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During archaeological excavations at Andriace, the harbour of Myra, an honorific inscription was discovered in front of the quay structure just north of the granarium (horrea Hadriani). It was prepared by Arrius Paetus Themistius, the praeses of Lycia province, to honour the Roman emperor Jovian with a statue. The discovery provides new information about Themistius, who was introduced to us only by the sophist Libanius, including his tria nomina and unexplored service period in Lycia. It has also led to reconsidering the tenure of the praesidatus of two uiri clarissimi, Themistius and Sozomenus. In this context, addenda et corrigenda are proposed for another honorific inscription to Emperor Jovian by Themistius, praeses of Lycia, at Andriace.
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emperor Julian in Andriace. Finally, the administrative importance of Myra and Andriace in Lycia during the 4th century is presented.
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1. Introduction

This paper aims to introduce a Latin honorary inscription to the Roman emperor Jovian from the mid-4th century AD, discovered at Andriace, the harbour settlement of Myra (Demre) on the Lycian coast. Throughout the Roman and early Byzantine periods, the harbour was one of the focal points for maritime trade in the eastern Mediterranean. While the earliest surviving literary references to Andriace date back to the early 2nd century BC, archaeological findings illustrating the early construction of the harbour and its associated structures strongly suggest that it was already in operation in the 3rd century BC. As an ἐπίνειον, it maintained the connection with its ἄστυ, Myra, located about 4.7 km southeast until Late Antiquity. It was used as a state harbour (Μυρεών ἐπίνειον) by the Myrians and probably served as a strategic outpost for the naval opera-

---

1 Akyürek 2016, pp. 465-487; Çevik & Bulut 2022, pp. 7-74. For a cartographic representation, see Şahin 2014, Har. 2.
2 Within his narrative of the diodochoi conflicts, Porphyrios of Tyros introduces the earliest episode involving Andriace. He describes the transition of authority over the harbour from Ptolemaic to Antiochian sovereignty in 197 BC: *FgrHist* II B, 1224 F 46: «Eo enim tempore (ante 197) captae sunt Aphrodiasias et Soloe et Zephyrion et Mallos et Anemurium et Selenum et Coracesium et Coricus et Andriace et Limyra et Patara et Xanthus et ad extremum Ephesus».
3 Marksteiner 2013, p. 284.
4 The term ἐπίνειον is occasionally used to refer to harbours with military status, where city or state fleets anchored, but more commonly describes harbours that are politically associated with a city or local government while not being located within the borders of the city (ἄστυ). Ancient records frequently mention Andriace as an ἐπίνειον, partly due to the harbour’s location outside Myra. See Rougé 1966, pp. 107-110; Zimmermann 1992, pp. 219-220; Hild & Hellenkemper 2004, pp. 102-103; Bonnier 2008, p. 54.
tions of the Lycian League\textsuperscript{5}. Furthermore, the nomenclatures ἐμπόριον and λιμήν further embody its commercial characteristics\textsuperscript{6}. Especially after the Hellenistic Period, the frequent storms during maritime activities that led to several shipwrecks along the Lycian coastline reinforced the need for a safe and multifunctional harbour. Hence, the importance of Andriace grew progressively over time. Consequently, it became, along with Patara, one of the most important destinations for merchant ships and naval fleets sailing along the Lycian coast.

The harbour settlement attracted the interest of travellers and scholars during the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries owing to its historical heritage and strategic geography. In particular, over the past twenty-five years, it has been the subject of research by numerous scholars. One of the most recent instances of this has been the archaeological excavations in Andriace, the harbour of Myra, since 2009. In this context, an honouring inscription (H: 117.5 cm; W: 42 cm; D: 41.5 cm; LH: 4 cm) on a limestone statue pedestal was unearthed in front of the quay structure just north of the granarium, which is now the Lycian Civilisations Museum (Fig. 1-4), in 2010\textsuperscript{7}. Nevertheless, it is uncertain whether the statue pedestal was found \textit{in situ}. It was probably located near the two monuments carrying other honorific inscriptions for emperors (Fig. 5)\textsuperscript{8}. Dowel slots were engraved in different sizes and shapes on the pedestal for the statue to stand on (Fig. 4). It is evident that Themis-

---

\textsuperscript{5} App., BC IV 82: Τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ χρόνῳ καὶ Λέντλος ἐπιπεμφθεὶς ᾿Ανδριάκη Μυρέων ἐπινεῖον τὴν τε ἅλυσιν ἔρρηξε τοῦ λιμένος καὶ ἐς Μύρα ἀνῄει.

\textsuperscript{6} Within the custom inscription dated between 60 and 62/3 from Andriace, one of the major harbour frequented by the Eastern Mediterranean trade, is referred to as ἐμπόριον (Takmer 2006, p. 27). Andriace is described in late antique sources (e.g. The Life of Nikolaos) as a multifunctional harbour settlement with a status such as ἐμπόριον, λιμήν and ἐπίνειον, cf Anrich 1917, 67, 77, etc.

