

Article

The Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica: an overview

François Chevrollier

Louvre Abu Dhabi, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

Abstract

Although Greek was the dominant epigraphic language in Cyrenaica throughout the Classical period, Latin was introduced by Roman merchants and administrators at the time of the formation of the province of Crete and Cyrene c. 67 BC, and remained in use, albeit by a constant minority, until at least the fourth century AD, with the last well-dated Latin inscription dating from the Valentinian dynasty. The aim of this article is to provide an overview of Latin inscriptions in the region, based on the *IR Cyrenaica 2020* corpus, which brings together hitherto scattered documents and also includes many texts published for the first time. After a general overview of the corpus in terms of geographical, typological and chronological distribution, we will look at the linguistic landscape of ancient Cyrenaica, focusing on the multilingualism of the region, the literacy of the populations, the borrowings from one language to another (Latinisms), and the influences of the western provinces on the Latin of the region, among other topics. Lastly, a series of Latin funerary inscriptions allow us to examine the multiple identities claimed by the populations, as well as the cultural influences between Greek-, Latin- and Libyan-speaking populations.

النقوش اللاتينية في برقة: نظرة عامة. فرانسوا شيفوليه

على الرغم من أن اليونانية كانت اللغة الكتابية السائدة في برقة طوال الفترة الكلاسيكية، تم إدخال اللاتينية عن طريق الرومان التجار والإداريين في وقت تشكيل مقاطعة كريت-برقة حوالي عام 67 قبل الميلاد، وبقيت قيد الاستخدام، وإن كان بين الأقلية، باستمرار حتى القرن الرابع الميلادي على الأقل، مع آخر نقش لاتيني مؤرخ جيداً يعود تاريخه إلى أسرة فالنتينيان الحاكمة. تهدف هذه المقالة إلى تقديم لمحة عامة عن النقوش اللاتينية في المنطقة، استناداً على مجموعة IR لبرقة 2020، التي تجمع وثائق منفردة معاً، كما تتضمن العديد من النصوص المنشورة لأول مرة. وبعد إعطاء نظرة عامة على المجموعة من الناحية الجغرافية، و التوزيع النمطي والزمني، سوف ننظر إلى المشهد اللغوي ببرقة القديمة، مع التركيز على التعددية اللغوية في المنطقة، و إمام السكان بالقراءة والكتابة، والافتراض من لغة إلى أخرى (اللاتينية)، وتأثيرات المقاطعات الغربية على اللغة اللاتينية في المنطقة، بالإضافة إلى مواضيع أخرى. وأخيراً، سلسلة من النقوش اللاتينية الجنائزية تسمح لنا بفحص الهويات المتعددة المزعومة من قبل السكان، فضلاً عن التأثيرات الثقافية بين السكان الناطقين باليونانية، واللاتينية والليبية.

The recent publication of the corpus of *Inscriptions of Roman Cyrenaica* (*IR Cyrenaica 2020*), prepared for online publication by Charlotte Roueché and Gabriel Bodard at King's College London and based on the research of Joyce Reynolds, has already proved to be an indispensable tool for our understanding of Roman Cyrenaica.¹ Conceived decades ago by Joyce Reynolds, it complements the corpus of Greek inscriptions from the pre-Roman period (*IG Cyrenaica*) and the Greek verse-inscriptions of Cyrenaica (*IG Cyrenaica Verse*),² and now includes nearly 2,400 entries with a number of new texts to be added in a forthcoming edition. Among the inscriptions from the Roman period – defined in this article as beginning in 96 BC with the bequest of Ptolemy Apion and ending with the Arab conquest at the beginning of the seventh century AD – now grouped together in *IR Cyrenaica 2020* are a large number of Latin documents, which I would like to focus on in the following pages.

Although the majority of inscriptions are engraved in Greek, Roman Cyrenaica also has some exceptional documents in Latin: from the dossier of bilingual boundary-markers restoring landed estates to the Roman people (see below) to prayers addressed to the emperor similar to the *acta* of the Arval brothers found on the agoras of Cyrene (C.146) and Ptolemais (P.97, P.204, P. 339, see Reynolds 1962b); from building inscriptions for the construction or repair of monuments under Augustus

and after the Jewish revolt of AD 115–17 to milestones (again often bilingual) that dotted the main roads in the region; from several documents relating to the Roman administration of the province to a copy of the price edict of Diocletian (P.144), to name but a few. This modest collection is therefore worthy of attention and provides new insights into the history of Cyrenaica from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity.

