



<https://publications.dainst.org>

iDAI.publications

ELEKTRONISCHE PUBLIKATIONEN DES
DEUTSCHEN ARCHÄOLOGISCHEN INSTITUTS

Dies ist ein digitaler Sonderdruck des Beitrags / This is a digital offprint of the article

G. P. Burton The Curator Rei Publicae: Towards a Reappraisal

aus / from

Chiron

Ausgabe / Issue **9 • 1979**

Seite / Page **465–488**

<https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron/1384/5733> • urn:nbn:de:0048-chiron-1979-9-p465-488-v5733.7

Verantwortliche Redaktion / Publishing editor

Redaktion Chiron | Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Amalienstr. 73 b, 80799 München

Weitere Informationen unter / For further information see <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/chiron>

ISSN der Online-Ausgabe / ISSN of the online edition **2510-5396**

Verlag / Publisher **Verlag C. H. Beck, München**

©2017 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de / Web: dainst.org

Nutzungsbedingungen: Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) von iDAI.publications an. Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeberinnen/Herausgeber der entsprechenden Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de).

Terms of use: By downloading you accept the terms of use (<https://publications.dainst.org/terms-of-use>) of iDAI.publications. All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de).

G. P. BURTON

The Curator Rei Publicae: Towards a Reappraisal

The appearance of the office of *curator rei publicae* (in Greek entitled λογιστής) in the last third of the first century A. D. presents an important and enduring institutional innovation of a kind rare in the administrative history of the principate. The original characteristics of the social status of this official and of his duties were firmly and incontrovertibly established by LIEBENAM in his fundamental article many years ago.¹ This short paper has three main purposes. First, to challenge on empirical grounds modern assertions about the date of changes in the social status and method of appointment of *curatores*, and to demonstrate that these changes occurred in the period of the tetrarchy rather than in the course of the first half of the third century. Secondly, to show that although the office of *curator* was a qualitatively important institutional development it never became the endemic phenomenon that our modern accounts assert or imply. Thirdly, to press the implications of an important contribution by LUCAS (about the *curatores* of the provinces of North Africa) and thereby place the duties of the *curator* more clearly within the general framework of provincial administration.² I will try to show, consequently, that developments in the social status and duties of the *curator* were linked, and that they gain coherence if they are situated in the cadre of the general reforms of provincial administration which occurred in the tetrarchic period. Cognately I hope also to suggest by example that this functional analysis of the development of the office of *curator* is useful and historically cogent precisely because it avoids recourse to a series of *a priori* modern notions about the character of the early third century and about the 'centralisation' of the administration of the empire which have structured the tone of much discussion and helped to obfuscate the facts and their implications.

¹ W. LIEBENAM, *Curator Rei Publicae*, *Philologus* 56, 1897, 290 ff. (= LIEBENAM).

² C. LUCAS, *Notes on the Curatores Rei Publicae of Roman Africa*, *JRS* 30, 1940, 56 ff. (= LUCAS); this article is the only substantial contribution to the subject since LIEBENAM.

I. *The Social Status, Method of Appointment and Frequency of the Curator Rei Publicae in the Second and Third Centuries*

Our literary sources do not record the date of the origin of this office. The matter is not of great moment for our purposes. The first attested example perhaps occurs at Smyrna during the reign of Nero, and there are a reasonable number of examples in various parts of the empire during the reign of Trajan from which period onwards the post remains amply attested.³ Despite this lacuna in our knowledge there is general and, on the whole, well-founded agreement about basic aspects of the office during the second century. The *curator* was appointed by the emperor, of elevated social rank (typically senatorial or equestrian), and by origin foreign to the city (or cities) where he held office.⁴ By the early fourth century a substantial transformation had occurred. The *curator* was elected by the local councils (though his nomination may have had to be confirmed by the emperor) and was normally himself a local politician who had completed all the other liturgies and magistracies of his town.⁵ The original distinguishing features of social preeminence, foreign origin and appointment from above by the emperor have either disappeared or been severely transformed. The *curator* has ceased to be a distinct appointment of the central government, and has evolved (or been absorbed) into a senior magistrate within the local civic community.

When did these radical changes in the social status, origin and method of appointment of *curatores* occur? LIEBENAM left the problem in suspense.⁶ Nearly all subsequent authorities have been clear and confident. «At first they [*curatores*] are of senatorial or equestrian rank, but in the third century the local senates appoint members of their own order, and the office of *curator rei publicae* thus becomes a municipal one overshadowing the older magistracies.»⁷ The general

³ Smyrna: Philostratus, v. Soph. 512; for the date see Appendix. Possible examples from the reign of Domitian were gathered by D. MAGIE, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton 1950, 1454 f.; the recent article by R. SYME (The Enigmatic Sospes, JRS 67, 1977, 38 ff.) demonstrates that L. Caesennius Sospes was a *curator* in Domitian's reign. I would, therefore, withdraw my earlier support for a Trajanic date (JRS 62, 1972, 183). It is important to note that the standard attributions of the origin of the institution of *curatores* to Trajan (or less frequently Domitian) rely on arguments from silence which presume that the earliest attested (or rather, the supposedly earliest attested) holders of the post are identical with the historically earliest holders.

⁴ For all these points see LIEBENAM 293–297.

⁵ Again see LIEBENAM 319 ff.; note especially C. Th. 12, 1, 20 (A. D. 331).

⁶ LIEBENAM 319: «Wann diese Wandlung des Amtes vor sich gegangen ist, ist meines Erachtens schon aus dem Grunde nicht mit Sicherheit zu bestimmen, weil sie sich vermuthlich in den einzelnen Städten zu verschiedenen Zeiten vollzogen hat.»

⁷ So H. F. JOLOWICZ, *Historical Introduction to the Study of Roman Law*³, Cambridge 1972, 350. Cf. E. KORNEMANN, *Curatores*, RE 4 (1901) 1806 ff., at 1810: «Diese Wandlung hat sich im 3. Jh. seit Alexander Severus vorbereitet und ist mit der Reform des Diocletian

view prevails that sometime during the first half of the third century the main features of the fourth century *curator* can already be clearly detected. It is assumed that this change took place either because of the policies of some third century emperor, such as Severus Alexander, or – a more popular explanation – because in the third century the appointment of *curatores* had become so frequent and normal that the post ceased to be distinguishable from and became assimilated to the older magistracies; consequently, also, the emperors were not able to keep up with such an extensive flow of appointments and primary responsibility for these appointments devolved to the local councils.

However, a reexamination of the evidence for *curatores* in one province, Asia, up to A. D. 260 suggests that this prevailing view of the evolution and transformation of the office is substantially flawed. First, the evidence for the social status and geographic origin of the *curatores* of Asia is generally stable and consistent, and indicates no radical shift during the first half of the third century. Secondly, strong, and probably decisive, doubt can be cast on the contention that *curatores* were appointed consistently even to a majority, let alone all, of the cities of Asia in the late second and early third centuries.⁸

a) *The case of Asia: Social status and origins*

Thirty-eight cases of an official holding the post of *curator* of a city or a village community in Asia can safely be enumerated before c. 260.⁹ The absolutely small size of this surviving universe evokes two immediate comments. First, so few

beendet»; F. F. ABBOTT and A. C. JOHNSON, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, Princeton 1926, 91; D. NÖRR, *Imperium und Polis in der hohen Prinzipatszeit*², Munich 1969, 19 ff.; W. LANGHAMMER, *Die rechtliche und soziale Stellung der Magistratus Municipales und der Decuriones*, Wiesbaden 1973, 165 ff., esp. at 172, canvassing Alexander Severus again; A. H. M. JONES, *The Greek City*, Oxford 1940, 137: «normal for the *curator* to be a citizen of the city which he supervised», by the middle of the third century. For a brief statement of dissent from this orthodoxy now see F. JACQUES, *Ampliatio et Mora: Évergètes récalcitrants d'Afrique romaine*, *Antiquités Africaines* 9, 1975, 159 ff., at 161.

⁸ The only other recent analysis of the office, by LUCAS, for the provinces of Roman Africa, where the late third and fourth century epigraphic evidence remains relatively good, came to conclusions equally divergent from the consensus. She placed the period of transformation of the office in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine. However the total number of pre-Diocletianic examples was too small to provide a good basis for wider speculation. But, as will be seen, the congruence of the Asian evidence with the African should allow firm generalisation.