\textsuperscript{7} The granarium was built under the reign of the emperor Hadrian (119-138, probably during the emperor’s second visit in 129). See CIL III 232 and suppl. 6738: Horrea Imp. Caesaris diui Traiani Parthici f. diui Neruae nepotis Traiani Hadriani Augusti cos. III. Hereby Andriace became one of the prominent storage stations for the grain trade transferred by the empire from internal and external harbours. The construction of the granarium and the likely related other parts of the settlement, such as the adjacent agora with its shops and a commercial quarter, at Andriace, reached a significant improvement in the early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century, see Borchhardt 1975, p. 66; Wörle 1975, p. 67; Zimmermann 1992, p. 221.

\textsuperscript{8} See the Conclusions section below for details of the monuments and their inscriptions.
Themistius, the praeses of Lycia, set up a statue (now lost) in honour of the Roman emperor Flavius Claudius Iovianus during his reign, over eight months between 28 June 363 and 17 February 364. Due to destruction from the river stream, some letters at the end of the few lines on the pedestal are unreadable.

D(ominum) n(ostrum) Iobianum
fortissim(um) ac
nobilissimum
4 semper Augus(tum)
Arrius Paet[us]
Themistius
u(ir) c(larissimus), praeses
8 prouĭ(nciae) Ḷ yc[iae].

Arrius Paetus Themistius, of clarissimus rank, praeses of Lycia province [set up this statue of] our Lord Jovian, the noblest and most powerful, ever Augustus.

---

Fig. 2a. Detail of the inscription. Fig. 2b. Drawing of the proposed reading.

Fig. 3. Inscription on the statue pedestal to emperor Jovian by Themistius, the praeses of Lycia.

Fig. 4. Dowel slots of the statue on the pedestal.
Fig. 5. Two monuments carrying honorific inscriptions for the Roman emperors.

2. Themistius, the Praeses of Lycia

The name Themistius is frequently mentioned to refer to the famous statesman, rhetorician, and philosopher alias Eὐφραδής (Euphradēs: eloquent) in the 4th century AD\(^{10}\). As is well known, he lived between 317 and 388/9 and spent nearly all his life in Constantinople. There was another Themistius in the same century. He was called the Younger, the praeses introduced here, and his name is rarely mentioned. Until now, the only source on the younger Themistius was the sophist Libanius of Antiocheia, his tutor\(^{11}\). In letters, sometimes to Themistius and sometimes to his father, Heortius, Libanius describes his life, education, and administrative duties\(^{12}\). Some of them, such as *Oratio* LXII 55, are ambiguous about whether they refer to him. However, this new document from Andriace indeed confirms his *praesidatus* in Lycia.

\(^{10}\) *PLRE* s. u. ‘Themistius’ 1.

\(^{11}\) On Libanius’ letters to Themistius, see *Ep.* 309, 621, 635, and 664; on the references about Themistius in the letters to his father Heortius, see *Ep.* 428, 547, and 579. Libanius also provides information about himself in one of his speeches (*Or.* LXII 55). On major topics about Themistius’ biography, see *PLRE* s. u. ‘Themistius’ 2.

\(^{12}\) On his father being Heortius, see *Lib.*, *Ep.* 428, 547, and 579. Heortius, also called Gaudatius, lived in Tarsus in 362 and was still alive in 380 (Seeck 1906, p. 171).
According to Libanius, Themistius originated from a wealthy family\textsuperscript{13}. The inscription also provides new information on his identity; his praenomen is unknown, but it is attested that he was a member of the gens Arria for the first time\textsuperscript{14}. The earliest members of the gens Arria emerged during the middle or late Republican period\textsuperscript{15}. In the early period, the predecessors of the gens were not members of the patrician families\textsuperscript{16}. However, as the new inscription attests, they occasionally could take high-level office such as consulatus, proconsulatus, and praesidatus due to their various contributions to the Roman Republic and the Empire. Various praenomina and cognomina have been documented among the members of the gens Arria. In the inscription, Themistius introduced himself with a new cognomen, Paetus, which was not previously exemplified for the gens\textsuperscript{17}. In Latin, the cognomen means ‘blink-eyed’. As likely as not, it implies that, concerning his physical appearance, Themistius might have some unusual features in his eyes.

\textsuperscript{13} Lib., \textit{Ep}. 309: ἐπεὶ δὲ εὖ ποιῶν ἐν πρώτοις εἶ τῶν εὐπόρων... In addition to this, Libanius only mentions Themistius as a Heracleian in one of his references (\textit{Or}. LXII 55). However, he gives no further information as to which Heracleian this city was. This city is probably Heracleia Pontice.

\textsuperscript{14} In his paper on an overview of the Myra inscriptions, Öztürk (2010, p. 297) only briefly announced the discovery of the inscription without presenting an edition or a photo. It is clear that he misread the name of the praeses as Arbius Pletus Themistius honouring the emperor Jovian. Besides, based on Libanius’ letters, he incorrectly claimed that Themistius’ praesidatus continued from 361 to 363-364.

