21

DIVVS DIOCLETIANVS?

Simon Corcoran

Department of History, UCL



Two milestones from Heraclea-Perinthus published in 1998 present confusing palimpsests of imperial colleges of the early fourth century. They were found at or near Çizmetarla, about 23km west of Heraclea, by the route of the *via Egnatia*. Their texts are difficult to read, but, as each seems to mirror the other, can be reconstructed as follows:

Sayar	1998:	no. 2	290	= 3	SEG	XLVI	II.913
= <i>AE</i> 1	998.1	180;	cf.	Ste	fan	2004:	282-3

diuis Dio[cletiano] et Cons[tantio et]
Gal(erio) Maximi[ano Augg(ustis)
[[θεοῖς]] Σεβ[αστοῖς — — —]
[]
(5) []]
[]
Κωσταν [[]
Οὐαλ(ερίῳ) Φλ(αβίῳ) [— — — —]
καὶ Φλαβίῳ [— — — — — — —]
(10) καὶ ὑοῖς <Σ>εβα[στῶν — — —]
καὶ Γαλ(ερίῳ) Οὐαλ(ερίῳ) [Μαξιμίνῳ]
καὶ Φλαβίῳ [Κωνσταντίνῳ]
vacat
ἡ Ἡρακλ[εωτῶν]

πόλις



18.87	A	12.02.00
	A PRODUCTION OF	76 1
BV 481	1 ASHORESSI	100.00
10.000	- + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	V/68
	Constant Part - Constant	- 6285
DR.	and the second second	2315
200	COLOR WINDOW AND	100
and the second		132
8050		(ALAS)
A-186	TO DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF	133
		5,225
100		1999
11	- 1. C. 1. March 1. C. 1. 1.	6.515
A	22	- 建設
1000	. CALLER MERCE	- 8632
1 m	A REAL PROPERTY.	1120
1000		283
	A CONTRACTOR OF A	- 5935
0.000	CONTRACTOR OF A	2012
5-S. 1		- 15.98
	A SAMPLE AND A CALL	1000
Contraction of the	AND DECEMBER OF A	120
X^{*+}		1. 1875.
2	Contraction of the second s	1927
11.61	CONTRACTOR STATES	382
83	and the second second	6.00
2 67	CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OF THE	19730
6465	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	1008
1000	State of the state	0.035
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	- 100AM
	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	1.2
There	AND REPORT FOR	1000
100	SALE STREET, ST	623
100	C. F. C. C. S. N. S.	1200
SU.	A STATE OF THE STA	1000
	C & TABLES CANADA STATE	845
Sc. 11	CARGE CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OF	1000
102	The second s	10.00
	Contraction Contraction	1000
1 Sec. 1		1992
	Charles and the second of the	600
1. A.S.	A MARKED AND A	 E.22
	CARLES STREET, STRE	1233
1	Distances in the second second second	628
		3.37
10	1 - Charles and the second	125
		2028
		10.2
		63
Sec. 2		120
1940 - B		Ser.
10.1	Contraction of the August	388
the second	and the second se	28
10 million (10	A DE LA COMPANY A DE LA COMPANY	0.00
2.19.18	CONTRACTOR / OFFICIAL	100
10 C	States and a state and the	- 88
10 10 10	CONTRACTOR OF CONTRACTOR	30.0
2.0	Constant of the Sold of the	100
F. (/ 1	and the second	011
istan -		1 200
10.00	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXABLE PARTY	1.30
1.9		1 ANIS
BUAG	Contraction of the second second	1.1.1
1000000	CONTRACTOR OF A DESCRIPTION OF A DESCRIP	

Sayar 1998: no. 291 = *SEG* XLVIII.914 = *AE* 1998.1181

ἀγαθῆ τύχη· diuis Diocletiano et Constantio et G[al(erio)] Maximiano Augg(ustis)

(5) []
Κωσταντι[— — — — — — —]
καὶ [ὑοῖς Σεβα]στῶ[ν?— — — — —]
καὶ[—————]
καὶ Γαλ(ερίῳ) Οὐαλ(ερίῳ) [Μαξιμίνῳ(?)]
(10) καὶ Φλαβίῳ Οὐαλ(ερίῳ)
Κωστ[αντίνω(?)]
[ἡ Ἡρακλεω]τῶν
πόλις τὸ μείλι<ο>ν
ιζ'.