The first recorded Latin inscriptions from Cyrenaica were copied by Paolo della Cella in 1817 (A.53, C.4), then by Jean-Raimond Pacho in 1825 (T.365, P.281, C.554, C.775) and Joseph Vattier de Bourville in 1848 (C.272): these seven texts were included by Theodor Mommsen in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. III 1, nos 6–12, published in Berlin in 1877. Numerous discoveries were subsequently made by the Italian archaeological mission in the inter-war period. From 1953 until his death in 1966, Richard G. Goodchild (1976) was in charge of the antiquities department of Cyrenaica, enlisting the talents of Joyce Reynolds, who had been active in Tripolitania since the late 1940s. Roman inscriptions were henceforth mainly studied by her as part of the preparation of the corpus of Roman-period texts.³ Italian epigraphers, however, were by no means indifferent to Latin texts, as shown by the important lexicon published by Giuseppina Giambuzzi (1971), a former student of Lidio Gasperini.

Gianfranco Paci (1994) also devoted attention to the Latin inscriptions of the region, on which he published a brief study just 30 years ago. The purpose of this article is not to repeat Paci's study, which is still relevant in many respects: its aim is rather, on the one hand, to take a fresh look at the Latin corpus

Email: francois.chevrollier@gmail.com

Cite this article: Chevrollier F (2024). The Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica: an overview. *Libyan Studies* 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/lis.2024.9>

on the basis of *IR Cyrenaica 2020*, in which a number of previously unpublished texts have been edited and which makes it easy to put together a series of inscriptions that have hitherto been widely scattered, and on the other hand, to set the Latin inscriptions in the context of recent studies on bilingualism and multilingualism in the Roman Empire, subjects that have attracted the attention of researchers over the last 20 years or so (Adams 2003, 2007; Adams, Janse and Swain 2002; Mullen and James 2012; Clackson 2015; and also, before Adams' studies, Dubuisson 1992 and Leiwo 1995 on the notions of bilingualism, diglossia, linguistic interference and contact, and code-switching in Roman inscriptions; see also the concluding remarks below).

A first step towards understanding the presence of Latin in Cyrenaica is to take a quick look at the diversity of the population and languages in the region (section I). Statistics should always be approached with the greatest caution and even suspicion in the field of ancient history, and counting inscriptions does not necessarily reflect the level of literacy of a given population, but a few figures can provide an idea of the geographical and typological distribution of Latin inscriptions (section II) recorded in Cyrenaica between the age of Pompey and the last quarter of the fourth century AD (section III). The availability of all these texts now allows us to engage in some preliminary thoughts on the linguistic landscape of Cyrenaica (section IV), on the vocabulary influences received from other provinces as a result of the movement of administrators and soldiers in an Empire that was already 'globalised' (section V) and finally on the multiple identities of the region's population that can be felt through the choice of a particular epigraphic language (section VI).

I. Population diversity and multilingualism in Roman Cyrenaica

The population of Roman Cyrenaica comprised three main linguistic groups: Greek, Latin and 'Libyc'.

Greeks settled in these lands at the end of the seventh century BC from the island of Thera and their number increased over time through regular population movements. As a result, Cyrene was first and foremost a Greek *polis* and a centre of Hellenism in North Africa, which gave rise to major scholars and intellectuals of Classical to Late-Antique Greek thought, such as Aristippus, Callimachus, Eratosthenes and Synesius. The vast majority of inscriptions are therefore written in Greek, which remained the dominant language of the region for a millennium and a half.

In the absence of a Roman colonial foundation, the spread of Latin seems to have been the result of two main factors, beginning in the first century BC: the settlement of Italians for commercial reasons⁴ and the imposition of an administrative apparatus in Latin from the time of the formation of the province, supplemented a little later by a military presence which, however, remained relatively discreet during the High Empire.⁵ In 7/6 BC, the edicts of Augustus (C.101, ll. 4–6) listed only 215 Roman citizens, which is very few. This small Latin-speaking group⁶ always remained largely in the minority compared with the Greek-speakers. We also know of new population influxes, the composition of which remains unknown, for instance in the aftermath of the Jewish revolt of AD 115–17 when 3,000 veterans were sent to repopulate the region, giving the population of the areas in which they settled a more military – and perhaps Latin – flavour (SEG.17.584, but we are not sure of their precise origin).

The last group are the so-called 'Libyan' peoples, who were present in these areas long before the arrival of the Greeks. They originally belonged to tribes, some of whom had acculturated to the Greek way of life, while others, further away from urban centres, retained a nomadic or semi-nomadic lifestyle.

