



BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Barron, Caroline (2020) *Amator Concordiae, Ornator Patriae. The Latinisation of Punic titles in early imperial Leptis Magna. Libyan Studies* 51 , pp. 10-23. ISSN 0263-7189.

Downloaded from: <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/30725/>

Usage Guidelines:

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>
contact lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk.

or alternatively

*Amator Concordiae, Ornator Patriae. The Latinisation of Punic titles in early imperial
Lepcis Magna**

Abstract

The translation of so-called ‘honorific’ titles from Punic to Latin, and their deployment in a number of public monumental inscriptions in Lepcis Magna, have often been promoted as evidence for successful Romanization in the cities of Tripolitania. Titles such as *amator concordiae* and *ornator patriae* have been understood as affirmations that the local Lepticitan community had engaged with Augustan ideological concepts and were using them to demonstrate loyalty and support for the principate. This paper argues that a more likely influence on the translation of the titles into Latin came from the notions of *philia* exhibited by the Greek-speaking communities of the eastern Mediterranean in their interactions with Rome.

Introduction

There are 16 bilingual inscriptions in Latin and Neo-Punic from Roman Tripolitania, three of which are in fact trilingual texts in Neo-Punic, Latin, Greek.¹ Two of the bilingual inscriptions are funerary,² six are building dedications,³ and the remaining eight are dedications to people or gods.⁴ Of these 16 multilingual texts, 11 are from the city of Lepcis Magna, five of which are the focus of the following discussion. These five inscriptions contain Punic honorific titles that have been calqued into Latin - *amator concordiae*, *amator civium*, *ornator patriae*, *ornator civium* and *servator civium* -⁵ seemingly in order to describe local success and honours,⁶ but using language that had significance in a Latin speaking, rather than Punic, context. To these, for the purpose of the present study, can be added five further inscriptions which, although only inscribed in Latin, also contain the Punic titles in their Latin form.⁷ These titles are unique to Lepcis Magna (with the exception of one text from Sabratha),⁸ and appear only in public dedications involving Latin text; they do not appear in the funerary record nor are they used to

describe individuals in public or monumental inscriptions recorded only in Punic text.⁹ Their appearance in Latin has, however, been interpreted as evidence for the successful ‘Romanization’ of North Africa, particularly with respect to the programme of public building, the adoption of Latin and the emergence of monumental, public epigraphy, all of which have been characterised as a singular phenomenon of the Augustan period there (Cooley 2012, 253).¹⁰ The titles have repeatedly been cited as indicative of the reception of Augustan imperial ideology, especially *Concordia* and the importance of the ‘fatherland’, which David Mattingly has interpreted as an effort by the Tripolitanian elites to “identify themselves strongly with the imperial project” (Mattingly 2011, 239). Rather than interpreting these Latinised forms of the Punic titles as calques of Punic to Latin,¹¹ or as attempts to represent concepts that engaged with or attempted to emulate Rome, this paper suggests that the process by which these Punic titles were rendered into Latin owes more to Hellenistic expressions of friendship than to the influence of Roman political and imperial virtues. By focusing on examples from the Greek-speaking eastern parts of the Roman world, as well as the ways in which such communities expressed friendship and alliances with Rome, the nuance with which these honorific titles were deployed in Lepcis Magna can be better determined. These so-called ‘honorific titles’ are argued to be a continuation of the Hellenistic tradition in Tripolitania, not only evident in the choices made in the construction of certain buildings, but also here in the epigraphic record, where their translation from neo-Punic to Latin is suggested to be closer in concept to Greek notions of *philia* and *homonoia* than the Roman imperial virtues to which they have been traditionally attributed.

***Philia* in the face of Rome**

Declarations of friendship with Rome were common in the Greek-speaking eastern part of the Mediterranean, particularly in areas where the promise of Rome’s alliance was used to deal

with the tensions that sprang up between cities (Price 1985, 126-132). As Roman influence grew, the practice of rewarding Hellenistic kings and dynasts with benefits such as lodging in Rome, gifts and the official recognition given by the *appellatio* as “friend and ally of the Roman people” (*socius et amicus populi Romani*) by the Senate, which began to be extended to eastern Kings from the second century BCE onwards.¹² As Andrea Raggi has noted, to be declared a “friend and ally” of Rome was desirable because it helped to secure a “protection of their position against the arbitrary exercise of Roman power, and as a moral and substantial support against their neighbours” (Raggi 2010, 82). It was, in short, a way of promoting a good relationship with one’s overseers both overtly in their direction, but also to those communities in the immediate vicinity, whose potential to challenge might be checked by the knowledge that Rome recognised these kings and dynasts favourably.

In return, these kings might represent their relationship with Rome to their subjects through the adoption of certain epithets in their royal titulature; from the middle of the second century BCE the titles *philorhomaïos* and *philokaiser* began to appear, joining other *philos* compounds such as *philandros*, *philopator*, *philadelphos*, and *philometor* in the official titles of the Kings, which had traditionally been used to describe familial and friendly concepts in both private and official dedications (Braund 1984, 105). Kings such as Mithridates I of Parthia, Aretas III of Nabataea, Tigranes of Armenia and Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia all adopted *philorhomaïos* as an official epithet in the late Hellenistic period, although they not often expressed in regular inscriptions such as dedications, and were instead reserved for moments of “dynastic self-stylisation” in which the status of the king was being advertised both to local neighbouring dynasts, and indirectly to Rome (Versluys 2017: 163-4). *Philos* compounds were not reserved solely for royalty either; other combinations, such as *philopatris*, *philodoxos* and *philotimos* had been used to describe members of the local elite who acted as benefactors of their cities, either through earning merit for their cities, or through acts of generosity and/or patriotism.¹³

With the advent of the principate, *philorhomaïos* and *philokaisar* were gradually replaced in a civic context by *philosebastos*, to express the loyalty of an individual to the emperor and the imperial project as a whole, with a number of studies arguing for the title to be indicative of the individual's engagement with the imperial cult (Heller 2017, 1).¹⁴ The introduction of *philorhomaïos*, *philokaisar* and *philosebastos* into the list of Hellenistic titles advertised “the friendly attitude towards Rome on the part of a king” and their ideological investment in the imperial project (Braund 1984, 106), and in the case of individuals a definition of identity and social status within their communities (Heller 2017, 1).