Bibliography:

S. MacCormack, Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity (Berkeley &c., 1981)

M.H. Sayar, Perinthos-Herakleia (Marmara Ereğlisi) und Umgebung : Geschichte, Testimonien, griechische und lateinische Inschriften (Vienna, 1998)

A. Stefan, 'Un rang impérial nouveau à l'époque de la quatrième tétrarchie. *Filius Augustorum*,' *Antiquité Tardive* 12 (2004) 273-91

E. Volterra, 'Sulle *inscriptiones* di alcune costituzioni di Diocleziano,' in *BIDR*³ 15 (1973) 245-70 (cf. *Mélanges Seston*: 489-508) [repr. *Scritti Giuridici* V (Antiqua 65; Naples, 1993) 373-98]

Thanks are due to David French and Benet Salway, and to those who made comments on an earlier paper delivered at the Cambridge Epigraphy Day, January 2006, on which see *British Epigraphy Society Newsletter* n.s. 15 (Spring 2006) 11-12.

As is common for later milestones, the emperors appear as dedicands in the dative, with the city of Heraclea in the nominative. The lower lines of each milestone (10-12 and 7?-11 respectively) seem to preserve, in Greek, the college of the Fourth Tetrarchy (309-310), with traces of some Constantinian college above (lines 7-9 and 6-8?). But the two lines in Latin are the most intriguing. With each milestone helping to restore the text of the other, these lines must read:

« Divis Diocletiano et Constantio et Gal. Maximiano Augg. » Here we have the members the First Tetrarchy without the elder Maximian, some or all being called *divi*, but only two *Augusti* and with no Caesars. How do we explain this mysterious formulation without supposing, like Sayar (1998: 409-10), that this is a mangled First Tetrarchy (293-305), or, like *AE* and *SEG*, a mangled Second Tetrarchy (305-306)?

Problem 1: *Divi* do not appear on milestones, except in patronymics; thus Constantius as *divus* on milestones of Constantine (e.g. *RIB* 2220, 2233, 2237, 2302-3). Reading *DD.NN.* (*Domini nostri*) would make more sense, but does not seem to match the letters on the admittedly difficult photographs. *Divis* may be a retro-translation of [[θεοῖς]] Σεβ[αστοῖς, the guess of Sayar, but is that the living or the dead? θεός for a living ruler is not typically tetrarchic.

Problem 2: Diocletian does not seem to have been officially deified. Eutropius (*Brev.* IX.28) states that Diocletian was the only *privatus* to be enrolled among the gods, but this merely represents politeness towards deceased but not damned emperors (cf. Valens calling Diocletian *divus* at *CTh* VIII.4.11). For earlier fourth-century practice (MacCormack 1981: 106-15), official deification is largely marked by *consecratio* coinage, generally issued by the western dynasts:

From the mints of Constantine: Divus Constantius 306/7; Divus Constantius, Divus Claudius and Divus Maximianus Senior c.317/18. From the mints of Maxentius: Divus Constantius 307/8; Divus Romulus from 309, joined by

From the mints of Maxentius: Divus Constantius 307/8; Divus Romulus from 309, joined by Divus Constantius, Divus Maximianus Senior 310 and Divus Maximianus lunior 311. From the mints of Licinius and Maximinus: Divus Galerius Maximianus 311 to 313 From the mints of Constantine II and Constantius II: Divus Constantinus 337-355. All divus issues cease after 355.

Which emperor would so honour Diocletian? Maxentius would have. He used all he could in his *divus* series. But Diocletian survived him, only dying in Dec. 312. Heraclea was ruled by Licinius between 311 and 324, yet his hostility may have driven Diocletian to suicide and he later executed Diocletian's wife and daughter. Maximinus briefly controlled Heraclea in April 313 (Lact. *DMP* 45.5-6). Did he make a show of his tetrarchic legitimacy in this fleeting window of time?

Problem 3: Would the Heracleotes use a style without official approval? There is some contemporary evidence for Diocletian as *divus. P. Princ.* III, 119 (rev. *SB* XII, 10989; *c.* 325) col. 2 I. 9 refers to Diocletian as $\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{9} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{9}$. More explicit are several headings to imperial rescripts in the *Fragmenta Vaticana*, parts of a juristic work probably written in Italy before the fall of Licinius. This uses the strange style *Divi Diocletianus et Constantius (FV* 270, 275, 297, 312, 325, 338) for Diocletianic rescripts, clearly a coinage of the author (Volterra 1973). This is eerily close to our milestones.

So we are left with a mystery. Some contemporaries did refer to Diocletian as *divus*, but no emperor seems to have done so. Whose viewpoint or decision do these milestones represent?

Simon Corcoran, Senior Research Fellow, Department of History, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT. Tel.: ++44 (0)20 7679 1340. E-mail: s.corcoran@ucl.ac.uk