⁹ They are listed, with relevant testimony, in the table in the appendix to this article. The numbers used in the text hereafter refer to the number assigned to each *curator* in the table. The universe of thirty-eight excludes a) putative officials whose tenure is deduced from heavily restored evidence and b) *curatores* of local associations such as *gerousiae*. The evidence for these two groups is added for the sake of completeness in an addendum at the end of the appendix.

instances of attestation of this office over a period of around 180 years suggests that the phenomenon was scarcely as widespread as is usually assumed or stated. We will return to this crucial question in the next section. Secondly, it is evident that generalisation about the character of the office and any notional trends of significance must be made with considerable caution. That said (and emphasised), what does a first crude analysis of the *curatores* of Asia by social status and origin indicate?

Seven of these *curatores* were senators (nos. 1, 7, 15, 17, 20, 25 and 33), and three were of equestrian status (nos. 13, 22 and 36). Eleven more were active members of the provincial political and social elite who, besides being *curatores*, had held the provincial priesthood of Asia (nos. 3, 6, 8, 11, 12, 19, 23, 24, 29, 30 and 32).¹⁰ In contrast stands a group of nine examples (nos. 2, 4, 9, 10, 16, 26, 27, 28 and 34) where either the *curator* can be shown to be of local origin or the post can be shown to be considered as part of the matrix of local office-holding.¹¹ The office of *curator* in these last examples has been subsumed into local institutional practice, and has ceased to be, or never was, appointed from outside by the emperor or given to men of social preeminence. Penultimately, and unfortunately, there is a substantial group of six examples on whose social status and origin no light can be shed with any degree of plausibility (nos. 18, 21, 31, 35, 37 and 38).¹² Finally two examples subsist which are more difficult to categorise, but who can, with some degree of plausibility, be counted with the non-indigenous *curatores* of substantial social status. Aulus Cl. Caecina (no. 5), a *curator* of Ilium, was a citizen of Cyzicus and had been appointed to his post by Antoninus Pius.¹³ Aurelius Diodotus (no. 14), a *curator* of Ceramus, should probably be identical with a contemporary homonym who had been first secretary of Nysa; on this supposition Diodotus will have completed a local *cursus* at Nysa before appointment to Ceramus.¹⁴

Twenty-three, therefore, of the attested *curatores* of Asia in this period exhibit in full or in part the characteristics normally attributed to this office.¹⁵ Nine others

¹⁰ It is of course possible that this group were *curatores* of their place of origin, since provincials who became high-priest had frequently first performed all the magistracies (and liturgies) of their city of origin. But in the four cases (nos. 8, 12, 23 and 30) where origin is known, they were foreign to the city of their curatorship. In no case do we know any of them to have been of local origin or, *a fortiori*, to have held the curatorship as the summit of a local *cursus* in their home town.

¹¹ For example the holder may have promised a *summa honoraria* for the post as for any other local magistracy (e.g. no. 27). For *summa honoraria* see only P. D. GARNSEY, *Honorarium decurionatus*, *Historia* 20, 1971, 309 ff.

¹² P. A. Antiochus (no. 31) has been equated with a famous sophist from Aegeai in Cilicia, but this is not convincing. For a brief discussion of the difficulties surrounding the identification of this man see the appendix.

¹³ IGR IV 218.

¹⁴ For documentation see the relevant comments in the appendix.

¹⁵ That is the senators, the equestrians, the provincial priests and the last two mentioned holders, Caecina and Diodotus.

were of local origin and probably held their post as part, if not necessarily the peak, of a local *cursum*. For convenience these two groups will be termed I and II. Further analysis of group II by the character of the community where office was held, and of both groups by their chronological distribution is revealing.

Five *curatores* of group II in fact held their post in village, not civic, communities (nos. 2, 4, 26, 27 and 28); moreover two of them were active relatively early in the history of the institution during the reigns of Trajan and Antoninus Pius respectively (nos. 2 and 4). The village character of these communities and the early date combine with the local origin to suggest that historically they were not connected with the original *curatores rei publicae* appointed by emperors to civic communities. As local village financial officials, they may have acquired the title of λογιστής in imitation of the Roman appointees, but such occurrences can in no way be construed as examples of the supposed process whereby communities, presumably after frequent outside appointees, internalised the post and transformed it into the leading local executive magistracy. The λογισταί of these minor Asian village communities should be removed from the discussion of the development of the *curator rei publicae* altogether.¹⁶

The four other members of group II are attested in the cities of Apollonia, Synnada, Tralles and Cidyessus (nos. 9, 10, 16 and 34). Instructively from our view-point, the first three of these were all appointed in the second, not the third century A. D. It is impossible to deduce internally from the evidence whether or not the description λογιστής connotes a top executive, financial official who out-ranked all other magistracies. Certainly we cannot legitimately infer that these cities once received imperial *curatores* before internalising the office within their institutional life. And if it was a permanent local office, why are more examples not known from these towns?¹⁷ Perhaps, as with the village communities, they represent examples of a local financial official appointed in imitation of the Roman model, to meet some particular local need.

A chronological analysis of the members of group I provides, again, no support for the notion of clearly defined and far reaching changes in the character of the office in the third century A. D. Senators, consular and praetorian, as well as equestrians and provincials of social eminence continue to appear as *curatores* in the first half of the third just as in the second half of the second century.¹⁸ Analogously the omission of the phrase 'appointed by the emperor' – *datus ab imperatore* or some such periphrasis – in the titulature of *curatores* all over the empire from

¹⁶ Cf. P. HERRMANN, *Ergebnisse einer Reise in Nordostlydien*, Denkschr. Ak. Wien 80, 1962, 8 ff. n. 4/5 (= our no. 4), who suggests that λογιστής here stands for a local financial official rather than a *curator*.

¹⁷ That is, of course, an argument from silence. For arguments for its efficacy in this matter see below p. 481 f.

¹⁸ Note esp. the two consular examples, Cassius Dio (no. 25) and Iunius Quintianus (no. 33).

the reign of Severus Alexander has been adduced as an index of the transformation of their method of appointment.¹⁹ Caution in such arguments is always necessary. D. Iunius Quintianus, *curator* of Ephesus and Miletus in the reign of Philip the Arab, was a consular, and can only have been appointed by the emperor, but none of the inscriptions which record his office contains the phrase 'appointed by the emperor' or an equivalent. Indeed the argument from omission of titulature would only carry weight if it could be demonstrated that the epigraphic evidence for *curatores* before the reign of Severus Alexander normally, or at least frequently, referred to appointment by the emperor. But of the thirty examples (nos. 1–30) probably to be dated up to the reign of Severus Alexander twenty-eight are known from inscriptions, and of these only three (nos. 3, 5 and 8) refer to their appointment by the emperor.²⁰ The argument from titulature should therefore be discarded.

The evidence from Asia for the social status and method of appointment of *curatores* up to A. D. 260 presents a generally stable picture. No indications emerge of any clear shift in the character of the office in the third century. On inspection, when local office-holders appear as *curatores* of their own communities, half of the latter are village communities. Almost certainly such local officials have nothing but a title in common with the imperially appointed *curator rei publicae*. In cities some (four) local men holding the title of *curator* can be attested. But again there is no certainty that they are not merely ordinary financial magistrates (like ταμίαι), rather than examples of a new senior executive official. No single city can be instanced where imperially appointed *curatores* occur in the second century to be succeeded in the third by a new senior local executive magistrate bearing the same title. Conversely the evidence, limited though it is, still shows senators, equestrians and provincial priests holding curatorships of cities down to about A. D. 250.

b) *The case of Asia: Number and frequency of appointments*

The view that in the third century the *curator rei publicae* was transformed into the senior local executive official of local origin was underpinned, either explicitly or implicitly, by the assertion or belief that the number of *curatores* appointed by emperors increased rapidly in the course of the second and early third centuries. Once, on this view, *curatores* had become a normal and constant feature of the life of perhaps a majority of cities of the empire, it was only a short step to their transformation into a local internal office.²¹ Further, the question of number is crucial in more general terms as any convincing appraisal of the role and importance of

¹⁹ So W. LANGHAMMER, *op. cit.* 172/3. The argument was known to LIEBENAM (319), but he was suitably cautious about its applicability.

