

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

**THE PRODUCTION OF SHOWS
IN THE CITIES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE:
A STUDY OF THE LATIN EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE**

by

GUY CHAMBERLAND, M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

© Copyright by Guy Chamberland, March 2001

**THE PRODUCTION OF SHOWS
IN THE CITIES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE**

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2001)
(Classics)

McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: *The Production of Shows in the Cities of the Roman Empire:
A Study of the Latin Epigraphic Evidence*

AUTHOR: Guy Chamberland, B.A. (McGill University), M.A. (University
of Ottawa)

SUPERVISOR: Professor W.J. Slater

NUMBER
OF PAGES: vi, 329

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 amphitheaters, &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 Italicense*, 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.

* * *

At this point it is appropriate for me to thank my supervisor, Dr. William J. Slater, for his invaluable help and encouragement throughout the process of writing this dissertation. I have greatly benefited from his thorough knowledge of the Graeco-Roman world. Thanks must also be addressed to Drs. E.W. Haley and C.F. Eilers for their very valuable comments at all stages of my research; to Drs. E. Glanville and G. Moyal who were on the examining committee; and to the external examiner, Dr. Kathleen M. Coleman, whose numerous comments and corrections were invaluable.

I wish to thank McMaster University for three consecutive Alvin Irwin Ogilvie Scholarships, the Classics Department for teaching and research assistantships, and the Government of Ontario for an Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

I would also like to thank my parents, Raymond and Gemma, my brothers Marcel and Alain, and my in-laws, Maria and Enrico Iulianella, for their support. This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Claudia, and our son, Jérémie.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Descriptive note</i>	ii
<i>Abstract</i>	iii
<i>Foreword</i>	iv
<i>Table of contents</i>	v
<i>List of tables</i>	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. <i>LVDI</i>	31
III. <i>MVNERA, VENATIONES AND LVSIONES</i>	53
IV. ATHLETIC CONTESTS	81
V. THE <i>LVSVS IVVENVM</i>	93
VI. "NON-TRADITIONAL" DENOMINATIONS	105
VII. VERBS EXPRESSING THE PRODUCTION OF SHOWS	115
VIII. FEATURES SHARED BY ALL KINDS OF SHOWS	127
IX. PRODUCERS AND <i>CAVSAE SPECTACVLORVM</i>	159
X. CONCLUSIONS	221
ANNEX I: INSCRIPTIONS	227
ANNEX II: COMPARATIVE TABLE	309
ANNEX III: INDEX OF PRODUCERS	315
REFERENCES	321

LIST OF TABLES

II.1: <i>Ludi</i> known by their official name	32
II.2: <i>Ludi circenses</i>	39
II.3: <i>Ludi scaenici</i>	45
II.4: <i>Ludi</i> not qualified as either <i>circenses</i> or <i>scaenici</i>	46
III.1: <i>Munera</i> known by their official name	56
III.2: Events with name of the producer in the genitive	58
III.3: Other <i>munera</i>	61
III.4: Expressions equivalent to <i>munus</i>	63
III.5: <i>Venationes</i>	70
III.6: <i>Lusiones</i>	75
IV.1: Athletic contests	83
V.1: The <i>lusus iuuenum</i>	93
VI.1: “Non-traditional” denominations	106
VII.1: Verbs used to express the production of games	116
VIII.1: Dates or occasions when games were produced	128
VIII.2: Duration of events	140
VIII.3: Prices of events	146
VIII.4: Average prices of events	151
IX.1: Evidence for statutory games	160
IX.2: The “ <i>pro ludis</i> ” inscriptions	167
IX.3: <i>Curatores muneris</i>	169
IX.4: <i>Munerarii</i>	182
IX.5: “ <i>Ob honorem</i> ” shows	194
IX.6: “ <i>Ob dedicationem</i> ” shows	196
IX.7: Bequests for shows	200
IX.8: Shows with unknown <i>causae</i>	204

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. PIGANIOL 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, *RPh* 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 muneris publici*. 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.

349 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

⁵Cf. WISSOWA 1912 pp.466–67; Degrassi, *InsIt XIII*² p.534; Polverini in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 p.2015; VILLE 1981 pp.172–73.

⁶For these and other figures, WISSOWA 1912 p.451 n.7; CAVALLARO 1984 pp.132–33.

⁷*Fasti Ostienses*, *InsIt 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

⁸Dio 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.

⁹RGDA 22.1

¹⁰It 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.

¹¹MOMMSEN 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.¹² 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.¹³ 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.¹⁴

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.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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 (*uestis 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 circo 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

¹⁶Cf. most recently M.-L. Freyburger-Galland, "Dion Cassius et le carrousel troyen", *Latomus* 56, 1997, pp.619–29.

concerns is with the conduct of the emperor during the games.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.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.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.

¹⁷NEWBOLD 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).

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

¹⁹On this cf. Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps*, Oxford 1969 pp.18–24; A. Cameron, *Circus Factions*, Oxford 1976 pp.157–92; F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, 1977 pp.369–75.

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 *impensae* (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 χρῆμα, "money"), they have been included in this study when

²⁰Some 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.

²¹Eusebeia: C X 515 = ILS 340; Malavolta in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 pp.2032-33 for further references. Pythia: C XIV 474 = ILS 5233; Malavolta *ibid.* p.2039 for further references; more recently, M.L. Caldelli in G. Paci ed., *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica. Actes de la LX^e rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain*, Macerata 1998, p.227.

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 <de re publica> 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 peculiaria huius urbis uitia paene in utero matris concipi mihi uidentur, histrionalis fauor et gladiatorum equorumque studia: quibus occupatus et obsessus

*animus quantulum loci bonis artibus relinquit?*²²

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).

²³Cf. BRADLEY 1981 pp.129–37.

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 Caesarum 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).*²⁵ These are the funerary *munus* that Caesar gave in 46 and the games by which he celebrated his Spanish triumph in 45.²⁶ Suetonius goes on with details about each of the events. At the circus games, beside the regular chariot races and a *Troia, uenationes*²⁷ 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.”²⁸ But Suetonius makes it clear that even when the promise was being made these were generosityes (*largitiones*) 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,²⁹ 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 ἄστυ τοῦτο καὶ κατακόσμηι πάσῃ πολυτελείᾳ καὶ ἐπιλάμπρυνε παντὶ εἶδει πανηγύρεων· προσήκει τε γὰρ ἡμᾶς πολλῶν ἄρχοντας ἐν πᾶσι πάντων ὑπερέχειν, καὶ φέρει πως καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸς τε τοὺς συμμάχους αἰδῶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους κατάπληξιν. ... ἔπειτα δὲ μήτ' οἰκοδομημάτων πλήθεσιν ἢ καὶ μεγέθεσιν ὑπὲρ τἀναγκαῖα χρήσθωσαν, μήτ' ἀγῶνων πολλῶν καὶ παντοδαπῶν ἀναλώμασι δαπανᾶσθωσαν, ἵνα μήτε σπουδαῖς ματαίαις ἐκτρύχωνται μήτε φιλοτιμίαις ἀλόγοις πολεμῶνται. ἐχέτωσαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πανηγύρεις καὶ θεωρίας τινάς, χωρὶς τῆς ἵπποδρομίας τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν ποιουμένης, μὴ μέντοι ὥστε καὶ τὸ δημόσιον ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους οἴκους λυμαίνεσθαι, ξένον τέ τινα ἀναγκάζεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ὀτιοῦν ἀναλίσκειν, καὶ σίτησιν ἀθάνατον πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς τοῖς ἀγῶνά τινα νικήσασι δίδοσθαι.³³

³⁰“He produced a great number and variety of shows: ljuvenalia, 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 δ' ἵπποδρομίας τὰς ἄνευ τῶν γυμνικῶν ἀγῶνων ἐπιτελουμένας οὐχ ἡγοῦμαι δεῖν ἄλλη τινὶ πόλει ποιεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν, ὅπως μήτε χρήματα παμπληθῆ εἰκῆ παραπολλύηται μήθ' οἱ ἄνθρωποι κακῶς ἐκμαίνωνται, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον, ἵν' οἱ στρατευόμενοι τοῖς ἀριστοῖς ἵπποις ἀφθόνως χρῆσθαι ἔχωσι. τοῦτο μὲν δὴ διὰ ταῦτ' ἀπαγορεύω παντάπασι μηδαμόθι ἄλλοθι πλὴν ἐνταῦθα γίγνεσθαι³⁴

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.³⁵ 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

³⁴As 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.*)

³⁵Cf. esp. F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964, pp. 102–18. For bibliography up to the early 1980s cf. CAVALLARO 1984 pp.75–76 nn.122–123. Add JACQUES 1984 pp.789–803; M. Reinhold's commentary of books 49–52, vol. 6 of P.M. Swan & J.W. Humphrey eds., *An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History*, Atlanta 1988. U. Espinosa Ruiz, *Debate Agrippa-Mecenas en Dion Cassio. Respuesta senatorial a la crisis del Imperio Romano en época Severiana*, Madrid 1982 pp.377–79, does little more than paraphrase Dio's words.

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*.³⁶ 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.”³⁷ 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,³⁸ 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.”³⁹ 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

³⁶That is what must be meant by the periphrasis at 30.7 (quoted above).

³⁷Reinhold, *ibid.*, ad 30.1.

³⁸And we shall see that in the rare instances when he shows interest for events held elsewhere, the emperor is usually involved in some way.

³⁹NEWBOLD 1975 p.603.

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,

⁴⁰Iuv. 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,

⁴²On the date, cf. M. Turcan's edition, *Tertullien. Les spectacles* (Sources chrétiennes 332), Paris 1986 pp.37–43. We are still in a period of plentiful epigraphic commemoration of gifts of games.

⁴³Cf. 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”.⁴⁴ 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*.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ 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*.⁴⁸ 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*

⁴⁷With 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.

⁴⁸See 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.

spectaculum). It is worthy of notice that the Secular Games, “the greatest religious festival of Augustus’ reign”,⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰

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

⁴⁹BRUNT & MOORE 1967 ad loc.

⁵⁰Cf. Dio 55.10.6–8. The construction of this temple, symbolically so significant for the new dynasty, is mentioned in an earlier chapter (21) to conform to Augustus’ presentation of his expenditures: building activity in §§ 19–21; games in 22–23. On the temple see R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939 pp.470–71; P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor 1988 passim (cf. index p.384 s.v.).

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).⁵¹ 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 Nuceriaans, 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

⁵¹Quotation at 2.67; transl. Church & Brodrigg; the Latin reads: *numquam ita ad curas intento Vitellio ut uoluptatum 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 materiem obtrectatoribus arguendae sententiae. cur enim, si rem publicam egere libertate senatoria crederet, tam leuia consecraretur? quin de bello aut pace, de uectigalibus et legibus, quibusque aliis <res> Romana contineretur, suaderet dissuaderetue? ... Thrasea contra, rationem poscentibus amicis, non praesentium ignarum respondebat eius modi consulta corrigere, sed patrum honori dare, ut manifestum fieret magnarum rerum curam non dissimulatuos qui animum etiam leuissimis aduerterent.⁵²

The decree may have been a trivial matter, but the senator who opposed it, P. Claudius Thrasea 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).

⁵³*Cos. suff.* 56. *PIR*² C 1187; R. Syme, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1957, esp. pp.555–61; M.T. Griffin, *Nero. The End of a Dynasty*, New Haven–London 1984, esp. pp.165–6, 170–3.

History took place outside Rome.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵ That at Fidenae (58.1a) would be unrecognizable without Tacitus' account.

Dio's own views, exposed in Book 52 but purporting to be Maecenas',⁵⁶ 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).⁵⁷ 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.

⁵⁴Again only books 51 and following are taken into consideration (cf. supra n.17).

⁵⁵This feature is absent from the lists in NEWBOLD 1975.

⁵⁶In the second part of his speech, §§ 19–40 and esp. 30 on the games: supra pp.14–16.

⁵⁷Cf. ANDRÉ 1975 pp.476–77.

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.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.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?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.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 *évergésies* (gifts to the community of buildings, banquets, games, &c.) were exceptional

⁵⁹Three examples: (1) there is an echo of the *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 Irni (3), but in cities all over the Roman world (pp.159–69); and (3) a *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 (ILS 9340).

⁶⁰Cf. in particular *CIDER*, *EAOR*, *Fora*, *Robert* and *ST* in the list of abbreviations, pp.315–17.

⁶¹What follows is to some extent inspired by Keith Hopkins, “Seven missing papers”, in *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l’antiquité romaine* (CEFR 129), Rome 1990, pp.623–30, esp. 623–25.

⁶²It 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.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.⁶⁴

This problem can be rectified to a large extent by studying the inscriptions together with the legal sources, whose purpose is to record conflicts⁶⁵ 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, *Le pain et le Cirque*,⁶⁶ even though it will be cited only very infrequently in the following chapters.⁶⁷ The term

⁶³JACQUES 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 *ludi* rarely did (cf. infra pp.819–27 and esp. 824–27).

⁶⁴JACQUES 1984 p.XXIII; cf. p.719.

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

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

⁶⁷For 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”.⁶⁸ 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*.⁶⁹

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.”⁷⁰ 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.⁷¹ 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 y 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.

⁶⁸P. Garnsey, “The Generosity of Veyne”, *JRS* 81, 1991, pp.164–68 (an important review of Veyne’s most fundamental contributions), at p.164.

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*. Chapter 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.

II. *LVDI*

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.

⁷²Tarquinius: 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.).

⁷³The following fragmentary inscriptions could not be attributed to any one category: nos. **24, 113, 215E, 216, 309, 329, 351, 352, 386, 410, 411, 417, 427, 441, 449, 450.**

Table II.1

LVDI KNOWN BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAME

A. *Ludi*:

1. *l. 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)*); *FVen* May 3 (*l. in circo Florae*).
2. *l. 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 L.36 (*l. V. Caes. et Claudi*).
3. *l. Augustales* **167** (*pro ludis Augustalibus*); cf. *FFil* Oct. 12 (*Augustales c(ircenses)*); *TabHeb* L.50; *FAMit* Oct. 5–12, *FAntMin* Oct. 3–12 (*diuo Augusto et Fortunae 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(atina²) religione digni Fortunae Primigeniae*); **2** (§ LXX: *munus l.ue sc. Ioui Iunoni Mineruae deis deabusque*; § LXXI: *m. l.ue sc. l. l. M. et 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).⁷⁴ These games were created officially in Rome some time in the third century B.C. and became annual in 173.⁷⁵ They were famous in part for their obscenity, which was com-

⁷⁴No. **87** (LL.4, 9) records Apollinaria, a festival to Apollo, rather than (*ludi*) *Apollinares*; the term “Apollinaria” is attested in e.g. *Gloss.* III 239.41 (cf. III 171.52); one should also understand “*Apollinar(ia)*” in the *menologium Colotianum* (which records holidays and sacrifices, but not *ludi*: *C VI* 2305; *ILS* 8745) and in the *feriale Cumanum* for 13 July (*III idus Iul.*, last day of the *ludi Apollinares*: *ILS* 4917).

⁷⁵On these games see G. Wissowa, *RE VI*, 1909 s.v. “Flora”, coll.2747–49; s.v. “Floralia”, coll.2749–52; U. Pestalozza, *DizEp* III s.v. “Flora”, esp. pp.166–68; P. Habel, *RE Suppl. V*, 1931, s.v. “Ludi publici”, coll.625–26; Polverini in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 esp. pp.2008–9 (all with bibliography and references to sources).

mented upon not only by Christian writers but also by first- and second-century authors such as Valerius Maximus, Seneca and Martial.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.⁷⁷

Two municipal inscriptions record *ludi Florales* (210, 325); another, *Floralia* (160), that is, the festival to the goddess Flora rather than the games as such (if there were any). Do the *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, *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.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 *Floralia*, but the attributes of Flora seem to have been assimilated early on by the much better attested Tanit Caelestis.⁷⁹ These facts suggest that in nos. 210 and 325 the divine epithet is more a reference to the particular program of these *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 *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.

⁷⁶Lact. *Div.Inst.* 1.20; Val.Max. 2.10; Sen. *Ep.* 97.8; Mart. 1.35.8–9: *quis Floralia uestit et stolatum / permittit metrecibus pudorem?*

⁷⁷According to Pestalozza, *ibid.* p.167, mimes were probably the only scenic representations at these games.

⁷⁸This is not arguing from absence of evidence: vows to all kinds of deities are very abundant in the African epigraphy (cf. *C VIII Suppl.* 52, index pp.221–33).

⁷⁹The 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 *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;⁸⁰ 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 45.⁸¹ 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 *saepia* (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 *seuiri 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

⁸²At Aufidena: C IX 2658 = ILS 6517; IX 2810; EE VIII 111. On the *Augustales* in general cf. DUTHOY 1978; S.E. Ostrow, "The *Augustales* in the Augustan scheme", in K.A. Raaflaub & M. Toher, eds., *Between Republic and Empire. Interpretations of Augustus and His Principate*, 1990, pp.364–79; FISCHWICK 1991 pp.609–16; A. Abramenko, *Die municipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien*, 1993. On their games: infra pp.191–92.

⁸³Cf. Table II.4: K.4 and pp.49–50, where it is argued that "*ludi seuirales*" is probably not an official denomination.

⁸⁴Extensive discussion by W.D. Lebek, ZPE 75, 1988 pp.59–71.

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

⁸⁶Such 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

⁸⁷S. Segenni, *SI* 9 ad no. 21. J. Bodel, *JRA* 11, 1998, p.489, who mistakenly gives the date of 11 B.C. Cf. also Malavolta in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 pp.2030–31 for brief discussion with references. The rapprochement was suggested also by Segenni, ad loc.

⁸⁸Were 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.⁸⁹

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.⁹⁰ Juno Sospes, to whom games were vowed in Lanuvium (18), was “la divinità lanuvina per eccellenza”.⁹¹ 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).⁹² As we saw, the *Lex Vrsonensis*

⁸⁹Cf. 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.

⁹⁰See 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.

⁹¹FORA, *EAOR* IV ad no. 27.

⁹²Extensive 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 CIRCENSES⁹³

C. *Ludi circenses* not characterized as in D below:

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>l. circenses</i> | Leges: 2 § CXXVIII, 225 L.30, <i>TabHer</i> L.64; Galliae: 252; Africa: 312, 422. |
| 2. <i>circenses</i> | Roma: C VI 31200 ^a , <i>FOst</i> A.D. 140, <i>Fasti</i> passim (<i>c(ircenses)</i>); cf. <i>LudSaecS</i> L.38 (<i>circensium spectacula</i>); Italia: [178], <i>AE</i> 1927, 158 = Sherk 41; cf. 126 (<i>spectaculum ... circensium</i>); 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 (<i>circensium spectaculum</i>). |
| 3. [---] | Italia: 127. Hispania: 282, 286, 287, 305, 306. |

D. *Circenses* + program:

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>c. missus</i> ... | [265] ([---]XXX <i>missus per magistr[os]</i>); 311 LL.10, 14 (<i>per magistr[os] ... circuenses ce[ler]es missus sex</i>); <i>FOst</i> A.D. 112, [116] (<i>c. missus XXX</i>). |
|-------------------------|--|

circus games on the anniversary of his death (225).⁹⁴ Several decrees from Cumae which record honors to a prominent individual mention the games, including *circinses (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.

⁹³See also Tables II.4: H.2 (*ludi in circo*) and VI.1: A.3 (*spectaculum aurigarum*).

⁹⁴Is it necessarily the case that circus games were put on in Pisae 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

⁹⁵Cf. 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.

⁹⁶HUMPHREY 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”.

⁹⁷HUMPHREY 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.

⁹⁸HUMPHREY p.577. Cf. also Dio 52.30.4, 7–8, quoted supra pp.14–15.

⁹⁹See 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,¹⁰⁰ and beside the architectural remains of that building, has left ample evidence for the popularity of chariot racing, particularly mosaics and lead curse tablets.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³ 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

¹⁰⁰Cf. HUMPHREY 1986 p.304. Nothing was added to our knowledge of the earlier stages of the building during the 1982–83 American dig; cf. N.J. Norman in Humphrey ed., *The Circus and a Byzantine Cemetery at Carthage* I, Ann Arbor 1988, p.31.

¹⁰¹Mosaics: DUNBABIN 1978, chapter VI. Curse tablets: A. Audollent, *Defixionum tabellae*, Paris 1904, nos. 232–245 (233 = *ILS* 8754); D.R. Jordan, “New defixiones from Carthage”, in Humphrey ed. (supra n.100), pp.117–34.

¹⁰²Cf. *infra* pp.150–51. On the circus at Auzia, HUMPHREY 1986 pp.329–30.

¹⁰³On these sites cf. HUMPHREY pp.321, 330. Cf. also an early 3rd c. inscription from Thugga: *agrū qui appellatur Circus ad uoluptatem po[p]uli reipubl(icae) 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 Ullia (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

¹⁰⁴On this circus and on the popularity of chariot racing in Hadrumetum: HUMPHREY pp.317–20.

¹⁰⁵HUMPHREY 1986 p.386.

dedication of a building or statue.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 *ludi circenses*.¹⁰⁷ In Toletum, Corduba and Italica (this one the only site in Baetica where a circus has been discovered¹⁰⁸), gifts of *ludi circenses* are attested, but all were privately funded.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).¹¹⁰ During the period for which *ludi circenses* are attested epigraphically, only three monumental circuses are known in these parts, at Vienna, Arelate, and Lugdunum.¹¹¹ For some reason the inscription from Narbo is mentioned by neither M. Gayraud nor J.H. Humphrey when they consider the possibility of

¹⁰⁶HUMPHREY 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.

¹⁰⁷On the circus at Saguntum, HUMPHREY 1986 pp.344–50. The recently discovered circus of Valentia is reported by A. Ribera i Lacomba, *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 *ad aemulationem alterius ciuitatis*, cf. *Dig.* 50.10.3.

¹⁰⁸There probably was a circus at Singili Barba as well; cf. R. Atencia Páez, *La ciudad Romana de Singilia Barba*, Málaga 1988, pp.44–45, with E.W. Haley, *JRA* 10, 1997, p.501. J. DeLaine's claim that the circus at Urso was famous for its racing stables (*Oxford Classical Dictionary*³ s.v. "circus") is mistaken; her source, Plin. *H.N.* 8.166, says nothing of the sort.

¹⁰⁹Nos. 284, 295 and 299 respectively; all three are dedicatory shows, on which cf. pp.196–200.

¹¹⁰There is literary evidence for these and other provinces and centers, but for later periods; for example Salvian, *Gub. Dei* 6.87 says something of the passion for *circenses* in Augusta Treverorum.

¹¹¹On 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.

a circus in that provincial capital.¹¹² 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.¹¹³

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

¹¹²GAYRAUD 1981 p.273; HUMPHREY 1986 pp.409, 418.

¹¹³Funded privately: no. 252 (a dedicatory show: infra pp.196–200); private bequest: nos. 261 and 265 (infra pp.200–2).

Table II.3

LVDI SCAENICI¹¹⁴

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

1. *l. sc.* (R) 21; (A) 10, 180, 225; *LudSaeca* L.153; (R⇒I) *LexVrs* §§ cxxvi; cxxvii; (I) [15], 159, 162, 299; (I/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:

1. *l. sc.* + *missilia* (II/III) 316, 320, 321B (cf. A: Table II.4: J.2), 322, 323, 324, 328, 335, 336; cf. Table II.4: J.3.

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*¹¹⁵G. *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–cxxxvii; (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:¹¹⁶

1. *l. in circo* 2 § LXXI (*dies (ludorum munerisue) in c. aut in foro Veneri*); cf. *LudSaecS* L.38 (Table II.2: C.2); *Fasti* passim (*l. in circo*).

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

dedicatory (pp.197–98). Few inscriptions were erected by and for a single individual during this period. In Amiternum 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 *Di-Ep* 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 conlato* ("(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* VII² p.1786 LL.72–83 for other examples); likewise *gladiatoribus* can mean "while gladiatorial combats are presented": cf. VILLE 1981 p.44 n.112.

TABLE II.4 – CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

2. <i>l. in theatro</i>	277, 355, AE 1927, 158; 304 (<i>l. iuuenum in th.</i>); cf. 67, FOst A.D. 112 (J.3), LudSaecA passim, LudSaecS passim.
3. <i>l. in foro</i>	192; cf. 2 (H.1), 87.
 J. <i>Ludi</i> + programme or largesses:	
1. <i>l. + lumina</i>	18 (<i>lumina (et) l.</i>); 280 (<i>l. cum uasis luminum</i>); 83, 84, 86 (<i>pro ludis luminibus</i>); cf. LudSaecS L.52 (<i>l. nocturni</i>).
2. <i>l. + acroamata</i>	87 (<i>l. omnibus acr. pantomimisque omnibus et Pylade; l. factione prima adiectis acr.</i>); 277 (<i>in theatro ludis cum acr.</i>); 321A (<i>l. cum missilibus et acr.</i>); cf. C VI 1064 = ILS 2179 (<i>[l.] cum suis acroamatibus</i>) (cf. C VI 1063 = ILS 2178).
3. <i>l. + missilia</i>	338 (<i>l. cum m.</i>); 321A (J.2); cf. 416, C VIII 23991 = ILS 5776; cf. F.1; FOst A.D. 112 (<i>l. commisi theatris tribus [dieb]us XV, in is missilia triduo</i>).
4. <i>varia</i>	370 (<i>l. cum uenatione</i>); cf. 87 (J.2), 30, 188 (<i>l. cum [---]</i>).
 K. <i>Ludi</i> qualified by an epithet:	
1. <i>l. gymnici</i>	67; cf. Table IV.1: Z.2.
2. <i>l. Latini et Graeci</i>	214, LudSaecA passim, LudSaecS passim; cf. C VI 10096 = ILS 5213 = ILL 803 (<i>Graeca scaena</i>), C VI 10095 (<i>denuntiator ab scaena Graeca</i>).
3. <i>l. sollemnes</i>	179, LudSaecA LL.112, 156, LudSaecS L.36; cf. C VI 31200 ^a (<i>[--- s]ollemnes</i>); 203 LL.51–52 (<i>sollemnitas editionum</i>).
4. <i>varia</i>	140 (<i>l. palmares</i>); 304 (<i>l. priuati</i>); 224, [257], 304 (<i>l. publici</i>); 266 (<i>l. seuirales</i>).

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.¹¹⁷ (3) 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*.¹¹⁸ 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:^{118a} 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 teatro* 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.¹¹⁹ 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.

^{118a}Or less probably Singilia Barba: LEROUX 1991 p.273.

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.¹²⁰

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

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 *ludi Graeci* were shown the tragedies of Livius Andronicus, of Ennius, the comedies of Naevius, Plautus, and others; at *ludi Latini* were presented *praetextae*, *togatae* and other dramatic genres which were Latin in origin.¹²¹ However, J. Beaujeu pointed out that “*ludi Graeci*” is used by Cicero to mean Greek athletic games: it is therefore possible that the *ludi Latini et Graeci* of our inscription might have been scenic and athletic games rather than Latin and Greek scenic games.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.¹²³ It is therefore probable that these *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 *ludi seuirales* (266: K.4 and p.35). Homonymous games were already known from the *Historia Augusta* (*Marc.* 6.3), but these were organized

¹²⁰Cf. 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 (*theatrum ligneum*) was built also for the Severan Secular Games: *LudSaecS* LL.37, 43, &c.

¹²¹Cf. WISSOWA 1912 pp.462–63.

¹²²Cic. *Att.* 16.5.1, *Fam.* 7.1.3, with BEAUJEU 1988 pp.13–16; contra: COURTNEY 1995 p.238; on our inscription: BEAUJEU p.17.

¹²³On 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.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 Perugia 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*;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. 204.¹²⁶

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

¹²⁴Cf. G. Chamberland, *Recherches sur les sévirs augustaux de la cité de Nîmes*, M.A. thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa 1994.

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

¹²⁶17 B.C.: Suet. *Aug.* 31.3; A.D. 204: *LudSaecS* L.52. Cf. in general FRIEDLÄNDER 1907–13 II pp.13–14, IV pp.497–98; CÉBEILLAC GERVASONI 1990 pp.706–7.

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*).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.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

¹²⁷Cf. 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, ‘turn’” 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.

¹²⁸E.g. Suet. *Cal.* 18.2; *Nero* 11.2; Dio 59.9.6, 61.18.1–2. Cf. FRIEDLÄNDER 1907–13 II pp.15–16 with IV pp.498–99. On the Greek evidence: L. Robert, *AE* (= *ArchEph*) 1969 pp.34–39 = *Opera minora selecta* VII pp.740–45.

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. *MUNERA, VENATIONES AND LUSIONES*

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.¹²⁹ 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.¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ 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

¹²⁹VILLE 1981 pp.1–8; J.-P. Thuillier in DOMERGUE & AL. eds. 1990 pp.137–46.

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*.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.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.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.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

¹³²No. 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.

¹³³Cf. VILLE 1981 pp.49–51.

¹³⁴Even 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.

¹³⁵The 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 muneris 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. Fulvius 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.

¹³⁹Cf. e.g. Suet. *Iul.* 39.1 (*supra* p.13 with n.27). On what follows: VILLE 1981 pp.52–56, 123–28.

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 III.1

MUNERA KNOWN BY THEIR OFFICIAL NAME
OR NAMED AFTER THEIR FOUNDER

L. *Munera* to be dedicated to gods:

1. *munus* 2 § LXX (*m. ludiue Ioui Iunoni Mineruae diis deabusque*); § LXXI (*m. ludiue 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, ?452 (*m. Catinianum, Cornelianum, Reginianum, Tullianum, Tup[—ianum], Quinti(anum?)*, respectively); 153 (*m. pecuniae Aquillanae*).
2. *munus* ... 264 (*m. gladiatorium Villianum*); 431 LL.17-18 (*m. publicum ex testamento Iuni 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

¹⁴⁰The 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 *[mu]neris Corneliani editio* at LL. 6–7: why an *editio* and not a *cura* as in all other cases?¹⁴¹ 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 (*[---] 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.¹⁴²

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

Table III.2

EVENTS WITH NAME OF THE PRODUCER IN THE GENITIVE

N. All such events:¹⁴³

1. <i>munus illius editoris</i>	74, 90, 95, 99, 122, 124, 269; cf. [91b] (P.6).
2. <i>familia gladiatoria i. ed.</i>	[49], 91, 93, 94, 102; cf. R.2: 122, 184.
3. <i>paria gladiatorum i. ed.</i>	61, 66, 70, 73, 76, 78, 89, 96, 98, 105, ?106, 107, 108, 109, 123; cf. R.3.

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).¹⁴⁴

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

¹⁴²In Rome, too, the emperor, as *editor*, entrusts his games to a *curator*; cf. Plin. *Nat.* 37.45: *Iuliano curante gladiatorium munus Neronis principis*; Tac. *Ann.* 13.22.1: *cura ludorum, qui a Caesare parabantur. Arruntio Stellae ... permitt[er]tur*. Cf. also Dio 43.1.1–2 with VILLE 1981 p.212.

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

¹⁴⁴Faustus: 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 Augustorum*.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.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)*.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

¹⁴⁵It is also possible that this expression means “*munera* in honour of the *Augusti*”; the genitive does not offer a valid objection: cf. *Iudi Honoris e[st] Virtutis]* (41); one should also remember Tiberius’ notorious dislike for the games. On the meaning of *familia Capiniana*, SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.103.

¹⁴⁶SABBATINI 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.

¹⁴⁷Nos. 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 *scriptor* 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”).

edictum (91, 94, 98a). Moreover, producers who are known to have presented several *paria* or a *familia* are acclaimed as *munerarii*.¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹

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*.¹⁵⁰ 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.

¹⁵⁰*Munus gladiatorium*: 203; *munus*: 146, 204, 240.

Table III.3

OTHER *MUNERA*¹⁵¹

P. *Munera* not categorized as in Q below:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>munus</i> | <u>2</u> § CXXXIV, 4 LL.18, 30, 35, 52, <u>12</u> , <u>14</u> , <u>19</u> , <u>35</u> , <u>47</u> , <u>52</u> L.12, [65], <u>68</u> , <u>128</u> , <u>132</u> , <u>138</u> , [146], <u>149</u> , <u>150</u> , [151], <u>204</u> , <u>220</u> , <u>237</u> , <u>240</u> , <u>254</u> , <u>317</u> , <u>332</u> , <u>358</u> , <u>381</u> , <u>392</u> , <u>394</u> , <u>424</u> , <u>445</u> , C XI 575 = ILS 8206; 431 L.21 (cf. P.3); <u>428</u> (=uenatio); <u>293</u> (<i>potestas muneris edendi causa</i>). |
| 2. <i>m. gladiatorium</i> | [8], [9], <u>22</u> , <u>31</u> , <u>39</u> , <u>52</u> L.10, <u>62</u> , <u>116</u> , <u>117</u> , <u>129</u> , [130], <u>145</u> , <u>147</u> , <u>169</u> , <u>171</u> , <u>173</u> , <u>200</u> , <u>203</u> LL.20, 33, [206], <u>207</u> , <u>208</u> , <u>212</u> , <u>236</u> , [265], <u>272</u> , <u>295</u> , <u>333</u> , <u>366</u> , <u>368</u> , [369], <u>429</u> , <u>442</u> ; <i>RGDA</i> § 22. |
| 3. <i>m. publicum</i> | <u>13</u> , ?14, <u>33</u> , <u>37</u> , <u>181</u> , <u>195</u> , <u>263</u> , 431 L.17 (M.2), <u>440</u> . |
| 4. <i>m. publicum gladiatorium</i> | <u>11</u> , <u>34</u> , <u>246</u> . |
| 5. <i>m. familiae gladiatoriae</i> | <u>40</u> ; <u>186</u> (<i>m. f. gl. Telesinae</i>). |
| 6. <i>munus</i> ... | <u>80</u> (<i>m. yp(a)e[t(h)]rum</i>); <u>91b</u> (<i>Nero[n(ianorum -is²) mun]era</i>); <u>140</u> (<i>munus quinquennale</i>); 4 L.29 (<i>munera quae assiforana appellantur</i>). |

Q. *Munera* + programme or largesses:¹⁵²

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>m. + paria gladiatorum</i> | [388], [453]; cf. <u>220</u> (<i>in editionem muneris decem p. gl. optulit</i>); <u>192</u> L.24 (<i>[munus cum²] familia gladiatoria</i>). Cf. R.3. |
| 2. <i>m. + ...</i> | <u>118</u> (<i>m. cum uenatione</i>); <u>125</u> (<i>m. suum cum ferarum¹ Libycarum</i>); <u>139</u> (<i>m. ... feris ... ursis ... noxeis ... ceteris herbariis</i>); [391] (<i>m. ... [cum] occisioni[bus ferarum ...]</i>); <u>447</u> (<i>m. uenationum et gladia[t(orum)]</i>). |

title of the *curatores muneris 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 muneris* and *curatores muneris* are underlined: cf. pp.60–61.

¹⁵²Note 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*.¹⁵³

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[ie]m*) with public funds (155). Just as in the case the *ludi publici* and *privati* 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 ὑπαίθερος ὄν) must have been a *munus* presented in the open, and therefore should be contrasted with the many events at which *ueta* were installed.¹⁵⁴ In no. 91b several

¹⁵³EAOR 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.

¹⁵⁴Cf. SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 ad no. 67. Note Ulp. *Dig.* 33.7.12.20: *uelis quae in hypaethris extenduntur*.

interpretations present themselves, but *Nero[n(ianorum)] 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.¹⁵⁵ 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*¹⁵⁶

R. Gladiators, gladiatorial troops, pairs of gladiators:

1. <i>gladiatores</i>	2 § LXVI, 18, 137, 193, 239; <i>TabHer</i> L.138.
2. <i>familia gladiatoria</i>	12, [133], 154, 155, 156; 184 (f. <i>[gl. Ar]rianorum</i>); 122 (f. <i>Capiniana</i>). Cf. N.2, P.5.
3. <i>p. gladiatorum</i>	Edicta Pompeiana: [49], 51, 63, [64], 77, [111A]; cf. N.3. Elsewhere: 32, 88, 119, [158], 161, 162, 189, [194], 288, 445, [451]; <i>FOst</i> passim; 210 (gl. <i>p. decem</i>); 459 (<i>paria</i>); 196 (<i>p. ordinaria</i>). Cf. Q.1.
4. <i>varia</i>	253 (<i>gladiatorum certamina</i>).

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.¹⁵⁷

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-Pompeian shows. It was therefore not always felt necessary to tell prospective spectators from Pompeii who the producer was.¹⁵⁸ *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.¹⁵⁹ 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.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷Cf. VILLE 1981 pp.66, 77–78, 87 n.31 for discussion and examples.

¹⁵⁸This says much about the nature of the relationship between the producer and the spectators, as we shall see.

¹⁵⁹No. 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.

¹⁶⁰No. 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 ordinariis paribus et postulaticiis 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

¹⁶¹Very 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).

¹⁶²Sen. *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".

¹⁶³Cf. 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 *fuertunt* (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

¹⁶⁴See 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.

¹⁶⁵Cf. 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.¹⁶⁶

G. Ville, followed by R. Frei-Stolba, argues that “*munus*” in chapters LXX and LXXI is a case of post-Caesarean insertion,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.”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.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):

¹⁶⁶Transl. Crawford, *RomSt* pp.423–24, slightly modified.

¹⁶⁷I will refrain from using the term “interpolation”, which implies that such insertions were corruptions of the original while in fact they were updates.

¹⁶⁸VILLE 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.

¹⁶⁹For 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 Ilvir, 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

¹⁷⁰Transl. Crawford, *RomSt* p.423.

¹⁷¹VILLE 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.

¹⁷³Note the instructive parallels provided by Pompeii (infra pp.216–20) and Irni (infra pp.161–53).

¹⁷⁴Transl. 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.¹⁷⁵ 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.¹⁷⁶

4. *Venationes*

During the Empire, *uenationes* 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 *uenationes* 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 *uenationes* on their own. The next table presents all occurrences of *uenationes* (p.70).

Except for the doubtful no. 260 from Narbonensis, all epigraphically attested *uenationes* 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 *uenationes*, even when this is not

¹⁷⁵On 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.

¹⁷⁶On such events, cf. infra pp.193–96; cf. also supra p.53.

Table III.5

VENATIONES¹⁷⁷

T. *Venationes* not categorized as in U below:

1. *uenatio* 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 uenatione*); [RGDA App.4]; cf. **428** (P.1); **447** (Q.2).
2. *uenatio ...* **27, 88, 96a, 161, 210** (*u. legitima*); **108** (*u. matutina*), cf. **111B** (*matutini*); **118, 120** (*u. passiuu ...*; cf. U.1); **162** LL.8–9, **[459]** (*u. plena*); **87** (*u. uaria*), cf. **333** (U.1); **92** (*Ti. Claudi Veri u.*).

U. *Venationes* + program or largesses:

1. *uenatio* + *bestiae* or *ferae* **162** LL.5–6, **[414]**, RGDA § 22 (*u. bestiarum Africanar.*); **333** (*u. uari generis dentatar. ferar. et mansuetar. item herbaticar.*); **445** (*uenationes cotidie omnis ge[neri]s*); **120** (*u. passiuu denis bestis et IIII feris dentatis*); cf. **125, 139, [391]** (Q.2).
2. *uenatio* + *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).

¹⁷⁸On 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.¹⁷⁹ In Italy, no. 241 is one such case, but since the inscription is quite early (first half of first century) it is probably that *uenationes* were not yet well integrated into the program of the *munus* (cf. supra pp.55–56). There are two Pompeian posters in which *uenationes* are presented as the main attraction, without an accompanying gladiatorial program (92, 99; also 112?). According to Ville, these again are independent *uenationes*, but Sabbatini Tumolesi is perhaps right to link them with the ban on gladiatorial shows (and, as it seems, not on *uenationes*, *athletae* and other attractions) following the riot of A.D. 59.¹⁸⁰ In the later first and second century common expressions are *paria gladiatorum* (or *familia gladiatoria*) *et uenatio*¹⁸¹ and *paria gladiatorum adiecta* (or *cum*) *uenatione*.¹⁸² These expressions suggest that *uenationes* were not yet well integrated into the *munus*, while the phrases *adiecta/cum uenatione* also indicate a subordination of the *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, *uenationes* continued to be listed as a special attraction in Pompeian posters, together with athletes and *uela*, up until the last days of Pompeii (T.1–2).¹⁸³ Following Augustus' reform (supra pp.55–56), one might have expected that, in the course of the Julio-Claudian era, *uenationes* would have become well integrated into the program of *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 *uenatio*. It is clear, therefore, that *uenationes* were no longer just a special attraction, and that they indeed had become an integral part of

¹⁷⁹Cf. ROBERT 1940 p.310, and more generally pp.309–12 on the topic of this section.

¹⁸⁰VILLE 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.

¹⁸¹Nos. [27], 88, 162, 189; cf. also 87.

¹⁸²Nos. 88, 158, 161, 210; cf. also 125.

¹⁸³VILLE 1981 pp.221–22.

munera.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.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,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

¹⁸⁴Cf. VILLE p.221. Curiously, he seems not to have realised that “*familia gl.*” and “*paria gl.*” are also to be explained by epigraphic formalism.

¹⁸⁵DUNBABIN 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.

¹⁸⁶Nos. 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.¹⁸⁷ 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.¹⁸⁸ 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.¹⁸⁹

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*

¹⁸⁷Although 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).

¹⁸⁸For the meaning of “*ob*” cf. FORA 1996 pp.44 n.145, 51.

¹⁸⁹On all this, VILLE 1960; ID. 1979; WIEDEMANN 1992 pp.128–64.

atque ordinarii (p.65).¹⁹⁰ 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 Africanae*). 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*).

¹⁹¹So VILLE 1981 p.358, who is confirmed in his opinion by the recently discovered no. 88; contra: SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.131.

¹⁹²Cf. especially Sen. *Ep.* 7.

pertaining to the arena.¹⁹³ 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*.¹⁹⁴ The very few epigraphic commemorations of *lusiones* that came down to us are collected in the next table.

Table III.6

LVSIONES

<i>V. lusio</i>	<i>FOst</i> passim; 295 (<i>munus gladiatorium et duo lusiones</i>); 36 (<i>dies lusionis seu compositionis</i>); 350, 400 (<i>editio lusionis</i>).
-----------------	---

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.¹⁹⁵ 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 muneris ipsi praemissi”).¹⁹⁶ 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.¹⁹⁷ 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

¹⁹³Literary attestations of the term *lusio* are never about public shows (cf. *TLL* VII s.v.) and, therefore, not useful for the present purpose.

¹⁹⁴It 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).

¹⁹⁵L. Wickert, *SPAW* 1928 pp.53–54; Ch. Hülsen, *RhM* 82, 1933, p.376.

¹⁹⁶A. Degrassi, *Instt 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.

¹⁹⁷GRANINO CECERE 1987 pp.205–8, followed by Sabbatini Tumolesi in FORA, *EAOR* IV ad no. 9 and FORA *ibid.* p.101; cf. also MOSCI SASSI 1992 pp.87–89 s.v. “componere”.

appropriate for a passage of the *Fasti* belonging to the time of Hadrian:

[--- *Imp(erator) Caesar Traianus Hadria]nus Aug(ustus) mu[nus edere / coepit gladi]ator(um) p[p(aribus) ---]II. XIII k(alendas) Maias composit[a sunt /^β II lusio]nibus et munere dier(um) XXXVIII gladiatoru[m pp(aria) / ---]XXVIII, bestiae confectae n(umero) II (milia) CCXLVI. VII k(alendas) Iunias / [Augustus p]r(imam) lusionem muneris Veneri edere coepit, pugnat(um) /^β [diebus ---]II; pr(idie) non(as) Iun(ias) lusionem secundam edere coep(it), pugnat(um) / [diebus ---]III gladiator(um) pp(arib.) CLXXXV, bestiae confectae n(umero) CCCCXXXIII □-----¹⁹⁸*

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 *composit[a]* refers to the total number of pairs that were displayed (just as *confectae* 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*Inslt XIII* 5, fr. XXXVI; *EAOR* IV 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 *fasti 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*,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.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*,

¹⁹⁹The passage quoted belongs to the bottom part of a tablet; the rest was evidently at the top of the next tablet.

²⁰⁰FORA, *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*.²⁰¹ 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.²⁰²

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

²⁰¹Hübner, *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* II² 7 ad no. 221 refers to Granino Cecere.

²⁰²WILKINS 1988 p.219.

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

²⁰³THUILLIER 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.

²⁰⁴Dion.Hal. 7.72.2; 73.3; cf. *FGrH* IIIC 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.

²⁰⁵Cic. *Leg.* 2.38: *Iam ludi publici, quoniam sunt cauea circoque diuisi, 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 *Capitolia*, 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

public games are either held in the theater or in the circus, let the athletic competitions – running, boxing and wrestling – and the horse-races be presented together in the circus for a decisive victory"). I follow the Teubner text (A. du Mesnil, 1879); THUILLIER pp.111–12 was apparently the first scholar to realize the relevance of this passage in the present context.

²⁰⁶Liv. 39.22.2: *decem deinde dies magno apparatu ludos M. Fulvius, quos uouerat Aetolico bello, fecit; ... athletarum quoque certamen tum primo Romanis spectaculo fuit ...* For what follows, MÄHL 1974 pp.29–31; THUILLIER 1982.

²⁰⁷However, CALDELLI 1993 pp.15–21 rightly points out the lack of periodicity of this event.

²⁰⁸Cf. e.g. Sen. *Breu.* 12.2; Tac. *Ann.* 14.21. MÄHL 1974 pp.40–54.

²⁰⁹Cf. e.g. Ter. *Hec. prol.*; Quint. 2.8; Sen. *Ep.* 80.2; *HAMarc.* 4.9.

Table IV.1

ATHLETIC CONTESTS²¹⁰W. *Pugiles* and *pyctae*:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>pugiles</i> | 364, 365, 420; [79B]; cf. C VI 10156 = ILS 5175 (<i>pugil</i>). |
| 2. <i>certamen pugilum</i> | 285 (<i>barcarum c. et p.</i>); 373, 412 (<i>certamina p.</i>). |
| 3. <i>spectaculum pugilum</i> | 273, 379, 419, 460. |
| 4. <i>pugiles cateruarii</i> | (87); cf. C VIII 7413 = ILS 5176 (<i>citiruarius</i>), C VIII 7414 = ILS 5176a (<i>cathruarius</i>). |
| 5. <i>pyctae</i> | (87); cf. C IV 387 = ILS 6418 ^b (<i>pycta</i>). |

X. *Athletae*:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>athletae</i> | (87), (92), (99), (123). |
| 2. <i>certamen athletarum</i> | [261]; cf. C VI 10154 = ILS 5164 (<i>aciheticum c.</i>); RGDA § 22.1 (<i>athletarum spectaculum</i>). |

Y. *Varia*

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. <i>certamen gymnicum</i> | 444. |
| 2. <i>ludi gymnici</i> | 67 L.8 (<i>l. gumnici</i>). |

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;²¹¹ 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.

²¹⁰Athletic 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.

²¹¹O. Benndorf & R. Schöne, *Die antiken Bildwerke des Lateranische Museums*, p.54 no. 81; B. Schröder, *Der Sport im Altertum*, Berlin 1927, Taf. 96. C.P. Jones, "The Pancratiasts Helix and Alexander on an Ostian Mosaic", *JRA* 11, 1998 pp.293–98, esp. 294 fig. 2.

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.²¹² 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.²¹³ The Etruscans fought in pairs, as is attested by several representations, such as in the Tomb of the Augurs at Tarquinia,²¹⁴ 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:

*spectavit 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.*²¹⁵

Pugiles legitimi atque 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

²¹²Differences 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.

²¹³See in particular PIGANIOL 1923 pp.15–31; cf. THUILLIER 1982 pp.108–11.

²¹⁴THUILLIER p.110 on this and further examples.

²¹⁵Suet. *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 *uici*". *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 πύκτης. 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

²¹⁶Suet. *Cal.* 18.1: *cateruae Afrorum Campanorumque pugilum ex utraque regione electissimorum.*

²¹⁷Thuillier 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.

²¹⁸Phaed. 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.

²¹⁹Another *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.²²⁰ Cicero, who never uses *pyctae*, says *pugiles* for boxers who fight at the Olympics.²²¹ In the Suetonian passage quoted earlier from the *Diuus 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.²²²

Interestingly, all epigraphic mentions of shows of *pugiles (nude dicti)* 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).²²³ 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.²²⁴ 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 inexercitati ... Olympiorum cupidi ...*

²²²Tert. *Ieiun.* 17 (CSEL 20 p.297 L.18: *saginentur pugiles et pyctae Olympici* (“one fattens Roman and Olympic boxers”). Likewise in *Scorp.* 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.

pancratiasts.²²⁵ 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,²²⁶ and in others, as “heavy” athletes – boxers, wrestlers or pancratiasts – either Greek or Roman.²²⁷ 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.²²⁸ 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 Nuceriens of the *pugiles* produced by a candidate to the censorship: “... Nuceriens, you watched his boxers!” (79B);

²²⁵VILLE 1981 p.389 n.95; cf. Suet. *Cal.* 18.1; Dio 59.13.9; 60.23.5.

²²⁶For example, when Livy mentions Nobilior’s *athletarum certamen* (supra n.206).

²²⁷THUILLIER, esp. pp.116–17.

²²⁸VILLE 1981 p.222 overestimates the number of shows during which both gladiators and *athletae* were presented (“le *munus* pompéien (ou la *venatio* indépendante) comporte souvent des athlètes”).

this could mean that his show included only boxers, but since the language is not that of a formal *edictum 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, Gigthis 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, *Lib.Ant* 15–16 p.74 with pl. XXVIII^b. 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 *Mosaïque 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 gumnici* 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

²³¹Vienna: LE GLAY 1982; O. Leblanc in LANDES ed. 1994, no. 109: wall painting of two boxers in public baths at the suburb of St-Romain-en-Gal. Massilia: C XII 410 + p.812; C V 7914 = ILS 6761; cf. IG XIV 2444, 2445; C VI 33973. Nemausus: AE 1969-70, 376 = 1992, 1216. CALDELLI 1997 provides a comprehensive collection and discussion of the evidence for the entire province.

²³²For 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. Wiblé in LANDES ed. 1994 pp.73–75. Wiblé 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 *mappu* 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.

²³⁶Described by M. Khanoussi, *CRAI* 1988 pp.543–60.

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 *LVSVS IUVENVM*

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 *LVSVS IUVENVM*

Z. *Lusus iuuenum* and variant appellations:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. <i>lusus iuuenum</i> | 5, C XII 533 = <i>ILN</i> III 41; 45, 198, [199] (<i>curator l. i.</i>); 197 (<i>cur. l. i. Victoriae Felicitatis Caesaris</i>); cf. 304 (<i>ludi iuuenum in teatro</i>). |
| 2. <i>lusus iuuenalis</i> | 25, 30, 43 (<i>cur. l. i.</i>); C XIV 2640 = <i>EAOR</i> IV 40 (<i>sodales l. i.</i>). |
| 3. <i>Iuuenalia</i> | 215B, C; 201 (<i>editor Iuuenalium</i>); 166 (<i>dena Iuuenaliorum</i>). |
-

The *lusus iuuenum* is known almost exclusively from Italian inscriptions. Elsewhere in the West, it is only in Singili Barba (304, if *ludi 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 *iuvenes* 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 *iuvenes*, 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 *iuvenes* 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 *Iuvenes*.

²³⁹JACZYNOWSKA 1978 pp.52–55; GINESTET 1991 pp.155, 157–58, 187.

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(alium)*. For Jaczynowska this function was probably identical with that of curator; Gregori disagrees, but without providing an alternative explanation.²⁴¹ 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.”²⁴² 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 muneris 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

²⁴¹JACZYNOWSKA 1978 p.45. GREGORI, *EAOR* II p.112.

²⁴²GINESTET 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 *Iuuenalia* 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 Anagnina 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 *Iuuenalia*, 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 *Iuuenalia* 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 *Iuuenalia* 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,²⁴³ 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.²⁴⁴ 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.).

²⁴⁴Nos. 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 Primi|genio Benneiani | Laurentis | Lauinatis | lib(erto), Augustali, | homini probissimo, | summarudi suo, | studiosi iubenēs ob plu|rīma ac maxima beneficia | eius in se conlata. | L(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum). _ Dedic(ata) sextum kal(endas) April(es) | Imp(eratore) 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 quadriduum ludos scaenicos 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.

²⁴⁶On the revolt and Gordian’s accession: Herod. 7.5–9; *HAMaxim* 13.5–14.5; *HAGord* 7.2–10.1. Cf. JACZYNOWSKA 1978 pp.27–29; Jacques, cit. n.238.

²⁴⁷“To Marcus Tullius Primigenius, freedman of Benneianus, Laurens and Lavinias, 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 iuuenum*. 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

²⁴⁸On *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*.

²⁴⁹On this and what follows, cf. DUTHOY 1974; J.M. Serrano Delgado, *Status y promoción social de los libertos en Hispania Romana*, Seville 1988, pp.132–33.

²⁵⁰This 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 context²⁵⁴ 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

²⁵¹KLEIJWEGT 1994 pp.85–86; cf. p.91.

²⁵²Particularly August. *Ep.* 185.3.12 and *Contra Gaudentium* 1.28.32: cf. C. Lepelley, "Iuvenes et circoncillions: les derniers sacrifices humains de l'Afrique antique", *AntAfr* 15, 1980 pp.261–71 at 264–66, whose demonstration I find convincing; contra: GINESTET 1991 pp.189–90. Note also that some inscriptions neither in Jaczynowska's catalogue nor Ginestet's are believed by Kleijwegt to probably identify *iuuenes*: C VIII 11914 (Thibigga) and C VIII 16566 = *ILAlg* I 3146 (Theveste), along with other, non-African inscriptions (KLEIJWEGT 1991 pp.111–13; ID. 1994 pp.87–88).

²⁵³C 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 annos ... qui, docili lusu iuuenum bene doctus harenis. Pulcher et ille fui; uariis circumdatus armis, saepe feras lusi; 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).

²⁵⁴So 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;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 Spolegium is attested a *pinn(irapus) iuuenum*, which is perhaps a title for a trainer of the *iuuenes* in pseudo-gladiatorial activities.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

²⁵⁵AE 1935, 27 = EAOR III 64; cf. supra pp.97–99.

²⁵⁶C XI 7852 = EAOR III 24; cf. Iuv. 3.152–158; the expression *pinnas gladiatorum rapere* is found in the *Tabula Larinas* (SCLar 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 *iuuenes* performed as *uenatores*, as well as the *iuuenis* from Aix. The expression *feras ludere* in the latter's epitaph suggests that *iuuenes* who displayed their skills against wild beasts did not face the same dangers as professional *uenatores*.²⁵⁷

In Rome, *iuuenes* trained at athletics; there is evidence that some did elsewhere as well. M. Le Glay came up with convincing arguments that the *Mosaïque des athlètes vainqueurs*, found in Vienna on the Rhône, adorned the local seat of the *iuuenes*.²⁵⁸ The latter are otherwise attested in that city thanks to several first- and second-century inscriptions of the *flamines iuventutis*.²⁵⁹ At the center of the mosaic is a depiction of the killing of the Nemean lion by Hercules, whose cult among the *iuuenes* is well attested;²⁶⁰ in eight medallions are depicted, as the name indicates, triumphant athletes. If Le Glay is right, this means that the local *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.²⁶¹

The mosaic also depicts eight actors' masks on pedestals, but Le Glay thinks the *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

²⁵⁷Cf. supra nn.252, 253. According to Tertullian, *morsus ferarum ornamenta sunt iuventutis* (*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 *lusus iuuenum*.

