the ancient historian's purposes in doing so.

Tacitus makes several references to the holding of ludi, munera and other events elsewhere than Rome. These can be divided into two basic categories. One of them, not surprisingly, has for its real subject the emperor (or a pretender) and his family. Thus, at the

---

49 BRUNT & MOORE 1967 ad loc.
birth of a daughter by Poppaea, Nero was overcome with joy – *ultra mortale gaudium* says Tacitus – and among other benefactions presented Antium, her birthplace, with a *certamen* like that at Actium, and a *ludicrum circense* in honor of the Claudii and Domitii, just as the Iulii had theirs at Bovillae (Ann. 15.23). *Munera* in Cremona and Bononia are mentioned because they were organized for Vitellius by Fabius Valens and Alienus Caecina, his legates. “Vitellius”, we are told, “was never so intent on the cares of Empire as to forget his pleasures” (Hist. 2.67, 70–71; 3.32). In these and other instances, the pattern is quite like that described earlier about games held at Rome. Tacitus is provided with a setting where the imperial family can be judged for its behavior.

In some other instances a disaster occurred and accounts for the author’s parenthetical interest. At Fidenae near Rome, under Tiberius, a poorly built wooden amphitheater collapsed during a show. Fifty thousand were either disabled or crushed to death (but cf. infra n.488). The provider of the show, a freedman, who was also responsible for building the amphitheater, was banished. Tacitus has a dig at Tiberius in passing, since so many in the audience had come from Rome where, under his rule, they were deprived of such kinds of entertainment. A senatorial decree followed to regulate the production of such shows and the building of amphitheaters (Ann. IV.62–63; cf. infra pp.208–10). At Pompeii in A.D. 59, during a gladiatorial show, a riot, which had broken out in the audience between Pompeians and Nucerians, turned into bloodshed. The organizer of the event, Livineius Regulus, who had been expelled some time before from the Senate, was banished, as well as the instigators of the riot. The Pompeians were forbidden to have any public gatherings of this sort for ten years (Ann. XIV.17).

Otherwise, municipal games are perceived by Tacitus as a trivial matter – perhaps rightly so, in the context of the telling of Roman imperial history. No example

---

51 Quotation at 2.67; transl. Church & Brodribb; the Latin reads: *numquam ita ad curas intento Vitellio ut voluptatum obliuisceretur.*
reveals better his view than a decree of the Senate, passed in A.D. 58, about allowing the Syracusans to increase the size of their municipal (?) munus above the regulations which were in force. It is worth quoting at some length (Ann. 13.49):

Non referrem uulgarissimum senatus consultum quo ciuitati Syracusanorum egredi numerum edendis gladiatoribus finitum permittebatur, nisi Paetus Thrasea contra dixisset praebuissetque materiæ obrectatoribus arguendae sententiae, cur enim, si rem publicam egere libertate senatoria crederet, tam leuia consecetaretur? quin de bello aut pace, de uectigalibus et legibus, quibusque aliis <res> Romana continetur, suaderet dissuaderetue? ... Thrasea contra, rationem poscentibus amicis, non praesentium ignarum respondebat eius modi consulta corrigere, sed patrum honori dare, ut manifestum jieret magnarum rerum curam non dissimulaturos qui animum etiam leuissimis aduiderent.52

The decree may have been a trivial matter, but the senator who opposed it, P. Claudius Thrseae Paetus,53 is given the final words on the issue and leaves the reader with a favorable impression of him. The whole incident is in fact a pretext for Tacitus to provide his first character sketch of one of the most honorable senators of the period, one of the few who would not submit to Nero’s whims. His murder, on Nero’s orders a few years later, was the murder of virtue itself – uirtutem ipsam (16.21). One may note that, while they were no trivial matters, the disasters at Fidenae and Pompeii are not made to stand on their own either. In each instance, as here, the incident deserved in some way the attention of the Senate. It also provided Tacitus with a setting where characters from emperors to freedmen revealed their true nature.

Very few of the numerous gifts of games which found their way into Dio’s

52"I should not mention a very trivial decree of the Senate which allowed the city of Syracuse to exceed the prescribed number in the gladiatorial shows, had not Paetus Thrasea spoken against it and furnished his traducers with a ground for censuring his motion. ‘Why,’ it was asked, ‘if he thought that the public welfare required freedom of speech in the Senate, did he pursue such trifling abuses? Why should he not speak for or against peace and war, or on the taxes and laws and other matters involving Roman interests? (...)’ Thrasea in reply, when his friends asked an explanation, said ‘that it was not in ignorance of Rome’s actual condition that he sought to correct such decrees, but that he was giving what was due to the honor of the senators, in making it evident that those who attended even to the merest trifles, would not disguise their responsibility for important affairs.” (Transl. Church & Brodribb).

History took place outside Rome. As with Tacitus, when this happens it is usually that the event had something to do with the emperor himself or members of the imperial family. Such is the case of a munus recorded because it was given by Nero at Puteoli in honor of Tiridates (63.3.1). Munera in Lugdunum and Cremona (the latter also recorded by Tacitus: cf. supra) are mentioned because Vitellius was present at them (65.1.3). The occurrence of disasters at municipal events seems not to have concerned Dio as much as Tacitus. That at Fidenae (58.1a) would be unrecognizable without Tacitus’ account.

Dio’s own views, exposed in Book 52 but purporting to be Maecenas’, are more interesting and useful for our purposes since they provide a counterweight to the positive take which, as will become obvious, is characteristic of the inscriptions. The speeches in Book 52 constitute a long digression from the historical narrative and, in fact, it is perhaps from genres other than history that material can best be gathered which helps understand the inscriptions. A case in point is Pliny’s attitude towards the games in his Letters. This varies according to context and results in flagrant contradictions. Pliny is usually critical of the kinds of entertainment provided for the crowd. Thus in one letter he contrasts his studia with the banality of the circus and its worthless crowd (Ep. 9.6). But elsewhere he praises his friend Maximus for a splendid munus he gave in Verona (6.34). Likewise, in the Panegyricus, Trajan is praised for a gladiatorial show in which even the performers – slaves and criminals – provided a lesson of courage to the audience (33.1). Should this be dismissed as pure flattery? Whatever the answer is to that question, it is more important to see in Pliny’s inconsequence a useful reminder that our evidence, including the inscriptions, may only provide a very partial and biased depiction of the facts.

---

54 Again only books 51 and following are taken into consideration (cf. supra n.17).
55 This feature is absent from the lists in NEWBOLD 1975.
56 In the second part of his speech, §§ 19–40 and esp. 30 on the games: supra pp.14–16.
For the most part, inscriptions in this study are handled in bulk. The likelihood that we may better understand each individual inscription will be improved once certain basic questions have been answered, even if only imperfectly. For example, To what extent should we account for differences in the gift of games between towns or regions by a difference in local traditions or tastes, or rather by local epigraphic practices? Should we explain a greater amount of evidence in any given area by a greater degree of Romanization, by economic factors, or once again by epigraphic practices?

Because of the nature of the present study, every effort was made to produce a catalogue as complete as possible, and it should be obvious throughout the following eight chapters that the catalogue of inscriptions is an integral part of this dissertation. Inscriptions were included which contain facts directly relevant for the study of the production of municipal games in the Latin part of the Empire: mainly, records in honorary, dedicatory and funerary inscriptions of actual productions of games and of those who organized them; and copies in bronze or marble of regulations on the production of games. Except when they also inform on these aspects, epitaphs of performers or dedications of theaters and other entertainment buildings are not included. Also excluded are inscriptions which allude to liturgies (munera ciuilia) in general and which may or may not have included the production of statutory games.58 The material is arranged geographically according to where the games were produced, which is not always the same as where the inscription was found (such as in the case of several Pompeian posters advertising events to be held in Nuceria or some other Campanian town). However, relevant excerpts from municipal charters were brought together at the beginning of the catalogue since the measures they contain have a

58An excellent example is the Rescript from Vardagate (AE 1947, 44 = SI 13, 1) which deals at LL.3–6 with munera to be performed by freedmen of municipal patrons. Note also that the expression omnibus honoribus et muneribus (or oneribus) functus is common in Latin inscriptions. "Munus" here must be understood as the duties or charges which one must perform for his community.
much wider reach than the cities where they were found.\textsuperscript{59} It should be clear by now why, unlike most other thematic collections used in this study, no consideration was given to categories of events in the presentation of the material.\textsuperscript{60} One important aim of the geographical presentation is to stress how fragmentary our evidence is; entire regions have produced little or no evidence of the kind described above, even regions well equipped with the usual entertainment buildings.

However, should we really limit our corpus to such “positive” evidence as that which is contained in the catalogue?\textsuperscript{61} Among the regular duties of local magistrates was the production of statutory games which, as we shall see, normally had no reason to be recorded by an inscription. In many or perhaps even in most cases, inscriptions record gifts of games because they fall outside the normal pattern of production of such events. It would be impossible to take account of the entire mass of “negative” evidence of the kind just mentioned, but shortcomings caused by this will as much as possible be taken into consideration whenever generalizations need to be made.

It is worth adding in this context that a catalogue of 461 numbers (for a total of over 500 inscriptions), as impressive as it may seem, is surprisingly small when one considers that it covers a period of over 500 years.\textsuperscript{62} This tells that our evidence is very fragmentary, but also that non-statutory gifts of games were probably not as frequent as leafing through the catalogue might lead one to believe. F. Jacques is certainly right that \emph{évergésies} (gifts to the community of buildings, banquets, games, &c.) were exceptional

---

\textsuperscript{59}Three examples: (1) there is an echo of the \textit{lex Tarentina} (1) in a Pompeian inscription (81); (2) the evidence is plenty that magistrates were required to produced games not only in Urso (2) or Irmi (3), but in cities all over the Roman world (pp.159–69); and (3) a \textit{senatus consultum} of 176/177 on the price of gladiatorial shows is known from inscriptions found in Italica in Baetica (4) and Sardis in Asia (\textit{ILS} 9340).

\textsuperscript{60}Cf. in particular \textit{CIDER}, \textit{EAOR}, Fora, Robert and ST in the list of abbreviations, pp.315–17.


\textsuperscript{62}It is also remarkable that there is a comparable number of over 500 attested or probable entertainment buildings (mainly theaters, amphitheaters and circuses, but also odeons and stadia) in the Latin part of the Empire.
moments in the life of a notable and that even a single benefaction could secure a life-time glory.\textsuperscript{63}

There are still other problems with the approach adopted in this dissertation. Most importantly, as Jacques pointed out, the epigraphic evidence mostly presents an idealized view of things:

A de rares exceptions près, les conflits n'apparaissent pas [dans les inscriptions] et les actes sont traduits dans un code où il est difficile de démêler ce qui relève du poncif et de la réalité: les femmes sont vertueuses, les époux aimants; les enfants révèrent parents et ancêtres qui leur dictent leur conduite; les notables se consacrent à leur cité et ils dépensent sans compter pour des humbles qui leur savent gré de leur munificence; pas un décret qui ne soit pris à l'unanimité du conseil.\textsuperscript{64}

This problem can be rectified to a large extent by studying the inscriptions together with the legal sources, whose purpose is to record conflicts\textsuperscript{65} and relate the rulings of the imperial authorities to resolve them. However, given the quantity of epigraphic evidence to be sorted and analyzed, it was judged preferable within the limits of this dissertation to leave aside the legal sources. For the most part this will not affect the analyses in the following chapters, except perhaps in chapter IX where, for example, notables may appear very eager to honor their community with games, while the legal sources show that they were at times more eager to make promises of games and other benefactions than to deliver on them.

Finally, it needs to be said that the approach adopted in this dissertation owes much to the fundamental study of Paul Veyne on euergetism, \textit{Le pain et le Cirque},\textsuperscript{66} even though it will be cited only very infrequently in the following chapters.\textsuperscript{67} The term

\textsuperscript{63}JACQUES 1984 p.711. With regard to the games, the gift of a single gladiatorial show could bring about such glory, while the much less expensive \textit{ludi} rarely did (cf. infra pp.819–27 and esp. 824–27).

\textsuperscript{64}JACQUES 1984 p.XXIII; cf. p.719.

\textsuperscript{65}E.g. between a city and a notable over the payability of a benefaction promised \textit{ob honorem} (on which cf. infra pp.193–96).

\textsuperscript{66}VEYNE 1976; Veyne had already published an article on this topic: “\textit{Panem et Circenses: l’évergétisme devant les sciences humaines}”, \textit{Annales ESC} 24, 1969, pp.785–825.

\textsuperscript{67}For one thing, Veyne discusses euergetism in the Greek cities of the Hellenistic and imperial periods, and in Republican and imperial Rome, but resolved to exclude municipal life in the western part of the Empire,
"évergétisme" ("euergetism", for which there is no exact ancient equivalent) was apparently coined by A. Boulanger in the 1920s but, as P. Garnsey remarked, "the topic is Veyne's invention". Veyne provides definitions of euergetism at several points in his study and the following one will serve our purpose:

Euergetism means the fact that communities (cities, collegia) expected the rich to contribute from their wealth to the public expenses, and that this expectation was not disappointed: the rich contributed indeed, spontaneously or willingly. Their expenditure on behalf of the community was directed above all to entertainments in the circus or the arena, and, more broadly, to public pleasures (banquets) and the construction of public buildings - in short, to pleasures and public works, voluptates and opera publica.

Elsewhere, such benefactions are said to be "contributions ... versées, spontanément ou du moins sans obligation formelle, par des personnes qui ont un intérêt quelconque, matériel ou spirituel, à la poursuite de l'objectif que ces contributions permettent d'atteindre." So far as the games are concerned, Veyne's definition puts emphasis on the distinction between what I have termed statutory and non-statutory games, since only the latter are true benefactions. However, in order to establish which gifts of games are statutory and which

"whose treatment would have overburdened the historical narrative with a weight of sociological theory and learned references" and bored readers who are not specialists in ancient history (VEYNE 1976 pp.9–10 = English translation pp.1–2). More importantly, it was said (rightly) that Veyne is "retranché derrière un fichier inaccessible au lecteur"; also, that often "il s'abstient de fournir les preuves de ce qu'il affirme" or "se limite à un ou deux exemples qu'il juge caractéristiques"; finally, that "il a moins démonstration historique [in chapters II–IV] qu'illustration historique d'un ensemble théorique qui se présente entièrement constitué [in chapter I, which is a methodological exposé], même s'il a été en partie forgé au contact des documents" (J. Andreau, P. Schmitt, A. Schnapp, Annales ESC 33, 1978, pp.307, 324 n.8, 308 respectively). It should be clear by now why the present study, undoubtedly not without problems of its own, will not be undermined by these shortcomings. Therefore, Veyne's geographical focus and method of composition are sharply at odds with mine, which makes reference to his study a rather uneasy task.

69VEYNE 1976 p.20 (= English translation p.10, which is quoted here).
70VEYNE 1976 p.25 (omitted from the English translation).
71It does not matter much in the present context that Veyne's understanding of what constitutes euergetism as such (= non-statutory gifts) and obligatory euergetism (= statutory gifts, which according to him came later and were a manifestation of the decline of civic values and institutions) is often at odds with mine; but it does matter that without his investigation of the notion of euergetism, the present study would probably not have been conceived in the same way. (On Veyne's acceptance of the notion of the decline of the city, cf. JACQUES 1984 p.687 n.87.)
are not, it is necessary in a first stage to take into consideration all gifts of games. In fact, this approach will help to emphasize the fundamental distinction between public and private (or statutory and non-statutory) productions.

4. Content of the following chapters

The objective of chapters II–V is essentially to present and analyze the epigraphic material by individual categories: *ludi*, *munera* and *uenationes*, athletic contests, *lusus iuuenum*. Chapters VI deals with what I call “non-traditional” terms and expressions (such as *spectaculum* and *editio*) which appeared comparatively late in the inscriptions and, so to speak, challenged the traditional categories. Verbs used to express the production of games, prices, periodicity and duration of events, are some of the main topics discussed in chapters VII and VIII; the topical approach will better bring to light some important features shared by all kinds of games, and lead to a better understanding of distinctions which in my view have not received enough attention so far, such as that between public and private funding. Chapter IX expounds the reasons why local notables produced games, and why these were (or were not) worthy of being recorded in an inscription.
There were two forms of Roman *ludi publici* ("public games"): *ludi circenses* and *ludi scaenici*. The former, as their name indicate, were presented in a circus. According to the annalistic tradition, they were introduced to Rome by the Etruscan king Tarquinius Superbus. Their main program was one of chariot races, but there were also athletic competitions (on which cf. chapter IV). It is only several centuries later, precisely in 364 B.C., that under Greek influence scenic representations were integrated into the Roman system of public festivities.\(^{72}\)

The tables in the following pages provide all the expressions in our catalogue which contain the term *ludi*; the term *circenses*, derived from *ludi circenses* by nominalization of the adjective, is also included.\(^{73}\)

The first table presents the evidence on those games which are given their official name in the inscriptions (p.32). A glance at it allows one to appreciate how little data there is outside Rome for games known by an official name.

---

\(^{72}\)Tarquinius: Liv. 1.35.8; 1.56.2; Dionys. 3.68.1; 4.41.1. 364 B.C.: Liv. 7.2.3; cf. Tac. Ann. 14.21.1. Cf. in general *DizEp IV* s.vv. "ludi" (= POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977), “ludi circenses” (A. Licordari), “ludi scaenici” (Id.).

\(^{73}\)The following fragmentary inscriptions could not be attributed to anyone category: nos. 24, 113, 215E, 216, 309, 329, 351, 352, 386, 410, 411, 417, 427, 441, 449, 450.
### Table II.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LVDI KNOWN BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A. Ludi:  

1. **Florales**  
   - 210, 325; cf. 160 (Floralia); FCaer, FMAff, FPraen Apr. 28–May 3 (l. Florae); FFil Apr. 30–May 3 (l. Florales), id. May 3 (Floralici c(ircenses)); FVon May 3 (l. in circo Florae).

2. **Victoriae**  
   - 211 (l. V); 205 (l. V Caesaris Aug.); C VI 37836 = ILS 9349 (l. V Caes. ...); cf. G.2; FPinc, FMAff, FAllif, FMag July 20–30; FAmit July 20– (l. V Caes(aris) diui Iul(ii)); C VI 37834 i.36 (l. V Caes. et Claudi).

3. **Augustales**  
   - 167 (pro ludis Augustalibus); cf. FFil Oct. 12 (Augustales c(ircenses)); TabHeb t..50; FAmit Oct. 5–12, FAntMin Oct. 3–12 (diuo Augusto et Fortuna Reduci); FMAff Oct. 12 (August(alia)); AE 1927, 158 = Sherk 41 (Augu[stalia]). Cf. 164 (A.4).

4. **varia**  
   - 18 (l. Iunoni Sospiti Matri Reginae); 171 (l. deae Vetidinae); [41] (l. Honoris et Virtutis), cf. 26; 164 ([Aug.?] Caesari ... l. Augusti); 114 (Neroni Claudio Caes. Aug. et Agrippinae Aug., Ioui Optimo Max. et Genio coloniae l.).

### B. Ludi circenses or scaenici:  

1. **varia**  
   - 36 (l. sc. Pal(atina?) religione digni Fortuna Primigeniae); 2 (§ LXX: munus l.ue sc. Ioui Iunoni Minerzwe deis deabusque; § LXXI: m. I. lie sc. I. I. Met unus dies in circo aut in foro Veneri).

---

Of the six most important Roman *ludi publici* – magni, plebeii, Apollinares, Megalenses, Florales and Ceriales – *Florales* alone are attested outside Rome (A.1 in the table). These games were created officially in Rome some time in the third century B.C. and became annual in 173. They were famous in part for their obscenity, which was com-
mented upon not only by Christian writers but also by first- and second-century authors such as Valerius Maximus, Seneca and Martial.\textsuperscript{76} As for the scenic representations, there is no evidence that tragedies or comedies were part of the program; though mimes at least were presented.\textsuperscript{77}

Two municipal inscriptions record \textit{ludi Florales} (210, 325); another, \textit{Floralia} (160), that is, the festival to the goddess Flora rather than the games as such (if there were any). Do the \textit{ludi Florales} mentioned in the first two inscriptions belong as in Rome to a festival in honor of Flora (28 April–3rd May)? In no. 210, \textit{ludi Florales} are appended to a gladiatorial show. No. 325 from Cirta is the only reference to Flora known to me from the whole of the African provinces, which suggests that her cult was not particularly important there.\textsuperscript{78} It is true that Africa is better represented than any other region for events taking place at any point between the 28th April and 3rd May, that is, during the \textit{Floralia}, but the attributes of Flora seem to have been assimilated early on by the much better attested Tanit Caelestis.\textsuperscript{79} These facts suggest that in nos. 210 and 325 the divine epithet is more a reference to the particular program of these \textit{ludi} than to the cult to Flora. But even if the games took place during the festival to Flora, the language of both inscriptions (and also of no. 160) indicates that they, unlike Rome’s \textit{ludi Florales}, were not annual events, and were offered only irregularly, when a rich benefactor came forward and provided the funds to put on a show.

There are two municipal mentions of games to a Victory (A.2 in the table). No.

\textsuperscript{76}Lact. \textit{Div.Inst.} 1.20; Val.Max. 2.10; Sen. \textit{Ep.} 97.8; Mart. 1.35.8–9: \textit{quis Floralia vestit et stolatum / permittit metrecibus pudorem?}

\textsuperscript{77}According to Pestalozza, ibid. p.167, mimes were probably the only scenic representations at these games.

\textsuperscript{78}This is not arguing from absence of evidence; vows to all kinds of deities are very abundant in the African epigraphy (cf. \textit{C VIII Suppl.} 5, index pp.221–33).

\textsuperscript{79}The epigraphically attested dates for the period of the Floralia are collected and discussed by HERZ 1975 pp.193–97, 493–96. In the absence of an explicit reference to Flora, there is no reason to think that the games recorded in no. 249 were \textit{ludi Florales}; that the event was to take place every year on 30th April seems to be a coincidence; cf. further infra n.322.
205 from Iguvium records games to the Victory of Augustus. In the other inscription, no. 211 from Spoletum, whose Victory is not mentioned, but several inscriptions from the area, including that from Iguvium, record a cult or games to the Victory of either Caesar or Augustus; it is likely, therefore, that the games in Spoletum were also to the Victory of one of them. Such games, as well as the *ludi Augustales* to be discussed shortly, arose in the context of the impetus given to the ruler cult in the West at the time of Caesar and, after the civil war, Augustus.

The Caesarean colony of Urso required from each of the two aediles four days of games, one of which was vowed to Venus (2 § LXXI: B.1). Interestingly, the *ludi Victoriae Caesaris* celebrated in Rome by Octavian in 44 B.C. were a repetition of *ludi Veneris Genetricis*; these games in honor of Venus Genetrix, alleged mother of the *gens Iulia*, had been celebrated by Caesar in 46 for the dedication of the goddess' temple, and were repeated in his absence in 45. It is probable, therefore, that the day of games to Venus in Urso, and certainly in other Caesarean colonies as well, were a celebration of the Julian dynasty.

Outside Rome, *ludi Augustales* are attested in a single early imperial inscription from Aufidena which records that a portico and a *saepta* (voting enclosure or place) were built instead of giving *ludi Augustales* (167: A.3). There are several inscriptions which commemorate the building of monuments or paving of roads *pro ludis* (infra pp.166–68) but this one is singular in at least two ways: no other inscription fails to mention the title of the would-be producer (unless one cannot tell because of damage to the stone) and, at the same time, no other inscription says what games exactly would normally have been produced. The expression *pro ludis* indicates that the games were statutory, reiterated at regular intervals and, therefore, organized by an official or board of officials. In a municipal

---

80Nos. 197, 198, 205, and C XI 4367 are all from Umbria; C IX 5904 is from nearby Picenum.
81Detailed discussion in WEINSTOCK 1971 pp.88–103 and passim. Evidence is that both names were used as synonyms; cf. ibid. p.156.
context, the most likely candidates to organize *ludi Augustales* are the *augustales, seuiri augustales* and other similar boards which appeared in the middle years of the Augustan principate. These priests of the imperial cult, attested at Aufidena, are known elsewhere to have produced games or to have erected monuments *pro ludis*.\(^{82}\) Moreover, pontiffs, *flamines* and other priests were generally exempted from the production of games (p.191). All this suggests that Clemens was an *augustalis* and that he did not say so in his inscription, in an age when epigraphic concision was *de rigueur*, since the term *ludi Augustales* on the next line made that clear. The rapprochement *augustales–ludi Augustales* finds some support in a later second-century inscription from Nîmes which records *ludi seuirales*, that is, games organized by the *seuirales augustales*, a board of six *augustales* (266).\(^{83}\)

The title *ludi Augustales* indicates that an aspect of these games was devotion to Augustus alive or deified. This is true for Rome, where such games had been celebrated since 11 B.C.,\(^{84}\) but one may wonder whether such devotion mattered much in Aufidena, where these games were cancelled and replaced by some program of public building (perhaps even at a time when Augustus was still alive and well).\(^{85}\) This suggests that any connection between Roman and municipal *ludi Augustales* must have been rather weak,\(^{86}\) the more so when one considers that the *augustales* were a municipal institution which had no exact equivalent in Rome. Still, the *ludi Augustales* normally celebrated in Aufidena

---


\(^{83}\) Cf. Table II.4: K.4 and pp.49–50, where it is argued that “*ludi seuirales*” is probably not an official denomination.


\(^{85}\) The title *ludi seuirales*, in the inscription from Nîmes just mentioned, also suggests that the religious function came to lose much of its significance.

\(^{86}\) Such connection is suggested by M. Buonocore, *SI* 8 ad no. 5 (= 167), but he remains vague.
could well be a case of adaptation of a Roman institution to the more modest needs and capabilities of a small Italian community.

There is no parallel to the *ludi Augusti* attested in Foruli, a subdivision of Amiternum (164: A.4 in the table). According to S. Segenni, these games were possibly the same thing as *ludi Augustales* (which she too understands as being provided by the *augustales*, but without saying why exactly). J. Bodel replied that they rather recall or even translate the quinquennial Greek *agon* instituted at Naples in honor of Augustus in A.D. 2;\(^{87}\) and he reminds us of Suetonius' statement, that *ludi quinquennales* were established in the provinces in almost every town — *paene oppidatim*. Neither hypothesis, however, is satisfactory, since they both take for granted that these *ludi Augusti* were periodical (and therefore statutory), which is improbable. The unusual quantity of details provided strongly suggests that these games were exceptional. The recipient of the honor, Augustus, is named and given at least one title (*pontifex maximus*); we are told where inside the town the games took place; and a consular date is provided. The very fact that the event was commemorated argues in the same sense, since statutory games were rarely the object of an inscription (chapter IX). One can note also a "personalized" ring to the document, which was obviously commissioned by the producer whose name is at the head of the inscription; his colleague's name, meanwhile, introduced by *cum*, is inconspicuously relegated to the third line. Since we are dealing with some kind of board, it is likely that such *ludi Augusti* were official and public in some way. The question of their exact nature will have to remain open,\(^{88}\) but the hypotheses of Segenni and Bodel can safely be set aside.

An inscription from Puteoli, no. 114 (A.5), shows similarities with, but also important differences from, the inscription just discussed. It tells about games organized by


\(^{88}\)Were they votive games? Cf. C VI 385 = ILS 95; C VI 386 = ILS 88; *AE* 1904, 84 = ILS 8894.
three *augustales* (therefore, *ludi Augustales*?) and dedicated to Nero, Agrippina, Jupiter and the Genius of the colony. There are several reasons to consider these games as statutory (and not as an exceptional production, as in no. 164), that is, as a regular duty of the local *augustales*. The inscription reads as a factual account of the event; there seems to be more emphasis on the producers' title than on their name, which indicates that it was in their capacity as *augustales* that they organized the games. The wording of the whole document, the fact that the three producers are given an equal weight, and most of all, the mention of some curators (of the event? for the erection of the inscription?), strongly suggests that this is an official document of the local college of *augustales*. This is also one of the few municipal inscriptions which say something of the religious function of the games, namely, in this case, the cult of the reigning emperor.  

The remaining events follow the pattern of being identified by the name in the dative or genitive of the deity to which they were offered (A.5 and B.1 in the table). *Ludi Honoris et Virtutis* (41) are known also in Rome, where according to one source (*schol. Bob. ad Cic. Sest. 116*) they were celebrated in honor of Marius. The homonymous games of no. 41 were possibly inspired by those.  

Juno Sospes, to whom games were vowed in Lanuvium (18), was "la divinità lanuvina per eccelenza". The goddess Vetidina (171) is not otherwise known; obviously this was a local deity. Games in Praeneste were vowed to Fortuna Primigenia, the most important local deity (36). As we saw, the *Lex Vrsonensis* 

---

89 Cf. further infra pp.132–33. The significance of this inscription for our knowledge of the functions of the *augustales* has been neglected by scholars; cf. in particular DUTHOY 1978 p.1297 with n.357, who considers these games simply as a liberality.

90 See WEINSTOCK 1971 p.231. Note that in Ostia, games were offered for the dedication of statues of Honor and Virtue (26). Weinstock takes them to be *ludi Hon. et Virt.*, but this is misleading since they are dedicatory games, not statutory games repeated periodically in honor of the two deities. Moreover, the *Fasti Ostienses* do not record statutory games, but only exceptional gifts of games in Rome (particularly the *munera* offered by emperors) and Ostia. This explains why so few Ostian events – *ludi* or *munera* – are recorded.

91 FORA, *EAOR* IV ad no. 27.

92 Extensive discussion in GRANINO CECERE 1987. The goddess is known from other local inscriptions, including no. 32.
mentions *ludi Veneri* to be organized by the aediles alone, but both duoviri and aediles had to provide for games to the Capitoline triad and to other unnamed gods and goddesses (2).

All *ludi* known by an official name have a religious element to them. Two broad categories can be identified: *ludi* vowed to a Roman or local god or goddess; *ludi* produced in the context of the cult of the reigning or posthumously deified emperor. Reasons were provided above to think that the religious significance of municipal *ludi Florales* and *ludi Augustales* was rather superficial. It is unfortunately not possible in most cases to know what was the true significance of the religious element; as we saw in the Introduction, our inscriptions are not likely to say much on that issue, and it would be adventurous to conclude from epigraphic evidence alone that this aspect was unimportant. It is worth noticing that almost all the inscriptions in the table come from a narrow area corresponding roughly to central Italy (*regiones* I, IV and VI). It is perhaps because of a longer history of contacts with Rome and earlier adoption of its *ludi* that the practice of naming the gods to whom they were vowed persisted during the Empire. In other words, it may be safer to explain this regional difference by epigraphic formalism than by a greater religious significance of the games in central Italy.

Geographical distribution is noticeable also with regard to our next category, *ludi circenses*, for they are almost never recorded in Italian inscriptions, while most of the fairly numerous provincial examples come from Spain (p.39).

Italy has produced half of the material in our catalogue, but accounts for only two actual productions of circus games (126, 127), and one testamentary foundation which seems to provide for annual gifts of such games (178). A decree from Pisa about funerary honors to Gaius Caesar forbids among other things to hold or watch scenic or
Table II.2

LVDI CIRCENSES

C. Ludi circenses not characterized as in D below:

1. l. circenses
   Leges: 2 § cxxvii, 225 l.30, TabHer l.64; Galliae: 252; Africa: 312, 422.

2. circenses
   Roma: C VI 312008, FOst a.d. 140, Fasti passim (circenses); cf. LudSaecS l.38 (circensium spectacula); Italia: [178], AE 1927, 158 = Sherk 41; cf. 126 (spectaculum ... circensium); Hispania: (I/II) 276, 283, 289; (II) 278, 279, 281, 290, 301, 307, 310; (II/III) 295, 303; (III) 308; (?) 284, 296, 297; elsewhere: [261], [408]; cf. 366 (circensium spectaculum).


D. Circenses + program:

1. c. missus ...
   [265] ([---]XXX missus per magistr[os]); 311 l.10, 14 (per mag[istros] ... circenses ce[leres] missus sex); FOst a.d. 112, [116] (c. missus XXX).

Circus games on the anniversary of his death (225). Several decrees from Cumae which record honors to a prominent individual mention the games, including circenses (sic) (AE 1927, 158: Tiberian). This is all the Italian epigraphic evidence for circus games. It is not impossible, however, that some programs of ludi (i.e. nude dicti: Tables II.1: A and II.4) contained both scenic and circus games; but this seems rather unlikely since ludi circenses were generally more expensive and prestigious, a strong incentive for the producer or those who honor him to be more specific. Moreover, Table II.2 shows that there is a strong tendency in the inscriptions, as in the literature, to use the nominalized form “circenses” in apposition to “ludi (scaenici)”. All this suggests that few, if any, of the Italian inscriptions listed in Tables II.1: A and II.4 record games that included one or several days at the circus.

---

93 See also Tables II.4: H.2 (ludi in circio) and VI.1: A.3 (spectaculum aurigarum).
94 Is it necessarily the case that circus games were put on in Pisa at that time, or at any other time? It seems to me that the measure might have been preventive. This is also what HUMPHREY 1986 p.574 thinks.
Our meagre epigraphic data are paralleled by the scarcity of archeological evidence for Italian circuses outside Rome. I follow J.H. Humphrey in dividing Italian circuses into two categories: those at sites connected with the emperor, which will not concern us here,\(^{95}\) and those in other Italian towns. In Puteoli a building has been identified at times as a circus, but that it might have been a stadium is more likely.\(^{96}\) Humphrey was able to find evidence for only two actual circuses, in Assisi and Anagnia, and neither from archeological remains.\(^{97}\) Even though producing chariot races did not require an actual stone building, the evidence for circus games and circuses in Italy is so scanty that it is safe to conclude that *ludi circenses* were virtually absent from Italian municipal life. "What are the reasons for this dearth?" – asks Humphrey. "The most plausible explanation may be that the races at Rome acted as a constant drain on the resources of the rest of Italy, pulling away promising drivers and horses almost before they began to be noticed."\(^{98}\)

Five of the inscriptions in Table II.2 come from Africa.\(^{99}\) To these we should add another which records a "show of charioteers" (*spectaculum ... aurigarum*) put on at Siliana (379: Table VI.1: A.3). In view of the abundant African material in our catalogue, this is very little evidence. However, one should not conclude that circus games were rarely seen in these regions; the inscriptions rather say that private gifts of *ludi circenses*, that is, non-statutory *ludi circenses*, were quite rare, while they say nothing about statutory

\(^{95}\) Cf. HUMPHREY 1986 pp.561–71, 613–25. To the list of sites connected with the emperor one could append the sacred grove of the Arval Brethren, where they held circus games, since Augustus was responsible for the revival of their cult and brought it in line with the imperial cult; cf. supra n.20 for references to some of their inscriptions.

\(^{96}\) HUMPHREY 1986 p.572. Descriptions of the building suggest that its width was too small for a circus and appropriate for a stadium; but its length, for what is left of it, was too great for a normal stadium. Was it a hybrid building designed to hold athletic events as well as Greek-style chariot races? For HUMPHREY, ibid., "it is most tempting to associate this building with the famous Greek-style games founded at Puteoli by Antoninus Pius in 138".

\(^{97}\) HUMPHREY p.574. Assisi: C XI 5390 = ILS 5346; Anagnia: Liv. 9.42.11–12. Medieval sources (the earliest from 1267) mention a circus at Capua: cf. Beloch, *Campanien*, 1890 p.343; HUMPHREY p.572. The latter also mentions p.686 n.125 that a circus has been reported for Telesia.

\(^{98}\) HUMPHREY p.577. Cf. also Dio 52.30.4, 7–8, quoted supra pp.14–15.

\(^{99}\) See FLORIANI SQUARCIAPINO 1979 for a useful survey of the epigraphic and archaeological evidence.
productions. Let us consider the example provided by Carthage. This city, the third largest during the High-Empire after Rome and Alexandria, had a circus by the early second century at the latest, and beside the architectural remains of that building, has left ample evidence for the popularity of chariot racing, particularly mosaics and lead curse tablets. The latter also show that there were factions as in Rome (the blues, greens, reds and whites), which means that the sport was highly organized. However, as yet not a single inscription commemorating an actual production of *ludi circenses* has come down to us from Carthage. But if such games were statutory and required from local magistrates, probably less or no need was felt for privately funded shows which alone were true benefactions and worthy of mention in an inscription. The inscriptions suggest in fact that in Carthage the preferred way of making an exceptional gift of games was rather to put on a gladiatorial show or a *uenatio* (353–355).

It is worth mentioning that some of the gifts of circus games which have come down to us from Africa seem to have been quite small. This is obviously the case in Auzia (311), where HS540 to be spent every six months on such games is a very small amount by any account. Siliana (379) and Henchir Bou-Cha (422) were so small that they are most likely to have held chariot races in open fields with as little man-made additions as necessary; horses and charioteers were probably gathered locally. The events mentioned in nos. 312 (Saldae), 366 (Hadrumetum) and 408 (Thysdrus) were probably bigger if only because those centers were much more important. Hadrumetum was also the site of a

---


103 On these sites cf. HUMPHREY pp.321, 330. Cf. also an early 3rd c. inscription from Thugga: *agrum qui appellatur Circus ad voluptatem poli[poluli] reipub(licae) remisit* (*IL Afr* 527 = *AE* 1997, 1654: “she gave to the city the field called ‘Circus’ for the people’s enjoyment”).
monumental circus,¹⁰⁴ and all four factions were known there.

Even though these shows may have varied greatly in size, they share one important feature. With the possible exception of no. 366, these ludi circenses were non-statutory gifts. The commemoration of an event, therefore, depended not so much on its size but on its private rather than statutory character. It is hard to imagine that any of the shows recorded in our six inscriptions, particularly those at Auzia, Siliana or Henchir ech-Châr, were in any way comparable in scale to even the most ordinary of shows put on in the circus at Carthage.

From Spain come twenty-two of the thirty-two productions of ludi circenses contained in Table II.2. To these we may add the legal provisions of the Urso charter on ludi circenses and on the aediles' dies in circo (2: C.1 and Table II.4: H.1). Several of the events were put on at sites which were quite small. This is particularly obvious in Baetica south of the Guadalquivir, where ludi circenses are attested at Ulia (308), Tucci (306, 307), Ossigi (296), and at the much more important Astigi (289, 290). No circus has been found at any of these sites, which suggests that they were not monumental stone buildings, but rather open fields adapted for chariot-racing. Humphrey probably holds part of the truth when he states that

the overall popularity of the sport in the small towns of these provinces [i.e. Baetica, but also Lusitania] may have much to do with the availability of high-quality racing horses from local stud farms: such horses needed to train and practise locally, and local circuses, even of a non-monumental kind, would have provided the opportunity as well as popular entertainment for the local inhabitants.¹⁰⁵

However, as in Africa, events are not commemorated for their size or magnificence but because they were produced while not formally required from the benefactor, such as at the

¹⁰⁵ HUMPHREY 1986 p.386.
dedication of a building or statue.\textsuperscript{106} To produce circus games privately seems to have been easier, and therefore cheaper, in Spain than elsewhere.

In light of the discussion so far, there is nothing surprising if such an important city as Tarraco, or for that matter smaller centers such as Saguntum or Valentia where monumental circuses are attested, have produced no epigraphic evidence of actual gifts of \textit{ludi circenses}.\textsuperscript{107} In Toletum, Corduba and Italica (this one the only site in Baetica where a circus has been discovered\textsuperscript{108}), gifts of \textit{ludi circenses} are attested, but all were privately funded.\textsuperscript{109} Just as in Carthage, the evidence suggests that such events were regularly offered and were part of the duties of the local magistrates or, in provincial capitals such as Tarraco or Corduba, of the priests of the imperial cult.

From the north-western provinces come only three inscriptions, one each from Narbo (265), Arelate (261) and Lugdunum (252).\textsuperscript{110} During the period for which \textit{ludi circenses} are attested epigraphically, only three monumental circuses are known in these parts, at Vienna, Arelate, and Lugdunum.\textsuperscript{111} For some reason the inscription from Narbo is mentioned by neither M. Gayraud nor J.H. Humphrey when they consider the possibility of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{106}HUMPHREY 1986 p.387 makes short but perceptive remarks to that effect. PIERNAVIEJA, CIDER pp.144–46 entirely misses the significance of the private/public or statutory/non–statutory dichotomy.
\item \textsuperscript{107}On the circus at Saguntum, HUMPHREY 1986 pp.344–50. The recently discovered circus of Valentia is reported by A. Ribera i Lacomba, \textit{JRA} 11, 1998 pp.318–37. The author is struck by the presence of such a building in a small center (p.318), but it could be that a circus was felt to be a higher priority than, say, an amphitheater, since horses and horse breeding were so important. I do not see how the circus at Saguntum, 25 km distant, should have prevented Valentia from having its own (ibid.). Games – statutory or private – were a municipal matter; if anything, the circus at Sagunto will have been an incentive for the people of Valentia to have their own . . . ; on monuments erected \textit{ad aemulationem alterius ciuitatis}, cf. Dig. 50.10.3.
\item \textsuperscript{108}There probably was a circus at Singilit Barba as well; cf. R. Atencia Páez, \textit{La ciudad Romana de Singilí Barba}, Málaga 1988, pp.44–45, with E.W. Haley, \textit{JRA} 10, 1997, p.501. J. DeLaine’s claim that the circus at Urso was famous for its racing stables (\textit{Oxford Classical Dictionary}\textsuperscript{3} s.v. “circus”) is mistaken; her source, Plin. \textit{H.N.} 8.166, says nothing of the sort.
\item \textsuperscript{109}Nos. 284, 295 and 299 respectively; all three are dedicatory shows, on which cf. pp.196–200.
\item \textsuperscript{110}There is literary evidence for these and other provinces and centers, but for later periods; for example Salvian, \textit{Gub. Dei} 6.87 says something of the passion for \textit{circenses} in Augusta Treverorum.
\item \textsuperscript{111}On these buildings, HUMPHREY 1986 pp.390–407. The circus at Lugdunum has not been located but is known from a famous mosaic (cf. HUMPHREY esp. pp.216–18) and two inscriptions: C XIII 1919 = ILS 5659; C XIII 1805.
\end{itemize}
a circus in that provincial capital. Humphrey’s arguments in favor of a circus are convincing and the present inscription supports his claim. Once more the shows were funded privately or on the returns from a private bequest to the community.

Since the epigraphic evidence is strongly biased in favor of privately produced events, the data in Table II.2 cannot be used to determine how frequent or popular circus games were in any given city or region. It is remarkable that very little evidence of actual gifts of circus games has come down to us from important centers, even where a monumental circus is known to have been part of the urban landscape in the High-Empire. This is probably because it would have been inappropriate for a magistrate to boast of a gift of statutory games or for others to honor him for that. It is in this context significant that those gifts of circus games that have come down to us from such important centers as Corduba, Lugdunum and Narbo were commemorated by an inscription precisely because they were private benefactions, falling outside the pattern of regular games.

The next table presents all epigraphic instances of ludi scaenici. Again, the geographical distribution is noticeable since most of our evidence this time comes from the African provinces (p.45).

Since scenic games were most of the time simply called ludi rather than ludi scaenici, the data in the table will be fully discussed only after ludi (nude dicti) have been presented. As we saw in chapter I, “ludi” was increasingly used in opposition to “circenses” to mean “ludi scaenici”. However, as the present table shows, the full form “ludi scaenici” was never entirely displaced and is particularly well attested in second- and third-century

---

Table II.3

*LVDI SCAENICI* 114

**E. Ludi scaenici not characterized as in F below:**

1. *l. sc.* (R) 21; (A) 10, 180, 225; *LudSaeccA* l.153; (R→l) *LexVrs* §§ cxvii; cxviii; (I) [15], 159, 162, 299; (II) 185, 292, 313; (II) 29, 38, [127], 171, 298, 302, 306, 307, 375, 377, 380, 385, 389, 390, 398, 402, 403, 461; 426 (spectaculum ludorum sc.); (II/III) 300, [326], [327], 340, 341, 342, 343, 397, 416, 418, 379 (sp. l. sc.); (III) 319, 331, 337, 345, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 404, [407], 425; (III/IV) 423; (IV) 203 l.19; l.32 (sp. l. sc.).

**F. Ludi scaenici + largesses:**


---

African inscriptions.

The last table presents the evidence on *ludi* which are not known by an official name nor qualified as *circenses* or *scaenici* (pp.46–47).

Table II.4 includes almost all of our Republican inscriptions. These are Italian except for no. 274 from Carthago Nova in Tarraconensis (G.1 in the table). Nearly all of the Republican inscriptions mention either *ludi* (G.1) or *ludi scaenici* (21: Table II.3: E.1); the expressions “(*ludi*) *circenses*” and “(*ludi*) in *circo*” are attested in late Republican legal documents, but actual productions are known only for post-Augustan periods. The only Republican documents in the catalogue which record something else than *ludi* are three sister inscriptions from Canusium (145: chapter III).

*Ludi* produced by boards during the Republic and early Empire were likely

114See also Table II.4: H.3: *ludi in theatro*; Table VI.1: E: laetitia theatralis.
Table II.4

LVDI NOT QUALIFIED AS EITHER CIRCENSES OR SCAENICI

G. Ludi not characterized as in H–K below:

1. ludi

(R) 17, 53–60, 163, 218, 274; 81, 82, 182, 183 (pro ludis); (A) 23, 32, 234; 42, 85, 136, 219 (pro ludis); (R⇒I) LexVrs § CXXV–CXXVII; (I) 3, [193], 222, 275; 6, 44, 86b, 190, 202, 221, [227], 228 (pro ludis or similar expression); C VI 31200A, Fasti passim; (I/II) 244, 259; (II) 26, 28, 31, 115, 126, 215A, C, D, 217, 249, 256, 330, 374; FOST a.d. 116. 140; 318 (editio ludorum); 16, 401 (spectaculum ludorum). (II/III) 187, 215F, 230, 344, 346, 347, 366, 378, 392, 399; 174, 314, 315, 334 (dies ludorum); 382, 383 (editio ludorum); (III) 387, 405, 406, 413, 431; 48, 231 (dies ludorum); 335 (ludum); (III/IV) 348; (IV) 213; 435 (editio ludorum); (VI) 349; (?) 223, 356, 421.

2. l. quos fecerunt ... ... magistratus: 1 LL.36–37 (l. quos publice (m.) facit), 2 § LXVI (l. quot publice m. faciunt); ... II uiri: 232, 233; cf. C VI 37836 = ILS 9349 (l. Martiales quos fecerunt (... consules, l. Victoriae Caesaris quos fecerunt ... praetores).

H. Ludi + place where they were held:

1. l. in circo

2 § LXVI (dies (ludorum munieris) in c. aut in foro Veneri); cf. LudSaecS l.38 (Table II.2: C.2); Fasti passim (l. in circo).

dedicatory (pp.197–98). Few inscriptions were erected by and for a single individual during this period. In Amitemum an aedile says most succinctly that he organized games (163). Much more informative is an Ostian inscription which is probably Augustan (23). Beside the unusually long and detailed list of benefactions, this document provides one of our earliest extant statements that a magistrate gave back the lucar, or public money he was

---

115Cf. also Table II.1: A.

116The expression ludi in orchestra found in DESSAU’s indices ad ILS III p.917, in DizEp IV pp.2024, 2093 (= POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977), 2125 (A. Licordari), must be rejected; the three quoted inscriptions, all from Veii (230, 232, 233), have the phrase ex aere conlata (“made” with money from a collection”), and one (233) clearly shows that in orchestra is meant to indicate where that collection of money took place; ludis, “during the games”, is an ablative of time within which (cf. TLL VII 1 p.1786 ll.72–83 for other examples); likewise gladiatoribus can mean “while gladiatorial combats are presented”; cf. VILLE 1981 p.44 n.112.
entitled to receive for the organization of *ludi* (LL.12–14). These were therefore statutory, and it is significant that they deserved to be mentioned precisely because the producer paid entirely for them.

What is meant by *ludi* when they are not qualified as either *circenses* or *scaenici*? Several points can be made: (1) As was suggested above (p.39) the greater prestige and cost of circus games probably were incentives to indicate that they were *circenses*, and not just any *ludi*. (2) The term “*circenses*” is much more common than “*ludi*.
circenses" in the inscriptions (Table II.2), and "ludi" more common than "ludi scaenici" (Tables II.3–4); as we saw, this same dichotomy ludi (scaenici)–(ludi) circenses is well attested in first- and second-century authors such as Suetonius. There is no Italian or provincial inscription in which ludi can be shown to positively mean a program of events (at least partially) at the circus; meanwhile there are several instances of ludi meant as a program of scenic representations. In Veii for example, three inscriptions state that money for statues was collected "in the orchestra" during the games (230, 232, 233). No. 87 from Pompeii mentions the production of ludi on two occasions; the program included pantomimes and acroamata (on which cf. infra), which means again that they were ludi scaenici. There are therefore good reasons to believe that in most cases ludi (nude dicti) were scenic representations. However, in areas where circenses were particularly common, such as southern Spain, it is not impossible that "ludi" at times was used to mean a program of both scaenici and circenses. One thinks in particular of ludi publici recorded in no. 304 from Singili Barba: we know that circenses were produced by magistrates in Urso (2) and therefore certainly elsewhere in the area, and Singili Barba probably had its own circus (supra n.108). Elsewhere, in Lepcis Magna, a city with a monumental circus from the second century, it is hard to imagine that the opulentissimi and splendidissimi ludi edited in the second or third century by a highly prominent local notable did not include a program of circenses (431).

Ludi in circo and in theatro surely are the same as ludi circenses and scaenici (H.1–2 in the table). Ludi in foro (H.3) are attested in no. 192, a problematic inscription. It is possible that these games were held in the forum because a theater had not yet been

---

117Cf. discussion at pp.19–20. No. 366 has the phrase ludorum et circensium spectacula; in no. 321, to ludi in A corresponds ludi scaenici in B.

118Many more examples will be presented below.


119The dies in foro in the Urso charter (2 § LXXI) applies to a munus and need not be discussed here. It is likely that both productions of ludi recorded in no. 87 were presented in the theatre, not in the forum.
built, but the commentarii of the Secular Games show that there might have been times when tradition dictated that games should be performed in a given place even when more appropriate facilities existed.\textsuperscript{120}

The expression \textit{ludi gymnici} is attested in a single inscription (67: K.1). Since it is likely to correspond to what is usually termed a \textit{certamen gymnicum} or \textit{agon gymnicus}, it will be discussed in chapter IV.

\textit{Ludi Latini et Graeci} are mentioned in a Tiberian inscription from Caere (214: K.2). This expression occurs several times in the commentarii of the Augustan and Severan Secular Games. At \textit{ludi Graeci} were shown the tragedies of Livius Andronicus, of Ennius, the comedies of Naevius, Plautus, and others; at \textit{ludi Latini} were presented praetextae, togatae and other dramatic genres which were Latin in origin.\textsuperscript{121} However, J. Beaujeu pointed out that \textquotedblleft\textit{ludi Graeci}\textquotedblright is used by Cicero to mean Greek athletic games: it is therefore possible that the \textit{ludi Latini et Graeci} of our inscription might have been scenic and athletic games rather than Latin and Greek scenic games.\textsuperscript{122} But it is unlikely that in a non-Greek city and in early imperial times a board would have been required to produce athletic games among its official duties.\textsuperscript{123} It is therefore probable that these \textit{ludi Latini et Graeci} were comparable to the scenic games presented at the Secular Games, though on a much smaller scale.

I have already alluded to an inscription recently discovered in Nemausus which provides our only epigraphic mention of \textit{ludi seuirales} (266: K.4 and p.35). Homonymous games were already known from the \textit{Historia Augusta} (Marc. 6.3), but these were organized

\textsuperscript{120}\textit{Cf. e.g. LudSaecA L.108: ludi Latini in th[ea]tro ligneo quod erat constitutum in Campo s[ecu]ndum Tiberim sunt commissi}; a wooden theatre (\textit{theatrum ligneum}) was built also for the Severan Secular Games: \textit{LudSaecS} LL.37, 43, \&c.

\textsuperscript{121}\textit{Cf. WISSOWA} 1912 pp.462–63.


\textsuperscript{123}On the official character of these games cf. infra pp. 133–34.
in Rome by the six leaders of squadrons of Roman knights, the seuiri equitum Romanorum; in Nemausus they were certainly games of the seuiri augustales, attested locally in over 75 inscriptions.\textsuperscript{124} The name ludi seuirales is probably rather informal, since it stresses the collegiality of the institution, the fact that the men were six, rather than its raison d'être, the cult to the emperor. This suggests that the religious function of those games was secondary, something which we have come to realize about ludi Augustales probably produced by the augustales at Aufidena (167: supra pp.34–36).

An inscription from Perusia records a benefaction which a duovir made “while he was producing public games” (224: ludos publicos edens). Another one from Singili Barba contrasts ludi publici with ludi priuati which a duovir organized while in office (304). This indicates that ludi publici were statutory games, and that games organized on top of them by a magistrate were acknowledged as a personal benefaction. Ludi publici certainly are the same thing as ludi sollemnes, which are attested in a single municipal inscription (179: K.3 in the table).

A fragment of Lucilius reads Romanis ludis forus olim ornatus lucernis;\textsuperscript{125} the provision of lighting (lumina) during the games is known from several municipal inscriptions as well (J.1). The relevant Italian inscriptions are all concise and difficult to interpret, but a Spanish one mentions “vases of light” (280). Scenic representations at night may have been required from a religious point of view: they are attested at the Secular games of 17 B.C. and A.D. 204.\textsuperscript{126}

Acroamata (J.2) seem to have been entertainers who performed at ludi scaenici,


\textsuperscript{125} Frg. 148 Warmington (Remains of Old Latin III, Loeb, 1938 [1967]: “as at times the forum decked with lamps at the Roman games”).

but unlike actors they did not usually take part in the programme of competitions; Suetonius says at one point acroamata et histriones (Aug. 74.2: "entertainers (?) and actors"); the phrase adiectis acruamatis in no. 87 L.15 suggests likewise that they supplemented the regular programme. These entertainers were musicians, dancers, but also mimes and pantomimes. In no. 87, however, they obviously were not pantomimes, or at least not pantomimes alone (L.7: acroamata pantomimique).\textsuperscript{127}

Some inscriptions record the gift of ludi scaenici et missilia (Table II.3: F.1), or in a few cases of ludi et missilia (Table II.4: J.3). Interestingly all examples come from the so-called Cirtan Confederation, which suggests that the expression was a regionalism, not necessarily that missilia (gifts thrown to the spectators) were peculiar to those parts. In fact, missilia are epigraphically attested elsewhere as well (cf. Table II.4: J.3), and there are many records in the literature of emperors who threw missilia at the audience.\textsuperscript{128}

As we shall see in more detail in chapter IX, most of the productions of ludi recorded in municipal inscriptions were non-statutory. It is possible that some or perhaps most of the games known by an official name (Table II.1) were statutory, but only three inscriptions explicitly say about ludi that they were sollemnes or publici (nos. 179, 224 and 304: supra p.50). In light of what was said in the Introduction, this should not come as a surprise: there is no reason to honor someone for the production of games that were required from him, or to recall in one’s epitaph the production of such games. The epigraphic evidence, therefore, cannot be taken as a reflection of the actual pattern of the production of

\textsuperscript{127}Cf. esp. L. & J. Robert, Claros I. Décrets hellénistiques, Paris 1989, pp.46–49. The OLD s.v. “acroama” gives the following definition: "An item in an entertainment, act, "tum"" and cites e.g. Cic. Sest. 116 and Petr. 78.5; but in light of the passage just quoted from Suetonius, another in his life of Vespasian (19.1: uetera ... acroamata reuocauerat – quoted by OLD), and our no. 87 (also quoted by OLD), it seems likely that a translation occurred whereby “acroama” came to be used for the performers as well.

ludi, which were certainly much more common than it appears. In fact, municipal statutes (1–3), and much more evidence to be discussed in chapter IX, show that duoviri and aediles or similar top magistrates were generally required to produce ludi. Several hundreds of these magistrates are known, yet their statutory ludi are almost never attested. In fact, we hear more often about such games in the “pro ludis” inscriptions, that is, when they actually were not produced (pp.166–68).
III. MVRERA, VENATIONES AND LVSIONES

1. Introduction

It is likely that gladiatorial combats originated in southern Italy, more precisely in Lucania or Campania, early in the fourth century B.C. or perhaps before. Gladiators were first seen fighting in Rome when M. and D. Iunius Brutus presented three pairs in 264 B.C. at the funeral of their father. Later events were also given at funerals, but the number of pairs steadily increased: in 183, for the funeral of P. Licinius, 120 gladiators were exhibited. It seems that until Caesar’s death, in fact, gladiatorial shows in Rome always had a funerary function, at least nominally; but Romans were so fond of them that the politically ambitious came to see in them a means to gain popular support. Thus some munera are known which were presented during one’s aedileship to prepare the way to a higher magistracy such as that of praetor, and honored a relative who had died several years or even decades earlier. Caesar, to take an extreme example, was aedile when he gave a munus in honor of his father, twenty-one years after his death. By the time Augustus became sole ruler, the pretext of a funeral was no longer needed. However, as we saw (p.5), soon enough, the emperor took entire control of this powerful means of swaying public opinion.

Why and how all this happened need not be discussed here, since almost all of the relevant municipal inscriptions were erected after the process just described had reached some sort of finality. For example, a single municipal inscription provides formal evidence

---

130Brutus: Liv. Ep. 16; Val.Max. 2.4.7; Serv. ad Aen. 3.67; cf. VILLE 1981 p.42 n.100. Licinius: Liv. 39.46.2-3.
131VILLE 1981 pp.60, 80 with references; cf. pp.78-81 for discussion and other examples.
of a funerary munus.\textsuperscript{132} Still, we know that, already in the second century B.C., munera had spread to the whole of Italy and to some provincial areas.\textsuperscript{133} However, beside some archaeological remains, our knowledge of early municipal shows – some of which, incidentally, are funerary – is derived mainly from literary sources. As we saw in chapter I, these tend to mention events when leading men of the Roman state, not unremarkable local notables, were involved in some way.\textsuperscript{134}

$Ludi$ had been celebrated for centuries when the Romans saw their first gladiators. Partly because of the comparatively late introduction of gladiatorial shows to Rome, we are in a position to picture the evolution not only of their function and program, but also of the terminology to designate them. This process was still going on in the early Empire and has left its mark in the epigraphy, so that a word on the Latin terminology for gladiatorial shows is in order. From a careful study of the literary sources, G. Ville has drawn the following picture of how matters evolved.\textsuperscript{135} In the earliest period the usual expression is gladiatores, as in gladiatores dare. Somewhat later, the term munus starts to be used for gifts of all kinds to the people, and in particular for gifts of spectacles – not only munera but also ludi – to gain popular support. To refer more specifically to a gladiatorial show

\textsuperscript{132}No. 39, which is Augustan. Suetonius reports that, at the funeral of a centurion at Pollentia under Tiberius, the plebs extorted money for a gladiatorial show from his heirs (Suet. Tib. 37: cf. infra n.416). FORA 1996 p.58 believes that munera funebria are also recorded in nos. 18, 95 and 241; on no. 18, cf. ID., EAOR IV ad no. 27, where a funerary context is presented only as a possibility on the basis of a public distribution of meat (uisceratio – cf. VILLE 1981 p.46 n.121); FORA’s interpretation of no. 95 is based on a most unlikely hypothesis put forward by SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 ad no. 29; one cannot be sure that the uenatio in no. 241 was staged in a funerary context, nor is this suggested by GREGORI, EAOR II ad nos. 28–29. On funerary munera in general, cf. VILLE 1981 pp.202–4.

\textsuperscript{133}Cf. VILLE 1981 pp.49–51.

\textsuperscript{134}Even for Rome, Livy records only the most remarkable gladiatorial shows; cf. VILLE 1981 p.43; K. Welch, JRA 4, 1991, p.279. A good provincial example of the kind of events recorded by Livy is the munus produced at Carthago Nova in 206 by Scipio Africanus (Liv. 28.21.10); cf. VILLE 1981 p.49.

\textsuperscript{135}The following summary is based on VILLE 1981 pp.72–78. The author provides a wealth of evidence for his views and is justified in rejecting Tertullian’s generally accepted etymology: munus dictum est ab officio, quoniam officium etiam muneres nomen est; officium autem mortuis hoc spectaculo facere se ueteres arbitrabantur (Spect. 12.1: “Gladiatorial shows get their name from the obligation (officium) to offer them, officium being another word for munus (‘duty, obligation’); for the Ancients believed that by offering such spectacles they were fulfilling their duties towards the dead”).
show, when the context does not make that clear, *munus* is supplemented with the name of the producer in the genitive, or else one has recourse to the expressions *munus gladiatorium* or *munus gladiatorum*. Cicero employs all of the above, but uses *gladiatores* most frequently. *Munus* as meaning a gift of any kind of spectacle seems to have become obsolete by the Tiberian age at the latest. *Gladiatores* is progressively eclipsed by *munus illius editoris* and *munus gladiatorum/-ium*, which are the usual ways to refer to a gladiatorial show until the end of the first century. Martial, in a passage datable to the years 87–88, provides the earliest known instance of the term *munus* standing entirely on its own to mean a gladiatorial show.¹³⁶ This use of the term became more general as time went on. Finally, as we saw above (p.19), it is only from the very end of the second century that *ludi gladiatorii* appears as a synonym for *munus*; this expression, however, never gained wide acceptance and is not once attested epigraphically. The material presented below in Tables III.1–4 will be assessed in terms of linguistic change against this background.¹³⁷

The pre-Roman evolution of the *uenatio* is not well known, but this will not affect us in any way, since the earliest known municipal *uenatio* dates to the middle years of the Augustan principate.¹³⁸ In Rome, during the Republic, *uenationes* were fought in the circus as an optional part of the program of *ludi*.¹³⁹ They were entirely financed by the magistrates in charge of the games who had taken it upon themselves to offer this gift to the people. The earliest securely attested *uenatio* was produced by M. Fuluius Nobilior during votive games, in 186 B.C. (Liv. 39.22.2). Once more, the Augustan age provides a turning point, for it is in the last years of the first emperor’s reign that *uenationes* became part of the

¹³⁶Mart. 3.59, quoted infra p.207; VILLE 1981 p.76 n.10.
¹³⁷D. Matz, *Epigraphical Evidence Relating to the Roman Gladiatorial Establishment*, Diss., Minnesota 1977, is the worst piece of scholarship I know of and will be entirely disregarded.
¹³⁸No. 87: Flaccus’ *uenationes* belong to his 2nd duovirate, which should be placed after about 20 B.C., date of the 1st duovirate, and before 2 B.C., date of the 3rd. Note also a fragmentary inscription from Atina, perhaps late republican (7). On pre-Roman *uenationes*, AYMARD 1951 pp.74–79; VILLE 1981 pp.51–52.
regular program of *munera*, though they also continued to be presented in the circus as an appendix to *ludi*. In municipal inscriptions, *uenationes* are either presented independently or together with a gladiatorial *munus*, but only once with *ludi* (370). It is therefore appropriate to discuss them in this chapter.

### 2. Munus and equivalent expressions

This section collects and discusses all expressions used in inscriptions to refer to gladiatorial shows.\(^{140}\)

Table III.1, like Table II.1, presents evidence for events which are known by their official name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table III.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MUNERA KNOWN BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAME OR NAMED AFTER THEIR FOUNDER</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L. Munera** to be dedicated to gods:

1. *munus*  
   2 § LXX (m. *ludiiue Ioui Iunoni Miner/we diis deabusque*); § LXXI (m. *ludiiue I. I. M. ... et unus dies ... in foro Veneri*); FOst A.D.?120 (m. *Veneri*).

**M. Munera** named after their founder:

1. *munus*  
   152, 165, 191, 245, 415, 7452 (m. *Catinianum, Cornelianum, Reginianum, Tullianum, Tup[—ianum], Quinti(anum)*, respectively); 153 (m. *pequiniæ Aquillanae*).

2. *munus* ...  
   264 (m. *gladiatorium Villiamum*); 431 L.L.17-18 (m. *publicum ex testamento luni Afri ... edendum*; cf. P.1).

Epigraphic concision may explain why no example of an actual production of a *munus* dedicated to the gods has come down to us from elsewhere than Rome (L.1 in the table). As we saw, however, the inscriptions are rarely concerned with the religious content.

---

\(^{140}\) The following fragmentary inscriptions could not be attributed to any category: 36 L.12, 110, 111, 134, 135, 141, 157, 170, 176, 194, 229, 247, 268, 355, 367, 430, 443.
of the games and rather stress the gift of visual entertainment for the local population. Chapters LXX–LXXI of the Urso charter, which we have in a Claudian version, provide evidence that munera offered to the gods were (potentially at least) produced instead of ludi. We shall see below (pp.66–69) that the term munus in these chapters was probably not part of the original drafting of the law, when the colony of Urso was founded by Caesar.

All the other events in the table (M.1–2) were provided for by a private foundation. The expression used in no. 431 (M.2) rings more formal than the usual munus (gl.) + adjective in -anus derived from the founder’s name, and is possibly the only event actually known by its official name. It is also only in this case that a privately instituted event is qualified as a munus publicum. But it is probable that the other events in M.1–2 were also considered munera publica. After all, the money was entrusted to the city in order to institute a regular munus. Just as with munera publica (Table III.3), the organization of such events was entrusted to curatores, and most are known from the titles of these curatores (e.g. 152: curator muneris Catiniani). Inscription no. 165 provides further evidence of the similarity between the two categories. Scholars have been puzzled by the phrase [m]uneris Corneliani editione at ll. 6–7: why an editio and not a cura as in all other cases? Simply because what is being recorded is not so much the cura (obviously performed by the father, though this is not stated), but rather the supplementary program (f---] cum quattuor paribus ...); it is for this and his other benefactions that the anonymous man is being honored. It so happens that he appended his show to an editio of the munus Cornelianum. As legatee of Cornelius (the founder of the show), the city is the editor of the munus; which is therefore a munus publicum; it of course needs to appoint a curator, but

---

141VILLE 1981 p.199 says it is an exception, even though he understands that the city was in charge of the editio; BUONOCORE, EAOR III ad no. 13, thinks the son was the curator, but does not suggest who the editor was; FORA 1996 p.28 n.63 argues along the same lines as I do, but falls short of explaining who the editor and curator were.
the present inscription is not about him.  

The next category is attested almost only in Pompeian parietal inscriptions.

---

**Table III.2**

EVENTS WITH NAME OF THE PRODUCER IN THE GENITIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. All such events:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>munus illius editoris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>familia gladiatoria</em> i. ed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us remove no. 269 from Nemausus out of the way, since the rest of the material is all from Pompeii. This is the epitaph of the gladiator Faustus who died “during the *munus* of C. Pompeius Martialis”. It is unfortunately not possible to determine whether the show was statutory or privately produced, and the producer’s name is of little help to establish his status since Martialis is well attested among freeborn as well as freedmen. It is interesting that much prominence is given to the fact that Faustus died during a show; also that the producer’s name is spelled out almost in full: the show may have been particularly sumptuous, or else affection was felt between the producer and his gladiator, something which is encountered in at least one other inscription (240).  

The expression *munus illius editoris* is found three times in accounts of events scratched (not painted) informally on Pompeian walls or tombstones by fans of the sport.

---


143 A *venatio* of this type is recorded in no. 92 (Table III.5: T.2).

144 Faustus: he was an *essedarius*, a type of gladiator who fought on a chariot (*essedum*; cf. MOSCI SASSI pp.101–2 s.v.; he was also *liber*, that is, freeborn: this mention was felt necessary since the *nom de guerre* Faustus could have been taken for a slave’s name (cf. ROBERT 1940 pp.287–91; VILLE 1981 p.253). Martialis: if he were a freedman, we would know at least that his show was not of the kind prescribed by the *lex Ursonensis* (2) §§ LXX–LXXI, since slaves and freedmen were debarred from holding magistracies.
(N.1: 74, 90, 95). The munus Cn. Allei Nigidi Mai is also an event of the past in the four posters in which it is mentioned (99). Another poster, for a show to be held in Puteoli (122), says that a familia Capiniana, that is, a gladiatorial troupe possibly created and maintained with money left to the community by one Capinius, will fight in munera offered in Puteoli by the Augusti (Tiberius and Livia?), if this is the correct interpretation to give to munera Augurorum.\textsuperscript{145} Finally, in no. 124, passers-by on their way to or from Nuceria are informed that a producer (whose name is lost) will display his gladiators in a munus organized in Puteoli by one Valerius Stasi[mus]. In none of these three edicta is the munus itself the object of the announcement; nor, for that matter, is any event called a munus ever advertised in an edictum. A look at our other edicta will show why.

By contrast to the aforementioned documents, which are singular in some way or other, almost all edicta announce a show with the expressions paria gladiatorum (illius editoris) or familia gladiatoria (illius editoris) (Tables III.2: N.2–3 and III.4: R.2–3). This is true of the earliest (Augustan/Tiberian) as well as most recent edicta. Just as in electoral posters (programmata) the formulary used in such announcements was extremely rigid.\textsuperscript{146} This is demonstrated by the strange syntax that resulted at times from the addition of optional elements, such as in the phrase gladiatorum paria et uenatio pug(nabunt).\textsuperscript{147} We find the term munus used in all contexts other than edicta per se, thus in the inscriptions discussed above, in 80 (which is not an edictum), but also in any text appended to an

\textsuperscript{145}It is also possible that this expression means “munera in honour of the Augusti”; the genitive does not offer a valid objection: cf. ludi Honoris et Virtutis} (41); one should also remember Tiberius' notorious dislike for the games. On the meaning of familia Capiniana, SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.103.

\textsuperscript{146}SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.116–19. On electoral posters: MOURITSEN 1988 pp.9–10, 31. Our nos. 79B (?) and 104 belong to the latter category; as always in such documents, the name of the candidate is in the accusative; one has to understand the standard formula O(ro, -ramus, ...) v(os) f(aciatis) ... at the head of the poster.

\textsuperscript{147}Nos. 66, 76; see also 89, 106, 109. Unless there is an omission, the show announced in no. 92 seem not to have included gladiators (probably because of the interdiction following the riot of 59); if so, one would have expected a verb after uenatio (now the main attraction), but the scription seems to have preferred not to replace the usual pugnabit/-unt with anything at all; but cf. 112, where uenatio pugnabit stands on its own (literally, “a uenatio will fight”).
Moreover, producers who are known to have presented several paria or a familia are acclaimed as munerarii. This complementarity in the distribution of the terms used, between formal and less formal or less stereotyped contexts, indicates that posters had taken their definitive shape before munus had become the usual technical term to refer to a gladiatorial show. As for the choice between paria ... and familia ..., it was apparently not entirely arbitrary, since familia ... seems to have been preferred when the number of pairs was rather unimpressive.

Table III.3 presents all the remaining expressions that include the term munus (p.61).

In spite of what was said above (p.55), there is little evidence in the inscriptions that the term munus gladiatorium evolved towards a simpler form munus. Both terms (P.2 and P.1 respectively) are found throughout the first three centuries of the Empire and still in the early fourth, when epigraphical evidence for games virtually comes to an end. Still, our very earliest (late Republican) inscriptions say munus gladiatorium (145A–C), while late third- and fourth-century ones tend to use the simpler munus. That munus gladiatorium was never entirely supplanted by munus may be explained once more by the conservative language of the inscriptions. However, the simpler form munus is generally preferred when the context is entirely unequivocal, such as in the title of the curators, when the editor’s name is given, or when one says editio or cura. This at least seems to parallel what Ville had found in the literary sources.

The term munus publicum (P.3–4 in the table) is known almost only from the

---

148Nos. 101, 103; cf. also 104, an electoral poster for which we have as yet no corresponding edictum.
149SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.51–52, 140.
150Munus gladiatorium: 203; munus: 146, 204, 240.
MVNERA, VENATIONES & LVSIONES

Table III.3
OTHER MUNERAI

P. Munera not categorized as in Q below:

1. munus

2 § CXXXIV, 4 l.18, 30, 35, 52, 12, 14, 19, 35, 47, 52 l.12, [65], 68, 128, 132, 138, [146], 149, 150, [151], 204, 220, 237, 240, 254, 317, 332, 358, 381, 392, 394, 424, 445, C XI 575 = ILS 8206; 431 l.21 (cf. P.3); 428 (=uenatio); 293 (potestas muneris edendi causa).

2. m. gladiatorium

[8], [9], 22, 31, 39, 52 l.10, 62, 116, 117, 129, [130], 145, 147, 169, 171, 173, 200, 203 l.20, 33, [206], 207, 208, 212, 236, [265], 272, 295, 333, 366, 368, [369], 429, 442; RGDA § 22.

3. m. publicum


4. m. publicum gladiatorium

11, 34, 246.

5. m. familiae gladiatoriae

40; 186 (m. f. gl. Telesinae).

6. munus ...

80 (m. yp(a)e[th]rum); 91b (Nero[n(ianorum -is?) mun]era); 140 (munus quinquennale); 4 l.29 (munera quae assiforana appellantur).

Q. Munera + programme or largesses:

1. m. + paria gladiatorum

[388], [453]; cf. 220 (in editionem muneris decem p. gl. optulit); 192 l.24 (munus cum" familia gladiatoria). Cf. R.3.

2. m. + ...

118 (m. cum venatione); 125 (m. suum cum ferarum1 Libycarum); 139 (m. ... feris ... ursis ... noxes ... ceteris herbariis); [391] (m. ... [cum] occasioni[bus ferarum ...]); 447 (m. venationum et gladiat[orum])

Title of the curatores munieris publici. To these instances one can add munera organized by the other curatores in table III.3 (P.1–2), since they too certainly were munera publica (i.e. of the type not provided for by a private foundation). As M. Fora observed, whenever a curator does not specify that his munus had been established by a foundation (M.1–2), it

151 Curae munerais and curatores munieris are underlined: cf. pp.60–61.
152 Note that (1): this section includes only attractions which are joined to "munus" in a clause; and (2): no. 333 (munus gladiat. et uenatio), because of the conjunction, is attributed to categories P.2 and U.1 rather than placed here.
must be that it was financed by the city and was therefore a *munus publicum*.\footnote{EAOR IV pp.103–4. In Table III.3, P.1: 19, 138, 149, [151], 430; P.2: [8], 52, 116, 117. Cf. also infra on nos. 40 and 186.}

While *ludi publici* are at times contrasted with *ludi privati* (p.50), there is no "*munus priuatum*" in the literary or epigraphic sources to correspond to the *munus publicum*. But this is to be expected: since *munera* were by definition a private matter, only the newer *munus*, funded by the city, needed to be qualified. Still, a *dies priuatus* appended to a *munus publicum* is attested twice (40, 186; cf. 134). We also find the reverse situation, whereby a notable who produced a show *ex sua liberalitate* was asked to organize another day (*alium d[iem]*) with public funds (155). Just as in the case the *ludi publici* and *priuati* of no. 304, the public vs private nature of the event is stressed in terms of the provenience of the funding, an issue which is explored further in chapters VIII and IX.

