

# CHANGE IN CIVIC EPIGRAPHY OF PHOENICIA AT THE ARRIVAL OF ROME: SOME PRELIMINARY REMARKS ON PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND THEIR DISPLAY\*

## CAMBIOS EN LA EPIGRAFÍA CÍVICA DE FENICIA A LA LLEGADA DE ROMA: OBSERVACIONES PRELIMINARES SOBRE LOS DOCUMENTOS PÚBLICOS Y SU EXPOSICIÓN

Piotr GŁOGOWSKI\*\*  
University of Wrocław, Poland

**ABSTRACT:** The paper discusses certain aspects of the development of Phoenician communities and their epigraphic culture during the Hellenistic and Roman times in terms of public documents, i.e. inscriptions issued on behalf of either the state or some of its agents as well as other texts of state importance like imperial correspondence etc. It is proposed that tracing the evolution of local public documents might contribute to our understanding of the change taking place in Phoenicia on the socio-political level. Several preliminary observations can be formulated. Despite a considerable transformation Phoenician communities underwent during the Hellenistic times, with the linguistic shift to Greek in state practices, the appearance of collective agency in documents and the emergence of honorific culture, the activity of civic authorities is not attested epigraphically. Public documents are mainly honorific and cultic dedications offered to Hellenistic rulers made both by locals and imperial agents. In that respect, Phoenicia served as a space for displaying imperial allegiances. Although it continued to play that role also later, during the Roman era

\* This paper came into existence as a result of a research project entitled «The Development of the Epigraphic Culture of the Near-Eastern Peoples in the Greco-Roman Period: The Case-Study of the Southern Levant (Phoenicia, Judaea-Palestine and Transjordan)», carried out within the Preludium 19 programme funded by the National Science Centre, Poland (project no. 2020/37/N/

HS3/02749). I would like to thank Dr. Andoni Llamazares Martín for the invitation for the seminar as well as for the generous hospitality of Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea. I also wish to express my gratitude to all participants of this event for the valuable discussion and all their comments, as well as to thank the reviewers of this paper for their helpful advice.

\*\* **Correspondence to:** Piotr Głogowski, University of Wrocław, Poland – piotr.glogowski@uwr.edu.pl – <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0391-4372>.

**How to cite:** Głogowski, Piotr (2025), «Change in Civic Epigraphy of Phoenicia at the Arrival of Rome: Some Preliminary Remarks on Public Documents and Their Display», *Veleia*, 42, 77-96. (<https://doi.org/10.1387/veleia.26330>).

Received: 2024 may 17; Final version: 2024 july 3.

ISSN 0213-2095 - eISSN 2444-3565 / © 2025 UPV/EHU Press



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License

Phoenicia produced much more inscriptions issued in the name of civic authorities. These texts were *tituli honorarii* dedicated mostly to Roman emperors and imperial officials. The fact that most of them are in Latin just highlights the importance of the Roman element in the public life of Phoenicia and possibly implies a certain degree of breakup with older indigenous attitudes, co-occurring with the establishment of Roman settlements. The scarcity of public documents within the epigraphic evidence is another problem and perhaps should make us think about the possibility that some text could be carved in bronze that did not come down to our times.

**KEYWORDS:** Epigraphy, Phoenicia, city-state, collective agency, public documents, Hellenistic kingdoms, Roman empire, imperial interactions.

**RESUMEN:** El artículo analiza ciertos aspectos del desarrollo de las comunidades fenicias y su cultura epigráfica durante los períodos helenístico y romano, centrándose en los documentos públicos, es decir, inscripciones emitidas en nombre del estado o de algunos de sus agentes, así como otros textos de importancia estatal, como la correspondencia imperial, por ejemplo. Se propone que rastrear la evolución de los documentos públicos locales podría contribuir a comprender los cambios socio-políticos ocurridos en Fenicia. Pueden formularse varias observaciones preliminares. A pesar de la considerable transformación que las comunidades fenicias experimentaron durante la época helenística, como el cambio lingüístico hacia el griego en las prácticas estatales, la aparición de agencias colectivas en los documentos y el surgimiento de una cultura honorífica, la actividad de las autoridades cívicas no está atestiguada epigráficamente. Los documentos públicos consisten principalmente en dedicatorias honoríficas y cultuales ofrecidas a los gobernantes helenísticos tanto por locales como por agentes imperiales. En este sentido, Fenicia sirvió como un espacio para exhibir lealtades imperiales. Aunque continuó desempeñando ese papel, durante la época romana Fenicia produjo muchas más inscripciones emitidas en nombre de autoridades cívicas. Estos textos fueron principalmente *tituli honorarii* dedicados mayormente a los emperadores romanos y a funcionarios imperiales. El hecho de que la mayoría de ellos estén en latín resalta la importancia del elemento romano en la vida pública de Fenicia y posiblemente implica un cierto grado de ruptura con actitudes indígenas más antiguas, coincidiendo con el establecimiento de asentamientos romanos. La escasez de documentos públicos en el registro epigráfico plantea otro problema, lo que quizás nos lleve a considerar la posibilidad de que algunos textos fueran gravados en bronce y no hayan llegado hasta nosotros.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Epigrafía, Fenicia, ciudad-estado, agencia colectiva, documentos públicos, reinos helenísticos, Imperio romano, interacciones imperiales.

## INTRODUCTION

Similarly to many other peoples of the ancient world, Semitic populations of the Levant developed literacy in their own native languages. Putting aside the scriptural traditions, we can see that already in the pre-Hellenistic era these peoples produced a substantial amount of writing in more or less durable materials. The way they used to inscribe was hardly uniform and, depending on a particular cultural environment, some differences can be observed. For instance, in the case of Canaanite languages like Hebrew or Ammonite, monumental or lapidary inscriptions were quite rare. The extant evidence was mainly *ostraca*, writings on pottery, and other small objects. Being mostly proprietary, economic, or administrative texts, they were rather of quotidian nature<sup>1</sup>. However, there were exceptions: the inhabitants of the coastal city-states, whom we conventionally use to call Phoenicians, established their own prevalent and persistent practice of inscribing texts for commemorative purposes, i.e. by carving inscriptions in durable material that both bear texts of lasting significance within a given society and are very often intended for public display. In this respect, their culture of writing appears to be, at least to some extent, similar to the one we find later among Greeks and Romans who, throughout the ages, produced hundreds of thousands of inscriptions carved in stone<sup>2</sup>.

This custom of inscribing texts makes the indigenous epigraphic evidence one of our main categories of sources for the Phoenician-Punic culture: given the scarcity of other kinds of local evidence and the troublesome nature of the Greek, Biblical, or Mesopotamian material dealing with Phoenicia —the value of inscriptions cannot be overestimated. It is all the most important if we consider the epigraphy to be not only particular items bearing particular texts but also a cultural phenomenon that develops over time and reflects the major trends of cultural change<sup>3</sup>. However, we need to be aware that, especially from the Hellenistic period onwards, the Phoenician-Punic epigraphy, i.e. the indigenous practice of inscribing texts in the Phoenician language, is far more problematic than it might look at first glance. Being attested in many different environments of the ancient Mediterranean, Phoenician-Punic inscriptions were very often immersed in multicultural contexts and constituted just an element of a bigger picture of local epigraphic landscapes. In the meantime, most scholarly works in the field tend to focus only on the evidence in the Phoenician language thus sustaining what sometimes can be considered artificial disciplinary boundaries between Semitic and Classical studies<sup>4</sup>. Perhaps we should take into account a more local approach instead and try to introduce a distinction between the «Phoenician-Punic epigraphy» that indicates the general practice of inscribing in the Phoenician language throughout the Mediterranean world and «local epigraphy» as a shorthand for every kind of epigraphic evidence from a par-

<sup>1</sup> Out of around 2,100 known ancient epigraphs that can be classified as Hebrew, there are only a couple of dozen of inscriptions written for commemorative purposes and inscribed on durable materials. This small group includes texts like lapidary inscriptions with epitaphs, dedications, building texts or graffiti on walls. Most of the attested ancient Hebrew epigraphs are written on *ostraca* or clay vessels bearing texts of a rather everyday nature; see: *AHI*.

