

# REVISTA CICSA

serie nouă



**XI/2025**

Consiliul Științific/ Scientific Board:

Prof. Dr. Paolo **Carafa** – Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

Prof. Dr. Carol **Căpiță** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Dr. Miron **Ciho** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Assist. Prof. Dr. Emna **Ghith-Hmissa** – University of Sousse, Tunisia

Prof. Dr. Andreas **Gutsfeld** – Université de Lorraine (Nancy 2), France

Prof. Dr. emer. Antal **Lukacs** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Dr. Ecaterina **Lung** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Prof. Dr. emer. Gheorghe-Vlad **Nistor** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Dr. Cristian Eduard **Ștefan** – Institute of Archaeology „V. Pârvan”, Bucharest, România

Prof. Dr. Christoph **Uehlinger** – Universität Zürich, Switzerland

Dr. Mădălina **Vârtejanu-Joubert** – Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales  
(INALCO), Paris, France

Prof. Dr. Anton Carl **van Vollenhoven** – North-West University, South Africa

Lect. Dr. Daniela **Zaharia** – University of Bucharest, Romania

Comitetul de Redacție/ Editorial Board

Florica (**Bohîlțea**) **Mihuț** – University of Bucharest

Diana **Pavel** – University of Bucharest

Mădălina-Teodora **Comănescu** – Site Administrator

ISSN 2457 – 3809

ISSN – L 2457 – 3809

<https://cicsaunibuc.wordpress.com/revista/revista-online>

## Cuprins/ Contents

### Studii/ Studies

#### A. Papers of the International Colloquium on “Epistolography, knowledge, and the Ancient World”, Bucharest, October 3-4, 2025

Carlos HEREDIA CHIMENO – Letters from a Broken Republic: Cicero’s Correspondence and Constitutional Transgression (91–79 BCE) .....	5-17
Florentina NICOLAE – The Silence of Men, reflected in “Heroides”, the imaginary letters of love written by Publius Ovidius Naso.....	18-25
Lorenzo MONACO – L’immagine delle campagne daciche traianee e di Decebalo in Plinio il Giovane, <i>Ep.</i> , 8. 4. 2.....	26-38
Jörg VON ALVENSLEBEN – Fronto’s letter <i>De nepote amisso</i> as lament, self-consolation and self-reflection.....	39-49
Giovanni TAGLIALATELA – Die Verwirklichung des quintilianischen Lehrideals in Fronto Pädagogische Tugenden und Lehren durch Briefe.....	50-68
Mariana BODNARUK – Inscribing Senatorial Authority: Epigraphic Epistles and Senatorial Legislation from Constantine I to Theodosius I.....	69-89
Ethan CHILCOTT – <i>Varietas</i> in the <i>Variae</i> : Erudition and Audience in Cassiodorus’ <i>Epistles</i> ...90-113	
Lorenzo MONACO – <i>Licet interdum confabulationis tale conuiuium doctrinae quoque sale conditur</i> : Jerome’s letters to Marcella, and biblical exegesis in epistolary form.....	114-127
Titus SARKAR, Letters of Obligation: Debt, Trust and Moral Economy in the Lekhapaddhati.....	128-140

#### B. Papers of the 13<sup>th</sup> annual session of CICSA, “Circulația persoanelor, a bunurilor și a ideilor (din Preistorie în Antichitatea Târzie)”/ ‘Movement of persons, goods, and ideas (from Prehistory to the Late Antiquity)’, Bucharest, April 25-26, 2025

Ioana-Teodora STAN – The Panathenaic amphorae: an instrument for the propagation of Athens’ discourse and a subject of symbolic conflict.....	141-150
Ana-Maria BALȚĂ – When distance is not an obstacle. Several preliminary considerations on <i>Liberalitas</i> coin types of <i>Nikopolis ad Istrum</i> and <i>Marcianopolis</i> .....	151-166

Aurelia PARASCHIV, Alexandra-Clara ȚÂRLEA – Roman glass vessels in funerary contexts from Tomis and Callatis. A reassessment of older publications.....167-194

### C. Interpretări și analize/ Interpretations and Analyses

Darius COVACIU – The ecclesiastic status of the see of Tomis between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> centuries. Reading notes on Ionuț Holubeanu’s research.....195-211

### D. Recenzii și prezentări de carte / Reviews and Book Presentations

Sergiu Popovici, *Cultura Usatovo. Arheologia funerară a unei societăți din epoca bronzului*, Târgoviște, Editura Cetatea de Scaun, 2023, 475 pag., ISBN 978-606-537-623-6 – Elena FERARU.....212-214

Anthony A. Barrett și John C. Yardley, *The Emperor Caligula in the Ancient Sources*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2023, 203 pag., ISBN 978-0-19-885457-9 – Andreea Luisa MIHAL.....215-218

Eckart Frahm, *Assyria. The Rise and Fall of the World’s First Empire*, New York, Basic Books, 2023, 528 pag., ISBN: 9781541674400 – George Cătălin ROBESCU .....219-221

Daniel Unruh, *Talking to Tyrants in Classical Greek Thought*, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2023, VIII+272 pag., ISBN 978-1-78962-123-5, ISBNe 978-1-78962-426-7 – Ioana-Teodora STAN....  
.....222-224

Daniela Zaharia, Vladimir Crețulescu (coords), *Sensibilități, obsesii, fobii și istoriile lor neașteptate / Sensitivities, Obsessions, Phobias, and Their Intriguing Histories*, 2024, Editura Universității din București, 282 pag., ISBN: 978-606-16-1499-8 – Cristina POPESCU.....225-227

Plutarh, *Vorbele de duh ale spartanilor*, traducere din greaca veche, studiu introductiv și note de Liviu Mihail Iancu, ilustrații de Mihail Coșulețu, București, Editura Humanitas, 2024, 200 pag., ISBN 978-973-50-8647-3 – Florica (BOHÎLȚEA) MIHUȚ.....228-231

### E. Rezumate teze de licență și disertație/ Abstracts of Bachelor and Master Theses

Maria-Irina SOCOLAN – *A Comparative Analysis of Mithraic Imagery: The Regional Adaptation of the Tauroctony in Dacia*, (abstract of the Bachelor’s Thesis, 2025).....232-245

**Cronica activității CICSA, anul 2025**, Florica (BOHÎLȚEA) MIHUȚ.....246-247

# Inscribing Senatorial Authority: Epigraphic Epistles and Senatorial Legislation from Constantine I to Theodosius I

Mariana BODNARUK,  
University of Warsaw

<https://www.doi.org/10.31178/cicsa.2025.11.6>

**Abstract:** Imperial epistles (*sacrae litterae*), which conveyed the emperor's laws and decrees, were inscribed throughout the empire. Imperial functionaries of the senatorial order in the provinces were the most common recipients of these communications. As a new form of late antique honorific commemoration, honorific inscriptions reproducing imperial letters were set up for the high-ranking members of the aristocracy in Rome and Constantinople. However, the preserved legal inscriptions show that official utterances by high-standing senatorial officials, for which public posting is likely to have taken place, could be also recorded by inscribing in stone in the East and West. This article examines a small dossier of epigraphic *epistulae* by prefects and governors in the regional administration of the late Roman Empire. It argues that the legal inscriptions of officeholders in the provinces – recorded in the form of epistles in Latin and Greek – testify to the legislative means of the senatorial elite in the imperial service. The inscription in the public archives of the (fragmentary extant) prefectorial and proconsular letters, even if valid within the narrow jurisdiction, served to memorialize the laws issued by the imperial officials, whose authority derived from their appointment by the “sacred” ruler.