²⁰ Nos. 1 and 25 are attested in literary sources. The latter, Cassius Dio, specifically refers to his appointment by Macrinus (Dio 79, 7, 4).

²¹ For this view see H. LAST, *CAH XI*, 469/70; A. H. M. JONES, *op. cit.* 137/8; W. LANGHAMMER, *op. cit.* 172.

curatores in the administrative cadre of the second and third centuries must depend on a clear idea of the frequency with which they were appointed to provincial cities. The evidence from Asia, if pressed, will lead to the view that *curatores* were in fact only appointed sporadically (in both place and time) and were not the endemic phenomenon of the late second and third centuries that our textbooks have suggested.

If we exclude *curatores* of village communities, only thirty *curatores rei publicae* can be registered for the cities of the province of Asia from the accession of Marcus until A. D. 260, a hundred-year period.²² Yet Asia was a heavily urbanised province containing at least 300 cities of varying size and importance.²³ If the institution of *curator* was as common as is usually assumed, one would have expected over a hundred years many more examples to have survived. But to argue from this paucity of examples that *curatores* were less commonly appointed than is usually assumed can of itself only be an argument from silence with all its attendant dangers.²⁴ To provide support and a control for any numerical argument, it is necessary to isolate a comparable post of which we know not only the surviving number in our evidence, but of which we can calculate the historically possible maximum. A serviceable candidate for comparison may be provided by the institution of the high priesthood of Asia in the second and third centuries.²⁵

Originally there was only one high-priest of Asia in charge of the provincial temple at Pergamum; later Smyrna also obtained the right to be a centre for the provincial cult, and in the second century there were five centres (at Pergamum, Smyrna, Ephesus, Sardis and Cyzicus) and, consequently, five provincial priests appointed each year. In the first century A. D. the title of the provincial priest was ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας or ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀσίας ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ etc., during the second and third centuries the title was normally, but not always, ἀσιάρχης or ἀσιάρχης ναῶν τῶν ἐν Περγάμῳ etc.²⁶ A small calculation may be attempted for the sake of

²² Nos. 6–38, omitting 26–28 from the village of Apateira; the undated nos. 36–38 are treated for convenience as falling within this period.

²³ C. HABICHT, *New Evidence on the Province of Asia*, JRS 65, 1975, 64 ff., at p. 67 for the number of 300 in the Flavian period.

²⁴ For the possible defects in our knowledge one need only note the case of M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus (no. 8) who was λογιστὴς of Cyzicus (after consulars) (CIG 2872 and MAMA 6 no. 74). No record of these consular *curatores* of Cyzicus has otherwise survived.

²⁵ For a lucid and exemplary discussion of this institution and various difficult problems of interpretation see J. DEININGER, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, München 1965, 36–60, on which this paragraph relies heavily.

²⁶ See DEININGER, *op. cit.* 37–50. DEININGER convincingly demonstrated in the face of a long and previously unresolved controversy, that ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς Ἀσίας and ἀσιάρχης were synonyms for the high-priesthood, and that after c. A. D. 100 ἀσιάρχης is the normal designation. My figures in the text for known high-priests from c. A. D. 105–255 only count men designated ἀσιάρχης. Since the term ἀρχιερεὺς continued to be used at times (e.g. SEG

comparison with the *curatores*. If we take a period of 150 yrs (c. 105–c. 255), there would have been a maximum of 750 holders of the high-priesthood (150×5).²⁷ The number of asiarchs known for this period is 124.²⁸ The survival rate of known to possible asiarchs is c. 16.5% ($\frac{100}{750} \times 124$). Let us call this survival rate 15% since we are interested in rough orders of magnitude. By comparison if our 30 attested *curatores* represent a similar survival rate, the maximum universe of *curatores* from A. D. 160–260 would have been 200 [$\frac{30}{15} \times 100$]. That number, of course, is less even than the number of civic communities in the province. If, on this basis, we were to assume that *curatores* normally served as long as ten years, then in the hundred year period only twenty cities could have been continuously supervised by *curatores*.²⁹ Alternatively the argument from number can be used in another fashion, if we attempt to quantify the standard assumption that the post of *curator rei publicae* had become a regular appointment in the late second and early third centuries. For example if we assume that between A. D. 160 and 260 about half – say 150 – of the cities of Asia normally received a *curator* who served for ten years, there would have been 1,500 such officials appointed. Our extant universe of 30 would thus represent only a 2% survival rate compared with c. 15% for provincial priests.³⁰ Unless convincing reasons can be proposed which would explain such a marked divergence in survival rate for the two institutions, it appears to me necessary – on the assumption that the survival rates are in fact roughly similar – to conclude that *curatores* were much less frequently appointed than is normally assumed.

Many scholars will, no doubt, not find an argument that is both numerical and hypothetical to their taste. But the cumulative thrust of three factors, that is the

XVII 200 of A. D. 221), these figures therefore somewhat under-estimate the number of known high-priests in the period. However even on this underestimate if *curatores* survive in our evidence at a similar rate, their overall maximum number, as will be seen, must have been relatively small. Compare now M. ROSSNER, *Asiarchen und Archiereis Asias*, *Studii Clasice* 16, 1974, 101 ff.

²⁷ See DEININGER, *op. cit.* 42 n. 1., for the earliest epigraphically attested asiarchs in the first decade of the second century A. D.

²⁸ MAGIE, *op. cit.* 1604–1607, lists 119 asiarchs whose names are known (I have excluded ignoti and fragmentary names at the end of MAGIE's list); DEININGER, *op. cit.* 42 n. 3, added 7 more and noted two doublets in MAGIE's list. The total known in 1965 is thus $(119 + 7) - 2 = 124$.

²⁹ Unfortunately we do not know how long a tenure a *curator* served on average. Examples of ten years are known (BCH 17, 1893, 98), but the average should have been much shorter. Senators of praetorian status, for example (nos. 7, 15, 17, and 20), will probably only have held the post for a single year, especially if they held the post while legate to the proconsul.

³⁰ If we halved the supposed average tenure to 5 years, the putative number of *curatores* doubles to an incredible 3,000, while the putative survival rate slips to 1%.

absolutely small number of attested *curatores*, the comparison with the evidence for asiarchs, and the implications of quantifying the assumption that *curatores* became an endemic institution, tends to two connected conclusions: that during our period many cities of Asia never received a *curator* and that he did not necessarily become a permanent feature in those cities where he once had been appointed. As a rider one final contention in this numerical context deserves to be made. According to A. H. M. JONES, the importance of the office of *curator* in the third century was demonstrated by the «almost universal practice of dating monuments ἐπὶ λογιστοῦ». ³¹ The reader will not be surprised to learn that there are only six examples from Asia between 193 and 252 A. D. (nos. 18, 19, 21, 23, 31 and 35) of the appearance of the formula «ἐπὶ λογιστοῦ» or «λογιστεῦόντος» on inscriptions. This scarcely amounts to a universal practice.

c) A comparison with North Africa

Asia presents the example of only one province, though one for which more *curatores* can be documented in the second and third centuries than any other. ³² Fortunately one other empirical study of the *curatores* of a specific area, the provinces of North Africa, has been undertaken, and its conclusions tend to substantiate those made here. LUCAS, in her excellent analysis, concluded that up to the time of Constantine it was men of senatorial and equestrian standing in the central service who were appointed *curatores rei publicae*, but that later the *curatores* were drawn from the ranks of those local dignitaries who had reached the major priesthoods. The time of the tetrarchy and Constantine was a period of transition, when instances of either regime are to be found, or when a mixed regime was in force in which local officials who had entered the central service became *curatores* of their own cities. ³³ The strength of LUCAS' analysis lay in the wealth of late third and fourth century A. D. epigraphic evidence which allowed distinctions to be made between the post-Constantinian and earlier periods. On the other hand, partly because the first *curator* in Africa is not attested until A. D. 196, there was an absolutely small number of known instances of the office in North Africa up to A. D. 282. Even now only 18 examples of *curatores* can be registered before this date. ³⁴ Two can be

³¹ A. H. M. JONES, *op. cit.*, 326 note 82.