<sup>2</sup> The estimated number of all ancient inscriptions from the Eastern Mediterranean world ranges from 200,000 to 300,000, see: Nawotka *et al.* 2020, 216.

<sup>3</sup> For the discussion on the problem of the epigraphic culture, see: Nawotka 2020, 1-12.

<sup>4</sup> For the overviews of Phoenician-Punic epigraphy, see: Amadasi Guzzo 1995; Richey 2019. For an attempt to adopt a wider approach towards the epigraphic culture of Phoenicia in its multilingual and diachronic aspects and to reconstruct the multicultural epigraphic landscape, see: Głogowski 2020.

ticular area. In order to do that, this paper offers to focus on Phoenicia itself<sup>5</sup>, with introducing, when appropriate, supplementary evidence from different environments.

With inscriptions being one of the most important categories of evidence, analysing the epigraphic culture may help us to examine many aspects of Phoenician societies in the Levant, including their socio-political life. In fact, our knowledge of the state organisation of civic communities of Phoenicia is quite limited, especially in terms of the substantial transformation they underwent in the Hellenistic and Roman times. Although the inscriptions give us names and titles of kings and dignitaries and commemorate some of their deeds, they rarely allow us to perform any functional analysis of the state institutions of the Phoenician community. However, perhaps when focusing on the epigraphic evidence in a more nuanced manner we can extend the interpretative frameworks of our research here. While conducting a diachronic analysis of various qualities and trends attested in local epigraphy might allow us to trace changes taking place both within the society and the state, we need to adopt an adequate analytical tool for that purpose. What might be of use here are public documents, a category of inscriptions that we can thereby define as every text that is issued by a state authority, attests activities of state agents, or directly refers to rulers or state matters, regardless of the language it was inscribed in<sup>6</sup>. Such a definition can be inclusive enough to allow us to put side by side and compare texts, written not only in Phoenician but also Greek and Latin, produced by a particular civic community throughout the ages. As will be proposed below, this comparison can give us some valuable insight not only into the local epigraphic culture but also into major socio-political processes that shaped the development of Phoenician city-states. This includes both the constitutional and mental change reflected in the emergence of collective agency in public documents.

The socio-political life, epigraphic culture, and public documents in Phoenicia, especially during the Hellenistic and Roman times, did not develop in a vacuum but were also influenced by more global tendencies. One of the significant factors in this process was the great powers of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean and the imperial systems they established, with their own modes of interactions and negotiations imposed on subject polities. The change of civic epigraphy of Phoenicia in this period took place on several levels and, as a whole, it is surely a very complex problem that still needs to be explored in greater detail, especially since, still up to this day, the evidence is quite dispersed. The aim of this paper is to preliminarily discuss some aspects of the transformation of civic epigraphy of Phoenician communities by addressing the inter-related problems of public documents, individual and collective agency within institutions of the city-state, and imperial interactions. The chronological frameworks of this research are Hellenistic and Roman eras understood mostly as the time from Alexander's conquest till the imperial period up to the end of the 3rd cent. CE, although occasionally it is necessary to look beyond this time

<sup>5</sup> Phoenicia, as an ancient concept, can be a very fluid one: cf. Głogowski 2018. Therefore, for purely practical reasons, in this paper, it is understood as a Levantine area extending from the city of Marathos in the north to the eastern slopes of Mount Carmel, with the most important Phoenician cities like Arados, Byblos, Berytos, Sidon, and Tyre, and their hinterlands: cf. Głogowski 2020, 166.

<sup>6</sup> In order to specify this definition, some examples can be given. For, instance, a short text on a funerary

stela of a certain woman, dated to the late 8th or early 7th cent. BCE and originating from Tyre, should be understood as a commemorative yet purely private inscription that cannot be defined as a public document of socio-political significance. On the other hand, although not in public display, the epitaph on the sarcophagus of the Sidonian king Eshmunazar (ca. the mid. 6th cent. BCE), with its lengthy description of royal deeds and royal ideology of power, reveals its importance as an official document of the state (*KAI* 14).

scope. As it will be argued, in that respect the Roman times should be considered a time of breakthrough of the development of the local epigraphic culture.

## INSCRIPTIONS AND COMMUNITIES

One of the main features of the Phoenician city-state and its socio-political organisation that is tangible through the available evidence was monarchy. For centuries Phoenician communities used to be ruled by hereditary kings who exercised vast power in a number of domains: in our sources, we find them as commanders in chief of fleets, organisers of trade ventures, and founders of monumental building projects; monarchy appears to have also a strong religious sanction and kings seem to be closely associated with high priests of patron deities of a city. All of this indicates high importance of a king within the city-state. On the other hand, occasionally we encounter evidence of some collective bodies playing quite a meaningful role within the state structure. Their significance makes the position of a king rather ambiguous but we should keep in mind how sketchy the picture of the local institutions of power can actually be. However, due to the scarcity of available sources, it is difficult to tell how constant and uniform were certain socio-political features among different Phoenician city-states<sup>7</sup>.

Nevertheless, it is the importance of monarchy that is strongly reflected in lapidary inscriptions: a great deal of the evidence at hand are religious dedications, building texts (which actually very often have a form of a religious dedication), and epitaphs of kings. It does not mean that a ruler was the only one to leave behind inscriptions though, since we find texts set up also by other dignitaries. But what is striking is that state documents issued by particular agents of a Phoenician community display the individual agency: the act, usually a religious dedication, that is commemorated by a particular inscription is presented as a deed of a king or some other high official. In the meantime, the Hellenistic era was a time of substantial change<sup>8</sup>. It also has its reflection also in within the Phoenician city-state, its structure and institutions: at some point, in the early Hellenistic period, we witness the decline of kingship; it is also the 2nd cent. BCE when Greek became the main language of inscriptions, used not only by a great deal of the local population but occasionally by the city-state as well (cf. Głogowski 2020, 170-173). It is noteworthy that this process should be considered as an element of a long-lasting socio-political evolution rather than a violent intervention of the Hellenistic powers (cf. Millar 1983, 61-63). Despite these transformations, however, in Phoenicia, the individual agency in public documents prevails mostly unchallenged and it is only later, in the Roman times, that we can see greater development in that respect.

As a matter of fact, the collective agency and presenting a given act as an endeavour of an entire community is almost unheard of in Phoenician-Punic epigraphy. The known examples of this are few and quite late since they appear only as early as the end of Classical times. This feature of public documents of Phoenician-Punic city-states stands in some contrast to Greek and Roman state practices where collective agency was common in epigraphic documents of public importance. In Greco-Roman epigraphic culture these attitudes manifested themselves through the custom of publishing decrees as well as in issuing other genres of texts, especially honorific inscriptions or dedications, on behalf of the community or one of its collective institutions. Thus, public docu-

<sup>7</sup> For the political system of the Phoenician city-state in the pre-Hellenistic times, see: Bondi 1995.

<sup>8</sup> For the overview history of Phoenicia in the Hellenistic and Roman eras, see: Bonnet 2019; Aliquot 2019; Sommer 2022.

ments produced by Greek and Roman communities usually contain a formula that points out the acting collective body or indicates its state importance. These formulae are for instance, in Greek, «the council and the people have decided» (ἔδοξεν τῆι βουλῆι καὶ τῶι δήμῳ) or, in Latin, «publically» (*publice*) or «by a decree of the *decuriones*» (*ex decreto decurionum*) etc.<sup>9</sup>

In Phoenician inscriptions, the adoption of the collective agency in public documents seems to be closely associated with an apparent shift in understanding of the role the individual played in society. This phenomenon is manifested in two ways. The first one is the emergence of a new category of texts, namely honorific texts. This fact is the more meaningful as it introduces an important yet unusual social quality into the Phoenician epigraphic culture: commemorating and distinguishing a living member of the society for his contribution to the welfare of the entire community. The most notable case of such an inscription within the entire corpus of known Phoenician-Punic texts is the honorific decree of a Sidonian *koinon* at Piraeus dated to around the late 4th or early 3rd cent. BCE (*KAI* 60). The fact that the document comes from the diaspora and that there is no comparable text from Phoenicia proper is telling and points out the cultural context in which the honorific habit emerged among Phoenicians. As one can presume, it has been adopted from the Greek world where issuing *tituli honorarii* was a common practice of great importance both in terms of local socio-political life and interactions with other polities<sup>10</sup>. The second way is the direct reference to the collective as a causal factor of the act commemorated by a particular inscription. This element is present in the decree from Piraeus, it is also the case for a communal dedication from southern Phoenicia dated to the year 222 BCE (*KAI* 19). These texts name the collective by using the Phoenician denominations like *ʿm* («people»), *gw* («community»), and *bʿl* («citizens»).