\textsuperscript{15} The existence of gens Arria in Asia Minor dates back to the second half of the 1st century. Gnaeus Arrius Antoninus, the maternal grandfather of the Roman emperor Antoninus Pius, was appointed proconsul of the Asia province in 78/79. Another prominent representative of the gens, Gnaeus Arrius Cornelius Proculus, was governor (πρεσβυτης και ἀντιστράτηγος) of the province of Lycia and Pamphylia between ca. 138 and 139. In addition to this, Gaius Arrius Antoninus, consul sufectus around 173, became proconsul of the Asia in 188/189. Thus, the gens seems to have achieved a privileged position throughout Asia Minor, particularly in the 1st and 2nd centuries, due to the high-ranking officials it introduced to the service of the empire.

\textsuperscript{16} Cic., \textit{Brut}. LXIX.

\textsuperscript{17} Only the husbands of two women of the gens Arria used the cognomen Paetus. One was Aulus Caecina Paetus (married to Arria maior), consul sufectus of 37, and the other was Publius Clodius Thrasea Paetus (married to Caecinia Arria [minor]), consul sufectus of 56. For Aulus Caecina Paetus, see \textit{PIR} II 103 and for Publius Clodius Thrasea Paetus, see \textit{PIR} II 1187.
Themistius was born in 339. He and his father retained their pagan beliefs in the 4th century AD when Christianity became widespread. At the age of 16, Themistius went to Antioch to attend some of Libanius’ lectures. From approximately 355 to 357, he spent all three years as a pupil there. Libanius reports that he had financial problems, especially at the beginning of his education. Seeing his pupil in distress, Libanius occasionally tried to console him and even wrote to his father, Heortius. In this letter, he subtly criticised Heortius for not sending enough money to buy books for his son, even though Heortius was wealthy, and he noted that it was not ideal for a young man to have such an inadequate budget. However, he also tended to praise Themistius to his father, mentioning that the distance he had progressed during his education was remarkable. Moreover, Libanius sometimes acted as a mediator between father and son by inviting Heortius to the school in Antioch to prove the wisdom and dignity of his son.

Additionally, he periodically attended the lectures of the sophist Maximus in Athens and occasionally collaborated with Severus of Lycia. Libanius reports to Themistius’ father, Heortius, on his son’s marked improvement (for further, see Watson 2010, p. 155).

---

18 On his paganism, see Lib., Ep. 309. Sozomenus, the praeses of Lycia prior to Themistius, was also a pagan; see Lib., Ep. 1383.

19 Born in Antiocheia in 314, Libanius, a member of one of the aristocratic families, was educated in Athens. He activated his school in Constantinople in 340/41, moved to Nicomedia in 346, but soon returned to Constantinople. Finally, in 354, he settled in his native land and continued his lectures with Themistius. For a brief chronology of Libanius’ career, see Downey 1959, p. 652.

20 The pupils of Libanius in Antioch remained close to him even during the summer seasons (Cribiore 2007, p. 25). Even though he had attended Libanius’ lectures at Antioch for only two years and apparently questioned the usefulness of his studies at the time, Themistius is refashioned as an ideal sophistic governor who enables the province to recover from the corruption of previous officials. See Ep. 309. 1: σὺ δὲ ἤσχαλλες παιδευόμενος περὶ πράγμα ἄχρηστον ἀναλίσκειν τὸν πόνον «You were distressed during the course of your education, supposing that you were wasting your efforts on something useless». In Ep. 579 (C182), however, Libanius reports to Themistius’ father, Heortius, on his son’s marked improvement (for further, see Watson 2010, p. 155).

21 Regarding Themistius’ conveyance of Libanius’ letters to various recipients (such as Acacius, the governor of Phrygia), see Lib., Ep. 99. Furthermore, this underscores the author’s confidence in him for this pivotal task, even preceding his tenure as praeses (Bradbury 2004, p. 138).

22 Maximus, the philosopher, was also from Lycia. (Lib., Ep. 1384), and in the years 336 to 340, he lectured in Athens. Libanius and Severus attended his courses (PLRE s. u. ‘Mazimus’ 10).

23 Severus, of Lycian origin (Lib., Ep. 309: 1383, 1451), lectured as a sophist on various topics (Lib., Ep. 19; 383; 659; 664; 665; 1451; 1479) in Lycia between 359-365 and was a merchant who traded in wood from his estates (Lib., Ep. 1191; 1383).
er, Libanius reports that Themistius was appointed governor of Lycia before reaching the age of 25 «οὔπω μὲν ἔτη πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι»\textsuperscript{24}. At the beginning of his \textit{praesidatus}, he encountered a population in Lycia that had been «ruined by the depredations of his predecessors» (ταῖς τῶν ἐμπροσθέν κλοπαῖς διωφθαρμένοι)\textsuperscript{25}. In the \textit{Letters} of Libanius, Themistius’ office is described with the verbs ἑπιτροπεύσας, ἄρχεις and ἄρχοντι\textsuperscript{26}. Both of these expressions refer to the Latin term \textit{praeses} found in the new inscription introduced above (line 7), thereby confirming Themistius’ \textit{praesidatus} in Lycia\textsuperscript{27}.