Amator concordiae, Ornator patriae

It is in such a context that the Lepcitan titles *amator concordiae*, *amator civium*, *ornator patriae*, *ornator civium* and *servator civium* might also be considered. Appearing in 11 inscriptions in the city, five of which are bilingual and six in Latin alone, the titles appear to have been used alongside other municipal honours in public dedications that advertised the municipal and cultural prestige of those who dedicated them. Although the epigraphic habit was well-established in northern Africa pre-Rome,¹⁵ the Punic and neo-Punic texts were largely funerary or votive in nature, and it was only through contact with Rome that epigraphic culture developed to include building inscriptions in neo-Punic for the first time (Wilson 2012, 269). The best-known of these is found on one of the most prominent monumental features of Lepcis Magna: the Theatre (*fig 1*). Built on the slope of the hill previously occupied by a 5th-3rd century BCE cemetery, the theatre followed a Roman plan. The semi-circular seating, the lower part of which was built directly into the rock, with the upper tiers resting on artificial embankments, was contained by a plain semi-circular wall with regular vertical pilasters. Five arched doorways in the base provide access, via internal staircases, to the different tiers of seating, which faced the orchestra and stage (Di Vita *et al* 1999, 63-64).¹⁶ The Theatre had been paid

for and dedicated in 1-2 CE by the same Annobal Tapapius Rufus, who had previously also donated the Macellum building to the city.¹⁷ Three near-identical inscriptions were set up at the Theatre within monumental moulded *tabula ansata*: one on the exterior,¹⁸ found re-used and has replaced above the street door of the East dressing room, and two interior texts, which remain *in situ*, above the lateral *aditus maximus* arches that lead to the orchestra.¹⁹ The inscription now on the exterior of the building was recorded only in Latin, but the two interior texts record the same Latin inscription as the exterior, with slight variation, followed by two lines of text in neo-Punic immediately after:

Latin text:

Imp(eratore) Caesare Divi f(ilio) Aug(usto) pont(ifice) max(imo) tr(ibunicia)
 pot(estate) XXIV
 co(n)s(ule) XIII patre patr(iae)
 Annobal ornator patriae amator concordiae flamen
 sufes praef(ectus) sacr(orum) Himilchonis Tapapi [f(ilius)] Rufu[s] d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia)
 fac(iendum) coer(avit) idemq(ue) dedicavit

Neo-Punic text:

ḥnb^l myšql ʾrṣ mḥb d^t htmt zbh špt ʾdr
 ʿzrm bn ḥmlkt ṭbhpy r^{ps} bn ʾrm btm p^l w^yqdš.

English translation of Latin:

When Emperor Caesar Augustus, son of the deified (Caesar), chief priest, (was) holding tribunician power for the twenty-fourth time, consul for the thirteenth, father of the country, Annobal Rufus, adorer of the fatherland, lover of concord, flamen (local priest), sufete, in charge of sacred things, son of Himilcho Tapapius, saw to the construction at his own expense and also dedicated it.

English translation of neo-Punic:

Annobal, adorer of the fatherland, lover of complete knowledge, sacrifice, sufete, lord of the ʿzrm offering, the son of Imilco Tapafi Rufus, made it according to plan at his own expense and consecrated it

Several points on the bilingualism of the inscription should be noted here; by the early first century CE, the epigraphic record contained dedications in which the local Lepcitan elite –

many of whom were Libyophoenicians, descended from the marriages of Phoenician settlers with local Libyans – had begun to Latinize their Punic names (Mattingly 2011, 238-239). In his earlier dedication of the Macellum building, Annobal Rufus appears to adopt the tripartite naming structure that belonged to Roman male citizens and is recorded as *Annobal Tapapius Rufus*.²⁰ However, the nomenclature actually represents a convergence of two different traditions. Punic names typically give the individual's name and filiation, but in the case of the earlier dedication to Annobal – the Punic name – is supplemented with the Latinisation of his family name, *Tapapius*, plus the adoption of a Roman name – Rufus – in place of a *cognomen*. It is tempting to read Annobal Tapapius Rufus as *tria nomina*, the naming system used by all male citizens of Rome, but that does not appear to be the case at the Macellum. Firstly, there is no evidence to prove that Annobal Tapapius Rufus had acquired citizenship himself; second, in this inscription the Punic element is retained in the inclusion of the family name, *Taphpi*, which is Latinised to *Tapapius*, plus the addition of a Roman name – Rufus – in place of a *cognomen*, to give something that looks like the Roman *tria nomina* naming system.²¹ He makes reference to Rome without fully assimilating to her practices.²² Comparison with other building dedications from Leptis makes this clear; a Punic name and filiation is always given, but the addition of a Roman-style *cognomen* is far more sporadic (Quinn 2010, 63).