²⁵⁸LE GLAY 1982; CALDELLI 1997 pp.448–51.

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 *flamen iuventutis* to organize a *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.

²⁶⁰JACZYNOWSKA pp.55–56; GINESTET pp.172, 174.

²⁶¹D. Valerius Asiaticus, a senator from Vienna who had been made to commit suicide, was contemptuously called a *palaesticum prodigium* by the emperor Claudius (*C* XIII 1668 = *ILS* 212: the *Table claudienne* from Lyon; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 11.1 on his suicide; a troop of *scaenici Asiaticiani* is attested: *C* XII 1929 = *ILS* 5205). There was also an athletic competition (*gymnicus agōn*) 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. *Ep.* 4.22).

stage (as well as the arena) had a great appeal even for some among the equestrian youth.²⁶² At the municipal level, sources are scarce, and only suggestive that *iuuenes* may have appeared on stage. Associations of *iuuenes* in Lanuvium and Milan are known for their close links with pantomimes who were famous in their days.²⁶³ 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).²⁶⁴

Ginestet claims that in nos. 166, 201 and 215C the *iuuenes* did not perform in the show, which gives him one more reason to think that few *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 *uenatio* recorded in no. 201 that "il est évident qu'à cette *venatio* ne parurent pas des bestiaires professionnels, mais les *juvenes* de la cité".²⁶⁵ As for the *ludi iuuenum in theatro* held in Singili Barba (304), which were unknown to Ginestet, P. Le Roux has argued that the *iuuenes* were spectators, not performers,²⁶⁶ 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 *lusus iuuenum* was produced, *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

²⁶²On this issue, SLATER 1994 esp. pp.131–32 (knights performing as pantomimes), 139–43 (equestrian *iuuenes*, the *Tabula Larinas*), with further references.

²⁶³C XIV 2113 = ILS 5193 (Lanuvium: *pantomimo sui temporis primo ... allecto inter iuuenes*); IRT 606 (Lepcis Magna: *pantomimo temporis sui primo ... Mediolano inter iuuenes recepto*). Cf. J.-P. Morel, "Pantomimus allectus inter iuuenes", *Hommages à Marcel Renard II*, Bruxelles 1969, pp.525–35; KLEIJWEGT 1994 p.90.

²⁶⁴Herod. 7.8.5. They also carried for weapons the lances they used in the arena to fight wild beasts. Cf. supra p.6. On *iuuenes* and the stage, see for further references KLEIJWEGT 1994 pp.88–90.

²⁶⁵GINESTET pp.157, 296 (Table V); VILLE 1981 pp.219–20. GREGORI, *EAOR* II ad no. 33, also thinks that the *iuuenes* performed in that show.

²⁶⁶LE ROUX 1991 p.276.

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.

²⁶⁷On these activities, see JACZYNOWSKA pp.55–66; GINESTET pp.159–83; KLEIJWEGT 1994 *passim*.

²⁶⁸GINESTET 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

²⁶⁹Those which do not fit the traditional categories are presented in this chapter.

Table VI.1

“NON-TRADITIONAL” DENOMINATIONS

A. *Spectaculum*:²⁷⁰

1. = *ludi* *sp.* = *ludi* and/or *circenses*: (A): *RGDA* App.4; cf. *LudSaecA* L.54; (II): 16, [401], 426, (II/III): 187, 300, 366, [411]; *LudSaecS* LL.37, 38, 80; *IRT* 606.
2. = *mumus* *sp. muneris* ...: (II): 47; (II/III): 442; *sp. gladiatorum (et Africanarum)*: (II): 177, 210, 353, [354]; (II/III): 355; *sp. = gladiatores*: (II): 277; [—]: (II): [255].
3. = ... *sp. = ludi* and/or *circenses* + *mumus*: (II): 126; (IV): 203 LL.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. = ? *spectaculum/-a*: (I): *C XI* 3805 = *ILS* 6579, *C XII* 6038 = *ILS* 6964 LL.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*.²⁷¹ 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),²⁷² 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) fac(iunda) coer(auerunt)* ...; cf. WELCH 1994 p.61).

²⁷¹*LexIrn* § LXXXI: *quae spectacula in eo municipio edentur* ...; § LXXXII: ... *quibusque diebus ex decurionum conscriptorum decreto spectacula in [e]o{m} municipio edentur* ...

²⁷²*Quicumque locus ludis decurionibus datus ad signatus relictusue erit, ex quo loco decuriones ludos spectare o(portebit)* ... (“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”.

TABLE VI. I – CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

B. *Editio*:

1. = *ludi* *ed. ludorum*: (II): 318; (II/III): 378, 382, 383; (IV): 435.
2. = *munus* *ed. muneris* ...: (II): 140, 147, 165, 212, 220, 236, *Aeslt* LL.18.60; cf. 47, 132; (II/III): 14, 35, [367], 392, [443]; (III): 22; (IV): 332; *ed. familiae* ...: (II): 154; *ed. lusionis*: (II/III): 400; (III): 350.
3. = ... *ed. = ludi + munus*: (II/III): 247; (IV): 203; *ed. uoluptatum*: (III): 384; *ed. debotionis*: (IV/V): 20; *editiones*: (IV): [437]; [---]: (II/III): 268.

C. *uoluptas/tes*: *u.*: (II): 431 L.23, cf. 34, 172; (II/III): 247, 400, cf. 334; (III+): 384, 434, 438, 439, cf. 166, *IL Afr* 527; *theatri u.*: (II/III): 247. Cf. E.

D. *certamen*:

1. *certamen* *c. athletarum*: (II): [261]; *barcarum c. et pugilum*: (II): 285; cf. *c. iselasticum*: (II): C X 515 = *ILS* 340; cf. C III 7086; *c. Massiliense*: (?): C VI 33973; *c. pentahetericum*: (I/II): C II 4136 = *ILS* 1399 = *CIDER* 15; *c. gymnicum*: (?): 444; *c. quinquennale*: (II): C XII 3232 = *ILS* 5082; *c. quinq. talantiaeum*: (II): 446.
2. *certamina* *c.*: (II): C XIV 1 = *ILS* 3385; *gladiatorum c.*: (III): 253; *c. pugilum*: (II): 373; (II/III): 412.
- E. *varia*: *laetitia theatralis*: (IV): 204; *deuotio* (= ?): cf. B.3; *exhibitio uoluptatum*: (III/IV): 433, 435.

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”.²⁷³ 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 prouinciae 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.²⁷⁴

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*).²⁷⁵ 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*

²⁷³C XI 3805 = ILS 6579 LL.8–12 (A.D. 26) ...*ut / Augustalium numero habeatur aequae ac si eo / honore usus sit liceatque ei omnibus spectaculis / municipio nostro bisellio proprio inter Augustales* On the ornaments of *augustales*, M. Christol, J. Gascou & M. Janon, *Latomus* 46, 1987, pp.388–98. A contemporary decree from Cumae is much more detailed in its exposition of seating privileges for a local benefactor and his mother, and does not use *spectaculum* in the extant portion (*AE* 1927, 158 = SHERK 1970 no. 41).

²⁷⁴Cf. no. 265; for other evidence: GAYRAUD 1981 pp.273–78.

²⁷⁵*LudSaecS* esp. LL.37–38: ... *item nonarum die et VIII id. easdem, theatris tribus, ligneo, Pompeiano, Odi[o --- spect]acula quae s[u]mus e[dituri ---]is fr[--- / dein die] VII iduum earundem circensium spectacula in circo Maximo dabimus.*

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*]tacu[*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, θέατρον); 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 ualetudine 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, Suetonius 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 conservative.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 muneris*. 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 GAGÉ’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, *ILN* II 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 (*impetrata editione ab ...*).

²⁸⁴*CodTheod* 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.²⁸⁵ 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 *uoluptates* than *ludi*, which suggests that the epigraphic evidence represents an earlier stage of a trend which gained in strength.²⁸⁶

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.²⁸⁷ 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 *uoluptas*, 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 uoluptates* 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 *uoluptas oculorum*, a “pleasure of the eyes” (*Inst.* 6.20.6; cf. *Epit.* 57).

²⁸⁶Cf. e.g. *CodTheod* 2.8.25.2 (*nullas edi patimur uoluptates*); 6.4.13.2 (where the praetors’ *editio* and the people’s *uoluptates* are two ways of looking at the same thing); 15.5.5 (*theatrorum adque circensium uoluptate*); 15.7.5 (*uoluptatibus publicis*).

²⁸⁷Tert. *Coron.* p.9 L.16 (CSEL 70); *CodTheod* 15.6.1.2 (*maiumae laetitia* – the *maiuma* being a water spectacle celebrated in the East); 9.38.6.2 (Easter: *Paschalis laetitiae 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 uoluptatum* 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 *deuotiones*, 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 *uoluptates*: 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*

²⁸⁸THUILLIER 1996 p.59.

²⁸⁹As in *certamen iselasticum* (ἀγών εἰσελαστικός, 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).

²⁹⁰Also 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*.²⁹¹ However, the expression suggests that it was not an aquatic display, such as *naumachiae* were,²⁹² but rather a race between small boats (*barcae*).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*.

²⁹¹Hübner, *CIL* II ad no. 13; PIERNAVIEJA, *CIDER* ad no. 13.

²⁹²*Naumachiae* were reenactments of historical naval battle. The most detailed recent studies are GOLVIN & REDDÉ 1990, and K. Coleman, “Launching into History: Aquatic Displays in the Early Empire”, *JRS* 83, 1993, pp. 48–74.

²⁹³Cf. Isid. *Or.* 19.1.19: *Barca est quae cuncta nauis 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

A. *dare*:

1. *ludi* *l. (scaenici)*: (R): 218; (II): 171, [215F], 304, 374, 377, 385, 402B, 461; (II/III): 343, 346, 355; (III): 359, 360, 361, 387, 404B, 413; (III+): 421; *dies = l. (scaenici)*: (II): 174, 398; *l. circenses*: (II/III): 252, 422; *spectaculum = l. [---]*: (II): 411.
2. *munera* *gladiatores, paria ...*: (A/I): 18, 32, 88, 137, 193, [239]; (II): 162, 288; *munus ...*: (I): 128; (II): 445; (II/III): 31, 447; (V): 254; *spectaculum = munus*: (II): 177, 353; *uenatio*: (II): 162; *feras ...*: (VII): 184.
3. *varia* *pugilum spectaculum*: (II/III): 460.

B. *edere*:

1. *ludi* *l. (scaenici)*: (II): 26, 28, 38, 217, 224, 277, 280, 299, 302, 307, [309], 313, 330, 380, 389, 390, 402A; (II/III): 36, 322, 324, 326, 327, [329], 340, 341, 342, 344, 378, 392, [397], 416, 431; (III): 179, 319, 320, 321B, 331, 336, 425; (IV): 213; *dies = ludi (sc.)*: (II/III): 418; (III): 338, 345; *spectaculum = ludi (sc.)*: (II): 16, 401, 426; (II/III): 300; *circenses*: (I/II): 276, 283; (II): 277, 278, 279, 281, 289, 290, 291, 301, 307, 310; (II/III): 303; (III): 308, 311; (?): 284, 297.
2. *munera* *gladiatores, familia ..., paria ...*: (I): 155; (II): 12, 27, 158, 161, 189, 210, 277; (II/III): 119; (III): 22; *munus ...*: (I): 68, 129; (I/II): 293, 453; (II): 118, 132, 139, 140, 171, 208, 212, 333; (II/III): 295, 366; 431 (*munus edi curare*); (III+): 22, [146], 166, 368, 424, 428; (?): 237; *dies = munus*: (II): 40, 47, 186, 317; *sp. = munus*: (II): 210; (II/III): 355, 442; *uenatio ...*: (I/II): [260]; (II): 118, 189, 333; (II/III): 201; (III): 179; *feras ...*: (II/III): 36; *lusio*: (II/III): 295.
3. *varia* *certamen barcarum et pugilum*: (II) 285; *c. pugilum*: (II/III) 412; (III) 373; *spectaculum pugilum*: (II): 273; *pugiles*: (III): 420; *spectaculum/a*: (II-III): 253, 264, 267, 294, 378; *sp. gladiatorum et circensium*: (II): 126; *sp. pugilum et aurigarum et ludorum sc.*: (II/III): 379; *sp. = [---]*: (II): 172; *[---]*: (I-III): 175, 260, 355, 367, 386.

C. *exhibere*:

1. *ludi* *l. (scaenici)*: (II): 375; (III+): 48, 363, 423; cf. C.3; *circenses*: (II/III): 312; *l. palmares*: (II): 140; *spectaculum = ludi (+ circenses)*: (II/III): 187, 366.
2. *munera* *uenatio ...*: (II/III): 81; cf. C.3.
3. *varia* *biduum theatrum et dena luuenaliorum*: (IV): 166; *ludi, munus, editiones, celebritas, spectaculum = ludi + munus*: (IV): 203; *sp. = pugiles*: (III): 419; *uoluptates*: (II-IV): 247, 434; cf. *dies sacri liberaliorum*: (II/III): 416.

D. *facere*:

1. *ludi* *l. (scaenici)*: (R): 10, 17, 21, 53–60, 163; (R⇒I): 2 §§ LXX, LXXI; (A): 18, 32, 164, 234; (I): 114, 192, 193, 214, 222 (*ludos faciendos curare*), 275; (I/II): 259, 292; (II): 29, 31, 162, 171, 215A, 298; (II/III): 185; (III): 232, 233; (VI): 349; (?): 356; *dies ludorum Floraliū*: (II/III): 325; *erogatio = ludi*: (A): 23; (*ludi circenses*): (R⇒I): 2 § CXXVIII (*ludos circenses faciendos curare*); (II/III): 295, 296; *ludi gymnici*: (I): 67.
2. *munera* (R⇒I): 2 §§ LXX, LXXI; (II/III): 452; *uenatio*: (I): 241 (*testamento fieri iussit*).
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.
 3. *celebrare ludi*: (II): 256, 266; *editio = munus*: (II): 236; (III): 22; *editiones = ludi scaenici + munus*: (IV): 203; cf. *dedicatio*: (II/III): 314.
 4. *curare ludi*: (R): 274; (R⇒I): cf. 2 § CXXVIII (D.1); (I): cf. 222 (D.1); *alius dies = familia gladiatoria*: (I): 155; *munus*: (III): cf. 431 (B.2).
 5. *donare ludus*: (III): 339; *ferae*: (III): 432.
 6. *explicare munus*: (II/III): 52.
 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.
 12. *reddere editio*: (II/III): 247.
 13. *renouare lusus iuuenum*: (III): 5; *editio deuotionis*: (IV/V): 20.
 14. *suscipere paria ...*: (III): 22; *gladiatorum muneris cura*: (II/III): 52.
-

gladiatores dare and *munus dare* were regular Republican expressions. In all but two cases Republican inscriptions provide accounts of a board's activities.²⁹⁵ 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.²⁹⁶ Meanwhile, *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,²⁹⁷ like posters do, while no. 459 sounds very much like a poster slightly adapted to serve as a funerary inscription.²⁹⁸ 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*)

²⁹⁶In 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).

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

²⁹⁸It is reported that the text of no. 459, which is very faulty, was engraved on a sarcophagus; one notes *pugna[ue]ru(n)t* 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.²⁹⁹ 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

²⁹⁹Other 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 (*uenatio*); 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).

pp.110–11).³⁰⁰ The same verb is rather infrequently encountered in Republican and early imperial authors, who say *ludos facere* and *gladiatores/munus dare* much more frequently.³⁰¹ 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;³⁰² 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.³⁰³

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.³⁰⁴ 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 uoluptatum*, which do not let us

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

³⁰¹So 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).

³⁰²Nos. 31, 215A, 232, 233; non-statutory, in the order of occurrence in the table (B.1): 171, 298, ?259, 356, 295, 296.

³⁰³In 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.

³⁰⁴Nos. 166 L.19, 203 LL.20, 33, 49, 54, 423, 434 (*exhibere*); 146, 166 L.25, 424 (*edere*); 254, 421 (*dare*); other verbs are attested once, in nos. 203 LL.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");³⁰⁵ interpolated clauses in the ablative absolute (e.g. *ludis factis, editis circensibus*) are common in dedications.³⁰⁶ 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*).³⁰⁷ 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 publ(icam) exqu[isitis edit]ionum g[ene]ribus fecerit ampliore[m]* – "(he) who aggrandized our state by means of his exquisite and varied productions").

attested than in earlier periods.³⁰⁸

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 muneris 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.³⁰⁹

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

³⁰⁸This in spite of the fact that they are only a handful: nos. **20**, **203**, **332**, **433**, **435**, **437**. Compare no. **332** (*pro editione muneris*) with early imperial no. **150** (*pro munere*).

³⁰⁹Other 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** LL.16–17).

evidence does not mean that gladiatorial shows were not offered.³¹⁰

As we saw, the dichotomy *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 *ludi* and the private character of gladiatorial shows. By the time we get into the Augustan age, however, non-statutory *ludi* are attested and, eventually, public *munera gladiatoria*. But while *dare* conveys the idea of a gift or benefaction, *facere* does not, which is shown by the frequent use of expressions such as *sua pecunia* or *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. *Edere* and *exhibere* emerge as technical terms expressing the production of all kinds of privately financed shows; *dare* widens its application to *ludi* and other events such as boxing contests. In a second- or third-century inscription from Althiburos, *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 *editio*, an abstract noun derived from *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 *ludi* and public *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

³¹⁰Cf. 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

³¹¹So SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.29, 133–35.

Table VIII.1

DATES OR OCCASIONS WHEN GAMES WERE PRODUCED³¹²

A. With indication of date:³¹³

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

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

³¹²Pompeian posters are italicized for easy identification.

³¹³The 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).

TABLE VIII. I – CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

94	1 May?	<i>munus</i>	?
73	1-3 May	<i>munus</i>	?
90	?-2 May; 11?-15 May	2 <i>munera</i>	?
76	5-8 May	<i>munus</i>	to emperor's <i>numen</i>
79	10-14 May	<i>munus</i>	?
122	?, 12, 14, 16, 18 May	<i>munera Augustorum</i>	?
93	15?-16 May	<i>munus</i>	?
194	somewhere between 16-31 May	<i>munus</i> , every other year	?; testamentary bequest
64	18-20 May	<i>munus</i>	?
66	20-23 May	<i>munus</i>	?
91	31 May	<i>munus</i>	?
111A	from 1 June	<i>munus</i>	?
110L	4-5 June	<i>munus</i>	?
51	5-6 June	<i>munus</i>	?
273	10 June	boxing contest	bequest; (anniversary of <i>legio VII Gemina</i>)
99	13 June	<i>uenatio + athletae</i>	dedication of what probably were panels with amphitheatrical scenes
100	4 July	<i>munus</i>	health of emperor; dedication of altar
	... 28 ... July	<i>munus</i>	? [also ... 15 ... Aug.: C IV 4299 = ST 78] ³¹⁴
192	1-4 Aug.	annual <i>ludi in foro</i>	(imperial cult?)
311	5 Aug.	annual <i>circenses</i>	bequest: donor's birthday; cf. 11 Jan.
222	13-18 Aug. 18	<i>ludi</i>	(imperial cult: dedication of altar)
	... 15 ... Aug	<i>munus</i>	? [cf. ... 28 ... July]
112	28 Aug.	<i>uenatio</i>	?
63	1, 5-6 Oct.	<i>munus</i>	?
351	4-6 Oct. 280?	[<i>ludi</i>]	dedication of temple, &c.
78	29-30 Oct.	<i>munus</i>	?
89	4-7 Nov.	<i>munus</i>	?

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

TABLE VIII.1 – CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

166	from? 13 Nov. 325	scenic games, <i>Iuuenalia</i>	dedication of buildings on anniversary of Constantius' elevation as Caesar.
98	24-26 Nov.	<i>munus</i>	?
110D	27-30 Nov.	<i>munus</i>	?
69	?-9 Dec.	<i>munus</i>	health of Caesars and Livia
364	17 Dec.	annual boxing contest	bequest: donor's birthday
378	23 Dec.	annual games	?; bequest

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

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

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.*).³¹⁵

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–VIII kal. Mart.*), the first day falling on the anniversary of Nero's

³¹⁴Scratched by a gladiator no later than A.D. 62: *V k. Aug. Nuceriae Florus uic(it); XILX k. Sept. Herclanio uicit.*

³¹⁵Cf. *FOst* A.D. 116: *ludi facti V, IIII, pr. k. M[art(ias) ---]* ("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.³¹⁶ 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.³¹⁷ 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,³¹⁸ it is likely that anniversaries were at best a pretext or happy coincidence for the *munerarius*, not his incentive to produce a show.³¹⁹

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.³²⁰ 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

³¹⁶As remarked by A. Martin, *Latomus* 44, 1985, p.189, in his review of SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980.

³¹⁷In Rome at any rate, the dates of the completion and dedication (30 Jan., 9 B.C.) of the *Ara Pacis* became festive days: cf. Degrassi, *InsIt XIII*² pp.404–5, 476. On the temple and altar in our inscription, SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980, ad no. 15.

³¹⁸This point is argued *infra* pp.216–20.

³¹⁹As 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.³²¹ 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 *Floralia*.³²² 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

³²¹On 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 PIERNAVIEJA, *CIDER* ad no. 14, p.78 n.106*).

³²²F. Hettner, cited by O. Hirschfeld, *CIL* XIII ad no. 4132, and HERZ 1975 p.194 mention the fact that 30 Apr. falls during the *Floralia* (28 Apr.–3 May), and the latter believes that a celebration of *Floralia* 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,³²³ 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,³²⁴ 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.³²⁵ 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.³²⁶ 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

³²³This, however, may not be true for all emperors, particularly Tiberius who deprecated divine honors: Suet. *Tib.* 26; Tac. *Ann.* 4.37–38; *AE* 1929, 99–100 = *SEG* XI 922–923 = E&J 102 (from Gythium) with M. Rostovtzeff, *RH* 55, 1930, pp.1–26.

³²⁴See lastly, J. Linderski, *JRA* 11, 1998, pp.464–66.

³²⁵Cf. e.g. *FAnt*: *Aug(ustus) Alexan(driam) receipt*. 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^a).

³²⁶On these dates, HERZ 1975 ad loc. 214: at Rome, on 24 Feb. (*VI kal. Mart.*) fell the *Regifugium*, 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 *Diuus 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

³²⁷DUTHOY 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[ugustales]* at L.2.

³²⁸No. 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.

³²⁹The few incidental mentions of such games in other categories of inscriptions are discussed *infra* pp.159–69.

³³⁰Cf. 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).

³³¹Nos. 10, 17, 21, 53–59, 159, 161 (?), 164 (?), 180, 215, 274, 450.

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 Amiternum 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,³³² 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 Ruscade 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.³³³ 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 a 4 October (*III non. Oct.*) suggests another imperial anniversary, and certainly not the *Ieiunium 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;

³³²Or 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.

³³³The 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 duovirates and, in the first two of these at least, during the *Apollinaria*,³³⁴ or festival to Apollo. In Rome, meanwhile, *ludi Apollinares* 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”;³³⁵ 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.³³⁶

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 *Quinquatria* (19–23 March), which suggests that this is no more than a coincidence.³³⁷ 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

³³⁴On this term cf. *supra* n.74.

³³⁵SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 p.21.

³³⁶See L.R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, Middletown CT, 1931, esp. pp.118–20, 153–55, 178.

³³⁷Pace HERZ 1975 pp.163–64.

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

³³⁸Promptitude 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.

³³⁹An 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 (*LX 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

erected on public land is not stated, but if so, this could explain why more emphasis was put on the erection, which perhaps was allowing for a more personal anniversary to be celebrated, than on the dedication itself.

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.³⁴¹ 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.³⁴² 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;³⁴³ 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*

³⁴¹On the evidence from the eastern part of the Empire, cf. ROBERT 1940 pp.258, 280–81.

³⁴²Number 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.

³⁴³No. 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* 48, 174 314, 315, 323, 325, 334, 338, 345, 348, 398, 418; 187, 304^{L.11}, 311, 407, 413, 416.
 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^{LL.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^{LL.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, 110D, 123.
 3. *varia* 2 § LXX (*munus ludiue*); 2 § LXXI (*m. lue ... : triduum + unum diem*).

E. Five-day events and up:

1. *ludi* 5 days: 32, 38, 234, 352; 6 days: 222; 214; 7 days: 321B (4 times = 28 days), 387; *Lud-SaecA* L.156; 10 days: 213; 15 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 (*biduum theatrum et dena luuenaliorum*); *FOst* A.D.107 (*lusio*); 13 days: *FOst* A.D.108 (*lusio*).

³⁴⁴A 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 muneris bidui (35: “singular production of a two-day *munus*”), *exornatum munus diebus IIII* (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;³⁴⁵ 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 HS40,000 to be spent on a five-day program of *ludi* (32). In Siagu, an anonymous benefactor left 1500 denarii (= HS6000) 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.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 *ludi* from *munera* or other shows. It is true that *ludi (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 *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 *pièce de résistance*; as a matter of fact they were, unlike *ludi*, rarely offered at the dedication of a building or as one in a string of concomitant benefactions.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 *ludi* were to be produced every year by municipal magistrates – mostly duo- or quattuorviri, and aediles – who were themselves elected for a year. The *lex Vrsonensis* is our most explicit source on this issue (2 §§ LXX–LXXI). In Veii the expression *ludis quos fecerunt ... II uiri* (232, 233: “during the games produced by the duoviri”), certainly refers to these annual, statutory *ludi*. Several other inscriptions are relevant, in particular dedications by magistrates of monuments erected with money normally spent on games.³⁴⁸ The games of the probable *seuiri augustales* at Trebula Suffenas were also produced annually, when new office holders were

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

³⁴⁷Most 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 *ludi*, such as no. 359 LL.13–17: for the dedication of a statue the honorand “gave scenic games, a banquet and oil to the people”.

³⁴⁸These 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 lustris muneris quinquennal(is)* (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.³⁴⁹ 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).³⁵⁰ Another bequest prescribed that six pairs of gladiators be produced every second year (194: *alternis annis*). It is probable that similar

³⁴⁹The 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 mag(istratu)*. Cf. also no. 52 L.18 and 319 LL.18–19.

³⁵⁰The 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

³⁵¹This 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.

³⁵²TOLLER'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

PRICES OF EVENTS

<i>no.</i>	<i>date & place</i>	<i>price in HS</i>	<i>type of event</i>	<i>notes</i>
2 LXX	Republican ⇒ Claudian Urso	2000 + at least 2000	<i>ludi or munus</i> of the duoviri for 4 days	a duovir is to receive HS2000 from the state and spend at least HS2000 from his purse
2 LXXI	Republican ⇒ Claudian Urso	1000 + at least 2000	<i>ludi or munus</i> of the aediles for 4 days	an aedile is to receive HS1000 from the state and spend at least HS2000 from his purse
12	2nd c. Formiae	25,000 + 25,000	<i>munus</i>	The plebs doubled the amount spent by the honorand to "increase the fame of his <i>munus</i> ".
24	1st c. Ostia	50,000 or 100,000	<i>ludi</i> (+ ...?)	<i>ex testamento</i>
28	mid 2nd c. Ostia	perhaps 50,000/year	<i>alimenta</i> for 100 girls + <i>ludi</i> + 3 dinners	foundation of HS1,000,000? price based on a 5% annual return
32	Augustan Praeneste	40,000	5 days of <i>ludi</i>	<i>ex testamento</i>
44	earlier 1st c. Ulubrae	2000	<i>pro ludis</i>	public monument erected with money for the games
72	2nd/earlier 3rd c. Neapolis	(40,000 or 45,000?)	gift of HS5000 per <i>phretria</i> instead of promised <i>uenatio</i>	since there were 8 and then 9 <i>phretriae</i> , the total expense can be evaluated
134	mid 2nd c. Aeclanum	100,000 + 100,000	2-day <i>munus publicum</i> ? + 1 private day, road pavement, statues	the probable public <i>munus</i> cost on average HS50,000/day
155	late 1st c. Paestum	25,000	extra day to a <i>munus</i>	public funds to add extra day to someone's <i>munus</i>
156	mid 2nd c. Paestum	25,000 + over 25,000	1-day <i>munus</i>	funds provided by the city, which the ?curator more than doubled
162	2nd c. Allifae	13,000	<i>munus</i>	the funds seem to be a contribution of the city to a <i>munus</i> given by the honorand
202	earlier 1st c. HisPELLum	80,000 (or more?)	<i>pro ludis</i> over 2 years	public works supervised and ?partly financed by 4 duoviri
205	Augustan Iguvium	7750	<i>in ludos Victoriae</i> <i>Aug. Caes.</i>	
208 209	later 2nd c. Pisaurum	120,000 per event	<i>munus</i> every four years	HS600,000, out of a foundation of HS1,000,000; price based on a 5% annual return

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

TABLE VIII.3 – CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

244	1st/early 2nd Concordia	300,000	<i>ludi + cenam? + epulum</i>	<i>ex testamento</i>
249	198 Beda	10,000/year	care of the stage + annual <i>ludi</i>	foundation of ¥50,000; price based on a 5% annual return
261	2nd c. Arelate	10,000/year	annual <i>certamen</i> or <i>circenses</i>	foundation of HS200,000; price based on a 5% annual return
266	later 2nd c. Nemausus	15,000/year	annual? <i>ludi</i> <i>seuriales</i>	foundation of HS300,000; price based on a 5% annual return
273	mid 2nd c. Barcino	1000/year	1-day boxing show	foundation of ¥7000; return is 6% annually; another HS800 is to be spent on oil
311	soon after 235 Auzia	1080/year	<i>circenses</i> , 2 days each year; &c.	foundation of c. HS40,000? ¥135 (= HS540) for each day of <i>circenses</i>
334	2nd/3rd c. Rusicade	6000	1 day of <i>ludi</i>	
347	198/211 Ammaedara	10,000	<i>ludi</i>	the HS10,000 correspond to the <i>summa legitima</i>
353	133/38 Carthago	200,000	4-day <i>munus</i>	<i>ob honorem quinquennialitatis</i>
364	3rd c.? Gori	240/year	1-day boxing show + oil + banquet	foundation of HS4000; return is 6% annually
378	2nd/3rd c. Siagu	6000	3 days of <i>ludi</i>	probably <i>ex testamento</i> : games to be produced for the dedication of a statue
397	2nd/3rd c. Thisi	10,000/year	1 day of <i>ludi scaenici</i> + <i>sportulae</i>	foundation of HS200,000; price based on a 5% annual return
404	205 Thugga	5000/year	annual <i>ludi scaenici</i> + <i>sportulae</i> (+ oil + banquet)	foundation of HS100,000; price based on a 5% annual return
413	after 230 Uchi Maius	600/year	1 day of <i>sportulae</i> and <i>ludi</i>	foundation of HS10,000; price based on a 6% annual return
428	235/50 Smirat	16,000 (prize money only)	1-day <i>uenatio</i>	the <i>uenatores</i> expected HS2000 for each leopard killed but the benefactor apparently doubled that amount
441	164/8? Oea	50,000/year	annual <i>sportulae</i> and <i>ludi</i>	foundation of HS1,000,000; price based on a 5% return
448	After 36 B.C. Cnossus	2000	<i>pro ludis</i>	the task (<i>munus</i>) of erecting a public monument was done with money for the games

(*epulum*). 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 HS2000 of his own resources, and is entitled to a municipal subvention of up to HS2000 (2 § LXX); aediles must likewise spend at least HS2000, but their subvention is limited to HS1000 (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 duovirate, 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 HS2000 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 [= HS2000] which, in accordance with the colonial law, he had to disburse for the games” (448).³⁵⁴ Likewise, a text from Ulubrae (?) reports that HS2000 were spent (scil. 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 HS80,000 (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* I 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 HS96,000 (which would mean HS24,000 per man); but HS80,000 is perhaps the more likely figure, since each man would thereby have managed the round sum of HS20,000. 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

³⁵⁶I take the phrase *ob diem ludorum* to indicate that the games were required. DUNCAN JONES 1982 p.149 rightly does not assume 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

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

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

³⁵⁷DUNCAN-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.

³⁵⁸Let 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, which a senator delivered after the reading of the imperial oration. We happen to have a

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.

small section of the latter preserved in a marble fragment from Sardis in Asia.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."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.³⁶³ It is obvious from the lines quoted above, and overall from the first twenty-six lines of the tablet, that wealthy aristocrats were extremely reluctant to take on a provincial

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

³⁶²Translation 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.

³⁶³Cf. n.362 and *infra* p.192.

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.³⁶⁴

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,³⁶⁵ 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 ...³⁶⁶

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 producing a show were moderate, and that a system based on recent prices was deemed

³⁶⁴Egypt: 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.

³⁶⁵But not in Rome itself, as MOMMSEN 1892 p.396 remarked.

³⁶⁶Translation Oliver, in OLIVER & PALMER 1955.

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 inscriptions record the *indulgentia principis*, an imperial authorization which allowed a

³⁶⁷Even 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).

³⁶⁸Cf. 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).

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.³⁶⁹ 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 HS332,000.³⁷⁰ 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 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.

³⁶⁹No. 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.

³⁷⁰PFLAUM 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*.

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 SPECTACVLORVM*

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,³⁷¹ 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.

³⁷¹I am aware of the following: VEYNE 1976 p.486 (= English translation p.258); JACQUES 1984 p.399; HUMPHREY 1986 p.386; CÉBEILLAC GERVASONI 1990 p.703; WIEDEMANN 1992 p.10; CHAMBERLAND 1999 p.616. COLEMAN 1998 pp.24–29 says a little more. Cf. also, on the omission of statutory payments in general, DUNCAN-JONES 1982 pp.86–87 (and already in *PBSR* 17, 1962 p.66); P. Garnsey, "Honorarium decurionatus", *Historia* 20, 1971 p.314 and, on no. 87, p.324.

Table IX.1

EVIDENCE FOR STATUTORY GAMES

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

To present the evidence on statutory games in a systematic way is not an easy task.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

³⁷²LANGHAMMER 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; CÉ-BEILLAC 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 *conscripti*” (*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 Perugia 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.³⁷⁸ Likewise in Veii (230, 232, 233) and Ocriculum (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”.³⁷⁹ For the same reason no. 179 distinguishes a *uenatio* offered *ob honorem* from the *ludi sollemnes* which immediately followed.³⁸⁰ 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 publi[cos]* in no. 257, but it is also possible to reconstitute *ludos, publi[ce ...]*.

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 ludis sollemnibus* (cf. *LudSaecS* L.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*).³⁸¹ 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*.³⁸² 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 quinquennialitatis*, and not as generally believed a

³⁸¹JACQUES 1984 pp.403–4 on this and what follows.

³⁸²A 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).

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

³⁸⁴Shown by the phrase *ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* (“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.

Table IX.2

THE "PRO LVDIS" INSCRIPTIONS

-
- A. by magistrates: *duouir q.q.*: 429 (*ex pollicitatione muneris gl. ob honorem q.q.*). *duouiri (iure dic.)*: 82, 86b, 136 (*p. l.*); 83, 84, 86a, c, d (*p. l. luminibus*); 202 (*(ex) pecunia ludorum*); cf. 81. *praetores duouiri*: 183 (*p. l.*). *aediles*: 6 (*p. l.*). *quattuoruir (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 seiue m. louei compagei*: 60 (*tamquam sei ludos fecissent*).
- D. by ... some notable: 72 (*ob promissam uenationem*); 403 (*ob diem [mun]jeris*); 332 (*pro editione muneris debiti*). [---]: 42, 182, 190, 448 (*p. l.*); 339B (*pro specta[culo]?*).
-

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 ludis* 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 ludis* 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 ludis* 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.³⁸⁶ 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;³⁸⁷ 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;³⁸⁸ and 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.,³⁸⁹ 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

*CVRATORES MVNERIS*³⁹⁰

- A. *c. muneris (gladiatorii publici)* [8], (11), (13), 19, 33, 37, (52), 246, 263, [430]; 149, 181, 195 (twice); 34 (thrice); 138 (*diei 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*).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.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.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.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

³⁹¹MOMMSEN 1892 p.402, followed by LAFAYE 1896 p.1569, LIEBENAM 1900 p.372.

³⁹²VILLE 1981 pp.193–200.

³⁹³SABBATINI 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.

³⁹⁴FORA 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.³⁹⁵ 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.³⁹⁶ 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).³⁹⁷ 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

³⁹⁵I 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.

³⁹⁶Note also no. 304, which honors “for his fine administration of the state” (LL.15–16: *ob rem publicam bene amministratam*) 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.

³⁹⁷The curator of no 33 was also *sevir 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

³⁹⁸On the award of a *biga* to *munerarii*, cf. ZELAZOWSKI 1997, esp. pp.181–85.

³⁹⁹Cf. JACQUES 1984 pp.399–406, where he discusses nos. 22, 40, 52 and 428.

belongs to the later second and early third century.⁴⁰⁰ She interprets this as an emergence of local *curae muneris* at a time of decline of municipal institutions (*infra*). It seems more likely that local *curae muneris* 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 *cura* belong to the second or third century,⁴⁰¹ while first- or early second-century inscriptions always present the *cura muneris publici* as no more than a step in a notable's *cursus*.⁴⁰²

But why – it may be asked – did this process not affect foundation *munera* to the same extent? Probably because, as it seems, foundation *munera* generally appeared later than public *munera*. There is no proof that any of them was created in the first century,⁴⁰³ while several *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 *munus*. They and the people rather resorted increasingly to exerting pressures on the wealthy and promising them public honors.⁴⁰⁴ On the other hand, when a *cura muneris*

⁴⁰⁰SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1984a p.105, followed closely by FORA 1996 pp.78–79.

⁴⁰¹Nos. 11, 13, 34, 52, 151; cf. 156 and 162, which may refer to institutionalized *curae muneris publici*.

⁴⁰²Nos. 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 *cura muneris* gained in prestige: 8, 37, 117, 195, 246, 430, 440.

⁴⁰³M. BUONOCORE in *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. *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.

⁴⁰⁴This does not mean that all *curae* of public *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*).

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 muneris 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.⁴⁰⁵ 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 Cornelianum* 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*,

⁴⁰⁵Nos. 50, 116, 117; cf. VILLE 1981 p.196. No. 138 is of a *curator muneris diei unius*, whom VILLE, pp.194–95, understands as a curator of a portion of the whole event.

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.⁴⁰⁶ 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.⁴⁰⁷ 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 munerarius* or *munificus* could very well be a curator who had taken on himself to pay for

⁴⁰⁶KLEIJWEGT 1995 pp.41–42.

⁴⁰⁷A. Rizakis, *ZPE* 82, 1990 pp.204–8 esp. 206.

the entire show; admittedly, it could also mean that he produced one or more extra days beside administering the *cura muneris*.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 muneris* 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 muneris*) 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 muneris* (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 muneris*. This tells us that the conditions of access to the *cura muneris* were not the same everywhere and at all times, and that attempts to define the *cura muneris* should not have the effect of concealing

⁴⁰⁸As suggested by VILLE 1981 p.196.

⁴⁰⁹This 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.

⁴¹⁰VILLE 1981 p.195; SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1984 p.105; BUONOCORE, *EAOR* III p.142; FORA 1996 pp.74–76.

local variations or adaptation to changing circumstances.

The inscription from Patras of a *munerarius bis* suggests that the *cura muneris* was in some places performed by office-holders, in this case by one of the duovirs (452). Possibly another sitting duovir was *curator muneris publici*, 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,⁴¹¹ and we have four cases of the conjunction *et* linking a *cura muneris* to an office. One instance is of a *duovir quinquennalis et curator muneris Tup[---]*, that is, a duovir-censor who assumed his curatorship while duovir (415). We have, on the same pattern, a *III uir quinq. et curator muneris publici* (181). At Dea in Narbonensis, we know of two *flamines* who as such were curators of a *munus* (263: *flam. Aug. et muner. publici curat.*; 264: *flamini et curator muneris gladiator 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 muneris*. It should be noted that several other *curatores muneris* 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 muneris* 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.⁴¹² This may suggest that some public *munera* were quinquennial events, just as the foundation *munus* from Pisaurum (208), and that not all notables, except for those with an eye on the most prestigious honors, were

⁴¹¹Cf. R. Cagnat, *Cours d'épigraphie latine*⁴, Paris 1914, p.99 n.1. The distinction between *item* and *et* is well illustrated by no. 264.

⁴¹²Nos. 13, 134, 149, 151, 152, 153, 156, 191, 195; cf. 155.

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 muneris 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 (= munerarius) comincia a recalcitrare; si impone un controllo sul prelievo e la retta gestione della quota stanziata ad hoc dalla città; si crea a tal fine il curator muneris 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 muneris 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 occasionally 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*

⁴¹³VILLE 1981 p.196; SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1984 p.105; FORA 1996 pp.78–79; PLEKET 1987 p.220.

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.⁴¹⁴ 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.⁴¹⁵ 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 rely as heavily as before on the benevolence of the very wealthy, either as public figures or

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

⁴¹⁵JACQUES 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).

private citizens.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.

⁴¹⁶Moreover, 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: *Illuir quinq. m.*: 148A (cf. B: *munificus*). *Iluir (... 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 (*Iluir munificus*), 384 (*Iluiralis iuuenis m.*), 452. *aedilis (et) m.*: ?104, 258, 357. *flamen (Aug.) m.*: 250 (three men); 253X. *Vluir Flualis 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 munerariorum*); cf. AE 1927, 158; 97 (*munificus* 4 times); 271 (*dendrophorus munificus*); ?372 (*largus munidator*); 162 (*munificentissimus ciuis*).

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 honoratus tuus / et ita gratum edat munus tuus munerarius / et tu s[is] felix, scriptor, si hic non scripseri[s]!* ("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. 103b]). 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 acceptance of the term is attested in the *Digesta*: cf. esp. D 50.4.1.2 with KLEIJWEGT 1995 p.42.

munerarii three or four times (cf. table), which indicates that the epithet was not of a general character but was earned for single productions.⁴²⁰

Beside *munerarius* we encounter the equivalent terms *munificus* and *munidator* (though the meaning of the latter, found in a metrical inscription, is less secure). That *munificus* is synonymous with *munerarius* is shown by no. 148, since to *munerarius* in inscription A corresponds *munificus* in B. We also have a duovir *munificus* (119), just as we have duoviri *munerarii*. Likewise a probable curator [*muneris*] *munificus* (151) seems to be the same thing as a curator *muneris munerarius* (440). In Pompeii a famous producer is acclaimed as *munificus IV*, meaning that he had given shows on four occasions (97; cf. 88, 96), just as another one is *munerarius ter* (103; cf. 102). *Munifici* will therefore be discussed together with *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 *munerarius* (*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 (*AE* 1927, 158 = Sherk no. 41). Then there are three *munerarii* and one *munificus* known from exclamatory phrases painted on the walls of Pompeii, three of whom are known otherwise to have given gladiatorial shows.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.⁴²² Interestingly, there is an approximately similar proportion of honorary and funerary inscriptions, while honorary and dedicatory

⁴²⁰Cf. VILLE 1981 p.186 n.24.

⁴²¹Nos. 97 (*munificus*), cf. 88, 96; 101, cf. 98–100; 103, cf. 102; 104.

⁴²²Nos. 148, 262, 393, 395.

inscriptions are usually more numerous than funerary ones.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 *ob honorem* (pp.193–96).

The titles *duovir munerarius*, *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).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 *not* become *munerarii*.⁴²⁵ These men certainly gave games, though probably not a *munus* but the much less expensive and rewarding *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 *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 *ludi* (2 §§ LXX–LXXI). This is the view taken by most scholars who have worked on this topic since Ville.⁴²⁶
- (2) The magistrate offered the usual *ludi publici* and, on top, a *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

⁴²³The 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.

⁴²⁴The 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).

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

⁴²⁶VILLE 1981 pp.185–87; FORA 1996 pp.54–55; Gascou, *ILN* III pp.31–32, about no. 29 = 258.

this view, M. Clerc, almost a century ago in a monograph on *Aquae Sextiae*.⁴²⁷

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 *quinq.*) 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*.⁴²⁸ 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 duumviratu* (“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

⁴²⁷M. Clerc, *Aquae Sextiae. Histoire d'Aix-en-Provence dans l'Antiquité*, Aix-en-P. 1916, cited by Gascou, *ibid.* p.32 n.79. I adopted the same view in my review of FORA 1996: CHAMBERLAND 1999 p.614.

⁴²⁸Alternatively, it is conceivable that a *munus* had been promised while running for the aedileship, 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 couiunctos* (295, 335 LL.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.⁴²⁹ 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;⁴³⁰ 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,

⁴²⁹I can think of no exception; even VILLE, 1981 p.183, who believes that municipal *munera* had become quite common in some areas by the end of the Republic, doubts that the *munus* and *uenatio* offered by Balbus in Gadis as quattuorvir was statutory (Pollio apud Cic. *Fam.* 10.32.2–3); but he provides no other example ...

⁴³⁰Cf. e.g. GALSTERER 1987.

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 amphitheaters,⁴³⁴ and hold plenty of evidence such as

⁴³¹On 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* (CEFR 198), Rome 1994 pp.230–31, 236–37, with references.

⁴³²That is, either a pair each of duoviri and aediles in the colonies, or two pairs of quattuorviri (i.e. *iure dicundo* and *aedilicia potestate*) in the *municipia*. That size and economic strength matter is shown by the *aes Italicense* = 4 LL.46–48 with p.156 supra.

⁴³³It is also possible that the duovir in question wished to express his love for his fatherland; cf. no. 120.

⁴³⁴G.L. GREGORI, author of *EAOR* 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 amphitheaters 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.⁴³⁵ 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,⁴³⁶ hence the rich epigraphic record.⁴³⁷ 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*.⁴³⁸

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.⁴³⁹

1981 p.222. The same view is expressed more succinctly by HOPKINS 1983 p.2 (misinterpreted by FEAR *ibid.* p.82).

⁴³⁵Cf. GAYRAUD 1987 for a survey of the material from Narbonensis.

⁴³⁶At 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).

⁴³⁷Admittedly, 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*.

⁴³⁸Cf. BOULEY 1994.

⁴³⁹The 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

⁴⁴⁰GREGORI, *EAOR* II p.112.

⁴⁴¹The *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

that he was a *curator muneris* (recently GREGORI, *EAOR* II ad no. 10), but the title literally means that he managed the fund and collected the interests from debtors, which is what *curatores calendarii* were for; since the show was quinquennial, unless he was in charge for an entire quinquennium, he may not even have organized a show.

⁴⁴²The 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 Torquata* and *Septimiana*.

⁴⁴³Cf. 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.”

⁴⁴⁴Gaul: 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.

⁴⁴⁵Cf. the remarks of C. Lepelley in *Ciudad y comunidad cívica en Hispania* (Coll. Casa de Velázquez 40), esp. pp.19–21.

Italy.⁴⁴⁶

Municipal priests – *flamines, pontifices, &c.*, but excluding *augustales*, who are different – play a very small part in the production of public games.⁴⁴⁷ The *Vrsonensis* attributes special seats to them at shows, but does not require that they produce a show themselves.⁴⁴⁸ 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 *munerarii* (250: three men; 253X) or *curatores muneris* (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 *augustales* (or *seuiri augustales, &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 *augustales* were freedmen.⁴⁴⁹ They have been mentioned on several occasions in this and the preceding chapters as providers of public games. One cannot suppose, however, that all

⁴⁴⁶Continuity: 351, 357, 373, 376, 407, 410, 421, 423; evolution: 406, 409, and 433–439 from Lepcis Magna; unhelpful: 332, 348, 372, 424.

⁴⁴⁷Cf. MOMMSEN 1892 p.403; LIEBENAM 1900 pp.371–72 with n.5; VILLE 1981 p.192–93.

⁴⁴⁸Cf. 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 *iuenis* from Puteoli upon being appointed augur.

⁴⁴⁹DUTHOY 1974 pp.135–41.

such boards gave games, since their function and members' profile varied significantly between regions and localities.⁴⁵⁰ In Nemausus a bequest of HS300,000 was left by testament to the sevirs' fund "to celebrate *ludi sevirales* in perpetuity" (266); this suggests that such *ludi* were not regularly produced until then and, therefore, that they were not formally required from the local *seuiri augustales*.

In Rome, Italy and the provinces, *magistri* of various kinds (*m. pagi, uici, ad fana, &c.*) had to produce public games. Some erected *pro ludis* inscriptions (60: cf. p.198; 85: cf. p.168). Chapter CXXVIII of the Urso charter deals with *magistri* assigned to sanctuaries, temples and shrines, who had among other duties to produce circus games. The expression used, *magistri ad fana, templa, delubra*, is not technical; whenever the article was first drafted, it was designed to accommodate any community. But *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.⁴⁵¹ The fundamental function of the provincial priests to produce such games, as Jacques remarked, is nowhere questioned in the *aes Italicense* (cf. 4 LL.13–18):

le principe 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.⁴⁵²

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

⁴⁵¹Cf. in general MOMMSEN 1892 pp.403–5; FISHWICK 1991 pp.574–84 *passim*.

⁴⁵²JACQUES 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,⁴⁵³ and “the shows of all kinds” he gave in this capacity, including an impressive gladiatorial show (253 LL.5–9).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.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 *ob honorem* ..., “in return for the honor of ...”. The evidence is sorted in the next table.

⁴⁵³It 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.

⁴⁵⁴It 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.

⁴⁵⁵GASCOU 1967 pp.647–48. Literary sources show the same for Spain (C. Lepelley, loc. cit., n.445) and Africa (J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Munich, 1965, pp.133–34; Lepelley, *Les cités de l’Afrique romaine au bas empire*, Paris, 1979–1981, I pp.364–69; II pp.44–47). Other provincial priests in the catalogue are nos. 295, 433, 438 and probably 254 (cf. SIVAN 1989).

Table IX.5

"OB HONOREM" SHOWS⁴⁵⁶

- A. *Ludi ob h. ... flamonii* or *flaminatus perpetui*: [425]; cf. 398, 404; *sacerdotii*: 290 (woman); cf. 383; *quinquennialitatis*: 38; *aedilitatis*: 171, ?346; *quattuoruiratus*: 171; *seuiratus m. M.*: 461. Cf. also 321.
- B. *Munus ob h. ... flaminatus*: 295; *flamonii annui*: 388; *quinquennialitatis*: 155, 171, 177, 353; cf. 189, [220], 429; *tresuiratus*: 317; *aedilitatis*: 179 (*uenatio*); *decurionatus*: 162; *bisellii*: cf. 12; *ob honores coniunctos*: [451].

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.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).⁴⁵⁸

It is important, therefore, not to confuse gifts *ob honorem* with *summae honorariae*, 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.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)

⁴⁵⁶For shows produced at the dedication of a monument built *ob honorem*, see next table.

⁴⁵⁷But 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 ...".

⁴⁵⁸Cf. JACQUES 1984 p.XXIII on the "mirage épigraphique" (cf. supra p.27).

⁴⁵⁹JACQUES 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 (*quinquennialitatis*, *decurionatus*, *duoviratus*), *honore sibi quinquennialitatis 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 priesthoods: "[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

⁴⁶⁰FORA 1996 pp.54–55; cf. GREGORI, *EAOR* II p.109; BUONOCORE, *EAOR* III pp.33 ad no. 9 (= 155), 144; FORA, *EAOR* IV pp.72 ad no. 34 (= 22), 102; and already SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.129–31.

⁴⁶¹JACQUES 1984 pp.730–32.

⁴⁶²DARDAINE 1995 p.284.

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 IX.6 — “OB DEDICATIONEM” SHOWS⁴⁶³

- A. *Ludi ob d.* ... of a building (and eventually statue): ?16, ?53–?59, 127, ?159, 166, 180, 275, 281, 283, 292, 306, 310, 315, 324, [326], [329], 330, 335, 336, [351], 352, [355], 370, 374, 375, 380, ?[386], 387, 389, ?390, [401], 402, ?403, 407, [411], 421, 423, 426, ?449; of one or more statues: 26, 48, ?113, ?216, 252, 276, 278, 279, 287, 289, 290, 291, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 301, 305, 307, 308, 312, 313, 314, 316, 319, 320, 322, 323, 327, 330, 331, 337, 338, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, ?346, ?348, 359, 360, 361, 362, 378, 385, ?392, ?399, [410], 416, ?418, 422, 427; of an altar: 222; of painted panels: 140; of [---]: ?17, ?21, 174, 187, 284, 302, 303, [363], [417].
- B. *Munus ob d.* ... of a building: 9, 27, 141, 196, ?355, ?[443], 453; ?[260] (*uenatio* alone, it seems); of painted panels?: 99 (procession, *uenatio*, athletes, but no gladiators); of an altar: 100; of a statue: 210, 236.
- C. Other shows *ob d.* ... of a building: 166, ?235, 294, 373, ?400, 412; of a statue: 285, [379], 419, 420, 460.
-

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

⁴⁶³Underlined 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;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.”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.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

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

⁴⁶⁵M.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 I²* pp.931–33 for corrections and recent bibliography. The two possible exceptions are *C I²* 686 = *ILS* 6303 and *C I²* 684 (Frederiksen’s nos. 20 and 21).

⁴⁶⁶I 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 II^e et I^{er} 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 *proscenium* 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*).⁴⁶⁷ It was remarked in the previous chapter that,

⁴⁶⁷Cf. nos. 323: *addito die ludorum sceniorum*; 399: *amplius ludos*; also, in contexts other than a dedication, nos. 398 and 400. JACQUES 1984 p.750 identifies 2 kinds of *ampliationes*: those corresponding to payments of interests, and therefore required, for delays in the realization of *ob honorem* promises; those which are true benefactions, made on top of what had originally been promised. Gifts of games *ob dedicationem* must be of the second kind.

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 LL.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. <i>ludi</i> | 24, 28, [178], 249, ?256, 266, 280, 311, 397, 404, 405, ?408, 413, 441; 378 (<i>l. et spectacula</i>). |
| 2. <i>munus</i> | [131], [133], 194, 208, 236. Cf. Table IX.3: B. |
| 3. <i>varia</i> | 273, 364, 365, 444; 261 (<i>certamen athletarum</i> or <i>circenses</i>). |

B. Bequests for one-time events:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. <i>ludi</i> | 32 (also in B.2), 211, 244. |
| 2. <i>munus</i> | 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 (*uisceratio* – 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

⁴⁶⁹Cf. VILLE 1981 chs. I and II passim; outside Rome: *ibid.* pp.201–4.

⁴⁷⁰Malavolta in POLVERINI & MALAVOLTA 1977 p.2080.

⁴⁷¹VILLE 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 *uiscerationes*.

