A New Inscription from Aphrodisias and the Title πατὴρ τῆς πόλεως

Charlotte Roueché

Recent excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria, in particular since 1972, have revealed to the east of the Theatre a large piazza surrounded by colonnades which was remodelled at several periods. The latest phase of this piazza appears to be of the fourth or fifth century (we know from a recently discovered inscription that substantial work was done in the piazza under Julian), and several statue bases of the late Empire have been found in the area; two are in situ, and others have been found built into the Byzantine wall which blocked off the Theatre from the piazza when the acropolis was fortified.

Of the two surviving bases which stood just east of the Theatre with their inscribed faces towards the piazza, one is badly damaged, but the other is almost complete, and the statue which stood on it was found beside it. This statue is about to be published, accompanied by a very brief note on the inscribed base. The purpose of this article is to describe and discuss this base more fully.

The rectangular base of Aphrodisias marble (height 1.01 meters, width 0.48, depth 0.60) with upper and lower moulding is almost certainly reused; a half-moon, in relief, remains on the far side. The base stood, rather awkwardly, on another base cut down to receive it. The first line of the inscription is on the upper moulding. The letters, which are irregular and inelegant, average 4 cm in height (Plate 1).

1 For the current excavations at Aphrodisias, conducted by Professor Kenan Erim of New York University with the generous help of the National Geographic Society and many other benefactors, see the annual reports in the American Journal of Archaeology and Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi, as well as the bibliography in the Princeton Encyclopaedia of Classical Sites (Princeton 1976). I am preparing an edition of the late Roman and Byzantine inscriptions from Aphrodisias and assisting in the preparation by Miss Joyce Reynolds of a corpus of inscriptions from the site.

2 In Römische und frühbyzantinische Porträtplastik aus der Türkei, by E. Alföldi-Rosenbaum and J. Inan (Berlin 1979). The statue is now on display in the Aphrodisias Museum, and the base is in the Museum garden.
Flavious Palmatus was named in another inscribed monument, presumably from Caria, but not found (Anth.Pal. 16.35):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Mνήμονες οί Κάρες πολλέων ευεργετιάων} \\
\text{Παλμάτων (Παλμάν edd.) ἰθυδίκην τόσσον ἀγασίμενοι.}
\end{align*}\]

L. Robert pointed out that this epigram almost certainly derives from an inscription honouring a late imperial governor of Caria, and so probably at Aphrodisias;^{3} Alan Cameron, in studying the manuscripts of the Planudean Anthology, showed that the original reading was \(\text{Παλμάτων}.\)^{4} Caria was still governed by a \textit{praeses} at the time of the redaction of the Notitia Dignitatum (ca A.D. 400) but was under a \textit{consularis} by the time of the composition of the source for Hierocles’ \textit{Synecdemus} (in the 440’s).^{5} It is attractive to associate such upgradings of provincial governorships (which are typical of the late Empire and appear unrelated to changes in the importance of the particular provinces) with a change in emperor or of ministry, and a consequent wish for senatorial support; but in Theodosius II’s long reign it is difficult to identify any one particularly appropriate moment which could serve as a \textit{terminus post quem} for our inscription. A definite \textit{terminus ante quem} must be Justinian’s \textit{Novel viii}, of May 536, which abolished the vicariate of Asia. The inscription reflects

^{3} \textit{Hellenica} IV (Paris 1948) 14, \textit{cf.} 148–49.


^{5} For the date of the Notitia Dignitatum see A. H. M. Jones, \textit{Later Roman Empire II} (Norman 1964) 1417–21 [\textit{hereafter, Jones, LRE}]. For the date of the \textit{Synecdemus} and its sources, see Jones, \textit{Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces}^{2} (Oxford 1971) 514–21. The material is summarized in \textit{LRE} 1451–61.
the withering away of that office, and Justinian’s legislation seems merely to have legalized the status quo; by 536 the vicariate appears to be held regularly by the governor of Phrygia Pacatiana (τὸν βικάριον τῆς 'Ασίανής, ὄντα δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντα τῆς Πακιτανίης Φρυγίας; so Jones, LRE 374). Our inscription presumably reflects an earlier stage in this process, before the vicariate came necessarily to fall to the governor of Phrygia Pacatiana.