**Keywords:** epistolography, epigraphic epistles, edicts, senatorial aristocracy, late Roman Empire.

## Introduction

One of the principal means by which late Roman emperors exercised their legislative authority was through pronouncements designed for general observance. These were issued, most commonly, either as edicts (*edicta*) transmitted to the public or as letters (*epistulae*) dispatched to prefects and provincial governors, whose duty it was to promulgate them locally by means of their own edicts.<sup>1</sup> Such communications were made known by public reading and display in

---

This paper was presented at the *Epistolography, Knowledge, and the Ancient World* conference at the University of Bucharest on October 3–4, 202, and I am grateful to the organizers for their valuable comments. This study was supported by the European Commission with a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowship for the Research Project "Mapping the Central Administration in the Later Roman Empire: The Epigraphic Representation and Elite Networks of the Palatine Bureaucracy" (Grant agreement: 101152703) at the University of Warsaw. Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. (n.a)

<sup>1</sup> The emperor could order that a law be publicized to all concerned by instructing the praetorian prefect to forward it by means of letters to provincial governors, who would then display it under their own edicts—an arrangement attested by a law recording both the imperial directive and its execution in Africa (*Sirm.* 12), and by another showing that the prefect could add written emphasis when addressing governors (*Sirm.* 6)—see Matthews 2000, 163. On late

prominent civic spaces – most often through notices written on papyrus, linen sheets, or wooden panels, and, when a more permanent record was preferred, inscribed in stone or bronze. In contrast to rescripts and decrees, which primarily addressed specific legal disputes, edicts and letters could concern any matter that drew the emperor’s attention or required his intervention. It is these broader, general pronouncements – rather than judicial decisions – that late Roman juristic sources denote by the term *leges*. Imperial rulings did not all possess identical legal weight, nor did they appear in a single standardized format. Depending on their purpose and audience, some took the shape of edicts – formal proclamations addressed to the general populace – while others were conveyed, most prominently, as letters directed to particular office-holders, serving as administrative or legislative instructions.<sup>2</sup>

Imperial letters (*sacrae litterae*) were recognizable not only by their official seal but also by a distinctive style of script. In a law issued by Valentinian I to the proconsul of Africa, the emperor reaffirmed that this special form of writing was reserved for the emperor alone and prohibited its unauthorized imitation by provincial officials in their correspondence with the ruler. According to the law, the emperor had noticed that the governor’s bureau had begun imitating the “celestial letters” (*caelestes litterae*) used in imperial documents, employing the same script as the emperor’s chancery when submitting legal referrals and reports to the court. Valentinian denounced this practice (as fostering forgery), declaring that all correspondence from provincial governors must henceforth be written in ordinary script (*communibus litteris*), and that no individual should be allowed, publicly or privately, to reproduce the imperial style (*stili huius exemplum*).<sup>3</sup> Was this distinctive script preserved in legislative inscriptions? How did the publication of imperial letters carved in stone differ from the posting of epistles from prefects and governors? Before an imperial law was officially promulgated in a public setting and permanently displayed – whether carved in stone or otherwise – it was first received through a formal ceremony marking the arrival of the “divine writing” in the cities of the empire. Participation in this event, as evidenced by a letter from the proconsul of Africa to Constantine I and a contemporary Greek legal text, involved ritual gestures such as the “embracing and

---

Roman legal system in general, see Mousourakis 2007. On the fourth-century legislation, see Harries 1999; Matthews 2000; Sirks 2007; Schmidt-Hofner 2008; Schmidt-Hofner 2010.

<sup>2</sup> Matthews 2000, 17. *CTh* 1.1.5 (429) stipulates that when conveyed through the “sacred imperial letters,” the law must be received by the bureaus (*scrinia*) throughout the entire empire and “published with the due formality of edicts.”

<sup>3</sup> *CTh* 9.19.3 (367), with Matthews 2000, 188.

kissing” of the imperial edicts.<sup>4</sup> Yet this raises the question: under what circumstance were the letters of prefects or governors received and read aloud?

The imperial legislation could manifest in a variety of forms. First, there are the pronouncements addressed to the senate as imperial orations (or issued directly as edicts), originating either from the emperor’s own initiative or another occasion. Second, there are imperial constitutions sent to provincial governors or high-ranking officials in regional and urban administration, made public through their edicts, giving them general applicability. This latter category comprises the vast majority of the texts in the *Theodosian Code*, most of which take the form of epistles to public officials. However, only a small number of imperial laws explicitly mention that they were officially posted by provincial governors under their own edicts. This is because before the law of 426, those transcribing the constitutions did not consider such procedural details necessary to confirm the law’s general validity. The authority of a law depended on the emperor’s intent in issuing it, not on whether it happened to be published by a governor according to administrative practice; thus, compilers focused on the content of the law rather than the formalities of its publicizing. As John Matthews notes, only after 426 editors of the *Code* faced the question of whether letters (*epistulae*) not explicitly recorded as having been posted by governors still counted as general laws. In practice, the *Code*’s compilers likely assumed that any law dispatched as an imperial letter to a governor carried the force of general validity, even without a surviving record of its formal promulgation (by posting).<sup>5</sup>

The emperors commonly pronounced on various matters in epistles to public officials. In an *epistula*, the header mentions the recipient, and the body of the text uses the second-person singular when addressing a prefect or provincial governor. This feature is characteristic of the epistolary style and begins with an *inscriptio* in the dative, addressing the official by name. In contrast, an *edictum* is defined by its lack of a designated recipient, requiring the verb characteristic of the edict *dicit* after the *intitulatio*.<sup>6</sup> Neither *epistula* nor *edictum* in the strict sense, an imperial encyclical letter was a circular addressing multiple recipients, with none of them individually named in the *praescriptio*. Similarly, an ordinance issued by the prefect could be preceded by an *intitulatio* without *inscriptio*: neither an epistle nor an edict *stricto sensu*, it was nevertheless, a kind of a circular or *forma generalis* concerning several provinces.<sup>7</sup> However, these distinctions between the forms of law were not rigid, especially when legal

---

<sup>4</sup> Proconsul’s letter to Constantine: Augustine, *Epistula* 88.2. Law: Riccobono et al. 1943, no. 101. See Matthews 2000, 181–82, 187–89.

<sup>5</sup> *CTh* 1.1.5 (*ad senatum*). Matthews 2000, 66–67, with n.27.

<sup>6</sup> Feissel 2010, 445.

<sup>7</sup> *SEG* 44, 909 (480). See Feissel 2010, 486 n.58.

documents show signs of confusion between genres. For example, the absence of an *inscriptio* designating the recipient means that it is not an *epistula*, even though the document's subjective style, as opposed to the objective style of an *edictum*, makes it more akin to one.<sup>8</sup>

The epigraphic record from the late Roman state contains a significant number of pronouncements made public by letter, edict, or decree. Among them, some imperial *epistulae* by which the legislation was communicated to the administrative departments and to local audiences are preserved inscriptionally. Many of the surviving epigraphic texts are copies of imperial letters, addressed to specific officials and with limited territorial application, of laws formulated in more general terms which had not been recovered. This article investigates an epigraphic dossier of laws in a form of epistles issued and posted in the cities across the empire under imperial office-holders' authority. The *Sirmondian Constitutions* demonstrate that praetorian prefects were routinely ordered, upon receipt of imperial laws, to transmit them to provincial governors together with letters directing the governors to promulgate the documents by posting edicts.<sup>9</sup> When this intermediary correspondence is noted, it appears under the formula *antelata* or *praelata litteris*, or a similar subscription, signifying that the imperial law was enclosed with the prefect's or governor's covering letter.<sup>10</sup> This article analyzes a select group of epigraphic *epistulae* issued by the fourth-century senatorial prefects and provincial governors within the administrative framework of the late Roman Empire. It contends that these legislative inscriptions – preserved inscriptionally in the form of official letters, chiseled in stone – reveal the active juridical and administrative agency of the senatorial office-holders, demonstrating their role as a governing class that both implemented and shaped imperial authority through the written instruments of law.

### Inscribed Imperial Orations *ad Senatum* as a Medium of Epistolary Communication

Extant inscribed Late Roman imperial orations (*orationes*) to the senate testify to the participation of senators in epistolary communication with the emperor. The *sacrae litterae* –

---

<sup>8</sup> Feissel 2010, 486.