In the Greco-Roman times, Phoenician cities appear to share all the usual features of civic life in the Eastern Mediterranean of that time, with Greek as a language of the state and standard civic institutions. Because of that, the communities of Phoenicia were likely to subscribe, at least to some extent, to the prevalent constitutional model and adopt its institutions, including the practice of recording the decision-making process together with highlighting the collective agency of *boule* and *demos* in their public documents. It does not mean, however, that in terms of the epigraphic culture, they would display the exact same characteristics as communities of other parts of the Greco-Roman world. In fact, we can see that during that period Phoenician communities display certain idiosyncrasies depending on the context of their documents. While the Phoenician diaspora in the Mediterranean seems to follow local epigraphic practices and indeed we find some Greek documents issued not only by rulers or other individual agents of Phoenician city-states but also by communities themselves<sup>11</sup>, the evidence from their Levantine homeland gives a different picture. One of the most problematic issues of the state epigraphic practice of Phoenician communities at that time is civic decrees in the extant material.

Indeed, the evidence for civic decrees in the epigraphic culture of Phoenicia during the Greco-Roman times is scarce. One of the best-preserved specimens of that genre of epigraphic texts is a proxy decree that comes from Sidon. The inscription was issued by the Boeotian League and

<sup>9</sup> For Greek and Roman official formulae in public decrees and other documents, see: Rhodes & Lewis 1997, 1-7; Cooley 2012, 5-52 [subchap. 1.2], esp. 29.

<sup>10</sup> For the euergetism and honorific culture in maintaining socio-political relations both within and outside a polis, see: e.g. Ma 1999; Mack 2015; Domingo Gyax 2016.

<sup>11</sup> For instance: *IG* II2 4210 (Sidon honouring at Athens); *I.Didyma* 151 (Tyre honouring at Didyma); *OGIS* 595 = *IG* XIV 830 = *IGR* I 421 (correspondence between Tyre and its trade posts in Italy, minutes of civic council session).

obviously, we are dealing here with a product of a foreign community. While little is known about this fragmentary text, the inscription was written in the Boeotian dialect sometime around 200-175 BCE (*I.MNB* 138). If not a *pierre errante*, we can presume that the inscription came into being in a consequence of the grant of *proxenia* to a Sidonian and was only later taken to Phoenicia and set up in public as a reminder of his individual status and recognition of his achievements abroad<sup>12</sup>. Another case is the grand inscription at the sanctuary of Baitokaike, in the hinterland of Arados. The inscription, dated to the rule of Valerian (253-260 CE), records a dossier of privileges granted to the sanctuary by Hellenistic and Roman rulers and thus contains also excerpts of older documents. One of the elements of the text is «a decree of the city» (ψηφισμα τῆς πόλεως), which was once sent to Augustus (*IGLS* VII 4028d), with «the city» being most likely Arados. However, we do not have the original document in the form of a separate inscription. Sometimes also other inscriptions referred to the civic decree that stood behind a particular act of putting up honorific statues, as it is in the case of *titulus honorarius* granted by the civic authorities of Arados «by the decree» (ψηφίσματι) to Domitius Leon Procellianus, a governor, in the 3rd cent. CE (*IGLS* VII 4016 bis).

Based on the extant evidence from Phoenicia, we have no civic decrees preserved in any meaningful detail. However, there are some minor indications that occasionally such documents could actually be published. There are two badly damaged inscriptions from Tyre that could be possibly fragments of civic decrees. In the first case, which is an inscription carved in a piece of white marble that should most likely be dated to Hellenistic times, the traces of official terminology as well as the length of the text and its apparently narrative character suggest that we might deal here with a decree (*I.Tyr* II 387). In the second case, for which we lack most details, what could indicate that the inscription is indeed such a text are the remnants of an official formula referring to the publication on bronze tablets (δέλτοις χαλκαῖς, *I.Tyr* II 388). Despite that, our conclusion can be that Phoenician communities generally did not use to inscribe their decrees for public display. And we can suppose that, if they did, it was rather incidental and it by no means constituted a relevant feature of the local state practices. With no decrees present in the corpus of the extant epigraphic evidence, the decision-making process and the activity of civic collective bodies in Phoenicia are attested by honorific inscriptions carved in statue bases, i.e. «honorific inscriptions which do not quote the text of a decree but which result from a decree» (Rhodes & Lewis 1997, 2). In fact, in the local epigraphic culture, it is the *tituli honorarii*, not necessarily issued by the community itself, that are the main category of public documents. A great deal of them is closely associated with the imperial presence in the region. In the Greco-Roman times, this relation between public documents and empires seems to be a long-lasting phenomenon that deserves a closer look.

## EMPIRE AND EPIGRAPHY

From time immemorial, Phoenicia constituted an important element of imperial systems in the Levant and the Near East. The Phoenician communities were very often subjects and tributaries of great powers like Egypt, Assyria, or Persia. Quite frequently, the region itself was also a borderland between these imperial entities and, occasionally, a bone of contention for them and a

<sup>12</sup> For the nature and role of *proxenia* in the Greek world, see: Mack 2015.

battleground for their struggle. These circumstances had also an impact on the local monumental landscape. A noteworthy case of this is the valley of Nahr el-Kalb which for millennia served as a space for symbolic display of imperial power: in the valley, we find reliefs and inscriptions carved by ancient rulers like Ramses II, Esarhaddon, Nebuchadnezzar, or Caracalla (Maïla-Afeiche [ed.] 2009). In this respect, the epigraphic culture of Phoenicia of the Hellenistic period seems to be affected by the rivalry between the Ptolemies and Seleucids over Coele Syria. As we are going to see, this rivalry manifests itself rather indirectly, with inscriptions testifying to the process of shaping allegiances towards consecutive masters of the region and establishing their legitimacy in the local landscape. What indicates such an aspect of the imperial struggle at that time is the relatively large number of inscriptions devoted to Hellenistic rulers set up in Phoenicia, unparalleled by other parts of the southern Levant<sup>13</sup>.

Despite the socio-political transformation of Phoenician communities at that time, the system of interactions between the city-states and Hellenistic rulers, known so well from Greece and Asia Minor where we have hundreds of inscriptions recording such a correspondence<sup>14</sup>, apparently did not find its way into Phoenicia proper. In the Levant, what we do have though are royal ordinances, supplied with the correspondence between the king and his officials, brought to the attention of the local community. As such, the city-states of Phoenicia did not engage in direct dialogue with Ptolemaic or Seleucid rulers on the epigraphic level. Since Phoenician communities did not issue their decrees for display, we are deprived of this specific kind of documents that usually bears witness to the contacts between a particular community and imperial authorities in other parts of the Hellenistic world. Moreover, there are also no extant inscriptions attesting grants of honours or statues for the Hellenistic kings made by the communities, although such documents could be produced by Phoenician associations abroad, with an honorific inscription issued by the Berytians at Delos for Antiochus Grypus being an example (*I.Délos* 1551). It does not mean, however, that the Phoenician city-states were deprived of Hellenistic imperial monuments: there are monuments like statue bases, altars, or stelae that we find within the civic space of Phoenician cities but they were set up not by a community but on the initiative of other political agents, especially imperial governors, high-ranking commanders, and priests of the royal cult. We know of a couple of such cases. The first is an equestrian statue of Ptolemy IV Philopator, by Thraseas, a *strategos* of Syria and Phoenicia (*I.Tyr* II 18). Another one is a statue dedicated most likely to Antiochus the Great by a certain priest «of the king» (ἱερεὺς τοῦ βασιλέως) whose name went missing (*I.Tyr* II 19).