It would be tempting to try to draw a conclusion about the date from Palmatus’ title περιβλεπτός (spectabilis). The governor of Caria is referred to as λαμπρότατος ἄρχων in 426 and as μεγαλοπρεπέστατος, κύριος (κύριος) καὶ ὅπατοκός under Anastasius, but neither of these usages allows definite conclusions to be drawn. The Anastasian governor very probably had another, more specific, rank as well as μεγαλοπρεπέστατος, which was omitted in the curtailed style of this milestone inscription. As for Palmatus, he may well have been περιβλεπτός by virtue of his office of deputy vicar rather than by virtue of being consularis of Caria.7

Palmatus is called, with the standard rhetoric of the late Empire, ἀνανεωτῆς, κτίστης and, in the epigram, ἱθοδίκης. L. Robert has shown all of these to be typical epithets of the period.8 Ἐνεργέτης is common at all periods. Palmatus’ benefactions to “all Caria” were sufficient, apparently, to earn him two statues, one put up by the Carians; this suggests that the expense was met by the provincial assembly, from their own funds (however these were raised).9 Our statue, however,


7 Dr J. R. Martindale comments that the evidence “appears to show that only in the West under the Ostrogoths were ordinary provincial governors automatically of spectabilis rank (and this may be due to defective evidence); otherwise, all governors who were spectabilis held that rank by virtue of some other title (usually that of comes, although the nature of the comitia may vary).” The governor of Phrygia Pacatiana became spectabilis comes when he absorbed the functions of the vicar of Asiana in 536.


9 On the provincial assemblies, see Jones, LRE 763–66. “The Carians” also erected statues to Aelia Flaccilla (Th. Reinach, REG 19 [1906] 110 no.30 [ILS 9466, IGC 280]; cf. Robert, Hellenica IV 14) and to the governor Helladius (MAMA VIII 531, with Hellenica XIII [Paris 1965] 157); further fragments of this latter inscription have been found during the excavations, to read:
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gives the appearance of having been put up, almost as in the good old days, by an individual, Flavius Athenaeus, the πατήρ τῆς πόλεως.

It is L. Robert, again, who has helped to clarify the use of this term. The honorific titles ‘father’, ‘mother’, ‘son’ and ‘daughter of the city’ were given to benefactors of the cities in the classical period, but titles of this kind fell out of use with the diminution of civic benefactions in the late Empire. In 465 a law of Leo I (Cod. Just. 10.44.3) declared: Si quis vero ex his omnia decurionum munera vel functiones vel honores nulla imminente necessitate, sed sua sponte peregerit, eum pro sua liberalitate patrem civitatis, in qua voluntarius municeps apparebit, si hoc ei libuerit, fieri constituisse hac lege decernimus. It is an interesting indication of the loss of independence by the late Roman cities that a law should be considered necessary to allow them to offer such a title. It is quite likely that Leo’s law, like so much late Roman legislation, in fact was inspired by existing piecemeal practice, itself based on a memory of the earlier usage. The title appears, however, to accompany a function which is more specific than the liberalitas of Leo’s law. From the fifth century onwards, the title πατήρ τῆς πόλεως, and even the verb πατερεῖν, are found quite frequently in inscriptions and in the laws. It may be useful to collect these examples here.

Among inscriptions, the following are known to me. While a few can be dated with some precision, the majority reflect the current state of the epigraphy of the period and are dated only within a margin of one or two centuries by editors.

APHRODISIAS

(1) (cross) ἐπὶ Φ(αβίου) Φωτίου χο(λαστικοῦ) καὶ πατρός (cross). Letters 3 cm. This new inscription is cut on the lower rim of a marble ‘game-board’, as is the similar inscription published by Reinach (REG 19 [1906] 297 no.213, whence IGC 264): (cross) ἐπὶ Φ(αβίου) Φωτίου χο(λαστικοῦ) (cross). Late fifth or sixth century.

(2) An inscription cut on the northeast gate at Aphrodisias, published most recently by Cormack (MAMA VIII 427, citing earlier publications), dates the repairing of the gate ἐπὶ Φ(αβίου) Ἀμπελίου τοῦ ἐλλογμ. (ωτάτων) χο(λαστικοῦ) καὶ πατρός ἦδ. η’ (cross). A new fragmentary inscription on the rim of the Odeon stage at Aphrodisias, referring to work done on the Odeon in almost identical terms, refers to a χο(λαστικοῦ) καὶ πατήρ whose name is lost, but who is very probably also Flavius Ampelius. Fifth century.

