

- Väänänen, Veikko. 1966. *Le latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*<sup>3</sup>. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.  
– 1981: *Introduction au latin vulgaire*<sup>3</sup>, revue et augmentée. Paris: C. Klincksieck.  
Whatmough, Joshua. 1937: *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. London: Methuen and Co.  
Wick, F.C. 1905: La fonetica delle iscrizioni parietarie pompeiane specialmente in quanto risenta dell'osco e accenni all'evoluzione romana. *Atti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti* 23. [non vidi]

## Roman Roads, Greek Terms: Translation, Transliteration and Transfer

By PHYLLIS CULHAM, Annapolis (Maryland)

The standard lexica and studies of Greek administrative terminology in the Roman period tend to mishandle the Greek terms *οὐνόκουρος* and *ὁδοποιός* both by sometimes associating them with the wrong posts in the Roman bureaucracy and by understanding them as technical terms in literary contexts where that is not appropriate (e.g. Dio 54.8.4). Close attention to epigraphical usage and comparison of the use of these terms to that of associated terms, e.g. *ἐπιμελητὴς ὁδῶν* and *κουαττόρουρι* will offer more precise understanding. It will also produce the interesting side effect of removing the Emperor Augustus from the *fasti* of the *curatores viarum*, where he is often wrongly placed.

Mason's *Greek Terms* has largely superceded Magie's manual and has a well deserved reputation for utility and reliability among scholars working with Greek documents which translate Roman bureaucratic and legal terms.<sup>1)</sup> Although this lexicon is of generally outstand-

---

<sup>1)</sup> H.J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*=*American Studies in Papyrology* 13, Toronto 1974; and D. Magie, *De Romanorum Iuris Publici Sacrique Vocabulis Sollemnibus in Graecum Sermone Conversis*, Leipzig 1905, respectively. E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, New York 1887, was never as widely used; it tends to rely excessively upon idiosyncratic literary texts to the neglect of epigraphic and papyrological evidence. P. Viereck's compilation of comparatively early material, *Sermo Graecus Quo Senatus Populusque Romanus Magistratusque Populi Romani usque ad Tiberii Caesaris Aetatem in Scriptis Publicis Usi Sunt* Göttingen, 1888, has been supplanted by the commentary in R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents From the Greek East*, Baltimore 1969 who was able to incorporate Viereck's own notes for a planned revision. Sherk, *Documents*, 3 collects much of the bibliography as of that date for 'Greek Copies, Translations, Influence of Latin on Greek'.

ing quality, any compilation incorporating such a mass of literary, epigraphic, and papyrological data will inevitably allow some deficiencies to slip through the editing process. One such problem is Mason's treatment of the term *οὐδόκουρος*. A reexamination of this term and of some related questions will serve the purposes of, first, aiding historians of the Roman Empire by supplementing *Greek Terms*, on which they frequently rely, second, serving as an interesting case study in the mutually interactive linguistic influences operating within a bilingual empire, and, third, illustrating the gulf between epigraphic and literary usage and demonstrating the danger of reading bureaucratic and legal precision into literary, narrative accounts.

Mason's lexicon is constructed to allow the user to look up a Greek term in the Greek alphabetical order to find the Latin term translated by the Greek and textual excerpts which illustrate the Greek usage in question. A short index of Latin terms at the end permits the user to work in reverse by looking up the Latin to find a list of all the Greek terms in the main lexicon which translate the Latin in question. If one turns to the term *οὐδόκουρος*, one is given the correct translation: *IV vir viarum curandarum*, the minor imperial office in the vigintivirate, and referred to instances in which minor spelling variations occur.<sup>2)</sup> If, however, one looks in the Latin index under *curator viarum*, the term for the republican and imperial office in charge of the main trunk roads of Italy, generally praetorian in status under the empire, one is referred not to the correct *ἐπιμελητῆς [ὁδῶν]*<sup>3)</sup> but to *ὁδοποιός* (which will be discussed later) and to *οὐδόκουρος*.<sup>4)</sup> The inadvertent confusion of the praetorian *curator viarum* with *οὐδόκουρος* is serious and would cause great difficulty for