In fact, the epigraphic evidence from Phoenicia indicates the importance of the local royal cult. Among the inscriptions set in that context, we find several dedications made to Hellenistic rulers. Although most of these texts come from Tyre, occasionally we can find them also elsewhere, usually at local sanctuaries. These inscriptions are often said to be offered by imperial agents, so outsiders and not members of local communities. This is the case of an inscription on an altar for a Ptolemaic king set up at Khoraïbé near Tyre by a certain Dorymenes of Aetolia, possibly the Do-

<sup>13</sup> The epigraphic monuments related to Hellenistic rulers are relatively rare in the evidence originating from the southern Levant and we have a couple of dozens of specimens of inscriptions like royal ordinances on stelae, honorific inscriptions on statue bases, religious dedications, issued for kings. These objects are mostly attested at local political and administrative centres like Tyre in Phoenicia, Marisa in Idu-

maea (*CIIP* 3511-3514), Scythopolis and its vicinities in Galilee (*CIIP* 7561; 7615), Samaria (*SEG* 8.96), or in some towns of the Palestinian coastland like Ioppa, Iamnia, or possibly Anthedon (*CIIP* 2172; 2267; 2439?).

<sup>14</sup> For the mechanisms of imperial interactions between Hellenistic rulers and Greek cities, see Ma 1999; Strootman 2011.



rymenes the commander who took part in the wars against Antiochus the Great. The altar is dedicated to Ptolemy IV Philopator and perhaps should be dated to ca. 219/217 BCE<sup>15</sup>. Another such case is an inscription supposedly from Libo in the north Marsyas valley (Beqaa) dedicated to Serapis and Isis for the welfare of king Ptolemy IV and his wife Arsinoe, made most likely in late 217 BCE by a certain Marsyas of Alexandria, an *archigrammateus* (SEG 38.1571). There is also a dedication to Zeus Soter for the welfare of Antiochus VII Sidetes offered at Ptolemais-Akko around the year 130/129 BCE by a high official in Seleucid service: although his name is missing, the dedicatory was one of «the first among [royal] friends and *archigrammateus* of the forces, appointed at the territories» (τῶν πρώτων φίλων καὶ [ἀρ]χιγραμματεὺς τῶν δυνάμεων, ἀπολελειμμένος δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων) what indicates that he was also a royal official and one of the king's entourage rather than a member of local elites (SEG 19.904, Landau 1961, 118-126).

We can also find dedications associated with the royal cult set up by either members of Phoenician communities or unknown agents. One such case is a text, presumably inscribed on an altar dedicated at Tyre to Ptolemy II Philadelphos and Arsinoe as *Theoi Adelphoi* (I.Tyr II 386). The text does not name any dedicatory but, keeping in mind the obscure context of its discovery, we cannot tell if it should be considered a monument dedicated by the city. Another local text is the graffito from the grotto at Wasṭa with a dedication to most likely king Ptolemy and Aphrodite Epekoos. The dedication, perhaps dating to ca. the 3rd cent. BCE, is offered by an individual whose name and ancestry, can possibly be restored as Pimilkas son of Nabousamon? (Πιμίλκ[ς Ναβου(?)]σαμῶτος) or rather Himilkas, suggests his indigenous descent (SEG 20.389; 64.1646). At the sanctuary of Eshmun-Asklepios at Bostan esh-Sheikh near Sidon, there is also a dedication offered most likely to king Antiochus, queen Laodice, and their son Antiochus. The royal family supposedly bears titles of «saviour gods and benefactor gods» ([θεοὶς σ]ωτῆρσιν καὶ [θεοὶς εὐεργέτ]αις) and dating to 200-193 BCE. The inscription, a badly damaged one, seems to be dedicated by a group of priests but it is rather difficult to tell if they were of local origins (SEG 55.1658, Wachter 2005, 323 n. 5). Moreover, among royal dedications there is a text that appears to be set at a gymnasium in Tyre: it is a fragmentary altar inscription dedicated to king Antiochus the Great and his son Seleucus as well as Hermes and Heracles offered by a victorious ephebe in the year 188/187 BCE (I.Tyr II 1). The available evidence sometimes includes rather problematic specimens. This is the case of an inscription dedicating an altar to Aphrodite Epekoos for the welfare of king Demetrius and queen Laodice and their children offered somewhere around 159-150 BCE by a certain priest Apollophanes son of Apollophanes. The marble plaque with the text originates from greater Syria and, while the exact provenance of the object is unknown, it is possible that it comes from the Phoenician coastland, perhaps also from Wasṭa or maybe even Sidon (SEG 50.1462, Hoover 2000; 53.1824, Gatier 2003, 113-114 n. 59).

When discussing the inscriptions set up for the Hellenistic rulers in Phoenicia, we can make several observations concerning the nature of public documents, imperial interactions, and monumental landscape<sup>16</sup>. First of all, we see that *tituli honorarii* play only a very limited role in the way kings were commemorated. The allegiance towards rulers used to be expressed through the royal cult and dedications offered to them. Furthermore, most of the dedications come from the heated time of the conflict between the Ptolemies and Seleucids over Coele Syria which shows that this

<sup>15</sup> SEG 7.326, Mouterde 1932, 96-98 [no. 11].

<sup>16</sup> Honouring Hellenistic kings was a widespread practice in the East but we can notice different local dynamics in various cultural and political environ-

ments. It is noteworthy that, when compared with other regions, Coele Syria and Phoenicia produced a rather limited amount of evidence, see: Lorber 2022, 56-59.

struggle had a monumental dimension as well. It is meaningful, however, that a great deal of dedications were set up by royal dignitaries among whom we can expect to find foreigners rather than members of the indigenous population. Although the local elites seem also to engage in the practice, it is noteworthy that their dedications appear to be quite comparable in number to the foreign ones. Also, on the ideological level, even in this case the agency is almost only individual and not communal in nature. This and the fact that there are no honorific inscriptions for Hellenistic kings issued by the authorities of Phoenician city-states shows that, for some reason, the role of the community in the Hellenistic times is quite limited and reduced merely to providing the monumental space for public documents.

We should also look at this issue from the other side: how imperial overlords actually took advantage of the monumental and epigraphic space of the Phoenician communities. The extant inscriptions that could attest the direct imperial activity in the southern Levant during the Hellenistic or early Roman times are quite rare. However, occasionally we do encounter some texts that contain ordinances or correspondence inscribed in stone. The most notable case, that tells us something concerning Phoenicia as a space for the display of imperial documents, is the ordinance of Seleucus IV Philopator appointing Olympiodorus in charge of the sanctuaries in the satrapy of Coele Syria and Phoenicia. In terms of the place of display, this inscription is to be set up «in the most conspicuous of temples in these places» (ἀνατεθῆι ἐν τοῖς ἐπιφανεστάτοις τῶν ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἱερῶν). Indeed, in the Levant, we know of two copies of this text, including Marisa in Idumaea and Byblos in Phoenicia (*J.MNB* 1; *CIIP* 3511-3512). Despite the scarcity of material evidence, the importance of Phoenician cities as a space for the display of imperial documents is also attested by our literary sources. This is the case of 1 Maccabees which quotes a letter issued by the Romans attesting their friendship with the Jews. The letter was sent to «kings and countries» (τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν καὶ ταῖς χώραις) including cities among which we do find Arados (1 Macc 15:22). According to Josephus, in his letter concerning privileges granted to Hyrcanus and the Jews that was sent to the Sidonians, Caesar ordained that «a bronze tablet containing these decrees shall be set up in the Capitol and at Sidon and Tyre and Ascalon and in the temples, engraved in Latin and Greek characters» (Joseph. *AJ* 14.197). It is also Josephus who quotes letters of Antony to Tyrians concerning Jews and reports Antony's order to carve these texts on public tablets (εἰς τὰς δημοσίας δέλτους) in both Latin and Greek and to set them up in the most conspicuous place (ἐν τῷ ἐπιφανεστάτῳ) so everyone could read them; similar letters were sent to Sidon, Antioch, and Arados (Joseph. *AJ* 14.305-323).

