Imperial Commissioners Again

James H. Oliver

Since the publication of "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia," GRBS 14 (1973) 389-405, two more documents attesting an epimelete of the city at Athens have come to the author's attention. One is the inscription near the bottom of a block, two fragments recently joined at the Epigraphical Museum and then published by D. Peppa-Delmousou and Khara Karapa, Deltion 27 (1972, in 1976) Xρονικά 12, no.8:

vacat

['Ε]πιμελητεύον[τος τής πόλες]
[w]ε
t[ε]
[ν]ον 'Ρούφον]

vacat

The restoration by the editors is based on IG II² 2472, a catalogue with the name Μουσώνιος 'Ρούφος squeezed in between lines just after the title ἱερέως 'Απαλλονος Δηλών, and from Inscr. de Délos 2538, in which C. Musonius Rufus is mentioned as lifelong priest of the Delian Apollo and epimelete of holy Delos under Antoninus Pius. He is not the only Musonius, but Mrs Peppa-Delmousou and Miss Karapa are, I think, right in restoring the cognomen 'Ρούφος and the phrase τής πόλεως.

As the editors point out, this restoration would imply that the office of the epimelete of the city continued after the Hadrianic reform of the Athenian constitution. In my original article I noted that in the first century after Christ prominent men served as epimelete and men of less distinction did so under Hadrian, and then none at all seemed to postdate Hadrian. Now C. Musonius Rufus, epimelete of the city under Antoninus Pius, shows that the office did continue and with distinguished incumbents after Hadrian.

Accordingly, another document may be claimed as an even later attestation of an epimelete of the city at Athens, namely IG II² 3405 "for the victory and health of the godlike and brother-loving emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aurelius Verus." At the bottom of the inscription is the note:
The family was a distinguished one well known from the catalogues of paeanistae (TAPA 71 [1940] 302-10, and M. Woloch, Roman Citizenship and the Athenian Elite, A.D. 96-161 [Amsterdam 1973] 62-67).

In the original article we compared the rise of the imperial correctores with the decline of the epimeleteia of the city. We noted that the Trajanic-Hadrianic correctores were not, as far as our scanty evidence permits us to say, continued by Antoninus Pius, but that a new period began with the appointment of the Quintilii as interim consular governors of both the free cities and the old province. Since we recognize a correlation between the rise of imperial correctores and the decline of epimeleteia of the city, it is easy to accept prominent epimeleteia after Hadrian and before the Quintilii. At the present state of our evidence Antoninus Pius and the divi fratres, by their abstention from appointing correctores, seem to have allowed the epimeleteia to recover its previous importance, but with the arrival of the Quintilii it probably fell once again into a more permanent decline.
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