However, in the text from the Theatre, the Latin reverts to Punic practice, naming him as Annobal Rufus, son of Himilcho Tapapius, in a further mixing of both systems; Annobal identifies himself personally with the addition of a Roman name, *Rufus*, but maintains a Punic identity through the traditional statement of filiation that follows.²³ Although Augustus' titles are given prominence at the beginning of the Latin text, they are omitted entirely from the neo-Punic version, which focuses on Annobal Rufus and the “local significance of his public offices” (Cooley 2012, 258). They are described in the Latin as *ornator patriae* (“adornor of

the fatherland”) and *amator concordiae* (“lover of concord”). *Patria* and *concordia* were keystones of Augustan social and political ideology which focused on the peace that Augustus had brought to the Roman world, and their replication here has been understood to may be indicative of Annobal Rufus’s desire to represent himself as a loyal ally in the language and vocabulary of the principate. A parallel might be drawn here with the inscription of the so-called Eumachia Building in Pompeii, which dedicated the structure to *Concordiae Augustae Pietati*, in imitation of the shrine to *Concordia Augusta* dedicated in the *porticus Liviae* in Rome and using the same language and form as that employed by the imperial household.²⁴

This concept of Roman *Concordia* is not reflected in the Punic version of the titles. *Amator Concordiae* is a very liberal rendering of the Punic *mḥb dʿt htmt*; the first part of this – *mḥb* – derives from the verb *ḥbb*, “to love”,²⁵ and the second part *dʿt htmt*; “of perfect knowledge”.²⁶ “Of perfect knowledge” was first suggested as the parallel translation by Giorgio Levi della Vida and Maria Amadasi Guzzo, who argued that a “perfect knowledge” implied a necessary *Concordia*, or harmony, which led to the Latin version of the title. It was not a literal translation of the Punic concept, but it worked on a “spiritual” level in both languages.²⁷ The other Latin titles follow a similar pattern, although are perhaps closer to their Punic counterparts in meaning than *amator concordiae*: *amator patriae* and *amator civium* both use the same Punic verb *ḥbb*, “to love”, with *ʾrṣ*, “earth”,²⁸ for *patriae* and *bnʾ ʿm* for “citizens” or *civium* respectively.²⁹ *Ornator* represents the Punic *myšql*, which more uncertainly is believed to belong to the *yiph’il* causative verb *šql*, “to lay out money for” which has been equated with “to adorn”.³⁰ Finally, *servator civium*, “saviour of the people” does not correspond easily to its Punic equivalent; while *civium* is represented by the above noted *bnʾ ʿm*, *mšlk* may be a *pi’el* participle of *šlk*, which is more commonly found in proper names,³¹ but appears to have been used as a verb here with the sense “to save”.³² They are not, therefore, perfect translations of

the Punic concepts into Latin; *amator concordiae* is a particularly divergent rendering, and one that appears to have been motivated by what the Latin would mean to an audience outside of Lepcis, perhaps in Rome. As Maria Gabriella Bertinelli Angeli remarked in her study of the nomenclature of Semitic inscriptions, as these titles (or names, as she prefers them), exist epigraphically only within the Latin inscriptions of this part of north Africa, it is possible that they represent the true Punic honorifics, according to an inverse process of reception of the local titles in Latin, which have been adapted as much as possible to fit a Roman mentality (Bertinelli Angeli 1970, 52).

Annobal Tapapius Rufus' engagement with Roman imperial concepts could be further emphasised by the presence in the middle of line 3 of one of the interior inscriptions, *IRT 322* - of a relief carving of two hands, clasping each other (*fig. 2*). This symbol had appeared on coinage in the late Republican period and had come to symbolise the union between potential political rivals and the subsequent harmony within the state that their union produced (Noreña 2011, 132).³³ The symbol became most popular in the period following the death of Julius Caesar, when it was paired with the deity *Concordia*, to emphasise the new peace brought to Rome by Augustus.³⁴ The depiction of the clasped hands in the middle of the inscription at the Theatre could be understood as representing the harmony that existed between Rome and Lepcis, in an example of visual code-switching; the bilingual inscriptions of the Theatre are set within giant *tabulae ansatae*, indicating knowledge of how epigraphic text was presented at Rome, and the clasped hands demonstrated an engagement with the full cultural repertoire of the capital by employing current and meaningful iconography. Later examples too appear to support the link between the titles and the Augustan principate. In 35-36 CE, a shrine to Ceres Augusta was dedicated by the proconsul Caius Rubellius Blandus in the upper tiers of the cavea of the Theatre; the inscription was recorded only in Latin, and detailed that although dedicated by the proconsul, the structure had been paid for by Suphunibal, wife of Annobal Ruso, an

ornatrix patriae.³⁵ That the shrine contained a statue of Ceres Augusta, with the features of Livia and wearing a crenelated mural crown,³⁶ again supports the earlier arguments for a programme of Augustan imperial iconography and language in the Theatre, and the desire of these members of the local elite to exhibit traditional Roman euergetic behaviour in order to promote their loyalty to the imperial administration.

The titles continued to be used in inscriptions, in bilingual neo-Punic and Latin texts, and in Latin alone. In *c.* 79 CE a dedication to the Gods of Lepcis Magnus was set up, perhaps near its findspot close to the temple of Liber Pater, in which Marcus Vipsanius Clemens was celebrated as *amator patriae*, *amator civium* and *ornator patriae*, the latter of which perhaps especially fitting given he is also named in the inscription as a marble merchant (*redemptory marmorarius*).³⁷ Under Domitian, in *c.* 92 CE, an octagonal altar - discovered on the raised pavement near the centre of the Orchestra of the Theatre - was set up with inscriptions on three faces of the shaft, two of which are in Latin and the third in neo-Punic.³⁸ The name of the benefactor does not survive in the Latin inscription, but is given by the Punic as Tiberius Claudius Sestius, with both the Latin and neo-Punic texts describing him with four of the five honorific titles: *amator patriae*, *amator civium*, *ornator patriae*, and *amator concordiae*. Giorgio Levi della Vida's initial assessment of the titles proposed that these were "municipal honours, of a principally national character", which might explain why they continued to be used – albeit infrequently – beyond the 1st century CE (Levi della Vida 1935, 105).³⁹ Indeed, *amator civium suorum* is suggested in a fragment from the first/second century CE,⁴⁰ and *amator patriae ac civium* in two inscriptions that date to the third/fourth centuries CE,⁴¹ meaning that the titles continued to resonate with the local community beyond their Augustan context.