³² Compare Lycia-Pamphylia where, perhaps, only eight examples can be registered (IGR III 474 and 491; TAM II 194 and 771; III 113 and 130; SEG XIX 758; Inscriptions of Side no. 19).

³³ LUCAS 93.

³⁴ IRT 542; ILT 574; CIL VIII 20751; CIL VIII 25808 c; CIL VIII 2437 and 17871; CIL VIII 2480/1; CIL VIII 26577; CIL VIII 25808 b; ILAfr. 130; CIL XIV 3593 = ILS 1185; AE 1957, 161; ILAlg II 3596; ILTun 1416; AE 1954, 59; CIL VIII 23601; CIL VIII 11536; CIL VIII 1181; CIL VIII 11332 = ILS 6836. Note that CIL VIII 15496, cited by LUCAS, did not necessarily hold his post in Africa; I have also omitted CIL VIII 12032

excluded since we know neither their names, status or geographic origin.³⁵ Of the remaining sixteen, nine were senators and five equestrian.³⁶ As concerns geographic origin eight were not indigenous to the city of their post while two were; the origin of the six others is not known.³⁷ If for such a large geographic area this evidence is not impressive *in toto*, at least it does not contradict our analysis of the Asian material. In short, the evidence from Asia up to A. D. 260 and that from North Africa, especially looking back from the fourth to the third centuries, converge to demonstrate that the critical period for the transformation of the major social characteristics of the *curator rei publicae* was the time of the tetrarchy and of Constantine, and not the first half of the third century.³⁸

II. *The Duties and Functions of the Curatores*

To proceed further we must analyse the work of the *curatores* to see what changes occurred in their duties. LUCAS has already demonstrated that a concomitant shift in their duties took place, in Africa at least, in the fourth century. But if we first revert to the relations between *curatores*, cities and provincial governors in the second and third centuries, we can specify the character of this shift more precisely and also suggest an attractive, if obvious, occasion for these changes.³⁹

a) Curatores, governors and provincial cities in the second and third centuries

The major area of the duties of *curatores* in the second and third centuries is well known and not in dispute. The few extant sections of Ulpian's treatise of one book on the duties of the *curator* register functions which pertain fundamentally to the

as doubtful. For the earliest datable *curator* in Africa now see R. DUNCAN-JONES, *Latomus* 33, 1974, 118 ff.

³⁵ ILTun 1416 and CIL VIII 26577.

³⁶ Senators: IRT 542; CIL VIII 2437 and 17871; ILS 1185; ILAlg II 3596; CIL VIII 11536; CIL VIII 23601; CIL VIII 1181; ILS 6836; AE 1957, 161. Equestrians: ILTun 574; CIL VIII 25808 c; CIL VIII 2480/1; ILAfr 130 and AE 1954, 59.

³⁷ Non-indigenous: IRT 542; ILTun 574; CIL VIII 2437 and 17871; CIL VIII 25808 b; ILS 1185; ILAlg II 3596; CIL VIII 23601 and CIL VIII 11536. Local: CIL VIII 20751 and CIL VIII 25808 c.

³⁸ One rider should be added. As LUCAS notes, in the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine we find men of senatorial rank holding the office of *curator* in their own town (cf. now IRT 543, 561, and 567 from Lepcis). Such men are no longer active members of the imperial political elite, but rather high status representatives of the local aristocracy. For example L. Suanus Victor Vitellianus (*c. v. et consularis vir*) was *curator* of Calama after performing all the honours of that city (ILAlg I 283). In this sense such men fit exactly the fourth century definition of a *curator* (C. Th. 12, 1, 20).

³⁹ For LUCAS' views see below p. 478. The treatment of LIEBENAM (297–305) remains the best general review of the powers of *curatores*.

financial administration of civic communities: the letting out of civic lands,⁴⁰ the prevention of the misuse of public lands or buildings by private citizens,⁴¹ the general supervision of public funds, and the protection of specific funds and endowments from malversation and speculation.⁴² The epigraphic evidence accords with this picture. M. Ulpus Eurycles, the *curator* of Aphrodisias in the early part of Commodus' reign, made a series of decisions to ensure the correct employment of funds bequeathed in endowments for the holding of various games and festivals in the city.⁴³ At Attaleia in the second century a *curator* provided a sanction to protect an endowment of a different character which was to provide distributions of oil to the populace.⁴⁴ At Ephesus the letter of an emperor describes the far-reaching investigation a *curator* was to make into the accounts of city officials, both living and dead, of the previous twenty years; only heirs of officials who died more than ten years before could claim exemption from examination. The *curator* was to disregard any claims for the carrying over of debts, and, in the interests of expediency, no appeals were to be allowed from this examination. In this manner the city could speedily recover its debts.⁴⁵

The *curator* of the second and third centuries, then, was something more than another local executive magistrate. His powers impinged on the policies of the local councils and executives as far as they concerned public finance and building; above all through his appointment by the emperor the *curator* possessed powers of decision and judgement which transcended the rights of the local communities and which putatively were used to suppress the misuse and malversation of public funds whether by powerful *privati* or by the local executives themselves.⁴⁶ Neither in theory nor in practice were any of these powers new or specific to the office of *curator*. Provincial governors, from before the first appointments of the *curatores* and throughout the subsequent period of the principate, possessed complete power to investigate or control the financial activities and policies of the subject communities. A governor of Asia in the reign of Claudius, Paullus Fabius Persicus, attempted to carry through an extensive audit and restructuring of the civic accounts and expenditure of Ephesus: the sale of priesthoods, excessive expenditure on games, the pledging of future income as surety for immediate borrowing and the diversion

⁴⁰ Dig. 50, 8, 11, 2.

⁴¹ Dig. 50, 10, 5, 1.

⁴² Dig. 22, 1, 33; 50, 8, 12, 2; and 50, 12, 1.

⁴³ BCH 9, 1885, 71 no. 2; OGIS 509; L. ROBERT, *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 314 ff. on CIG 2742.

⁴⁴ IGR IV 1168.

⁴⁵ FEph II 24 and JÖAI 27, 1932, Beibl. 21 f.

⁴⁶ Note ILS 5918 a (Caere in Italy) for the clearest example of control of policy. The use of the terms *κέλευσις* or *ἀπόφασις* to describe the decisions of *curatores* (e.g. BCH 9, 1885, 71 no. 2 and IGR IV 1168) is a good index of the character of their power, since these terms are part of the normal vocabulary of the powers of Roman magistrates.

of funds from uses to which they were theoretically assigned – all these issues came under his purview.⁴⁷ In scope and attitude this investigation resembles clearly that undertaken by the unknown λογιστής of Ephesus a hundred or so years later. Governors also frequently restored public lands which had fallen under private control, and even organised the leasing out of such public lands.⁴⁸ By the middle of the second century cities were probably obliged to seek the approval of governors for new public building undertaken at civic rather than private expense;⁴⁹ at all times governors are found organising the finances of public projects, sometimes even instigating them.⁵⁰ Finally, like *curatores*, they provided, if petitioned, sanctions to try to protect endowments from misuse.⁵¹ In short the *curator rei publicae* possessed a series of responsibilities all of which could have been performed by the provincial governor. In Asia this mutuality is emphasized on occasions by the appointment of a legate of the governor to act as λογιστής.⁵²

A Roman governor possessed immense theoretical powers, but was constrained in their use, whatever his own personal inclinations and attitudes, by limited administrative resources, instruments of coercion, and time. His vague brief «to see to what needed correction» or «to go around their province inspecting sacred buildings and public works» gave him ample scope to become involved in a wide variety of civic matters, but in practice his impact could only be uneven and spasmodic.⁵³ The *curator rei publicae*, without any competence in civil or criminal jurisdiction or any responsibility for the supervision of imperial taxes and services, could concentrate solely on the area of civic finance and administration. As such, and in this one

⁴⁷ F. K. DÖRNER, *Der Erlaß des Statthalters von Asia, Paullus Fabius Persicus*, Greifswald 1935, *passim*.