10 See in particular Hellenica IV 130 and n.6; RevPhil 32 (1958) 50.
(3) L. Robert pointed out that Rhodopaios, apostrophized as πατήρ in an epigram published by him (Hellenica IV 127ff), was probably πατήρ τῆς πόλεως. Late fifth or sixth century.

(4) Flavius Athenaeus, in our new inscription.

(5) For another πατήρ τῆς πόλεως from Aphrodisias, Aristocrates, see below, p.182.

MILETUS
(1) IGC 219 (datable to 538): dates the building of a gate by regnal year, consulate, the governor, the bishop and πατερεύλατος Ἰωάννου τοῦ λαμπροτότατον κόμης (ητογος).

SMYRNA
(1) Anth.Pal. 9.615 (cited by L. Robert, Hellenica IV 131) is apparently taken from an inscription, with the lemma εἰς λουτρών ἐν Συμόρφη; the text is uncertain, but it appears to refer to a Theodore δὲ γὰρ ἔως πόλος κτείνων τὸμής τε πατήρ τε ἔστησε ταῖς ἐπετρεπτεῖς ταῖς την πόλιν ἔστησε. Probably sixth century, perhaps even by Agathias—see Hellenica IV 132 n.3.

(2) Agathias (Anth.Pal. 9.662, with Hellenica IV 132; A. and A. Cameron, JHS 86 [1966] 9–10, believe that this is the poet himself; P. Maas, ByzNeugrJb 3 [1922] 163–64, had his doubts) πατήρ...πολὺς repairs the public lavatories at Smyrna. Sixth century.

ATTALIA
(1) IGC 307: [ἐ]πὶ... an anonymous [c]χο(λαστικοῦ) καὶ(καὶ) πατ[ρὸς...]; the context is not clear. Sixth century—Grégoire.

(2) IGC 309: ἐπὶ (the governor and) Ἰεροδόξου τοῦ λαμπροτότατον πατρός, referring to the facing (πλάκωςας) of a gate. Fifth–sixth century—Grégoire.
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(2) G. Laminger-Pascher (op.cit. 35, from R. Heberdey’s notes): ἐπὶ Φλ(άβιος) ἵωνον τοῦ μεγαλοπρ(επεκτάτου) καὶ περιβλ(έπτου) κόμ(ητος) καὶ ἀρχοντὸς ἡμῶν κ(αὶ) Ζήσιωνος τοῦ λαμπρ(τάτου) κόμ(ητος) κ(αὶ) πατρὸς τοῦ πάν ἔφγον γέγονεν ἐν χρό(νῳ) ἴνδ(ικτίωνος) ἀ’. The reference to the comes Isauriae as περιβλέπτος, particularly with the reinforcement of μεγαλοπρεπέστατος, ought to put this inscription well after Justinian’s Novel xxvii De Comite Isauriae (535), although it is not impossible that these titles were already being usurped by the comes; Laminger-Pascher’s proposed fourth-century date for both these inscriptions is unacceptable.¹¹

(3) A. E. Raubitschek, in H. Goldman (ed.), Excavations at Güzülı Kule, Tarsus I (Princeton 1950) 384 no.8, with pl.258; reproduced, but with a question mark, in BullEp 1951, no.223. I would prefer to see this not as a fourth-century tombstone, [(cross) τόπος τοῦ μεγα]λοπρ(επεκτάτου) κόμ[ητος] κ[αὶ] ῥήτορος Μουσουνίου [... .c.10] ου τοῦ περιβλ(έπτου) [... c.10] κ Κομ:path τοῦ [... c.10] ιατρίου κ[αὶ] [... c.10] περιβλ(έπτου) τρ(ι)β [... c.10] ΤΣΟΝΤΟΣ [... c.10] ξοτέρου [... c.10] ΙΟΥ (cross)—so Raubitschek—, but as a building inscription: [(cross) ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγα]λοπρ(επεκτάτου) κόμης τ[ος] κ[αὶ] σχ[α]τικοῦ καὶ πατρ[ὸς] Μουσουνίου, κ.τ.λ. If this restoration is correct, we should assume a late-fifth or sixth-century date (which would accord well with the letter forms) in view of the debased titulature; for another μεγαλοπρ(επεκτατος) πατήρ, see below. The other people listed must then be private contributors to the building.