Such an argument fits with the proposal advanced by Andrea Giardina, who claimed that the use of *amator* in the inscriptions in Lepcis Magna was representative of the Roman ideology of “civic love”, which immediately became, because of its use in a very specific epigraphic Roman tradition, part of a formula of civic *laudatio*, a qualification of virtue and not therefore a residual official title of the Punic institutional framework (Giardina 1988, 77-78). He noted a “precision” in the encounter between the Lepcitan and Italian epigraphic traditions in this respect, and stated that the hypothesis of a direct Hellenistic influence had only “analogical value”, concluding that the origin of the way in which the Punic phrases were translated into Latin had to be found in the ideological sphere of Roman urbanism (*ibid*, 76-77).⁴² The differences between the Latin vocabulary and the concepts expressed by the Punic were explained away as “reformulations and paraphrasing”, which attempted to specify otherwise “foreign” concepts (*ibid*, 77). However, such easy dismissal of the Hellenistic influence as “analogous” is an oversimplification, and does not take into consideration the wealth of material evidence within in the city that also attests to the continued use of certain building styles in Lepcis that were taken directly from Alexandrian and Cyrenean forms, and adapted to fit the buildings that they adorned. For example, an Alexandrian style of column capital, which featured interwoven, S-shaped helics, was known in Lepcis Magna and later replicated further inland in the mausoleum of Gasr Doga in the Tarhuna Gebel in the first century CE, demonstrating not only the continued relevance of these Hellenistic and Alexandrian models in Tripolitania, but their status and value too, which led them to be communicated and replicated away from the more cosmopolitan coastline.⁴³ Indeed, the foliage of the Corinthian capitals from the Chalcidicum of Lepcis Magna has been identified as a “good quality reproduction” of the same vegetal form known from Hellenistic Egypt, although, the total form of the capitals of the Chalcidicum is rather that of a “pastiche” of influences, from both Alexandria and Edfu, dating from the 3rd century BCE to the 1st century CE (Bigi 2006, 2364-

2366). Such Alexandrian influences may also have been transmitted to Tripolitania through their use and adoption in neighbouring Cyrene, where a number of Egyptian features have been identified from the Republican period in buildings such as the *Strategeion* (Rocco 2010: 31). Hellenistic Alexandrian influences have also been identified in the architecture of the mausolea at Sabratha too.⁴⁴

Of course, there is also evidence for the influence of Italic architectural forms in Lepcis,⁴⁵ as well as the continued use of Punic styles, particularly in the bulky palmettes of the column capitals in the Temple of Roma and Augustus.⁴⁶ The Hellenistic and Cyrenean-Alexandrian influences on Punic urbanism and building are, it seems, as visible as any Roman model, and demonstrate that there was no single over-riding influence on building in Lepcis Magna; the forms introduced by contact with Italy were certainly replicated throughout the city, but indigenous Punic designs as well as those imported much earlier from the Hellenistic metropoleis of Egypt and North Africa nonetheless remained as prevalent, making it harder to follow Giardina's logic that Roman municipal practice provided the sole inspiration for the translation of the Punic titles into Latin. Although the form of dedication – monumental public inscription – certainly had more in common with Roman practice than indigenous Punic or Hellenistic tradition, the concepts expressed by the honours ascribed to individuals such as Annobal Tapapius Rufus are closer in kind to the notions of *philia* and *homonioia* than Giardina's argument allows. There may not be a direct relationship, or "filiation" between the Greek and Punic vocabulary in each case, but it is hard to ignore the similarity of *homonioia* and *concordia* and what they meant to civic experience under Rome; the positive relationship between Lepcis and the imperial capital may have been understood and exploited at a local level through the lens of the Hellenistic cities' friendship with Rome. As a thriving *emporium*, Lepcis would have come into contact with these examples of *philia* between Rome and the

eastern cities through trade, the same mechanism by which Hellenistic architectural practice had also spread in popularity. The integration of the Greek world in such friendly terms also introduced the Tripolitanian cities to a new way of recognising figures of special status and honour, through the awarding and adoption of honorific titles, which the Lepcitan community sought to achieve by transforming them into Latin using vocabulary that had a contemporary resonance with the period in which they were first used (Heller, 2017: 19). The *philos* compounds used by the communities of the Greek speaking world created a system that worked both for Rome and for the Kings, dynasts and individual members of those communities who expressed them; the notion of *philia*, whether in regards to the fatherland, to Rome or to the emperor himself advertised reflected positively on all concerned, and as such acted as qualifying attributes that were meaningful to all. It is worth noting perhaps that the honorific titles of the Roman world in the early principate were largely either military or municipal in nature, and as such did not themselves communicate the same concepts of friendship, harmony and loyalty achieved by the Greek. By using the framework of Hellenistic friendship to construct the honorific titles such as *amator concordiae* and *ornator patriae*, Lepcis Magna created new expressions that appears to have satisfied both Rome and local community alike.

Conclusion

The bilingual inscriptions from Roman Tripolitania have generated much attention in the epigraphic corpus and have been celebrated for the example they provide for the multilingual experiences and exchanges that interaction with Rome brought to the new lands under her control. They have been promoted as evidence of the fluidity of language, and the multiple identities, statuses and prestige that language choice could communicate to different audiences, as well as the “strategic deployment” of those identities in different contexts (Wallace-Hadrill 2008, 85). It is possible that the decision to use one language instead of another may be “due

to idiomatic or lexical gaps” in either tongue (Mullen 2012, 24), but it is equally likely that the choice represented a symbolic value that enhanced or contained some other, societal context (Myers-Scotton 2006, 143). In the case of Lepcis Magna, the multilingual environment and its presence in the epigraphic record has been understood as a response to the rapid expansion of the city in the first century CE, in which it became the “major and dominating urban centre in the region” (Mattingly 2011, 238); the impressive edifices that were constructed and their accompanying dedications in Latin have been promoted as indications of the popularity of Roman models and behaviours amongst the leading families of the city, who embraced them as markers of cultural prestige and prosperity. Their choice to begin recording the construction and dedication of public buildings in epigraphic form, and the inclusion of Latin, sometimes in visual preference to the neo-Punic, in bilingual inscriptions, has been used as further evidence for the engagement of the local elite with Roman models, using their form to communicate their position to both a local and external audience.