---

<sup>2)</sup> This reverses the arrangement of Magie, *ibid.*, in which the reader looked up the Latin term to find the Greek translations. Mason's intent, specified in his preface (ix) is not to provide the scholar with illustrations of how the Greeks 'might handle a given term' but with knowledge of what is the 'regular, "standard" term in both inscriptions and literature' and what is infrequent in either medium. The listing for *οὐδόκουρος* is at 73. The reader is referred to *ἰόκουρος* SEG 6.555 and ILS 8842 and *ἰόκουρος* Ephes. 3.84-85 (= Forsch. Eph. 3, 1932, 165 nrs. 84 and 85.)

<sup>3)</sup> Greek Terms, 46.

<sup>4)</sup> Reference to *viarum curator* produces only *ὁδοποιός*. The entry under *curator viarum* refers to the discussion of *οὐδόκουρος* at Greek Terms, 6-8, where the term is connected with *IV vir viarum curandarum* and described as a transliteration of the Latin *viocurus*. *Viocurus* in the Latin index (all these terms at 207) is equated with *IV vir viarum curandarum* and reference given to *οὐδόκουρος*.

anyone trying, from a knowledge of the office in Latin, to obtain access to the numerous testimonia in Greek which supply crucial data.<sup>5)</sup>

The place to begin, clearly, is with the original Latin, *viocurus*. The etymology certainly seemed transparent to Varro. In *Ling. Lat.* 5.7, when he wanted to illustrate the simplest, most elementary inquiry into etymological derivation he asked, *Infimis quo populus etiam venit: quis enim non videt unde ar(g)e(n)tifodinae et viocurus?* He supplied examples of *viocuri* in 5.158: *Clivos Public(i)us ab aedilibus plebei Publici(i)s qui eum publice aedificarent. Simili de causa Pullius et Cosconius, quod ab his viocuris dicuntur aedificati*. It appears, therefore, that Varro thought that *viocuri* were originally assigned to carry out aedilician functions such as needed maintenance or improvement projects on roads or streets, perhaps acting in aid of the aediles.<sup>6)</sup> The evidence for the early republic is scanty, but the earliest attested minor projects (as opposed to the great original building programs requiring censorial contracts, or, if military transport projects, consular or praetorian imperium) are assigned by Livy to aediles; curule aediles carry out paving and improvement projects in Livy 10.23.12 and 10.47.4. More surprising is the milestone from the Pomptine marshes, *ILLRP* 448 = *ILS* 5801, placed by two aediles c.255 B.C.<sup>7)</sup> and *ILLRP* 449 = *ILS* 5802, another milestone set by a plebeian aedile on the far bank of the Tiber about twenty-eight miles from Rome; the Menates involved may have been a contemporary of Cicero and Varro (cf. Varro *Rus.* 2.11). Other early work by aediles closer to home is recorded in *ILLRP* 463 from the Via Ostiensis. This evidence implies that aediles were frequently involved in extensive and demanding road improvement projects over two hundred or more years of the Republic. It would not be

<sup>5)</sup> On the imperial, praetorian-rank post *curator viarum*, see O.Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, Berlin 1905, 205 ff.; and T.Mommsen, *St. R.* 2.1077 ff.; and now W.Eck, *Die Staatliche Organisation Italiens in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, München 1978, 25 ff. Illustrating the significance of Greek testimonia for the history of the office are the compilations of evidence by H.-G.Pflaum, especially in *Romanica et Occidentalia: Mélanges Hiram Peri*, Jerusalem 1963, 268 ff.; *JS* 1962, 110 ff.; Corolla Swoboda, Graz 1966, 185 ff.

<sup>6)</sup> *OLD* s.v. *viocurus* is of no help. They provide only 'one who has charge of roads' citing these passages of Varro and the inscriptions which are discussed in the text above. On the semantics of *cura* and related terms see A.Palma, *Le 'Curae' pubbliche*, Naples, 1980 = *Pubblicazioni della Facoltà Giuridica dell'Università di Napoli* 184, 32 following and passim.