Some inscriptions say something about the program of the shows (Q.1–2). In most cases a *uenatio* was offered together with a gladiatorial show (Q.2). The phrase *munus cum uenatione* (118, 125; cf. 391) shows that the *uenatio* was not the main attraction. But the lack of any detail about the gladiatorial program, paired with some specifics about the *uenatio*, suggests that the producer gave more attention to the latter. As we shall see in section 4, part of the explanation may lie in the fact that *uenationes* became increasingly popular and progressively gained their independence from gladiatorial *munera*.

Some expressions are attested only once and are in fact difficult to categorize (P.6). Epigraphic formalism probably explains why none of them is found in the more typical stone inscriptions in our catalogue. Two of them were painted on Pompeian walls, but neither belongs to the formal part of a poster. A *munus hypaethron* (from the Greek ὑπαίθρος) must have been a *munus* presented in the open, and therefore should be contrasted with the many events at which *uela* were installed.\footnote{Cf. SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 ad no. 67. Note Ulp. Dig. 33.7.12.20: *uelis quae in hypaethris extenduntur.*} In no. 91b several
interpretations present themselves, but *Neronianorum munera* seems probable; shows displaying the emperor’s gladiators, in this case *Neroniani*, who belonged to Nero, were the more prestigious, and this would justify the exclamation appended to the *edictum* proper. The other expression, *munus assiforanum*, will receive full treatment in chapter IX (pp. 210–12).

The next table presents all the remaining expressions that can be considered equivalent to *munus gladiatorium*.

| Table III.4 |
| EXPRESSIONS EQUIVALENT TO *MUNUS* |
| **R. Gladiators, gladiatorial troops, pairs of gladiators:** |
| 1. *gladiatores* | 2 § LXVI, 18, 137, 193, 239; *TabHer* L:138. |

The literary sources show that expressions such as *gladiatores dare* are more ancient than *munus*, but as we saw, our earliest inscriptions, no. 145A–C, use the expression *munus gladiatorium*. There are only four examples in our corpus of the expression *gladiatores dare* (R.1), which means that epigraphy starts leaving its mark only when the major transitional phase from “*gladiatores*” to “*munus (gladiatorium)*” is almost

---

155That shows displaying *Iuliani* and *Neroniani* were more prestigious is shown by the fact that all three extant “score-cards” (74, 90, 95) record mostly either or both of these categories; the gladiators whose names were scratched on the walls of the small *ludus* at Pompeii belonged to private impresarios (*lanistae*) and were probably not so famous. On no. 91b, SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 ad no. 22.

156Excluded from this table are therefore the following examples mentioning *paria gladiatorum*: nos. 22, 36, 87, 120 and 165 L:8.
completed. All four inscriptions can be dated to the Augustan age or in the first half of the first century. Since "gladiatores" was by then no longer used by Latin writers, this means once again that epigraphy was more resistant to change. Two Republican laws also use the term gladiatores, the Urso charter (2 § LXVI: infra pp.67–68), and the tabula Heracleensis from ca. 45 B.C., where one reads: ludeis, cumue gladiatores ibei pugnabunt, that is, "during ludi or when gladiators fight here"; the expression is temporal as often in the authors, particularly Cicero.\footnote{157}{Cf. VILLE 1981 pp.66, 77–78, 87 n.31 for discussion and examples.}

Paria (gladiatorum) ("pairs of gladiators") is the most common expression after munus. In Pompeii, where most examples come from, the fuller expression paria gladiatorum illius editoris advertises events to be held in Pompeii or elsewhere (Table III.2: N.3), but the simpler paria gladiatorum (R.3) always advertises non-Pompeiian shows. It was therefore not always felt necessary to tell prospective spectators from Pompeii who the producer was.\footnote{158}{This says much about the nature of the relationship between the producer and the spectators, as we shall see.} Paria gladiatorum is found in stone inscriptions of the first two centuries of the Empire and perhaps even beyond that. The term was therefore never entirely displaced by munus (gladiatorium). In Pompeii stone inscriptions use paria gladiatorum, not munus (87–88), which, as in posters, is to be explained by epigraphical formalism. In later periods, this term is used mainly when the number of pairs was rather important.\footnote{159}{No. 162: 30 pairs; nos. 158, 189, 288: 20 pairs. In no. 87 (cf. n.156): 40 pairs of gladiators and 30 pairs of athletes. On the other hand, a small number of pairs is sometimes worth mentioning if offered in supplement to the regular program (22 L.11 and 165: 3 and 4 pairs respectively), or if they are an unusual feature, such as, possibly, the 3 pairs of pontarii in no. 87.} Outside Italy, only in two eastern and one Spanish inscriptions do we find reference to paria gladiatorum. Since they all postdate the first century, there is no reason to think that, as in Italy, the use of the term should be explained by tradition.\footnote{160}{No. 288 apparently dates from the middle of the 2nd c.; 445 is dated to the 1st half of the 2nd c. and 451, to the 2nd c.}
We have seen that in the history of Pompeian show-advertising the expressions *familia gladiatoria* and *paria gladiatorum (illius editoris) pugnabit-unt* were certainly quite early. In stone inscriptions, *familiae gladiatoriae* are attested only in central Italy (Campania, Lucania, Apulia and Samnium), that is, in regions which witnessed the birth and earliest diffusion of *gladiatura* (Table III.4: R.2; cf. Table III.3: P.5); examples are found as late as the middle of the second century (154, 156). This is further evidence that more ancient expressions survived only where gladiatorial shows were already well established by late Republican times. More generally, while there is a fair number of provincial gladiatorial shows in our corpus, names for gladiatorial shows other than *munus (gladiatorium)* are almost never found outside Italy. It looks as if on the whole the provincials adopted the practice of producing gladiatorial shows once the term *munus* had become generally accepted.161

Twin inscriptions mention *paria ordinaria* which were offered for the dedication of the privately built amphitheater at Urbs Salvia (196: R.3 in the table). The same expression is found in Seneca: *hoc* (i.e. *meridianum spectaculum*) *plerique ordinaris paribus et postulaticis praeferunt*.162 Suetonius offers other interesting parallels. Caligula at times replaced the *ordinarius apparatus* of the amphitheater with a programme of decrepit men and beasts (*Cal. 26.5*). Augustus’ fondness for *pugiles legitimi atque ordinarii* was matched by his pleasure at watching boxers who fought in gangs (*cateruarii*) on street corners (*Aug. 45.2*); this suggests that *pugiles legitimi atque ordinarii* were boxers who fought in pairs during official events (be they solemn or privately organized with sanction of the Senate).163 On the basis of this evidence, M. Buonocore asks whether the *paria ordinaria* of our two

161 Very few provincial shows are contained in the relevant sections of Tables III.2 (N.2–3: none) and III.4 (R.1–3: five, one found in a legal document while three others, interestingly, are from the East).
162 Sen. *Ep. 7.4*: “most of the audience [scil. at the amphitheater] prefer the mid-day show [when unarmed men were exposed] to pairs of regular or even famous gladiators”.
163 Cf. further pp.84–85, where the passage is quoted and discussed.
inscriptions were pairs of professional gladiators. But while in the passages quoted above “ordinary” events are contrasted with rather unusual or particular ones, in our inscriptions it is difficult to see in what way *paria ordinaria* were different from the more usual *paria gladiatorum*. Should they rather be contrasted with *gladiatores nobiles*, encountered in one single, second century inscription from Paestum (156)? This term, according to Buonocore, probably applied to “gladiatori ben equipaggiati e famosi, e pertanto più costosi”. If so, in light of the exceptional benefaction they record, the inscriptions from Urbs Salvia may simply contain a touch of false modesty.\(^{164}\)

The expression *gladiatorum certamina* is found in one single Gallic inscription (253: R.4 in the table). The singularity of the text, which is not written in the usual formulaic language – note the odd *fuerunt* (L.7) and *ediderunt* (L.9) – may explain in part this hapax. The context makes it clear that we are dealing with one single *munus* which lasted four days. Thirty-two *certamina* were offered, that is, presumably, thirty-two *paria*, probably eight each day, and eight fights ended with the death of the defeated.\(^{165}\)

3. *Munera* in the *lex Vrsonensis*

The extent to which the *lex Vrsonensis* was redrafted between 44 B.C., when it was granted to the Caesarean colony of Urso, and the Julio-Claudian period, when our extant copy was probably engraved (2), is still being debated. With regard to *munera*, chapters LXX and LXXI are fundamental. A translation of chapter LXX follows:

\[LXX.\] Whoever shall be duoviri, they, except for those who shall be first appointed after this statute, they during their magistracy are to organize a *munus* or dramatic spectacle for Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, and the gods and goddesses, during four days, for the greater part of the day, as far as <shall be possible> according to the decision of the decurions, and each

\(^{164}\)See BUONOCORE’s discussion at *EAOR* III 78 (= 196) and 34 (= 156); he, however, does not make the rapprochement suggested here. The expression *gladiatores nobiles* is a hapax. Sensitivity to the quality of gladiators is expressed e.g. at Petr. 45.

\(^{165}\)Cf. further infra p.114.
one of them is to spend on that spectacle and on that munus not less than HS2000 from his own money, and it is to be lawful to take and spend out of public money up to HS2000 for each duovir, and it is to be lawful for them to do so without personal liability, provided that no-one take or make assignment from that sum, which sum it shall be appropriate to give or assign according to this statute for those sacrifices, which shall be publicly performed in the colony or in any other place.\textsuperscript{166}

G. Ville, followed by R. Frei-Stolba, argues that “munus” in chapters LXX and LXXI is a case of post-Caesarean insertion,\textsuperscript{167} particularly on the basis of a comparison with chapter LXVI, which has the Republican term gladiatores. This view, which takes for granted that “munus” here means a gladiatorial show, is rejected by M.H. Crawford, according to whom the term munus in these chapters “need mean no more than ‘show offered to the people’”, a meaning attested in the Republican period (cf. supra pp.54–55); it is therefore “illegitimate to interpret it as ‘gladiatorial show’ and then to hold that it belongs to a later phase than the body of the text.”\textsuperscript{168} However, since chapters LXX and LXXI belong to a section of the law dealing with state religious matters (§§ LXIV–LXXII), it is unlikely that munus, here, means just any kind of show. It is clear that the events being regulated are the official state celebrations (i.e. statutory games) to be organized by the local magistrates. Crawford’s interpretation blurs the distinction between public and private (i.e. between statutory and non-statutory) and, therefore, cannot be accepted.\textsuperscript{169} If this is right, the charter of Urso was therefore updated at some point after the colonial foundation in order to make it lawful for the duoviri and aediles to produce a gladiatorial show instead of the traditional ludi.

The end of chapter LXVI provides further evidence that in chapters LXX and LXXI munus certainly means ‘gladiatorial show’ (2 § LXVI):

\textsuperscript{166} Transl. Crawford, RomSt pp.423-24, slightly modified.
\textsuperscript{167} I will refrain from using the term “interpolation”, which implies that such insertions were corruptions of the original while in fact they were updatings.
\textsuperscript{168} VILLE 1981 esp. p.181; FREI-STOLBA 1988 esp. pp.204–12. Crawford, RomSt p.395; he applies the same definition to munus in § CXXXIV, on which cf. infra.
\textsuperscript{169} For the evidence see VILLE 1981 pp.73–75.
And those pontiffs and augurs at the games, whenever the magistrates shall give them publicly, and when those pontiffs and augurs shall perform the public sacrifices of the colonia Genetiva Iulia, are to have the right and power of wearing *togae praetextae.* And those pontiffs and augurs are to have the right and power to watch the games and combats of gladiators among the decurions.\(^{170}\)

In the first lines of this excerpt, public (i.e. the magistrates') spectacles are limited to *ludi.* Further on, when the pontiffs' and augurs' seating privileges are mentioned, *gladiatores* are included alongside *ludi.* This indicates that when the charter was granted to Urso, all statutory shows were *ludi.*\(^{171}\) The lack of something like *gladiatoribusue* following *ludis* should not be taken as an accidental omission. In this context, and assuming, as is probable, that the term *gladiatores* belongs to the Caesarean redaction, the provision on seating privileges indicates that gladiatorial shows were (potentially) produced in Urso at the time it was granted colonial status, but not, like *ludi,* as statutory events.\(^{172}\) In Republican Urso, as in Republican Rome, gladiatorial shows must have always been privately organized.\(^{173}\) There remains little doubt that in chapters LXX–LXXI *munus* is indeed a post-Caesarean insertion.

There is one other occurrence of the term *munus* in the *lex Vrsonensis,* just before the inscription breaks off (2 § CXXXIV):

No IIvir, aedile or prefect of the colonia Genetiva, whoever shall be one, after this statute, is to raise with the decurions of the colonia Genetiva, or discuss with the decurions (...) to the effect that public money [or] anything [else] be given or [granted] to anyone with a view of their holding office or [giving] or promising a show [or for] giving or erecting a statue [---].\(^{174}\)

---


\(^{171}\) VILLE 1981 pp.181–83; at 176, he may be right to say that, taken literally, the law leaves it to the decurions (*arbitratu decurionum*) to determine whether the magistrates were to produce a *munus* or *ludi,* but since he also shows that *munus* is a later updating, this cannot apply to the original version of the law.

\(^{172}\) § LXVI not being about the production of shows, it was not a problem then nor is it for the view adopted here that, unlike §§ LXX–LXXI, it was not updated.

\(^{173}\) Note the instructive parallels provided by Pompeii (infra pp.216–20) and Irmi (infra pp.161–53).

\(^{174}\) Transl. Crawford, *RomSt* p.432.
What this chapter seems to be doing is to forbid the grant of public funds for undertakings which, although they benefit the whole community, are in fact private. Thus, while the actual holding of the duovirate and aedileship is a public matter, carrying with it the obligation to organize statutory games (§§ LXX–LXXI), one's candidacy for an office is a private undertaking. The term munus here is entirely appropriate. It must be taken to mean any spectacle, as it often does during the Republic and, in the present context, any non-statutory spectacle.\footnote{On this interpretation, VILLE 1981 pp.73–75 (cf. supra pp.54–55), even though at p.181 he obviously believes that munus, here, is an updating. Crawford’s definition (supra p.67) is right in this case; but this author must be wrong that “the next tablet may well have contained an exception to accommodate §§ LXX–LXXI”: this misses the public/private distinction drawn implicitly by the law. Note also that nowhere is the erection of statues among the public duties of magistrates.} It is therefore not arbitrary that in chapters LXX–LXXI, on public events, facere is used (munus ludosue ... faciunto), and here, dare and polliceri. With this last verb in particular the drafters of the law must have had in mind those shows and other gifts which were promised in return for a successful bid for an office.\footnote{On such events, cf. infra pp.193–96; cf. also supra p.53.}

4. Venationes

During the Empire, venationes are generally taken to be part of the program of gladiatorial munera, but some inscriptions show that they could still be produced independently. It is worth noticing, too, that venationes presented at gladiatorial munera are sometimes described in more details (kinds and number of beasts) than the gladiatorial program. It is therefore appropriate to discuss venationes on their own. The next table presents all occurrences of venationes (p.70).

Except for the doubtful no. 260 from Narbonensis, all epigraphically attested venationes in the West come from either Italy or Africa. It is possible, of course, that several of the munera recorded in Tables III.1–4 also included venationes, even when this is not...
Table III.5

VENATIONES

T. Venations not categorized as in U below:

1. venatio

   Edicta Pompeiana: 63, 66, 73, 76, 89, 91, 93, 94, 96b–d, 98b, 99, 100, 102, 106, 109, 110D–F, 123; 112. Elsewhere: 9, 72, 87, 158 (cf. U.2), 179 (ad deam Pelinam ... u.), 189, 201, 241, [260], 355, 370 (ludi cum venatione); [RGDA App.4]; cf. 428 (P.1); 447 (Q.2).

2. venatio ...

   27, 88, 96a, 161, 210 (u. legitima); 108 (u. matutina), cf. 111B (matutini); 118, 120 (u. passiua ...; cf. U.1); 162 ll.8–9, [459] (u. plena); 87 (u.uria), cf. 333 (U.1); 92 (Ti. Claudi Veri u.).

U. Venationes + program or largesses:

1. venatio + bestiae or ferae 162 ll.5–6, [414], RGDA § 22 (u. bestiarum Africanar.); 333 (u. uari generis dentatar. ferar. et manslletar. item herbaticar.); 445 (uenationes cotidie omnis ge[neri]s);

   120 (u. passiua densis bestis et IIII feris dentatis); cf. 125, 139, [391] (Q.2).

2. venatio + noxei 158 (u. quae noxeorum comparatione adornata est).

specified. In no. 139 from Beneventum, a munus is recorded in which different kinds of wild beasts were displayed, but the term uenatio is not used. No. 428 – an unusually long mosaic inscription – is unique in having “munus” meant for a uenatio. The term shows up three times in a part of the inscription which alleges to be reporting the audience’s very words in praise of the munerarius, one Magerius. Since there seems to be no parallel for this in the stone inscriptions, this usage could be colloquial and, perhaps once again, the inscriptions are showing their conservatism and resistance to change.178

Just as in the Greek part of the Empire, uenationes are rarely mentioned outside

---

177 Venationes presented independently from a gladiatorial or other show are underlined, including no. 179 (T.1).

178 On the mosaic, BESCHAOUCH 1966 (who discusses the inscription at length), DUNBABIN 1978 pp.67–69, pls. 52–53, and infra pp.221–22. It is not impossible that in African inscriptions “munus” sometimes means “uenatio”, but since some inscriptions make a distinction between the uenatio and the munus gladiatorium (333, 355), this is rather unlikely.
the context of a gladiatorial show.\footnote{Cf. ROBERT 1940 p.310, and more generally pp.309–12 on the topic of this section.} In Italy, no. 241 is one such case, but since the inscription is quite early (first half of first century) it is probably that \textit{uenationes} were not yet well integrated into the program of the \textit{munus} (cf. supra pp.55–56). There are two Pompeian posters in which \textit{uenationes} are presented as the main attraction, without an accompanying gladiatorial program (92, 99; also 112?). According to Ville, these again are independent \textit{uenationes}, but Sabbatini Tumolesi is perhaps right to link them with the ban on gladiatorial shows (and, as it seems, not on \textit{uenationes, athletae} and other attractions) following the riot of A.D. 59.\footnote{VILLE 1981 p.222; SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.33, 45; her interpretation depends on the date to assign to the relevant posters. On no. 112 cf. EAD. p.82.} In the later first and second century common expressions are \textit{paria gladiatorum} (or \textit{familia gladiatoria}) et \textit{uenatio}\footnote{Nos. [27], 88, 162, 189; cf. also 87.} and \textit{paria gladiatorum adiecta} (or \textit{cum} \textit{uenatione}).\footnote{Nos. 88, 158, 161, 210; cf. also 125.} These expressions suggest that \textit{uenationes} were not yet well integrated into the \textit{munus}, while the phrases \textit{adiecta/cum \textit{uenatione}} also indicate a subordination of the \textit{uenatio} to the gladiatorial program. But is this still true in the second century? To answer this let us go back to earlier periods. As Ville remarked, \textit{uenationes} continued to be listed as a special attraction in Pompeian posters, together with athletes and \textit{uela}, up until the last days of Pompeii (T.1–2).\footnote{VILLE 1981 pp.221–22.} Following Augustus’ reform (supra pp.55–56), one might have expected that, in the course of the Julio-Claudian era, \textit{uenationes} would have become well integrated into the program of \textit{munera}. It was apparently not so. But as we have seen, the language of posters was extremely stereotyped, and might well reflect, here again, a more ancient state of affairs than the reality of their time. It so happens that almost all gladiatorial shows advertised in Pompeii included a \textit{uenatio}. It is clear, therefore, that \textit{uenationes} were no longer just a special attraction, and that they indeed had become an integral part of
munera.\textsuperscript{184} From this perspective the phrase "gladiatorum paria et uenatio pugnabunt" (cf. supra p.59) looks like a rather ill-conceived attempt to "drag" the uenatio out of the special attractions, at the bottom part of posters, and into the main program. All this suggests that, even if the expressions "paria gl. adiecta uenatione" and the like were still used in the second century, they seem to reflect earlier conditions, stilted by epigraphic formalism. This hypothesis also accounts for the fact that the term "munus", which is otherwise much more frequent, is found once only in such expressions (9; cf. 118).

Several second- and third-century African inscriptions mention uenationes. As in Italy, at least some of the events combined a uenatio with a gladiatorial show (333, 355), though it should be noted that the expression munus gladiatorium is used rather than the Italian paria gl. and familia gl. We have seen above that on the Magerius mosaic the term munus is used for a uenatio (428). Since the representation itself is limited to venatorial scenes, there is no reason to doubt that this uenatio was the main event of the program. This independence from a gladiatorial program appears elsewhere. In mosaics, uenationes are in fact commemorated much more frequently than gladiatorial shows.\textsuperscript{185} In no. 370 a uenatio is offered at ludi. In no. 333 the uenatio is, unlike the accompanying munus, described in quite a lot of detail; the producer seems to have given more importance to it than to the gladiatorial program.

Other inscriptions, which are mostly difficult to date but roughly contemporary with the African ones,\textsuperscript{186} show that a reemergence of independent uenationes occurred in Italy at about the same time (second century, rather in the later part, and third century). In no. 139, we are in the context of a munus, but details are given only about the uenatio; as in

\textsuperscript{184}Cf. VILLE p.221. Curiously, he seems not to have realised that "familia gl." and "paria gl." are also to be explained by epigraphic formalism.

\textsuperscript{185}DUNBABIN 1978 pp.65–87 and in particular 67–70, where it is argued that the Magerius mosaic and other such representations commemorate actual events; cf. G.-Ch. Picard, RA 1980 p.347.

\textsuperscript{186}Nos. 72, 120, 179, 201. All are 2nd c., rather in the later part, or 3rd c.; no. 179 dates from A.D. 271.
no. 333, the producer seems to have invested more energy and money in it than in the gladiatorial program.\footnote{Although no mention is made of gladiatorial fights, I do not think that this munus was limited to the uenatio; for in that case one would expect a phrase such as munus ... ferarum ... rather than munus ... feris ... (in which I take feris to be an ‘instrumental-accompanying’ ablative).} In nos. 120 and 201, uenationes are mentioned without any word about a gladiatorial show. No. 72 contains a phrase encountered nowhere else in our catalogue: *ob promissam uenationem*, which probably means “instead of a uenatio”; this uenatio, though it was not actually produced, apparently had again been promised outside the context of a gladiatorial show.\footnote{For the meaning of “ob” cf. FORA 1996 pp.44 n.145, 51.} In no. 179, as in the African inscription no. 370, a uenatio is presented in the context of ludi. There is, however, a major difference between the two, for the entire African event was privately organized and financed, while the Italian uenatio, also a private undertaking, was “prefixed” to ludi sollemnes. Still, both documents show that the uenatio had gained much independence from the gladiatorial munus. There are unfortunately no inscriptions which would document later periods, but those discussed here belong to the early stages of a lengthy process, which lead to the disappearance of gladiatura in different parts of the Empire between the third and fifth century, while uenationes thrived for a few more centuries.\footnote{On all this, VILLE 1960; ID. 1979; WIEDEMANN 1992 pp.128–64.}

Some inscriptions and posters record *uenationes legitimae* (T.2). In his *Claudius*, Suetonius mentions this emperor’s numerous gifts of spectacula; among these he recalls two munera in particular; one took place in a praetorian camp and did not include a uenatio or the apparatus (*Claud. 21: sine uenatione apparatuque*); the other one he calls a *munus iustum atque legitimum* (ibid.), which seems to mean that it was produced according to legislation, probably Augustus’ (pp.55–56), and therefore that a uenatio was included. We have seen above how Suetonius also contrasted boxers in gangs with *pugiles legitimi*
All this suggests that uenationes legitimae were produced as part of the program of a munus, which of course also included a gladiatorial program. Two more points need to be made: first, since most uenationes of this type were privately organized (chapter IX), that a uenatio is legitima in terms of the content of its program and occasion on which it is offered, not only in terms of its public or private nature; second, that probably many uenationes (nude dictae) were also, therefore, uenationes legitimae, though this is not specified; this is demonstrated by the four posters 96a–d, if one agrees that they are all about one single event which was postponed twice.191

“Venatio matutina”, a term encountered in a single Pompeian poster (108), is probably not particularly meaningful either, since uenationes normally constituted the morning (matutinum) program, while gladiatorial fights were presented in the afternoon.192 In another poster (111B), among the attractions we find matutini, that is, probably, the uenatores who fight in the morning uenatio. Two inscriptions record uenationes passiuae (T.2: 118, 120) which, on the evidence of no. 120 (cf. U.1), probably means that the program was diversified. Perhaps about the same thing is meant by the uenationes omnis generis found in an inscription from Antiochia (U.1: 445); the uenatio uaria of no. 87 (and cf. U.1: 333); and the uenationes plenas of no. 162, where we find another uenatio, but limited this time to African wild beasts (bestiae Africaneae). Unfortunately, because these expressions are very rare, it is not possible to establish with certainty their exact meaning.

5. Lusiones

As we are about to see, when encountered in inscriptions, lusiones are events

190For the record, note also how Petronius compares his characters to legitimi gladiatores, who hand themselves over, body and soul, to their master (117.5: tamquam legitimi gladiatores domino corpora animasque religiosissime addicimus).

1915 Ville 1981 p.358, who is confirmed in his opinion by the recently discovered no. 88; contra: Sabbatini Tumolesi 1980 p.131.

pertaining to the arena. It is therefore appropriate to discuss them in this chapter, in spite of the fact that the term *lusio* is derived from the same root *lud- as ludi.* The very few epigraphic commemorations of *lusiones* that came down to us are collected in the next table.

---

**Table III.6**

**LUSIONES**

V. *lusio*  
F.Ost passim; 295 (*munus gladiatorium et duo lusiones*); 36 (*dies lusionis seu compositionis*); 350, 400 (*editio lusionis*).

---

Several interpretations have been proposed for *lusiones,* particularly in the course of this century as the fragments of the *fasti Ostienses* were being brought together and studied. L. Wickert and Ch. Hülsen suggested that *lusiones* were episodes of the *munus* itself. A. Degrassi, editor of the *Fasti* for *Inscriptiones Italiae,* rather proposed that they were short representations given as a prelude to the actual *munus* ("breves ludi muneri ipsi praemissi"). M.G. Granino Cecere recently published an inscription from Praeneste in which a ‘day of *lusio*’ is equated with a ‘day of *compositio*’ (36). According to her, *lusiones* are thereby defined as preliminary matches to determine pairs of opponents for the *munus* proper. But while it is true that *compositio* can mean just that, it can also mean, more basically, ‘the matching (of two opponents, at the actual show)’. This in fact seems more

---

193. Literary attestations of the term *lusio* are never about public shows (cf. *TLL VII* s.v.) and, therefore, not useful for the present purpose.
194. It is worth noting that other gladiatorial terms are also derived from this root, particularly *ludus* (training school of the gladiators and *uenatores*) and *prolusio* (warming up exercises before the actual fights).
196. A. Degrassi, *Inst* XIII 1 pp.227–28; Id., *RPAA* 12, 1936, pp.182–83. According to Degrassi, *lusiones* were synonymous with *prolusiones,* but G. Lafaye and others after him are probably right that *prolusiones* were rather the gladiators’ warming up exercises. *Prolusiones* are attested in several authors, but never in inscriptions; cf. esp. Cic. *Orat.* 2.316, 325; LAFAYE 1896 p.1594; VILLE 1981 p.408; MOSCI SASSI pp.158–61 s.v.
appropriate for a passage of the *Fasti* belonging to the time of Hadrian:

[--- Imperator Caesar Traianus Hadriani]nus Aug(ustus) munus edere / coepit gladiatore / r(um) / p[aribus] ---] II XXXIII kalendae Maias composit[ae sunt] / II lusiorum et munere dier(um) XXXVIII gladiatori[m] pp(aribus) / ---]XXVIII, bestiae consectae n(umero) II (milia) CCXLVI. VII kalendae Iunias / [Augustus] munere muneris Veneri edere coepit, pugnat(um) / s [diebus ---] II; pr(idie) non(as) Iun(ias) lusionem secundam edere coepit, pugnat(um) / [diebus ---] III gladiatori[m] pp(aribus) CLXXXV, bestiae consectae n(umero) CCCXXXIX

At ll.2-5 it is said that a number (now mostly lost) of pairs of gladiators were matched during two (or more?) *lusiones* and the *munus* proper; also, that 2246 beasts were killed. It is clear that *composita* refers to the total number of pairs that were displayed (just as *consectae* refers to the total of beasts killed), and that it applies not only to the two *lusiones* but also to the *munus* itself. Of course, Granino Cecere’s interpretation is not thereby ruled out, but as we are about to see, there are further reasons to question it.

For one thing, in the years 107-108 of the *fasti Ostienses*, a total of about a thousand to twelve hundred pairs of gladiators fought in three *lusiones*. The ensuing *munus* of 108-109, celebrating Trajan’s Dacian victory, displayed close to five thousand pairs, that is, between four and five times the number of pairs which fought in the *lusiones*. If the function of *lusiones* was to determine who will be matched at the actual *munus*, one should expect that the number of pairs displayed in them and in the ensuing *munus* be approximately equal, or else that an explanation for the huge difference should be provided.

One other problem to consider is that the honorand of no. 36 needed an imperial authorization (*indulgentia sacra*) to produce his *lusio*. Granino Cecere and others after her have difficulty in explaining this. Fora suggested that it might have been needed for the

---

198 InsIt XIII 5, fr. XXXVI; EAO Ri 11 (the restitutions are secure enough): “[On such-and-such a date the Emperor Caesar Trajan Hadrian] Augustus [inaugurated a] *munus* [with so many] pairs of gladiators; by April 18 during [two] *lusiones* and the *munus*, for thirty-eight days, [so many pairs] of gladiators were matched, and 2246 beasts were killed. On May 26 Augustus (i.e. Hadrian) inaugurated the first *lusio* of the *munus* to Venus which was fought for [eight/nine days]; on June 4 he inaugurated the second *lusio* which was fought for [eight/nine days]; 195 pairs of gladiators (fought) and 443 beasts were killed.”
simultaneous production of a *uenatio* which, after all, seems to be inappropriate at a *lusio* if one adopts Granino Cecere's definition. However, this is to neglect the fact that beasts were killed also at imperial *lusiones*, at least from the time of Hadrian. The passage quoted above from the *fosti Ostienses* records two different sets of events. In the first one, which has already been discussed, it is not possible to determine whether some of the beasts were killed during the two *lusiones*. The text is more explicit about the *munus* vowed to Venus, which immediately follows. All that is left is the account of the two *lusiones*.\(^\text{199}\) but it is clear that the number of 443 beasts killed concerns only these, not the *munus* proper. Fora assumes that *uenationes* were offered separately, even though the term *uenatio* is not used.\(^\text{200}\) This is consistent with his understanding of *lusio* which is basically that of Granino Cecere, but the very fact that the *lusio* of no. 36 was also the occasion of a display of wild beasts should have led him to reconsider the whole issue. In fact, since this inscription dates to the middle of the second century, it is very possible that the honorand was consciously imitating, on a very modest scale, the emperors' *lusiones* in Rome. There is left no reason to doubt that the imperial authorization was granted not just for the *uenatio* but for the entire *lusio*. This type of event was for Praeneste an innovation, and this is likely what called for an imperial authorization, or what caused the perception that one should be obtained.

So far as the Italian evidence is concerned, therefore, when all the above facts are taken into consideration, it seems preferable to return to Degrassi's suggestion, that *lusiones* were shorter preludes to the actual *munus*, even though there is no apparent reason why some shows were structured in such a way.

In the text from Corduba (295), two *lusiones* are recorded but, after what was just said, it seems rather unnatural for them to be mentioned not before but after the *munus*,

---

\(^{199}\)The passage quoted belongs to the bottom part of a tablet; the rest was evidently at the top of the next tablet.

\(^{200}\)FORA, *EAOR IV* ad no. 11: "Le coppie di gladiatori esibite in questa occasione [i.e. *lusiones*] furono 185, mentre le *bestiae* uccise durante le *venationes*, che evidentemente ebbero luogo, furono 443."
especially since care was otherwise taken to list the different benefactions and events in their order of occurrence. E. Hübner, followed by P. Piernavieja, suggested hesitatingly that these lusiones were ludi scaenici; F. Bücheler, that they were uenationes. The locution munus et duo lusiones suggest an amphitheatrical context – if not uenationes, then gladiatorial exhibitions and/or executions of criminals. Two African inscriptions, nos. 350 and 400, record lusiones independently of any munus. For P.I. Wilkins, who published no. 400, these were “probably venationes rather than gladiatorial contests given the predilections of audiences in Africa and an abundant supply of beasts.” As we have seen, this African predilection is perhaps not so marked as generally believed, but Wilkins could still be right. At the very least, we can be confident that in Africa lusiones belonged, as in Italy and in Corduba, to an amphitheatrical context, since the honorand of no. 400 was being praised at the same time for his embellishment of the local amphitheater.

What to conclude from all this? At the very least, that there is no reason to doubt that lusiones, when recorded in inscriptions anywhere, were events belonging to the arena of the amphitheater. Our single Italian lusio was presented before a munus, as in Rome, but provincial inscriptions show that this was not a universal rule. Perhaps, just as with uenationes, lusiones progressively became autonomous from munera. This might have been facilitated by the fact that lusiones did not belong to a long tradition. The explanatory phrase seu compositionis of no. 36 suggests that, even after the middle of the second century, not everyone was expected to know what a lusio was. In fact, lusiones are not attested before the age of Trajan, when they appear in year 107 of the fasti Ostienses, and possibly did not go back much earlier since they were apparently unknown to the Pompeians. In the present state of our knowledge, it seems preferable to adhere to Degrassi’s hypothesis, with the

---

201 Hübner, EE III ad no. 16; PIERNAVIEJA, CIDER ad nos. 41 and 87, cf. p.149; Bücheler, Kleine Schriften II p.234; A.U. Stylow, CIL II 7 ad no. 221 refers to Granino Cecere.
proviso that lusiones might not have been required everywhere and at all times to precede a munus, nor even to have been presented in conjunction with one.

6. Municipal munera and uenationes

Our inscriptions allow us to have a fairly good idea of why gladiatorial shows and uenationes were recorded in stone. This topic will receive full treatment in chapter IX, and here will only be touched upon. Munera publica are particularly instructive. These are known mainly from the title of the curators of such events. When a munus publicum is recorded in some other way, it is always for another benefaction, usually a supplementary program offered privately at the same time. This is exactly what we found about no. 165 (supra pp.57–58). Likewise, in a text from Telesia (186), it is a privately funded day appended to the public show that is being commended. That these supplements were in most cases rather modest compared to the two- to four-day long public part of the show is irrelevant. Private days were outbursts of generosity, not required from the curator, and this accounts for the emphasis put on them in the inscriptions. The pattern of commemoration of munera is therefore similar to that of ludi (supra pp.51–52).

Since the Pompeian material is unique in its variety and quantity, more has been said in this chapter about Pompeii than any other site. But this is due primarily to the exceptional conditions which allowed the material, particularly parietal inscriptions, to survive, and there is no a priori reason to think that Pompeii was any different from other towns in the area. After all, if the Pompeian evidence for munera and uenationes had been limited to stone inscriptions (87–88), there would be little to distinguish Pompeii from the rest of Campania and adjacent areas. However, the local amphitheater is the earliest one known to us to have been built of stone in the entire Roman world, and probably few communities had, like Pompeii, their own gladiatorial school. From very early on, therefore, gladiatura must have been tied to Pompeian society and economy in ways known in few
other places, and it is perhaps no accident that the riot of A.D. 59 occurred precisely in what otherwise must have been a rather unremarkable town.
IV. ATHLETIC CONTESTS

As was said in the Introduction, sacred *agones* such as the *Sebasta* at Naples are not discussed in this dissertation. However, some Greek athletic sports were gradually accepted in the West and integrated into local *systèmes spectaculaires.* Athletic events produced and financed in the same way as other Roman shows are the subject of this chapter.

This having been said, it is important to stress that the Etruscans had a greater influence than the Greeks in the introduction and appreciation of boxing, wrestling and running at Rome.203 According to Livy, at the first *ludi Romani,* organized by the Etruscan king Tarquinius Priscus, horse races were presented as well as boxers, almost all from Etruria (Liv. 1.35.9: *ludicrum fuit equi pugilesque ex Etruria maxime acciti*). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in a famous passage in which he borrows from Fabius Pictor, claims to describe the opening procession and program of the votive circus games organized by the dictator A. Postumius at the beginning of the fifth century. After the notorious chariot races, there was another event: an athletic program of racing, wrestling and boxing competitions.204 In a passage from the *De legibus,* Cicero mentions exactly the same athletic program, his wording implying that this was an entirely regular feature of the *ludi circenses.*205

---

203 THUILLIER 1982 is fundamental on this issue and will be used extensively throughout this chapter. Almost at the same time appeared another useful study, CROWther 1983, which deals with the same issues as Thuillier, but more succinctly. The terms “athletics” and “athletes” will be used for Greek as well as Etruscan and Roman events, even though they should apply more properly to Greek events only.

204 Dion.Hal. 7.72.2; 73.3; cf. *FGrH* IIC pp.866–68 where Fabius’ and Dionysius’ words are distinguished typographically. Dionysius wants to prove the Greek origin of the Romans, but this aberration does not mean that the facts themselves, borrowed from Fabius Pictor, are false; cf. THUILLIER p.114.

205 Cic. Leg. 2.38: *iam ludi publici, quoniam sunt cauea circoque divisi, sint corporum certationes cursu et pugillatu et luctatione curriculique equorum usque ad certam uictoriam in circo constituti* (*Now, since*
There is no contradiction between these facts and Livy’s recording of the *athletarum certamen* offered in 186 B.C. by M. Fulvius Nobilior, which according to the historian was the first such event ever presented to the Romans.206 While the events discussed above were Etruscan and Roman in origin, this was an *agon* or *certamen* – Latin writers use either term to render the Greek *ἀγών* – of the Greek type.207 Nobilior’s *athletae* probably included runners, boxers and wrestlers, as in the Roman program, but there must also have been pancratiasts, as well as pentathletes running, wrestling, long jumping, and throwing the discus and javelin. Moreover, while Roman athletes were wearing a loincloth, their Greek counterparts performed naked. This was perhaps the most shocking novelty for the Romans: still under the Empire, after Nero had established his short-lived *Neronia* and Domitian, the *Capitilia*, there were many in the élite who showed their indignation and blamed the moral decline of their time on the Romans’ adoption of Greek nakedness and rubbing with oil for gymnastic training.208

The paucity of sources shows that the athletic program of the circus games was much less popular than the horse-races. Still, the literary evidence also indicates that boxing was by far the most popular athletic sport among the Romans.209 This is reflected also in the Italian and provincial inscriptions, which are presented in Table IV.1 (next page).

The Romans’ preference for boxing is immediately apparent. There is not one inscription in which athletic events such as running, the pentathlon, or even wrestling, are...
Table IV.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W. Pugiles and pyctae:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pugiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. certamen pugilum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. spectaculum pugilum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. pugiles cateruarii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. pyctae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. Athletae:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. athletae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. certamen athletarum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y. Varia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. certamen gymnicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ludi gymnici</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

recorded, though they may be comprehended by the more general term *athletae*. Iconographic evidence, however, suggests that wrestling and the pancration were also popular. For example, a sarcophagus in the Lateran Museum in Rome and a mosaic from Ostia show these three combat sports together; there are also some wrestling scenes known from African mosaics (cf. infra). Together, the evidence shows a marked preference among the Romans for combat sports, and it is likely that the term *athletae* can be a generic for fighters in these sports. This issue will be further explored below.

---

210 Athletic contests which were a lesser feature in the program of a show are in brackets. A new inscription from Misenum records an annual show of 10 pairs of wrestlers (*luctatores*): cf. infra n. 515.
There were different types of boxers. They could fight in pairs or in gangs; and fighting in pairs could be done according to the Greek or some indigenous technique. The belief held by some scholars in the past that, while Greek boxers fought in pairs, early Roman ones fought in gangs (*cateruae*, hence *pugiles cateruarii*), has been shown by Thuillier to be false. The Etruscans fought in pairs, as is attested by several representations, such as in the Tomb of the Augurs at Tarquinia, and as we shall see, there is no evidence before the Empire that Roman boxers fought in gangs. This fits well with the linguistic evidence, for the expression *pugiles cateruarii* found in no. 87 suggests that *pugiles* (i.e. *nude dicti*) normally fought in pairs.

All this is supported by a passage in Suetonius’ life of Augustus that deserves some attention here:

spectauit autem (Augustus) studiosissime pugiles et maxime Latinos, non legitimos atque ordinarios modo, quos etiam committere cum Graecis solebat, sed et cateruarios oppidanos inter angustias uicorum pugnantis temere ac sine arte.

*pugiles legiti mi etque ordinarii* are contrasted with (*pugiles*) *cateruarii*, which suggests that “regular and ordinary” boxers fought in pairs. This is confirmed by the fact that “Latin” boxers of this type could be matched against Greek boxers, who always fought in pairs. One other point has not received all the attention it deserves. As we saw (pp.65–66), events which were termed *legitimi* were probably presented at public games, or with private funds but according to rules and regulations that applied at public games. Boxers exhibited in the

---

212 Differences in techniques and equipment will not be discussed in detail here; see POLIAKOFF 1987, though he is more concerned with Greek than Etruscan and Roman combat sports.
214 THUILLIER p.110 on this and further examples.
215 Suet. Aug. 45.2: “(Augustus) watched boxers with great interest, especially Latin ones, and not only those of the regular and ordinary type, whom he even used to match against Greek boxers, but also boxers from other towns who fought in gangs, without art or thought, in the narrow places of Rome’s *uiset*”. *Cateruarii oppidani* are boxers, not just townspeople fighting in gangs, as the Loeb (J.C. Rolfe, 1914) and Budé (H. Ailloud, 1931) translations have it.
circus at the great public games of Rome were therefore fighting in pairs, while *cateruarii* fought where they did – in narrow public places – probably because there was no room for them at such games. But why are *cateruarii* also qualified *oppidani* by Suetonius, that is, ‘from elsewhere than Rome’? The most likely explanation is that boxing in gangs had been introduced rather recently to Rome; performers were probably coming for the most part from those centers where it was commonly practised. We may have some indications where that might have been. Suetonius records of Caligula that he used to introduce, during gladiatorial shows, fights between gangs (*cateruae*) of the best African and Campanian boxers.\(^{216}\) It is perhaps more than a coincidence that the epigraphic evidence for *cateruarii* is so far limited to one inscription from Pompeii in Campania (87) and two from Caesarea in Mauretania (W.4 in the table). It should be noted too that no. 87, which belongs to the Augustan age, and the passage quoted from Suetonius’ life of Augustus, constitute together our earliest evidence for *cateruarii*. That they are not attested under the Republic is probably to be explained by their local (non-Roman) character and the fact which ensues that they did not perform at public games.\(^{217}\)

The more common term for a boxer is *pugilis*; but one also finds *pycta* (or *pyctes*) which probably means a boxer in the Greek style since it is transliterated from the Greek ποίκτης. This term is used only very occasionally by Latin writers,\(^{218}\) but the earliest attestation of all is found in an Augustan inscription, again no. 87 from Pompeii, which records our single example of a show that included *pyctae*.\(^{219}\) This is too little to come to

---

\(^{216}\) Suet. *Cal.* 18.1: *cateruae Afrorum Campanorumque pugilum ex utraque regione electissimorum.*

\(^{217}\) Thuillier suggested that *pugiles cateruarii* may have been copying the technique of *gladiatores gregarii*, who likewise fought in gangs; however, his claim that *gregarii* are attested under Caesar is unsubstantiated since his source, Suet. *Caes.* 39, says nothing of the sort; cf. THUILLIER p.111 n.27. In fact, gladiators fighting *gregatim* are not attested before Caligula (Suet. *Cal.* 30.3), and MOSCI SASSI p.110 could be right that this rather means that several pairs were fighting at the same time in the arena.

\(^{218}\) Phaed. 4.25(26).5; Sen. *Nat.* 4a pr.8; Plin. *Nat.* 7.152; Mart. 11.84.14; Tert. *Ieiun.* 17 (cf. n.222). Cf. THUILLIER p.109.

\(^{219}\) Another *pycta* painted an electoral poster: *C IV 387 = ILS 6418b.*
any solid conclusion, but it is possible that such boxers were more popular in more Hellenized regions, such as Campania. However, Greek boxers may have been seen more frequently in local shows than it appears at first. In no. 87 pyctae are just one of several attractions, and we are simply fortunate that so many details were provided about the program of events. Moreover, as Thuillier has shown, pugiles could be Greek as well as Roman boxers. Cicero, who never uses pyctae, says pugiles for boxers who fight at the Olympics. In the Suetonian passage quoted earlier from the Divus Augustus, both Latin and Greek boxers are pugiles, while Tertullian places side by side pugiles and pyctae Olympici, which indicates that he thinks of pugiles as Roman boxers.

Interestingly, all epigraphic mentions of shows of pugiles (nude dictO come from the provinces, except for one in an electoral poster from Pompeii (W.1–3 in the table). It is remarkable that such events were often organized independently from other shows. Some of the displays of pugiles were extremely small and must have attracted only local contenders, such as those at Barcino (273) and Gori (364), for which we know how much was spent each year (cf. infra). But to determine the exact nature of these events, we must also look at shows of athletae, since their geographical distribution seems to complement that of shows of pugiles.

Only a few inscriptions mention athletae (X.1–2 in the table), but it is not clear what these are meant to be. Sabbatini Tumolesi thinks that those athletae mentioned in an inscription (87) and a few posters (92, 99, 123) from Pompeii were wrestlers. Ville, on the evidence of Suetonius and Dio for Rome, wonders whether they were boxers, or perhaps

---

220THUILLIER p.109 for this and what follows.
221Cic. Tusc. 2.40–41; Brut. 243; pugiles inexcercitati ... Olympiorum cupidī ...
222Tert. Iesu i.7 (CSEL 20 p.297 L.18: soginenitur pugiles et pyctae Olympici ("one fattens Roman and Olympic boxers"). Likewise in Scorpi. 6, he says pyctes of the boxer who competes in the Pythia at Carthage.
223This would therefore be evidence that the youth in these (and other) towns practiced athletic sports.
224SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 ad nos. 1, 11–13, 18–19, 75, but without discussion.
Looking at both the literary and epigraphic evidence, Thuillier came to the conclusion that in some contexts, *athletae* are to be understood as Greek athletes in general, and in others, as “heavy” athletes – boxers, wrestlers or pancratiasts – either Greek or Roman. The evidence Thuillier puts forward is compelling, but when he further suggests that in no. 87 *athletae* were Greek athletes in the general sense, he misses the fact that they fought in pairs, which shows that they performed in some combat sport. Note also that *athletae* were advertised in posters for only two Pompeian shows, and that there were gladiators in neither of them (92, 99); we are probably in the period following the ban on gladiatorial shows in A.D. 59, and *athletae* seem to be working as a substitute for gladiators. It is likely, therefore, that these *athletae* were fighting in pairs like gladiators or the *athletae* of no. 87. Therefore, if for now we leave aside no. 261, which belongs to a later period, the evidence suggests that the *athletae* mentioned in Augustan and Julio-Claudian inscriptions were heavy athletes. There seems to be no reason why they would have to be only boxers, or only wrestlers or pancratiasts; the use of *athletae* rather indicates that more than one of these categories were displayed at one time. Moreover, so far as the epigraphical evidence goes, wrestlers and pancratiasts are never attested during this period, while *pugiles* (*nude dicti*) are attested only once, in a peculiar electoral poster (but cf. infra), which further suggests that a show normally included more than just one of these categories. In no. 87 the thirty pairs could very well have included an equal number of ten pairs of each.

In the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, *pugiles* (*nude dicti*) are attested only once epigraphically, in an electoral poster which reminds the Nucerians of the *pugiles* produced by a candidate to the censorship: “... Nucerians, you watched his boxers!” (79B);
this could mean that his show included only boxers, but since the language is not that of a formal *editum muneris*, it could be that the term *pugiles* was substituted for *athletae* to make the message more effective, by stressing the most popular of combat sports.

This can be no more than a suggestion, but one that should make us cautious about the meaning of *pugiles* in provincial inscriptions: the neat geographical and chronological distribution between earlier Campanian *athletae* and later provincial *pugiles*, rather than a difference of program, could be the result of a linguistic process whereby “*pugiles*” gradually extended its meaning to designate any show of heavy athletes; no. 79B could be providing an early example of this usage, when possibly it was still a colloquialism (which the informal and exclamatory tone allows). The process may have been accelerated by the spread of Greek-style competitions and *athletae* in the West, particularly on the North African coast, where in the later second and early third century four sacred *agones* are attested together at Caesarea and Carthage. This would fit well with the iconographic evidence: Africa, where most inscriptions mentioning *pugiles* come from, has produced as many mosaic depictions of wrestlers as of boxers;229 pancratiasts, too, were familiar to provincials, as is shown by representations in mosaics and other media.230

Another, probably second-century, inscription from Arelate (Arles) records a testamentary foundation for annual athletic or circus games (261). The amount of the gift is quite large, HS200,000, which at 5 or 6% interest means that HS10,000 or 12,000 could be spent on the show each year. This is considerably more than the 250 denarii (= HS1000)

229The evidence is collected by KHANOUSSI 1991; wrestling scenes are known from Utica, Githis and Thaenae; boxing scenes, from Thaenae, Thuburbo Maius and Silin. The last is missing in Khanoussi’s list, and is only superficially described by O. Al Mahjub, *LibAnt* 15–16 p.74 with pl. XXVIIIb. Boxers and wrestlers are shown together in representations of Greek-style *certamina*: cf. infra.

230Mosaics: beside representations of pancratiasts in Greek-style *agones*, on which cf. infra, there is a panel from a bath-building at Herrera in Baetica; cf. A.S. Romo Salas & J.M. Vargas Jimenes in *Anuario arqueológico de Andalucía* 1990, 3 p.439 with figs. pp.437, 440–41. Bronze sculpture: e.g. A. Scherer in *LANDES* ed. 1994, no. 42, a first-century statuette of a pancratiast from Augustodunum (Autun). Ceramics: note H. Chew in *ID.*, no. 72: a lamp of Augustan date from Orange with what appears to be a pair of pancratiasts (*THUILLIER* 1996 p.114), but wearing loincloth; if this identification is correct, it would mean that the pancration had been integrated into Roman athletics.
provided annually for a boxing show at Barcino (273), or the surprisingly small annual return of 60 denarii (= HS240) at Gori, which was apparently sufficient to provide for a boxing competition, oil distribution and banquet for the decurions (364). For a show of such a scale as at Arles there is no reason to restrict the meaning of athletae to heavy athletes. Moreover, Narbonensis is one of the provinces in the West where Greek athletics is best attested. Among the extant scenes of the Mosaique des athlètes vainqueurs from Vienna is that of a discus thrower. An agon is recorded for the same town by Pliny the Younger which, like the one at Arles, had been established by a private foundation. Agonothetae are attested in Arles’ neighbour, the Greek Massilia, but also at Nemausus, on the right bank of the Rhône river.231

The athletic show at Arles, if it was ever organized, was not a sacred competition but one that attracted athletes by handsome cash prizes for the winners. The inscription from Arles is the only one from the West which records such a competition. Otherwise, beside Pliny’s letter quoted above, we are mostly limited to archaeological evidence, such as a mosaic from Theveste which depicts an athletic show and a uenatio offered after the return of a successful commercial expedition.232 In most cases, however, such depictions are open to several interpretations and the nature of the competition cannot be established with certainty.

There remains an early first-century inscription from Herculaneum which is rather different from the rest (67: Y.2 in the table). It records that one day was added to ludi gymnici to honor after his death a prominent local notable. The formulation makes clear that these “gymnic games” were a periodic event. Because of the early date, they were more

232 For this interpretation, DUNBABIN 1978, esp. pp.74, 126, with pl. 59; KHANOUSSI 1991 p.319 reached the same conclusion, apparently not aware of Dunbabin’s discussion.
probably statutory than instituted by means of a private foundation (infra chapter IX). The term "gymnicus" indicates that athletes were naked and that the program was Greek, whether this was limited to combat sports or included other events as well. At any rate, this inscription is one more piece of evidence that shows that athletics was well received in Campania. No doubt the great Greek city of the area, Naples, influenced its neighbors.

The small amount of evidence, epigraphic and other, indicates that athletic shows were never disseminated in the West as far and wide as ludi or munera. Still, what we do have seems to form a coherent picture, and several interrelated points can be made. Firstly, during the Empire, Italians and provincials usually preferred programs limited to combat sports, perhaps influenced in this more by the Roman than the Greek model. However, since our evidence is almost only about privately financed events, the choice of program must have reflected above all the preferences and financial capability of the producer or founder. Some of the shows, particularly in the smaller African towns, were very modest and definitely local in character; it is hardly imaginable that a professional athlete would have made a special trip to Gori for the handful of denarii he could have hoped to win there (364, 365; and cf. infra n.515). Interestingly, except for Dalmatia (460), there is no epigraphic evidence from the northern provinces for shows of heavy athletes. This silence need not be caused by a lesser interest for combat sports: still in the first half of the third century or thereabout, one finds at Tarnaiae (Massongex) in Switzerland a mosaic panel depicting a pair of boxers wearing loincloth.233 While epigraphic evidence for games is at any rate sporadic in the more remote parts of the Empire, in more urbanized regions there was perhaps a better integration of athletic sports into the system of public games. Thus inhabitants of Narbo, Lugdunum and other cities with a circus may well have seen

---

233V. von Gonzenbach, Die römischen Mosaiken der Schweiz (Basle 1961) pp.131–34; F. Wible in LANDES ed. 1994 pp.73–75. Wible thinks this is a training scene, but a palm shown between the two boxers suggests rather an actual contest.
athletes during their annual circus games, just as in Rome. For lack of evidence, however, this can be no more than a hypothesis.

Secondly, even if the independence of heavy events is characteristic of the western part of the Empire, it is clear that Roman athletics was greatly influenced by its Greek counterpart. Thus in extant mosaic panels from Africa, none of which is earlier than late second century, boxers and wrestlers are always naked, while in at least one of the boxing scenes, the opponents are equipped with the terrible Roman caestus (gloves) adorned with metal spikes.234 In most cases, however, it is not possible to determine whether a scene is Roman or Greek, or whether this distinction is still meaningful in this comparatively late period. As for the inscriptions, the fact that some say certamen (W.2 in the table) and others, spectaculum (W.3), does not seem to correspond to any distinction between Roman and Greek events. The combination of a regatta with a boxing contest (certamen) has nothing Greek to it (285); and the plural certamina in nos. 373 and 412 calls to mind the notion of pairs of contenders, not that of the Greek agon.

Lastly, the security and prosperity brought about by the pax Romana encouraged the diffusion of Greek culture throughout the Empire. With this came the creation of numerous new Greek sacred agones, some in the West, as at Puteoli and Carthage.235 It is interesting to note that some Roman features occasionally crept their way into Greek-style agones. Agonistic mosaics from Ostia and Tusculum, in which pentathletes can be identified, show boxers wearing the spiked caestus. Among the scenes of a magnificent mosaic from Baten Zammour in central Tunisia,236 which shows the complete program of an athletic agon, is one of an athlete brandishing what in all likelihood is a mappa or “flag”, which was normally used by a presiding magistrate in starting chariot-races at the circus;

234The mosaic from Silin shows the caestus, which is possibly also depicted at Thaenae, though J. Thirion, MEFR 69, 1957, p.225 with pl. III.2, does not contemplate this possibility; cf. supra n. 229 for references.
235Cf. in particular ROBERT 1984 on this whole issue.
another scene depicts a race in armor with torch, for which there is no Greek parallel; but
the whole representation has a strong Greek character, particularly because all athletes are
naked, except obviously for those racing in armor. The general impression left by the
documentation is that the Romans' appreciation for Greek athletics increased as time
passed, but that they saw no problem in integrating Roman elements to Greek-style contests.
V. THE LVSYS IVVENVM

The interpretation of the evidence, literary, epigraphic and numismatic, relevant to the study of the *lusus iuuenum* (also called *lusus iuuenalis* and *iuuenalia*), is not without problems. Fortunately, from the point of view of the production of such spectacles at the municipal level, the numismatic evidence and almost all relevant literary passages have little to offer and can be left out without cause for concern. It is enough to know that organizations of *iuuenes* ("youth") were either revived (particularly at Rome) or instituted for the first time as one of Augustus' numerous reforms. Table V.1 presents all municipal instances of the *lusus iuuenum*.

---

**Table V.1**

**THE LVSYS IVVENVM**

1. *lusus iuuenum* 5, C XII 533 = ILN III 41; 45, 198, [199] (curator i. i.); 197 (cur. l. i. Victoriae Felicitatis Caesaris); cf. 304 (*iudi iuuenum in theatro*).
2. *lusus iuuenalis* 25, 30, 43 (cur. l. i.); C XIV 2640 = EAOR IV 40 (*sodales l. i.*).
3. *iuenalia* 215B, C; 201 (editor Iuuenalium); 166 (*dena iuuenaliorum*).

---

The *lusus iuuenum* is known almost exclusively from Italian inscriptions. Elsewhere in the West, it is only in Singili Barba (304, if *iudi iuuenum* means the same thing, which is probable) and in a metrical epitaph from Aquae Sextiae in Narbonensis, of a young man who died at nineteen, that this term is attested. Little is actually known about this spectacle which was either performed by, or for — modern scholars do not even agree on that — members of local *iuuentutes* or *collegia iuuenum* (youth associations). Relevant for
the study of the latter, beside a few literary passages, are more than two hundred inscriptions from all over the Roman West.237

Several important studies about the iuuenes have appeared in the last two decades or so.238 Most have something to say about their games but, to take two extreme positions, while M. Jaczynowska argues that training for the lusus iuuenum was, with religion, the main occupation of the iuuenes, P. Ginestet believes rather that these youth enjoyed the show as spectators and only occasionally performed in it.239 Ginestet supports his claim by pointing out that the evidence for such games is almost entirely limited to a small area in central Italy. But this is to miss one important aspect of epigraphic commemorations. As we have now seen on several occasions, games are usually recorded when they, unlike statutory games, are not expected or required, such as the public games organized by duoviri and aediles all over the Roman West. It is therefore necessary to reexamine the evidence about the lusus iuuenum with that in mind.

The inscriptions we do have are few, but very instructive. As Ginestet himself remarked, though he did not realize the consequences of his observation, the lusus iuuenum is known mostly from the inscriptions of the curatores of such events (cf. Table V.1). The title of curator lusus iuuenum and its variants is well integrated into the municipal cursus, as is clear from a look at our inscriptions.240 At least in cities where this title is attested, the lusus iuuenum was certainly a public event, produced annually or at least at regular intervals. In Capena, on the other hand, fragments of local fasti record ludi and Iuuenalia

237JACZYNOWSKA 1978 and GINESTET 1991 provide catalogues, but disagree on the inclusion or exclusion of many documents (they have 224 and 242 respectively); cf. KLEIJWEGT 1994 pp.80–81. Beside the inscriptions in Table V.1, cf. nos. 18, 168, 191 and 384.

238To the studies mentioned in the previous note, add e.g. F. Jacques, “Humbles et notables. La place des humiliores dans les collèges de jeunes et la révolte africaine de 238”, AntAfr 15, 1980 pp.217–30; and M. Kleijwegt, Ancient Youth, Amsterdam 1991. SLATER 1994 has more to say about iuuenes than the title (“Pantomime Riots”) suggests. E. Eyben, Restless Youth in Ancient Rome, London 1993, does not deal with the epigraphic evidence, nor with the games of the iuuenes.


240We also find titles such as magister, praefectus and quaestor iuuenum (e.g., in our catalogue, 191, 18 and 25, respectively) along with other titles and honors in municipal inscriptions.
but, so far as one can tell, no other category of event; apparently, only the public spectacles organized by the local magistrates were recorded, and these, again, included the Iuuenalia (215B, C). Dio tells us that, as a iuuenis in his native town of Reate, Titus performed in the amphitheater with blunt weapons during the lusus iuuenum – ἐν ταῖς τῶν νεανίσκων παιδίαις (65.15); the definite article suggests that these were regular or normal events in Reate, and therefore should have been regulated by local legislation. The presence of sodales lusus iuuenalis at Tusculum (Z.2 in the table) indicates yet in another way that this spectacle was well organized. The evidence mentioned so far does fit a public and regulated show, not one that was produced privately on the impulse of, or by (successfully) exerting pressures on, members of the local élite.

Still, there is clear evidence that the lusus iuuenum was at times produced thanks to the generosity of wealthy individuals. An inscription from Carsulae, no. 201, provides our single attestation of an editor Iuuen(aliun). For Jaczynowska this function was probably identical with that of curator; Gregori disagrees, but without providing an alternative explanation. Ginestet touches upon a fundamental aspect of the problem when he claims that the title of editor puts emphasis on the private aspect ("l’aspect personnel") of the function; the editor "n’agit peut-être même pas au nom de sa ville ou du collège, mais il assure encore plus certainement le financement de l’opération." One should note in this context that, unlike our editor, no curator is honored for his lusus iuuenum; it was the duty of the latter, once appointed, to produce a show (entirely or at least partly with municipal funds); his function was probably very similar to that of the curator munieris publici (chapter IX). Could it be that there was no such fund in Carsulae for the Iuuenalia? If so, the iuuenes were probably compelled to court local notables, for example by honoring them as

---

242 Ginestet 1991 p.134. Once again, however, Ginestet did not appreciate fully the importance of his observation.
patrons of their association, in order for a show to be produced.

It is also conceivable that the *Iuvenalia* had in Carsulae a long history behind them, but that for some reason the city had forsaken the responsibility of producing them. In an inscription from Anagnia that could be contemporary with that from Carsulae, another patron is honored by the local association of *iuuenes* (3). This man, a Roman knight, had restored the *lusus iuuenum* after it had fallen into oblivion. This revival of an old tradition was therefore privately financed. Later, in A.D. 325, a notable from Amiternum was honored as patron of the city for his numerous benefactions, among which was the restoration of public works and several public buildings (166). For the dedication of these he offered two days of scenic representations and ten days of *Iuvenalia*, if this is the correct interpretation to give to the Latin, very poor at this point (*biduum theatrum et dena Iuuenaliorum spectaculis exhibuit*). This is the only occasion known to us when *Iuvenalia* were offered for a dedication. But for our purpose, what matters most is that, once more, the show was produced with private money. The whole passage (cf. catalogue ad loc.) leaves one with the impression that Amiternum, in the early fourth century, was hardly able to maintain much of its basic infrastructures. Providing for the local *Iuvenalia* must have been very low on the list of priorities.

A pattern can be discerned. All attestations of a municipal (i.e. public) *lusus iuuenum* belong to the period between the Tiberian age and the end of the second century, while the three privately financed shows that we know of are to be dated between the end of the second century and the age of Constantine. Could it be that the cities became increasingly incapable of maintaining the *lusus iuuenum*, possibly at the time of the progressive decline of the Italian economy? This would explain why the *iuuenes* eventually

243 *Curatores*: 43 (A.D. 32/33), 45 (mid 1st/mid 2nd c.), 25 (late 1st/early 2nd c.), 30 (after 150), 199 (2nd c.), 197 and 198 (2nd half of 2nd c.); duovir (cf. infra): 304 (A.D. 109); duoviri or other magistrates (cf. infra): 215B and C (2nd c.).

244 Nos. 201 (end of 2nd/3rd c.), 5 (1st half of 3rd c.), 166 (A.D. 325).
had to solicit local notables. In 257, we see the *iuuenes* at Beneventum coopt patrons, among them senators and equestrians; they express no shame in telling why: *plus speramus beneficia uberiora* (C IX 1681: “we hope for even more generous benefactions”). In this context a passage from the *Historia Augusta* deserves notice. In the life of the three Gordians it is stated, on the (probably fictitious) authority of Cordus, that the future Gordian I, apparently consul at the time, “produced at his own costs, in all the cities of Campania, Etruria, Umbria, Flaminia and Picenum, scenic games and *Iuuenalia* for four days”.245 To claim that Gordian produced such spectacles in all the cities of these regions is an obvious exaggeration. But it is not inconceivable that, in the early third century, local associations of *iuuenes* would have approached and honored a personage of his stature in the hope he would defray the cost of their games. If so, when, early in 238 in Thysdrus, noble *iuuenes* revolted against Maximinus, they had very good reasons to turn to Gordian and beg him for his consent to their proclaiming him emperor: not only was he governor of the province, he also was known for his close ties with the *iuuenes*.246

I suspect that the following inscription from Paestum, dated to the year 245, belongs to the same general context (AE 1935, 27 = EAOR III 64):

*M. Tullio Primigenio Benneiani | Laurentis | Lavina(tis) | lib(erto), Augustali, | homini probissimo. | summari(sus) suo, | studiosi jüuenes ob plurima ac maxima beneficia | eius in se conlata. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). | Dedic(ata) sextum kal(endas) April(esi) | Imp(eratoris) Philippo et | Titiano co(n)s(ulibus), cur(antibus) L. Digitio, L. Celado.* 247

245*HAGord 4.6: Cordus dicit in omnibus ciuitatibus Campaniae, Etruriae, Vmbriae, Flaminiae, Piceni de proprio illum per quadridentum ludos scenicos et *Iuuenalia* edidisse.* On Cordus cf. R. Syme, *The Historia Augusta. A Call for Clarity*, Bonn 1971 pp.62-64. On Gordian’s consulship, cf. *HAGord* 4.1–5.1. If the *Historia Augusta* is to be trusted, Gordian was consul with Caracalla; the latter reached that office in 213 and that would be the year when the *Iuuenalia* were produced or promised.


247*To Marcus Tullius Primigenius, freedman of Benneianus, Laurens and Lavinas, priest of the imperial cult, most virtuous man, the devoted *iuuenes* (give this statue) to their umpire for his many and excellent kindnesses towards them. Site given by decree of the decurions. Dedicated on 27 March when the Emperor Philip and Titianus were consuls (= A.D. 245); Lucius Digitius and Lucius Celadus were curators.”*
The "devoted" iuuenes erected a monument to "their umpire" (summarudi suo), a freedman and augustalis, for his numerous benefactions towards their association. It is therefore possible that Primigenius was an ancient gladiator who became summarudis after a successful career in the arena, that is, umpire at gladiatorial shows.\(^{248}\) However, it seems to me that the title of summarudis could be entirely honorary in this inscription. Indications of this are the affectionate suo and, more importantly, the actual cause of the erection of the monument (ob ... beneficia eius), which tells us that the honorand was an important benefactor of the association. Moreover, Primigenius' career, for what we know of it, is typical of that of an ambitious freedman and parvenu, not an expert at gladiatorial matters. His seat on the local board of augustales was probably earned with the support of a benevolent ex-master and patron, but also after considerable expenditures on public works or games.\(^{249}\) In fact we know from another inscription that he was curator of the restoration of local baths, which was financed by his patron (AE 1935, 28). In order to build up a personal fortune he is likely to have been involved in business activities, as is well attested for men of servile background who became augustales like him. Also typical is Primigenius' patronage over a local association, in his case the iuuenes. The title which the latter bestowed upon him suggests strongly that he had, like others at this comparatively late date, financed the production of the lusus iuvenum. The iuuenes obtained the right from the decurions to erect the monument on public land;\(^{250}\) they were possibly hoping for more benefactions from Primigenius, but they may also have hoped to attract the attention of

\(^{248}\) On summa- and secundarudes, see VILLE 1981 pp.369–72 (also pp.217–18 on our inscription) and L. Robert, Hellenica 5, 1948, pp.84–86. Some of the evidence adduced by Ville could indicate that at times summarudis was rather said of a trainer, as Mommsen, Hermes 21, 1886 pp.269–70 and LAFAYE 1896 p.1590 thought; if so, it could be that, in our inscription, the iuuenes claim that their relationship with Primigenius is as intense as that with their trainers: cf. infra.


\(^{250}\) This was quite a common occurrence; cf. J.-P. Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains I, Louvain 1895, pp.510–12.
others among the wealthy who were in need of social recognition. Whatever may be the case, the document appears to be typical of later periods and shows once again that the *iuuenes* became considerably dependent on private patronage to maintain their activities.

What of Ginestet’s remarks about the distribution of the inscriptions? Was the *lusus iuuenum* mostly an Italian phenomenon? M. Kleijwegt rightly pointed out that we cannot rely entirely on the inscriptions to determine the diffusion of the *lusus iuuenum*.\(^{251}\) This is most obvious when the African evidence is examined, for while the inscriptions could be taken to show that it was unknown there, several passages in the Christian authors prove the opposite.\(^{252}\) Besides, the two provincial mentions we do have owe their existence to peculiar conditions. It is only because he died at nineteen, still a *iuuenis*, that the “exploits” at the *lusus iuuenum* of the young man from Aix were immortalized in a poem.\(^{253}\) In no. 304 from Singili Barba the honorand is not praised for his *ludi iuuenum in theatro* but because he took on himself to give, on the same day, free access to the baths; these *ludi iuuenum* are mentioned only to provide a context\(^{254}\) and look very much like a regular duty of the local magistrates, just as they apparently were in Capena (215C). If this is right, we have a crucial reason to question Ginestet’s analysis. In any city where it was entrusted to magistrates or other officials, the *lusus iuuenum* had become one of their regular duties and

\(^{251}\)KLEIJWEGT 1994 pp.85–86; cf. p.91.  
\(^{253}\)C XII 533 = *ILN* III 41. Here is the part of the inscription that concerns us (LL.3–4, 6–10): *Vno minus quam bis denos ego uixi per ann o s ... qui, docili lusu iuuenum bene doctus harenis, Pulcher et ille lui; uariis circumdatus armis, saepe leras fusi; medicus tamen is quoque uixi et comes ursaris ...* (“I lived twenty years less one; ... well instructed in the arena in the skillful *lusus iuuenum*, I was the famous Pulcher; girt with a variety of weapons, I often made sport of wild beasts, but I also lived as their veterinarian and a comrade of those who fight bears ...”; my punctuation and translation of the text are influenced by those of J. Gascou, *ILN* ad loc., and COURTNEY 1995 ad no. 119).  
\(^{254}\)So are, in fact, in the same inscription, the *ludi publici*, because the benefactor had increased them by as many days of private games.
therefore was unlikely to be rewarded with an honorary inscription. Some other cities adopted a different approach: they created a special fund which was administered by a curator lusus iuuenum, whose title happens to be self-explanatory. These different approaches have not left the same mark in the epigraphy. In fact, it is conceivable that the appointment of a curator was peculiar to some parts of Italy, and that perhaps many more cities entrusted the lusus iuuenum to their annually elected magistrates, which we may never be able to prove. It is therefore not possible to determine the diffusion of the lusus iuuenum on the basis of the epigraphic evidence. Literary sources are of little help since they almost never refer to specific productions of the lusus iuuenum. Still, as we have seen, what they do say provides a reminder that the epigraphic record, or lack thereof, should not be taken for a reflection of the reality.

What was the program of the lusus iuuenum, and who performed in it? It will soon become apparent that these two questions are better treated together. As we have seen, modern authors disagree about the extent to which the iuuenes performed in their own games, but all who have dealt with this question agree that some, at least, did. In Ostia, an association calls itself iuuenes qui Ostiae ludunt (C XIV 4148). The iuuenes at Paestum had their summarudis, that is, their umpire;\textsuperscript{255} even if summarudis is honorary, as was suggested above, it shows that training to perform in the arena was a defining characteristic of this iuuenes association. In Spoletium is attested a pinn(irapus) iuuenum, which is perhaps a title for a trainer of the iuuenes in pseudo-gladiatorial activities.\textsuperscript{256} This man was, as the summarudis from Paestum, a seuir augustalis and probably a freedman. His title could very well again be honorary. Nevertheless, here as in Paestum, the iuuenes show their

\textsuperscript{255} AE 1935, 27 = EAOR III 64; cf. supra pp.97–99.
\textsuperscript{256} C XI 7852 = EAOR III 24; cf. Iuv. 3.152–158; the expression pinnas gladiatorum rapere is found in the Tabula Larinas (SCLor L.10). GINESTET pp.142–43 argues that the pinnirapus was a trainer at gladiatorial skills; KLEIJWEGT p.87 adds that this is true for pseudo-gladiatorial fighting.
commitment to some form of gladiatorial training.

As we saw, African \textit{iuuenes} performed as \textit{uenatores}, as well as the \textit{iuuenis} from Aix. The expression \textit{feras ludere} in the latter's epitaph suggests that \textit{iuuenes} who displayed their skills against wild beasts did not face the same dangers as professional \textit{uenatores}.\textsuperscript{257}

In Rome, \textit{iuuenes} trained at athletics; there is evidence that some did elsewhere as well. M. Le Glay came up with convincing arguments that the \textit{Mosaïque des athlètes vainqueurs}, found in Vienna on the Rhône, adorned the local seat of the \textit{iuuenes}.\textsuperscript{258} The latter are otherwise attested in that city thanks to several first- and second-century inscriptions of the \textit{flamines iuuentutis}.\textsuperscript{259} At the center of the mosaic is a depiction of the killing of the Nemean lion by Hercules, whose cult among the \textit{iuuenes} is well attested;\textsuperscript{260} in eight medallions are depicted, as the name indicates, triumphant athletes. If Le Glay is right, this means that the local \textit{iuuenes} were particularly fond of athletic games. In this they were no different from the community at large, since several sources attest to the importance of athletics in Vienna.\textsuperscript{261}

The mosaic also depicts eight actors' masks on pedestals, but Le Glay thinks the \textit{iuuenes} enjoyed scenic representations only as spectators and did not act on stage because of the actors' infamy. Early imperial legislation, however, shows that, in Rome at least, the

\textsuperscript{257}Cf. supra nn.252, 253. According to Tertullian, \textit{morsus ferarum ornamenta sunt iuuentutis} (\textit{De an.} 58.5: “wild beasts' bites are the youths' ornaments”); this indicates, if it applies to hunts in the amphitheater, that there was some danger to perform even at the \textit{lusus iuuenum}.

\textsuperscript{258}LE GLAY 1982; CALDELLI 1997 pp.448–51.

\textsuperscript{259}C XII 1783, 1869, 1870, 1902, 1903, 1906 and, from Cularo (Grenoble), which was then a dependence of Vienna, C XII 2238, 2245. Could it be that it was a duty of the \textit{jlamen iuuentutis} to organize a \textit{lusus iuuenum}? If so, such a spectacle would be a defining characteristic of this priesthood and it would be otiose to claim in an inscription to have organized it.

\textsuperscript{260}JACZYNOWSKA pp.55–56; GINESTET pp.172, 174.