These populations had a specific language called 'Libyc', most probably an ancestor of Berber (Chaker 2008). In the western African provinces (from the Atlantic to Tripolitania),⁷ Libyc is known in the epigraphical record at least until the third century AD mainly for funerary and votive texts,⁸ along with Punic (until the fifth century AD), thus creating a unique and very diverse linguistic landscape (Coltelloni-Trannoy 2015; Coltelloni-Trannoy and Veisse 2007; Millar 1968). However, no written documents in Libyc have come to light in the region, so the local form of the language – which we can assume was in a dominant position at least among the rural populations – remains completely unknown: in Cyrenaica, Libyc is therefore a 'ghost language'.⁹

Only a few anthroponyms transliterated into Greek make it possible to trace it, although these names do not determine any ethnicity for their bearers (Camps 2002; Chevrollier 2020–2024, 216–17; Dobias-Lalou, this volume; Marini 2018, 119–40; Masson 1974; Rebuffat 2018). The Libyans and those who belonged to mixed groups chose to engrave their inscriptions in Greek or Latin certainly for reasons of prestige (Bérenger 2023, 58) and in order to emphasise their adoption of elite writing practices. This also testifies to a nascent literacy and a new epigraphic habit among this population, based on the influence of Graeco-Roman traditions.

However, the question of the absence of inscriptions in Libyc in Cyrenaica remains unexplained.¹⁰ In the other Roman provinces of Africa (Egypt aside), the influence of Phoenician and/or Punic on the development of writing practices in Libyc proved to be very important.¹¹ This raises the question of why the influence of Greek, which had been present in Cyrenaica since the seventh century BC and which also had an alphabetic script as well as epigraphic practices, apparently did not have the same impact as Phoenician or Punic on the development of a local epigraphic production in Libyc. This might be explained by the presence of urban centres populated by newcomers (Greeks in Cyrenaica, Punic in the West) who would have 'spurned' the local language: the fact that Libyans were not constituted as a 'state' would have prevented the language from being standardised and institutionalised, and from imposing itself in the face of other idioms. It is in fact interesting to note, as a comparison, that no Libyc inscriptions have been found so far in the Punic territory which became the first Roman province of *Africa* in 146 BC (Ghaki 2022, 156 and fig. 3): Libyc must have been quite undervalued by the urban elites and was spoken by segments of the population who had remained distant from Hellenism and Romanness. We can simply conclude from this that the Libyc language existed in Cyrenaica, but that neither the practice of writing nor the habit of engraving it on stone or other materials had taken root there.¹² On the other hand, the lack of archaeological research in areas far from the Graeco-Roman cities and their immediate surroundings may explain the supposed absence of Libyc texts in present-day eastern Libya. These considerations would take me too far in these pages, but research into Libyc in Cyrenaica, and more broadly into the populations who lived in the vicinity of the Greeks *poleis*, is a subject that needs to be developed further, but to do so it must take into account the whole of North Africa, from the Atlantic to the Nile (Desanges 1962), as well as parts of the Sahara.

Therefore, it is important to bear in mind that the society of ancient Cyrenaica was in fact trilingual, and there is no reason to believe that some members of the local elite did not speak Libyc as well. But in the inscriptions, bilingualism is exclusively Greek-Latin in Cyrenaica:¹³ it is therefore impossible to study Latin/Greek/third language plurilingualism in the same way as in other regions of the ancient world, such as the Levant with Phoenician, the Near East and notably Palmyra with Aramaic,

Asia Minor with the various Anatolian languages, Sicily with Punic and southern Gaul with Gallic.¹⁴

Besides, these three groups intermingled considerably thanks to matrimonial alliances. Some mixed families included individuals with Libyan and Greek names, and even with *tria nomina* with Greek or Latin *cognomen*. At the same time, Italian immigrant families acquired citizenship of one of the local Greek *poleis*, whereas *ciuitas Romana* was extended to the members of the elite of the local cities, especially during the Julio-Claudian and Flavian periods, so that it becomes difficult to distinguish between ‘Greeks’, ‘Italians/Romans’, or ‘Graeco-Libyans’. Demography, marriages, population movements, social mobility and civic status are all factors that have had an impact on identity, and so indirectly on the language spoken and used in the inscriptions during the Principate.

Studying multilingualism in Cyrenaica on the basis of epigraphy therefore constitutes a methodological bias, even if inscriptions remain the only means of expression that survived and can give an idea of the place of Latin. There is also a documentary bias since, among the inscriptions studied here, there is an over-representation of official documents, which are more likely to be written in Latin, since they emanate from Roman authorities. A few figures will demonstrate this.