<sup>9</sup> *Sirm.* 9 offers perhaps the clearest articulation of this procedure: the prefect is told to notify everyone through letters to the provincial governors so that “edicts posted in the accustomed manner” will make the regulation publicly known everywhere. Comparable formulae recur at the close of nearly all Theodosius’ and the majority of Valentinian’s *Novels*, attesting the regularity of this mechanism for imperial promulgation. *Sirm.* 12 illustrates the full sequence from the imperial law’s transmission to its public posting by the proconsul (the only omitted step here, however, is the explicit mention of the “letters” through which the prefect would send the constitution to the proconsul with instructions to promulgate it by edict). See Matthews 2000, 186.

<sup>10</sup> Compare the similar phrasing for the edicts: “*sub edicto*” (*Nov. Val.* 27) and “*antelata edicto*” (*Nov. Val.* 21.1, 23, and 25), meaning that the emperor’s law was “prefixed to” or “placed” before the prefectural edict; see Matthews 2000, 186 n.62. See also Lactantius, *De Mortibus Persecutorum*, 48.12; *P. Cairo Isid.* I; with Corcoran 1996, 158–60, 174–75, 246.



imperial epistles transmitting laws and administrative decisions – were widely disseminated and permanently recorded in stone, bronze, or wood across the empire, including imperial centers. In this context, a remarkable new form of late antique honorific practice emerged in the fourth century: at least seven known inscriptions reproduce imperial letters (*orationes ad senatum*) formally addressed to the senate. These were included as part of honorific dedications for eminent members of the fourth-century office-holding senatorial aristocracy. Such monuments erected in Rome, Constantinople, and other cities of the empire did not merely celebrate individual merit of the aristocratic officials in the imperial government but also embodied the evolving dynamics of imperial-senatorial dialogue, making visible the textual and statuary materialization of communication between emperor and senate.

The senate employed the dedication of honorific statues as a means of formal communication and negotiation of status within the imperial system. This practice is exemplified by at least six fourth-century imperial letters to the senate of Rome (*orationes ad senatum Romanum*) that survive in epigraphic form.<sup>11</sup> Of these, no fewer than five can be associated with honorific monuments in Rome that incorporated inscribed copies of the imperial decisions granting permission for the dedication.<sup>12</sup> This mode of commemoration represented a significant innovation in senatorial representation: it marked a departure from earlier, more collective forms of honor and elevated the recipients – members of the traditional aristocracy – to a distinct and privileged position within the senatorial body. The Forum of Trajan, where most of these monuments were erected, functioned as the most prominent urban setting in Rome for such dedications. Long associated with imperial commemoration, the forum not only celebrated the ruling dynasty but also became a fourth-century venue to monumentalize the highest imperial functionaries among the senatorial elite. Traditionally, this space had hosted statues commissioned by imperial ruling in response to petitions from the senate and the Roman people; in the fourth century, however, it became a locus for articulating the renewed prestige and self-representation of the late Roman aristocracy within the evolving imperial order.<sup>13</sup>

Between the mid-fourth and early fifth centuries, a series of honorific monuments erected in Rome reveal the close interaction between the imperial court and the senate through the medium of inscribed imperial *orationes*. The earliest surviving example, dedicated to the urban prefect L. Aradius Valerius Proculus Populonium (336–337), reproduces a letter from Emperor Constantine and his co-rulers celebrating the prefect's virtues and granting permission for a

---

<sup>11</sup> Weisweiler 2012; Orlandi 2017.

<sup>12</sup> Weisweiler 2012; Orlandi 2017, 408.

<sup>13</sup> Chenault 2012. On petitions, see White 1972.

statue in the Forum of Trajan, where the base was later discovered.<sup>14</sup> Similarly, a gilded bronze statue for L. Aurelius Avianus Symmachus Phosphorius, consul and urban prefect, father of the famous orator, was ordered by Gratian and Valens at the senate's request in 377, also placed at the Forum of Trajan. The inscription, carved on marble and recording the now-lost attached imperial oration (*oratio adposita*), notes that a twin monument of "equal splendor" was to be erected in Constantinople, commemorating the same honorand.<sup>15</sup> A fifth-century example concerns the praetorian prefect Virius Nicomachus Flavianus, whose memory was rehabilitated by decree of Theodosius II and Valentinian III in 431, again through an imperial letter authorizing his posthumous statue in the Forum of Trajan—installed by his grandson Appius Nicomachus Dexter; the inscription omits any mention of the senate's role in erecting the statue.<sup>16</sup> Two further fragmentary inscriptions, both found in the Roman Forum, preserve parts of similar imperial communications granting honorific statues to high-ranking officials, possibly urban prefects.<sup>17</sup> References to a senatorial decree (*decretum senatus amplissimi*) and prestigious setting (*celeberrimus locus*) confirm the legal and honorific contexts of the latter monument erected under Emperors Valentinian and Valens. Together, these monuments demonstrate a distinctive late Roman phenomenon: the integration of imperial epistolography into the fabric of aristocratic honorific display in the cities of Rome and Constantinople. By inscribing imperial letters on statue bases, urban prefects, the heads and "epigraphic spokesmen" of the senate, transformed acts of imperial commemoration into material expressions of aristocratic prestige, political loyalty, and negotiated imperial favor within the most important public spaces of the two imperial centers.

The dedication of Proculus' statue served as an early model for later honors like those given to Symmachus the elder and Nicomachus Flavianus. It contains an official letter sent by the emperor to the senate of Rome (ll. 1-20).<sup>18</sup> The fragmentary marble block measuring 93 × 65 × 24 cm was uncovered in the Forum of Trajan. Only its upper section is preserved, with the lower part broken and missing. The block has been cut down, and all original mouldings are lost. The inscription surface appears roughly worked, perhaps as a result of the erasure of an earlier text. Along the right edge are three post-antique perforations, likely unrelated to the original use of the monument. The top surface bears no evidence of attachment holes that would indicate the presence of a statue above. The inscription reproduces an imperial letter addressed to the senate,

<sup>14</sup> *CIL* VI 40776=LSA-2685.

<sup>15</sup> *CIL* VI 1698=LSA-342+LSA-343.

<sup>16</sup> *CIL* VI 1783=LSA-1247.

<sup>17</sup> *CIL* VI 41357=LSA-1584; *CIL* VI 41344a=LSA-1572. See Machado 2006, 92.

<sup>18</sup> *CIL* VI 40776=AE 1934, 158=EDR073236.

commending the virtues and prestige of Proculus. A distinguished senator from a prominent family, he held several high offices under Constantine and his sons, culminating in the consulship of 340; the imperial titles in the inscription date it to 336–337, when, after serving as count of the first order at Constantinople, he assumed the prefecture of Rome.<sup>19</sup> Although neither the fragmentary block nor the surviving inscription offers definitive proof, the rectangular form of the marble and the honorific content praising Proculus make the identification of the monument as a statue base highly plausible. Moreover, the Forum of Trajan, where the block was found, was a customary location for statue dedications for the senatorial office-holders, typically commissioned by emperors at the request of the senate and people of Rome, reinforcing the likelihood that this piece belonged to such a monument.<sup>20</sup>

The surviving inscription is composed of three elements: the nomenclature and titulature of the ruling imperial college (ll. 1-9), the initial formal greeting from the Augustus and Caesars to the senate of Rome (ll. 10-13), and a letter regarding Proculus's honors (ll. 14-20). The inscription includes the honorific epithets of Emperor Constantine ("pious, fortunate, victorious and triumphant"), his titles ("highest priest (*pontifex maximus*), greatest victor over the Germanic peoples for the fourth time, greatest victor over the Sarmatians for the fourth time, greatest victor over the Goths for the second time, greatest victor over the Dacians, holding the tribunician powers for the thirty-third time, consul for the eighth time, *imperator* for the thirty-second time, father of the fatherland, proconsul"), and the names of his four Caesars with their titles (Flavius Claudius Constantinus, "*victor* over the Alamanni," Flavius Iulius Constantius, Flavius Iulius Constans, and Flavius Iulius Delmatius, "most noble Caesars"). The name of Caesar Delmatius in line 8 was later erased following his death and *damnatio memoriae* in 337. The letters range in height from 2 to 4.5 cm. The names of the ruling emperors are chiseled at a maximum of 4.5 cm, and the greeting and body of the epistle is at a minimum of 2 cm.<sup>21</sup> The greetings are addressed "to the consuls, praetors, tribunes of the plebs and their senate:" "If you and your children are well, it is good. We and our armies are well." The body of the imperial law is separated from the greeting formula on the stone. The preserved fragment reads as follows: "Recalling the distinguished nobility of the ancestry of Proculus, of *clarissimus* rank, and the virtues acknowledged in the private and public performance of his services, conscript fathers, it is easy to value just how much glory Proculus, of *clarissimus* rank, ... received from his

---

<sup>19</sup> *PLRE* I, 747–49 Proculus 11; Kienast 1990, 301–302; Chastagnol 1962, 100.