However, while it cannot be disputed that the public inscriptions set up in Lepcis, and which employed the above honorific titles, are indicative of the city attempting to advance a good relationship with the city, the creation of the honorific titles in the Latin and neo-Punic texts is not simple case of one community – Lepcis – responding to a more powerful one – Rome. The earliest of the inscriptions were set up at a crucial moment in the relationship between the city and Roman power, shortly before Augustus declared Lepcis a *civitas libera et immunis* - a ‘free community’, over which the Roman governor exerted little control (Quinn 2010, 52) – in 7-5 BCE,⁴⁷ and it may be that the creation of the titles fit the Hellenistic model of declaring “friendship” in order to advertise the status of the city and its elite to its neighbours. Although the titles appear in singular, Latin-only dedications in Lepcis Magna as late as the fourth century CE, they were infrequently used, and even less so beyond the middle of the first century

CE, indicating that their meaning was especially relevant at a period in which the city's relationship with Rome was expanding. Just as *philorhomaïos*, *philokaisar* and *philosebastos* were introduced as honorific epithets in the Greek-speaking world in the middle of the second century BCE, at a time when the power of Rome was visibly increasing, so too did the honorific titles in neo-Punic and Latin emerge in Lepcis Magna at a time when the relationship of the city and the imperial capital was at a crucial moment of coalition. Lepcis had supported Rome in campaigns against local Libyans and their victory against the Gaetulians in 6 CE,⁴⁸ the result of which was the presence of Roman generals and proconsuls in the region, who were actively engaged in Roman expansion (Cooley, 2012: 254). The deployment of the honorific titles in such specific municipal and euergetic instances such as the construction of the theatre, as well as the use of decorative forms such as the *tabula ansata* within which in the inscription was placed and the motif of the clasped hands, is indicative of the ambitions of Lepcis Magna and her leading citizens to engage with and be received by Rome and her official representatives in friendly terms; however, rather than simply replicating Roman forms of this, local Punic traditions, such as the titles *mḥb bnʷ ʿm* (“*amator civium*”) and *mḥb dʿt htmt* (“*amator concordiae*”) were adapted according to the model already successfully implemented in the Greek-speaking cities of the eastern part of the empire.

References

- Adams, James, 2002, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge
- Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia, 2005, ‘Les phases du Phénicien: Phénicien et Punique’ in *Proceedings of the 10th Meeting of Hamito-Semitic (Afroasiatic) Linguistics (Florence, 18-20 April 2001)*, ed. P. Fronzaroli and P. Marrassini, Florence, p. 95-103
- Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia, 1988, ‘Cultura punica e cultura latina in Tripolitania. Osservazioni in base alle iscrizioni puniche e alle iscrizioni bilingui’ in *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico : atti del colloquio interdisciplinare tenuto a Pisa il 28 e 29 settembre 1987*, eds. E. Campanile, G. R. Cardona and R. Lazzeroni, Pisa, p. 23-33
- Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia, 1986, ‘L’onomastica nelle iscrizioni puniche Tripolitane’ in *Rivista dei Studi Fenici* 14, 1, p. 21-51
- Balzat, Jean-Sébastien, 2019, “The Diffusion of Roman Names and Naming Practices in Greek Poleis (2nd c. bc–3rd c. AD),” in Robert Parker, ed., *Changing Names: 217-236*, Oxford
- Benz, Frank L., 1972) *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Rome
- Bertinelli Angeli, Maria Gabriella, 1970, *Nomenclatura pubblica e sacra di Roma nelle epigrafi semitiche*, Genova
- Bianchi, Fulvia, 2005, ‘La decorazione architettonica in pietra locale a Lepis Magna tra il I e il II sec. d.c.’ in *Archeologia Classica*, 56, p. 189-223
- Bigi, Francesca, 2006, ‘I capitelli di *Leptis Magna* fra modelli italici e influenze alessandrine’ in *L’Africa Romana. Mobilità delle persone e dei popoli dinamiche migratorie, emigrazioni ed immigrazioni nelle province occidentali dell’Impero romano*, eds. A. Akerraz, P. Ruggieri, A. Siraj and C. Vismara, Roma, p. 2351-2375
- Birley, Anthony R., 1988, ‘Names at Lepcis Magna’ in *Libyan Studies* 19, p.1-19
- Braund, David, 1984, *Rome and the Friendly King*, London and New York
- Caputo, Giacomo, 1987, *Il teatro augusteo di Leptis Magna : scavo e restauro (1937-1951)*, Roma
- Coarelli, Filippo and Thébert, Yvon, 1988, ‘Architecture funéraire et pouvoir : réflexions sur l’Hellénisme Numide’ in *Mélanges de l’École Française de Rome. Antiquité*, 100, p. 761-818
- Cooley, Alison, 2012, *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge

- Di Vita, Antonino, 1982, 'Gli *Emporia* di Tripolitania dall' età di Massinissa a Diocleziano: un profilo storico-istituzionale' in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II, 10.2, p. 515-595
- Di Vita, Antonino, Di Vita-Everard, Ginette and Bacchielli, Lidiano. Photographs by Robert Polidori, 1999, *Libya: the lost cities of the Roman Empire*, Cologne
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis, 1999, 'La liberté des cités et ses limites à l'époque républicaine' in *Mediterraneo Antico* 2.1, p. 69–84
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis, 2008, "L'onomastique dans les provinces orientales de l'empire à la lumière du dossier des mémoriaux de délégations de Claros." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 19, p. 247-278
- Fontana, Sergio, 2001, 'Leptis Magna. The Romanization of a Major African City through Burial Evidence' in *Italy and the West. Comparative Issues in Romanisation*, eds. S. Keay and N. Terrenato, Oxford, p. 161-172
- Gaggiotti, Marcello, 1990, 'Considerazioni sulla <<punicità>> del *macellum* romano' in *L'Africa Romana* 7, p. 783-792
- Giardina, Andrea, 1988, 'Amor Civicus. Formule e immagini dell'evergetismo Romano nella tradizione epigrafica' in *La terza età dell'epigrafia : Colloquio AIEGL-Borghesi 86, Bologna, ottobre 1986*, ed. A. Donati, Faenza, p. 67-87
- Guerber, Éric, 2009, *Les cités grecques dans l'Empire romain. Les privilèges et les titres des cités de l'Orient hellénophone d'Octave Auguste à Dioclétien*, Rennes
- Heller, Anna, 2017, 'Priesthoods and Civic Ideology: Honorific Titles for Hierois and Archierois in Roman Asia Minor' in *Empire and Religion: Religious Change in Greek Cities under Roman Rule*, eds E. Muñoz Grijalvo, J. M. Cortés Copete and F. Lozano Gómez, Leiden/Boston, p. 1-20
- Hock, Hans Henrich and Joseph, Brian, 1996, *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, Berlin
- Hoftijzer, Jacob and Jongeling, Karel, 1995, *Dictionary of The North-West Semitic Inscriptions*, Leiden, New York, Köln
- IPT = Levi della Vida, Giorgio and Amadasi Guzzo, Maria Giulia, 1987, *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania, 1927-1967*, Roma
- IRT2009 = *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, by J. M. Reynolds and J. B. Ward-Perkins, enhanced electronic reissue by Gabriel Bodard and Charlotte Roueché (2009). ISBN 978-1-897747-23-0. Available: <http://inslib.kcl.ac.uk/irt2009/>
- Jongeling, Karel, 2008, *Handbook of Neo-Punic Inscriptions*, Tübingen

- Levi della Vida, Giorgio, 1935, 'Il teatro augusteo di Leptis Magna secondo le ultime scoperte e un'iscrizione bilingue in latino e neo-punico' in *Africa Italiana*, 6, 3-4, p. 104-109
- Levi della Vida, Giorgio, 1971, 'Magistrature Romane e indigene nelle iscrizioni puniche tripolitane' in *Studi in onore di E. Volterra VI*, Milan, p. 457-469
- MacMullen, Ramsay, 2000, *Romanization in the time of Augustus*, New Haven
- Mattingly, David, 2011, *Imperialism, Power and Identity*, Princeton and Oxford
- Mattingly, David, 1995, *Tripolitania*, London
- Mugnai, Niccolò, 2020 *forthcoming*, 'Architectural ornament in Tripolitania, North Africa and beyond: some remarks on research approaches and interpretation' in *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia*
- Mullen, Alex, (2012), 'Introduction. Multiple languages, multiple identities' in *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, eds. A. Mullen and P. James, Cambridge, p. 1-35
- Mullen, Alex, 2011, 'Latin and Other Languages: Societal and Individual Bilingualism' in *A Companion to the Latin Language*, ed. J. Clackson, Oxford, p. 527-548
- Myers-Scotton, 2006, *Multiple Voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*, Oxford
- Quinn, Josephine, 2013, 'Monumental Power: 'Numidian Royal Architecture' in Context' in *The Hellenistic West: Rethinking the Ancient Mediterranean*, eds. J. Quinn and J. Prag, Cambridge, p. 179-215
- Quinn, Josephine, 2010, 'The Reinvention of Lepcis' in *Bollettino di Archeologia Online, volume speciale (Proceedings of the 2008 AIAC Congress, 2010, published online)* p. 52-69
- Price, Simon R. F., 1985, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge
- Raggi, Andrea, 2010, 'The First Roman Citizens among Eastern Dynasts and Kings' in *Kingdoms and Principalities in the Roman near East*, eds T. Kaizer and M. Facella, Stuttgart, p. 81-97
- Rocco, Giorgio, 2010, 'Tradizione locale e influssi esterni nei tre temple giulio-claudii del Foro Vecchio di Leptis Magna' in *Bollettino di Archaeologia Online I, Volume Speciale A*, p. 22-36
- Romanelli, Pietro, 1925, *Leptis Magna*, Roma

- Ruyt, Claire de, 1983, *Macellum: marché alimentaire des romains*, Louvain-la-Neuve
- Salomies, Olli, 1987, *Die römischen Vornamen: Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki
- Salway, Benet, 1994, 'What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700.' *Journal of Roman Studies* 84, p. 124-145
- Stucchi, Sandro, 1987, 'L'architettura funeraria suburbana cirenaica in rapporto a quella della chora viciniora ed a quella Libia ulteriore, con speciale riguardo all'età ellenistica' in *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 12, p. 249-377
- Veligianni, Cryssoula, 2001, 'Philos und philos-Komposita in den griechischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit' in *Aspects of friendship in the Graeco-Roman world*, ed. M. Peachin, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, p. 63-80
- Versluys, Miguel John, 2017, *Visual Style and Constructing Identity in the Hellenistic World. Nemrud Dag and Commagene under Antiochus I*, Cambridge
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew, 2008, *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge
- Wilson, Andrew, 2012, 'Neo-Punic and Latin inscriptions in Roman North Africa. Function and display' in *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, eds. A. Mullen and P. James, Cambridge, p. 265-316
- Woolf, Greg, 1996, 'Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire' in *Journal of Roman Studies* 86, p. 22-39

* This research was funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Seventh Framework Program (FP/2007-2013)/ERC Grant Agreement no. 614 424. It was conducted within the framework of the ERC project JUDAISM AND ROME, under the auspices of the Centre national de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) and Aix-Marseille University, UMR 7297 TDMAM (Aix-en-Provence, France). Versions of this paper were given at the *Theorizing Contacts* conference at Edinburgh University in 2017, and at research seminars at the CNRS (Aix-Marseille) and the Institute of Classical Studies (London) in 2018; my thanks to the organisers of and participants in those events. My thanks also to Dr Aitor Blanco-Perez, Dr Niccolò Mugnai and Dr Christopher Siwicki who read drafts of this article and offered essential feedback.