⁴⁷²Suet. *Tib.* 37; cf. *supra* n.43.

⁴⁷³Plin. *Ep.* 6.34; cf. Veyne *Latomus* 26, 1967 pp.735–36.

municipal *munus*, whether the latter was introduced according to his views or those expounded earlier in this chapter.⁴⁷⁴

It is to be noted that all epigraphic instances of *munera* and *ludi funebres* were provided for by testament (*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 (*pro salute* ...). It is not clear whether this should be considered a *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 *ob honorem* show. In some cases, however, the producer was a priest of the imperial cult, which would indicate that the invocation *pro salute* was purposeful (40, 100, 212). But in some other cases only magisterial functions are recorded on the stone: the shows were possibly *ob honorem* (129, 288).

According to M. Le Glay, *munera 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.⁴⁷⁵ This could be true in areas

⁴⁷⁴Cf. VILLE 1981 p.224.

⁴⁷⁵M. Le Glay in DOMERGUE & AL. 1990 pp.222–23, followed by BUONOCORE, *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.⁴⁷⁶ 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,⁴⁷⁷ 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 (*AesIt*). 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 CAUSAE

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. *seuir* 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.
2. municipal magistrate or priest: *ludi*: 163, 188, 300, 325, 406. *munus*: 14, 31, 68 L.12, 129, 130, 132, 139, 146, 147, 158, 176, 200, 229, 243, 288, 368, 442, 445. *ludi* + *munus* or other shows: 30, 172, 201, 350, 433, 434, 435, 438.
3. *seuir* or *augustalis*: *ludi*: 185, 234, 265, *munus*: 137, ?170, 212. *ludi* + *munus* or other shows: 193, 277.
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 tribunicus*, but perhaps also *curator muneris*), 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.

⁴⁷⁸The 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 *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 *ludi* or *munera*. This suggests that more of these shows were *ob honorem* than dedicatory, though some may have been *munera funebres*. It was, after all, not necessary to record the *causa*, particularly in honorific inscriptions; most important was the benefaction itself and the *munificentia* or *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 *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, *munera* could not be produced by private persons (even, as in this case, when they belonged to the élite) since magisterial powers were required. A rich notable from Minturnae had to obtain permission from the emperor in order to produce a *munus post honorem Iluiratus*, 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 *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

⁴⁷⁹In 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 *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 *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 freedman⁴⁸⁰ – of a man honored in Nemausus may have been *augustales*, well attested in both localities (160, 267: B.6 in the table). We find in Vienna a *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 *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.⁴⁸¹ Some individuals of more moderate means may have been able to afford the rather inexpensive *ludi*, but not the statue and base which would have immortalized their benefaction. In fact, there is some evidence that non-statutory *ludi* were even more frequent than it appears. No. 277 is of a *seuir* (*augustalis*) who produced two gladiatorial shows, but

⁴⁸⁰Cf. next note.

⁴⁸¹No. 267: a Greek surname in Narbonensis, and particularly Nemausus, is a strong indicator of servile origin; on Nemausus and the local *seuiri augustales* cf. Chamberland, *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 *seuir augustalis* since he bequeathed a huge sum for the periodic celebration of *ludi seuirales*. DARDAINE 1995 p.288 has remarked for Baetica that gifts *ob honorem* performed by *seuiri* are commemorated only in dedicatory inscriptions (which are erected by the *seuiri* themselves); meanwhile, gifts *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

⁴⁸²The 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 distributions of oil) in the same phrase.

⁴⁸³Mart. 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.

⁴⁸⁴On the attributes and powers of the president of the games cf. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* I³ pp.391–93 = *Droit public romain* II pp.24–26.

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.⁴⁸⁵ Moreover, as Ville saw, not a single piece of evidence unambiguously supports this claim.⁴⁸⁶

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 compagem superstruxit, ut qui non abundantia pecuniae nec municipali ambitione sed in sordidam mercedem id negotium quaesiuisset. adfluxere auidi talium, imperitante Tiberio procul uoluptatibus habiti, uirile ac muliebre secus, omnis aetas, ob propinquitatem loci effusius.*⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁵SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980 pp.128–29; FORA 1996 pp.36–37. *Infamia: TabHer* LL.108–25; *lanistatura* 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.

⁴⁸⁶VILLE 1981 p.274; on Suet. *Vit.* 12.2, frequently cited as supporting evidence, *ibid.* p.216 n.97.

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 & Brodrigg, slightly modified). Cf. also *supra* p.22.

The collapse of the structure caused the death or injury of 50,000 people⁴⁸⁸; 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,⁴⁸⁹ 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

⁴⁸⁸The 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.* I, p.145).

⁴⁸⁹E.g. MOMMSEN 1892 p.399; BALSDON 1974 pp.333–34; VILLE 1981 pp.215–16.

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 assiforana* are discussed since they too are generally claimed to be gladiatorial shows organized for profit.

The expression *munera assiforana* is attested only once, in the *aes Italicense* (4 L.29). Since Mommsen's important commentary, *munera assiforana* have been generally understood to be touring gladiatorial shows produced by owners of gladiatorial troupes (*lanistae*) for their own profit.⁴⁹⁰ 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.⁴⁹¹ But, beside etymological arguments, there are more fundamental reasons to doubt that the proposed definition is right. These reasons are

⁴⁹⁰MOMMSEN 1892 p.399, followed among others by DESSAU, *ILS* ad no. 5163; OLIVER & PALMER 1955 p.341 n.14; BALIL 1961 p.21; VILLE 1981 pp.216, 430; MOSCI SASSI 1992 p.128; WIEDEMANN 1992 pp.134–37; FORA 1996 p.61; cf. also next note on *OLD*.

⁴⁹¹The 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: *assiforanus* 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 HS30,000 in expenditure. That to those, however, who produce spectacles at an expenditure between (HS)30,000 and 60,000, gladiators be furnished in equal number in three classes: maximum price for the first be HS5000, for the second class HS4000, for the third class HS3000.⁴⁹²

(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 HS30,000), 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

⁴⁹²Translation 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

⁴⁹³On this cf. VILLE 1981 pp.430–31; CAVALLARO 1984 pp.207–8 n.45.

⁴⁹⁴On this question, cf. lastly M. Chelotti in *Les élites municipales de l’Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron* (CEFR 215), Naples–Rome 1996, pp.58–59.

⁴⁹⁵LIEBENAM 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*.⁴⁹⁶ Since this formulation is very common in honorary inscriptions, and is therefore stereotyped,⁴⁹⁷ 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.⁴⁹⁸ 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 honor[ibus] 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.⁴⁹⁹ 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

⁴⁹⁶Nos. 35, 358, 442; cf. 120; and cf. 433, 434: (*ex suffragio populi*).

⁴⁹⁷Still, 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.

⁴⁹⁸Their 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.

⁴⁹⁹Cf. 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,

[l]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 p(ecunia) s(ua) f(ecit) col. lul. Felici Lucoferonensium* ...: “he built at his own expense the amphitheater for the colony Iulia Felix of the Lucoferonenses”); cf. *C* XI 3938 = *ILS* 6589 = *EAOR* II 65; *AE* 1937, 64 = *EAOR* III 73 (... *amphitheatrum loco priuato suo ... sua pec. in honor(em) Imp. Caesaris August[i] coloniaeque Luceriae f(aciendum) c(urauit)*.); &c.; on its own the expression *sua pecunia*, even in phrases so concise as *amphitheatrum d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) fecit* (*C* IX 3044 = *EAOR* III 74) indicates that the building was not owned by the builder himself and, therefore, was public.

⁵⁰¹JACQUES 1984 p.688; cf. also VEYNE 1976 pp.103–10 (= English translation pp.34–42) for an extensive discussion.

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 *adventores* (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 amphitheatres 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

⁵⁰²GOLVIN 1988 p.43.

⁵⁰³LIEBENAM 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.⁵⁰⁴ This material was republished two decades ago by Patrizia Sabbatini Tumolesi, which greatly facilitates the present task.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

⁵⁰⁴MOURITSEN 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).

⁵⁰⁵SABBATINI 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.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);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,

⁵⁰⁶Cf. esp. HÖNLE 1982; MOURITSEN 1988 pp.34–37

⁵⁰⁷Cf. SABBATINI, esp. p.127.

some 2600 electoral posters (*programmata*) record the name of 176 magisterial candidates.⁵⁰⁸ 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

⁵⁰⁸MOURITSEN 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. Beschouch 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 réciproquement 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'*unanimitas*, l'adhésion générale; les notables sont les chefs naturels, mais leur position ne suffit pas à justifier leur pouvoir et leur supériorité: 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 BESCHOUCH 1966 pp.136, 139. The Telegenii are a corporation of professional *uenatores* (“hunters”): cf. *ibid.* pp.150–57.

⁵¹⁰BESCHOUCH p.141. JACQUES 1984 p.401.

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; *Lex Vrs* § CXXVII).

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”).⁵¹³ 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.⁵¹⁴ 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

⁵¹³Cf. 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.

⁵¹⁴Cf. 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.

(2) 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 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", *JRA* 13, 2000, pp.1–20). In the 3rd letter, (A.D. 124/125; loc. cit. p.9 LL.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 (“⇒”), 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:

-----	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
[+], [..]	<i>n</i> letters are missing (here, four and two respectively)
[-]	lost <i>praenomen</i>
[abc]	letters intentionally erased (usually resulting from <i>damnatio memoriae</i>)
<abc>	letters accidentally omitted by the cutter

'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!	<i>sic</i>
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* = *milia*; (*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. 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.* = *uir clarissimus*; *u. p.* = *uir perfectissimus*.

The order of presentation is as follows. Firstly, legal measures (1–4); then, Italy, in the order of the Augustan *regiones* (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 ludis* is doubtful in light of the page make-up. *AE* 1974, 266 = 1980, 236 = *Fora* 116 (Puteoli): it is unlikely that a *munus* was recorded in the erasures at LL.5–6. *C* I² 687 = *ILL* 723 (Capua): *eidem ludos ...* must be corrected to read *eidemque ...* (*AE* 1987, 259^f). *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 scrupolo 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 I² 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, LL.32–38.

... *vacat* / nei quis in oppido quod eius municipi e[rit] aedificium detegito neive dem[olito] /³³
neive disturbato, nisei quod non deterius restitutus erit, nisei d[e] s(enatus) s(ententia). / sei quis aduersus ea
faxit, quant[i] id aedificium f[u]erit, tantam pecuni[a]m / municipio dare damnas esto eiusque pecuniae [qu]ei
uo[l]et petiti[o] esto. /³⁶ magi(stratus) quei exegerit dimidium in [p]ublicum referto, dimidium in l[u]deis, quos /
publice in eo magistratu facie[t], consumito, seive ad monumentum suum / in publico consumere uolet, l[icet]o
idque ei s(ine) f(raude) s(ua) facere liceto. *vacat* / ...

2 C II 5439 + p.1038; Bruns 28; ILS 6087; FIRA I 21; CIDER 27; RomSt 25; C I² 5, 1022 (apparet atque extat legem Tiberio vel potius Claudio imperante in aes incisam esse). Bronze tablets: the *Lex coloniae Genetivae*, from Urso in Baetica, §§ LXVI, LXX, LXXI, CXXVIII, CXXXIV.

LXVI. ... Eis/que pontificib. auguribusque ludis, quot publice ma/gistratus facient, et cum ei
pontific(es) augures sa/cra publica c(oloniae) G(enetivae) l(uliae) facient, togas praetextas haben/di ius potes-
tasq. esto. Eisque pontificib. augurib/q. ludos gladiatoresq. inter decuriones specta/re ius potestasque esto.

LXX. II uiri quicu[m]que erunt, ei praeter qui primi / post h(anc) l(egem) [fa]cti erunt, ei in suo
mag(istratu) munus lu/dosue scaenicos Ioui Iunoni Mineruae deis /⁹ deabusq. quadriduom m(aiore) p(arte) diei,
quot eius fie/ri 'poter'it, arbitrato decurionum faciun/to inque eis ludis eoque munere unusquis/¹²que eorum de
sua pecunia ne minus HS (2000) / consumito et ex pecunia publica in sing(ulos) / II uir(os) d(um)t(axat) HS
(2000) sumere consumere liceto, i't' /¹⁵que eis s(ine) f(raude) s(ua) facere liceto, dum ne quis ex ea / pecun(ia)
sumat neue adtributionem faciat, / quam pecuniam h(ac) l(egem) ad ea sacra, quae in co/¹⁸lon(ia) alioue quo loco
public(a)e fient, dari / adtribui oportebit. *vacat* /

LXXI. Aediles quicumq. erunt in suo mag. munus lu/²¹dos^{<ue>} scaenicos Ioui Iunoni Mineruae
tri/duom maiore parte diei, quot eius fieri pote/rit, et unum diem in circo aut in foro Veneri /²⁴ faciunt, inque
eis ludis eoque munere unus/quisque eorum de sua pecunia ne minus HS (2000) / consumito de^{<q>}ue publico in
sing(ulos) aediles HS (1000) /²⁷ sumere liceto, eamq. pecuniam II uir praef(ectus)^{<ue>} / dandam adtribuendam
curanto itque iis / s. f. s. c(apere) liceto. *vacat*

CXXVIII. II^{<uir>} aed(ilis) pra^{<e>}f(ectus) c. G. I. quicumque erit, is suo quoque anno mag(istratu) /
imperioq. facito curato, quod eius fieri poterit, u(ti) 'q(uod)' r(ecte) f(actum) 'e(ss)e' u(olet) s(ine) d(olo) m(alo)
mag(istri) ad fana templa delubra, que /¹⁵ ad modum decuriones censuerint, suo qu'o^{<ue>}que anno fiant e' i' qu[e]
d. d. suo quoque anno / ludos circenses, sacr[i]ficia puluinariaque /¹⁸ facienda curent, que [a]d modum quitquit
de iis / rebus, mag(istris) creandis, [lu]dis circensibus facien/dis, sacrificiis procu[r]andis, puluinaribus 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 consu⁴¹lito ... quo cui pecunia publica a[liutue] /⁴⁶ quid honoris habendi causa munerisue d[andi pol]/licendi <proue> statua danda ponenda detur do[netur ---] / -----

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 inpensis in sacra ludos cenasque faciendas. / Duumui, qui in eo municipio iure dicundo praerunt, / primo quoque tempore ad decuriones conscriptosue /²⁴ referunt quantum in inpensas sac^rorum lud^orum et quantum / in cenas, quae municipibus aut decurionibus conscriptis/ue communibus dentur, eroge⁽ⁿ⁾tur, quantumque mai²⁷(i)or pars eorum censuerit, tantum eroganto uti quod / recte factum esse uolent. *vacat*

4 C II 6278; Bruns 63; *ILS* 5163; *FIRA* I 49; OLIVER & PALMER 1954 pp.330–34; *CIDER* 80. JACQUES 1984 pp.712–15. A.D. 176/177. Excerpts from the so-called *aes Italicense* or *Senatus consultum de sumptibus ludorum gladiatoriorum minuendis*, from *Italica* in Baetica.

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

LL.29–37 *vacat* Itaque censeo uti munera quae assiforana appellantur in sua forma maneant nec egrediantur sump/³⁰tu HS XXX (m.); qui autem supra HS XXXI¹ (m.) ad LX (m.) usque munus edent, is gladiatores tripertito praebeantur numero pari: summum pre/³¹tium sit primae parti quinque milia, secundae quattuor milia, tertiae tria milia; a HS LX (m.) ad C (m.) usque trifariam coetus gladiator(um) diuisus /³² sit: 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] /³⁴ erit, infimi gladiatoris pretium sit VI (m.), super eum VII (m.), terti retro VIII (m.), quarti XII (m.) adusque XV (m.); – et haec sit summo ac ‘p`o`strem`o`² gladiatoris defi/³⁵nita quantitas. Utique in omnibus muneribus quae generatim distincta sunt lanista dimidiam copiam uniuersi numeri promisqu(a)e multitu/³⁶dinis praebeat exque his qui gregari appellantur qui melior inter tales erit duobus mili[bu]s sub signo pugnet, nec quisquam ex eo numero /³⁷ mille nummum minore.

LL.46–53 De pretis autem gladiatorum opseruari paulo ante censui secundum praescrip/⁴⁷tum diuinae orationis, sed ut ea pretia ad eas ciuitates pertineaⁿt in quibus ampliora gladiatorum pretia flagrabant. Quod si

quibus ciuitatibus /⁴⁸ 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 rationib[us] repperientur pretia summa ac media ac postrema, si q[ui]dem prouinciarum eae ciuitates sunt, ab eo /⁵⁰ qui praesidebit prouinciae opseruentur, ceterarum autem iuridico uel curatore 'u'iae uel classis praetoriae praefecto uel procuratori /⁵¹ maxumorum principum uel cuiusque ciuitatis potestas qu(a)e ibi prima erit. Atque ita rati[o]nibus decem retrouersum annorum inspectis, exemplis /⁵² munerum in quaque ciuitate edito'res' erunt consideratis, consti[tua]ntur ab eo cuius arbitratus erit de tribus pretis; uel, si melius ei uidebitur, /⁵³ ex eo modo quem peraequ[e] fi[er]i lic'ebi'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. Vegellio P. f. Pub. Primo, / eq(uiti) R(omano), II uir(o), q(uaestori) al[i]m(entorum), cur(atori) pec(uniae) /³ annon(ariae), q. aerar(ii) arcae pu/b., cur. r(ei) p. Trebanorum, ex/semplis munifi[c]entiae sua/⁶e optime merent[i], collegius¹ l/uuenum patrono dignissimo / ob renouatam¹ ab eo lusus¹ luue/⁹num, quod uetustate temporum / fuerat oblitteratum, ob quam hon/oris huius oblationem, die nata/¹²is sui eidem collegio V kal. Oct. / <—>?
- 6 **Antium:** *C VI 903 + p.3070; ILS 160. A.D. 36/37.*
Ti. Caesari diui / Augusti f. diui Iuli /³ nepoti Aug., / pontifici / maximo, cos. V, /⁶ imp. VIII, tr. pot. XXXVIII, / auguri, XV uir. sacr. / faciend., VII uir. epulon. /⁹ L. Scribonius L. f. Vot. Celer, / aedil(is), ex d. d. / pro ludis.
- 7 **Atina:** *AE 1981, 219; Fora 13; EAOR IV 36* (Blocco di calcare locale. Fine età repubblicana/prima età augustea, in base alla paleografia).
C. Obin[ius —] / aedi[culum² —] /³ dedi[cauit² —] / best[—] / INSA[—].
- 8 **Casinum:** *AE 1992, 245; Fora 14; EAOR IV 26* (Lastra di marmo. Fine II/inizi III sec. d.C.).
—— / [II uir(o)²], q(uaestori) p(ecunia) p., / [cur(atori)² mune]r(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-canale, comunemente ritenuto di età neroniana). L.1: *MO*; L.2: *JNLU*MS.
[—]s Montanus, IIII uir i. d. m(unicipio)²) C(irceiensium)²) / [—]neum amphitheatrum sua /³ [pecunia fecit id]emque munere gladiatorio / [—] et uenatione dedicauit. L. 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. I. SABB, / [-] Pollius L. I. Hilar[us], /⁶ R O Publil(ius), L. Pu/blilius Pompon(ius) / ludos scaenicos fecer(unt). / Locus ex s. c. datus.

11 **Formiae:** *C X 6090; ILS 6295; Fora 16; EAOR IV 20* (Iscrizione rinvinuta a Gaeta, ma da attribuire probabilmente a Formiae. Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. Irreperibile. Età adrianea inoltrata).

L. Villio C. f. Tromen. / Atiliano, praef(ecto) fabr(um), /³ praef. coh(ortis), trib(uno) milit(um), / proc(uratori) Aug(usti), patron(o) colon(iae), / qui rogatus ab ordine pari⁶ter et populo gladiatori / muneris publici curam / susciperet, fecit et, explicito /⁹ quod promiserat, impendium / bigae, quam populus ex collatione / legatiui epuli offerebat, remisit /¹² eo anno quo et optimus Imperator / Hadrianus Augustus etiam / duumviratus honorem suscepit. /¹⁵ L. Sterinius 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 Hilario, / biselliario /³ cui ordo conscript(or)um / ornamenta decur(ionalia) dedit, / quod is ob honor(em) biselli /⁶ HS XXV (m.) rei p. obtulerit, ex quib. / familia glad(iatoria) ex postulatu / uniuer-sor(um) per ipsum edita est, /⁹ ad cuius inpensas insuper / uniuersa plebs ad ampliandam / muneris eius famam /¹² optulit¹ insuper HS XXV (m.) n.; / ordo Augustal(ium) pec(unia) sua; / ob cuius dedic(ationem) paut in Capitol(io) /¹⁵ pane et uino promiscue posito / et dedit sportulas / dec(urionib.), August(alib.), regal(ib.) sin-gulis) ✕ quinos. /¹⁸ 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, /³ aedili II quinq., / quod curam muner(is) / publici splendide /⁶ administrauerit, / Fundani aere conlato. / L. d. d. d. / [---]++ functi sunt +[--- / ---]++T[---] / -----?

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, /³ aed(ili), q(uaestori) alim(entorum). / Hic ad declaran/dam ordi-n(is) dec(urionum) /⁶ et populi beniuo/lentiam¹, obla/tam sibi ob edi⁹tionem mune/ris p(ublici) statuam, / d. d. s(olo) p(ublico)?

15 **Gabii:** *C XIV 2794. A.D. 51/54.*

----- / [---]ustian(---) qui [--- / --- flamen perp²]etius ade[--- /³ --- VI u]ir(---) Aug(ustal-) IIII uiri [--- / --- ludos sca]enicos et [--- / --- e]t decurio[n--- /⁶ ---] cum prin[--- / ---]mi cum [--- / --- /⁹ --- / --- / ---] Aug. Drusi patris, Germanici Caesaris, Drusi Cae[saris --- /¹² --- Ag]rippinae auiae Neronis Caesaris Germanici [--- / ---] Antoniae Aug. f. et clupea inaurata VI² et [--- / ---]tile una cancellos acerneos pod[---] / -----?

16 **Gabii:** *C XIV 2804* (Basis marmorea); *ILS 6218. A.D. 139/161.*

Agusiae T. f. Priscillae, / sacerdoti Spei et Salutis Aug., /³ ex d. d. Gabini statuam publice po/nendam curauerunt quod post / inpensas exemplo inlustrium feminar(um) /⁶ factas, ob sacerdotium etiam opus portic(us) / Spei uetustate uexatum pecunia sua refectu/ram se promiserit populo cum, pro /⁹ salute principis Antonini Aug. Pii / patris patriae liberorumque eius, / eximio ludorum spectaculo edito, /¹² religioni, ueste donata / uniuersis, satis fecerit; / cuius statuae honore contenta /¹⁵ inpensam populo remisit. / L. d. d. d.

17 Lanuvium: C XIV 2118 (Marmor. L.1: 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.

----- / P. Furius P. [l.] Flaccus, / C. Luscius C. C. L. I. Summachus, /³ L. Camerius L. I. Doroteus, / Q. Septicius C. Q. I. Verna, / [i]demque ludos triduum feceru[nt].

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) iuventutis, / municipes compitenses uei-
corum / quinque, quod specus {millia} /⁶ passus¹ (3000) purgavit refecit, / fistulas reposuit, balnea uirilia /
utraque et muliebre de sua /⁹ pecunia refecit, populo uiscerati(onem), / gladiatores dedit, lumina, ludos /
I(unoni) 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/prima metà III sec. d.C.). On the date cf. n.402.

D. [---]cirio D. f. Pal. / Auspicato, /³ aedili municipi, / curatori muner(is), / municipes, curiales /⁶
[e]t curia Flamonal(is), / ob merita eius.

20 Lavinium: C XIV 2080; ILS 6186; Fora 4; EAOR IV 35 (Base marmorea. Non anteriore al IV/V sec. d.C.).

Valerio Frume/ntio, u. p., patro³no et defe(n)sori / (h)abitatori cibitatis¹, qui pos¹ multum /⁶
temporis aeditio/nem¹ debotionis¹ / renobabit¹ et ite⁹rabit¹, pro meri/tu¹ m[unifice]nti(a)e su(a)e ordo cibes-
/12que¹ Laurentum / LL(auinatium).

21 Minturnae: AE 1934, 253; ILL 727; C I² 2687. Late Republican.

[---], Pist[u]s Gemini [- s.], / vacat / Philargurus Li[coui]² - 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 Philomusus 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 [spl]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), /⁶ quod et in sing(ulos) et uniuers(os) / aequal(em) semp(er) reuerentiam /
praebuit, et quod munus glad(iatorium) post /⁹ honor(em) II uir(atus) edidiss(et), postul(ante) populo q(uando²)
/ process(us) editio celebrata est, / ex indulg(entia) paria tria cum ursis 'et' /¹² herban(is) liuenter¹ suscepit. Is
ob / dedic(ationem) statu(ae) dec(urionib.) sing(ulis) ✕ tern(os) ded(it). / [L.] d. d. d. / Hic Mint(urnis) diebus IIII
/ edidit paria XI, /³ ex his occid(it) gla(diatores) / prim(arios) vel -ores) Camp(aniae) vel -anos) XI, ur/sos quoque
crudel(es) /⁶ occid(it) X. Quod ipsi / meminist(is), ciues / optimi, herban(os) /⁹ uniuers(os) in dies / sing(ulos)
occidit / quaternos. / Ded(icata) kal. Aug., Aemiliano II et / Aquilino cos.

23 Ostia: C XIV 375 + p.482; ILS 6147; C I² 3031^a. Augustan (cf. MEIGGS 1973 pp.493-502, who rightly does not assume that the *bellum naualis*, probably the war against Sex. Pompeius in 38-36 B.C., occurred

towards the end of Gamalla's public life; cf. also D'Arms, *JRA* 13, 2000, pp.192–200). L.12: *public(e)?*

P. Lucilio / P. f. P. n. P. pro³nep. Gamalae, / aed(ili) sacr(is) Volk(ani), / [a]edili, d. d. allecto /⁶
[g]ratis decurioni, / [p]ontifici, II uir(o) censo/riae pot(estatis) quinquennal(i), /⁹ in comitis facto cura/[tor]i
pecuniae publicae exigen/[d]ae et adtribuendae, /¹² [i]n ludos cum accepisset public(um) / lucar, remisit et de
suo erogati/onem fecit; / ... /³⁶ [H]uic statua inaurata d. d. / p(ecuria) p. posita est, / [i]tem ahenea d. d. p. p.
posita /³⁹ [p]roxume tribunal(em) quaes(toris²) / [propt]erea quod cum res publica / [p]raedia sua uenderet ob
pol/⁴²[l]icitationem belli naualis / HS XV (m.) CC rei publicae donau[it. / Hu]nc decuriones funere pu/⁴⁵[b]lico
effere[ndum] cen[s]uerunt.

24 Ostia: C XIV 4693 (Fragmentum tabulae marmoreae). L.3: *HS* [---?] *I*]. 1st c.

----- / --- test]ament[o --- / ---] colonis [--- /³ --- HS [(50,000 vel 100,000)] ad ludos [---? / ---]+M
vacat / -----?

25 Ostia: C XIV 409; *ILS* 6146; *EAOR* IV 39 (Ara sepolcrale. Fine I/inizi II sec. d.C., in base ai motivi decorativi dell'ara). LL.1–4, 9, 15–20.

Cn. Sentio Cn. fil. / Cn. n. Ter. Felici, /³ dec(urionum) decr(eto) aedilicio adl(ecto), d. d.
d(ecurioni) adl., / q(uaestori) a(erarii) Ostiens(ium), II 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.; curatorius lus luuenalis. /¹⁸ Cn. Sentius Lucilius / Gamala
Clodianus f(ilius), / patri indulgentissimo.

26 Ostia: *Inst* XIII¹ fr.XXVIII; VIDMAN 1982 fr.Pb. *Fasti Ostienses*, A.D. 146.

... /⁴ [II uir(i) I]I q.q. c(ensoriae) p(otestate) A. Egrilius Agricola, p(atronus) p(erp.) c(oloniae),
D. Nonius Pompilian(us), p. p. c. / [--- P.² Au]fidius Fortis, p. p. c., ob dedicatione(m) statuarum argent(earum)
/⁶ [Ho]noris et Virtutis ludos per triduum sua pec(unia) edidit. / ...

27 Ostia: *Inst* XIII¹ fr.XXIX; VIDMAN 1982 fr.Qa; Fora 1; *EAOR* IV 15. *Fasti Ostienses*, A.D. 152.

... /¹⁴ II uir(i) ---]s, M. Iulius Seuer[us. /¹⁵ ---]us ob dedicationem basili[cae / --- quam pec]unia
sua ex(s)truxit famili[am / gladiat(ori)am] cum uenatio]ne legitima edidit, in qua [--- /¹⁸ --- fu]erunt duo;
praeterea statu[as / dedic(auit) Genii et Fort(unae) po]puli Ostiensis, quas pos(uit) s(ua) p(ecunia) in [foro / ex
u(oto) s(uscepto) ---]i pr. k. Iunias, Iuliano et Torq[uato] cos.]. / ...

28 Ostia: C XIV 350 = 4450 (Tabula marmorea. Fabium v. 2 put[at Wickert] eundem atque C. Fabium Agrippinum cons. suff. a. p. Chr. 148, cuius ad aetatem forma litterarum optime quadrat. Origine Ostiensem eum fuisse suspicatur Dessau).

[---] f. / Ag[ripp---] /³ Fabi Agr[ippini] cons[ulis filiae²] / decurion[um dec]reto col[onorum] /
consensu pu[bli]ce quod e[a ---] /⁶ sestertium [X²] centen[a milia n.] / testament[o s]uo deder[at ut ex eius] /
summae usu[r]is p]uellae [alime]ntar[iae] /⁹ centum alerentu[r e]t [---] Maia[s] / quodannis ludi eder[entur in]
memori[am] / Aemiliae Agrippinae [filiae²] suae [et /¹² t]er in ann[o] decurio[nes c]enare[nt] / -----

29 Ostia: **a:** C XIV 4642 (Tabula marmorea marginata). **b:** C XIV 353; *ILS* 6148 + add. 2nd half of 2nd c.

a C. Domitio L. fil. Pal. F[abio] / Hermogeni, /³ e[quiti] Romano, scribae aedil(ium) curul(ium), dec(urioni) adle[ct(o)], / fl[am(ini) diui H]ad[ria]ni in cuius sacerdotio solus ac primus lud[os / scaenic]os sua p[e]cunia fecit, aedili. Hunc splendidissimus ordo decur[ion(um)] /⁶ fun(ere) publ[ic]o hon[o]rauit ...

30 Ostia: C XIV 4616 + 5381 + *AE* 1977, 153; Fora 3; *EAOR* IV 29 (Lastra di marmo. Dalla metà del II sec. d.C.). L.4: cf. nos. 139 and 177.

[---]+SA[--- H]ostilian[o / --- II uir(o), q(uaestori) aerar[is] Ostiensium, flam(ini) d. d., cur(atori) lusus luuenal(is), /³ [---] qui primus om[ni]um ab urbe condita ludos cum / [--- edidit item noxeos quattuor] et mulieres [a]d ferrum dedit, una cum / [--- Sa]bina u[x]ore fecit sibi et /⁶ [---]nio Agon[is] / [--- c]orporis togat[ens(ium)] / [---]VM+[---] / [---]?

31 Ostia: C XIV 376; Fora 2; *EAOR* IV 28 (Blocchetto parallelepipedo di marmo appartenuto ad un'erma). After A.D. 161 (L.18: *dius Pius*). LL.1-13, 28-30.

P. Lucilio P. [f.] / P. n. P. pron. Gamala[e], /³ aed(ili) sacr(is) Volcani, / eiusdem pr(aetori) tert(io), dec(urioni) / adlecto d. d. infanti, /⁶ II uir(o), praefecto L. Caesar. / Aug. f. cens(oria potestate), q(uaestori) a(erarii), pontif(ici), / tabular(um) et librorum /⁹ curatori primo constitut(o). / Hic ludos omnes quos fecit / amplificauit impensa sua, /¹² idem munus gladiatorium ded(it), / idem aedem Castoris et Pollucis rest(ituit), / ... / Huic statua aenea peq(unia) pub. d. d. posit(a) / est, /³⁰ ++++++[---] / [---]?

32 Praeneste: C XIV 3015; *ILS* 6256; Fora 7; *EAOR* IV 19 (Lastra marmorea. Età augustea). L.6: *HS (I)I*).

L. Vruineio L. I. Philomuso, / mag(istro) conl(egii) libert(inorum), /³ publice sepulturae et statuae in foro locus / datus est quod is testamento suo lauationem populo gratis / per triennium gladiatorumque paria X et Fortunae Primig(eniae) /⁶ coronam auream p(ondo) I dari, idemque ludos ex HS (40,000) per dies V fieri iussit. / Philippus I. monumentum de suo fecit.

33 Praeneste: C XIV 3011; Fora 11; *EAOR* IV 22 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà II sec. d.C., in base alla funzione di *curator muneris*). On the date cf. n.402.

D. Velio / Trophimo, /³ seuiro / Augustali, / curatori /⁶ muneris / publici, / decreto /⁹ decurionum / postulante / populo. / [Cura]ntibus / [--- Vic²]torino /³ [---] Aprile II uir(is).

34 Praeneste: C XIV 3014; *ILS* 6252; Fora 10; *EAOR* IV 23 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C., per le presenza della funzione di *curator muneris publici*).

Cn. Voasio / Cn. fil. Apro, /³ quaestori, aedili, II uiro, / flamine diui Aug(usti), VI uiro / Augustali, curatori annon(ae) /⁶ triennio continuo, curat(ori) / muneris publici gladiatorum III, / quot¹ is tempore honorum cu⁹rarumque suarum plenissimo / munificentiae studio uoluptatib. / et utilitatibus populi plurima /¹² contulerit, ludum etiam gladiatorium et spoliar(ium) solo empto / sua pecunia exstructum publice op¹⁵tulerit¹; cuius meritis postulante populo / statuam publice poni 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, /³ spl(endido) eq(uiti) R(omano), pat(rono) col(oniae), / omnibus honor(ib.) / nitide functo, ob /⁶ insignem eius edition(em) / muneris bidui, populo / postulante bigam, /⁹ placuit aequest(ri)¹ statua / decreto ordinis eum / ornari. /¹² 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(---) 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”.

M. Aurel(io) M. fil. Pal. T'ulio / Eupraepeti, spl(endido) eq(uiti) R(omano), /³ patron(o) col(o-
niae), II uir(o) q.q., pon(tifici), s(acerdoti?) F(ortunae) P(rimigeniae). / Ludos scaenicos Pal(atina *vel* -atorum)
relig(ione) dign(os) / Fort. Prim. ededit. Conuocatis etiam /⁶ corporib. colleg(iorum) cum honest(a) diuis(ione) /
sport(ularum) promeruit. Hic primus / Praenest(inorum) indulgent(ia) sacra /⁹ impetrata die lusiois seu {con} /
compositionis singul(ari) feras cum / par(ib.) gladiator(um) ededit et d[ie] /¹² mune]ris [---] / ---

37 Praeneste: C XIV 2972; ILS 6253; Fora 12; Album 291; EAOR IV 24 (Base di marmo modanata). A.D. 243.

P. Acilio P. f. Men. / Paullo, /³ IIIIII uir(o) Aug(ustali), q(uaestori) col(oniae), / aed(ili), II uir(o), /
flamini diui Aug(usti), /⁶ cur(atori) annonae, / cur. muneris publici, / cur. kal(endarii), /⁹ cultores Iouis / Arkani
/ regio(nis) macelli /¹² patrono dignissimo. / L. d. d. d. / Dedicata V idus / Maias, /³ Arriano et Papo / cos., /
curante Ti. Cl(audio) /⁶ Vitale IIIIII / uir(o) Aug(ustali).

38 Privernum: AE 1974, 228 (Base de calcaire). A.D. 137.

T. Flauio Acindyni fil. / Quir. Scopelliano, duo[r] /³um equit(um) Romanor(um) patri, adlec/to in
decuris, pr(aetori) II uiro iterum, / pr. II uiro quinquennali, patrono colon(iae). /⁶ Huic Priuernates cenam idib. /
Mar. d[ari] et statuam ponendam / [--- red?]imire c[e]n[er]u[er]unt? ob merita eius quod ob / honor(em) quin-
quennialitatis ludos / scaenicos diebus quinque ediderit. /¹² L. d. d. d. / XIII k. Sept. / L. Aelio Caesare II, /³ P.
Coelio Balbino cos. / ob dedicationem crustu[lum] / et mulsum /⁶ populo dedit.

39 Sinuessa: C X 4727; C I² 1578 + p.1009; ILS 6297; ILL 667; Fora 124 (Età augustea).

L. Papius L. f. Ter. Pollio, duouir, L. Papius L. f. Fal. patri, / mulsum et crustum colonis Senuisanis
et Caedicianeis /³ omnibus, munus gladiatorium, cenam colonis Senuisanis / et Papieis, monumentum HS
(12,000) ex testamento, / arbitrato L. Nouercini L. f. Pup. Pollionis.

40 Suessa Aurunca: 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.

C. Titio / Chresimo, Aug(ustali) II. /³ Huic ordo decurionum, / quod pro salute et indulgen/tia
Imp. Antonini Pii Felicis Aug. /⁶ et ex uoluntate populi munus / familiae gladiatoriae ex pecunia / sua diem
priuatum secundum digni/⁹tatem coloniae ediderit, honorem / biselli quo quis optimo exemplo in / colonia

Suessa habuit et ut aquae /¹² digitus in domo eius flueret com/modisque publicis ac si decurio fru/eretur, et Titio Chresimo filio eius /¹⁵ ob merita patris honorem decurionatus gratuitum decreuit. / Ordo decurionum et Augustalium /¹⁸ et plebs uniuersa. /

[Q. S]ossio Falcone, C. Iulio / Erucio Claro cos., /³ nonis Septembr. / Suessae in b[y]bl[i]othea M[at]i/diana scribundo adfu[erunt] /⁶ T. Iulius Bassus, M. Maesius Q[---], / M. Arrius Adiutor, L. Mildius [---] / L. Asinius Marsirianus /⁹ quod uniuersi [---]ANTIBA[---]/lius HE[---] diem [--- / ---] eius [---]/¹²ANT gratuitum [---] / decurionatus ei O[---] / statuiq. eius ob munificen[tiam] /¹⁵ diem priuati editi [---]. / L. d. d. d.

41 **Tarracina:** C X 8260; *ILS* 5051.

C. Paccius C. f. [---] / X uir ad hastam, [---] / ludos Honoris e[t] Virtutis² fecit. / C. Paccius C. l. Ano[ptes ---] /⁵ f]actum ex test[a]men[to arbitratu C. Pacci] / C. l. Pote[---] / -----²

42 **Tusculum:** C XIV 2623. Early imperial.

(a) [--- C.² 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 [--- / ---] *vacat* lapide Tiburtino cum[---] (g) [---] locanda [--- / ---] pro l]udis [---]

43 **Tusculum:** C XIV 2592; *EAOR* IV 37 (Epistilio marmoreo). A.D. 32/33.

[Ti. Caesari diui A]ugusti f. diui Iuli n. Aug[usto, / pontifici ma]ximo, trib. potest. XXXIII, cos. V, imp. VIII, /³ [---] L. Priscus filius, curator lusus [Iuuenalis].

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 / [Eu²]carpus /³ [---]ON VI uir / [pro l]ud(is) HS II (m.) / [n. d]edit /⁶ [---]+o Fortunato / II uir(is) / [---] Norbano.

45 **Velitrae:** C X 6555 + *SI* 2 pp.31–32; *ILS* 3697 + add.; *EAOR* IV 38 (Base rotonda. Tra la seconda metà del I e la prima metà del II sec. d.C.).

M. Ofasius / Firmus Marus /³ Cornelius Mari f. / Clu. Cossinus, / praefectus fabrum, /⁶ tribunus militum / leg(ionis) XIII Gemin(ae) Victric(is), / curator lusus Iuuen(um), /⁹ II uir, patronus colon(iae), / Fortunis Antiatibus / d(ono) d(edit).

46 **Velitrae:** C X 6565 + *SI* 2 p.33; *ILS* 5632 (eritor duodena = erogator munerum duodecim? [index p.689]); *Fora* 21; *EAOR* IV 48 (Lastra marmorea). A.D. 364/375.

Dd. nn. Valentiniano et Valente senper¹ Augg. / Lol(lius) Cyrius, princ(ipalis) cur(iae) et [er]jitor¹ duodena de prop¹io suo /³ uetustatem¹ conlapsum at¹ statum pristinum red[ux(it)] / amphit(h)eatrum cum po[r]tis posticiis et omnem fabric[am] / aren(a)e; nepus¹ Lol(li) Cyri princ. cur. et ante eretoris¹, filius [Lol(li)] /⁶ Claudi princ. et patroni curiae, pronepos Messi Gorgotis / princ. Filiciter¹!

Regio I Campania

47 **Abella:** C X 1211 (Basis. In latere [sin.]: duo gladiatores pugnantes, quorum alter cecidit; in latere [dex.]: infra [inscr.] amphitheatrum exhibetur, cuius apparent gradus, fenestrae, portae; intus gladiatores duo pugnantes repraesentantur); *ILS* 5058; Fora 111. A.D. 170.

L. Egnatio Inuento, / patri L. Egnati Polli /³ Rufi, honorati equo p. / ab Imperatorib. Antonino / et Vero Aug. /⁶ Hic obliterato muneris spectac(ulo) / impetrata editione ab innulgen(tia)¹ / max. principis diem gladiatorum /⁹ et omne(m) apparatus pecunia sua / edidit; / coloni et incolae /¹² ob munificentiam eius. / L. d. d. d. / [E]ditum XII k. April. Claro et Cet(h)ego cos.

48 **Acerrae:** C X 3759 (Descripti[t Mommsen] et recognovi[t]); *ILS* 6340. 1st half of 3rd c.

Heuresi. / Gn. Stennio Egnatio, Gn. Stenni /³ Egnati Rufi fil., Fal. Primo, IIII uir(o) / II q.q., omnibus oneribus et / honoribus functo, sac(erdoti) p. /⁶ deae Isidis et Serapidis, curat(ori) / operum publ., ingenui honorati / et Augustales patrono dignissi /⁹mo ob infinita merita eius; cu/ius dedicatione singulis uni/uersisq. eorum HS centenos n. /¹² dedit, diem autem ludorum plenissi/me exhibuit. L. d. d. d.

49 Pompeii ⇒ **Atella:** C IV 9968a; ST 81 (Iscrizione dipinta; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 107. Not after A.D. 79.

[Familia] gladiat(oria) Celeris Atella(e) / [--- pug(n)abit --- p]aria XX [---].

50 **Caiaia:** C X 4588; H. Solin ed., *Le iscrizioni antiche di Trebula, Caiaia e Cubulteria, Caserta* 1993, 48; Fora 122 (Datazione: ?). L.4: *curatori muneris*?

C. Iulio [---] / decuria[li tribu]/³nicio ITI[---] / SVSVLLA[--- munus?] / glad(iat-) tri[duo? ---] /⁶ PVIIOIII+[---] / IOSVOIISC[---].

51 Pompeii ⇒ **Cales?**: C IV 9977; ST 82 (*Edictum* dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 108. Not after A.D. 79.

Gla(diatorum) par(ia) XX pug(nabunt) / [Ca?]libus non. et VIII /³ [i]dus lun.; [ue]lla [erunt]. / Ce[ler?] scr(ipsit)?].

52 **Cales:** C X 4643; Sherk 44; Fora 123 (II/III sec. d.C.). JACQUES 1984 pp.404–5. Statue base.

Calibus in curia Torq(uata)² [V]itr(asia); scrib(endo) [adf(uerunt)] / Ti. Cl(audius) Felix, Ti. Cl. Cal[.]nus, Q. Ser[gius]² /³ Priscus. / Quod recit(ata) epistula L. Vitr(asi) Siluest[r]is / L. Marcius Vitalio, IIII uir ad ordin[em u(erba) f(ecit)], /⁶ q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), d. e. r. i(ta) c(ensuerunt). Ordinem iam pr[ide]m / intellexisse L. Vitrasii Siluestris [erga] / communem patriam et studium et [uo]/⁹luntatem, cum is primo petitione m[unici]pum suorum in suscipienda gladiat[ori] mu[neris] cura tam sumptuose iniunc[tum] /¹² sibi munus explicuerit ut et nos [eum] / orn(amentis) dec(urionalib.) et municipes statuae ho[nore] / orandum merito arbitrati sim[us] ...

53 **Capua:** a: *AE* 1952, 55; *ILL* 708 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); C I² 2944. b: C I² 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. Iu(u)enti(us) L. f. Ruf(us), / C. Tittius C. f., C. Heluius N. f., /³ L.

Heluius L. f., C. Heluius N. f. Gero, / P. Plinius M. f., Q. Matuius Q. f., / C. Paccius Cn. f., M. Mamius M'. f., /⁶
C. Sattius C. f., P. Staius P. f. Stag(on): / heisce magistrei louei Optumo / Maxsumo murum coniungendum⁹ et
peilam faciendam et teatrum / terra exaggerandum locauere / eidemque luudos¹ fecere, /¹² Ser. Sulpicio Ser. f.
Galba cos.

54 a: Capua: C X 3776; C I² 675 + p.931; ILS 3185; ILL 709 (Tabula). L.9: COF. b: C X 3777; C I²,
676 + p.931: same text, but fragmentary. 108 B.C.

a (pag. sin.) N. Pumidius Q. f., / M. Cottius M. f. /³ M. Eppilius M. f., / C. Antracius C. f., / L.
Sempronius L. f., /⁶ P. Cicereius C. f., / (pag. dex.) M. Raecius Q. f., / N. Arrius M. f., /³ L. Heioleius P. f., / C.
Tuccius C. f., / Q. Vibius M. f., /⁶ M. Valerius L. f.: / (infra) heisce magistreis Venerus Iouiae murum / aedifi-
candum coirauerunt ped(es) CCLXX et⁹ loidos fecerunt Ser. Sulpicio, M. Aurelio co's.

55 Capua: C X 3779; C I² 677 + p.932; ILS 3340; ILL 714. 106 B.C.

(pag. sin.) Ser. Sueti(us) Ser. l. bal(neator²), / P. Babrius L. l., /³ M. Sexti(us) N. M. l., / N.
Sexti(us) N. M. l., / L. Hordioni(us) L. l. Lab(eo²), /⁶ C. Lucretius C. l. Apul(us), / A. Gargonius Q. l., / (pag.
dex.) [-] Babrius L. l., / P. [S]eruius M. l., /³ Cn. Octaui(us) N. l. uest(iarius²), / M. Ocrati(us) M. l. pist(or²), /
P. Staius P. M. l., /⁶ M. Mai(us) M. l. Nic(---); / vacat / (infra) heisce magistreis Cererus murum⁹ et pluteum
long(um) p(edes) LXXX, alt(um) p(edes) XXI, / faciund(um) coirauere eidemq. loid(os) fec(ere), / C. Atilio, Q.
Seruilio cos.

56 Capua: C X 3778; C I² 678 + p.932; ILS 3397; ILL 715 (Tabula). 106 B.C.

(pag. sin.) T. Iunius N. f., / C. Numolei(us) Cn. f., /³ M. Fisius M. f., / M. Fufius L. f., / C. Tittius
C. f., /⁶ Q. Monnius N. f., / (pag. dex.) D. Rosci(us) Q. l. lin[t]io, / D. Iteius Cn. l., /³ M. Valerius M. l., / Q.
Fuluius Fulviae l., / P. Pactumeius C. l., /⁶ L. Pomponius C. l.: / (infra) heisce magistrei Castori et / Polluci
murum et pluteum faciundu(m)⁹ coerauere eidemque loedos / fecere, Q. Seruilio, C. Atilio cos.

57 Capua: AE 1958, 267; ILL 712 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); C I² 2947. 105 B.C.

(pag. sin.) L. Veicius L. f., / L. Fuluius Q. f., /³ M. Curtius C. f., / L. Fuficius L. f., / M. Arrius A.
f., /⁶ N. Spurius D. f., / T. Pescennius T. f., / M. Annius L. f., /⁹ Q. Hostius Q. f., / C. Lucretius C. f., / Ti.
Asicius Ti. f., /¹² P. Suesanus M. f., / (pag. dex.) P. Baebius N. l. aerari(us), / C. Cossutius C. l. Gent(ius), /³ A.
Fuluius Fulviae l., / L. Flauius Q. l., / P. Cippius Cn. l., /⁶ L. Nerius M. l., / Cn. Pescennius L. l., / P. Nerius P. l.,
/⁹ C. Cippius C. l. Pera, / C. Nerius M. l., / P. Caesius M. l., /¹² P. Seruius N. l. purpur(arius): / (infra)
mag(istreis) Castori et Polluci et Mercu[ri]o Felici fornicem et / gradus supra fornicem omnis et [cloac²]as
aequndum /¹⁵ fornicem faciend(um) coe(arunt) eidemque lud[os] fecer(unt)], P. Rutil(io), Cn. Mal(li)os cos.

58 Capua: AE 1952, 54; ILL 711 (Tabula calcaria); C I² 2946. Before 94 B.C., but probably between
108–105, when other sections of the theatre were being built; cf. DEGRASSI, ILL ad loc.

[---]T. L. M. l., / [---]onius Q. l., /³ [--- - Cos²]sutius C. l. Eup(---), / [---]onius [-] l. Dion(ysius):
/ [heisce magistreis] hunc cu[n]eum ab [imo ad /⁶ summum² gra]dum l aedifi[c]arunt uiam / [---]am strauerunt

gradusque / [---] refecerunt, loedos fecerunt, /⁹ [---] cos.

59 Capua: *ILL* 713 (Tabula ex lapide calcario); *C I²* 2506 + p.932. Probably 108/105 B.C., on which date cf. no. 58.

(*pag. sin.*) [-⁴ LL- / ---] Epic(adus²), /⁶ [---]cl(---), / (*pag. dex.*) Q. Annius Q. l. Fe[---], / P. Biuelius T. l. [---], /³ P. Messius Q. l. [---], / C. Lusius C. l. [---], / P. Ouius P. l. Plut(us), /⁶ C. Antonius C. l. [---]: / (*infra*) [heisce magistris --- tr]eib(unal), / cuniu(m)¹ muliereb[us¹ --- /⁹ ---] ludosq. fecerun[t --- / ---]o cos.

60 Capua: *C X* 3772; *C I²* 682 + p.933; *ILS* 6302; *ILL* 719 (Basis quadrata sesquipedalis). L.1: *A. O.*; L.8: *LUOOS*. 94 B.C.

Pagus Herculaneus sciuit a. 'd.' X Termina[lia]: / conlegium seiue magistrei louei compagei s[unt] /³ utei in porticum paganam reficiendam / pequniam consumerent ex lege pagana / arbitrato Cn. Laetori Cn. f. magistrei /⁶ pagei¹ uteique ei conlegio seiue magistri / sunt louei Compagei locus in teatro / esset tamqua(m) sei¹ lu'd'os fecissent. /⁹ L. Aufustius L. l. Strato, C. Antonius M. l. / Nico, Cn. Auius Cn. l. Agathocles, C. Blossi(us) / M. l. Protemus, M. Ramnius P. l. Diopant(us), /¹² T. Sulpicius P. Q. pu(pi) l., Q. Nouius Q. l. Protem(us), / M. Paccius M. l. Philem(o), M. Licculeius M. l. / Philin(us), Cn. Hordeonius Cn. l. Euphemio, /¹⁵ A. Pollius P. l. Alexand(er), N. Munnus N. l. / Antiocus, C. Coelio C. f. Caldo, / [L.] Domitio 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[---]ami² pug(nabunt) / Cap(uis) d(ie) eid. (*sc. Ianuar.*)²
X, IX k. Februar.; uela et /³ rac(---) erunt / aqua[---]CSC[---]RIPE[---].

62 Capua: *C X* 3925 (Litteris maximis); Fora 121 (Datazione: ?).
L. Vettius Tribunus [---²] / a[---]rauit P[--- idem²] /³ munus gladiato[r(ium) edidit²], / idem populo Ca[mpano] / modios binos de[dit].

63 Pompeii ⇒ **Cumae**: *C IV* 9983a; *ST* 79 (*Edictum muneris* dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 105. Not after A.D. 79.

Cumis gl(adiatorum) p(aria) XX / [et eorum] suppos[itici pu]gn(abunt) k. Oct., III, pr. n[onas Oct.]; /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(ia) --- pug(nabunt)] 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] muneris huic posi[ta est ---²] / ---] conse(n)su dec(urionum) biga in fo[ro --- /³ et locus sepultur]ae p(ublice) dat(us) d. d. et Anton[iae --- / --- et] suis et Octauiae Val[--- / ---] Q. Octauius

M. f. Pal. Q[--- / --- prou]nciae Dalmatiae pientissim[ae et sibi] / -----?

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 Popili 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 I^{er} 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 at¹ 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 liberalitat(e) / singulis uniuersisque prais² iterit, placere decurionibus statuum equestrem ei poni quam / celeberrimo loco ex pecunia publica inscribique: "M. Nonio M. f. Men. Balbo pr(aetori) proco(n)s(uli), patrono, uniuersus /⁶ ordo populi Herculaniessis¹ 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 gumnicis¹ qui soliti erant fieri diem adici unum in honorem eius et cum in theatro /⁹ ludi fient sellam eius poni. 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(ensuere): Placere huic ordini, cum MM. Remmi pat(er) et fil(ius) II uir(i) iter(um) in edendis muneribus adeo liberales fuerint, ut eorum monu-menta decori municipio sint et MM. Remmis Rufis patri et fil(io) publice gratias agei, quod iterationem honoris eorum non ambitio neque iactationi suae dederint sed in cultum municipi et decorem contulerint.

69 Pompeii ⇒ **Herculaneum**: *C* IV 9969; *ST* 77 (*Edictum* dipinto, fuori porta Nocera); *AE* 1992, 270; *Fora* 103. ANGELONE 1989–90 pp.220–22 reads *Puteo[li] ... pugn. Herculanei* ("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. / pug(nabunt) Herculanei pro sal[ute Cae]sarum et Liuiaae 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»]; annotazione graffita); *Fora* 112. Not after A.D. 79.

VIII k. Martias / Numisii Genialis /³ gladiatorum paria X / Herculani.

70X **Misenum**: J.H. D'Arms, *JRS* 2000 p.136: inscription B, LL.18–21. Cf. n.515.

/¹⁸... et ad cepotaphium meum quodannis die Parentaliorum / luctatorib. paribus decem in eo loco uictoribus sing(ulis) HS VIII / superatis sing(ulis) HS IIII n., oleum HS XVI n., uernis HS LX n., conducto/²¹ri

harenae HS VIII n. ...