II. The Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica: geographical distribution and typologies

Over the nearly 30 years since the publication of G. Paci’s article, the corpus of Latin texts has doubled. Paci indicated that he was relying on just over 100 texts, whereas *IR Cyrenaica 2020* now comprises 237 Latin or bilingual inscriptions,¹⁵ to which must be added five texts published subsequently:

- 1) A bilingual funerary inscription for the freedman G. Cascellius Mommus, dated to the first century BC (Mei and Antolini 2019, 59–60, no. 3), from the southern necropolis of Cyrene.
- 2) A *restitutio agrorum* cippus bearing the name of the imperial legate L. Acilius Strabo, from the time of Claudius or Nero, found *in situ* at the start of the road leading from Cyrene to Balagrae (Mei and Antolini 2019, 60–61, no. 4).
- 3) A boundary inscription demarcating the border between the province of Cyrenaica and a village outside it, by the same legate L. Acilius Strabo (Alshareef *et al.* 2021, 60–64, no. 4).
- 4) A *terminatio* from the area of Bersis, in the territory of Taucheira, under emperor Titus (Chevrollier *et al.* 2023).
- 5) A first/early-second-century-AD bilingual funerary inscription from Cyrene with the name of P. Iodius Apol(lonios?), son of Manius (Dobias-Lalou, *in print*). Iodius might derive from the Jewish name Ioudios/Ioudas; the integration of such a name as a *gentilicium* would be an *unicum*.

This study therefore covers a total of 242 texts geographically distributed as shown in Table 1.

Cyrene is the city with the most Latin inscriptions, but Ptolemais has around 50, which is consistent with its rise during

Table 1. Geographical distribution of the Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica.

Provenances	Number of inscriptions
Cyrene	122
Ptolemais	47
Taucheira	18
Apollonia	15
Berenice	10
<i>Chora</i> /minor sites	30

the High Empire to the rank of capital of the Pentapolis after the reforms of Diocletian. Boundary-markers and milestones are over-represented among the inscriptions from the *chora*; but if we exclude them, there are only two texts from the Altar of the Philaeni (M.1–2),¹⁶ graffiti in the fort at Esc-Sheleidima (M.46, M.49) and an isolated funerary inscription from Limnias-Lamludah (M.258), to which I return in section VI.

The online corpus makes it easy to pinpoint the findspots of the inscriptions and to carry out micro-topographical analyses, especially as it is linked to the *Heritage Gazetteer of Libya*.¹⁷ Such research shows that some areas of Cyrene were home to more Latin documents than others. This is the case, for example, with the forum-*Caesareum* and the basilica (Luni 1992; 2007). The *Caesareum* was built on the site of the ancient gymnasium of Cyrene in the early Imperial era. From the Flavian period onwards, the architectural complex was equipped with a three-aisled basilica and became the forum of the Roman city. In the centre of the monument, bordered on the south, west and east by porticoes and on the north by the basilica, a temple was built in the Antonine era. It was dedicated either to Bacchus or to Antoninus Pius, according to various hypotheses. The quadriportico was restored under Hadrian after the damage caused by the Jewish revolt, and the basilica was given an apse on its west end. Among the inscriptions from those two buildings,¹⁸ three are in Greek, two are bilingual but seven are in Latin (e.g., C.4, C.7, C.9, C.10, C.18). The forum area is therefore the place where Latin inscriptions dominate in number throughout the site. Other places were also home to many Latin inscriptions, such as the *Augusteum* on the agora (C.105 to C.112, with the exception of C.110, in Greek), in this case because of the building’s particular link with the imperial cult.

By contrast, Latin inscriptions in the sanctuary of Apollo, the core of the Greek rituals in the city, are unusual and only two were discovered among the multiple shrines located inside the sanctuary.¹⁹ These are two dedications to Luna and Mars respectively (C.300–301) recovered from the temple of Isis, both belonging to a series dedicated to the gods of the seven planets and days of the week. The online corpus and its additional resources are therefore also relevant to understanding the ‘ideology’ that the Romans wanted to convey in such or such monument.

The Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica can roughly be divided into the categories listed in Table 2.

G. Paci (1994, 254) pointed out that the majority of Latin inscriptions were official texts and were related to the activities of the provincial government; the publication of the *IR Cyrenaica 2020* corpus confirms this general assessment, since around half of the documents belong to this typology.

To get into more details, Table 3 lists the official inscriptions mentioning Roman magistrates whenever the texts show that they had a concrete action – starting in 27 BC, Cyrene, joined with Crete, became a public province of praetorian rank governed by a proconsul assisted by legates residing in Cyrene and quaestors residing in Gortyn. These texts include building inscriptions relating to the construction or restoration of public and religious monuments; dedications in honour of emperors, members of the imperial family, or governors; consecrations of statues or temples to deities; other types of official document of uncertain nature; and ephebic inscriptions (in one case). This small corpus is dominated by bilingual inscriptions, here again over-represented by the *restitutio agrorum* boundary-markers and the milestones, which were both in Latin, the administrative language, and in Greek, so that they could be understood by everyone.

I shall return in section III to the chronological conclusions we can draw from Table 3, but I would like to stress first that this

Table 2. Typologies of the Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica.