<sup>7)</sup> On the date Broughton *MRR* 1. 211.

surprising, if those aediles assigned to these projects of such high visibility (including the much sought after right to place milestones), might themselves have come to be called *viocuri* colloquially. In any case, it is striking that those who held special appointments to the major trunk roads and were called *curatores viarum* in the period of the republic seem to come from every possible status except for the aedilician.<sup>8)</sup> There were no grounds, then, for confusing those who were *curatores* on special assignment with those performing normal aedilician functions. Nor can the term *viocurus* have originally referred to the *IV viri viarum curandarum*, since the office did not exist in that form until Augustus regularized the vigintivirate as the first step in the imperial cursus.<sup>9)</sup>

It remains to explain how a colloquialism for, as argued above, minor officials assisting in aedilician function or for aediles themselves when assigned to paving or improvement projects, was transliterated into Greek in order to provide a translation for the title *IV vir viarum curandarum*. Since the term was originally, if the discussion above is correct, a colloquial shorthand, one could not expect it to occur frequently among the formal titles listed in public testimonia; and, in fact, there are only two such occurrences: *ILS* 6290 and 6529. Both inscriptions are from the empire, almost certainly from the end of the first or beginning of the second century A.D., but cannot be dated more closely than that. *ILS* 6529 provides the indisputably municipal cursus of the locally prominent Q. Statius Syrus, who held every possible local office, including *quaestor alimentorum*, a post which, obviously, could only have been held after the establishment of the *alimenta* by Nerva or Trajan.<sup>10)</sup> At the beginning of his municipal career, he was *viocurus viae Claudiae*, presumably for a

---

<sup>8)</sup> Republican *curatores viarum* are listed by T.P. Wiseman, *PBSR* 38 (1970) 144–45 along with others who engaged in road repairs in the same period; and by G. Radke, *Viae Publicae Romanae*, Stuttgart 1971, 57, who also includes as a potential *curator viarum* C. Scribonius Curio whose effort to pass a *lex viaria* failed, cf. Caelius in Cic. Fam. 8.6.5, and At. 6.1.25., and App. B.C. 2.27.1. On neither list is there anyone known both as *viocurus* and *curator viarum*.

<sup>9)</sup> On the prefixing of the vigintivirate to the cursus shortly before 13 B.C. see Dio 54.26.5, cf. Tac. An. 3.29.

<sup>10)</sup> On the difficulties in finding an exact date for the establishment of the imperial *alimenta*, see Eck, *Organisation*, 146 ff.; and R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*, Cambridge 2nd ed. 1982, section three especially chapter seven. The argument in the text is not affected by these difficulties.

road near Aufinum, the site of the inscription.<sup>11)</sup> *ILS* 6290 provides an equally unparalleled *viocurus ex s. c. II d. d.*, i. e. M. Baebius Secundus was *viocurus* as the result of a joint appointment authorized simultaneously by both the senate at Rome and the *decuria* at Sora, the site of the inscription. Joint imperial and municipal efforts to improve *vicinales* were not uncommon under Hadrian and Pius; the joint involvement does not mean that Baebius held an imperial office, simply that some sort of financial aid to the municipality was involved.<sup>12)</sup> In the case of both inscriptions the communities involved have offices modeled after those at Rome: aediles, *praefecti*, quaestors, and *flamines* are examples. Both inscriptions reflect the use of an originally colloquial term for someone performing a certain type of aedilician assignment to refer to someone performing the same sort of assignment for an Italian city.

One can see how a similar linguistic process could have worked with the minor urban offices at Rome itself. The Roman aediles' general responsibility for city streets is well known (e.g. Plautus *Stich.* 352f. and Cicero *Leg.* 3.7) and may have contributed to associating the aediles and *viocuri* in the popular mind. At the end of the republic other minor officials at Rome had responsibilities that overlapped those of the aediles. The most obvious source on this point is the Tabula Heracleensis, sometimes called the Lex Julia Municipalis.<sup>13)</sup> In that inscription both curule and plebeian aediles draw lots

<sup>11)</sup> The road is presumably the Via Claudia Nova from Amiternum; Radke, *Viae*, 231 provides a map.