Although the Hellenistic and early Roman periods are in general a time of relatively modest epigraphic activity in Phoenicia, we can certainly observe the transformation of the local epigraphic culture. This transformation includes not only the linguistic shift but also some change in the nature of the public document and its imperial dimension: we see the emergence of collective agency as well as the introduction of *tituli honorarii*. Surprisingly enough, both elements do not find their wider application in one of the most important fields of epigraphic activity of the city-state in the Eastern Mediterranean world at that time, namely in the interaction with imperial structures. In fact, both elements also did not serve as an instrument of the elites: there are also almost no public documents like decrees or honorific inscriptions offered to individual members of the indigenous communities. The most meaningful exception is the inscription of Diotimus the *dikastes*, who is praised by the «city of the Sidonians» (Σιδωνίων ἡ πόλις) with a statue and honorific epigram for his victory in the chariot race in the Nemean games at Argos, which comes from somewhere around the turn of the 3rd and 2nd cent. BCE (*LAG* 41). There is also one damaged text from Sidon issued by «the people» (ὁ δῆμο[ς]) for a certain Apollphanes the archon; the dating is

problematic and we cannot be sure if it should be dated to the 2nd cent. BCE (*I.MNB* 142). Since we are strictly bound to the evidence, maybe to some extent our perception is constrained by its poor preservation rate in a highly urbanised coastal area<sup>17</sup>. On the other hand, however, the deficiency of these two important elements testifies to the dynamics of the change of civic epigraphy of the Phoenician communities.

#### COLLECTIVE AGENCY AND CIVIC HONOURS

The development of the civic epigraphy in Phoenicia was a complex process and, while it surely proceeded during the Hellenistic period, its dynamic was rather slow-paced. It also not necessarily followed the trajectories known from other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean world. The question might emerge to what extent this epigraphic transformation of Phoenician communities actually reflected the socio-political and cultural change they underwent during that period. But perhaps we should put this problem aside, for the time being. The change can be characterised by the decline of indigenous language as a means of epigraphic expression, the adoption of Greek as the main language of the state, and the appropriation of different patterns of thinking about the community. However, features of public epigraphic practice that have been discussed above might at least to some extent indicate a certain degree of conservatism and continuity of traditional attitudes towards inscriptions among Phoenicians. When tracing the evolution of their civic epigraphy we should have a look at the Roman times as well. Indeed, in that respect, the Roman imperial era was a time of significant intensification of the epigraphic activity in the region.

The establishment of Roman rule over the East changed many aspects of political realities in which Phoenician city-states used to function. Being important urban, commercial, and cultural centres, Phoenician cities were also a crucial part of the Roman system of power in the Levant. Furthermore, under Roman rule, Phoenicia was also a land where Roman veteran colonies, namely Berytos and Heliopolis-Baalbek, had been founded<sup>18</sup>. This introduction of the Roman element had a significant impact on the cultural landscape of the region which is also reflected in the local epigraphic culture with a substantial amount of Latin evidence<sup>19</sup>. As one could expect, these circumstances provided local communities with new factors and stimuli that could lead to a transformation of civic institutions and state practices. However, the amount of public evidence is still scarce; to some extent, some features of the process can be explained by more global socio-cultural trends attested in the Eastern Mediterranean<sup>20</sup>. On the other hand, we can notice a significant growth of honorific inscriptions issued within Phoenician communities and it is they that fall mostly under the definition of a public document proposed in this research. This category can be divided into several groups, including texts issued by Roman dignitaries honouring emperors as

<sup>17</sup> Due to the lack of evidence it is difficult to evaluate the scale of this phenomenon. For instance, Lehmann and Holum (2000, 1) estimated the number of available texts from a neighbouring city, namely Caesarea Maritima, which was 411 at that time, to be around 10% of the whole epigraphic output of the ancient city. However, since it is impossible to verify this assessment, perhaps we should consider it rather as merely guesswork.

<sup>18</sup> For the history of Roman Berytos and Heliopolis-Baalbek, see: Hall 2004; Sawaya 2009; Paturol 2019.

<sup>19</sup> For the importance and role of Latin and Latin epigraphy in the Near East, see: Millar 1995; Eck 2009; Isaac 2009.

<sup>20</sup> For instance, at some point, in many areas of the Eastern Mediterranean the number of civic decrees—a very common category of inscriptions in the Greek world during the Hellenistic times—declines, while the number of *tituli honorarii* grows: cf. Heller 2016.

well as private individuals dedicating statues to Roman rulers, governors, or other high officials. For the sake of the current paper, however, we will deal only with those documents that attest the collective agency with an adequate indication of the issuing authority like *boule* and *demos* etc.

In fact, among the epigraphic evidence from Phoenicia, there are 40 texts that can be characterised as public *tituli honorarii* (see: table 1). We can formulate several observations. First of all, the practice of officially granting honours by the community is attested mostly for the imperial Roman period, in a time span ranging from the 1st cent. to the 3rd cent. CE. As we have seen above, the specimens dated to the Hellenistic era are few and are attested only at Sidon. Moreover, the majority of honorific inscriptions (23 out of 40) are actually Latin. It is hardly surprising if we take into account that a lot of public *tituli honorarii* of the cities of Phoenicia come from those places where the Roman element was particularly strong, namely Berytos (with 15 Latin inscriptions and supposedly 2 Greek ones) and Heliopolis-Baalbek (with 5 Latin inscriptions). The rest of the inscriptions come from other major cities: Arados (with 7 Greek and 1 Latin texts), Tyre (with supposedly 5 Greek and 2 Latin texts), and Sidon (with 1 Greek text dated to Roman times and 2 Hellenistic ones).

As a whole, the honorific culture of Phoenicia is strongly associated with Roman rule which is reflected in a list of individuals to whom public honours were granted (25 out of 38 texts dated to Roman times). The most of *tituli honorarii* is dedicated to either a Roman ruler, especially to Hadrian, or a female member of an imperial family like Sabina, daughter of Antoninus Pius, or Julia Domna, wife of Septimius Severus and mother of Caracalla. Another category of honorands are Roman governors, high officials, or military commanders like Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, Tiberius Claudius Alexander, or Domitius Leon Proclilianus. The least numerous group of honorands of that kind are local dynasts engaged—in one way or another—within the framework of the Roman imperial system in the Near East like king Agrippa and, much later, Odenaethus of Palmyra. The members of local civic elites relatively rarely appear to be distinguished by their own community; it is also meaningful that even then we can notice the imperial aspect of their status, as it is the case of a certain Statia Rufilla, a priestess of the imperial cult.

Occasionally, the collective agency in an honorific context is also attested in other kinds of inscriptions with a dedication of an altar offered to Heracles by a certain Diodorus son of Nithymbalos (Tyre, 187/188 CE) who is said to be «esteemed by the council and the people for his purity, diligence, and ambition» (μαρτυρηθε[ις] ὑπό τε βουλῆς δήμου ἐπὶ ἀγνείᾳ καὶ ἐπιμελείᾳ καὶ φιλοτιμίᾳ, *I.MNB* 306). Sometimes public honours are attested in the form of an honorific title that would indicate the public character of the inscription even when the formula testifying to the collective decision-making process went missing: this is the case of a damaged inscription from Tyre, dedicated to king Agrippa who bears the title of the «son of the city» (ὕιὸν πόλεως, *I.Tyr* II 25). Some mentions concerning civic honours can be found in funerary texts: one such case is epitaphs at a family tomb with the deceased «honoured with decurional decorations by the decree of *decuriones*» (*honoratus decurionalibus ornamentis decreto decurionum*, *I.MNB* 94a-d). These indications are however quite rare. All of this, namely the widespread use of Latin and the role of the Roman imperial element, indicates that the public manifestation of the honorific culture of the Phoenician cities and setting up statues on behalf of the community served mainly its interactions with the Roman authorities. Contrary to many other parts of the Greco-Roman world, where public honorific culture was primarily an instrument accommodating civic elites in exercising their distinguished status and pursuing rivalry for prestige and recognition, in Phoenicia the practice seems to involve members of local noble families quite rarely, and most of them seem to be actually either Roman veterans or their antecedents.