⁴⁸ E.g. ICret I 288, no. 2; AE 1954, 188; AE 1963, 197 (all of the first century); cf. Syll.⁸ 884 for detailed regulations of a governor concerning the administration of public land at Thisbe in Achaia.

⁴⁹ Dig. 50, 8, 7, 1; 50, 10, 3; and 50, 10, 7. On this see A. H. M. JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 136.

⁵⁰ E.g. ILS 97; SEG IX 96; I Kourion 84 and 111; TAM II 396; IGR III 840; ILS 5350; AE 1937, 246; ILS 6885; FEph II no. 40; CIL X 7946; and JRS 49, 1959, 98 no. 3 b. Compare, of course, Pliny, ep. 10, 23. 24. 30. 90. and 98.

⁵¹ See J. H. OLIVER, *The Ruling Power*, TAPHs NS 43, 1953, ch. VII, 963 ff. for examples.

⁵² E.g. nos. 7 and 17 (at Ephesus). The surviving fragments of Ulpian's treatise «de officio curatoris rei publicae» are also germane in this context. As F. JACQUES has recently pointed out (*Antiquités Africaines* 9, 1975, 160 ff.) this treatise was a brief manual designed to aid *curatores* by collating references to previous legislation on financial and civic matters with which the *curator* might be confronted. So, for example, Ulpian cited a rescript of Pius about the duties of a provincial governor (Dig. 50, 10, 5, pr.). That is to say the *curator* took on the responsibilities which once had fallen only to the provincial governor or his legate(s).

⁵³ Strabo, 3, 4, 20; ἔφορῶν ἀεὶ τινα τῶν δεομένων ἐπανορθώσεως, and Dig. 1, 16, 7, 1 (Ulpian): *aedes sacras et opera publica circumire inspiciendi gratia... curare debe*. For the points made in this paragraphs see my discussion, *Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire*, JRS 65, 1975, 92 ff., esp. 102–105.

specific field, the *curator* of the principate can be legitimately perceived as a surrogate provincial governor.

b) The work of curatores in the fourth century and the evidence of North Africa

It is precisely these two cognate prime characteristics of the duties of *curatores*, their activity as a surrogate governor in the realm of civic finance and, as such, their competence as an imperial agent to control the financial policies and administration of a provincial community, which disappear in the fourth century.

For example a record survives from Cirta in Numidia of the execution of the first edict of persecution of Diocletian in 303 and of the role of a *curator*.

«In the eighth and seventh consulships of Diocletian and Maximian respectively, 19th May, from the records of Munatius Felix, flamen for life, *curator* of the colony of Cirta. After arriving at the house where the Christians used to meet, Felix, flamen for life, *curator* of the city, said to Paul the bishop: «Bring out the writings of the law and anything else you have here, according to the order, so that you may obey the command». Paul the bishop said: «The readers have the writings, but we will give what we have here». Felix, flamen for life, *curator* of the city, said to Paul the bishop: «Point out the readers or send for them». Paul the bishop said: «You all know them». Felix, flamen for life, *curator* of the city, said: «We do not know them». Paul the bishop said: «The municipal office knows them, that is Edusius and Junius the clerks». Felix, flamen for life, *curator* of the city, said: «Leaving aside the question of the readers whom the office will point out, produce what you have»», etc.⁵⁴

The salient, for our purpose, features of this record are worth emphasising. Not only has the *curator* of Cirta moved outside the domain of finance, he is also performing an investigatory function which is contemporaneously carried out elsewhere by *duoviri* or other *local*, not imperial, magistrates.⁵⁵ Indeed it had always been common for local magistrates to play an important role in the preliminary stages of criminal proceedings in the provinces by taking statements from defendants before sending them on to the governor's court with the specification of their offences (*elogium*).⁵⁶ This use of local magistrates for preliminary hearings is no better attested, indeed, than for the great persecutions of Decius and Valerian; and no clearer analogy to the investigation of Felix, priest and curator, at Cirta could be wanted than the preliminary investigation (probably in 251) of the martyr Pionius

⁵⁴ Gesta Apud Zenophilum, in: CSEL 26, Appendix I, pp. 186–7. The record continues in similar vein as Felix searches diligently for more copies of scriptures and other church property as well as arresting two recalcitrant sub-deacons.

⁵⁵ For examples see LUCAS 67–8 with notes 33–36.

⁵⁶ For *elogia* see Dig. 48, 3, 6, 1 and 48, 3, 11, and Tertullian, ad Scapulam 4, 3.

at Smyrna by the local temple-warden (νεωκόρος) Polemon and other local worthies before the arrival of the proconsul.⁵⁷

A similar shift in the locus of the activities of *curatores* can be demonstrated if we return briefly to the evidence for the organisation of public building activity in North Africa in the early fourth century. For example at Thamugadi, c. 303–305, a temple of Mercury was restored, on the orders of the governor, under the supervision of the *curator*; at Cuicul, during the tetrarchic period, a governor is credited with the restoration of the water supply though the whole work is accomplished by the *curator*.⁵⁸ Such examples are striking precisely because they show *curatores* playing a role which could have been performed by other senior local magistrates. In contrast in the second and third centuries there are plenty of examples, of course, of local magistrates or liturgists carrying out building projects ordered or initiated or approved by the provincial governor, but not of *curatores*.⁵⁹ A final and important indication of the transformation of the *curator* into a senior member of the local executive is provided by the *album* of the *ordo* of Thamugadi; in this document the *curator* is listed after the *sacerdotes* but before the *duoviri*.⁶⁰ The shift of position from that of an external imperial agent to that of a senior local magistrate is patent.

In view of this, and other, documentation LUCAS propounded a firm distinction between fourth century and earlier *curatores*. Originally they had «encroached» from outside upon the work of the local magistrates, by the fourth century they worked together with the local *ordo*. Further, as a corollary development, LUCAS «detected evidence of real encroachment by the proconsuls and their *legati* on the work of the *curatores* and local councils in those inscriptions in which governors seem to be responsible for the work of building or restoring while the *curator* when he appears is mentioned in some such formula as «*curante*». It seems from such inscriptions that their office has become merely formal and executive, and that the control of policy has passed to the provincial governors». ⁶¹ Though these formulations clearly move to the heart of the problem, they tend to misprise seriously the possible rôle of the provincial governor in the second and third centuries and to obscure the original parallelism of the duties of *curatores* and governors in their relations with local executives. This aspect is emphasised here precisely because it

⁵⁷ Generally see G. W. CLARKE, Double Trials in the Persecution of Decius, *Historia* 22, 1973, 650 ff. For Pionius, probably a Decian martyr, see *Acta Pionii*, esp. ch. 3–9 for the interrogation by Polemon, and 9, 1 for the presence of a local clerk taking a verbatim record.

⁵⁸ BCTH 1907, 274 (Thamugadi) and AE 1920, 15 (Cuiçul). More examples of *curatores* supervising and executing building projects in the fourth century, whether with or without any involvement of a governor, are cited by LUCAS 68–9.

⁵⁹ E.g. BE 1963, 210; CIL VIII 20982; ILS 6885; I Kourion 84 and 111.

⁶⁰ CIL VIII 2403 and 17903.

⁶¹ LUCAS 70–71; cf. 73–4.

immediately suggests an obvious and attractive setting for the social and functional transformation of the office of *curator* which occurred in the tetrarchic period. This period saw radical changes in the organisation of the administration of the provinces. Above all the number of provinces was increased to over a hundred. These new provinces were grouped into larger administrative circumscriptions, called dioceses, under *vicarii* or deputies of the praetorian prefect. Provincial governors not only had smaller geographical units to control, but a majority of them finally had any residual military duties removed from their sphere.⁶² *A priori* the governors of the fourth century were better placed to exercise a consistent and regular oversight of the administrative and financial affairs of the constituent communities of their province. As one contemporary, if jaundiced, observer put it: «provinces were split into innumerable parts; numerous governors and more bureaus were imposed on each region, almost on each city».⁶³ Such reforms should have tended to make the appointment of *curatores* to individual cities to supervise their financial policies redundant. Any hypothesis about the grounds for the change in the character of the office must remain fragile especially as our literary sources remain silent; but in my opinion the changes in function, social status, origin and method of appointment of *curatores* should be seen as a direct result – if not a conscious part – of the major reforms in the superstructure of Roman imperial administration which Diocletian had initiated.⁶⁴

III. Prospect and Conclusion

The study of *curatores*, since LIEBENAM, has generally not brought the best out of ancient historians. The empirical basis for the study of the office has not been adequately reviewed; worse, few scholars have resisted the temptation to indulge in wild speculation about the influence of the office and its effects during the late second and third centuries on the «local autonomy» of the provincial communities. One eminent scholar was moved even to speak of «the complete control» – which

⁶² For a clear summary see A. H. M. JONES, *The Later Roman Empire*², Oxford 1973, 373–5; cf. 42–46. It is important to remember that this was a long-term reorganisation through his reign and did not occur at a stroke.