\textsuperscript{261}D. Valerius Asiaticus, a senator from Vienna who had been made to commit suicide, was contemptuously called a \textit{palaestricum prodigium} by the emperor Claudius (C XIII 1668 = ILS 212: the \textit{Table claudienne} from Lyon; cf. Tac. \textit{Ann.} 11.1 on his suicide; a troop of \textit{scaenici Asiaticiani} is attested: C XII 1929 = ILS 5205). There was also an athletic competition (\textit{gymnicus agon}) established by a testamentary foundation; its legally dubious cancellation by a duovir had caused enough stir for the matter to be referred to Rome (Plin. \textit{Ep.} 4.22).
stage (as well as the arena) had a great appeal even for some among the equestrian youth.\footnote{On this issue, SLATER 1994 esp. pp.131–32 (knights performing as pantomimes), 139–43 (equestrian \textit{iuuenes}, the \textit{Tabula Larinas}), with further references.}

At the municipal level, sources are scarce, and only suggestive that \textit{iuuenes} may have appeared on stage. Associations of \textit{iuuenes} in Lanuvium and Milan are known for their close links with pantomimes who were famous in their days.\footnote{C XIV 2113 = ILS 5193 (Lanuvium: \textit{pantomimo sui temporis primo ... allecto inter iuuenes}); IRT 606 (Lepcis Magna: \textit{pantomimo temporis sui primo ... Mediolano inter iuuenes recepto}). Cf. J.-P. Morel, \textquote{Pantomimus allectus inter iuuenes}, \textit{Hommages à Marcel Renard} II, Bruxelles 1969, pp.525–35; \textit{KLEIJWEGT} 1994 p.90.} When, following the outbreak of the revolt in 238, Maximinus addressed his army he ridiculed Gordian’s forces: their combat training was in choruses, jesting, and rhythmic dances (that is, mime or pantomime).\footnote{Herod. 7.8.5. They also carried for weapons the lances they used in the arena to fight wild beasts. Cf. supra p.6. On \textit{iuuenes} and the stage, see for further references \textit{KLEIJWEGT} 1994 pp.88–90.}

Ginestet claims that in nos. 166, 201 and 215C the \textit{iuuenes} did not perform in the show, which gives him one more reason to think that few \textit{iuuenes} associations were training for this purpose. However, there is no evidence in these inscriptions to support or refute his claim. Interestingly, Ville wrote about the \textit{uenatio} recorded in no. 201 that “il est évident qu’à cette \textit{uenatio} ne parurent pas des bestiaires professionnels, mais les \textit{juvenes} de la cité”\footnote{GINESTET pp.157, 296 (Table V); VILLE 1981 pp.219–20. GREGORI, \textit{EAOR} II ad no. 33, also thinks that the \textit{iuuenes} performed in that show.} As for the \textit{ludi iuuenum in theatro} held in Singili Barba (304), which were unknown to Ginestet, P. Le Roux has argued that the \textit{iuuenes} were spectators, not performers,\footnote{LE ROUX 1991 p.276.} but there is actually no reason to think they did not perform as well. Ginestet’s thesis is therefore not supported by the evidence; so far as one can tell, in cities where a \textit{lusus iuuenum} was produced, \textit{iuuenes} were indeed training to appear in the arena, in the palaestra or stadium, possibly also on stage.

As we have seen, it seems not possible to determine how widespread was the
lusus iuuenum, but we know that youth organizations at times focused on occupations other than training. In some border areas, particularly in remote parts of North Africa and Germany, we see them training at warlike skills and serving a paramilitary function; some have argued that they had a significant political role at the municipal level; they also have left much evidence of their cultic activities, which is not surprising since there was no association without a cult being shared by its members.\(^{267}\) As so often, a careful examination of the inscriptions does not allow for a simple and neat account to be drawn. Ginestet's attempt to find one defining purpose for the associations of iuuenes in the Roman West is unconvincing and has been rightly criticized.\(^ {268}\) Moreover, even in places where the iuuenes trained and performed, the program of the lusus iuuenum corresponded to local tastes and preferences. This may explain why most of our evidence is for programs of amphitheatrical events.

\(^{267}\) On these activities, see Jaczynowska pp.55–66; Ginestet pp.159–83; Kleijwegt 1994 passim.

\(^{268}\) Ginestet makes the questionable statement on p.159 that since the games were not the main activity of the iuuenes, then other activities, particularly (para)military ones, must have been. Jaczynowska on pp.60–66 provides enough evidence for one to question her statement on p.55 that sport and religion were the main activities of the iuuenes. Kleijwegt 1994 is a long review of these two books.
VI. “NON-TRADITIONAL” DENOMINATIONS

In the previous four chapters, almost all gifts of games known from the inscriptions have been presented in the tables and discussed.\(^{269}\) In this and the next three chapters will be studied terms and features which encompass or disregard the traditional categories of *ludi (scaenici)*, *(ludi) circenses*, *munera*, *uenationes* and athletic contests. Terms such as *editio* or *spectaculum*, verbs used to express the production of games, or the mention of the duration or price of events, tell us much about what Italian and provincial Romans understood their games to be, and what significance they gave them. It is therefore in chapters VI–IX that our premise of a need to examine together all kinds of gifts of games will be fully justified.

As we have been able to see, the different categories of games are rarely confused in the inscriptions. However, other terms are encountered which bring together the traditional categories. These terms, which we will qualify as “non-traditional”, have been presented in the tables throughout the previous chapters, but are only now brought together in Table VI.1 (pp.106–7).

In documents of a legal nature, *spectacula* are any and all kinds of shows that are or could eventually be produced locally (A.3 in the table). Thus the *lex Irnitana* says *ludi* for the games which the duoviri were to produce at Irni (§ LXXVII = 3); but in chapters on seating arrangement at games (LXXXI) and days when matters may not be judged

---

\(^{269}\)Those which do not fit the traditional categories are presented in this chapter.
Table VI.1

"NON-TRADITIONAL" DENOMINATIONS

A. Spectaculum:

1. = ludi

- sp. = ludi and/or circenses: (A): RGDA App.A; cf. LudSaecA l.54; (II): 16, [401], 426, (II/III): 187, 300, 366, [411]; LudSaecS l.l.37, 38, 80; IRT 606.

2. = munus


3. = ...

- sp. = ludi and/or circenses + munus: (II): 126; (IV): 203 l.l.32, 36, [409]; sp. pugilum: (II): 273; (II/III): 460; (III) 419; sp. pugilum et aurigarum et ludorum sc.: (II/III): 379; [- - -]: (II): 270; (III): 339B; cf. athletarum ... sp.: (A): RGDA § 22.

4. = ?

- sp. = spectaculum-l-a: (I): C XI 3805 = ILS 6579, C XII 6038 = ILS 6964 l.l.8, 15; LexIrn § LXXXI, LXXXII; (II): 267, 294; (II/III): 235, 264, 378; (III): 253; (IV): C VI 31893 = ILS 6072.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE.

(LXXXII), the law uses spectacula, obviously not limiting the provisions to only those ludi. By contrast, the Urso charter ignores the term spectaculum; among the privileges of the pontiffs and augurs is the right to sit among the decurions to watch the games and gladiatorial fights (2 § LXVI: ludos gladiatoresque); meanwhile, chapters CXXV–CXXVII, which specifically address the issue of seating privileges, deal only with ludi in general (CXXV), and ludi scaenici (CXXVI–CXXVII). This discrepancy perhaps reflects the fact that the materials used in the drafting of the law belonged to periods when gladiatorial

---

270In nos. 87, 120 and perhaps 166 l.25, the term spectacula means the amphitheater (cf. ÉTIENNE 1965). This sense is the earliest one attested in the epigraphy, in the dedication of the amphitheater at Pompeii which was probably begun between 80–70 B.C. (C X 852 = ILS 5627: ... spectacula de sua peq(unia) fact(unda) coer( auerunt) ... ; cf. WELCH 1994 p.61).

271LexIrn § LXXI: quae spectacula in eo municipio edentur ...; § LXXXII: ... quibusque diebus ex decurionum conscripseruntur decreto spectacula in [e]o [m] municipio edentur ...

272Quicumque locus ludis decurionibus datu ... ad signatus relictus erit, ex quo loco decuriones ludos spectare opportebit ... ("Whatever place will be given, assigned or left to the decurions at the games..."); CRAWFORD 1993 p.616 and ID., RomSt p. 449 is not justified in claiming that ludi here are "shows in general as opposed to plays".)
shows were only sporadically seen outside Rome and parts of Italy, and when there existed as yet no permanent facilities to hold them; moreover, they lacked the official character of ludi and may originally have been considered to fall outside the scope of municipal constitutions.

From Veii comes a Tiberian decree which grants to a benevolent imperial freedman what apparently are the ornaments of an augustalis, which included “his own bisellium among the augustales during all shows (omnibus spectaculis) to be held in our
town". To my knowledge, this is the earliest inscription in which the term *spectaculum* is used to designate all kinds of shows comprehensively. The extant portion of the so-called *lex de flamonio provinciae Narbonensis* (C XII 6038), a Flavian *constitutio*, details among other things the seating privileges of provincial priests during shows; the term *spectaculum publicum* is used twice: obviously, the same dispositions were to prevail at scenic representations, circus games and gladiatorial shows, which are all attested in some way or other at Narbo.

Secular Games are called *spectacula* in the Augustan and Severan records of these events, but the differences are significant. In the Severan record, we find expressions very similar to those of other second- and third-century inscriptions (infra). In the Augustan fragments, *spectaculum* occurs only once, at line 54: *quod tali spectaculo [nemo iterum intererit]: “no one will assist twice at such a sight”*. Pighi’s restitutions must be close enough to the original since the *saeculum* corresponded in theory to the longest possible human life. There is no reason in this case to restrict the meaning of *spectaculum* to a performance of *ludi*, as in the Severan record, rather than to the more basic meaning of a sight or spectacle, since it would reduce the effectiveness of the statement being made.

One more document deserves our attention that is not in our catalogue: Augustus’ *Res Gestae*. In the princeps’ political testament, neither *ludi* nor gladiatorial *munera* or *uenationes* are assimilated to *spectacula* (§§ 9, 22); but a mock naval battle (§ 23: *naualis proeli spectaculum*) and three athletic displays (§ 22: *athletarum undique accitorum*

---


275 LudSaecS esp. LL.37–38: ... *item nonarum die et VIII id. easdem, theatris tribus, ligneo, Pompeiano, Odifo --- spectacula quae s[ux]mus e[dituri ---]is fr[ --- / dein die] VII idium earundem circensium spectacula in circo Maximo dabimus.
"NON-TRADITIONAL" DENOMINATIONS

spectaculum) are. These shows were exceptional and their being called spectacula by Augustus seems to leave them out of Rome's system of regular mass entertainments. The naval battle was a one-time event staged in 2 B.C. at his personal expense. Two athletic shows were offered on the Campus Martius by the princeps in his own name, and a third in the name of a nephew (Germanicus or Drusus?); the private character of these events is certainly one main reason why Augustus calls them spectacula, not certamina or agones, which would have been more appropriate for a periodic Greek competition. Moreover, at that time, Greek athletes were still an exceptional sight in Rome, where the first quinquennial certamen was founded by Nero.276

In the Appendix of the Res Gestae, one finds the expression [spec]tacul[a] sca[enica] (App. 4), which is otherwise unattested. But the Appendix, "poorly written and useless to the readers in Rome", was not composed by Augustus but by some provincial hand for a provincial audience.277 Moreover, it has been argued that it was originally written in Greek, and only then translated into Latin; in the Res Gestae proper, whenever Augustus says ludos — which, as we know, were scenic representations and/or chariot races — the Greek translates θέας (§§ 9, 22); but spectacula scaenica, in the Appendix, is in fact a better equivalent to the corresponding Greek θέας (which, more basically, were spectacles at the theatre, θέατρου); accordingly, it seems likely that someone more preoccupied with the correct rendition of the Greek than the actual nature of the Roman institution translated θέας by spectacula scaenica. For our purposes, therefore, spectacula scaenica is an artificial construct and can be disregarded. One can conclude from all this that Augustus

276THUILLIER 1996 p.51 is certainly right to reject M.-L. CALDELLI's claim, 1993 pp.21–24, that the quinquennial ludi pro aeternitatem Caesaris, decreed by the Senate in 30 B.C. in honour of Octavian (Dio 51.19.2, were a Greek-style certamen: according to Augustus himself they were ludi (RGDA 9.1), and the program is not tripartite; moreover, Suétionus says that Nero's agon, the Neronia, was the first such event in Rome (Nero 12.3).

277GAGÉ p.9, with further references. The Res Gestae were primarily intended for the inhabitants of Rome itself: BRUNT & MOORE 1967 pp.3–4. Cf. CAVALLARO 1984 pp.22–24 for "una rilettura di R.G. App. 4", which I find unconvincing since it does not take into account the peculiar character of the Appendix.
was meticulous in the terminology he used to describe the games he offered to the Roman
people, which is consistent with his penmanship throughout his political testament.278

Therefore, the inscriptions outside our catalogue record several nuances of
meaning for the term spectaculum. These nuances, incidentally, are all to be found earlier in
the literary sources, which suggests again that the language of inscriptions is rather con-
servative.279 In municipal contexts, however, so far as the evidence goes, actual productions
of shows are called spectacula only from the second century.280 But when this happens, any
kind of show can be called a spectaculum (A.1–4 in the table); thus we find expressions
such as spectaculum ludorum scaenicorum and spectaculum munere. It is particularly
interesting that several spectacula were mixed programs of ludi and gladiatorial or
sometimes boxing fights (A.3), while at other times the program is not even specified (A.4).
The significance of this will be examined after other non-traditional terms have been
reviewed.

There are almost as many editiones in our catalogue as there are spectacula, but
while spectaculum, with the meaning of “games”, is common in the literature from Cicero to
the Christian authors of the fourth and fifth centuries, editio, when taken to mean the
production of a show (and not, for example, the publication of a book), is attested only from
the second century in inscriptions (B.1–3 in the table) and still later in Ulpian (who wrote
mainly under Caracalla) and other jurists whose excerpts were collected in the Digesta.281

278In GAGÈ’s words, 1977 p.38 (with references), Augustus is “soucieux du mot précis et volontiers
technique, surtout quand il s’agit du vocabulaire politique”.
279E.g. in Cicero: spectacula = all public show: Mur. 73; Fin. 5.48; spectaculum = privately organized
show (most of the times gladiatorial): Tusc. 2.41; but also spectaculum = solemn ludi: Phil. 1.36. Livy is
more inclined than Cicero to refer to solemn ludi as spectacula: e.g. 2.36.1 (ludi magni); 45.1.8 (ludi
Romani). Suetonius shows even less restraint in doing so, and note the expression sollemne spectaculum at
Gal. 6.2).
280No. 270 has been dated by A. Chastagnol, IN L’ad Riez no. 15, to the late 1st or 2nd c., but the
evidence collected here indicates that we should prefer a date in the 2nd c. On no. 126, cf. catalogue ad loc.
281E.g. Ulpian, Dig. 50.12.5. For later examples, cf. infra n.284.
Tertullian seems to be the first author to use this term (*Spect. 6: legatariae editiones*). Before him, it is noteworthy that Suetonius, whose terminology for the games is rich and composite, never does, although he frequently uses *edere* ("produce"). The reason for the discrepancy between *spectaculum* and *editio* is probably linguistic. While both *spectaculum* (from *spectare*: *spect- + -culo-*) and *editio* (from *edere*: *ed- + -ti-on-*) are nouns derived from verbs, only the latter conveys a verbal force, and it so happens that *editio* is mostly used in non-verbal phrases, somewhat as a substitute for phrases with *edere* + direct object (*ludos, munus, &c.*: infra ch. VII). The most common of such phrases is *ob editionem* + genitive (*ludorum, muneris, &c.*):²⁸² also common are expressions using the ablative *editione* with or without a preposition;²⁸³ the verbal force is particularly obvious in nos. 132 and 378 (perhaps also in 367), where an immediately preceding *edere* is taken over by *editio*. It is only in a few inscriptions that *editio*, like *spectaculum*, is allowed to stand on its own as a subject or direct object; some of these inscriptions are quite late and composed in highly abstract (203, 437) when not downright poor (20) Latin. Still, in later periods we find, for example, that *editio* is more frequently attested in the *Codex Theodosianus* than *ludi* and *circenses* taken together.²⁸⁴

Another verbal name is *exhibitio* (*ed- + -ti-on-; E in the table*). The two known instances come from Lepcis Magna and occur in virtually identical phrases, *ob diuersarum uoluptatum exhibitionem/es* (433, 435), which recall the *ob editionem* phrases.

By definition *uoluptates* are any kind of pleasures or delights, but this term often

²⁸²Nos. 14, 35, 147, 203, [212], 268, 350, 383, 384, 435.
²⁸³Without preposition: 165 (ablative of time); 400 (instrumental abl.); with preposition: 318 (*cum*); 332 (*pro*); 378 and 392 (*in*; cf. 220: *in* + accusative); too fragmentary to tell: 367, 443. Note also the abl. absolute in nos. 47 and 132 (*imperata editione ab ...*).
²⁸⁴CodTheod 6.4.13 passim (A.D. 361); 6.4.21.14, 22, 23 (A.D. 372); 15.5.1 (A.D. 372); 15.9.1 (A.D. 384); &c.
is applied specifically to the games. This particular meaning appears in the inscriptions from the second century, possibly not before the second half (C in the table). Examples are rather few, but they seem to be increasing in the third century, when our evidence overall considerably diminishes. Later, in the Codex Theodosianus, scenic representations and the races of the circus are more commonly called *vuluptates* than *ludi*, which suggests that the epigraphic evidence represents an earlier stage of a trend which gained in strength.

The expression *laetitia theatralis* is attested once in our corpus, in a fourth-century inscription (204: E in the table). Games and other celebrations are occasionally called *laetitiae* in literature, but this is a late development since there seems to be no example before Tertullian. Instances in the Codex Theodosianus are few and apply to all kinds of public festivities, including Christian holidays. All this suggests that *laetitia* never acquired a special meaning in the context of the games as did some of the terms discussed above.

It is almost suddenly, at about the beginning of the second century, that new terms appear which are not linked to a specific program, such as the “traditional” terms are. In a way, one who says *editio* looks at an event from the point of view of the producer, while if he says *spectaculum* or *vuluptas*, he takes it first of all as something to enjoy watching, and therefore adopts an audience-oriented perspective. This approach to things seems to be challenging the traditional categorization. Moreover, non-traditional terms often

---

285Cf. e.g. Cic. Mur. 74; Tac. Ann. 3.6.3; 4.62.2: “pleasures”, including the games. Apuleius says *publicae vuluptates* of the several shows produced by a generous notable from Plataea (Met. 4.13; cf. 14). For Lactantius, who discusses at length the pleasures of the five senses, the games are more specifically a *vuluptas oculorum*, a “pleasure of the eyes” (Inst. 6.20.6; cf. Epit. 57).

286Cf. e.g. CodTheod 2.8.25.2 (nullas edidit patimur vuluptates); 6.4.13.2 (where the praetors’ *editio* and the people’s *vuluptates* are two ways of looking at the same thing); 15.5.5 (theatorum adque circensium vuluptate); 15.7.5 (vuluptatibus publicis).

287Tert. Coron. p.9 L.16 (CSEL 70); CodTheod 15.6.1.2 (*maiumae laetitiia* – the *maiuma* being a water spectacle celebrated in the East); 9.38.6.2 (Easter: *Paschalis laetitiiae dies*). Tacitus uses *laetitia* twenty-seven times in his extant works, but never in the sense described here; on two occasions, though, he mentions the joy (*laetitia*) of watching the games (Ann. 14.21.3; 15.53.1); similarly in Suet. Nero 10.2; cf. also Cal. 17.2, where the games are one aspect of public festivities (*laetitia publica*).
stand on their own, so that one cannot tell what kind of show was produced. The language becomes more obscure (from our point of view) in the third and fourth centuries. There is no way to know what *exhibitiones voluptatum* were exactly, and it is not even clear whether they comprehended only privately funded shows, or some statutory shows as well. One of our latest inscriptions mentions the production of *devotiones*, and it is not even certain that these were shows, though this is probable (20: B.3 in the table).

*Ludi circenses* were still celebrated at Rome and elsewhere as late as the middle of the sixth century, but as J.-P. Thuillier observed,

[i]ls n’étaient plus officiellement des *ludi*, c’est-à-dire l’expression de la religion païenne, mais de simples *voluptates*: d’une part, on les dissociait de l’ancienne superstition, et d’autre part on faisait en sorte qu’ils ne fissent pas d’ombre aux fêtes chrétiennes.288

The epigraphic evidence almost disappears after the fourth century, but third- and fourth-century inscriptions seem to testify to earlier stages of this transformation.

As with the Greek term ἀγών, which it often translates,289 the term *certamen* stresses the competitive nature of an event and looks at it from the point of view of the performers (D in the table). It seemed legitimate to distinguish between singular and plural uses. The singular applies to an entire event and can perhaps best be rendered by the expression "sporting contest". The plural, meanwhile, found in three of our inscriptions, is meant to identify the sum of the individual fights during a single show.290

Used in either way, the term *certamen* is usually associated with athletic events, but there are some interesting exceptions. No. 285, from Balsa, records a *barcarum*

---

289 As in *certamen iselasticum* (ἀγών ἐλαστικός, i.e. "sacred contest") said of the Eusebeia, an agon established at Puteoli by Pius in honour of the divinized Hadrian (C X 515 = ILS 340).
290 Also attested in C XIV 1 = ILS 3385 from Ostia (excluded from this study since it is about an imperial event).
certamen. Hübner and, more recently, Piernavieja believed that this was a naumachia.\textsuperscript{291} However, the expression suggests that it was not an aquatic display, such as naumachiae were,\textsuperscript{292} but rather a race between small boats (barcae).\textsuperscript{293} It is likely that this event and the boxing competition that came along with it were rather modest and attracted only local contenders, especially since it was ancillary to the dedication of a statue.

Another hapax legomenon is the expression gladiatorum certamina found in no. 253. This use is probably not technical, and Latin authors occasionally refer to combats between gladiators as certamina; in Suetonius, a troupe of five gladiators is said to have been defeated sine certamine, “without fighting” (Cal. 30.3). Likewise, chariot-races at the circus are certamina, for instance in Ovid (Ars 1.135: certamen equorum) and Suetonius (Claud. 21.3: quadrigarum certamina). In all these passages and in no. 253, what is being stressed is the competitive aspect of the fights, which must determine a winner.

It is only from the second century that the term certamen is epigraphically attested. When this means “sporting contest”, it never identifies a statutory event, except when a sacred Greek agon is meant. Interestingly, athletic contests are attested twice in the first century, but in neither case is the event termed a certamen (67, 87). In no. 67 from Herculaneum, the otherwise unattested expression ludi gymnici is used; the context shows that this was a statutory event, and ludi may have been considered at that time, in a Roman town, more appropriate to translate this fact than certamen or agon.

\textsuperscript{291}Hübner, CIL II ad no. 13; PIERNAVIEJA, CIDER ad no. 13.
\textsuperscript{292}Naumachiae were reenactments of historical naval battle. The most detailed recent studies are GOLVIN & REDDE 1990, and K. Coleman, “Launching into History: Acquatic Displays in the Early Empire”, JRS 83, 1993, pp. 48–74.
\textsuperscript{293}Cf. Isid. Or. 19.1.19: Barca est quae cuncta naus commercia ad litus portat ("A barca carries all of a ship's cargo to the shore").
VII. VERBS EXPRESSING THE PRODUCTION OF SHOWS

Now that all denominations have been introduced and discussed, other features and aspects of the epigraphic language of the production of games require our attention. In this chapter, verbs used to express the production of games will be studied. It is to be hoped that, generally, different verbs translate different realities and, therefore, that verbs are informative with regard to the fundamental question of the public (statutory) or private nature of the games.

Five verbs expressing the production of games account for almost all of our evidence. These are, in order of frequency: *edere*, *facere*, *dare*, *pugnare* and *exhibere*. These verbs (including past participles and gerundives) are presented in alphabetical order in Table VII.1 and are followed by less frequently encountered verbs (pp.116–17).

There are several ways to look at the evidence but a chronological approach is perhaps the more informative in light of the results of our inquiry in the preceding chapter.

So far as the inscriptions are concerned, the verb *facere* ("do, make") is the earliest one to be used regularly for the production of games (D.1 in the table). In the Republican period, it is used almost to the exclusion of other verbs. Republican inscriptions, however, are not a good indicator of Republican practices in general: all recorded events are *ludi*,294 for which the usual expression is *ludos facere*, and there are no Republican honorary inscriptions in our catalogue, which in later periods provide plentiful evidence for private gifts of games, particularly gladiatorial shows; moreover, as we saw in chapter III,

294There is no verb in the three inscriptions recording our only Republican *munus*, no. 145.
### Table VII.1

VERBS USED TO EXPRESS THE PRODUCTION OF GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. dare:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ludi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. munera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. varia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pugilum spectaculum: (II/III): 460.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. edere:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ludi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. munera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. varia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. exhibere:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ludi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. munera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uenatio ...: (II/III): 81; cf. C.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. varia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VERBS EXPRESSING PRODUCTION

D. facere:
3. varia certamen gymnicum: (I/II): 444.

E. pugnare (all Augustan/A.D. 79, except for nos. 133 (II), 194 (I) and 459 (?); all are Pompeian posters except for the same three inscriptions):
1. munera familia ... : 91, 93, 94, 102, 122, [133]; paria ... : 51, 61, 63, 66, 73, 76, 77, 78, 89, 96, 98, 107, 108, 109, 110B, K, 111A, 123, [194], 459; [---]: 75, 100, 110D, 111D, E, 124; Puteolani: 69; uenatio: 112.

F. other verbs:
1. addere ludi: (II/III): 323.
2. administrare ludi: (II): 115.
4. curare ludi: (R): 274; (R⇒I): cf. 2 § CXXVIII (D.1); (I): cf. 222 (D.1); alius dies = familia gladiatoria: (I): 155; munus: (II): cf. 431 (B.2).
7. inchoare editio = munus: (II): 236.
8. iterare editio deuotionis: (IV/V): 20.
9. offerre paria gladiatorum: (I/II): [220].
10. praestare ludi: (II): 405.
11. procurare ludi: (II): 249.
gladiatores dare and munus dare were regular Republican expressions. In all but two cases Republican inscriptions provide accounts of a board’s activities. The verb facere, unlike dare, edere or curare, is rather uninformative since it does not say anything about the actual role of the organizers or whether they spent any of their own money. But since most of these inscriptions are very factual and impersonal at the same time, this is perhaps precisely why in most cases this verb was used.

In no. 218, possibly our earliest inscription, a corporation of cooks organized games, which obviously were not statutory; they say ludos dare, not facere. It is difficult to determine to what extent this is significant since the inscription is metrical, but it suggests that ludos facere was not the only way to express the production of ludi, and that ludos dare may have generally been used for more private undertakings. Eventually, however, ludos facere became the standard expression for all kinds of productions of ludi.

The expression ludos curare (“to organize games”) is attested only once in our entire catalogue, in a Spanish inscription (274: F.4 in the table). These games and the procession (pompa) that preceded them were organized by a board of four men who also saw to the erection of a column. Since these undertakings were vowed to the Genius of the oppidum (“town”), the inscription was probably set up before the colonial foundation of 45 B.C., which the archaic coirauerunt also suggests. It is tempting to see curare in this inscription as more or less synonymous with facere in Italian inscriptions; just as the latter, the Spanish inscription was erected by a board and its formulation is entirely factual; the verb curare suggests that the undertakings were required from the board, just as it was probably the case with the games of the Capuan magistri (infra pp.197–98). However, while curare may imply that the board managed public funds entrusted to them without addition of personal money, it is likely that in most cases, perhaps even in this one, local officials

295Nos. 17, 21, 53–60, 218, 274; cf. also 81, 183 and perhaps 182 (pro ludis); 145 (supra n.1); 1 and 2 (legislation). The exceptions are 163 and perhaps 7. Cf. also infra: 197–98.
had to make a financial contribution of their own (cf. 2 §§ LXX–LXXI). This could explain why *ludos facere* became the standard way to express the organization of games, since no statement is thereby made on who bore the costs of the production.

From the Augustan age until the later first century, the production of shows is essentially expressed by three verbs: *facere, dare* and *pugnare* (respectively D, A and E in the table). But it is remarkable that *dare* is used only for gladiatorial shows, while *facere* is still being used to express the production of *ludi*, and virtually never for other kinds of shows. Moreover, *pugnare* is almost entirely limited to the language of Pompeian posters; the exceptions are interesting since nos. 133 and 194 mention gladiatorial combats that are to take place in the future, like posters do, while no. 459 sounds very much like a poster slightly adapted to serve as a funerary inscription. Such a neat distribution is further evidence that the language of the inscriptions is very conservative and formulaic, something that we have noticed already on several occasions. The dichotomy *ludos facere–munus dare* (or *gladiatores dare, &c.*) is probably to be explained by the public and solemn character of *ludi*, which *munera*, as private undertakings (at least originally), lacked. There is evidence that this distinction was weakening already in the late Republic (cf. infra), which suggests that the two expressions were well-established by that time.

In Augustan and later inscriptions, *facere* is used for private as well as statutory productions of *ludi*. This is certainly why it is with this verb that expressions such as *(de)*

---

296 In no. 241, the expression used is standard for gifts provided by testament; in §§ LXX–LXXI of the Urso charter (2) one reads *munus ludosue ... faciunto*, but *facere* is otherwise unattested to express the production of a gladiatorial show; this is one more reason to think that *munus* is a later insertion (cf. supra pp.66–67).

297 Cf. also the late Republican *TabHer* LL.137–38: *ludaeis, cumue gladiatores ibei pugnabunt* (“at the games or when gladiators will fight here”).

298 It is reported that the text of no. 459, which is very faulty, was engraved on a sarcophagus; one notes *pugna[ue]ru(n)at* at L.2 where a poster would have read *pugnabunt*. It is also conceivable that the editor of this text misunderstood its function (as a poster?) and, accordingly, emended it to sound like an epitaph. Posters are occasionally engraved on stone in the East: ROBERT 1940 p.51 with nos. 11, 38 and 39; ID., *Hellenica* III pp.112–15 no. 303; VII pp.132–5 no. 324. VILLE 1981 p.359 notes that all of Robert’s examples come from the northern Balkans; so does the inscription discussed here.
sua pecunia ("with his own money") are most often used when the producer or those who honor him want to stress that the games were his gift to the community. Spain provides an excellent illustration of this; in this region, most of the evidence is for dedicatory games; phrases are almost always in the ablative absolute and always use either edere (at least twenty-five occurrences — e.g. editis circensibus) or facere (at least five occurrences — e.g. ludis factis); but while edere is attested five times as often as facere, the kind of expressions discussed here are found only with the latter (275, 292). Similar expressions are used occasionally for statutory ludi, when a magistrate remitted the public funds he was entitled to receive. We are fortunate to have inscription no. 23 from Ostia, which recapitulates this procedure: “as he was receiving the lucar [i.e. this public funding], he refused it and took on himself the expense” (LL.12–14).

From the latter part of the first century the system just described starts to break down. For one thing, dare can now be said of ludi; this is particularly well attested in Africa, but examples are also found in Italy and Spain, which shows that this was not a localized phenomenon. The earliest dated example is no. 304 from A.D. 109. In this period we also see the emergence of verbs not attested before in the inscriptions. The most prominent among these are edere and exhibere (B and C in the table), but several others show up as well (F), though most are attested only once or twice.

The earliest attestation of edere ("produce") is found in a decree from Herculaneum, which therefore predates the A.D. 79 eruption of Vesuvius (68: B.2); a few more may date from the late first century, which suggest that edere became commonly accepted in the language of inscriptions a little before the nominal form editio did (supra

---

299 Other expressions are, for instance, pecunia nostra ("with our money"), impensa sua and sumptu proprio ("at his expense"), and de suo ("on his own"). Here is the list of all instances from all periods: facere: 23, 29, 162, 222, 275, 292, 325 (ludi); 452 (venatio); there are more examples with edere, but this verb is better attested: 26 (ludi); 40, 47, 189, 212, 333, 366, 453 (munera); 172 (spectaculum); dare: 184, 447 (munus); exhibere: 416, 419 (C.3 in the table).
The same verb is rather infrequently encountered in Republican and early imperial authors, who say *ludos facere* and *gladiatores/munus dare* much more frequently. In the second and third centuries, *edere* is by far the most commonly used verb to express the production of games in the inscriptions. *Dare* and *exhibere* are well attested too. *Facere* is still used but proportionally less so than in earlier periods; interestingly, once the inscriptions containing an expression of the type *sua pecunia fecit* are removed, a relatively high proportion of the remaining inscriptions record statutory *ludi*, which shows that *facere* was still being used with its original function; the contrast with *ludos dare, edere* and *exhibere* (A.1, B.1 and C.1) is marked, since very few, proportionally, of the productions recorded with these verbs are statutory.

We have enough evidence for the age of Diocletian and later periods to see where things are going. *Exhibere* is better attested than other verbs, although there are only four examples; *edere* and *dare* are attested thrice and twice respectively. There is no discernible pattern in the use of these and other verbs according to the category of games or public or private nature of the production, which contrasts with earlier periods. One should recall in this context expressions such as *editio* or *exhibitio voluptatum*, which do not let us

---

300 Also attested twice in the *lex Irnitana* (§§ LXXXI L.22, LXXXXII L.32), which was engraved under Domitian.

301 So far as I can tell, *ludos/gladiatores edere* is never attested in Cicero; one finds occasionally such expressions in Livy (e.g. 28.21.1: *munus gladiatorium edendum*), but *ludos facere* (10.23.13; 30.27.12; 42.10.5; &c.) and *gladiatores/munus dare* (31.50.4; 41.20.11; 41.28.11; &c.) are much more common in his work. VEYNE 1976 p.388 is therefore mistaken when he claims, in a discussion on games in Republican Rome, that *ludos edere* is the usual Latin expression (the meaning of the French is lost in the English translation, p.208).


303 In the order of occurrence in the table: *dare*: [215E, F], 304 (half of the program is public, half is private, but it is probably for the private program that the magistrate is being praised); *edere*: 224 (it could be that the magistrate refused the municipal subvention for his *ludi*), ?217 (more probably private), ?36, ?431 (more probably private; cf. infra, ch. IX), 179 (but note the emphasis on the private program); *exhibere*: ?366.

304 Nos. 166 L.19, 203 L.20, 33, 49, 54, 423, 434 (exhibere); 146, 166 L.25, 424 (edere); 254, 421 (dare); other verbs are attested once, in nos. 203 L.23-24 (celebrare), and 20 (renouare and iterare); *facere* is not attested in the 4th–5th c., then "reappears" in a 6th-c. (?) inscription (349).
know what games were offered and, conceivably, may have been intended in some cases to embrace a benefactor's private as well as public productions (though probably only if the latter were particularly sumptuous). All this may be taken to suggest that the fundamental division between statutory and private games was becoming blurred.

Verbal phrases become rather uncommon in later inscriptions. To appreciate this, it is necessary to go back for a moment to earlier inscriptions. In the first three centuries of the Empire usual phrases include a verb + direct object: *hic...diem gladiatorum...edidit* (47: "he produced a one-day gladiatorial show"); *diem...ludorum plenissime exhibuit* (48: "he most thoroughly produced a day of scenic games"); phrases introduced by *quod* ("because") are frequent in honorary inscriptions: *ob merita eius quod...ludos scaenicos diebus quinque ediderit* (38: "for his merits because he produced scenic games during five days"); interpolated clauses in the ablative absolute (e.g. *ludis factis, editis circensibus*) are common in dedications. In later periods, such phrases seem to be falling into disuse, as the Diocletianic and later evidence discussed earlier comes from only ten documents altogether. This change is probably to be explained by the greater degree of abstraction of later inscriptions. From the later second century, verbal phrases are progressively being replaced in honorary inscriptions by nominal ones in which the quality of the games (or production) is stressed, not the games themselves; these phrases are usually introduced by *ob* ("on account of"), as when a notable from Hippo Regius is honored "for the magnificence of his gladiatorial show" (*368: ob magnificentiam gladiatorii muneris*).

Meanwhile, verbal abstracts such as *editio* and *exhibitio* become proportionally better

---

305Cf. also nos. 12, 13, 18, 22, 28, 40, 155, 156, 158, &c. The same phrase is used in laudatory funerary inscriptions, such as no. 32.
306These are particularly frequent in Spanish inscriptions: cf. nos. 275–279, 281, 283–285, &c.
307Other similar phrases with *ob*: 35, 118, 147, 169, 264, 384, 406, 433, 435; note also the ablatives of means in nos. 437 and 438 (e.g. 437: *qui [r]em publi[cam] exqu[itis editi]onum g[ene]ribus fecer[i]t am]/piorem – "(he) who aggrandized our state by means of his exquisite and varied productions").
At the same time, we see the emergence of editor (derived, like editio, from edere) as a virtual title of producers of games. In no. 125 editor muneres sui ("producer of his own munus") sounds like a circumlocution for munerarius or munus edidit. No. 358 honors a man who had been munerarius while, for some reason, his father and brother are called editores munerum. In nos. 46 and 201, and even more so in no. 204, editor is integrated into the cursus. All these indicate a shift of emphasis from expressing an action with verb and object to greater abstraction by attributing a title to the performer of that action.  

The evidence provided by verbs suggests the following model of how the language of inscriptions evolved. In the earliest period, which means in our terms the second century B.C., ludos facere becomes the standard way to express the production of scenic games. Two other expressions are attested, ludos dare and ludos curare, but only once in each case; these expressions apparently became obsolete before the end of the Republic. This is supported by the Augustan and first-century evidence: no example of these expressions is attested in this period, while the production of private gifts of ludi, which only now is attested for the first time, is always expressed with the verb facere.

Gladiatorial shows provide evidence for our present purposes only from the Augustan age. The production of such shows is almost always expressed with the verb dare (except in posters). This corresponds to the Republican usage as we know it from the literary sources and is one of several reasons to think that the lack of Republican municipal

---

308 This in spite of the fact that they are only a handful: nos. 20, 203, 332, 433, 435, 437. Compare no. 332 (pro editione muneres) with early imperial no. 150 (pro munere).  
309 Other interesting examples are instaurator moenium publicorum (437: "rebuilder of the city's walls"); and amator patriae et ciuium suorum (432: "lover of his fatherland and fellow citizens"; cf. 187, 433) where earlier inscriptions have ob amorem erga patriam (118: "for his love of his fatherland") or similar expressions (120, 165, 198, 213, 358, 375, [391], 426, 435, 437 L.L.16-17).
evidence does not mean that gladiatorial shows were not offered.\textsuperscript{310}

As we saw, the dichotomy \textit{ludos facere–munus dare}, which goes back to Republican times, is probably to be explained by the strong (though not absolute) dichotomy between the public character of \textit{ludi} and the private character of gladiatorial shows. By the time we get into the Augustan age, however, non-statutory \textit{ludi} are attested and, eventually, public \textit{munera gladiatoria}. But while \textit{dare} conveys the idea of a gift or benefaction, \textit{facere} does not, which is shown by the frequent use of expressions such as \textit{sua pecunia} or \textit{impensa sua} with this verb.

It is only in the second half of the first century that new terms appear which better express the notion of games as benefactions. \textit{Edere} and \textit{exhibere} emerge as technical terms expressing the production of all kinds of privately financed shows; \textit{dare} widens its application to \textit{ludi} and other events such as boxing contests. In a second- or third-century inscription from Althiburos, \textit{primus ludos dedit} (346: “he was first to give scenic games”) does not imply that scenic games had never been produced there, but rather that there had been as yet no non-statutory production. As we saw in the previous chapter, it is at about the same time that a whole series of new denominations start showing up; the appearance of \textit{editio}, an abstract noun derived from \textit{edere}, in the late first or early second century, is evidence that the language of the inscriptions was becoming more abstract. These rather sudden changes, however, are not an expression of concomitant changes in the production of games; they rather indicate that changes had already taken place, since private gifts of \textit{ludi} and public \textit{munera} were by that time well-attested. It seems that, once again, epigraphic formalism considerably slowed down the adaptation to changes that had started to occur, in this case, almost a century earlier.

But in spite of epigraphic formalism, it can be claimed that verbs are generally

\textsuperscript{310}Cf. supra pp.54, 115 for other reasons.
meant to express different realities with regard to the public or private nature of the games. But the system is starting to break down as we enter into the third century. By the end of this same century, there is no identifiable pattern. The language becomes very abstract and, to modern scholars, more difficult to understand. There is often no desire expressed or need felt to distinguish between different kinds of shows offered by a benefactor. Even the distinction between statutory and private productions, so fundamental in earlier periods, seems to be becoming irrelevant.
VIII. FEATURES SHARED BY ALL KINDS OF SHOWS

Several reasons have been given in the two preceding chapters to study the games comprehensively. Some more features are shared by the games which qualify or quantify the program. The most significant of these are the subject of this chapter. In the first place, inscriptions will be discussed which specify on what days games were held or how long they lasted, as well as those few which tell us something about periodicity. Then, records of the price of events will be examined and, in particular, the senatus consultum of A.D. 176/177 regulating the price of gladiators (Aes Italicense).

1. Dates, duration and periodicity

Many inscriptions indicate on what date an event took place; others, for how long it lasted or at what frequency it was to be repeated. These facts will now be collected and examined. Table VIII.1 collects all inscriptions which state the dates and occasions or anniversaries when games were (or were to be) offered (pp.128–30).

The table contains fifty-eight entries, most of which come from Pompeian edicta. By their very nature, posters advertise forthcoming events and must inform passers-by when these will take place. In most cases, the dates seem not to have been chosen to coincide with a religious event or imperial anniversary.311 For instance, some shows were produced inside the period of Rome’s ludi Florales (28 Apr.–3 May), but in fact probably because the whole period from 20 April to the end of May was generally preferred for the

311 So SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.29, 133–35.
### Table VIII.1

**DATES OR OCCASIONS WHEN GAMES WERE PRODUCED**

A. With indication of date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>type of event</th>
<th>occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>11 Jan.</td>
<td>venatio + munus</td>
<td>“birthday” of local patron god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>11 Jan.</td>
<td>annual circense</td>
<td>bequest: donor’s wife’s birthday; cf. 5 Aug.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>13?, 23-24 Jan.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>?-23 Jan.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>somewhere between 29 Jan.-12 Feb.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>17-18 Feb. 56</td>
<td>ludi to Nero, &amp;c.</td>
<td>(imperial cult; Quirinalia?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>22 Feb.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>24 Feb.-1 Mar. 25</td>
<td>ludi Latini et Graeci</td>
<td>(imperial cult?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>25-26 Feb.</td>
<td>venatio + athletae</td>
<td>health of Nero; (25 Feb. = adoption of Nero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>17-20 Mar.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>21 Mar. 170</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>private gift with emperor’s authorization; (Quinquatria?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>29 Mar. 151</td>
<td>ludi circenses + scaenici</td>
<td>probably dedication of baths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>31 Mar. 225</td>
<td>ludi</td>
<td>dedication of repairs to theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>(from 28 Mar.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?; postponed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(from 5 Apr. 8-12 Apr.)</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?; postponed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>5 Apr.? (or 5 Aug.)</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>somewhere between 14 Apr.-14 May</td>
<td>ludi</td>
<td>bequest in memory of the ?mother of the donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>17 Apr</td>
<td>ludi</td>
<td>erection of statue to wife/mother on her birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>from 20 Apr.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>21 Apr</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>(Rome’s anniversary?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>30 Apr. 198-...</td>
<td>annual ludi</td>
<td>bequest; (imperial cult? Floralia?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

312 Pompeian posters are italicized for easy identification.

313 The following are not included, in most cases because the date is too fragmentary: **75, 77, 111B, 111C, 124 (munera in Pompeian posters); 215D, F (?statutory ludi); 216 (ludi which were not necessarily produced on the date of the dedication); 280 (bequest for annual ludi on donor’s birthday).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1-3 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>?-2 May; 11?-15 May</td>
<td>2 munera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5-8 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>to emperor’s numen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>10-14 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>?, 12, 14, 16, 18 May</td>
<td>munera Augustorum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>15?-16 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>somewhere between 16-31 May</td>
<td>munus, every other year</td>
<td>?; testamentary bequest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>18-20 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>20-23 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>31 May</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111A</td>
<td>from 1 June</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110L</td>
<td>4-5 June</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5-6 June</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>10 June</td>
<td>boxing contest</td>
<td>bequest; (anniversary of legio VII Gemina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>13 June</td>
<td>uenatio + athletae</td>
<td>dedication of what probably were panels with amphitheatrical scenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 July</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>health of emperor; dedication of altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... 28 ... July</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>? [also ... 15 ... Aug.: C IV 4299 = ST 78]^{314}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>1-4 Aug.</td>
<td>annual ludi in foro</td>
<td>(imperial cult?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>5 Aug.</td>
<td>annual circenses</td>
<td>bequest; donor’s birthday; cf. 11 Jan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>13-18 Aug. 18</td>
<td>ludi</td>
<td>(imperial cult: dedication of altar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... 15 ... Aug</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>? [cf. ... 28 ... July]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>28 Aug.</td>
<td>uenatio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1, 5-6 Oct.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>29-30 Oct.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4-7 Nov.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>type of event</th>
<th>occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>from? 13 Nov. 325</td>
<td>scenic games, Iuuenalia</td>
<td>dedication of buildings on anniversary of Constantius’ elevation as Caesar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>24-26 Nov.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110D</td>
<td>27-30 Nov.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>?-9 Dec.</td>
<td>munus</td>
<td>health of Caesars and Livia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>17 Dec.</td>
<td>annual boxing contest</td>
<td>bequest: donor’s birthday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>23 Dec.</td>
<td>annual games</td>
<td>?; bequest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Without indication of date (cf. also n.515):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>type of event</th>
<th>occasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>ludi, pugiles, &amp;c. on 2 occasions</td>
<td>Apollinaria (probably early July), while the donor was duovir (ludi sollemnes in part?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>probably annual munus</td>
<td>“birthday” of the colony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>ludi scaenici</td>
<td>donor’s birthday; bequest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>2 days of circenses</td>
<td>birthday of 2 daughters; bequest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>ludi</td>
<td>donor’s birthday; bequest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>annual athletic competition</td>
<td>festival of the Moon; testamentary bequest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

production of munera (perhaps because weather conditions were at their best). One can find no formal occasion or anniversary to explain why the show advertised in no. 63 started on 1st October, skipped the following three days, and was resumed and concluded on the 5–6 of the same month (kal. Oct., III-pridie non. Oct.).

There are, however, a few dates which may have been chosen for their significance. Thus, a show was given at Nuceria on Rome’s anniversary (80: 21 Apr.: XI kal. Mai.); another event was organized for the health of Nero (92: pro salute Neronis ...) on 25–26 February (V–III kal. Mart.), the first day falling on the anniversary of Nero’s

---


315 Cf. FOst A.D. 116: ludi facti V, IIII, pr. k. M[art(ias)] ---J (“ludi were organized on 25, 26 and 28 Feb.”), where 27 Feb. was skipped probably because circus games were regularly held on that day for the Equirria: PIGANIOL 1923 p.150; VIDMAN 1982 p.115.
adoption by Claudius. A priest of the imperial cult offered a show for the health of Vespasian and dedication of an altar in his new temple on 4 July (100: *III non. Iul.*), a day which may have been chosen because it had seen the completion of the *ara Pacis Augustae* in 13 B.C. Meanwhile, there is no obvious reason why a show dedicated to the *numen* of some emperor took place on 5–8 May (76: *III non.–VIII id. Mai.*). Therefore, since, for one thing, dates of shows rarely correspond to significant dates in the calendar and, for another, posters always record privately sponsored events, it is likely that anniversaries were at best a pretext or happy coincidence for the *munerarius*, not his incentive to produce a show.

We are left with twenty-seven mentions of dates or occasions from all other categories of documents put together. Twelve of these are found in records of bequests to the community. As in the case of posters, the shows are forthcoming, and in most cases the donor specifies for what occasion the event is to take place, though it is only occasionally that the actual date is mentioned in the inscription. The most common occasions are the donor’s birthday or that of a close relative; there are six or seven such cases in our catalogue, but only three, possibly four, actually indicate the date of the birthday. No. 444 records a testamentary bequest for an annual athletic event to take place during a festival of the Moon (*diebus festis Lunae*), but why this occasion was chosen is not said; since the name of the festival is given rather than a date, one can suggest that the donor actually was a

---

318 This point is argued infra pp. 216–20.
319 As for no. 90, a “scorecard”, dates are given probably to distinguish the two events recorded (cf. 74, our other “scorecard”, where duration is recorded).
320311: 11 Jan. and 5 Aug.; 364: 17 Dec.; 280: date lost except for the numeral *V*; also 28 if, as is likely, the date is that of the mother’s (or some other female relative’s) birthday; without indication of the date: Table VII.3: B. Similar occasions, but without gifts of games: 52, 217, [265], 391; also 208, since the donor apparently did not prescribe his son’s birthday as the occasion for the quinquennial *munus*. Cf. Table IX.7 (infra p. 200) for a complete list of shows provided for by testamentary and other bequests. Cf. also infra n. 339 on no. 331.
worshipper of that goddess. An inscription from Barcino, no. 273, does not state why the donor chose 10 June (III id. Iun.) for an annual boxing contest and distribution of oil; this date, however, is known from other Spanish inscriptions to be the anniversary of legion VII Gemina, stationed in north-western Spain; since the donor had been centurion in that same legion, it is probable that he chose 10 June to match that occasion. No reason is stated in no. 249 why 30 April was chosen for annual ludi; in light of the opening address, some forgotten imperial anniversary seems more likely than a celebration of the Flora. Two other texts are too fragmentary to know whether the meaning of the date was stated in some or other way (194, 378). The results are therefore somewhat disappointing, since only four or five inscriptions in this group allow us to know what kind of anniversaries donors wished to commemorate with games (28, 273, 311, 364; also 444 if the donor had no other intention but to celebrate the Moon); but in terms of the number of usable inscriptions, this is rather satisfactory, since only no. 249 remains unexplained.

The remaining inscriptions record past gifts of games. A few dates have to do with the celebration of games on religious occasions, most of which are linked to the imperial cult. In Puteoli, augustales organized games vowed to Nero, Agrippina, Juppiter and the Genius of the colony on 17–18 February 56 (114: XIII–XII kal. Mart.). The 17th happens to be the date of the Quirinalia, the festival of Quirinus, a god to whom Romulus had been entirely assimilated by early imperial times. The importance of Romulus in Augustan ideology and the role of the augustales, an Augustan institution, as priests of the imperial cult suggest that the games, which were probably statutory (cf. infra), had been

---

321 On this date in Spanish epigraphy, HERZ 1975 pp.223–24, though he, like DESSAU, ILS ad nos. 9125–9126, missed our inscription; but see I. Roda’s doctoral diss., El origen de la vida municipal y la prosopografía romana de Barcino, Barcelona 1974 p.19 (non vidi: cited by PIERNAVEJA, CIDER ad no. 14, p.78 n.106*).

322 F. Hettner, cited by O. Hirschfeld, CIL XIII ad no. 4132, and HERZ 1975 p.194 mention the fact that 30 Apr. falls during the Flora (28 Apr.–3 May), and the latter believes that a celebration of Flora seems secure; however, if so, one would have to explain why the donor shows his devotion to the Severan dynasty, and at the same time wishes to celebrate games which have their origin in Republican times.
instituted on that date during the Augustan principate; if so, the inscription would show that these games were adapted to serve the emperor of the moment, but that their (opening) date had been established earlier and was immutable. In this context one should mention no. 192 from Trebula Suffenas, since the local seuiri augustales are probably the body whose fasti it contains. In spite of the many problems posed by the text, two basic facts are secure: this body entered upon office on 1st August (kal. Aug.) and thereupon celebrated ludi for four days. The date, which occurs quite frequently in inscriptions, was possibly chosen to commemorate Octavian’s victory over Antony on that day in 30 B.C. All this suggests not only that the augustales, in some cities at least, were required to produce ludi, but also that the date of these was not the same everywhere, though they may have generally been celebrated on the occasion of a significant imperial celebration or anniversary.

Two Tiberian inscriptions record dates of games celebrated in the context of the imperial cult (214: 24 Feb.–1st March; 222: 13–18 Aug.). In neither case, however, do the dates appear to be of especial significance for the reign of Tiberius or that of his predecessor, Augustus. One notes that in no. 222 significant dates are named after the occasion (thus natalibus Augusti et Ti. Caesarum at L.10; natali Augustae at L.15), while 13 August (L.13: id. Aug.) probably just happens to be the date of the dedication, with games, of an altar to the numen Augustum. As for no. 214 from Caere, it is unlikely that the board

---


325 Cf. e.g. FAnt: Aug(ustus) Alexan(driam) recepit. The augustales of Petelia also entered upon office on 1st Aug. (C X 112 = ILS 6467); so did at Rome, from 7 B.C., the magistri uicorum in charge of the cult of the lares Augusti (FMag XXV, XXVII L.21; C VI 445 = ILS 3613; cf. C VI 446–447 = ILS 3612–3612 a), a body which seems to have fulfilled in Rome a function similar to that of the augustales elsewhere: cf. M. Silvestrini, QS 18, 1992, pp.83–110 (= AE 1992, 302). In Caere the meeting hall of the augustales was dedicated on that same day in A.D. 114 (C XI 3614 = ILS 5918).

326 On these dates, HERZ 1975 ad loc. 214: at Rome, on 24 Feb. (VI kal. Mart.) fell the Regifikium, a ritual concluded with the rex sacrorum running away from the Comitium; 1st March was consecrated to Mars and marked the beginning of the civil year in the old Roman calendar; 222: several gods were celebrated on 13 Aug.; and it is on 18 Aug. (XV kal. Sept.) 29 B.C. that Augustus dedicated the temple of Divus Iulius.
of freedmen whose names are listed is that of the local *augustales* (at times restituted at L.2), unless the high number of twelve men includes veterans of the organization as well;\(^{327}\) however, in light of what was said above about the games of the *augustales*, one would then expect some significant imperial anniversary for the celebration of their games, which is not the case.

It is worth noting that the four inscriptions just discussed were erected by boards in their official capacity. These inscriptions are written as accounts of the boards’ fulfillment of duties; the language of three of them, nos. 114, 214 and 222, recalls that of Republican inscriptions such as of the Capuan *magistri*,\(^{328}\) though they provide more details; all three date from the Julio-Claudian period and could be seen as late examples of a “*genre*” which had appeared no later than the late second century B.C. (the Capuan inscriptions 53–59). In later periods, we know only of municipal *fasti* that provided a regular record of games produced by boards of officials, but little has come down to us.\(^{329}\) The *fasti* preserved in no. 192, our fourth inscription, extended at least into the early second century, but only a few years during the reign of Tiberius are of any use.\(^{330}\) There is a religious element to each of the four inscriptions just discussed, which suggests that the mention of the date in the inscriptions of this kind stressed the formal aspect of the production of the games rather than the benefaction that they were for the spectators. The religious dimension is not so obvious in the other inscriptions erected by boards which organized games, except in no. 274.\(^{331}\)

---

\(^{327}\) DUTHOY 1978 p.1284 considers that “le nombre d’*augustales* aura rarement dépassé dix”; ibid. n.229 he hesitates on the validity of the restitution *au[gustales]* at L.2.

\(^{328}\) No. 222 is “a series of excerpts or summaries from *decreta*” (SHERK 1970 p.46 ad no. 50); in spite of that, the selection of excerpts reveals the same desire as in the other inscriptions to record plain facts.

\(^{329}\) The few incidental mentions of such games in other categories of inscriptions are discussed infra pp.159–69.

\(^{330}\) Cf. catalogue ad loc.; one line mentions the consuls of A.D. 108, but nothing else is preserved after A.D. 30. Capena has produced fragments of local *fasti* that belong to the 2nd c. (215), but dates are unusable (D and perhaps F).

\(^{331}\) Nos. 10, 17, 21, 53–59, 159, 161 (?), 164 (?), 180, 215, 274, 450.
FEATURES SHARED BY ALL KINDS OF SHOWS

One document alludes to a *munus* produced for the anniversary of the colony of Beneventum (143). This is a taurobolic inscription, erected by a priest of the Great Mother who had been duovir and, while assuming that office, producer of a *munus* for the anniversary of the colony. This title seems to be well-integrated into the *cursus* (LL.4–8), which suggests that the *munus* was a public and regulated event, organized every year by one (or both?) duoviri.

Some inscriptions record games privately produced. A patron of Amitemum was honored in A.D. 325 for his numerous benefactions to the community (166). Among these were restorations of an aqueduct and a bathing establishment, which he dedicated on 13 November (*id. Nov.*); we are told that the date was chosen because it fell on the anniversary of Constantius' elevation as Caesar; several days of games, which presumably started on that day, were offered for the occasion (LL.19–25). The games, therefore, probably served in part as a means to express devotion to the imperial household. Likewise, no. 337 from Rusicade records a dedication celebrated with games, this time on 31 March (*pridie kal. Apr.*). This date corresponds to one of Septimius' military victories and occurs several times in inscriptions of the Severan period, particularly in Africa. This suggests that these inscriptions, including no. 337 which dates from the reign of Severus Alexander, were intended to commemorate this victory. In yet another inscription, no. 351 from Capsa, the opening invocation for the good health of the emperor in the dedication of a temple on 4 October (*III non. Oct.*) suggests another imperial anniversary, and certainly not the *leiunium Cereris*, which occurred on that date. Another inscription, no. 127 from Teanum Sidicinum, records a probable dedication, with games, of baths and possibly other buildings;

---

332 Or ended on that day? Several inscriptions, particularly from Spain, show that it was common to have completed the presentation of games before the dedication: cf. e.g. from Castulo nos. 275, 278, or 276: “after having produced two days of games in the circus, the citizens of Castulo gave and dedicated (this monument)” (LL.15–17). Whatever may be the case, it is the day of the dedication that matters.

333 The evidence is collected and discussed by HERZ 1975 pp.36–37, 171–72.
this happened on a 29 March (III kal. Apr.), a day of no significance whatsoever in the calendar.

A funerary inscription lists the many shows, mostly private except perhaps for the scenic games, organized by A. Clodius Flaccus, one of the most prominent Pompeian notables in Augustan times (87). The shows were produced for each one of his three duovirirates and, in the first two of these at least, during the Apollinaria, or festival to Apollo. In Rome, meanwhile, ludi Apollinaires were celebrated for nine days in the period 5–13 July. The Pompeian games may or may not have been called by the same name, but it is very possible that Flaccus, whose military tribunate was granted by the emperor himself on the recommendation of his fellow citizens (a populo), was “un devoto rappresentante della politica augustea a Pompei”; if so, his grand celebration of the Apollinaria may have been intended as a celebration of the Augustan regime since the princeps claimed a special relationship with Apollo.

Three inscriptions remain. No. 331 records games produced privately on the occasion of the erection of a statue to a wife and mother on her birthday (17 Apr.: XV kal. Mai.). In no. 47, the date of 21 March (XII kal. Apr.) falls in the middle of the Quinquatraginta (19–23 March), which suggests that this is no more than a coincidence. However, no other anniversary or celebration is known for this date, which seems to be attested in no other inscription except fasti. Finally, no. 120 provides a good example of a date chosen for its significance, but unlike what we have seen so far. In this inscription, a notable is honored by his fellow citizens for having placed his love of his homeland before his personal interest; this is certainly why he had given a munus on 11 January (III id. Ian.), when the
patron god of the community (*deus patrius noster*) was celebrated.

As we saw, scholars generally agree in distinguishing the religious nature of *ludi* from the profane character of *munera* (cf. e.g. supra pp.11–12); however, the six inscriptions just examined, though they constitute meagre evidence, tell a different story. At most we find in some of them, whether they record *ludi* or other games, devotion to the emperor or imperial family (166, 337, 351; perhaps also 87), but nothing like the cult of the living or deified emperor performed by some boards of officials. Moreover, the indication of the date in some inscriptions may very well be intended to underline the excellence of the producer more than say something about the games. In no. 120, the producer’s love for his homeland is stressed; in no. 166, his devotion to the imperial family. As for no. 337, one should not neglect that, beside 31 March, date of the dedication with games, another date is given, 3 January (*III non. Ian.*), when the benefactions had been promised; together, the two dates show the producer’s eagerness to fulfill his promises, since less than three months had been necessary for their realization.338 These examples suggest some sort of opportunism (not necessarily to be taken as pejorative) on the part of the producer. One notes also that individuals who privately built or restored public works or buildings chose an imperial anniversary for the dedication (166, 337, 351; perhaps also 100), while those who bequeathed money to their community for the periodic production of games generally prescribed a date that was significant for themselves, usually their own birthday or that of a relative. There was, therefore, no formal requirement to honor a divinity or the emperor when producing games privately, even *ludi* (28, 311, 331), but it was apparently inappropriate to choose a personal occasion for the dedication of a public building.339 One is

---

338 Promptitude is also recorded for instance in nos. 162 (a *munus* and *uenatio* are produced the same year they had been promised), and 321B (LL.11–15: an arch and statue are finished the same year they had been promised). Delays in fulfilling such promises were common; cf. JACQUES 1984 pp.735–51.

339 An interesting parallel is provided by African mosaics: cf. DUNBABIN 1978 pp.25–25 with n.46. Note in the case of no. 331 that *sportulae* and games were given on the woman’s birthday for the erection of a statue in her honor, but not for the dedication which took place several months later; whether the monument was
left with the impression that religious considerations played at best a secondary role for most private producers of games. Meanwhile the Urso charter shows that magistrates had to consecrate to the gods the statutory ludi or munus they were required to produce (2 §§ LXX–LXXI). Once more, the distinction statutory–private proves to be more significant than the distinction ludi–munus, which has perhaps been given too much weight by scholars so far as the religious nature of games is concerned.

In spite of all that has been said so far, there are so few dates in honorary and dedicatory inscriptions, and so few significant dates in Pompeian posters, that it can be claimed with some confidence that a producer usually arranged for a non-statutory show to be organized on whatever date was most convenient for him, the community, and the impresario or troupe he hired. In fact, one can even suggest that a producer’s concern was in general to avoid some specific dates in the year. A decree from Pisa (225) forbids the holding of games on 21 February (IX kal. Mart.), anniversary of the death of C. Caesar in A.D. 4. It is conceivable that, after A.D. 14, many cities enforced a similar prohibition for 19 August, date of Augustus’ death; as we saw, the six days of games recorded in no. 222 ended on 18 August: avoiding the next day was perhaps more of a concern than finding a significant date for the start of the celebrations. Note, finally, that producers avoided not only certain dates but also periods in the year. Pompeian parietal inscriptions show that the three months from April to June, most of all May, were preferred for the production of munera, while no show has been attested so far in Campania – or, for that matter, anywhere else outside Rome – for the month of September.340

340The harvest probably has something to do with this. Interestingly, September happens to be one of the most festive months in Rome: 16 days of ludi, 6 of which circenses, and 4 days of market. On the Pompeian evidence: SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.135.
There are many more inscriptions which record how long events lasted. The material is sorted in Table VIII.2 (p.140).

The Urso charter requires that each board of duoviri and aediles organize four days of games (2 §§ LXX-LXXI: D.3 in the table). Another Spanish inscription, no. 262 from Singili Barba, shows that other cities as well had prescriptions for the number of days that solemn events were to last. The same seems to be true for the ludi organized each year at Trebula Suffenas probably by the seuiri augustales (192: D.1).

It is perhaps not surprising that the duration of privately funded events varies greatly, from one day to seven or eight and even, in later inscriptions, ten or twelve days. It is likely that benefactors produced as many days as the money they were willing or able to spend allowed them. But one should note about the costly munera that the number of pairs of gladiators per day could vary significantly, and that there were gladiators of different categories and prices. At times, too, especially in the later second century, the production of gladiatorial shows was so severely restricted that even a single day could be perceived as a remarkable benefaction; a century earlier, at Pompeii, two- to five-day shows were not at all uncommon. To estimate the generosity of a producer according to the length of his show is therefore not an easy task, but the inscriptions which record duration are numerous enough to know that this was a significant criterion in Roman eyes.

There are no less than fifty-two inscriptions which record how long games lasted (Table VIII.2). The context is often one in which the generosity of the producer is being stressed. For example, expressions such as pecunia sua (47, 26; cf. 447) or ob merita (38) are used; or else adjectives which emphasize the excellence of the production: insignis

---

341 On the evidence from the eastern part of the Empire, cf. ROBERT 1940 pp.258, 280–81.
342 Number of pairs: compare e.g. 445 (36 pairs over 8 days) with 98b (30 pairs over 3 days); categories: e.g. 4, 119, 156, 196.
343 No. 47: a dies priuatus produced with M. Aurelius’ authorization (see HERZ 1975 pp.163–64); also no. 40 for another such show under Commodus.
Table VIII.2
DURATION OF EVENTS344

A. One-day events:
1. ludi  
2. munera  
   47, 40, 134 (cf. C.2), 138, 156, [186], 317, 394; cf. 155, 70, 80, 94, 91, 99, 100, 112, 120, 143, 236.
3. varia  
   36; cf. 87 (B.3); 273, 364, 378 L.L.1–2.

B. Two-day events:
1. ludi  
   166 L.24 (cf. E.3), 180, 260, 276, [297], 355, 360, 363; 114.
2. munera  
   35, [134] (cf. C.2), 144, [367]; 51, [78], [93], 92, 155.
3. varia  
   87 L.L.9–14.

C. Three-day events:
1. ludi  
   17, [351], 374, 378 L.4, [386], [401], 461.
2. munera  
   [50], 177, 368; [134] (bidui [munus] ... tertium diem); 61, 63, 64, 75, 98.

D. Four-day events:
1. ludi  
   159, 192, 300, 307.
2. munera  
   22, 74, 117, 139, 253, 353; 66, 76, 77, 89, 110 D, 123.
3. varia  
   2 § LXX (munus ludiue); 2 § LXXI (m. l.ue ... triduum + unum diem).

E. Five-day events and up:
1. ludi  
   5 days: 32, 38, 234, 352; 6 days: 222, 214; 7 days: 321 B (4 times = 28 days), 387; Lud-Saec A 1.156; 10 days: Fost A.D.112.
2. munera  
   5 days: 442; [90], 96a, 124; 8 days: 445; 117 days: Fost A.D.109.
3. varia  
   6 days: Fost A.D.109 (naumachia); 12 days: 166 (biduam teatrum et dena Iuuenaliorum); Fost A.D.107 (lusio); 13 days: Fost A.D.108 (lusio).

---

344 A distinction was made between explicit and implicit mentions of the duration of events; most of the latter, which are italicized in the table, are found in Pompeian posters; they will mostly be ignored in what follows, since it was not the intention of the author of the inscription to indicate how long the show lasted.
editio munera bidui (35: "singular production of a two-day munus"), exornatum munus diebus III (139: "a sumptuous munus for four days), spectaculum per dies quinque splendidissimum (442: "very splendid spectacle over five days"). Several of the inscriptions, particularly from Spain and Africa, record games produced for the dedication of a building or statue and were erected by the benefactor himself or a relative; the context is always one in which the amplitude of the benefaction towards the population is being underlined, though without the kind of adulatory formulas found in honorary inscriptions but inappropriate in dedications; moreover, games are often only one of several benefactions produced for the occasion; in this context, the mention of the number of days is clearly intended to underline the extent of the generosity of the benefactor. An eloquent example is no. 360, erected by the benefactor himself; this man tells us that he gave ludi over two days (biduo) for the dedication of a statue, as well as a banquet to all (omnibus) the decurions and wards; in spite of the sobriety of the text, which is appropriate for a dedication, the two terms biduo and omnibus allowed him discreetly to say something about the extent of his generosity.

Among the inscriptions erected by boards of officials, nos. 17, 159 and 180 mention how many days games lasted; two more, nos. 192 and 222, mention both date and duration. One does not discern in the first three of these inscriptions the same religious element as in the inscriptions erected by boards when they provide the date of events (the last two and nos. 114 and 214: supra pp.132–34). Again, the mention of the duration suggests that the games were to be perceived as a benefaction, not so much as a duty that the boards had to fulfill. In no. 222 the mention of both date and duration underlines not only that a religious task was performed, but also that entertainment was provided; so far as games are concerned, this kind of ambivalence is unusual, but our interpretation is

345Nos. 277, 300, 321B, 351, 352, [355], 360, 387, 401; cf. also 297, 307, [362], 363, 374.
supported by the use of the expression *pecunia nostra*, found twice at LL.13–14, which is rather unexpected in the context of the very formal language of the inscription.

Two testamentary bequests provide for a certain amount of money to be spent over a fixed number of days on games. A powerful freedman from Praeneste left by testament 120,000 to be spent on a five-day program of *ludi* (32). In Siagu, an anonymous benefactor left 1500 denarii (= 6000) for three days of *ludi* to be organized, and another amount of money, now lost, for annual *ludi* on 22 December (378 LL.3–6 and 1–3 respectively). It should be noted on the other hand that records of bequests for periodic gifts of games never specify the number of days events were to last. At times, as in the inscription just mentioned, we know that an event was to take place on a specific day, but this is different from saying that the event was to last one day; moreover, in at least four cases the sums would likely not have allowed for more (273, 311, 364, 413: cf. Table VIII.3). As we shall see, what mattered most was to specify the amount of money to be spent on each occasion; presumably, when the amount was substantial enough, a curator was expected to organize a show on as many days as the fund allowed for a well-rounded daily program. It was probably more feasible for donors to prescribe the details of their show when it was a one-time event to be produced soon after death.

As a general rule, when temporal expressions are used at all, past gifts of games are quantified in terms of their duration, while promises of games (announced in posters; to be produced with the interests from a bequest) are qualified in terms of the dates or occasion when they will take place. As we saw, however, the desire to stress the formal or religious dimension of the games occasionally explains why some past gifts of games are assessed in terms of dates in the calendar, rather than total number of days. Otherwise, there is a strong tendency to emphasize the magnitude of the benefaction or the excellence of the producer. This is perhaps to be expected since most of our evidence comes from honorary and
dedicatory inscriptions.\textsuperscript{346}

Once we set aside Pompeian posters – most singular by their nature and the circumstances of their preservation – there is very little in Tables VIII.1 and VIII.2 that distinguishes \textit{ludi} from \textit{munera} or other shows. It is true that \textit{ludi} (\textit{scaenici}) account for about half of our evidence and are offered on a wider range of occasions, but this reflects the fact that, on the whole, there are more inscriptions recording \textit{ludi} than gladiatorial or other shows. Moreover, gladiators became considerably more expensive than scenic representations (pp. 150–53); it made more sense to present them as a \textit{pièce de résistance}; as a matter of fact they were, unlike \textit{ludi}, rarely offered at the dedication of a building or as one in a string of concomitant benefactions.\textsuperscript{347} Still, no temporal expression is peculiar to any one category of games. Again, the statutory or private character of the production is, to a certain extent, more relevant to an understanding of the distribution of such expressions.

A word should be said about periodicity. Statutory \textit{ludi} were to be produced every year by municipal magistrates – mostly duo- or quattuorviri, and aediles – who were themselves elected for a year. The \textit{lex Vrsonensis} is our most explicit source on this issue (2 §§ LXX–LXXI). In Veii the expression \textit{ludis quos fecerunt ... II uiri} (232, 233: “during the games produced by the duoviri”), certainly refers to these annual, statutory \textit{ludi}. Several other inscriptions are relevant, in particular dedications by magistrates of monuments erected with money normally spent on games.\textsuperscript{348} The games of the probable \textit{seuiri augustales} at Trebula Suffenas were also produced annually, when new office holders were

\textsuperscript{346}Funerary inscriptions, too, at times praise the deceased for his games; this is particularly obvious in nos. 71, 87, 126, 139, 146 and 372.

\textsuperscript{347}Most examples to be cited infra p.199 belong to the 1st c., which suggests that prices increased in the course of time. Dedications: Table IX.6 with discussion. Strings of concomitant benefactions (all Augustan or early imperial): 18 and 39 (the latter, perhaps both, in a funerary context); cf. also 87 and 170; examples are much more numerous, and obvious, which include \textit{ludi}, such as no. 359 I.I.13–17: for the dedication of a statue the honorand “gave scenic games, a banquet and oil to the people”.

\textsuperscript{348}These are discussed pp.166–69. Cf. also nos. 224 and 304.
sworn in (192). We learn from a Constantinian rescript that every year, according to an ancient custom, the citizens of Hispellum and Volsinii elected priests to give scenic and gladiatorial games in Volsinii (203 LL.15–20); the rescript now allows the Hispellans to have their own annual games. At Minturnae, by the mid-third century, duoviri were responsible for the production of an annual munus when they entered upon office (22: processus editio). Another third-century inscription, this one from Beneventum, indicates that a munus was produced there, probably every year, for the anniversary of the colony (143). From the same city we have record of an editio primi lustri munerae quinquennalis (140 LL.4–6: “the production of the quinquennial munus of the first lustrum”). This means that this munus was to be repeated every four (or five) years and, therefore, that it was regulated by the city.

Most of our data on periodicity actually comes from records of bequests. In eleven cases the event is to be repeated every year. In only one of these is it a question of a gladiatorial show (236); this could be due to chance, but the great cost of munera in the second century (to which period most of our evidence belongs) provides a more satisfactory explanation: at an annual return of 5–6%, to produce even a single day (as in our inscription) required a foundation of gigantic proportion. This is certainly why some donors stipulated that their munus was to be produced at a lesser frequency. A notable from Pisaurum bequeathed money for a munus to be produced quinto quoque anno, that is, in our terms, probably every four years (208). Another bequest prescribed that six pairs of gladiators be produced every second year (194: alterno annis). It is probable that similar

---

349 The expressions used are quotannis (28, 273, 280, 397, 413, 444); omnibus annis (236, 249, 261, 378); per omnes annos (311 L.14); suo quoque anno and grammatical variations (311 LL.9–10; cf. 364); this last expression refers to the magistrates “in their year in office”, or to each decurion “every year (while a decurion)”; this expression is used three times in § CXXVIII of the Urso charter while in §§ LXX–LXXI the same notion is rendered by the phrase in suo magistratu. Cf. also no. 52 L.18 and 319 LL.18–19.

350 The same terms are prescribed in a foundation from Hadrumetum (366); the benefaction to be provided was lost with the lower part of the monument, but the foundation is definitely too small for a gladiatorial show.
terms governed the administration of a foundation for ludi circenses at Narbo, known from a fragmentary inscription (265); at any rate, it must have been much more costly to produce such a show in this provincial capital than, say, in Auzia, a small center of the interior of Mauretania Caesariensis, where two days at the circus could be produced annually for as little as HS1080.

At what frequency public (i.e. municipal) munera were produced is not known, nor for how long curators were appointed. It is conceivable that some local senates determined they could afford shows only at a two-year interval, or even less frequently.351

2. Prices

On prices we have R. Duncan-Jones’ important works, but his enquiry is mostly limited to Italy and Africa. Admittedly, these regions have produced most of our evidence, and by far, but there is still a need for a comprehensive list and discussion of all known expenses on games.352 This is the purpose of what follows (but cf. further infra n.515). As usual, we shall start off with a table presenting all the evidence (pp.146–47).