Based on the chronology of Libanius’ letters, Themistius’ \textit{praesidatus} is generally dated to 361, suggesting that his term likely commenced during the summer of that year\textsuperscript{28}. The new inscription introduced above also indicates that he continued his service during the reign of emperor Jovian (26/27 June 363 - 17 February 364). Considering this evidence, Themistius’ term in office appears to extend at least from 361 to 364. However, Libanius’ letter (\textit{ep.} 1383) to Sozomenus, the brother of the Spartan grammarian Nicocles and tutor to emperor Julian, dates Sozomenus’ \textit{praesidatus} in Lycia to 363, thereby ruling out the possibility of the mentioned tenure of Themistius\textsuperscript{29}. Furthermore, by publishing a new milestone from Balboura, Ch. Naour proves that Sozomenus must have occupied this office under Julian’s reign (3 September 361 - 26/27 June 363)\textsuperscript{30}. Earlier, based on the letter, it was thought that Sozomenus served as \textit{praeses} of Lycia in 363. The two inscriptions indicate that

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{24}{Lib., \textit{Or.} LXII 55.}
\footnotetext{25}{Lib., \textit{Or.} LXII 55.}
\footnotetext{26}{On the references implying Themistius of being ἑπιτροπος, see \textit{Or.} LXII. 55: ὁ δὲ πρὸ τούτων Ἑράκλεωτῆς ἑπιτροπεύσας τὴν Λυκίαν; for ἄρχον, see \textit{Ep.} 309: ἄρχεις γάρ, τῷ δὲ ἄρχοντι δεῖ λόγων, ὡσπερ τοῖς πλέουσιν οἰακών; 635: ὡς ὅστις ἄρχον ἐπάνων παρόντας καὶ ἀπόντας εὐ̇ ιοιεν̇; 664: ὅτι τὸ τῇ φύσει χαλεπὸν ῥᾷστόν ἐστι σοι, τὸ ἄρχειν καλῶς.}
\footnotetext{27}{On the term \textit{praeses} and its equivalents of ἑπιτροπος and ἄρχον in Greek, see Mason, 1974, pp. 27 and 49.}
\footnotetext{28}{Lib., \textit{Ep.} 309 (summer 361), 635 (autumn 361), 664 (end of 361); \textit{Or.} LXII 55. On dating these letters, see Seeck 1906, p. 322; Petit 1994, pp. 249-250.}
\footnotetext{29}{Seeck 1906, pp. 32, 281; \textit{PLRE} s. u. ‘Sozomenus’.}
\footnotetext{30}{Naour 1978, pp. 177-178 n. 4: Φλ. Κλ. Ἰουλιανὸν | τὸν ἀήττητον Αὐγ(ουστον) | Φλ. Σωζόμενος | ὁ λαμπρ(ότατος) ἠγε(μόνων) | Ἡ Βαλ(βουρέων πόλις) | μί(λια) ιζ’. On Sozomenus, see also Robert & Robert 1979, p. 509 n. 4; \textit{SEG} XXVIII 1229; \textit{AE} 1981, p. 236 n. 807; Kuhoff 1983, pp. 86; 331; A.126; Conti 2004, p. 90 n. 44; Feissel 2010, p. 78 n. 11; Feissel & Wörrle 2015, p. 280; Begass 2019, p. 228 n. 69.}
\end{footnotes}
the timing of their praesidatus should be reviewed. In this context, it becomes evident that Sozomenus held the position of praeses of Lycia under Julian’s reign, while Themistius assumed his praesidatus under Julian’s or Jovian’s reign. When considering both the inscriptions and the letters together, the year 361 emerges as pivotal in determining their tenures.

On the other hand, the accession of emperor Julian on 3 September 361 and Themistius’ praesidatus, which dates from the summer months to at least the end of that year, do not allow Sozomenus the opportunity to serve under emperor Julian in 361. Moreover, it is generally assumed that the main reference point of Sozomenus’ praesidatus was the close relationship between his brother Nicocles and emperor Julian. For this reason, his assignment probably took place immediately after Julian became Augustus in the East.

The manuscripts of Libanius’ letters do not follow a chronological order. It is therefore necessary to re-examine the dates of the letters which were addressed to the praesides of Lycia based on the inscriptions. The letters of the years 355-365 and 372-382 are mainly preserved in three manuscripts: Vaticanus gr. 83 (V), Vaticanus gr. 85 (Va) and Vossianus Leidensis gr. 77 (Vo). Seeck (1906, p. 23) noted that epp. 19-607 were divided into six books in medieval manuscripts based on six batches of duplicates kept by Libanius. Moreover, the corpus’s present framework suggests that the letter collection was organised posthumously by an unidentified literary executor or admirer.