⁶³ Lactantius, *de mortibus persecutorum* 7, 4. A full scale investigation to see in general how strict a control fourth century governors maintained over provincial cities would be worth-while; certainly, for example, P. Caeonius Caccina Albinus, legate of Numidia in 364–7, was extremely active (see PLRE 34–5).

⁶⁴ In this context it should also be noted that the office of *λογοστής* was introduced into Egypt for the first time during the tetrarchic period (B. R. REES, *The Curator Civitatis in Egypt*, JJP 7–8, 1953–4, 83 ff., and A. BOWMAN, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*, Toronto 1971, esp. 90 and 124–7). Is there any connection with the contemporaneous changes in the character of the office occurring in the rest of the empire?

curatores were presumed to wield – «which meant the end of self-government and changed cities with a healthy interest in life into the homes of a weary and apathetic population under the heel of the central power».⁶⁵ Such moral rhetoric – unfortunately typical of much modern historiography of the third century – serves only to obfuscate difficult issues of historical interpretation and analysis. Comprehension of the reasons for the appointment of *curatores* and of their role in provincial society demands, as we have tried to show, careful interpretation of their functions in relation to provincial governors and communities. To proceed further it is necessary to understand – not approve or disapprove of – the aims and needs of the imperial government and to present a convincing picture of the rôle of the provincial cities and their ruling classes in the organisation of the empire. For the provincial cities played a vital part in the collection of imperial tribute, the maintenance of the road-system and the organisation of the various forms of requisitions.⁶⁶ It may, therefore, be attractive to understand the appointment of *curatores* to provincial cities as an attempt by the imperial government to protect its extraction of surplus resources from the provinces.⁶⁷ Such a hypothesis would of course demand prior demonstration that the embezzlement or malversion of civic funds by local elites or the mere mismanagement of local financial administration did in fact adversely affect the system of liturgies, requisitions, *corvée* labour and charges on private property through which the local authorities provided the surplus for the imperial government. Whatever the merits of this suggestion, it should be clear, in short, that any future analysis of *curatores* ought to attempt to place the office in the full cadre both of provincial administration and of the relations between imperial and local government.

Such a complete analysis has been outside the scope of this paper. Its purpose has been more modest: to review the empirical basis for the study of the *curator* and, in consequence, to exorcise a series of factual and evaluative assertions which haunt standard accounts of the office. Three major conclusions have emerged. The social characteristics – origin, status and method of appointment – of the *curatores* of Asia did not substantially alter in the period to A. D. 260. This result is congruent with LUCAS' analysis of the evidence for the provinces of North Africa. The two analyses, taken together, suggest that the basic period of transition of the office

⁶⁵ H. LAST, CAH XI, 470. The whole discussion of *curatores* by LAST is of interest for the way in which a series of modern notions about the presumed virtues of local self-government and about the evils of central control determine the structure and tone of his description.

⁶⁶ Roads: see the important remarks of T. PEKÁRY, *Untersuchungen zu den römischen Reichsstraßen*, Bonn 1968, 113 ff.; requisitioning: see S. MITCHELL, *Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire: A New Inscription from Pisidia*, JRS 66, 1976, 106 ff.; in general see A. H. M. JONES, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 138–144.

⁶⁷ Compare the comments of A. H. M. JONES, *ibid.* 145; though it would have to be admitted that the numerous appointments of *curatores* in Italy cannot easily be subsumed into this hypothesis.

was the late third, not early third, century. Secondly, the absolute known number of *curatores* in Asia is very small. Given the large number of urban communities in Asia, there is no positive evidence that *curatores* were appointed at any time, before 260, to a majority of that province's cities. This argument from silence received support from a comparison with the institution of the provincial priesthood of Asia. This comparison suggests that the office of *curator rei publicae* never became endemic to that province. Consequently any discussion which assumes that a majority of cities ever received *curatores* or that, once one had been appointed, replacements were regularly renewed will seriously misprise the spread and influence of the office. Thirdly, the change in functions of the *curatores*, specifically in the area of their relations to governors and the subject cities, which turned them into senior local executives within their city of origin, occurred also in the late third and early fourth centuries. Despite the lack of explicit contemporary literary evidence, this concatenation of changes can be confidently ascribed to result from the major structural transformation of provincial administration initiated by Diocletian, which obliterated the nexus of causes which had once led to the appointment of the original *curatores* of the principate.

Appendix: The Curatores of Asia up to A. D. 260

This appendix is intended to provide a complete list, with annotation, of all the known *curatores* of the province of Asia before c. A. D. 260. A previous list was published by M. N. Tod, JHS 42, 1922, 172, but is defective on various counts. There is a useful collection of material by D. MAGIE, Roman Rule in Asia Minor, Princeton 1950, 1454–1456, but this was not intended to be complete, nor did it repair all the omissions or mistakes in Tod.

In the following table the name of each *curator* is given in chronological order – as far as that can be ascertained – in the left-hand column. The succeeding columns give brief indications of social status, geographic origin, place of office and date respectively. In the second column a question mark indicates that no clear designation of social status is attested. In the third column a cross indicates that a *curator* was alien to his place of office, a circle that he was indigenous, and a question mark that his place of office is not securely attested as alien to his place of origin. In the final column a date such as 161–169 indicates the probable *terminus post* and *ante quem* for his office.

Two further points should be noticed. Firstly, though the list is intended to be complete, I have not included the anonymous, and otherwise unknown, consular *curatores* of Cyzicus (see above note 24), nor the *ignotus* at Ephesus mentioned in an imperial letter (above note 45). He may well be identical with any of the second century *curatores* of Ephesus cited in this appendix (below nos. 6, 7, 15, and 17).

No.	Name	Social Status	Origin	Place of Office	Date
1.	Verginius (?) Rufus	Consular	×	Smyrna	Nero
2.	Heracleius	?	○	Apareira	Traian
3.	M. Ulpius Damas Catullinus	Asiarch	?	Trapezopolis	Hadrian
4.	Valerius Apollonides	?	○	Maonia	154/5
5.	Aulus Cl. Caecina	?	×	Ilium	Antoninus Pius
6.	T. Oppius Afer Pollio Tertullus	Provincial priest	?	Ephesus	c. 160
7.	M. Luceius Torquatus	Praetorian	×	Ephesus	c. 160
8.	M. Ulpius Carminius Claudianus	Related to asiarchs and senators	×	Cyzicus	c. 160
9.	[...]nagoreas	?	○	Apollonia	c. 150-175 (?)
10.	Cl. Artalus	?	○	Synnada	161-169
11.	M. Antonius Alexander Appianus	Asiarch	?	Julia Gordus	177-180
12.	M. Ulpius Eurycles	Asiarch	×	Aphrodisias	Commodus
13.	C. Iulius Philippus	Equestrian	×	Aphrodisias	Commodus
14.	Aur. Diodotos	?	×	Ceramus	c. 150-190
15.	Tib. Cl. Candidus	Praetorian	×	Ephesus	190-193
16.	Tib. Cl. Glyptus	?	○	Tralles	193-217
17.	C. Iulius C. f. Philippus	Praetorian	×	Ephesus	c. 200
18.	Dionysius Menogenes	?	?	Priene	198-212
19.	Ti. Fl. Demetrius	Asiarch	?	Iasos	198-212
20.	Ignotus	Praetorian	×	Alexandria Troas	c. 210
21.	M. Volusius Pericles	?	?	Pergamum	c. 210
22.	L. Cl. Iberinus Eudaimon	Equestrian	?	Aphrodisias	200-210 (?)
23.	(Ti. Cl. Aelius) Crispus	Asiarch	×	Magnesia sub Maeandro	211-217
24.	Polybius	Asiarch	?	Artalea	Before 212
25.	Cassius Dio	Consular	×	Pergamum and Smyrna	217