The price of an event may vary according to the nature and quality of its program, its duration, and the purchasing power of the currency when and where it is produced; other factors are also at work, such as the law of offer and demand, as suggested by the senatus consultum from Italica (cf. infra). It is therefore rather difficult to compare prices of different events. Moreover, as the table shows, prices often include other benefactions beside games, such as a distribution of money (sportulae) or banquet

---

351 This needed not be stated in the inscription: the HS600,000 bequeathed by Valentinus and mentioned in no. 209 were to be used for the production of a quinquennial munus, a fact we know thanks only to no. 208. Cf. further infra pp.178–79 and n.441.
352 Toller's 1889 list at pp.57–58 was based on 14 inscriptions (one of which, C XIII 5042 should not have been included); we now have 33 (including a new inscription mentioned infra n.515).
Table VIII.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>date &amp; place</th>
<th>price in HS</th>
<th>type of event</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>2000 + at</td>
<td><em>ludi</em> or <em>munus</em></td>
<td>a duovir is to receive HS2000 from the state and spend at least HS2000 from his purse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>least 2000</td>
<td>of the duoviri for 4 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1000 + at</td>
<td><em>ludi</em> or <em>munus</em></td>
<td>an aedile is to receive HS1000 from the state and spend at least HS2000 from his purse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXI</td>
<td>Claudian</td>
<td>least 2000</td>
<td>of the aediles for 4 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2nd c. Formiae</td>
<td>25,000 + 25,000</td>
<td><em>munus</em></td>
<td>The plebs doubled the amount spent by the honorand to &quot;increase the fame of his <em>munus</em>&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st c. Ostia</td>
<td>50,000 or 100,000</td>
<td><em>ludi</em> (+ ...)</td>
<td><em>ex testamento</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>mid 2nd c. Ostia</td>
<td>perhaps 50,000/year</td>
<td><em>alimenta</em> for 100 girls + <em>ludi</em> + 3 dinners</td>
<td>foundation of HS1,000,000? price based on a 5% annual return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Augustan Praeneste</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>5 days of <em>ludi</em></td>
<td><em>ex testamento</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>earlier 1st c. Ulubrae</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td><em>pro ludis</em></td>
<td>public monument erected with money for the games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2nd/earlier 3rd c. Neapolis</td>
<td>(40,000 or 45,000?)</td>
<td>gift of HS5000 per <em>phretria</em> instead of promised <em>venatio</em></td>
<td>since there were 8 and then 9 <em>phretriae</em>, the total expense can be evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>mid 2nd c. Aeclanum</td>
<td>100,000 + 100,000</td>
<td>2-day <em>munus</em> publicum? + 1 <em>private day, road pavement, statues</em></td>
<td>the probable public <em>munus</em> cost on average HS50,000/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>late 1st c. Paestum</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>extra day to a <em>munus</em></td>
<td>public funds to add extra day to someone's <em>munus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>mid 2nd c. Paestum</td>
<td>25,000 + over 25,000</td>
<td>1-day <em>munus</em></td>
<td>funds provided by the city, which the <em>curator</em> more than doubled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>2nd c. Allifae</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td><em>munus</em></td>
<td>the funds seem to be a contribution of the city to a <em>munus</em> given by the honorand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>earlier 1st c. Hispellum</td>
<td>80,000 (or more?)</td>
<td><em>pro ludis</em> over 2 years</td>
<td>public works supervised and ?partly financed by 4 duoviri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Augustan Iguvium</td>
<td>7750</td>
<td><em>in ludos Victoriae Aug. Caes.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>later 2nd c. Pisaurum</td>
<td>120,000 per event</td>
<td><em>munus</em> every four years</td>
<td>HS600,000, out of a foundation of HS1,000,000; price based on a 5% annual return</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table VIII.3 — Continued from Previous Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>261</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>273</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>311</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>347</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>353</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>378</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>397</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>404</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>413</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>428</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>448</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In spite of these obstacles, much was and can still be said about the cost of producing games.

The Urso charter specifies that each duovir must spend on solemn games at least 20,000 of his own resources, and is entitled to a municipal subvention of up to 20,000 (2 § LXX); aediles must likewise spend at least 20,000, but their subvention is limited to 10,000 (2 § LXXI). Why this difference exists is not stated. There was probably more competition to obtain one of the two seats on the board of aediles, since the duoviriate, with the same number of two seats, was virtually open only to ex-aediles; it is therefore likely that candidates for the aedileship committed themselves to greater spending from their own resources in order to outbid other candidates.353

A personal contribution for statutory games of 20,000 is known from other sources as well. An inscription from Cnossus records that a construction of some sort was paid for (at least in part) by a magistrate (?) with “the 500 denarii [= 20,000] which, in accordance with the colonial law, he had to disburse for the games” (448).354 Likewise, a text from Ulubrae (?) reports that 20,000 were spent (sci. on some monument) which normally should have been used for the games (44). Other amounts are known. In Hispellum, a decree of the decurions directed four duoviri, probably elected in two successive years, to invest in road improvement some 80,000 (or somewhat more?) which otherwise should have been spent on games (202: pecunia ludorum);355 this means that each

---

353Cf. JACQUES 1984, esp. pp.729-31, who shows for Africa that more gifts ob honorem were linked to bids for the aedileship than for other honors; cf. infra pp.193-96.
354“A construction of some sort”, and not a gladiatorial munus, as generally believed (e.g. ROBERT 1940 p.124 ad no. 66b; VILLE 1981 p.180; FREI-STOLBA 1988 p.206 n.58; cf. Crawford, RomSt p.437, for whom “munus here simply = ‘spectacle’, not specifically ‘gladiatorial show’”); the phrase in hoc munere certainly means “in this task” and refers to the cylindrical structure on which the inscription was engraved (cf. ICret 1 51 for a line drawing and no. 202A for the comparable phrase in id opus); the magistrate was required to build or restore this structure as he would otherwise have been required to produce ludi.
355The figure is possibly incomplete and may have been as high as 96,000 (which would mean 24,000 per man); but 80,000 is perhaps the more likely figure, since each man would thereby have managed the round sum of 20,000. We see 4 duoviri acting together pro ludis in Pompeii as well: no. 86.
duovir managed a fund of HS20,000 (on average?), not necessarily that each of them personally contributed that much money; it is conceivable, for instance, if we take chapter LXX of the Urso charter as a model, that half of the sum or HS10,000 was contributed by each magistrate, the other half, by the city. The formulation can be contrasted with that of the Cnossus inscription, which makes clear that the price of HS2000 is the magistrate’s personal contribution (but without ruling out the possibility that municipal funds were also used). Still other magistrates do not indicate the amount spent, but make it clear that they acted *sua pecunia pro ludis* (221, 226, 228 – for some reason, all from Etruria; cf. also 150); the city, therefore, could save for later or reallocate the funds (if any) which it normally contributed towards the production of statutory games.

The price of HS10,000 is attested in an inscription from Ammaedara (347); in this case at least, the magistrate’s required contribution towards statutory games and the *summa legitima* (or *summa honoraria*, a cash payment which magistrates, priests and sometimes decurions were required to disburse to the city upon assuming office) are one and the same thing. But it would be adventurous to generalize from this example and suppose that *summae honorariae* were generally spent on games or, as some inscriptions show, on monuments. In fact, one text, no. 334 from Rusicade, shows that magistrates could be required to make two distinct payments, one as a *summa legitima*, the other for the games; in this particular case, an aedile was required to disburse HS20,000 as a *summa legitima* and HS6000 for the games.356

So far, all the evidence considered is for statutory *ludi*. One notes some significant differences in how much was spent on such events and, at the same time, what contribution was expected from magistrates in different cities. A contribution of at least

---

356 I take the phrase *ob diem ludorum* to indicate that the games were required. DUNCAN JONES 1982 p.149 rightly does not assumes that the duoviri’s and aediles’ cash payments for solemn games at Urso corresponded to the *summa honoraria* since the law is seriously incomplete (but cf. ibid. p.83). One notes also that pontiffs and other municipal priests could be required to pay a *summa honoraria*, but were generally exempted from putting on games (cf. e.g. our no. 120 and infra p.191).
HS2000 seems to have been the standard set by many municipal constitutions, in the West as well as in the East, at least in the early imperial period to which our evidence for this figure belongs (2, 44, 448). The figure of HS10,000 found in the text from Ammaedara (347) is Severan and therefore cannot readily be used for comparative purpose. But the inscription from Hispellum (202), which is early imperial, shows that spending on solemn games could vary greatly from city to city: while at Urso the minimum price spent on the duoviri’s games was HS8000 altogether, at Hispellum it was apparently at least five times higher, at HS40,000, and perhaps much more if the HS20,000 per duovir corresponded only to a personal contribution.

Such discrepancy, though worthy of notice, does not match in any way the range of variation we are about to discover by comparing prices of shows according to category. This can be done by establishing the average price per day, provided price and number of days are both recorded. The evidence is summarized in Table VIII.4 (p.151).

Picking up where we have left off, we notice that gladiatorial shows at Paestum, Carthage and Aeclanum cost over two hundred times more per day than the boxing contest at Gori, while the entire gladiatorial show at Carthage cost eight hundred and thirty times more than it; the differences would be greater still if we took into account currency depreciation. The show at Gori probably attracted only non-professional and local contenders; it is likely that most of the HS240 available each year, except for expenses on organization, was used as a purse for the champion of the day, or perhaps divided up into smaller purses if there were several categories or prizes for finalists. This seems the most likely explanation for another price which appears, as one scholar put it, “surprisingly
Table VIII.4
AVERAGE PRICES OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no.</th>
<th>place</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>event</th>
<th>total price</th>
<th>price/day in HS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>mid 2nd c.</td>
<td>1-day munus</td>
<td>50,000+</td>
<td>over 50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Carthago</td>
<td>133/8</td>
<td>4-day munus</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Aeclanum</td>
<td>mid 2nd c.</td>
<td>3-day munus</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>late 1st c.</td>
<td>munus, 1 extra day</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Praeneste</td>
<td>Augustan</td>
<td>5 days of ludi</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Thisi</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c.</td>
<td>?1 day of ludi sc.</td>
<td>?/year</td>
<td>less than 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Rusicade</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c.</td>
<td>1 day of ludi</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Siagu</td>
<td>2nd/3rd c.</td>
<td>3 days of ludi</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urso</td>
<td>44 BC ⇒ Claudian</td>
<td>4-day ludi or munus of the duoviri</td>
<td>8000+/year</td>
<td>at least 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Urso</td>
<td>44 BC ⇒ Claudian</td>
<td>4-day ludi or munus of the aediles</td>
<td>6000+/year</td>
<td>at least 1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Barcino</td>
<td>mid 2nd c.</td>
<td>1-day boxing show</td>
<td>1000/year</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Uchi Maius</td>
<td>after 230</td>
<td>1 day of ludi</td>
<td>?/year</td>
<td>less than 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Auzia</td>
<td>after 235</td>
<td>2 days of circenses</td>
<td>1080/year</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Gori</td>
<td>3rd c.?</td>
<td>1-day boxing show</td>
<td>240/year</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

low": HS540 per day for circus games at Auzia.357 And again, the HS1000 to be spent every year on a boxing contest appears ridiculously small for an important center like Barcino358 unless used mostly as prize money or, at best, to attract local figures; by way of comparison, this amount would not pay for even a single pair of ordinary gladiators (gregarii) by the terms of the contemporary aes Italicense (on which cf. infra).

The ludi put on as funerary games in Praeneste (32), when compared with other

---

357 DUNCAN-JONES 1982 p.82; this author (ibid.) explains the difference of price between the Carthage and Gori shows by the fact that "the entertainments in question differed greatly in type"; this explains the author's surprise at the figure from Auzia. Cf. also infra n.515.

358 Let alone Tarraco, to which the source of this income, a bequest of HS7000, is to be transferred if stipulations are not respected.
ludi in the table, prove to have been particularly sumptuous. The average of HS8000/day is approached only at Rusicade, where a day of ludi was produced for HS6000, though it should be noted that that was at least a century later. Roughly contemporary to the Praenestine ludi are the dispositions of the Urso charter, where an average day of ludi cost between four and five times less. As for the games to be held annually at Thisi (397), it is not at all certain that they were to last only one day; if so, however, they must have been quite impressive: of the available HS10,000/year, probably no more than HS2000 were spent on cash hand-outs for the decurions (at HS20 per decurion, assuming that there were no more than a hundred of them), which would still leave HS8000 for the games. Another bequest, this one from Uchi Maius, shows that it was possible in the third century to organize ludi with as little as HS600/day.

The two inscriptions from Paestum in the table (155, 156) suggest that HS25,000 was the average price per day for a gladiatorial show in that town. But no. 156 also reveals that improving on the quality of the program, without extra days, could lead to a more than two-fold price increase for the entire show; in this particular case, better quality gladiators were leased, and huge bears and a man condemned to the beasts were added. Judging by their price, the shows at Aeclanum and Carthage may have been of the same order in terms of magnificence (though, as we are about to see, there may have been important differences of prices between regions or localities).

The three most expensive munera in the table belong to the middle of the second century or thereabout. We unfortunately have little comparative material from earlier periods. It is not possible to determine the quality of the program recorded in no. 155, which belongs to the late first century, but it is perhaps significant that the extra HS25,000 were used to add a day rather than improve on quality as in no. 156: this may (and only may) suggest that HS25,000 bought a better quality program in the late first than mid-second century.
It is remarkable that four *munera* top our list, while the least expensive among these still cost over three times more per day than the next event in the list, the Praenestine *ludi* (though not taking into account the difference of date). In this context, the municipal subvention of HS2000 granted by the Urso charter to duoviri and aediles appears ridiculously small for the production of a *munus* – let alone a four-day *munus*. Was there a dramatic increase of prices sometime in the second half of the first century? As we saw, strings of concomitant benefactions including a *munus* or at least some gladiatorial pairs are not attested after early imperial times (p.199; cf. p.145); and dedicatory *munera*, presented at the dedication of some monument and therefore subordinated to other benefactions, are rarely mentioned after the first century (p.199). Taken together, these facts and what we just discovered about prices indicate that the price of gladiatorial shows had substantially increased by the late first or early second century. If the subventions of HS2000 and 1000 remained in force at Urso in the later first century and after, it is likely that they were devised for duoviri and aediles of more modest means – probably the great majority of them – who would not have been able to afford a *munus*. 359

Prices continued to increase in the course of the second century, especially in provincial capitals and other major centers, as shown by the *aes Italicense* or so-called *Senatus Consultum de sumptibus ludorum gladiatoriorum minuendis* of A.D. 176/177 (4).360 This is a *senatus consultum* of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus that aimed at regulating and reducing expenditures on gladiatorial shows. The bronze tablet, which was found in 1888 in Italica (Baetica), contains a sizeable portion of the *sententia prima*, that is, the first opinion,

---

359VILLE 1981 pp.176–77 insists on the magistrate’s freedom to decline the subvention; cf. no. 23 LL.12–14 and supra p.120.
360Studies on this document are numerous; cf. especially MOMMSEN 1892, OLIVER & PALMER 1954, GUEY 1964; BALIL 1961 hardly deals with the s. c. at all. Add WIEDEMANN 1992 pp.134–37 for the context of the legislation, though his interpretation is on several points at odds with mine. On whether there is a causal relationship between the s. c. and the persecution at Lugdunum in A.D. 177, see also W.O. Moeller, “The Trinci/Trinqui and the Martyrs of Lyons”, *Historia* 21, 1972, p.127.
which a senator delivered after the reading of the imperial oration. We happen to have a small section of the latter preserved in a marble fragment from Sardis in Asia.\textsuperscript{361} That copies of this s. c. were found in such distant provinces testifies to its Empire-wide reach.

Part of the senator's sententia recalls how the greed of the lanistae (owners of a troupe of gladiators, impresarios) and the heavy taxes exacted by the imperial fiscus had turned gladiatorial munera into a heavy burden for the provincial priests. The terms of the imperial oration apparently rectified that situation to the satisfaction of the priests. One passage in particular is worth quoting at some length (4 LL.13–18):

The official reading of the address in our assembly has barely finished, but when it was unofficially reported that the profits of the lanistae had been pruned back and that the fiscus had renounced all that money has contaminated, immediately the priests of your most loyal Gallic provinces rushed to see each other, were full of joy, and plied each other with questions and answers. There was one who upon being appointed priest had given up his fortune for lost, had named a council to help him in an appeal addressed to the Emperors. But in that very gathering, he himself, before and after consulting his friends, exclaimed, "What do I want with an appeal now? Their most sacred Majesties the Emperors have released the whole burden which crushed my patrimony. Now I desire and look forward to being a priest, and for the duty of putting on a spectacle, which we once hated, I welcome it."\textsuperscript{362}

Further on in his speech our senator thanks the emperors for putting an end to the progressive fall of the leading men (principales uiri) into ruin (LL.23–26). The appeal (prouocatio and then, less formally it seems, appellatio) of the man cited in example certainly was an appeal to have his appointment as priest abrogated, and not, as suggested by Oliver's translation, an appeal to be discharged of the obligation to produce a gladiatorial show.\textsuperscript{363} It is obvious from the lines quoted above, and overall from the first twenty-six lines

\textsuperscript{361} Text of the main fragment: AE 1909, 184; OLIVER & PALMER 1955 pp.328–30 for complete text with bibliography up to 1955.

\textsuperscript{362} Translation Oliver, in OLIVER & PALMER 1955, except for the italicized part, which he has thus: "of which we once were solemnly asking to be relieved", but there is no reason to give a legal meaning to detestor, especially since it is in opposition to amplector which immediately follows.

\textsuperscript{363} Cf. n.362 and infra p.192.
of the tablet, that wealthy aristocrats were extremely reluctant to take on a provincial priesthood, however prestigious, and that their appointment was (generally?) imposed from above. Appeals for release from public service are poorly documented in the West, but are well attested in the Greek part of the Empire – in Egypt in particular, where numerous papyri preserve letters addressed to the authorities for exemption from liturgies.  

To appreciate the full significance of the senator’s words for our purpose, we need to examine what he has to say about smaller cities as well. After agreeing with the emperors’ proposed categorization of gladiators and events, and tables of costs which were aimed at regulating the production of any gladiatorial show in Italy or in the provinces, he adds (4 ll.46–48):

Concerning the prices of gladiators, however, I expressed a little while ago an opinion in accord with the prescription of the divine oration, but I think the rule is formulated in such a way that those prices apply to those states in which prices of gladiators have been flagrantly high. In respect to those states which have a rather weak commonwealth, on the other hand, (I suggest that) these rules which are prescribed in stronger communities be not so rigidly maintained and not place burdens upon them beyond the limit of their strength but keep within that limit …  

He then suggests that, in those cities where munera were and will be produced, three levels of prices be established. The authority to perform the task (for example, the provincial governor in the cities in his province) is to consider for each city the costs of events in public and private accounts in the last ten years, and determine the highest, mean and lowest prices. These will be the starting point for the system he will consider best in each particular case (ll.49–53). It seems therefore that in such cities as the senator has in mind, the costs of

---

364 Egypt: e.g. A.S. Hunt & C.C. Edgar, Select Papyri no. 283. In 147 Aelius Aristides sojourned in his native Smyrna, but declined honors offered enthusiastically to him by his fellow citizens. Still, they had him elected High Priest of Asia; he appealed to the governor and was exempted on account of his poor health. Later, however, when his health had improved and he was appointed to various honors and offices, he (successfully) came up with all sorts of arguments to be exempted. See Ael.Arist. Hier.log. 4.95-104 passim; C.A. Behr, Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales, Amsterdam 1968, esp. pp.61–68, 77–86.
365 But not in Rome itself, as MOMMSEN 1892 p.396 remarked.
366 Translation Oliver, in OLIVER & PALMER 1955.
producing a show were moderate, and that a system based on recent prices was deemed appropriate.

But why were there, as the passages quoted or alluded to make clear, important differences in the price of gladiatorial troupes between different cities? The *aes* shows that provincial priests were required to put on a gladiatorial show (infra p.192). This they could not escape, except by persuading the emperor and his representatives to cancel their appointment. The senator's words indicate that he did not have in mind the same sense of constraint or inexorable necessity about smaller cities. He is aware that not in all of them were gladiatorial shows produced in the past, nor will they necessarily be in the future; also, that both public and private money is involved, while no mention is made of public money for the priests' *munera*. In Urso, as we saw, by Claudian times magistrates could choose between the production of a *munus* or *ludi*. Paired with all that is the reasonable assumption that a *munus* fit for a provincial capital must have been more grandiose in terms of size and quality than any local *munus*. Therefore, when negotiating with *lanistae*, provincial priests were probably in a much more vulnerable position than local magistrates or private persons. 367 In fact, the emperors' oration was so much concerned with this problem that, if we believe the author of the *sententia*, the proposed legislation, had it been adopted as proposed, would have been detrimental to smaller communities.

Before the *aes italicense*, we hear nothing about the practices of *lanistae* or complaints about them. Imperial legislation on gladiatorial shows seems to have been mostly concerned with limiting the number of pairs of fighters that could be exhibited, and was therefore monitoring the producers’ conduct rather than that of the *lanistae*. 368 Several

---

367 Even in provinces where *familiae gladiatoriae* were passed on from one chief priest to the next, without any recourse to *lanistae*, priests coming out of office were known to sell their troupe at a profit (LL.59–61).
368 Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13.49.1 (supra p.22); Plin. *Pan.* 54.4; cf. no. 236; VILLE 1981 pp.209–10; for the East, ROBERT 1940 p.281 with no. 152. After the disaster at Fidenae under Tiberius, it was ruled that noone without a fortune of at least HS400,000 could give a *munus* (Tac. *Ann.* 4.63.2).
inscriptions record the *indulgentia principis*, an imperial authorization which allowed a producer to surpass the permitted number of fighters and beasts or to organize a show which would otherwise have been forbidden (for example, because of his young age: nos. 132, 165). However, it is worth noting that only one of these inscriptions securely antedates the 176/177 legislation, while at least six postdate it. This suggests that the new legislation was of some consequence. Moreover, we are dealing in probably all cases with local shows, so that, beside powerful provincial priests, some much smaller producers were affected; whether the latter generally welcomed such intrusion is not known, but emperors were apparently willing to bend the rules to accommodate them, and producers were grateful for it.

The *munus* organized by a provincial priest at Lugdunum in A.D. 220 (253) must have been considerably more expensive than any of the shows in Table VIII.4. On the basis of the regulations contained in the *aes Italicense*, the price of hiring the sixty-four gladiators alone (excluding, that is, *uenationes* and/or other attractions, and the *apparatus*) has been estimated by H.G. Pflaum at HS332,000. This figure is realistic enough to give a sense of the amplitude of expenses incurred in the largest shows, but must be taken with some caution. Pflaum reads the *aes Italicense* literally, taking prices of gladiators for the fifth category of *munera*, those priced over HS150,000, as fixed prices (4 LL.33–34); but it seems more likely that, as for the three categories of *munera* priced between HS30,000 and 100,000 (LL.30–32), these are maximum prices. Two reasons can be put forward. (1) If read literally, prices of gladiators for the fourth category of *munera* (HS100,000–150,000) are also fixed.

---

369 No. 47 dates from A.D. 170; nos. 36, 165, 247 are not earlier than the middle of the 2nd c.; nos. 22, 40, 118, 243 and 407 are dated between A.D. 180–265; and no. 432 is 3rd/4th c. Most examples, it should be noted, are Italian and date from a period when the epigraphic evidence is rapidly dwindling in Italy. Permission to produce a show: nos. 47, 132, 165, 210, 243. Cf. also FORA 1996 pp.66–67 and, on no. 36, supra p.77. On the Greek evidence, ROBERT 1940 p.274 with nos. 63 and 139.

370 PFLAUM 1948 p.15. At p.16 he claims on the evidence of LL.45–46 that prizes for victorious gladiators, too, have to be added on top of his estimate, but the wording rather suggests that this was deducted from the lease paid to the *lanista*. 
prices, but this would mean that all shows necessarily displayed five pairs of gladiators (one for each of the five classes of gladiators) at a price of HS82,000, with ten *gregarii* on top (cf. LL.32–33); such rigidity, leaving no room whatsoever for negotiations between parties and not found in any other category, is highly improbable. (2) Unlike the three lower categories of *munera*, it is not stated for the fourth and fifth that an equal number of pairs of each class of gladiators must be produced; this, however, is assumed by Pflaum – and rightly: otherwise, the regulations would be ineffective, not to say pointless; but this also indicates that the senator whose words are reported became more expedient as he reached the end of a tedious list of figures. It is therefore likely that (1) we have here a somewhat truncated version of the corresponding passage in the (lost) imperial oration; (2) in all categories, prices for gladiators are maximum prices; and (3) Pflaum’s figure could be somewhat too high, unless the producer found himself compelled to pay maximum prices for all gladiators.
IX. PRODUCERS AND CAVSAE SPECTACULORVM

The main issue to be discussed at this point was raised on several occasions throughout the preceding chapters. It is now time for a comprehensive analysis of the data in order to establish the public or private nature of the games recorded in inscriptions. The reader should already have a good idea of what to expect: inscriptions mostly record non-statutory productions and supplementary programs since only these are true benefactions; statutory ludi and munera were the price to pay in return for an honor such as the duovirate or aedileship and, therefore, were not deserving of a mention in one’s epitaph or honorary inscription. This, it should be noted, was remarked by several authors, but always incidentally, and no-one, it seems, has ever fully exploited the data.

1. Statutory games

It will be best to start by extracting from the catalogue statutory games, since there are less of them and they share one basic purpose, the fulfilling of an obligation in return for an honor or priesthood. The evidence is collected in the following table.

---

Table IX.1
EVIDENCE FOR STATUTORY GAMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Regulations about their production</td>
<td>1, 2 §§ LXX–LXXI, 3, 67, 225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ludi and munera qualified in some or other way as statutory (excluding curae muneris publici)</td>
<td>179, 224, [257], 304 (ludi); 22, ?140 (munera).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ludi which are shown to be statutory by the circumstances of their production</td>
<td>18, 23, 31, ?36, 115, 205, 334, 347; ?304 (l. iunens).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ludi produced by boards (excluding ludi that are probably or definitely dedicatory)</td>
<td>duoviri: ?87, 215, 232, 233; (seuiri) augustales: 114, 192; freedmen and slaves: 17, 21, 214; unidentified: ?164, 274.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other games produced by boards and likely or possibly statutory</td>
<td>?87 (uenatio); 145, 161 (munus).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To present the evidence on statutory games in a systematic way is not an easy task.\(^\text{372}\) Only very few inscriptions state that games were public or solemn (B in the table). Otherwise, one has to rely on other indications, such as the mention of the public fund made available to magistrates for their games (C), or on more subjective criteria (D–E). Moreover, there is no neat line of demarcation between statutory and private games. For example, private bequests for periodic gifts of games were entrusted to cities; the latter appointed curators to manage such funds just as other cities, equipped with a munus publicum fed by a municipal fund, appointed curatores muneris publici. However, it will be convenient to leave for a little later all events organized by curatores, especially since they represent a later (imperial) development. The material contained in the table will be surveyed mainly in order to solve one of our most fundamental problems, the extent to which gladiatorial shows

\(^{372}\)LANGHAMMER 1973, esp. pp.180–81 on “die cura ludorum” at the municipal level, provides a summary of some earlier views which, in my opinion, are unsupported by the evidence and fail to take into account the selective character of the material contained in the inscriptions. Interestingly, the author never considers the fact that the cura ludorum – his subheading – and curatores ludorum are not yet attested epigraphically, while municipal curae muneris and curatores muneris are not uncommon (Table IX.3).
were substituted for statutory ludi in non-Greek cities throughout the Roman world.

It is not necessary to deal in extenso with the lex Tarentina of ca. 45 B.C. (1) or the Caesarean version of the lex Vrsonensis (2 with supra pp.66–69); both of these show that magistrates were required to organize ludi, which is consistent with the fact that, in Republican times, gladiatorial shows were almost always private undertakings. As for later periods, many scholars conclude or assume on the evidence of the emended version of the lex Vrsonensis that obligatory munera became a common occurrence, or that magistrates often took on themselves, with the decurions’ assent, to substitute a munus for statutory ludi (2 §§ LXX–LXXI).³⁷³ There are, however, several reasons to disagree with this view, some of which have already been discussed in some details.³⁷⁴ It is now time to complete our demonstration.

One document which is directly relevant for our present purpose and supports our contention, but is usually neglected by students of the gladiatorial establishment (since it does not say anything about this) is the lex Irnitana, from Irni in Baetica, which we have in a version dating probably to A.D. 91. Comparison of this bronze inscription with other municipal laws from the same region, especially the leges Malacitana and Salpensana, also engraved on bronze, reveals that a single model was used by Domitian to provide a constitution to municipia in Spain, or at least Baetica, some years after Vespasian had granted Latin right to the whole Peninsula.³⁷⁵ Therefore, the chapters we are about to examine from the Irnitana have a relevance well beyond the limits of the territory of Irni.

Most important for the present purpose is chapter LXXVII (= 3), of which a translation

³⁷³SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.128; VILLE 1981 pp.175–88 esp. 183; HOPKINS 1983 p.13; CÉBEILLAC GERVASONI 1990 p.706; FORA 1996 p.54. FRIEDLÄNDER 1921–23 II p.103 (= English transl. p.82) mentions the law in his examination of gladiatorial shows, but not when he discusses scenic games. ³⁷⁴Cf. supra p.153: few municipal magistrates are likely to have possessed the kind of wealth necessary to produce a gladiatorial show; p.156: some smaller cities never hosted a gladiatorial show. ³⁷⁵The leges Malacitana (C II 1964 + p.878; ILS 6089) and Salpensana (C II 1963; ILS 6088) should be consulted together with the Irnitana; cf. GONZÁLEZ 1986 (= AE 1986, 333). Fragments from Lauriacum in Noricum suggests that it had a law quite similar to those: Crawford in GONZÁLEZ 1986 pp.241–43.
follows:

Rubric: Concerning expenses for religious observances, *ludi* and dinners which are to be provided. The duoviri who are in charge of the administration of justice in that municipality are to raise with the decurions or *conscripti* at the earliest possible moment how much should be spent for expenses on religious observances *and ludi* and how much on dinners which are offered to the citizens or the decurions or *conscripti* in common, and they are to spend as much as the majority of them decides, as they may think proper.376

So far as the games are concerned, this chapter is of a much more general character than the corresponding chapters in the Urso charter (2 §§ LXX-LXXI); each Flavian *municipium* had to determine for itself the amount of funds the treasury and/or magistrates would be required to spend on public games. The two laws can more easily be compared on the issue of the nature of those public games. In the Claudian copy of the Urso charter, duoviri and aediles could, with sanction of the decurions, organize either *ludi* or a gladiatorial show. A few decades later, in the Flavian law, only *ludi* are envisaged. The omission of *munera* should not be considered accidental: elsewhere in the law, the term *spectacula* is used in contexts when all shows, public and private and not only *ludi*, are meant. Chapter LXXXI, on seating arrangement, applies to “whatever shows are produced in that municipality” (*quae spectacula in eo municipio edentur*). In chapter LXXXII, days when shows are produced count among those when certain legal matters may not be conducted, but only such “shows that are produced in that municipality by decree of the decurions or conscripts” (*quibus diebus ex decurionum conscriptorumue decreto spectacula in com [sic for eo] municipio edentur*); the clause is more restrictive than in chapter LXXXI, necessarily includes public *ludi*, but possibly not all private shows. It could be objected that the distinction *ludi–spectacula* was caused by the pasting together of material from different sources and periods, a well established fact.377 However, so far as the games are concerned, the Flavian

---

376Translation M.H. Crawford (slightly modified) in GONZÁLEZ 1986 p.194.
377Cf. e.g. GALSTERER 1987.
law shows uniformity of style and coherence of content that can be contrasted with the incoherence of the *Vrsonensis* and, in particular, its provisions on seating arrangement: in chapter LXVI, the priests' seating privileges extend to *ludi* and gladiatorial shows, but chapters CXXV–CXXVII, specifically devoted to seating arrangement, deal only with *ludi*. Provisions on games in the *Irnitana* are, as we just saw, coherent from a linguistic point of view, unlike the corresponding passages of the *Vrsonensis* (supra: pp.66–69). All this strongly suggests that, in chapter LXXVII of the *Irnitana*, the mention of only *ludi*, rather than *spectacula* as in other sections of the law, or of something like “*ludi munusue*” as in the Urso charter, should not be considered a careless omission. *Ludi* were probably the usual program of public games in towns regulated by the Flavian municipal law.

The Augustan and later evidence about to be presented indicates that, elsewhere as well, *ludi* generally remained the more common form of statutory games during the Empire since almost no corresponding evidence concerns *munera*. As we saw in the previous chapter, boards of officials sometimes saw to it that a formal account of their activities be engraved in stone; these are records of duties fulfilled rather than benefactions provided. At times such records mention *ludi* which, unless dedicatory, are likely to have been required from boards such as the *augustales* (D in the table: 114). Annals (*fasti*) of a city or single association within a city accomplish the same function for successive years over a long period of time (D: 192, 215). There is no corresponding evidence for gladiatorial shows.

Statutory games are otherwise rarely recorded in inscriptions, but that can happen under particular circumstances (B in the table). An inscription from Perusia reports events that took place in A.D. 161, or shortly before, and involved a duovir “while he was producing *ludi publici*” (224: *ludos publicos edenti*); these public games are mentioned only
to provide a context. Likewise in Veii (230, 232, 233) and Oriculum (223) inscriptions record events that occurred “during ludi”; in nos. 232 and 233, both from the middle of the third century, “money was collected in the orchestra, during ludi which the duoviri organized”. For the same reason no. 179 distinguishes a uenatio offered ob honorem from the ludi sollemnes which immediately followed. At Singili Barba in the early second century a duovir gave as many days of private as of public ludi; the latter are mentioned apparently only to give the measure of the former (304). In none of these cases is credit given for the production of statutory games.

Sometimes we are not told that games are statutory, but this is made clear by the circumstances of their production (C). In Lanuvium, probably in the Augustan age, a local notable was honored among other things because “he organized alone the illuminations and ludi to Juno Sospes Mater Regina” (18 LL.10–11); in other words, he did alone what normally was done by a board; neither his nor some other ludi produced in Puteoli apparently under similar circumstances (115) would have deserved notice otherwise. In Ostia a prominent notable remitted the municipal subvention for his ludi – which were therefore statutory – as he received it; had he not done so, we would not know anything about these (23 LL.12–14). Nor would we hear about ludi organized by one of his descendants if he had not increased their splendor (31 LL.10–11). In Africa, in the second or third century, magistrates take the opportunity of the erection of a dedicatory inscription to recall that they handed over to their city obligatory payments for the production of ludi (334, 347).

We have only one secure case of a munus which was required from the

---

378The present participle edenti, derived from edere, further suggests that a municipal subvention, if any, was declined (supra pp.120–21 with n.303. We may have another instance of the expression ludos publius in no. 257, but it is also possible to restitute ludos, publ[ic...].
379Each time the duoviri worked together as a board; this situation is also found with duoviri and other officials in pro ludis inscriptions, but almost never in dedicatory, honorary or funerary inscriptions.
380Similarly, LudSaecA L.156: ludos quos honorarios adiecimus luidis sollemnis (cf. LudSaecS1..36).
magistrate who produced it, P. Baebius Iustus, at Minturnae for the duovirate (22 L.10: *processus editio*). As Jacques remarked, this show was recalled because the people then asked for another show from Iustus (the latter complied, once he had returned to private life, but the inscription stresses that he did so of his own will: *libenter*). However, it cannot be claimed on this evidence that Minturnae required a *munus* from all duoviri. It is obvious that Iustus was very wealthy, and popular expectations from a man like him were probably higher than from most notables. One should recall that the Urso charter does not require a *munus* from magistrates, since they may choose to produce *ludi*; however, so far as the duoviri are concerned, the phrase *arbitratu decurionum* (2 § LXX L.10) suggests that at times, the decurions may have used their authority to impose on the very wealthy the more expensive and better liked *munus*.

There are a few other possible cases of statutory *munera*. Two quattuorvirs from Canusium erected statues with revenues from the selling of seats at their *munus* (145; on the selling of seats, cf. infra pp.212–15). That they certainly were sitting magistrates, and acted together, makes it likely that the show was statutory; however, they may have decided to come together and give a *munus* on top of *ludi publici*; the show would then be a *munus ob honorem*. The same can be said of a *munus* organized by two probable magistrates in Alba Fucens (161), even though the show comprised a *uenatio legitima*, organized according to the norms; this could be taken to mean that the event was statutory; but Pompeian posters, too, record that *uenationes legitimae* were held at *munera*, shows which were probably not statutory in Pompeii (infra pp. 216–20).

The *pro ludis* inscriptions show that *ludi* were the normal program of statutory games in Pompeii (infra). It is therefore probable that the *uenatio cum collega* recorded in no. 87 (L.14) was a show *ob honorem quinquennalitatis*, and not as generally believed a

---

381 Jacques 1984 pp.403–4 on this and what follows.
382 A kind of show better attested than statutory *munera*; cf. infra pp.193–96.
statutory event. It is to be noted that the *quinquennalis* Flaccus, whose inscription this is, was probably more powerful than his colleague; he gave several shows of his own (LL.9–13), and came together with his colleague only for a *uenatio*. They probably also gave *ludi*, either individually or together, though these *ludi* must have been not as outstanding since not recorded.\(^{383}\)

What other evidence we have about the legal obligation for municipal magistrates to produce games during the Empire also argues for the greater diffusion of *ludi*. Most telling are those inscriptions which record that some public building or statue, road, &c., was built or restored *pro ludis*, that is, "instead of putting on *ludi*". The evidence is collected in Table IX.2 (p.167).

The expression *pro ludis* can mean either one of two things: (1) a magistrate, *augustalis* or some other official who was required to put on statutory *ludi* reallocated, with sanction of the local senate;\(^{384}\) some or all of the budget to some other public purpose; (2) successful candidates to an honor were asked or required by the local senate to substitute *ob honorem* promises (i.e. made while campaigning) of games, which were binding by virtue of their election, for some other public purpose. For now we shall be concerned with the first of these two possibilities; the other belongs to our discussion on non-statutory games (infra pp.193–96).

\(^{383}\)I suspect that Flaccus' *ludi* for his 1st and 3rd duovirate were also statutory, but worthy of being recorded because of their magnificence.

\(^{384}\)Shown by the phrase *ex decreto decurionum* ("by decree of the decurions"), which also tells of the public and obligatory character of the substitution, and therefore of the *ludi* that would otherwise have been put on.
PRODUCERS & CAVSAE SPECTACVLORVM

Table IX.2
THE “PRO LVDIS” INSCRIPTIONS

A. by magistrates: duoviri q.q.: 429 (ex polllicitatione muneris gl. ob honorem q.q.). duoviri (iure dic.): 82, 86b, 136 (p. l.); 83, 84, 86a, c, d (p. l. luminibus); 202 (ex pecunia ludorum); cf. 81. praetores duoviri: 183 (p. l.). aediles: 6 (p. l.). quattuorviri (iure dic.): 221 (p. l. sua pec.); 226 (de sua pec. p. l.).

B. by augustales: aug.: 150 (pro munere ... sua pec.); magistri aug.: 219 (pec. sua p. l.); seuiri (aug.): [44], [227] (p. l.); 228 (pro impensa ludorum ... sua pec.); cf. 167 (p. l. Augustalibus).

C. by magistri: m. pagi: 85 (p. l.); conlegium seuie m. louei compogei: 60 (tamquam sei ludos fecissent).

D. by ... some notable: 72 (ob promissam uenationem); 403 (ob diem muneris); 332 (pro editione muneris debiti). ...: 42, 182, 190, 448 (p. l.); 339B (pro specta[cullo?]).

We have mentioned on several occasions the fact that statutory games are usually not commemorated in inscriptions; but when a magistrate or priest substituted some construction for games, he was provided with a support to record his doings.385 We, in our turn, are provided with a peculiar form of evidence, since pro ludi inscriptions tell us that games were not produced, while their actual production would have probably left no trace in the epigraphy. These non-events were almost always ludi. So far as the Republican evidence is concerned, this should not surprise us. Augustan and later pro ludi inscriptions, however, do not support claims that the early Empire progressively saw the integration in some or other way of munera among the magistrates’ obligations. G. Ville, who supported this view, was aware of this problem, but he dismissed it by attributing pro ludi inscriptions erected

385Cf. CÉBEILLAC-GERVASONI 1990 p.706; COLEMAN 1998 pp.24–29. JACQUES 1984 p.728 remarked that statues erected by African notables were often worth much less than the benefactions recorded on the base, which suggests that their main purpose was to perpetuate one’s career and munificence.
by magistrates to the immediately post-Sullan period. This is impossible in at least two cases; one inscription, which records the erection by an aedile of a statue (?) to Tiberius in A.D. 36/37 (6), is relegated by Ville to a footnote; the other, of a quattuorvir, opens with an invocation to Mars Augustus and is therefore Augustan or later, but goes unmentioned (221). Several other inscriptions are more probably Augustan or, at the earliest, posterior to Caesar’s death. In Pompeii sections of the amphitheater are being built or improved pro ludis, mostly by duoviri (83, 84, 86); of the six duoviri in question, only one does not bear a cognomen (84), which suggests a date closer to the Augustan than the Sullan period. In fact, pro ludis inscriptions, whether they were erected by magistrates or other officials, seem to be mostly confined to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius. Thus it is possibly during the same (re)building phase of the amphitheater at Pompeii that some magistri pagi Augusti, whose title indicates a post-27 B.C. date, erected a wall between the arena and spectators’ seats (85). Elsewhere we see boards of augustales, which by definition are Augustan or later, erect pro ludis inscriptions; a portico and voting enclosure (or place?) were built pro ludis Augustalibus (167). Therefore, the pro ludis inscriptions strongly suggest that ludi were still the most common form taken by official shows in early imperial times.

What is more, our single pro munere inscription, which belongs probably to the first half of the first century A.C., was erected at Luceria not by magistrates but by two augustales (150). This is perhaps because the community had seen in the foundation of a new college an opportunity to require from its members the production of a munus, leaving unaltered those provisions in the local legislation which concerned their magistrates; presumably, the latter had to produce, as elsewhere, ludi publici (cf. further infra n.515).

386VILLE 1981 pp.181–83; cf. p.188 n.32.
387Ibid. p.182 n.19.
388Nos. 44, 219, 227, 228; on no. 150 (pro munere) cf. infra. Actual productions of ludi by augustales are recorded in nos. 114, 167 and 192 (supra pp.34–37, 132–33, and infra pp.191–92).
389The pro ludis inscriptions seem to be disappearing during or not long after the reign of Tiberius; the much later African examples, nos. 332, 339B and 429, belong to another context.
Actual mentions of obligatory gladiatorial shows do not suffice in themselves to determine the relative commonness of such events. We know of several public munera thanks only to the title of curator muneris. In some cities, too, the producer of a gladiatorial show assumed the title of munerarius. How the shows produced by these officials compare with those already discussed is the object of the next section.

2. Curatores muneris and munerarii

There is no agreement among scholars on the exact nature of the curatorship of the public and foundation munera, nor on what distinguishes munerarii from curators of public and foundation munera. The inscriptions are somewhat more loquacious on the curatores, and it will therefore be appropriate to start with them. The following table presents curators of municipal as well as foundation munera.

Table IX.3

CURATOES MVNERIS390

A. c. muneris (gladiatorii publici) [8], (11), (13), 19, 33, 37, (52), 246, 263, [430]; 149, 181, 195 (twice); 34 (thrice); 138 (dies unius); [50], 116 (tridui); 117 (2 curatores, 1 quadriduo); 440 (c. m. munerarius); [151] (c. m. munificus); cf. 40, [134], 155, 156, 162, [186].

B. c. of a foundation munus 152, 191, 245, 264, 415, 431; 153 (twice); cf. 165, 209, 452. Cf. Table IX.7: B.2.

Municipal (or public) and foundation munera gladiatoria, and the curators of such events, are known exclusively from the inscriptions. There are three main problems which have drawn the attention of scholars and will be addressed here: (1) the extent of the curator’s competence and especially whether or not he was required, in order to produce the

390The brackets "( )" indicate the mention of a cura, from which one can infer that the official in charge was a curator.
show, to contribute some of his own money beside managing a special fund; (2) his profile; and (3) the reasons explaining the emergence of the cura muneris publici.

(1) Mommsen thought that the curator muneris publici took on himself to give a munus while assuming an honor, his title being therefore synonymous to that of munerarius (on which cf. infra).\textsuperscript{391} We owe the first account of some substance on this issue to G. Ville. According to this author, the curator muneris publici was expected to make a monetary contribution towards the cost of producing the show; so did the curator of a foundation munus, who may also have had to respect some conditions prescribed by the testator, such as a fixed date for the event.\textsuperscript{392} Sabbatini Tumolesi disagrees that any of these curators had to contribute financially to their cura. The curators of foundation munera who, she claims, constitute a close parallel to curatores muneris publici, prove the opposite: their purpose was to see to it that the conditions accompanying the bequest were scrupulously respected, which rules out any financial increment of their own.\textsuperscript{393} Fora agrees with Sabbatini, giving much weight to no. 13, which honors a notable “because he splendidly administered the public gladiatorial show” (quod curam muneris publici splendide administrauerit), and to nos. 11 and 52, which use the expression curam suscipere. The verbs administrare and suscipere are taken to mean that the curator contributed none of his own money, that he only managed the funds made available to him towards the production of the show.\textsuperscript{394}

Despite what Sabbatini and Fora have to say, there are reasons to believe that Ville is closer to the truth and that curatores muneris publici, at least, were indeed expected to contribute financially to their cura. Let us first of all remove Fora’s linguistic arguments

\textsuperscript{391}\textsc{Mommsen} 1892 p.402, followed by \textsc{Lafaye} 1896 p.1569, \textsc{Liebenam} 1900 p.372.
\textsuperscript{392}\textsc{Ville} 1981 pp.193–200.
\textsuperscript{393}\textsc{Sabbatini Tumolesi} 1984a pp.104–5. It is unfortunate that the study there promised on curatores muneris, which would have probably expanded on her short remarks, did not appear before her untimely death in 1995.
\textsuperscript{394}\textsc{Fora} 1996 pp.71–79, esp. 76–77; he mentions also our no. 155, where curare is said of a supplementary day produced with public money.
out of the way. Of a cura one says administrare (13) or suscipere (11, 52), whether or not a personal monetary contribution is added, because this is the Latin usage. This is shown excellently by no. 11, cited by Fora, of a notable who assumed (suscipere) the cura muneris publici, but made promises about the program of his show, which is incompatible with exclusively administrative functions. It is also tempting to compare no. 13, in which a "splendid administration of the public munus" is recorded, with no. 156, of a "curator" who was entrusted HS25,000 of public money for the purchase of a gladiatorial troupe, but personally more than doubled that sum to obtain better quality gladiators; interestingly, the exact amount of this ampliatio is not stated. Could this be one of the forms taken by a "splendid administration"?

Curators of public and foundation munera were probably not so similar as Sabbatini thought. The cura muneris publici seems to have been somewhat more prestigious, probably because of greater expectations from the curator. In no. 52, from Cales, the curator receives the decurional ornaments and a statue for his munus publicum. Statues are awarded for such shows also to curators in Fundi (13) and Praeneste (33, 34). It seems unlikely that such honors would have rewarded purely administrative duties. This is supported by the case of a curator muneris publici who received a biga for his show (11), a distinction most frequently awarded to munerarii, who paid for their show (infra); as we just saw, this man had made some promises upon assuming the cura muneris, which would seem inappropriate if his duties were essentially administrative; the reward suggests that

---

395 I agreed with Fora in my review of EAOR IV (CR 102, 1998, pp.448–9; cf. EAOR IV p.103) but have since then changed my views. Cf. in general chapter VII.

396 Note also no. 304, which honors “for his fine administration of the state” (L.L. 15–16: ob rem publicam bene administratam) a duovir who had paid for games and given free access to the baths during his year in office; and no. 115, of a man who “administered” the games alone (ludos administravit solus): this means that he should normally have been assisted by a colleague, not that he was a curator ludorum (pace VILLE 1981 p.196 n.45); as a matter of fact, he probably paid twice (or more if there were normally more colleagues) the amount he would have been required to contribute personally under normal conditions.

397 The curator of no 33 was also servus augustalis, but this is not in itself worthy of a statue, which was therefore probably awarded for the munus. In no. 34 the cura muneris is one of several causes of the reward.
these promises went well beyond what the municipal fund alone would have allowed.398 There is one single case of a foundation munus whose production was the object of some honor. A prominent notable from Lepcis Magna was rewarded with two bigae for a series of benefactions which included the cura of a foundation munus (431). This suggests that a curator was free to improve even on a foundation munus.

In two cases there were pressures exerted on potential curators of the public munus (52: petitioni municipum suorum; 11: rogatus ab ordine pariter et populo). It seems unlikely that this was brought about by their exceptional administrative skills alone; such pressures are exerted on individuals because they are wealthy and can afford what is forbidden to most.399 There is no exact parallel which involves the curator of a foundation munus, but no. 431, again, suggests that in their case as well the wealthiest were considered better candidates.

The evidence presented so far is limited but suggests that curatores muneris publici could be asked to do more than just administer a special fund to organize a show. There is evidence in favor of Ville's view that they were expected to make a substantial monetary contribution to their cura, but it seems difficult to establish how widespread or how well integrated this practice was. One area where we may be able to improve on that author's analysis is the chronology. Our discussion on prices in the previous chapter has shown that the cost of gladiatorial shows substantially increased in the late first and second century. In order to maintain the quality of the program at levels established in previous years, curators may have felt increasingly compelled to supplement the special fund and any statutory payment they were required to make (if such payments existed). It was remarked by Sabbatini Tumolesi that most of the evidence about the munus publicum and its curators

399Cf. JACQUES 1984 pp.399–406, where he discusses nos. 22, 40, 52 and 428.
belongs to the later second and early third century.\textsuperscript{400} She interprets this as an emergence of local \textit{curae munera} at a time of decline of municipal institutions (infra). It seems more likely that local \textit{curae munera} were, for the most part, already well established, but became worthy of epigraphic commemorations only when demands on the curators increased. As a matter of fact, all inscriptions which praise a curator for his \textit{cura} belong to the second or third century,\textsuperscript{401} while first- or early second-century inscriptions always present the \textit{cura munera publici} as no more than a step in a notable's \textit{cursus}.\textsuperscript{402}

But why – it may be asked – did this process not affect foundation \textit{munera} to the same extent? Probably because, as it seems, foundation \textit{munera} generally appeared later than public \textit{munera}. There is no proof that any of them was created in the first century,\textsuperscript{403} while several \textit{munera publica} are to be attributed definitely or more probably to that period. This means that testators in most cases were aware of price increases, which is shown by the huge size of some bequests (208–209) and the two- and four- or five-year periodicity of some shows (194, 208). Testators were also concerned that the fund was used as they intended (cf. e.g. 265 L.10; 273 LL.29–38), and it was in their interest that the foundation and returns were large enough to guarantee the perpetuation of the show. Meanwhile, local senates may not have judged it necessary to augment the amount traditionally provided for the public \textit{munus}. They and the people rather resorted increasingly to exerting pressures on the wealthy and promising them public honors.\textsuperscript{404} On the other hand, when a \textit{cura munera}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{400}SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1984a p.105, followed closely by FORA 1996 pp.78–79.
\item \textsuperscript{401}Nos. 11, 13, 34, 52, 151; cf. 156 and 162, which may refer to institutionalized \textit{curae munera publici}.
\item \textsuperscript{402}Nos. 138, 181, 263; nos. 19, 33, 149 could date from the 1st half of the 2nd c.; examples are found later also, which is to be expected since the \textit{cura munera} gained in prestige: 8, 37, 117, 195, 246, 430, 440.
\item \textsuperscript{403}M. BUONOCORE in \textit{EAOR} III places his nos. 6 and 7 (= 194 and 131; no. 5 = 193, also mentioned, should be removed) in the 1st c. on very suspicious grounds (cf. \textit{EAOR} ad loc. and p.142); moreover, he erroneously alludes to a 1st-c. date for nos. 208 and 236, rightly attributed to the 2nd c. by GREGORI in vol. II ad nos. 8 and 9 and p.108.
\item \textsuperscript{404}This does not mean that all \textit{curae} of public \textit{munera} were inadequately funded by the 2nd–3rd c.; it is likely that such institutions were still being created in the 2nd c.; some events are even likely to have been quinquennial (cf. infra).
\end{itemize}
was associated with an office or priesthood (cf. infra), the desirability of these must have done much in itself to ensure that the quality of the show would be maintained over the years.

In addition, some communities may have required a statutory payment from the curator of a *munus publicum*, whether or not he intended to organize a supplementary program of his own. An inscription from Singili Barba honors a duovir who had given as many days of private as of public *ludi* (304); he therefore paid for the private games, but he must also have had to disburse a statutory payment for the public games – possibly Hs2000, as at Urso and elsewhere. There is no reason why the same situation could not have arisen with regard to the *munus publicum* where it existed. It seems at least likely that the system of funding *munera publica* would have been modeled after the system used for *ludi*, and that the function of the *curator muneres publici* would copy that of the magistrate as *curator ludorum*.

There are inscriptions which give an idea of how things could have proceeded when the curator wished to do more than the minimum required from him (including, eventually, a statutory payment). One inscription from Paestum records that, towards the middle of the second century, a notable was entrusted Hs25,000 of public funds to buy a *familia gladiatoria*, but that he personally more than doubled that sum in order to buy better gladiators (156); it is unfortunately not clear whether the show was a periodic *munus publicum*, but this is likely since Hs25,000 seem to have been a standard amount for a one-day *munus* at Paestum (where it is attested half a century earlier: 155; cf. supra p.152); the inscription seems to show that this amount, by the mid-second century, had become insufficient for a better quality show. The language used about a curator of a foundation *munus* in Lepcis Magna suggests that he may have done something similar to the notable from Paestum (431 LL.17–21). Some other inscriptions record the gift of private days at public
and foundation munera. In Aeclanum, a notable added a third day to the munus publicum, of which he seems to have been the curator (134). Private days were given by augustales at Suessa and Telesia (40, 186). The second of these two towns possessed its own gladiators, and both cities apparently had instituted a public show. Whether our augustales were also curators of the public part of the shows cannot be established, but the two inscriptions reveal at least that a privately funded supplementary program was welcome and worthy of public recognition. In still other inscriptions, the indication of how many days the munus lasted supposes that the curator gave more days than he was expected or required to. One inscription from Amiternum indicates that private days were offered at foundation munera as well: a father took the opportunity of his curatorship of the munus Corneliamum to further his son’s career by having him offer an extra day (165). One notes in this and several of the inscriptions just mentioned a desire to clearly distinguish between public and private segments of the show. Still, Sabbatini’s claim that curators of foundation munera, and therefore of public munera as well, strictly applied the conditions exposed by the testator, is perhaps too simplistic, since the addition of one or more days will have had the effect of spreading some basic spending over more days, thereby improving the ratio price/day of the entire show. This, incidentally, may explain why communities sometimes entrusted public funds to men who had promised a show of their own, since much could be saved in terms of organizational costs (155, 162; cf. 12). At other times, as we saw, public and private resources were brought together to improve on the quality of the program. There were therefore different strategies by which the curator of a public or foundation munus could make use of his own resources to improve the show.

I have kept until this point three illuminating inscriptions. One of them is of a curator muneris publici munerarius (440); another, of a probable curator [muneris]
munificus (151). It will be noted that munerarius and munificus (a synonym of munerarius, as we will see) are treated here as epithets of the title of curator muneris (as they are not preceded by a comma). Part of the justification for this will have to wait until munerarii are examined, but much will be said now in our discussion of the third inscription, no. 452 from Patras, published a decade ago.

In spite of some textual problems, no. 452, erected for P. Pomponius Quintianus, is perhaps the most explicit document on the nature of the difference between curatores muneris and munerarii, and provides yet more evidence on the options available to the cities and their curatores muneris. M. Kleijwegt is probably right that Ll.3–6 explain why Quintianus is said at L.2 to have been twice munerarius: he offered a gladiatorial show pro Iluir(atu) (cf. infra), and sold grain at a low price during a period of inflation. However, Kleijwegt ignores the problematic sequence QUINTI at L.3. A. Rizakis, author of the editio princeps, had made some suggestions: munus quinti may have meant a show with five pairs of gladiators or which lasted five days or, reading munus Quinti, a show produced by Quintianus in place of the real editor, a Quintius. None of these is satisfactory, either on grammatical grounds or for lack of parallels. It seems better to propose a new solution, munus Quinti(anum), and understand that this was a foundation munus instituted by a Quin(c)tius. Quintianus (the homonymy is probably coincidental) entirely paid for an event which was normally financed with the returns from a private bequest to the community. This was worthy of the title of munerarius and, presumably, the local senate could that year reallocate to some other purpose the returns on the fund bequeathed by Quintius (including reinvestment in the fund). If this is right, then we have discovered yet another way by which a curator could show his liberality and make himself stand out.

Quintianus’ inscription may shed light on the two others, for a curator muneris

---

406 KLEI1WEGT 1995 pp.41–42.
*munerarius* or *munificus* could very well be a curator who had taken on himself to pay for the entire show; admittedly, it could also mean that he produced one or more extra days beside administering the *cura munera*.\(^{408}\) One may also wonder whether in no. 14 LL.7–10 one should understand “a statue was offered to him for his production of the public *munus*” (which is attested in no. 13), rather than “a statue was offered publicly to him for his production of a *munus*” (cf. catalogue ad loc.); if so, we would have yet another instance of a *curator* who turned himself into a *munerarius*, even though neither title is used.\(^{409}\) Whatever may be the case, it is only because it is unusually informative that the inscription from Patras let us know of yet another way of showing one’s benevolence; there could be many more inscriptions where the bare mention of titles and honors conceal some other original situations.

(2) The curator of a public or foundation *munus* is often portrayed by scholars as an experienced administrator who assumed the *cura munera* after several other honors and charges.\(^{410}\) It is acknowledged that there are cases which do not conform to this model: two *augustales*, one in Beneventum (138: our earliest *curator munera*) and another in Praeneste (33: probably a freedman from his Greek surname); a freedman in Ticinum (245); and very probably freedmen again in Cales (52: he received the decurional ornaments) and Puteoli (116: for the nature of his career and Greek surname). Two more *augustales* may have been *curatores munera* (40, 186). While past administrative experience is no doubt a quality of most of the curators, wealth and a need for social recognition probably explains that a fair number of freedmen and *augustales* sought, or were offered, the *cura munera*. This tells us that the conditions of access to the *cura munera* were not the same everywhere and at all

\(^{408}\) As suggested by VILLE 1981 p.196.

\(^{409}\) This inscription could be as early as the reign of Trajan; it is likely that, by then, the title of *munerarius* was not yet commonly used in formal contexts: cf. infra.

times, and that attempts to define the *cura munera* should not have the effect of concealing local variations or adaptation to changing circumstances.

The inscription from Patras of a *munerarius bis* suggests that the *cura munera* was in some places performed by office-holders, in this case by one of the duovirs (452). Possibly another sitting duovir was *curator munera publica*, though this title is not used (162); the wording suggests a non-institutionalized version of the same thing. There are some other examples of sitting magistrates acting as curators of a *munus*, though they have not been acknowledged so far. In the enumeration of honors and charges, *et* indicates simultaneous plurality, while *item* indicates succession, and we have four cases of the conjunction *et* linking a *cura munera* to an office. One instance is of a *duovir quinquennalis et curator munera* Tup[---], that is, a duovir-censor who assumed his curatorship while duovir (415). We have, on the same pattern, a *III ur quin. et curator munera* publica (181). At Dea in Narbonensis, we know of two *flamines* who as such were curators of a *munus* (263: *flam. Aug. et muner. publica curat.*; 264: *flamini et curatori munera* gladiatori Villiani). In three cases, the context makes clear that *et* is used as explained above; in the other, no. 181, this is less obvious, but remains probable. Two of the four men in question were *quinquennales* while assuming the *cura munera*. It should be noted that several other *curatores munera* held at one point or another the quinquennial duovirate; in fact there are comparatively so many of them, nine in all, to suggest a stronger connection between the censorship and the *cura munera* than it appears at first; possibly this connection, where it existed, was lost to us because of the omission of *et* or manner in which the material was reorganized for engraving. This may suggest that some public munera were quinquennial events, just as the foundation munus from Pisaurum (208), and

\[411\] Cf. R. Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, Paris 1914, p.99 n.1. The distinction between *item* and *et* is well illustrated by no. 264.

\[412\] Nos. 13, 134, 149, 151, 152, 153, 156, 191, 195; cf. 155.
that not all notables, except for those with an eye on the most prestigious honors, were
expected in some cities to be able to afford a cura muneris.

(3) Ville and Sabbatini Tumolesi agree that the munus publicum appeared and
spread at a time when municipal magistrates were becoming less and less inclined to
produce a statutory munus. Sabbatini goes a step further by linking this to the well-known
notion of the steady decline of municipal life and institutions from the later part of the
second century:

I curatores munera publici ... sono creati in un momento [= end of 2nd–3rd c.] ... in cui la
salda e spontanea munificenza municipale cominciava a manifestare cedimenti. Il
magistrato, tenuto per legge a dare munera publica alla sua città (= muneratorius) comincia a
recalectrare; si impone un controllo sul prelievo e la retta gestione della quota stanziata ad
hoc dalla città; si crea a tal fine il curator munerus publici.

In his study of the Italian evidence, M. Fora follows closely Sabbatini Tumolesi.
Meanwhile, H. Pleket, in his review of Ville's book, believes that the introduction of the
curatores munera publici

is not a matter of chronological sequence but rather of juxtaposition. Similarly with
magistrates giving shows as a summa honoraria there was a special fund, fed by city money
and/or private donations. That fund either gave additional money to magistrates or occasion-
ally may have taken over the entire financing from insolvent functionaries.

Therefore, Pleket shares with others the notion of a reluctance on the part of magistrates to
produce a gladiatorial show, but he, unlike them, sees this as a matter of individual
capabilities, not as a phenomenon caused by a progressive and eventually generalized
decline of the civic value-system.413

There are, however, many reasons to disagree with all these views. Ville's
analysis leads one to believe that magistrates began to relinquish their duty of producing a

show already in the prosperous context of first-century Italy, when *curatores muneris* appear; on this matter Pleket has a more satisfactory interpretation. As for Sabbatini and her followers, they treat first- and early second-century *curatores muneris* as exceptions, which is unacceptable in light of their number. Moreover, later second-century *curatores muneris* provide only an approximate *terminus ante quem* for the apparition of the *cura muneris* in the corresponding cities, where this institution could go back to several decades earlier. What is more, Jacques’ powerful demonstration against the notion of the decline of the city, his substantiated claim that municipal offices were, after the middle of the second century, still sought after and the object of fierce competition between notables, leaves little doubt that Sabbatini’s interpretation cannot be the right one. Finally, all the views cited above take for granted that local magistrates were required to produce gladiatorial shows. The evidence presented so far in this chapter, and what is to come, strongly argues against that as a generalized practice.

The *cura* of public and perhaps foundation *munera* finds a new significance once it is recognized that probably few cities required any of their magistrates to produce a *munus*, while only the wealthiest among the latter could afford to substitute a *munus* for *ludi publici* where this was an option. By creating a special fund entrusted to a curator, some cities were able to regularize the production of the *munus* and turn it into a periodic event. This *cura muneris* came into existence at a time when gladiatorial shows were increasingly being recognized as part of official civic celebrations. It therefore became desirable not to

---

414 Cf. supra n.402 for *curatores* who more probably belong to the 1st-early 2nd c.

415 JACQUES 1984 passim. It is puzzling that the editors of the ongoing *EAOR* series, who cite Jacques, take Sabbatini’s analysis for facts and, at the same time, are at pains to explain away those curators who definitely or more probably belong to the 1st and early 2nd c., and predate the alleged decline. M. BUONOCORE, who produced vol. III in that series, is the only one who questions, though hesitatingly, Sabbatini’s view, since his no. 8 (= 138) belongs to the reign of Claudius or soon after (*EAOR* III p.142); he himself proposes no alternative solution and, in fact, somewhat inconsequently attributes some inscriptions to the 2nd or 3rd c. by virtue of the mention of a *curator muneris* (*publici*) (e.g. ibid. ad nos. 16 = 181 and 17 = 149: the sobriety of the one and *hederae distinguentes* of the other suggest a 1st- or, at the latest, early 2nd-c. date).
rely as heavily as before on the benevolence of the very wealthy, either as public figures or private citizens.\textsuperscript{416}

The diffusion of the *cura muneris* may have accelerated from the latter half of the first century when prices of gladiators began to significantly increase and even fewer of the wealthy could afford a show. This, as we saw, does not mean that the city took on itself the entire expense, though in some localities, originally at least, this may have been the purpose of the *cura muneris*. Reasons were given above to think that some public *munera* may have been quinquennial events. This could be indicative of a later first- or second-century date for the introduction of the public *munus* in some cities.

The *cura muneris publici*, therefore, in those cities which resorted to it, was not introduced everywhere at the same time and according to one single pattern. But it is important to stress that this institution is attested only in few cities, that it may not have been a generalized phenomenon – even in the southern half of Italy, where it is better attested. There were other ways to institutionalize the production of gladiatorial shows.

It is difficult to know how *munerarii* fit into the picture. Of especial interest is the case of magistrates who assumed that title. Was their *munus* given according to constitutional requirements or as a supplementary program? In other words, was their *munus* statutory and organized instead of statutory *ludi* or was it produced privately on top of these? As usual, the entire epigraphic evidence will first be presented.

\textsuperscript{416}Moreover, high popular expectations combined with a reluctance from the wealthy to produce a show could lead to social unrest. On one occasion, at Pollentia under Tiberius, the local population did not let a funerary procession take its course until they had exacted funds for a gladiatorial show from the heirs; the incident was serious enough to be heard about in Rome and by the emperor himself, who severely punished the trouble-makers (Suet. *Tib.* 37.3).
Table IX.4

MUNERARII

A. Officials who are munerarii at the same time: IIluir quinq. m.: 148A (cf. B: munificus). IIuir (...) et m.: 71, 143, [165], 242, 248, 251, [262], 357, [393], 394, [395], 396, [454], 455, 456, 457, 458; [358], 446 (twice, once quinq.); cf. 119 (IIuir munificus), 384 (IIuiralis iuuenis m.), 452. aedilis (et) m.: ?104, 258, 357. flamen (Aug.) m.: 250 (three men); 253X. Vfuir Flavialis et m.: 238. curator muneris m.: 440; cf. 151 (c. [m.] munificus).

B. Other munerarii: 154, 168, 240, 247, [371]; 103 (thrice); 144 (m. bidui); 376 (ex munerario); 409 (primus m.); 101 (princeps muneratorum); cf. AE 1927, 158; 97 (munificus 4 times); 271 (dendrophorus munificus); 372 (largus munidator); 162 (munificentissimus ciuius).

According to Quintilian, the term munerarius was coined by Augustus (Inst. 8.3.34). Some literary references indicate that this epithet identified the giver of a munus gladiatorium;417 so does an inscription from Tergeste (240), and another one from Forum Popili which provides our best evidence: ita gratum edat munus tuus munerarius.418 But we now know of an exception, that of a notable from Patras who, as we saw, was munerarius for a second time when he sold grain at a low price in a period of inflation (452).419 Still, in most of the other inscriptions, a gladiatorial context is obvious, such as in the case of a munerarius bidui, whose show lasted for two days (144). There are some who were

---

417Sen. Contr. 4 praef. 1; Suet. Dom. 10.2.
418C XI, 575 = ILS 8206 = EAOR II, 27. In its entirety this short poem reads as follow: Ita candidatus fiat honora tus tuus / et ita gratum edat munus tuus munerarius / et tu sis felix, scriptor, si hic non scripseris! (“May your candidate gain office, and may your munerarius put on a pleasing gladiatorial show, and may you, bill-poster, have good luck if you don’t write here!” [translation adapted from COURTNEY 1995 ad no. 1039]). The verb edat (from edere) leaves no doubt about the meaning of munus and, therefore, of munerarius. VILLE 1981 p.186 wrongly sees a causal relationship between the first 2 lines, as is revealed by his translation: “Que ton candidat devienne ton magistrat et qu’il donne un munus agréable, devenant ton munéraire”; this is used to argue that magistrates gave municipal munera (i.e. instead of ludi publici); though this may be true, it is not proven by this inscription: the 3rd and final line shows that whoever had this engraved did not want his monument to be spoiled by electoral posters and edicta munerum, whether or not munerarii were at the same time magistrates; one can hardly not think of the walls of Pompeii (cf. SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.122).
419This acceptation of the term is attested in the Digesta: cf. esp. D 50.4.1.2 with KLEIJWEGT 1995 p.42.
three or four times (cf. table), which indicates that the epithet was not of a general character but was earned for single productions.\textsuperscript{420}

Beside \textit{munerarius} we encounter the equivalent terms \textit{munificus} and \textit{munidator} (though the meaning of the latter, found in a metrical inscription, is less secure). That \textit{munificus} is synonymous with \textit{munerarius} is shown by no. 148, since to \textit{munerarius} in inscription A corresponds \textit{munificus} in B. We also have a duovir \textit{munificus} \textsuperscript{119}, just as we have duoviri \textit{munerarii}. Likewise a probable \textit{curator [muneris] munificus} \textsuperscript{151} seems to be the same thing as a \textit{curator muneris munerarius}.\textsuperscript{440} In Pompeii a famous producer is acclaimed as \textit{munificus IV}, meaning that he had given shows on four occasions (97; cf. 88, 96), just as another one is \textit{munerarius fer} \textsuperscript{103}; cf. 102). \textit{Munifici} will therefore be discussed together with \textit{munerarii}.

The earliest epigraphic attestation is found in a fragmentary Tiberian inscription from Cumae which records privileges granted to a local notable and his family; among these are seats opposite the \textit{munerarius} (\textit{contra munerarium}). It is likely that any producer of a gladiatorial show is meant, or perhaps, at this comparatively early date, any producer of any private show (\textit{AE} 1927, 158 = Sherk no. 41). Then there are three \textit{munerarii} and one \textit{munificus} known from exclamatory phrases painted on the walls of Pompeii, three of whom are known otherwise to have given gladiatorial shows.\textsuperscript{421} The stone inscriptions show again that they are conservative, for it is only from the end of the first century that epitaphs identify producers by that same title (238, 258), while honorary inscriptions do so later, in the course of the following century.\textsuperscript{422} Interestingly, there is an approximately similar proportion of honorary and funerary inscriptions, while honorary and dedicatory

\textsuperscript{420}Cf. VILLE 1981 p.186 n.24.
\textsuperscript{421}Nos. 97 (\textit{munificus}), cf. 88, 96; 101, cf. 98–100; 103, cf. 102; 104.
\textsuperscript{422}Nos. 148, 262, 393, 395.
inscriptions are usually more numerous than funerary ones.\textsuperscript{423} This is perhaps because munera recorded in honorary inscriptions are usually the very object of the honor, which means that more articulate terms are likely to be used rather than the bare title of munerarius. There may therefore be other notables who were known officially as munerarii even though this title is not used in their inscription; one thinks in particular of those who gave a show \textit{ob honorem} (pp.193–96).

The titles \textit{duovir munerarius}, \textit{duovir et munerarius}, and the likes, indicate that the magistrate, priest or other official in question organized a munus while in office (A in the table).\textsuperscript{424} So far as magistrates are concerned, it is essential to realize that in cities where such titles are attested, there are considerably more duoviri, aediles and quattuorviri who did \textit{not} become munerarii.\textsuperscript{425} These men certainly gave games, though probably not a munus but the much less expensive and rewarding \textit{ludi}. As for those who distinguished themselves as munerarii, there are two basic possible interpretations:

(1) The magistrate chose to organize a statutory munus rather than statutory \textit{ludi}. In this eventuality, the grant of a special title suggests that the municipal subvention was declined; the show was therefore produced according to prescriptions such as those of Urso charter, whereby duoviri and aediles were allowed to choose between a munus or \textit{ludi} (\textit{2 §§ LXX–LXXI}). This is the view taken by most scholars who have worked on this topic since Ville.\textsuperscript{426}

(2) The magistrate offered the usual \textit{ludi publici} and, on top, a \textit{munus} which he entirely financed on his own. According to this hypothesis, the special title granted official recognition for an act of private generosity. Only one scholar, to my knowledge, has adopted

\textsuperscript{423}The following are funerary, presented in the order of occurrence in the table: nos. 71, 242, 248, 357, 452, 258, 238, 144, 271, 372; add no. 240, erected by the munerarius himself for his fallen gladiators.

\textsuperscript{424}The link between office and title of munerarius is particularly obvious in nos. 242 and 357. In Philippi, if one excludes an inscription which is too fragmentary to tell, all known munerarii were sitting duoviri (455–458).

\textsuperscript{425}This is not an argument \textit{ex silentio}: one may neglect lesser honors and offices from his \textit{cursus}, but not the most prestigious ones.

\textsuperscript{426}VILLE 1981 pp.185–87; FORA 1996 pp.54–55; Gascou, \textsl{ILN} III pp.31–32, about no. 29 = 258.
In favor of the notion of a statutory munus speaks the Urso charter and perhaps also the fact that considerably more holders of a magistracy iure dicundo (several duoviri, one quattuorvir quing.) than aediles became munerarii, which suggests that there may have been more pressures put on candidates to the top magistracies to substitute a munus for ludi. The second hypothesis, however, has for it that it takes into account all munerarii, not only magistrates but also priests, other officials, and all those who definitely or more probably produced their munus as private persons (B in the table). In no. 452, the title munerarius was granted for two benefactions pro duumuiratu (“in return for the duovirate”): assuming the entire cost of a foundation munus and subsidizing the annona in a period of inflation; these were obviously not required constitutionally, which makes it likely that ludi publici were also produced. The title munerarius in no. 384 was awarded to a duovir for a uoluptatum editio, an expression which seems more appropriate for a private than statutory show. Still, it would be unwise to assume that one hypothesis should be preferred over the other in all cases. The fact that magistrates and other officials as well as private individuals and even curatores muneris could become munerarii suggests that the nature of the show – obligatory, privately undertaken, provided for by a foundation – did not matter very much. The essential requirement to become a munerarius was probably to assume the entire expense of a show, or even the expense of only one or more supplementary days, as long as this was recognized as a personal contribution on top of the regular program. However, the inscriptions almost never allow us to establish the public or private nature of a munus produced by a sitting magistrate as munerarius. This makes it

---

428 Alternatively, it is conceivable that a munus had been promised while running for the aedilship, but on the condition that a later bid for the duovirate would also be successful; this is translated in some inscriptions by expressions such as ob honores cœtiunctos (295, 335 L.6–7, 399, [451]; cf. no. 29a L.9 = b L.12 [not provided]: ob honores ei habitos).
virtually impossible to determine how such *munera* fit in the process described above of the diversification of public shows and, in particular, the institutionalization of gladiatorial shows.