<sup>20</sup> *LSA*-2685 (C. Machado) See Niquet 2000, 80; Weisweiler 2012, 309–13.

<sup>21</sup> *EDR*073236.

ancestors....”<sup>22</sup> The imperial oration, addressing the members of the senate of Rome (*patres conscripti*) – who likely petitioned the emperor for the statue honors to their most distinguished colleague – praises Proculus for his noble lineage and exemplary public and private virtues. While the preserved text itself does not explicitly mention a statue, it was almost certainly part of a statue monument. Unlike the later honorific inscriptions, such as the one rehabilitating Nicomachus Flavianus, whose public inscriptions were composed of two separate elements – the standard statue dedication, including the *cursus* of the honorand, and an imperial letter addressed to the Roman Senate – Proculus’s inscription does not preserve the dedicatory part.

One further *oratio ad senatum* derives from the eastern court: Emperor Constantius II addressed the senate of Constantinople in a letter whose copy survives inscribed on the Arch of Hadrian at Perge in Pamphylia. The imperial speech *ad senatum Constantinopolitanum* in honor the praetorian prefect Flavius Philippus (c. 344–353) is a long Latin document recently edited by Denis Feissel.<sup>23</sup> The inscription preserves the text of an address delivered in 352 commissioning the erection of statues of the prefect both in Constantinople and in the provincial cities. The pillar of the arch most like carried two different inscriptions: a marble slab with a short honorific dedication naming the honorand and the awarder, and a longer text, cut in two plaques – likely flanking the shorter<sup>24</sup> – that reproduces the imperial communication to the *patres conscripti* of Constantinople requesting that the statues be granted to Philippus by imperial command. Because the dedication in honor of the prefect was not engraved on a statue base, it has been proposed that Philippus’ statue formed part of Hadrian’s Arch rather than standing independently. Yet, since the fragments of the dedication are no longer accessible, only a comprehensive architectural reassessment of the monument could confirm or refute this conjecture, which for now remains speculative. This oration appears to have formed part of the dossier that accompanied Philippus’ honorific monuments and was dispatched with instructions to provincial governors to erect statues on his behalf; the imperial speech itself indicates that Constantinople was to be the first city to receive such a dedication for Philippus, an early member of the eastern senate. The epistle frames the award as a deserved public recognition grounded in his deeds and family’s standing.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Trans. C. Machado, *LSA*-2685.

<sup>23</sup> Feissel 2024.

<sup>24</sup> Şahin 2015, 177–78, no. 1, hypothesized that the Greek inscribed plaque may have been inserted between the twin panels framing the principal Latin inscription. Regardless of their relative arrangement, the Latin inscription and the Greek dedication are complementary: Feissel 2024, 109.

<sup>25</sup> For a series of statue dedications for Philippus, see Bodnaruk 2022; Bodnaruk 2025, 8–9.

In late Roman law, the *orationes ad senatum* were fully epistolary in their written form. Although delivered orally, they were formally transmitted as written with a standard epistolary protocol. Imperial constitutions in the late Roman Empire, including the imperial *orationes*, were structured with a fixed arrangement that made them function as legal letters. The three main parts of this protocol, as found in both legal collections and inscribed monuments, were the inscription that served as the formal address and salutation (the beginning of the letter). It explicitly named the issuers: the full college of legitimate emperors (Augusti and Caesars) in order of seniority, as the source of authority, and the recipient, the specific imperial office-holder, such as the praetorian or urban prefect, or in the case of *orationes*, the senate, to whom the constitution was addressed. The body text contained the imperial decree (or response to the senate's petition). In the case of *orationes ad senatum*, this section contained the text of the speech, which in its final, written form became a binding law. The subscription (*subscriptio*) served as the closing and dating clause (the end of the letter), which formally recorded the circumstances of the document's issuance and typically included the place and date. The use of this format confirmed the document's authenticity and authority, with orations inscribed in a form of *epistulae*.<sup>26</sup>

### Epistolary Forms of Inscribed Prefectorial Legislation

Members of the senatorial order serving as imperial officials in the provinces frequently appeared as the recipients of imperial communications, underscoring their intermediary role between the imperial center and local administration.<sup>27</sup> Imperial legislation was frequently addressed to the praetorian prefects, and several such communications survive in epigraphic form. The corpus of legal inscriptions demonstrates that many imperial pronouncements – which were likely posted publicly – were subsequently inscribed in more durable media (stone, metal, etc.) across both the Greek East and the Latin West. At the same time, legislation was also promulgated by praetorian prefects themselves: first, prefects issued edicts, which are attested epigraphically as part of the monumental and inscriptional record. While the privilege of issuing edicts had contracted – by the high empire non-imperial officials had largely lost the right to issue edicts – the capacity of office-holders other than the emperor to issue enactments did not entirely vanish. Whereas imperial edicts had empire-wide force and conventionally opened with the words “*imperator dicit*,” prefectorial edicts (*edicta praefectorum*) began with “*praefectus*

---

<sup>26</sup> For broader context on the late Roman legal system and the codification of laws, see Matthews 2000.

<sup>27</sup> Feissel 2010.

*edixit.*”<sup>28</sup> An *edictum* was a formal, public proclamation issued by a praetorian prefect (or another high official) in his official capacity, typically displayed in public spaces and occasionally inscribed in stone. It had normative or regulatory authority, addressing a general audience – much like an imperial *edictum*. Yet several questions arise: Did ordinary Romans recognize that a prefect issuing an edict acted merely as the emperor’s delegate? Why did imperial constitutions require confirmation through a prefect’s edict or other official instrument? And to what degree could such officials introduce their own innovations? While certain answers remain elusive, the surviving edicts illuminate how imperial administrators contributed to the formulation and transmission of Roman law, materialized in public inscriptions.

Preserved examples from the late Roman period show that the latter edicts frequently accompanied constitutions issued by the emperor. A striking case is a copy of Julian’s letter (*CTh* 1.16.8=*CJ* 3.3.5) (*exemplum sacrarum litterarum*) regarding the administration of justice, which was posted on the island of Amorgos via the now very fragmentary Latin edict of the praetorian prefect of the East, Saturninus Secundus Salutius: the fragments re-examined by Denis Feissel form part of an imperial epistle sent to the prefect on 28 July 362 that was published together with the prefect’s own edict, which follows the emperor’s letter. The inscriptional record on Amorgos thus preserves both the imperial communication and the prefectorial edict – greetings and a copy of the prefect’s edict, issued by the prefect’s bureau (then stationed in Antioch with the emperor), were carved on Amorgos by the *praeses Insularum*. The imperial constitution, in a form of an *epistula*, was sent to Salutius, who in turn circulated it to the governors of the eastern prefecture – explicitly including the governor of the province of the Islands (where Amorgos lay) seated at Rhodes. Thus, the inscription from Amorgos most plausibly represents a subsequent copy of the letter as dispatched by the prefect’s administration.<sup>29</sup> The constitution transmitted to the provinces is followed by an edict of promulgation by the prefect: the letter of an office-holder whose duty was to convey the imperial law. Although the inscription might record a governor’s edict, the administrative hierarchy makes it far more probable that the fragments belong to the edict issued by the prefect – a conclusion further supported by indications within the surviving text itself. The prefect’s edict was the official promulgation or transmission act, by which the official communicated and enforced the imperial law in the provinces.<sup>30</sup> The legal nature of such non-imperial

<sup>28</sup> *PG* XLV, col. 1751: *Volusianus praefectus edixit*.