- 71** Neapolis: *EE* VIII 340 (Tabula marmorea); *Fora* 115 (Orientativamente fine II/III sec. d.C.).
D. M. / C. Aeclani /³ Fortunati, / decurioni Aecl/anensium, II uiro /⁶ munerari(o) sple(n)d/ido, uixit
annis / XXXV, men(sib.) XI, d(ie) I. /⁹ Aeclanius Iouanus, / libertus.
- 72** Neapolis: *C* X 1491; *ILS* 6456; *Fora* 113 (II/prima metà III sec. d.C.). Known from MSs.
C. Herbacio Maec. / Romano, demar/³chisanti, II uir(o) ali/mentor(um) quaest(ori), / cur(ator)is
sacrae pecun(iae), /⁶ cur. II frum(ento) compar(ando), / se uibo¹ fecit, / qui ob promiss(am) uenat(ionem) /⁹
phetris¹ 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[X²Q. Monni²] / Rufi pug. MALA +[--- V]I, V nonas M[aias² ---] / 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 Nola(e) de / quadridu(o) / 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) --- pu]gn(abunt) Nola(e) 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)² Pompei, flaminis / Augustalis
pugnab(unt) Constant(iae) Nuc(er)iae III, pr. non., / nonis, VIII eidus Maias. / Nuc(er)ini 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 pug(nabunt) Nuc(er)ia / 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 pug(nabunt) [IV], III k. Noue. / [---]
PRISCO[--- / Nuceria Con]stantia.

- 79** Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: A: C IV 9974; ST 66 (*Edictum muneris* dipinto; fuori porta Nocera); Fora 92. B: C IV 9939. Not after A.D. 79.
- A** [Glad(iatorum) par(ia)² — L.] Munati [Caesernini / pugn(abunt) Nuceriae] VI, [V], IV, III, pr. id. Maias.
- B** L. Munatium Caeserninum, quinq. / Nucernini [pu]giles spectastis.
- 80** Pompeii ⇒ Nuceria: C IV 10161; ST 67 (Iscrizione dipinta; *Reg. II*. “[...] a Nuceria 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 / Nuc(erinus).
- 81** Pompeii: C X 829 + p.1014; C I² 1635; *ILS* 5706; *ILL* 648 (Tabula ex lapide Tiburtino reperta Pompeis in thermis Stabianis). Sullan period or soon after.
- C. Vulius¹ C. f., P. Aninius C. f., II u(iri) i. d. / laconicum et dstrictarium /³ faciund(um) et porticus et palaestr(am) / reficiunda locarunt ex d. d. ex / ea pequnia quod¹ eos e lege /⁶ in ludos aut in monumento / consumere oportuit, faciun(da) / coerarunt eidemque probaru(nt).
- 82** Pompeii: C X 845 (Litteris aere incrustatis. Pompeis in pavimento theatri minoris. Videtur esse aetatis remotioris, cum iure dicundo appellatio absit et in altero eius titulo *pequnia* scribatur).
- M. Oculatius M. f. Verus, II uir, pro ludis.
- 83** Pompeii: C X 854 ([In amphitheatro] per totum cuneum secundum).
- T. Atullius C. f. Celer, II u(ir), pro lud(is) lu(minib.) cun(eum) f(aciendum) c(urauit) ex d. d.
- 84** 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 uir 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(uneum).
- 85** Pompeii: C X 853 (In summo muro qui amphitheatri harenam a sedibus separat. In cuneo); *ILS* 5653^c.
- Mag(istri) pag(i) Aug(usti) f(elicis) s(uburbani), pro lud(is) ex d. d.
- 86** Pompeii: C X 857^{a-d} (Per cuneos sextum septimum octavum scripti continuo); *ILS* 5653^b (= a), a (= d)
- (a) N. Istacidius N. f. Cilix, 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(aciendos) c(urauerunt) ex d. d.
- 87** Pompeii: C X 1074^d + p.967 + p.1006; *ILS* 5053⁴; 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, quinq., /³ trib(unus) mil(itum) a populo. / Primo

duomuiratu Apollinarib. in foro pompam, / tauros, taurocentas, succursores, pontarios: /⁶ paria III, pugiles cateruarios et pyctas, ludos / omnibus acruamatis¹ pantomimisq. omnibus et / Pylade et HS n. (10,000) in publicum pro duomuiratu; /⁹ secundo duomuiratu, quinq. Apollinarib. in foro / pompam, tauros, taurarios, succursores, pugiles / cateruarios; poster(o) die solus in spectaculis athletas: /¹² par(ia) XXX, glad(iatorum) par(ia) V, et gladiat(orum) par(ia) XXXV et / uenation(em) tauros, taurocentas, apros, ursos, / cetera uenatione uaria cum collega; /¹⁵ tertio duomuiratu ludos factione prima, adiectis acruamatis¹ cum collega.

88 Pompeii: *AE* 1994, 398 (Plaque). A.D. 41/54. Cf. **96**.

[D. Lucretio D. f. Men. Valenti --- / equo pub]lico honora[to a Ti. Cl]audio Caesare Au[gusto] / ann(is) VIII in ordinem decurionum gra[ti]s adlecto m[---]. / Hic cum patre gladiatorum XXXV paria c[um ---] / legitima uenatione dedit. Huic ordo de[curion]um [ob liberalitatem funera et] / locum sepulturae et [--- dari] laudarique publice eum et statuam equestrem poni pecunia public(a) / censuit. Item Augustales [paga]ni status pedestres et ministri eorum et nates et scabiliar(i) / et foreses clupeos censuerunt. Vi[xit a]nnis [---].

89 Pompeii: **a**: *C* IV 9979; ST 2; Fora 25. **b**: *C* IV 9980; ST 3; Fora 26. **c**: *C* IV 9981a; ST 4; Fora 27. All three painted edicta were found outside the Porta Nocera and belong to the Augustan age.

b Venat(io) et glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX M. Tulli / pug(nabunt) Pom(peis) pr. non., non., VIII, VII idu. / Nouembr.

90 Pompeii: *C* IV 2508 + p.224; ST 32 (Iscrizione graffita); Fora 57 (54/62 d.C.).

Pri[mum] / munus L. Maeso[ni --- / ---]VI nonas Maias: / Tr(aeces) – M(urmillos): [u(icit)² ---]nator Ner(onianus) II[---] (sc. pugnarum) – [m(issus)² ---] Tigris Iul(ianus) +[---; / u.² ---]ci[.].s Ner. III, m. Speculator LXIX. / Essed(arius) – R(etarius²): / u. Crysantus [---]II – m. Artorius [---]. / O(plomachi) – M(urmillos): / u(icit)² [---]eacius Iul. – m. [---] Iul. LV[---]; / u. [---]IV[---]SM[---] – [m. ---]VR II[---]. / [---] – [T]r(aex²): / [u.² ---]B[---] Ner. [---] – [m.² ---]. /

Munus [---] V, IV, III, prid[ie] idus, idi[b.] Mai(s): / Di(machaeri²) – O(plomachi²): / m. I[---]ciens Ner. XX[---] – / u. Nobilior Iul. II; / Laudand[---] IO[---]XI – / [---]ng[---] XIV. / T. – M.: m. L. Semproniu[s ---] – / u. Platanus Iul. ---; / No[---] m(issus²) – / Ri[---]ecius [..]. / T. – M.: / u. Pugnax Ner. III – / p(eriit) Murranus Ner. III. / O. – T.: / u. Cynus Iul. VIII – / m. Atticus Iul. XIV. / T. – M.: / u. Herma Iul. IV – / m. Q. Petillius [---]. / Ess(edarii): / m. P. Ostorius LI – / u. Scylax Iul. XXVI. / T. – M. u. Nodu[---] Iul. VII – / m. L. Petronius XIV. / T. – M.: / p. L. Fabius VIII – / u. Astus Iul. XIV.

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.

b A. Sueti Certi, / aedilis, familia gladiatoria pugnabit Pompeis /³ pr. k. Iunias; uenatio et uela erunt. / Omnibus Nero[n(ianorum)²] mun]eribus feliciter! / ...

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.

- a** Pro salute / Neronis Claudii Caesaris Aug. Germanici, Pompeis Ti. Claudii Veri uenatio / athletae et spartiones erint¹ V, IIII k. Mart. CCCLXXIII. / Claudio Vero felic(iter)!
- 93** Pompeii: C IV 1183; ST 30 (*Edictum* dipinto in lettere rosse. Basilica); Fora 55. Probably after A.D. 62 (MOURITSEN 1988 p.35).
N. Festi Ampliati / familia gladiatoria pugna(bit) iterum [---] /³ pugna[b(it) id. Mai.?,] XVII [kal.] Iun.; uenat(io), uel[a erunt].
- 94** Pompeii: C IV 1184 + p.204; ST 31 (Iscrizione dipinta in lettere rosse; Ludo Gladiatorio. L.4: *Form[i]is*); Fora 56. L.2: *FAMIL CC AD PUGN*; L.4: *PO RA^o IS*. Cf. no. 93 for the date.
[---]MAIAE / [---] TERTIO LEG /³ Ampliati I+[---] famil(ia) 'gl'ad(iatoria) pugna(bit) / Po[m(peis)]? 'k.?' Mais?; ue'n`a[t(io)], spars(iones) et uel(a) er[unt]. / Totius orbis desiderium / mun[us meu]m ubiq. /³ cum P`a`mp[h]ilo? '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 *uenatio*. After A.D. 62 (MOURITSEN 1988 p.35).
Munere [N. Fes]ti Ampliati, die summo: / Bebryx Iul(ianus) XI (sc. pugnarum) u(icit); Nobilior Iul. XIV. / [---] Iul. XVI; [---]IV m(issus) e(st). / [---] Iul. XXX u.; [---]sus Iul. XV m. o(biit). / Hippolytus I[ul.] V u.; Ce[l]latus Iul. VI. / Nedyms Iul. V [---]; [---]p[---] Iul. XV m. / [---] Iul. IV [---]
- 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 muneris* 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. Lucreti(o) Valentis fili / glad. paria X pug(nabunt) Pompeis VI, V, IV, III, pr. idus Apr.; uenatio legitima / et uela erunt. / ...
- b** D. Lucreti Satri / Valentis, flaminis [Neronis] Caesaris Aug. fili perpetui, glad. par. XX et / D. Lucreti Valentis fili / [glad.] paria X, / ex a. d. V k. Apr.; uenatio et uela er[unt].
- d** D. Lucreti Satri Valentis, flaminis [Neronis] Caesaris Aug. f. perpetui, glad. par. XX et D. Lucreti Valentis fili, glad. par. X pug(nabunt) Pompeis ex {a. d.} nonis Apr.; uenatio et uela erunt. / ...
- 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 muneris* dipinto; Reg. III. 55/56 d.C., anno della prima quinquennalita di Maio); Fora 33. b: C IV 1179 + p.462; ILS 5143; ST 10 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg. VII); Fora 34.
- a** Cn. Allei Nigidi / Mai, quinq(uennalis), sine impensa publica glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX et eorum supp(ositicii) pugna(abunt) Pompeis. / Gavellius Tigillo / et Clodio sal(utem); / Telephe, summa rudis, / instrumentum muneris / u(bique) u(ale). / ...

- b** [C]n. Allei Nigidi / Mai, quinq., gl. par. XXX et eor. supp. pugn. Pompeis VIII, VII, VI k. Dec.; / Ellios [et] uen(atio) erit; Maio quinq(uennali) feliciter! ...
- 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 tabula]rum muneris 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(le)! / ...
- 100** Pompeii: C IV 1180 + p.462 + p.790; ST 15 (Iscrizione dipinta a lettere rosse; Teatro Grande); Fora 39. A.D. 70/78.
Pro salute / [Imp. Vespasiani] Caesaris Augu[sti] li[b]e[ro]rumqu[e / eius ob] dedicationem arae [glad(iatorum) par(ia) —] Cn. [All]ei Nigidi Mai, / flami[nis] Caesaris Augusti, pugn(abunt) Pompeis sine ulla dilatione / IIII non. Iul.; uenatio, [spartiones], uela erunt.
- 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. Alleio Maio, / principi munerarior[um], / 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]n(abit) Pompeis; uenati[o], /³ ex XII k. Mai., mala [e]t uela erunt. / [—]o procurator[i] / felicitas!
- 103** Pompeii: C IV 1094 (colore nigro pictum); Fora 51 (72/77 d.C.).
Popidio Rufo, inuicto muner(ario) ter, / defensoribus colonorum feliciter!
- 104** Pompeii: C IV 3338 = 4999 (periit); 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.
[-²] 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. Auili² [—].
- 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.² —²].
- 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]tutin[a et uela erunt].

- 109 Pompeii: C IV 9982; ST 35 (Iscrizione dipinta fuori porta Nocera); Fora 61. Not after A.D. 79.
Venat(io) et [gl]ad(iatorum) par(ia) XX C. [--- Al²]exis pugn(abunt) [---].
- 110 Pompeii: fragmentary *edicta* found inside the city walls: A: C IV 1196; ST 36; Fora 62. B: C IV 7986^a; ST 38; Fora 64. C: C IV 9968^d; 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^a + p.204; 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^{b-c}; ST 20A; Fora 43.
- A Pro salute Domus Aug(ustae), gl(adiatorum) par(iae) [---].
- B Pro sal[ute ---] gladiatorum paria XX / pugna(bunt) [---].
- C [--- glad.] par. XX / [--- ue]lla er[unt / ---] TEGIT, uenatio erit. / Scr(ibo) / corrado ub(ique).
- D [---] pugn. V, IIII, III, pr. k. dec.; uenat[io ---].
- E [---] familia gladiatoria [--- / ---] uenatio et uela [erunt].
- F [--- gl]ad. [par. --- / ---] uenatio [---].
- G [---] familia / gladiatoria [---].
- H Gladiatorum / paria XX [---].
- J Gladia[torum par. ---].
- K Gla[diatorum par. ---] / pu[gn. ---].
- L [---]is / [---] Pompeis pr. non. et non. Iun. / Claudi[o ---].
- 111 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^a; ST 53; Fora 79. F: C IV 9985^b; ST 54; Fora 80. G: C IV 1203 + p.204; ST 55; Fora 81.
- A [---² gl]ad[iat(orum) p]ar(ia) XXX et / [---²]++CAE pu[g(nabunt) / ---] ex k. Iuni.
- B Scr(ipsit) Sexti[anus² --- / ---]IPO[--- / ---]CN[---]RI [---] XIII [k. ---] / glad. paria XXX [---];
matutini erunt [---].
- C Glad. [par. --- / ---] uela [--- / ---] XIII k. [---].
- D [---] pugnabunt [--- / ---] Sabinianus [---].
- E [---² glad. par.] XXXV pu[gn. Po]m[peis² ---].
- F T+[---] / CVI[---] paria / X.
- G [---] uela, pyrri[charii² --- / P]om[peis² ---]icio Aelio[doro ---].
- 112 Pompeii: C IV 1989 + p.214; ILS 5147; ST 46 (Iscrizione dipinta; Reg. VIII); Fora 72. Not after A.D. 79.
Heic uenatio pugnabet¹ V k. Septembres / et Felix ad ursos pugnabet¹.
- 113 Puteoli (Neapoli?): C X 1841 (L.1: p.C. 22?). L.3: [populo postula]nte?
-----²/[--- D. Haterio, C. Su]lpicio cos. / [---] vacat /³ [---]nte statuam / [---] ludos [---] / -----²
- 114 Puteoli: C X 1574; ILS 226. Known from MSs only. A.D. 56.

Q. Volusio Saturn(ino), / P. Cornelio Scip(ione) cos., /³ Augustaes / qui [Neroni] Claudio /
Caesari August(o) et /⁶ [Agrippinae] Augustae, / I(oui) O(ptimo) M(aximo) et Genio coloniae / ludos fecer(unt)
XIII, XII k. Mart., /⁹ C. Tantilius C. C. I. Hyla, / Cn. Pollius Cn. I. Victor, / C. Iulius C. I. Glaphyr(us), /¹²
curatoribus / -----

115 Puteoli: *C X 1824* (Litteris maioribus). After A.D. 161.

----- / [---]siae Rufinae mat[ri --- / --- cu]r(ator-) kal(endarii) Maioris et Clodiani et Minu[ci]ani ---
/ --- statuae² 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-
l(ium), accens(i) uelato¹, / 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 Rufinae, /³ honestissim(ae) matron(ae) et ra/rissim(ae) femin(ae), M.
Aur[[eli]] proc(uratoris) / summar(um) rat(ionum) uxori, M. Gaii Pute/⁶olani II uir(i), aed(ilis), cur(atoris)
muner(is) gla/diatori quadriduo et omnibus / honorib. et munerib. perfunc(ti) /⁹ filiae, M. Gaii Fabi Iusti
s'p`lendi/diss(imi) eq(uitis) R(omani), augur(is), II uir. II, q(uaestoris) II, / cur. muner. glad. et om[nibus ho-
no]/¹²rib. et munerib. perfun[cti sorori], / res publica peq(unia) oblat[ra ---].

118 Puteoli: *AE 1888, 126*; *EE VIII 369*; *ILS 5186* (L.12: Commodi nomen erasum et postea
restitutum); *Fora 118*. A.D. 180/192.

L. Aurelio Aug. lib. / Pyladi / pantomimo temporis sui primo, /³ hieronicae coronato IIII, patrono /
parasitorum Apollinis, sacerdoti / synhodi, honorato Puteolis d. d. /⁶ ornamentis decurionalib. et / duumuiralib.,
auguri, ob amorem / erga patriam et eximiam libera/⁹litate[m] in edendo muner(e) glad(i)atorum uenatione passiu
ex in/dulgentia sacratissimi princip(is) /¹² [Commodi Pii Felicis Aug.], / centuria Cornelia.

119 Puteoli (?): *C X 1795*; *ILS 1401*; *Fora 150* (Provenienza incerta: generalmente attribuita a Puteoli;
pertinente a Beneventum secondo G. Camodeca [*ANRW* II.13 p.503 n.23]. Fine II/inizi III sec. d.C.).

M. Bassaeo M. f. Pal. / Axio, /³ patr(ono) col(oniae), cur(ator) r(ei) p., II uir(o) mu/nif(ico),
proc(uratori) Aug(usti) uiae Ost(iensis) et Camp(aniae), / trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae), proc.
reg(ionis) Cala/⁶bric(ae), omnibus honorib. Capuae func(to), / patr. col. Lupiensium, patr. municipi /
Hudrentinor(um), uniuersus ordo municip(um) /⁹ ob rem publ. bene ac fideliter gestam. / Hic primus et solus
uictores Campani/ae pretis et aestim(atione) 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(ano), cur(ator) rei p. Tegianensium, adlecto in

ordin(em) /³ decurion(um), cui amantissimo, qui cum priuilegio sacer/doti Caeninensis munitus potuisset ab honorib. et munerib. / facile excusari, praeposito amore patriae et honorem aedilitat(is) /⁶ laudabiliter adminis- trauit et diem felicissim(um) III id. Ian. natalis / dei patri n(ostri) uenatione pass(ia), denis bestis et IIII feris dent(atis) et IIII paribus / ferro dimicantib. ceteroq. honestissim(o) apparatu largiter exhibuit; /⁹ ad honorem quoque duumuiratus ad cumulanda munera patriae / suae libenter accessit; huic cum et populus in spectaculis adsidue / bigas statui postulasset et splendidissim(us) ordo merito decreuiss(et) /¹² pro insita modestia sua unius bigae honore content(us) alterius / sumptus rei p. remisit. L. d. d. d. c(oloniae) I(uliae)².

121 Puteoli: C X 1825; Fora 117 (Orientativamente II sec. d.C., in base alla paleografia).
 ----- / [---]es suo [--- / ---] bestiar(um) XV [--- /³ ---] et tertia[rios --- / --- edidit ---] meruit [--- / --
 -] pecunia [--- / ---]++ [---] / -----²

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.).

Par(ia) XLIX. / Familia Capiniana muneri[bus] / Augustorum pug(nabit) Puteol(is) a. d. [VI², IV,]
 / pr. id. Mai. et XVII, XV k. Iu[n.]; / uela erunt. ...

123 Pompeii ⇒ Puteoli: C IV 9970; ST 75 (*Edictum* dipinto, fuori porta Nocera); Fora 101. Not after A.D. 79.

Glad(iatorum) par(ia) XX A. Suetti / [Par]tenionis [e]t Nigri liberti pugna(bunt) / Puteol(is) XVI,
 XV, XIV, XIII kal. Ap.; uenatio et / athletae, [uela] erunt.

124 Pompeii ⇒ Puteoli: C IV 9984^{a-b}; ST 76 (Iscrizione dipinta, fuori porta Nocera); Fora 102. Not after A.D. 79.

(a) [---]R[---] BA[---]RVM / pugn(ab-) Puteol(is) a. d. VII, VI, V, IV, III k.; spar[siones erunt] /
 munere Valeri Stasi[mi²]. (b) [---² uenatio et²] uela [erunt].

125 Salernum: C X 539; *ILS* 5061; *Inst* I 1, 21; Fora 22 (III sec. d.C.?).

Acerio Firmio Leontio, / primario uiro et editori /³ muneris sui cum <uenatione>² ferarum / Lib[y]-
 carum, qui uixit ann(is) / XXX, dignissimo filio /⁶ consacraberunt¹.

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 *splendidissimus* belong to the 2nd c. or later periods. *Ti* looks like a misreading for *ET*.

L. Cornelio L. f. Men. M[---], / flamine Romae TI C[---], /³ auguri, aed(ili), II uir(o), qu[inquenn.]
 / praef(ecto) fabr(um) bis. Hic togae uir[ilis die] / crustulum et mulsum populo [dedit] , /⁶ aedilitate spectaculum
 gladia[torum et] / circensium edidit, ob honor[em II uir(atus)] / decurionib. magnam cenam d[edit, quin]⁹quen-
 nalitate sua ludos spl[end(idissimos) edidit²]; / huic decurion(es) publice locum [sepulturae et in] / funer(e) HS
 (5000) et statuam [decreuerunt].

- 127 **Teanum Sidicinum:** *C X 617**; *AE 1979*, 156. A.D. 151.
 [---]umius M. f. / [Apo]llodorus / [---] thermas, / [lud(is)² cir]cens(ib.) et lud(is) / [scae]n[icis
 e]d[itis]², / dedic(auit)²] IIII kal. Apr., / [Sex. Quintiliis V]alerio / [Maximo et Cond]jiano cos.
- 128 **Venafrum:** *C X 4913*; *ILS 6516*; *Fora 126* (I sec. d.C.).
 ----- / [--- pra]efectus / [---] Quirites. / H(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur). / Bis
 sexuir factus peregi P[---], / bis populo munus dedi. Lib[---] /³ primum est Augusti parem [---].
- 129 **Venafrum:** *C X 4893*; *Fora 127* (Orientativamente I sec. d.C., in base alla paleografia). L.8:
q(uaestori)?
 Voto suscepto pro / salute perpetua domus /³ August(ae); cum edidisset / munus gladiatorium /
 populus in statuam cont(ulit) /⁶ Q. Vibio Q. Caesi f. Ter. / Rustico, / II uir(o) q(uinquennali).
- 130 **Venafrum:** *C X 4897*; *Fora 128* (Datazione: ?). Known from MSs.
 -----² / [---] q(uaestor-), II uir(-) [--- / --- mune]re gla[diatorio ---] / -----

Regio II Apulia et Calabria

- 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”).
 -----² / [---]ROM[--- / ---]Q Aug[--- /³ ---] redit[u --- / ---] gladiat[or- --- / ---] P d. d.
- 132 **Aeclanum:** *C IX 1156*; *ILS 5878*; *EAOR III 33* (Già perduta ai tempi del *CIL*); *Fora 141*. A.D.
 138/161.
 Ti. Claudio / Ti. fil. Ti. nepoti /³ Cor. Maximo, q(uaestori), / II uir(o) quinq.; / hic cum ageret
 ae/⁶tat(is) ann(os) XX in colon(ia) / Aeclan(ensium) munus edidit, / impetrata editione ab Imp. /⁹ Antonino
 Aug. Pio in quo / honore sepultus est; / cuius mater Geminia M’. fil. /¹² Sabina ob honorem eius in / uia ducente
 Herdonias / tria milia passuum ex d. d. in/¹⁵tra lustrum honoris eius re/presentata pecunia strauit.
- 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.
 ----- / H[---] / A[---] /³ VT[---] / fam[ilia gladiatoria²] / pugn[aret² --- item²] /⁶ tritic[i modios²
 ---] / distrib[uit ---] / ampli[u]s --- /⁹ fil(iis)q.² [---] / -----²
- 134 **Aeclanum:** *C IX 1175*; *EAOR III 52* (Visto dal Mommsen. Irreperibile nel 1987. Metà del II sec.
 d.C.); *Fora 143*. Probably A.D. 161/169.
 ----- / [---, II uiro] / q.q., flamin[i diui ---; ob merita²] /³ eius quod cum e[nt] antea plurima bene-
 ficia in rem p. contule/rit et quinquenn[alitate sua --- fecerit] / et, cum ex HS C (m.) bidui [munus publ(icum)
 curauerit², de] /⁶ suo alis HS C (m.) tertium d[iem ediderit et uiam ---] / strauerit per milia pass[uum ---], / ad

kaput eiusdem uiae [--- optimorum] /⁹ imperatorum statu[as collocauerit, et in tutelam earum?] / kalendar[io rei p. intulerit ---] / -----

135 Aeclanum: *C IX 1184; EAOR III 57* (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. II sec. d.C., per la presenza del termine *postulatus*); *Fora 144.*

----- / [---]O / [---]R /³ [---]CL / [---]MEDI / [--- mun]eris /⁶ [--- ex post]ulatu / [---. L. d. d.] d.

136 Beneventum: *C IX 1643* ("Piccolo quadr." Accursius); *ILS 5734a.*

P. Cerrinius [- f.], / L. Crassicius [- f.], /³ II uir(i) i. d., / uiam strauer[unt] / et lacus fecerun[t d. d.] /⁶ pro ludis.

137 Beneventum: *C IX 1703 + p.695; ILS 5067; EAOR III 25* (Nota da tradizione manoscritta. L.2: Si puo 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. I. Philocles, Augustal(is) / Beneuenti, gladiator(es) D² dedit; /³ hoc monumentum memoriae / caussa sibi et suis faciundum cur(auit) / P. Veidio P. I. Philodamo fratri et /⁶ Variae Primae uxori et / P. Veidio P. I. Philotimo fratri et / Veidiae P. I. 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, / cur(atori) muneris diei un/us¹, Aulis Vibbis¹ /⁶ Iustinus, / Iustianus, / Ianuarius, /⁹ filis¹, patri bene m(erenti) 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(umero) IIII, ursis XVI, /⁹ noxeis IIII et ceteris / herbariis; / Licinia Marcella ma¹²rito karissimo, ex quo / et liberos IIII enixa est, / cum quo uixit annis /¹⁵ 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.

----- / idem basilicam in qua tabul(ae) muneris ab eo editi posit(ae) / sunt consummauit, ludos palmares ob dedicati³onem earum nomine Euploae suae exhibuit, porticum / omni ornatu elegantiae, in qua editio primi lustris / muneris quinquennal(is) munificentia principali /⁶ continetur, ex uoluntate Euploae suae fecit.

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; EAOR 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]ladiator[--- / ---]uum S+[---] / -----

143 Beneventum: *C IX 1540; ILS 4186* (Dies natalis coloniae celebrabatur munere gladiatorio, cuius curator fuerat Iustianus); *FIRA III 77c; EAOR III 44* (Dispersa già ai tempi del *CIL*. Intorno al 228 d.C. LL.5-6: *munerarius, natalis ...*); Fora 151.

Attini sacr(um) et Miner/uae Parachintiae.³ L. Sontius Pineius Iustia/nus, eq(uitis) R(omani) adne(pos), uir princi/palis, duumuir et munera/⁶rius natalis coloniae, om/nibus honoribus perfunct(us) / et sacerdos Matris deum M(agnae) I(daeae) /⁹ in primordio suo taurobo/lium a se factum traden/te simul Cosinia Celsina /¹² consacerdote sua, / praeunte Flauio Libe/rali har(uspice) publ. primario.

144 Beneventum: *C IX 1663; ILS 5179; EAOR 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 pa/⁶triae suae et <--->, uibus¹ / sibi fecit qui uixit ann(is) LVIII, m(ensib.) VI, d(ieb.) XII, /⁹ hor(is) III. / Esterti, / primus³ Beneuenti, / studiorum¹ or/chestopales /⁶ instituiti.

145 Canusium: **A:** *AE 1969-70, 134; C I² 3182; EAOR 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 I², 3183; EAOR III 20* (Cippo votivo quadrangolare in calcare); Fora 130. **C:** *C IX 327; ILS 3589; C I², 3184; EAOR 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. Salassu(s), /³ P. Titius L. f., IIII uir(i), / de munere gladiator(io), / ex s. c.

B Vestae sacru(m). / P. Titius L. f., /³ P. Curtius P. f. Salas(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 gla-diator(io), / ex s. c.

146 Roma ⇒ Canusium: *C VI 31850; EAOR III 46* (Lastra marmorea. L.3: *Splendido*; L.8: *lecaro pro pr(a)ecaro* (= «carissimo»). III/IV sec.); Fora 132. Silvestrini in *Le epigrafi romane di Canosa*, Bari 1990, App. I, 5.

A. Kanuleius fra(tri) ve(ne)¹ me(renti). / D. M. s. /³ A. Kanuleio A. K(anulei) / f. Ispeldido!² equiti / Romano, cib[i¹ Ca]/⁶nusino, omnis¹ [hono]/ris¹ funtus!¹, bis m[unus] / ededit¹, lecaro!² XXIII [annorum].

147 Compsa: *C IX 981; EAOR III 54* (Dispersa già ai tempi del Mommsen. Verosimilmente base onoraria. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 139.

----- / Gal. [---] / IIII uir(o), ae[dili, IIII] /³ uir. q.q., q(uaestori) [pec(uniae) publ., qua]/est(ori) aliment(orum), [sacerd(oti)] / XV uir(ali) Matri[s deum]; /⁶ ob merita eius [et splen]/didam editio[nem]

mu]/neris gladia[tori] /⁹ pleps urban[a aere] / conlato, cuius de[dicat(ione)] / populo utrius[que] /¹² sexsus
[HS²] C² et e[pulum²] / biduo ded[it]. / L. d. d. [d.].

148 Herdonia: A: *AE* 1967, 93; *EAOR* III 30 (Base onoraria di statua in calcare locale. Prima metà II sec. d.C.); *Fora* 134. B: *AE* 1967, 95; *EAOR* III 31 (Base di statua in calcare locale. Prima metà II sec. d.C.); *Fora* 135.

A L. Arrenio L. fil. / Pap. Menandro, /³ aed(ili), IIII uir(o) II q.q. mu/ner(ario) ciu(itatis) H(erdo-
niae), om/nib. hon(orib.) et one/⁶ribus rei publ. fu/ncto, patrono; / coll(egium) fabr(um) tign(uariorum) /⁹ ob
praecipuam / adfectionem / eius statuam po/¹²nendam meren/t[i] decreuit. / L. d. d. d.

B Bruttiae L. fil. / Nereidi, L. Ar/³reni Menand/ri dec(urionis) et munif(ici) (sc. uxori), / coll.
cannopho/⁶rum ob merita / eius. / L. d. d. d. / Ded(icata) kal. Mar.

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]ncipi, 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(am) 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 Fauor, / P. Didiolenus /³ Strato, / Augustales, / pro munere /⁶ ab summa quadragint(a)
/ ++DA ad uicum Laris / s(ua) 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 I]I uiro q.q., cur(atori) [mun(eris) / m]unifico, patr[ono] /
co[lon]iae secu[ndum] /⁶ merita], benefic[iis] / i[nnu]merab[ilib]. / pr[ou]ocatus, [uni] /⁹uersus p(opulus) Lucer[i-
nus / ponenda]m 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 *muneris*); *Fora* 133.

L. Paccius L. f. / Priscus, aid(ilis), II uir q(uinq.), /³ cur(ator) muner(is) Catinian[i], / Cl(audio)
Maximo [---?] / -----?

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. Stremponio /³ C. f. Pom. Basso, ae(dilicia) p(otestate), / pr(aetori) II uir(o) q.q., auguri,
/ curatori rei p. ka/⁶lendari Potentinor(um), / curator(i) muneris peq(uniae) / Aquillinae II, q(uaestori) rei pub.
III; /⁹ Heluia Psychario uxor, / C. Stremponi(us) Bassianu[s] / et Faustina, fili, b(ene) m(erenti) /¹² fecerunt.

- 154** Grumentum: *C X 228*; *EAOR III 36* (Ara in calcare. Metà II sec. d.C.); Fora 154.
 [---]+tio L. f. Pom. / [---] *vacat* /³ [in nostra] colonia omn[i]bus mun[er]ibus et princi[alibus] honoribus innoc[en]t[er] fu[n]cto, munerario / [egregiae?] editionis familia[e / gladiat]oriae, decurioni E+ /⁹ [---] splend[idi]ae ciuitatis / [Reginor]um Iuliensium, / [ob animu]m eius (h)onorific(um) /¹² [in nos; col]l[egium] Beneris¹ patrono / [opti]mo.
- 155** Paestum: *AE 1975, 252*; *EAOR III 9* (Base in calcare); Fora 156 (Fine I sec.?).
 C. Pomponio M. Pom/[p]oni Libonis trierarchi /³ [f]il. Maec. Diogeni, / II uir(o) q.q.; huic ordo decurio/num ob munificentiam eius quot¹ /⁶ familiam gladiatoriam ex sua / liberalitate ob honorem q(uin)q(uenalitat[is]) / primus ediderit [it]em accep[er]it HS XXV m. n. p[ro]p[ri]etaria pu[blica] alium d[omi]ni exice c[on]trauerit, statuam ponendam /¹² pecunia publica censuerunt. / L. d. d. d.
- 156** Paestum: *AE 1975, 255*; *EAOR III 34* (Base marmorea. Metà II sec.); Fora 157.
 M. Egnio M. f. / Mae. Fortunatiano, /³ II uir(o) iter(um) q.q.; huic splen[did]issimus ordo decurionum postulante populo ob /⁶ praecipuam et insignem munificentiam erga patriam / statuam ponendam decre[uit] quod cum XXV (m.) HS ac[cep]tis at comparationem / familiae gladiatoriae ma[gn]iore[m] quantitatem au[er]it at nobilium gladiatorum conductionem, /¹⁵ adiectis etiam ursis mi[ser]ae magnitudinis set et / noxio omni quoque /¹⁸ cultu atparatuque aucto, / diem sublimiter exornauit.
- 157** Paestum: *EAOR III 58* (Scheggione in calcare, relativo, probabilmente, ad una base. II sec. d.C., sostanzialmente per motivi paleografici); Fora 159.
 ----- / [---]N[on] [---] / [---]O+[---] /³ [---] munu[s] / [---]um p[ro]p[ri]etaria p[ro]p[ri]etaria, / [---] p[ro]p[ri]etaria. /⁶ [L. d. d.] d.
- 158** 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 / Romani fil[ii], --- /³ nepot., A. Vinici +[---], / II uiri II q.q., patro[ni] coll[eg]on[um] pron., flamini per/petuo diui M. Anton[ini], curat(ori) r(ei) publi[ca]e municipi Eburinorum, sa[cerdoti] ---, / praefecto fabrum; huic or[do] decur(ionum) statuam / ponendam censuit propter e[cc]lesiam liberali[um] /⁹tatem eius, eo quot¹ uiginti par[ia] gladiatorum / edidit, adiecta uenatione quam [etiam] / noxeorum comparatione ad[omi]nauit nec non /¹² decurionibus singulis HS XX n. [ex suo distribuit?]; / Vinicia Lucana fil[ii]. pecuniam / a re p. conlata(m) rest[itu]it.

Regio IV Sabina et Samnium

- 159** Aequiculi: *C IX 4133* (Litteris elegantibus); *ILS 5525^a*. Early imperial.
 ----- / [---] L. Volu[s]ius / [---], T. Mall[us] /³ [---]caius, Q. Pom[ponius] / [---]ram strauerunt, podium

et tribun[al et / statuum I]ustitiae Augustae, decurionibu[s --- /⁶ --- I]udos scaenicos quadriduo et [---] / -----?

160 Alba Fucens: C IX 3947 (Cippus sepulchralis. Lectio *floralibus* certa est, nec videtur aliud posse significari nisi populum vel potius collegium aliquod defuncto post mortem gratiam referre pro ludis Floralibus recte editis). LL.2-3: -PO/TD.

L. Septimio / Philadespo³t'o', pro suis / meritis et / Floralibus cipp(us) /⁶ p(ositus).

161 Alba Fucens: a: AE 1951, 19 + 23; EAOR III 41 (Blocco in calcare. II sec. d.C.); Fora 172. b: AE 1951 p.169; EAOR III 56 (Frammento di lastra in calcare.); Fora 173.

a P. Le[-⁶⁻⁷-]esia[nus], / M. S[-^{c.6}-] Marc(---), /³ gladiatorum par(ia) [---] / in colonia Alba Fuc(ente), / adiecta uenatione /⁶ legitima, ediderun[t] / -----?

162 Allifae: a: C IX 2350; ILS 5059; EAOR III 26 (Iscrizione nota della sola tradizione manoscritta); Fora 163. L.8: *XIIIX* 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 /³ qui ob honorem decur(ionatus) / eodem anno quo factus est / glad(iatorum) paria XXX et uenationem /⁶ bestiarum Africanar(um), et post / paucos menses duumuiratu / suo, acceptis a re p. HS XIII [m.] n., uenation(es) /⁹ plenas et gladiatorum paria XXI dedit, / item post annum ludos scaenicos p(ecunia) s(ua) f(ecit), / Augustales. /¹² L. d. d. d.

163 Amiternum: C IX 4205 + SI 9 p.34; C I² 1857; ILL 530 (Tabula ex lapide calcario). Late Republican.

[-] Proculeius P. f., / aed(ilis), lud(os) f(ecit).

164 Amiternum (vicus Forulensium): C IX 4395; SI 9, 21 (Tabula in pietra locale); AE 1992, 374. L.2: *imperatorij*? A.D. 2.

L. Siluanus Pater[nus? Augusto?] Caesari / diui f., pont. maxs., pr[--- Fo]rulis ludos /³ Augustos fecit cum L. R[---], P. Cornelio / Scipione, [T. Quinctio Crispino cos.].

165 Amiternum: 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] munerario? --- / ---]orum Proculi p[atris --- /³ sace]rdoti Laniuino immu-
n[i, pontifici, patrono / s]plendidissimi ordinis et populi Am[itern(inorum), summo mag(istro)] / Septaquis,
patrono Aueiatium et Pel[tuinatium; hic] /⁶ ex indulgentia, praetextatus, adiu[tore patre mu]neris Corneliani
editione primus om[nium die priu(ato)?] / cum quattuor paribus gladiatorum [et reliquo] /⁹ splendido adparatu,
patriam suam ho[norauit ---] / ipsosque ciues sincera amoris adfect[ione officis om]nibus fouere non desinat;
plebs urba[na ex aere] /¹² conlato bigam quam in amphitheatr[o postulauerat], / -----

166 Amiternum: 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. LL.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". LL.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/¹²li pat(roni), fil. Sal(li) Proculi patroni pat(riae) ord(inis) Aueia^(ia)tium Vest(inorum) patronum co/hoptemus¹; si modo de eius dignatione testimonium perportemus quis / etenim immo exultet et suam proferat uolu^(m)ptatem; ideo igitur, domini cos/¹⁵cripti, quod ex origine prisca genus eiusdem patronatus olim pro/cesseri⁽ⁿ⁾t; et labores quantos et quales in nos / et patriam nostram contulit; quiq. ex suis laboribus munera patro/¹⁸natus dena, et sena magg(is-tratib.[?]) filiorum suorum sple(n)didissima ciuita/ti n(ostrae) cum fauore ededit; Aquas Arentani quas iam delaps(a)e fuerant / ciuitati n. additis lacis castellisq. salientes restituit; /²¹ thermas quas iam olim disperierant antiquitus inpendiis et sua pecunia / cum porticis nouis factis et omni ornamento at pulc(h)ri[>]tu[>]dinem restaurauit / statuisque decorauit; et nomine d(omini) n(ostri) Constanti beatiss(imi) Caes. nata/²⁴le idibus Nob. dedicauit, quarum dedicatione biduum t(h)eatrum et dena iuue/naliorum spectaculis exs(h)ibuit sub pr(a)esentia Cl(audi) Vrani u. p. corr(ectoris) n(ostri) ...

167 **Aufidena:** *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 faciend(a) curauit.

168 **Bovianum Undecimanorum:** *Fora* 166 (Fine II sec. d.C.); *AE* 1991, 535 + 1996, 497; *AE* 1997, 442; cf. *EAOR* III 88.

C. Nummio C. f. / Vol. Chresto, /³ aed(ili), Iluir(o) quinq., / cur(atori) frum(enti), q(uaestori) al(imentorum), / q. rei p., cur. ka[l(endarii)], /⁶ munerar[io], / luuenes [ob amo]/rem p[at]ro[n]o /⁹ sua peq(unia) p(osuerunt). / L. d. d. d.

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(uaestori), aed(ili), pat(rono) col(oniae), / pat. mun(icipi) Sae-pin(atium), pat. / mun. Vicentin(orum), pat. et cur(atori) /⁶ r(ei) p. Tereuent(inor.), sacer(doti) Tuscul(anor.) / fanitali, / ordo et populus /⁹ ob insign(em) fidem, industriam / erga se in ciuilib. officis / [e]t splendor(em) muneris /¹² gladiatorii; / [adu]ocato fisc(i) stat(ionis) hereditati(um) / -----

170 **Cliternia:** *C* IX 4168; *EAOR* III 24 (Lastra in calcare. L.4: *q(uadriduo) c(iuib.)*. Prima età imperiale); *Fora* 174. 2nd/3rd c., according to MROZEK 1987 p.26.

C. H[er]jennius Philo, [VI uir] / Re[gi]o Lepidi iterum, Au[gustalis] /³ e[t VI] uir Augustalis Rea[te]; gladiat(orum) / p[ar]ia V Q C dedit et crust(ulum) mu[lsumq.; sibi et] / – u(ixit) h(oneste) a(nnis) XCII – /⁶ Fulviae uxori Treb[---].

171 **Corfinium:** *AE* 1961, 109; *SI* 3, 8; *EAOR* III 40 (Lastra in marmo. Fine II sec. d.C.); *Fora* 168.

Q. Auelio Q. f. Serg. Prisco / Seuerio Seuro Annao Rufo, flamine diui /³ Augusti, patrono municipi, / primo omnium Corfiniensium quaestori rei publicae, / IIII uir(o) aedili, IIII uir. i. d., IIII uir. quinq., pontif(ici) Laurenti(um) Lauinati(um). /⁶ Hic ob honorem quinq(uennalitat)is munus gladiatorium edidit et ob /

honorem IIII uir(atus) ludos scaenicos dedit et ob honor(em) aedilit(atis) ludos deae Vetidinae / fecit et in subsidium annonae frument(ariae) HS L m. n. rei p. Corfiniens(ium) et balineum Auelianum /⁹ muliebre cum HS XXX m. n. donauit frequenterque epulationes et diuisiones nummar(ias) / uniuersis ciuibus ex suo distribuit et onera rei p. gratuita pecunia saepius iuuuit; / Corfinienses publice ob insignem /¹² eius erga rem publicam adfectum; / Auelius Priscus honore usus inpens(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 [paribu]s); Fora 181.

[Q. -c.3-]uio Q. fil. Col. Pri[-2-3- / IIII uir(o) iur. dic. Curibu[s Sa/³bin]is III, praef(ecto) iur. dicu[ndo, / quae]stori alimentor(um), q(uin)q(uennalicio) decur[ion(um) / dec(reto)] allecto in perpet(uum), item q(uin)q(uennali) p[erp. /⁶ c(ollegi) fabr]um, legato apud diuum Piu[m ob / fi]nes publicos ob merita e[ius / quod] i]s primus omnium exhibi[tor(um) /⁹ uolu]ptatum spectaculum V [die/bu²]s splendide pecunia s[ua] / ediderit; /¹² [decu]riones memores hon[esta/tis] et integritatis iuris d[ic]tio[n]is s]uae quam eis praebuit p[ub]lica /¹⁵ pecu]nia posuerunt; ob cuius [dedic(ationem) / po]p(ulo) clustrum et mulsum et sport[ulas / dedi]t; curam agentib. quaestor(ib.) L. Etr[ilio / Ba]sso, T. Flauio Hermete. L. d. d(creto) c(entum) u(ironum). / [Dedicata --- / ---]I-O[--- / ---] IIII uir(is) [--- / ---]o Proculo, / [---]o Pio.

173 Forum novum: SI 5, 25; AE 1990, 252; EAOR III 48 (Lastra marmorea. La datazione sembra orientarsi nel I sec. d.C.); Fora 179.

[---]liae C. I. Hila[rae / ---] in Sabi[ni]s Foro N[ouo / ---] m]unus gladiator[um / ---]+iones eiu[s ---] / -----

174 Iuanum: C IX 2962 (Litteris pulchris). 2nd/3rd c.

----- / cuius dedicatione diem / ludorum et cenam /³ decurionibus et filis / item quinq(uennalib.) Aug(ustalib.) et filis et / plebi epulum dedit.

175 Marruuium: 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.

----- / [--- praete]rquam ab ii[s --- / ---]riam munici[p--- /³ ---]etiam exped[--- / ---]ca et decur[--- / ---]+ Augustum [--- /⁶ munus² gladiatoriu]m ediderit [--- / ---]a prisca ui[--- / ---]s faciem sa[--- /⁹ ---] p]ublica re[---] / -----

176 Nursia: AE 1989, 206 (L.3: [curator(i) m]uneris?); EAOR III 49 (Blocco in calcare locale. Datazione orientativa: I/II sec. d.C.); SI 13, 20; Fora 178.

-----² / [---]+onio [- f. ---, / VII]I uir(o) aed(ilicia) [pot(estate), --- /³ in editione] muneris [gladiatorii² / ob honorem² patr]ocinii / -----²

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. /³ Maximo, / aedili, / quinq., praef(ecto) /⁶ iuris dic(undi), quaestori / alim(entorum), flaminiali Aug(ustali); / hic ob honorem quin(quennalitat)is /⁹ spectaculum glad(iatorum) triduo / dedit et noxeos quatt(u)or; /¹² uix(it) an(nos) XXXIII dies IIII; / C. Pausculanus

Rufus / filio karissimo /¹⁵ p(osuit). Hic¹ monumentum em(p)tori / non cedit, sic ut liciat¹ itum, / aditum, ambitum mihi posteris/que meis; in agro p(edes) LXX, in fronte p. XII.

178 Sulmo: *AE* 1986, 219; *SI* 4, 50 (Blocco in calcare. La datazione si orienta all'inizio del II secolo d.C.).

-----² / [---]++O[.]I / [ciuibus meis denarios² --- praest²]ari uolo/³ [ex quorum reditu die natali vel quotannis² cir]censes mando / [filiis filiabusque, heredibus mei]s, libertis liber/[tabusque quos antea manumissi et q]uos siue hoc te⁶[stamento siue codicillis manum]isi manumisero. / [-c.25- in homines a]lgros muliere[^{sq.} / ab heredibus meis praestari uolo, eande]m pecuniam in /⁹ [-c.10-, eandem pecuniam in annonam f]rumentariam. / [Hoc amplius ab heredibus meis prae]stari uolo plebi / [-c.30- numer²]us, et si in anno /¹² [-c.35- fu²]erit, eo anno / [-c.40-][NI aut fian[t] / -----

179 Superaequum: *C IX* 3314 + *SI* 5 p.101; *ILS* 5056; *AE* 1985, 327; *EAOR* III 62 («Ara marmorea». Irreperibile nel 1987); *Fora* 169. A.D. 271.

L. Vibius Seuerus, / aedilis, IIII uir q.q., /³ splendidus eq(ues) / Romanus, patro/nus ciuitatis Supe⁶raequanorum, item / patronus ciuitatis / Anxatium Frenanor(um) /⁹ et Peltuinatium Vestin(orun); / hic ob honorem aedilita/tis L. Vibi Ri[ti²]li fili sui /¹² eq(uitis) R(omani) at¹ deam Pelinam pri/mus huic¹ loco uenatio/nem edidit, deinceps ludos /¹⁵ sol[li]emnes. L. Vibius Nepos / filius, aed(ilis), IIII uir iur. d., eq(ues) R(omanus), / patronus ciuitatis, ob /¹⁸ nomen fratris sui ti/tulum publice dica/uit, 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(ua) 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) muneris / publici.

182 Telesia: *C IX* 2230 + p.674; *C I²* 3200 (In lapide ex aedificio rotundo [scil. turri] litteris maximis et pulcherrimis Mommsen [*C IX* ad loc.]). Late Republican.

M. Lollius M. f. Qua[rtus² ---] / turreis duas pro l[udeis] fecit].

183 Telesia: *C IX* 2235; *C I²* 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 I 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 Fabie Seuro / patrono coloniae, ob me³rita eius domi forisque / et quod primus omnium /

editorum sum[ptu pr]oprio⁶ quinque fer[as Libyc]as / cum familia [glad(iatoria) Ar]ria/norum et adpa[ratu] mag⁹nifico 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 crustum⁶ 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(uetur).

186 Telesia: *C IX 2249* (L.3: *EDENT(i)* [vel] *EDENTI*); *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”.

[D.] M. s(acrum). / [—]nio Castori, August(ali) /³ [et² bis]jell(iario) Telesiae, edente / [diem] p]riu(atum) muner(e) famil(iae) glad(ioriae) Teles(inae) / [orn(ato) ho]nor(e) biselli, qui uixit ann(is) LVII, /⁶ [m(ensib.) — d(ieb.) —]XVIII. Cassia Congordia¹ coniu[gi aman]tissimo cum quo uixit ann. XV, / [m. — d. —]III et L. Cocceio Lucciano, fil(io) /⁹ [honesti²]ssimo qui uixit ann. XVII / [m. — d. —]XVII benemerentibus fec(it).

187 Telesia: *C IX 2243*. 2nd/3rd c.

—— / [—]EV+[— cuius dedi]ca[ti]one dedit d[uouir]alib.² /³ HS XX, decurionibus [et] / popularibus liberisque / eorum HS VIII, sed et populo⁶ passim pecuniam distri[b]uit, / ludorum quoque spectacu/lum ea die ciuibus exhibuit; /⁹ patrono abstenentissimo, / cui prestantissimo, / amatori ciuium simplicissim(o). /¹² L. d. d. d.

188 Tibur: *AE 1983, 140*. L.3: the restitution *cu[m]* is preferable to *cu[ravit]* given in *AE*.

L. Asinio [—], / IIII uir(o) iur[e dic. —] /³ qui ludos cu[m —] / ita 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 quinquen/nalitat[is] oblato XX paria / gladiatorum et uenation(em) /⁹ sua pecunia ediderit. / L. d. s. c. / Dedicata / VIII kal. August., /³ L. Eggio Marullo, / Cn. Papiro Aeliano cos.

190 **Trebula Mutuesca**: *C IX 4903* (Fortasse agitur de canalibus lapide structis per passus CCCLXXXVI inde a foro).

——² / [—] aedi[les — / —] canales la[pide structi]² /³ [—] p(ass-) CCCLXXXVI[— / —] foro de con[scriptorum senten]tia p]ro ludis f[ecerunt]² — /⁶ — pe]cunia sua [— / —] fa]ciund[um curauerunt]. / ——²

191 Trebula Mutuesca: *AE* 1964, 19; *EAOR* III 14 (Lastra in calcare, pertinente alla parte anteriore di base onoraria. Non prima della metà del II sec. d.C.); *Fora* 180. Later 2nd/earlier 3rd c.

L. Coelio L. f. Pal. Ve[ro], / VIII uiro mag(istro) iuu(ent[utis]), / VIII uiro II fano[rum], / VIII uiro III aera[ri], /⁵ praef(ecto) coh(ortis) I Hispano(rum), / VIII uiro IIII aer(ari) q.q., / curatori muneris / Reginiani, / decuriones et Augus/¹⁰tales, aere conlato. / L. d. d. d.

192 Trebula Suffenas: *C* VI 29681; *SI* 4, 42; *EAOR* III 23 (Lastra marmorea. Fasti del collegio dei *severi* e dei *severi Augustales* locali); *Fora* 175. *VILLE* 1981 pp.190–92; *Linderski, JRA* 1998 pp.464–66. AA.D. 22 (Col. I, L.1), 23 (I, 12), 30 (II, 4), 108 (I, 25). Col. I, LL.1–24 are provided here.

—— / [D. Haterio, C. Sulpicio cos., / —] Sestuleio I[I uir(is)], /³ — C]apito; hunc VI ui[ri et / h]onore functi rogarunt ut eo / honore fungeretur. /⁶ C. Iulius diui Augusti l. Sosthenes, / M. Iunius Felix, / M. Etrilius Eros, /⁹ L. Fadius Hetario, / k. Aug. honor(em) p(ublice) d(ederunt), ludos in foro / per (quadriduum) fecerunt. /¹² C. Asinio, C. Antistio cos., / L. Manlio, M. Plautio II uir(is), / Q. Caluius Auctus, /¹⁵ L. Tribulanus Pamphilio, / M. Etrilius Onomastus, Q. Vrsius Secundio, /¹⁸ T. Traebulanus Felix praec(o), / k. Aug. honorem edederunt, lud[os in foro] / per (quadriduum) fecerunt; IIII primi /²¹ natale Iuliae August. in pu[blico] / cenam decurion(ib.) et Augu[stal(ib.)] / dederunt; eorum seuir[atu munus cum?] /²⁴ familia gladiat[oria dederunt?]. / *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* [[[I]]].

—— / [I]udos fecit, gladiatores dedit, / cenam sexuirelem primus dedit, /³ [I]legauit colonis Auximatibus singulis [HS —] / et decurionibus singulis HS XX / et legauit 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.

—— / [— testame]nto suo dedit, ex quorum r[editu / quotannis epul?]um colonis Auxumatibus dar[etur, /³ et gladiatoru]m paria sena alternis annis emere[ntur / quae —] k. Iunias Auxumi pu[gn]arent qui [— / —] quotannis eoque consumeret[ur —] / ———?

195 Hadria: *C* IX 5016; *EAOR* III 15 (Sarcofago ora irreperibile. Verosimilmente II sec. d.C.); *Fora* 183. L.3: *PAET*; L.6: *VCIA*.

C. Capiue Vitali, dec(urioni) col(oniae) / Had(riae), (a)ed(ili) III, pr(a)ef(ecto) Cast(ri) Nou(i), II uiro, /³ curatori kal(endari) Aueia(tium), p'r'(a)e'f. tert(ium) q.q., / curat(ori) muner(is) public(i) bis, qui uixit / annis LII, me(n)s(ib.) VII, die(b.) XII. Iulia Rufina /⁶ marito et Capiue 'Iul'ia Vitalis et / Vitalis, Anpliatius, Rufinus, fili / et (h)ered(es), patri pientissimo b(ene) m(erenti) / fecerunt.