3. Statutory *ludi* and *munera*

In spite of huge gaps in our knowledge, we now have before us yet more evidence of the polyvalence of the system allowing cities to integrate gladiatorial shows among their official celebrations. How widespread was the practice of imposing such shows on local magistrates will have to remain an open question; statutory *ludi* were apparently much more common, but caution is in order. Let us return for a moment to our main legal sources, the charters from Tarentum (1; cf. 81), Urso (2) and Irni (3). These cannot be taken as models for all colonies and *municipia* throughout the Empire. The *Tarentina* dates from a period when *munera* were almost always private undertakings. Admittedly, both the *Vrsonensis* and *Irnitana* borrow much from earlier legislation and have a much wider than strictly local or regional relevance; it has been established, too, that the *Irnitana* is one of several almost identical laws which were granted to Flavian *municipia* in Spain, or at least Baetica; still, notions that a single constitutional framework governed colonies (such as Urso) on the one hand, and *municipia* (such as Irni) on the other, have been rightly criticized; while neither Urso nor Irni required their magistrates to produce a *munus*, this possibility must not be ruled out for other cities as well.

One thinks in particular of cities considerably larger than Urso or Irni. In fact,
the legal status of a community (colony, *municipium*) probably mattered less than its size.\(^{431}\)

Candidates were more likely in larger centers to commit themselves to a more costly program of public festivities, including gladiatorial shows, in order to win popular support, since competition must have generally been fiercer to obtain one of the usual four top magisterial positions.\(^{432}\) Did this eventually lead to the institutionalization of an obligatory *munus* in some cities? In the earlier third century, a duovir from Beneventum, the most important non-coastal city of southern Italy, produced a *munus* on the colony’s anniversary (143); the corresponding title, *duumvir et munerarius natalis coloniae*, suggests that the show was an annual event and that other magistrates were in charge of other *munera* in the course of the year.\(^{433}\) This is very thin evidence, but we should expect, at any rate, that wherever *munera* were institutionalized, little about them will show up in the inscriptions since the title of those in charge of such shows – duoviri, aediles, &c. – would then carry with it the notion of *munerarius* or, when a municipal subvention was accepted, of *curator muneris*.

Northern Italy and the Gallic provinces have produced comparatively few documents on the production of *munera*, even though they were particularly well-equipped with gladiatorial schools and amphitheatres,\(^{434}\) and hold plenty of evidence such as

\(^{431}\)On the evidence of the *aes Italicense*, D.S. Potter remarked: “the bigger the place, the better the games” (in Id. & D.J. Mattingly, eds., *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor 1999 p.319; cf. Hopkins 1983 p.13 and already Friedländer 1921–23 II p.103 = English tr. p.82); this is also what our discussion shows, supra p.156. There is no evidence in the inscriptions of a difference in the pattern of the production of gladiatorial and other shows between colonies and *municipia*. The size of a community also mattered for one who wished to make a distribution of food or money: cf. J.R. Patterson in *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (CEF R 198), Rome 1994 pp.230–31, 236–37, with references.

\(^{432}\)That is, either a pair each of duoviri and aediles in the colonies, or two pairs of quattuoruiri (i.e. *iure dicundo* and *aedilia poestate*) in the *municipia*. That size and economic strength matter is shown by the *aes Italicense* = 4 L.L.46–48 with p.156 supra.

\(^{433}\)It is also possible that the duovir in question wished to express his love for his fatherland; cf. no. 120.

\(^{434}\)G.L. Gregori, author of *EAO R* II, which covers the northern half of Italy, is puzzled by the small number of documents from those parts (cf. ad loc. pp.110–11 passim); he and FORA 1996 pp.12–13 attribute this to the “casualità dei rinvenimenti”, which is hardly likely in light of the many hundreds of inscriptions which record the acts and deeds of as many notables from northern Italian cities. In spite of some inexactitudes, FEAR 2000 rightly doubts that amphitheatres were built by Italian and provincial communities largely to express their *Romanitas*; they did so because they loved the games; cf. also Ville...
gladiators’ epitaphs and representations of scenes from the amphitheater in mosaic, sculpture and ceramic.\footnote{Cf. GAYRAUD 1987 for a survey of the material from Narbonensis.} This, and the fact that these regions were composed of large cities, suggest that gladiatorial shows had been integrated among the magistrates’ obligations. Meanwhile, most of the inscriptions recording munera come from southern Italy, roughly regiones I–VI; it seems likely that gladiatorial shows were not so well integrated among the annual public festivities in those areas and, presumably, more pressure was exerted on the wealthier to privately finance them,\footnote{At Rome, those who favored Nero’s creation of a state-funded quinquennial athletic show argued that it would relieve the élite from popular demands to organize them at their expense (Tac. Ann. 14.21).} hence the rich epigraphic record.\footnote{Admittedly, the overall epigraphic evidence from southern Italy is more plentiful, but this is not enough to account for the difference; note for example the insignificant number of 9 documents recording munera or their producers from the whole of CIL V.} Possibly the weight of the Republican tradition, which recognized ludi as the main form of annual public entertainment, considerably slowed down the integration of gladiatorial munera among the magistrates’ duties.

Areas conquered and pacified during the Empire certainly did not feel this weight as much when urban centers emerged on the Roman model. The urbanization of Dacia, for instance, looks like an excellent context for the inclusion of munera among the magistrates’ requirements. The area was conquered by Trajan, a prince who was extremely fond of gladiatorial combats and offered them in Rome on an unprecedented scale. Scenes from his column (XXXIII, C) show urban centers on the Roman model, which included amphitheaters for the production of munera and uenationes.\footnote{Cf. BOULEY 1994.}

Something should also be said in the present context about the lusus iuuenum, since it too was integrated by some communities among their official civic celebrations.\footnote{The evidence is collected in Table V.1.}
There were *curatores lusus iuuenum* just as there were *curatores muneris*, and there is a distinct possibility that the two curatorships represent parallel developments. G.L. Gregori realized that, but he came to the improbable conclusion that what Sabbatini Tumolesi had to say about the emergence of the *curatores muneris publici* applies also to the *curatores lusus iuuenum*.\(^{440}\) No. 43, which dates to the year 32/33, indicates that the *cura lusus iuuenum* went back to early imperial times and should probably be connected with the Augustan revival of that institution. It was pointed out in chapter V that a curatorship was only one of several possibilities open to the cities to institutionalize the *lusus iuuenum*, some choosing rather to rely on their magistrates or perhaps on officials such as the *flamines iuuentutis* (supra pp.99–100 and n.259). Although the Republican background of the gladiatorial establishment and *iuuenes* association have little in common, in the Julio-Claudian era and perhaps already under Augustus, the *lusus iuuenum* and gladiatorial *munus* were both institutionalized in a trend towards the diversification and expansion of the program of public shows. As is typical of the period, cities were to a large extent left free to determine for themselves what shows they could afford and how they would integrate them alongside the traditional *ludi*.

In chapter VII we saw that the title of *curator ludorum* is not attested once in our inscriptions, while one single (and very early) occurrence of the expression *ludos curare* is known. This is probably because for the most part duoviri and aediles, or other magistrates fulfilling duties similar to theirs, were by definition *curatores ludorum*. In this context the function of the *curator muneris* may well have been to complement that of the magistrate as provider of *ludi*.\(^{441}\) Sabbatini Tumolesi was perhaps right to see great similarities between

\(^{440}\) GREGORI, *EAOR* II p.112.

\(^{441}\) The *pro ludis* inscriptions are the best evidence for the magistrate's role as *curator ludorum*. It so happens that the titles of *munerarius* and *curator muneris*, unlike *duovir* or *aedilis*, are self-explanatory – one more proof that a catalogue like ours is far from being a reflection of the reality. One interesting case is that of a *curator calendarii pecuniae Valentinianae HS600,000* (209); on the evidence of no. 208, all agree
the curators of public and foundation munera, but it seems to me that the parallels between
the curator muneris and the magistrate as "curator ludorum" are more fundamental. When
private bequests were entrusted to cities to produce a gladiatorial show, these naturally
resorted to a cura muneris; as a matter of fact, no. 431 records a munus publicum ex
testamento Iuni Afri ... edendum (supra p.57).442

The system begins to show signs of decay in the third century. This appreciation
is not based on the dramatic decrease in the number of inscriptions, but rather on the
changing nature of the information contained in the few we do have. As we saw, the
production of games becomes the affair of fewer and wealthier individuals – so much so
that the distinction between private and public seems to become irrelevant. Such evolution
is attested mostly in Italy,443 and may not have taken place everywhere at the same time.
Inscriptions from Gaul and Spain which are later than the first half of the third century are
unhelpful for the present purpose.444 However, literary sources are there to show that,
despite the decline of the epigraphic culture, municipal life and institutions were still alive
and well in later periods, with magistrates producing public games as before.445 We have
more later third- and fourth-century inscriptions from Africa, which argue mostly for
continuity with the past, though a few may be taken to suggest an evolution similar to that in

442 The public character of foundation munera has not been stressed enough so far. A parallel can be drawn
with public buildings which carry the name of their builder, such as in nos. 52 and 166 the curiae
Torq(iwta) and Septimiana.
443 Cf. supra pp.121–22; nos. 46, ?125, 166; the lusus iuuenum was a thing of the past in Anagnia when a
rich benefactor revived it in the 3rd c. (5; cf. also 20). Cf. R. Whittaker in L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien
(CEFR 198), Rome, 1994 p.141: "It is not self evident to me that the reason urban élites became more
reluctant to indulge in acts of private munificence from the later second century was because of a general
economic decline, so much as because wealth was redistributed."
444 Gaul: nos. 253 and 254 concern provincial priests. Spain: the latest datable inscription is no. 308, from
A.D. 212; none can be attributed to the 2nd half of the 3rd c. even on subjective criteria.
445 Cf. the remarks of C. Lepelley in Ciudad y comunidad cívica en Hispania (Coll. Casa de Velázquez 40),
Municipal priests—flamines, pontifices, &c., but excluding augureles, who are different—play a very small part in the production of public games. The Vrsonensis attributes special seats to them at shows, but does not require that they produce a show themselves. No pro ludis inscription was erected by a priest (Table IX.2). A notable from Puteoli, "protected by the privileges attached to the priesthood of Caeninensis," is praised for his aedileship and production of a uenatio since "he could have easily been excused from honors and charges" (120). In Ostia a flamen of the divine Hadrian was, some time in the later second century, still the first and only such priest to have given scenic games (29).

In the Gallic provinces, some priests were at the same time munogerii (250: three men; 253X) or curatores muneres (263, 264); but considering the number of priests known from these areas, such sparse evidence suggests that links between priesthoods and gladiatorial shows were no more than local or temporary. A priest of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste gave to that goddess games "worthy of the Palatine cult"; these may have been statutory games, but the priesthood and cult were special to Praeneste (36).

The priesthood of the augureles (or seuiri augureles, &c.) was of a different kind, since it was open to freedmen (debarred from public honors and priesthoods since the lex Visselia of A.D. 24). As a matter of fact, estimates are that over eighty-five per cent of all augureles were freedmen. They have been mentioned on several occasions in this and the preceding chapters as providers of public games. One cannot suppose, however, that all

448 Cf. supra pp.67–68. They are also exempted from military service and munera publica (i.e. compulsory public service): § LXVI LL.37–39, 1–3 (with Crawford & Gabba, RomSt pp.434–35; cf. also EE VIII 372 = SHERK 1970 no. 39 with p.77: grant of rights and privileges to a iuuenis from Puteoli upon being appointed augur.
such boards gave games, since their function and members’ profile varied significantly between regions and localities.\textsuperscript{450} In Nemausus a bequest of HS300,000 was left by testament to the sevirs’ fund “to celebrate \textit{ludi seuirales} in perpetuity” (266); this suggests that such \textit{ludi} were not regularly produced until then and, therefore, that they were not formally required from the local \textit{seuir augurales}.

In Rome, Italy and the provinces, \textit{magistri} of various kinds (\textit{m. pagi, uici, ad fana,} \&c.) had to produce public games. Some erected \textit{pro ludis} inscriptions (60: cf. p.198; 85: cf. p.168). Chapter CXXVIII of the Urso charter deals with \textit{magistri} assigned to sanctuaries, temples and shrines, who had among other duties to produce circus games. The expression used, \textit{magistri ad fana, templo, delubra}, is not technical; whenever the article was first drafted, it was designed to accommodate any community. But \textit{circenses} are to be provided, which fits well with what we know about games in the Spanish provinces, but not in Italy; the provision seems therefore to have been adapted to the particular situation of Spain.

A word should be said about games in honor of the emperor held at provincial sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{451} The fundamental function of the provincial priests to produce such games, as Jacques remarked, is nowhere questioned in the \textit{aes Italicense} (cf. 4 \textit{L}.13–18):

\textit{Le prince même, l’obligation de donner des jeux, n’est pas en cause. Les princes n’ont pas songé à la suppression des jeux, seule médecine pouvant assurer à long terme la salus publica. Les notables gaulois sont de nouveau prêts aux dépenses désormais allégées: édition de jeux et sacerdoce provincial sont pour eux indissociables. L’honneur était un tout impliquant des sacrifices financiers; on faisait appel de sa désignation au lieu de réclamer une modification des règles d’exercice.}\textsuperscript{452}

\textsuperscript{450}In some regions, \textit{augustales} were assimilated to an \textit{ordo} (e.g. much of Italy); in others, to a \textit{corpus} (e.g. Narbonensis); the expression \textit{ob honorem seuiratus}, most common in Spain, assimilates \textit{augustalitas} to an honor; cf. DUTHOY 1978 pp.1266–68, 1272–76, 1281–82, 1284–87.

\textsuperscript{451}Cf. in general MOMMSEN 1892 pp.403–5; FISHWICK 1991 pp.574–84 passim.

\textsuperscript{452}JACQUES 1984 p.713. Again later, provincial priesthoods were being avoided, as revealed by an inscription from soon after 376/378 (C VI 1736 = ILS 1256).
Likewise some of our inscriptions show the importance given to the games of the provincial and, in Italy, "regional" priests. When the Vinducassi of Aregenua honored one of their own, T. Sennius Sollemnis, they recalled his priesthood of Rome and Augustus at the federal sanctuary of the Three Gauls in Lugdunum,\textsuperscript{453} and "the shows of all kinds" he gave in this capacity, including an impressive gladiatorial show (253 LL.5–9).\textsuperscript{454} Commenting on the Constantinian Rescript from Hispellum (203; cf. 204), J. Gascou stressed the secularization of the festivities of the imperial cult, which could therefore survive side by side with the Christian faith (elevated as state religion by Constantine himself) in spite of the apparent contradiction. As for the priests, Gascou justly remarks that the petitioners seem to have cared only for their role as providers of scenic and gladiatorial shows.\textsuperscript{455}

4. Non-statutory shows

Most of the shows recorded in inscriptions were not required by the local constitution. They were private undertakings, entirely financed by the producer himself and, therefore, true benefactions.

In spite of that, some shows are closely linked to one's receipt of an honor and are said to have been produced \textit{ob honorem} ..., "in return for the honor of ...". The evidence is sorted in the next table.

\textsuperscript{453}It is remarkable that the local amphitheater was built as an integral part of the sanctuary -- another proof of the central importance of the games for the provincial imperial cult and priests in charge of it; cf. FISHWICK 1991 pp.580–82, with further examples and references. VILLE 1981 p.213 stresses the early date of the dedication of the building, A.D. 19, which indicates that production of gladiatorial shows had already started before, perhaps as soon as 12 B.C., when the federal cult was founded.

\textsuperscript{454}It is unusual for obligatory shows to be recorded in such a way in the inscriptions, but provincial shows were far more magnificent than municipal shows. The Vinducassi were obviously very impressed by the show of power and wealth of one of their own, and proud of him.

Gifts of all kinds were made ob honorem: distributions of money and food, statues, buildings and games. It is well established now that such gifts were not obligatory but voluntary, made in return for an honor of some sort.\textsuperscript{457} They may have been promised at the time of an election or nomination, or when already in office; it is possible that popular pressures forced the hand of reluctant notables but, as one would expect, this never shows up in the inscriptions; notables claim always to give spontaneously, or to wholeheartedly comply with the people’s demands (e.g. 22, 267).\textsuperscript{458}

It is important, therefore, not to confuse gifts ob honorem with summae honora\-riae, which are obligatory payments (eventually used on games) made upon assuming office. This fact has been recognized for some time now and given much attention by F. Jacques in his important study of the African evidence.\textsuperscript{459} The editors of the EAOR series, however, confuse the two forms of spending, even M. Fora who cites Jacques in volume IV. In his book on gladiatorial munera in Italy, Fora sums up excellently his, Gregori’s (vol. II)

\textsuperscript{456}For shows produced at the dedication of a monument built ob honorem, see next table.

\textsuperscript{457}But occasionally the expression is used in a non-technical manner to also include statutory payments; cf. e.g. no. 334; in no. 382 it apparently means “for having assumed the honor of ...”.

\textsuperscript{458}Cf. JACQUES 1984 p.XXIII on the “mirage épigraphique” (cf. supra p.27).

\textsuperscript{459}JACQUES 1984 pp.687–765 passim; cf. also DARDAINE 1995 on the Spanish evidence, and already DUTHOY 1978 pp.1267, 1281 n.206 with regard to the augustales.
and Buonocore’s (vol. III) position:

Tutte le volte che s’incontrano, quali causae di munera offerti da magistrati, espressioni come ob honorem, ob honorem + genetivo della carica (quinquennialitas, decurionatus, duoviratus), honore sibi quinquennialitas oblato o che viene indicata la carica stessa espressa in ablativo (primo, secundo, suo duoviratu, aedilitate), si deve ammettere che la rappresentazione sia stata data per assolvere un obbligo imposto dalla costituzione cittadina.460

It is therefore not without purpose that the following few examples, clearly showing the “private” character of ob honorem gifts, are provided: in no. 353 a munus ob honorem was produced with money promised over the summa legitima; likewise nos. 340, 342, 344 and 361 record that statues had been promised and erected ob honorem on top of the summa legitima; in nos. 179, 291 and 377 games ob honorem were paid for by a relative.

There is only one discernible pattern in Table IX.5: munera ob honorem are more frequently offered for the quinquennialitas than for other offices; this is the more significant when one considers that quinquennales were appointed every fifth year. When all kinds of gifts ob honorem (games, buildings, banquets, &c.) are taken into consideration, interesting patterns emerge. It is as aedile that African notables most often made such gifts, which seem therefore to have prepared the way for a bid for the duovirate.461 In Spain, however, gifts ob honorem were usually made for the more prestigious offices, the duovirate and priesthods: “[c]es dons couronnaient des carrières plus qu’ils ne les préparaient”.462 It is not clear whether the difference is to be explained mainly in geographical or chronological terms, since the African material is on the whole later than the Spanish. I know of no study for the Italian evidence, but it is in this region that most gifts of games ob honorem quinquennialitatis were offered. Presumably, in Italy and Spain, the prestige of the

top offices brought about greater commitments from those seeking them. Some other provinces, such as Narbonensis, have produced little or no evidence for gifts *ob honorem* of any kind; this practice was either unfamiliar to them or not recorded in the inscriptions in the same manner.

Shows were often presented at the dedication of public buildings or statues. These shows offered *ob dedicationem* were, just as the *ob honorem* ones, privately financed, usually by the builder himself or, at times, a close relative or an heir. The wealth of the evidence, which follows, indicates that games were perceived as a natural way to celebrate a dedication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table IX.6 — “OB DEDICATIONEM” SHOWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Munus ob d.</strong> ... of a building:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is immediately apparent that *ludi* were far more commonly offered at dedications than other shows. In Capua, different boards of *magistri* record their building activity and the organization of *ludi* in the late second century B.C. (53–59). These *ludi* were

---

463 Underlined are the shows produced at the dedication of buildings and statues built *ob honorem*. 
probably limited to scenic representations since there is, as we saw, almost no epigraphic or other evidence for *ludi circenses* in Italy outside Rome. The format of the inscriptions is invariably the same: at the top a list of names is given in the nominative (the number of men is either 12 or 24 in complete inscriptions); they are then identified as *magistri* of one kind or another; this is followed by a list of the duties or tasks they performed, last of which is the staging of games;\textsuperscript{464} finally, a consular date is given. As M.W. Frederiksen remarked, these and the other inscriptions of the series, with two possible exceptions, “record the construction of various buildings, and were clearly intended to be incorporated in the monument itself, or to stand alongside it.”\textsuperscript{465} This and the fact that the builders were organized in boards indicates that tasks such as the building of sections of the theatre or the paving of roads were expected from them and possibly were their main function.\textsuperscript{466} But what about the *ludi*? It seems difficult to determine whether or not they were required from the *magistri*, but since the inscriptions were closely linked to the buildings themselves, one can be confident at least that they were dedicatory games. As a matter of fact most were appropriately produced by those *magistri* who built sections of the theater. In Supinum this is also what happens (180: cf. infra). However, most boards of Capuan *magistri* do not mention any gift of games, either because they did not put on a show or did not say that they did. Interestingly, however, while datable inscriptions in the whole series are spread between the years 112–71 B.C., all records of games belong to the period 108–105 B.C. or thereabout. After 105 B.C., games ceased to be mentioned probably because they became statutory, and surely not because they stopped being produced now that the theatre was

\textsuperscript{464}The expression used is invariably the same: *ludos fecerunt*; cf. pp.115, 118.

\textsuperscript{465}M.W. Frederiksen, “Republican Capua: a Social and Economic Study”, *PBSR* 27, 1959 pp.80–118 at p.84. On the inscriptions and their support, cf. pp.83–85. He also conveniently provides the 28 inscriptions in appendix, pp.126–30; see C I\textsuperscript{2} pp.931–33 for corrections and recent bibliography. The two possible exceptions are C I\textsuperscript{2} 686 = ILS 6303 and C I\textsuperscript{2} 684 (Frederiksen’s nos. 20 and 21).

\textsuperscript{466}I agree with J.-M. Flambard that the religious aspect cannot have been the most important aspect of these colleges: see his study in *Les bourgeoisie municipales italiennes aux Ie et Ire siècles av. J.-C.*, Paris 1983 pp.75–89, esp. p.79.
completed or nearly so. There is proof that this happened at the latest by 94 B.C., for in that year *magistri* accomplished some building activity "pro ludis" (60), which means that *ludi* would otherwise have been required from the *magistri* and, consequently, were statutory. The Capuan inscriptions, therefore, may very well be showing a transition from dedicatory to statutory games, a process not attested anywhere else.

Some other late Republican or early Imperial inscriptions were erected by boards of officials and may record dedicatory games. In Minturnae a board of slaves and one freedman produced *ludi scaenici* (32). A text from Lanuvium records that yet another board, of at least four freedmen, organized three days of *ludi* (28). Both inscriptions are fragmentary and the nature of their support is poorly documented, but the expression "idemque ludos fecerunt" ("and these same (board-members) produced games") indicates that the games came along with another achievement, possibly the very building or statue (?) on which the inscription was engraved. In Carthago Nova, before 45 B.C., four men erected a column and saw to the organization of *(coirauerunt)* a procession and *ludi* in honour of the Genius of the *oppidum* (274). Again here, since the producers acted as a board and had built a monument, it is likely that their games were dedicatory. A secure case of dedicatory games is found in Supinum, where a *magister Herculis* records that he and his unnamed colleagues dedicated their rebuilding of the theatre, tribunal and *proscaenium* with two days of *ludi scaenici* (180: Augustan or thereabout).

During the Empire, most of the evidence comes from the African provinces, where *ludi* were frequently offered for dedications of buildings and statues erected *ob honorem*. These *ludi* seem to constitute a form of *ampliatio*, a spending on top of what had originally been promised (the *pollicitatio*). It was remarked in the previous chapter that,
during the Empire, known dates for dedications of public buildings and statues correspond mostly to imperial anniversaries and never to private occasions such as the benefactor’s birthday. Such events, therefore, including the celebration of games, took on an official character, even though privately undertaken and paid for.

The price and prestige of gladiatorial shows explain why they were usually not subordinated to other benefactions. But that happened occasionally at the dedication of a major building, most appropriately an amphitheater (9, 196, ?260), but also, so far as the evidence goes, buildings such as a basilica (27), library (453), or baths (141).468 In Pompeii some shows were presented at the dedication of rather minor achievements, some painted panels and an altar (99 and 100, both by Cn. Alleius Nigidius Maius); this reflects again the comparatively lower price of munera in that city and region, and in the first century in general. In only two cases was a munus offered at the dedication of a statue. One such event took place at Pisaurum, but it appears that the dedication was as much a pretext for the honored man’s son, who gave the show with his father at his side, to further his public image (210). The other case also is peculiar: the munus produced for the dedication of a statue to Antoninus Pius at Pollentia was the first of annual munera to be organized with the returns from a private bequest; the dedication of the statue, evidently erected by the same man, was an opportune occasion to launch this annual event (236).

In Amiternum a dedication was celebrated with two days of scenic games and another ten days of iuuenalia (166 L.L.24–25); a twelve-day celebration is unusually long for a dedication, but matches an impressive program of rejuvenation of local public works and buildings. It is worth noticing that most boxing contests in the catalogue were presented at dedications (285, 373, 379, 412, 419, 420, 460); this is to be explained in part by the low price of such events. Likewise the fact that our only barcarum certamen was offered for the

468No. 443 is a very doubtful case; so are nos. 303 and 355, mentioned by VILLE 1981 p.205 as possible cases.
dedication of a statue (together with boxers: 285) supports our claim that that event was a regatta and not a naumachia (supra pp.113–14).

Some shows were financed with the interests from a private bequest. We have already dealt at some length with bequests for periodic munera, administered by a curator; but there were also bequests for periodic gifts of ludi or boxing contests. Sometimes, too, a fixed amount of money was left by testament for a one-time event to be organized by an heir. The evidence is presented in Table IX.7 (but cf. also infra n.515).

| Table IX.7 |
| BEQUESTS FOR SHOWS |
| A. Foundations for periodic events: |
| 1. ludi | 24, 28, [178], 249, ?256, 266, 280, 311, 397, 404, 405, ?408, 413, 441; 378 (l. et spectacula). |
| 2. munus | [131], [133], 194, 208, 236. Cf. Table IX.3: B. |
| 3. varia | 273, 364, 365, 444; 261 (certamen athletarum or circenses). |

| B. Bequests for one-time events: |
| 1. ludi | 32 (also in B.2), 211, 244. |
| 2. munus | 32 (also in B.1), 39, 241. |

Foundations for ludi appear to be more numerous than for munera. However, we do not know of a single curator of foundation ludi that would correspond to the curators of foundation munera. The organization of a munus seems to have required more time, energy and administrative skills on the part of the curator (perhaps also money, as we saw) than the organization of ludi. It may well be, therefore, that the cura of foundation ludi did not require the appointment of a special official. A parallel comes to mind, the lusus iuuenum, which seems to have been a responsibility of the magistrates in some cities or regions (chapter V).
There were also bequests for one-time events. In all cases, the money was left by testament and entrusted to a relative or freedman (B in the table). The inscriptions seems to be intended in part at least as a record of the proper execution of the last wishes of the deceased. One needs to stress the fundamentally private character of the games organized in these conditions, which contrasts with the public nature of foundation ludi and munera.

Funerary games, and particularly the munus funebre, are well attested in the literary sources for the Republican period.\(^{469}\) The paucity of evidence about such games in later periods suggest that this institution was on the wane from late Republican times. M. Malavolta can think of only one example of ludi funebres in a municipal inscription, our no. 211 from Spoletium, but this is improbable since they were ludi Victoriae.\(^{470}\) More likely to have been funerary ludi are the one-time events provided for by the deceased himself, according to his testamentary dispositions (32, 244: B.1 in the table).

We have one secure case of a munus funebre in an Augustan inscription from Sinuessa (39). We may have another instance of it in no. 18, also Augustan, since the gift of meat (visceratio - either at a banquet or public distribution) together with a gladiatorial show is attested in the context of funerals.\(^{471}\) Under Tiberius, Suetonius tells, the plebs of Pollentia exacted from the heirs of a deceased centurion the funds for a munus, for which the city was severely punished by the emperor.\(^{472}\) Still later, Pliny congratulates his friend Maximus for the gladiatorial show he organized in memory of his wife.\(^{473}\) There are no other instances of actual funerary munera, or demands for them, known to us from the imperial period. Ville is probably right that the munus funebre was displaced by the

---

\(^{470}\) Malavolta in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 p.2080.
\(^{471}\) VILLE 1981 pp.202-3. BUONOCORE, EAOR III ad no. 24 and p.149, suggests that no. 170 may also record a funerary munus, for the spouse; he dates the inscription to the early imperial age, which gives credence to his hypothesis, but it should be noted that MROZEK 1987 p.26 dates it to the 2nd/3rd c. ... Cf. ibid. pp.42-43 on viscerationes.
\(^{472}\) Suet. Tib. 37; cf. supra n.43.
municipal munus, whether the latter was introduced according to his views or those expounded earlier in this chapter.\textsuperscript{474}

It is to be noted that all epigraphic instances of munera and ludi funebres were provided for by testament (\textit{ex testamento}), but not those attested in the literary sources; the two kinds of sources may therefore be dealing with variants of the same phenomenon. If, as Ville and others have shown, the funeral became only a pretext for a show, then it is likely that inscriptions will have stressed the testator’s generosity rather than his piety, as is possibly the case with no. 18 if the show was funerary. Some of the events discussed in the next section, for which we do not know the occasion or cause, may also have been funerary, at least nominally.

Some shows were offered for the health of the emperor or imperial family (\textit{pro salute ...}). It is not clear whether this should be considered a \textit{causa} or pretext for a show. In favor of a pretext argue those events which also had some other purpose. In Pompeii a munus for the health of Vespasian was offered at the dedication of an altar (100). Ludi for the health of Pius given in Gabii by a priestess were probably also dedicatory (16). A text from Rusicade records the production of a munus which he had earlier promised; this suggests an \textit{ob honorem} show. In some cases, however, the producer was a priest of the imperial cult, which would indicate that the invocation \textit{pro salute} was purposeful (40, 100, 212). But in some other cases only magisterial functions are recorded on the stone: the shows were possibly \textit{ob honorem} (129, 288).

According to M. Le Glay, munera \textit{pro salute imperatoris} are an expression of the archaic notion that the spilling of blood at shows had a sacrificial function; the show would therefore represent a sacrifice in honor of the emperor.\textsuperscript{475} This could be true in areas

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{474}Cf. VILLE 1981 p.224.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{475}M. Le Glay in DOMERGUE & AL. 1990 pp.222–23, followed by BUONOCORE, \textit{EAOR} II p.109.}
where gladiatorial shows were already well implanted by the end of the Republic, particularly Campania, which has produced all first-century evidence. However, most of the non-Campanian documents are concentrated in the period which goes from Pius to Severus (40, 212, 288, 333); it seems likely that this represents an independent development, perhaps related in part to an increase of imperial control over the production of gladiatorial shows, in part to the increasing authority of the emperor over his subjects. What is more, two inscriptions of the same period record *ludi pro salute* (16, 256), for which the sacrificial explanation does not hold.

5. Shows with unknown causae

So far, our inquiry has revealed a great preponderance of games marked by some sort of official character, but we are left with a considerable number of inscriptions which do not let us know the occasion or reason why the games recorded in them were produced. One way to go about this is to determine as best as possible whether the general character of the remaining material might affect in any significant way our analyses. It seems to me that the most efficient approach is to determine how many of the remaining producers assumed at one time or another some kind of official function. This requires once more a systematic presentation of the evidence.

---

476Posters: 69, 92, 100, 110A, 110B; stone inscription: 129.
477So far as we can tell, the culminating point was the s. c. of 176/177 (Aeslt). The phrase *ex indulgentia sacra* and the like belong mostly to this period and may have appeared for the same reason (supra pp.156–57); cf. no. 40: *pro salute et indulgentia Imp.* ....
Table IX.8 — SHOWS WITH UNKNOWN CA’SAE

A. Shows produced while in office:
1. magistrate: *ludi*: 259 (duovir; *ludi publici*?), 304 (duovir), 346 (as aedile?), 431 LL.9–13 (duovir). *munus*: 120 (aedile; *uenatio*), 132 (quinq.), 210 (duovir), 220 (quinq.), 239 (quattuorvir), 354 (duovir), 447. *ludi + munus*: 126 (as aedile and censor; perhaps *ob honorem*), 366 (as aedile and duovir).
2. priest: *ludi*: 29, 431 LL.5–7; cf. 36, 382. *munus*: cf. 120 (also in A.1).
3. *sevir* or *augustalis*: *munus*: 128 (apparently while in office), 192 LL.23–24 (as a board).

B. Highest distinction of producers of “uncategorizable” shows:478
1. municipal patron: *munus*: 35, 169, 184, 237. some show: 20, 437.
4. other: *munus*: 118 (ornaments of a duovir), 125 (*primarius uir*), 268 (military career), 428 (?). some shows: 46 (*principalis curiae*).
5. [--]: *ludi*: 41 (decemuir ad hastam in Rome), 356. *munus*: 140 (quinquennalis?), 65 (a distinguished notable), 88 (*eques Romanus, decurio adlectus*); 459.
6. not known for an office: *ludi*: 160 (Greek surname), 377 (probably a magistrate or priest, his son being a decurion; his wife, a *flaminica*); 349 (?). *munus*: 381 (*medicus*); 269, 272, 432 (?). some shows: 267 (freedman).

C. Inscriptions too fragmentary to know whether the *causa* was stated:
1. [--]: *ludi*: 328 (dedication?), 213 (for the sons’ patronate? as praetor of Etruria?); 15, 286. *munus*: 50 (*decurialis tribunicius*, but perhaps also *curator munera*), 173 (a freedwoman is mentioned); 62, 135, 142, 157, 175, 206, 207, 367, 369, 414, 424, 436, 443. *ludi + munera* or other shows: 355 (in part at least probably dedicatory); 255, 270.

478 The higher the distinction, the higher it is in the list. In fragmentary inscriptions, the highest distinction still extant was retained. Only municipal offices are taken into consideration; imperial distinctions and charges (*eques Romanus, procurator Augusti*, &c.) are of little relevance so far as the production of games at the municipal level is concerned. Add to B.2 the *munerarii* in Table IX.4: B, except for nos. 240 and 271 (which belong here with B.6).
It is striking that the majority of these remaining producers were notables who held public offices at some or other point in their life.\(^{479}\) It seems likely, therefore, that many shows with unknown \textit{causa} were produced for reasons similar to those already discussed. Still, one notes that most were gladiatorial, which is probably true also of those shows which cannot be categorized as either \textit{ludi} or \textit{munera}. This suggests that more of these shows were \textit{ob honorem} than dedicatory, though some may have been \textit{munera funebres}. It was, after all, not necessary to record the \textit{causa}, particularly in honorific inscriptions; most important was the benefaction itself and the \textit{munificentia} or \textit{liberalitas} of the producer which brought it about. It is likely, too, that few dedicatory shows are hidden in our table since the main benefaction, usually a building or statue, in itself almost gives away the purpose of the games. Some more shows may have been statutory, but worthy of being recorded for their exceptional splendor; this may be the case of the \textit{ludi} produced for the duovirate by a prominent notable from Lepcis (431 LL.9–13).

Were games produced by private individuals and for private occasions frequent at all? No. \(^{293}\) suggests that, at least in some places and periods, \textit{munera} could not be produced by private persons (even, as in this case, when they belonged to the \textit{élite}) since magisterial powers were required. A rich notable from Minturnae had to obtain permission from the emperor in order to produce a \textit{munus post honorem Iuirus}, that is, once he had returned to private life after his year in office as duovir (22). Very few are the producers in Table IX.8 who definitely did not belong to the sphere of public life. In Sufetula a physician died three days before his show (381); but in another inscription from the same town, the \textit{medicae professio} is called an honor (382); one may wonder whether physicians enjoyed a special status there, which would explain why the only two physicians known to have given

\(^{479}\)In the case of gladiatorial shows, some scholars go a step further and assume that they were produced during the highest office recorded; although this is likely in many cases, it is preferable not to risk an abusive interpretation of the material; cf. e.g. FORA 1996 p.30, where an equestrian and \textit{commentariensis rei publicae} (no. 152 = 144) is considered to have produced his show while assuming this office; no honor or priesthood is recorded, which suggests that the \textit{cursus} was limited to the most prestigious office reached.
games come from the same town. A probable freedman gave Floralia in Alba Fucens; but he and the father – certainly a freedman\textsuperscript{480} – of a man honored in Nemausus may have been \textit{augustales}, well attested in both localities (160, 267: B.6 in the table). We find in Vienna a \textit{dendrophorus munificus}, a member of the guild of tree-bearers who gave a gladiatorial show, but his epitaph is fragmentary (271: Table IX.4: B). In four other cases, the lack of any office is likely to have more to do with the nature of the inscription than with the actual status of the producer. No. 269 is a gladiator’s epitaph which recalls the occasion of his death: “during the \textit{munus} of C. Pompeius Mart(ialis)”. There was less urge to recall one’s career in a votive inscription, such as no. 272, than in one’s epitaph or honorary inscription. No. 349 is very late, hopelessly brief, and has little in common with the rest of our material. Finally, no. 432 is a mosaic inscription.

One is left with the impression that very few were those outside the ruling élite who could, or were allowed to, produce games. However, one must always remember that the epigraphic evidence need not be a reflection of Roman society at large. Honorary inscriptions, in particular, were awarded mostly by the ruling class to the more distinguished among their own rank. The inscription just mentioned from Nemausus and another one from the same town recognize a freedman’s worth by honoring his freeborn son or daughter.\textsuperscript{481} Some individuals of more moderate means may have been able to afford the rather inexpensive \textit{ludi}, but not the statue and base which would have immortalized their benefaction. In fact, there is some evidence that non-statutory \textit{ludi} were even more frequent than it appears. No. 277 is of a \textit{seuir (augustalis)} who produced two gladiatorial shows, but

\textsuperscript{480}Cf. next note.

\textsuperscript{481}No. 267: a Greek surname in Narbonensis, and particularly Nemausus, is a strong indicator of servile origin; on Nemausus and the local \textit{seuir augustales} cf. Chamberland, \textit{Recherches sur les sévirs augustaux de la cité de Nîmes}, M.A., University of Ottawa, Ottawa, 1994, pp.40–42; no. 266: the father was probably a \textit{seuir augustalis} since he bequeathed a huge sum for the periodic celebration of \textit{ludi seurales}. DARDAINE 1995 p.288 has remarked for Baetica that gifts \textit{ob honorem} performed by \textit{seuir} are commemorated only in dedicatory inscriptions (which are erected by the \textit{seuir} themselves); meanwhile, gifts \textit{ob honorem} of the priests and magistrates are attested in dedicatory as well as honorary inscriptions.
also frequent scenic games; and it is said of a notable from Numluli that he often gave
scenic games (377 L.6: ludos scaenicos ... adsidue dedit).482

Martial in Book III of his Epigrams recalls shows given by a cobbler in Bononia
and a fuller in Mutina, and wonders where a taverner will do the same next:

sutor cerdo dedit tibi, culta Bononia, munus
fullo dedit Mutinae: nunc ubi copo dabit?483

Predictably, Martial shows contempt for such producers who belonged to the world of
artisans, traders and shop-owners (this is particularly obvious at 3.16). However, in the late
first century, when Martial is writing, it seems unlikely that an ordinary cobbler or bleacher
would have had the kind of wealth to afford a gladiatorial show, especially of the kind
expected in such large centers as Bononia and Mutina. Were those men wealthy
industrialists, perhaps even augustales? Mutina was an important wool-trading center, and
augustales are well attested in Bononia. Martial’s testimony is, for our purposes, too vague
and therefore not particularly helpful, except to uncover the kind of class snobbery that
hardly ever makes its way into the inscriptions. We may never know how far down the
social scale producers of shows were to be found. But it is hard to imagine that Roman
society, so deeply class conscious, would have allowed individuals from more modest
milieus to produce, and preside over,484 events where each order and class was entitled to its
space, and get credit for entertaining the whole community. Holders of the decurional
ornaments and augustales were probably some sort of an exception, but they were for the

482 The idea expressed is that he gave ludi scaenici on frequent occasions, not that he gave them on one
single occasion over a long period of time; this is shown by the plural gymnasia (for a number of dis-
tributions of oil) in the same phrase.

483 Mart. 3.59: “A cobbler gave you a show, lettered Bononia, a fuller gave one to Mutina. Now where will
the taverner give one?” (transl. W.C.A. Ker, Loeb, slightly modified); cf. 3.16 and 99, and Iuv. 3.34–37.
J.W. Spaeth Jr., CW 37, 1943–44, pp.171–72, provides an interpretation of the passage discussed here
which cannot be maintained in light of the epigraphic evidence.

484 On the attributes and powers of the president of the games cf. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht I3
most part wealthy freedmen from prominent and influential families. In this context it is quite surprising that there are still some who believe that lanistae, owners of a troupe of gladiators and impresarios who were afflicted with infamia, produced gladiatorial shows. Moreover, as Ville saw, not a single piece of evidence unambiguously supports this claim.

6. Shows organized for profits

There is evidence that profits could be made from the organization of shows. Since almost all our evidence in this regard is for munera, the present section deals only with these. Several situations are conceivable: shows free for all who attend; shows where a part of the audience has free access while others have to pay an entrance fee; shows organized exclusively for profits.

The locus classicus for that last possibility is the story in Tacitus of the collapse of a temporary amphitheater at Fidenae, which supposedly happened during such a show (Ann. 4.62–63). An excerpt follows (4.62.1–2):

coepto apud Fidenam amphitheatro Atilius quidam libertini generis, quo spectaculum gladiatorum celebraret, neque fundamenta per solidum subdidit neque firmis nexibus ligneam compagam superstruxit, ut qui non abundantia pecuniae nec municipali ambitione sed in sordidam mercedem id negotium quaesiusset. adfluxere auidi talium, imperitante Tiberio procul uoluptatibus habiti, urile ac muliobre secur. omnis aetas, ob propinquitatem loci effusius.

---

485SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.128–29; FORA 1996 pp.36–37. Infamia: TabHer LL.108–25; lanistaturum is mentioned at L.123; cf. also SCLar esp. LL.15–16, where the sons and daughters of actors, gladiators, lanistae and procurers are all placed on the same low level.
487"One Atilius, of the freedman class, having undertaken to build an amphitheater at Fidenae for the exhibition of a show of gladiators, failed to lay a solid foundation and to frame the wooden superstructure with beams of sufficient strength; for he had neither an abundance of wealth, nor municipal ambition, but he simply sought the work for sordid gain. Thither flocked all who loved such sights and who during the reign of Tiberius had been wholly debarred from such amusements; men and women of every age crowding the place because it was near Rome" (translation Church & Brodribb, slightly modified). Cf. also supra p.22.
The collapse of the structure caused the death or injury of 50,000 people; the Senate took measures to insure that such a disaster would not occur again: prospective *editores* were to have a personal fortune of at least HS400,000, and amphitheaters were to be erected only once their foundations had been inspected; Atilius was banished. The passage has been mentioned by several authors to support their claim that *munera* could be organized solely for profit, but such a view is questionable. First of all, one should be suspicious of what Tacitus has to say about anyone who belongs to the lower social orders and, particularly, about their motive in doing something. But even if Atilius’ sole or main motivation was profit, it is likely that he also had to take into consideration local regulations. We are not told how many Fidenans were admitted, nor whether Atilius had a legal or moral obligation to reserve some seating emplacement for them, perhaps even free seats, at least for the elite. The *Tabula Heracleensis* suggests that, by ca. 45 B.C. when it was engraved, gladiatorial shows were, unlike *ludi*, always private undertakings, but at the same time, that an emplacement had to be reserved for the decurions by whoever organized such a show (LL.137–38: cf. supra p.64). Chapter LXVI of the Urso charter likewise shows that *ludi* were required from magistrates, but not gladiatorial shows, which were organized privately (supra pp.66–69); still, decurions and priests had the right to a special section at both *ludi* and gladiatorial shows. The *lex Irnitana* makes no restriction whatsoever on the kinds of shows where seating privileges were to be enforced (supra p.162). Tacitus, not surprisingly, has nothing to say on such matters since he recalls the disaster because of its impact in Rome itself. One should add to this that the show at Fidenae was clearly atypical. Fidenae happens to be in Rome’s vicinity, and the reign of Tiberius, who hated the games, was notorious at

---

488 The figure is highly suspicious, considering that the maximum capacity of the largest of all amphitheaters, the “Colosseum”, was about 50,000 (GOLVIN 1988 p.287). Suetonius claims that over 20,000 were killed (Tib. 40; followed by Oros. *Hist.* 7.4.11), while the Chronographer of 354 gives, perhaps more realistically, the figure of 4205 killed (*Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auct. ant. IX, Chron. Min.* 1, p.145).

Rome for a dearth of gladiatorial shows (they, unlike ludi, were mostly a benefaction of the emperor and not part of the calendar of annual celebrations, except for several days in December). Profits could therefore be made by selling seats most of all to Romans who loved the shows but were deprived of them at home. It seems conceivable, therefore, that huge profits were expected not because the show was fundamentally different from other municipal shows, but rather because the proportion of the audience which had to pay for their seat was unusually large. This statement implies that it was usual for some places or sections of an amphitheater to be sold to the audience, an issue which will be examined soon, but not before munera assiorana are discussed since they too are generally claimed to be gladiatorial shows organized for profit.

The expression munera assiorana is attested only once, in the aes Italicum (4 L.29). Since Mommsen's important commentary, munera assiorana have been generally understood to be touring gladiatorial shows produced by owners of gladiatorial troupes (lanistae) for their own profit. A rapprochement with Suetonius' circumforan(e)us lanista (Vit. 12: "itinerant" lanista, who goes "from forum to forum") accounts for Mommsen's circumscribing of producer and purpose as he does. The element assi- is taken to be derived from the as, a low denomination bronze coin, which accordingly would have been the price paid for a seat. That -for-an(e)us, originally at least, qualifies something that pertains to the forum is secure, while the derivation of assi- from as is perhaps the point which has been most criticized by scholars. But, beside etymological arguments, there are more fundamental reasons to doubt that the proposed definition is right. These reasons are

---


491 The editors of OLD, s.v., regard the origin of assi- as dubious, but on the whole retain Mommsen's definition. Piernavieja, Cider ad no. 80H (with references to other hypotheses), has proposed an interesting alternative (infra). However, his premise in attacking Mommsen's view, that an as is much too low a price per seat to even cover expenditures, is weak: assioranus could have lexicalized in an earlier period and kept being used even after prices increased.
provided by the very context in which *munera assiforana* are mentioned. Therefore, before going any further, it is appropriate to quote a few lines from the relevant section (4 LL.29–31):

Accordingly, I support the proposals that the spectacles which are called *munera assiforana* remain within their old form and not exceed $30,000$ in expenditure. That to those, however, who produce spectacles at an expenditure between ($30,000$ and $60,000$, gladiators be furnished in equal number in three classes: maximum price for the first be $5000$, for the second class $4000$, for the third class $3000$. (And so on for the other, more expensive, categories of events.) In the emperors' *oratio*, quoted by the senator in his *sententia*, all *munera* of the least costly category (up to $30,000$), and only these, are called *assiforana*. If we followed Mommsen, all the smaller events, those of the kind one expects in the smaller towns, would have to be organized for profit. One might object that, for whatever reason, no need was felt to impose regulations on magistrates and private benefactors who planned to organize a small show, and that this category was simply left out. But this is improbable. It is clear from the rest of the *s. c.* that, although the emperors were mostly responding to the provincial priests’ concerns, they aimed at regulating all gladiatorial shows; and also, that the senator was taking this very fact for granted, which accounts for his concerns about the applicability in smaller cities of the measures as presented (supra p.156). Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to quantify the size of actual *munera* – those recorded in our inscriptions – according to the terms of the *s. c.*, but several examples of what look like very small shows were mentioned throughout chapter III.

There need not be such a close relationship between *assiforanus* and *circumforanus* as Mommsen had assumed. P. Piernavieja has come up with a more promising hypothesis. He suggested that *assi-* could be derived from *ad-sid-* with assimilation of the

---

492 Translation Oliver (slightly modified), in OLIVER & PALMER 1955.
first d to s, of the second d to the f of foran-, and degemination of ff. Accordingly, munera assiforana would be ‘gladiatorial shows produced on a forum provided with seating’. However, I would suggest that, since we are at a comparatively late date, this term might well have evolved from one that applied to shows which were organized on a forum and whose size was restricted accordingly (for logistical or perhaps security reasons?) to one that applied to any smaller event, particularly in terms of expenditures as in the s. c. Moreover, the circumlocution used by the senator (munera quae assiforana appellantur = “so-called’ munera assiforana”), can be taken to suggest that he was aware of a conflict between etymological meaning and current understanding of the term (for example, that the obvious reference to the forum had become meaningless?).

This having been said, there is evidence that gladiatorial shows could bring in some revenues. Several literary references indicate that only a certain number of seats were free usually at Rome (and taken long hours before a show started).\(^{493}\) At the municipal level the most compelling piece of evidence is our no. 317, in which a benefactor states that he produced a munus at his own expense (de liberalitate sua), but at the same time that he erected, as promised, a statue to the divine Pertinax with the revenues from the selling of seats. Three statues were erected apparently under similar circumstances by two quattuorviri in Canusium, if this is what is implied by the vague expression de munere gladiatorio (145).\(^{494}\) What is most troubling is that a show presented as a liberalitas or produced by holders of a municipal office could bring in some revenues.\(^{495}\) Municipal constitutions say nothing about this issue, and the inscriptions in our catalogue never allow us to establish firmly whether access to a show was entirely or partly free. In Abella the coloni (colonists with Roman citizenship) and incolae (the indigenous population without that status) erected


\(^{495}\)LIEBENAM 1900 p.114; VILLE 1981 p.430–32.
a monument to a notable who had produced a show at his own expense (47). Did these two groups, at least, have free access to the show? Some other inscriptions record the erection of a monument postulante populo, that is, at the people's demand, to honor the producer of a munus. Since this formulation is very common in honorary inscriptions, and is therefore stereotyped, it is difficult to know what its true significance is. Should we assume that the entire people had been admitted free of charge, as long as seats were available? Some inscriptions say that the municipes (18, 189, 212), people (129, 288), urban plebs (147, 210), decurions and citizens (184), or curiae (368) honored the producer of a show with a monument. We may wonder again whether they did so because of free admission to the show. However, this need not be so. When an amphitheater was available, it is conceivable that the producer of a show had only a limited say on the issue of an admission fee, while the city may have wished to receive one in order to pay for the maintenance of the building and personnel, such as the ushers (dissignatores) attested in several inscriptions. The best evidence for this is perhaps that benefactors at times "bought" a number of places to make them free of charge, which means that they would otherwise have been sold at shows.

Appended to no. 196b from Urbs Saluia is a record of the gift of 650 seats for the people (Ex eis honoribus data Urbi)saluiensium plebei loca DCL) by the builder of the amphitheater; this does not refer to the building, but to the granting, of those seats. A Pompeian poster (98a) states that a show was going to be organized at no costs for the city (sine impensa publica), which suggests that such costs did exist, and perhaps even that the city was willing to subsidize them. Be that as it may, according to our hypothesis, we should

---

496 Nos. 35, 358, 442; cf. 120; and cf. 433, 434: (ex) suffragio populi.
497 Still, note how in no. 35 the people asked for a biga (statue of the honored man on a two-horse chariot), while the decurions granted only an equestrian statue.
498 Their title proves that they were hired permanently; cf. HEp 1989, 254 (Corduba) and the material collected in DizEp Ii s.v. On the question of the ownership of amphitheaters, infra n.500.
499 Cf. BUONOCORE, EAOR III ad no. 78. Cf. also C II 3364 = ILS 5657 with CAVALLARO 1984 p.209 n.46.
expect that the munus was still perceived as a liberality, since entrance fees were the affair of the city and not the producer.500

Still, no. 317 from Cirta indicates without the shadow of a doubt that the producer himself could expect revenues from a show which was considered to be a liberality. We need to stress that the erection of a statue with these revenues is mentioned because it too was a liberality; that it is also presented as the fulfillment of a promise made while campaigning for the triumvirate suggests that it was usual for a producer to derive some revenues from a gladiatorial show, but that he was not required to share them. There seems to be only one way to account for the apparent contradiction between liberalitas and expectation of revenues. As Jacques said,

[I]a générosité envers sa patrie est considérée comme un des comportements propres aux notables des civilisations grecques et romaines. Elle ne se conçoit que dans un système de cité et, donc, traduit directement l’attitude des notables envers les communautés.501

Pompeian posters support this claim, for those without the name of the producer (51, 63, 77) always advertise shows to be held elsewhere than at Pompeii; but a Pompeian never remains anonymous when he advertises a show for his fellow citizens. In the inscriptions mentioned earlier it is clear that populus, ciues and other social categories are segments of the local population, not strangers. No. 368 is more explicit than the rest for saying that the producer organized the show “for his fellow citizens” (ciuibus suis). Note also how a person’s love for his fatherland occasionally played a role in the gift of games (e.g. 118, 120, 435, 437). It

500This supposes that entertainment buildings were publicly and not privately owned; this is supported by the inscription just quoted from Urbs Salvia, but by other inscriptions as well: AE 1962, 87 = EAOR II 64 (... amphitheatrum a solo pecunia s(u) fecit col. Iulia Felix of the Lucoferonenses”); cf. C XI 3938 = ILS 6589 = EAOR II 65; AE 1937, 64 = EAOR III 73 (... amphitheatrum loco privato suo ... sua pec. in honor(em) Imp. Caesars August[i] coloniaeque Luceriae faciendum) curavit); &c.; on its own the expression sua pecunia, even in phrases so concise as amphitheatrum d(e) s(u) pecunia fecit (C IX 3044 = EAOR III 74) indicates that the building was not owned by the builder himself and, therefore, was public.
is easy to conclude that a benefactor moved by municipal ambition or at least some form of social recognition would gain much by offering a show to his community. But what would he hope to gain from spectators coming from other towns? The events at Fidenae and, most of all, the Pompeian evidence which will be examined in detail in the next section, indicate that people were coming from, or traveling to, neighboring communities to enjoy the show. Moreover, a number of posters show that “strangers” – in this case the Pompeians – were expressly invited to attend shows elsewhere, for instance at Nuceria (76–80) or even at the quite distant Forum Popilii (66), while non-Pompeians attended shows at Pompeii, such as the Nucerians (cf. supra p.22). Chapter CXXVI of the Urso charter, on seating at scenic games, mentions several categories of spectators: *coloni*, *incolae*, *hospites* (guests) and *aduentores* (strangers); the chapter says little in many words, but at least it shows that these categories were relevant for the organization of seating at scenic games and, no doubt, at other shows. I would therefore suggest that strangers were the main category of spectators from which a city or producer could derive some revenues, and that this did not affect the liberality that the show represented for the local population.

In connection with this it should be noted that some of the known municipal amphitheaters were designed to accommodate many more spectators than could be gathered locally, such as at Pompeii, where the capacity of the amphitheater has been estimated at over 22,000.502 Liebenam was perhaps right when he suggested that revenues could thus be derived from the selling of seats to foreigners.503 By its seriousness – the matter was referred to Rome – the riot of 59 shows that the Nucerians were coming in great numbers to Pompeii when a show was presented.

It was claimed earlier in this chapter that *lanistae* probably never produced gladiatorial shows. If our interpretations of the passages in Tacitus and the *aes italicense* are

---

502 GOLVIN 1988 p.43.
503 LIEBENAM 1900 p.118; FRIEDLÄNDER 1885 pp.492–93.
correct, then there remains no evidence supporting the claim that *munera* could be produced entirely for profit. It is perhaps not surprising that what one finds instead is a system which attributes seats and sections to spectators according to their status inside, and even outside, the community.

7. A case study: Pompeii

The Pompeian material is so unique and abundant that it allows for a separate treatment. Painted posters, announcing upcoming events, and graffiti, providing accounts of *munera* with name and fate of opponents, are virtually not found anywhere else.\(^\text{504}\) This material was republished two decades ago by Patrizia Sabbatini Tumolesi, which greatly facilitates the present task.\(^\text{505}\) Besides, we have two stone inscriptions recording gifts of *munera, ludi*, and other shows (87, 88), while “*pro ludis*” inscriptions are more numerous in Pompeii than anywhere else (82–86); one other inscription makes an interesting allusion to the colonial law (81). Moreover, the entertainment buildings (theater, odeum, amphitheater), as well as the house and portico successively used as gladiatorial schools, are very well preserved.

So far as the public or private nature of the events and status of the producers are concerned, Sabbatini Tumolesi’s views can be summarized as follows. One can identify two basic categories of producers: (1) magistrates and priests (nos. 1–27 = 87–102 passim); and (2) *lanistae* (nos. 30–33 = 90, 93, 94 and infra p.228). Magistrates and priests organized

\(^{504}\) MOURITSEN 1988 pp.31–32 provides a good introduction to this material. By comparison, the walls of Herculaneum, which suffered much more damage from the eruption of 79, have produced a single poster (70).

\(^{505}\) SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1981. Most of her analyses, however, will be rejected here. For sound criticisms cf. HÖNLE 1982 and, particularly with regard to the dating of the material, MOURITSEN 1988 pp.34–37. Several corrections to the inscriptions were made by A. Martin in his review (*Latomus* 44, 1985, pp. 188–89). The interpretations of VILLE 1981 are often sharply at odds with those of Sabbatini. It is of interest to note that in her long review of Ville’s book, Sabbatini says almost nothing about this (EAD. 1984); compare e.g. Ville’s views on *lanistae* (esp. p.274) with hers (1980 esp. pp.128–9; cf. 1984 p.108). FORA 1996 passim closely follows Sabbatini Tumolesi; cf. CHAMBERLAND 1999.
statutory shows in accordance with the requirements of the local constitution; lanistae staged private shows with entrance fee in order to make a profit. Other categories of gladiatorial shows did exist, such as those in honor of the imperial family or for the dedication of a building, but it is not at all clear from Sabbatini’s discussion (pp.131–33) whether they should be distinguished from, or assimilated to, statutory shows. This is perhaps not surprising since the author’s analyses are highly questionable and, at any rate, vitiated by serious methodological faults.\footnote{506} Briefly, Sabbatini identifies as lanistae those producers who are not known otherwise in Pompeian epigraphy and do not add a title to their name. But there is no reason to exclude the possibility that they were wealthy private individuals who sought some prestige by putting on a show – perhaps the kind of producers who are known to us from the epigrams of Martial – or simply did not mention their title. Note that if the augustalis of no. 27 (= 108), who is not known otherwise, had not mentioned his title, he would accordingly have been categorized as a lanista. Meanwhile, producers are considered to probably be sitting magistrates even when their title is attested not in posters but some other inscriptions (89, 92, 102);\footnote{507} this is certainly due to Sabbatini’s belief that Pompeian magistrates were required to produce a gladiatorial show: prominent individuals, known for their political career, will therefore have produced such shows while assuming office. That this need not be the case is shown by D. Lucretius Valens, who seems not to be holding any office when he assists his father in the production of a munus (88, 96); this is one of several cases of a father seeing the gift of games as an opportunity to launch his son’s career. Moreover, as H. Mouritsen remarked, Sabbatini’s view that magistrates were required to produce gladiatorial shows “is hardly likely, since from the entire history of Pompeii we know of only seven potential magistrates who have sponsored such contests,” a figure “far too low for it to have been an established custom”; by comparison, 

\footnote{506}{Cf. esp. HÖNLE 1982; MOURITSEN 1988 pp.34–37}  
\footnote{507}{Cf. SABBATINI, esp. p.127.}
some 2600 electoral posters (*programmata*) record the name of 176 magisterial candidates. There remains no reason to exclude the possibility that any one of the three men mentioned above gave his show privately to launch his career or prepare his way to a higher office. Moreover, as we saw, it is highly improbable that *lanistae* ever organized gladiatorial shows.

One further argument against Sabbatini’s views is that no two shows recorded in posters took place exactly at the same time; they are in fact attested in almost every month of the year (cf. Table VIII.1). The evidence on the dates when statutory shows were produced is meagre, but the *munus* offered in Minturnae as a *processus editio* (22: supra p.165), and the *ludi* organized by the *augustales* of Trebula Suffenas upon assuming office on the kalends of August every year (192) suggests that at the municipal level, as in Rome, statutory shows had to be produced on the same dates or at least in the same period every year. It should be noted, too, that statutory *ludi* are never advertised in posters, which indicates that this was unnecessary, and perhaps even inappropriate, since the producer would have advertised himself on the occasion of a show which was due to the community. If this is sound, we have no way to know from posters whether the production of *munera* was required from magistrates.

This begs a fundamental question apparently neglected by all who have looked at the evidence for gladiatorial shows in Pompeii: Where did *ludi* fit in the program of annual public games? It is claimed by Sabbatini Tumolesi and others that gladiatorial shows were required by the Pompeian constitution, but there is formal evidence only for scenic

---

508 MOURITSEN 1988 pp.188–89 n.145; the same author supposes that Pompeii was the site of an annual statutory *munus*, but there is no evidence to argue for or against this view, which should have been presented as a hypothesis; still, and in spite of what will be said infra, I would suggest that the building *pro ludis* of sections of the amphitheater by different categories of officials in a relatively short span of time, probably within the Augustan age (nos. 83–86), could be taken to suggest that a need was felt to upgrade the facilities for the institution of a statutory *munus*; and as we saw, the Augustan age was fundamental for the diversification of official celebrations at the municipal level. On *programmata*, MOURITSEN pp. 9–10, 42, 81.
games; and what is more, this evidence seems to exclude gladiatorial munera. In the period that followed the Sullan colonial deduction, duoviri were required to either organize ludi or engage in building activity (81). By Augustan times, they were normally required to produce ludi with illuminations, as indicated by contemporary pro ludis inscriptions (82–86). We do not know for the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods whether there were any changes to this situation; but the amount of evidence for private gladiatorial shows suggests that the existing system of statutory ludi and private munera functioned well. Therefore, the need may not even have been felt to require munera from top magistrates.

Our knowledge of the gladiatorial establishment, including those aspects which are not relevant for our purpose, is better for Pompeii than for any other city. Still, in spite of the wealth of evidence, the gaps in our knowledge are considerable; the documentary value of our material is limited and often leaves room for several interpretations. It is remarkable how different categories of documents, rather than complementing one another, often seem to describe irreconcilable situations. Thus we learn about ludi in stone inscriptions, never in posters. “Score-cards” seem to record only the more prestigious gladiatorial shows, featuring imperial gladiators (Iuliani, Neroniani), rather than shows where “local” gladiators fought, such as those who scratched their name on the walls of the old gladiatorial ludus (V.5.3: not far from the Porta Capua). Likewise, when the documents are arranged chronologically, the realities seem irreducible. Our evidence for ludi disappears after the reign of Augustus, and at about the same time, gladiatorial shows start to leave a record in stone inscriptions (87) and posters (89). Interestingly, the main entertainment buildings, the theatre, odeon and amphitheater, were all three already erected before the middle of the first century B.C., which strongly suggests that the chronological distribution of the inscriptions has little or nothing to do with the actual production of ludi and munera in different periods. The wealth of the Pompeian evidence raises more questions than it
allows us to answer. This tells us that our understanding of the production of shows in the Latin part of the Roman Empire will probably always remain unsatisfactory.
X. CONCLUSION

In what follows I would like to return to two of the main themes of this dissertation: (1) the nature of the epigraphic evidence; and (2) the significance of the Augustan age for the diversification of statutory shows.

(1) Probably one of the most important conclusions to draw from the preceding chapters is that the inscriptions mostly record non-statutory events and, therefore, do not provide a faithful reflection of the production of games in the Roman world. Moreover, the more costly and prestigious munera were more likely than other shows to be recorded in an inscription, so that the epigraphic evidence is certainly not even representative of the frequency at which ludi, munera and other shows were produced privately.

Magistrates and other notables produced games privately for a variety of reasons, but it is hard to imagine that they did not seek some form of social recognition in doing so. Such recognition could take the form of a statue of the benefactor with an accompanying honorary inscription, particularly when he had given a costly gladiatorial show. But was some form of recognition manifested towards the benefactor at the show itself? Almost all the evidence on this is found in the literary sources. Municipal inscriptions say very little; in fact, our most illuminating epigraphic document is singular in not being a stone but mosaic inscription (428). This is an unusually long mosaic inscription (and the only one in our catalogue), obviously commissioned by the producer of the show himself. A translation follows:

(c) Said by the herald: “My lords, in order that the Telegenii should obtain what they deserve from your favor, give them 500 denarii per leopard.” (d) “Magerius! Magerius!” (e) Shouted out: “By your example, may future munerarii learn to give a munus! may your
predecessors hear about it! Who ever gave such a munus? When was such a munus ever seen? You will produce a munus such as a quaestor’s munus; you will produce it at your own expense: that’s your day! Magerius pays! That’s to be rich! That’s to be powerful! It’s over now; it’s night-time now! The Telegenii are dismissed from your munus with money-bags.509

According to A. Beschaouch Magerius paid for the show only after the audience urged him to do so, but F. Jacques must be right that Magerius and the audience “se jouèrent récipro- quement une comédie aux rôles bien définis auparavant”; that the uenatores were to come must have been planned or known in advance, and the sum paid to them, 4000 denarii (= HS16,000) in liquid money, had to be put together.510 Still, the inscription shows that Magerius gave much weight to the audience’s acclamations and found legitimacy in them:

Nous sommes dans un système aristocratique, mais qui éprouve le besoin de se légitimer par l’unanimité, l’adhésion générale; les notables sont les chefs naturels, mais leur position ne suffit pas à justifier leur pouvoir et leur superiorité: il faut qu’elle soit confirmée – ou plutôt reconnue – par tous, donc aussi par le peuple.511

Magerius’ mosaic helps give life to a few other similar occasions, but for which the language of the inscription is not so vivid. In Puteoli the people were gathered in the amphitheatre (in spectaculis) when they demanded assiduously that a local notable, who had honored his city with a uenatio and several other benefactions (including the very show which was taking place?), be rewarded with two bigae, to which the local senate agreed (120). A quinquennial duovir was editing a gladiatorial show in Venafrum when the people collected money for a statue in his honor (129).512 Finally an augustalis was rewarded with

509My translation is somewhat influenced by that of BESCHAOUCH 1966 pp.136, 139. The Telegenii are a corporation of professional uenatores (“hunters”): cf. ibid. pp.150–57.
511JACQUES ibid.
512Money could also be collected for an honorific statue during statutory games: cf. nos. 223, 224, 230, 232 and 233; these are all from Etruria, which is to be explained probably by local epigraphic practices rather than cultural differences. Note further that in nos. 230, 232 and 233 the money was collected “in the orchestra”; one can imagine the sheer pressure exerted by the public at large – the people (cf. infra) – on the more privileged and wealthiest, who indeed were sitting in the orchestra (Vitr. 5.6.2; LexVrs § CXXVII).
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a bisellium while he was sponsoring a private day appended to the municipal munus at Telesia (186). In none of these three cases does the inscription give an idea of the reigning atmosphere at the show, but to any contemporary reader the gesticulating and shouting of the audience must have immediately come to mind. It is of interest to note that in the inscriptions from Puteoli and Venafrum, the audience is referred to as “the people” (populus). Several other documents in our catalogue record honors and distinctions which were awarded postulante or petente populo (“at the people’s demand”). It is unfortunately not said how and where the people voiced their wishes, but it is tempting to suggest that in some occasions at least they were gathered for the games. As in Rome, therefore, the games seem to have played an important social function. Little can be derived from the inscriptions probably because this was perfectly normal.

So far as epigraphic commemorations are concerned, the distinction between statutory and non-statutory shows appears more important generally than the distinction between ludi and munera or other shows. It is true as we saw that private gladiatorial shows are proportionally better represented than other private productions, but at the same time it is remarkable that the evidence for statutory munera is very poor; moreover, we would know even less than we do about the munus publicum if it were not for the self-explanatory titles of the curators of such events (Table IX.3). The discussion on prices in chapter VIII shows that munera became much more costly than ludi or other shows generally, and this must have been true for statutory as well as non-statutory munera. Meanwhile, some very modest but non-statutory productions of scenic games, boxing fights or even circenses are

513 Cf. JACQUES 1984 pp.399–425 and our nos. 28, 33, 34, 35, 52, 65, 151, 224, 247, 264, 268, 350, 358, 406 and 442 which are all to be found in Jacques’ tables at pp.410–16; add nos. 156 and 446. That the people’s opinion mattered to a notable is shown especially by no. 35: it was seen as worth mentioning that the people demanded a biga for the benefactor even if the local senate granted only an equestrian statue.

514 Cf. JACQUES p.420: “Les uoces frequentissimae s’exprimaient sans doute de préférence au théâtre ou à l’amphithéâtre sous forme de manifestation spontanée, éventuellement turbulente, ou au contraire soigneuse­ment orchestrée par le bénéficiaire ou ses amis.”
known from the inscriptions. The evidence for *circenses* is particularly revealing, for in some small Spanish and African cities we find them offered at the dedication of statues or other rather minor monuments. Meanwhile, *circenses* are rarely attested in major centers where they were organized into factions as in Rome: the great cost of highly organized shows must have made it very hard for anyone but the most powerful notables, who could afford a top magistracy, to organize them in such centers.

I stressed in the introduction and on several occasions in the following chapters that religious devotion appears as a rather minor function of the games compared to that of entertaining the community. It seems again that part of the explanation lies in the preponderance in the inscriptions of non-statutory games. Admittedly these are at times vowed to the gods (Table II.1 with discussion), but there are more attestations of games celebrated on other occasions, such as the producer’s (or founder’s) birthday or an anniversary (such as a military victory) of the living emperor.

The evidence on statutory games is meagre, but this is an area where some of our most important conclusions were reached. A careful examination of what we do have indicates that a diversification in the program of statutory games took place from the Augustan age, when several important reforms were effected. Until then, *ludi* were the almost exclusive form taken by such games. This is true even for Pompeii: even though Campania and adjacent areas saw the earliest diffusion of the gladiatorial establishment, at the time of Sulla’s colonial foundation and until at least the reign of Augustus, *Romanitas* in terms of statutory shows meant the production of *ludi publici*.

If this is sound, then the *princeps* shows in yet another way how profoundly he transformed the Romans’ world. Of course changes did not occur overnight, and probably many if not most cities never integrated gladiatorial shows among their statutory games (and
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Perhaps not even Pompeii). But for those which did – either then or later during the High-Empire – the transformation of such a basic institution as the games seems to have proceeded rather smoothly. As often in the Roman world, and with Augustan institutions in particular, communities seem to have largely been left free to determine for themselves when and how to integrate new institutions alongside or instead of existing ones. This probably explains why the production of visual entertainments is a rather complex phenomenon, conditioned by regional, chronological and other differences such as the size of communities, and this in spite of the rather small number of basic categories of shows which the Empire’s citizens and subjects were given to enjoy.515

515While revising my manuscript for submission, I became aware of a very interesting Greek inscription which reproduces several imperial letters sent to the Aphrodisians (J. Reynolds, “New Letters from Hadrian to Aphrodisias: Trials, Taxes, Gladiators and an Aqueduct”, JR4 13, 2000, pp.1–20). In the 3rd letter, (A.D. 124/125; loc. cit. p.9 L.27–41, and pp.16–19) Hadrian praises their proposal of requiring the local high priests to spend on the new aqueduct money they should otherwise have spent on gladiatorial shows. This surely means that by then high priests in Aphrodisias were normally required to produce such shows. The context strongly suggests that the reallocation of moneys “pro munere” was to be effective for several years (presumably as long as the financing of the project was not entirely secured). It seems remarkable that the Aphrodisians dared to ask for the cancellation of games which are generally believed to be an important aspect of the imperial cult in the East, and that the emperor agreed with and even praised the proposal. This new inscription, therefore, lends support to G. Ville’s view that munera were given in the East by municipal imperial priests not so much because they were an expression of the imperial cult, but rather because “les aristocrates, parvenus, à travers le sacerdoce impérial, au point le plus haut de la hiérarchie municipale, offraient ce qui était le plus haut dans la hiérarchie des spectacles: les combats de gladiateurs” (VILLE 1981 pp.192–93, 206–8; quotation at p.208).

Finally, 3 remarkable inscriptions, cut on a single statue base found in situ in the Augustalium at Misenum, were just published (J.H. D’Arms, “Memory, Money, and Status at Misenum: Three New Inscriptions from the Collegium of the Augustales”, JRS 90, 2000, pp.126–44). They honor Q. Cominius Abascantus, holder of the decurional ornaments and perpetual curator of the augustales (inscription A, LL.1–4), and his wife Nymphidia Monime. Abascantus left HS10,000 to the local corporation of augustales (inscription B): part of the annual 6% return was to be used on a day during the Parentalia (13–21 Feb.) on 10 pairs of wrestlers (luctatores – 1st attestation in the Latin epigraphy) in his garden tomb (cepotaphium). The more relevant lines are included in the catalogue as no. 70X. Altogether, HS204 were spent every year on the show itself (some more money was spent on the same occasion on flowers to decorate the sepulchre, nard-oil to be poured over Abascantus’ remains, a banquet and a sacrifice). This amount is smaller than any amount recorded in Tables VIII.3–4. Much of the money (HS120) was used for small cash prizes for winners and losers (which confirms my hypothesis, supra pp.90, 150–51, to account for the surprisingly small price of some shows).
ANNEX I: INSCRIPTIONS

This corpus includes only Latin inscriptions which are directly relevant for the production of municipal games. Criteria for inclusion or exclusion are defined in chapter I.

The number of the inscription is followed by the name of the locality (first occurrence in bold) where the event took place. When two localities are separated by an arrow (\(\Rightarrow\)), on the left is where the inscription was erected (or sometimes, brought to and first recorded), on the right, where the show actually took place. This is followed by references to major corpora and supplements. Background information such as description of support, textual problems, whereabouts of the inscription, criteria used in dating, is quoted (often in a slightly modified or abbreviated form) in brackets following the source where it was gathered. A translation is only occasionally supplied (several of the more important documents are translated in the appropriate place in chapters II–IX). An apparatus criticus or short commentary is added when this was deemed necessary or useful. The last piece of information given before the inscription itself is the date, when this has not already been provided as just explained. Inscriptions distinguished by lower-case letters (a, b, &c.) are two or more copies of the same text (though often with minor differences), so that only one is usually given; those separated by capital letters (A, B, &c.) are dissimilar and therefore all provided, but they usually record a single event or name a single producer.

As for the inscription itself, ligatures, letters erased by the lapicide himself, reengraving at a later date over an erasure, &c., are not provided if not relevant for the purpose of this study. Doubtful letters have not been underdotted since collections of inscriptions do not all apply the same criteria, or even provide this kind of information. Otherwise, the following epigraphic conventions are used:

- \(\ldots\) undetermined number of missing lines
- (abc) filled out abbreviation
- (---) unresolved abbreviation
- + unidentifiable letter of which there is a trace
- [---] missing line or part of line
- [abc] lost letters restored by conjecture
- \([-\ldots,\ldots]\) \(n\) letters are missing (here, four and two respectively)
- [\(-\)] lost \textit{praenomen}
- [abc] letters intentionally erased (usually resulting from \textit{damnatio memoriae})
- "abc" letters accidentally omitted by the cutter
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'a' correct letter inserted by the modern editor to replace a wrong one

'a' letter added in an afterthought over or below the line

{abc} repeated letters or words, or superfluous letters

abc? uncertain resolution or restitution

abc! sic

ABC letters whose meaning cannot be established

/ division of line (the exponent, e.g. /9, indicates which line number follows)

/ division of line where the new line starts on another part or face of the monument.