*AERE PERENNIUS: PUBLIC DOCUMENTS IN BRONZE?*

One should ask if this overall picture actually reflects the historical reality and the exact nature of the public documents of Phoenicia in the Greco-Roman times or maybe it is somehow distorted. Perhaps an important element of epigraphy and its development is the problem of the medium used for inscribing. In the Phoenician-Punic world, as in many other environments in antiquity, stone was hardly the only kind of material inscriptions used to be carved in. A great deal of Phoenician-Punic epigraphs— mostly minor items like writings on arrowheads, bowls, and pendants —have been produced in metals, and most importantly bronze<sup>21</sup>. By large, the Levant as an environment lacks decorative stone that could be more adequate for monumental inscriptions. While many public documents are issued in local limestone, a lot of them are carved in imported marble or granite (cf. Sartre 2001, 689; 836; Butcher 2003, 203-211). On the other hand, stone was not the only possible medium: another one was bronze which was used for epigraphic purposes in certain areas of the ancient world. Most importantly, bronze was extensively utilized by Romans for public inscriptions in monumental display. The distribution of bronze was hardly even and, while attested in a quite substantial amount in the West, it was used far less often in the East (cf. Eck 2014). But we do find some evidence for its application in the Levantine and Phoenician-Punic context as well. In fact, there are some indications that might suggest that sometimes Phoenician communities could use bronze for their official epigraphic practices.

Occasionally, bronze was utilised for public documents in the multicultural environment of Cyprus. This is a case of a Greek syllabic honorific text on a little bronze plaque issued by the king and the people of the city of Idalion for a physician in reward for his service during the siege of the city. The text is dated to the 5th cent. BCE (*JCS* 217). An important example of indirect evidence for the application of bronze in Cyprus within the context of local power structure is the Phoenician inscription of Yatanbaal. The text comes from Lapethos and is dated to the year 273/272 BCE. It is carved in a marble statue base that was supposed to be offered at the sanctuary of Melqart (*KAI* 43). The text provides us with some valuable insight into the local epigraphic practices: Yatanbaal is a man of prominence since he, as both his father and grandfather, uses a rather general title of «a chief» or «a governor» etc. (*rb*); the inscription itself is dated according to three dating systems: the regnal year of Ptolemy, the era of the people of Lapethos, and the year of an eponymic official holding the office of the priest of «the lord of kings» (*ʿdn mlkm*) which is most likely a reference to the royal cult of Ptolemaic rulers. One can notice the emphasis put on the role of Ptolemaic kings in the dating system of this text. Because of that, perhaps we can assume that the interactions between the community and its imperial overlords were considered a significant element of the local socio-political identity. As such, it was to be reflected in inscriptions of civic elites. Most importantly, however, when Yatanbaal lists his earlier numerous acts of religious devotion, he mentions «the tablet of bronze (*bdlt bnhšt*) which I wrote and nailed to the wall which is there as my gift of supplication» [trans. J. C. L. Gibson]. There are also some traces of this phenomenon throughout the Phoenician-Punic world during the Hellenistic and Roman eras attested in the Greek evidence. One such case is an inscription on a bronze column base from Sardinia (the 2nd cent. BCE) bearing a trilingual Greek-Latin-Phoenician dedication to Eshmun-Asclepius (*KAI* 66). Another item of that sort is a proxenic decree issued by the people of Akragas and Melita, once a Punic community (Bonanno 2015, 51-123; 137-63), in honour of a Syracusan, a text that is known from Rome and is dated to the 2nd/1st cent. BCE

<sup>21</sup> E.g. bronze arrow- and spearheads: *KAI* 20-22; bronze items (spatula, bowl, statuettes, plaque):

*KAI* 3, 31, 52, 72; golden minor objects: *KAI* 71; 73; 277.

(*IGUR I 3 = IG XIV 953*): the decree is carved on a bronze tablet<sup>22</sup>. We can also recall the above-mentioned fragment from Tyre bearing the reference to bronze tablets<sup>23</sup>.

We should also keep in mind that, for the Levant in the Hellenistic and Roman times, inscriptions in bronze are quite often mentioned by literary sources, some of which have been already mentioned above. One such case is the honorific decree issued for Simon the Maccabee: the Jewish people was said to inscribe the inscription on bronze tablets and set it up on stelae at Mount Zion (1 Macc. 14:25-49; cf. Van Henten 2001; Krentz 2001). Inscriptions in bronze set up for display in Phoenician cities like Tyre, Sidon, or Arados, are mentioned by Josephus (*AJ* 14.197). We also hear of several bronze inscriptions from the Punic West. According to Polybius, while staying at Cape Lacinium, Hannibal set up a bronze plaque containing the description of the conduct and composition of his armies: Polybius himself took advantage of this narrative as his source (Polyb. 3.33.17-18; 3.56.4). Perhaps it is the same text that is later referred to by Livy when he states that Hannibal erected and dedicated an altar at the sanctuary of Juno Lacinia with a bilingual Punic-Greek inscription (Liv. 28.46.15-16). Also, Strabo mentions an inscription from the sanctuary of Heracles at Gades: the text, carved on bronze pillars, was supposed to record the building expenses incurred during the erection of the temple (Strab. 3.5.5-6).

Keeping this in mind, we can see both the epigraphic and literary evidence attests utilising bronze for monumental or state practices in the Levant. After all, the application of bronze, an easily reusable metal that is far less likely to come down to our times, could explain the scarcity of public documents like decrees or imperial correspondence. But if it was the case, was the application of bronze for such purposes a widespread, deeply-rooted indigenous custom or rather an appropriated and incidental practice? And was it associated, during the late Hellenistic and Roman times, mainly with the Roman presence and Roman state practices? One can have some serious doubts concerning the whole idea of bronze being of particularly great importance in this context. First, we cannot stress enough the scarcity of extant bronze evidence for Phoenicia proper. While surely —by assuming the connection between bronze and documents— this lack might seem obvious, we should be fully aware that it might lead us to a circular reasoning. After all, such an interpretation draws heavily from the absence of evidence, thus strongly weakening the argument. Second, it is difficult to properly evaluate the literary sources: without having the inscriptions themselves, we cannot tell for sure if all of these texts, if any, refer to genuine objects that could once be seen in the display of the epigraphic space of Phoenician communities; furthermore, we can suspect that our literary sources could be strongly influenced by Roman patterns of thinking of epigraphic culture favouring bronze as a medium of monumental inscribing.

## CONCLUSIONS

As it was intended to show, tracing the development of public documents issued by Phoenician communities allows us to trace certain aspects of the transformation of the local epigraphic

<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, it is rather doubtful if the application of bronze might be of any greater significance concerning supposed local practices in the Phoenician-Punic cultural environments. The inscription itself, being set in a Roman context and obviously grouping two different city-states as honouring communities, seems to be set up in «domestic honor-

ific display» and was rather of private importance, cf. Mack 2015, 109.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. *I.Tyr* II 388; on the other hand, we cannot tell if the formula does not refer to bronze tablets set up somewhere else, for instance in Rome, where such a practice was common. This is the case of an inscription from Apamea: *Choix d'Inscriptions* no. 3.

culture and its socio-political role. We can distinguish several significant phenomena that come to our attention during the Hellenistic period. Most importantly, we see the emergence of collective agency, a feature that indicates a substantial breakup from the main tendencies displayed in indigenous Phoenician-Punic epigraphic traditions. Furthermore, most likely because of their interactions with the Greek world, Phoenician communities adopted the honorific culture by distinguishing people of merit with commemorative statues and granted privileges. It is meaningful, however, that throughout the Hellenistic times the dynamic of this change is low: these features are poorly attested and do not necessarily correspond to patterns known from other parts of the Eastern Mediterranean. For instance, the epigraphic culture of Phoenicia proper lacks civic decrees and the epigraphic attestations of collective decision-making process include merely two or three known cases.