196 **Urbs Saluia:** a: *AE* 1969–70, 183; *EAOR* III 78A; *Fora* 184. b: *AE* 1969–70, 183; *EAOR* III 79B; *Fora* 185. Cf. *AE* 1961, 140. Underlined letters are seen in b. After A.D. 81.

a [L. Flavius - f. Vel. Silu]a Nonius Bassus co(n)s(ul), / [pont(ife)x, legat(us) Aug(usti) pro praetore] prouinciae Iudaeae, adlectus inter patricios /³ [a diuo Vespasiano et diuo Tito censoribus, ab] isdem adlect(us) inter praetorios, legat. leg(ionis) XXI Rapac(is), / [trib(unus) pleb(is), quaest(or), trib. mil(itum) leg. IIII Scithicae, III] uirⁱ kapitalis, praetor, quinquennalis II, patron(us) colon(iae), suo et / [Ann-c.20-rt]ae matris suae item /⁶ [-c.10-millae] uxoris nomine, pec(unia) sua, solo suo, / [amphitheatrum faciendum curauit et] parib. XXXX ordinar(iis) dedicauit.

Regio VI Umbria

197 **Ameria:** *C* XI 4395; *ILS* 6632; *EAOR* II 30 (Base marmorea. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.).

T. Petronio T. f. / T. n. Clu. Proculo, /³ III uir(o) aed(ilicia) p(otestate), IIII uir. / i. d., curatori lu/sus Iuuenum V(ictoriae) (et) F(elicitatis) C(aesaris), /⁶ Iuuenes Aug(ustiani)?, / ob merita e(ius) qui ob / statuae dedicati⁹ onem dedit Iuuenibus s(ingulis) HS XXX n., / adiecto pane et /¹² uino epulantibus. / L. d. d. d.

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, /³ pontifici, flamine Vic(toriae) et Felic(itatis) Caesar(is) / perpetuo, praef(ecto) coh(ortis) /⁶ III Astur(um) eq(uitatae) c(iuium) R(omanorum), trib(unus) leg(ionis) / II Italic(ae), IIII uir(o) q.q., IIII uiro / i. d., sacerdoti V. F. C., cur(atori) Iusus /⁹ Iuuenum, VI uiri Augustal(es), / patrono, ob amorem eius / erga singulos uniuersosque.

199 **Ameria:** *C* XI 4386; *EAOR* II 32 (Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. II sec. d.C.).

L. Calpur[nio] — / curato]ri Iusus Iu[uenum] —? /³ 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; / [—]lio Ti. f. Clu. fratri; / [—]iae matri; / [—]lius Ti. f. Pup. Clemens, scr(iba) XXVI / [uir(or)um, tr(ibunus) m]il(itum) a populo, II uir iure dicundo Carsulis, sex / [-c.8- e]x s(enatus?) c(onsulto?); hic primus munus gladiatorium municipio (sc. dedit).

201 **Carsulae:** *C* XI 4580; *ILS* 6634; *EAOR* II 33 (Base parallelepipedica in pietra locale. Fine II/III sec. d.C.). Probably not after 1st half of 3rd c.

Sagitti. / L. Egnatio L. f. Clu. /³ Victorino, IIII uir(o) / i. d. quinq., patrono / August(alium) itemque /⁶ fabr(um), editori Iuuen(alium), / ob insignes uenat(iones) ab eo edita[s], /⁹ Iuuenes ex aere coll(ato) / patrono; cuius ob / dedic(ationem) dedit Iuuen(ib.) sing(ulis) (HS) XII, /¹² decur(ionib.) (HS) XII n., VI uir(is) (HS) II[X² n.].

202 Hispellum: A: C XI 5276 (Tabula marmorea); *ILS* 5377. L.7: HS80,000 or more. B: C XI 5277 ("Di trevertino" Magnani). 1st half of 1st c.

A Cn. Aequasius C. f. Caluo[s], / L. Aelius L. f., II uir(i) i. d., /³ ex d. d. uiae latitudin(em) / adiecer(unt), substruction(em) / et erismas fac(iendum) loc(auerunt); /⁶ [i]n id opus ex d. d. pecu(n(ia)) / lud(orum) HS (80,000)[—²], / Cn. Aequasius C. f. Caluo[s], /⁹ L. Aelius L. f., II uir(i) i. d., / M. Suestidius L. f., / C. Arrenus M. f., II uir(i) i. d. /¹² deder(unt) idemq. probar(unt).

B — / [—]us M. f., / ex d. d. uiae substructionem /³ ex pecun(ia) lud(orum) faciend(am) / cur(a-uerunt) idemq. prob(auerunt).

203 Hispellum: C XI 5265; *ILS* 705; *EAOR* II 20 (Lastra marmorea rettangolare. Copia di un rescritto inviato dall'imperatore Costantino e dai suoi tre figli, in risposta ad una petizione rivolta loro, come par di capire, dagli *Umbri*, per il tramite dei rappresentanti di *Hispellum*). A.D. 333/337.

... /¹⁵ ... Cum igitur ita uos Tusciae adsereretis esse coniunctos, ut in (i)stituto / consuetudinis priscae, per singulas annorum ui/¹⁸ces, a uobis [a]dque¹ praedictis sacerdotes creentur, / qui apud¹ Vulsinios, Tusciae ciuitate(m) ludos / schenicos¹ et gladiatorum munus exhibeant, /²¹ sed propter ardua montium et difficultates itinerum saltuosa^s inpendio posceretis ut indulto / remedio sacerdoti uestro ob editiones celebrandas Vulsinios pergere necesse non esset, / scilicet ut ciuitati, cui nunc Hispellum nomen / est quamque Flaminiae uiae confinem adque¹ con/²⁷tinuam esse memoratis, de nostro cognomine / nomen daremus, in qua templum Flauiae gentis / opere magnifico nimirum pro amplitudine(m) /³⁰ nuncupationis exurgere^t, ibidemque (h)is / sacerdos, quem anniuersaria uice Vmbria de/disset, spectaculum tam scenicorum ludorum/³³ quam gladiatorii muneris exhibere, manente / per Tuscia(m) ea consuetudine, ut indidem creatus sacerdos apud¹ Vulsinios ut solebat /³⁶ editionum antedictarum spectacula frequentare^t: praecationi¹ (h)ac desiderio uestro / facilis accessit noster adsensus. ... /⁴⁸ Consequenter etiam editionum in praedicta ciuitate exhibendorum¹ uobis / licentiam dedimus; scilicet ut, sicuti /⁵¹ dictum est, per uices temporis sollempnitas editionum Vulsinios quoque non deserat, ubi creati^s e Tuscia sacerdotibus memorata⁵⁴ celebritas exhibenda est; ita quippe nec / ueteribus institutis plurimum uidebitur / derogatum et uos, qui ob praedictas causas /⁵⁷ nobis supplices extitistis, ea quae inpendio postulastis, impetrata esse gaudebitis.

204 Hispellum: C XI 5283; *ILS* 6623; *EAOR* II 21 (Base in calcare modanata); Fora 191. After A.D. 333/337: cf. **203**.

C. Matrinio Aurelio / C. f. Lem. Antonino, u. p., /³ coronato Tusc(iae) et Vmb(riae), / pont(ifici) gentis Flauiae, / abundantissimi muneris sed et /⁶ praecipuae laetitiae theatralis editori, / aedili, quaestori, duumuiro / iterum q. q. i. d. huius splendidissimae /⁹ coloniae, curator i(r)ei p. eiusdem / colon(iae) et primo principali, ob meritum / beneuolentiae eius erga se /¹² [ple]bs omnis urbana Flauiae / Constantis patrono / dignissimo.

205 **Iguvium:** *C XI 5820; ILS 5531* (In theatro rep. Unius inscriptionis duo exempla); E&J 336. Datable to Augustus' reign.

[C]n. Satrius Cn. f. Rufus, IIII uir iur. dic., / [b]asilicas sublaqueauit, trabes tecti ferro suffixit, /³ lapide strauit, podio circumclusit sua pec(unia) et dedit / decurionatus nomine HS (6000), / in comneatum legionibus HS (3450), /⁶ in aedem Dianae restituendam HS (6200), / in ludos Victoriae Caesaris August(i) HS (7750).

206 **Mevania:** *C XI 5062; EAOR II 25* (Pietra rosa. VII sec. d.C.); Fora 189.

----- / [--- ob ho]nor[em --- / --- fec²]it, inpen[sa sua /³ munus g]ladiato[rium dedit² ---] / -----²

207 **Mevania:** *C XI 5031; EAOR II 26* (Lastra di bronzo. Non prima del III sec. d.C.); Fora 190.

----- / [---]++++[--- / --- si]ngulis u[niuersisque² --- /³ ---] pontif[---], patr[on--- / ---]uam digni-
[tatem --- / ---]+ maximu[m --- /⁶ ---] munus g[ladiatorium --- / --- eode]m fauor[e ---] / -----

208 **Pisaurum:** *C XI 6377 + SI 1 pp.80-81; EAOR II 9* (Base marmorea modanata. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 194.

C. Titio C. f. Cam. Valentino, / aedili, q(uaestori), II uir(o), qui testamen/³to colonis coloniae Iul(iae) / Felic(is) Pisaur(i) decies centena / millia¹ num. dedit, ita ut per sing(ulos) /⁶ annos ex sestertiorum CCCC (m.) / usuris populo epulum, die / natali Titi Maximi filii eius, /⁹ diuideretur et ex sestertiorum / DC (m.) usuris, quinto quoque an/no munus gladiatorium ederetur. /¹² Plebs urbana.

209 **Pisaurum:** *C XI 6369; EAOR II 10* (Nota da trascrizione manoscritta. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 195.

C. Mutteio C. f. Pal. / Quinto Seuro /³ q(uaestori), II uir(o), q. alimentor(um), / curatori calen-
dar(ii) / pecuniae Valentini[a]n(ae) HS DC (m.), /⁶ patrono VI uir(or)um August(alium) et / coll(egiorum)
fabr(or.), centonar(ior.), nauicular(ior.), / decuriones et plebs urbana, /⁹ ex diui'sione' epularum, / ob merita. / L.
d. d. d.

210 **Pisaurum:** *C XI 6357 + SI 1 p.80; ILS 5057; EAOR II 15* (Nota dalla tradizione manoscritta. Seconda metà del II sec. d.C.); Fora 193.

T. Anchario T. f. Pal. Prisco, / aedil(i), quaest(ori), II uir(o), /³ quaest. alimentorum; / huic primo
II uir(or)um biga posita / ob eximias liberalitates et /⁶ abundantissimas in exemplum largitiones / et quod ex in-
dulgentia Aug(usti) octies / spectaculum gladiator(um) ediderit, /⁹ amplius ludos Florales; / ob haec merita plebs
urbana / [ex aere conlato²]; cuius dedicatione /¹² T. Ancharius Priscianus filius, / aedilis, quaestor, adsedente /
patre gladiatorum paria decem ad[i]jecta /¹⁵ uenatione legitima edidit. L. d. d. d.

211 **Spoletum:** *C XI 4814*. Known from MSS.

[A.] Sosidio A. l. / [Xi²]philino patrono /³ [suo] Lic[ha²]s fecit / [et²] ludos Victoriae / [ex] testa-
mento /⁶ [arbi²]tratu Mest[riani²] / -----

212 Tuficum: C XI 5716; *EAOR* II 17 (Frammento di base. L.2: sono possibili anche [*ornato*] vel [*decorato*]. Irreperibile nel 1986); *Fora* 192. A.D. 180/192.

L. Tif[anio L. l.] / Felici, A[ug(ustali) honor(ato)?] /³ orname[ntis decur(ionalib.) in] / municip(iis) T[uficano] / et Septempe[d(ano), patrono] /⁶ collegi fabr(orum), m[unicipes] / Tuficani, mer[enti ob] / editionem mune[r(is) gla]/⁹diatorii quod pro [salute] / [[I]mp. Comm[odi] A[ntonini]] / Aug. ex pecunia sua edid[it] /¹² et mox honesta epulatione / uniuersos sit prosecutus; / cuius dedicat(ione) decurion(ib.) /¹⁵ sing(ulis) HS VIII n. et ceteris / utriusque sexus HS IIII n. dedit. / L. d. d. d.

213 Vettona: C XI 5170 ("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 populorum*, Bruxelles 1969, p.67).

----- / [---]+ Tuscia(m) suam [--- / ---]auit neq[ua] idem ad aliquam q[ua]es[---] /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[s --- /⁶ ---] plebis ciuica patronos cooptarunt ex quibus [--- / ---] prae]tore Aetruriae¹ XV pp[opulorum] dedit Discolium et Apronia[num --- / ---]m Aetruriae¹ ludos aeditit¹ paradoxis ex urbe et diu[isiones ---] /⁹ ---] lud[os] per decen¹ dies aepula¹ ordinibus propina[t] et ce[nas --- / ---]nis diebus dedit et ciuitatibus ex sen[atus --- / ---]t]otidem et annonas et cum [--- /¹² ---]VS[---]AXIS[---] / -----?

Regio VII Etruria

214 Caere: C XI 3613 (Tabula marmorea); *ILS* 5052. A.D. 25.

----- / [---]+[--- / ---] Au[g---] /³ C. C]ercenius C. [l. ---], / L. Magiliu[s L. l. ---], / T. Mercel[lo ---], /⁶ L. Tuccius Cels[us uiator con]sulum, praet(orum), / L. Arrunt[ius] L. l. Helenus, / C. Titinius C. l. Adiutor, /⁹ M. Visinius M. l. Philadelphus, / Q. Pomponius Q. l. Vrbanus, / C. Sulpicius C. l. Cthesus¹, /¹² C. Calumeius C. l. Erastus, / L. Otius L. l. Communis, / C. Oppius C. l. Secundus, /¹⁵ ludos Latinos et Graecos fecer(unt) VI, V, IIII, III, pr. k. et k. Mart. / et populo crustulum et mulsum dederunt, / M. Asinio Agrippa, Cosso Cornelio Lentulo cos.

215 Capena: Fragments from local *fasti* engraved on marble slabs. **A:** C XI 3896. A.D. 112. **B:** C XI 3907; *EAOR* II 34 (II sec. d.C.). **C:** C XI 3904; *EAOR* II 35 (II sec. d.C.). **D:** C XI 3901. A.D. 182? **E:** C XI 3903. **F:** C XI 3905.

A -----? / [Imp. Nerua Traia]no Caes. / [Aug. Germanico Da]cico VI, /³ T. Sextio Africano cos. lud(os) fecer(unt) / [--- Diadu⁹]menus / [---] et N[---] / -----?

B ----- / [---]+R[---] / primi [lu]uen[alia fecer(unt)?] /³ - S]extilius Castor, / [-] Marius Eudaemon.

C ----- / [---] cos. / [I]l]udos et Iu[uenalia fecer(unt)?] /³ -] Naeuius [--- / -] Memmius [---, / ---]ius Bonades[potus].

D -----? / [---]F dexter[--- / ---]orus ludos /³ [deder(unt)? XIII², XII]I, XII kal. / [--- Petro²]nio Ma[mertino², Q. Tineio Rufo²] cos. / -----?

- E** ----- / [---]S [--- / ---² ludos] deder(unt) [---² / ---]+rio [--- cos.?²] / -----²
- F** -----² / [---]ius Nereus [---²] / [---]ius Rufinus [---²] /³ [---]us Leo VI [---²] / [--- lu]dos ded[e-
r(unt)] / -----²
- 216** Capena: *C* XI 3936 (Cippus); *ILS* 6588. A.D. 162.
L. Pacatio Tyranno, / honorato collegi /³ fabrum tignariorum / Romanensium, ex / decreto ordinis
municipi /⁶ Capenatium foederatorum, / conlatione facta ordinis / eiusdem municipi et /⁹ Augustalium et
uicanorum, / item libertorum ipsius, / ob merita eius. /¹² L. d. d. d. / Dedicata XIII k. Oct., / Iunio Rustico [II,
/³ Plautio] Aquilino [cos.]; / ludos / [---] de /⁶ [---]nto.
- 217** Capena: *AE* 1954, 168. A.D. 172.
M. Gellio Seruando / seniori, seiuo August(ali) /³ municipio Capene foederato, / ludos edenti ob
merita / eius collatione facta decurionum /⁶ et Augustalium item uicanorum / hoc¹ honorem sibi oblatum HS V m.
n. / in aerarium r(ei) p. C(apenatium) f(foederatorum) contulit ut ex eo die na⁹ talis sui V k. Apr. de ✕ LXXV
usure decurio/nibus et August(alib.) et uicanis diuidatur prae/sentibus et ex ea diuisione iubeo statuae /¹² meae
coronas emi ✕ III. L. d. ex d. d., / curantibus C. Naeuio Proculo et M. Gellio / Seruando iun(iore) et Vatinio
Prisco scriba p. r(ei) p. C. f. / Dedic(ata) est III kal. Decembr., Maximo et Orfito coss.
- 218** **Falerii novi:** *C* XI 3078 = 7483 + *SI* 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
K. f., C. Salu[e]na Voltai f., / coiraueront. /
Gonlegium quod est aciptum aetatei aged[ai],
opiparum a[d] ueitam quolundam festosque dies,
3 qui soueis aastutieis opidque Volgani
gondecorant saip[i]sume comuiiua loidosque,
ququei huc deder[unt i]nperatoribus summeis,
6 utei sesed luben[tes be]ne iouent optantis.
- 219** **Falerii Noui:** *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.).
Honoris / Imp. Caesaris diui f. /³ Augusti pont. maxim., / patr. patriae et municip(ii), / magistri
Augustales /⁶ C. Egnatius M. I. Glyco, / C. Egnatius C. I. Musicus, / C. Iulius Caesar. I. Isochrysus, /⁹ Q.
Floronius Q. I. Princeps / uiam Augustam, ab uia / Annia extra portam ad /¹² Cereris, silice sternendam /
curarunt pecunia sua / pro ludis.
- 220** **Falerii Noui:** *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.
----- / [pontif(ici) sacr(ario) Iun(onis)² C]urr(itis)², / [hic in² hono]re q(uin)q(uennialitatis) sua[e

/³ ---]+ in editionem / [mune]ris decem pari/[a glad(iatorum)] optulit¹; cui ob /⁶ [merit]a sua, ordo et / [populus r(ei) p.] Faliscorum / [p(ecunia) p(ublica)]² statua]m equest[rem /⁹ ponen]da[m censuerunt²].

221 **Ferentum:** *AE* 1909, 59. Marble slab.

Marti / Aug. /³ T. Rufilius Priscus, / IIII uir aedil(icius²), ex d. d. / pro ludis sua pecun(ia) posuit.

222 **Forum Clodii:** *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 tert(ium), 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 Aug(usti) VIII k. Octobr. duae, quae p(er)p(etuo) / inmolari adsueta e' sunt ad aram, quae numini Augusto dedic(ata) est, VIII et VIII k. Octobr. /⁶ inmolentur /¹³ Ara(m) numini Augusto pecunia nostra faciendam curauimus; ludos / ex idibus Augustis diebus sex p(ecunia) n(ostra) faciendos curauimus. /¹⁵ Natali Augustae mulsum et crustulum mulieribus uicanis ad / Bonam deam pecunia nostra dedimus. / ...

223 **Oericulum:** *C* XI 7806.

[---]o L. f. Ataedio qu[aestori² --- / --- a]ere conlat(o) ludis dedica[---].

224 **Perusia:** *C* XI 1924 (basis marmorea); *ILS* 5503. Only the front-face inscription is provided. The right-side inscription carries the date A.D. 166, but the events described here at LL.4–10 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 publ(i-cos) / edenti ad statuam sibi ponendam /⁶ pecuniam optulisset, is honore / contentus impensam remisit / et impetrata uenia ab ordine /⁹ Perusinor(um) optimo maximoq. princ(ipi) / de sua pecunia posuit; cuius / ob dedicationem dari iussit /¹² ab herede suo decurionib. / sing(ulis) HS IIII n., plebi HS II n. / L. d. d. d.

225 **Pisae:** *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.

... ob eas res uniuersi decu/¹⁸rio[ne]s colonique, quando eo casu in colonia neque II uir(i) neque praefecti / er[ant] neque quisquam iure dicundo praerat, inter sese consenserunt /²⁵ di[em]que eum, quo die C. Caesar obit, qui dies est a. d. VIII k. Martias, pro Alliensi / lu[gub]rem memoriae prodi, notarique in praesentia omnium iussu ac /²⁷ uo[lun]tate cauerique, ne quod sacrificium publicum neue quae suppli/ca[tio]nes niue sponsalia niue conuiuia publica postea in eum diem / eo[ue] d]ie, qui dies erit a. d. VIII k. Mart., fiant concipiantur indican/³⁰tu[rue], niue qui ludi scaenici circiensesue eo die fiant spectenturue; / ...

226 **Tarquinia:** *AE* 1951, 185 (Sur une vasque, sans doute de fontaine); M. Torelli, *Elogia Tarquiniensia*, Firenze 1975 pp.164–65 no. 14 (età 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 pec(unia) pro ludis.

- 227** Veii: C XI 3782; Liverani 33 (Lastra. Tra il 2 d.C. e un anno non molto posteriore al 42).
 ----- / (*supra*) pontif. [max--- cos. ---], / tribunic. po[est---] /³ patri patria[e]. / (*pag. sin.*) Q.
 Numisius Q. l. / Thyrsus, /⁶ M. Numicius (mulieris) l. / Acastus, / L. Postumius L. l. /⁹ Eros maior, / (*pag. dex.*)
 L. Messius [L. l.] / Saluius, /⁶ C. Volumnius C. l. / Bello, / Q. Marius Q. l. /⁹ Stabilio, / (*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.
 -----? / sacrum. / L. Decimius L. l. Gamus V[I uir Aug(ustalis)], /³ pro impensa ludorum [---] /
 s(ua) p(ecunia) ponendum curauit [---] / Ti. Caesaris Augu[sti --- /⁶ se]uiris et seuiralibus et R[---] / *vacat* ded[i-
 cata] / Paullo Fabio Pers[ico, L. Vitellio cos.]. /⁹ *vacat* VI[---] / L. Mummio L. f. Ru[fo ---] / -----?
- 229** Veii: C XI 3803; *EAOR* II 22 (Frammento già perduto al tempo del *CIL*. Datazione incerta ma probabilmente compresa all'intorno dell'età giulio-claudia); *Fora* 197.
 ----- / [---? trib(uno) m]ilit(um) leg(ionis) XXII [---? / ---? inter?] duumuir(ales?) all[ecto? ---? /³
 --- munus?] gladiato[r]ium ---] / -----
- 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), / [t]rib(uno) milit(um), praef(ecto) fab[r(um), / mu]nicipes
 extramuran[i / et] Augustales ex aere conl(ato) / ludis in orchestra¹.
- 231** Veii: C XI 3811 (basis marmorea); *ILS* 6583. Mid 3rd c.
 Caesiae Sabinae / Cn. Caesi Athicti (sc. uxori); /³ haec sola omnium / feminarum / matribus C
 uir(or)um et /⁶ sororibus et filiab. / et omnis ordinis / mulieribus municipib. /⁹ epulum dedit diebusq. / ludorum
 et epuli / uiri sui balneum /¹² cum oleo gratuito / dedit. / Sorores piissimae.
- 232** Veii: C XI 3807; *ILS* 6582b; Liverani 43 (Base di statua). A.D. 256.
 Cn. Caeso / Athicto, /³ allecto inter C uir(os), / omnibus honoribus / exornato, /⁶ ex aere conlato /
 quam municipes omnis / ordo ei contulit /⁹ in orchestra ludis / quos fecerunt / P. Memmius Apulus [..] et /¹² C.
 Poppaeus Priscus II uir(i). / Dedicata / kalendis /³ Apriles, / Maximo / et Glabrione cos., /⁶ Olo Ortesio / Felice
 et Nemonio / Siluano II uiris /⁹ Veientium.
- 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(i) et seuir(i) et / Augustales et municipes / intramurani ex
 aerae¹ quod / in orchestra conlatum est / ludis quos fecerunt / Vergilius Cogitatus, / Iulius Senecio II uiri.

Regio VIII Aemilia

234 Claterna: C XI 683 + p.1238. **a:** (Cippus ex lapide arenario). **b:** (Cippus ex lapide harenaceo supra rotundus. L.1: Quid significet nesci[t Bormann]). Two almost identical inscriptions. Late 1st c. B.C.?

b ♀ / P. Camurius /³ 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.

[--- / --- / ---] Orphitae [--- / --- / --- bib]liothec[am] CXXC [--- / ---] porticum uet[ustate] /⁵ corrup-
tam refecit,] forum s(ua) p(ecunia) rest[ituit / in cuius dedi]catione epulum inter / spectacula et [---] HS col(o-
niae) / dedit. Ciu[i optimo,] / decur[iones] et pl[ebs] col(oniae) /¹⁰ [Iuliae A]jugus(tae) Derton(ae), / [---]CEL[---
Ar²]runtio cos. S P P P.

236 Pollentia (ager): C V 7637; *ILS* 5065; *InsIt* IX 1, 166; *EAOR* II 8 (Lastra marmorea); *Fora* 198. A.D. 139/161.

----- / diuisiones reliq[ua]m consentiente pleb(e) / in munus gladiatorium [e]t saepta lignea /³
inpendere, ita ut dedicat[i]one statuae / Imp. Antonini Aug. Pii p. patriae editio inchoetur / et eodem die
omnibus annis celebretur, /⁶ dum ea quae legibus plebisue scitis / senatusque consultis cauta compre/hensaue
sunt, seruentur.

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 ante*]? 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.

[E]dideram munus m[irabile² m]ense N[ou]embri
annonaq. meo su[mptu est lax- vel leu²]ata per an[nos²].

- 3 Solliciti, insonte[s], proponi magna put[antes]
 sperantesq. mihi se munera ferre, fere[bant]
 funera. Set sanctus deus hic felicius i[lla]
6 transtulit in melius! Sic denique fata tuler[unt]:
 a]juratam (sc. statuam) faciunt generatis undique nummi[s];
 i]nuidia creuit de nomine magna; patronu[m,
9 s]ic, tamquam domini, ciues expellere temp[erant];

plebi?'] praecisus pudor e[s]t; ...

238 Brixia ⇒ **Cremona**: *C V 4399; ILS 6702; Inslt X 5, 192 + SI 8 p.168; EAOR II 14* (Ara in pietra locale); *Fora 203*. End of 1st c.

Q. Caecilio / Telesphor(o), VI /³ uir(o) Flauiali / Cremon(ae) et munerar(io), / Caluentia /⁶ Corneliana, / marito optimo / et sibi.

239 Aedro ⇒ **Patavium**: *C V 2878 + AE 1975, 427; EAOR II 13* (Lastra marmorea. Prima metà I sec. d.C.); *Fora 200*. L.4: [HS /]X, I]] ~.

[---]lutius [-] f. Fab., IIII uir / [i. d.²], gladiat[or]es in IIII ui/³[r]atu Patau[i de]dit; idem / [te]stamento [HS] (1,050,001) / [po]pulo legau[it, q]ua pecuni[a /⁶ ---]+EADV[---] / -----?

240 **Tergeste**: *C V 563 + p.1022; ILS 5123; Inslt X 4, 77 + SI 10 p.223; EAOR II 19* (Già perduta al tempo del *CIL*. Incerta è la divisione delle righe. Iscrizione in senari giambici. Probabilmente III/IV sec. d.C.); *Fora 199*.

Constantius munerarius / gladiatoribus suis /³ propter fauorem / muneris, munus se/pulcrum dedit De/⁶corato retiari'um' / qui peremit Caeruleum / et peremptus decidit. /⁹ Ambos extinxit rudis; / utrosque protegit / roguis; 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 parallelepipedica 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*.

a 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; Inslt XI 1, 11; EAOR II 16* (Stele in pietra locale. II sec. d.C.); *Fora 207*. LL.1-8 are provided here.

D. M. / P. Vinesi Fir/³mi, q(uaestoris), aed(ilis) et / II uir(i) munerar(ii), / P. Vinesius For/⁶tunatus et Vi/nesia Faustina, / patri karissimo. /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 /³ Pii Fel. Aug., / edente M. Mamilio / Eutyichiano IIII u(iro) i. d., /⁶ Thr(aex) Pinne(n)sis S V / de Val(erio) Valerian(o) nat(ione) Raet(o); / docet Faustus.

244 **Concordia**: *C V 8664* (Basis); *EAOR II p.16*. Two almost identical inscriptions; text of *a*: underlined letters in brackets are seen on *b*. 1st/early 2nd c.

M. [Ac]utio M. l. / N[oe]to, Aug[u]st(ali). /³ Hi[c test]a[m]ento [c]ol(oniae) / C[onc]ordia(e) et or[d(ini)] [in] ludos [et] in / c[enam²] et [i]n epulum /⁶ HS C[C]C (m.), ite[m] / in [leuament]u[m] anno[n]ae / HS [---] dari iu[ss]it; pr[ae]ter[ea] [f.] quant[um] / [ex to]ta [he]redit[ate] s[uper]f[ui]t oper[ib. publicis] i]npend[it].

245 **Ticinum:** *CILSI* 870; *ILS* 6742; *EAOR* II 11 (Lastra marmorea. Fine II/III sec. d.C.); Fora 206.

Tullio Marc(i) / lib. Achilleo, /³ decurioni / ornamentario, / cultori d(omus) d(iuinae), /⁶
q(uin)q(uennali) p(e)r(petuo²) / c(ollegiorum²) f(abror.²) c(entonarior.²) it(em²) / curatore¹ muner(is) /⁹
Tulliani, / Aelius [A]sclepiades, / amic[o] kariss(imo).

Sicilia

246 **Lilybaeum:** *AE* 1964, 181; *EAOR* III 12 (Lastra in calcare. 169/172 d.C.).

Pro salute et reditu et / uictoria /³ Imp. Caesaris M. Aureli Antonin[i] / Aug. Armeniaci, Medici,
Parthici / Maximi liberorumque eiu[s. /⁶ - A]nnius L. f. LEMONIA Tertius, / duumvirum aedilis, q(uaestor)
p(ecuniae) p., cura[t(or)] / muneris publici gladiator[i]; /⁹ ob honorem aedilitatis promi[s(it) / e]x s(ua)
p(ecunia) HS XXV m. n., ex quibus, iussu / [-] Valer[i] Seponiani, q(uaestoris) /¹² S(iciliae), c(larissimae)
m(emoriae) u(iri), in / straturam plataeae¹ Cererum / sacrae HS XIII m. n. numerau(it) /¹⁵ et [dec(urionib.)²
r]eliquos HS XII m. n. d(edit) donis.

247 **Panormus:** *C* X 7295; *ILS* 5055; *EAOR* III 53 (Lastra marmorea. Non prima della seconda metà del II sec. d.C.). More probably 3rd c.

----- / [curatori kalendari² ---]iani quod mera fide admi[nistravit eodemque tempore] cur. por-
tensis kal. quod singulari /³ [diligentia tractavit, ---] laudabili munerario qui indulgentia / [sacra --- ex]hibuit,
illu¹ meruit optando quod uoluit / [et uniuersis ciuibus --- e]ditionem gratissimam reddidit, quod die/⁶[bus ---
populum per multa]s horas theatri uoluptas tenuit et hilaris / [totus in harenam --- inde a m]eridie transiit; in qua
miratus honestissimum / [apparatum instructum omni] genere herbarium et numerosas orientales /⁹ [feras
uersatusque --- inde a] meridie in utriusque caueis uaris missionibus / [delectatus est, idemque ex indulg]entia
sacra specialiter meruit at¹ cultum / [epulum instructumque --- a]mplissimo apparatu ciues suos uniuersos /¹² [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 bigiis¹ et
equestrib. /¹⁵ [statuis tribus² contentus ---] / -----?

Alpes Maritimae

248 **Cemenelum:** *C* V 7915; *CILSI* 1024; G. Laguerre, *Inscriptions antiques de Nice-Cimiez*, Paris 1975 pp.101-2.

D.M. M. Nemunio M. fil. / Cupito, dec(urioni), Iluir(o) /³ muner(ario), flam(ini) ciuit(at); / M.
Nemunius Nepos, fil(ius), / patri, s(ua) p(ecunia) p(osuit).

Gallia Belgica

249 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 / numin[i]bus Augg., l(oui) O(ptimo) M(aximo). /³ L. Ammius¹
Gamburio / proscen[ium c]um tribun/ali et eo [ampl]ius ✕ L. (m.) ex q/⁶uorum [usur]is tutela(m) prosceni e[ti]
ludos omn/ibus annis pri. kal. Mai. /⁹ curatores uici procu/¹⁰rare debunt¹, fide manda/uit. D(e)d(icatum?)
Saturnino et Gallo cos.

Gallia Lugdunensis

250 **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 ho[nor(em) dom(us) A]jug.; Mart(i), Volk(ano) et deae sancti[s]s(imae) Vestae. M. Magilius Honor[atus ex u]oto pos(uit) [pro se su]isqu[e].

(1) Sext. Iul(io) Thermiano, / sacerdoti arae in/³ter confluent(es) Arar(is) / et Rhodani, omnib.
ho[nor]ibus apud suos /⁶ functo, socero.

(5) M. Magilio Honorato, / flamine Aug(ustali) munera/³rio, omnibus honorib. / apud suos functo.

(6) M. Aemilio Nobili, / flamine Aug. mune/³rar(io), omnibus honorib. / apud suos functo, fratri.

B [Se]xto Iu[li]o / Thermia[n]o, / Senonio, fl[ami]n(i) / Aug(ustali) mune[ra]r(io) / in sua ciuitate, / [sacer]do(ti) arae / [inte]r confluent(es) / [Ara]ris et Rhod(ani), / [omn]ib. honorib. / [apu]d suos funct(o).

251 **Agedincum:** C XIII 2949 (Tabula aenea [ansata]). L.2: *FILIATERNINO*. A.D. 250.

C. Amatio C. Amat(ii) Patern(i) / fil. 'P'aternino, aedil(i) uikan(orum) / Agied(incensium), aedil.
c(iuitatis) S(enonum), actor(i) p. pagi / Tout(iaci?)², act(ori) 'p.' quinquenn. ciuit(atis), /⁵ II uir(o) ab aer(ario)
muner(ario), praef(ecto) an/non(ae) design(ato), iu(u)en(i) integerr(imo), / Matern(ius) Eucharistus et
Pat[er]n(ius) / Pollio Sill(---), off(iciales) eius ob mer(ita) p(ecunia?)² p(ublica?)², / d. n. Decio Aug. II et Grato
cos. / kal. Apr.

252 **Lugdunum:** C XIII 1921 (Lapis quadratus); *ILS* 7024. 2nd half of 2nd/early 3rd c. L.9: i.e. (*hoc munumentum*) dat.

Sex. Ligurius Sex. fil. / Gal. Marinus, /³ summus curator c(iuium) R(omanorum) / prouinc(iae)
Lug(dunensis), q(uaestor), II uir lib. / ornamentis suffrag(io) /⁶ sanct(issimi) ordinis hono/ratus, II uir
designatus / ex postul(atione) populi ob hono/⁹rem perpetui pontif(icatus) dat; / cuius doni dedicatione
de/curionib. ✕ V, ordini eques/¹²tri, IIIIII uiris Aug(ustalib.), negotiato/rib. uinaris ✕ III, et omnib. cor/porib.
Lug(dunensib.) licite coeuntibus ✕ II, /¹⁵ item ludos circenses dedit. L. d. d. d.

253 Aregenua ⇒ Lugdunum: C XIII 3162; PFLAUM 1948; *ILTG* 341. Cf. *AE* 1949, 136, 137, 214. A.D. 238. The so-called *marbre de Thorigny*, LL.1–14 of the front-face inscription.

T. Sennio Sollemni Sollem/nini fil., Il uir(o) sine sorte quater, aug(uri) /³ [o]mnib. honorib. mun[eribusq. f]un[cto]; hic flamen perp. fact[us] in / [s]ua c[i]uitate, eodem tem[po]re sacerdo[s] /⁶ R[om]ae [et Augusti ad aram omn]e genus spec[taculorum e]didit; [f]uerunt gladia[to]/r[um] c[er]tam(ina) n[um]ero XXXII, ex quibus per qua[d] /⁹riduum [n]u[m]ero] V[III] s[ine] missione edideru[nt]; / [bal]neum quod [pop]u[lar]ibus coloniae s[uae] / pr[ofutu]rum S[ollemninus -c.7-]ribus /¹² funda[me]ntis inst[itutis reli]querat / consumm[auit] [item legauit ---] fructum unde / in perpetuum instauraretur. ...

253X Lugdunum ⇒ ? : *AE* 1992, 1239 (Base en calcaire qui devait appartenir à un monument plus important); probably 2nd c.

Tib. Domitio / Proculo / flam(ini) munerario / 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 deuinctus membra sopore
2 hic situs est caelo mens pia perfruitur
...
9 te coluit proprium prouincia cuncta parentem
optabant uitam publica uota tuam
excepere 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 coniunx magni solacia luctus
20 hunc tumuli titulum maesta Serena dicat
...

255 *La Croisille-sur-Briance*: *AE* 1990, 717 (Villa de Liégeaud. Peintures représentant des gladiateurs et des scènes de *uenatio* sur les murs d’une galerie, accompagnés d’une inscription. Le texte, difficile à lire, se développait sur deux lignes. Milieu du II^e s. p. C.).

(a) [---]AN[.]R spectac[ulum --- / ---] signo dato [---] (b) [---] uocati sunt VI[---] (c) [---] populi [---] (d) [---]OT[---] Romulus [---].

Gallia Narbonensis

- 256** **Allobroges** (vicus Aquensis): *AE* 1934, 165 (Le texte daterait de l'époque de Marc-Aurèle).
[Decemlecti² pos/se]sso[r]um Aq[uen]/sium donauer(unt) /³ lucum cum sua ui/nea uicanis
A/quens(ib.) ad ludos /⁶ celebrand(os) pro / salute Imp. Aug. / Zmertuccius Ti/⁹tianus, p(atronus²) u(ici²), aram
/ d(e) s(uo) d(at).
- 257** **Apta**: *C* XII 1121 + p.823; *ILN* IV 24. Known from a MS. L.3: *im]pensa s(ua), ludos publi[ce* —
?
——² / [— f]lam(en) Romae et diui Aug(usti) S VFF / porti²]cus et arcum cum ostiis et clu[suris
— /³ — im]pensas ludos publi[cos² —] / ——²
- 258** **Aquae Sextiae**: *C* XII 522 + p.814; *ILN* 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, *ILN* ad nos. 29 and 216, does not rule out.
Sex. Iulio Se[x. f.] / Vol. Verino, [fla]/³mini, aedili m[u]nerario, pat[ri] / trium decur[io]/⁶num,
cum fil[is] / uiu(u)s sibi feci[t].
- 259** **Arausio**: *C* XII 1236 + p.824. LL.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 — balneum²] / et oleum prim[us —], /³ flamen Rom(ae) et d[iui Aug(us-
ti) —]; / huic d. d. sta[tua—] / ——²
- 260** **Arelate**: *C* XII 697 + p.818 (Litterae videntur esse saeculi primi vel secundi incipientis); *ILGN*
109; *AE* 1965, 270 (Dédicace gravé[e] deux fois sur le podium [de l'amphithéâtre]).
C. Iunius Priscus, II u[ir] quinquen[alis] cand(idatus) Arelate[nsium], item flam[en Augusta]lis,
[postq(uam)] podi[u]m cum [ia]nuis /² [—] et signum Nept[uni a]rgenteu[m rei pu]blica[e] pollicit[us erat] HS
CC (m.) d[e suo adie]c[tis IV ae]nea s[igna] fac[i]en[da cu]rauit, /³ [du]orum dierum [operas sc]en[i]cas, [uena-
ti]onem edid[it, decur(ionib.)²] epulum in XIII [tricl]in(iis), XXXIII [biclin. f]lorens[ibus it(em) corpo]r(ib.) it.
IIIIII [uir(is) Aug(ustalib.)] epulum secun[dum discipli]nam mores[que] dedit.
- 261** **Arelate**: *C* XII 670 (Tabula marmorea) + p.817 + *ILGN* p.33; Ch. Landes in *ID.* ed. 1994 pp.268–
69, 293 no.93. L.12: [— ludi], 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, /³ [X uir stlit(ib.)] iud(icandis), trib(unus) mil(itum) / [leg(ionis)
—, seui]r eq(uitum) Rom(anorum) turm(ae) / [—, q(uaestor), trib. p]leb(is), praet(or), proco(n)s(ul) /⁶
[prou(inciae) —, leg(atus) pr(o)] pr(aetore) prou. Africae, / [— statua²]s sibi et T. Annio / [— f. e]x arg(enti)
libris m. ded(it) /⁹ [—] quar(um) manupret(ium) / [rei p.² dona]uit item HS CC (m.) n. / [ex quor(um) usur]is
omnibus annis /¹² [certamen] athletar(um) aut circen[ses ederen]tur. / [Idem ad me]moriae aeternitat(em) /¹⁵
[monumentum] ex(s)truxit.
- 262** **Arelate**: *C* XII 701 (Cippus, litteris saeculi secundi).

[D.] d. / [- P]recilio M. f. /³ [Tere]t. Pompeiano, / [ex qui]nque decuriis, / [II uir(o)] munerar(io), fl(amini), pontif(ici), /⁶ [decurio]ni. Arelatenses / [muni]cipes optime de / [se me]rito patrono. /⁹ [Hic² s]tatuae honor[e / conte]n[t]us impendium / [rei] p. remisit.

263 Dea Vocontiorum: C XII 1529 + p.826.

Dis Manib. / Q. Caetrone Q. fil. /³ Volt. Titulli, ueter(ani) / coh(ortis) VI pr(aetoriae), loco II uiri pontif(ici) col(oniae) Aug. Arim(ini), praef(ecti) /⁶ pagi Epoti, flam(inis) Aug(usti) et / muner(is) publici curat(oris) / ad Deam Aug. Voc(ontiorum); /⁹ heredes, ex test(amento).

264 Dea Vocontiorum: C XII 1585 ("Lettres grandes et bien proportionnées" Dupérier); ILS 6992. 2nd/3rd c.

Sex. Vencio / Iuuentiano /³ flamine diui Aug(usti), / item flamine et cura/tori muneris gladi⁶atori Villiani, adlec/to in curiam Lugudu/nensium nomine /⁹ incolatus a splen/didissimo ordine / eorum, /¹² ordo Vocontior(um) / ex consensu et pos/tulatione populi /¹⁵ ob praecipuam / eius in edendis / spectaculis li/¹⁸bera-litatem.

265 Narbo: AE 1908, 185; ILGN 578 (Table de marbre. Lettres de bonne forme). 2nd c.?

(a) [---]VRA DIO[--- / --- mune]re gladiato[rio --- /³ --- prae]dicati mercatus [--- / --- Fadium Syn- tro]phum quot ipse per aeta[tem --- / ---]imum cum Fadio Syntroph[o --- /⁶ --- circenses²]XXX missus per magistr[os --- / ---] fieri posset altero quoq[ue anno² --- / --- e]a pecunia in alium usum [conuertatur --- /⁹ ---] ordine quod si omissa ess[et --- / --- ii]sdem conditionibus ac c[--- / ---] sis inpedenta ea cessasse tu[---] / ---²
(b) ----- / [seuiris Au]gustalib. / [---] eis HS XXXIII (m.) /³ [Syntr]opho patre [--- / ---]ris dies nat[alis / ---]cum ce[--- /⁶ ---]OPI[---] / -----²

266 Nemausus: AE 1982, 680 (Base en calcaire. Entre le règne de Marc Aurèle et la fin du II^e s.).

Attiae L. fil. Pa/terclae, flami/³nicae perpet(uae) gra/tuitae decret(o) or/dinis [.].a[.].t(---), ob libera/⁶litates [p]atri[s] eius qui / praeter c[e]tera CCC (m.) HS / rei pub. II[II] uirorum /⁹ reliquit ad ludos se/uiral(es) in perpet(uum) celebr/andos. Daphnion, /¹² lib(ertus). L. d. d. d.

267 Nemausus: AE 1982, 681 (Base en calcaire. Seconde moitié du II^e s.).

Ordo sanctissim(us), / Q. Auilio Q. f. Sennio /³ Palatina Comini/ano, in honorem pa/tris eius Q. Auili Hyacin/⁶thi quod is, praeter libera/litates spectaculorum quae / sponte ededit¹ uel postulata /⁹ non negauit, uelis nouis sum/ptu suo in theatro positus cum / suis armamentis, saepe pecunia /¹² mutua quae a magistratibus / petebatur data actum publicum / iuuerit.

268 Nemausus: C XII 3185. 2nd/3rd c.

-----² / [---]+ trib(uno) co[h(ortis) --- / ---] praep[osit(o)] equit(um) Panno[niorum --- /³ ordo splen]didissim(us), ob edit[ionem muneris², / ex] postulatione po[puli --- / ---]O posui[t].

- 269** Nemausus: *C XII 3324* (Haud longe ab amphitheatro rep.).
Muner(e) C. Pomp(eii) Mart(ialis)?, / 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 I^{er} ou II^e siècle).
----- / [--- utri]/usque sex[us --- colleg(ium)] / utric[ulariorum] /³ ob liberali[tatem ---] / statua-
r(um) im[pensam remisit?] / ADGNITON[---] /⁶ DEDECERVN[---] / et oleum p[lebei utriusque] / sexus II
P[---] /⁹ specta[cul---].
- 271** Vienna: *C XII 1917* (Tabula litteris non bonis).
D. M. / Tib. Iulius /³ Diadochus, / dendropho/rus /⁶ munificus [---] / -----

Tarraconensis

- 272** **Aquae Flaviae:** *C II 2473; CIDER 75 + p.255* (Ara de granito. «As letras são elegantes» Leite).
Ermaeei De/uori, ob eu/³entum bo/num gladi/atori m[u]n/⁶eris, / L. Cexaec/us Fuscus /⁹s X ex /
uoto.
- 273** **Barcino:** *C II 4514* (Litteris elegantibus); *ILS 6957; CIDER 14 + p.255* (Inscripción de piedra caliza). L.19: *publi[c(as)]?* Some time before A.D. 169.
L. Caecilius L. f. / Pap. Optatus, /³ (centurio) leg(ionis) VII G(eminae) Fel(icis) / et (centurio) leg.
XV Apollin(aris), / missus honesta /⁶ missione ab Imp. M. / Aur. Antonino et Aur. / Vero Aug., atlectus¹ a
Bar[c(inonensib.)] /⁹ inter immunes, consecut(us) / in honores aedilicios, / II uir III, flam(en) Romae /¹² diuo-
rum et Augustorum / qui r(ei) p. Barc(inonensium) ita leg(auit): “Do, lego / darique uolo ✕ VII (m.) D, ex /¹⁵
quorum usuris semissibus / edi uolo quodannis spectac(ulum) / pugilum die IIII iduum Iuni. /¹⁸ usque at ✕ CCL,
et eadem die / ex ✕ CC oleum in thermas publi[c(e?)] / populo praeberi. Haec ita praes/²¹tari ea condicione
uolo, ut / liberti mei item libertorum meorum / libertarumque liberti quos /²⁴ honor / seuiratus contige/²⁷rit, ab
omnibus mu/neribus seuiratus ex/cusati sint. Quot si quis /³⁰ eorum at munera / uocitus¹ fuerit, / tum ea ✕ VII
(m.) D at /³³ rem pub. Tarrac(onensis) / transferri iubeo / sub eadem forma /³⁶ spectaculorum quot / s(upra)
s(criptum) est edendorum / Tarracone.” /²⁵ L. d. d. d.
- 274** **Carthago Noua:** *C II 3408; C I² 2269 + pp.1103–4; ILL 117* (LL.1–2: quattuoruirii?); *CIDER 43*
(La alusión al *Genius 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. Taurus L. f., Ser. Aefolan(us) [- f.], /³ Genio opidi¹
columnnam, / pompam ludosq. / coirauerunt.
- 275** **Castulo:** *C II 3269 + p.1167* (Fragmenta sunt epistylli alicuius, 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.
[Ti. Clau]dius Caesar Aug. Germanicus, p. p., [et? / P. Cor]nelius P. f. Gal. Taurus et Valeria P. f.

Verecunda [uxor d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecerunt). /³ P. Cor]nelius P. f. Gal. Taurus, f(ilius), ludis impensa 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 aedificandum /⁶ dedit, uiam quae per Castul(onensis) / saltum Sisaponem ducit / adsiduis imbribus corrup/⁹tam muniuit, signa Vene/ris Genitricis¹ et Cupidi/nis 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.
[Im]p. Caes. T. Aelio / [Ha]driano Antonino /³ [Au]g. Pio p. p., pont. max., tri/[bu]nicipiae potest. XVIII, / cos. IIII. /⁶ [-] Licinius Abascantio / [in re publica] Castulonensi(um) VI uiratu functus ex indul/[gen]tia splendidissimi ordinis quos [is] gerendos in hono/⁹res d[iuoru]m et d[iuinae] [d]om[us] cen[sue]rat edi[tis] in amp[h]iteatro¹ gladi/[atoribu]s bis spectaculorum die[b. tot], item in theatro / [ludis cum] acroam[a]tibus frequenter editis, statu[am] /¹² Imp. Ant[onini] Aug. p. p. optimi maximique prin/[cipis, ac]cepto loco a re publica Castulonensium / [ob hon]orem VI uiratus [d(ono)] d(edit).

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(neliae) / Marullinae matris / eius, quod ciuitatem /⁶ Castulonensium sta/tuis argenteis et epulo et circensib. decoras/⁹set, statuam ei et filio su/o posituram se decre/uerat. Cor(nelia) Marulli/¹²[n]a honore accepto / d[e] pec(unia) sua poni iussit. / Hoc donum illius /¹⁵ C. Cor(nelius) Bellicus heres / d(edit) d(edicauit) / edi[tis] circensib.

279 Castulo: *C* II 3265; *CIDER* 47 (Base de una estatua a Pietas Augusta); *CILA* III 80. 2nd c.
Pietati Aug. / Quod Cor(nelia) C. f. Mar[ullina] /³ ara]m posituram se o[r]dini / Castulonensiu[m] / pr[omiserat] in m[emori]a]m L. Cor(nelii) Maru[lli] filii / C. Cor(nelius) [Bellicus, heres eius, / e]x arg(enti) libris [---] /⁹ editis circensibus / [(i]bens)] an(imo) loco d[ato] d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) curauit[?].

280 Ebusus: *C* II 3664; *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. Ebusi[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) nat'a(li) eius V / -----

281 Oretum: *C* II 3221 = 6339; *ILS* 5901; *CIDER* 44 (Acaso del s. II por la fórmula de los rs. 8–10).
P. Baebius Ve/nustus, P. Bae/³bi Veneti f., P. B/aebi Baesisce/ris nepos, Or/⁶etanus, peten/te ordine et po/pulo in hon/⁹orem domus / diuinae 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: *ded]ic.* or *pub]lic.*, 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.

----- / [--- ded²]ic(---) / [--- circe]nse]s /³ [--- ex HS ---] M CCL / -----

283 **Tagilis:** *AE* 1979, 352 (Plaque de marbre blanc. Fin du I^{er} ou début du II^e s.).

Voconia Q. f. Auita / thermas rei publicae /³ suae Tagilitanae s(olo) s(uo), s(ua) p(ecunia) f(ecit) / easdemque circensibus / edi^cis e^c epulo dato dedicauit /⁶ at quot opus tuendum usumq. / perpetuum [t]hermarum praebandum / r(ei) p. Tagilitanae d(enariorum) duo milia q(uingentos) dedi(t).

284 **Toletum:** *AE* 1986, 428 (Bloc calcaire).

-----² / [---]us ob / [hon]or(em) IIIIII uir(atus) /³ 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. / Annis Primitiuus, / ob honorem /⁵ IIIIII uir(atus) sui, / edito barcarum / certamine et / pugilum, sportulis / etiam ciuibus /¹⁰ 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.

----- / [---] circen[s---].

Baetica

287 **Arunda:** *C* II 1360; *CIDER* 37 (Hübner recoge dos lecturas diferentes. Poco o nada puede inferirse del texto, muy estropeado).

Liciniano Iunio [---] L. Cor[---] Anob[---] Mealia L. Iuni Liciniani pater [---]us amico [---] MIR[---] statuam [---] loco a s[plendi]dissi(mo) ordine Arundensi[um dato, editis] circens[ib]us, d(---) d(---).

288 **Asido:** *C* II 1305; *CIDER* 85 (Encontrada en Jerez de la Frontera. Perdida. Hübner cree que procede de Asido. Probablemente del siglo II mediado). L.7: *PIR*.

L. Fabio L. f. Gal. Cordo, / IIII uiro, /³ populus m(unicipii) C(aesarini²) ob XX paria / gladiatorum data pro / salute et uictoria Caesarum, /⁶ locus et inscriptio d. d. p'e'r tabellam data.

289 **Astigi:** *C* II 1479; *CIDER* 32; *C* II² 5, 1179 (Basis marmorea. Perit. Saec. II prioris).

D. d. / P. Numerio Martiali, /³ Astigitano, / IIIIII uiro co[l(onorum)] col(oniae) Aug. / [Firmae --- /⁶ P.] Num[erius Eupa²]tor / [---] / patrono optimo et /⁹ indulgentissimo / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) / et editis circiensib. dedicauit.

- 290** Astigi: *C II 1471; CIDER 31; C II² 5, 1162* (Basis marmorea statuae argenteae. Saec. II prioris).
Bon(i) Euentus. / Aponia Montana, sacerd(os) diuar(um) Augustar. col(oniae) Aug. Fir(mae), /³
editis ob honorem sacerd(otii) circiensibus et / ob dedicationem aliis, 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.
Imp. Caesari / M. Aurelio [A]nto[n]ino Aug., [p.] m., /³ Armeniaco P[ar]thico Maximo / Medico,
tribuniciae pot. XX, imp. V, / cos. III, p. p., diui Antonini fil., [diui] /⁶ Hadriani nepoti, diui Traiani P[ar]th. /
pro[nepo]ti, diui Ner[uae] a[bne]p[oti], / conser[ua]tori generis hu[mani], /⁹ ob honorem pontifica[tus] / M.
Sergii Materni mariti, / Annia Q. fil. Seuera /¹² epulo diuiso, editis circe(n)sibus / posuit / et d(edicauit).
- 292** Canana: *C II 1074; ILS 5544. L.2: CANAM*. Flavian or later.
L. Attius Quir. Vetto, flamen, / II uir m(unicipum) m(unicipii) Flau(i) Cana'n'(itanum), /³ suo et L.
Atti Vindicis f(ilio) et / Attiae Autumninae f(iliae) et / Antoniae Proculae neptis nomine, /⁶ porticus lapideas
marmoratas solo / suo ludis sc[a]enicis impensa sua factis epulo / dato d(edicauit).
- 293** Carmo: *C II 1380 (L.3: an pontifex Augusti?); ILS 5080a; CIDER 84. 1st/2nd c.*
L. Iunio L. f. M. n. L. / pron. Gal. Rufo, /³ III[I] uir(o), pont(ifici), aug(uri), / quattuoruir(a)[l(i)] /
potest(ate) muneri[s] /⁶ edendi causa, / equites Roman[i] / aere conlato /⁹ p(osuerunt).
- 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 Cartimitan[o], / porticus public.
uetustate corruptas refecit, solum / balinei dedit, uectigalia publica uindicauit, signum /⁵ aereum Martis in foro
posuit, porticus ad balineum / solo suo cum piscina et signo Cupidinis, epulo dato / et spectaculis editis, d(e)
p(ecunia) s(ua) d(edit) d(edicauit), statuas sibi et C. Fabio / Iuniano f(ilio) suo ab ordine Cartimitanorum decre-
tas / remissa impensa, item statuam C. Fabio Fabiano uiro suo / d. p. s. f(actam) d(edicauit).
- 295** Corduba: *C II 5523; ILS 5079; CIDER 41 + 87; C II² 7, 221* (Mensula marmorea, duobus orificiis
ad statuam infigendam instructa. Litterarum formae sunt aetatis Severorum).
Colonia Patric(ia). / L. Iunius P. f. Serg. Paulinus, pontif(ex), flamen perpet., II uir c(olonorum)
c(oniae) P(atriciae), flam(en) prouinc(iae) /³ Baet(icae), edito ob honorem flaminatus munere gladiatorio et
duabus lusionib., / statuas quas ob honores coniunctos promiserat, ex HS CCCC (m.) posuit et factis circien-
s(ib.) ded(icauit).
- 296** Iliturgi: *C II 2100 + p.885; ILS 3395; CIDER 35; CILA III 224; C II² 7, 28–29.*
Sacrum / Polluci. /³ Sex. Quintius / Sex. Q(uintii) Succes/sini lib. Fortu/⁶natus ob hono/rem VI
uir(atus) ex d(ecreto) / ordinis soluta pe/⁹ccunia petente po/pulo donum de / sua pecunia, /¹² dato epulo ci/uibis
et incolis et / circensibus factis, /¹⁵ d(edit) d(onauit).