¹ For a general introduction to bilingualism pre-Rome and in the imperial period, see Mullen (2011: 527-548) and (2012: 1-35). For the development of bilingualism across the Roman world, see Adams (2002), esp. p. 200-245 for discussion of Punic bilingualism.

² *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, hereafter *IRT2009* 654 (= *IPT* 13 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 5; *IRT2009* 655 (= *IPT* 12 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 4)

³ *IRT2009* 319 (= *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania* (hereafter *IPT*) 21 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 14); *IRT2009* 321 (= *IPT* 24 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 16); *IRT2009* 322 (= *IPT* 24 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 16); *IRT2009* 323 (= *IPT* 24 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 16); *IRT2009* 338 (= *IPT* 26 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 19); *IRT2009* 481 (= *IPT* 16 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 8)

⁴ *IRT2009* 294 (= *IPT* 25 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 17); *IRT2009* 318 (= *IPT* 27 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 20); *IRT2009* 347 (= *IPT* 17 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 20); *IRT2009* 305 (= *IPT* 30 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 22); *IRT2009* 349 (= *IPT* 9 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 1); *IRT2009* 349a (= *IPT* 9 = Jongeling 2008: *Labdah* N 1); *IRT2009* 246 (= *IPT* 5a = Jongeling 2008: *Oea* N 1); *IRT2009* 229 (= *IPT* 5b = Jongeling 2008: *Oea* N 2)

⁵ *IRT2009* 318, 321, 322, 323 and 347

⁶ Wilson (2012: 280). Calquing is the term given to the translation of “morphologically complex foreign expressions by means of novel combinations of native elements that match the meanings and the structure of the foreign expressions and their component parts”, see Hock and Joseph (1996: 264). For detailed discussion with examples, see Adam (2003: 459-468).

⁷ *IRT2009* 275, 269; 553, 567 and 603

⁸ *IRT2009* 95

⁹ Although well-attested in studies on the epigraphy of Lepcis Magna, the languages of the bilingual inscriptions have only been considered together, as parts of the same text, only recently. Both the 1952 and 2009 publications of the *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* gave the Latin and the Greek and indicated when neo-Punic appeared on the stone but did not provide the neo-Punic texts. Similarly, the *Iscrizioni puniche della Tripolitania* (1987) gave only the Punic texts. The inscriptions have been published with all languages recorded and translations for each part in Jongeling (2008); Quinn (2010: 52-69); Wilson (2012: 265-316). Fontana (2001: 161-172) offers a good discussion of the bilingual funerary inscriptions.

¹⁰ See Macmullen (2000: 35-42) and Masturzo (2003) for the strongest arguments for the evidence of Romanization in Tripolitania.

¹¹ Wilson (2012: 280). Calquing is the term given to the translation of “morphologically complex foreign expressions by means of novel combinations of native elements that match the meanings and the structure of the foreign expressions and their component parts”, see Hock and Joseph (1996: 264). For detailed discussion with examples, see Adam (2003: 459-468).

¹² For the declaration of a King as a “friend and ally” of Rome, Braund (1984) remains the definitive study.

¹³ For detailed discussion of these terms and the frequency of their use, see Veligianni (2001: 63-80); Heller (2017: 1-20) has identified the frequency with which these titles appear in a study of more than 20,000 inscriptions, and particularly when and how they are used in the titles of priests and high priests.

¹⁴ See e.g. Veligianni (2001: 63080). Heller's study (2017: 1-20) refutes this argument, using quantitative evidence to demonstrate that when attributed to priests and high priests, the titles expressed loyalty to a city or community with greater frequency than to the emperor.

¹⁵ Lapidary inscriptions were represented in Tripolitania in both urban centres and rural settlements in a number of different languages, including Libyan, Punic, neo-Punic (the cursive form of the Phoenician-Punic script that emerged in North Africa after the sack of Carthage in 146 BCE), Latino Punic (Punic written in the Greek or Latin alphabets), as well as the vast numbers inscribed in Greek and Latin. See Cooley (2012, 251); Amadasi Guzzo (2005: 95-103) for discussion of the difference between Phoenician, Punic and neo-Punic. Karel Jongeling's *Handbook of Neo-Punic* (2008) notes roughly 600 inscriptions in neo-Punic carved on stone in the eastern Maghreb and Tripolitania, of which 68 are from the city of Lepcis Magna.

¹⁶ For detailed discussion of the theatre see Caputo (1987); Sear (2006: pp. 281-282)

¹⁷ *IRT2009* 319 (= *IPT* 21 = Jongeling (2008) *Labdah* N 14). The Macellum building was constructed by the same Annobal Tapapius Rufus in the northern centre of the city in 8 BCE. The dedicatory inscription is in Latin and neo-Punic, but the texts are not on the same stone. The Latin inscription is found on the exterior of the building, and the Punic within. For discussion of the inscription, see Adams (2002: 222-224); Wilson (2012: 274-278). For analysis and discussion of the Macellum building, see De Ruyt (1983: 284-303). The theory advanced by Gaggiotti (1990: 783-792) that the Macellum structure has Punic origins has been decisively rejected by Wilson (2012: 274, n. 21).