ELAEUSSA (CILICIA TRACHAEA)

(1) Bent and Hicks, JHS 12 (1891) 259 no.32; (cf. R. Heberdey, DenkschrWien 44 [1896] 50); Laminger-Pascher, from Heberdey’s notes, op.cit. 67: ἐπὶ Ἰμου τοῦ μεγαλοπρ(επεκτάτου) κόμ(ητος) πατρός, on an aqueduct supplying Elaeussa-Sebaste. Laminger-Pascher reads μῆλου, which from the facsimile looks possible; but L. Zgusta, Kleinasiatische Personennamen (Prague 1964) 196, suggests that Ἰμου could be from Ἰμας, a widespread name. In any case, Laminger-Pascher’s identification with the famous general Illus is very improbable. Late fifth or sixth century.

CAESAREA (PALESTINE)


(2) B. Lifschütz, op.cit. 122–23, with n.51 for earlier bibliography: ἐπὶ (the governor and) Ἡλιου λαμπρο(τάτου) πατρός τῆς πόλεως, concerning the

¹¹ For the abbreviation ἐν χρῷ, which puzzled Laminger-Pascher, see SEG VIII 34 and 35, whence M. Avi-Yonah, Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions (QDAP IX Suppl., London 1940) 113.
building or repairing of a basilica; datable (by the same arguments) before 536.

**Palestine (location uncertain)**

**Sepphoris (?)**
(1) B. Lifschitz, *ZDPV* 79 (1963) 94–95 (*SEG* XX 416, *cf. BullEp* 1964, 512) reediting *SEG* VIII 15, a private inscription on a lintel, conjectures a πατήρ τῆς πόλεως. But the private character of this inscription and the difficulties at several points make this very uncertain.

**Jerusalem (?)**
(1) *CIG* 9140, from a dubious copy by Bailie (on whose unreliability see Robert, *Hellenica* XIII 152–53), apparently refers to the daughter of ... νος ἐλλογιμο[τά] του πατρός[...]

**Perinthus (Thrace)**

**Gortyna (Crete)**
(1) M. Guarducci, *I.Creticae* IV 461; A. C. Bandy, *Christian Inscriptions of Crete* (Athens 1971) 32: ἐπὶ Βεγλίου τοῦ λαμμπροτάτου σκριμαρίου καὶ πατρὸς τῆς πόλ(εως), referring to the restoration of a pavement and (?) a church (a cistern, Bandy). The only copy of this inscription (A. Lollini, in *cod. Vat.gr.* 1759 fol.135°) is very unsure.

The pattern that emerges from this list is, first, that almost all the inscriptions are associated with public works, and secondly, that certain cities produce clusters of πατέρες while others, with abundant evidence of public works dating from this period (*e.g.*, Gerasa and Syria in general), produce no mention of such an official.12

As to the references in the legislation, these also follow an interesting pattern. By far the majority of these passages speak of πατέρες and/or some other kind of official. Thus:

12 There are also mentions in papyri: see, *e.g.*, C. Wessely, *StudPal* III (Leipzig 1904) nos. 67 (7th cent., Heracleopolis) and 176 (6th cent., Arsinoe); these, unhelpfully, are simply descriptions of individuals.
A NEW INSCRIPTION FROM APHRODISIAS

Cod. Just. 10.27.2.12 (Anastasius, on the organization of corn levies): καὶ οἱ πατέρες τῶν πόλεων καὶ πάς ἔτερος τῆς εὐνωνίας προνοούμενος.

Cod. Just. 1.5.12.7 (487 or 510): τοὺς δὲ αὐτοὺς αἰρετικοὺς οὔτε ἐκδίκου οὔτε πόλεως πατρὸς μετέναι φροντίδα εὐγνωμοὺς.

Cod. Just. 8.51.3.3 (529): concerning the protection of rights of abandoned children, entrusted to governors and episcopis nec non officiis praesidalibus et patribus et defensoribus civitatum et omni civili auxilio.

Cod. Just. 3.43.1.1 (529): concerning laws about dicing to be enforced a patribus seu defensoribus locorum (cf. Cod. Just. 1.4.25).