Abbreviations are filled out except, to save space, in the following cases:

—imperial nomenclature and titles;

—names: praenomen, filiation and tribe;

—dates; cos. or coss. = consulibus in indications of the consular year;

—numerals and monetary symbols (n. = nummi; $ = denarii; HS = sestertii; m = milita; (m.) usually means that thousands are expressed in the inscription by a horizontal stroke over the numeral);

—some adjectives: Aug. = Augustus -a -um; p. = publicus -a -um; perp. or p.p. = perpetuus -a -um; quinq. or q.q. = quinquennalis -e;

—the second (and third, &c.) of identical abbreviations (provided they are in the same case or tense);

—and the following: D. M. and D. M. s. = Diis Manibus (sacrum); d. d. = decreto decurionum; l. d. d. = locus datus decreto decurionum; i. d. = iure dicundo or iuris dicundi; -q. = -q(ue) (conjunction); -b. = -b(us) (ending of the dative and ablative plural); u. c. = vir clarissimus; u. p. = vir perfectissimus.

The order of presentation is as follows. Firstly, legal measures (1–4); then, Italy, in the order of the Augustan regions (I Latium: 5–46; Campania: 47–130; II: 131–152; III: 153–158; IV: 159–192; V: 193–196; VI: 197–213; VII: 214–233; VIII: 234; IX: 235–236; X: 237–241; XI: 242–245); lastly, the provinces in the following order: Sicilia (246–247); Alpes Maritimae (248); Belgica (249); Lugdunensis (250–253); Aquitania (254–255); Narbonensis (256–271); Tarraconensis (272–284); Lusitania (285–286); Baetica (287–310); Mauretania Caesariensis (311–313); Numidia (314–345); Africa Proconsularis (346–428); Tripolitana (429–443); Pisidia (444–447); Creta (448); Achaia (449–452); Macedonia (453–459); Dalmatia (460–461). To the best of my knowledge, other regions have not yet produced inscriptions directly relevant for this study.

Inside each geographical section, cities are presented in alphabetical order; those for which the ancient name is not known are relegated at the end of the relevant section. When a city has produced two or more inscriptions, these are presented as far as possible in chronological order.

Some inscriptions have been excluded which were comprised in earlier collections. AE 1904, 39
(Volsinii): the restitution *pro l[udis] is doubtful in light of the page make-up. *AE* 1974, 266 = 1980, 236 = Fora 116 (Puteoli): it is unlikely that a *mumus* was recorded in the erasures at LL.5–6. *C I² 687 = ILL 723* (Capua): *eidem lu[dos ...] must be corrected to read *eidemq[ue ...] (AE 1987, 259f). C II 1190 = CIDER 77* (Hispalis): at LL.5–6 of this corrupt inscription, *in ludis Hispal(ensibus)*, if correct, refers to local gladiatorial schools rather than to the production of a show. *C IV 2476 = ST 33 = Fora 58* (Pompeii): this is not a poster announcing a show. *C IV 6900 = ST 62 = Fora 88* (Pompeii): included by Sabbatini “[s]oltanto per scrupulo di documentazione” (ST ad loc.). *C XII 3290* (Nemausus): *curator lud[i] (“curator of the gladiatorial school”) rather than *curator lud[orum]*. *C XIV 1* (Ostia): the games are Roman, not municipal.

For the record, note that our reading of the following inscriptions was (hopefully) improved over earlier editions: nos. 30, 36, 69, 133, 134, 165, 172, 186, 194, 220, 282, 286, 391, 451 and 452.
Legal measures

1. **C I 590 + p.833 + p.915; Bruns 27; ILS 6086; FIRA I 18; RomSt 15.** Bronze tablet: the *lex Tarentina*, from *Tarentum* (Regio II), col. I, L.32–38.


2. **C II 5439 + p.1038; Bruns 28; ILS 6087; FIRA I 21; CIDER 27; RomSt 25; C II 5, 1022 (apparret atque extat legem Tiberio vel potius Claudio imperante in aes incisam esse).** Bronze tablets: the *Lex coloniae Genetiuae*, from *Urso* in Baetica, §§ LXVI, LXX, LXXI, CXXVIII, CXXIV.

LXVI. ... Eis/que pontificib. auguribusque ludis, quo publice ma[g]istratus facient, et cum ei pontific(es) augures sa/cra publica c(oloniae) G(enetiuae) I(uliae) facient, togas praetextas habent/di ius potestasq. esto. Esque pontificib. augurig. ludos gladiatoresq. inter decuriones spectalre ius potester esto.

LXX. II uiri quicu[m] quorum erunt, ei praeter qui primi / post h(anc) l(egem) [fa]cti erunt, ei in suo magistratu munus ludosue scaenicos Iou[ii] Iunoni Mineruae deis /9 deabusq. quadriduom m(aiores) p(arte) censuerunt, quot eius fieri poterit, arbitratu decurionum faciunt / to inque ei ludis coeque munere unusquisque /12 quo eorum de sua pecunia ne minus HS (2000) / consommato et ex pecunia publica in sing(ulos) / II uir(os) d(um)x(at) HS (2000) sumere consumere licet, ei`/15 que eis s[ine] f(raude) s(ua) facere licet, dum ne quis ex ea / pecun(ia) sumat neu adtributionem faciat, / quam pecuniam h(ac) l(egem) ad ea sacra, quae in co/18 lon(ia) aliue quo loco publicae fient, dare / adtribu[i] oportebit... *vacat* / ...

LXXI. Aediles quicumq. erunt in suo mag. munus lu/dosue scaenicos Iou[ii] Iunoni Mineruae tri/dum maiore parte diet, quot eius fieri poterit, et unum diem in circo aut in foro Veneri /24 faciunt, inque ei ludis coeque munere unusquisque corum de sua pecunia ne minus HS (2000) / consommato de quae publico in sing(ulos) aediles HS (1000) /27 sumere licet, eamq. pecuniam II uir praef(ectus) /ue` / danum adtribuendum curanto itque iis / s. f. s. c(apere) licet. *vacat* / ...

CXXVIII. II`uirae aed(illis) praef(ectus) c. G. I. quicumque erit, is suo quoque anno ma[g]istratu / imperioq. faciunt curato, quod eius fieri poterit, u(ti) `qu(uo)d` r(ecte) f(actum) `e(sse)` u(olet) s(ine) d(olo) m(alo) ma[g]istratu ad fana templa delubra, que /15 ad modum decuriones censurersunt, suo qu'o/'que anno fiant e`i qu[e] d. d. suo quoque anno / ludos circenses, sacrif[i]cia puluinariaque /18 facienda carent, que [a]d modum quitquit de iiis / rebus, ma[g]i striis creandis, [lu]dis circensibus facien/dis, sacrif[i]ciis procul(r)andis, puluinariibus fa/21ci-
endis decuriones statuerint decreuerint, ea omnia fiant. …

CXXXIV. Ne quis Iluir aedil(is) praefectus c. G. quicumque erit, post / h(anc) l(egem) ad decuriones c. G. referto neue decuriones consu44lito … … quo cui pecunia publica a[l]iue /46 quid honoris habendi causa numerusue [and pol]licendi “proue” statua danda ponenda detur do[netur ---] /w-----

3 GONZÁLEZ 1986; AE 1986, 333. Bronze tablets probably engraved in A.D. 91: the Lex Irnitana, from Irni in Baetica, § LXXVII.

21 R(ubrica): De inspensis in sacra ludos cenasque faciendas. / Duumuirii, qui in eo municipio iure dicundo praeerunt, / primo quoque tempore ad decuriones conscriptosue/24ferentum quantum in inspensas sacrorum ludorum et quantum / in cenas, quae municipibus aut decurionibus conscriptis/ue communibus /46eroge[n] tur, quantumque mai/or pars eorum censuerit, tantum eroganto uti quod / recte factum esse volent. vacat


LL.13–18 Legebatur etiam nunc apat nos oratio, sed ubi rumor delatum est qu(a)estus lanistarum recisos, fis/14cum omnem illam pecuniam quasi contaminatam reliquisse, statim sacerdotes fidelissimarum Galliarum uestrarum /15concursare, gaudere, inter se loqui. vacat/16 Erat aliquis qui deploraverit fortunas suas creatus sacerdos, qui auxilium sibi in prouocatione ad principes facta constituerat. Sed /17ibidem ipse primus et de consilio amicorum: “Quid mihi iam cum appellazione? Omne onus quod patrimonium meum opprimebat sanctissimi imperatoris remiserunt. iam sacerdos esse et cupio et opto et editionem munen, quam olim detestabamur, amplector.” vacat

LL.29–37 vacat Itaque censeo uti munera quae assiforana appellantur in sua forma maneant nec egrediantur sumptu HS XXX (m.); qui autem supra HS XXVL (m.) ad LX (m.) usque munus edent, is gladiatores triperito praebentur numero pari: summum pre31tium sit primae parti quinque milia, secundae quattuor milia, tertiae tria milia; a HS LX (m.) ad C (m.) usque trifariam coetus gladiator(um) diuisus /32sit: primi ordinis gladiatoris summum pretium sit VIII (m.), mediae classis VI (m.), deinde quinque; porro a centum milibus ad CL (m.) quinque sint mani/33puli, cuius primi pretium sit XII (m.), secundi X (m.), terti VIII (m.), quarti VI (m.), postremo quinque; iam hinc porro a CL (m) ad CC (m.) et quidquid supra susum uers[um] /34erit, infimi gladiatoris pretium sit VI (m.), super eum VII (m.), terti retro VIIIIL (m.), quarti XII (m.) adusque XV (m.); – et haec sit summum ac “p o’ streo” gladiatori def[5] nta quantitas. Utique in omnibus munibus quae generatim distincta sunt lanista dimidiam copiam uniuersi numeri promisqu(a)e multimtu36dinis praebat exque his qui gregari appellantur qui melior inter tales erit duobus milibus sub signo pugnet, nec quisquam ex eo numero /37mille nummum minore.

LL.46–53 De pretis autem gladiatororum opseruari paulo ante censui secundum praescrip47tum diuinae orationis, sed ut ea pretia ad eas ciuitates pertinea n’t in quibus ampliora gladiatorum pretia flagrabant. Quod si
quibus ciuitatibus res publica tenuior est, non eadem seruentur quae ap[ut] fortiores ciuitates scripta sunt; nec supra modum uirium onerent, sed hactenus in eundem; ut qu(a)e in publicis priuatisque rationibus repperientur pretia summa ac media ac postrema, si q(u)i[dem] prouinciarum eae ciuitates sunt, ab eo qui praesidebit prouinciae opseruentur, ceterarum autem iuridico uel curatore uel iuris prouinciae praefecto uel procuratori maxumorum principum uel cuiusque ciuitatis potestas qu(a)e ibi prima erit. Atque ita rati(n)ibus decem retrouersum annorum inspectis, exemplis munerum in quaque ciuitate edito<res> erunt consideratis, const(i)tua(r)e uerum ab eo cuius arbitrus erit de tribus pretis; uel, si melius ei uidebitur, ex eo modo quem peraequ[e] fi[er]i lic'e'bi't trifariam pretia diducantur; eaque forma etiam in posterum seruetur ...

Regio I Latium

5 Anagnia: C X 5928; ILS 6264; EAOR IV 42 (Base marmorea. III sec. d.C., non oltre la metà).

P. Vegelio P. f. Pub. Primo, / eq(uiti) R(omano), II uir(o), q(uaestori) al[i]m(entorum), cur(atori) pec(uniae) annon(ariae), q. aera(ar)i arcae pu/b., cur. r(ei) p. Trebanorum, ex/semplis munif[i]cientiae sua optime merenti, collegius luuenum patrono dignissimo / ob renouatam ab eo luue9num, quod uetustate temporum / fuerat oblitteratum, ob quam hon/oris huius oblationem, die natalis sui / kal. Oct. / <---?.


----- / [II uir(o)?], q(uaestori) p(ecuniae) p., / [cur(atori)? muner(is) glad(iatorii), /3 [Casina]tes / [aere col]lato / [ob mer]ita / <---?

9 Circeii: C X 6429; Fora 20; EAOR IV 45 (Perduta al tempo del CIL. Irreperibile. Datazione incerta ma verosimilmente posteriore allo scavo del porto-canal, comunemente ritenuto di età neroniana). L.1: M O; L.2: JNLM MS.

[---]s Montanus, IIII uir i. d. m(unicipio?) C(irciciensium?) / [---]neum amphitheatrum sua /3 [pecunia fecit id]emque munere gladiatorio / [---] et uenatione dedicauit. L. d. d. d.

10 Cora: C X 6512 (LL.3, 5: videntur initio praenomina excidisse).

Magistri Ment(is) / signum dant: /3 [-] Furius S F VIR, / Q. Vibius Q. l. SABB, / [-] Pollius L. l. Hilar[us], /6 R O Publil(ius), L. Publilius Pompon(ius) / ludos sacra(m) fecer(unt). / Locus ex s. c. datus.
11 **Formiae**: C X 6090; *ILS* 6295; Fora 16; *EAOR* IV 20 (Iscrizione rinvenuta a Gaeta, ma da attribuire probabilmente a Formiae. Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. Irreperibile. È stata Adriana inoltrata).

L. Villio C. f. Tromen. / Atilianio, praef(ecto) fabr(um), / praef. coh(ortis), trib(uno) mili(itum), / proc(uratori) Aug(usti), patron(o) colon(iae), / qui rogatus ab ordine pari/6ter et populo gladiatori / muneris publici curam / susciperet, fecit et, explícito 9 quod promiserat, inpendium / bigae, quam populus ex collazione / legatiui epuli offerebat, remisit /12 eo anno quo et optimus Imperator / Hadrianus Augustus etiam / duuumuiratus honorem suscepit. /15 L. Stertinius L. lib. Parthenopaeus / amico incomparabili. / L. d. d. d.

12 **Formiae**: *AE* 1927, 124; Fora 17; *EAOR* IV 31 (Base di calcare. II sec. d.C.).

C. Clodio Hilaro, / bisellario / cui ordo conscript(orum) / ornamenta decur(ionalia) dedit, / quod is ob honor(em) bisellii 6 HS XXV (m.) rei p. obtulerit, ex quib. / familia glad(iatoria) ex postulatu / uniuerso(um) per ipsum edita est, / ad cuius inspensas insuper / uniuersa plebs ad ampliandam / muneris eius famam / optulit 1 insuper HS XXV (m.) n.; / ordo Augustal(ium) pec(unia) sua; / ob cuius dedic(ationem) pautit in Capitol(io) pane et unio promiscue posito / et dedit sportulas / dec(urionib.), August(alib.), regal(ib.) sin-g(ulis) quin. / L. d. d. d.

13 **Fundi**: C X 6240; Fora 19; *EAOR* IV 21 (Base di calcare. Seconda metà II sec. d.C.).

L. Runtio L. f. Aem. / Gemello, / aed ili q(uinquini), / curam muner(is) / splendide administrauerit, / Fundani aere conlati. / L. d. d. d. / Fun(dulectores) sunt ++ functi sunt +[--- / ---]+++[---] / ------?

14 **Fundi**: C X 6243; Fora 18; *EAOR* IV 33 (Perduta già al tempo del *CIL*. A partire dall’età traianea e non oltre la metà del III sec. d.C.). L.10: p(ublice)?

M. Vlpio M. f. / Aem. Natali, / aed(ili), q(uaestori) alim(entorum). / Hic ad declaranldam ordi-n(is) dec(urionum) / et populi beniuolentiam!, oblaltam sibi ob edi/9tionem mune/ris p(ublici) statuam, / d. d. s(olo) p(ublico)?

15 **Gabii**: C XIV 2794. A.D. 51/54.


16 **Gabii**: C XIV 2804 (Basis marmorea); *ILS* 6218. A.D. 139/161.

Agusiae T. f. Priscillae, / sacerdoti Spei et Salutis Aug., /Gabini statuam publice

po/nendam curaerunt quod post / inspensas exemplo iunstrium feminar(um) fac tas, ob sacerdotium etiam

opus portic(um) / Spei utuutateuxatrum pecunia sua refectu ram pro pro / salute principis Antonini Aug. Pi / patris patriae liberorumque eius, / eximio ludorum spectaculo edito, /12 religioni,

ueste donata / uniuersis, satis fecerit; / cuius statuae honor contenta /15 inspensam populo remiserit. / L. d. d. d.
17 Lanuvium: C XIV 2118 (Marmor. L.l: fuerit F potius quam L, cum Flaccus cognomen parum conveniat libertino). In fact, Flaccus is not uncommon among freedmen, and a freedman is more likely in the present context. Late Republican or early Imperial.


18 Lanuvium: C XIV 2121; ILS 5683; Fora 5; EAOR IV 27 (Irreperibile. Età augustea).

M. Valerio M. f., aed(ili), dict(atori), /3 praef(ecto) iuuentutis, / municipes compitenses uel corum, quod specus /6 passus (3000) purguit refeci, / fistulas reposuit, balnea uirilia / utraque et muliebre de sua / pecunia refeci, populo uiserati(onem), / gladiatores dedit, lumina, ludos / I(unonii) S(ospiti) M(atri) R(eginae) solus fecit.

19 Lanuvium: C XIV 2114; ILS 6201; Fora 6; EAOR IV 25 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà II/primà metà III sec. d.C.). On the date cf. n.402.

D. --]cirio D. f. Pal. / Auspicato, aed(ili), /6 praef(ecto) municiipes, / curiales / curia Flamonal(is), / ob merita eius.

20 Lavinium: C XIV 2080; ILS 6186; Fora 4; EAOR IV 35 (Base marmorea. Non anteriori al IV/V sec. d.C.).

Valerio Frume/ntio, u. p., patro/3 no et defe(n)sori /3 habitatori cibitatis, qui pos' multum /6 temporis aeditio/nem' debotionis / renobabit' et iteI 9 rabit', pro meri/tu' munific(e)te su(a)e ordo cibes-/12que! Laurentum / LL(auinatium).

21 Minturnae: AE 1934, 253; ILL 727; C I 2687. Late Republican.

[--], Pist[u]s Gemini [- s.], / vacat / Philargurus Li[cou? - s.], / Stabilio Trebi [- s.], / vacat /5

Alexsander Ca[- s.], / Anteros Rusti [- s.], / Philargurus Cl[-c.2-] P. s., / vacat / Chilo Caecili [- s.], / L.

Heluidius L. I. M[--], /10 Philemopus M[--] Q. s. / isdemque lu[dos] / fecer(unt) scaen[icos].

22 Minturnae: C X 6012; ILS 5062; Fora 15; EAOR IV 34 (Andò perduta subito dopo [il 1787]). JACQUES 1984 pp.403–4. L.9: the four works cited here restitute [sp]e[n]didiss(imum), which demands a temerarious and unwarranted correction of the MS; moreover, it adds too many letters to the line. A.D. 249.

P. Baebio P. f. / Ter. Iusto. Huic /3 splendidiss(imus) ordo / stat(uam) ponend(am) cens(uit), / omnib. / honorib. in re publ. funct(o), / quod et in sing(ulos) et uniuers(os) / eaeual(em) semp(ér) reuerentiam / praebuit, et quod munus glad(iatorum) post /9 honor(em) II ur(iatus) edidiss(et), postul(ante) populo qu(ando?) / process(us) editio celebrata est, / ex indulg(entia) paria tria cum ursis 'et' /12 herban(is) liuent' materper. Is / ob / dedic(ationem) statuae dec(urionib.) sing(ulis) X tern(os) ded(it). / [L.] d. d. d. / Hic Minturnis diebus IIII / edidit paria XI, /3 ex his occid(it) gla(diatores) / prim(arios) vel -ores) Camp(aniae vel -anos) XI, ur/sos quoque / crude(les) / occid(it) X. Quod ipsi / meminist(is), ciues / optimi, herban(os) / uniuers(os) in dies / sing(ulos) occidit / quaternos. / Ded(icata) kal. Aug., Aemiliiano II et / Aquilino cos.

23 Ostia: C XIV 375 + p.482; ILS 6147; C I 3031a. Augustan (cf. MEIGGS 1973 pp.493–502, who rightly does not assume that the bellum navalis, probably the war against Sex. Pompeius in 38–36 B.C., occupied


24 Ostia: *C XIV* 4693 (Fragmentum tabulae marmoreae). L.3: *HS* (l^2) 1. 1st c.

------ / --- testamen[o --- / ---] colonis [---/3 --- HS ([50,000 vel 100,000]) ad ludos [---? / ---]+M vacat / -------?


Cn. Sentio Cn. fil. / Cn. n. Ter. Felici, /3 dec(urionum) decr(eto) aedilicio adl(ecto), d. d. d(ecurionum) adl., / q(uaestori) a(erarii) Ostiens(ium), Il uir(o), q. luuenum, / .../9 ... patrono .../15 ... libertor(um) et seruor. publicor. et olearior. et luuen(um) / cisianor. et ueteranor. Aug(usti), item beneficiarior. proc(uratoris) / Aug(usti) et piscator. propolar.; curatorii lusus luuenalis. /18 Cn. Sentius Lucilius / Gamala Clodianus f(ilius), / patri indulgentissimo.


... /4 [Il uir(i) I] q.q. c(ensoriae) p(otestate) A. Egrilius Agricola, p(atronus) p(erp.) c(oloniae), D. Nonius Pomplian(us), p. p. c. / [---? P.?] A[ufius Fortis, p. p. c., ob dedicatione(m) statuarum argent(earum) /6 [Ho]noris et Virtutis ludos per triduum sua pec(unia) edidit. / ... /14 Il uir(i) ---s, M. Iulius Seuer[u]s, /15 ---us ob dedicationem basil(ice) / --- quam pec(unia) sua ex(s)truxit famili[am / gladiat/oriam] cum uenatoino]e legitima edidit, in qua [---?/18 --- fu]erunt duo; praeterea statu[as / dedic(auit) Genii et Fort(unae) po]puli Ostiensis, quas pos(uit) s(uam) p(ecunia) in [foro / ex u(oto) s(uscepto) ---ji pr. k. Iunias, Iuliano et Tor[q]uato cos.]. / ... /18

27 Ostia: *InsIt* XIII fr.XXXIX; VIDMAN 1982 fr.Qa; Fora 1; *EAOR* IV 15. *Fasti Ostienses*, A.D. 152.

... /14 Il uir(i) ---s, M. Iulius Seuer[u]s, /15 ---us ob dedicationem basil(ice) / --- quam pec(unia) sua ex(s)truxit famili[am / gladiat/oriam] cum uenatoino]e legitima edidit, in qua [---?/18 --- fu]erunt duo; praeterea statu[as / dedic(auit) Genii et Fort(unae) po]puli Ostiensis, quas pos(uit) s(uam) p(ecunia) in [foro / ex u(oto) s(uscepto) ---ji pr. k. Iunias, Iuliano et Tor[q]uato cos.]. / ... /18


29 Ostia: a: C XIV 4642 (Tabula marmorea marginata). b: C XIV 353; ILS 6148 + add. 2nd half of 2nd c.
   dec(urioni) ad[e]ct(o), / [flam(iini)] diui H[adriani]ni in cuius sacerdotio solus ac primus lud(os) / scaenici(os) sua
   p(ecunia) fecit, aedili. Hunc splendidissimus ordo dec(urionum) / fun(eris) pub(lus) via hon(orum) rauuit ...

   ---[--- H]ostilian(o / --- II u]ir(o), q(uae)stori) aerar[i] Ostiensium, flam(ini) d. d., cur(a)tori
   lusus luuenal(is), [---] qui primus om[niu]m ab urbe condita ludos cum [--- edidit item noxeos quattuor] et
   mulieres [a]d ferrum dedit, una cum [--- Sabina u]xor fecit sibi et [---]ni Agon[--- / ---]orporis
togat(is)/ --- / VM+++ / ---7

   P. Lucilio P. [F.] / P. n. P. pron. Gamala[e], e[ae(dii)]i (is) Volcani, / eiusdem pr(aetori) ter-
   tt(io), dec(urioni) / adlecto d. d. infantii, / II uir(o), praefecto L. Caesar. / Aug. f. cens(oria potestate), q(uae)stori)
a(erarii), pontif(ici), / tabular(um) et librorum / curatori primo constitut(o). / Hic ludos omnes quos fecit / amplificavit impensa sua, / idem minus gladiatorium ded(it), / idem aedem Castoris et Pollucis rest(ituit), / ...
   ... / Huic statua aenea peq(unia) pub. d. d. posit(a) / est, +++[---] / ----7

32 Praeneste: C XIV 3015; ILS 6256; Fora 7; E4OR IV 19 (Lastra marmorea. Età augustea). L.6: HS (d)I(d)j.
   L. Vruineio L. I. Philomusio, / mag(istro) conl(egii) libert(inorum), / publice sepulturae et statuae
   in foro locus / datum est quod is testamentum suo lauationem populo gratis / per triennium gladiatorumque paria X
   et Fortunae Primig(eniae) / coronam auream p(ondo) I dari, idemque ludos ex HS (40,000) per dies V fieri
   iussit. / Philippus l. monumentum de suo fecit.

33 Praeneste: C XIV 3011; Fora 11; E4OR IV 22 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà II sec. d.C., in base alla funzione di cura tor muneris). On the date cf. n.402.

34 Praeneste: C XIV 3014; ILS 6252; Fora 19; E4OR IV 23 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C., per la presenza della funzione di curator mun eris publici).
   cu / rarumque suarum plenissimo / munificentiae studio uluptati. / et utilitatis populi plurima / contulerit,
   ludum etiam gladiatori et spoliarii (ium) solo empto / sua pecunia exstructum publice op / / tulerit; / cuius
   meritis postulante populo / statuam publice ponit placuit d. d.
35 Praeneste: C XIV 2991; Fora 9; EAOR IV 32 (Base marmorea. Fine II/metà III sec. d.C.).
   A. Munio A. fil. / Men. Euaristo, / omnibus honoribus / nitide functo, ob insignem eius editionem / munus bidui, populo / postulante bigam, placuit 
aequestri statua / decreto ordinis eum / ornari. / L. d. d. d.

36 Praeneste: AE 1987, 230; Fora 8; EAOR IV 30 (Base marmorea. Tra la seconda metà del II e la
   prima metà del III sec. d.C.). L.3: s(ortilego)? L.10: singul(ari) feras has puzzled scholars, but one should read
die ... singul(ari) as one unit and translate LL.9-11 thus: “during an exceptional day of lusio, that is, of
matching [scil. pairs of gladiators], he produced wild beasts together with pairs of gladiators”.

37 Praeneste: C XIV 2972; ILS 6253; Fora 12; Album 291; EAOR IV 24 (Base di marmo modanata).
   A.D. 243.

38 Privernum: AE 1974, 228 (Base de calcaire). A.D. 137.

39 Sinuessa: C X 4727; C 1578 + p.1009; ILS 6297; ILL 667; Fora 124 (Età augustea).

40 Suessa Auruncia: C X 4760 (Basis litteris pulchris); ILS 6296; Sherk 45; Fora 125. JACQUES
   1984 pp.402-3. L.8: one should perhaps understand (et) diem priuatum; 2nd inscription L.15: one would expect
diei. A.D. 193.
Suessa habuit et ut aquae /² digitus in domo eius fluereret cum/modisque publicis ac si decurio fru/eretur, et Titio Chresimo filio eius /⁵ ob merita patris honorem decuriona/tus gratuitum decreuit. / Ordo decurionum et Augus-talium /⁶ et plebs uniuersa. /  


41  

Tarracina: C X 8260; _ILS_ 5051.  
C. Paccius C. f. [---] / X uir ad hastam, [---] / ludos Honoris et Virtutis² recit. / C. Paccius C. I.  

42  

Tusculum: C XIV 2623. Early imperial.  
(a) [--- C.? Cae]lius C. f. Ru�us? --- / --- circa eam aream [---] (b) [---]M et [--- / ---] et L[---] (c)  
[---]ea emissarium [--- / ---] lapide Tiburtino [---] (d-f) [---]tur et gradus circa eam aream [--- / ---] vocat lapide  
Tiburtino cum[---] (g) [---]locanda [--- / --- pro l]udis [---]  

43  

Tusculum: C XIV 2592; _EAOR_ IV 37 (Epistilio marmoreo). A.D. 32/33.  
V, imp. VIII, /³ [---] L. Priscus filius, curator lusus _luuenalis_.  

44  

Ulubrae (?): _AE_ 1995, 291 (plaque de marbre blanc). LL.1-2: possibly the same man as in _AE_ 1985, 55. The expression _pro ludis_ argues for a date in the 1st half of the 1st c.; so does the disposition of the text into short lines.  
[- D]omitius / [E]urus? /⁴ [---]ON VI uir / [pro l]ud(is) HS II (m.) / [n. d]edit /⁶ [---]+o  
Fortunato / II uir(is) / [---] Norbano.  

45  

M. Ofasius / Firmus Marus /³ Cornelius Mari f. / Clu. Cossinus, / praefectus fabrum, /⁶ tribunus militum / leg(ionis) XIII Gemin(ae) Victric(is), / curator lusus luuen(um), /⁹ II uir, patronus colon(iae), /  
Fortunis Antiatibus / d(on)o d(edit).  

46  

Dd. nn. Valentiniano et Valente senper¹ Augg. / Lol(lius) Cyrius, princi(palis) curiae) et [er]itor³ duodena de prop[r]io suo /³ uetustatem¹ conlapsum at¹ statum pristinum red(ux(it)] / amphit(h)eatrum cum  
pol[r]lis posticiis et omnem fabric[am] / aren(ae); nepus¹ Lol(lii) Cyri princi. cur. et ante eretoris¹, filius [Lol(li)] /⁶ Claudi princi. et patroni curiae, pronepos Messi Gorgotis / princ. Filiciter¹!
Regio I Campania

47 **Abella:** C X 1211 (Basis. In latere [sin.]: duo gladiatorum pugnantes, quorum alter cecidit; in latere [dex.]: infra [inscr.] amphitheatrum exhibetur, cuius apparent gradus, fenestrae, portae; intus gladiatorum duo pugnantes repraesentantur); *ILS* 5058; Fora 111. A.D. 170.


48 **Acerrae:** C X 3759 (Descripsi[t Mommsen] et recognovi[t]); *ILS* 6340. 1st half of 3rd c.

49 **Pompeii ⇒ Atella:** C IV 9968a; ST 81 (Iscrizione dipinta; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 107. Not after A.D. 79.

50 **Caiatia:** C X 4588; H. Solin ed., *Le iscrizioni antiche di Trebula, Caiatia e Cubulteria*, Caserta 1993, 48; Fora 122 (Datazione: ?). L4: *curatori muneris?*?

51 **Pompeii ⇒ Cales?:** C IV 9977; ST 82 (*Edictum* dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 108. Not after A.D. 79.


53 **Capua:** a: *AE* 1952, 55; *ILL* 708 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); C I 2 2944. b: C I 2 2945. A second copy of the same text, but lacking the last four lines. 108 B.C.

a L. Quincti(us) L. f. Gela(---), L. Lu(u)enti(us) L. f. Ruff(us), / C. Tittius C. f., C. Heluius N. f., /³ L.

54 Capua: C X 3776; C I 675 + p.931; ILS 3185; ILL 709 (Tabula). L.9: COF. b: C X 3777; C I 676 + p.931: same text, but fragmentary. 108 B.C.

55 Capua: C X 3779; C I 677 + p.932; ILS 3340; ILL 714. 106 B.C.

56 Capua: C X 3778; C I 678 + p.932; ILS 3397; ILL 715 (Tabula). 106 B.C.

57 Capua: AE 1958, 267; ILL 712 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); C I 2947. 105 B.C.

58 Capua: AE 1952, 54; ILL 711 (Tabula calcaria); C I 2946. Before 94 B.C., but probably between 108–105, when other sections of the theatre were being built; cf. DEGRASSI, ILL ad loc.
gradusque / [---] refecerunt, loedos fecerunt, /9 [--] cos.

59  Capua: ILL 713 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); C¹ 2506 + p.932. Probably 108/105 B.C., on which date cf. no. 58.

(pag. sin.) [-4 lll- / ---] Epic(adeus²), /6 [---]cl(---), / (pag. dex.) Q. Annius Q. l. Fe[---], / P. Buei-
lius T. l. [--], / P. Messius Q. l. [--], / C. Lusius C. l. [--], / P. Ouius P. l. Plut(us), /6 C. Antonius C. l. [--]: /
(infra) [heisce magistreis --- tr(eib(unal), / cuni(u)m)¹ muliereb(us¹ --- /9 ---] ludosq. fecerun[t --- / ---]o cos.

60  Capua: C X 3772; C¹ 682 + p.933; ILS 6302; ILL 719 (Basis quadrata sesquipedalis). L.¹: A. Q.;
L.8: LUXOS. 94 B.C.

Pagus Herculanus sciuit a. 'd. X Termina[iia]: / conlegium seiue magistrei louei compagei
s[unt] /3 utei in porticum paganam reficiendam / pequiam consumerent ex lege pagana / arbitratu Cn. Laetori
Cn. f. magistrei /6 pagei¹ei] uteique ei conlegio seiue magistri / sunt louei Compagei locus in teatro / esset
tamqua(m) sei {sei} lu'd(os fecissent. /9 L. Augustius L. l. Strato, C. Antonius M. l. / Nico, Cn. Auius Cn. l.
Agathocles, C. Blossi(us) / M. I. Protemus, M. Ramniius P. l. Diopant(us), /12 T. Sulpicius P. Q. pu(pi) l., Q.
Nouius Q. I. Protem(us), / M. Paccius M. l. Philem(o), M. Licculeius M. l. / Philin(us), Cn. Hordeonius Cn. I.
Cn. f. Ahenobarb(o) cos.

61  Pompeii ⇒ Capua: AE 1990, 177b (Zone de la Porte de Nocera); Fora 109. Not after A.D. 79.

Glad(iatorum) par(ia) XL P. Furi et L. R[---]amnii² pug nabunt / Capuis d(ie) eid. (sc. Ianuar.³)
X, IX k. Februar.; uela et /3 rac(--e) erunt / aqua[---]CSC[---]RIPE[---].

62  Capua: C X 3925 (Litteris maximis); Fora 121 (Datazione: ?).

L. Vettius Tribunus [---?] / a[---]luaet P[---]emus /3 munus gladiato(r)um edidit², / idem
populo Ca[mpano] / modios bins des[dit].

63  Pompeii ⇒ Cumae: C IV 9983a; ST 79 (Edictum munere dipint); fuori porta Nocera); Fora 105.
Not after A.D. 79.

Cumis gl(adiatorum) par(a)ria) XX / [et eorum] suppos[itici pu]gn(abunt) k. Oct., III, pr. n[onas
Ocot.;] /3 cruciarii, uen(atio) et uela er(unt).

64  Pompeii ⇒ Cumae: C IV 9976; ST 80 (Iscrizione dipinta; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 106. Not after
A.D. 79.

Glad(iatorum) pa[r(iia) --- pugn(abunt)] Cum(is) / a. d. XV, [XIV.] XIII k. Iunias /3 [---]XIC / D
[---] / MV[---].

65  Cumae (?); C X 3702 + p.1010 (Litteris saec. III). Probably not later than the 1st half of the 3rd c.
because of the mention of the tribe.

----- / [ob editionem] munere huic posita est / ---? / ---] conse(n)su dec(urionum) biga in fo[ro ---
/3 et locus sepultur[a]e p(ublice) dat(us) d. d. et Anton[iae --- / ---] et] suis et Octauiae Val[--- / ---] Q. Octauius
242 ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS


66 Pompeii ⇒ Forum Popilii: AE 1990, 177 c (Zone de la Porte de Nocera); Fora 110. Not after A.D. 79.

Glad(iatorum) par(ia) XXIII et uenatio pug(nabunt) / in Falerno Foro Popilii LL. Atiliorum /3 (a.)
d. XIII, XII, XI, X k. Iuni.

67 Herculaneum: AE 1947, 53 (Base ayant le caractère d’un hotel); Sherk 28; AE 1976, 144 (Le texte date du début du Ier s. p. Chr.). M. Nonius Bassus was tribune of the plebs in 36 B.C. (cf. Dio 50.2.2).

[Qu]od M. Ofillius Celer, II uir iter(um), u(erba) f(ecit): Pertinere at' municipi / dignitatem

meritis M. Noni Balbi respondere, d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt). /3 [Cu]m M. Nonius Balbus quo hac1 uixerit

parentis animum cum plurima liberalit(æ) / singulis uniuersisque prais‘t‘iterat, placere decurionibus statuum

pr(aetori) proco(n)s(uli), patrono, uniuersus /6 ordo populi Herculaniessi1 ob merita eius”; item eo loco quo

cineres eius conlecti sunt, aram / marmoream fieri et constitui inscribique publice: “M. Nonio M. f. Balbo”;

exque eo loco Parentalibu(s) / pompam duci ludisque gumnicis! qui soliti erant fieri diem adici unum in

honorem eius et cum in theatro /9 ludi fient sellam eius pon. C(ensuerunt).

68 Herculaneum: C X 1453; ILS 5616; Sherk 27. Known from two 16th c. MSs; line division is uncertain. Not after A.D. 79.

Prid. kal. Martias in curia; scribendo adfuerunt cuncti. Quod uerba facta sunt MM. Remmios

Rufos patr(em) et fil(ium) II uir(os) iter(um) ex sua pequnia pondera et chalcidicum et scholam secundum

municipii splendorem fecisse, quae tueri publice deceret, d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerent): Placerre huic ordini, cum

MM. Remmi pat(er) et fil(ius) II uir(i) iter(um) in edendis muneribus adeo Iiberales fuerint, ut eorum monu-

menta decori municipio sint … … et MM. Remmis Rufis patri et fil(io) publice gratias agei, quod iterationem

honoris eorum ambitio neque iactationi suae dederint sed in cultum municipi et decorum contulerint.

69 Pompeii ⇒ Herculaneum: C IV 9969; ST 77 (Editicum dipinto, fuori porta Nocera); AE 1992, 270;

Fora 103. ANGELONE 1989–90 pp.220–22 reads Puteo[lis] ... pugn. Herculani /e/ (“Herculanei [i.e. gladiators

from Herculaneum] will fight in Puteoli”), but the locative usually follows pugn., and by its importance Puteoli

was probably more capable than Herculaneum to sustain prestigious gladiators (for prestige probably explains

why the gladiators were qualified as they were). A.D. 14/29.

Puteo[liani ---] V [id]us Dec. / pugn(abunt) Herculanei pro sal[lute Cae]sarum et Liuiae Aug(us-
tae); uela erunt. / Iole sal(ue)!

70 Herculaneum: C IV 10579; ANGELONE 1989–90 pp.219–20 (Peristilio [della casa dell’«Atrio

Corinzio»]; annotation graffita); Fora 112. Not after A.D. 79.

VIII k. Martias / Numisii Genialis /3 gladiatorum paria X / Herculani.


/18... et ad cepotaphium meum quodannis die Parentaliorum / luctatorib. paribus decem in eo loco

victoribus sing(ulis) HS VIII / superatis sing(ulis) HS III n., oleum HS XVI n., uernis HS LX n., conducto/21ri
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

harenae HS VIII n. ...

71 Neapolis: EE VIII 340 (Tabula marmorea); Fora 115 (Orientativamente fine II/III sec. d.C.).

D. M. / C. Aeclani / Fortunati, / decurioni Aeclanensis, II uir(o) / munerari(o) spl(en)dido, uixit
nannis / XXXV, men(sib.) XI, d(ie) I. / Aeclanius Iouanus, / libertus.

72 Neapolis: C X 1491; ILS 6456; Fora 113 (II/primà metà III sec. d.C.). Known from MSs.

C. Herbacio Maec. / Romano, demar(3)chisanti, II uir(o) ali/mentorum quaest(ori), / cur(atori)
sacrae pecun(iae), / cur. II frum(ento) compar(ando), / se uibo / qui ob promiss(amo) uenat(ionem) / phetris / diuisit qui/na mil. num.

73 Pompeii ⇒ Nola: a: C IV 3881 + p.462; ST 69 (Iscrizione dipinta a lettere rosse; fuori porta
Nocera. Probabilmente di primissima età imperiale); Fora 95. b: C IV 1187 + p.204 + p.462; ST 70 (Iscrizione
dipinta; fuori porta Ercolano); Fora 96 (Età augustea?).

a Glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX Q. Monni / Rufi pug nabunt) Nola(e) k. Mais, VI, / V nonas Maias et /
uenatio erit.

b [G]lad. par. X[X² Q. Monni²?] / Rufi pug. MALA + [--- VJI], V nonas M[aiai? ---] / et uenatio e[rit].

74 Pompeii ⇒ Nola: C IV 10236–10238; ST 71 (Iscrizione [e] raffigurazioni graffite: resoconto di
uno spettacolo; fuori porta Nocera); AE 1985, 280; Fora 97. Not after A.D. 79.

Munus Nolae de / quadriduo / M. Comini / Heredi(s).

M. Attilius, t(iro), u(icit); Hilarus Ner(onianus), XIV (sc. pugnarum), (coronarum) XIII, m(issus).

/ M. Attilius, I, (cor.) I, u.; L. Raecius Felix, XII, (cor.) XII, m. / Princeps Ner., XII, (cor.) XII, u.; Creunus,
VII, (cor.) V, m.

75 Pompeii ⇒ Nola: C IV 9978; ST 72 (Edictum dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 98. Not after
A.D. 79.

[--- glad(iatorum) par(ia) --- pugn(abunt) Nolae XIII, XIII, XII k. [---] / uno die li[beri vel -berti,
/poste]ro serui ferro s[anguinari iussi ---].

76 Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: C IV 3882; ILS 5146; ST 63 (Iscrizione dipinta a lettere rosse; fuori porta
Nocera. Prima metà del I sec. d.C.); Fora 89.

Numini / Augusti / glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX et uenatio Sta(ti)? Pompei, flaminis / Augustalis
pugnab(unt) Constant(iae) Nucer(iae) III, pr. non., / nonis, VIII eiidus Maias. / Nuceroni officia mea certo index.

77 Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: C IV 9972; ST 64 (Edictum dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 90. Not after
A.D. 79.

Glad(iatorum) par(ia) XXXVI pugnabunt Nucer[a]/ Constantia pr. k. et k., VI, V non. [---].

78 Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: C IV 9973; ST 65 (Edictum dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 91. Not after
A.D. 79.

L. T[---]mi Feli[cis et --- Gro]sphi glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX pugn(abunt) [IV], III k. Noue. / [---]

PRISCO[--- / Nuceria Con]stantia.
Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: A: C IV 9974; ST 66 (Edictum munerae dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 92. B: C IV 9939. Not after A.D. 79.

A

[Glad(iatorum) par(ia)? --- L.] Munati [Caesernini / pug(abunt) Nuceriae] VI, [V], IV, III, pr. id.

Maias.

B

L. Munatium Caeserninum, quinq. / Nucerini [pulg]iles spectatist.

Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: C IV 10161; ST 67 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg. II. "[...] a Noceria il 21 aprile per il munus a cielo scoperto. Qui (era presente) il nocerino Habitus."); Fora 93. Not after A.D. 79.

[---]AC+ [---] / Nuce(riae) XI k. Mai. munere ype[t(h)]ro. Habitus hic / Nucerinus.

Pompeii: C X 829 + p.1014; C I 1655; ILS 5706; ILL 648 (Tabula ex lapide Tiburtino reperta Pompei in thermis Stabianis). Sullan period or soon after.

C. Vulius C. f., P. Aninius C. f., II u(iri) i. d. / laconicum et destrictarium /^3 faciund(um) et por-ticus et palaest(ram) / reficunda locarunt ex d. d. ex / ea pequnia quod\(^1\) eos e lege \(^6\) in ludos aut in monumento / consumere oportuit, faciund(da) / coerarunt eidemque probar(unt).


M. Oculatius M. f. Verus, II uir, pro ludis.

Pompeii: C X 854 [(In amphitheatro] per totum cuneum secundum).

T. Atullius C. f. Celer, II u(ir), pro lud(is) lu(minib.) cune(um) fac(ierat) ex d. d.

Pompeii: a: C X 855 (per totum cuneum tertium, harenam versus); ILS 5653\(^c\); b: C X 856 (ibidem, versus sedes); ILS 5653\(^d\).

a

L. Saginius, II u ir i. d., pr(o) lu(dis) lu(minib.) ex d. d. cun(eum).

b

L. Saginius, II u(ir) i. d., p(ro) l(udis) l(uminib.) ex d. d. c(uñeo).

Pompeii: C X 853 (In summo muro qui amphitheatri harenam a sedibus separat. In cuneo); ILS 5653\(^e\).

Mag(istrui) pag(i) Aug(usti) r(eлицис) s(uburbani), pro lud(is) ex d. d.

Pompeii: C X 857\(^a--\)d (Per cuneos sextum septimum octavum scriptum continuo); ILS 5653\(^b\) (= a), a

(= d)

(a) N. Istacidius N. f. Clelix, II uir, pro lud(is) lum(inib.), (b) A. Audius A. f. Rufus, II uir, pro lud.,
(c) P. Caesetius Sex. f. Capito, II uir, pro lud. lum., (d) M. Cantrius M. f. Marcellus, II uir, pro lud. lum., cuneos III f(aciendo) c(urauerunt) ex d. d.

Pompeii: C X 1074\(^d\) + p.967 + p.1006; ILS 5053\(^d\); E&J 327; Fora 24. LL.4–8: "In his first duovirate, during the festival to Apollo (he gave) in the forum a procession, bulls, taureadors, escape artists, bridge fighters [a kind of gladiators], boxers—those who fight in bands and those who fight a duel—, games with all kinds of entertainments and all kinds of pantomimes, among whom was Pylades, and HS10,000 as a public gift in honour of his duumvirate." After 2 B.C. (date of Flaccus' 3rd duovirate: C X 890 = ILS 6391).

A. Clodius A. f. / Men. Flaccus, II uir i. d. ter, quinqu., /\(^3\) trib(uns) mil(itum) a populo. / Primo
duomiiratu Apollinarib. in foro pompam, / tauros, taurocentas, succursores, pontarios: /6 paria III, pugiles / ceterarios et pystas, ludos / omnibus acruamatis / pantomimisq. omnibus et / Pylade et HS n. (10,000) in publicum pro duomiiratu; /9 secundo duomiiratu, quinqu. Apollinarib. in foro / pompam, tauros, taurarios, / succursores, pugiles / ceterarios; poster(o) die solus in spectaculis athletas: /12 par(nia) XXX, glad(iatorum) par(nia) V, et gladiat(orum) par(nia) XXXV et / uenation(em) tauros, taurocentas, apros, ursos, / cetera uenatione / uaria cum collega; /15 tertio duomiiratu ludos factione prima, adiectis acruamatis / cum collega.


89 Pompeii: a: C IV 9979; ST 2; Fora 25. b: C IV 9980; ST 3; Fora 26. c: C IV 9981; ST 4; Fora 27. All three painted edicta were found outside the Porta Nocera and belong to the Augustan age.

90 Pompeii: C IV 2508 + p.224; ST 32 (Iscrizione graffita); Fora 57 (54/62 d.C.).

91 Pompeii: a: C IV 1189; ST 21; Fora 45. b: C IV 1190 + p.204; ST 22; Fora 46. Both edicta are Neronian and were found in Regio VII.

92 Pompeii: a: C IV 7989A-c; ST 18 (Grande edictum dipinto a lettere rosse; Grande Palestra); Fora 41. b: C IV 1181 + p.462; ST 19 (Edictum dipinto; Reg. VI); Fora 42. A.D. 61/68.
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a Pro salute / Neronis Claudi Caesaris Aug. Germanici, Pompeis Ti. Claudi Veri uenatio / athletae et spartiones erint¹ V, III k. Mart. CCCLXXIII. Claudio Vero felic(iti)!


N. Festi Ampliati / familia gladiatoria pugna(bit) iterum [- -] § pugna[bit] id. Mai.² j XVII [kal.] lun.; uenat(io), uel(a erunt).

94 Pompeii: C IV 1184 + p.204; ST 31 (Iscrizione dipinta in lettere rosse; Ludo Gladiatorio. L.4: Fam[il]ias); Fora 56. L.2: Fam[il]ia CC AD PUGN; L.4: PO RMP IS. Cf. no. 93 for the date.

[- -] MAIAE / [- -] TERTIO LEG /³ Ampliati I[- -] fam[i(ia)] ‘gl’ad(iatoria) pugnabit / Po[mpeii]³ MaI?; uenat(i) et uel(a) erunt. Totius orbis desiderium / munus meu in ubiq. /³ cum P’a’mphilo? et ‘Fortunato.

95 Pompeii: C IV 1182 + p.462; ST 29 (Iscrizione dipinta a lettere nere. 41/54 d.C.); Fora 54. Ampliatus’ tomb; on a stucco relief showing scenes from a gladiatorial show with venatio. After A.D. 62 (MOURITSEN 1988 p.35).


96 Pompeii: a: C IV 3884; ILS 5145; ST 5; Fora 28. b: C IV 7995; ST 6; Fora 29. C: C IV 1185; ST 8; Fora 31. d: C IV 7992; ST 7; Fora 30. Edicta munere painted in red and/or black, found in different parts of the town. A.D. 68 (MOURITSEN & GRADEL 1991). Edictum c, which has the same date as b, is not provided. Cf. 88.

a D. Lucreti / Satri Valentis, flaminis Neronis Caesaris Aug(usti) fili / perpetui, gladiatorum paria XX, et D. Lucretio Valentis fili / glad. paria X pugnabit Pompeis VI, V, IV, III, pr. idus Apr.; uenatio legitima / et uela urunt. / …


97 Pompeii: C IV 1084; Fora 32.

Satrio Lucretio Valenti, munifico / IV, sibi, liberis feliciter pro Valente ex rog(---).

98 Pompeii: a: C IV 7991; ST 9 (Edictum munere dipinto; Reg. III. 55/56 d.C., anno della prima quinquennalità di Maio); Fora 33. b: C IV 1179 + p.462; ILS 5143; ST 10 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg. VII); Fora 34.

a Cn. Allci Nigidi / Mai, quinque(quennalis), sine impensa publica glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX et corum supp(ositicii) pugnabit Pompeis. / Gavellius Tigillo / et Clodio sal(utem); / Telephe, summa rudis, / instrumentum munere / u(bique) u(ale). / …
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS


99 Pompeii: a: C IV 1177; ILS 5144; ST 11; Fora 35. b: C IV 7993; ST 12; Fora 36. c: C IV 3883; ST 13; Fora 37. d: C IV 1178 + p.462; ST 14; Fora 38. Edicta painted in red in different parts of the town. After A.D. 59.

a Dedicazione / [operis tabulare]rum munere Cn. Allei Nigidi Mai, / [--- pompa], uenatio, athletae, sparsiones, uela erunt. / Maio, / principi coloniae, / feliciter!

b Dedicazione / operis tabularum Cn. Allei Nigidi Mai, Pompeis idibus Iunis; / pompa, uenatio, athletae, uela erunt. / Nigra ua(lei)! / …

100 Pompeii: C IV 1180 + p.462 + p.790; ST 15 (Iscrizione dipinta a lettere rosse; Teatro Grande); Fora 39. A.D. 70/78.


101 Pompeii: C IV 7990; ST 16 (Acclamatio dipinta in lettere di color nero; Reg. II); Fora 40 (A partire del 55 d.C.).

Cn. Alleo Maio, / principi munerario[rum], / feliciter!

102 Pompeii: C IV 1186 + p.204; ST 25 (Iscrizione dipinta in lettere di color nero, eccettuata la seconda riga che è di color rosso; Ludus Gladiatorius); Fora 49 (72/77 d.C.).

N. Popidi / Rufi fam(ilia) glad(iatoria) [p]u[g]nabit Pompeis; uenati[o], /3 ex XII k. Mai., mala [e]t uela erunt. / [---]o procurat[ior] / felicitas!

103 Pompeii: C IV 1094 (colore negro pictum); Fora 51 (72/77 d.C.).

Popidio Rufo, invicto munero(ario) ter, / defensoribus colonorum feliciter!

104 Pompeii: C IV 3338 = 4999 (perit); Fora 59 (Tarda età flavia).

M. Casellium Marcellum, aedilem bonum et munerarium magnum!

105 Pompeii: C IV 9986; ST 28; Fora 53. Not after A.D. 79.

[-? Acuti Antulli / glad(iatorum) par(ia) XXXX 'glad. par.]/ [pugn(abunt) ---] X k. Fe[br.]

106 Pompeii: C IV 1201; ST 48 (Iscrizione dipinta su un muro esterno dell’anfiteatro); Fora 74. Not after A.D. 79.

[---] uen(atio) et glad. / par. XX Q. Aulli[-?].

107 Pompeii: C IV 1193; ST 34 (Edictum dipinto fuori porta Ercolano); Fora 60. Not after A.D. 79.

Gladi(atorum) / par(ia) XX Q. P[---] /3 pugn(abunt) non. A[pr. ? ---?].

108 Pompeii: C IV 9962; ST 27 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg. I); Fora 52. Not after A.D. 79.

[---]R[---] / glad(iatorum) pa[r(ia) ---] / L. Valeri Primi, Augustalis, pugn(abunt) Pomp[eis IV,]

III, [pr. ---] / Februarias; uenatio m[a]utin[a et uela erunt].
Pompeii: C IV 9982; ST 35 (Iscrizione dipinta fuori porta Nocera); Fora 61. Not after A.D. 79.
Venat(io) et [gl]adiatorum par(ia) XX C. [- Al?] exis pugn(abunt) [- -].

Pompeii: fragmentary edicta found inside the city walls: A: C IV 1196; ST 36; Fora 62. B: C IV 7986; ST 38; Fora 64. C: C IV 9968; ST 44; Fora 70. D: C IV 1199; ST 47; Fora 73. E: C IV 1192; ST 50; Fora 76. F: C IV 1202; ST 51; Fora 77. G: C IV 1192; ST 56; Fora 82. H: C IV 9963; ST 57; Fora 83. J: C IV 9965; ST 58; Fora 84. K: C IV 9967; ST 59; Fora 85. L: C IV 7988; ST 20A; Fora 43.

A Pro salute Domus Aug(ustae), gl(adiatorum) par(iae) [- -].
B Pro sal(ute) gladiatorum paria XX [- -].
C [- -] glad.] par. XX / [- -] ue[ll]a er[unt] / [- -] TEGIT, uenatio erit / Scr(ibo) / corrado ub(ique).
D [- -] pugn. V, III, III, pr. k. dec.; uenat[io] -.
E [- -] familia gladiatoria [- -] uenatio et ue[la] [erunt].
F [- -] gl]ad. [par. --- / ---] uenatio [- -].
G [- -] familia / gladiatoria [- -].
H Gladiat[orum] paria XX [- -].
J Gladiat[orum] paria XX [- -].
K Gladiat[orum] paria XX [- -].
L [- -] uenatio et uela [erunt].

Pompeii (=> ?): fragmentary edicta found outside the city walls (A–C Porta Ercolano; K–N Porta Nocera); some may advertise events held elsewhere: A: C IV 1204 + p.204; ST 73; Fora 99. B: C IV 1200; ST 45; Fora 71. C: C IV 1194; ST 49; Fora 75. D: C IV 9975; ST 52; Fora 78. E: C IV 9985; ST 53; Fora 79. F: C IV 9985; ST 54; Fora 80. G: C IV 1203 + p.204; ST 55; Fora 81.

A [- -? gl]adiat(orum) par(ia) XXX et [- -?+CAE pu[nabunt] / ---] ex k. luni.
B Scr(ipsit) Sexti[anus? --- I]PO[--- I]CN[---]RI [- -] XIII [k. ---] / glad. paria XXX [- -]; matutini erunt [- -].
C Glad. [par. --- / ---] uela [- - / ---] XIII k. [- -].
D [- -] pugnabunt [- - / ---] Sabinianus [- -].
E [- -? glad. par.] XXXX pu[gn. Po]m[peis? ---].
F T+[---] / CVI[---] paria / X.
G [- -] uela, pyrr[rachiari] --- / P]om[peis? ---]cicio Aelio[domo ---].

Pompeii: C IV 1989 + p.214; ILS 5147; ST 46 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg VIII); Fora 72. Not after A.D. 79.

Heic uenatio pugnabet! V k. Septembres / et Felix ad ursos pugnabet!

Puteoli (Neapoli?): C X 1841 (L.1: p.C. 22?). L.3: [populo postula]nte?
-----? / [- -] D. Haterio, C. Su]lpicio cos. / [- - vacat / ---]nte statuam / [- -]udos [- -] / -----?

Puteoli: C X 1574; ILS 226. Known from MSs only. A.D. 56.


------ / [---]siae Rufinae mat[ri --- / --- cu]r(ator-) kal(endarii) Maioris et Clodiani et Minu[ciani --- / --- statuae] e]questris aureae diui Antonini [/ --- / --- hic idem ludos administravit solu[s --- /5 --- sum]ptu publico splendidissim(us) ordo ei decreui[t ---].

116 Puteoli: EE VIII 370 + 868 (Basis marmorea reperta prope amphitheatrum); ILS 1937; Fora 120 (Fine II sec. d.C.).

Anniae / Agrippinae, /3 uxori / C. Iuli Apolloni / decur(ialis) Romae /6 trib(unorum) item aedi(lium), accens(i) velato1, / cur(atoris) mun(eris) glad(iatorii) /9 tridui, hered(es). / L. d. d. d.

117 Puteoli: C X 1785; ILS 6333; Fora 119 (fine II sec. d.C.).

Gauiae M. f. / Fabiae Rufinæ, /3 honestissimae matronae et ra/rissimae feminae, M. Auræ[i] proc(uratoris) / summat(um) rat(ionum) uxor(i), M. Gaui Puteolani IIuir(i), aed(ulis), cur(atoris) muneris gladiatorum et omnibus / honorib. et munerib. perfuncti /9 filiae, M. Gaui Fabii luti /p’lendi/diss(imi) eq(uitatis) R(omani), augur(is), IIuir. II, q(aeestor) II, / cur. muner. glad. et om[nibus hon­no]12rib. et muneriib. perfuncti [cti sorori], / res publica peq(unia) oblata [a ---].

118 Puteoli: AE 1888, 126; EE VIII 369; ILS 5186 (L.12: Commodi nomen erasum et postea restitutum); Fora 118. A.D. 180/192.


M. Bassaeo M. f. Pal. / Axio, /3 patr(ono) col(oniae), cur(atoris) r( ei) p., IIuir(o) munif(ico), proc(uratori) Aug(usti) uiae Ost(ensis) et Camp(aniae), / trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae), proc. reg(ionis) Calae/6bricae, omnibus honorib. Capuae functo, / patr. col. Lupiensium, patr. municipi / Hudrentinorum, uniwersus ordo munieip(um) /9 ob rem publ. bene ac fideliter gestam. / Hic primus et solus uictores Campani/ae pretis et aestimatione paria gladiat(orum) edidit. /12 L. d. d. d.

120 Puteoli (?): C X 3704; ILS 5054; Fora 114 (Orientativamente fine II/prima metà III sec. d.C.). For the attribution to Puteoli: D'Arms, PP 27, 1972, p.267 n.41.

A. Veratio A. f. Pal. Seueriano, / equiti Rom(an)o, cur(atori) rei p. Tegianensium, adlecto in
ordin(em) decurion(um), qui cum privilegio sacer/doti Caeninensis munitus potuiisset ab honorib. et muneri. / facile excusari, praeposito amore patriae et honorem aedilitatis / laudabilius administravit et diem felicissimum(um) III id. Ian. natalis / dei patri(nostri) uenatione pass(iua), denis bestis et IIII feris / dent(atis) et IIII paribus / ferro dimicantibus. ceteroquo, honestissimo apparatu largiter exhibuit; / ad honorem quoque duumuiratus ad cumulanda munera patriae / sue libenter accessit; huic cum et populus in spectaculis / bigae statui postulasset et splendidissim(us) ordi merito decreuiss(et) / pro insita modestia sua unius / bigae honore content(us) alterius / sumptus rei p. remisit. L. d. d. c(oloniae) (uliae).

121 Puteoli: C X 1825; Fora 117 (Orientativamente II sec. d.C., in base alla paleografia).

122 Pompeii ⇒ Puteoli: C IV 7994; ST 74 (Edictum dipinto in lettere rosse, di carattere arcaico; Reg. III); Fora 100 (Primi decenni del I sec. d.C.).

123 Pompeii ⇒ Puteoli: C IV 9970; ST 75 (Edictum dipinto, fuori porta Nocera); Fora 101. Not after A.D. 79.

124 Pompeii ⇒ Puteoli: C IV 9984a-b; ST 76 (Iscrizione dipinta, fuori porta Nocera); Fora 102. Not after A.D. 79.

125 Salernum: C X 539; ILS 5061; InsIt I 11, 21; Fora 22 (III sec. d.C.).

126 Surrentum: C X 688 (Tabula magna); Fora 23. The restitution (et) Ti. C[aes. Aug.] usually supplied at L.2 is doubtful; a Tiberian date is unlikely since edere appears in the later 1st c., while spectaculum and splendidissimius belong to the 2nd c. or later periods. Ti looks like a misreading for ET.

127 **Teanum Sidicinum**: C X 617*; AE 1979, 156. A.D. 151.


128 **Venafrum**: C X 4913; ILS 6516; Fora 126 (1 sec. d.C.).

------ / [--- pra]efectus / [---] Quirites. / H(o)c m(onumentum) h(eredem) s(equetur). / Bis sexuir factus per [---], / bis populo munus dedi. Lib[---] / primum est Augusti parem [---].

129 **Venafrum**: C X 4893; Fora 127 (Orientativamente I sec. d.C., in base alla paleografia). L.8: q(uae)storji?

Voto suscepto pro / salute perpetua domus / August(ae); cum edidisset / munus gladiatorium / populus in statuam cont(ulit) Q. Vibio Q. Caesi f. Ter. / Rustico, / II uir(o) quinquennali).

130 **Venafrum**: C X 4897; Fora 128 (Datazione: 2 sec. d.C.). Known from MSs.

------ / [---] q(uae)stori, II uir(-) / munus gladiatorium / ---?

131 **Aeclanum**: C IX 1179; EAOR III 7 (Già perduto al tempo del CIL); Fora 140. 1st/2nd c. (contra BUONOCORE, EAOR ad loc., who mistakenly believes that “l’uso della legazioni testamentarie per munera gladiatorii sembra concentrarsi nel primo periodo dell’Impero”).

------ / [---] ROM[---] / Q. Aug[---] / redit[u ---] / g]ladiator[or---] / P. d. d.

132 **Aeclanum**: C IX 1156; ILS 5878; EAOR III 33 (Già perdata ai tempi del CIL); Fora 141. A.D. 138/161.

Ti. Claudio / Ti. fil. Ti. nepotii / Cor. Maximo, q(uae)stori, / II uir(o) quinq.; / hic cum ageret ae[---] / ann(os) XX in colon(i)a / Aeclan(ensium) munus edidit, / imperata editione ab Imp. / Antonino Aug. Pio in quo / honore seputus est; / cuius mater Geminia M. / II uir(o) quinquennali).

133 **Aeclanum**: C IX 1176; EAOR III 51 (Non fu rinvenuta dal Mommsen. Irreperibile anche nel 1987); Fora 142. BUONOCORE, EAOR ad loc., dates this inscription to the 1st half of the 2nd c., but without supporting evidence; on the basis of this datation he thinks unlikely that a bequest is being recorded; however, since (1) fam[ilia] at L.3 is probably the subject of pugn[aret], and (2) pugnare is normally used to announce upcoming events (supra p.119), this is the most likely interpretation; otherwise, one would have expected dedit or edidit with the benefactor as subject of the action.


------ / [---, II uiro] / q.q., flamin[i diui ---] / ob merita / eius quod cum e[t antea plurima beneficia in rem p. contule]rit et quinquenn[alitate sua --- fecerit] / et, cum ex HS C (m.) bidui [munus publ(icum) curauerit, de] / suo alis HS C (m.) tertium d[iem ediderit et uiam ---] / strauerit per milia pass[uum ---], / ad
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS


Acclanum: C IX 1184; EAOR III 57 (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. II sec. d.C., per la presenza del termine postulatus); Fora 144.

136 Beneventum: C IX 1643 (“Piccolo quadr.” Accursius); ILS 5734a.
P. Cerrinius [- f.], / L. Crassicius [- f.], /3 II uir(i) i. d., / uiam strauerunt / et lacus fecerunt [t d. d.] /6 pro ludis.

137 Beneventum: C IX 1703 + p.695; ILS 5067; EAOR III 25 (Nota da tradizione manoscritta. I.2: Si può pensare ad un errore per L. Entro la prima metà del I sec. d.C. essenzialmente per l’espressione gladiatores dare); Fora 145.
P. Veidius P. l. Philocles, Augustal(is) / Beneuenti, gladiator(es) D' dedit; /3 hoc monumentum memoriae / caussa sibi et suis faciundum cur(auit) / P. Veidio P. l. Philodamo fratri et / Variae Primaee uxori et / P. Veidio P. l. Philotimo fratri et / Veidiae P. l. matri.

138 Beneventum: C I 1541b; C IX 1705; ILS 5066; EAOR III 8 (Ara in calcare); Fora 146. Mid to late 1st c. A.C.

D. M. s. / A. Vibbio Ianuario, /3 Claudiali Augustali, / curatori(m) muneris diei un/us1, Aulis Vibbis1 /6 Iustinus, / Iustinianus, / Ianarius, /9 filis1, patri bene m(eren)ti p(osuerunt).

139 Beneventum: AE 1899, 207; ILS 5063a; EAOR III 42 (Cippo in calcare locale. II sec. d.C., essenzialmente per la paleografia); Fora 149.

Dis manibus / M. Rutili Macedo3nis, curatoris ark(ae) / Puteolanor(um), aedil(is), / II uir(i), edente Be6neuenti exornato / munere diebus IIII, / feris n(umeri) IIII, ursis XVI, /9 noxes III et ceteris / herbariiis; / Licinia Marcella ma12 rito karissimo, ex quo / et liberis III enixa est, / cum quo uixit annis / XVIII, ob obsequium / omnem erga ipsam / qua ac uixit, bene me/renti fecit.

140 Beneventum: C IX 1666; ILS 5068; EAOR III 50 (Nota da tradizione manoscritta. I/II sec. d.C. L.5: quinquennal(itatis)); Fora 147. L.5: VILLE 1981 p.195 n.42, probably rightly, reads quinquennal(is). 2nd c. since exhibere is used.

141 Beneventum: C IX 1665 (Litteris elegantibus); EAOR III 55 (Lastra. Irreperibile nel 1987); Fora 148. A.D. 185/192.

[Be]neuent[--- / ---]um sua pec(unia) [--- / omni]que cultu exor[nauit --- / Comm]odus Pius Fe[lix --- edito munere /5 gladi]atorio dedic[auit].
142 Beneventum (?): C IX 2127; EAO III 59 (Nota da tradizione manoscritta. La presenza della tribù consente di non andare molto oltre l’inizio del III sec. d.C.); Fora 153.

--- f. Men. V[--- / --- g]adiator[--- / ---]uum S+[---] / -----  

143 Beneventum: C IX 1540; ILS 4186 (Dies natalis coloniae celebrabatur munere gladiatorio, cuius curator fuerat Iustianus); FIRA III 77c; EAO III 44 (Dispersa già ai tempi del CIL. Intorno al 228 d.C. LL.5–6: munerarius, natalis ...); Fora 151.

Attini sacrum et Mener/iae Parachintiae. L. Sontius Pineius Iustianus, eq( uitis) R( oman i) adne(pos), uiur principal, duumuir et munera6rius natalis coloniae, om/nibus honoribus perfunct(us) / et sacerdos Matris deum M(a gnae) I(daeeae) /9 in primordio suo taurobo/lium a se factum traden/te simul Cosinia Celsina /12 consaccertode sua, / praevente Flauio Libe/rali har(uspice) publ. primario.

144 Beneventum: C IX 1663; ILS 5179; EAO III 45 (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. III sec. d.C.); Fora 152.

C. Concordius Syria/cus, eq(ues) R(omanus), comm( entariensis) rei p.3 Beneuent(anorum), munerarius / bidui, poeta Latinus co/ronatus in munere pa6triae suae et “---”, uibus1 / sibi fecit qui uixit ann(is) LVIII, m(ensib.) VI, d(ieb.) XII, / Esterti, / primus /3 Beneuenti, / studiorum1 or/chestopales /6 instituisti.

145 Canusium: A; AE 1969–70, 134; C P 3182; EAO III 19 (Cippo votivo quadrangolare in calcare. Fine età repubblicana per l’evidenza paleografica, ed anche per motivi prosopografici pertinenti a P. Curtius P. f. Salassus); Fora 129. B: C IX 326; ILS 3316; C P, 3183; EAO III 20 (Cippo votivo quadrangolare in calcare); Fora 130. C: C IX 327; ILS 3589; C P, 3184; EAO III 21 (Cippo votivo in marmo); Fora 131. Morizio in Le epigrafi romane di Canosa, Bari 1990, nos. 4, 7 and 8 respectively.

A Martei sacra. / P. Curtius P. f. Salassus(s), /3 P. Titius L. f., IIII uir(i), / de munere gladiator(i)o, / ex s. c.

B Vestae sacra(m). / P. Titius L. f., /3 P. Curtius P. f. Salassus(sus), / IIII uir(i), de munere / gladiatorio, /6 ex s. c.

C Vortumno sacrum. / P. Curtius P. f. Salassus, /3 P. Titius L. f., IIII uir(i), / de munere gladiator(i)o, / ex s. c.


A. Kanuleius fratri ve(ne1 me(renti). / D. M. s. /3 A. Kanuleio A. K(anulei) / f. Ispeldido!? equiti / Romano, cib[1 Ca]/6nusino, omnis1 [hono]ris1 funtus1, bis m[unus] / ededit1, lecaro12 XXIII [annorum].

147 Compsa: C IX 981; EAO III 54 (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. Veroasimilmente base onoraria. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 139.

----- / Gal. [---] / IIII uir(o), ae[diiI, IIII] /3 uir. q.q., q(uae)tori [pec(unionae) publ., qua]/est(ori) aliment(ornam), [sacerd(oti)] / XV uir(ali) Matri[s deum]; /6 ob merita eius [et splen/idam editio]nem
mu/neris gladia[tori] /9 pleps urban[a aere] / conlato, cuius de[dicat(ione)] / populo utrius[que] /12 sexsus


A L. Arrenio L. fil. / Pap. Menandro, /3 aed(ili), IIIII uir(o) II q.q. mu/ner(ario) ciu(itatis) H(erdon)-niae), om/nib. hon(orial) et one/6ribus rei publ. fu/ncto, patrono; / coll(egium) fabr(um) tign(uarorum) /9 ob praecipuam / adfectionem / eius statuam po/12ndam meren/t[i] decreuit. / L. d. d. d.


149 Herdonia: C IX 690; AE 1967, 98; EAOR III 17 (Cippo in calcare con base modanata; probabilmente era il supporto per una statua. II sec. d.C.); Fora 136.

----- / m[u]nicipi, aed(ili) / iur. dic., q(uaestori) bis, /3 IIII uir(o) i. d. bis., / q.q., curat(ori)
mu/neris bis; /6 colleg(ium) mancip(um); / honor(e) cont(entus) impens(a) remisit. / L. d. d. d.

150 Luceria: C IX 808 (Lapis magnus et crassus); ILS 5381; EAOR III 29 (Visto dal Mommsen. Irreperibile nel 1987. Datazione non ben definibile, ma verosimilmente entro il I sec. d.C., se non addirittura nella prima metà); Fora 137.

C. Obinius Fauer, / P. Didio Iulius /3 Strato, / Augustales, / pro munere /6 ab summa quadragint(a)
/ ++DA ad uicum Laris / s(u) p(ecunia) strauer(unt).

151 Luceria: C IX 804; EAOR III 18 (Lastra in calcare. II/III sec. d.C.); Fora 138.

[-] Aurelio P. f. / tentio, quaes[tori] /3 l ii uiro q.q., cur(atori) /[mun(eris)] / m[unifico], patr[ono] /
us / ponendajm decre[uit].

152 Venusia: C IX 447; EAOR III 10 (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. II sec. d.C. per la presenza del titolo di curator muneri); Fora 133.

L. Paccius L. f. / Priscus, aid(ilis), II uir q(uinq.), /3 cur(ator) mun(eris) Catin[ian[i], / Cl(audio)
Maximo [---7] / ------?

Regio III Lucania

153 Grumentum: C X 226; ILS 6451; EAOR III 11 (Cippo sepolcrale in calcare. Metà II sec. d.C.); Fora 155.

D. M. / C. Streponio /3 C. f. Pom. Basso, ae(dilicia) p(otestate), / pr(aetori) II uir(o) q.q., auguri,
/ curatori rei p. ka/6endari Potentinor(um), / curator(i) muneri peq(uniae) / Aquillianae II, q(uaestori) rei pub.
III; /9 Heluia Psychario uxor, / C. Streponi(us) Bassianu[s] / et Faustina, fili, b(ene) m(erenti) /12 fecerunt.
Grumentum: C X 228; EAOR III 36 (Ara in calcare. Metà II sec. d.C.); Fora 154.  
[---]l. f. Pom./ [---] vacat /3 [in nostra] colonia omnibus munieribus et principi/[palibus]

Inscriptions  
255

---5[enter fun]ncio, mineraria / [egregiae] / editionis familiae / gladiatoriae, decurioni E+ /9 [---

sp]le[n]didae civitatis / [Rer[og]in]um luliensium, / [ob animu]m eius (h)onorificum /12 [in nos; col][egium]
Beneris 1 patrono / [optimo].

Paestum: AE 1975, 252; EAOR III 9 (Base in calcare); Fora 156 (Fine I sec.?).

C. Pomponio M. Pom/poni Libonis trierarchi /3 [fil. Maec. Diogeni, / II uir(o) q.q.; huic ordo
decurio/num ob munificentiam eius quotl /6 familiam gladiatoriam ex sua / liberalitate ob honorem q(uin)q(ue-

nalitatis) / primus ediderit item accep9itis HS XXV m. n. p(ecunia) p(ublica) alium d[iem] enixe [c[ui]]/rauerit,
statuam ponendam /12 pecunia publica censuerunt. / L. d. d. d.


M. Egnio M. f. / Mae. Fortunatiano, /3 II uir(o) iter(um) q.q.; huic splenddidissimus ordo decu-

rionum postulante populo ob /6 praecipuam et insignem mu/nificentiam erga patriam / statuam ponendam
decr9uit quod cum XXV (m.) HS acceptis at comparationem / familiae gladiatoriae ma12iorem quantitatem
au/xerit at nobilium gladi/a torum conductionem, /15 adiectis etiam urcis mi/rae magnitudinis set et / noxo

omni quoque /18 cultu atparatuque aucto, / diem sublimiter exornuit.