<sup>29</sup> *CIL* III 459=*AE* 2000, 1370a. Feissel 2010, 216.

<sup>30</sup> *CTh* 7.13.11 (382) was probably part of an edict of the praetorian prefect of the Orient sent on to a provincial governor. See also *CTh* 5.14.34; 8.1.8, 4.6; 16.2.12, 15, for other cases.

pronouncement, beginning with a standard formula (“*praefectus dicit...*”), was that of a public edict.

Second, prefectorial letters (*litterae*) represented another form of legislative or administrative communication issued by the praetorian prefects. A representative mid-fourth-century instance of a rare *praelata litteris* subscription preserved in the *Codex Theodosianus* records an imperial law sent to the praetorian prefect, who transmitted it (to subordinate officials under his jurisdiction) through his own letter to which the imperial letter was attached.<sup>31</sup> An *epistula* of the praetorian prefect was a letter or communication, usually addressed to a specific person or body (e.g. a provincial governor or a city council). While it could transmit legal or administrative instructions, it did not have the same public, general, or legislative character as an *edictum*. Only a handful of such documents survive, and among them are two unpublished prefectorial letters from Delphi, both addressed to Flavius Felicianus, a former *comes* and priest of Apollo, likely between 342 and 344. These Greek epistles were issued collectively by a college of prefects. According to Polymnia Athanassiadi’s reconstruction, Felicianus initially appealed to his former colleague, Fabius Titianus, consul in 337 and later praetorian prefect of Gaul, seeking a formal ruling to secure the continuation of Apollo’s cult and the oracle’s activities at Delphi. Titianus subsequently brought the issue to his fellow prefects – Flavius Leontius, praetorian prefect of the East, and Furius Placidus, praetorian prefect of Italy – who consented to respond jointly. In their first collective letter, the three prefects struck a tone of measured authority and deference, assuring Felicianus of their protection: anyone interfering with his priestly functions would face exile and a monetary penalty. However, Felicianus later renewed his appeal, prompting a second letter from the same prefects. Although this second communication survives only in fragments, it likely followed the same conciliatory and supportive pattern as the first. Ultimately, the council of the *δαμιουργοί* passed a ruling ordering both prefectorial letters to be displayed publicly as stone inscriptions, thereby formally concluding the matter and reaffirming the prefects’ role as intermediaries between imperial authority and local religious institutions.

The letters were most likely authored by Placidus, as Delphi fell within his jurisdiction; they were originally composed in Latin and subsequently translated into Greek. The first inscription begins with the words “Letters sealed by decision of the demiurges and engraved in the public archives” (*Ἐπιστολαὶ δαμιουργῶν δόγματι ἐσφ[ρα][γισμέναι καὶ εἰς τὰ δημ]όσια χαραχθεῖσαι*) and is followed by a salutation of the priest by the prefects: “*Fl(avius) Dom(itius)*

---

<sup>31</sup> *CTh* 8.4.6 (358) (*data epistula praefecto cui haec sacra fuerat antelata*). See Matthews 2000, 187 n.63.

*Leontius, Fa(bius) Titianus, Fur(ius) Placidus to the former count Fl(avius) Felicianus greeting.*” The *subscriptio* reads as follows: “We wish you health and wellness” (ἐρρωῶ[σθαί σε κα]ὶ εὐτυχεῖν εὐχόμεθα). The second inscription starts with the identical greeting, while the subscription is not preserved. These two fragments of letters originally belonged to a white marble slab that had been mounted in the public archives of Delphi, where official records were kept and displayed. These two legislative inscriptions were official letters, the joint communications of the praetorian prefects to the aristocratic priest, even if they personalized the matter.

Only a few inscriptions preserving legal acts sent to or issued by urban prefects have survived. Some imperial constitutions addressed to city prefects are known from epigraphic sources – for example, a law of Valentinian I (or II) in favor of St. Peter’s Basilica, probably addressed to Eutherius.<sup>32</sup> Prefectorial edicts, similar to imperial ones, typically opened with the formula “*urbi praefectus dicit*,”<sup>33</sup> and a number of their inscribed copies are extant. Epigraphic evidence of prefectorial edicts from Rome largely pertains to the *annona* corporations and the regulation of urban provisioning. Two edicts issued by the city prefect Turcius Apronianus in 362–363, for example, address the reorganization of the meat market and the operation of the *pecuarii* and *suarii*.<sup>34</sup> Both open with an *ex auctoritate* clause typical of official edicts: *Ex auctoritate Turci Aproniani, u(iri) c(larissimi), praefecti urbis*, followed by the law. Another fourth-century edict, preserved only in fragments, appears to concern the administration of the city’s wine distribution.<sup>35</sup> Yet another edict, promulgated by Taraccius Bassus in 375/376, regulates the activities of the *tabernarii* guild.<sup>36</sup> Additionally, three fragments, postdating 374, record topographically arranged lists of names and were produced under the authority of the same urban prefect; they originate from several sites in Rome, including the Basilica Iulia in the Forum Romanum.<sup>37</sup> Although incomplete, these inscriptionally preserved documents shed light on the prefect’s *ius edicendi* – the right to issue edicts – and on the mechanisms by which such laws were publicly displayed and disseminated. They were intended for public posting (*sub conspectu publico*), a hallmark of *edicta*. The publication of laws by city prefects involved a

<sup>32</sup> CIL VI 31982=ICUR II 4099: [Imp. Caess. FFl. Valentinianus Valens et Gratianus PPP. FFF. se]mper Auggg. Fl(avio) Eutherio suo salute[m].

<sup>33</sup> CIL VI 1711=CIL VI 31908: Claudius Iulius Ecclesius Dynamius, v(iri) c(larissimus) et tñl(ustris), urb(i) praef(ectus) d(icit).

<sup>34</sup> CIL VI 1770; CIL 6 1771.

<sup>35</sup> CIL VI 1785.

<sup>36</sup> CIL VI 1766.

<sup>37</sup> CIL VI 1766=31894=41328=ILCV 672,1; CIL VI 41329=31893=ILCV 672,3; CIL VI 41330=10099=31899=ILCV 672,2: Ex auctoritate Tarraci Bassi v(iri) c(larissimi) praef(ecti) urb(i).



posted legal-administrative announcement in the prominent spaces of Rome issued to regulate urban economic life. However, these documents by the urban prefects cannot be classified as epistles; they present a different structure and formulae and employ impersonal, normative language. Nonetheless, *epistulae* were sent by the fourth-century city prefects. A rare mid-fourth-century example from the *Theodosian Code* documents a law sent to the urban prefect of Rome, which he then prefixed to his own letters addressed to the provincial governor of one of the Italian provinces (*consularis Campaniae*), who received and published the document at Venafrum.<sup>38</sup>

### Provincial Governors' Epistolary Legislation

The two principal forms of gubernatorial acts were the *edictum* and the *epistula*. These legal documents differed in terms of their protocol and eschatocol. The edict in its strict sense was introduced by stating the governor's name followed by the verb *dicit* and customarily ended with the subscription *proponatur*. In turn, an epistle began with both the author (*intitulatio*) and recipient (*inscriptio*) of the text and concluded with a final salutation followed by the date.<sup>39</sup>

The proconsul possessed the authority to issue edicts and to dispatch official orders to his subordinate administrators. In the East, several examples of such proconsular legislation have been preserved epigraphically from the province of Achaea. For instance, a Greek inscription from Chalkis on the island of Euboeia, dating to 359, records a proconsular edict issued by Publius Ampelius, while in office between 359 and 360.<sup>40</sup> This edict, which includes a list of ἐπιμεληταί (*curatores operum publicorum*), deals with the supervision of public works, notably including the repair of the stoa. It begins with the standard formula introducing an official edict or pronouncement “*proconsul dixit*” (ἀνθύπατος λέγει).<sup>41</sup> A Greek decree (πρόσταγμα) by the same proconsul, likewise dated to 359, was found in Sparta; it also published a list of ἐπιμεληταί, suggesting a systematic effort to regulate civic maintenance across the province.<sup>42</sup> Another Greek proconsular edict, engraved on a marble base at Corinth, the provincial capital and the seat of the proconsul, concerns judicial administration and was issued by Flavius Ulpus

<sup>38</sup> CTh 8.5.22 (365) (*prolata (sic!) litteris sub die XII k. Mart. Rom.; acc. IIII k. Apr. Venabri*). Compare a law prefixed to and published with letters from the count of the sacred bounties, CTh 11.12.4 (407) (*praelata litteris v. inl. com(itis) s(acrarum) l(argitionum)*) and another law addressed to the count of the sacred bounties and dispatched by him with letters to the prefect of Constantinople, CTh 7.8.11 (414) (*praelata litteris ad Eutychianum praef. urbi*). See Matthews 2000, 187 n.63.