Typologies	Number of documents
Official inscriptions, including:	
– Imperial titulatures	28
– Honours/dedications to emperors, the imperial family and Roman officials	30
– Building inscriptions involving an emperor, a Roman official, the Roman military	46
– Other official documents (letters, etc.) ¹	6
Boundary-markers	21
Milestones ²	21
Decrees, honorific inscriptions	4
Building inscriptions without names of officials (benefactions, uncertain initiatives, etc.)	12
Religious inscriptions, including:	
– Dedications to gods	10
– Prayers for the safety of the emperors	4
Funerary inscriptions	25
Names (isolated and lists of names)	12
Others ³	13
Uncertain/fragmentary/unintelligible	10

¹Including, for instance, the price edict of Diocletian P.144.

²M.244 and P.199 have been recorded here as milestones.

³A.73 (brick stamp), C.122 (validation of a weight), C.268 (sculptor's signature), C.479 (seal legend), P.378 (mason's mark?). The category also includes the series of graffiti from the Berenice 'hostel' B.4, B.5, B.6, B.27, B.33, B.34, B.35, B.40.

group of inscriptions also raises the question of the governor's accessibility to the local population. We know that governors had to deal with multilingualism in the provinces they ruled, particularly in matters of justice (Bérenger 2023), in the context of a bilingual Latin-Greek empire (Corbier 2008; Rochette 2010). Of the 52 proconsuls of Crete and Cyrene whose geographical origin can be determined with varying degrees of certainty, only six came from the Greek-speaking East, while 46 originated from Italy (35) and the western provinces (11), meaning that they may have had to hire interpreters, although we can assume that the education of senators included Greek (Bérenger 2004; 2023, 59–62). In Cyrenaica, it is clear that both in the Augustan era (edicts of Augustus: C.101) and in the Antonine period (dossier of imperial rescripts of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius: C.163), it was necessary to have texts relating to justice or directly addressed to the people engraved in Greek so that the local inhabitants could understand them. Even if the elite could be expected to be bilingual, it is likely that not all Cyrenaeans understood the inscriptions erected in Latin by their governors. Cyrenaica was therefore in a situation of Latin-Greek diglossia, with the Latin language in a hierarchically superior position but in a large minority in practice.

III. From Pompey to the Valentinian dynasty: a brief chronological overview of the corpus

The earliest Latin inscriptions date from the year 67 BC and the rule of Pompey the Great and his legate Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus. Eight inscriptions belong to this period (Reynolds 1962a):

- 1–3/ Three inscriptions in dialectal Greek in honour of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus (C.132[?], C.271 and C.280).
- 4/ An *epikrīma* ('decree', from Apollonia, A.8), in Greek, relating to a dispute between Cyrene and Apollonia (according to J. Reynolds). However, André Laronde (1987, 457–59) suggested that it may instead refer to a sanctuary of Apollo. If Reynolds' proposal is correct, it could be the earliest mention of Apollonia as an autonomous city.

- 5/ A decree written in Greek and then translated into Latin,²⁰ for Alexis son of Alexander, in which the legate's name and that of the eponymous priest of Apollo are both used to date the document (C.688). This translation was certainly commissioned by the legate to honour a *philorhomaïos* at the time of the establishment of the first Roman administration in Cyrenaica.
- 6/ A fragmentary account of contribution to an aqueduct probably mentioning Pompey (C.687), in Latin.
- 7–8/ A decree, in Latin, potentially concerning an allocation of lands, or a census list of landowners, from Ptolemais, under the authority of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus and probably mentioning Pompey the Great as well (P.100, possibly the Latin version of P.101, in Greek).

The use of both Greek and Latin in this dossier, which can be dated to the foundation of the Roman province, needs to be addressed. The first four inscriptions were either initiatives of the *poleis* or intended for a local audience, and were therefore written in Greek – as were, for example, the inscriptions in honour of Cyrene's first Roman patrons.²¹ Documents in Latin, on the other hand, are written in this language because they fall under Roman authority. In the decree in honour of Alexis son of Alexander, the use of Latin is also explained by the involvement of the association of the *ciues Romani qui Cyrenis negotiantur*.²² These businessmen may have included publicans, who are documented from the earliest years of Roman rule in Cyrenaica.²³ This group of inscriptions shows that the Roman authorities understood the importance of maintaining the Greek language in the process of provincialisation, and that the use of Latin was never exclusive, neither at the time of the formation of the province nor later, as expected for a *provincia* of the Roman East.

Table 3 clearly shows that, from a chronological perspective, there is a clear break between a long first century AD dominated by Latin in official documents, and a second century in which Greek inscriptions outnumber the Latin ones, bilingual inscriptions left aside. It also demonstrates that a first period of expansion of Latin epigraphy in Cyrenaica occurred at the beginning of the Julio-Claudian era with numerous inscriptions dated to the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius – other texts, not included in Table 3 because magistrates are not involved, could be added such as the dedications to Augustan deities (*numina Augusta*, C.106–109) and to Ceres by a *promagister* of a company of publicans (C.455). The strong presence of Latin texts in the first century AD on the agora, where the first monuments dedicated to imperial worship were erected, where Roman governors were particularly active and where members of the *familia Caesaris* were honoured, had already been stressed by S.M. Marengo (1988; cf. also the building inscription of the *nomophylakeion* under Domitian: C.92).