<sup>12)</sup> Such efforts appear in *ILS* 5875 in which both Hadrian and the neighboring *possessores* contribute to repairs on a particularly nasty stretch of the Via Appia. *CIL* 9.2655 from Aesernia provides an official with an otherwise municipal cursus, who is *curator viae Cu---datus a Divo Hadriano* and *curator viae A---datus ab Imp. Antonino Pio item IIIIvir i. d. q.* A strange appointment outside the series of assignments of praetorians to the great, named, trunk roads is the military *eques* who is *curator ciarum et pontium Umbriae et Piceni allectus ab Optimo Imp. T. Pio Aelio Antonino Aug.* in *ILS* 5891 and who may reflect a similar cooperative venture. It is not clear if the *curator ad populum viarum Traianae et Aureliae Aeclanensis* of *ILS* 1371 may have been part of a similar cooperative effort to improve the *vicinales*. The *curator viarum sternendarum a vicinis lectus ex auctoritate Ti. Claudii Caesaris Augusti Germanici* of *ILS* 964 presents special problems. He was, obviously, much earlier than the others and was a member of the imperial family on special assignment. On the imperial-municipal dialogue in funding local needs cf. the broad review of the question by H. Jouffroy, 'Le financement des constructions publiques en Italie: Initiative municipale, initiative impériale, évergétisme privé', *Ktema* 2 (1977) 328-337.

<sup>13)</sup> The many problems presented by the Tabula Heracleensis cannot be discussed here. Some basic modern studies of *ILS* 6085 = Riccobono 140 are G.

to decide in what section of the city they will be responsible for the streets (line 24 ff.). They work with *IIIIViri vieis in urbem purgandeis* and *IIIIViri vieis extra propiusve urbem Romam passus [M] purgandeis* (line 50). These were, of course, the offices which Augustus made into the *quattuorviri* of the vigintivirate. Holders of the republican offices of the Tabula Heracleensis are nowhere attested as being called *viocuri* but one can guess at both a possible tendency to associate these officials with the aediles and aedilician functions and a search for something less unwieldy to call them. It is likely that similar offices modeled on those at Rome were common throughout Italy.<sup>14)</sup> The association of aediles with all these minor officials and functions in the Italian mind, as a consequence of these Roman models, is illustrated by *ILS 5406* from Patavium, which commemorate a *IIIIVir aediliciae potestatis e lege Julia municipali*. On the smaller scale of the *municipia* of Italy and the western provinces, the full range of urban officials would have been superfluous; each little Rome could borrow the functional concepts, while labeling each official as it wished. The outstanding instance is the Lex Tarentina, whose line 39 shows traces of derivation from a general model in which concern for the streets and sewers is assigned to a *IIIIVir IIvir aedilisve*.<sup>15)</sup>

In summary, then, aediles assigned responsibility for Roman streets and highways in Italy were associated early on in these func-

---

Hardy, *Six Roman Laws*, Oxford 1915, 241 ff.; E. Schönbauer, *RIDA* 1 (1954) 373 ff.; H. Rudolph, *Stadt und Staat: Untersuchungen über die Entwicklung des munizipalen Wesens in der republikanischen Zeit*, Leipzig 1935, 217–225; M. W. Frederiksen, *JRS* 55 (1965) 183 ff.

<sup>14)</sup> This essay cannot discuss the question of whether or not there was a model municipal code drawn up in Rome and adopted by the Italian *municipia*. The references listed above for the 'Lex Julia Municipalis' are relevant. The epigraphic evidence, including that from Spain, suggests that such administrative measures were becoming common conceptual coin in the *municipia* of the western Mediterranean, imposed model code or no. This is illustrated by the Lex Tarentina (*ILS* 6086 = Riccobono 166) and a similar code from Urso in Spain (*ILS* 6087 = Riccobono 177). The persistence of these practices is illustrated by a charter from Salpensa (*ILS* 6088 = Riccobono 202), one from Malaga (*ILS* 6089 = Riccobono 208), and fragments of similar documents (Riccobono 219), all of them Flavian. The argument in the text above depends only on the existence of the effect, not on the mechanism by which the effect was achieved.