Paestum: EAOR III 58 (Scheggione in calcare, relativo, probabilmente, ad una base. II sec. d.C.,
sostanzialmente per motivi paleografici); Fora 159.

-------- / [---]N[--- / ---]+O[--- / ---] munus[s / ---]um p(ecunia) p(ublica), / [--- p]ublica. /6 [L. d.
d.] d.

Paestum: a: AE 1975, 256; EAOR III 38 (Lastra marmorea. Non molto dopo il 181 d.C.); Fora 158.

b: EAOR III 61 (Quattro frammenti pertinenti ad una medesima lastra marmorea fra loro non combacianti);
Fora 160. Of b, only fragment B, which is possibly complete at the upper left-hand corner and perhaps provides
a name, is given here. Underlined letters are seen in b.

b (B) -----? / Ti(berio)? Ro[--- / .]IO A[---] / ------

a ------ / [---]R[--- / equitis / R]omani fi[l, ---]3 nepot., A. Vinici [+---], / II uiri II q.q., patro[ni col-

(oniae) pron., flamenti per/ petuo diui M. Antoni[i, curat(ori) r(ei) pubi]6cae municipi Eburinorum, sa[cerdoti
---], / praefecto fabrum; huic or[do decur(ionum) statuam] / ponendum censura propter e[ximiam liberali]/9tatem

eius, eo quol1 uiginti par[a gladiatorum] / edidit, adiecta uenatione quam [etiam] / noxeorum comparatione
ado[nuit nec non] /12 decurionibus singulis HS XX n. [ex suo distribuit2]; / Vinicia Lucana fi[l, pecuniam] / a
re p. conlata(m) rest(ituit).

Regio IV Sabina et Samnium

Aequiculi: C IX 4133 (Litteris elegantibus); ILS 5525a. Early imperial.

-------- / [---] L. Volu[sius / ---], T. Mall[ius / ---]carius, Q. Pom[ponius / ---]ram strauerunt, podium
et tribun[al et / statua] Iustitiae Augustae, decurionibus ludos scaenicos quadriduo et [---- / ----- /]?

160 Alba Fucens: C IX 3947 (Cippus sepulcralis. Lectio floralibus certa est, nec videtur alius possidens insignificare nisi populum vel potius collegium aliquod defuncto post mortem gratiam referre pro ludis Floralibus recte editis). LL.2-3: -PO/TD.

L. Septimio / Philadespo/t'o', pro suis / meritis et / Floralibus cipp(us) / p(ositus).


a P. Le[6-7-]esia[nus], / M. S[c.6] Marc(---), / gladiatorum par(i)a [---] / in colonia Alba Fuc(ente), / adicta uenatione / legitima, ediderunt[t] / ----?

162 Allifae: a: C IX 2350; ILS 5059; EAOR III 26 (Iscrizione nota della sola tradizione manoscritta); Fora 163. L.8: XIIIIX in most MSS; L.9: XX edidit one MS. b: C IX 2351; EAOR III 27 (Vista dal Mommsen «in aedibus Civitellae». Irreperibile); Fora 164. b is almost identical to a except from L.11: P. Ho[---]. / ex a[ere collato]. / L. d. d. d. Probably 2nd c. for the mention of the Augustales in a, and the expression ex a[ere collato] in b (pace BUONOCORE, EAOR ad no. 26, who suggests a later 1st c. date).

a L. Fadio Piero, II uiro, / munificentissimo ciui / qui ob honorem decur(ionatus) / eodem anno quo factus est / glad(latorum) paria XXX et uenationem / bestiarum Africanar(um), et post / paucos menses duumuiratu / suo, acceptis a pe. HS XIII [m.] n., uenation(es) / plenas et gladiatorum paria XXI dedit, / item post annum ludos scaenicos p(ecunia) s(ua) f(ecit), / Augustales. / L. d. d. d.

163 Ami ternum: C IX 4205 + SI 9 p.34; C P 1857; ILL 530 (Tabula ex lapide calcario). Late Republican.

[-] Proculeius P. f., / aed(ilis), lud(os) f(ecit).


165 Ami ternum: C IX 4208 + SI 9 pp.34–35; EAOR III 13 (Irreperibile. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C., soprattutto in base al formulario); Fora 176.

----- / [--- II uiro atq[ue minerario] / 3 quir ob homorem decur(ionatus) / eodem anno quo factus est / glad(latorum) paria XXX et uenationem / bestiarum Africanar(um), et post / paucos menses duumuiratu / suo, acceptis a pe. HS XIII [m.] n., uenation(es) / plenas et gladiatorum paria XXI dedit, / item post annum ludos scaenicos p(ecunia) s(ua) f(ecit), / Augustales. / L. d. d. d.

166 Ami ternum: AE 1937, 119–120; Sherk 21; AE 1984, 280; SI 9, 34; EAOR III 47 (Lastra di bronzo pertinente ad una tabula patronatus); Fora 177. L.17–19: “he toiled hard to produce for our city, with approval, munera 10 times (= 10 days? cf. LL.25–26) for his patronate, and 6 times (= 6 days?) for his sons’ magistracies”. L.24–25: “at whose dedication (i.e. of public works and buildings) he presented 2 days (of games) in the theatre (?) and 10 days (lit.: «10 times») of Iuuenalia in the amphitheatre”. A.D. 325. Excerpt from
the relatio.

... /11 dignetur C. Sallius Pompeianus Sofronius, pronepos Salli Procu/12[1]i pat[coni]; fil. Sal(li) Proculi patroni pat(riae) ord(inis) Aueia[1]ium Vest[ini]orum patronum co/hoptemus; si modo de eius dignatione testimonium perportemus quis / etenim immo exultet et suam proferat uolu[1]mptatem; ideo igitur, domini cos/15cripti, quod ex origine prisa genus eiusdem patronatus olim pro/cesser[i]t; et labores quantos et quales in nos / et patriam nostram contulit; quiq. ex suis laboribus munera patro/18[natus dena, et sena magg(is-tratib.) filiorum suorum sple[n]didissima ciuita/ti n[ostri]e cum fauore ededit; Aquas Arentani quas iam delaps(a)e fuerant / ciuitali n. additis lacis castellisq. salientes restituit; /21 thermas quas iam olim disperierant antiquitus inpendiis et sua pecuni/a / cum porticiis nouis factis et omni ornamento at pulc(h)i'ri tu'dinem restauauit/statuisque decorauit; et nomine d(omi)ni n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes. nata/24[e idibus Nob. dedicaui, quarum dedicatione biduum t(h)eatrum et dena iuue/nalorum spectaculis exs(h)ibuit sub pr(a)esenta Cl(audi) Vrani u. p. corr(ectoris) n(ostri) ...

167 Aufidaena: AE 1933, 152; SI 8, 5 (Lastra in calcare. Datazione orientativa: prima età imperiale).
C. Acellius Clemens portic(um) / et saepta pro ludis Augustalib. /3 faciendo curauit.


169 Bovianum Undecimanorum: C IX 2565; ILS 5017; EAOR III 43 (Cippo in calcare. Fine II sec./inizio III d.C.); Fora 165.
Q. Arruntio / Q. f. Vol. Iusto, /3 q(aestori), aed(ili), pat(rono) col(oniae), / pat. mun(iicipii) Sae/pin(atum), pat. / mun. Vicentini(orum), pat. et cur(atori) /6 r(ae) p. Tereuent(innor.), sacer(dotii) Tuscul(anor.) / fanitali, / ordo et populus / ob insign(em) fidem, industria / erga se in ciuilib. officis / [e]t splendor(em) muneris /12 gladiatori; / [adu]ocato fisc(i) stat(ionis) hereditati(um) ------


honorem III uir(atus) ludos scaenicos dedit et ob honor(em) aedilit(atis) ludos deae Vetidinae / fecit et in subsidium annone ae frument(ariae) HS L m. n. rei p. Corfiniens(ium) et balineum Auelianum / muliebre cum HS XXX m. n. donauit frequenterque epulationes et divisiones nummari(as) / uniuersis ciubibus ex suo distribuit et onera rei p. gratuita pecunia saepius iuuit; / Corfinienses publice ob insignem / eius erga rem publicam adfectum; / Auelius Priscus honore usus inpes(am) remisit.

172 Cures: C IX 4976; EAOR III 37 (Base onoraria in marmo lunense. Non molto dopo il 161 d.C. LL.9-10: V [paribujs]; Fora 181.


[---]iae C. I. Hila[ræ / ---] in Sabi[ni]s Foro N[o]o munus gladiator[ium / ---]+iones eiu[s ---] / -----

174 Iuvanum: C IX 2962 (Litteris pulchris). 2nd/3rd c.

----- / cu[s dedicacione diem / ludorum et cenam / decurionibus et filis / item quinquennalia gladiatorii Aug(ustalii) et filis et / plebi epulum dedit.

175 Marruvium: C IX 3692; EAOR III 60 (Vista dal Mommsen a Pescina. Irreperibile nel 1987. II/III sec. d.C., unicamente in base al formulario); Fora 171.


177 Peltuinum: C IX 3437; ILS 5063; EAOR III 35 (Cippo in calcare. Metà II sec. d.C.); Fora 170.

C. Pausculano / C. f. Quir. / Maximo, / aedili, / quinq., praef(ecto) / iuris dic(undi), quaestori / alim(entorum), flamina]l Aug(ustali); / hic ob honorem quin(quennalitatis) / spectaculum glad(iatorum) triduo / dedit et noxeos quatt(u)or; / item annoneae curat(ori); / uix(it) an(nos) XXXIII dies III; / C. Pausculanus
Rufus / filio karissimo /\(^1\) p(osuit). Hic\(^1\) monumentum em(p)tori / non cedet, sic ut liciat\(^1\) itum, / aditum, ambitum mihi posteris/que meis; in agro p(edes) LXX, in fronte p(edes) LXX, in fronte.

178 Sulmo: AE 1986, 219; SI 4, 50 (Blocco in calcare. La datazione si orienta all’inizio del II secolo d.C.).

---? / [---]++ Of[.]I / [ciuibus meis denarios? --- praest\(^2\)ari uolo\(^3\) [ex quorum reditu die natali vel quotannis\(^2\) cir]censes mando / [filiis filiabusque, hereditibus meis], libertis liber/[tabusque quos antea manumissi et q]uos siue hoc te\(^6\)[stamento siue codicillis manum]isi manumiserio. / [\(^{C.25.}\) in homines a]egros muliere[sq. / ab hereditibus meis praestari uolo, eande)m pecuniam in\(^9\) [\(^{C.10.}\), eandem pecuniam in annonam f]rumentarium. / [Hoc amplius ab hereditibus meis praestari uolo plebi / [\(^{C.30.}\) numer\(^2\)]us, et si in anno /\(^{C.35.}\) fu\(^2\)erit, eo anno /\(^{C.40.}\).INI aut f]ian[t] / ---


L. Vibius Seuerus, / aedilis, IIII uir q.q., \(^3\) splendidus eq(ues) / Romanus, patro/nus ciuitatis

Supe\(^6\)raequanorum, item / patronus ciuitatis / Anxatium Frentanor(um); / hic ob honorem aedilita/tis L. Vibi Ri[tii]\(^{I}\)li fili sui /\(^{12}\) eq(uitis) R(omani) at\(^1\) deam Pelinam pri/mus huic\(^1\) loco uenatio/nem edidit, deinceps ludos /\(^{9}\) sol[I]lennes. L. Vibius Nepos / filius, aed(ilis), IIII uir iur. d., eq(ues) R(omanus), / patronus ciuitatis, ob /\(^{13}\) nomen fratris sui ti/tulum publice dicaluit, Aureliano Aug. \(^{21}\) et Basso II cos., XVI kal. Iun.

180 Supinum: C IX 3857 (Litteris magnis et bonis); ILS 5644. Early Imperial.

Melanthus P. Deci (s.) / et collegae, mag(istri) He(rculis), \(^3\) tribunal nouom a solo fecer(unt), / theatrum et proscaenium refecer(unt), / ludis scaenicis biduo dedicar(unt), /\(^{6}\) d(e) s(u)a p(ecunia).

181 Teate Marrucinorum: C IX 3025 + SI 2 p.155; EAOR III 16 (Da un disegno acquerellato. Forse II sec. d.C.); Fora 167. A date in the 1st c. seems likely.

C. Publicio Donato, / equiti Romano, \(^3\) aedili, IIII uiro quinq. / et curator(i) mun/eris / publici.

182 Telesia: C IX 2230 + p.674; C I 3200 (In lapide ex aedificio rotundo [scil. turri] litteris maximis et pulcherrimis Mommsen [C IX ad loc.]). Late Republican.

M. Lollius M. f. Qua[r(tus)]/ / turreis duas pro I[udeis fecit].

183 Telesia: C IX 2235; C I 1747 + p.1031; ILS 5328; ILL 675 (L.2: turreis in alio apographo). Late Republican.

L. Mummius L. f., C. Manlius C. f. / pr(aetores) duouir(i), pro ludeis turris duas /\(^3\) d(e)

d(ecurionum) s(ententia) faciundas coerarunt.

184 Telesia: C IX 2237; ILS 5060; EAOR III 28 (Base marmorea. Fine 1 sec. d.C./inizi II); Fora 161. The mention of a private troupe of gladiators is the main reason for BUONOCORE, EAOR ad loc., to date this inscription as he does, but the middle or second half of the 2nd c. seems more likely; another inscription of the same notable supports this date (C IX 2238 = ILS 5507).

Titio Fabio Seuero / patrono coloniae, ob me\(^3\) rita eius domi forisque / et quod primus omnium /
editorum sum[ptu pr]oprio/six quinque fer[as Libyc]as / cum familia [glad(iatoria) Ar]ria/norum et adpa[ratu]
map[ptu pr]onifico dederit; ordo / ciuesque libentissime / statuam tribuerunt.

185 Telesia: C IX 2252. 2nd/3rd c. according to MROZEK 1987 p.26, but later 1st/early 2nd c. seems more likely.

L. Manlius Rufio, seuir, / an(norum) LXXVII, Telesiae ludos /3 scaenicos fecit, epulum / colonis
Telesinis et liberis / eorum et incolis crustum /6 et mulsum dedit, eique pro / meritis eius coloni et incolae / in
clupeum contulerunt h(onoris) c(ausa). /9 Hoc mon(umentum) si(ue) ho(c) se(pulcrum) h(e)r(edem) no(n)
seq(utur).

186 Telesia: C IX 2249 (L.3: EDENT(i) [vel] EDENT?): EAOR III 32 (Irreperibile. L.2: [L. Cocc] 'e' io;
L.3: edent(i). Prima metà II sec. d.C.); Fora 162. L.3: the MSS' reading EDENTE must be maintained (cf. nos.
139, 243); Ll.3-5: "rewarded with the honour of a bisellium while he was offering a private day during a show
of the gladiatorial family of Telesia".

pr]iu(atum) mun(eri) famil(iae) glad(atoriae) Teles(iae)/ [orn(ato) ho]nor(e) biselli, qui uixit ann(is) LVII, /6
[mentis --- d(eb.) ---]XVIII. Cassia Congoria1 coniu/[gi am]issimo cum quo uixit ann. XV, / [m. --- d.
---]III et L. Cocceio Luciano, fil(io) /9 [honesti?jssimo qui uixit ann. XVII / [m. --- d. ---]XVII benemerentibus
feci(it).

187 Telesia: C IX 2243. 2nd/3rd c.

----- / [---] EV+[--- cuius dedi]/ca[ti]one dedit d[ouiralib].?? HS XX, decurionibus [et] / pop(ularibus)
liberis / eorum HS VIII, sed et populo /6 passim pecuniam distri[b]uit, / ludorum quoque
spectaculorum ea die ciuiues exhibuit; /9 patrono abstenentissimo, / ciui prestantissimo, / amator ciuium
simpliciss(imo)./12 L. d. d. d.

188 Tibur: AE 1983, 140. L.3: the restitution cu[m]j is preferable to cu[rauit] given in AE.

L. Asinio [--], / IIII ur(i)o iur[e di] /3 qui ludos cu[m]j / its uti [-- / ---].

189 Tibur: C XIV 3663; ILS 6234; InsIt IV 12, 192; EAOR III 39 (Base di statua in travertino); Fora
182. A.D. 184.

M. Lurio M. f. Palat. / Lucretiano, /3 patrono municipi, / Tiburtes municipes / aere collato, quod /6
honore sibi quinque/nalitatis oblato XX paria / gladiatorum et uenation(em) /9 sua pecunia ediderit. / L. d. s. c.

190 Trebula Mutuesca: C IX 4903 (Fortasse agitur de canalibus lapide structis per passus
CCCLXXXXVI inde a foro).

-----2 / [---] aedi[les ---] c]anales la[pide structi]2 /3 p(ass-) CCCLXXXXVI[--- / ---] foro de
con[scriptorum senten/tia p]ro ludis f(ecerunt)2 /6 pe[cunia sua [--- / ---] ciund[um curauerunt]. / -----2

L. Coelio L. f. Pal. Ve[ro], / VIII uiro mag(istro) iuu[ent(utis)], / VIII uiro II fano[rum], / VIII uiro III aera[ri], / praef(ecto) coh(ortis) I Hispano(rum), / curatori muneri / Reginiani, / decuriones et Augus[ta]/ tales, aere conlato. / L. d. d. d.


vacat

Regio V Picenum

193  Auximum: C IX 5855; EAOR III 5 (Grande blocco parallelepipedo in calcare. Metà I sec. d.C.); Fora 186. L.5: HS (([1]))

--- / [l]udos fecit, gladiatores dedit, / cenam sexuiralem primus dedit, / legavit colonis Auxi­matibus singulis [HS ---] / et decurionibus singulis HS XX / et legavit colonis coloniae Auximati HS [(100,000)] / ---?

194  Auximum: C IX 5854 (Litteris magnis et bonis); ILS 5064; EAOR III 6 (Blocco parallelepipedo in calcare. Fine I sec.); Fora 187.


195  Hadria: C IX 5016; EAOR III 15 (Sarcofago ora irreperibile. Verosimilmente II sec. d.C.); Fora 183. L.3: PAET; L.6: VCAH.

C. Capiue Vitali, dec(urioni) col(oniae) / Had(riae), (a)ed(ili) III, pr(a)e(ecto) Cast(r)ii (Nou(i)), II / uiro, / curatori kal(endari) Aueia(tium), p(r)a(e) r. terti(tium) q.q., / curat(ori) muner(is) public(i) bis, qui uixit /annis LII, me(n)s(ib.) VII, die(b.) XII. Iulia Rufina / marito et Capiue 'Iul'ia Vitalis et / Vitalis, Anpliatus, Rufinus, fili / et (h)ered(es), patri pientissimo b(ene) m(erenzi) / fecerunt.

a [L. Flavius - f. Vel. Sila] Nonius Bassus co(n)s(ul), legat(us) Aug(usti) pro pr(aetore) pr(quinque) fudjaeae, adoptus inter patricios 1/2 [a diuo Vespasiano et diuo Tito censoribus, ab] isdem adopt(us) inter pr(aetorios), legat. leg(ionis) XXI Rapac(is), / [trib(unus) pleb(is), quaest(or), trib. mil(itum) leg. III Scithicae, III] ur(1) kapitalis, pr(aetor), quinquinナルnalis II, patron(us) colon(iae), suo et / [Ann. c. 20, III]ae matris suae item 1/6 [-c. 10, millae] uxor(is) nomine, pec(unia) sua, solo suo, / [amphitheatrum faciundum curauit et] paribus. XXXX ordinari(is) dedicauit.

Regio VI Vmbria

197 Ameria: *C XI* 4395; *ILS* 6632; *EAOR* II 30 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.).


198 Ameria: *C XI* 4371; *ILS* 6631; *EAOR* II 31 (Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. Probabilmente seconda metà del II sec. d.C.).

Sex. Ticiaseno Sex. f. Sex. / nep. Sex. pron. Clu. Alliano, 1/3 pontifici, flamini Vicتورiae et Felicitatis Caesar(is) / perpetuo, prae(ecto) coh(ortis) 1/6 Astur(um) eq(uitatae) c(iuium) R(omanorum), trib(uno) leg(ionis) / II Ilici(ae), III ur(o) q.q., III ur(ius) / i. d., sacerd(oti) V. F. C., cur(atori) luus 1/9 luuenum, VI ur(i) Augustal(es), / patrono, ob amorem eius / erga singulos uniusesque.

199 Ameria: *C XI* 4386; *EAOR* II 32 (Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. II sec. d.C.).

L. Calpur[nio --- curato]ris luus Iuuenenum ---? /13 curatori kalen[dari] ---? / municip(es ---).

200 Carsulae: *C XI* 4575; *ILS* 1901; E&J 337; *EAOR* II 12 (Blocco curvilineo, in pietra locale, appartenente verosimilmente ad un monumento funerario a tamburo. Prima età Augustea); Fora 188.

[Ti. ---]io Vibi f. Clu. patri; / [--]io Ti. f. Clu. fratri; / [---]iae matri; / [---]ius Ti. f. Pup. Clemens, scr(iba) XXVI / [uir(orum), tr(ibus) mijil(itum) a populo, II ur(ius) dicundo Carsulis, sex / [-c. 8, enatus] s(enatus?) c(onsulto?); hic primus unus gladiatorium municipio (sc. dedit).

201 Carsulae: *C XI* 4580; *ILS* 6634; *EAOR* II 33 (Base parallelepipeda in pietra locale. Fine II/III sec. d.C.). Probabilmente non after 1 half of 3rd c.

Sagitti. / L. Egnatio L. f. Clu. 1/3 Victorino, III ur(o) / i. d. quinqu. patrono / August(alium) itemque 1/6 fabr(um), editori luuen(alium), / ob insignes uenat/iones ab eo edita[s], 1/9 luuenes ex aere coll(ato) / patrono; cuius ob / dedicacionem dedit luuen(iub.) sing(uulis) (HS) XII, /12 decur(ionib.) (HS) XII n., VI ur(is) (HS) II[X2 n].

A

Cn. Aequasius C. f. Caluo[s], / L. Aelius L. f., II uir(i) d. d. d. uiae latitudinem / adiecer(unt), substructionem / et erismas fac(iendum) loc(auerunt); / Hs (80,000)[---?], / Cn. Aequasius C. f. Caluo[s], / L. Aelius L. f., II uir(i) d. d. / M. Suestidius L. f., / C. Arrenus M. f., II uir(i) d. / deder(unt) idemq. prob(auerunt).


... / 15 ... Cum igitur ita uos Tusci/aes adsereretis esse coniunctos, ut in{i}stituto / consuetudinis prisciae, per singulas annorum ui/18 cas, a uobis [a]dque prae dictis sacerdotes creentur, / qui apud Vulsinios, Tusciae cuitate(m) ludos / schenicos et gladiatorum munus exhibant, / sed propter ardua montium et / difficultates iti/nerum saltuosa inpendio posceretis ut indu di / remedio sacerdote uestro ob editiones cele- / brandas Vulsinios pergere necesse non esset, / sic uicit ut ciuitati, cui nunc Hispellum nomen / est quamque Flaminiae uiae confines ad andecu- / mem, de nostro cognomine / nomen daremus, in qua / templum Flauiae gentis / opere magnifico nimirum pro amplitudinem / nuncupation is / exsurgere, ibi- / demque uis sacerdos, quem anniuersaria uicie Vmbria de/disset, spectaculum tam sceni- /orum ludorum quae inpenldio postulastis, impetrata esse gaudebitis.

ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

205 **Iguvium:** C XI 5820; ILS 5531 (In theatro rep. Unius inscriptionis duo exempla); E&J 336. Datable to Augustus' reign.


206 **Mevania:** C XI 5062; EATOR II 25 (Pietra rosa. I/II sec. d.C.); Fora 189.

---- / [--- ob hon[orem --- / --- fec?it, inpen[sa sua / --- munus g]ladiatorio --- / --- eode / ---

207 **Mevania:** C XI 5031; EATOR II 26 (Lastra di bronzo. Non prima del III sec. d.C.); Fora 190.

---- / [---++]++[--- / --- si]ngulis u[niuersisque? --- /3 ---

208 **Pisaurum:** C XI 6377 + SI 1 pp.80–81; EATOR II 9 (Base marmorea modanata. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 194.

C. Titio C. f. Cam. Valentino, / aedili, q(uaestori), II ur(o), qui testamen[to colonis coloniae / iul(iae) / Felic(is) Pisaur(i) decies centena / milia1 num. dedit, ita ut per sing(ulos) /6 annos ex sestertiorum CCC (m.) / usuris populo epulum, die / natali Titi Maximi fili eius, / diuideretur et ex sestertiorum / DC (m.) usuris, quint(o quoque an/no munus gladiatorium ederetur. /12 Plebs urbana.

209 **Pisaurum:** C XI 6369; EATOR II 10 (Nota da trascrizione manoscritta. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 195.

C. Mutteio C. f. Pal. / Quinto Seuero / q(uaestori), II ur(o), q. alimentor(um), / curatori calendarii / pecuniae Valentini[ae] HS DC (m.), /6 patrono VI ur(orum) August(alium) et / coll(egiorum) / fabr(or.), centonar(ior.), nauticular(ior.), / decuriones et plebs urbana, /9 ex diui'sione' epularum, / ob merita. / L. d. d.

210 **Pisaurum:** C XI 6537 + SI 1 p.80; ILS 5057; EATOR II 15 (Nota dalla tradizione manoscritta. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 193.


211 **Spoletum:** C XI 4814. Known from MSS.

212 Tuficum: C XI 5716; EAOR II 17 (Frammento di base. 1.2: sono possibili anche [ornato] vel [decorato]. Irreperibile nel 1986); Fora 192. A.D. 180/192.


213 Vettone: C XI 5710 ("In sasso siliceo durissimo tagliato e riquadrato; torte sono le linee mal formate le lettere e pochissimo incavate" Di Costanzo). 4th c. (B. Liou, Praetores Etruriae XV populum, Bruxelles 1969, p.67).

----- / [--] Tuscia(m) suam [...] jaut neq'ui'idem ad aliquam q'u'acin[--- / 3 ---]it ob quem liberalitatem suam etiam [...] in Vrbe sacra administrans et pro amore ciuico filios ei[us --- / ---] Di[scolium et Apronianum tabulis aere inciso[--- / 6 ---] plebis ciuica patronos cooptarunt ex quibus [...] praetore Aetruriae1 XV pp(opulorum) dedit Discolum et Apronia[num --- / ---]m Aetruriae1 ludos aeditit1 paradosex or urbe et diu[isiones --- / ---] os per decen1 dies aepula1 ordinibus propiner[t] et ce[nas --- / ---]nis diebus dedit et ciuiatibus ex sen[atus --- / ---] totem et annonas et cum [...] VS[---]AXIS[---] / ------?

Regio VII Etruria

214 Caere: C XI 3613 (Tabula marmorea); ILS 5052. A.D. 25.


C ------ / [---] cos. / [Jud(os et Iu]uenalia fecer(unt)] / Naeuius [...] Memmius [...] / /ius Bonades[putos].

D ------ / [---]F dexter [...] orus lud(os) / [der(unt)] XIIII, XII]I, XII kal. / [- - Petro?]nio Ma/[mertino?, Q. Tineio Rufo] cos. / ------?
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

216 Capena: C XI 3936 (Cippus); ILS 6588. A.D. 162.

M. Gellio Seruando / seniore, seuiro August(ali) /3 municipio Capene foederato, / ludos edenti ob merita / eius collatione facta decurionum / et Augustium item uicanorum / hoc honorem sibi oblatum /6 HS n. / in aerarium r(ei) p. C(apenatium) f(oederatorum) contulit ut ex eo die /12 USC X7V usure decurio/nibus et August(alib.) et uicanis diuidatur prae/entibus et ex ea diuisione iubeo statuae /12 meae coronas emi /6 III. L. d. ex d. d., / curantibus C. Naeuio / Proculo et M. Oeilio / Seruando iun(iore) et Vatinio / Prisco scriba p. r(ei) p. C. f. / Dedic(a) est III kal. Decembr., Maximo et Orficio coss.

218 Falerii novi: C XI 3078 = 7483 + /1 J 1 p.124; ILS 3083 + add.; ILL 192 (Lamina aenea utrimque inscripta olim clavis donario cuidam affixa). 2nd c. B.C.
Iouei, Iunonei, Mineruae / Falesce quei in Sardinia sunt /3 donum dederunt. Magistreis / L. Latrius /3 K. f., C. Salu(e)na Voltai f., / coiraueront. /
 Gonlegium quod est aciptum aetatei aged[a], opiparum a[d] uetam quolundam festosque dies,
3 quei souei aastutieis opidque Volgani
 gondecorant saip[i]sume comuiua loidosque,
ququei hue dede[unt i]nperatoribus summeis,
6 utei sesed luben[ttes be]ne iouent optantis.

219 Falerii Novi: C XI 3083; ILS 5373; E&J 334; SI 1, 10 (Probabile piedistallo, la cui epigrafe si conosce al completo solo attraverso copie di umanisti. Fra il 2 a.C. e il 14 d.C.).
Floronius Q. I. Princeps / uiam Augustam, ab uia / Annia extra portam ad /12 Cereris, silice sternendam / curant pecunia sua / pro ludis.

220 Falerii Novi: SI 1, 24; AE 1982, 276; EAOR II 24 (Lastra marmorea. I/II sec. d.C., per il formulario ed i caratteri paleografici); Fora 196. 
6 [pontif(ici) sacr(ario) lun(onis) C]urr(itis)², / [hic in² hono]re q(uin)q(uennalitatis) sua[e
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS 267

\[3 \text{---} J^+ \text{ in editionem} / [\text{mune} \text{ris decem pari} [\text{a gladiatorum}] \text{ optulit}]; \text{ cui ob} \delta \text{ [merita] sua, ordo et} / [\text{populus} \text{ r(ei) p.}] \text{ Faliscorum} / [\text{p(ecunia) p(ublica) optulit}] \text{m equestrem} / \delta \text{ ponem da[m censuerunt]}.

Marti / Aug., /3 T. Rufiliius Priscus, / IIII uir aedilicius?, ex d. d. / pro ludis sua pecunia pensuit.

222 Forum Clodi: C XI 3303 (Tabula parva marmorea); ILS 154; Sherk 50 (Series of excerpts or summaries from decreta; the material has clearly been lifted out of context); E&J 101. A.D. 18.
Ti. Caesare tertium, Germanico Caesare iter(um) cos., / Cn. Acceio Cn. f. Arn. Rufo Lutatio, T. Petillio P. f. Qui. II uir(is), /3 decreta: / Aediculam et statuas has, hostiam dedicationi. Victimae natali Augusti usti VIII k. Octobr. duae, quae p(er)p(etuo) et (etuo) inmolari adsueta sunt ad aram, quae numini Augusto dedicata est, VIII k. Octobr. /6 inmolemunt ... /13 Ara(n) numini Augusto pecunia nostra faciendam curamus; ludos / ex idibus Augustis diebus sex p(ecunia) n(ostra) faciendos curamus. /15 Natali Augustae mulsum et crustulum multieribus uicanis ad / Bonam deam pecunia nostra dedimus. / ...

223 Ocriculum: C XI 7806.
[..]o L. f. Ataedio quaestori /--- aere conlat(o) ludis dedica[---].

224 Perusia: C XI 1924 (basis marmorea); ILS 5503. Only the right-side inscription carries the date A.D. 166, but the events described here at A.D. 10—10 happened before Pius' death in 161 (cf. Jacques 1984 p.410).
Diuo Antonino / Pio. /3 C. Egnatius Festus, aedil(is), II uir; / huic cum pleps urbana ludos pub(i-cos) / edent ad statuam sibi ponendam, /6 pecuniam optulisset, is honore / contentus impensam remisit / et imperata uenia ab ordine /9 Perusinor(um) optimo maximoq. princeps / de sua pecunia posuit; cuius / ob dedicationem dari iussit /12 ab herede suo decurionib. / sing(uis) HS III n., plebi HS II n. / L. d. d. d.

225 Pisa: C XI, 1421 (Tabula ex marmore Lunensi); ILS 140; Insit VII 1, 7; Sherk 48; E&J 69; A.R. Marotta D’Agata, Decreta Pisana, Pisa 1980. A.D. 4. LL.17—19, 25—31 are provided here.

226 Tarquinia: AE 1951, 185 (Sur une vasque, sans doute de fontaine); M. Torelli, Elogia Tarquiniensia, Firenze 1975 pp.164—65 no. 14 (et£ Augustea); AE 1993, 682 (Il s’agirait d’un récipient monumental pour l’huile, présente dans plusieurs sanctuaires, destinée aux athlètes lors des jeux). This is unlikely: pro ludis surely means “instead of games” and not “for the games”.
Q. Cossutius P. f., IIII uir i. d., de sua pecunia pro ludis.
227 Veii: C XI 3782; Liverani 33 (Lastra. Tra il 2 d.C. e un anno non molto posteriore al 42).

Quot --- / (supra) pontif. [max--- cos. ---] / tribunic. po[rest---] / patri[a(e)] / (pag. sin.) Q.

Numius Q. l/ / Thyrsus, / M. Numicius (mulieris) l. / Acatus, / L. Postumius L. / Eros maior, / (pag. dex.)
L. Messius [L. ] / Saluius, / C. Volumnius C. l./ Bello, / Q. Marius Q. l. / Stabilius, / (infra) seuir Augustales,
pro [ludis] / ------?

228 Veii: C XI 3781 (Tabula marmorea litteris magnis et bonis); Album 67 (L.9: A date seems intended; L.11: [curantibus]?). A.D. 34.

Quot ----? / sacrum. / L. Decimius L. i. Gamus V[I uir Aug(ustalis)], / pro impensa ludorum [---] /

s(ua) p(ecunia) ponendum curauit [---] / Ti. Caesaris Augu[sti ---] / seuir et seuiralibus et R[---] /

vacat ded[i-cata] / Paullo Fabio Pers[ico, L. Vitellio cos.], / vacat VI[---] / L. Mummius L. f. Ru[fo ---] /

229 Veii: C XI 3803; EATOR II 22 (Frammento già perduto al tempo del CIL. Datazione incerta ma probabilmente compresa all’intorno dell’età giulio-claudia); Fora 197.

Quot ------? / trib(uno) mjlilit(um) leg(ionis) XXII [---? inter?] duumuir(ales?) all(ecto? ---? / --- munus?

230 Veii: C XI 3798; ILS 6581; Liverani 40 (Lastra marmorea di giallo antico, ora [1987] irreperibile). 2nd/mid 3rd c.?

[-] Aescionio C. [f.], / Capellae, II uir(o), / trib(uno) milit(um), praef(ecto) fab[rum], / munici-
pes extramur[i / et] Augustales ex aere conl(ato) / ludis in orchestra^1.

231 Veii: C XI 3811 (basis marmorea); ILS 6583. Mid 3rd c.

Caesiae Sabinae / Cn. Caesi Athicti (sc. uxori); / haec sola omnium / feminarum / matribus C
uir(orum) et / sororibus et filiab. / et omnis ordinis / mulieribus municipib. / epulum dedit diebusq. / ludorum
et epuli / uiri sui balneum cum oleo gratuito / ded. / Sorores piissimae.

232 Veii: C XI 3807; ILS 6582b; Liverani 43 (Base di statua). A.D. 256.


233 Veii: C XI 3808 (tabula marmorea); ILS 6582c. Mid 3rd c.

Cn. Caeso Ath[icto], / adlecto inter C [uir(os)], / ob pietatem et / munificentiam eius / erga
domum diuinam / et municipium Aug. Veios, / centumuir et seuir et / Augustales et municipes / intramurani ex
eaer^1 quod / in orchestra conlatum est / ludis quos fecerunt / Vergilius Cogitatus, / Iulius Senecio II uiri.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS  269

Regio VIII Aemilia

234  Claternae: C XI 683 + p.1238. a: (Cippus ex lapide arenario). b: (Cippus ex lapide harenaceo supra rotundus. L.1: Quid significet nesc[i]t Bormann]). Two almost identical inscriptions. Late 1st c. B.C.?

b  Ψ / P. Camurius Nicephor, / sex uir, ludos fecit / dies V. P(edes) q(uoquouersus) [X]XIII.

Regio IX Liguria

235  Dertona: C V 7376 (Lectio tota incerta est et parum fida). L.11: the restitution in CIL of the names of the consuls of 22 B.C. (M. Claudius Marcellus and L. Arruntius) is improbable because too early in light of the language of the inscription; MROZEK 1987 p.26 n.50 came to the same conclusion.


236  Pollentia (ager): C V 7637; ILS 5065; Istit IX 1, 166; EAOR II 8 (Lastra marmorea); Fora 198. A.D. 139/161.


Regio X Venetia et Histria

237  Ausugum: C V 5049; EAOR II 23 (Lastra in marmo rosso. Probabilmente seconda metà I sec. d.C.); SI 12, 2; AE 1994, 716; COURTNEY 1995 no.108 (L.2: ... ter an[ie]f. Ll.1–3, 7–10: “I had put on a (wonderful) gladiatorial show in the month of November, and thrice before that the price of grain was lowered at my expense. Solicitous men ..., collecting funds from all sources made a gilt statue. Great envy grew up because of the title (of patron); the citizens, like proprietors, tried to drive me out; shame was abandoned ....” Mommsen thought the lettering consistent with the 1st c. A.D., but the poem looks much later); Fora 204. Ll.1–10 are provided here.

anonaq. meo su[mptu est lax- vel leu³]ata per an[nos³].

3 Solliciti, insonte[s], proponi magna put[antes]
sperant[e]sq. mihi se munera ferre, fere[bant]
funera. Set sanctus deus hic felicius i[lla]

6 transtulit in melius! Sic denique fata tuler[unt:]
a]uratam (sc. statuam) faciunt generatis undique nummi[s;
i]nuidia creuit de nomine magna; patronu[m,

9 s]ic, tamquam domin[i], ciues expellere temp[tant;
plebi praecibus pudore e[st]; ... 

238 Brixia ⇒ Cremona: C V 4399; ILS 6702; Inslit X 5, 192 + SI 8 p.168; EAOR II 14 (Ara in pietra locale); Fora 203. End of 1st c.

Q. Caecilio / Telesphoro, VI/3 uir(o) Flauiali / Cremonae et munera(i) / Caluentia i.6 Cornelia, / marito optimo / et sibi.


[---]lutius [-] f. Fab., III/3 uir [i. d.?], gladiator(es) in IIII uii[ratu Patau[i de]dit; idem / [te]stamento [HS] (1,050,001) / [po]pulo legau[it, qu]ua pecuni[a /6 ---]+EADV[---] / ------?


Constantius munera(r)ius / gladiatoribus suis /3 propter fauorem / muneris, munus se/pulcrum dedit
De/corato retiarii 'um' / qui peremit Caeruleum / et peremptus decidit. /9 Ambos extinxit rudis; / utrosque pro-tegit / rogus; Decoratus /12 secutor pugnar(um) VIII, / Valeriae uxori do/lore(m) primum /15 reliquit.

241 Verona: a: C V 3222; ILS 3264 (venatio: fortasse picta vel marmore expressa [index p.905]); EAOR II 28 (Base parallelepipeda in pietra rossa della Valpolicella, con testo ripetuto sulla fronte e sul retro. Prima metà del I sec. d.C.); Fora 201. b: EAOR II 29 (Grande basamento parallelepipedo in pietra rossa della Valpolicella); Fora 202.

Nomine / Q. Domitii Alpini, /3 Licinia mater / signum Dianae et uenationem / et salientes t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit).

Regio XI Transpadana

242 Augusta Praetoria: C V 6842; Inslit XI 1, 11; EAOR II 16 (Steire in pietra locale. II sec. d.C.); Fora 207. L.l.1-8 are provided here.

D. M. / P. Vinesi Fir[i]mi, q(uaestoris), aed(ilis) et / II uir(i) munera(i), / P. Vinesius For tunatus
et Vinesia Faustina, / patri carissimo. /9 ...

243 Bergomum: C V 5124; ILS 5092; EAOR II 18 (Lastra in arenaria); Fora 205. A.D. 238/244.

[E]x indulg(entia) d. n. / M. Ant. Gordiani i.3 Pii Fel. Aug., / edente M. Mamilio / Eutychiano IIII
u(iro) d. n., /6 Thr(aex) Pinne(n)sis S / de Val(ericio) Valerian(o) nat(ione) Raet(o); / docet Faustus.

244 Concordia: C V 8664 (Basis); EAOR II 16. Two almost identical inscriptions; text of a; underlined letters in brackets are seen on b. 1st/early 2nd c.

ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

245 Ticinum: CILSI 870; ILS 6742; EAOR II 11 (Lastra marmorea. Fine II/III sec. d.C.); Fora 206.

Tullio Marc(i) / lib. Achilleo, ü3 decurioni / ornamentario, / cultori d(omus) d(iuiniae), ü6
q(uin)q(uenni) p(e)r(petuo?) / c(ollegiorum?) f(abror?) c(entonarior?) i(t(em?) / curatore muner(is) ü9

Sicilia


Pro salute et reditu et / uictoria ü3 Imp. Caesaris M. Aureli Antonin[i] / Aug. Armeniaci, Medici,
Parthici / Maximi liberorumque eiu[s. ü6 - A]nius L. f. Lemonia Tertius, / duumuirum aedilis, q(uaestor)
p(ecuniae) p., cura[(or)] / muneris publici gladiatori[j]; ü9 ob honorem aedilitatis promi[s(it)] / e[X] s(ua)
p(ecuniae) HS XXV m. n., ex quibus, iussu [ - ] Valer[i] Seponiani, q(uaestoris) ü12 S(iciliae), c(larissimae)
m(emoriae) u(iri), in / straturam plataeae ü1 C ererum / sacrae HS XIII m. n. numerau(it) ü15 et [dec(urionib.) ü2]
reliquis HS XII m. n. d(edit) donis.


------ / [curatori kalendari? ---]iani quod mera fide admi/[nistrauit eodemque tempore] cur. por-
tensis kal. quod singulari ü3 [diligentia tractuit, --- ]audabili munerario qui indulgentia / [sacra --- ex]hibuit,
illui ü1 meruit optando quod uoluit / [et unuiersis ciuibus --- e]ditionem gratissimam reddidit, quod dieü6[bus ---
populum per multas] horas theatru uoluptas tenuit et hilaris / [totus in harenam --- inde a] meridie transiit; in qua
miratus honestissimum / [apparatum instructum omni] genere herbarium et numerosas orientales ü9 [feras
uersatusque --- inde a] meridie in uiuscasque caueis uaris missionibus / [delectatus est, indeque ex indulg]entia
sacra specialist meruit atü1 cultum / [epulum instructumque --- a]mplissimo apparatu ciues suos universos ü12 [ut
uocaret; cui cum populus propter] uoluptates honeste exhibitas ad augendam / [optimi uiri honorificentiam
freq]uentissimis uocibus, bigas centuriatim / [postulasset, motus --- uerec]undia quod esset duabus bigisü1 et
equestrib. ü15 [statuis tribus? contentus ---] / ------?

Alpes Maritimae

248 Cemenelum: C V 7915; CILSI 1024; G. Laguerre, Inscriptions antiques de Nice–Cimiez, Paris

D.M. M. Nemunio M. fil. / Cupito, dec(urioni), Huir(o) ü3 muner(ario), flam(ini) ciuit(atis); / M.
Nemunius Nepos, fil(ius), / patri, s(uam) p(ecunia) p(osuit).
**Gallia Belgica**

**Treveri:** *Beda:* C XIII 4132 (L.3: *AMMIA[TIVS]*); L.8: *Hunc diem incidere in ludos Florales monet Hettner); *ILS* 5646. A.D. 198.

In h(onorem) d(omus) d(iuinae) et / numinibus Augg., I(oui) O(ptimo) M(aximo). /3 L. Ammius¹

Gamburio / proscenium cum tribunali et eo [amplius] X L (m.) ex q6uorum [usuris] tutela(m) prosceni e[t]
ludos omnibus annis pri. kal. Mai. /9 curatores uici procu/10 rare debuit1, fide mandavit. D(e)dicatum?
Saturnino et Gallo cos.

**Gallia Lugdunensis**

**Agedincum:** A: C XIII 2940 (Stylobates litteris bonis); *ILS* 7050. B: AE 1992, 1240 (Grand bloc en calcaire qui appartenait à un monument important. Date: fin du règne de Trajan ou début de celui d'Hadrien); this inscription was erected in Lugdunum.

A In honorem domus Augg.; Marti, Volk(ano) et deae sanctis(iae) Vestae. M. Magilius
Hon(atus ex u)oto pos(uit) [pro se suo] r(m) et sua ueritate, / pro se suo[squae]n[ei].

(1) Sext. Iul(i)o Thermiano, / sacerdoti ara(e) in,i(ter) confluent(e) Arar(is) / et Rhodani, omnib.
ho[noribus apud suos /6 functo, socero].

(5) M. Magilio Honorato, / flamini Aug(ustali) munera/3rio, omnibus honorib. / apud suos functo.

(6) M. Aemilio Nobili, / flamini Aug. mune/3r(io), omnibus honorib. / apud suos functo, fratri.

B [Se]xto Iul(i)o / Thermiano, / Senonio, fl[ami]n(i) / Aug(ustali) munera/3rio / in sua ciuitate, /

**Agedincum:** C XIII 2949 (Tabula aenea [ansata]). L.2: *FILIATERNIND.* A.D. 250.

C. Amatio C. Amat(ii) Patern(i) / fil. 'P' aternino, aedil(i) uikan(orum) / Agied(incium), aedil.
c(iuitatis) S(enonum), actor(i) p. pagi / Tout(iaci²), act(ori) 'p.' quinquenn. ciuit(atis), /5 II uir(o) ab aer(ario)
muner(ario), praef(ecto) an/nonae designato, uiu(um)en(i) integerr(imo), / Matern(ius) Eucharistus et
Pat[e]ri(m) / Pollio Sil(i) / off(iciales) eius ob mer(ita) p(ecunia²) p(ublica²), / d. n. Decio Aug. II et Grato
cos. / kal. Apr.

**Lugdunum:** C XIII 1921 (Lapis quadratus); *ILS* 7024. 2nd half of 2nd/early 3rd c. L.9: i.e. *hoc mumumentum* dat.

Sex. Ligurius Sex. fil. / Gal. Marinus, /3 summus curator c(iuium) R(omanorum) / prouinc(iae)
Lug(enseis), q(uaestor), II uiralib. / ornamentis suffrag(io) /6 sanct(is) ordinis hono/9rem perpetui pontif(icutis) dat; / cuius doni dedicatione
Lug(unsib.) licite coeuntibus *IX, /15 item ludos circenses dedit. L. d. d. d.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS


253X Lugdunum ⇒ ?: AE 1992, 1239 (Base en calcaire qui devait appartenir à un monument plus important); probably 2nd c.

Tib. Domitio / Proculo / flam(ini) munerao / apud suos.

Gallia Aquitania

254 Convenae ⇒ Aucis?: C XIII 128 (Tabula marmorea [ansata] litteris bonis saec. fere quinti); AE 1987, 766; SIVAN 1989 (LL.9–14: “The entire province honoured you as its own parent, and public vows desired life for you; the public services (games) formerly given at your expense received expressions of joy throughout rows of cheering people. Through you your fatherland that nurtured you summoned the council of the chief men, saying that it spoke more solemnly through your mouth”); AE 1989, 507. If Nymphius gave his shows as provincial priest, then this must have happened at Aucis (modern Auch), then capital of Novempopulana.

1 Nymphius aeterno deuentus membra sopore
2 hic situs est caelo mens pia perfruir
...  
9 te coluit proprium prouincia cuncta parentem
optabant uitam publica uota tuam
exceperu tuo quondam data munera sumptu
plaudentis populi gaudia per cuneos
concilium procerum per te patria alma uocauit
14 seque tuo duxit sanctius ore loqui
...  
19 parua tibi coniuunj magna solacia luctus
20 hunc tumuli titulum maesta Serena dicat
...  


(a) [---]AN[..]R spectac[ulum --- / ---] signo dato [---] (b) [---] uocati sunt VI[---] (c) [---] populi [---] (d) [---]OT[---] Romulus [---].
Gallia Narbonensis


[Decemlecti pos/sero]m Aq[uen]/si/sium donauer(unt). luctum cum sua ui/nea uicanis
A/quens(ib.) ad ludos / celebraz(os) pro / salute Imp. Aug./ Zmertuccius Ti9/tianus, p(atronus?) u(ici?) aram
/ d(e) s(uo) d(at).

257 Apta: C XII 1121 + p.823; I LN IV 24. Known from a MS. L.3: im]pensa s(ua), ludos publi[ce --- ?]

[---] flamen Romae et diui Aug(usti) S VFF / portições et clu[suris --- / impensas ludos publi[cos? ---] / ---?

258 Aquae Sextiae: C XII 522 + p.814; I LN III 29 (Cippe de marbre avec base et couronnement. Époque julio-claudienne). The title of munerarius suggests at the earliest a Flavian date, which Gascou’s
discussion, I LN ad nos. 29 and 216, does not rule out.


259 Arausio: C XII 1236 + p.824. L.0–2: perhaps something like ... hic simul cum in II uiratu ludos fecerit, populo balneum (or epulum) et oleum primus dedit ... (cf. 231, 304).

[---] / II uir ludos fe[cit --- balneum?] / et oleum prim[us ---], / flamen Rom(ae) et d[iui Aug(usti ---); / huic d. d. sta[taux- ---] / ---?

260 Areliate: C XII 670 + p.818 (Litterae videntur esse saeculi primi vel secundi incipientis); I LGN 109; AE 1965, 270 (Dédicace gravé[e] deux fois sur le podium [de l’amphithéâtre]).

C. Iunius Priscus, II u[ir] quinquen[nalis] cand(idatus) Areliate[nium], item flamen Auctusatijlis,
[post(aum)] podi[u]m cum [ia]nus / signum Neptuni argentae pollicit[us erat] HS
CC (m.) d[e suo adie]c[tis] (IV ae) s(igna) fac[i]en[da] cu[rat], / flamen Rom(ae) et d[iui Aug(usti ---); / huic d. d. sta[taux- ---] / ---?

261 Areliate: C XII 697 + p.817 (Tabula marmorea) + p.817 + I LGN p.33; Ch. Landes in ID. ed. 1994 pp.268–69, 293 no.93. L.12: [...] lud(i), which is usually restituted at left, is unlikely for a show of athletes, and causes a
void of c. 3 letters difficult to fill at the beginning of the line. 2nd c.

[- An]nius / [- f. Te]r. Camars, / [X uir stlit(ib.)] lud(i)ds, trib(unus) mil(itum) / [leg(ionis)
---, seui]r e(quium) Rom(anorum) turm(ae) / [...] q(uaestor), trib. p)leb(is), praet(or), proco(n)s(ul) /6
[pro(a)te] libris m. ded(it) / [...] quar(um) munopret(ium) / [rei p.? dona]uit item HS CC (m.) n. / [ex quor(um) usur][lis omnibus annis /12 [certamen] athletar(um) aut circen/[ses ederen]tur. / [Idem ad me] moriae aeternitatem(em) /15 [monumentum] ex(s)truxit.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

262 Arelate: C XII 701 (Cippus, litteris saeculi secundi).

263 Dea Vocontiorum: C XII 1529 + p.826.

264 Dea Vocontiorum: C XII 1585 ("Lettres grandes et bien proportionnées" Dupéríer); ILS 6992. 2nd/3rd c.
Sex. Vencio / Iuuentiano /3 flamini diuì Aug(usti), / item flamini et cura/tori munera[r(usb)] gladiato[r(usb)] Villiani, adiec/to in curiam Lugudu/nensium nomine; /9 incolatus a splen/dissimo ordine / eorum, /12 ordo Vocontior(um) / ex consensu et pos/tulatione populi /15 ob praeципuam / eius in edendis / spectaculis li/18beralitatem.

265 Narbo: AE 1908, 185; ILGN 578 (Table de marbre. Lettres de bonne forme). 2nd c.?
(b) ------- [seuiris Au]gstalib. / [---] eis HS XXXIII (m.) /3 [Syntr]opho patre [--- / ---]ris dies nat[alis / ---]uum cei[--- / ---]OP[--- / ---]?

266 Nemausus: AE 1982, 680 (Base en calcaire. Entre le règne de Marc Aurèle et la fin du IIe s.).

267 Nemausus: AE 1982, 681 (Base en calcaire. Seconde moitié du IIe s.).
Ordo sanctissim(us), / Q. Auilio Q. f. Sennio /3 Palatina Comini/ano, in honorem pa/tris eius Q. Auulli Hyacin]]/6thi quod is, praeter libera[r]itates spectaculorum quae / sponte ededit1 uel postulat[a --- / ---] non negauit, uelis nouis sum/ptu suo in theatro positi cum / suis armamentis, saepe pecunia /12 mutua quae a magistratibus / petebatur data actum publicum / iuuerit.

268 Nemausus: C XII 3185. 2nd/3rd c.
269 Nemausus: C XII 3324 (Haud longe ab amphitheatro rep.).
Muner(e) C. Pomp(eii) Mart(ialis)², / esse(darius) lib(er) /³ Faustus (coronarum) XXXVII, / n(atione) Arabus; / Euche contubern(alis), de suo.

270 Reii: C XII 372; ILN II 15 (Perdue. Date probable: fin du Ier ou IIe siècle).

271 Vienna: C XII 1917 (Tabula litteris non bonis).
D. M. / Tib. Iulius;³ / Diadochus, / dendropho/rus /⁶ munificus [---] / ------

Tarracronensis

272 Aquae Flauiae: C II 2473; CIDER 75 + p.255 (Ara de granito. «As letras são elegantes» Leite).
Ermæei De/uori, ob eu/³ entum bo/num gladi/atores m[u]n/³ eris, / L. Cæxae/us Fuscu/⁹ s X ex /
uoto.

273 Barcino: C II 4514 (Litteris elegantibus); ILS 6957; CIDER 14 + p.255 (Inscripción de piedra caliza). II.19: publi[c(as)?] Some time before A.D. 169.
L. Caecilius L. f. / Pap. Optatus, /³ (centurio) leg(ionis) VII G(eminæ) Fel(icitis) / et (centurio) leg.
XV Apollin(aris), / missus honesta /⁶ missione ab Imp. M. / Aur. Antonino et Aur. / Vero Aug., atlectus¹ a
Bar[c]inonensib.) /³ inter immunes, consecut(us) / in honores aedilicios, / II ur[um] III, flam(en) Romae /¹² diuo-
rum et Augustorum / qui r(ei) p. Barc(ìnensium) ita leg(auit): “Do, lego / darique uolo /¹⁵
quorum usuris semissibus / edi uolo quodannis spectac(ulum) / pugilum die III iduum Iuni. /¹⁸ usque at X CCL,
et eadem die / ex X CC oleum in thermas/publ[i][c(e?)] / populo praebeti. Hæc ita praes²¹ tari ea condicione
uolo, ut / liberti mei item libertorum meorum / libertarumque liberti quos /²⁴ honor / seuratur contigit /²⁷ rib, at
omnibus mu/neribus seuratus ex/cusati sint. Quot si quis /³⁰ eorum at munera / uocitus¹ fuerit, / tum ea X VII
(m.) D at /³³ rem pub. Tarrac(onensis) / transferi iubeo / sub eadem forma /³⁶ spectaculorum quot / s(ypra)
s(critum) est edendorum / Tarracone.” /²⁵ L. d. d. d.

274 Carthago Nova: C II 3408; C I 2269 + pp.1103–4; ILL 117 (L.L.1–2: quattuoruirii?); CIDER 43 (La alusión al Geniu opidi nos indica que es anterior al año 45 a. J.C., fecha que Julio César fundó la colonia).
L. Baebius L. f., L. Cati(us) M. f., / L. Taurius L. f., Ser. Aefol(an)us [- f.], /³ Genio opidi¹
columnam, / pompam ludosq./ coirauerunt.

275 Castulo: C II 3269 + p.1167 (Fragmenta sunt epistylii alicius, litteris optimis et grandibus); CIDER 45; CILA III 88. Three similar inscriptions; given here is a; underlined letters in brackets are extant in b or c. A.D. 42/54.
Verecunda [uxor d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt). /³ P. Cornelius P. f. Gal. Taurus, f(ilius), ludis inpsensa sua factis de[dicauit].

276 Castulo: C II 3270; ILS 5513; CIDER 48 + p.255; CILA III 91. Known from a MS. 1st/2nd c.?
Q. Torio Q. f. Culleoni, / proc(uratori) Aug(usti) prouinc(iae) Baet(icae), /³ quod muros uetustate / collapsos d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) refecit, solum / ad balineum adedicandum / dedit, uiam quae per Castul(onensis) / saltum Sisaponem ducit / ad theatrum posuit. /¹² HS centies quae illi summa / publice debebatur, addito / etiam epulo, populo remisit. /¹⁵ Municipes Castulonenses / editis per biduum circens(ib.) / d(ederunt, d(edicauerunt).

277 Castulo: AE 1976, 351 (Haute stèle); CILA III 84. A.D. 155.

278 Castulo: AE 1958, 4; CIDER 46 (Mármol grisáceo); CILA III 101. 2nd c.
L. Cor(nelio) Marullo. / Quod ordo Castulon(ensium) /³ pro liberalitate Cor(nelio) / Marullinae matris / eius, quod ciuitatem / Castulonensium sta[tuis] argenteis et e[pu]lo et circensib. decoras[et], statuaum ei et filio su/o posituram se decre/uerat. Cor(nelio) Marull[i] /¹²[n]a honore ac[cepto / d(e)] pec(unia) sua poni iussit. / Hoc donum illius /¹⁵ C. Cor(nelio) Bellicus heres / d(edit) d(edicauit) / editis circensib.

279 Castulo: C II 3265; CIDER 47 (Base de una estatua a Pieta Augusta); CILA III 80. 2nd c.
Pietati Aug. / Quod Cor(nelio) C. f. Mar[ullina] /³ ara[m] posituram se d[edit] / Castulonensi[m / pr]omiserat in m[em[ori[a]]m L. Cor(nelio) Marull[i] / C. Cor(nelio) / Bellicus, heres eius, / e]x arg(entii) libris [...] /³ editis circensibus / [l(ibens)] an(imo) loco d[ato d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) curauit].

280 Ebusus: C II 3646; ILS 6960; CIDER 28 (Lápida perdida). Late 1st or early 2nd c.
----- / P X² et C. Cornelius / Seruinus, h(eredes) et curatores /³ operis eius p(osuerunt); / hic r(ei) p. Eburi[t(anorum)] XC milia / numorum legauit, ut ex eis /⁶ quodannis tributum Romanis / penderetur, et ne ciues iniquo / tempore tributa pendere /⁹ cogentur reliqua VI milia / fenerarentur, et ex usuris / ludi ederentur quodannis /¹² cum uas(is) lum(inum) V / -----.

281 Oretum: C II 3221 = 6339; ILS 5901; CIDER 44 (Asacor del s. II por la fórmula de los rs. 8–10).
P. Baebius V/neasitus, P. Bae/³bi Veneti f., P. B/aebi Baesisce/ris nepos, Or/⁶ etanus, peten/te ordine et po/pulo in hono/³re domus / diuiniae pont/em fecit ex HS XXC (m.) circensib/¹²us editis dono / d(edit) i(demq.) d(edicauit).
282 **Saguntum**: Hernández Hervás & Al., *Saguntum* 29, 1995 p.226 (Fragmento perteneciente a una gruesa placa de mármol blanco. Siglo II d.C. [?]. L.1: *ludos scaen(ic(os))*. Rather, at L.1: *dedjc.* or *publjic.*, because of the nature of the support and the monumental lettering (which suggest that this is the dedication of a public building), and page make-up.

```
------/ [--- dedjic(---)] / [--- circe]nse[β] [--- ex HS ---] M CCL / ------
```

283 **Tagilis**: *AE* 1979, 352 (Plaque de marbre blanc. Fin du Ier ou début du IIe s.).

Voconia Q. f. Auita / thermas rei publicae /³ suae Tagilitanae s(olo) s(uo), s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecit) / easdemque circensibus / editis e[t] epulo dato dedicauit /⁶ at quot opus tuendum usumq. / perpetuum I[her]marum praebandum / r(ei) p. Tagilitanae d(eariorum) duo milia q(uingentos) dedit(t).

284 **Toletum**: *AE* 1986, 428 (Bloc calcaire).

```
------/ [---]us ob / [hon]or(em) IIIIIIII uir(atus) β³ circensib. editis / d(---) d(---).
```

**Lusitania**

285 **Balsa**: *C II* 13 + p.785; *ILS* 5069; *CIDER* 13 + p.255 (Ara de piedra caliza). 2nd c.

Fortunae Aug. / sacr. / Annius Primitius, / ob honorem /³ IIIIII uir(atus) sui, / edito barcarum / certamine et / pugilum, sportulis / etiam ciuiibus /⁷ datis / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(ono) d(edit).

286 **Emerita**: *C II* 478; *CIDER* 29. The several fragments (some in granite and one at least in marble) brought together by Hübner in *CIL* came from different parts of the town and were recorded at different times. The restitution of the whole is therefore very doubtful and only fr. d. mentioning *circenses*, is provided here.

```
------ / [---] circens[---].
```

**Baetica**

287 **Arunda**: *C II* 1360; *CIDER* 37 (Hübner recoge dos lecturas diferentes. Poco o nada puede inferirse del texto, muy estropeado).


288 **Asido**: *C II* 1305; *CIDER* 85 (Encontrada en Jerez de la Frontera. Perdida. Hübner cree que procede de Asido. Probablemente del siglo II medio). L.7: *PIR*.


289 **Astigi**: *C II* 1479; *CIDER* 32; *C II* 5, 1179 (Basis marmorea. Periiit. Saec. II prioris).

D. d. / P. Numerio Martiali, /³ Astigitano, / IIIIII uiro co[I(onorum)] col(oniae) Aug. / [Firmae --- /⁶ P.] Num[erius Eupa]⁷ tor […] / patrono optimo et /⁹ indulgentissimo / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) / et editis ciciensib. dedicauit.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS 279

290 Astigi: C II 1471; CIDER 31; C II² 5, 1162 (Basis marmorea statuae argenteae. Saec. II prioris).
Boni Euentus. / Aponia Montana, sacer(ods) duar(um) Augustar. col(oniae) Aug. Fir(mae), / editis ob honorem sacerdotii circiensibus et / ob dedicationem alii, ex arg(enti) libris CL d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) d(edicauit).

291 Batora: C II² 5, 59 (Basis ex lapide calcario). A.D. 166.

292 Canana: C II 1074; ILS 5544. L.2: Flavian or later.

293 Carmo: C II 1380 (L.3: an pontific Augusti?); ILS 5080a; CIDER 84. 1st/2nd c.

294 Cartima: C II 1956 (Est basis magna marmorea litteris altis et subtilibus aevi Vespasiani); ILS 5512. The cognomina in -anus and the term spectacula together suggest a 2nd c. date.
Iunia D. f. Rustica, sacerdos / perpetua et prima in municipio Cartimian[o], / porticus public.
uetestate corruptas refecit, solum / balinei dedit, uectigalia publica uindicauit, signum aereum Martis in foro / posuit, porticus ad balineum / solo suo cum piscina et signo Cupidinis, epulo dato / et spectaculis editis, s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) d(edicauit), / statuas sibi et C. Fabio / Iuniano filio suo ab ordine Cartimianorum decreta / remissa impensa, item statuam C. Fabio Fabiano uiro suo / dato d(edicauit).

295 Corduba: C II 5523; ILS 5079; CIDER 41 + 87; C II² 7, 221 (Mensula marmorea, duobus orificiis ad statuam infingendam instructa. Litterarum formae sunt aestatis Severorum).
Colonia Patric(ia). / L. Iunii P. f. Serg. Paulinus, pontif(ex), flamen perpet., II uir c(olonorum) / c(oloniae) P(atriciae), flam(en) provinc(iae). Baet(icae), edito ob honorem flaminatus munere gladiatorio et / duabus lusionib., / statuas quas ob honores coniunctos promiserat, ex HS CCCC (m.) / posuit et factis circenses / s(ibi) d(edicauit).

296 Iliturgi: C II 2100 + p.885; ILS 3395; CIDER 35; CILA III 224; C II² 7, 28–29.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

297  **Ilipula:** C II 954 + p.834; *CIDER* 30 (Ara?); *CILA* I 73. Flavian or later.

Mineruae / sacrum. /^3^ M. Curiatu[us?] Q[uir. Longinus / All---]ensis, decurio / Ilipu[ensis
---]BONO[---] /\ editis [per] bidu[um] cirensibus / [---]CVR[---] M[---] / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(onum) d(edit).

298  **Isturgi:** C II 2121 + p.885; *CIL* A 3 265 (a mediados del s. II); C II^2^ 7, 56 (Ex litteris aetati Antoninianae tribuit Hübner).

Signum Mart(is) Au[g.], / A. Terentius A. f. Gal. Rusticus, / aed(ilis), IIuir, pont(ifex) m(unicipum) m(unicipii) Triump(atuis), / ludis scaenicis factis / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit).

299  **Italica:** C II 1108 (Basis marmorea. Litterae sunt tempori Traiani).

Libero Patri sacrum. / L. Caelius Saturninus, / L. Caeli Parthenopaei / lib., ob honorem IIII
"uir(atus)" / editis ludis scaenicis / d(onum) d(edit).

300  **Lucurgentum:** *AE* 1953, 21; *CIDER* 10 (Pedestal de mármol). L.14: TANP; L.15: s(ua) p(ecunia) vel s(o)lo p(ublico); d(onum) d(edit) vel d(ecr.) d(ecam). mid 2nd/mid 3rd c.?

M. Heluius Anthus, Lucurg(entinus), / IIIIII uir Aug(ustalis), edito spec/\^3^ taculo per quadridu/um
ludorum scaeni/corum et dato gyn/\^6^hasio per eosdem / dies, item mulie/ribus balineum
gra/\^9^tis; huic ordo splen/dissemissus Lucurgentin/orum, petente populo, orna/\^12^menta decurionatus decreuit; / Heluius Anthus ob
honorem / statuam Tani patris cum / S P D D / p(---)q. f(ecit).

301  **Murgi:** C II 5490; *CIDER* 40 (Pedestal de piedra caliza. Por el tipo de letra, según Hübner, la lápida es del s. II d.C.).

Porciae / Maurae. /^3^ L. Pedanius / Venustus / uxori opti/\^6^mae et / L. Ped(anius) Clarus e[t] / L.
Ped. Lupus f(iili)/^9^ matri piissim(ae) / posuerunt, / editis circ(iensib.) / dedit, donauit, dedicauit.

302  **Oset:** C II 1255. 2nd c.?

-----? / [--- / ---] / ludis s(ca)enicis [e]ditis [---] / dedit, donauit, dedicauit.

303  **Ostippo:** C II 1441; *CIDER* 38 + 86; C II^2^ 5, 985 (Basis marmorea. Periit).

----- / [---] M qui excoli ex HS [--- / ---]XII ep(ulo)? or[dini et?J plebi data M[--- /3 ---]IPI
circen[sib.] editis dedit; An(n)ia / [---]ais uxor / et heres eius / [---]NO [---]XX dedicauit / DE
parium / [---]DO / [---stat?]uam / D D.

304  **Singili(a?) Barba:** *AE* 1989, 420; *HEP* 1990, 469 (Pedestal de caliza blanca); *AE* 1992, 977; C II^2^ 5, 789. Soon after A.D. 109.

M. Valerio M. f. / M. n. G. pron. Quir. /^3^ Proculino, II uir(o) m(unicipum) m(unicipii) / liberi
Singiliensis, / ciues et incolae ex aere conlato; /\^6^ hic in II uiratu publicos ludos et / totidem die
erum priuatos
dedit; / item populum uniuersum in municipio, /\^9^ habitantem et incolas oleo et balineo / gratuito dato peruo
caut; / item quo die ludos iu(u)enum in theatro / dedit gymnasium et balinea uiris et / mulieribus gratuita praestitit. / Huic
ciues et incolae pr. k. Ianuarias / dedit, donauit, dedicauit / II uiratu ob rem publicam / bene at
ministratum consensu
omnium / in foro publice gratias egerunt et / hostias quas inmolarent item / statuam ex lapide calcario roseo. 
Ex litterarum formis saec. II posterioris fere).

--- / [---] L. Clodio [-- / -- m(unicipi) li]beri S(ingi) / Barb(ensis) [--- / β L. Clodius²]
Montanus +[--- / pontifex] perpetuus m(unicipum) m(unicipi) Sing(i) / ensibus [--- / editis citra iensibus vacat [---?] / ---]?

--- / 


--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?

--- / 

--- / --- L. Clodi / --- / --- m(uncipii) li[beri] S(ingiliensis) Barb(en) / --- / --- Clodius?
circiens(ib.) [ded(icit)]

Mauretania Caesariensis


313 Sitifis: C VIII 8438 + p.1919; ILS 6873; W-K 1 (Altar?). Nerva or later.

Marti / deo Aug. / Gen(i)o co(noniae) / ex testamento / P. Herenni Ma/mertini. / P. Arrius Iau/an/ariu Mamer/tinus, heres, / posuit et ob de/dicationem lu/12 dos scaenicos / edidit et / sportulas de/15 curionib. dedit.

Numidia

314 Arsacal: C VIII 6046 + p.1835; W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.). L.14: one would have expected die.

Victoriae / Aug. sacr. / C. Iulius Victor / aed(ilis), praef(ectus) pr(o) III uir(is) / signum Victo- riae, / quod nomine lulio/rum Tertulli, Martialis, Quadrati, lulio/ani, Victoris, Hono/ratae filior(um) suor(um) / promiserat, sua pec(unia) fec(it) / idemque dedicauit / et dedicationem / diem ludorum celebrazit.

315 Castellum Celtianum: I/Alg II 2106; W-K 3 (Bauinschrift). 2nd/3rd c.

----- / / [] HS II (m.) n. facturum se promiserat su(a) pec(unia) ex HS V (m.) a solo ex(s)tr[u- xit --- / ---] sui exornauit idemq. dedicauit super diem ludorum quo A[---].
316 Cirta: C VIII 6948 + p.1847; ILS 6858; IAlg II 479 (Encastrée dans le mur d’enceinte de la Casba); W-K 5 (H.-G. Pflaum weist die Inschrift in die Zeit von Commodus).

Genio populi. / M. Roccius Felix / M. fil. Quir., eq(uo) publ., / III uir, sac(erdos) urb(is Romae), fl(amen) diui / M. Antonini, statuam quam / ob honorem III uiratus promisit, / ex HS VI mil. n. sua pecunia / posuit; ad cuius dedicationem / sportulas denarios singulos / secundum matricem publicam / ciuibus de suo dedit itemque / ludos scaenicos cum missilibus / [edidit].

317 Cirta: C VIII 6995 + p.965; ILS 411; lAlg II 560 (Base); W-K 6. A.D. 193 or soon after.

Diuo Pertinaci / Aug. patri. /3 L. Scantius L. til. Quir. / Iulianus, eq(uo) publ. / exomatus, statuam /6 quam promisit / ex reeditibus lo/corum ampithe/ 9 atr(um) diei muneris, / quem de liberallitate sua ob ho/12 norem III uir/u(tus) edidit, dedit.

318 Cirta: C VIII 6994 + p.1847; IAlg II 559 (Base). A.D. 1971198.


319 Cirta: C VIII 6944 + p.1847; IAlg II 473 (Base de marbre; détruite); W-K 10. A.D. 202/203.


320 Cirta: C VIII 7000 + 19418; IAlg II 569; W-K 11. A.D. 211.


321 Cirta: A: C VIII 6996 + p.1847; IAlg II 562 (Table de marbre); W-K 12. A.D. 209. LL.16–19 (LL.1–15: “To the Indulgentia of the emperors Septimius, Caracalla and [Geta]”). B: C VIII 7095; ILS 2933;
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

ILA\text{lg} II 675 (see also C VIII 7094, 7096-7098 + 19434-6 + p.965; ILA\text{lg} II 674, 676); W-K 12. A.D. 212/217.

A

.../10\text{M. Caecilius Q. f.] Quir. Natalis III uir, ob honorem III uiratus pr(aeter) / [HS XL (m.) n. quae ex] leg(itimis) ob honorem III [ui]ratus et aed(iilitatis) t(iei) p. intuil et /18 [statuam Securitatis saeculi quam ob] hon(orem) aed. pol(licitus est) posuit etludos cum missil(ibus) et acro/famam. --- edidit.

B

[M. Ca]ecilius Q. f. Q(uir.) Natalis, aed(ilis), III uir, quaes/tor, q(uin)q(uennalis), praef(ectus) coloniarum Mileuitanae et/3 Rusicadensis et Chullitanae, praeter HS / LX (m.) n. quae ob honorem aedilitatis et III uir(atus) / et q(uin)q(uennalitatis) rei p. intuil et statua aeream Securi/tatis saeculi et aediculam tetraesty-lam / cum statua aerea Indulgentiae do/mini nostri quas in honore aedi/litatis et III uiratus posuit et ludos scae/nicos diebus septem quos cum missi/lib. per IIII colonias edidit, arcum tri/12umphalem cum statua aerea Virtutis domini n. / Antonini Aug., quem ob honorem quinquen/nalitatis pollicitus est, eodem anno sua/15 pecunia ex(s)truxit.

322 Cirta: C VIII 6947 + p.1847; ILA\text{lg} II 478 (base); W-K 13 (Ende 2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).


323 Cirta: C VIII 7123 + p.1848; ILA\text{lg} II 696 (Trois fragments d’un entablement); W-K 15 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).


324 Cirta: C VIII 19489; ILA\text{lg} II 529; W-K 17 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

[Te]l\text{liuri Aug. / Iulius P. Iuli Vrbani / Iulius P. Iuli Vrbani, eq(uo) p. / [o]rana(tus), quaest(or), aed(ilis) III / [col(onia) (or)] Rusicadensis Chullitanae, praef(ectus) pro IIII uir(is), ob /6 [ho]norem aedilitatis praet(er) / [HS XI]X (m.) n. decurionat(us) rei p. in[lat]a cum tetrastylo de/9dit idemque dedic(auit) / [et ob] dedic(ationem) lud(os) scae(nicos) cu[m missilibus edidit. L. d. d. [d].

325 Cirta: C VIII 6958 + p.1847; ILA\text{lg} II 501 (base); W-K 20 (2./3. Jh.).


326 Cirta: C VIII 7121 + p.1848; ILA\text{lg} II 689 (Copie); W-K 21 (2./3. Jh.).

+++ ++++/ Iunior, eq(ues) R(omanus), ae[d(i)]lis, III uir, nomine? /3 Septimiani fil(ii) tr[ibunal?]
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

quod ob honorem aedilitatis [...] / polliticos cum IE[--- mense?] /6 duodecimo in[ra annum?] / honoris editis / [ludis scaenici] / et praeterea / [HS --- m. n. ob honorem III uirae?] /9 tuis rei p. inlatis sua p[ecunia posuit]. / L. d. [d. d.].