The second part of the Julio-Claudian period and the Flavian era are characterised by the presence of the already mentioned serial documents such as milestones and boundary-markers dated to the reigns of Claudius, Nero and Vespasian.

In the second century AD, official documents were more likely to be written in Greek (Table 3). It is entirely possible that the legacy of Hadrian, who played an active role in restoring Cyrene on Hellenic, and more specifically Dorian, cultural grounds (Rosamilia 2021 based on C.163) after the difficulties caused by the Jewish revolt that broke out during the principate of his predecessor (Chevrollier 2019), explains the (re)expansion of Greek in a region where Latin had finally never really taken root among the population. However, this observation is not free of exceptions. Table 4 lists the inscriptions relating to this phase in the city's history: it includes inscriptions in honour of Hadrian, building inscriptions relating to repairs after the *tumultus Iudaicus* and milestones on the road to Apollonia. The table

Table 3. Inscriptions pertaining to the activities of Roman magistrates in Cyrenaica. This table includes only those inscriptions in which Roman officials have an action of their own (either by dating the inscription, initiating a construction or a dedication, authorising it on behalf of the emperor, etc.). By contrast, proconsuls who are only mentioned in official documents that do not emanate directly from them have not been included. This is the case: 1. of P. Sextius Scaeva, mentioned in the edicts of Augustus (C.101); 2. of Saluius Carus, who appears in the letter of Hadrian to the Cyrenaicans (C.163, ll. 7–8); 3. of the legate M. Tittius, honoured by the Jewish *politeuma* in AD 24/5 (B.75). The latter documents are in Greek as they were supposed to be sent and read by the local inhabitants.

Roman official	Function	Latin	Bilingual	Greek	Date
Q. Lucanius Proculus	Proconsul	Building inscription for the fortifications of the acropolis (C.151, Cyrene)		Statues in honour of Augustus (C.319, Cyrene)	between 12 and 2 BC
[- -]lus	Proconsul	Architrave of the <i>Augusteum</i> (C.104, Cyrene)			Augustan era
Lucius Corona	Proconsul	Monumental base (A.19, Apollonia)			probably Augustan era
M. Sufenas Proculus	Legate	- Building inscription for the north <i>stoa</i> (C.118, Cyrene) - Building inscription for the <i>Caesareum</i> (C.9, Cyrene) - Building inscription for the <i>Strategeion</i> (C.225, Cyrene) - Base of a statue in the <i>Strategeion</i> (C.226, Cyrene) - Building inscription for the extramural temple of Demeter near the southern gate (C.437, Cyrene)			between AD 4 and 14
C. Clodius Vestalis	Proconsul	- Building inscription for the arch (?) of the north entrance of the agora (C.116, Cyrene) - Building inscription for the <i>porticus Augusta</i> (C.113, Cyrene) - Building inscription for the stairway of the north entrance of the agora (C.117, Cyrene)	Consecration of the <i>Aqua Augusta</i> (C.322, Cyrene)	Base of the equestrian statue of the proconsul (C.115, Cyrene)	between AD 6/7 and the beginning of the reign of Tiberius
C. Rubellius Blandus	Proconsul	Building inscription for the <i>Caesareum</i> (C.4, see Gasperini 1996, Cyrene)			ca. AD 15–20
P. Octavius	Proconsul	Dedication of a statue of Livia (C.272, Cyrene)			ca. AD 15–20
P. Viriasus Naso	Proconsul	Inscription mentioning the governor's name (C.696, Cyrene)			ca. AD 35
Anonymous	Proconsul	Architrave of the temple of Zeus (C.418, Cyrene)			Tiberian?
Caesernius Veiento	Proconsul		Milestone on the road to Balagrae (C.537, Cyrene) [probably bilingual with the Greek text now lost]		AD 46/7
[- -]lus	Proconsul	Building inscription for the <i>Caesareum</i> (C.3–C.4, Cyrene)			Neronian?
[- -]lus Pacilaeus	Legate				
L. Acilius Strabo	Imperial legate		17 boundary-markers related to <i>restitutio agrorum</i> operations (A.25; A.50; A.68; C.434; C.748; M.68 (?); M.125; M.141; M.143; M.153; M.172; M.173; M.238; M.251; M.275; Mei and Antolini 2019, no. 4, 60–61; Alshareef, Chevrollier, Dobias-Lalou 2021, no. 4, 60–64)		AD 53/4 to 55/6

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued.)