No.	Name	Social Status	Origin	Place of Office	Date
26.	Glycon and ignotus	?	○	Apateira	206/7
27.	Aur. Hermolaus Rusticus	?	○	Apateira	After 212
28.	Aur. Lareisaeus	?	○	Apateira	After 212
29.	M. Aur. Zosimus	Asiarch	?	Tralles	After 212
30.	Ti. Cl. Frontonianus	Asiarch	×		c. 220
31.	P. A. Antiochus	?	?	Sebastopolis (Caria)	222-235
32.	L. Pescennius Gessius	Asiarch	?	Philadelpia	c. 240
33.	D. Iunius Quintianus	Consular	×	Miletus and Ephesus	c. 245
34.	Aur. Varus	?	○	Cidyessus	244-249
35.	Flavius Priscus	?	?	Trajanopolis	251/2
36.	Capito	Equestrian	?	Thyateira	?
37.	Ti. Cl. Cleitianus	?	?	Magnesia sub Sipylo	?
38.	Aur. Traianus	?	?	Synnada	?
38 a.	Tatianus	?	?	A village near Thyateira	After 212

Secondly the appendix is followed by an addendum which lists, firstly, possible, but doubtful, references to *curatores* in Asia and, secondly, men who were *curatores* of individual civic institutions.

1. Philostratus, v. Soph. 512 which records a quarrel between the sophist Nicetes and a Rufus (presumably Verginius Rufus) who was λογιστής of the city. A. BOULANGER, *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie*, Paris 1923, 84 n. 1, has suggested that the emperor mentioned in this section was Nero, not Nerva. The manuscript tradition appears to be uncertain.

2. IGR IV 1660. This broken stone records some bequest made during the curatorship of Heracleius. That the name of the community where this inscription was found was Apteira (not Teira as in IGR) is evident from an improved version of IGR IV 1662 (see below no. 26). The analogies of nos. 26, 27 and 28 clearly suggest that in this village the title λογιστής referred to a regular local financial official distinct from the imperially designated *curator rei publicae*. It is therefore all the more illegitimate to speak of Heracleius as «appointed by Trajan» (so MAGIE, o. c. 1455 n. 13) merely because this inscription dates from Trajan's reign.

3. OGIS 492, which gives his social status and date.

4. P. HERRMANN, *Ergebnisse einer Reise in Nordostlydien*, Denkschr. Akad. Wien 80, 1962, no. 5 (cf. BE 1963, 221). Apollonides should be of local origin since he appears, as HERRMANN argues, to have offered a *summa honoraria* for the post of λογιστής as if it were a normal local office. Further the immediately antecedent document published by HERRMANN contains the end of a decree of some corporate body which refers to a crowning to be undertaken annually by ὁ λογιστής καὶ βραβευτής. The obvious deduction emerges that at Maionia the λογιστής was a regular community official like the βραβευτής. For this official see MAGIE, o. c. 1026 n. 70.

5. IGR IV 218. Caecina was a citizen of Cyzicus. No indication of his social status subsists.

6. Forsch Eph IV 3 no. 41: an honorary inscription of the city of Ephesus to Tertullus (and his wife). Tertullus is described as [τριβ. λε]γίωνος ἐ' Ἀπολιναρίας, γενόμενον [ἀρχιερέα?] τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ λογιστὴν τῆς πόλεως. The restoration ἀρχιερέα (first suggested by F. MILTNER, *Arch. Δελτ.* 9, 1924/5, 118) appears probable and has never been seriously contested. The date must be coterminous with no. 7 since the two men who saw to the erection of the statue out of their own funds were also responsible for the statue to M. Luceius Torquatus (no. 7) which is datable to about 160 on independent grounds.

7. CIG 2977; cf. PIR² L 363. Since he was consul designate in 169, he will have held his praetorship about 160 and gone to Asia as legate to the proconsul soon afterwards.

8. CIG 2782 (from Aphrodisias) provides the fullest testimony for our man since it includes reference to four generations of his family from his father to his grand-children (see PIR² C 429-433 and 440-441). His father was a high-priest of Asia and his first wife a high-priestess (cf. MAMA VIII 517, from Aphrodisias, honouring this wife's family). His son obtained the consulship (CIG 2783). Although our man was entrusted with the financial organisation of the provincial assembly (ἀρχυροταμίας τῆς Ἀσίας), he probably never became high-priest himself. The coins from Attuda (cited by GROAG at PIR² C 433) should refer to his homonymous father's high-priesthood rather than to one held by himself but not recorded on any of the inscriptions. The family came by origin from Attuda as these coins and an honorary inscription to his younger son (MAMA VI 74) indicate. These coins, minted during the reigns of Antoninus Pius and of Marcus and Verus, also provide the approximate date.

9. MAMA IV 152. Our man is honoured for his services as ἀγορανόμος(?), παραφύλαξ, στρατηγός, λογιστής, γυμνασιάρχης of the gerusia, and president of «the great five-yearly imperial games». Patently the post of λογιστής here belongs to a local *cursus*, and our man must be of local origin. The date is given by the editors without comment and, presumably, is deduced (guessed?) from letter-forms and consequently of dubious worth.

10. See PIR² C 797 for coins from Synnada which refer to a Claudius Attalus as prytanis and λογιστής of Synnada. However there is no good reason to identify him with the homonymous son of the sophist Polemo as PIR² wishes. Moreover a recent inscription from Synnada (MAMA VI 374) honours a Claudius Attalus, son of Piso Tertullinus asiarch; since other coins of Synnada (BMC Phrygia 400, no. 41) of the reign of Antoninus Pius are dated by a Piso Tertullinus, there should be little doubt that our λογιστής was identical with the honorand of MAMA VI 374 and a member of a prominent local family (cf. IGR IV 709 for possible descendants).

11. IGR IV 1294 (dated by the joint rule of Marcus and Commodus). There is no indication of his geographic origin.

12. OGIS 509 and BCH 9, 1885, 71, no. 2; it is probable that the acephalous letters, published as LBW 1620c and CIG 2742 (on which see L. ROBERT, *Études Anatoliennes*, Paris 1937, 314–319), pertain also to the work of Eurycles. Eurycles was a citizen of Aezani (see e.g. OGIS 507).

13. OGIS 500 (from Aphrodisias). A member of an important family from Tralles. Since he probably obtained his procuratorship under Marcus and Commodus, the sole reign of Commodus provides a plausible date for his curatorship. See PIR² J 458–460 for full testimony on this family.

14. JHS 11, 1890, 121 no. 5 (from Ceramus). The inscription is dated by the magistracy of a P. Aelius Protoleon, son of Aelius Themistocles asiarch. As Protoleon is attested on coins of Ceramus from the reign of Pius (BMC Caria 78, no. 7), the inscription should date from the late second century. Consequently it is tempting to identify Diodotos with a homonym who was secretary (γραμματεύς) of Nysa under both Marcus and Commodus (BMC Lydia p. LXXX and 178/9). On this supposition Diodotos will have held his post at Ceramus after fulfilling a local *cursus* at Nysa.

15. ILS 1140. Candidus was also *curator* of Nicomedia. These two posts, held successively, were his last duties before his illustrious career as a general of Severus in the wars of 193–197 (see esp. G. ALFÖLDY, *Fasti Hispanienses*, Wiesbaden 1969, 43–45 with literature).

16. CIG 2926, from Tralles (a much better version of JHS 6, 1885, 348, no. 93 = IGR IV 1341). This inscription has caused considerable confusion. ΤΟΔ (o. c. 172) even registered two non-existent *curatores* of Sardis and Magnesia sub Sipylo by registering JHS 6, 1885, 348, no. 93, and IGR IV 1341 as distinct from each other as well as from CIG 2926! The sources of this hopeless muddle are explained with typical acuity and lucidity by L. ROBERT, RPh 1927, 138–140 = *Opera Minora Selecta* II, 1104–1106, to which the reader is referred. Glyptus was a local magistrate from Tralles since the inscription refers to his post as ἀγορανόμος as well as λογιστής; moreover coins of Tralles of the reigns of Severus, Caracalla and Geta are dated ἐπὶ γραμματέως Γλύπτου (R. MÜNSTERBERG, *Die Beamtennamen auf den griechischen Münzen*, Wien 1914, 153).

