

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. 290 = *SEG* XLVIII.913
= *AE* 1998.1180; cf. Stefan 2004: 282-3

diuis Dio[cletiano] et Cons[tantio et]
Gal(erio) Maximi[ano Augg(ustis)]
[[θεοίς] Σεβ[αστοίς — — — —]
[- - - -]
(5) [- - - -]
[- - - -]
Κωσταν [— — — — — — — — — —]
Ούαλ(ερίω) Φλ(αβίω) [— — — —]
καὶ Φλαβίω [— — — — — — — — — —]
(10) καὶ ὑοῖς <Σ>εβα[στῶν — — —]
καὶ Γαλ(ερίω) Ούαλ(ερίω) [Μαξιμίνω]
καὶ Φλαβίω [Κωνσταντίνω]
vacat
ἢ Ἡρακλ[εωτῶν]
πόλις



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(ερίω) Ούαλ(ερίω) [Μαξιμίνω(?)]
(10) καὶ Φλαβίω Ούαλ(ερίω)
Κωστ[αντίνω(?)]
ἢ Ἡρακλεωτῶν
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 *inscripciones* di alcune costituzioni di Diocleziano,' in *BIDR* 15 (1973) 245-70 (cf. *Mélanges Seston*: 489-508) [repr. *Scritti Giuridici V* (Antiqua 65; Naples, 1993) 373-98]

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 [[θεοίς] Σεβ[αστοίς], 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 *Divus Constantius, Divus Maximianus Senior* 310 and *Divus Maximianus Junior* 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 l. 9 refers to Diocletian as ἐν θεοίς. 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?