327 Cirta: C VIII 19513; ILAlg II 688 (Copie d’auteur inconnu); W-K 22 (2./3. Jh.). LL.0–1: perhaps /--- - fil. --- filia, Verania L. [fil. ---].


328 Cirta: C VIII 7122 + p.1848; ILAlg II 697 (Pierre); W-K 23 (2./3. Jh.).

[---] anua, eques Romanus --- / --- ob honorem aedilitatis [...] / praeterea rei publicae --- / --- Iudos scaenicos cum m[issilibus edidit].

329 Cirta: ILaLG II 709; W-K 26 (Wohl Bauinschrift). 2nd/3rd c.

--- / ob ded[icationem ludos scaenicos?] / ec[-----t e[i] ob honor[em --- /3 ite?] /m fl(a­moni) p.p. genii pop(uli) / ---] col(oniae) n(ostrae) C[]tae ad cu[jus ---] / jum d[e]dicaui[t].

330 Cuicul: C VIII 20152 (cf. AE 1938, 38); W-K 2. A.D. 146/147.


332 Cuicul: C VIII 8324; ILS 5535. A.D. 367/375.


333 Rusicade: C VIII 7969 + p.967 + 19851; ILS 399; ILaLG II 17 (Plaque); W-K 3. A.D. 186/187.


334 Rusicade: a: C VIII 7990 + p.1879; ILS 6861; ILaAlg II 42; W-K 10. b: C VIII 7991 + p.1879; ILaAlg II 43; W-K 10 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

b Sex. Otacilius M. f. / Quir. Restitutus, / M. Otacilius Fructius / pontificis frater, / III vir aedil(is) quaestorae/6riae potestate(is), augur, / super HS XX (m.) legita(ima) qua/ ob honor(em) aedilitatis / r(ei) p. dedit et HS /9 VI (m.) ob / diem ludorum et HS / XXXIV (m.) inibi legitimata /12 ob honorem augurat(us) / r(ei) p. intulit et at HS III (m.) / quae in uoluptat(es) pro/11 miser(is) adictione a se / facta dextros duos / sua pecunia fecit de/18 dicaitique d. d.

335 Rusicade: C VIII 7938 + 7984 + p.1879; ILaAlg II 34; W-K 8 (2./3. Jh.).

C. Annius C. fil. Quir[ir. ---], / dec(urio) III col(oniaurum), pont(ifex) /3 HS XX (m.) n. quae ob honorem dec(urionatus rei p. dedit et) / HS LV (m.) n. quae ob honorem pont(ificus rei p. intulit) / et statuas aeneas duas Vic(toriae Augustae et For)/6/tunae eae reduc_quas ob [honorem dec(urionatus) et ob hono]rem pont(ificus) pollic(itus) est [n eodem anno] posuit et HS ---III (m.) n. quae [ob honorem --- ad per]fectionem operis te[tri] pollis. est contul(it) itemq. HS XXX (m.) qua[ae ad opus] / ampitheatri/11 po[llic. est ded]i statuam Herculis c[um tetrastylo] HS XXXIII (m.) [n. --- ex liber]alitate sua s(ua) p(ecunia) fecit(it) idemq. d[edicavit] / ad cuius d(edicacionem e)tiam ludos scaenicos cum m[issilib.] / edidit.

336 Rusicade: C VIII 7963 + p.967 + 19849; ILS 5473; ILaAlg II 10 (Table de marbre); W-K 4. A.D. 218/235.

Victoriae Augustae sacrum. / [Imp. Caes. [---/3 ---/ ---] C max. / [...]]./6 L. Cornelius L. fil. Quir. Fronto Probianus, eq(uo) p. orn(atus), / dec(urio) III col(oniaurum), fil(ament) p.p. diui Magni Antonini, / statuam cum tetrastylo quam ob honorem flam(onii) praeter HS LXXXII (m.) n. /9 quae rei p. praesentia intulit, promi­serat, et dec(urionatus) HS XX (m.) n. sed et / ceter[a] quae liberalitate sua patriae contulit, ex HS XXX mil. n. dedit / idemque dedicavit, ad cuius dedicacionem etiam ludos /12 scaenicos cum missilibus edidit.

337 Rusicade: C VIII 7988; ILS 5648; ILaAlg II 37 (Base en marbre); W-K 5. A.D. 225.

M. Fabius Fronto, / augur, p(raefectus) i. d., cum lu/3dis scaeniciis de/di praeter dena/rios mille ad /6 opus theatri n(omine) / fili sui Senecio/nis /9 pollicitus / Fusco II et Dex/tro cos. /12 III non. Ian., / dedicavit / isdem cos. /15 pri. kal. April.

338 Rusicade: C VIII 7960 + p.967; ILS 5077; ILaAlg II 5; W-K 7 (Ende 2./3. Jh.).

Genio coloniae / Veneriae Rusicadis /3 Aug(usto) sacrum. / M. Aemilius Ballator / praeter HS X m. n. quae in /6 opus cultumue theatris / postulante populo de/di statuas duas Geni/9 um patriae n(ostrae) et Anno/nae sacrae urbis sua / pecunia posuit, ad /12 quaram dedicatio/nem diem ludorum / cum missilibus edidit. /15 L. d. d. d.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

A M. Amullio M. / fil. Pap. Optato / Cremetiano, / eq(uiti) R(omano), singula/ris fidei boni/tatis munifi-centiae uir[o], / ordo splen-di9 dissimus Tha/gastensium / coni/ata cer/12 atim pecunia / in cuius dedicat/ione / HS C mil. n. ad opus mu/15ificentiae suae patri/ae donauit et curiis / praeter epulas uini e[t] /18 ludum1, X quingen[s].
B (a) M. Amulli[---] (b) [---]R "q"-vod ob merita[---] (c) [--- aedificio etiam [---] (d) [--- po]tuisset pro spectaculo[---] (e-h) [--- por]ticum additis HS CC milibus nummum patriae suae ex HS CCC milibus [fecit ---].

340 Thamugadi: C VIII 17829; ILS 434; W-K 3. A.D. 198/211.
Concordiae / Augg[[g.]]3 / dominorum / nn[[n]]. / Impp. L. Septimi /6 Seueri et M. Au/rei Antonini / [[et Publi Septimi Getae / Caesaris]] Augg[[g.]]1 / et Iuliae Aug. / L. Licinius Optatia/12 nus ob honorem / fl(amenii) p.p. statuas quas / ex HS XX m. n. cum /15 basib. praeter le/gitim(am) pollicitus / est, ampliata pec(uni)a /18 ex HS XXXV m. n. / posuit easque / sportulis decuri(onib.) /21 datis et epul(o) curi/is, et ludis scae/nicis editis, de/24 dicauit.

341 Thamugadi: C VIII 17837; W-K 4. A.D. 198/211.
Mercurio Aug. / sacrum /3 pro salute dd[[d]]. / nn[[n]]. Seueri et / Antonini [[et /6 Getae Caes.]] / Augg[[g.]]2 et Iuliae / Augustae matri /9 Aug[[g.]]2 et castrorum. / L. Germeus Siluanus augur inlatis /12 r(ei) p. / ob honorem / auguratus HS / XXI mil. et CC n. /15 Mercurium ex / sua liberalita/te posuit et ob /18 dedicationem / ludos scenicos / edidit.

[V]ictoriae Victor/ici dominor. nos/3 tror. sanctissimo /rum fortissimor(um)/que Imperatorum /6 L. Septimi Seueri Pii / Pertinacis et M. Au/rei Antonini Pii / Felicis [[et P. Septimi / Getae Caesaris princ(ips)/]] Augg[[g.]]3 /12 et Iuliae Aug., matri / Aug[[g.]]1 et castrorum. / L. Iunius Vibianus /15 ob honorem / au/guratus inlatis / r(ei) p. super legiti/18 mam HS VI mil. n. / et statuam quam p/promiserat ex HS III /21 mil. n. adiectis HS (10 m.) DCCC n. / cum bas(i) posuit eam/que ludis scena/cis dedic(it).


344 Thamugadi: C VIII 2344 + 17812; W-K 9. Reign of Commodus or after 217.
Fortunae / Reduci Aug. /3 [[[--- /--- /--- /6 ---]]]. / C. Annius C. fil. / Pap. Victor, fl(amen) p.p., /9 aed(ilis), statuam / quam ob honorem / aed(i)litatis suae praeter /12 legitimam pol/licitus ex / HS XVI (m.) n.
posuit /posuit/ ludis editis et /dedieauit./

345 **Uzelis:** *AE* 1917–18, 44; W-K 1. A.D. 222.

**Africa proconsularis**

346 **Althiburos:** C VIII 27771; W-K 4 (2./3. Jh.).
C. Iulius Q. f. Felix / Aurunculeianus, aed(ilis), /3 ob honorem aeditatis signum / Marsyae quod ex HS II (m.) CCC n. cum / legitima summa taxauerat adiect(a) /6 amplius pecun(ia) posuit et dedic(auit) / d. d. idemq. primus ludos dedit.

347 **Ammaedara:** *AE* 1927, 30; *ILTun* 460; W-K 2. A.D. 211.

348 **Ammaedara:** *ILTun* 461 (Théâtre. Lintea). A.D. 293/305.

349 **Ammaedara:** C VIII 449; *AE* 1973, 622 (Varicus = Baricus. Vers le VI° s.).
Fecit Varicos ludos.

350 **Bulla Regia:** *AE* 1962, 184; W-K 6 (3. Jh.).

351 **Capsa:** C VIII 100 + 11228; W-K 3 (Th. Mommsen ... datiert die Inschrift 280).
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

352 Carthago: *AE* 1920, 29; *ILAfR* 384; BbA suppl. 25 (Plaque de marbre blanc); W-K 2. Not long after A.D. 114.

\[\text{---} / [--- sacerdos Cer]er(is) anni CLIX, aed(ilis), q(uestor), praef(ectus) [i. d., --- praet]er HS LXXXX m. quae ob honor(em) a(edilitatis) /3 promiserat --- ex]culturum se ob honor(es) flam(onius) et po(ntificatus) / --- et] continguit item marmoribus / --- ob dedicat(ionem) dies quinq(ue) ludorum /6 --- statu?)is ceteroq. cultu s(ua) p(ecunia) exornavit.

353 Carthago: *ILS* 9406; *ILAfR* 390 + *ILTun* 1050; W-K 3. A.D. 133/138.


354 Carthago: *AE* 1928, 24; *ILTun* 1066; *AE* 1977, 851 (II s’agirait d’un décret municipal); W-K 5 (2. Hälfte 2./1. Hälfte 3. Jh.).

[Quod postulantibus uniuersis decurionibus / Pompeius Faustin]us u. c., p(atronus) c(oloniae), II uir q.q. u(ertia) f(ecit) de [statua] /3 de publico ponenda Aelio Maximo o(ptimo) u(iro) q(uid) d(e) [e(a) r(e) f(eri)] p(laceret) / d. e. r. (ta) c(ensuerunt): Magnitudinis nostrae congruens [col(oniae) / Karthaginis] meritos uioris testimon[ium pro] /9 spectaculum etiam /12 ei publice ponendam decuriones decreuerunt.

355 Carthago: *ILAfR* 400; BbA suppl. 26 (Plaque de marbre blanc. Date postérieure à la construction du théâtre qui semble avoir été bâti sous le règne d’Hadrien); W-K 6 (2./3. Jh.).


356 Carthago: *EE* VII 191; *C VIII* 12571 (Tabula marmorea). L.1: *flamen adlectus*?

[---]ELNMDLECTVS eandem / [---] et ludos fecit ex cons(ensu) /3 [---] in locum Cn. Caluinii /
[---] aui sui vacat / [--- Ale]xandri I. Alexander.

357 **Chisiduo**: C VIII 1270 + 14764 (Litterae sunt aetatis inferioris); *ILS* 6831. 4th c. according to *Ville* 1981 p.186.

D. M. s. / Lusi Fortunatiani, /\admirtilis et mune/ra′ri(us) item duou/i ru et munera/rius, / agens uices curato/rum rei publicae, pius /9 uixit annis / XXXXXVI, / his / se semper in pace.

358 **Curubis**: C VIII 24101 (= 12453) + *IL T*un 837; W-K 2 (2./3. Jh.).

[---]OSI/[--- ad(ii), II ur(o) I[I] /3 [singul17]is annis mune/rius rario ob simplicem / uitam amor/que /6 largum erga ciues et / patriam ad remune/ran/um gratiam edi/9 torum munere/rius / eius et fratri Curubis/tanu ordo expositulan/12 te populo honorem statu/ae decreuit.

359 **Furnos Minus**: C VIII 25808b; *ILS* 9403; W-K 2 (Bald nach 232).


361 **Giufi**: C VIII 858; *ILS* 5073; W-K 8 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).


362 **Giufi**: C VIII 860; W-K 9 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).


363 **Giufi**: C VIII 867 + 12374; W-K 10 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

364 Gori: C VIII 12421 + p.2432 + ILTun 766; ILS 5071; W-K 2 (Wohl 3. Jh.).

Mensur(ii). / P. Ligario Maximi Ligari fil. Potito $^3$ decurioni et magistrato annuali ciui/tatis suae
Goritanae qui ex sua li/beralitate rei publ. suae HS IIII mil. /$^6$ n. inferenda repromisit ut ex eius / summae
reditum$^1$ id est usurae $^9$ LX / die XVI kal. Ian. natalis eius pugilii$^6$bus et gymnasio itemque
decurio/niibus epulo
suo quoque anno in per/petuum ab eadem re p. insumerentur /$^{12}$ P. Ligarius Securus ob debitam patri / pietatem
posuit. L. d. d. d.

365 Gori: ILTun 769; W-K 3 (Wohl 3. Jh.).

Vrani. / C. Mario Caelestino [-/-] $^3$ decurion(i) `ciuitatis G`oritanae. / Maria [-/-]c[-/-] mater et
Marius / [-/-] pater filio piissimo statuum$^6$ [pos(uerunt) o]"b" cuius dedicationem / [-/-] r(ei) p. X mille
policitus / est [ut ---] ex reditu eorum$^9$ [---]quamdiu [---]duum / [---] pugile$s$ et --- / ---$^{12}$ et epulum
decurionibus / [-/-] et post d[edic(ationem)]$^3$ sua [---] / P[---] / /$^{15}$ ita AB[---. / L. d. d.]

366 Hadrumetum: ILafr 58; W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.). L.3: one would have expected suis; L.5: according to
DUNCAN-JONES 1982 p.118 ad no. 264, HS XI (m.), which is an irregular and unusual sum, could be a
misreading for HS XL (m.), i.e. HS40,000.

Q. Caelio Maximo aedili, auguri, / II uir(o) quod in magg(istratibus) suo$^1$ ludorum et $^3$ circensium
spectacula exibuerit, / munus etiam gladiatorium de suo I
ediderit et hoc amplius in praesentis$^1$ tempore HS XI
(m.) rei publicae donauerit $^6$ ex cuius summae usuris quin{sho
qu[o/que an]no semper uni[versis curiis
iei/ciui ibus? ---}


(fr. I) ------ / [-/-]ESTAI[--- / --- a]mplifica[--- / ---]sset et [--- / --- p]ollicitati(on--- $^5$ ---)m
munus
[--- / ---] bidu[um ---] / ------ (fr. II) ------ / [---]e edidi[t --- / ---]am quattu[or --- / ---] uosq(uo$^3$) on[--- / --- am]-plius
[--- $^5$ ---]IM[---] / ------ (fr. III) ------ / [---] quod / [---] numero / [---] p[rima die / [---] octonas $^5$ [---]dem /
------ (fr. IV) ------ / [---] eius et A[--- / ---]edi?/tioni P[--- / ---]e prop[ter? --- / ---]VITAT[---] / ------ (fr. V) ------
/ [---]RESCLI[--- / ---]us editur[/--- / --- edit?]ione quat[tuor --- / ---] biduum [---] / ------

368 Hippo Regius: a: C VIII 5276 + 17454; ILaAlg 1 95; W-K 3 (3. Jh.); b: ILaAlg 1 96.

a L. Postumio Felici / Celerino a mil(itis), flam(ini) / Aug(usti) p.p., pontifici, II uir(o) / ob magni-
ficentiam $^5$ gladiatorii muneri / quod ciuibus suis tri/duo edidit quo omnes / priorium memorias / supergressus
est ob$^{10}$ que eius innocentiam / splendoremque et / in patriam suam in/contrabilem amorem / singulae curiae
singulas $^{15}$ statuas de suo posuerunt / ut eximiam uoluntatem eiu(s) / tanti honoris / adaequarent. / L. d. d. d.

369 Hippo Regius: CIL VIII 5232; ILaAlg 1 13 (Plaque de marbre blanc).

------ / [---]AS++[--- / --- muneri]s gladia[tori --- / --- splendidissimus]imus ordo [---].

370 Madauros: ILaAlg 1 2055; W-K 6 (2./etwa 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

cellam a solo ex(s)truxit [...] / decurionibus dedit.

371 Madauros: *ILA*lg I 2144 (Base).

L. Caesonio / Honorato / Caesonia/no, fl(aminis) p.p., e(gregio) u(ro) / [--- i]tem mu/[nerario?] ---]

/ ------?

372 Madauros: C VIII 4681; *ILA*lg I 2207 (Dé d’autel). 3rd/early 4th c.

D. M. s. / T*i*. Clodius Lo”q”ella / aed(ilis), II uir, q(uaesitor), fl(amen) p.p., sac(erdos) / Liberi Patris, u(xit) a(nnia) XLVIII. /

Hic situs est, /6 colum(en) moru(m) ac pie(tatis). /
L. aud(ib.) ac titulis or/natus u(xit) hon(est).
O mnibus/9s hic carus fuerat. / Felic(iter) a(nnos)
(Q uinquaginta) minus uno / gessit, studios(c) et /12
V sus (h)on(olib.) ordinis est / adque uir(u) m u(ir),
E gr(eius) fl(amen), patriae p(ius) admod(erator), /15
L argus munidator / ed1 sator in g(ente) suo[rum], /
L enaei Pat(ris) cul[tor] /18 fel(ixq.) sac(erdos),
A ddidit hic / decus ac nomen suae / Claudiae genti.

Inspic/21ies, lector, primordia / uersiculorum.

373 Membressa: C VIII 25836; *ILS* 8926; BbA 389 (Linteau en pierre calcaire); W-K 2. A.D. 275/276.


374 Mustis: C VIII 15576 (= 1574) and C VIII 1582 (= *ILTun* 1538c-d); *ILTun* 1538a; *AE* 1933, 33a; W-K 5. Two identical inscriptions. A.D. 164/165.

ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS


II ur(is), II ur[i]orum q.q., saceros publicis deae Cælestis et Aesculapi, arcum quem suo et C. O[r]f[i] [---]
nom[ine, / p]ro praecipua erga sanctissimum numen relig(i)one proque perpetuo patriae amore, pro[miserat,]
adiecta / amplius statua Iano Patri, perfe[c]it et dedicauit, statuam quoque in foro Mar[sva]e [constitu(it, / o)b
 cuius dedicatione(m) ludos [sca]ena(cis) et e(pulum) curiiis et Caerealicia e(xibuerunt).

376 Neapolis: C VIII 969 (in basi; litt. bene incisis). A.D. 400/401.

Saluis dd(ominis) nn(ostris) / Arcadio et Honorio /3 inclytis semper Augg(ustis) / administrante
d(iiunio²) m(andatu²) / Gabino Barbaro / Pompeiano, u. c., proc(onsule) / p(rouinciae) A(frica)e u(ice) s(acra)
i(udicante), Coelius Titianus / u(ir) h(onestus), ex t(ransuecturario) et nau(iculario), ex mun(erario) / ex
curatore r(ei) p., / cum Coelio Res/tituto, u(iro) h(onesto), filio suo, / sumptu proprio /[i]nstantia sua/
dedicauit, / administrante / Publiano, u. h., f(lamine) p(erpetuo), curat(ore) r(ei) p.


liberorumq. eius totiusque domus diuinae. / [L.] Memmius Pecuarius Marcellinus, cum suo et L. Memmi
Marcelli Pecuariani decorفينs (e[oloniae]) (u[liae]) K(arthaginis), flamini d[iuii]i Nervae designati, fili sui nomine,
templum Capitolii liberalitate sua [f]aciendum ex HS XX m.i. n. patriae suae pago et ciusuati Numulitanae
promississet, et ob honorem flamoni liniae Saturninae uxoris suae ex decreto utriusque ordinis HS IIII m. n. in id
/5 opus [e]rogass[et] multiplicant pecunia solo suo extruxit et marmoribus et statuis omniq. cultu exornavit
itemq. dedicavit ob quam dedicationem decorvinibus utriusq. ordinis sportulas / item populo epulum et
gymnasium dedit praeterea exigente annona frumenta quantacumq. habuit populo multo minore pretio quam
tunc erat benignissime praestiti item ludos scaenicos et gymnasia adside dedit.

378 Sius: C VIII 967 + 12448; W-K 1. (2./3. Jh.).

-------- / [--- ex quorum us]uris ludi et specta[cula] / omnibus annis die X [kal. /3 I]anuar. edantur;
(1000) omnibus ciuiibus n. HS diuidi uolo.

379 Siliana: C VIII 11998 + ILTun 610; ILS 5072; W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.).

[--- / ob honorem] flamoni [ex / summa h]onoraria (HS) II M n. /3 [promis]erat multiplicant
pec/[nia] d(onum) d(edit) et ob dedicationem / sportulas decurionibus. eisdem[6]que et uniuerso populo epu(rum)
et gymnasmium dedit / itemque spectaculum pugi[rum] et aurigarum et ludo(rum) scaenis[corum] edidit.
380 Sufetula: *ILAf* 125; BbA 110 (Plaque de marbre blanc opistographe. Date: 166/169); Duval 17; W-K 1.


381 Sufetula: C VIII 241 = 11347; *ILS* 7801; COURTNEY 1995 no.129 (“That distinguished physician Marcellus lies here. He lived about 33 years, but when he had got everything ready to win praise by putting on games, on the third day before the games, he burnt up by powerful fever, he ended his days and died”). 2nd half of 2nd c.?

```
-------^2
Marcellus hic qu/escit
medica nobi^3/ris arte,
anni qui fe/re uixit
---
triginta et / duobus,
6
sed cum /^6 cuncta parasset /
edendo placit/ruis,
tertium mu/9neris ante
ulida / febre crematus /
diem deflectus ob/12it.
```

382 Sufetula: C VIII 11345 + *ILTun* 354; *ILS* 7796; Duval 55; W-K 2 (Wohl 2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).


383 Sufetula: C VIII 11349; Duval 60; W-K 3 (Wohl 2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

L. Rasinio l. fil. Quir. Saturnino / Maximiano aedil(i), II uir(o) q.q. /^3 ob singularum morum eius / examplum et in utroque hono/ris gradu fidam clementiam /^6 filiorumque eius sacerdotii editionem ludorum et adsdium / erga singulos cives suos / liberalitatem, uniui'e-rus po/pulus c uriarum testim/o/9 niatum po/suit idemque suarum /perpetuum posuit idemque / dedicauit.

384 Sufetula: C VIII 11340 + p.2354; Duval 48; W-K 4. 1st half of 3rd c.?


385 Sutunurca: *ILAf* 303; W-K 3. A.D. 161/162.

Imp. Caes. diui Antonini / Aug. Pii fil. diui Hadria/ni nep. diui Traiani Par/thici pronep. diui Ner/5iae abnep. L. Aurelio V/ro Aug. pontifici max/i/mo, trib. po/t[est. II, cos. II. / Coclius Saturninus Go/licus ob [hon]orem /^10 flamoni p.[p.] Neri Moci / Septimi ex HS III mil. n. po/suit, item rei publ. HS (m.) n. in/tulit,
ob dedicationem / epulum et gymnasia¹ et /¹⁵ ludos scaenicos dedit. / d. d.

386  Tepelte: C VIII 12253; W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.). L.15: TR/JDVO?

296 ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

tr	extsuperscript{2}e suo quinquennalic(io) col(oniae) Theuest(inorum) in col(onia) Karthag(ine) /\textsuperscript{12} --- decurionib.? curiis?
Aug]ustalib. epulum gymnasium populo praestitit et / [---] d(e) s(uo) p(osuit).  

391 Theveste: C VIII 1887 + 16510; \textit{ILAlg} I 3066 (Base. Bonne gravure); \textit{AE} 1977, 859; W-K 7 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.). LL.2-3: --- II uir(o)? / mun(eratorio)?

T. Fl(uvio) T. fil(Papiria) / Caele[stino --- curatori?/] /3 mun(erais) qui [de suo diem? cum] / occi-
sion[ib. ferat(um)] \textsuperscript{4} [---] ded(it); hic] / ob insigne[m erga ciues suos] /6 et patriam [amorem statuas] / deae Caele[s-tis Aug. et] / deae Virtu[is posuit, item summam] /9 HS L (m.) n. cur[iis donauit ut ex] / usuris eius q[uotannis epularentur] / nat[i suos], /12 praetera [signum argentaeum] / dei Aescula[pi Aug. ex p(ondo) lib(ras)] / quin-
quagi[n]a [am unpliata pecunia] /15 ded[jit] [idemq. ded[iuit]].

392 Theveste: C VIII 16556; \textit{ILS} 6839; \textit{ILAlg} I 3064; W-K 9 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.). The wife's inscription \textit{(b)} is at the left.

\textit{(a)} Q. Crepereio Germani filio Pap. Rufino auguri, aedili, praef(ecto) i. d., II uir(o) ob in[signem eius uitam quietamque discipline et in muneris editione promtas! /3 liberalitates quas in ciues suos exercuit, curiae uniuersae et Augustales sumtu! proprio posuerunt, / cuius honoris remunerandi causa idem Rufinus sportul(as) decurionib. et lib(ertis) Caes(aris) n(ostri) itemq. forensibus et amicis, curiis quoque et Augustalibus /6 aureos
binos et populo uinum dedit et / ludos edidit.

\textit{(b)} Aureliae Excepti filiae / Iaurariae, sponsae \textsuperscript{5} et uxori / Q. Creperei Rufini.

393 Theveste: C VIII 16560; \textit{ILAlg} I 3071 (Table).

M. Valerio M. fil(Pap. Flauiano Sabinian[o ---, II uiro col(oniae) Theves]?/tis muneratorio, et
Aureliae Saluillae Au[--- coniugi eius ob] \textsuperscript{2} innocentiam honorum et simplicem [uitam, curiae uniuersae / e]t Augustales ob quam dedicationem [decurionibus ---? fore/n?]is sportulas curiis et Augustalibus ---
derunt].

394 Theveste: C VIII 16557; \textit{ILAlg} I 3065.


395 Theveste: C VIII 16558 (LL.2-3: col(oniae) Thevestis et [Karthag(inis)]; \textit{ILAlg} I 3067 (Base).
[---]oro Iuliano, eq(uiti) R(omano), e(gregio) u(ri)o, pontiff(ici), / [II uir(o)? m]uner(ario) col(oniae) Thevestis et \textsuperscript{3} [--- ob si]nceram fidem et inno/[centiam] qua cu[ium cuibas agit] / [---] uniuersae curiae \textsuperscript{6} et Augustales.

396 Theveste: A: C VIII 16555; \textit{ILAlg} I 3069 (Base). B: C VIII 16559; \textit{ILAlg} I 3070 (Base, trouvée avec le n\textsuperscript{o} précédent). L2: \textit{ELIAE}; L4: \textit{PONTIE, PRAEE.} Cf. no. 389.

A Aeliae Bene/auxidi, uxori \textsuperscript{3} Q. Titini Securi, / pontiff(ici), q(uaestoris), praef(ecti) / i. d., II uir(i) mun[erarii, \textsuperscript{6} curiae et Augustales; / qui inter ceter(as) / liberalitates suas \textsuperscript{9} sportul(asis) decur(ionibus) / \textsuperscript{9}SS[.]VI/ ------?
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

B Titiniae Iuliae / filiae Q. Titini Securi, / pontif. q., prae. i. d., II ur(i) muneri(ari), / uxori C. Roi Petro/niani, eq(uo) p. exoter(nati), / curiae et Augusta; / ob quas dedicator(iones) / ----- 397

Thisi (?): C VIII 25428 (= 14334) + ILTun 1190; W-K 1 (2./1. Dritte 3. Jh.).


Thuburbo Maius: C VIII 12370 (= 853) + ILTun 692 + AE 1942/43, 102; W-K 5. After A.D. 238.

M. Fannio M. f. / Papiria Vitalis (centurion) coh(ortis) / III Sygambrorum misso honesta / missione a diuo Ha[driano, praef(ecto) iuris / dic., flam(i) p(erp.) qui o[b ho]norems / flam(oni) HS X m. n.9 rei p. intulit et amplius usum ludi / scae[nici] novissimae pertinax / eam cum / ordo / statuam decre[us] posuit d. d. 399

Thuburnica: a: C VIII 25703; b: C VIII 25704; W-K 1 (2./1. Dritte 3. Jh.).


Thugga: C VIII 25627 (= 15258 [+ 15264]) + ...; cf. ILTun 1404); W-K 8. A.D. 164/166.


A P. Marcii Q. f. Arn. Quadratus flamen diui Augusti, pont(ifex) c(oloniae) I(ulieae) K(arthagine)


Q. Pacuuius Saturus fl(amen) perp., augur c(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis) et [solo] exstruit, sua pecunia fecit idemque ludis scaenicos editis et sportulis datis et epulo et gymnasio dedit.

404 Thugga: A: C VIII 26591b; W-K 16. B: C VIII 26590 (= 1495); W-K 16 (Um 205).


405 Thugga: C VIII 26458 (= 1500-1502 + 15509 + ...) + ILafr 514; W-K 6 III. A.D. 222/235.

gymnasio.


407 Thugga: C VIII 26559 (= 15521 + 15264a-b + p.2566 + VIII 10620 + ...) + IL Tun 1314; IL Tun 1416; W-K 21. A.D. 264/265.


408 Thysdrus: C VIII 22856 (Tabula marmorea) (cf. 22857–22859) + IL Tun 106; W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.).

[---] Comensi / [--- qui] iussit circenses / [---]AQ palmarum duodenar(um) nata/libus filiarum suarum Vi[corniae] et Macedonie item sportulas / decurionibus et epulum populo quod/annis dari praeceptor bono ciui p(ecunia) s(ua)2.

409 Thysdrus: C VIII 22852 (fragmentum basis marmorea. L.1: scriptus in spatio aliquantum depresso; forte restitutus in locum verborum erasorum; inde explicanda mera verborum collocatio; expectaveris [Aur]elio Maximiano (pio) felici Aug.). Reign of Maximianus (A.D. 286/305, 307/308) or perhaps earlier if his name was engraved over an erasure.


411 Tuccabor: C VIII 14856; W-K 5 (Bauinschrift? 2./3. Jh.).

Tuccabor: C VIII 14855 (= 1323) + ILT 1288; W-K 4 (2./3. Jh.). L. 1: M(arcus)?
M[--]IP/[--- ob honorem fl(amonii) p]erp.³ [-- mil]ia [praeter legitimam promisisset mul-ti-
plicata pecunia perfecit et.⁶ dedicavit et ob dedicatio(nem) pugilum certamina / edidit et decurionibus ⁹
sportulas et populo gymnium epul[um] dedidit et ob dedicat(ionem) epul(um) dec(urionib.) et pop(ulo) [gym(nasium) ded]it.

Uch Maius: C VIII 26275 (Basis); ILS 9405; W-K 8 (frühwestens 230).
L. Cornelio Quieto, / h(onestae) m(emoriae) u(iro) qui testamen[3]to suo rei publicae colo-
cuius / summae usuris quotannis die na⁹/tali eius decurionibus sportulae et / [po]pulo ludi darentur. / L.
dedicavit.

Utica: C VIII 25386 (Tabula marmorea). W-K 1 (2./3. Jh.).
-----² / [--- ob honorem] II uir(atus) ampl[iata pecunia --- / --- rei publicae in]tulit et ped[---³
---]mis aduexi[t --- / --- uentionem bestiarum Africanaru[m dedit --- / --- in th?]ermis.

Vaga: C VIII 1225 = 14403. 3rd c.
T.² Rutilius Iunior Iulianus, / aedilis ac sac(erdos), II uir q.q. ₁³ et cur(ator) munier(is) Tup[---], /
Dapani.

Vallis: C VIII 14783; ILS 5075; W-K 1 (Ende 2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).
C. Egnati C. fil. / Papiria [Fel]lici, aedi/⁶ li in[n]ocentissimo, / amici ob m[er]titum, ob cu/ius
dedicationem idem /⁶ Egnatius praeter gymna/sium et missilia quae aed[il]es edere solent diem sacri /⁹ Libera-
litorum auxit et omni in/pensa sua eum ciuibus. uniuersis / exhibuit, amplius etiam ludos scenici/₁²cos edidit et
ep[u]llum populo dedit. / L. d. d. d.

Vallis: C VIII 14782 (b = 1284); W-K 4 (3. Jh.?).
(a) L. Sallu[stius --- et ---] / Maxima [---] / ---- (b) ---- / [--- ob dedi]cationem ludo[s scaenicos
ediderunt --- / --- epul[um]² unieris con[defer[ium]ibus dederunt ---].

Numini Augustorum sacrum. / C. Aurelius Saturninus Papiria Cilonianus, /³ II uir inlata rei
publicae II uiratus honoraria summa / amplius de suo signum lupae cum insignib. / suis posuit et expostulante
populo diem ludo⁶/rum scaenicorum edidit d. d.

Ziqua: C VIII 12425 (= 895) + ILTun 770; ILS 5074; W-K 1. A.D. 239.
Marti Aug. protectori d. n. / Imp. Caes. M. Antoni Gordiani Pii Felicis /³ Aug. p. m., tr. pot. II,
cos., p. p. / Q. Caluius Rufinus aedilis sumptu / suo et T. Aeli Anni Litori quondam,/⁶ collegae sui ob honorem
aedilitatis / in compensatione(m) missiliorum\textsuperscript{1} communi pecunia fecerunt dedicante\textsuperscript{9} Caluio Rufino aedile ob cuius statu[ae] / dedicationem idem Rufinus de suo / et\textsuperscript{a} a\textsuperscript{m} spectaculum pugilum et gymnasia\textsuperscript{m} /\textsuperscript{12} exhibuit.

L. d. d. d.

420 Ziqua: C VIII 12426 = 24056; W-K 2 (1. Hälfte 3. Jh.).

Veneri Aug. / [-] Anniolenus Crescentianus [e]t\textsuperscript{3} M. Simminius Mistilta a[ed]il(es) / ad ornandum patriam modum / paupertatis\textsuperscript{1} suae egressi in /\textsuperscript{6} compensatione(m) missi[i]orum\textsuperscript{1} / pecunia sua fecerunt et ob dedicationem pugilis ediderunt\textsuperscript{9} / / / / CROM[---].

421 Ziqua: C VIII 897. Known only from MSs.

\[---\textsuperscript{2} / [-].\textsuperscript{2} piissimori\textsuperscript{u}mq.? principi[um]\textsuperscript{2} / [-] s[ub ad]ministratione procons(ulis) p(rovinciae) A(fricae)\textsuperscript{2},\textsuperscript{3} \[---\textsuperscript{i}] institutis nunc solio uno IFIMO / \[---\textsuperscript{a}] congestioni et \[c.\textsuperscript{3}]\textsuperscript{3} parieti in / \[---\textsuperscript{i}]\textsuperscript{3} stulinus

generosa familia progenitus\textsuperscript{6} perfecit excolluit ludos dedit dedicavit.

422 \textit{Henchir Bou Cha: ILTun 746; W-K 3 (Statuenbasis. 2./3. Jh.).}

\[---\textsuperscript{2} / [-].\textsuperscript{2} NDD S ex HS / octo mil. n. posuit ob cuius dedication(em)\textsuperscript{3} ludos circenses itemq.

epulum et / sportulas condecurionibus suis / dedit. L. d. d. d.

423 \textit{Henchir Bou Cha: C VIII 23964 (= 828 + 12347; cf. 23965); ILS 5713 + add. Probably late 3rd c. or after.}

Magnilianorum. / Q. Vetulienius Vrbanus Herennianus /\textsuperscript{3} fl(amen) p.p., cur(ator) r(ei) p., apodyterium nouum / in dextra cellis exeuntibus / a solo constructum et piscalas duas, /\textsuperscript{6} cetera restaurata adq. statuis / marmoribus tabulis pictis / columnis ingressu cellaru[m]\textsuperscript{9} /\textsuperscript{9} alisq. rebus omata, sumptu proprio / cum Magniliano filio suo / florentissimo adq. prudentissim[o]\textsuperscript{12} /\textsuperscript{12} adulescenti uoto / omnium ciuiu[m] / perfecit adq. dedicavit et uniuer\\textsuperscript{15} se pleui\textsuperscript{1} epulum per triduum dedit nec / non et ludos scenicos ex(h)ibuit.

424 \textit{Henchir Bou Cha: C VIII 830 (Epistylum litteris aetatis inferioris difficillimis lectu. L.2: ARMATIO SENORIO fortasse nomen est).}

\[---\textsuperscript{2} / [-] munus ede(ndo?) ipsi rur[sus --- / --- munera splendidida] edenti ARMATIO SENORIO[---].


426 \textit{Henchir Sidi Naoui: C VIII 23107 (= 754 + 12218 + …); W-K 1. A.D. 196.}

cos. II, p. p. et M. Aureli Antonin[i] Caes. fili eus totiusque diuinae domus. / M. Pinarius Fortunatus fl(amen) p.p. templum Fortunae quod adiectis HS mille n. ad summam flam(oni) sui ex HS VII mil. distribuen(dum) pro-

427 Henchir Zian: C VIII 11009; W-K 2 (2./3. Jh.). The last line is very uncertain.

[---] Lucretio [---] / et fortis[simo ---] / ordo statu[am --- del;/creuisset ob m[erita --- honore contentus de] /5 s(u) p(ecunia) f(ecit) et lu[dis editis dedicauit].?

428 Smirat: AE 1967, 549 (Mosaïque représentant une arène dans laquelle combattent des bestiaires et des fauves, en présence de Diane et de Dionysos. Date: entre 235 et 250). JACQUES 1984 pp.400–1. In the center, a young man shows a tray laid with four bags of money, each marked with the symbol “∞”, i.e. X1000. (a) and (b): names of the four hunters and leopards, respectively.

(c) Per curionem / dicturn: “Domini ini mei, ut / Telegeni / pro leopardo / meriti ha[beant uestri / fauris, dona(te eis denarios / quingentos.” (d) “Mageri! Mageri!” (e) Adclamatum est: / “Exemplo tuo, mu(nus / sic discant / futuri! audiant / praeteriti! unde / quale? quando tale? / Exemplo queasto/rum munus edes, / de re tua munus edes, / (i)sta dies. / Magerius do/nat! Hoc est habe/re, hoc est posse, / hoc est ia(m) / munere tuo / saccis missos!”

Tripolitana

429 Lepcis Magna: IRT 396 (Marble panel; Hadrianic Baths, in frigidarium. 2nd c. capitals); W-K 18. A.D. 180/192.


430 Lepcis Magna: IRT 594 (Rectangular base of grey limestone. Theatre, built into one of the late piers of the W dressing room. L.I.1–2: lapidary capitals; L.3: Rustic capitals). 2nd/early 3rd c.

Q. Cornelio Va[--], / curatori mun[eris ---] /3 M. Cornelius Amicus filio piissimo po[suit].

431 Lepcis Magna: IRT 601 (Rectangular base of white marble. Capitals with some Rustic forms, probably 3rd c.); Sherk 65; W-K 21. (a) front-face inscription (frs. 2 and 3 not provided); (b) left-hand face inscription; (c) right-hand face inscription (not provided).

(a) (fr. 1) [--- flam]ini, pon[tifici --- / --- uni]ersus ordo qua[--- /3 ---] uas ob mun[icentiam --- / ---] uas ob uerba is[--- / ---] /3 /3] uas ex testam[ento --- /6 --- d]e suo [...] /---

(b) [Q]uod expostulantes uni[ersis decurio/ribus uti Plautio Lupo o(ptimo) o(rdinis) n(ostri) uir(o) biga de pub(lico) /3 collocetur q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(leri) p(laceret) c(enentiis) L. Cassi Longini II / uir(i)
desig(nati) q. p. c(ircum) d) f. dec(uriones) i(ta) c(ensuerunt): "Cum Plautius Lupus / o. o. n. uir cum flamoni-omnium sibi delatum libenter suscep/et /his liberalitatis cellam thermar(um).\[15\] mar/mora atque

\[12\] f]lusissimis adfectibus iterum splendidissimos ludos ediderit nec contentus /huiusmodi affectus /remunerari ut reliqui quo/que ad eamdem uolup\[24\] tem

amatori patriae et ciuium suorum quod indulgentia sacra /civibus suis feras dentatas quattuor

\[16\] amatori patriae ac ciuium T. Flauio Vibiano, u. p., fl(amini) p.p. et pont(ifici), cur(atori) rei pub. Lepcimagn(ensis), sac(erdoti) Laur(entium) Lab(inatium) et sac. M(atris) D(eum), praef(ecto) omnium sacr(orum) ob diuersarum uoluptatum\[19\] adquisitionem et Libyca turum X, /ex populi suff(ragio et ordin(is) d(ecreto).

\[13\] Heraclii /Dignissimo principali, innocentissimo uiro /T. Flauio Vibiano iuniori, pontifici, du(u)muiro, filio ac colleg(a)e T. Flauio Frontini /Heraclii, in paraulis annis exibent aequaliter uolup\[19\] tem et sufragio quietissimi populi /et decreto splendidis/simi ordinis.

\[19\] Heraclii /Benignissimo uiro princi/pali prudentissimo et integirr(imo) /T. Fl(auiu) Frontino Heraclio, u. p., au/guri, sacerd(oti) Lauren(tium) Labinat(i)um, ii uiro ob diuersarum uolup\[19\] tem exhibitiones adq\[1\] / admirabilem ludorum editionem amore eque /incomparabilem in pa/triam et ciues suos suff(f)ra\[1\] tatem Qui/tissimis populi /et decreto splendidis/simi ordinis.

435 Lepcis Magna: \AE\ VIII 14 = 22673; \IRT\ 595 (On the reverse face of 476 [---]. Not seen). b: \IRT\ 652 (White marble base. The fragment appears to be inscribed with a text identical with the last four lines of 595). 3rd/4th c.

\[7\] Heraclii /Dignissimo principali, innocentissimo uiro /T. Flauio Vibiano iuniori, pontifici, du(u)muiro, filio ac colleg(a)e T. Flauio Frontini /Heraclii, in paraulis annis exibenti aequaliter uolup\[1\] tem et sufragio quietissimi populi /et decreto splendidis/simi ordinis.

\[16\] Heraclii /Benignissimo uiro princi/pali prudentissimo et integr(imo) /T. Fl(auiu) Frontino Heraclio, u. p., au/guri, sacerd(oti) Lauren(tium) Labinat(i)um, ii uiro ob diuersarum uolup\[1\] tem exhibitiones adq\[1\] / admirabilem ludorum editionem amore eque /incomparabilem in pa/triam et ciues suos suff(f)ra\[1\] tatem Qui/tissimis populi /et decreto splendidis/simi ordinis.

Lepcis Magna: \IRT\ 786 (Marble panel. 3rd/4th c. capitals).

\[---\] [---]borum [--- / ---]s ferar[u]m [--- / ---]uit.
437 Lepcis Magna: C VIII 22672; *ILS* 9408; *IRT* 569 (Lower part of moulded base of white marble. 4th c. capitals).


438 Lepcis Magna: *IRT* 578 (Moulded marble base. 4th c. capitals).

Amelii. / Multiplici laborum merito /3 uarioque uoluptatum / genere stimulantibus / paternis auitis etiam /6 documentis ab ineun/te aetate patriam ciues/que suos prouerenti /9 M. Vibio Aniano Gemino, / u. p., fla(mini) p.p., pont(ifici), sacerdotali/tiae Tripolitanae /12 bis II uir(o) ex su(f)ragio / quietissimi populi et de/creto splendidissimi ordinis.

439 Lepcis Magna: *IRT* 580 (Marble panel. 4th c. capitals).

-----? / --- curia ad squa/lorem --- i)n splendorem /3 ---] praeses prou(iiae Tripolitanae ---?) coluit, dedicauit / ---] didid uoluptati.


441 Oea: *AE* 1942–43, 1 + *AE* 1945, 68; *IRT* 230; W-K 2 (Bauinschrift). A.D. 164/168?


442 Sabratha: *AE* 1925, 103; *IRT* 117 (Marble panel. 2nd/3rd c. capitals); W-K 3 (Frühestens 138/161).

C. Flauio Q. fil. Pap. Pudenti, flam(inali) Liberi Patris, II uiro, flam. perpetuo ciuis pater Fl. Tullus post / multas liberalitates per quas patriam suam exornauit aquam priuata pecunia induxit item lacus n(umero) XII exstru/3xit eodemque crustis et statuis marmoreis excoluit praeterea HS CC mil. num. ad tutelam eiusdem / aquae rei publ. promisit et intulit quod ipse quoque Pudens super numerosam munificentiam quam in / ciues suos contulit etiam muneris gladiatori spectaculum primus in patria sua per dies quinq. /6 splendidissimum ediderit ordo Sabrathensium populo postulante quadrigam ei de publico ponend(um) censuit / Fl. Pudens honore contentus sua pecunia posuit.
ANNEX: INSCRIPTIONS

443 Sabratha: *JRT* 142b (Panel of white marble); W-K 5.

----- / [--- restau ?]rauit [--- / --- editi]one munere munum [---].

**Pisidia**

444 Antiochia: *C III* 295 = 6829; *ILS* 5070.

C. Albucio C. f. / Ser. Firmo, aed(ili),/3 II uir(o), qui pecuni/ am destinavit per / testamentum at¹ /6 certamen gymnicum / quo[d]annis [f]iacien/dum diebus festis,/9 Lunae; / d. d.

445 Antiochia: *AE* 1926, 78; Robert 92. Probably 1st half of 2nd c.


447 Antiochia: *C III* 297 = 6837; *ILS* 5081; Robert 93. After A.D. 180.

Cn. Dotio / Dotti Maryli[li]ii fil. Ser. Planco/ano, patr(on)o col(oniae), flam(ini), / II uir(o) II q(uin)q., munem(ar)ro II /6 et agonothe(tae) per[t(eto)] / certam(inis) q(uin)q. talant(iaei), / A[s]arch(iae) templ(orum) splend(idissimae) /9 ciuit(atis) Ephes(iorum), ex libre(ralitate) sua elect(о) ago/nothe(tae) perp. /12 diuo Marco cer(tam)inis) sacr(i) Hadria(nion Ephes/i), /15 postul(ante) populo, / ob merit(a) eius, / ui(c/us) Tuscus; d. d.

448 Antiochia: *AE* 1914, 266; Robert 94 (Inscription honorifique. II⁵/III⁵ s.).

----- / [---] Maximiano, / aedil(i), II uir(o) qui II u[i]/3 ratu suo munus u[е]nitionum et gladi- a[t(orum)] / ex liberalit(ate) sua bidu[um] /6 dedit, qui etiam testame[n]to / suo fidei commisit [---] / ------?

**Creta**

448 Cnossus: *C III* 12042; *ILS* 7210; *ICret* I 51 (Specie di colonna cilindrica). Probably not long after the colonial deduction of 36 B.C. Cf. n.354.

----- / dedit. In hoc munere X D sunt, quos e lege / coloniae pro ludis dare debuit.

**Achaia**

449 Delus: *BCH* 1910 pp.403–5 no. 54 (L'état du fragment 3 [= II.18–25], qui a longtemps séjourné dans l'eau et dont les lettres sont fort rongées, en rend la lecture fort difficile); *C F* 2248 (Fragmenta pilae ingentis. LL.2–13: nomina duodecim magistrorum). Late Republican.

-----? / [---] mag(istrei) FA[---] / N. Raecius M. f., /3 [-] Ellius M. f., / [---]ius M. f., / [---] A. l.
Antim(achus), /6 [---]trati(---), / [---]+con(---) / [---]+o(---) /9 [---] A. l. [---]oi(---) / [---] M. l. Ste[--- / ---]CL I.

450 Dyme: BCH 1878 p.100 no. 9; C III 7257 (Litteris male factis).

-----? / [---]enus Patern[us], --- / --- T]rebulanus [-?-/?3 -? -] Antonius Eu[tychus2 / ---? -]

Grattius P. [f. --- / ---?] M. vocat EP[--- /6 ---? -] Villius C. f. [--- / ---?] ex d. d., ludo[sq. fecerunt?].


[---]ius P. f. Q[uir.] /uir.? / ---+ II uir per(ticum cum /3 column]nis marmo[reis et --- / ---]a facien-
d(a) cu[ravit / ---] ob honor(em) aed[if(itatis) / ---6 ---] XV; item ob [honores) con/iuncto?Js II uir(atu) glad[iator-
rum / paria ---? ded?it eaq. omni [---] /9 vocat consum[muit].

452 Patras: AE 1990, 888 (Stèle de calcaire beige; écriture peu soignée qui se rapproche de la cursive); AE 1995, 1408. 2nd/3rd c.

P. Pomponius P. f. Quintianus MAS / CAICEICAESARE qu(aestor?), munera[rius] bis /3 q(uii)
pro II uir(atu?) munus Quinti(anum) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) fecit / et in annonam col(oniae) su(a)e leuandam /
uendidit f’reumentum DXV, sing(ulum) /6 mod(ium) X S; / cur(a) Publiciae Optatae matri’s².

Macedonia

453 Dynrrachium: C III 607; Robert 2. A.D. 98/117.

/ praef(ecto) coh(ortis) II equitat(ae) Hisp(anorum) Germ(an(i)a) / sup(erieore), II uir(o) q(uin)c., pontif(ici),
patr(ono) col(oniae), qui in /6 comparat(ione) soli oper(i) byblo[t(heacae)] HS CLXX (m.) f(aciundo) / rem p.
impend(io) leuauit et ob [ded(icationem) e]ius / [munus d(e)] s(ua) p(ecunia) gladiatorib. p(ariib.) XII ed[dit ---] 
MC / ------?

454 Philippoi: C III 660. After A.D. 79.

iani] / filius O[---]/niae [---] / ------?


P. Marius P. f. Volt. Valens, or(namentis) / dec(urionalib.) hon(oratus), aed(ilis) i. d. Philipp(is),
dec(urio), flamen /3 diui Antonini Pii, II uir mun(erarius).

456 Philippoi: AE 1939, 185.

L. Valerio L. fil. / Volt. Prisco, /3 orn(aumentis) dec(urionalib.) hon(orato), / dec(urioni), iren-
(chae), II uir(o) iur. d. munera/6rio; cultores / deor(um) Serapis [et] / Isidi[s].
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457 Philippi: BCH 1937 pp.413–14 no. 6; AE 1937, 52.

458 Philippi: C III 659 + p.1325; ILS 7189. 2nd c.
C. Vibius C. fil. Vol. Daphnus, / orn(amentis) dec(urionalib.) hon(oratus), an(norum) V m(ensi-
sium) IX, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); /3 C. Vibius C. fil. Vol. Florus, dec(urio), / II uir et munera-
rius Philippi, / fil(io) kariss(imo) [f(aciendum)] c(urauit).

459 Philippi: BCH 1923 p.86 no.4 (Partie supérieure d’un couvercle de sarcophage en marbre blanc;
surface endommagée); AE 1924, 54; Robert 22. L.3: PIGNA. Cf. n.298.
Iuli Fidei MANL[B---]LAETGAI[.]+ / sua, paria VII pugna[ue]ru(n)t Philippis /
[---?

Dalmatia

460 Epidaurum: C III 1745 + p.1492. 2nd c.
P. Aelio P. f. / Tro. / Osilliano, / Nouia Bassila /5 mater et Nouia Ius/tilla auia posuerunt / et spo-
tulis decurio(nib.), / Augustalibus et sexui/ris datis item pugilium /10 spectaculo dedicae/runt; huic uniuersus /
ordo decurionatus / honorem et locum / statuae decreuit.

461 Narona: C III 1769 (Credideri[t Mommsen] scriptam vivo etiamtum Augusto); ILS 7167. L.5: ARG.P.S-.
The expression ob honorem suggests a date not earlier than the late 1st c.; the sacrifice is made to the
living emperor (Augustus).
Aug(usto) sacr(um) / C. Iulius Macrini lib. /3 Martialis, IIIIII uir m(agister) M(ercurialis); ob /
honor(em) idem ludos scena(cios) / per trid(uum) d(edit) et canthar(um) arg(enteum) p(ondo) (uncia-
rum) s(eptem).
## ANNEX II: COMPARATIVE TABLE

| IV     | 1084: 97; 1094: 103; 1177: 99a; 1178: 99d; 1179: 98b; 1180: 100; 1181: 92b; 309 |
ANNEX: COMPARATIVE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1182</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 54a; 3777: 54b; 3778: 56; 3779: 55; 3925: 62; 4588: 50; 4643: 52; 4727: 39; 4760: 40; 4893: 129; 4897: 130; 4913: 128; 5928: 5; 6012: 22; 6090: 11; 6240: 13; 6243: 14; 6429: 9; 6512: 10; 6555: 45; 6565: 46; 7295: 247; 8260: 41. |
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### ANNEX: COMPARATIVE TABLE

**ICret** 151: 448.


**ILAfr** 151: 448.


**ILGN** 109: 260; 578: 265.


**ILN** II 15: 270; III 29: 258; IV 24: 257.


**ILTG** 341: 253.

**ANNEX: COMPARATIVE TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InsIt</th>
<th>VIII 7: 225; IX 166: 236; X 77: 240; X 192: 238; XI 11: 242; XIII 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(FOst) A.D. 146: 26; XIII 5 (FOst) A.D. 152: 27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX III: INDEX OF PRODUCERS

Small capitals indicate which element of the name is indexed; preference was given to the *nomen gentilicium* or, when this is lacking, to the (first) *cognomen*. With regard to games provided for by a testamentary bequest, names of the testator and executor are both included. Names in *italics* are those of would-be producers who substituted some building or public works for games. Some producers are known by a *signum*, which is given in brackets after their name. A '?' follows the name of a doubtful producer (not to be confused with a superscript '?', which is used to indicate an uncertain reading or restitution). Anonymi are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-] ACANT'H'VS?</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ACELLIVS Clemens</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACERIVS Firmius Leonius</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. ACILIVS P. f. Men. Paulus</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] ACIVTIVS Antillus</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. ACIVTIVS M. I. Notus</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-]us Mascanis f. ADIV[TOR]</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. AELANVS Fortunatus</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser. AEFOLAN(VS) [- f.]</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. AELIVS L. f.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AELIVS Maximus</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. AEMILIVS Ballator</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. AEMILIVS L. fil. Quir. [Frontinus?]</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMILIVS Honoratus</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMILIVS Marcianus</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. AEMILIVS C. f. Pap. Martialis</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMILIVS Martialis junior</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. AEMILIVS Nobilis</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. AEQIVASIVS C. f. Caluas[ ]</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] f. AG[RIPP---] Fabi Agr[ippini] cons[ulis filiae?]</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGYSIA T. f. Priscilla</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. [-] AL'TEXIS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ALBCIVS C. f. Ser. Firmus</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEXSANDER Ca[- s.]</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. ALLEIVS Nigidius Maius</td>
<td>98–101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] Q. f. Quir. ALL[---]++ +us? Fal[---]nus</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. AMATIVS C. Amat(ii) Patern(i) fil. 'Paterninus'</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. AMMIVS' Gamburio</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. AMVLLIVS M. f. Pap. Optatus Crementianus</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. ANCHARIVS T. f. Pal. Priscus</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. ANCHARIVS Priscianus</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. ANNIVS C. f.</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNIA Q. fil. Seuera</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] ANNOLENVS Crescentianus</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. ANNIVS L. f.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] AN[NIVS [- f. Te]r. Camars</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ANNIVS C. fil. Pap. Victor</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. ANNIVS Q. f. Fe[---]</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNIVS Memmianus</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNIVS Primitius</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] AN[NIVS L. f. Lemonia Tertius</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ANNIVS C. fil. Qu[ir. ---]</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTIVS Rusti [- s.]</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] A. I. ANTIM(ACHVS)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] A. D. I. ANTIO(ACHVS)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] ANTONIVS Eu[tychus?]</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ANTONIVS M. I. Nico</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ANTONIVS C. I. [-]</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ANTRACIVS C. f.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-]julius M. f. [APO]LLODORVS</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOAIA Montana</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMATIVS' Senorius'?</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. ARRENIVS L. fil. Pap. Menander</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ARRENIVS M. f.</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. ARRIVS M. f.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. ARRIVS A. f.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. ARRIVS Ianuarius Mamertinus</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASICIA Victoria</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti. ASICIVS Ti. f.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. ASINIVS [-]</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL. ATILII</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(L. ATTIVS ---)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. ATTIVS Quir. Vetto</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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T. ATVLIVS C. f. Celer 83
A. ATVLIVS A. f. Rufus 86
Q. AVELIVS Q. f. Serg. Priscus Seuerius Seuerus
Annaeus Rufus 171
[P. AVFIDIVS Fortis 26
G. AVFIDIVS G. f. Cai.Os. Aulus 310
L. AVFIVS C. l. Strato 60
AVILLIA Gabinius Venusta 405
Q. AVILIVS Hyacinthus 267
Q. AVILIVS’ [---] 106
Cn. AVILIVS Cn. l. Agathocles 60
M. AVRELIVS M. f. Pal. Aureianus 312
M. AVRELIVS M. fil. Pal. ‘Tullius Eupraepes 36
L. AVRELIVS Aug. lib. Pylades 118
C. AVRELIVS Saturninus Papiria Cilonianus 418
[---] AVRELIVS P. [f. .]tentius 151
D. [---]ierius D. f. Pal. AVSPICATVS 19
Q. A[---] 380

—B—
P. BABRIVS L. l. 55
[---] BABRIVS L. l. 55
L. BAEVIVS L. f. 274
P. BAEVIVS N. l. 57
P. BAEVIVS P. f. Ter. Iustus 22
P. BAEVIVS Venustus 281
M. BASSAEVS M. f. Pal. Axius 119
P. BIVELLIVS T. l. [---] 59
C. BLOIII(VS) M. l. Protemus 60
[---]ius BONADESPOTIVS 215c

—C—
L. CAECILIVS L. f. Athenaeus 384
[M. CAECILIVS Q. f. Quir. Natalis 321
L. CAECILIVS L. f. Pap. Oaptatus 273
Q. CAECILIVS Telesphor(us) 238
Q. CAELIVS Maximus 366
L. CAELIVS Saturninus L. Caeli Parthenopaei lib. 299
P. CAESTIVS Sex. f. Capito 86
P. CAESIVS M. l. 57
Cn. CAESIVS Athictus 231; cf. 232-233
L. CAESONIVS Honotarus Caesarianus 371
Q. CAETRIVS Q. fil. Volt. Titullus 263
C. CALPRINIVS Celsus 440
445
L. CALPRIVS [---] 199
Q. CALIVS Auctus 192
Q. CALIVS Rufinus 419
C. CALVMEIVS C. l. Erastus 214
L. CAMERIVS L. l. Dorotheus 17
P. CAMVRIVS Nicephor 234
M. CANTRIVS M. f. Marcellus 86
A. Kanuleius (= CANVLEIVS) A. K(anulei) f.
Ispeldidus 146
C. CAPIVE Vitalis 195
M. CASELLIVS Marcellus 104
L. CASSIVS Restutus 311
[---]ius CASTOR 186
L. CATIVS M. f. 274
CELER 49
[C. C]ERENIVS C. [l. ---] 214
P. CERRINIVS [---] 136
L. CEXAECIVS Fuscus 272
CHILO Caecili [- s.] 21
P. CICERIVS C. f. 54
C. CIPIVS C. l. Pera 57
P. CIPIVS Cn. l. 57
Ti. CLAVDIVS Ti. fil. Ti. nep. Cor. Maximus 132
Ti. CLAVDIVS Verus 92
[---]ius Ti. f. Pup. CLEMENS 200
COCLIVS Saturninus Golicus 385
COELIVS Titianus 376
M. CLODIVS f. Quir. Fidus 345
A. CLODIVS A. f. Men. Flaccus 87
C. CLODIVS Hilarus 12
T’i. CLODIVS Lo’tueilla? 372
Q. COMINIVS Abascantus 70X
M. COMINIVS Heres 74
C. CONCORDIVS Syracus 144
CONSTANTIUS 240
C. CORNELIVS Belicus 278-279
L. CORNELIVS L. fil. Quir. Fronto Probianus 336
L. CORNELIVS L. f. Men. M[---] 126
L. CORNELIVS Quietus 413
P. CORNELIVS P. f. Gal. Taurus 275
Q. CORNELIVS Va[---] 430
M. COSINIVS M. f. Quir. Celerinus 333
Q. COSSTIVS P. f. 226
C. COSSTIVS C. l. Gent(ius) 57
[---]SVTIVS C. l. Eup(-- ) 58
M. COTTIVS M. f. 54
L. CRASSIVS [---] 136
Q. CREPERRIVS Germani filius Pap. Rufinus 392
M. CVR[ATIVS]Quir. Longinus 297
M. CVRITIVS C. f. 57
P. CVRITIVS P. f. Salassus 145

—D—

[---] fil. Pap. DATVS 394
L. DECIVS L. i. Gamus 228
[---] DIADV? MENVS 215A
P. DIDIOLIVS Strato 150
[---]ius [---] I. DION(YSIVS) 58
Q. DOMITIVS Alpinus 241
[---]DOMITIVS [Eu?]carpus 44
Tib. DOMITIVS Procules 253X
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cn. DOTTIVS Dotti Mary</td>
<td>[ilini fil. Ser. Planclanius 446]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EGNATIVS C. fil. Papiria [Fe]lix</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EGNATIVS Festus</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EGNATIVS M. l. Glyco</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. EGNATIVS Inuentus</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EGNATIVS C. l. Muscius</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. EGNATIVS l. f. Clu. Victorinus (Sagittius)</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. EGNATIVS M. f. Mae. Fortuanianus</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. EGNATIVS M. f. 56</td>
<td>L. EGNATIVS 1. f. Clusius 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABIVS 1. f. Gal. Cordus</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titius FABIVS Seuerus</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. FABIVS Herarium</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. FABIVS Pius</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABIVS Syntrophus</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. FANNIVS M. f. Papiria Vitalis</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Ti[---]ius FELI[x]</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] EPIC (Advs?)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. EPRIVS M. f. 54</td>
<td>L. EPRIVS Eros 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. EPRIVS Onomastus</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---F---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---I---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. ISTITACIVS N. f. Cilix</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. ITELIVS Cn. l.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]orius IVLIVANVS</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS Apollonius</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS Q. f. Felix Aurunculeianus</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib. IVLIVS Diadochus</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVLIVS Fideus²</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS C. l. Glaphyrius</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IIIVS Caesar. l. Isochrysis</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS Macrini lib. Martialis</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. IVLIVS Martialis</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. IVLIVS Q. f. Quirina Rogatianus</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVLIVS Senecio</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS diui Augusti l. Sosthenes</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. IVLIVS Therminian</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. (IVLIVS) Titiusenus Honoratus Kappianus</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. IVLIVS Tituisenus Rogatus Kappianus</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. IVLIVS Se[x. f.] Vol. Verinus</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS Victor</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVLIVS [---]</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVNIA D. f. Rustica</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] IVNIOR</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. IVNIVS N. f.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. IVNIVS Felix</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. IVNIVS P. f. Serg. Paulinus</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. IVNIVS Priscus</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. IVNIVS Vicianus</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. IV(V)ENI(VS) L. f. Rufi(us)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KANVLEIVS cf. Canuleius</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. LE[---] [-esia[nus]]</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LICCLEIVS M. I. Philinthus</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIC[HA]S</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICINIA</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] LICINIVS Abascantio</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. LICINIVS Optatianus</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. LIGARIVS Maximi Ligari fil. Potitus (Mensur[ius])</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. LIGVRIVS Sex. fil. Gal. Marinus</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLIVS M. I.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. LVCILIVS</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. LVCILIVS P. [f.] P. n. pron. Galamala</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVCR(ETIA) L. f. Campana</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LVCRETIVS</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. LVCRETIVS Satrius Valens</td>
<td>96, 97 (Satrius Lucretius Valens); cf. 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LVRlVS Felix</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. LVRiVS M. f. Palat. Lucretianus</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LVSCIVS C. f.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVSIVS Fortunatianus</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. LVSIVS C.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAESO[NIVS] ---</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGERIVS</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MAGILIVS Honoratus</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MAGILIV[S L. I. ---]</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MAI(VS) M. 1. Nic(---)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. MALL[NS] ---</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MAMILIVS Eutychianus</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. MAMIVS M'. f.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MANLIVS C. f.</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MANLIVS Rufio</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCELVS</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. S[---] MARC(---)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. MARIIVS Q. f. Arm. Quadratus</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIVS ---</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIA ---</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] MARIIVS Eudaem[on]</td>
<td>215B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. MARIIS Q. I. Stabili[to]</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. MARIIVS P. f. Volt. Valens</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIVS --- [Vranuis]</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MATRINIVS Aurelius C. f. Lem. Antoninus</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. MATIVS Q. f.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMA ---</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMIANVS</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELANTHVS P. Deci (s.)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. MEMMIVS Apulus</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[L.] MEMMIVS Pecarius Marcellinus</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] MEMMIVS ---</td>
<td>215C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. MERCEL[LO] ---</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. MESSIVS Q. I.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. MONNIVS N. f.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. MONNIVS Rufus</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[L. Clodius?] MONTANVS</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---] MONTANVS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MVMIIVS L. f.</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MVNATIVS Caeseminius</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. MVNATVS A. fil. Men. Euaristus</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. MVNIVS N. I. Antius</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. MVTTEIVS C. f. Pal. Quintus Seuerus</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-] NAEIVS [---]</td>
<td>215C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. NEMNIVS M. fil. Cupitus</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. NERIVS M. I.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. NERIVS M. I.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. NERIVS P. I.</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]CL I. NICEPHO(RVS)</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]lus C. I. NICIA</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVIA Bassilia</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVIA Justilla</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. NOVIVS Q. I. Protem(us)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[P.] NVM[ERIVS Eupa?tor]</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. NVMICIVS (mulieris) I. Acastus</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVMISIVS Genialis</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. NVMISIVS Primus</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. NVMISIVS Q. I. Thyrsus</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. NVMSIVS C. f. Vol. Chrestus</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. NVMOLEI(VS) Cn. f.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYPHIIVS</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OBIN[IVS Favor]</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OBINS [---]</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. OCRATI(VS) M. I.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn. OCTAVI(VS) N. I.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. OCTAVIIVS Felix Octauianus</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. OCVILATIVS M. f. Verus</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. OFASIVS Firmus Marus Cornelius Mari f. Clu. Cossinus</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. OPPIVS C. I. Secundus</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ORFIVS Q. I. Stabili[to]</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. OR[IVS] L. f. Cor. Luciscus</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Q[RF]IVS [---]</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex. OTACILIVS M. f. Quir. Restitutus</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. OTIVS L. I. Communis</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. OVIIVS P. I. Plut(us)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. PACATIVS Tyrannus?</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. PACIVS Cn. f.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

M. PACCIUS M. l. Philem(o) 60
L. PACCIVS L. f. Priscus 152
C. PACCIVS C. f. [---] 41
P. PACTIVMEIVS C.l. 56
Q. PACCIVMEIVS Saturnus 403
L. PAPIVS L. f. Ter. Pollio 39
[---]enus PATER[INVS] 450
C. PAVSCVLAVS C. f. Quir. Maximus 177
L. PEDANIVS Clarus 301
L. PEDANIVS Lupus 301
L. PEDANIVS Venustus 301
Cn. PESCENNIVS l. 1. 57
T. PESCENNIVS T. f. 57
T. PETRONIVS T. f. T. n. Clu. Proculus 197
PHILARGVRVS C[--] P. s. 21
PHILARGVRVS Li[couiai? s.] 21
PHILARGVRVS M[---] Q. s. 21
PIST[IVS] Gemini [- s.] 21
PLAVTVS Lupus 431
P. PLINIVS M. f. 53
A. POLLIVS P. l. Alexander) 60
[---] POLLIVS L. I. Hilar[us] 10
Cn. POLLIVS Cn. I. Victor 114
Sta(tius)³ POMEIVS 76
C. POMEIVS Mart(malis)² 269
L. POMEIVS M. fil. Quir. Nouelius 330
M. POMEIVS Pudentanians 43
L. POMPOIVS C.I. 56
Maec. Diogenes 155
P. POMPONIVS P. f. Quintianus 452
Q. POMPONIVS Q. l. Virbanus 214
Q. POMEIVS[---] 159
C. PONTIVS T. fius Quir. Saturninus 322
N. POPIDIVS Rufus 102–103
C. POPPAEIVS Priscus 232
PORFYRIVS 432
L. POSTIVS L. I. Eros maior 227
L. POSTIVS Felix Celerinus 368
[---]RECILIVS M. f. [Tere]t. Pompeianus 262
L. PRISCIVS 43
[Q. ---]ius Q. fil. Col. PRI[---] 172
[---] ROCYLEINVS P. f. 163
C. PVBLIVS Donatus 181
L. PVBLIVS Pomponius 10
R O PVBLIVS) 10
N. PVMDIVS Q. f. 54
Q. P[---] 107

---Q---

[--- QVA]DRATVS Baebianus [--- f. V]index 325
L. QVINCTIVS L. f. Gelaf[---] 53
Sex. QVINCTIVS Sex. Q(uintii) Successini lib.

Fortunatus 296

---R---

M. RAECIVS Q. f. 54
N. RAECIVS M. f. 449
M. RAMAINVS P. l. Diopant(us) 60
L. RASINIVS L. fil. Quir. Saturninus Maximianus 383
MM. REMMIU Rufi pater et filius 68
M. ROCCIVS Felix M. fil. Quir. 316
D. ROSCI[VS] Q. l. 56
T. RVTLIVS Iunior Iulianus 415
T. RVTLIVS Priscus 221
[---] RYSONIANS 429
M. RVTLIVS Macedo 139
RVTLIVS Saturninus 332
L. R[---] 164
L. R[---]AMIVS¹ 61

---S---

L. SAGINIVS 84
C. SALIVS Pompeianus Sofronius 166
C. SALIVSTIVS C. fil. Quir. Felix 400
L. SALLIVSTIVS --- 417
(Aurelius)³ SALIVANVS 390
M. SALIVS Celsus Pinarianus 426
SATRIVS cf. Lucretius Satrius
[Cn. SATRIVS Cn. f. Rufus 205
C. SATTIVS C. f. 53
L. SCANTIVS L. fil. Quir. Iulianus 317
L. SCRIBONIVS L. f. Vot. Celer 6
M. SEIVS Gn. fil. Quir. Maximus 320
L. SEMPRONIVS L. f. 54
M. SEMPRONIVS Rusticinus 318
T. SENIVS Sollemnis Sollemnini fil. 253
Cn. SENTIVS Cn. f. Cn. n. Ter. Felix 25
Q. SEPTIVS C. Q. l. Verna 17
L. SEPTIVS Philadepotus 160
P. [S]ERVIVS M. I. 55
P. SERIVS N. I. 57
[---] SEVERIVS [--- f. Verus 362
[---] SEXTIVS Castor 215B
M. SEXTIVS N. M. I. 55
N. SEXTIVS N. M. I. 55
Ho[no]ratianus 350
L. SILIVANVS Pater[nus] 164
M. SIMMINIVS Mistilia 420
C. SITTIVS Q. fili. Quirina Flavianus 319
L. SONTIVS Pineius lustianus 143
[A.] SODIVS A. l. [X]philinus 211
N. SPVRIVS D. f. 57
STABILIO Trebi [- s.] 21
P. STATIVS P. M. I. 55
P. STATIVS P. f. Stag(on) 53
Annex: Index of Producers


[---] M. I. Ste[---] 449


P. Svesanvs M. f. 57

M. Svestidws L. f. 202

Ser. Svetivs Ser. l. 55

A. Svetivs Certus 91

A. Svetivs [Par]tenio [et] Niger libertus 123

T. Svilpicivs P. Q. pu(p) i. 60

C. Svilpicivs C. l. Cthesus 214

-----T-----

C. Tantilivs C. C. l. Hyla 114

L. Tavrivs L. f. 274

A. Terentivs A. f. Gal. Rusticus 298


L. Tif[Anivs L. l.] Felix 212

C. Titivs C. i. Adiutor 214

Q. Titivs [Q. fil. Pap.] Securus 389, 396


P. Titivs L. f. 145

C. Titivs Chresimus 40

C. Titivs C. f. Cam. Valentinus 208

P. Titivs Celsi [f. ---] 362

C. Titivs C. f. 53

C. Titivs C. f. 56

T. Traebvlansvs Felix 192

[---] Trebvlansvs 450

L. Tribvlansvs Pamphilio 192

L. Tvccivs Cels[us] 214

C. Tvccivs C. f. 54

M. Tvlivs 89

Tvllivs Marc(i) lib. Achilleus 245

TvRivs Verna[.] 351

-----V-----

M. Valerivs L. f. 54

M. Valerivs M. f. 18

M. Valerivs M. l. 56

M. Valerivs M. fil. Pap. Flauianvs Sabinian[us] 393

Valerivs Frumentius 20


L. Valerivs Primus 108

L. Valerivs L. fil. Volt. Priscus 456


Valerivs Stasi[mus?] 124

Varicos 349


P. Vegellivs P. f. Pub. Primus 5

L. Veicivs L. f. 57

P. Veidivs P. l. Philocles 137

D. Velivs Trophimus 33

Sex. Vencivs Juuentianus 264

A. Verativs A. f. Pal. Seuerianus 120

Vergilivs Cogitatus 233

L. Vetivs Tribunus 62

Q. Vetvlenivs Vranus Herennianus (Magnilianus) 423

Q. Vibivs M. f. 54

M. Vibivs Anianus Geminus (Amelius) 438

C. Vibivs C. fil. Vol. Florus 458

Q. Vibivs Q. Caesi f. Ter. Rusticus 129

L. Vibivs Seuerus 179

A. Vibivs Januarius 138

Q. Vibivs Q. l. SABB 10

L. Villivs C. f. Trom. Atilianus 11

[- V]illivs C. f. [---] 450

P. Vinesivs Firmus 242

M. Visinivs M. l. Philadelphia 214

L. Vitrias C. f. Phil. Natalis 14

Vocovia Q. f. Auita 283

Cn. Voesivs Cn. fil. Aper 34


C. Voltenivs C. l. Bello 227

L. Volv[sius ---] 159

Q. Vrsivs Secundio 192

L. Vrvinivs L. l. Philomousus 32

Vvllivs cf. Vlius

[---] f. Men. V[--] 142
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