- 297** **Illipula:** *C II 954 + p.834; CIDER 30 (Ara?); CILA I 73.* Flavian or later.
Mineruae / sacrum. /³ M. Cur[iatius]² Q[uir]. Longinus / Al[---]ensis, decurio / Illipu[lensis
---]BONO[---] /⁶ editis [per] bidu[um] circiensibus / [---]CVR[---] M[---] / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(onum) d(edit).
- 298** **Isturgi:** *C II 2121 + p.885; CILA III 265 (a mediados del s. II); C II² 7, 56 (Ex litteris aetati Antoninianae tribuit Hübner).*
Signum Mart(is) Au[g.], / A. Terentius A. f. Gal. Rusticus, / aed(ilis), II uir, pont(ife)x m(unicipium) m(unicipii) Triumph(alis), / ludis scaenicis factis / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) [d(edit)].
- 299** **Italica:** *C II 1108 (Basis marmorea. Litterae sunt temporis Traiani).*
Libero Patri sacr(um). / L. Caelius Saturninus, /³ L. Caeli Parthenopaei / lib., ob honorem IIIII
<uir(atus)> / editis ludis scaenicis /⁶ d(ono) d(edit).
- 300** **Lucurgentum:** *AE 1953, 21; CIDER 10 (Pedestal de mármol). L.14: TANI; L.15: s(ua) p(ecunia) vel s(olo) p(ublico); d(ono) d(edit) vel d(ecr.) d(ec.). mid 2nd/mid 3rd c.?*
M. Heluius Anthus, Lucurg(entinus), / IIIII uir Aug(ustalis), edito spec/³taculo per quadridu[um]
ludorum scaeni/corum et dato gym/⁶nasio per eosdem / dies, item mulie/ribus balineum¹ gra/⁹tis; huic ordo
splen/didissimus Lucurgentin/orum, petente populo, orna/¹²menta decurionatus decreuit; / Heluius Anthus ob
honorem / statuam T'ani patris cum /¹⁵ basi 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/⁶mae et / L. Ped(anius) Clarus e[t] / L.
Ped. Lupus f(ili) /⁹ matri piissim(ae) / posuerun[t], / editis circ(iensib.) /¹² dedicaueru[nt], / q(uo) l(oco)
a(cceperunt) a r(e) p.
- 302** **Osset:** *C II 1255. 2nd c.?*
----- / [--- / ---] / ludis s[ca]enicis [e]ditis [---] / dedit, donauit, dedic[auit].
- 303** **Ostippo:** *C II 1441; CIDER 38 + 86; C II² 5, 985 (Basis marmorea. Perit).*
----- / [---]M qui excoli ex HS [--- / ---]XII ep(ulo)² or[dini et²] plebi dato M[--- /³ ---]IPI
circen[sib.] edi(tis) dedit; An(n)ia / [---]lais uxor [---²] et heres eius / [---]NO [---]XX dedicauit /⁶ [---]DE
parium / [---]DO / [---stat²]uam /⁹ [---²] D D.
- 304** **Singili(a)² Barba:** *AE 1989, 420; HEp 1990, 469 (Pedestal de caliza blanca); AE 1992, 977; C II² 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 dierum priuatos
dedit; / item populum uniuersum in municipio /⁹ habitantem et incolas oleo et balineo / gratuito dato peruocauit;
/ item quo die ludos iu(u)enum in theatro /¹² dedit gymnasium et balinea uiris et / mulieribus gratuita praestitit. /
Huic ciues et incolae pr. k. Ianuarias /¹⁵ abeunti e II uiratu ob rem publicam / bene atministratam¹ consensu

omnium / in foro publice gratias egerunt et /¹⁸ hostias quas inmolarent item / statuam ex aere conlato dederunt / ordo decreto locum eligere /²¹ permisit / II uir(atu), A. Cornelio Palma Front^oniano II, / P. Caluisio Tullo cos.

305 Singili Barba: *HEp* 1995, 570; *C II* 5, 785 (Basis statuae (vix pedestris) ex lapide calcario roseo. Ex litterarum formis saec. II posterioris fere).

----- / [---] L. Clodio [--- / --- m(unicipii) li]beri S(ingiliensis) Barb(ensis) [--- /³ L. Clodius²]

Montanus +[--- / pontife]x perpetuus m(unicipum) m(unicipii) Sing(iliensis) [--- / editis ci]r[ci]ensibus *vacat* [---²] / -----²

306 Tucci: *C II* 1685; *ILS* 5623; *CIDER* 34; *CILA* III 446; *C II* 5, 93 (Parallepipedum marmoreum. Ex litterarum formis aetati Traiani tribuit Hübner).

M. Val(erius) M. f. Quir. Marc[ellus² aed(ilis)², II] uir munic(ipii) Aurgi(tani), *vacat* /² accepto loco a re public. horologium omni [impensa sua² editis] circensibus et ludis scaenicis [d. d.²].

307 Tucci: *C II* 1663 + p.703 (LL.11–12: Litteris minimis additi sunt post titulum absolutum); *ILS* 5080; *CIDER* 33; *CILA* III 420; *C II* 5, 69 (Ex litterarum formis aevo Antoniano tribuit Hübner).

Pietati Aug. / L. Lucretius Fuluianus, flamen /³ col(oniarum) immunium prouinciae / Baetic(ae), pontifex perpetuus / domus Aug., t(estamento) p(oni) i(ussit) ex arg(enti) p(ondo) *vacat* /⁶ ob honor(em) pontificatus; / Lucr(etia) L. f. Campana, flam(inica) perp. do/mus Aug., editis ad dedicationem /⁹ scaenicis ludis per quadriduum / et circensibus et epulo diuiso posuit. / –Huic dono Lucr. Campana amplius nomine suo coronam /¹² auream adiunxit– / D(onum) d(edit), d(edicauit).

308 Ulia: *C II* 1532 + p.703; *CIDER* 42; *C II* 5, 492 (Basis rotunda ex lapide calcario caesio). A.D. 212.

Imp. Caes. diui Septimi Seueri Pii Arabici / Adiabenici Parthici max. Britannici /³ max. filio, diui M. Antonini Pii Germanici / Sarmatici nepoti, diui Antonini Pii prone/poti, diui (H)adriani abnepoti, diui Traiani Par⁶thici et diui Neruae adnepoti / M. Aurelio Seuero Pio Aug. Parthico max. Brit. / max., pont. /⁹ max., trib. pot. {pot.} XVI, p. p., cos. III, / procos., consuli designato ob innumeras / glorias eius; splendidissimus ordo rei p. /¹² Vliensium statuam faciendam dedicandamque / editis circensibus censuit, dedicante M. Manio Corneliano / curatore ANNO ET AM+R Clodiano [---]TEPPRIA PRIMAM.

309 Urgauo: *C II* 2113 (Certo male descriptus est); *CIDER* 39; *CILA* III 566; *C II* 7, 89 (Saec. II videtur). *C II*² retained the generally accepted reading: *A. Cantilius, II uir / bis, editis ludis / -----*; the commentary gives an alternative interpretation which has been retained here – a Greek surname (Acanthus) being preferable to no surname at all; according to J.M. Serrano Delgado, *Status y promoción social de los libertos en Hispania Romana*, Seville 1988 p.102, about 3 to 4% of the decurions and magistrates from the Iberian Peninsula bear a Greco-Oriental surname.

[---] Acant^hus², II uir [---²] / [statuam² ---]is, editis lud[is scaenicis ---].

310 *Burguillos* (Conuentus Hispalensis): *EE* III 8; *C II* 5354; *CIDER* 36 (Puede fecharse en el s. II). L.4: *G.M.* Between LL.5–6: *caput Sileni*.

In hon(orem) dom(us) diuinae / G. Auf(idius) G. f. Gal. Vegetus, /³ II uir II, curat(or), balineu(m) / aedifi(cauit) et G. Auf. G. f. G'al'. / Auitus f., II uir desig(natus), /⁶ d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) d(edit) / et editis

circiens(ib.) [ded(icauit)].

Mauretania Caesariensis

311 **Auzia:** C VIII 9052 + p.1960; W-K 3. Soon after A.D. 235. LL.1–11, 14–16.

[L. Cass]io Restuto, ueterano, ex decurione et / [Clod]iae Luciosae (uxori) eius, Cassi Rogatus et Satur[ni]³nus parentibus be[ne]me[n]tibus, piiss]imis. L. Cassius Restutus ex dec(urione) uet(eranus) te[st]amen[to sic prae]cept[is] / [---] liberos quos a te Clodia Luciosa uxore mea suscep[i --- / ---] essem non haberem [---]atus [---] cogitans quae eius adfectionem /⁶ [---]VERE[---] uiuus decentem memoriam meam et / [Clodi]ae Luciosae uxoris meae benemerentis idem XXVI in memoriam patris uos posterosq. uestros decc(uriones) futuros / [solemnia quotannis facere uolo ad eas] res n[umer]abitis --- quae s[u]mm(ae) fenerantur n. XX menses quosque asses octonos qui efficiuntur n. /⁹ [---] ex hac [---]s meos item non. Aug. natalis mei edere per magg(istros) s(ui) c(uius)/q. ann(i) circuales ce[ler]²es missus sex ✕ CXXXV, [eadem d]ie ante hora(m) tertia(m) dabuntur sportulae{s} uniuersis / con[de]curionibus meis et [scri]bis duobus [---]B[---]denario I /¹⁴ ... item V iduum Ianuariarum natalis Clodiae L[uci]osae uxoris meae edentur per magg(istros) per omnes annos circu/¹⁵[e]nses ce[ler]²es missus VI ✕ CXXXV, eadem die ante horam tertiam ante basem statuarum tam meae quam uxoris meae dabun[tur] sportulae uniuersis condecursionibus meis et scribis duobu[s ---]denario I ...

312 **Saldae:** C VIII 8938 + p.1953; ILS 5078; W-K 2 (Nach 160/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

Aureliae Lai/di Aug. libertae. /³ M. Aurelius M. f. / Pal. Aurelianus / matri piissimae /⁶ loco ab ord(ine) concessio / dedit dedicauitq., / ob quam dedic(ationem) dec(urionib.) /⁹ et eq(uitib.) R(omanis) uictoriat(os) ter/nos sportulas dis/tribuit et ludos cir/¹²censes populo / exhibuit.

313 **Sitifis:** C VIII 8438 + p.1919; ILS 6873; W-K 1 (Altar?). Nerva or later.

Marti / deo Aug. /³ Gen(io) col(oniae) / ex testamento / P. Herenni Ma⁶mertini. / P. Arrius Ianu- / arius Mamer⁹tinus, heres, / posuit et ob de/dicationem lu/¹²dos scaenicos / edidit et / sportulas de/¹⁵curionib. 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. /³ C. Iulius Victor / aed(ilis), praef(ectus) pr(o) III uir(is) / signum Victo- riae, /⁶ quod nomine Iulio/rum Tertulli, Mar/tialis, Quadrati, Iuli⁹ani, Victoris, Hono/ratae filior(um) suor(um) / promiserat, sua pec(unia) fec(it) /¹² idemque dedicauit / et dedicationem / diem ludorum celebrauit.

315 **Castellum Celtianum:** ILS II 2106; W-K 3 (Bauinschrift). 2nd/3rd c.

----- / [---]x HS II (m.) n. facturum se promiserat s(ua) p(ecunia) ex HS V (m.) a solo ex(s)tr[ui]xit --- / ---] sui exornauit idemq. dedicauit super diem ludorum quo A[---].

316 Circa: *C VIII 6948 + p.1847; ILS 6858; ILAG 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 Circa: *C VIII 6995 + p.965; ILS 411; ILAG II 560* (Base); W-K 6. A.D. 193 or soon after.

Diuo Pertinaci / Aug. patri. /³ L. Scantius L. fil. Quir. / Iulianus, eq(uo) pub. / exornatus, statuam /⁶ quam promisit / ex redditibus lo/corum amphe/⁹atri¹ diei muneris, / quem de libera/litate sua ob ho/¹²norem III uira/tus edidit, dedit.

318 Circa: *C VIII 6994 + p.1847; ILAG II 559* (Base). A.D. 197/198.

Diuo Comm[odo / d]iui M. Anton[ini Pii] /³ Germanici S[armatici] / filio, fr[atri] / Imperatori[s Caesaris L. Sep]/⁶timi Seueri [Pii Pertinacis] / Aug. Arabici [Adiabeni Parthici] / propagato[r]is imperi], /⁹ pontif. max., [trib. pot. VI], / imp. X, cos. II, p. p., [procos., patruo] / M. Aureli Ant[onini Caesaris] /¹² Imp. destinati. [-] Marcius / Verus statuam quam in / aedilitate sua pollicitus /¹⁵ est cum editione ludor(um), L. Iulius Martialis / nepos et /¹⁸ M. Sempronius Rusticinus / heredes posuerunt. / L. d. d. d.

319 Circa: *C VIII 6944 + p.1847; ILAG II 473* (Base de marbre; détruite); W-K 10. A.D. 202/203.

[Fortu]nae reduci / Aug. sacrum /³ pro salute et felicissimo reditu / Imp. Caesaris L. Septimi Seueri Pii Pertina/cis Augusti Arabici Adiabeni /⁶ Parthici maximi, fortissimi feli/cissimique pr(incipis) et Imp. Caesaris / M. Aureli Antonini Pii Felicis /⁹ Augusti [[et L. Septimi Getae / nobilissimi Caesaris pii]]ssi-m(orum) / fil[[iorum Aug. n(ostri)]] et Iuliae Augus/¹²te matris Augusti [[et Caes.]] et cas/trorum totiusque domus diuina[e] / eorum. C. Sittius Q. filii. Quirina /¹⁵ Flavianus aedilis, III uir, praefec/tus coloniarum ob hono/rem III uiratus dedit dedicauitque /¹⁸ representatis etiam suo quoque / tempore utriusque honoris r(ei) p. ho/noraris summis HS uicenum mill/²¹ium nummum et ob dedicationem / tanti numinis ludos quoque scae/nicos populo aedidit¹. /²⁴ D. d. s(ua) p(ecunia) p(osuit).

320 Circa: *C VIII 7000 + 19418; ILAG II 569; W-K 11. A.D. 211.*

[Pro salute] / Imp. Caes. M. Aureli A[n]tonini Pi[i Felicis] /³ Aug. Parthici maximi Britannici [maximi] / pontif. maximi, p. p., fortis[simi principis et] / Imp. [C[ae]s. P. Septimi Getae Pii Aug. Britannici /⁶ fortissimi principis]], diui Seueri Pii Felicis Aug. filiorum. / M. Seius Gn. fil. Quir. Maximus equo publico ex/ornatus, ob honorem III uiratus [s]tatuam cum /⁹ tetrastylo et ludis scaenicis cum missilibus quos / in honore cum dedicaret edidit praeter HS XX (m.) n. quae / ob honorem III uiratus rei p. intulit dedit [d]edicauitq[ue]. /¹² L. d. d. d.

321 Circa: *A: C VIII 6996 + p.1847; ILAG 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;*

ILAlg II 675 (see also *C VIII* 7094, 7096–7098 + 19434–6 + p.965; *ILAlg* II 674, 676); W-K 12. A.D. 212/217.

A ... /¹⁶ 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(ilitatis) r(ei) p. intulit et /¹⁸ [statuam Securitatis saeculi quam ob] hon(orem) aed. pol(licitus est) posuit e[t] ludos cum missil(ib.) et acro/[amatib. --- 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(uennalitis) rei p. intulit et statuam aeream Securi⁶tatis saeculi et aediculam tetrastylam / cum statua aerea Indulgentiae do(mini) nostri quas in honore aedi⁹litis et III uiratus posuit et ludos scae(nicos) diebus septem quos cum missi/lib. per IIII colonias edidit, arcum tri¹²umphalem cum statua aerea Virtutis domini n. / Antonini Aug., quem ob honorem quinquen(nalitis) pollicitus est, eodem anno sua /¹⁵ pecunia ex(s)truxit.

322 Circa: *C VIII* 6947 + p.1847; *ILAlg* II 478 (base); W-K 13 (Ende 2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

Genio populi / [[--- /³ ---]imi]. / C. Pontius T. fili(us) Quir. Satur⁶ninus statuam / quam ob honorem / aedilitatis promi⁹[s]it sua pecunia posuit / [a]d cuius dedicatio[n]em ludos etiam scae¹²[n]icos cum missilibus / [e]didit. L. d. d. d.

323 Circa: *C VIII* 7123 + p.1848; *ILAlg* II 696 (Trois fragments d'un entablement); W-K 15 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

----- / Q. f. Quir. All[---]++ +us² Fa[---]nus, eq(uo) pub. / [exor]natus, aed(ilis), pon(tif(ex)), mag(ister) pont(ificum) II, [III] uir, praef(ectus) / [iu]ri d(icundo) coloniar(um) Ru[s]jic(adensis) et Chul(itanae) q.q., [s]tatus / [Sat]yrorum duas quas ob hono[rem] qui[n]q(uennalitis) pollici⁵[tus] est addito die ludorum scenico[rum] cum missili/[bu]s pecunia dedit idemque de[dica]uit.

324 Circa: *C VIII* 19489; *ILAlg* II 529; W-K 17 (2./1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

[Te]lluri Aug. / [Iul]ius P. Iuli Vrbanus /³ [fil.] Quir. Vrbanus, eq(uo) p. / [o]ma(tus), quaest(or), aed(ilis) IIII / [co]l(oniarum), praef(ectus) pro III uir(is), ob /⁶ [ho]norem aedilitatis praet(er) / [HS XX]X (m.) n. decurionat(us) rei p. in/[lat]a cum tetrastylu de⁹dit idemque dedic(auit) / [et ob] dedic(ationem) lud(os) scaen(icos) cu[m] / miss]ilibus edidit. L. d. d. [d.].

325 Circa: *C VIII* 6958 + p.1847; *ILAlg* II 501 (base); W-K 20 (2./Mitte 3. Jh.).

[--- Pal]ladi sacrum. / [--- Qua]dratus Baebianus /³ [--- f. V]index, aedil(is), quaest(or), III uir, / [praef(ectus) i. d. col(oniarum)] Rusicadensis Chullitanae, / [III uir q.q. praete]r diem ludorum Floraliu[m] /⁶ [--- qu]os III uir(atu) sua pecunia fecit / [--- et] quod quinquennal[is] publicum / [--- i²]tem tumultu Gaetulorum /⁹ [---]li fratris sui, centuri[o]nis et --- fr[at]ris sui eiusdem uoluntat[e] / [---] rei publicae inlat[is] h[on]o[re] /¹²or(ariis) summis --- cum ad opus] nouum HS C mil. [n. pro]mis[s]et / cum simula]cro sua pecunia feci[t].

326 Circa: *C VIII* 7121 + p.1848; *ILAlg* II 689 (Copie); W-K 21 (2./3. Jh.).

+++ +++++ / Iunior, eq(ues) R(omanus), aed(ilis), III uir, nomine²] /³ Septimiani fil(ii) tr[ibunal]²

quod ob hono]rem aedilitatis [---] / pollicitus cum IE[--- mense²] /⁶ duodecimo int[ra annum² ---] / honoris editis [ludis scaeni]/cis et praeterea [HS --- m. n. ob honorem III uira²]/⁹tus rei p. inlatis sua p[ecunia posuit]. / L. d. [d. d.].

327 Circa: *C VIII 19513; ILAG II 688* (Copie d'auteur inconnu); W-K 22 (2./3. Jh.). LL.0-1: perhaps [--- - fil. ---]iula, Verania L. [fil. ---].

----- / Iula Verania¹ L. [fil. --- ob] / amorem eorum A[--- remissa colla]/³tione posuit ad cui[us dedicatio]/nem ciuibus suis spo[rtulas asses²] / octonos et condecu[rionibus eorum] /⁶ denarios ternos ded[it, ludos quoque²] / scaenicos edi[dit]. D. [d.].

328 Circa: *C VIII 7122 + p.1848; ILAG II 697* (Pierre); W-K 23 (2./3. Jh.).

[---]anua, eques Rom[anus --- / --- ob hon]orem aedilitatis [--- /³ ---] praeterea rei publ[icae --- / ---]ludos scaenicos cum m[issilibus edidit].

329 Circa: *ILAG II 709; W-K 26* (Wohl Bauinschrift). 2nd/3rd c.

----- / [ob dedi]cationem ludo[s scaenicos² --- / ---] edid[er]unt e[t] ob honor[em --- /³ --- ite²]m fl(a-
moni) p.p. genii pop[uli] [--- / ---] col[oniae] n[ost]rae C[i]rtae ad cu[ius --- / ---]um d[e]dicauit.

330 Cuicul: *C VIII 20152* (cf. *AE 1938, 38*); W-K 2. A.D. 146/147.

M. Aurelio / Caes., Imp. Caes. /³ T. Ael. Hadrian. / Antonini Aug. / Pii p. p. filio, trib. pot., /⁶ cos. II, ex testa/mento M. Pom/pei M. fil. Quir. Ve⁹teris Flauiani, / aug(uris), L. Pompeius / M. fil. Quir. Nouel- /¹²lus, aed(ilis), II uir, aug(ur), ma⁶g²(ister) / aug(urum) bis, frater, / adiecto podis/¹⁵mo posuit et lu/dis editis dedicauit.

331 Cuicul: *AE 1914, 45-46; W-K 5. A.D. 225.*

Gargiliae C. f. / Marcianae, ma³ritae rarissimae. / C. Aemilius C. f. Pap. / Martialis, ponti⁶fex, quaestor, et / Aemili Marcia/nus et Martialis /⁹ iunior, ordinis nos/tri uiri, equites R(omani) / cum Honorato /¹² fratre matri dignis/sim(a)e diuisis spor/tulis tam decuri/¹⁵onibus quam ciuib., / editis ludis scaenicis de suo posu[er]unt. / Dedicat[us] /¹⁸ kal. Se[pt.] / Fusco II et Dex/tro cos., s(upra) s(cripta) /²¹ nat(ale) / eius XV kal. Mai.

332 Cuicul: *C VIII 8324; ILS 5535. A.D. 367/375.*

Pro beatitudine principum maximorum / ddd. nnn. Valentiniani, Valentis adq. Gratiani perpetu(o-
rum) / semper Auggg. Fl(auius) Simplicius, u. c., consularis sexfascalis p(rouinciae) N(umidiae) / Constantinae, numini maiestatiq. eorum semper dicatus, basi/licam dedicauit; Rutilius uero Saturninus u. c. pro editione mu/neris debiti a solo faciendam exaedificandamq. curauit.

333 Rusicade: *C VIII 7969 + p.967 + 19851; ILS 399; ILAG II 17* (Plaque); W-K 3. A.D. 186/187.

Pro salute / Imp. Caes. M. Aureli /³ Commodi Antonini Aug. Pii Sarm. Ger. / Britt.¹ Fel., p. p., pont. max., tr. p. XII, imp. VII¹, / cos. V, munus gladiat(orium) et uenat(ionem) uari gen(eris) /⁶ dentatar(um)

ferar. et mansuet(ar.), item herbat(icar.), / M. Cosinius M. f. Quir. Celerinus / in col(onia) Vener(ia) Rusicade de sua pec(unia) /⁹ promisit, edidit.

334 Rusicade: a: C VIII 7990 + p.1879; *ILS* 6861; *ILAlg* II 42; W-K 10. b: C VIII 7991 + p.1879; *ILAlg* II 43; W-K 10 (2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

b Sex. Otacilius M. f. / Quir. Restitutus, /³ M. Otacili Fructi / pontificis frater, / III uir aedil(is) quaesto⁶riae potestat(is), augur, / super HS XX (m.) legit(ima) quae / ob honor(em) aedilitatis / r(ei) p. dedit et HS /⁹ VI (m.) ob / diem ludorum et HS / XXXIV (m.) inibi legitim(a) /¹² ob honorem augurat(us) / r(ei) p. intulit et at HS IIII (m.) / quae in uoluptat(es) pro¹⁵miser(at) adiection(e) a se / facta dextros duos / sua pecunia fecit de/¹⁸dicauitque d. d.

335 Rusicade: C VIII 7983 + 7984 + p.1879; *ILAlg* II 34; W-K 8 (2/3. Jh.).

C. Annii C. fil. Qu[ir. ---], / dec(urio) IIII col(oniarum), pont(ificus) [--- super] /³ HS XX (m.) n. quae ob honorem de[curionatus rei p. dedit et] / HS LV (m.) n. quae ob honorem pon[tificatus rei p. intulit] / et statuas aeneas duas Vic[toriae Augustae et For] /⁶tuna^e reducis quas ob [honorem decur(ionatus) et ob hono]rem pont(ificatus) pollic(itus) est i[n eodem anno² posuit et HS ---]II (m.) n. quae [ob honorem² — ad per]fectionem operis tea[tri¹ pollic. est] contul(it) itemq. HS XXX (m.) qu[ae ad opus] / ampitatri¹¹ po[llic. est dedi]t statuam Herculis c[um tetras] /¹⁰tylo ex HS XXXIII (m.) [n. — ex liber]alitate sua s(ua) p(ecunia) fec(it) idemq. d[edicauit] / ad cuius d[edicationem e]tiam ludos scaenicos cum m[issil(ib.) / edi]dit.

336 Rusicade: C VIII 7963 + p.967 + 19849; *ILS* 5473; *ILAlg* 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) IIII col(oniarum), fl(amen) 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 dedicauit, ad cuius dedicationem etiam ludos /¹² scaenicos cum missilibus edidit.

337 Rusicade: C VIII 7988; *ILS* 5648; *ILAlg* II 37 (Base en marbre); W-K 5. A.D. 225.

M. Fabius Fronto, / augur, p(raefectus) i. d., cum lu³dis scaenicis de/dit 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., / dedicauit / isdem cos. /¹⁵ pri. kal. April.

338 Rusicade: C VIII 7960 + p.967; *ILS* 5077; *ILAlg* II 5; W-K 7 (Ende 2/3. Jh.).

Genio coloniae / Veneriae Rusicadis /³ Aug(usto) sacr(um). / M. Aemilius Ballator / praeter HS X m. n. quae in /⁶ opus cultumue theatri / postulante populo de/dit statuas duas Geni⁹um patriae n(ostrae) et Anno/nae sacrae urbis sua / pecunia posuit, ad /¹² quarum dedicatio/nem diem ludorum / cum missilibus edidit. /¹⁵ L. d. d. d.

339 **Thagaste:** A: C VIII 5146 + p.1634; *ILAlg* I 876; W-K 2. B: C VIII 5147 + 5148 + p.1634; *ILAlg* I 877; W-K 2 (Etwa 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

A M. Amullio M. / fil. Pap. Optato /³ Crementiano, / eq(uiti) R(omano), singula/ris fidei boni/⁶tatis munifi/centiae uir[o], / ordo splendi/⁹dissimus Tha/gastensium / conlata cer/¹²tatim pecunia / in cuius dedica-tione / HS C mil. n. ad opus mu/¹⁵nificentiae suae patri/ae donauit et curiis / praeter epulas uini e[t] /¹⁸ ludum¹, ✕ quingenos[s].

B (a) M. Amulli[---] (b) [---]R <q>uod ob merit[a ---] (c) [--- aed]ificio etiam [---] (d) [--- po]tuisset pro specta[culo ---] (e-h) [--- por]ticum additis HS CC milibus nummum patriae suae ex HS CCC mil. n. [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/reli Anto-nini / [[et Publi Septimi Getae /⁹ Caesaris]] Augg[*[g.]*]. / et Iuliae Aug. / L. Licinius Optatia/¹²nus ob honorem / fl(amonii) p.p. statuas quas / ex HS XX m. n. cum /¹⁵ basib. praeter le/gitim(am) pollicitus / est, ampliata pec(unia) /¹⁸ ex HS XXXV m. n. / posuit easque / sportulis decuri(onib.) /²¹ datis et epul(o) curi/vis, et ludis scae/nicis editis, de/²⁴dicauit.

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]*]. et Iuliae / Augustae matri /⁹ Aug[*[g]*]. et castrorum. / L. Germeus Silua/nus 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 dedica-tionem / ludos scenicos / edidit.

342 **Thamugadi:** *AE* 1941, 49; W-K 5. Quadrangular limestone base. A.D. 198/211.

[V]ictoriae Victri/ci dominor. nos/³tror. sanctissimo/rum fortissimor(um)/que Imperatorum /⁶ L. Septimi Seueri Pii / Pertinacis et M. Au/reli Antonini Pii /⁹ Felicis [[et P. Septimi / Getae Caesaris princ(ipis) / iuuentutis²]] Augg[*[g]*]. /¹² et Iuliae Aug., matri / Aug[*[g]*]. et castrorum. / L. Iunius Vibianus /¹⁵ ob honorem au/guratus inlatis / r(ei) p. super legiti/¹⁸mam 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 scaenicis /²⁴ [e]ditis dedic(auit).

343 **Thamugadi:** *AE* 1941, 46; W-K 6. Large limestone base. A.D. 198/211.

Genio coloniae / Thamugadis. /³ M. Pompeius Pudentianus, / uet(eranus), fl(amen) p.p., ob ho-norem fla/moni inlata rei p. legitima /⁶ amplius statu<a>m Martis ad ar/cum Pantheum et hic in thea/tro statuas dd[*[d]*]. nn[*[n]*]. et /⁹ Iuliae Aug. ex HS XL mil. n. / promiserat ampliata pecu/nia HS X mil. n. ex HS L mil. n. po/suit et ob dedicationem / curiis epulum et gymnasi/um populo et ludos scae/¹⁵nicos dedit.

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(iilis), statuam / quam ob honorem / aed(ilitatis) suae praeter /¹² legitimam pol/llicitus est ex / HS XVI (m.) n.

posuit /¹⁵ ludis editis et / dedicauit.

345 Uzelis: *AE* 1917–18, 44; W-K 1. A.D. 222.

Herculi Inuicto sac(rum) / conseruatori domini n. /³ [[Imp. Caes. M. Aureli / Antonini Pii Felicis Aug.]] / M. Clodius L. f. Q(uir.) Fidus, mag(ister) /⁶ quaest(ura) func(tus), amator patriae, / statuum cum base quam die / III nonar. Ianuar. sua liberali/⁹tate pollicitus est inlatis / praeterea r(ei) p. honorariis / summis decurionatus et mag(istratus) /¹² et ob eius dedicationem edi/to die ludorum scaenico/rum sua pecun(ia) fecit idemq. /¹⁵ dedicauit. L. d. d. d. / Promissa III nonas / Ianuar., Grato [[et /¹⁸ Seleuco]] cos. / Dedicata [[Antonino / III et Alexandro cos.]].

Africa proconsularis

346 Althiburos: *C* VIII 27771; W-K 4 (2/3. Jh.).

C. Iulius Q. f. Felix / Aurunculeianus, aed(ilis), /³ ob honorem aedilitatis signum / Marsyae quod ex HS II (m.) CCCC n. cum / legitima sum(ma) taxauerat adiect(a) /⁶ amplius pec(unia) posuit et dedic(auit) / d. d. idemq. primus ludos dedit.

347 Ammaedara: *AE* 1927, 30; *ILTun* 460; W-K 2. A.D. 211.

[Iul]iae Do[mnae Aug. / m]atri c[astrorum] /³ Imp. Ca[es. L. Septimi [Seueri Pii / Pert. A]ug. Arabici A[diab. Parth. max. / ---]ius Fabianus [--- /⁶ ---] pr[ae]f[ectus] i. d. ex HS X [mil. n. --- / ---] honores sacros [--- / ---] q[ui]nq[ue]nnalis pollicitus [--- /⁹ ---] ampliata pecu[nia] --- / pos]uit idemque ded[icauit] / prae]ter HS X mil. n. legit(ima) [quae /¹² ad] ludos erogauit et pra[eter] / HS] V mil. n. quae ob honorem / [fl]am(oni) ad opus theatri rei pub[licae] /¹⁵ d(onum) d(edit).

348 Ammaedara: *ILTun* 461 (Théâtre. Linteau). A.D. 293/305.

[Florentissimo²] saeculo dddd. nnnn. [Dio][cletiani et Maximiani A]ugg. et Constanti et Maximia³[ni nobb. Caess. ---] cancelli per orchestra(m), ambitum et casam / [---] his die ludorum suorum propriis.

349 Ammaedara: *C* VIII 449; *AE* 1973, 622 (Varicus = Baricus. Vers le VI^e s.).

Fecit Va/ricos ludos.

350 Bulla Regia: *AE* 1962, 184; W-K 6 (Wohl 3. Jh.).

Q. Sili[c]io L. [fi]l. Qu[i]r. Victo/rino Corneliano Ho[no]rati³ratiano, fl(amini) p(erp.), Il uiral(i) aedil(icio); / uniuersus populus sin/ceris suffragiis suis et /⁶ ordo splendidissimus / grauissimo iudicio decer/nente Burrenio Felice c. u., /⁹ cur(atore) rei p. n(ostrae), praeter cetera / eius iuxta omnes merita ob / editionem lusionis primo / p(ecunia) p. p(osuerunt).

351 Capsa: *C* VIII 100 + 11228; W-K 3 (Th. Mommsen ... datiert die Inschrift 280).

[Pro salute d. n. Imp. Caes. M.] Aur. [[Probi]] Inuicti Aug. totiusq. domus diuinae e[ius] / ---

te]mplum co[e]mtis¹ spatia ampliata et a solo exaedificatu[m] /³ et marmoribus ornatu[m] cum sim[ula]cro aeneo et aereis ianuis Turius Verna[. / --- cur(ator)] rei p. Taca[pitanorum et Cap]sensium d(ono) d(edit) IIII non. Oct., Me[s⁵salla et Grato cos., dedicauit et] epulu[m] ciuibus² dedit et ludos per t]riduum ob dedicatio[nem edidit²].

352 Carthago: *AE* 1920, 29; *ILAFr* 384; BbA suppl. 25 (Plaque de marbre blanc); W-K 2. Not long after A.D. 114.

-----² / [--- sacerd(os) Cer]er(is) anni CLIIIX, aed(ilis), q(uaestor), praef(ectus) [i. d., / --- pr]aeter HS LXXXX m. quae ob honor(em) a[ed(ilitatis)] /³ promiserat --- ex]culturum se ob honor(es) flam(oni) et po[nt(ificatus) / --- e]t contignauit item marmorib[us / --- et] ob dedicat(ionem) dies quinq(ue) ludorum /⁶ [--- statu²]is ceteroq. cultu s(ua) p(ecunia) exornauit.

353 Carthago: *ILS* 9406; *ILAFr* 390 + *ILTun* 1050; W-K 3. A.D. 133/138.

Q. Voltedio L. [f. Arn.] / Optato Aurelian[o, fl(amini)] /³ diui Ner(uae), equo pub. adle[cto a diuo] / Traiano et in quinq(ue) dec(urias) ab [Imp.] / Caes. Hadriano Aug., trib(uno) mi[l(itum) leg(ionis)] /⁶ VI Victricis p(iae) f(idelis), aed(ili), praef(ecto) i. [d., mag(istro)] / Cer(eris) sacror(um) ann(i) CLXXVII, [II uir(o)], / II uir. quinq., qui ob honorem /⁹ cum HS CC mil. promississet inla[tis] / aerar(io) HS XXXVIII mil. leg(itimis) am[pliata] / pec(unia) spectaculum in amphitheatro] /¹² gladiatorum et Africanaru[m] / quadriduo dedit. D. d. p(ecunia) p.

354 Carthago: *AE* 1928, 24; *ILTun* 1066; *AE* 1977, 851 (Il 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(erba) f(ecit) de [statua /³ de publico ponenda] Aelio Maximo o(ptimo) u(iro) q(uid) d(e) [e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret) / d. e. r. i(ta) c(ensuerunt): Magnitu]dinis nostrae congruens [col(oniae) / Karthaginis] meritis uiros testimon[ium pro]bitatis esse] iam pridem Aelio Ma[ximo] statua / ponenda esset qui] honorem aedilitat[is] func[tus] erit insigni in]nocentia in anno [II uirat(us) /⁹ spectaculum etia]m gladiatoru[m] et Africanaru[m] /² / amplius summae legitim]ae cum [HS --- mil. n. / promississet ediderit propter quod statuam] /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.).

[---]N a solo omni sua impen[sa --- / ---] duas siluas cum statu[is ---] /³ --- di]eb. edid(it), tertiam quoq. portic[um --- / --- e]xaltatis duab. exhedris¹ omni [cultu --- / ---]BO[---]IVS ded(it), lud(os) in theat(ro) biduo de[d. /⁶ ---]i interposita, uenation(em) et gladiator(um) / [spectaculum ---] spect[a]c(ulum) A[fri]c[an]ar(um) et gladia[t(orum)] edid(it) [---].

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 l. 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, /³ aedilis et mune/ra¹ri(us) item duoui/ru et munera⁶rius, / agens uices curato/rum rei publicae, pius /⁹ uixit annis / XXXXXVI, / his¹ semper in pace.

358 Curubis: C VIII 24101 (= 12453) + ILTun 837; W-K 2 (2/3. Jh.).

[---]OSI/[--- a]ed(ili), II uir(o) I[I] /³ [singul²]is annis mune/rario ob simplicem / uitam amorem-que /⁶ largum erga ciues et / patriam ad remune/random gratiam edi⁹torum munerum patris / eius et fratris Curubi/tanus ordo expostulan/¹²te populo honorem sta/tuae decreuit.

359 Furnos Minus: C VIII 25808b; ILS 9403; W-K 2 (Bald nach 232).

L. Octauiio Felici Octa/uiano decurioni /³ col(oniae) Iul. Aur. Ant. Kart(haginis), / flamine diui Pii, magis/tro sacrorum Cerealiu⁶ anni CCLXXVI, professori / aedilitatis patrono et / curatori iterum municipi⁹pii Aureli Antoniniani Fur/nit(anorum) Minor(um) ob insignem / iustitiam et beneuolentiam /¹² eius uniuersus populus / ex aere conlato statuam / posuit ob cuius dedicatio/¹⁵nem ipse ludos scaenicos / et epulum populo dedit / et gymnasium. /¹⁸ L. d. d. d.

360 Furnos Minus: AE 1961, 53 (Cippe mouluré en haut et en bas. Début du III^e siècle).

[Ge]ntius Proculus Rogatia/nus F P L Genti Zebuciani /³ F P E M signum Marsyae ex / HS VII mil. [dedi]t ob cuius de/[di]cationem ludos scaeni⁶cos biduo dedit et epu/lum decurionibus et cu/riis omnibus dedit. L. d. d. d.

361 Giufi: C VIII 858; ILS 5073; W-K 8 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

Agenti. / Apollini Aug. sac(rum). /³ D. Fundanius Pap. Primianus, Fundani / Felicis aedilici fil., Fundani Primi fl(aminis) p.p. nepos, / aedilis, ob honorem aedilitatis quem ei ordo /⁶ suus suffragio decreuit hanc statuam imita/tus patris exemplum ex HS VIII millibus¹ n. sua li/beralitate numerata prius a se rei publicae /⁹ summa honoraria posuit eandemque dedica/uit et ob dedicationem simul cum Annio Memmi/ano collega suo ludos scaenicos et gymnasi/¹²um populo et aepulas¹ decurionib. dedit. L. d. d. d.

362 Giufi: C VIII 860; W-K 9 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

D[e]ae Liberae [Aug. sacr(um)]. / P. Titius Celsi [f. ---] /³ et [-] Seuerius [--- f.] / Verus aedil[e]s [sua liberalita]te fecerunt et ob dedicationem /⁶ ludos scaenicos [biduo² edi]/derunt gymn[asium] populo / epulum decurion[ibus] dederunt. /⁹ L. d. [d. d.].

363 Giufi: C VIII 867 + 12374; W-K 10 (Wohl 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

-----² / [---]II[--- / ---]IA[---]M[---]RITAI[---]ONI[---]PRI[---] / dedicauer[unt] et] ob dedicatio-nem /⁶ decurionibus [---]s epulum deder[unt] / et ludos scaenicos biduo exhibu[erunt]. / L. d. d. d.

- 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 ciuitatis suae
 Goritanae qui ex sua liberalitate rei publ. suae HS III mil. /⁶ n. inferenda repromisit ut ex eius / summae
 reditum¹ id est usurae ✕ LX / die XVI kal. Ian. natalis eius pugili⁹bus et gymnasio itemque decurio/nibus epulo
 suo quoque anno in perpetuum 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 Caestino [---] /³ decurion(i) <ciuitatis G>oritanae. / Maria [---]c[---] mater et
 Marius / [---] pater filio piissimo statuam /⁶ [pos(uerunt) o] 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(at)ionem]²] sua [---] / P[---] /¹⁵ ita AB[---] / L. d. d.] d.
- 366** Hadrumetum: *IL Afr 58; W-K 1* (2/3. Jh.). L.3: one would have expected *suus*; 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) suo¹ ludorum et /³ circensium
 spectacula exhiberit, / munus etiam gladiatorium de suo / ediderit et hoc amplius in praesentis¹ tempore HS XI
 (m.) rei publicae donauerit /⁶ ex cuius summae usuris quin(s)to qu[o/que an]no semper uni[uersis curiis uel
 ciuibus² ---].
- 367** Hippo Regius: *AE 1958, 140; W-K 5* (2/3. Jh.).
 (fr. I) ----- / [---]ESTAI[--- / ---]amplifica[--- / ---]sset et [--- / ---] pollicitati[on--- /⁵ ---]m munus
 [--- / ---] biduum [---] / ----- (fr. II) ----- / [---]e edidi[t --- / ---]am quattu[or --- / ---] uosq(ue²) on[--- / ---]am]-
 plius [--- /⁵ ---]IM[---] / ----- (fr. III) ----- / [---] quod / [---] numero / [---] prima die / [---] octonas /⁵ [---]dem /
 ----- (fr. IV) ----- / [---] eius et A[--- / ---] edi²]tioni P[--- / ---]e prop[ter² --- / ---]VITAT[---] / ----- (fr. V) -----
 / [---]RESCI[--- / ---]us edituru[--- / ---] edit²]ione quat[tuor --- / ---]+ biduum [---] / -----
- 368** Hippo Regius: **a:** *C VIII 5276 + 17454; ILLat I 95; W-K 3* (3. Jh.); **b:** *ILLat I 96*.
a L. Postumio Felici / Celerino a mil(it)is, flam(ini) / Aug(usti) p.p., pontifici, II uir(o) / ob magni-
 ficentiam /⁵ gladiatorii muneris / quod ciuibus suis tri/duo edidit quo omnes / priorum memorias / supergressus
 est ob/¹⁰que eius innocentiam / splendoremque et / in patriam suam in/comparabilem amorem / singulae curiae
 singulas /¹⁵ statuas de suo posuerunt / ut eximiam uoluntatem eiu(s) / tanti honoris / adaequant. / L. d. d. d.
- 369** Hippo Regius: *CIL VIII 5232; ILLat I 13* (Plaque de marbre blanc).
 -----² / [---]AS++[--- / ---]muner]s gladia[torii --- / ---]splendidiss]imus ordo [---].
- 370** Madauros: *ILLat I 2055; W-K 6* (2/etwa 1. Drittel 3. Jh.).
 [Ma]rti A[ug. sa]crum. / [---] Quir]ina [---]us, fla[men] perpetuus praeter /³ legitima]m summam
 [fla]mon[fi sui quam] rei p. c[ol(on)iae] Madaurensium intulit² / [---] summa per[---]N[---] stat[uam² --- / ---]SE

cellam a solo ex(s)truxit [— /⁶ — et o]b dedicationem ludos cum uenati[one edidit et sportulas²] / decurionibus dedit.

371 Madauros: *ILAlg* I 2144 (Base).

L. Caesonio / Honorato /³ Caesonia/no, fl(amini) p.p., e(gregio) u(iro) / [— i]tem mu[nerario² —] / ———?

372 Madauros: *C* VIII 4681; *ILAlg* I 2207 (Dé d'autel). 3rd/early 4th c.

D. M. s. / T^ci^p. Clodius Lo^cq^uuella /³ aed(ilis), II uir, q(uaestor), fl(amen) p.p., sac(erdos) / Liberi Patris, u(ixit) a(nnis) XLVIII. /

Hic situs est, /⁶ colum(en) moru(m) ac pie(tatis). /

L aud(ib.) ac titulis or/natus u(ixit) hon(este).

O mnibu⁹s hic carus fuerat. / Felic(iter) a(nnos)

(Q uinquaginta) minus uno / gessit, studios(e) et /¹²

V sus (h)on(orib.) ordinis est / adque uiru(m) u(ir),

E gr(egius) fl(amen), patriae p(ius) admod(erator), /¹⁵

L argus munidator / ed¹ sator in g(ente) suo[rum], /

L enaei Pat(ris) cultor /¹⁸ fel(ixq.) sac(erdos),

A ddidit hic / decus ac nomen suae / Claudiae genti.

Inspic/²¹ies, lec(tor), primordia / uersiculorum.

373 Membressa: *C* VIII 25836; *ILS* 8926; BbA 389 (Linteau en pierre calcaire); W-K 2. A.D. 275/276.

Victoriis ^{vacat} Au[gustis] / Imp. Caes. M. Claudii Taciti Pii Felicis Aug., pont. max. [—]. /³ Q.

Numisius Primus aedilic(ius) du(u)muirali[c. aedem quam] / ex HS XVI mil. n. facere promiserat multi[plicata pecunia cum] / Numisiis Praetextato et Primo filis et Nonia [— coniuge perfecit²] /⁶ et certamina pugilum edidit quam et[iam dedicauit²].

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.

Fortunae Augustae sacrum. / Imp. Caes. M. Aurelio Antonino Aug. Armeniaco et Imp. Caes. L. Aurelio Vero Aug. Armeniaco /³ templum, quod C. Iulius C. f. Corn. Galba (centurio) leg(ionis) XXII Primig(e-niae) hastatus ex HS XXX mil. n. testamento suo fieri iussit, L. Iulius L. f. Corn. / Rogatus Kappianus frater patruelis et heres eius adiectis ob honorem flam(oni) perp. sui HS X mil. n. et amplius quae professus est HS XXX mil. n. cum fratribus / Potito Natale et Honorata faciendum curauit; L. Iulius Titisenus Rogatus Kappianus fil. sororis et heres eius consummauit et cum /⁶ A. Titiseno Honorato Kappiano fil. suo dedicauit et ob dedicatio-nem triduo ludos decurionibus sportulas populo epulum et gymnasium dedit.

375 Mustis: *C VIII 16417 + AE 1962, 337; AE 1968, 609* (Non retrouvée); W-K 6. A.D. 187/188.

[Pro s]alute Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Comm[odi] Antonini Pii Fel[icis] Aug. German. Sarmat. Brittan.¹, / p.] max., trib. potest. XIII, imp. VIII, cos. V, p. p. C. Or[f]ius L. f. Cor. Luciscus, prae[f]ectus) i. d. pro II uir(is), II uir /³ it]erum q.q., sacerdos publicus deae Caelestis et Aesculapi, arcum quem suo et C. O[r]fi [---] n[omine], / p]ro praecipua erga sanctissimum numen relig(ione) proque perpetuo patriae amore, pro[miserat, adiecta / a]mplius statua Iano Patri, perfe[c]it et dedicauit, statuam quoque in foro Mar[sya]e [constituit, /⁶ ob] cuius dedicatione(m) ludos [sc]aenico[s et] epulum curiis et Caerealicis exhibuer[unt].

376 Neapolis: *C VIII 969* (in basi; litt. bene incisus). A.D. 400/401.

Saluis dd(ominis) nn(ostris) / Arcadio et Honorio /³ inclytis semper Augg(ustis) / administrante d(iuino²) m(andatu²) / Gabinio Barbaro /⁶ Pompeiano, u. c., proc(onsule) / p(rouinciae) A(fricae) u(ice) s(acra) i(udicante), Coelius Titianus / u(ir) h(onestus), ex t(ransuectorario) et nau(iculario), ex mun(erario) /⁹ et ex curatore r(ei) p., / cum Coelio Res/tituto, u(iro) h(onesto), filio suo, /¹² sumptu proprio / [i]nstantia sua / dedicauit, /¹⁵ administrante / Publano, u. h., f(lamine) p(erpetuo), curat(ore) r(ei) p.

377 Numluli: *C VIII 26121; W-K 2*. A.D. 169/170.

[I]oui Optimo Maximo, Iunoni Reginae Mineruae Augustae sacrum / [p]ro salute Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Antonini Aug. Armeniaci Medici Part. max., pont. max., trib. pot. XXIII, imp. V, cos. III, p. p., liberorumq. eius totiusque domus diuinae. / [L.] Memmius Pecuaris Marcellinus, cum suo et L. Memmi Marcelli Pecuariani decurionis c(oloniae) I(uliae) K(arthaginis), flaminis diui Neruae designati, fili sui nomine, templum Capitoli liberalitate sua [f]aciendum ex HS XX mil. n. patriae suae pago et ciuitati Numlulitanae promississet, et ob honorem flamonis Iuniae Saturninae uxoris suae ex decreto utriusque ordinis HS III m. n. in id /⁵ opus [e]rogass[et] multiplicata pecunia solo suo extruxit et marmoribus et statuis omniq. cultu exornauit itemq. dedicauit ob quam dedicationem decurionibus utriusq. ordinis sportulas / item populo epulum et gymnasium dedit praeterea exigente annonae frumenta quantacumq. habuit populo multo minore pretio quam tunc erat benignissime praestitit item ludos scaenicos et gymnasia adsidue dedit.

378 Siagu: *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; ob dedicatio[nem] / statua[e] ludi triduo edantur / in quorum editione erogari uolu⁶it ✕ (1500) et reliquis ✕ (1000) omnibus ciui[bus] n. HS diuidi uolo.

379 Siliana: *C VIII 11998 + ILTun 610; ILS 5072; W-K 1* (2/3. Jh.).

[--- / ob honorem] flamonis [ex / summa h]onoraria (HS) II M n. /³ [promis]erat multiplicata pec/[unia] d(ono) d(edit) et ob dedicationem / sportulas decurionib. eisdem/⁶que et uniuerso populo epu/lum et gymnasium dedit / itemque spectaculum pugi/⁹lum et aurigarum et ludo/rum scaenicorum edidit.

380 Sufetula: *IL Afr* 125; BbA 110 (Plaque de marbre blanc opistographe. Date: 166/169); Duval 17; W-K 1.

[Imp. Caes. M. Aurelio Anto]nino [A]ug. Arm. M[e]d. Par[th. max. / et Imp. Caes. L. Aurelio Vero A]ug. A[r]m. Med. Parth. m[ax. diui /³ M. Antonini Pii filis diui Hadriani n]epo[tibus d]iui Trai[ani pro]n[epotibus diui / Neruae abnepotibus ---]VIRPI[--- nomine suo et / ---]ani et Q. A[--- /⁶ --- et f]ront[es?] eiu[s] marmo[ribus ornaui? / --- don?]au[i]t id[e]mque dedica[uit --- / --- ob dedicatione]m lu[dos] scaenicos edider[unt].

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.?

-----?		sed cum / ⁶ cuncta parasset /
Marcellus hic qui/escit	6	edendo placitu/rus,
medica nobi/ ³ lis arte,		tertium mu/ ⁹ neris ante
3 annis qui fe/re uixit		ualida / febre crematus /
triginta et / duobus,	9	diem defunctus obi/ ¹² it.

382 Sufetula: C VIII 11345 + *ILTun* 354; *ILS* 7796; Duval 55; W-K 2 (Wohl 2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).

Q. Iul(io) Q. fil. Quirina / Rogatiano ob ho/³norem aedilita/tis et medicae pro/fessionis largamq. /⁶ liberalitatem dupli/cis editionis ludo/rum in sacerdo/⁹tio liberorum, / uniuersae curiae.

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 singularem morum eius / exemplum et in utroque hono/ris gradu fidam clementiam /⁶ filiorumque eius sacerdotii edi/tionem ludorum et adsiduam / erga singulos ciues suos /⁹ liberalitatem, uniu^ersus po/pulus curiarum testimo/nium gratiarum suarum /¹² perpetuum posuit idemque / dedicauit.

384 Sufetula: C VIII 11340 + p.2354; Duval 48; W-K 4. 1st half of 3rd c.?

L. Caecilio L. f. Athe/naeo aedilicio, II uirali /³ iuueni munerario, fl(amini) p.p., / eq(uiti) R(oma-no) [a militiis proc(urator) / Aug(usti) n(ostri) ab [epistulis]] /⁶ ob insignem morum / clementiam et erga singulos / uniuersosque ciues liberalitatem /⁹ et administrationem II uiratus / innocuam et singularem uo/luptatum editionem obque /¹² fili eius Caecili Donati Aufidia/ni fl(aminis) p.p. honorem, splendidis/simus ordo et uniuersus popul(us) /¹⁵ curiarum col(oniae) Sufetulensis / aeternum gratiarum / suarum testimonium po/suit idemque dedicauit.

385 Sutunurca: *IL Afr* 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/⁵uae abnep. L. Aurelio Ve/ro Aug. pontifici maxi/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 gimnasia¹ et /¹⁵ ludos scaenicos dedit. / d. d.