<sup>39</sup> Feissel 2010, 212–13.

<sup>40</sup> IG XII, 9, 907: Πούβλιος Ἀμπέλιος ὁ λαμ(πρότατος) ἀνθ(ύπατος) λέγει.

<sup>41</sup> See the restoration of a very fragmentary legal inscription from Carthage, dated to 362–364, CIL VIII 24609: ... [Flavia]nus pro[co(n)s(ul) Africae dixit] ... Octavianus pro[co(n)s(ul) Africae d(icit)] ...

<sup>42</sup> AE 1929, 19=SEG XI 464, 2: Κατὰ πρόσταγμα [τ]οῦ λαμ(πρότατου) ἀνθ(ύπατου) Πούβλιου Ἀμπελίου.

Macarius, governor of Achaëa, in the second half of the fourth century.<sup>43</sup> These laws cannot be classified as epistles on account of their structure, which is not consistent with the characteristics of letters.

By contrast, proconsular letters (*epistulae proconsulis*) adhered strictly to epistolary protocol. For example, the senator Decimius Secundinus, serving as proconsul of Achaëa, addressed a letter to the *curator et defensor Amfissensium* concerning the aqueducts of Amphissa and the illegal appropriation of public water (*aqua publica*).<sup>44</sup> This Latin inscription, discovered in Amphissa, can be dated after 364, since it mentions the office of *defensor*, established in the Illyrican prefecture by that year (*CTh* 1.29.1). The administrative epistle starts with the standard opening formula, identifying the sender (proconsul) and recipient (local civic official), ending with the formal greeting, common in late Roman epistolography (Il.1-4): “Decimius Secundinus, of *clarissimus* rank, proconsul, to the *curator* and *defensor* of the Amfissians, greetings.” The main text of the law begins with reference to an earlier order and issues further administrative commands: to repair and restore the water supply, prevent future usurpation, and mark the cisterns with a lapidary notice (*lapideo titulo posito*). It contains a justification clause and reference to delegation (*gratia agente Hesperio*), typical of provincial administrative style. The closing formula specifies the deadline (*ante diem decimum Kal. Ian.*) for completion and report (*uos ad officium nuntiare debere opto*) and ends with a courteous valediction (*bene ualeatis*), characteristic of formal Roman correspondence. This is a fully preserved proconsular administrative letter issued in epistolary form. It demonstrates the bureaucratic tone of late Roman governance: hierarchical (from proconsul to municipal officials), directive, formulaic, and closing with precise procedural instructions and a farewell clause. Collectively, the legal proconsular inscriptions attest to the continued administrative and legislative activity of proconsuls in late antiquity, as well as their practice of recording official edicts in durable, public form.

In turn, vicars are well attested in legal inscriptions, albeit rare, as shown by the case of Ablabius, probably *uicarius Asiae* in 324–326, who received an imperial letter from Constantine concerning the petition of Orcistus in Phrygia for *ciuitas* status. The emperor’s initial direct rescript (*adnotatio*) mentioned a favorable decision “through the intercession of the vicar” (*uicari intercessione*), while the indirect rescript addressed Ablabius (*grauitatis tuae*

<sup>43</sup> *IG* IV 364: Φλ(άβιος) Οὔλπ(ιος) Μακάριος ὁ λαμ(πρότατος) ἀνθ(ύπατος) (ν) λέγει.

<sup>44</sup> *CIL* 3 568=ILS 5794=IG IX<sup>2</sup> 751: *Decim(ius) Secundinus v(ir) c(larissimus) procons(ul) curat(ori) et defens(ori) Amfissensium salutem.*

*intercessione*).<sup>45</sup> A similar example is Constantius' letter to Marinus, likely vicar of Asiana, ordering the erection of statues for the prefect Philippus in 352 – copies of this imperial letter survive in several epigraphic fragments not only from Ephesus, the governor's seat, but also Alexandria Troas in Hellespontus and Laodicea ad Lycum in Phrygia, both addressed to Marinus.<sup>46</sup> Vicars exercised juridical authority and discharged both judicial and fiscal-administrative duties within their dioceses. In Proconsularis, a fiscal tariff for the African provinces – probably promulgated by the vicar of Africa around 370 – is recorded in a fragmentary Latin inscription (in five pieces) from Carthage, the provincial capital.<sup>47</sup> This vicarial law does not display the epistolary characteristics; it is a fiscal document, focused on payments. The legal inscription corroborates the vicar's judicial and administrative role, referring, according to Feissel, to an act of the vicar Caius Annus Tiberianus.<sup>48</sup> However, vicars did transmit imperial laws through their epistles: for example, the *Codex Theodosianus* attests to a mid-fourth-century law prefixed to letters from the vicar of Spain (*praelata litteris v.c. uicarii*) to a subordinate governor.<sup>49</sup> Here the compilers of the *Code* explicitly cite the date of the vicarial letter, to which the emperor's letter – apparently undated in itself – had been appended.<sup>50</sup> The expression *praelata litteris* signifies “placed before the letter” (of the vicar). Consequently, while the law is addressed to the named vicar, the date recorded in the subscription in fact refers to the vicar's own letter to a third party, in which the imperial communication was enclosed as an attachment.<sup>51</sup>

In the late Roman Empire, provincial governors (*praesides* and *consulares*) equally possessed the authority to promulgate legal enactments within their jurisdictions. The aforementioned copy of Julian's letter, together with the copy of the prefectorial edict by Salutius, was inscribed on Amorgos by the *praeses Insularum* in 362.<sup>52</sup> Although it remains possible that the Latin inscription represents an edict of the provincial governor, the established administrative hierarchy suggests an edict of promulgation issued by the praetorian prefect.<sup>53</sup> Within the corpus of legislative inscriptions of the fourth-century provincial governors, an edict

---

<sup>45</sup> *CIL* 3 352=7000.

<sup>46</sup> *IK Ephesos*, no. 41.

<sup>47</sup> *CIL* VIII 14280a.

<sup>48</sup> *CIL* VIII 14280a, 24609–24611 (Carthago). Feissel 2009, 127, no. 93, *vicarius* in Africa. *PLRE* I, 911–12 C. Annus Tiberianus 4.

<sup>49</sup> *CTh* 9.3.4 (365). See Matthews 2000, 187 n.63.

<sup>50</sup> In accordance with established editorial convention, quoted imperial letters always occupy the position of precedence, that is, they are placed before the officials' correspondence, even when their accompanying letters are necessary for understanding the overall context; see Feissel 2010, 80–83.

<sup>51</sup> Riedlberger 2024, 11, with n.38.

<sup>52</sup> *CIL* 3 459=AE 2000, 1370a.