31 In studies of Libanius’ letters, especially in the 20th century, their chronological irregularity is generally interpreted as evidence of a later editorial intervention; see Seeck 1906, pp. 14-34; Norman 1992, p. 39; Bradbury 2004, p. 21; Van Hoof 2016, p. 122.
32 Apart from the periods during which the letters were written, Libanius also sent letters before 355 and after 365. The matter is immediately apparent from letters 1-18, dated 350-353 and 365-388 at the beginning of the corpus. Moreover, during the reign of Emperor Valens (364-378), he avoided being accused of treason twice regarding his correspondence (Or. 1. 175, 177). The most likely reason for the gap in the timeline between the letters is, as S. Bradbury (2004, p. 19) rightly proposed, that he considered it politically imprudent to keep records during the reign of opposing emperors.
33 In the mediaeval age, Libanius was considered the second Demosthenes, and his works were frequently copied. As a result, his collection of letters, or parts of them, are to be found in more than 250 manuscripts. The three above, which provide the most letters, date to the 11th century. Vaticanus gr. 83 (V) is also the most complete. Only the letters numbered 18, 1543 and 1544 do not appear in all three manuscripts (Baroccianus gr. 50, f. 369 and Laurentianus IV. 14). For detailed information on the manuscripts, see Norman 1992, pp. 35-43; Bradbury 2004, pp. 19-23.
according to S. Bradbury (2004, pp. 21-22)\textsuperscript{34}. The possible executor combined six batches from the archive and other compilations from other years (350-353 and 365-388), placing them at the beginning of the corpus (\textit{epp.} 1-18), and then organised batches of six manuscript books. The sequence of the rest of the collection is still being determined, which leads to the assumption that these manuscripts were re-arranged by a subsequent editor\textsuperscript{35}.

Table 1. \textit{The order and chronology of Libanius’ Letters}  
(Bradbury 2004, pp. 21-22).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19-96</td>
<td>From summer 358 to winter 359/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>97-202</td>
<td>From winter 359/60 to spring 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>203-310</td>
<td>From spring 360 to spring 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>311-389</td>
<td>From summer 357 to winter 358/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>390-493</td>
<td>From spring 355 to spring 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>494-607</td>
<td>From summer 356 to summer 357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Latter edited batches}  
| 615-839 | 361 to 363 |  
| 840-1112 | 388 up to 393 |  
| 1113-1341 | 363 to 365 (in great irregularity) |  
| 1342-1461 | From 363 |  
| 1462-1542 | From 365 |  

Only a limited number of Libanius’ letters can be accurately dated\textsuperscript{36}. The chronology of some letters within batches and books shows remarkable

\textsuperscript{34} It is still being determined whether Libanius intended to publish the letters. O. Seeck (1906, p. 23) suggested that Libanius published the letters of 355-361 (\textit{Ep.} 19-607) in honour of Julian becoming Augustus in the East, but as R. Foerster (1927, pp. 49-52) points out, if this were true, at the beginning of the collection, Libanius would have organised the letters sent to Julian. Moreover, the fact that in 364, Aristophanes of Corinth asked Libanius for copies of his letters to Julian (\textit{Ep.} 1264/N133), implies that they were not included in any published edition.

\textsuperscript{35} Norman 1992, p. 39; Bradbury 2004, p. 22; Van Hoof 2016, pp. 122-123.

\textsuperscript{36} Libanius’ many letters of recommendation to his pupils roughly dated by the batch they were in, could have been written at almost any time during his career, see Seeck 1906, p. 74; van Hoof 2016, p. 123.
deviations. The same is valid for the letters concerning Themistius’ *praesidatus*. Most of the letters on him and Sozomenus were inserted into these books later. When the letters are considered together with the dating of the batch in which they are found, letter 309 in book 3 concerning Themistius is dated from the spring of 360 to the spring of 361, while the group containing letters 621, 635 and 664 is dated 361-363. The batch preserving letter 1383 to Sozomenus refers to texts from 363 onward. So, by the references of both the earliest letters addressed to Sozomenus (dated to 363) and also an honorific inscription erected by him during the reign of Julian, it can be suggested that the most probable year of Themistius’ arrival in Lycia could be 363. According to the inscriptions, Sozomenus may have served as *praeses* just before Themistius under the reign of Julian. Therefore, the earliest possible date for the handover of *praesidatus* from Sozomenus to Themistius seems to be 363. It is likely that Sozomenus’ inauguration was immediately after (or just before) Julian’s accession, and he handed it over to Themistius in 363, before Julian’s death. At the same time, the year 363 could be considered the *terminus post quem* for the letters in which Libanius refers to Themistius as *praeses*. Moreover, Libanius asserts in one of his discourses that Themistius was only 24 years old when he assumed the role of *praeses* of Lycia; hence, scholars had traditionally accepted 337 as his year of birth, based on the previously admitted date of 361 for his *praesidatus*. Nevertheless, if we now accept the newly proposed date, it might be more accurate to place his birth in 339.