On the other hand, being the major cities of the Levant, Phoenician communities were of great importance to Hellenistic powers which is clearly reflected in the local epigraphic landscape: cities like Tyre or Sidon served as a space of monumental display although the communities themselves apparently were not, on the epigraphic level, an agent in this activity. The collective agency was rarely displayed which perhaps confirms the limited extent of the cultural transformation within Phoenician civic practices. At that time, public documents were rather set up by individuals, often imperial agents of Hellenistic powers, very often in the context of the struggle between Ptolemies and Seleucids over Coele Syria escalating in the time of Antiochus the Great. We also see the importance of the royal cult in Phoenicia.

The Roman times brought a substantial intensification of the activity of collective bodies in the honorific context. However, *tituli honorarii* issued by Phoenician communities were mostly offered to imperial rulers and their officials. In that respect, we can see the continuation of the role the cities played in being space for monumental display. On the other hand, the amount of Latin evidence shows, however, the influence of the Roman presence on the state practices. Moreover, to some extent, it seems to mark a profound rupture within the development of indigenous civic epigraphic culture.

Keeping this in mind, we can try to look for other possible elements of cultural continuities that may have an impact on our perspective. One of the interesting problems is the issue of a medium of epigraphic expression: perhaps exploring this problem could contribute to our understanding of the development of the local epigraphic culture. But, although there is some evidence—both direct and indirect—suggesting bronze as a material applied in the ancient Levant for inscribing public texts, it is difficult to tell just how well this could explain the limited presence of public documents within the civic epigraphy of Phoenicia over the time.

All of these observations give us only a very limited picture of the genuine public life of Phoenicia. Of course, it is very often due to the scarcity of evidence which came down to us in a quite limited amount. On the other hand, however, we need to remember that still to this day we very often lack epigraphic corpora that would include the multilingual material allowing us to comprehensively reconstruct the epigraphic culture of Phoenicia in its diachronic and multilingual dimensions<sup>24</sup>. Let us hope that future editions will address this issue. On the whole, the preliminary observations proposed in this paper will definitely have to be verified and properly contextualised within the local epigraphic culture and more global socio-cultural trends within the Eastern Mediterranean during the Greco-Roman times.

<sup>24</sup> In my research I took advantage of the usual epigraphic corpora—most importantly the *IGLS* series—and resources (cf. Głogowski 2020, 166 n. 2; 180).

However, I did not have an opportunity to consult the most recent (2023) corpus *IGLS* VIII/1 that includes the evidence from Berytos and its vicinities.

## ABBREVIATIONS

AHI: *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance*.

*Choix d'Inscription*: Yon, J.-B., & P.-L. Gatier (eds.), *Choix d'inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*, Beyrouth 2009.

CIIP: *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae*.

ICS: Masson, O. (ed.), *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques*, Paris 1983.

IGLS: *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie*.

IGUR: *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Roma*.

LMNB: Aliquot, J., & J.-B. Yon (eds.), *Inscriptions grecques et latines du Musée national de Beyrouth*, Beyrouth 2016.

I.Tyr II: Rey-Coquais, J.-P. (ed.), *Inscriptions grecques et latines de Tyr*, Beyrouth 2006.

KAI: Donner, H., & W. Rölling (eds.), *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, Wiesbaden 2002.

SEG: *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

## REFERENCES

- ALIQOT, J., 2019, «Phoenicia in the Roman Empire», in: B. R. Doak, C. López-Ruiz (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 111-124.
- AMADASI GUZZO, M. G., 1995, «Les inscriptions», in: V. Krings, *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche*, Leiden: Brill, 19-30.
- BONANNO, A., 2005, *Malta: Phoenician, Punic, and Roman*, Malta: Midsea Books.
- BONDI, S. F., 1995, «Les institutions, l'organisation politique et administrative», in: V. Krings, *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche*, Leiden: Brill, 290-302.
- BONNET, C., 2019, «The Hellenistic Period and Hellenization in Phoenicia», in: B. R. Doak, C. López-Ruiz (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 98-110.
- BUTCHER, K., 2003, *Roman Syria and the Near East*, London: British Museum.
- COOLEY, A. E., 2012, *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DOMINGO GYGAX, M., 2016, *Benefaction and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City. The Origins of Euergetism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ECK, W., 2009, «The presence, role and significance of Latin in the epigraphy and culture of the Roman Near East», in: H. M. Cotton, J. J. Price, D. J. Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 15-42.
- ECK, W., 2014, «Documents on Bronze: A Phenomenon of the West?», in: J. Bodel, N. Dimitrova (ed.), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts, First North American Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (2011)*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 127-151.
- GATIER, P.-L., 2003, «Évolutions culturelles dans les sociétés du Proche-Orient syrien à l'époque hellénistique», in: F. Prost (ed.), *L'Orient méditerranéen de la mort d'Alexandre aux campagnes de Pompée*, Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 97-115.
- GŁOGOWSKI, P., 2018, «The Notion of Phoenicia in the Roman Period», *EOS: Commentarii Societatis Philologiae Polonorum* 105, 239-265.
- GŁOGOWSKI, P., 2020, «The Epigraphic Curve in the Levant: The Case Study of Phoenicia», in: K. Nawotka (ed.), *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*, London & New York: Routledge, 166-183.
- HALL, L. J., 2004, *Roman Berytus: Beirut in Late Antiquity*, London & New York: Routledge.
- HELLER, A., 2016, «Le I<sup>er</sup> s. av. J.-C. en Asie Mineure. Epigraphic habit et transition en histoire ancienne» in: Chr. Müller, M. Heintz (eds.), *Transitions historiques*, Paris: Éditions de Boccard, 69-80.



- HOOVER, O. D., 2000, «A Dedication to Aphrodite Epekoos for Demetrius I Soter and his Family», *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 131, 106-110.
- ISAAC, B., 2009, «Latin in cities of the Roman Near East», in: H. M. Cotton, J. J. Price, D. J. Wasserstein (eds.), *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 43-72.
- KRENTZ, E., 2001, «The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee», in: J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 146-153.
- LANDAU, Y. H., 1961, «A Greek Inscription from Acre», *Israel Exploration Journal* 11, 118-126.
- LEHMANN, C. M., & K. G. Holum, 2000, *The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Caesarea Maritima*, Boston: The American Schools of Oriental Research.
- LORBER, C. C., 2022, «Honoring the King in the Seleukid and Ptolemaic Empires: A Comparative Approach. Part 1», *Electrum* 29, 53-72.
- MA, J., 1999, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MACK, W., 2015, *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MAÏLA-AFEICHE, A.-M., (ed.), 2009, *Le site de Nahr el-Kalb*, Beyrouth: Ministère de la culture.
- MILLAR, F., 1983, «The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation», *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 209, 55-71.
- MILLAR, F., 1995, «Latin Epigraphy of the Roman Near East» [in:] H. Solin, O. Salomies, U.-M. Liertz (eds.), *Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini Helsingiae 3-6 sept. 1991 habiti*, Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 403-419.
- MOUTERDE, R., 1932, «Mission épigraphique et relevés archéologiques en Syrie (1931)», *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 16, 84-100.
- NAWOTKA, K., 2020, «Introduction: Epigraphic habit, epigraphic culture, epigraphic curve: statement of the problem», in: K. Nawotka (ed.), *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*, London & New York: Routledge, 1-30.
- NAWOTKA, K., et al., 2020, «Conclusions: One or many epigraphic cultures in the Eastern Mediterranean», in: K. Nawotka (ed.), *Epigraphic Culture in the Eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity*, London & New York: Routledge, 215-246.
- PATUREL, S. E., 2019, *Baalbek-Heliopolis, the Bekaa, and Berytus from 100 BCE to 400 CE: A Landscape Transformed*, Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- RHODES, P., & D. LEWIS, 1997, *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- RICHEY, M., 2019, «Inscriptions», in: B. R. Doak, C. López-Ruiz (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 223-240.
- SARTRE, M., 2001, *D'Alexandre à Zenobie. Histoire du Levant antique IVe siècle av. J.-C. – IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.*, Paris: Fayard.
- SAWAYA, Z., 2009, *Histoire de Berytos et d'Héliopolis d'après leurs monnaies (1er siècle av. J.-C. – 3e siècle apr. J.-C.)*, Beyrouth: Institut français du Proche-Orient.
- SOMMER, M., 2022, «Hellenistic and Roman Phoenicia», in: T. Kaizer (ed.), *A Companion to the Hellenistic and Roman Near East*, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell, 240-249.
- STROOTMAN, R., 2011, «Kings and cities in the Hellenistic age», in: R. Alston, O. van Nijf, C. Williamson (eds.), *Political Culture in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, Leuven: Peeters, 141-153.
- VAN HENTEN, J. W., 2001, «The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25-49) in Its Hellenistic Context», in: J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 116-145.
- WACHTER, R., 2005, «Die griechischen Inschriften», in: R. A. Stucky (ed.), *Das Eschmun-Heiligtum von Sidon. Architektur und Inschriften*, Basel: Vereinigung der Freunde antiker Kunst, 319-331.