386 Tepelte: *C VIII 12253; W-K 1 (2/3. Jh.). L.15: TR]IDVØ?*

[---]o Mascanis f. Adiu/[tori flam(ini)] perp., aedil(i), decurio³[ni in col(onia) Ma]xulit(ana),
 cuii optimo qui / [egregia fi]de maxima sollici[tudine --- rei p]ubl. nego⁶[tia gessit aliisq. reb. pu]blicis ab /
 [Imp.[?] ---] praepo[situs ---] quique⁹[---t]empla pecu[nia sua restituit² et per[?]]ic(u)lum con/[---]iauit /¹² [et
 ---]as / [--- operis m]usei / [---]o dedi¹⁵[cauit et ludos scaenicos² ad]siduo edidit / [statuam quam splendidis-
 sim]us ordo p[ecunia] p. p[onen(dam)] / decreuerat honore contentu]s de suo p[osuit] /¹⁸ d.] d.

387 Thabborra: *ILAFr 220 (Linteau); W-K 1 (Wohl 3. Jh.).*

[--- memoriae per]petuae fundatorum et exor[natorum --- / --- C]aess(arum)² [---] spatium quod
 pr[uiata pecunia² --- /³ ---] decem numero condecentium [--- / ---] decorauit et helioforum DA[--- / --- flamen]
 perpetu(u)s ob honorem sibi co[ncessum /⁶ --- / --- itemq]ue dedicauit et ob hoc diebus septem ludos dedit
 IIVI[---].

388 Theveste: *C VIII 1888; ILS 6838; ILAG I 3068 (Copie de Renier. «Cette pierre», dit-il, «a été exposée au feu, qui l'a considérablement détériorée. Les LL.13–17 sont très incertaines»); AE 1977, 860; W-K 4 (etwa Ende 1./Anfang 2. Jh.).*

[---]P / [--- Sa]turnini /³ [S]aturniani / [flami]n(is) p.p. filio, / [ne]poti C. Iul(ii) Romu⁶leani
 eq(uitis) R(omani), pontif(icis), / qui primus / a condita ciui⁹tate sua ob / honorem fla/moni annui /¹² munus,
 [idi²]bus / [o]mnibus, senis / [par(ib.)²] curiae suae /¹⁵ [dedit], uniuer/[sae] curiae / [et A]ugustales /¹⁸ [pecu-
 ni]a sua. / Locus datus ex / decreto ordinis.

389 Theveste: *AE 1933, 233; W-K 1. Marble table. Cf. no. 396. A.D. 164/166.*

[Saturno Aug. s]acr(um) pro salu[t]e / [Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Antonini Armeniaci] Med. Part.
 max. Aug. et Imp. Caes. L. Aureli Veri Armeniaci Med. Part. maximi Aug. /³ [Q. Titinius Q. fil. Pap. Securus
 pont]if(ex) ex HS XXXV m. quae Q. Titinius Sabinianus pater / [testamento dari iusserat s]ummam quam
 praesentem rei p. intulit et ex HS XV m. / [quae ipse ob honorem² --- adiecit sum]mam quam praesentem rei p.
 intulit ut ex HS L m. id opus /⁶ [perficeretur additis etiam HS XIII m. cellam laquea²]ribus auratis ex HS LXIII
 m. exornauit et statuam Saturni posuit idemq. dedic(auit) d. d. / [ob cuius dedicationem curiis² et Augustal²]ibus
 epulum dedit et ludos scaenicos edidit.

390 Theveste: *C VIII 16530 + p.2731; ILAG I 3032 (Fouilles des themes de l'annexe du génie. Plaque de marbre); W-K 2 (180/187?).*

[---] sac[rum] p[ro] salut[e] / Imp. Caes. M. Aureli Comodi Anto[n]ini Aug. et Crispinae A[ug.] /³
 --- Aure²]lio Sabino Saluiano S[.] / --- ab ordin[e] Theuestinorum splend[i]dissimo --- ob honor(em) d]ec(uriona-
 tus) Saluianus pater legitimam /⁶ [---] in opus erogaret alterum tantum / [adiecit --- inlati]s aerario HS XX (m.) n.
 sportulis etiam de/[curionibus datis epulum² gymnasium² praes]titit et ludos scaenicos edidit item ad /⁹ [---]
 adiecit ad hoc opus duplam legitimam / [---] marmoribus et laquiarib.¹ aureis et exedra / [ornauit² cum --- fra-

tr²]e suo quinquennalic(io) col(oniae) Theuest(inorum) in col(onia) Karthag(ine) /¹² [--- decurionib.² curiis²
 Aug]ustalib. epulum gymnasium populo praestitit et / [---] d(e) s(uo) p(osuit).

391 Theveste: *C VIII 1887 + 16510; ILaIlg I 3066* (Base. Bonne gravure); *AE 1977, 859; W-K 7 (2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.)*. LL.2-3: --- *II uir(o)] / mun(erario)?*

T. Fl(aui) T. fi[l. Papiria] / Caele[stino --- curatori²] /³ mun(eris) qui [de suo diem² cum] / occi-
 sioni[b. ferar(um) -^{tot}- dedit; hic] / ob insigne[m erga ciues suos] /⁶ et patriam [amorem statuas] / deae Caele[s-
 tis Aug. et] / deae Virtut[is posuit, item summam] /⁹ HS L (m.) n. cur[iis donauit ut ex] / usuris eius q[uo]tannis
 epularentur] / nata[li suo], /¹² praeterea [signum argenteum] / dei Aescula[pi Aug. ex p(ondo) lib(ras)] / quin-
 quagi[nta ampliata pecunia /¹⁵ ded]it [idemq. ded(icauit)].

392 Theveste: *C VIII 16556; ILS 6839; ILaIlg I 3064; W-K 9 (2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.)*. The wife's
 inscription (b) is at the left.

(a) Q. Crepereio Germani filio Pap. Rufino auguri, aedili, praef(ecto) i. d., II uir(o) ob in/signem eius
 uitam quietamque disciplinam et in muneris editione promtas¹ /³ liberalitates quas in ciues suos exercuit, curiae
 uniuersae et Augustales sumtu¹ proprio posuerunt, / cuius honoris remunerandi causa idem Rufinus sportul(as)
 decurionib. et lib(ertis) Caes(aris) n(ostri) itemq. foren/sibus et amicis, curiis quoque et Augustalibus /⁶ aureos
 binos et populo uinum dedit et / ludos edidit.

(b) Aureliae Excepti filiae / Ianuariae, sponsae /³ et uxori / Q. Creperii Rufini.

393 Theveste: *C VIII 16560; ILaIlg I 3071* (Table).

M. Valerio M. fil. Pap. Flauiano Sabinian[o ---, II uiro col(oniae) Theves]tis munerario, et
 Aureliae Saluillae Au[--- coniugi eius ob] /³ innocentiam honorum et simplicem [uitam, curiae uniuersae / e]t
 Augustales ob quam dedicationem [decurionibus ---² fore/n²]sibus sportulas curiis et Augustal[ibus --- de-
 derunt].

394 Theveste: *C VIII 16557; ILaIlg I 3065*.

----- / fil. Pap. Datus, II uir muner(arius), praef(ectus) i. d., / die muneris sui uniuersis cu[riis] /

395 Theveste: *C VIII 16558* (LL.2-3: *col(oniarum) Thevestis et [Karthag(inis)]*); *ILaIlg I 3067* (Base).
 [---]oro Iuliano, eq(uiti) R(omano), e(gregio) u(iro), pontif(ici), / [II uir(o)² m]uner(ario) col(o-
 niae) Thevestis et /³ [--- ob si]nceram fidem et inno[centiam] qua cum ciuib[us] agit / [---] uniuersae curiae /⁶ et
 Augustales.

396 Theveste: **A:** *C VIII 16555; ILaIlg I 3069* (Base). **B:** *C VIII 16559; ILaIlg I 3070* (Base, trouvée
 avec le n° précédent). L.2: *EILIAE*; L.4: *PONTIE, PRAEE*. Cf. no. 389.

A Aeliae Bene/auxidi, uxori /³ Q. Titini Securi, / pontif(ici), q(uaestoris), praef(ecti) / i. d., II
 uir(i) munerari, /⁶ curiae et Augustales; / qui inter ceter(as) / liberalitat(es) suas /⁹ sportul(as) decur(ionib.) /
 [-c.9-]SS[.]VI / -----?

- B** Titinia² Iuliae / filiae /³ Q. Titini Securi, / pontif. q., praef. / i. d., II uir(i) muner(ari), /⁶ uxori C. Roi Petro/niani, eq(uo) p. exor(nati), / curiae et Augustales; /⁹ ob quas ded[icatio]nes / -----
- 397** **Thisi** (?): *C VIII 25428* (= 14334) + *ILTun 1190*; W-K 1 (2/1. Dritte 3. Jh.).
M. Porcio Fla[m]ialis fil. Quir. / Dext[ri]a, [ae]di[ci]o, fl[am]ini p[er]p[et]ui qui /³ s[ingula]r[ita]te I[---] P[---] p[atri]ae sua[e] HS --- M n. legauit / ita ut ex [usur]is sestertiorum /⁶ ducentorum mil. ludi scae/nici quodannis natali / eius [ede]rentur et decuri[on]u[m] singulis sportulae / [denarii] quini darentur. D. d. p[ecunia] p.
- 398** **Thurburbo Maius**: *C VIII 12370* (= 853) + *ILTun 692* + *AE 1942/43, 102*; W-K 5. After A.D. 238.
M. Fannio M. f. / Papiria Vitali (centurioni) coh[ortis] /³ IIII Sygamb[ro]rum, coh. / I Hisp[ano]rum misso honesta / missione a diuo Ha[dr]iano, praef[ect]o iuris / dic., fl[am]ini p[er]p[et]ui qui o[bi]tinu[m] fl[am]oni HS X m. n. /⁹ rei p. intulit et ampli[us] ludorum scae/nicor[um] diem et epul[um] /¹² dedit cui cum / ordo statuam decre[uis]set titulo contentus /¹⁵ s[ua] p[ecunia] posuit d. d.
- 399** **Thurnica**: **a**: *C VIII 25703*; **b**: *C VIII 25704*; W-K 1 (2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).
a Marti Aug. / sacr[um]. /³ Q. Furfanius Q. f. Lem. M[art]ialis pec[un]ia a se ob hono[re]s / suos II uir[atus] et fl[am]oni Aug[usti] /⁶ rei p. inlata d. d. statu[as] / fac[ie]ndum cur[auit] praeter sum[m]am / numeratam ob decus [II uir[atus]] /⁹ quinq. et ampli[us] ludo[s] / et epul[as] bis et trit[ici] m[odios] X m. / cum esset ✕ denis ex ✕ /¹² nis a Bellico patre n[ost]ro eius populo dat[is] / item sportulas ordin[i] bis.
- 400** **Thurnica**: *AE 1988, 1116* (Base de statue en calcaire. II^e s./première moitié du III^e s. p.C.); W-K 2 (Ende 2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).
C. Sallustio C. fil. / Quir. Felici, aedili, /³ quod primus in co[lonia] / sua amphitheatrum / suis sumptibus excolue[rit] et quod insign[i] lusi[onis] edition[is] patriae / suae uoluptates ampli[us] /⁹ auerit addita etiam / singulari ac benigna / erga uniuersos ciues /¹² liberalitate curiales / [l]abori grata obsequi[um] et ut remuneraren[ur] /¹⁵ et ut facti eius gloria / etiam ad posteros perse[uer]aret de suo posuer[unt], /¹⁸ cur[ante] M. Petronio Felice / d[ono] d[ederunt] d. d.
- 401** **Thugga**: *C VIII 26527* (= 15528 [= 15246] + ...; cf. *ILTun 1404*); W-K 8. A.D. 164/166.
Pro sal[ute] Imp[er]atoris Caesaris M. Aureli [Anto]nini Augusti Ar[meni]aci liberor[um]que eiu[s] et Imp[er]atoris Ca[esaris] L. Aureli Veri Augusti Armeniaci --- suo et Faust[in]i patris et F[---] et --- liberorum [suorum] om[ne]s prom[issis] HS C mil. a[diectis] HS L m[il. n. ---] in [amorem] ciuitatis sua[e] fecit idemq. edito s[pe]c[taculo] ludor[um] tri[duo] decurio[n]ib. sportulas et uniu[erso] populo² epulum² et gymnasi[um] dedit et ded[icauit].
- 402** **Thugga**: **A**: *C VIII 26606* (cf. *ILTun 1434*; *C VIII 26607*); *ILS 9364*; W-K 9. **B**: *C VIII 26608*; W-K 9. A.D. 166/169.
A P. Marcius Q. f. Arn. Quadratus flamen diui Augusti, pont[ifex] c[oloniae] I[ul]iae K[arthaginensis]

in quinque decurias [adlectus ab Imp. Anton]ino Aug. Pio ob honorem flaminatus sui perpet[ui] patriae suae /² theatrum cum basilicis et porticu et xystis et scaena cum siparis et ornamentis om[n]ibus a [solo ex(s)t]ructum sua pec(unia) fec(it) idemq. ludis scaenicis editis et sportulis datis et epulo et gymnasio ded(icauit).

B [P. Marcio Quadrato / ob insignem eius in rem p. li]beralitem /³ [quod theatrum cum basi]licis et xystis / [et porticu et scaena sumptu su]o exstructum / [fec(erit) itemq. sportulas et ludos sc]aenicos et /⁶ [epulum et gymnasium p]romiscue dederit.

403 Thugga: C VIII 26482 (= 1503 + 15532 + ...) + *ILAFr* 516; W-K 12. A.D. 184/192.

Q. Pacuius Satorius fl(amen) perp., augur c(oloniae) l(uliae) K(arthaginis) e(t) Nahania [Victo]ria fl(aminica) perp. a[d opu]s templi Mercuri quot¹ M. Pacuius Felix Victorianus filius eorum codicillis suis ex HS L mil. fieri iussit amplius ipsi ob honorem fl(amoni) perp.] HS LXX mil. pollicitis [sum]mis templum M[er]curi et cellas duas cum stauis et porticum et ab[sides] /² [[—]] omnique cultum ampliata pecunia fecerunt, item porticum et [templu²]m macelli pago patr[i]ae extruxerunt et excoluerunt, item ciuitati Thugg(en-si) HS XXV mil. Q. Pacuius Satorius fl. perp. daturum se pollicitus est ex cuius summae reditu quotannis decurionib[us] sportul[ae] darentur et ob diem [mun]eris ludos scaenicos et sportu[las] decuri[o]nibus utriusque ordinis et uniuerso populo [epulum² ded(it)].

404 Thugga: A: C VIII 26591b; W-K 16. B: C VIII 26590 (= 1495); W-K 16 (Um 205).

A Asiciae V[ic]toriae coniugi A[—] / ob munificentiam liberalem et singulare[m in ciuitatem] /³ et patriam s[u]am quae probo animo et exem[plari] uirtute / ter summam flamonii perp. sui honorari[am] ampliauerit / etiam filiae [s]uae Asicianes singulari sple[ndore ob flam(onium)] /⁶ HS C mil. n. patriae suae donauerit ex [quorum red(itu) dec(urionib.)] / utriusq. ordinis sportulae curiis e[pulum et uniuerso] / populo gymnasia praestentur lud[ique] scaenici dentur; /⁹ statuam q[ua]m uterq. ordo decre[uerat] / res p. mun(icipii) S[e]pt(imii) Aur(elii) Thugg(ensis) posu[it].

B Asiciae Victoriae / fl(aminicae) Thuggenses ob muni³[f]icientiam¹ et singula/rem liberalitatem eius / in rem p. quae ob flamonium /⁶ [V]ibiae Asicianes fil(iae) suae HS C / mil. n. pollicitast ex quorum re/[d]itu ludi scaenici et sportulae /⁹ decurionibus darentur, d. d. / utriusque ordinis posuer(unt).

405 Thugga: C VIII 26458 (= 1500–1502 + 15509 + ...) + *ILAFr* 514; W-K 6 III. A.D. 222/235.

[—]in parentum su[orum] — patris et Auilliae Gab[ini]ae Venus]tae matris ex pollicitat[ione] — templum²] deae Caelestis [quod ob hon]ore[m] fl(amonii) perp[etui] —]is q(uin)q(uennal-) rei p. Thuggensium ante [fieri] ex HS sexaginta m. n. coeptum est, inlatis HS triginta mil. [n. quae] at deas Caelestes argenteas fabricanda[s] —]ae Aburnius Auillius F[elix] testamento suo ab heredibus praestari uoluit itemque [—]ratis ex testamento Auilli[ae] Gabini[ae] Venustae ex quorum reditu sportulae et ludi praest[are]ntur; Q. Gabinius Rufus Felix Beatianus multiplicata a se pec(unia) p[er]fecit excoluit et cum stauis ceterisq. solo priuato dedicat[is] —]ae suae liberalitate constitutis [—] ob] diem dedicationis rei p. n[un]me[ratis] —] ded[it] adiec[tis] sportulis et epulo et

gymnasio.

406 Thugga: C VIII 26618 + 26626 + *IL Afr* 539; W-K 22. Soon after 253/260.

[- Ti]tisenio Pap. Feli/[ciss]imo Corneliano, /³ [eq(uiti) R(omano)²], aedilicio, fl(amini) perp. / [ob lu]dorum magnific/[ent]iam et multiform[es /⁶ libera]li[tates qui/bus h]onestatem in rem / [pub]l. et patriam cum /⁹ [sui]s exegit / res publica splendi/[di]ssimae col(oniae) Thugg(ensis) /¹² [ex s]uffragiis populi / [et d]ecreto decurio/[nu]m p(ecunia) p.

407 Thugga: C VIII 26559 (= 15521 + 15246^{a-b} + p.2566 + VIII 10620 + ...) + *ILTun* 1314; *ILTun* 1416; W-K 21. A.D. 264/265.

[Pro sal]ute [Imp. Caes. P. Licini Gallieni Au]g. Germanici pont. max., trib. pot. XIII, i[mp.] X, cos. VI, p. p., pr[o]cos. et [Corneliae Sal[oninae Aug.] ---] cur(ator) rei publ. porticum f[aciendam curauit² ---] forma in huius modi sollemnit[er ---] et sportulae nomine Thuggam ex indulgentia [[domini nostri²]] sanctissimi [mp]er[ato]r[is] ac liberalita[te ---] obtuli[t --- / ---]s Pap. Felix Iulianus eq(ues) R(omanus), fl(amen) p(erp.), du[u]muirali[c]ius ex summa fla[moni perpetui --- de²]dit inlatis HS [--- mil. n. --- ep]ulum decurionibu[s --- rei pu]bl. praesentib. HS L milib. n. et die dedicationis [--- lud]os scaenicos [--- et] unie[rso] populo gymnasium² dedit²].

408 **Thysdrus:** C VIII 22856 (Tabula marmorea) (cf. 22857–22859) + *ILTun* 106; W-K 1 (2/3. Jh.).

[---] Comensi / [--- qui] iussit circenses / [---]AQ palmarum duodenar(um) nata/libus filiarum suarum Vi[ct]orinae /⁵ et Macedoniae item sportulas / decurionibus et epulum populo quod/annis dari praecepit bono ciui p(ecunia) s(ua)².

409 **Thysdrus:** C VIII 22852 (fragmentum basis marmorea. L.1: scriptus in spatio aliquantum depresso; fortasse restitutus in locum verborum erasorum; inde explicanda mira 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.

[--- Aur]elio² felici imp(eratori) Maximiano Aug. [--- / --- ampl]iata pecunia, primo munerario et omni spectac[ulorum /³ et ludo²]rum genere liberali innocentiae munificentiae / [huma- ve/ benign]itatis exem- plo plures merenti super bigas [--- / ---]XXI uniuersae curiae posuerunt [---²].

410 **Tichilla:** C VIII 1353 = 14891; W-K 1. A.D. 276/282.

Genio municipii / [pro salute Imp. Caes. M.] Aureli [[Probi]] Pii Fel. Aug. tot[ius/³que diuinae] domus eius C. Lurius Felix II[ui]r q.[q. / --- ex ---] mil. numm. q[ui]am promiserat num[--- / ---]O[.]V[---] m[ili]- bus statuam al⁶[teram ciuibu]s suis de den(ariis) VII (m.) ob a[m]orem patriae --- gymn[asium] et ludos [---].

411 **Tuccabor:** C VIII 14856; W-K 5 (Bauinschrift? 2/3. Jh.).

[---]ianus [---] omni m[agnificentia²] fecit itemq. dedicauit et ob de[dicatio]nem s[portulas / decurionibus et epulu]m et gymn[asium] et ludor[um scae/³nicorum²] spectacu[m] populo² dedit [---²].

- 412** Tuccabor: *C VIII 14855* (= 1323) + *ILTun 1288*; W-K 4 (2/3. Jh.). L.1: *M(arcus)?*
 M[---]IP/[--- ob honorem fl(aroni) p]erp. /³ [--- mil]ia [praeter legitim]am promississet mul/ti-
 plicata pecunia perfecit et /⁶ dedicauit et ob dedicatio/nem pugilum certamina / edidit et decurionibus /⁹
 sportulas et populo gymna/sium epulum dedit et hoc / amplius pro sua liberalita/¹²te cameram superposuit et /
 opere museo exornauit / [itemq.] cum M[---]eis Felice et /¹⁵ Rufino [fil]is ded(icauit) ob quam / dedicat(ionem)
 epul(um) dec(urionib.) et pop(ulo) [g]ym(nasium) ded(it).
- 413** Uchi Maius: *C VIII 26275* (Basis); *ILS 9405*; W-K 8 (frühestens 230).
 L. Cornelio Quieto, / h(onestae) m(emoriae) u(iro) qui testamen/³to suo rei publicae colo/niae
 Marianae Aug. Ale/xandrianae Vchitanor(um) /⁶ [Ma]jorum per fideicommissum / HS decem mil. n. reliquit ex
 cuius / summae usuris quotannis die na/⁹tali eius decurionibus sportulae et / [po]pulo ludi darentur. / L.
 Cornelius Quietus fl(amen) p.p. filius eius pa/¹²[r]emti¹ optimo sua pecunia fecit et / impetrato ab ordine loco
 dedicauit.
- 414** Utica: *C VIII 25386* (Tabula marmorea). W-K 1 (2/3. Jh.).
 -----² / [--- ob honorem] II uir(atus) ampl[i]ata pecunia --- / --- rei publicae in]tulit et ped[--- /³
 ---]mis aduexi[t --- / --- uenationem bestiarum Af]ricanaru[m dedit --- / --- in th²]ermis.
- 415** Vaga: *C VIII 1225* = 14403. 3rd c.
 T.² Rutilius Iunior Iulianus, / aedilis ac sac(erdos), II uir q.q. /³ et cur(ator) muner(is) Tup[---], /
 Dapani.
- 416** Vallis: *C VIII 14783*; *ILS 5075*; W-K 1 (Ende 2/1. Drittel 3. Jh.).
 C. Eгна[ti]o C. fil. / Papiria [Fe]lici, aedi/³li in[no]centissimo, / amici ob m[er]itum, ob cu/ius
 dedicationem idem /⁶ Egnatius praeter gymna/sium et missilia quae aedi/les edere solent diem sacri /⁹ Libera-
 liorum auxit et omni in/pensa sua eum ciuib. uniuersis / exhibuit, amplius etiam ludos sceri/¹²cos edidit et
 ep[u]lum populo dedit. / L. d. d. d.
- 417** Vallis: *C VIII 14782* (b = 1284); W-K 4 (3. Jh.?).
 (a) L. Sallu[stius] --- et --- / Maxima [---] / ----- (b) ----- / [--- ob dedic]ationem ludo[s scaenicos
 ediderunt --- / --- epulum² uniuersis condecursion[ibus dederunt ---].
- 418** Vina: *C VIII 958* + 12438; W-K 1 (Altar). JACQUES 1984 pp.401–2. End of 2nd/early 3rd c.
 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 ludo/⁶rum scaenicorum edidit d. d.
- 419** 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) missiliorum¹ communi pecunia fecerunt dedicante⁹ Caluio Rufino aedile ob
cuius statu[ae] / dedicationem idem Rufinus de suo / eti^am spectaculum pugilum et gymnasium /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 /³ M. Simminius Mistlita a[ed]il(es) / ad
ornandam patriam modum / paupertatis¹ suae egressi in /⁶ compensatione(m) miss[i]l[i]orum¹ / pecunia sua
fecerunt et o[b] de/[d]icationem pugi[l]es edider[un]t /⁹ [---] / CROM[---].

421 Ziqua: C VIII 897. Known only from MSs.

-----[?] / [---][?] piissimor[?] u[?] mq.[?] princip(um)[?] / [---] s[ub ad]ministratione procons(ulis) p(rovin-
ciae) A(fricae)[?] /³ [---] institutis nunc solio uno IFIMO / [---] congestioni et [-c.3[?]] parieti in / [---]stulinus
generosa familia progenitus /⁶ perfecit excoluit ludos dedit dedicauit.

422 *Henchir Bou Cha*: *ILTun* 746; W-K 3 (Statuenbasis. 2./3. Jh.).

----- / [---]NDD S ex HS / octo mil. n. posuit ob cuius dedication(em) /³ ludos circenses itemq.
epulum et / sportulas condecursionibus suis / dedit. L. d. d. d.

423 *Henchir Bou Cha*: C VIII 23964 (= 828 + 12347; cf. 23965); *ILS* 5713 + add. Probably late 3rd c.
or after.

Magnilianorum. / Q. Vetulenus Vrbanus Herennianus /³ fl(amen) p.p., cur(ator) r(ei) p., apody-
terium nouum / in dextera cellis exeuntibus / a solo constructum et piscinas duas, /⁶ cetera restaurata adq. statu-
is / marmoribus tabulis pictis / columnis ingressu cellaru[m] /⁹ alisq. rebus ornata, sumptu proprio / cum Magni-
liano filio suo / florentissimo adq. prudentissim[o] /¹² adulescenti uoto / omnium ciuiu[m] / perfecit adq. dedica-
uit et uniuer¹⁵se pleui¹ epulum per tridu(u)m dedit nec / non et ludos scenicos ex(h)ibuit.

424 *Henchir Bou Cha*: C VIII 830 (Epistylum litteris aetatis inferioris difficillimis lectu. L.2:
ARMATIO SENORIO fortasse nomen est).

[--- de]in decimum munus ede(ndo)[?] ipsi rur[sus --- / --- munera splend]ida edenti ARMATIO
SENRIO+[---].

425 *Henchir Sidi 'Abd el-Basset*: C VIII 14343; W-K 1 (etwa 1. Dritte 3. Jh.).

[M]egethi. / [---]o L. fil. Pap. Felici, decurioni ad[le]cto aedilicio /³ [II uiralicio f]lam(ini) perp.,
omni[bu]s honoribus functo qui ob / [honorem flamon]i perpetu]i ludo[s] scaenicos edidit itemq. ob a[edi]litatem
--- am]plius ad summam honoris [--- /⁶ ---]III[---].

426 *Henchir Sidi Naoui*: C VIII 23107 (= 754 + 12218 + ...); W-K 1. A.D. 196.

Fortunae reduci Aug. sacrum / pro salute Imp. Caes. diui M. Antonini P[er] Germanici Sarmatici
fili diui Commodi fratris diui Antonini P[er] diui /³ Hadriani pronep. diui Traiani Part[h]ici abnep. diui
Neruae adnep. L. Septimi Seueri Pii Pertinacis Aug. Arabici / Adiabenici pontif. max., trib. pot. IIII, imp. VIII,

cos. II, p. p. et M. Aureli Antonin[i] Caes. fili eius 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. distribuendum pro-
miserat /⁶ M. Saluius Celsus Pinarianus nepos et heres [i]n amorem patriae suae multiplicata pecunia simulacro
auro reculto solo publico / cons[um]mauit idemque dedicauit et ob dedicationem sportulas decurionibus item
epulum et gymnasium uniuersis ciuibus dedit / et spectaculum ludorum scaenicorum ed(idit).

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 --- de]/creuisset ob m[erita --- honore
contentus de] /⁵ s(ua) 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. ∞1000.
(a) and (b): names of the four hunters and leopards, respectively.

(c) Per curionem / dictum: “Domi/ni mei, ut / Telegeni / pro leopardo / meritum ha/beant uestri /
fauoris, dona/te eis denarios / quingentos.” (d) “Mageri! Mageri!” (e) Adclamatum est: / “Exemplo tuo, mu/nus
sic discant / futuri! audiant / praeteriti! unde / tale? quando tale? / Exemplo quaesto/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)! nox 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.

[--- / ---] /³ ---] Rusonianus fl[am(en),] augur, II uir q.q., cellam f[rigi]darii et [..]RY / [---] rui[na
con]labsas¹ [e]x pollicitatione m[un]eris gladiato[ri] ob honorem / [quinquennialita²]tis P[-^{6/7}-] permissu sacra-
tiss[imi] p[ri]ncipis diui M. Antonin[i] f. a fundamentis /⁶ [---] marmoribus et co[l]umnis exornauit, stat[ua]m
Aesculapii nouam / [---] res[tituit], ceter[as] refe[c]it ex [multi]s aliis [m]une[ri]bus rei p. suae conlatis et / [---] juli
nomine VI[-^{1/2}-]ITI[---].

430 *Lepcis Magna*: IRT 594 (Rectangular base of grey limestone. Theatre, built into one of the late
piers of the W dressing room. LL.1–2: lapidary capitals; L.3: Rustic capitals). 2nd/early 3rd c.

Q. Cornelio Va[---], / curatorum 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 --- / --- uniuers]us ordo qua[--- /³ ---]uas ob muni[ficentiam --- /
---]uit in uerba is[--- / ---]nus ex testam[ento --- /⁶ ---]d]e suo [--- / -----

(b) [Q]uod expostulantibus uniuersis decurio[nibus] 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(ieri) p(laceret) c(ensentis) L. Cassi Longini II / uir(i)

desig(nati) q. p. c(irca) i(d) f. dec(uriones) i(ta) c(ensuerunt): “Cum Plautius Lupus / o. o. n. uir cum flamonium consensu /⁶ omnium sibi delatum libenter suscepisset opulentissimos ludos ediderit sing(u)lariterq. magnificentissima liberalitate pro⁹meruerit in II uiratus quoq. honore om(n)ia secundum splendorem natalium / [s]uorum dignitatemq. col(oniae) n(ostrae) egerit et /¹² [e]ffusissimis adfectibus iterum splen(didissimos) ludos ediderit nec contentus / his liberalitatibus cellam thermar(um) /¹⁵ marmorib. Numidicis et opere musaeo exornauerit omni deinde occasione singul(ariter) / [p]romeruerit et proxime cum ad munus publ(icum) /¹⁸ [e]x(testamento) Iuni Afri c(larissimae) m(emoriae) uiri edendum curator e/le[c]tus esset sollicitudini laboriq. suo non pe/percerit et obseruata amplissimi senatus /²¹ uoluntate splendidissime munus edi curauerit[t]; / debentque huiusmodi adfectus / remunerari ut reliqui quoque ad eandem uolup²⁴[tat]em sollicitari possint placere Plautio Lupo / o. o. n. uir. [bi]gam de publ(ico) ubi uolet collocari pos[se].” Plau]tius de suo collocaturum se dixit.

432 Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1942–43, 4; *IRT* 603 (Tetrapylon statue-base of rough grey-brown limestone, panel cut into an earlier *tabella ansata*. Late form of Rustic capitals). 3rd/4th c.

Amatori patriae et ciuium suor[um] quod indulgentia sacra / ciuibus suis feras dentatas quattuor uiuas donauit / ex decreto splendidissimi ordinis bigam decreu[er]unt. / Porfyri Porfyri.

433 Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1929, 3; *AE* 1950, 151; *IRT* 567 (Rectangular marble base. Late form of Rustic capitals). 3rd/4th c.

Vno eodemque anno / du(u)muiro Lepcimagn(ensium) /³ et sacerdoti prou(inciae) Trip(o)l(ita-nae), / innocentissimo uiro, / principali integerrimo, /⁶ amatori patriae ac ciuium suor(um) T. Flauio / Vibiano, u. p., fl(amin) p. p. et pont(ifici), /⁹ cur(ator) rei pub. Lepcimagn(ensis), / sac(erdoti) Laur(entium) Lab(inatium) et sac. M(atris) D(eum), / praef(ecto) omnium sacr(or)um ob diuersarum uolup¹²tatum exhibitionem et Libycarum ferarum X, / ex populi suff(ragio) et ordin(is) d(ecreto).

434 a: Lepcis Magna: *C* 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.

a Heraclii. / Dignissimo principali, /³ innocentissimo puero / T. Flauio Vibiano iuniori, / pontifici, du(u)muiro, filio /⁶ ac colleg(a)e T. Flau Frontini / Heraclii, in paruulis annis / exhibenti aequaliter /⁹ uoluptatum genera patris / sui studiis populi suffragio / et decreto ordinis.

435 Lepcis Magna: *AE* 1929, 2; *IRT* 564 (Moulded marble base. 4th c. capitals). Probably 1st half of 4th c.

Heraclii. / Benignissimo uiro princi³pali prudentissimo et integir(imo)¹ / T. Fl(aui) Frontino Heraclio, u. p., au(guri), sacerdoti Lauren(tium) Labinat(i)um, /⁶ II uiro ob diuersarum uolup(tatum) exhibitiones adque¹ / admirabilem ludorum /⁹ editionem amoremque / incomparabilem in pa(triam) et ciues suos suff(ragio) /¹² quietissimi populi / et decreto splendidis(simi) ordinis.

436 Lepcis Magna: *IRT* 786 (Marble panel. 3rd/4th c. capitals).

-----² / [—]borum [— / —]s feraru[m] --- /³ ---]uit.

437 Lepcis Magna: *C VIII 22672; ILS 9408; IRT 569* (Lower part of moulded base of white marble. 4th c. capitals).

----- / [---]OM[-⁵-]M[-^{3/4}- / ---] honestiss[im-^{1/2}- /³ --- c]ognoscendi [-^{3/4}- / ---] perpenso qu[... / ---]meato [..] ob /⁶ [---] qui [r]em publ. exqu[isi/tis edit]ionum g[ene]ribus feceri[t am]/pliozem, instauratori moenium publ[i]⁹corum quod eius innumera circa se / ac suos officia supra genialis ciuis / affectum Lepcis Magna inclita fide /¹² deuotione praestans multifariam sense/rit merito[ru]m eius tenacissime memor [per] / ordini¹ sui [et] popul[i u]iros Fl(auio) Victori Calpurni[o, u. p.] /¹⁵ praesidi prou(inciae) Tripol(itaniae), patrono suo statuam de/creuit et ob indiuiduum mutui amoris affec/tum eamdem se propter constituit ac dedica/¹⁸uit.

438 Lepcis Magna: *IRT 578* (Moulded marble base. 4th c. capitals).

Amelii. / Multiplici laborum merito /³ uarioque uoluptatum / genere stimulantibus / paternis auitiis etiam /⁶ documentis ab ineun/te aetate patriam ciues/que suos promerenti /⁹ M. Vibio Aniano Gemino, / u. p., fla(mini) p.p., pont(ifici), sacerdotal(i) / prouinciae Tripolitanae /¹² bis II uir(o) ex suf(f)ragio / quietissimi populi et de/creto splendidissimi ordinis.

439 Lepcis Magna: *IRT 580* (Marble panel. 4th c. capitals).

-----² / [--- c]uria ad squa/[lorem --- i]n splendorem /³ [---] praeses proui/[nciae Tripolitanae ---²] coluit, dedicauit / [--- e]didit uoluptati.

440 Oea: *C VIII 24 + p.921 + 10999 + p.2292; IRT 232; W-K 1. A.D. 163/164.*

(North side) Imp. C[aes. M.] Aurelio Antonino Aug. p. p. et Imp. Caes. L. Aurelio Vero Armeniaco Aug. / Ser. Co[m]elius Scipio Saluidienus] Orfitus proco(n)s(ul) cum Vttedio Marcello leg(ato) suo dedica-uit /³ C. Calpurnius Celsus curator muneris pub(lici) munerarius, II uir q.q., flamen perpetuus / arcum pecunia sua [solo publ]ico et fund[auit et] marmore solido fecit.

441 Oea: *AE 1942–43, 1 + AE 1945, 68; IRT 230; W-K 2 (Bauinschrift). A.D. 164/168?*

Imp. Caes. M. Aurelio [[Commodo]] Antonino Aug. Pio p. p. L. A[e]milii L. fil. Quir. [Frontinus² c]o(n)s(ul), procos. Asiae genio co[loniae Oeensis dari iussit²] /² item HS X centena mil. n. legauit ex cui[us usur(is)] sportulae ciuibus et lu[di --- darent]ur quod opus Sulla frater et [---] perfec(er)unt².

442 Sabratha: *AE 1925, 103; IRT 117* (Marble panel. 2nd/3rd c. capitals); W-K 3 (Frühhestens 138/161).

C. Flauio Q. fil. Pap. Pudenti, flam(ini) Liberi Patris, II uiro, flam. perpetuo cuius pater Fl. Tullus post / multas liberalitates per quas patriam suam exornauit aquam priuata pecunia induxit item lacus n(umero) XII exstru/³xit eosdemque crustis et stauis 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 gladiatorum spectaculum primus in patria sua per dies quinq. /⁶ splendidissimum ediderit ordo Sabrathensium populo postulante quadrigam ei de publico ponend(am) censuit / Fl. Pudens honore contentus sua pecunia posuit.

- 443 Sabratha: *IRT* 142^b (Panel of white marble); W-K 5.
 ----- / [--- restau[?]]rauit [--- / --- editi]one munerum [---].

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 at[!] /⁶
 certamen gymnicum / quo[d]annis [f]acien/dum diebus festis /⁹ Lunae; / d. d.
- 445 Antiochia: *AE* 1926, 78; Robert 92. Probably 1st half of 2nd c.
 [L. Calpurnio / L. C]alpurnii Pau[l/i] f. Ser. Longo, pon[t(ifici)] /³ q[ui] primus omn[ium] / [---] /
 messe p[op]u[lo] Ant(iochensium) /⁶ m[unus] promisit [et / in]tra duos men[ses / a]mphi theatrum ligne⁹ /
 fecit; uenatione[s] / cotidie omnis ge[ner/i]s et sparsiones dedi[t /¹² et] gladiatorum paria / [X]XXVI per dies
 octo, [et[?] / con]summato mu[nere] /¹⁵ cenam[?] po]p[ulo] dedit[?]. / -----?

- 446 Antiochia: **a**: *C* III 296 = 6835 (L.16: *uic(us) Cermalus*); **b**: *C* III 6836 (L.16: [*u*]ic[us] *Salu-*
tar[is]); **c**: *C* III 297 = 6837; *ILS* 5081; Robert 93. After A.D. 180.

c Cn. Dottio / Dotti Maryl[i]i³ni fil. Ser. Planci/ano, patr(ono) col(oniae), flam(ini), / II uir(o) II
 q(uin)q., muner(ario) II /⁶ et agonothe(tae) perp(etuo) / certam(inis) q(uin)q. talant(iaei), / A[s]iarc(hae)
 templ(orum) splend(idissimae) /⁹ ciuit(at)is Ephes(iorum), ex libe(ral)itate sua elect(o) ago/nothe(tae) perp. ab
 Imp. /¹² diuo Marco cer/tam(inis) sacr(i) Hadria/nion Ephesi, /¹⁵ postul(ante) populo, / ob merit(a) eius, /
 uic(us) Tuscus; d. d.

- 447 Antiochia: *AE* 1914, 266; Robert 94 (Inscription honorifique. II^e/III^e s.).
 -----[?] / [---] Maximiano, / aedil(i), II uir(o) qui II u[i] /³ratu suo munus u[e] / nationum et gladi-
 a[t(orum)] / ex liberalit(ate) sua bidu[m] /⁶ dedit, qui etiam testame[nto] / 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 muner(e) ✕ 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 [= ll.18–25], qui a longtemps séjourné
 dans l'eau et dont les lettres sont fort rongées, en rend la lecture fort difficile); *C* I² 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. [---]ol(---) / [---] M. l. Ste[--- / ---]CL l.

Nicepho(rus) /¹² [---]us C. I. Nicia, / [---]+ A. D. I. Antio(chus) / [ma]gistrei [---] /¹⁵ [o]mnem / [---] / [---]FA[---] /¹⁸ [faciun]da coerau[erunt] / [I]udosque IAPEI[--- / fe]cerunt O[.]NATO / dederunt de [s]ua /²¹ pequnia [.]TART / tectaue tradiderun[t] /²⁴ [---]TEC[---] / [---]EVE[---] / -----?

450 **Dyme:** *BCH* 1878 p.100 no. 9; *C* III 7257 (Litteris male factis).

-----? / [---]ienus Pater[nus, --- / --- T]rebulanus [---? /³ ---? -] Antonius Eu[tychus? / ---? -]

Grattius P. [f. --- / ---?] M. *vacat* EP[--- /⁶ ---? -] Villius C. f. [--- / ---?] ex d. d., ludo[sq. fecerunt?].

451 **Patras:** *AE* 1990, 887 (Plaque de marbre blanc; lettres soignées). 2nd c.

[---]ius P. f. Q[uir.?[?] ---? / ---]+ II uir por[ticum cum /³ colum]nis marmo[reis et --- / ---]a facien-
d(a) cu[ravit / ---] ob honor(em) aed[il(itatis) --- /⁶ ---]XV; item ob [honor(es) con/iuncto[?]]s II uir(atu) glad[iato-
rum / paria ---? ded[?]]it eq. omni [---] /⁹ *vacat* consum[mauit].

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[?]), munerar(ius) bis /³ q(ui)
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^rumentum DXV, sing(ulum) /⁶ mod(ium) ✕ S; / cur(a) Publiciae Optatae matri^s.

Macedonia

453 **Dyrrachium:** *C* III 607; Robert 2. A.D. 98/117.

L. Fl(auio) T. f. Aem. Tellu[ri[?]] / Gaetulico, eq(uo) p. hon(orato) /³ ab Imp. Caes. Traiano Au[g.],
/ praef(ecto) coh(ortis) II equitat(ae) Hisp(anorum) Germ[an(ia)] / sup(eriore), II uir(o) q(uin)q., pontif(ici),
patr(ono) col(oniae), qui in /⁶ comparat(ione) soli oper(i) byblio[th(ecae)] HS CLXX (m.) f(aciundo) / rem p.
impend(io) leuauit et ob [ded(icationem) e]jus / [munus d(e)] s(ua) p(ecunia) gladiatorib. p(arib.) XII edi[dit ---]
MC / -----?

454 **Philippi:** *C* III 660. After A.D. 79.

----- / colo[ni]ae Vict[---] /³ensium [II uir[?]] / muner[arius] / it[e]rum [fla] /⁶men d[iui] / Vespa-
si[ani] / filius O[---]niae [---] / -----?

455 **Philippi:** *AE* 1948, 21. Epitaph. After A.D. 161.

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 **Philippi:** *AE* 1939, 185.

L. Valerio L. fil. / Volt. Prisco, /³ orn(amentis) dec(urionalib.) hon(orato), / dec(urioni), irenar-
(chae), II uir(o) iur. d. munera /⁶rio; cultores / deor(um) Serapis [et] / Isidi[s].

- 457** Philippi: *BCH* 1937 pp.413–14 no. 6; *AE* 1937, 52.
[- Varin]io [- f./ Vol. M]acedo[ni, /³ ae]d(ili), q(uaestori), II uir(o) i. d. Ph[ilip/pis] munerari[o II?[?], / pup]illae Vari[niae /⁶ M]acedonia et Pro[cula, / p]atri ex testam(ento) eius [f(aciendum) c(urauerunt)].
- 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(en-
sium) IX, h(ic) s(itus) e(st); /³ C. Vibius C. fil. Vol. Florus, dec(urio), / II uir et munerarius Philippis, / 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: *PINA*. Cf. n.298.
Iuli Fidei MANLI BA[---]LAETGAI[.]VR[.] + / sua, paria VII pugna[ue]ru(n)t Philippis /
[---?]VGNO IIII uenatio p'le'na et crocis sparsis / -----?

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 spor-
tulis decurio(nib.), / Augustalibus et sexui/ris datis item pugilum /¹⁰ spectaculo dedicaue/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, IIIII uir m(agister) M(ercurialis); ob /
honor(em) idem ludos scaenic(os) / per trid(uum) d(edit) et canthar(um) arg(enteum) p(ondo) (unciarum)
s(eptem).

ANNEX II: COMPARATIVE TABLE

AE 1888, 126: 118; 1899, 207: 139; 1908, 185: 265; 1920, 29: 352; 1909, 59: 221; 1914, 45–46: 331; 1914, 266: 447; 1917–18, 44: 345; 1924, 54: 459; 1925, 103: 442; 1926, 78: 445; 1927, 30: 347; 1927, 124: 12; 1928, 24: 354; 1929, 2: 435; 1929, 3: 433; 1933, 33^a: 374; 1933, 152: 167; 1933, 233: 389; 1934, 165: 256; 1934, 253: 21; 1937, 52: 457; 1937, 119–120: 166; 1938, 38: 330; 1939, 185: 456; 1941, 49: 342; 1941, 46: 343; 1942–43, 1: 441; 1942–43, 4: 432; 1947, 53: 67; 1948, 21: 455; 1950, 151: 433; 1951, 19 + 23: 161^a; 1951, 185: 226; 1952, 54: 58; 1952, 55: 53^a; 1953, 21: 300; 1954, 168: 217; 1958, 4: 278; 1958, 140: 367; 1958, 267: 57; 1961, 53: 360; 1961, 109: 171; 1962, 184: 350; 1964, 19: 191; 1964, 181: 246; 1965, 270: 260; 1967, 93: 148^A; 1967, 95: 148^B; 1967, 98: 149; 1967, 549: 428; 1968, 609: 375; 1969–70, 134: 145^A; 1969–70, 183: 196; 1973, 622: 349; 1974, 228: 38; 1975, 252: 155; 1975, 255: 156; 1975, 256: 158^a; 1975, 427: 239; 1976, 144: 67; 1976, 351: 277; 1977, 153: 30; 1977, 851: 354; 1977, 859: 391; 1977, 860: 388; 1979, 156: 127; 1979, 352: 283; 1981, 219: 7; 1982, 276: 220; 1982, 680: 266; 1982, 681: 267; 1983, 140: 188; 1984, 280: 166; 1985, 327: 179; 1986, 219: 178; 1986, 333: 3; 1986, 428: 284; 1987, 230: 36; 1988, 1116: 400; 1989, 206: 176; 1989, 420: 304; 1990, 177^b: 61; 1990, 177^c: 66; 1990, 252: 173; 1990, 717: 255; 1990, 887: 451; 1990, 888: 452; 1991, 535: 168; 1992, 245: 8; 1992, 270: 69; 1992, 374: 164; 1992, 1239: 253^X; 1992, 1240: 250^B; 1993, 682: 226; 1994, 398: 88; 1995, 291: 44; 1997, 442: 168.

CIL I² 675: 54^a; 676: 54^b; 677: 55; 678: 56; 682: 60; 1578: 39; 1635: 81; 1747: 183; 1857: 163; 2248: 449; 2269: 274; 2506: 59; 2687: 21; 2944: 53^a; 2945: 53^b; 2946: 58; 2947: 57; 3031^a: 23; 3182–3184: 145; 3200: 182.

II 13: 285; 478: 286; 954: 297; 1074: 292; 1108: 299; 1255: 302; 1305: 288; 1360: 287; 1380: 293; 1441: 303; 1471: 290; 1479: 289; 1532: 308; 1663: 307; 1685: 306; 1956: 294; 2100: 296; 2113: 309; 2121: 298; 2473: 272; 3221: 281; 3265: 279; 3269: 275; 3270: 276; 3408: 274; 3664: 280; 4514: 273; 5354: 310; 5439: 2; 5490: 301; 5523: 295; 6278: 4; 6339: 281.

II² 5, 59: 291; 5, 69: 307; 5, 93: 306; 5, 492: 308; 5, 785: 305; 5, 789: 304; 5, 985: 303; 5, 1022: 2; 5, 1162: 290; 5, 1179: 289; 7, 28–29: 296; 7, 56: 298; 7, 221: 295.

III 295: 444; 296: 446^a; 297: 446^c; 607: 453; 659: 458; 660: 454; 1745: 460; 1769: 461; 6829: 444; 6835–6837: 446; 7257: 450; 12042: 448.

IV 1084: 97; 1094: 103; 1177: 99^a; 1178: 99^d; 1179: 98^b; 1180: 100; 1181: 92^b;

1182: 95; 1183: 93; 1184: 94; 1185: 96c; 1186: 102; 1187: 73b; 1189: 91a; 1190: 91b; 1192: 110E; 1192^a: 110G; 1193: 107; 1194: 111C; 1196: 110A; 1199: 110D; 1200: 111B; 1202: 110F; 1203: 111G; 1204: 111A; 1201: 106; 1989: 112; 2508: 90; 3338: 104; 3881: 73a; 3882: 76; 3883: 99c; 3884: 96a; 4999: 104; 7986^a: 110B; 7988^{b-c}: 110L; 7989: 92a; 7990: 101; 7991: 98a; 7992: 96d; 7993: 99b; 7994: 122; 7995: 96b; 9939: 79B; 9962: 108; 9963: 110H; 9965: 110J; 9967: 110K; 9968^a: 49; 9968^d: 110C; 9969: 69; 9970: 123; 9972: 77; 9973: 78; 9974: 79A; 9975: 111D; 9976: 64; 9977: 51; 9978: 75; 9979: 89a; 9980: 89b; 9981^a: 89c; 9982: 109; 9983^a: 63; 9984^{a-b}: 124; 9985^a: 111E; 9985^b: 111F; 9986: 105; 10161: 80; 10236–10238: 74; 10579: 70.

V 563: 240; 2878: 239; 3222: 241a; 4399: 238; 5049: 237; 5124: 243; 6842: 242; 7376: 235; 7637: 236; 7915: 248; 8664: 244.

VI 903: 6; 29681: 192; 31850: 146.

VIII 14: 434a; 24: 440; 100: 351; 241: 381; 449: 349; 754: 426; 828: 423; 830: 424; 853: 398; 858: 361; 860: 362; 867: 363; 895: 419; 897: 421; 958: 418; 967: 378; 969: 376; 1225: 415; 1270: 357; 1323: 412; 1353: 410; 1495: 404B; 1503: 403; 1574: 374; 1582: 374; 1887: 391; 1888: 388; 2344: 344; 4681: 372; 5146: 339A; 5147 + 5148: 339B; 5232: 369; 5276: 368; 6046: 314; 6944: 319; 6947: 322; 6948: 316; 6958: 325; 6994: 318; 6995: 317; 6996: 321A; 7000: 320; 7095: 321B; 7121: 326; 7122: 328; 7123: 323; 7960: 338; 7963: 336; 7969: 333; 7983 + 7984: 335; 7988: 337; 7990–7991: 334; 8324: 332; 8438: 313; 8938: 312; 9052: 311; 11009: 427; 11340: 384; 11345: 382; 11347: 381; 11349: 383; 11998: 379; 12253: 386; 12370: 398; 12421: 364; 12425: 419; 12426: 420; 12453: 358; 12571: 356; 14334: 397; 14343: 425; 14403: 415; 14782: 417; 14783: 416; 14855: 412; 14856: 411; 14891: 410; 15576: 374; 16417: 375; 16530: 390; 16555: 396A; 16556: 392; 16557: 394; 16558: 395; 16559: 396B; 16560: 393; 17829: 340; 17837: 341; 19489: 324; 19513: 327; 20152: 330; 22672: 437; 22673: 434a; 22852: 409; 22856: 408; 23107: 426; 23964: 423; 24056: 420; 24101: 358; 25386: 414; 25428: 397; 25703: 399a; 25704: 399b; 25808^b: 359; 25836: 373; 26121: 377; 26275: 413; 26458: 405; 26482: 403; 26527: 401; 26559: 407; 26590: 404B; 26591^b: 404A; 26606: 402A; 26608: 402B; 26618 + 26626: 406; 27771: 346.

IX 447: 152; 690: 149; 804: 151; 808: 150; 981: 147; 1156: 132; 1175: 134; 1176: 133; 1179: 131; 1184: 135; 1540: 143; 1643: 136; 1663: 144; 1665: 141; 1666: 140; 1703: 137; 1705: 138; 2127: 142; 2230: 182; 2235: 183; 2237: 184; 2243: 187; 2249: 186; 2252: 185; 2350: 162a; 2351: 162b; 2565: 169; 2962: 174; 3025: 181; 3314: 179; 3437: 177; 3692: 175; 3857: 180; 3947: 160; 4133: 159; 4168: 170; 4205: 163; 4208: 165; 4395: 164; 4903: 190; 4976: 172; 5016: 195; 5854: 194; 5855: 193.

X 226: 153; 228: 154; 539: 125; 617^a: 127; 688: 126; 829: 81; 845: 82; 853: 85; 854: 83; 855: 84a; 856: 84b; 857: 86; 1074^d: 87; 1211: 47; 1421: 225; 1453: 68; 1491: 72; 1574: 114; 1785: 117; 1795: 119; 1824: 115; 1825: 121; 1841: 113; 3702: 65; 3704: 120; 3759: 48; 3772: 60; 3776:

ANNEX: COMPARATIVE TABLE

311

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.

XI 683: 234; 1924: 224; 3078: 218; 3083: 219; 3303: 222; 3613: 214; 3781: 228; 3782: 227; 3798: 230; 3803: 229; 3807: 232; 3808: 233; 3811: 231; 3896: 215A; 3901: 215D; 3903: 215E; 3905: 215F; 3936: 216; 3904: 215C; 3907: 215B; 4371: 198; 4386: 199; 4395: 197; 4575: 200; 4580: 201; 4814: 211; 5031: 207; 5062: 206; 5170: 213; 5265: 203; 5276: 202A; 5277: 202B; 5283: 204; 5716: 212; 5820: 205; 6357: 210; 6369: 209; 6377: 208; 7483: 218; 7806: 223.

XII 372: 270; 522: 258; 670: 261; 697: 260; 701: 262; 1121: 257; 1236: 259; 1529: 263; 1585: 264; 1917: 271; 3185: 268; 3324: 269.

XIII 128: 254; 1921: 252; 2940: 250A; 2949: 251; 3162: 253; 4132: 249.

XIV 350: 28; 353: 29b; 375: 23; 376: 31; 409: 25; 2080: 20; 2114: 19; 2118: 17; 2121: 18; 2592: 43; 2623: 42; 2794: 15; 2804: 16; 2972: 37; 2991: 35; 3011: 33; 3014: 34; 3015: 32; 3663: 189; 4450: 28; 4616: 30; 4642: 29a; 4693: 24; 5381: 30.

CILA I 73: 297; III 80: 279; 84: 277; 88: 275; 91: 276; 101: 278; 224: 296; 265: 298; 420: 307; 446: 306; 566: 309.

CILSI 870: 245; 1024: 248.

EAOR II 8: 236; 9: 208; 10: 209; 11: 245; 12: 200; 13: 239; 14: 238; 15: 210; 16: 242; 17: 212; 18: 243; 19: 240; 20: 203; 21: 204; 22: 229; 23: 237; 24: 220; 25: 206; 26: 207; 28: 241a; 29: 241b; 30: 197; 31: 198; 32: 199; 33: 201; 34: 215B; 35: 215C.