On the other hand, the new inscription above indicates that Themistius served as *uir clarissimus*. At the beginning of the 4th century, probably between 313 and 324, Lycia was separated from Pamphylia, organised as a province on its own, and then administered independently by a *praeses*.

---

37 The inconsistency in the dating of the letters begins with the first letter of the first book: Ep.19, addressed to Anatolius, despite being clearly out of chronological order and placed at the beginning of the letters. In another example, 9 (or possibly 11) of the 108 letters in Book 3, which covers the period from the spring of 360 to the spring of 361, date from 358 or the winter of 358/359 (*epp.* 248, 249, 254, 255, 260, 261, 270, 273, 279, and possibly also 281 and 282). Book 4, which covers the period from the summer of 357 to the winter of 358/359, begins with a letter from 355 (*ep.* 311) addressed to Anatolius 3/i. For further information, see Norman 1992, p. 38; van Hoof 2016, p. 124.
 Until the middle of the same century, the rulers of the ordo equester were appointed to this office and entitled with the rank of uir perfectissimus (διασημότατος ἱγμεών). Subsequently, in the latter part of the reign of the emperor Constantius II, especially after 355, there was a tremendous expansion of the number of ordo senatorius families. In many provinces, a new arrangement was introduced in which praeses of the ordo senatorius were appointed. Hence, regarding the queue of families awaiting their turn, it seems unlikely that Themistius undertook the office in 361 and was reassigned after Sozomenus. In this context, it could be assumed that Arrius Paetus Themistius (361-364?), of the ordo senatorius, also served as praeses of Lycia entitled to the rank of uir clarissimus after Nemesius olympius (337-361, probably between 355-361) and Flavius Sozomenus (361-363). According to the dates mentioned above, the order of Lycia’s praesides can be updated as follows:

38 The ethnoi of Lycia and Pamphylia made a common petition against the Christians to the emperor Maximinus Daia in 312 (Arýkanda n. 12), and Eusebius was also praeses Lyciae et Pamphyliae in 311/313 (Cod. Theodos. XIII 10, 2; PLRE s. u. ‘Eusebius’ 4). The Laterculus Veronensis, written between 314/315 and c. 324, mentions only Pamphylia. At the Council of Nicaea in 325, the division between Lycia and Pamphylia became more apparent. See Honigmann 1939, p. 47 n. 143-144. See also Behrwald 2000, pp. 156-159; Hild & Helenken 2004, p. 109.


40 In several provinces, such as Dacia, Macedonia, Pisidia, Cilicia, Palestina Salutaris, Phoenicia, and Thebais, the earliest clarissimi praesides are attested from about 360 to the early 370s. This development seems to have been an inevitable consequence of the enormous expansion of the ordo senatorius in the last years of Constantius II. For detailed information, see Jones 1964, I pp. 132-133; 527-528; Dagron 1974, pp. 129-135; Kuhoff 1983, pp. 85-86; Roueché 1989, pp. 40-41; Feissel 2010, pp. 78-79 and Moser 2018.

41 Fl(avius) Nemesius Olympius, praeses of Lycia, uir clarissimus, erected an honorary statue of the emperor Flavius Constantius (337-361) at Andriace, see CIL III 12126. Nevertheless, the editors of the PLRE (s. u. ‘Fl. Nemesius Olympius’ 16) argued for Olympus’
Table 2. The Updated List of Praesides of Provincia Lycia\textsuperscript{42}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aurelius Fabius Faustinus</td>
<td>uir perfectissimus, ἡγεμών, διασημότατος</td>
<td>333-337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Quirinus</td>
<td>θεραπεύσαντα</td>
<td>ca. 350-355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Flavius Nemesius Olympus</td>
<td>uir clarissimus praeses</td>
<td>(337/) after 355?-361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Sozomenus</td>
<td>ἡγεμὼν λαμπρότατος</td>
<td>361?-363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Arrius Paetus Themistius</td>
<td>ἰμχων, ἐπιτροπεύσας, uir clarissimus praeses</td>
<td>363-364?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Secundus [?] Cassius</td>
<td>ἡγεμὼν λαμπρότατος</td>
<td>367-375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Flavius Aetius Patricius</td>
<td>ἡγεμὼν λαμπρότατος</td>
<td>ca. 380-450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Flavius Claudius Spud(asius?) Marcianus</td>
<td>λαμπρότατος καὶ ἱκανομασίασας ἡγεμὼν</td>
<td>Early 5\textsuperscript{th} century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Iulius</td>
<td>ἰρχην ἐνεχείριζε</td>
<td>450-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Artemeōn</td>
<td>περίφρων</td>
<td>450-457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Anonymus</td>
<td>λαμπρότατος ἰρχων</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Addenda et Corrigenda on an Honorary Inscription