<sup>53</sup> Feissel 2000, 315–37; Porena 2003, 232 with n.106.

issued by the governor of the Islands concerning the *capitatio humana* (a head tax) – enforcing an imperial fiscal regulation from 371 (*CTh* 13.10.7) – has been discovered on the island of Cos. The Greek inscription, preserved on two fragments of a marble plaque, now broken at both top and bottom, records an edict dealing with taxation and financial administration.<sup>54</sup> The text indicates that the imperial law was transmitted by Modestus, the praetorian prefect of the East, to his subordinate, the *praeses Insularum*, whose province fell within the jurisdiction of the eastern prefecture. Written in the formal, administrative style of a legal or bureaucratic document, this edict concerning census (*ἀπογραφή; κῆνσος*) and taxation, reveals impersonal tone and lack of epistolary address, albeit fragmentary at the beginning and end. A further governor's edict, which specified the protocol for the *ordo salutationis* in the province's towns and was accompanied by a detailed list of the *sportulae* (fees) to be paid, was carved in stone (and engraved in bronze) at the Numidian city of Timgad in 362/363.<sup>55</sup> The *salutatio* (*εἴσοδος*) was a formal, ceremonial occasion – the prescribed way of presenting oneself to the governor, of attending a court session, or of taking part in an official audience at the *praetorium*. Appearances at these audiences followed a rigid precedence: foremost were the senators; next the heads (*principes*) of the *officium* and officials from the central administrative departments; then former provincial priests together with the most senior members of the city council; and finally, the bulk of councilors, municipal magistrates, and low-ranking members of the bureau. The law was issued by Ulpian Mariscianus, governor (*consularis*) of Numidia.<sup>56</sup> The Latin inscription, which records the official edict regulating the order of salutations in the cities of the province of Numidia, accompanied by a tariff of *sportulae*, does not take the form of an epistle. The edicts of provincial governors memorialized in bronze or stone stand as durable testimonies to the practical mechanics of late Roman provincial rule: they were instruments of lawmaking, administrative regulation, and public communication that both enacted and performed governmental authority at local level.

Lastly, a sixth-century fragmentary inscription contains with three partially preserved legal decisions placed one under another: an imperial letter probably from Emperor Justinian, a law by a high-ranking eastern office-holder, and a pronouncement by a governor of the province of Caria. Paweł Nowakowski assumes that the latter two pronouncements take a form of letters.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>54</sup> *IG* XII, 41, 273.

<sup>55</sup> *CIL* VIII 17896: *Ex au[ctori]tate Ulp[ian]i Marisciani v[er]i c[ons]ularis sexfascalis promoti primo a domino nostro invicto principe Iuliano ordo salutationis factus et ita at (sic!) perpetui[t]atis memoriam aere incises.*

<sup>56</sup> *PLRE* I, 561, Mariscianus.

<sup>57</sup> *Milet* VI/3, no. 1576: *Fl[avius] Marian(us) [Michaelius Gabrielius (?) --- ]ΑΙΙ( ) CO[--- ]Ιοhann(es) Patricius, [v(ir) sp[ectabilis], com(es) et cons(ularis) --- παντα]χόθεν ἀντιστῆ(ναι) (?)*. *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity*, E00812 (P. Nowakowski).

Found in and near Miletus, three fragments of the marble plaque record the legislation concerning the ecclesiastical asylum at a city's sanctuary of Gabriel the Archangel. Dated around 539–542, this Greek inscription curiously incorporates some names and formulae in Latin. First, the imperial constitution (rescript) (ll. 1-11) takes the form of a letter addressed rather to a high-ranking official than a provincial governor (or bishop). Second, the *illustris* office-holder in the regional administration, probably a praetorian prefect of the East under whose command Caria was placed at that time or *quaestor exercitus*, perhaps Bonus, issued possibly another letter or, more likely, an edict (ll. 11-27). Third, yet another letter (ll. 27-31), if correctly identified as such, presumably by the governor (*consularis*) of Caria, according to Feissel, is almost entirely lost.<sup>58</sup> It preserves only his polyonymous nomenclature: Flavius Marianus [Michaelius Gabriellus (?)] Iohannes Patricius, which must have been followed by his rank and office titles: *uir spectabilis*, count and *consularis*. However, the text of the rest of the document – more likely an edict – is in Greek. The governor's document from Miletus, the capital of the province, although preserved only in a couple of the initial lines, illustrates the final stage of a hierarchical chain of correspondence – following imperial letter and prefectural pronouncement in the tripartite inscription – through which provincial authority in Caria formalized the sanctuary's right of asylum under Justinian.

Letters from provincial governors served as the administrative instruments that translated imperial and prefectural directives into enforceable measures at the provincial level, ensuring their public proclamation and local implementation. Thus, a fragmentary Greek inscription from the site of the church of the Theotokos in Ephesus, probably dating to the sixth century, preserves what may have been a letter from a governor (*proconsul*) concerning the status of the churches of Mary and John the Apostle.<sup>59</sup> Two fragments of a marble plaque discovered at the episcopal church of Mary in Ephesus, reexamined by Feissel, appear – despite having been published independently – to constitute missing sections of another large inscription containing a governor's epistle from Ephesus, the provincial seat of Asia.<sup>60</sup> The inscription, which refers to both the emperor and a bishop, represents the monumental publication of a gubernatorial letter addressed to the Ephesians on the occasion of the announcement of an imperial rescript, likely inscribed on a separate plaque and displayed within the same church.<sup>61</sup> By having such epistles inscribed in stone and publicly displayed, governors ensured their authority was both visible and

---

<sup>58</sup> Feissel 2010, 329–38, suggests *PLRE* III, Bonus 1; *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity*, E00812 (P. Nowakowski).

<sup>59</sup> *IK Ephesos*, no. 1373. *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity*, E00765 (P. Nowakowski).

<sup>60</sup> Feissel 1999, 121–32.

<sup>61</sup> *IK Ephesos*, no. 4134. *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity*, E00778 (P. Nowakowski)

permanent, transforming legal correspondence into enduring stone monuments that affirmed imperial justice and reinforced provincial order.

## Conclusion

Undoubtedly, the members of the imperial consistory, and *quaestores (sacri palatii)* in particular, had a great influence on the drafting of the “sacred letters.”<sup>62</sup> The *scrinia (memoriae, libellorum, and epistularum)* served as the general secretariat and were responsible for dispatching official *epistulae*, among others, with *magister epistularum Graecarum* in the east drafting letters issued in Greek and translating epistles dictated in Latin into Greek.<sup>63</sup> Yet, senatorial officials in the civilian government such as praetorian prefects and governors played a crucial mediating role in transmitting imperial authority to the provinces, issuing and promulgating laws that regulated administration across the empire. The epistolary form of these enactments – imperial *sacrae epistulae*, prefectorial letters, and governors’ epistles – underscored their communicative nature, transforming legal directives into durable monuments inscribed in stone. These utterances frequently took the form of epistles, reflecting their nature as formal communications within a hierarchical bureaucratic network. Letters from imperial office-holders were also being sent to the emperor, but these reports had no legal force and have not been preserved in epigraphic form. Extant documents illustrate the chain of command through which imperial legislation was transmitted – from the emperor’s chancellery to the praetorian prefects and then to the provincial governors, who ensured its implementation. Once carved in stone, such letters functioned both as enduring legal records and as public manifestations of imperial power and administrative order within civic space. In terms of imagery, the sculptural depiction of imperial letters of appointment (*codicilli*) as an attribute of senatorial office-holders in honorific statues and funerary monuments was of central importance to the aristocratic self-representation.

The surviving inscribed epistles from the late Roman senatorial officials reveal how epistolography functioned not merely as part of empire-wide bureaucratic communication but as a performative tool of authority. The inscriptions chiseled in stone and engraved in bronze testify to materiality of late antique bureaucratic practices and public dissemination of laws. The

---

<sup>62</sup> Matthews 2000, 179–80: A distinction existed between *leges*—in the strict sense, measures approved by the imperial *consistorium* (council) and typically drafted by the quaestor—and the administrative letters through which these laws, or selected portions of them, were dispatched to officials responsible for their implementation within their respective jurisdictions.

<sup>63</sup> The quaestor oversaw the duties of the *magister memoriae*, and letters of appointment to various offices and commands were issued from the *scrinium memoriae* upon the quaestor’s authorization. See Harries 1988; Honoré 1998; Bodnaruk 2026, 248–52.

inscribed letters of senatorial functionaries in the government of the empire, who maintained their legislative rights throughout late antiquity, illuminate the connection between the central and regional administration, imperial authority and senatorial power. Unlike private correspondence, these texts exemplify formulaic, ceremonial language intended for collective audiences and public display, blending epistolography with monumental rhetoric. They reveal how imperial officials, from high-ranking praetorian and urban prefects to lower-ranking *praesides* – balanced administrative duties with performative authority, offering insights into imperial hierarchy. The epigraphic form of the legal *epistulae* exhibits the changing conventions of both late antique letter-writing and law drafting otherwise lost in manuscript traditions and legal codes.