Roman official	Function	Latin	Bilingual	Greek	Date
L. Pedius Blaesus	Proconsul		Milestone on the road to Apollonia (M.225)		AD 54/5 or 55/6
A. Minicius Rufus	Proconsul			Honours for Vespasian by the <i>polis</i> of Cyrene (C.273, Cyrene)	first century AD (AD 42/3 or 70/1 or 71/2)
C. Arinius Modestus	Proconsul	Boundary-marker (A.54, Apollonia; possibly also A.51)			70s AD
Q. Paconius Agrippinus ¹	Imperial legate		14 boundary-markers related to <i>restitutio agrorum</i> operations (C.147; C.428; C.429; C.430; C.438; C.747; M.68; M.165; M.229; M.230; M.232; M.238; M.239; P.397)		AD 71/2 to 73/4
L. Minicius Rufus	Proconsul		Milestones on the road to Balagrae (M.221 and M.199) [<i>probably bilingual with the Latin texts now lost</i>]		AD 77/8
C. Pomponius Gallus Didius Rufus	Proconsul	<i>Restitutio</i> of lands to the <i>polis</i> (P.28, Ptolemais)			AD 88/9 or 89/90
Bruttidius Sabinus	Proconsul	Building inscription from the basilica (C.22, Cyrene)			ca. end of first century AD
C. Memmius [- - -]	Proconsul	Building inscription for the baths of Trajan (C.239, Cyrene)			AD 98/9
P. Pomponius Secundus	Proconsul	Dedication to the nymph <i>Libya</i> (C.126, Cyrene)			first century AD
Subtotal first century AD		21	36	3	Subtotal: 60
P. Sestius Pollio	Legate			Mentioned as <i>hiereus</i> of Apollo in a catalogue of priests (C.223, ll. 8–13, Cyrene)	ca. AD 100
Anonymous	Proconsul			Architrave of the temple of Asklepios at Balagrae (M.179) [<i>very fragmentary and the title of proconsul is restored</i>]	Hadrianic
C. Claudius Titianus Dèmostratos	Proconsul			Dedication of the north <i>stoa</i> on the agora (C.119, Cyrene)	AD 160/1 or 161/2
Q. Iulius Potitus	Proconsul	Uncertain, possibly a building inscription (C.201, Cyrene)		Dedication of a statue of Antoninus Pius by the <i>polis</i> (C.110, Cyrene)	reign of Antoninus Pius
L. O[...] M[- - -]	Proconsul			Building inscription (?) for the arch of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (C.213, Cyrene)	probably AD 164/5
[Q. ?] Pomponius Naeuianus	Proconsul		Building inscription for cisterns (C.166–C.167, Cyrene)		probably AD 165/6
Silius Plautius Haterianus	Quaestor				
Numisius Marcellianus	Proconsul			– Consecration of a statue of Artemis (C.221, Cyrene) – Catalogue of ephebes (C.143, Cyrene) – Restoration of a temple of Isis (C.299, Cyrene) – Restoration of the temple of Apollo <i>Nymphagetas</i> (C.305, Cyrene)	ca. AD 172/3 to 175/6

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued.)

Roman official	Function	Latin	Bilingual	Greek	Date
[-]ae[-]anus	Proconsul			– Dedication by a priest of a temple and possibly a statue (C.661, Cyrene) – Building inscription for a temple (C.306, Cyrene)	between AD 176 and 180
Anonymous	Legate				
Claudius Attalus	Proconsul			Architrave of the <i>pronaos</i> of the temple of Zeus (C.419, Cyrene)	maybe reign of Marcus Aurelius
L. Sempronius [Senecio ?]	Proconsul			Dedication of a statue of Commodus by the <i>polis</i> of Cyrene (C.173, Cyrene)	between AD 190/1 and 192/3
P. Flavius Pudens Pomponianus	Proconsul			Dedication of a statue of Ammon by a local priest (C.330, Cyrene)	reign of Alexander Severus
Anonymous	Proconsul			Uncertain (C.202, Cyrene)	second century AD
Anonymous	Proconsul	Fragmentary official document (P.83, Ptolemais)			second or third century AD
Anonymous	Proconsul			Fragmentary official document (P.84, Ptolemais)	second or third century AD
Anonymous	Legate				
Anonymous	Proconsul			Uncertain dedication (C.664, Cyrene)	end of second – beginning of third century AD
Anonymous	Proconsul	Uncertain, probably building inscription (C.694, Cyrene)			third century AD (?)
Subtotal second and early third century AD		3	1	17	Subtotal: 21
Grand total		24	37	20	Total: 81
		Latin	Bilingual	Greek	

¹Q. Paconius Agrippinus had been quaestor of Crete and Cyrene under Claudius (Baldwin Bowsky 2006) before returning to the province under Vespasian as imperial legate.

clearly shows that Greek inscriptions were linked with the actions of benefactors or of the city of Cyrene, whereas Latin inscriptions were the result of imperial initiatives. The interest of this survey is to illustrate that, despite the emperor's insistence on a return to the city's Greek roots, the inscriptions concerning the buildings on which the imperial authority or imperial financing were involved remained in Latin. The corpus of inscriptions pertaining to the recovery of Cyrene is therefore quite balanced between Greek and Latin and could be considered a moment of transition in the epigraphic habit of the region. Inscriptions mentioning Roman officials also show that governors appear to have been less active in the second century and that their activities were carried out in deeper coordination with civic authorities and local magistrates than before.