It is necessary to reconsider a fragment of the honorary inscription to an emperor previously published after the revised dates of the praesides of Lycia. Unfortunately, the editors of \textit{CIL} (III 12128) were unable to find the complete honorary inscription and declared that nearly half of it had been lost by recording the phrase «reliqua perierunt». They did not have the chance to analyse the whole inscription. After that, there was no information about what happened to the pedestal until it was rediscovered (with dimensions H: 42.5 cm; W: 52 cm; D: 51 cm; HL: 4.5 cm) just near the honorary inscription to Jovian during our annual surveys at Andriace in the last three years (Figs. 6-8). It is disappointing that only three readable lines of the inscription remain; the rest are lost. The letters suffer from limited legibility, attributed to the compromised surface condition of the stone. However, an examination of the line \textit{praesidatus} of Lycia with the comment: «probably not the governor of Lycia, which seems to have been under perfectissimi throughout the fourth century». However, the later published inscription of Sozomenus and the inscription of Themistius, now included here, prove that Lycia was governed by a \textit{uir clarissimus} at least from about 360. See also Naour 1978, p. 178; Feissel & Wörrel 2015, pp. 280-281.

\textsuperscript{42} On the first version of the list and the all references of the praesides, see Hild & Hellenkemper 2004, pp. 403-404.
and word structure of the inscription makes it similar to the Themistius one mentioned above.

The only difference in the legible text of the two inscriptions is in the names of the emperors. Whereas the previous inscription honoured Julian, the new one is dedicated to Jovian. We may put forth two credible contenders as potential figures behind the evident act of honouring Julian based on the extensive data expounded upon before: Themistius and Sozomenus. It seems that the same authority could produce them with similar expressions and designs of inscriptions on pedestals. From this point of view, it is more conceivable that Themistius, who is certain to be the honouree of one, could be the only responsible praeses for carving these inscriptions for both emperors. Consequently, the following *addenda et corrigenda* could be proposed for it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editio Princeps</th>
<th>New Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D(omino) n(ostro) Iuli(ano?),</td>
<td>D(minum) n(ustrum) Iu[(i)]a[num]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fortissim(o),</td>
<td>[fortissim(um)] a[c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nobilissim(o),</td>
<td>[nobilissim(um)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 semper Augu(sto)</td>
<td>4 [semper Augus(tum)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[--]</td>
<td>[Arrius Paetus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Themistius]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[u(ir) c(larissimus), praeses]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 [prou(niae) Lyciae]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Arrius Paetus Themistius, of clarissimus rank, praeses of Lycia province *(set up this statue of)* our Lord Julian, the noblest and most powerful, ever Augustus.

Editor princeps has cleared up the abbreviated name and titles of the emperor by taking into account the rules of Latin grammar and consequently published his/her edition in *casus dativus* formation. Considering the honouring of Themistius for Jovian and the previous honouring for early Roman emperors at Andriace, it can be clearly understood that *casus accusativus* was used to address emperors. The epigraphic context demonstrates an explicit grammar adaptation from Greek into Latin. The emperor honoured by the inscription must be Julian, who reigned between 361-363 AD. The honoured emperor cannot be Constans (Augustus 337-350) or Constantius II (Augustus

---

43 Based on the considerations above regarding the updated order of the *praesidatus* of Lycia, it could also be concluded that the dedicator was Sozomenus, the *praeses* of Lycia at that time. In this case, lines 5-7 can be completed as follows: *(Flauius) Sozomenus | u(ir) c(larissimus), praeses | prou(niae) Lyciae*.
who were Julian’s predecessors, even though they also used this nomen gentilicium, Iulius. So, within the context of the inscriptions honouring Constans and Constantius II, they were introduced as Flavius Iulius\textsuperscript{44}.

---

\textsuperscript{44} CIL III 12126: D(ominum) n(ostrum) Fl(auium) Iul(ium) | Constantium, | uictorem, 
Aug(ustum), | Fl(auius) Nemesius | Olympius, u(ir) c(larissimus), | d(euotus) n(umini) m(aiestati)q(ue) eius. CIL III 12127: d(ominum) n(ostrum) Fl(auium) Iul(ium) | Constantium | d(ominum) n(ostrum) Fl(auium) Valentem | uictor(em) semper | Aug(u)s(tum) | d(euotus) n(umini) m(aiestati)q(ue) eius. The singular form «d. n. m. q. eius» in line 6 is probably related to the fact that only Constantius II was honoured with the statue in its original form. Therefore, line 3 must have been added later, after the beginning of Valens’ reign date of 28 March 364.
4. Conclusions

The *praesides* of Lycia, Olympus, Sozomenus and Themistius honoured the Roman emperors by inscribing honorific inscriptions in Latin. In contrast, nearly all imperial inscriptions were carved in Greek until the 4th century AD. Likewise, they erected statues of the emperors at Andriace, one of the most significant harbours in the region for eastern Mediterranean maritime activities\(^{45}\). Andriace, which centred primarily around the docks, *granarium*, and workshops, gained a cosmopolitan identity by becoming the meeting point for sailors of Egyptian, Lebanese, Israeli, Palestinian, and Syrian origin who sailed to different ports from the East together with Hellenic and Roman sailors. With this identity, it also had a higher cultural spectrum for merchants, politicians and clergy members than other cities in the region. The monuments, which welcomed the people who docked at the quay and travelled from one harbour to another for different purposes, are the major indications of this large promotional scale of the city. By the 4th century, the port of Andriace, with its high volume of trade and strategic location, had enabled the development of Myra and transformed it into the most crucial city in Lycia.