III 5: 193; 6: 194; 7: 131; 8: 138; 9: 155; 10: 152; 11: 153; 12: 246; 13: 165; 14: 191; 15: 195; 16: 181; 17: 149; 18: 151; 19–21: 145; 23: 192; 24: 170; 25: 137; 26: 162a; 27: 162b; 28: 184; 29: 150; 30: 148A; 31: 148B; 32: 186; 33: 132; 34: 156; 35: 177; 36: 154; 37: 172; 38: 158a; 39: 189; 40: 171; 41: 161a; 42: 139; 43: 169; 44: 143; 45: 144; 46: 146; 47: 166; 48: 173; 49: 176; 50: 140; 51: 133; 52: 134; 53: 247; 54: 147; 55: 141; 56: 161b; 57: 135; 58: 157; 59: 142; 60: 175; 61: 158b; 62: 179; 78: 196; 88: 168.

IV 15: 27; 19: 32; 20: 11; 21: 13; 22: 33; 23: 34; 24: 37; 25: 19; 26: 8; 27: 18; 28: 31; 29: 30; 30: 36; 31: 12; 32: 35; 33: 14; 34: 22; 35: 20; 36: 7; 37: 43; 38: 45; 39: 25; 42: 5; 45: 9; 48: 46.

EE III 8: 310; VII 53: 382; VII 56: 383; VII 191: 356; VIII 340: 71; 369: 118; 370: 116; 868: 116.

HEp 1990, 469: 304; 1995, 570: 305.

<i>ICret</i>	I 51: 448.
<i>IL Afr</i>	58: 366; 125: 380; 220: 387; 303: 385; 384: 352; 390: 353; 400: 355.
<i>IL Alg</i>	I 13: 369; 95: 368; 876: 339A; 877: 339B; 2055: 370; 2144: 371; 2207: 372; 3032: 390; 3064: 392; 3065: 394; 3066: 391; 3067: 395; 3068: 388; 3069: 396A; 3070: 396B; 3071: 393. II 5: 338; 10: 336; 17: 333; 34: 335; 37: 337; 42–43: 334; 473: 319; 478: 322; 479: 316; 501: 325; 529: 324; 559: 318; 560: 317; 562: 321A; 569: 320; 675: 321B; 688: 327; 689: 326; 696: 323; 697: 328; 709: 329; 2106: 315.
<i>IL GN</i>	109: 260; 578: 265.
<i>ILL</i>	117: 274; 192: 218; 530: 163; 648: 81; 667: 39; 675: 183; 708: 53a; 709: 54a; 711: 58; 712: 57; 713: 59; 714: 55; 715: 56; 719: 60; 727: 21.
<i>IL N</i>	II 15: 270; III 29: 258; IV 24: 257.
<i>IL S</i>	140: 225; 154: 222; 160: 6; 226: 114; 399: 333; 411: 317; 434: 340; 705: 203; 1401: 119; 1901: 200; 1937: 116; 2933: 321B; 3083: 218; 3185: 54a; 3264: 241a; 3340: 55; 3395: 296; 3397: 56; 3697: 45; 4186: 143; 5017: 169; 5051: 41; 5052: 214; 5053 ⁴ : 87; 5054: 120; 5055: 247; 5056: 179; 5057: 210; 5058: 47; 5059: 162a; 5060: 184; 5061: 125; 5062: 22; 5063: 177; 5063a: 139; 5064: 194; 5065: 236; 5066: 138; 5067: 137; 5068: 140; 5069: 285; 5070: 444; 5071: 364; 5072: 379; 5073: 361; 5074: 419; 5075: 416; 5077: 338; 5078: 312; 5079: 295; 5080: 307; 5080a: 293; 5081: 446c; 5092: 243; 5123: 240; 5143: 98b; 5144: 99a; 5145: 96a; 5146: 76; 5147: 112; 5163: 4; 5179: 144; 5186: 118; 5328: 183; 5373: 219; 5377: 202A; 5381: 150; 5473: 336; 5503: 224; 5512: 294; 5513: 276; 5525a: 159; 5531: 205; 5535: 332; 5544: 292; 5616: 68; 5623: 306; 5632: 46; 5644: 180; 5646: 249; 5648: 337; 5653a,b: 86; 5653c,d: 84; 5653e: 85; 5683: 18; 5706: 81; 5713: 423; 5734a: 136; 5878: 132; 5901: 281; 6146: 25; 6147: 23; 6148: 29b; 6186: 20; 6201: 19; 6218: 16; 6234: 189; 6252: 34; 6253: 37; 6256: 32; 6264: 5; 6295: 11; 6296: 40; 6297: 39; 6302: 60; 6340: 48; 6451: 153; 6456: 72; 6516: 128; 6581: 230; 6582b: 232; 6582c: 233; 6583: 231; 6588: 216; 6623: 204; 6631: 198; 6632: 197; 6634: 201; 6702: 238; 6742: 245; 6831: 357; 6838: 388; 6839: 392; 6858: 316; 6861: 334a; 6873: 313; 6957: 273; 6960: 280; 6992: 264; 7024: 252; 7050: 250A; 7167: 461; 7189: 458; 7210: 448; 7796: 382; 7801: 381; 8926: 373; 9364: 402A; 9403: 359; 9405: 413; 9406: 353; 9408: 437.
<i>IL TG</i>	341: 253.
<i>IL Tun</i>	460: 347; 461: 348; 746: 422; 769: 365; 1050: 353; 1066: 354; 1416: 407; 1538–1538A: 374.

InsIt I¹ 21: **125**; VII¹ 7: **225**; IX¹ 166: **236**; X⁴ 77: **240**; X⁵ 192: **238**; XI¹ 11: **242**; XIII¹ 5
(*FOst*) A.D. 146: **26**; XIII¹ 5 (*FOst*) A.D. 152: **27**.

IRT 117: **442**; 142^b: **443**; 230: **441**; 232: **440**; 396: **429**; 564: **435**; 567: **433**; 569: **437**;
578: **438**; 580: **439**; 594: **430**; 595: **434a**; 601: **431**; 603: **432**; 652: **434b**; 786: **436**.

SI 1, 10: **219**; 1, 24: **220**; 3, 8: **171**; 4, 42: **192**; 4, 50: **178**; 5, 25: **173**; 8, 5: **167**; 9, 21:
164; 9, 34: **166**; 12, 2: **237**; 13, 20: **176**.

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.

—A—

- [---] ACANT'H'VS? 309
C. ACELLIVS Clemens 167
 ACERIVS Firmius Leontius 125
 P. ACILIVS P. f. Men. Paullus 37
 [-?] ACVTIVS Antullus 105
 M. ACVTIVS M. I. No[e]tus 244
 [---]us Mascanis f. ADIV[TOR] 386
 C. AECLANVS Fortunatus 71
 Ser. AEFOLAN(VS) [- f.] 274
 L. AELIVS L. f. 202
 AELIVS Maximus 354
 M. AEMILIVS Ballator 338
 L. A[E]MILIVS L. fil. Quir. [Frontinus?] 441
 AEMILIVS Honoratus 331
 AEMILIVS Marcianus 331
 C. AEMILIVS C. f. Pap. Martialis 331
 AEMILIVS Martialis iunior 331
 M. AEMILIVS Nobilis 250
Cn. AEQVASIVS C. f. Caluo[s] 202
 [---] f. AG[RIPP---] Fabi Agr[ippini] cons[ul]is filiae? 28
 AGVSIA T. f. Priscilla 16
 C. [--- AL?]EXIS 109
 C. ALBVCIVS C. f. Ser. Firmus 444
 ALEXSANDER Ca[--- s.] 21
 Cn. ALLEIVS Nigidius Maius 98–101
 [---] Q. f. Quir. ALL[---]++ +us? Fa[---]nus 323
 C. AMATIVS C. Amat(ii) Patern(i) fil. 'P'aterminus 251
 L. AMMIVS? Gamburio 249
 M. AMVLLIVS M. fil. Pap. Optatus Crementianus 339
 T. ANCHARIVS T. f. Pal. Priscus 210
 T. ANCHARIVS Priscianus 210
P. ANINIVS C. f. 81
 ANNIA Q. fil. Seuera 291
 [-] ANNIOLENVS Crescentianus 420
 M. ANNIVS L. f. 57
 [- AN]NIVS [- f. Te]r. Camars 261
 C. ANNIVS C. fil. Pap. Victor 344
 Q. ANNIVS Q. I. Fe[---] 59
 ANNIVS Memmianus 361
 ANNIVS Primitius 285
 [- A]NNIVS L. f. LEMONIA Tertius 246
 C. ANNIVS C. fil. Qu[ir. ---] 335
 ANTEROS Rusti [-] s. 21
 [---] A. I. ANTIM(ACHVS) 449
 [---]+ A. D. I. ANTIO(CHVS) 449
 [-] ANTONIVS Eu[tychus?] 450
C. ANTONIVS M. I. Nico 60
 C. ANTONIVS C. I. [---] 59
 C. ANTRACIVS C. f. 54
 [---]JUMIUS M. f. [APO]LLODORVS 127
 APONIA Montana 290
 ARMATIVS? SENORIUS?? 424
 L. ARRENIVS L. fil. Pap. Menander 148
C. ARRENVS M. f. 202
 N. ARRIVS M. f. 54
 M. ARRIVS A. f. 57
 P. ARRIVS Ianuarius Mamertinus 313
 L. ARRIVNT[IVS] L. I. Helenus 214
 Q. ARRIVNTIVS Q. f. Vol. Iustus 169
 ASICIA Victoria 404
 Ti. ASICIVS Ti. f. 57
 L. ASINIVS [---] 188
 LL. ATILII 66
 (L. ATTIVS ---) 266
 L. ATTIVS Quir. Vetto 292

- T. ATVLLIVS C. f. Celer* 83
A. AVDIVS A. f. Rufus 86
Q. AVELIVS Q. f. Serg. Priscus Seuerius Seuerus Annaus Rufus 171
 [P.? AV]FIDIVS Fortis 26
G. AVF(IDIVS) G. f. G'al'. Auitus 310
L. AVFVSTIVS L. l. Strato 60
AVILLIA Gabinia Venusta 405
Q. AVILIVS Hyacinthus 267
Q. AVILIVS? [---] 106
Cn. AVIVS Cn. l. Agathocles 60
M. AVRELIVS M. f. Pal. Aurelianus 312
M. AVREL(IVS) M. fil. Pal. T'ulius Eupraepes 36
L. AVRELIVS Aug. lib. Pylades 118
C. AVRELIVS Saturninus Papiria Cilonianus 418
 [-] AVRELIVS P. [f. ..]tentius 151
D. [---]cirius D. f. Pal. AVSPICATVS 19
Q. A[---] 380
- B—
- P. BABRIVS L. l.* 55
 [-] BABRIVS L. l. 55
L. BAEBIVS L. f. 274
P. BAEBIVS N. l. 57
P. BAEBIVS P. f. Ter. Iustus 22
P. BAEBIVS Venustus 281
M. BASSAEVS M. f. Pal. Axius 119
P. BIVELLIVS T. l. [---] 59
C. BLOSSI(VS) M. l. Proteus 60
 [---]ius BONAESPOTVS 215C
- C—
- L. CAECILIVS L. f. Athenaeus* 384
 [M. CA]ECILIVS Q. f. Quir. Natalis 321
L. CAECILIVS L. f. Pap. Optatus 273
Q. CAECILIVS Telesphor(us) 238
Q. CAELIVS Maximus 366
L. CAELIVS Saturninus L. Caeli Parthenopaei lib. 299
P. CAESETIVS Sex. f. Capito 86
P. CAESIVS M. l. 57
Cn. CAESIVS Athictus 231; cf. 232–233
L. CAESONIVS Honoratus Caesonianus 371
Q. CAETRONIVS Q. fil. Volt. Titullus 263
C. CALPVRNIVS Celsus 440
 [L. CALPVRNIVS L. C]alpurnii Pau[lli] f. Ser. Longus 445
L. CALPVR[NIVS ---] 199
Q. CALVIVS Auctus 192
Q. CALVIVS Rufinus 419
C. CALVMEIVS C. l. Erastus 214
L. CAMERIVS L. l. Doroteus 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
 [---]nius CASTOR 186
L. CATI(VS) M. f. 274
 CELER 49
 [C. C]ERCENIVS C. [l. ---] 214
P. CERRINIVS [-.f.] 136
L. CEXAECVVS Fuscus 272
 CHILO Caecili [-.s.] 21
P. CICEREIVS 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
 [---]lius Ti. f. Pup. CLEMENS 200
COCLIVS Saturninus Golicus 385
COELIVS Titianus 376
L. COELIVS L. f. Pal. Ve[rus] 191
M. CLODIVS L. f. Q(uir.) Fidus 345
A. CLODIVS A. f. Men. Flaccus 87
C. CLODIVS Hilarus 12
 T'P. CLODIVS Lo<q>uella? 372
Q. COMINIVS Abascantus 70X
M. COMINIVS Heres 74
C. CONCORDIVS Syriacus 144
 CONSTANTIVS 240
C. COR(NELIVS) Bellicus 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. COSSVTIVS P. f. 226
C. COSSVTIVS C. l. Gent(ius) 57
 [- COS?]SVTIVS C. l. Eup[---] 58
M. COTTIVS M. f. 54
L. CRASSICIVS [-.f.] 136
Q. CREPEREIVS Germani filius Pap. Rufinus 392
M. CVR[IATIVS? Q]uir. Longinus 297
M. CVRTIVS C. f. 57
P. CVRTIVS P. f. Salassus 145
- D—
- [---] fil. Pap. DATVS 394
L. DECIMIIVS L. l. Gamus 228
 [--- DIADV?]MENVVS 215A
P. DIDIOLENVS Strato 150
 [---]onius [-] l. DION(YSIVS) 58
Q. DOMITIVS Alpinus 241
 [-.D]OMITIVS [Eu?]carpus 44
C. DOMITIVS L. fil. Pal. F[abius] Hermogenes 29
Tib. DOMITIVS Proculus 253X

Cn. DOTTIVS Dotti Maryl[li]ni fil. Ser. Plancianus
446

—E—

C. EGNATIVS C. fil. Papiria [Fe]lix 416
C. EGNATIVS Festus 224
C. EGNATIVS M. l. Glyco 219
L. EGNATIVS Inuentus 47
C. EGNATIVS C. l. Musicus 219
L. EGNATIVS L. f. Clu. Victorinus (Sagittius) 201
M. EGNIVS M. f. Mae. Fortunatianus 156
[-] ELLIVS M. f. 449
[---] EPIC(ADV[S?]) 59
M. EPPILIVS M. f. 54
M. ETRILIVS Eros 192
M. ETRILIVS Onomastus 192

—F—

[---]ius FABIANVS 347
L. FABIVS L. f. Gal. Cordus 288
M. FABIVS Fronto 337
Titius FABIVS Seuerus 184
L. FADIVS Hetario 192
L. FADIVS Pierus 162
FADIVS Syntrophus 265
M. FANNIVS M. f. Papiria Vitalis 398
L. T[---]mius FELI[X] 78
[---]us L. fil. Pap. FELIX ([M]egethius) 425
[---]s Pap. FELIX Iulianus 407
N. FESTIVS Ampliatus 93–95
M. FISIVS M. f. 56
L. FLAVIVS Q. l. 57
T. FL(AVIVS) T. fil. [l. Papiria] Caele[stinus] 391
T. FLAVIVS Frontinus (Heraclius) 434–435
C. FLAVIVS Q. fil. Pap. Pudens 442
[L. FLAVIVS - f. Vel. Silu]a Nonius Bassus 196
T. FLAVIVS Acindyni fil. Quir. Scopellianus 38
L. FL(AVIVS) T. f. Aem. Tellu[s?] Gaetulicus 453
T. FLAVIVS Vibianus 433
T. FLAVIVS Vibianus iunior (Heraclius) 434
FL(AVIVS) Victor Calpurni[us] 437
Q. FLORONIVS Q. l. Princeps 219
L. FVFICIVS L. f. 57
M. FVFIVS L. f. 56
A. FVLVIVS Fulviae l. 57
L. FVLVIVS Q. f. 57
Q. FVLVIVS Fulviae l. 56
D. FVNDANIVS Pap. Primianus (Agentius) 361
Q. FVRFANIVS Q. f. Lem. M[art]ialis 399
P. FVRIVS 61
P. FVRIVS P. [l.] Flaccus 17
[-] FVRIVS S F VIR 10

—G—

A. GARGONIVS Q. l. 55

M. GAVIVS Fabius Iustus 117
M. GAVIVS Puteolanus 117
M. GELLIVS Seruandus senior 217
[GE]NTIVS Proculus Rogatianus 360
L. GERMEVS Siluanus 341
[-] GRATTIVS P. [f. ---] 450
[--- GRO]SPHVS 78

—H—

L. HEIOLEIVS P. f. 54
L. HELVIDIVS L. l. M[---] 21
C. HELVIVS N. f. 53
L. HELVIVS L. f. 53
M. HELVIVS Anthus 300
C. HELVIVS N. f. Gero 53
C. HERBACIVS Maec. Romanus 72
C. H[ER]ENNIVS Philo 170
[---]lia C. l. HILA[RA]? 173
Cn. HORDEONIVS Cn. l. Euphemio 60
L. HORDIONI(VS) L. l. Lab(eo?) 55
[--- H]OSTILIAN[VS] 30
Q. HOSTIVS Q. f. 57

—I—

N. ISTACIDIVS N. f. Cilix 86
D. ITEIVS Cn. l. 56
[---]orus IVLIANVS 395
C. IVLIVS Apollonius 116
C. IVLIVS Q. f. Felix Aurunculeianus 346
Tib. IVLIVS Diadochus 271
IVLIVS Fideus? 459
C. IVLIVS C. l. Glaphyr(us) 114
C. IVLIVS Caesar. l. Isochrysus 219
C. IVLIVS Macrini lib. Martialis 461
L. IVLIVS Martialis 318
Q. IVL(IVS) Q. fil. Quirina Rogatianus 382
IVLIVS Senecio 233
C. IVLIVS diui Augusti l. Sosthenes 192
Sext. IVL(IVS) Thermianus 250
A. (IVLIVS) Titisenus Honoratus Kappianus 374
L. IVLIVS Titisenus Rogatus Kappianus 374
Sex. IVLIVS Se[x. f.] Vol. Verinus 258
C. IVLIVS Victor 314
[IVL]IVS P. Iuli Vrbani [fil.] Quir. Vrbanus 324
C. IVLIVS [---] 50
IVNIA D. f. Rustica 294
[---] IVNIOR 326
T. IVNIVS N. f. 56
M. IVNIVS Felix 192
L. IVNIVS P. f. Serg. Paulinus 295
C. IVNIVS Priscus 260
L. IVNIVS L. f. M. n. L. pron. Gal. Rufus 293
L. IVNIVS Vibianus 342
L. IV(V)ENTI(VS) L. f. Ruf(us) 53

—K—

KANVLEIVS cf. Canuleius

—L—

P. LE[---] [---]esia[nus] 161
M. LICCVLEIVS M. I. Philin(us) 60
 LIC[HA?]S 211
 LICINIA 241
 [-] LICINIVS Abascantio 277
 L. LICINIVS Optatianus 340
 P. LIGARIVS Maximi Ligari fil. Potitus (Mensur(ius))
 364
 Sex. LIGVRIVS Sex. fil. Gal. Marinus 252
 LOL(LIVS) Cyrius 46
M. LOLLIVS M. f. Qua[rtus?] 182
 P. LVCILIVS P. f. P. n. P. pronep. Gamala 23
 P. LVCILIVS P. [f.] P. n. P. pron. Gamala 31
 LVCR(ETIA) L. f. Campana 307
 C. LVCRETIVS C. f. 57
 C. LVCRETIVS C. I. Apul(us) 55
 D. LVCRETIVS Satrius Valens 96, 97 (Satrius
 Lucretius Valens); cf. 88
 D. LVCRETIVS [D. f. Men.] Valens 88, 96
 [---] LVCRETIVS [---]? 427
 C. LVRIVS Felix 410
 M. LVRIVS M. f. Palat. Lucretianus 189
 C. LVSCIVS C. C. L. I. Summachus 17
 LVSIVS Fortunatianus 357
 C. LVSIVS C. I. [---] 59

—M—

L. MAESO[NIVS ---] 90
 MAGERIVS 428
 M. MAGILIVS Honoratus 250
 L. MAGILIV[S L. I. ---] 214
 M. MAI(VS) M. I. Nic(---) 55
T. MALL[IVS ---] 159
 M. MAMILIVS Eutythianus 243
 M. MAMIVS M'. f. 53
 C. *MANLIVS C. f.* 183
 L. MANLIVS Rufio 185
 MARCELLVS 381
 M. S[---] MARC(---) 161
 P. MARCIVS Q. f. Arn. Quadratus 402
 [-] MARCIVS Verus 318
 MARIA [---] 365
 [-] MARIVS Eudaem[on] 215B
Q. MARIVS Q. I. Stabilio 227
 P. MARIVS P. f. Volt. Valens 455
 MARIVS [---] (Vranus) 365
 C. MATRINIVS Aurelius C. f. Lem. Antoninus 204
 Q. MATVIVS Q. f. 53
 MAXIMA [---]? 417
 [---] MAXIMIANVS 447
 MELANTHVS P. Deci (s.) 180

P. MEMMIVS Apulus 232
 [L.] MEMMIVS Pecuarius Marcellinus 377
 [-] MEMMIVS [---] 215C
 T. MERCEL[LO ---] 214
 P. MESSIVS Q. I. [---] 59
L. MESSIVS [L. I.] Saluius 227
 Q. MONNIVS N. f. 56
 Q. MONNIVS Rufus 73
 [L. Clodius?] MONTANVS 305
 [---]s MONTANVS 9
L. MVMMIVS L. f. 183
 L. MVNATIVS Caeserninus 79
 A. MVNIVS A. fil. Men. Euaristus 35
N. MVNNIVS N. I. Antiocus 60
 C. MVTTEIVS C. f. Pal. Quintus Seuerus 209

—N—

[-] NAEVIVS [---] 215C
 M. NEMVNIVS M. fil. Cupitus 248
 C. NERIVS M. I. 57
 L. NERIVS M. I. 57
 P. NERIVS P. I. 57
 [---]CL I. NICEPHO(RVS) 449
 [---]us C. I. NICIA 449
 NOVIA Bassila 460
 NOVIA Iustilla 460
Q. NOVIVS Q. I. Protem(us) 60
 [P.] NVM[ERIVS Eupa?]tor 289
M. NVMICIVS (mulieris) I. Acastus 227
 NVMISIVS Genialis 70
 Q. NVMISIVS Primus 373
Q. NVMISIVS Q. I. Thyrsus 227
 C. NVMMIVS C. f. Vol. Chrestus 168
 C. NVMOLEI(VS) Cn. f. 56
 NYMPHIVS 254

—O—

C. *OBINIVS Fauor* 150
 C. OBIN[IVS ---] 7
 M. OCRATI(VS) M. I. 55
 Cn. OCTAVI(VS) N. I. 55
 L. OCTAVIVS Felix Octavianus 359
M. OCVLATIVS M. f. Verus 82
 M. OFASIVS Firmus Marus Cornelius Mari f. Clu.
 Cossinus 45
 C. OPPIVS C. I. Secundus 214
 C. OR[F]IVS L. f. Cor. Luciscus 375
 C. O[RF]IVS [---] 375
 Sex. OTACILIVS M. f. Quir. Restitutus 334
 L. OTIVS L. I. Communis 214
 P. OVIVS P. I. Plut(us) 59

—P—

L. PACATIVS Tyrannus? 216
 C. PACCIVS Cn. f. 53

M. PACCIVS M. l. Philem(o) 60
 L. PACCIVS L. f. Priscus 152
 C. PACCIVS C. f. [---] 41
 P. PACTVMEIVS C. l. 56
 Q. PACVVIVS Saturus 403
 L. PAPIVS L. f. Ter. Pollio 39
 [---]ienus PATER[NVS] 450
 C. PAVSCVLANVS C. f. Quir. Maximus 177
 L. PED(ANIVS) Clarus 301
 L. PED(ANIVS) Lupus 301
 L. PEDANIVS Venustus 301
 Cn. PESCENNIVS L. l. 57
 T. PESCENNIVS T. f. 57
 T. PETRONIVS T. f. T. n. Clu. Proculus 197
 PHILARGVRVS Cl[---] P. s. 21
 PHILARGVRVS Li[coi? - s.] 21
 PHILOMVSVS M[---] Q. s. 21
 PIST[V]S Gemini [- s.] 21
 PLAVTIVS Lupus 431
 P. PLINIVS M. f. 53
A. POLLIVS P. l. Alexand(er) 60
 [-] POLLIVS L. l. Hilar[us] 10
 Cn. POLLIVS Cn. l. Victor 114
 Sta(tius)? POMPEIVS 76
 C. POMP(EIVS) Mart(ialis)? 269
 L. POMPEIVS M. fil. Quir. Nouellus 330
 M. POMPEIVS Pudentianus 343
 M. POMPEIVS M. fil. Quir. Vetus Flavianus? 336
 L. POMPONIVS C. l. 56
 C. POMPONIVS M. Pom[p]oni Libonis trierarchi [f]il.
 Maec. Diogenes 155
 P. POMPONIVS P. f. Quintianus 452
 Q. POMPONIVS Q. l. Vrbanus 214
Q. POM[PONIVS ---] 159
 C. PONTIVS T. filius Quir. Saturninus 322
 N. POPIDIVS Rufus 102-103
 C. POPPAEVS Priscus 232
 M. PORCIVS Fla[m]i[n]alis fil. Quir. Dext[ria]nus 397
 PORFYRIVS 432
L. POSTVMIVS L. l. Eros maior 227
 L. POSTVMIVS Felix Celerinus 368
 [- P]RECILIVS M. f. [Tere]t. Pompeianus 262
 L. PRISCVS 43
 [Q. ---]uius Q. fil. Col. PRI[---] 172
 [-] PROCVLEIVS P. f. 163
 C. PVBLICIVS Donatus 181
 L. PVBLILIVS Pompon(ius) 10
 R O PVBLIL(IVS) 10
 N. PVMIDIVS Q. f. 54
 Q. P[---] 107

—Q—

[--- QVA]DRATVS Baebianus [--- f. V]index 325
 L. QVINCTI(VS) L. f. Gela[---] 53
 Sex. QVINTIVS Sex. Q(uintii) Successini lib.

Fortunatus 296

—R—

M. RAECIVS Q. f. 54
 N. RAECIVS M. f. 449
M. RAMNIVS P. l. Diopant(us) 60
 L. RASINIVS L. fil. Quir. Saturninus Maximianus 383
 MM. REMMII Rufi pater et filius 68
 M. ROCCIVS Felix M. fil. Quir. 316
 D. ROSCI(VS) Q. l. 56
 T.? RVTILIVS Iunior Iulianus 415
T. RVFILIVS Priscus 221
 L. RVNTIVS L. f. Aem. Gemellus 13
 [---] RVSONIANVS 429
 M. RVTILIVS Macedo 139
RVTILIVS Saturninus 332
 L. R[---] 164
 L. R[---]AMIVS? 61

—S—

L. SAGINIVS 84
 C. SALLIVS Pompeianus Sofronius 166
 C. SALLVSTIVS C. fil. Quir. Felix 400
 L. SALLV[STIVS ---] 417
 (Aurelius?) SALVIANVS 390
 M. SALVIVS Celsus Pinarianus 426
 SATRIVS cf. Lucretius Satrius
 [C]n. SATRIVS Cn. f. Rufus 205
 C. SATTIVS C. f. 53
 L. SCANTIVS L. fil. Quir. Iulianus 317
L. SCRIBONIVS L. f. Vol. Celer 6
 M. SEIVS Gn. fil. Quir. Maximus 320
 L. SEMPRONIVS L. f. 54
 M. SEMPRONIVS Rusticinus 318
 T. SENNIVS Sollemnis Sollemnini fil. 253
 Cn. SENTIVS Cn. fil. Cn. n. Ter. Felix 25
 Q. SEPTICIVS C. Q. l. Verna 17
 L. SEPTIMIVS Philadespot'us' 160
 P. [S]ERVILIVS M. l. 55
 P. SERVIVS N. l. 57
 [-] SEVERIVS [--- f. Verus] 362
 [-] SEXTILIVS Castor 215B
 M. SEXTI(VS) N. M. l. 55
 N. SEXTI(VS) N. M. l. 55
 Q. SILI[C]IVS L. [fi]l. Qu[i]r. Victorinus Cornelianus
 Ho[no]ratianus 350
 L. SILVANVS Pater[nus] 164
 M. SIMMINIVS Mistlita 420
 C. SITTIVS Q. fili. Quirina Flavianus 319
 L. SONTIVS Pineius Iustianus 143
 [A.] SOSIDIVS A. l. [Xi?]philinus 211
 N. SPVRIVS D. f. 57
 STABILIO Trebi [- s.] 21
 P. STATIVS P. M. l. 55
 P. STATIVS P. f. Stag(on) 53

Gn. STENNIVS Egnatius, Gn. Stenni Egnati Rufi fil.,
 Fal. Primus (Heuresius) 48
 [---] M. I. STE[---] 449
 C. STREMPONIVS C. f. Pom. Bassus 153
 P. SVESANVS M. f. 57
 M. *SVESTIDIVS* L. f. 202
 Ser. SVETI(VS) Ser. I. 55
 A. SVETTIVS Certus 91
 A. SVETTIVS [Par]tenio [e]t Niger libertus 123
 T. *SVLPICIVS* P. Q. *pu(pi) l.* 60
 C. SVLPICIVS C. I. Cthesus 214

—T—

C. TANTILIVS C. C. I. Hyla 114
 L. TAVRIVS L. f. 274
 A. TERENTIVS A. f. Gal. Rusticus 298
 Sex. TICIASENVS Sex. f. Sex. nep. Sex. pron. Clu.
 Allianus 198
 L. TIF[ANIVS] L. I. Felix 212
 C. TITINIVS C. I. Adiutor 214
 Q. TITINIVS [Q. fil. Pap.] Securus 389, 396
 [- TI]TISENIVS Pap. Feli[ciss]imus Cornelianus 406
 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. TRAEBVLANVS Felix 192
 [--- T]REBVLANVS 450
 L. TRIBVLANVS Pamphilio 192
 L. TVCCIVS Cels[us] 214
 C. TVCCIVS C. f. 54
 M. TVLLIVS 89
 TVLLIVS Marc(i) lib. Achilleus 245
 TVRIVS Verna[.] 351

—V—

M. VALERIVS L. f. 54
 M. VALERIVS M. f. 18
 M. VALERIVS M. I. 56
 M. VALERIVS M. fil. Pap. Flavianus Sabinian[us]
 393

VALERIVS Frumentius 20
 M. VAL(ERIVS) M. f. Quir. Marc[ellus?] 306
 L. VALERIVS Primus 108
 L. VALERIVS L. fil. Volt. Priscus 456
 M. VALERIVS M. f. M. n. G. pron. Quir. Proculus
 304
 VALERIVS Stasi[mus?] 124
 VARICOS 349
 [- VARIN]IVS [- f. Vol. M]acedo 457
 P. VEGELLIVS P. f. Pub. Primus 5
 L. VEICIVS L. f. 57
 P. VEIDIVS P. I. Philocles 137
 D. VELIVS Trophimus 33
 Sex. VENCIVS Iuuentianus 264
 A. VERATIVS A. f. Pal. Seuerianus 120
 VERGILIVS Cogitatus 233
 L. VETTIVS Tribunus 62
 Q. VETVLENIVS Vrbanus 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. VIBBIVS Ianuarius 138
 Q. VIBIVS Q. I. SABB 10
 L. VILLIVS C. f. Trom. Atilianus 11
 [-] VILLIVS C. f. [---] 450
 P. VINESIVS Firmus 242
 M. VISINIVS M. I. Philadelphus 214
 L. VITR(ASIVS) Siluest[er] 52
 C. *Vulius (= VLIVS)* C. f. 81
 M. VLPIVS M. f. Aem. Natalis 14
 VOCONIA Q. f. Auita 283
 Cn. VOESIVS Cn. fil. Aper 34
 Q. VOLTEDIVS L. [f. Arn.] Optatus Aurelian[us] 353
 C. *VOLVMNIVS* C. I. Bello 227
 L. *VOLV[SIVS]* [---] 159
 Q. VRSIVS Secundio 192
 L. VRVINEIVS L. I. Philomusus 32
 VVLIVS cf. Vlius
 [---] f. Men. V[---] 142

REFERENCES

1. Abbreviations

- AE* *L'année épigraphique*, Paris, 1888– .
- AesIt* *Aes Italicense* or *Senatus consultum de sumptibus ludorum gladiatoriorum minuendis*: cf. no. 4.
- Album* A.E. (& J.S.) GORDON, *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions, Rome and the Neighborhood*, Berkeley/Los Angeles, 1958–1965.
- ANRW* H. TEMPORINI & AL. eds., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Berlin, 1972– .
- BbA* Z. BENZINA BEN ABDALLAH, *Catalogue des inscriptions latines païennes du musée du Bardo* (CEFR 92), Rome, 1986.
- BEFAR* Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome.
- Bruns* C.G. BRUNS, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*⁷, O. Gradenwitz ed., Tübingen 1909.
- Budé* Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé, Paris.
- C* = *CIL*
- CEFR* Collection de l'École française de Rome.
- CIDER* P. PIERNAVIEJA, *Corpus de inscripciones deportivas de la España romana*, Madrid, 1977.
- CIL* *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863– .
- CILA* *Corpus de inscripciones Latinas de Andalucía*, Seville, 1989– .
- CILSI* H. PAIS, *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum Supplementa Italica I*, Rome, 1888.
- CSEL* *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna.
- DictAnt* C. DAREMBERG, E. SAGLIO & E. POTTIER, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, Paris, 1877–1919.
- DizEp* E. DE RUGGIERO & AL., *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, Rome, 1895– .

- Duval = DUVAL 1989, catalogue pp.409–80.
- EAOR *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'occidente Romano*, Rome, 1988–. P. SABBATINI TUMOLESI, I, *Roma*, 1988; G.L. GREGORI, II, *Regiones Italiae VI–XI*, 1989; M. BUONOCORE, III, *Regiones Italiae II–V, Sicilia, Sardinia et Corsica*, 1992; M. FORA, IV, *Regio Italiae I: Latium*, 1996; C. VISMARA & M.L. CALDELLI, V, *Gallia Narbonensis, tres Galliae, duae Germaniae et Britannia*, to appear (*non vidi*).
- EE *Ephemeris epigraphica. Corporis inscriptionum Latinarum supplementum*, Berlin, 1872–1913.
- E&J V. EHRENBERG & A.H.M. JONES, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*², repr. with addenda, Oxford, 1976.
- F ... *F(asti) ... Allif(ani): InsIt XIII*² 24 (pp.177–84); *Amit(ernini): InsIt XIII*² 25 (pp.185–200); *Ant(iates) Min(istrorum domus Augustae): InsIt XIII*² 26 (pp.201–12); *Caer(etani): InsIt XIII*² 8 (pp.64–68); *(Furii) Fil(ocali): InsIt XIII*² 42 (pp.237–62); *Maff(eiani): ILS 8744; InsIt XIII*² 10 (pp.70–84); *Mag(istrorum uici): InsIt XIII*² 12 (pp.90–98); *Ost(ienses): InsIt XIII*¹ 5 (pp.173–241); VIDMAN 1982; EAOR IV 7–18; *Praen(estini): ILS 8744a; InsIt XIII*² 17 (pp.107–45); *Ven(usini): C IX 422; ILS 6123; InsIt XIII*² 6 (pp.55–62).
- FGrH F. JACOBY, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Leiden, 1923–.
- FIRA S. RICCOBONO & AL., *Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani*, Florence, 1941–1943 (1969).
- Fora = FORA 1996, catalogue pp.113–64.
- HEp *Hispania epigraphica*, 1–, Madrid, 1989–.
- ICret M. GUARDUCCI, *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Rome, 1935–1950.
- IL Afr R. CAGNAT, A. MERLIN & L. CHATELAIN, *Inscriptions latines d'Afrique (Tripolitaine, Tunisie et Maroc)*, Paris, 1923.
- ILAlg *Inscriptions latines de l'Algérie*, Paris/Alger, 1922–.
- ILGN E. ESPÉRANDIEU, *Inscriptions latines de Gaule (Narbonnaise)*, Paris, 1929.
- ILL A. DEGRASSI, *Inscriptiones Latinae liberae rei publicae*, Florence, 1957–1965.
- ILN *Inscriptions latines de Narbonnaise (Suppl. à Gallia 44)*, Paris, 1985–.
- ILS H. DESSAU, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, Berlin, 1892–1916.
- ILTG P. WUILLEUMIER, *Inscriptions latines des Trois Gaules*, Paris, 1963.
- ILTun A. MERLIN, *Inscriptions latines de la Tunisie*, Paris, 1944.

- InsIt* *Inscriptiones Italiae*, Rome, 1931– .
- IRT* J.M. REYNOLDS & J.B. WARD-PERKINS, *The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, Rome, 1952.
- L&S* CH.T. LEWIS & CH. SHORT, *A Latin Dictionary ...*, New York 1879.
- LexIrn* *Lex Irnitana*: cf. no. 3.
- LexTar* *Lex Tarentina*: cf. no. 1.
- LexVrs* *Lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae Vrsonensis*: cf. no. 2.
- Liverani* = LIVERANI 1987, catalogue pp.26–139.
- Loeb* Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge MA/London.
- LudSaecA* *Acta ludorum saecularium Quintorum* (17 B.C.): *C* VI 32323 + *AE* 1988, 20–21; *Bruns* 46, cf. 74; *ILS* 5050; *FIRA* I 40, cf. 57; *PIGHI* 1965 pp.107–30, 411–12; *E&J* 30–32; *EAOR* I 42 (LL.162–168).
- LudSaecS* *Acta ludorum saecularium Septimorum* (A.D. 204): *C* VI 32326–32335; *ILS* 5050^a; *PIGHI* 1965 pp.137–94; *EAOR* I 43 (LL.42–43).
- OLD* *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1982.
- PIR²* E. GROAG & AL., *Prosopographia Imperii Romani saeculi I, II, III*, 1933– .
- RE* A. PAULY, G. WISSOWA & AL., *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart/Munich, 1893–1980.
- RGDA* *Res gestae diui Augusti*: MOMMSEN 1883; BRUNT & MOORE 1967; *E&J* pp.1–31; GAGÉ 1977.
- Robert* = ROBERT 1940, catalogue pp.75–237.
- RomSt* M.H. CRAWFORD ed., *Roman Statutes*, London, 1996.
- SCLar* *Senatus consultum* from Larinum or so-called *Tabula Larinas*: *AE* 1978, 145 + 1990, 189 + 1991, 515; *EAOR* III 2.
- SEG* *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden, 1923– .
- Sherk* = SHERK 1970, catalogue pp.17–58.
- SI* *Supplementa Italica. Nuova serie*, Rome, 1981– .
- ST* = SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980, catalogue pp.17–110.
- TabHeb* *Tabula Hebana*: *AE* 1949, 215; *AE* 1952, 164; *E&J* 94^a; *RomSt* 37.
- TabHer* *Tabula Heracleensis*: *C* I² 593 + pp.724, 739, 833, 916; *ILS* 6085 + add.; *FIRA* I 13; *EAOR* III 1; *RomSt* 24.

- Teubner Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana, Leipzig.
 TLL *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, Leipzig, 1900– .
 W-K = WESCH-KLEIN 1990, catalogue pp.53-357.

2. Studies

- ANDRÉ J.-M., 1975, "Les «Ludi Scaenici» et la politique des spectacles au début de l'ère antonine", *Actes du IX^e Congrès de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, Paris, pp.468–79.
- ANDRÉ J.-M., 1990, "Die Zuschauerschaft als sozial-politischer Mikrokosmos zur Zeit des Hochprinzipats", in J. BLÄNSDORF ed., *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*, Tübingen, pp.165–73.
- ANGELONE R., 1989–90, "Spettacoli gladiatori ad Ercolano e gli edifici da essi postulati", *RAAN* 62, pp.215–43.
- AYMARD J., 1951, *Essai sur les chasses romaines des origines à la fin du siècle des Antonins*, Paris.
- BALIL A., 1961, *La ley gladiatoria de Itálica*, Madrid.
- BALSDON J.P.V.D., 1969, "Panem et circenses", in J. BIBAUW ed., *Hommages à Marcel Renard II. Histoire, histoire des religions, épigraphie* (Coll. Latomus 102), Bruxelles, pp.57–60.
- BALSDON J.P.V.D., 1974, *Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome*², London.
- BEAUJEU J., 1988, "Jeux latins et jeux grecs (à propos de Cic. *Fam.* VII, 1 et *Att.* XVI, 5)", *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec. Res sacrae* (Collection Latomus 201), Bruxelles, pp.10–18.
- BESCHAOUCH A., 1966, "La mosaïque de chasse à l'amphithéâtre découverte à Smirat en Tunisie", *CRAI*, pp.134–57.
- BLÄNSDORF J. ed., 1990, *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*, Tübingen.
- BOULEY E., 1994, "La gladiature et la *venatio* en Mésie inférieure et en Dacie à partir du règne de Trajan", *DHA* 20, pp.29–53.
- BRADLEY K.R., 1981, "The Significance of the *Spectacula* in Suetonius' *Caesares*", *RSA* 11, pp.129–37.
- BRUNT P.A. & J.M. MOORE, 1967, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti. The Achievements of the Divine Augustus*, Oxford [with revisions in successive reprints].
- CALDELLI M.L., 1993, *L'Agon Capitolinus. Storia e protagonisti dell'istituzione domiziana al IV secolo*, Rome.
- CALDELLI M.L., 1997, "Gli agoni alla greca nelle regioni occidentali dell'Impero. La Gallia

- Narbonensis”, *MAL* 9, pp.387–481.
- CAVALLARO M.A., 1984, *Spese e spettacoli. Aspetti economico-strutturali degli spettacoli nella Roma giulio-claudia*, Bonn.
- CÉBEILLAC GERVASONI M., 1990, “L’évergétisme des magistrats du Latium et de la Campanie des Gracques à Auguste à travers les témoignages épigraphiques”, *MEFRA* 102, pp.699–722.
- CHAMBERLAND G., 1999, “The organization of gladiatorial games in Italy” [review of FORA 1996], *JRA* 12, pp.613–16.
- COLEMAN K.M., 1998, “The *liber spectaculorum*: perpetuating the ephemeral”, in F. GREWING ed., *Toto notus in orbe. Perspektiven der Martial-Interpretation (Palin-genesia 65)*, pp.15–36.
- COURTNEY E., 1995, *Musa Lapidaria. A Selection of Latin Verse Inscriptions*, Atlanta.
- CRAWFORD M., 1993, “Arranging Seating”, *Athenaeum* 71, pp.613–18.
- CROWTHER N.B., 1983, “Greek Games in Republican Rome”, *AC* 52, pp.268–73.
- DARDAINE S., 1995, “L’évergétisme *ob honorem* en Bétique”, *Ktèma* 16, 1991, pp.281–91.
- DOMERGUE C. & AL. (CH. LANDES & J.-M. PAILLER) eds., 1990, *Spectacula I. Gladiateurs et amphithéâtres. Actes du Colloque tenu à Toulouse et à Lattes les 26, 27, 28 et 29 mai 1987*, Lattes.
- DUNBABIN K.M.D., 1978, *The Mosaics of Roman North Africa*, Oxford.
- DUNCAN-JONES R.P., 1982, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies²*, Cambridge.
- DUTHOY R., 1974, “La fonction sociale de l’augustalité”, *Epigraphica* 36, pp.134–54.
- DUTHOY R., 1978, “Les *Augustales”, *ANRW* II.16.2, pp.1254–1309.
- DUVAL N., 1989, “Inventaire des inscriptions latines païennes de Sbeitla”, *MEFRA* 101, pp.403–88.
- EDMONDSON J.C., 1996, “Dynamic Arenas: Gladiatorial Presentations in the City of Rome and the Construction of Roman Society during the Early Empire”, in SLATER ed. 1996, pp.69–112.
- ETIENNE R., 1965, “La naissance de l’amphithéâtre: le mot et la chose”, *REL* 43, pp.213–20.
- FEAR A.T., 2000, “Status Symbol or Leisure Pursuit? Amphitheatres in the Roman World”, *Latomus* 59, pp.82–87.
- FISHWICK D., 1991, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West II¹*, Leiden.
- FLORIANI SQUARCIAPINO M., 1979, “Cirche e spettacoli circensi nelle province romane d’Africa”, *RAL* 34, pp.275–90.

- FORA M., 1996, *I munera gladiatoria in Italia. Considerazioni sulla loro documentazione epigrafica*, Naples.
- FRANKLIN JR J.L., 1997, "Cn. Alleius Nigidius Maius and the Amphitheatre: *Munera* and a Distinguished Career at Ancient Pompeii", *Historia* 46, pp.434–47.
- FREI-STOLBA R., 1988, "Textschichten in der Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae Ursonensis", *SDHI* 54, pp.191–225.
- FRIEDLÄNDER L., 1885, "Die Spiele", in MARQUARDT 1885, pp.482–566. [French transl., 1890, "Les jeux", in MARQUARDT 1890, pp.245–349.]
- FRIEDLÄNDER L., 1921–23, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*¹⁰, G. Wissowa ed., Leipzig. [English transl. of the 7th/6th ed., 1907–1913, *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, London.]
- GAGÉ J., 1977, *Res gestae diui Augusti*³, Paris.
- GALSTERER H., 1981, "Spiele und «Spiele». Die Organisation der *ludi Juvenales* in der Kaiserzeit", *Athenaeum* 59, pp.410–38.
- GALSTERER H., 1987, "La loi municipale des Romains: chimère ou réalité?", *RHD* 65, pp.181–203.
- GASCOU J., 1967, "Le rescrit d'HisPELLUM", *MEFR* 79, pp.609–59.
- GAYRAUD M., 1981, *Narbonne antique des origines à la fin du III^e siècle*, Paris.
- GAYRAUD M., 1987, "La gladiature en Narbonnaise: l'apport de l'épigraphie", in *Les gladiateurs. Lattes, 26 mai–4 juillet 1987. Toulouse, 13 juillet–début septembre 1987*, Lattes, pp.63–65.
- GINESTET P., 1991, *Les organisations de la jeunesse dans l'Occident romain*, Bruxelles.
- GOLVIN J.-C., 1988, *L'amphithéâtre romain. Essai sur la théorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions*, Paris.
- GOLVIN J.-C. & M. REDDÉ, 1990, "Naumachies, jeux nautiques et amphithéâtres", in DOMERGUE & AL. eds. 1990, pp.165–78.
- GONZÁLEZ J., 1986, "The Lex Imitana: a New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law", *JRS* 76, pp.147–243.
- GRANINO CECERE M.G., 1987, "Base con iscrizione onoraria nel Museo nazionale di Palestrina", *MGR* 11, pp.189–210.
- GUEY J., 1964, "Le sénatus-consulte «*De sumptibus ludorum gladiatoriorum minuendis* » (177 ap. J.-C.)", *BSAF*, pp.42–46.
- HERZ P., 1975, *Untersuchungen zum Festkalender der römischen Kaiserzeit nach datierten Weih- und Ehreninschriften*, Diss., Mainz.
- HÖNLE A., 1982, Review of SABBATINI TUMOLESI 1980, *Gnomon* 54, pp.473–77.

- HOPKINS K., 1983, "Murderous Games", in ID., *Death and Renewal*, Cambridge, pp.1–30.
- HUMPHREY J.H., 1986, *Roman Circuses. Arenas for Chariot Racing*, London.
- JACQUES F., 1984, *Le privilège de liberté. Politique impériale et autonomie municipale dans les cités de l'Occident romain (161–244)* (CEFR 76), Rome.
- JACZYNOWSKA M., 1978, *Les associations de la jeunesse romaine sous le Haut-Empire* (Archiwum Filologiczne 36), Wrocław/Warsaw/Krakow/Gdansk.
- KHANOUSI M., 1991, "Les spectacles de jeux athlétiques et de pugilat dans l'Afrique romaine", *MDAIR* 98, pp.315–22.
- KLEIJWEGT M., 1991, *Ancient Youth. The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society*, Amsterdam.
- KLEIJWEGT M., 1994, "Iuvenes and Roman Imperial Society", *AClass* 37, pp.79–102.
- KLEIJWEGT M., 1995, "A Presumptuous *Quaestor* from Patras?", *Epigraphica* 57, pp.39–45.
- LAFAYE G., 1896, "Gladiator", *DictAnt* II, pp.1563–99.
- LAFAYE G., 1919, "Venatio", *DictAnt* V, pp.680–709.
- LANDES CH. ed., 1992, *Spectacula II. Le théâtre antique et ses spectacles. Actes du Colloque tenu au Musée archéologique Henri Prades de Lattes, 27–30 avril 1989*, Lattes.
- LANDES CH. ed., 1994, *Le stade romain et ses spectacles* (Catalogue d'exposition, Musée archéologique Henri Prades, Lattes), Lattes.
- LANGHAMMER W., 1973, *Die rechtliche und soziale Stellung der Magistratus municipales und der Decuriones*, Wiesbaden.
- LE GLAY M., 1982, "Hercule et la *iuventus* viennoise: à propos de la mosaïque des athlètes vainqueurs", *Mosaïque. Recueil d'hommages à Henri Stern*, Paris, pp.265–71.
- LE ROUX P., 1991, "Cité et culture municipale en Bétique sous Trajan", *Ktèma* 12 (1987), pp.271–84.
- LIEBENAM W., 1900, *Städteverwaltung im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Leipzig.
- LIVERANI P., 1987, *Municipium Augustum Veiens. Veio in età imperiale attraverso gli scavi Georgi (1811–13)*, Roma.
- MÄHL E., 1974, *Gymnastik und Athletik im Denken der Römer*, Amsterdam.
- MARQUARDT J., 1885, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, III² (ID. & TH. MOMMSEN, *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*, VI), Leipzig. [French transl., 1890, *L'administration romaine. Manuel des antiquités romaines*, XIII, Paris.]
- MEIGGS R., 1973, *Roman Ostia*², Oxford.

- MOELLER W.O., 1970, "The Riot of A.D. 59 at Pompeii", *Historia* 19, pp.84–95.
- MOMMSEN TH., 1892, "Senatus consultum de sumptibus ludorum gladiatoriorum minuendū factum a. p. C. 176/7" (Observatio epigraphica XLI), *EE* VII (published 1890), pp.388–416. [= *Gesammelte Schriften* VIII, pp.499–531]
- MOSCI SASSI M.G., 1992, *Il linguaggio gladiatorio*, Bologna.
- MOURITSEN H., 1988, *Elections, Magistrates and Municipal Élite. Studies in Pompeian Epigraphy*, Rome.
- MOURITSEN H. & I. GRADEL, 1991, "Nero in Pompeian Politics. *Edicta Munerum* and Imperial Flamines in Late Pompeii", *ZPE* 87, pp.145–55.
- MROZEK S., 1987, *Les distributions d'argent et de nourriture dans les villes italiennes du Haut-Empire romain* (Coll. Latomus 198), Bruxelles.
- NEWBOLD R.F., 1975, "Cassius Dio and the Games", *AC* 44, pp.589–604.
- OLIVER J.H. & R.E.A. PALMER, 1954, "Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate", *Hesperia* 23, pp.320–349.
- PFLAUM H.G., 1948, *Le marbre de Thorigny*, Paris.
- PICCALUGA G., 1965, *Elementi spettacolari nei rituali festivi romani*, Roma.
- PIGANIOL A., 1923, *Recherches sur les jeux romains*, Paris/Strasbourg.
- PIGHI G.B., 1965, *De ludis Saecularibus*², Amsterdam.
- PLEKET H.W., 1987, Review of VILLE 1981, *Mnemosyne* 40, pp.219–21.
- POLIAKOFF M.B., 1987, *Combat Sports in the Ancient World*, New Haven/London.
- POLVERINI L. & M. MALAVOLTA, 1977, "Ludi", *DizEp* IV, pp.2005–98.
- ROBERT L., 1940, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, Paris. Repr. 1971 with new preface, Amsterdam. [Supplements: ID., *Hellenica* 3, 1946, pp.112–50; 5, 1948, pp.75–99; 7, 1949, pp.126–51; 8, 1950, pp.39–72.]
- ROBERT L., 1984, "Discours d'ouverture", Πρακτικά του Η' διεθνούς συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής επιγραφής. Αθηνά, 3–9 οκτωβρίου 1982, I, Athens, pp.35–45. [= ID., *Opera minora selecta* 6, 1989, pp.709–19.]
- SABBATINI TUMOLESI P., 1974, "Documenti gladiatorii dell'Occidente romano (I. Iscrizioni dell'età repubblicana)", *RAL* 29, pp.283–92.
- SABBATINI TUMOLESI P., 1980, *Gladiatorum paria. Annunci di spettacoli gladiatorii a Pompei (Tituli 1)*, Rome.
- SABBATINI TUMOLESI P., 1984, Review of VILLE 1981, *RFIC* 112, pp.100–11.
- SHERK R.K., 1970, *The Municipal Decrees of the Roman West* (Arethusa Monographs 2),

- Buffalo.
- SIVAN H.S., 1989, "Town, Country and Province in Late Roman Gaul: the Example of CIL XIII 128", *ZPE* 79, pp.103–13.
- SLATER W.J., 1994, "Pantomime Riots", *ClAnt* 13, pp.120–44.
- SLATER W.J. ed., 1996, *Roman Theater and Society*, Ann Arbor.
- THUILLIER J.-P., 1982, "Le programme «athlétique» des *ludi circenses* dans la Rome républicaine, *REL* 60, pp.105–22.
- THUILLIER J.-P., 1996, *Le sport dans la Rome antique*, Paris.
- TOLLER O., 1889, *De spectaculis, cenis, distributionibus in municipiis Romanis occidentis imperatorum aetate exhibitis*, Diss., Altenburg.
- VEYNE P., 1976, *Le pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique*, Paris. [English transl., 1990, *Bread and circuses: historical sociology and political pluralism*, London]
- VIDMAN L., 1982, *Fasti Ostienses*², Prague.
- VILLE G., 1960, "Les jeux de gladiateurs dans l'Empire chrétien", *MEFR* 72, pp.273–335.
- VILLE G., 1981, *La gladiature en Occident, des origines à la mort de Domitien* (BEFAR 245), Rome.
- WELCH K., 1994, "The Roman Arena in Late-Republican Italy: A New Interpretation", *JRA* 7, 59–80.
- WISSOWA G., 1912, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², Munich.
- WEINSTOCK G., 1971, *Divus Iulius*, Oxford.
- WIEDEMANN TH., 1992, *Emperors and Gladiators*, London.
- WILKINS P.I., 1988, "Amphitheatres and Private Munificence in Roman Africa. A New Text from Thuburnica", *ZPE* 75, pp.215–21.
- WISSOWA G., 1912, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*², Munich.
- ZELAZOWSKI J., 1997, "Honos bigae. Le statue onorarie romane in forma di biga. Il caso dubbio di CIL II 1086", *Epigraphica* 59, pp.173–203.