No.	SOURCE	PLACE	DATE	LANGUAGE	HONORING INSTITUTION/ HONORIFIC FORMULA	HONORAND
1.	IAG 41	Sidon	3rd cent. BCE	Greek	ἡ πόλις	Diotimus the <i>dikastes</i>
2.	I.MNB 142	Sidon	2nd cent. BCE?	Greek	ὁ δῆμο[ς]	Apollophanes, an archon and agoranomos
3.	IGR III 1102	Tyre	1st cent. BCE [command of Pompey]	Greek	ἡ βουλῆ καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Marcus Aemilius Scaurus
4.	CIL III 170	Berytos	69-79 CE	Latin	[pu]blic[e] ex decr(ero)   dec(urionum) et  [po]puli voluntat(e)	Vespasian
5.	I.Tyr II 29	Tyre	1st cent. CE [reign of Nero]	Greek	ἡ βουλῆ καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Tiberius Claudius Alexander
6.	IGLS VI 2759	Heliopolis	1st cent. CE	Latin	pub(lice) fac(tum)	Agrippa rex
7.	IGLS VII 4008	Arados	1st cent. CE?	Greek	ὁ δῆμος	Decimus Laelius, a prefect of the fleet
8.	IGLS VII 4009	Arados	1st cent. CE?	Latin	civitas et bule	Lucius Domitius Catullus, a prefect
9.	IGLS VII 4011	Arados	1st cent. CE	Greek	ἡ βουλῆ [καὶ ὁ δῆμος]	? a high-rank Roman official
10.	IGLS VII 4015	Arados	1st cent. CE	Greek	ἡ βο[υ]λῆ καὶ ὁ δῆ[μ]μος	Marcus Septimius? Magnus, a centurion
11.	IGR III 1540	Tyre?	1st cent. CE [reign of Claudius]	Greek	ἡ βουλῆ καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Lucius Popillius Bابلus, a legate
12.	I.MNB 58	Berytos	Roman times	Latin	ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)	Mevius Seius Sabinus
13.	I.MNB 71	Berytos	Roman times	Latin	[Berytos?]	Marcus Sentius Proculus
14.	I.MNB 73	Berytos	Roman times	Latin	[Beryte]nsum metro [polis] poni constituit	<i>praefectus fabrum, duumvir quinquennalis, flamen Martialis</i>
15.	I.MNB 74	Berytos	Roman times	Latin	pub(lice), ex dec(reto) dec(urionum)	sevir augustalis
16.	I.MNB 75	Berytos	Roman times	Latin	publice, decurionum decreto	Statia Rufilla, a priestess of the Imperial cult
17.	I.Tyr II 40	Tyre	Roman times	Greek	[ἡ βουλῆ] καὶ ὁ δῆμος	a Roman military commander, a citizen of Tyre?
18.	IGLS VI 2774	Heliopolis	Roman times	Latin	ex decreto decurionum	?
19.	IGLS VI 2790	Heliopolis	Roman times	Latin	publice	Titus Alfius Taurus Sentianus

No.	SOURCE	PLACE	DATE	LANGUAGE	HONORING INSTITUTION/ HONORIFIC FORMULA	HONORAND
20.	AE 1900.142	Berytos [Deir el-Qala]	2nd cent. CE [reign of Hadrian]	Latin	col(onia) Iul(ia) Aug(usta) Fel(ix) B[erytus]	Hadrian
21.	AE 1994.1773	Berytos	133 CE	Latin	co(lonia) Iul(ia) Aug(usta) Fel(ix) Berytus	Hadrian
22.	I.MNB 62	Berytos	2nd cent. CE [reign of Hadrian]	Latin	colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Berytus	Hadrian
23.	I.MNB 63	Berytos	2nd cent. CE [reign of Hadrian]	Latin	colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Berytus	Hadrian
24.	I.MNB 64	Berytos	2nd cent. CE [reign of Marcus Aurelius]	Latin	colonia Iulia Augusta [Felix Berytus]	Marcus Aurelius
25.	IGLS VI 2764	Heliopolis	2nd cent. CE	Latin	Heliopolitani	Sabina, filia imperatoris Antonini Augusti
26.	IGLS VII 4006	Arados	2nd cent. CE [after Commodus?]	Greek	ἡ πόλις	deified Commodus
27.	IGLS VII 4013	Arados	2nd cent. CE	Greek	ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Antiochus, son of Democritus, grandson of Marion?, a secretary
28.	IGLS VII 4014	Arados	2nd cent. CE	Greek	ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Damis, son of Mneseas, an agoranomos
29.	IGR III 1077	Berytos?	2nd cent. CE [reign of Hadrian?]	Greek	[ἡ βουλή καὶ] ὁ δῆμος	Valerius Eudaemon?, a procurator
30.	IGR III 1098	Sidon	2nd cent. CE [reign of Antoninus Pius]	Greek	ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος	Antoninus Pius
31.	CIL III 166	Berytos	224 CE	Latin	col(onia) Iul(ia)   [Aug(usta) Fel(ix) Berytus]	Alexander Severus
32.	I.MNB 66	Berytos	204-217 CE	Latin	col(onia) Iul(ia) Aug(usta) Fel(ix) Berytus, ex dec(reto) dec(urionum)	Julia Domna
33.	I.MNB 67	Berytos	204-217 CE	Latin	col(onia) Iul(ia) Aug(usta) Fel(ix) Berytus, ex dec(reto) dec(urionum)	Julia Domna
34.	I.Tyr II 20	Tyre	3rd cent. CE [reign of Caracalla]	Latin	[Septimia Colonia Tyru]s metropolis]	Caracalla?
35.	I.Tyr II 32	Tyre	3rd cent. CE	Greek	Σεπτιμία κολωνία Τύρος ἡ μητρόπολις	Odenathus
36.	Alignot & Yon 2016 (Berytus 56): no. 14a-b	Berytos (Khalde)	253 CE	Greek	[Berytos?]	Marcus Antonius Marcellus Pilatus

No.	SOURCE	PLACE	DATE	LANGUAGE	HONORING INSTITUTION/ HONORIFIC FORMULA	HONORAND
37.	IGLS VII 4016 bis	Arados	3rd cent. CE	Greek	ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ γερονσία ψηφίσματι	Domitius Leon Procellianus, a governor
38.	IGLS VI 2772	Heliopolis	296-306 CE	Latin	colonia Iulia Augusta Felix Heliupolis	Galerius Maximianus Caesar
39.	ILS 1234 = CIL III 167	Berytos	ca. 344 CE	Latin	ordo Berytorum	(Flavius Domitius) Leontius, a praetorian prefect and consul ordinarius
40.	I.Tyr 28	Tyre	after 3rd cent. CE? [times of Justi- nian?]	Latin	Felix Aug(usta) Tyrrior(um) Col(onia) metropol(is)	Domitius Ulpianus

TABLE 1: *List of honorific inscriptions attesting the collective agency within civic communities of Phoenicia in Greco-Roman times.*