The above-mentioned honorary inscriptions of the *praesides* of Lycia with statues are located in the most magnificent place of the harbour, visible to everyone who came to Andriace in antiquity. Right next, there are various inscriptions of Roman emperors dated to the beginning of the 1st century AD, when Lycia had yet to become a province of the Roman Empire\(^{46}\). These honours are on one of the two monuments located in the area after the narrow alley west of the shop and storage buildings in the northeast direction of the *granarium* (*horrea Hadriani*), in the port settlement of Andriace, facing the harbour\(^{47}\). In particular, statues are standing on the upper side of Monument

\(^{45}\) For further information on the harbour of Andriace, see App., *BC IV* 10.82; Plin., *Nat. V* 100.6; *Stadias*. 238-239; Ptol., *Geog. V*. 3.3. See also Hirschfeld 1894, pp. 1240-1241; Borchhardt 1975, pp. 64-75; Hild & Hellenkemper 2004, pp. 435-439.

\(^{46}\) According to Öztürk (2010, p. 297), these constructions were erected by the Myrians as components of a *sebasteion* dedicated to Augustus and his family, located near the harbour’s quay so that they remained visible to all. Nevertheless, Çevik & Bulut (2022, p. 41) rightly proposed that no substantiated proof exists indicating the placement of the statues’ bases within a specific building. As a result, these structures should be more accurately characterised as honorary monuments from an architectural perspective despite sharing a functional similarity with a *sebasteion*.

\(^{47}\) Çevik & Bulut 2010, pp. 46, 78, 95.
2, which is located to the north and faces the harbour. The *demos* of Myra honoured Augustus, Tiberius, Germanicus, Agrippina, Agrippa, Drusus, Iulia Augusta, and Gaius Caesar with a total of 13 statue bases, two of which were carried to the island of Meis. Inscriptions and archaeological data suggest that the monuments here had two chronological phases, the second being built during the reign of the emperor Tiberius. The fact that the honour monuments with bronze statues were built on the south side of the quay street by the harbour indicates that the extreme density of daily traffic of the period was experienced in this area. The narrow streets to the east and west of these monument blocks, which welcomed the visitors anchoring in the harbour, provided access to the buildings on the upper level. In this way, these monument blocks were erected at the busiest point of the harbour regarding human circulation. Therefore, the intention of constructing these monuments and the divine titles such as *theos* used for the emperor and his family members was probably to improve relations with the Roman Empire through such honours, as seen in other Lycian cities. With the development of Andriace, especially during the Roman Imperial period, it seems that particular attention was paid to the honouring of the emperors in the city and port settlement.

As a result, new statues of emperors with their inscribed pedestals continued to be erected around these monuments until around the 4th century. The honorary inscriptions for emperors at Andriace show that there was dynamic and spec-

---

48 The people of Myra honoured Augustus, the first emperor of Rome, on this monument, as αὐτοκράτωρ γῆς καὶ βασιλάςσης «emperor of land and sea» and εὐεργέτης καὶ σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος κόσμου «saviour and benefactor of the whole universe», Agrippa as «saviour and benefactor of the people» and Livia, mother of Tiberius and wife of Augustus, as γοβέσσα Σεβαστή Ιουλία. *IGR* III 715: Θεον Σεβαστον, θεον αυτοκρατορα γης και βασιλαςσης τον Ευεργετην και σωτηρα τον ευεργετην. *IGR* III 716: Αγριππιναν θυγατριδην θεον Σεβαστον Καισαρον, | [γ]υναεκα δη[ξ] Γερμανικον Καισαρον, Μυρων ὁ δήμος.

49 On the dating of the monument see Öztürk 2010, p. 297; Çevik & Bulut 2022, pp. 41-42.

50 Çevik & Bulut 2022, p. 41.
tacular interaction in late antiquity and that the harbour of Andriace was of high interest to the empire. In addition, from the reign of Tiberius, the *demos* of Myra carved inscriptions for emperors, and their family members, and the *praesides* of Lycia further honoured them with inscribed statue pedestals in the 4th century. In this context, especially from the first quarter of this century, it is clear that Myra and its harbour, Andriace, became more critical in Lycia, which had separated from Pamphylia. However, even if it was proven that the city was the capital of Lycia in the 5th century, the commendations for the emperors by three different *praesides* support the opinion that the city may have been the capital earlier. In addition, honorary inscriptions confirm that the *praesides* were appointed from the *ordo senatorius* in the middle of the same century in Lycia. Finally, the governorships of Themistius and Sozomenus, which were dated by the letters of Libanius, have been redated, changing their *praesidatus* term.
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