Cod. Just. 12.63.2.6 (530): the responsibility for not giving more than a stated amount to requisitions by governors is urged: οὐ χρῆ δὲ οὔτε τοὺς πατέρας οὔτε τοὺς εἰτῶνας...παρέχειν.

Just. Nov. 75.2 (537): concerned with the ratification of local legislation in Sicily—id est pro defensoribus vel patribus civitatum decreta.

Just. Nov. 85.3.1 (539): responsibility for the control of private arms manufacture belongs to governors, their officia, καὶ τῶν τὰς πόλεις ἐκδικούντων καὶ πατέρων.

The implication of such phrases would seem to be that not every city had a πατήρ.

Against this background, it is useful to look at the laws which mention πατέρες more specifically. The earliest reference (after the law of Leo quoted above) is Cod. Just. 8.12 (Zeno, 485/6) which forbids central government officials from interfering with public works which are undertaken from civiles reeditus—the cities’ own income—and which are the concern of patribus civitatum.

Cod. Just. 11.33.2 is a law of Constantine (314) dealing with the regulation of debts by a private individual to a city. In the Theodosian Code (12.11.1) this money is to be invested periculo curatoris kalendarii, but in the Justinianic Code this is emended to cura patris civitatis.

Cod. Just. 1.4.26 (530) is also concerned with πολιτικοὶ πρόσωδοι; the care of the land owned by the city (πολιτικοὺ ἡ δημόσιον) is the responsibility of τὸν θεοφιλέστατον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν τε πατέρα τούς τε λοιποὺς ἐν ὑπολήψει κτήτορας (9). Decisions about the reliability of a surety are to be reached by τὸν θεοφιλέστατον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν τε πατέρα τὸν τε ἐκδίκου τῆς πόλεως (12).

Just. Nov. xvii (535) contains the mandata to be given to provincial
governors, setting out their duties. Chapter 4 is concerned with the governor’s conduct vis-à-vis central government envoys on special missions—it instances the construction of waterworks, roads, bridges, walls, etc. as the object of such missions. The governor is instructed not to allow such officials to oppress his subjects, and to check their credentials; the passage continues, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀφονίας τῶν ἐπιτηδείων καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν πόλεων ἐπιμελήσῃ, παρασκευάζων ἐκ τῶν πολιτικῶν χρημάτων αὐτοῦ ἄτε πατέρας τὰ ἀναγκαίωτα τῶν ἔργων ποιῶν καὶ γεφυρῶν ὁμοίως καὶ ὁδῶν καὶ λιμένων... καὶ τειχῶν ἐπιμελεῖσθαι (Lat. procurans ex civilibus pecuniis patres quae valde necessaria sunt operum facere, etc.). This very compressed passage has been found difficult by others, as the manuscript variants show. The editors took the reference to patres to mean πατέρας τῶν πόλεων.13 But this requires rather an abrupt change of subject matter from the envoys, with whom the preceding sentences are concerned, to local officials; the remainder of the chapter discusses the governor’s relations with soldiers (also the representatives of central government) in his province. It seems preferable to take ἄτε πατέρας as a rhetorical embellishment, characterizing the behaviour to be desired from the government envoys.14 The point of the sentence is that the envoys should use the existing resources of a city, rather than make a special requisition (ζημιών, above). If this interpretation is correct, we presumably need to assume ut before patres in the Latin text. If, however, the sense of the passage is that the governor should appoint πατέρας to obviate the need for such envoys, we should omit the αὐτοῦ ἄτε of the Greek text; but this correction is more violent and therefore less attractive.

Just. Nov. 128.16 (545) is concerned with protecting the funds of cities from taxation. Neither tax collectors (ἀπαίτησαι) nor local land owners (κτήτορες) nor the governor nor his officium are to interfere with this money; ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐκάστης πόλεως δειώτατον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τοὺς πρωτεύοντας τῆς πόλεως, οὗ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς αὐτῆς κτήτορας προβάλλεθαμ μὲν τὸν πατέρα τῶν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῶν εἰτών καὶ ἄλλους τοιούτους διοικητάς. Such officials are to present yearly accounts.

