

Although the consul is not named in the above passage the identification is revealed by two other passages (*Sat.* 2.2.13 and *Sat.* 2.3.6), where the first two jokes are recounted and their occasion given as the consulship of Caninius. Thus, apart from the difficulties outlined in the first part of this note, we have the curious, though not, admittedly, impossible, situation, that Cicero told the same joke about two different people.

There can be little doubt that a joke has been assigned to Vatinius that was, in reality, told about Caninius. *How* the substitution took place must remain an open question. It is clear that Vatinius' name is reported correctly by the MSS of the *Saturnalia* since Macrobius goes on to say that the jibes were provoked by Vatinius' remark about Cicero's varicose veins. It may be that Macrobius inherited the mistake from a handbook of Ciceronian witticisms:⁸ a copyist familiar with the name of Cicero's great rival and the butt of so much of his repartee could well have misread *Vatinius* for *Caninius*.

Whatever the reason, let it suffice to note that the mistake was somehow made and that this passage of the *Saturnalia* should not be allowed to confuse, as it has done in the past, the question of the length of Vatinius' consulship. Macrobius' *paucis diebus* is clearly the result of a compromise between his roles as honest historian and entertaining *raconteur*, a lame attempt to accommodate, if only partially, Vatinius' term of office to the requirements of a joke not originally meant for him.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

THE INSCRIPTION FROM THE SEA-WALL AT ANEMURIUM

C. P. JONES

PROFESSOR E. ALFÖLDI-ROSENBAUM has recently published in this journal, with detailed photographs and a facsimile, a metrical inscription from the sea-wall at Anemurium on the Isaurian coast.¹ Her text and translation are as follows (with marks of ligature added):

1. τείχος ἀμωμήτοιο ταγαῖς ἐτέλεσε τάχιστα
2. λαμπροτάτου κόμητος τοῦτο Ματρωνιάνου·
3. εὐσεβῆς ἀγαθὸς στρατιῆς τε τεταγμένος ἐσθλῆς
4. πρώτων Ἀρμενίων, ὧν κλέος ἐστὶ μέγα.

⁸See *Sat.* 2.1.12: *Cicero autem quantum in ea re valuerit quis ignorat qui vel liberti eius libros quos is de iocis patroni composuit, quos quidam ipsius putant esse, legere curavit?*

¹Elisabeth Alföldi-Rosenbaum, *Phoenix* 26 (1972) 183–186, with figg. 1–6. I owe thanks to several friends for their help.

"This wall was completed at great speed on orders of the blameless Matronianus, the illustrious *Comes*. Pious and good, he was in command of the valiant troops of the First Armenians, whose fame is great."²

Alföldi-Rosenbaum comments: "The text consists of two not very elegant distichs which show, however, no blatant metrical errors, the creticus at the beginning of line 3 not being very exceptional for epigrams of the time."³ *κόμητος* scanned as an anapaest in line 2 might also draw remark, except that Alföldi-Rosenbaum is uncertain about the eta (supposedly in ligature with the following tau), and considers iota possible, that is, *κόμιτος*. Though the photographs (her figg. 3 and 4) are not legible at this point, *κόμ[ι]τος*, or conceivably *κόμ[ε]τος*, must be right. Besides *κόμης*, the forms *κόμης* and *κόμης* are abundantly attested.⁴

There is no metrical objection, on the other hand, to *ἐτέλεσε* in line 1. This is not the Attic aorist, but merely a phonetic spelling, of a type common in inscriptions, of the archaic *ἐτέλεσσε*;⁵ there is no need to consider, with Alföldi-Rosenbaum, the impossible reading *ἐτέλησε*.⁶ Similarly, *Ματρωνιάνου* scanned with the second alpha short is to be expected in epigrams of this period.⁷

In line 3, the phrase *ἀγαθὸς στρατιῆς τε τεταγμένος* causes disquiet. Apart from the oddity of "pious, good and the commander of" (Alföldi-Rosenbaum translates as if the copula joined *ἀγαθὸς* with *εὐσεβής*), *τεταγμένος* with a genitive cannot mean "in command of".⁸ Now the preceding TE is not at all assured: Alföldi-Rosenbaum states that "on examination TE, or possibly TEC, with one superfluous letter can be seen".⁹ On the photograph (her fig. 4) the traces look like ΠΡΟ, with only the rho indistinct: that is, *προτεταγμένος*, which satisfies both sense and metre. Since this word precisely renders the Latin *praefectus*,¹⁰ it seems clear that a *praefectus legionis I Armeniacae* is in question.¹¹

²Alföldi-Rosenbaum, 183.

³Alföldi-Rosenbaum, 184.

⁴See, e.g., Fr. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* 3 (Berlin 1931) 126–127. *LSJ* acknowledge only *κόμης*, "gen. plur. κομίτων IG 3. 635."

⁵Among the countless examples note *μερόπεσιν* = *μερόπεσσιν* in L. Robert, *Hellenica* 4 (1948) 48, line 8 (15), an epigram almost exactly contemporary with this one.

⁶Alföldi-Rosenbaum, fig. 6.