#### List of abbreviations

*AE* = *L'Année Épigraphique*, Paris, 1888–.

*CIL* = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, eds. Th. Mommsen et al. Berlin, 1863–.

*CJ* = *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, vol. 2. *Codex Iustinianus*, ed. P. Krüger. Berlin, 1877.

*CTh* = *Codex Theodosianus. Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, eds. Th. Mommsen and P.M. Meyer. Berlin, 1904.

*EDR* = *Epigraphic Database Rome*, [www.edr-edr.it/](http://www.edr-edr.it/).

*ICUR* = *Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo antiquiores*, ed. G.B. De Rossi. Rome, 1857–1915.

*IG* = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, eds. A. Kirchhoff et al. Berlin, 1873–.

*IK Ephesos* = *Die Inschriften von Ephesos (Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien)*, eds. H. Wankel et al. Bonn, 1979–.

*ILCV* = *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*, eds. E. Diehl et al. Berlin, Dublin, and Zürich, 1925–1967.

*ILS* = *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 5 vols., ed. H. Dessau. Berlin, 1892–1916

*LSA* = *Last Statues of Antiquity* database, <http://laststatues.classics.ox.ac.uk/>.

*Milet VI 3* = *Milet VI. Inschriften von Milet 3*, eds. P. Herrmann, W. Günther, and N. Ehrhardt. Berlin and New York, 2006.

*Nov. Val.* = *Novellae Valentiniani. Liber legum novellarum divi Valentiniani A.*, in *Leges novellae ad Theodosianum pertinentes*, ed. P.M. Meyer, 69–154. Berlin, 1905.

*P. Cairo Isid.* = *Cairo Papyri. The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo and the University Michigan (P.Cair. Isid.)*, eds. A.E.R. Boak and H.C. Youtie. Ann Arbor, 1960.

*PG XLV*, col. 1751 = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*, vol. XLV, ed. J.-P. Migne, col. 1751. Paris, 1844.

*PLRE I* = *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. 1: AD 260–395*, eds. A.H.M. Jones, J.R. Martindale, and J. Morris. Cambridge, 1971.

*PLRE III* = *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, vol. 3: A.D. 527–641*, ed. J.R. Martindale. Cambridge, 1992.

*SEG* = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, eds. J.J.E. Hondius et al. Leiden, Alphen aan den Rijn, and Amsterdam, 1923–.

*Sirm.* = *Constitutiones Sirmondianae*. In *Codex Theodosianus. Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis*, vol. II, eds. Th. Mommsen and P.M. Meyer. Berlin, 1904.

*The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity* = *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity* database <http://csa.history.ox.ac.uk/>.

## Bibliography

Bodnaruk, M. 2022, “*Damnatio memoriae* of the High-Ranking Senatorial Office-Holders in the Later Roman Empire,” in *Fragmented Memory: Omission, Selection, and Loss in Ancient and Medieval Literature and History*, edited by N. Bruno, M. Filosa, and G. Marinelli, 185–214. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bodnaruk, M. 2025, “Urban Spatiality, Honorific Statuary, and the Celebration of Aristocratic Power in the Late Roman Empire,” *Antichthon*, Special Issue, 1–23.

Bodnaruk, M. 2026, *An Empire of Elites: The Self-Representation of the Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman State in the Fourth Century AD*. London: Routledge.

Chastagnol, A. 1962, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines.

Chenault, R. 2012, “Statues of Senators in the Forum of Trajan and the Roman Forum in Late Antiquity,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 102, 103–32.

Corcoran, S. 1996, *The Empire of the Tetrarchs: Imperial Pronouncements and Government, AD 284–324*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Feissel, D. 1999, “Épigraphie administrative et topographie urbaine: l'emplacement des actes inscrits dans l'Éphèse protobyzantine (IVe – VIe s.),” in *Efeso paleocristiana e bizantina*, edited by R. Pillinger et al., 121–32. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Feissel, D. 2000, “Une constitution de l'empereur Julien. Entre texte épigraphique et codification (CIL III, 459 et CTh 1,16,8),” in *La codification des lois dans l'antiquité: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg 27–29 novembre 1997*, edited by E. Lévy, 315–37. Paris: De Boccard.

Feissel, D. 2007, “Sources documentaires et histoire administrative de l'Orient romain tardif, IVe–VIIe siècles,” *Livret-Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études, IVe section: Sciences historiques et philologiques*, 21 (2005–6), 149–50.

Feissel, D. 2009, “Les actes de l'État impérial dans l'épigraphie tardive (324–610): prolégomènes à un inventaire,” in *Selbstdarstellung und Kommunikation: Die Veröffentlichung staatlicher Urkunden auf Stein und Bronze in der römischen Welt*, edited by R. Haensch, 97–130. Munich: Beck.

Feissel, D. 2010, *Documents, droit, diplomatie de l'Empire romain tardif*. Paris: Association des amis du centre d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance.

Feissel, D. 2024, “Un discours de Constance II au sénat de Constantinople en l'honneur du préfet du prétoire Philippe (inscription de Pergè, 352 ap. J.-C.),” *Philia*, 10, 72–119.

Harries, J. 1988, “The Roman Imperial Quaestor from Constantine to Theodosius II,” *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 78, 159–64.

Harries, J. 1999, *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Honoré, T. 1998, *Law in the Crisis of Empire 379–455 AD: The Theodosian Dynasty and Its Quaestors*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.



- Kienast, D. 1990, *Römische Kaisertabelle Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Machado, C. 2006, "Building the Past: Monuments and Memory in the Forum Romanum," *Late Antique Archaeology* 3(1), 157–92.
- Matthews, J.F. 2000, *Laying Down the Law: A Study of the Theodosian Code*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Moser, M. 2018, *Emperors and Senators: The Reign of Constantius II and the Transformation of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mousourakis, G. 2007, *A Legal History of Rome*. London: Routledge.
- Niquet, H. 2000, *Monumenta virtutum titulique. Senatorische Selbstdarstellung im spätantiken Rom im Spiegel der epigraphischen Denkmäler*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Orlandi, S. 2017, "Orations in Stone," in *The Epigraphic Cultures of Late Antiquity*, edited by K. Bolle, C. Machado, and C. Witschel, 407–26. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Porena, P. 2003, *Le origini della prefettura del pretorio tardoantica*. Rome: Bretschneider.
- Riccobono, S. et al. 1943, *Fontes iuris romani antejustiniani*, Vol. III. Florence: Sansoni.
- Riedlberger, G. 2024, "What is the Meaning of "dat." in Subscriptions of Late Antique Constitutions," *Frankfurter elektronische Rundschau zur Altertumskunde*, 54, 1–17.
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. 2008, *Reagieren und Gestalten. Der Regierungstil des spätrömischen Kaisers am Beispiel der Gesetzgebung Valentinians I*. Munich: Beck.
- Schmidt-Hofner, S. 2010, "Ehrensachen. Ranggesetzgebung, Elitenkonkurrenz und die Funktionen des Rechts in der Spätantike," *Chiron*, 40: 209–43.
- Şahin, S. 2015, "Spätrömisch-frühbyzantinische Inschriften aus Perge in Pamphylien," in *Inscriptions from Byzantium and Beyond*, edited by A. Rhoby, 177–86. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Sirks, B. 2007, *The Theodosian Code: A Study*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Weisweiler, J. 2012, 'Inscribing Imperial Power: Letters from Emperors in Late-Antique Rome', in *Historische Erinnerung im städtischen Raum: Rom in der Spätantike*, edited by R. Behrwald and C. Witschel, 309–29. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Weisweiler, J. 2012, "From Equality to Asymmetry: Honorific Statues, Imperial Power, and Senatorial Identity in Late-Antique Rome," *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 25, 319–350.
- White, J.L. 1972, *The Form and Structure of the Official Petition: A Study in Greek Epistolography*. Missoula: Scholars Press.