17. Forsch Eph III nos. 49 and 50. The son of our no. 13. See PIR² J 458 for details.

18. InschrPriene no. 230 = ILS 9464. The date is deduced from the reference to Julia Domna as «mother of the camps». Nothing else is known about Menogenes, though no other inscriptions of Priene record this name.

19. BCH 11, 1887, 216, no. 8. Again the date emerges from reference to Julia Domna. Nothing is attested about the geographic origin of Demetrius.

20. ILS 8842+III 2. p. CXCI: an acephalous career inscription in inverse order. For the chronology of this senator's career see G. ALFÖLDY, *o. c.*, 105–106.

21. IGR IV 468. Nothing else is known about this man, though it may be pertinent that no Pergamenes with the nomen Volussius are attested.

22. CIG 2791. Cf. PIR² C 861 and 891 suggesting Eudaimon to be identical with, or related to, a Claudius Eudaemon whose wife is mentioned among the *clarissimae* at the secular games of 204.

23. InschrMagnesia no. 197: a statue to Caracalla set up λογιστεύοντο[ς] Κρίσπου ἀσι[άρχου]. I have assumed him to be identical with the asiarch of Ephesian origin, Ti. Cl. Aelius Crispus, honored by his wife in JÖAI 49, 1968/71, Beibl. 38 f. no. 11.

24. IGR IV 1168. No indication of Polybius' geographic origin survives. A date before 212 is assumed since none of the characters in this document bear Roman nomina.

25. Dio 79, 7, 4. He was appointed by Macrinus.

26. J. KEIL and A. VON PREMIERSTEIN, Dritte Reise no. 116 (an improved version of IGR IV 1662). The improved reading shows that the name of the village (κατοικία) was Apateira, not Teira as in previous editions. The name of Glycon's associate as λογιστής is no longer extant on the stone. I have assumed them to be local men by analogy with the two succeeding cases.

27. IGR IV 1664 with the elucidation of M. ROSTOVITSEFF in JRS 8, 1918, 27–29. Since Rusticus paid a *summa honoraria* for his λογιστεία of the village, the post should be a local, not an imperial, office.

28. IGR IV 1665. Lareisaeus, who had already been ἀγορανόμος, is recorded giving a *summa honoraria* for his λογιστεία. The nomenclature of this and the preceding inscription firmly suggests that they belong to the period soon after the «Constitutio Antoniniana».

29. BCH 19, 1895, 560 = MDAI(A) 21, 1896, 114. Zosimus' father had been an asiarch and Zosimus himself was a «relative of people of senatorial and consular rank». No indication subsists about his geographic origins (though note no. 16 for a local as λογιστής at Tralles). The approximate date again is suggested by the nomenclature.

30. IG XII 3, 1119 (from Melos). Frontonianus is honoured as τὰς γ' στρατείας ἐπιφανῶς στρατευσάμενον, β' τῆς Ἀσίας ἀρχιερασάμενον καὶ ἀγωνοθετήσαντα καὶ πόλεων ἐπιφανεστάτων λογιστείας εὐράμενον καὶ εὐσεβῆ ἤητορα. I assume that one or more of the outstanding cities where he held his curatorships was in Asia. His son also became an asiarch, and his daughter married into a senatorial family from Tralles (see E. GROAG, JÖAI 10, 1907, 282 ff.); but the origin in Asia of his family is not attested. The approximate date emerges from the dedication, at Ephesus, by his son to the proconsul, M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus, who governed Asia probably in the late 220's. See now DIETZ, Chiron 6, 1976, 395 f.

31. J. and L. ROBERT, La Carie, Paris 1954, II no. 169. The editors wished hesitantly to identify our man with the sophist from Aigeai in Cilicia, P. Antius Antiochus (Philostratus, *v. Soph.* 568–570); but I. AVOTINS, Prosopographical and Chronological Notes on Some Greek Sophists of the Empire, California Studies in Classical Antiquity 4, 1971, 67–72, demonstrated this hypothesis to be chronologically untenable (arguments accepted in BE 1973, 396). Instead he suggested plausibly that our man was the grandson of P. Aelius Antiochus attested as eponymous priest of the temple of Asclepius at Epidaurus (IG IV² 126, and cf. 480 for his performing priestly functions at Epidaurus). However, even if this is correct, we are unfortunately still ignorant whether our Antiochus had any previous connections – by family or by office-holding – with Sebastopolis or not.

32. IGR IV 1642: the council and people of Philadelphia honour Gessius as asiarch and λογιστής. His origin is not attested. The approximate date emerges from SEG II 642 where

Gessius, as asiarch for the third time, honours the proconsul, L. Egnatius Victor Lollianus, who governed Asia for three years in the mid-240's (PIR² E 36).

33. InschrMilet I 9, no. 344: λογιστής at Miletus; AE 1972, 594: at Ephesus. Cf. PIR² J 803.

34. BMC Phrygia 151–152, nos. 10, 11, and 14 (from the reign of Philip the Arab). The appearance of the title λογιστής on the local coinage again suggests that the post has become integrated into the local cursus (cf. no. 10).

35. IGR IV 626. Nothing is known of Priscus' origin or social status.

36. L. ROBERT, Études Anatoliennes, Paris 1937, 349 no. 1 (from Thyateira). Again there is no attestation of origin or of date.

37. IGR IV 1343: an honorific inscription which also describes Cleitianus as διάσημον ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχείᾳ. But his origin and social status remain a mystery. No indication of date.

38. MAMA VI 379 (from Synnada). The editors wished to identify Traianus with a homonymous *libertus Augusti* from Laodicea Combusta (MAMA I 22). But the argument was, from our view point, circular, since it was based on the assumption that a *curator* of Synnada could not have been a citizen thereof (now see no. 10 anyway). In fact no profitable speculation about Traianus appears possible.

38a. As the editor kindly pointed out to me, a recently published inscription (G. PΕΤΖΛ, ZPE 23, 1976, 243 f.) records a λογιστής at a village near Thyateira. By analogy with nos. 2, 4, 26, 27, and 28 above I would assume this man to be a local village financial official who carried the title λογιστής but was not an imperially appointed *curator*.

Addendum

I: Possible curatores of cities in Asia not included in the analysis in the text or in the appendix

- i. IGR IV 351, fragment n, contains a reference to a λογιστής (unnamed) at Pergamum; but he may have been λογιστής to a *collegium* within the city.
- ii. Inscriptions of Sardis no. 45 (= IGR IV 1509). The restoration of lines 12–13 of this inscription as [λογι]σ[τεύ]οντος Κοίντ[ου Σουλπικίου Φ]ίμου is not «obvious» as the editors suggest. Indeed in IGR the word ἐ[πιμεληθέ]ντος is restored. The date is from the sole reign of Titus.
- iii. IGR IV 739 (from Eumenia). An honorary inscription to a local notable who has performed various magistracies and liturgies one of which is described as ἐκλογισ- [τεύσαντα]. Acting as ἐκλογεύς (tax-collector?) is not necessarily, in my view, the same as being a λογιστής.
- iv. JÖAI 49, 1968/71, Beibl. 80ff. no. 15: an acephalous career (inscribed at Ephesus) of a senator who had been a λογιστής. But his place of office (perhaps Ephesus) is not explicitly attested.

II: Curatores of individual civic institutions

- i. CIG 2987b = J. H. OLIVER, The Sacred Gerusia, Hesperia Supplement VI, no. 9 (the gerusia of Ephesus).
- ii. ForschEph II no. 23 = J. H. OLIVER, *ibid.* no. 11 (the gerusia of Ephesus).
- iii. IGR IV 1555 (the gerusia of Clazomenae).
- iv. IGR IV 652 (the council and gerusia of an unnamed city, probably Acmonia).