<sup>15)</sup> *ILS* 6086 = Riccobono 166 again, with the treatment in Hardy, *Laws*, 102; Mommsen *Ges. Schr.* 1. 146 ff.; H. Galsterer, *Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien*, München 1967 = *Munchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte* 68, 120–129.

tions with *viocuri* and might even have been termed *viocuri* colloquially. In the late republic other municipal officials were created to share these duties; they came, naturally enough, to be associated with the aediles. They are, nonetheless, not attested as being called *viocuri*. *Municipia* throughout the west adopted systems of city government modeled upon those at Rome. On that smaller scale, however, the whole range of offices was superfluous. The same basic tasks had to be performed everywhere, but, given the smaller population and geographic area, responsibility would not be divided but assigned to one office, which might be labeled aedile, *IIIvir*, or *IIvir* according to the individual charter. None of these chartered officials are called *viocuri* in epigraphic testimonia, but the term reemerged from a colloquial substratum into the public written record at the end of the first century A.D., when local officials were assigned specific road projects, as some of the original aediles had been, and a designation was sought for them. It was *viocurus*. At no point in this process was *viocurus* used in the bureaucratic record to refer to the imperial office in the vigintivirate or to the minor positions which were the forerunners of that one, i.e. those recorded in the Lex Heracleensis. It is especially ironic, then, that the imperial *IIIvir viarum curandarum* could be called *οὐδόκουρος* or one of its variants in Greek. This is surely the effect of the epigraphic medium. Transliterations, usually abbreviated, of the *IIIviri viarum curandarum* title are the norm, but a desire for a shorter, easier to carve title led some engravers to fall back on transliterations of *viocurus* to translate *IIIvir viarum curandarum*.<sup>16)</sup> No ambiguity would result from this use of the vague colloquialism, which had come to refer to function rather than to specific office, since the position of the term at the beginning of the cursus would illustrate that an office in the vigintivirate must be meant.

There is an interesting instance of retrograde influence in *CIL* 6.1529. In that inscription C. Vettius Gratus Sabinianus' office in the vigintivirate at the beginning of his cursus is listed as *viocurus*. Later, after his praetorship, he served as a *curator viae Flaminiae et alimentorum*. This is the only extant case in Latin of *viocurus*' referring to the office of *IIIvir viarum curandarum*.<sup>17)</sup> Pflaum noted that the

<sup>16)</sup> On transliterations of *IIIvir viarum curandarum* as the norm, see Mommsen, *St. R.* 2. 603 n. 4. Examples given by Mason, *Terms*, 63.

<sup>17)</sup> Sabinianus' name is restored in *CIL* 6.1529 = 31671 on the basis of that of his father in *CIL* 823 and of an earlier generation of the family, cf. *PIR*<sup>1</sup> V 322, 328, 329, 330, 331. *PIR*<sup>1</sup> assigned this inscription to the father, but that is

datable occurrences of *οὐióκουρος* and its orthographic variants, as opposed to the more ordinary *κουαττόρουρ* and its variants in reference to that office, are clustered around 250 A.D. That is roughly the time at which *CIL* 6.1529 was dedicated to Sabinianus.<sup>18)</sup> The obvious explanation is that Greek epigraphical usage of the third century could influence Latin epigraphical practices in similar documents. In this case the Latin word transliterated to provide a translation for a different term was substituted *in the Latin* for the technical Latin bureaucratic title as a result of the influence of the contemporary Greek translation!