⁷Thus Robert, op. cit., 47 line 4 (3), 73 line 4, 81 line 1, 97 line 2.

⁸*τῆς πρώτης (τάξεως) τεταγμένος*, Lys. 14. 11, 16. 15, cited by *LSJ* s.v. *τάσσω* I 2, of course means "stationed in the front line."

⁹Alföldi-Rosenbaum, fig. 6.

¹⁰*Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 2. 156. 17: "*praefectus προτεταγμένος*"; Charis. *Ars Gramm.* 5. 480. 23 Barwick: "*praeficio προτάσσω*." I am grateful to Professor H. J. Mason for these references.

¹¹On the *praefecti legionum* of the late Empire, see W. Ensslin, *RE* 22 (1954) 1323–1328, A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602* (Oxford 1964) 2. 640. On the *legio I Armeniaca*, which was at the disposition of the *magister militum per Orientem* (Not. Dign.

That leads to the heart of the problem. Alföldi-Rosenbaum punctuates, and translates, as if the quatrain divided into two sentences. There are two difficulties: *ἐτέλεσε* has to be understood intransitively, and a new main verb equivalent to "he was" has to be supplied in line 3, without any connecting particle to indicate that the man just referred to in the genitive has turned into the nominative. Moreover, since the *comes* Matronianus cannot simultaneously be a *praefectus legionis*,¹² the sense seems to require another proper name, that of a *praefectus* who will also be the subject of *ἐτέλεσε*. Now in the same line *εὐσεβῆς*, besides being unmetrical, is not quite secure as the reading: it would present the only ligature in the inscription (*κόμητος* having been eliminated), and there would have to be a gap of a letter or so before the next word. Inspection of the photograph indicates that the correct reading is *Εὐσεβίος*, with the last syllable lengthened *in arsi*, a frequent licence in late epigrams.¹³ This Eusebius, who does not seem to be identifiable among the many known bearers of the name,¹⁴ is the required *praefectus legionis*. In this capacity it would have fallen to him to fulfil the command of the *dux et comes* Matronianus for the sea-wall to be built.¹⁵

The text may be constituted as follows:

τείχος ἀμωμήτοιο ταγαῖς ἐτέλεσε τάχιστα
 λαμπροτάτου κόμ[ι]τος τοῦτο Ματρωνιάνου
 Εὐσεβίος, ἀγαθὸς στρατιῆς προτεταγμένος ἐσθλῆς
 Πρώτων Ἀρμενίων, ὧν κλέος ἐστὶ μέγα.

"This wall was most swiftly finished on the orders of the irreproachable Matronianus, most excellent count, by Eusebius, the valiant prefect of the brave host of the First Armenians, whose fame is great."

Or. 7. 13, 49), see Alföldi-Rosenbaum, 184–185. She seems right that *στρατιῆς* (note the Ionicism) is used poetically to refer to a legion, though the passages that she alleges from Josephus lend no support at all.

¹²On the *comes Isauriae*, see O. Seeck, *RE* 4 (1901) 656–657; on the *praefecti legionum*, see preceding note.

¹³R. Wagner, *Quaestiones de epigrammatis graecis ex lapidibus collectis grammaticae* (Leipzig 1883) 57–58; J. Bertels, *De pentametro inscriptionum graecarum quaestiones* (diss. Münster 1912) 27–30. There are many examples in the epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus, of precisely this period: thus *Anth. Gr.* 8. 13. 4, 27. 2, 51. 2, etc.

¹⁴On these see Seeck, *RE* 6 (1909) 1366–1370; A. H. M. Jones et al., *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* 1 (Cambridge 1971) 301–309.

¹⁵For Matronianus, the only previously known testimony was *Cod. Theod.* 9. 27.3 = *Cod. Just.* 9. 27. 1 (12 June 382). As is correctly reported by A. H. M. Jones et al., *op. cit.* (above, n. 14) 568, the *Cod. Theod.* calls his province Sardinia, the *Cod. Just.* Isauria: they do not mention, however, that the reading of the *Cod. Theod.* had already been emended by Seeck. Misled by Ensslin, *RE* 14 (1930) 2309, "Matronianus" no. 2, Alföldi-Rosenbaum overlooks the evidence of the *Cod. Just.* (184, "If any proof for the correctness of Seeck's emendation was needed, our inscription now provides it"), although she

The piece is not without art: witness the alliteration of tau in the first two lines, the placing of the proper names precisely in the middle, and the interlaced adjectives and nouns in the third line. The new inscription from Anemurium may take a modest place in the class of late epigrams that celebrate provincial officials for their buildings: fortifications are not often mentioned.¹⁶

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

refers to the *Prosopography*. I owe thanks to Professor T. D. Barnes for guidance on this point.

¹⁶On these epigrams see Robert, *Hellenica* 4 (1948) 60–110, especially 61: “Les constructions de murailles ne sont pas, dans l’empire d’Orient, les plus fréquemment mentionnées; loin de là.” See also Robert in J. des Gagniers et al., *Laodicée du Lycos: Le Nymphée, Campagnes 1961–1963* (Quebec 1969) 339–351.