13 Justinian, Novellae, ed. R. Schöll and W. Kroll (Berlin 1895) 120; so also R. Ganghoffer, L’évolution des institutions municipales en Occident et en Orient au Bas Empire (Paris 1963) 161.
14 For such embellishments, compare ch.1, where the governor is urged καθαράς φυλάττειν...τὰς χείρας: for this standard rhetorical cliche applied to governors, see Robert, Hellenica IV 38–39, and I. Ševčenko in A. Grabar, Synthronon (Paris 1968) 35.
For an example of this system in practice, we return to Aphrodisias; Just. Nov. clx (not datable) was written in response to an appeal from Αριστοκράτης ὁ ἐλλογμώτατος πατήρ τῆς Ἀφροδισίας πόλεως, καὶ οἱ καὶ αὐτὴν κεκτημένοι, over the management of the large legacies (χρυσίων συχνών) which had been left to the city, the income from which had been endangered by Justinian’s laws restricting the liabilities of debtors (Nov. cxxxviii, before 535). It is clear that at Aphrodisias a tradition of public benefactions by individuals continued to a late date. This may have been partly inspired by the continuance of pagan traditions (e.g., the elder Asclepiodotus, for whom see Hellenica IV 115–26; I hope to publish soon fresh evidence of public benefactors in this circle); but the generous Hermias was a Christian, as was Rhodopaios.\(^\text{15}\) It does not appear to be paralleled to quite such an extent elsewhere at this period, however.

Finally, the earliest reference to a πατήρ would appear to be in a letter of Nilus of Ancyra (Ep. 2.36) addressed to Δημοσθένεις πατρὶ πόλεως and presumably written before ca 430. But Alan Cameron has recently demonstrated that the headings of these letters are largely the work of a sixth-century editor, and in view of our other evidence, this reference should probably be added to the list of anachronisms collected by Cameron.\(^\text{16}\)

There is, therefore, no reliable evidence to date the use of the title πατήρ τῆς πόλεως before the middle of the fifth century, although this situation largely reflects the general difficulties in dating late imperial inscriptions. It may well be that further work in this field will allow us to be more precise and perhaps to give an earlier date to some occurrences of the title; for the moment, its absence from the Theodosian Code is the most substantial indication of date that we can adduce.\(^\text{17}\) From the middle of the fifth century and throughout the sixth, the πατήρ τῆς πόλεως appears to be a civic official in charge

\(^{15}\) For Hermias see IGC 277, with Robert, Hellenica IV 130. For the three inscriptions honouring Rhodopaios, see Hellenica IV 127–29. Reexamination of the stone published by Reinach (REG 19 [1906] 142 no.75) shows a well-cut cross below the inscription.


\(^{17}\) R. Ganghoffer, op.cit. (supra n.13) 161 n.31, claims “le pater apparaît en Egypte dès le IV\(^\text{e}\) siècle,” referring to L. Harmand, Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques (Paris 1949) 428; but Harmand only cites references for the term πάτρων.
of the civic revenues (τὰ Ἵδια χρήματα, Side 2; τὰ πολιτικά, Caesarea 1; the civiles redivus [Cod. Just. 8.12] or πολιτικαὶ πρόοδοι [Cod. Just. 1.4.26]). Other subsidiary duties—supervising gaming (Cod. Just. 3.43) and protecting the rights of children (Cod. Just. 8.51)—were probably assigned to him simply out of administrative convenience. Buildings erected from these revenues are dated by the πατήρ; perhaps when they are also dated by the governor (e.g., Miletus 1, Attalia 2, Caesarea 2), this indicates more than one source for the money (and, if my interpretation of Tarsus 3 is correct, private citizens can also be involved). He is indeed well described as πόλιος κτεάνων ταμίης τε πατήρ τε (Smyrna 1). These functions have been known for some time.18

Jones proceeds to equate the πατήρ with the curator, an office descended from the earlier λογιστής, and to attribute a πατήρ to every city.19 But the pattern that emerges from the inscriptions—where πατέρες seem to turn up in clusters, at particular cities—seems to me to be reinforced by the tone of the legal evidence, where the πατήρ is so often referred to as one alternative in a list of officials. Modern understanding can be too easily influenced by the legislators, especially Justinian, who undoubtedly wanted to create a neat and uniform system of administration; but the reality was often different. I very much doubt whether every city had a πατήρ τῆς πόλεως. The office of ἐκδικος seems to have been more widespread—but then the functions of a defensor were more widely needed. It is not clear to me that a πατήρ would be required in a city whose revenues were merely those set aside for them from the imperial revenues (Jones, LRE 733-34); such an arrangement was probably very largely a fiction in any case. I suspect that the πατήρ τῆς πόλεως, as opposed, perhaps, to other officials with somewhat similar functions, will be found only in cities with a substantial income from possessions of their own—of which we know Aphrodisias to be one.