It ought, incidentally, to be clear from the above that there are no grounds for the connection made in Mason's Latin index between *οὐióκουρος* and *curator viarum* and that serious bureaucratic and historical confusion could result from identifying the two terms. One may wonder how such confusion could arise in a lexicon of such general reliability. An examination of the nexus of terms Mason associates with the *curator viarum* title suggests an explanation. The public, epigraphic texts are consistent in their insistence that the *curator viarum* is just that, unless it is necessary to refer to him in the Greek as *ἐπιμελητῆς ὁδῶν*.<sup>19)</sup> Mason, on the other hand, seems to have been heavily influenced by the literary narrative of Dio and, as a result, to believe that almost any term associated with roads or referring to them in the immediate context could serve as a translation of the *curator viarum* title. Mason's Latin index, as noted at the beginning, associates *curator viarum* with *ὁδοποιός* as well as *οὐióκουρος*. The entry for *curator* (no area of concern specified) refers to *ἐπιστάτης*. The entry for *viarum curator* refers the user to *ὁδοποιός*.<sup>20)</sup> In none of these cases is the reader referred to the epig-

---

unacceptable, since the father is known to have been *tribunus militum* and *quaesitor candidatus*, and these offices will not fit into the cursus recorded in this inscription. A. Cameron, 'Latin Words in the Greek Inscriptions of Asia Minor', *AJP* 52 (1931) 232 notes that a number of Latin terms which occur in the Greek inscriptions are rare in Latin. This may be explained in a case like *viocurus* by the unique demands of the epigraphic medium, which borrows a colloquialism if it's short and less unwieldy than the standard bureaucratic term. Some Greek speaking regions did seem to prefer some suffixes to others, when they borrowed, cf. R. Cavenaile, 'Quelques Aspects de l'apport linguistique du Grec', *Aegyptus* 32 (1952) 194 ff.

<sup>18)</sup> For a chronological survey of the Greek transliteration see Pflaum, JS, 118. Sabinianus was cos. ord. in 242 (*CIL* 6.2133 and 9.3429) and may have been cos. ord. II in 250 (*PIR*<sup>1</sup> 328).

<sup>19)</sup> Illustrated by the tables in Eck, *Organisation*, 80 ff.

<sup>20)</sup> Greek Terms, 182-183 and 207.



raphically standard *ἐπιμελητής*. It is the epigraphic texts, of course, which provide by far the most data on the office. Related problems emerge in the Greek entries. *Ὀδοποιός* in turn is defined as *curator viarum* on the basis of Dio 54.8.4 and 60.17.2. The *προστάτης* entry asymmetrically, but correctly, does not list *curator* as one of the possible meanings of that term, but inexplicably lists Dio 54.8.4 under definition number seven: *praefectus*. If one examines the texts which Mason cites to support his claims in the Greek lexicon that these other terms could all serve to translate *curator viarum*, one finds immediately that they are all from literary narrative and all but one from Dio in particular.<sup>21)</sup> Dio does clearly mean *curator viarum*, when he uses *Ὀδοποιός* in 60.17.2 and *ἐπιστάτης* in 59.15.4. This is, nonetheless, purely *variatio*, by means of which Dio escapes the limits of the bureaucratically standard *ἐπιμελητής*. The desire of Dio and, indeed, his contemporaries writing in prose, to avoid Roman bureaucratese is well known.<sup>22)</sup> *Ἐπιμελητής*, however, occurs in his text at 59.15.3 in the same anecdote in which *ἐπιστάτης* is used, illustrating precisely this effort to achieve *variatio*. It is ironic that Mason himself describes Appian as using literary language rather than exact terminology, precisely on the grounds that he relies on *ἐπιστάτης* and *προστάτης* to describe various magistrates.<sup>23)</sup> Dio 54.8.4 where Augustus himself is *προστάτης τῶν περὶ τὴν Ῥώμην*

<sup>21)</sup> Ibid., 73, 81–82. The exception is Appian B.C. 2.27, but see text below and note 23.