¹⁸ *IRT2009* 323

¹⁹ *IRT2009* 321 and 322 (= *IPT* 24 = Jongeling (2008) *Labdah* N 16)

²⁰ For Roman naming practice, see Salway (1994: 124-145); Salomies (1987). For naming practice in the Greek-speaking Eastern Mediterranean, see Balzat (2019: chp. 10); Ferrary (2008: 247-278)

²¹ *IRT2009* 319: **a**: [Imp(erator) Caesar Divi f(ilius) Augustus] co(n)s(ul) XI imp(erator) XIII trib(unicia) pot(estate) XV pont(ifex) m(axi)mus; **b**: M(arco) Licinio M(arci) f(ilio) Crasso Frugi co(n)s(ule) augure proco(n)s(ule) patrono flaminib(us) August(i) Caesaris Iddib[a]le Arinis f(ilio) [- - -]one [et· ? ·· A]nnobalis [f(ilio) - - -]on[- - -] [su]feti(b(us) M[uttun] Annonis f(ilio) ·· ? ··]; **c** Annobal «Himilcho» f(ilius) Tapapius Rufus sufes flamen praefectus sacrorum de sua pequ[nia] faciun[dum] coe[ravit] idem[que] de[d]icavit

²² See Amadasi Guzzo (1986: 21-51)

²³ Punic and neo-Punic names in Tripolitania were typically formulated of two parts, the first a personal name and the second a family name, followed by their filiation, indicated by the Punic BN, or ‘son of’. For discussion of Punic naming practices and closer analysis of their Latinisation, see Amadasi Guzzo (1986: 21-51); Amadasi Guzzo (1999: 23-33); Birley (1988: 1-19); Fontana (2001: 161-172, esp. 168)

²⁴ *CIL* X, 810, 811. For the Eumachia building, see Zanker (1998: 93-102)

²⁵ Jongeling (2008: 389); Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995: I, 343-344)

²⁶ Jongeling (2008: 388); Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995: I, 439-442)

²⁷ *IPT* 24, p. 60: “Si potrebbe pensare che una conoscenza perfetta, quindi totale, implichi necessariamente una Concordia: da qui la corrispondenza delle due espressioni (da un significativo letterale, l’espressione punica avrebbe assunto un senso traslato).”

²⁸ Jongeling (2008: 383); Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995: I, 109-112)

²⁹ Jongeling (2008: 385); Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995: I, 171). *IPT* 27 explains it literally as “he who loves the sons of the people” (“colui che ama i figli del popolo”), with “the people” representing the citizen body.

³⁰ Jongeling (2008: 25 and 408); Hoftijzer and Jongeling (1995: II, 1187). The *yiphil*

³¹ For example, in the Punic names B^oLŠLK and B^oLŠYLK (Latinised as *Balsillecus*, see *CIL* VIII, 1249). For further examples of the *piel* participial in names, see Benz (1972: 416-417)

³² *IPT* 27, p. 68 notes that Bertinelli Angeli (1950: 51) translated the Punic *bn^o m mšlk* as “colui che salva i membri del popolo” thus rendered the Latin as *servator patriae*.

³³ Examples of coins bearing this symbol can be found at *Roman Republican Coinage* 494.

³⁴ For example, Cohen 338; *BMCRE* 200; *RIC* I 420.

http://numismatics.org/crro/results?q=issuer_facet:%22C.%20Vibius%20Varus%22

³⁵ *IRT2009* 269. See *Appendix* for full texts of the following inscriptions.

³⁶ The statue is now in Tripoli Museum, inv. no. 208/54.

³⁷ *IRT2009* 275

³⁸ *IRT2009* 318 and 347 (= *IPT* 27 = Jongeling (2008) *Labdah* N 20)

³⁹ “Onori municipali, di carattere prettamente nazionale”. The same titles appear in *IRT2009*, 275 (119-120 CE); *IRT2009* 567 (4th century CE) and *IRT2009* 603 (3rd- 4th century CE).

⁴⁰ *IRT2009* 553

⁴¹ *IRT2009* 553 and 603

⁴² “La precisione dei raffronti tra la tradizione epigrafica lepcitana (con le sue propaggini) e quella italiana, e l’anteriorità di quest’ultima, conferiscono di conseguenza all’ipotesi di una *diretta* origine ellenistica della formule lepcitane un valore analogico, più che quello di uno stringente rapporto genetico fondato su un preciso nesso lessicale. In mancanza di ulteriori indizi, la filiazione diretta delle formule lepcitane va invece ricercata (con esito positivo, come si è visto), nel quadro ideologico dell’urbanismo romano, particolarmente italico, e nelle tradizioni epigrafiche che lo esprimono.”

⁴³ Mugnai (*forthcoming* n. 10 for bibliography). I am very grateful to Dr Niccolò Mugnai for sharing his paper in advance of publication, and for his invaluable comments on this research. See also Bianchi (2005: 189-223); Bigi (2006: 2351-75) and Rocco (2010: 22-36).

⁴⁴ See Di Vita (1976: 273-285) and (1984: 858-877). See also Quinn (2013: 179-215) and Stucchi (1987: 249-377) for discussion of the influence of Alexandrian architectural forms in Cyrenaica and beyond.

⁴⁵ Bigi (2006: 2359-60) notes, for example, the ‘diagonal’ capitals that are present in Lepcis largely in the Julio-Claudian era, which depict large palmettes between ornate volutes, which converge from the base to the centre along a diagonal line, a similar form of which is known from Pozzuoli.

⁴⁶ For the Punic building forms, see Pensabene (1986: 285-429); Ward-Perkins (1971: 101-144). For comparison of the different styles evident at Lepcis Magna, see Bianchi (2005: 189-223) and Bigi (2006: 2351-2375)

⁴⁷ Lepcis had been brought under Roman control following the end of the Second Punic War in 146 BCE. The city had later appealed for an alliance of *societas*, or friendship, against the Numidians during the Jugurthan War, which was rescinded during the civil war between Julius Caesar and Pompey when the city allied with Juba, resulting in a fine of three million pounds of olive oil from the victorious Caesar, but an alliance was struck again during the early Principate. At an uncertain date between 74-77 CE, Lepcis was rewarded with an honorary promotion to a *municipium*, and in 109 CE elevated further as an official 'colony' of Rome. This latter honour was especially significant, as most *coloniae* in Africa at this point, even in the early second century CE, were set up for military veterans who were already Roman citizens, see Romanelli (1925); Mattingly (2011). For other *civitates liberae et immunes*, see Ferrary (1999: 69-84); Guerber (2009: 33-78).

⁴⁸ Mattingly (1995: 51-3)