18 See for example Waddington ad Le Bas-Waddington no.594; E. Hanton, Byzantion 4 (1927/28) 114; A. H. M. Jones, The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian (Oxford 1940) 250; LRE 726.

19 Jones, op.cit. (supra n.18) 209; LRE 726 and n.30, 759 and n.104. This assumption creates some difficulties: cf. e.g., E. Stein, Histoire du Bas Empire II (Paris 1959) 212 n.1. R. Ganghoffer, op.cit. (supra n.13), devotes a section (170–72) to "Rapports du 'defensor civitatis' avec le 'curator reipublicae'," whom he too equates with the πατήρ. D. Claude found too many obstacles to the coexistence of the πατήρ and the defensor and concluded, "Eine Stadt besass demnach einen defensor oder einen pater civitatis": Die byzantinische Stadt (Munich 1969) 115.
This money will have come from loan income (so *Cod. Just*. 11.33.2, and *Just. Nov.* clx) and from the cities' own land (*Cod. Just.* 4.26), and the management of both of these is specifically entrusted to the *πατέρες*. Alternatively, it could be suggested that a *πατὴρ* was always appointed but that in cities without their own wealth he was insignificant. This latter suggestion cannot be disproved; but it is based on an assumption of a uniformity of civic administration which seems to me improbable.

The overall history of the cities of the later Roman empire is of a constant struggle by the central government to keep them solvent and functioning, with diminishing success. The rate of decline, however, varied dramatically from city to city. I believe that it is necessary to reexamine the evidence on a geographical basis and to explore the diversities over time and over space which have made it possible to propose two contrary 'models' for the provincial life of the period: either one of flourishing municipal communities or one of irresistible municipal decline. The truth (not surprisingly) is likely to be far more complex.

In my own view, the appearance of the title *πατὴρ τῆς πόλεως* at a particular city, especially if it appears more than once (e.g., at Attalia, Side, Tarsus, Smyrna, Caesarea and, above all, Aphrodisias) indicates that that city enjoyed in the later fifth and sixth centuries a considerable measure of independent, secular prosperity, as opposed to depending on the generosity of governors or of a well-endowed church. The balance between the two sources of funds is well illustrated at Aphrodisias. There, the governor's generosity was still a matter of importance, which was acknowledged and encouraged, in the case of Palmatus, by two statues. One was erected by the provincial assembly with money to which Aphrodisias presumably contributed. The other, however, was put up by Flavius Athenaeus, either from his own money (demonstrating a still lively tradition of

---

20 Thus perhaps the *πατέρες* found witnessing documents (*supra* n.12) were of little importance, and the *pater civitatis* at Mopsuestia in 550 (Mansi IX 278 and 285, cited by Jones, *LRE* 760).


22 See the discussion of Ševčenko, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.14) 38.

23 It is particularly striking that, of these cities, Aphrodisias, Caesarea, Side and Tarsus were all metropolises, and as such particularly liable to central government benefactions. But the evidence from Aphrodisias suggests that the presence of the governor and his *officium* in the city contributed to the continuing prosperity of the local ruling class.
private munificence) or, as I believe, from the substantial city funds which he administered as δ λαμπρ(ότατος) πατήρ τῆς λαμπρ(οτάτης) Ἀφροδ(ειςεῖον) μητροπό(λεως); similarly, the work referred to as being done by the πατήρ in Smyrna 1 and 2 and Palestine 1 is probably work carried out in his official capacity from public money, even though this is not specifically mentioned, as it is in Caesarea 1. From the evidence of Justinian's *Novel clx* (cited above, p.182) it is clear that these funds still gave the city a fair measure of fiscal independence and self-esteem well into the sixth century.24

Kuwait
March, 1979

---

24 I am grateful to Professor and Madame Louis Robert, Dr J. R. Martindale and Miss J. M. Reynolds for generously giving their guidance and encouragement in the preparation of this article, and to Professor Kenan Erim, whose energy has made available so much new material which he has kindly allowed me to publish. I thank also the editors of *GRBS* for constructive advice.
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