<sup>22)</sup> On Dio's stylistic preferences for avoiding the rigidity of bureaucratic terminology see F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio*, Oxford 1964, 177. One of the best descriptions of the preferences of these prose authors is H. J. Mason, 'The Roman Government in Greek Sources', *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 151 ff., where Mason comments at 152, 'But it should be noted that, even without the question of translation, there was a tendency, presumably going back to the school of Isocrates, to avoid the strict, precise technical term. His audience ... could be counted on to perceive the Roman reality under the Attic facade, which was the product of a literary fashion that considered long familiar Roman expressions as "difficult to translate" (difficult that is, without offending literary sensibilities)'. On Dio's transformation of his sources for the period of these passages in general see B. Manuwald, *Cassius Dio und Augustus: Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45–56 des Dionischen Geschichtswerkes*, Wiesbaden 1979, 25 ff.; and V. Fadinger, *Die Begründung des Prinzipats: Quellenkritische und Staatsrechtliche Untersuchungen zu Cassius Dio und der Parallelüberlieferung*, Berlin 1969. On the treatment of *προστάτης* in particular see G. Vrind, *De Cassii Dionis Vocabulis Quae ad Ius Publicum Pertinent*, Amsterdam 1923, 26; and H. A. Anderson, *Cassius Dio und die Begründung des Principates*, Berlin 1938, 57 ff.

<sup>23)</sup> Greek Terms, 16; cf. Appian B.C. 2.27, where Appian uses *ἐπιστάτης* apparently to refer to the republican post *curator viarum*.

ὁδῶν certainly does not mean that Augustus held the post *curator viarum*.<sup>24)</sup> This is simply a literary description of the process by which a *senatus consultum* authorized Augustus to appoint the newly regularized praetorian *curatores viarum* of the imperial period, as he does within that very passage.<sup>25)</sup> This same point is illustrated by 53.22.1, where Augustus προσέταξε the Via Flaminia, meaning only that he financed repairs on it. Augustus claims in the Res Gestae to have *refecit* the Via Flaminia (summary 3, the verb is lost in the Latin of 4.20). That same event is described on the great arch at Ariminum as *Via Flaminia et reliqueis celeberrimeis Italiae vieis consilio et sumptibus eius muniteis*.<sup>26)</sup> Augustus did not serve in the post *curator viarum*.

Some conclusions may be adduced. In translating the title of the imperial *curatores viarum*, Dio's usage represents a literary attempt at *variatio*, not an attempt to provide a bureaucratically standard translation, which may be found in the public, epigraphic documents. Dio referred to the *curatores viarum* in much the same language he used to describe Augustus' own efforts to renovate the Italian highways, and Augustus occupied no specific office charged with those tasks. Some of Mason's definitions and examples listed in the entries for προστάτης and ἐπιστάτης should be removed. The case of *viocurus* also illustrates that the public, epigraphic texts demanded the development of a vocabulary which was not only descriptive but efficient and that epigraphic usage might select a colloquialism as the best solution to a problem of translating and engraving an unwieldy title. That these epigraphic texts constituted an autonomous linguistic realm with its own, internal channels of influence is illustrated by the listing of Sabinianus' office in the vigintivirate as *viocurus*.

<sup>24)</sup> E.g. D.Strong, 'The Administration of Public Building in Rome During the Late Republic and Early Empire', *BICS* 15 (1968) 104.

<sup>25)</sup> Examples of such S.C. which authorized Augustus to create an administrative post and fill it but did not charge him with the administrative task itself are well known, e.g. Frontinus Aqu. 100 and 104, which provide the directly parallel case of the *curatores aquarum*.

<sup>26)</sup> *ILS* 84. Dio 52.21.2 where τῆς πόλεως προστατῆς is the recommended practice for the urban prefect is no better evidence that προστάτης is a term with a standardized bureaucratic meaning or a bureaucratically appropriate translation for the word prefect. Augustus was constantly engaged in financing and inspiring efforts to repair the highways in Italy and elsewhere, and various terms were used to describe his involvement in the various cases; none imply a post assigned by the senates *ILS* 9371, a milestone, *Viam Aemiliam ab Arimino ad flumen Trebiam muniendam curavit*; and *ILS* 5828, from Pisidia, *Viam Sebasten curante Cornuto Aquila leg. suo pro praetore fecit*.