The most recent surviving Latin inscriptions date from the fourth century AD:

- the Price edict of Diocletian dated AD 301 (P.144).
- imperial honours for Diocletian at the altar of the Philaeni on the border with Tripolitania (M.1).²⁴
- milestones from the Tetrarchy (P.199, A.69, A.70).²⁵
- imperial honours for Maximin Daia, Constantine and Licinius, from Ptolemais, dated AD 311–13 (P.118).
- imperial honours (but possibly a milestone) for Constantine and his sons, from the Christian church at Ras al-Hilal, east of Cyrene, dated AD 333–37 (M.244).
- imperial honours for Gratian (?), Valentinian and Valens dated AD 375–78 (C.157).²⁶ [*Diuina stirpe progenitos [D(ominos) n(ostros) tres) imp(eratores) Caes(ares) Gratianum et Valentinian]um et Valentem pios, [felices, semper Augustos], 'Born of [divine] stock, our [three masters, the emperors Caesars Gratian, Valentinian] and Valens, pious, [fortunate, eternal Augusti]'*].
- other fourth- or fifth-century AD inscriptions not precisely datable (M.2: inscription from a governor-*praeses* at the altar of the Philaeni;²⁷ P.141: building inscription [uncertain]).

The latest well-dated Latin text from Cyrenaica is therefore the dedication to Gratian, Valentinian and Valens. On the contrary, much later Greek inscriptions are attested, such as copies of the imperial edict of Anastasius I dating from AD 491–518 and found in fragments at Taucheira (T.219), Ptolemais (P.116) and Apollonia (A.30). Other types of texts in Greek, mainly in a Christian context (but not only, e.g., P.120), were known until the Arab conquest in the mid-seventh century AD (see the

Table 4. Inscriptions pertaining to Hadrian's actions after the Jewish revolt.

Date	Latin	Bilingual	Greek
117–38 (not precisely dated in the reign of Hadrian)	C.13: building (?) inscription in the <i>Caesareum</i>	C.292: building inscription for the temple of Hekate	C.274: honours in the <i>Apollonion</i>
	C.177: honours in the Central Quarter		C.283: building inscription for the temple of Artemis (initiative of a benefactor)
	C.21: building inscription from the basilica		C.298: building inscription for the temple of Isis (initiative of a benefactor)
	C.5: building inscription from the <i>Caesareum</i>		C.673: honours for Hadrian
	C.10: building inscription from the <i>Caesareum</i>		M.179: building inscription for the <i>Asklepieion</i> at Balagrae (seemingly an initiative of several benefactors)
	P.322: fragmentary imperial titulature		Unpublished: building inscription for the basilica at Taucheira ¹
	T.1: building inscription of a public building		
117/8		C.7: building inscription for the <i>Caesareum</i>	
118	C.63: fragmentary imperial titulature from the temple of Hermes	C.18: honours by the <i>ciuitas Cyrenensium</i> in the basilica	
	C.246: repairs on the road between Cyrene and Apollonia [<i>most likely originally bilingual</i>]	C.102: honours by the <i>ciuitas Cyrenensium</i> on the agora	
		M.223: repairs on the road between Cyrene and Apollonia	
119	C.281: building inscription for the restoration of the baths of Trajan		
122/3	A.37: building inscription	T.706: building inscription from Taucheira	
128/9			C.14: honours by the <i>polis</i> of Cyrene
138			C.91: honours by the <i>polis</i> of Cyrene
Total	11	6	8

¹This inscription has not been included in *IR Cyrenaica 2020*. The only fragment I know of is in Greek, but it is possible that the text was originally bilingual. Ongoing research in Joyce Reynolds' notebooks may provide further information. This entry is therefore temporary.

index of *IR Cyrenaica 2020* as well as Dobias-Lalou 2012; Dobias-Lalou and Elhaddar 2018).

The survey shows that the first Latin texts date to the foundation of the province in 67 BC. A flourishing of Latin inscriptions can be observed during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, followed by a fairly significant maintenance until the reign of Hadrian, and then a certain decline which is more noticeable in the third century.²⁸ Finally, several important documents in Latin are still known up to the early Valentinian dynasty.

IV. A complex and diversified linguistic landscape: literacy and hybridity

From a general perspective, it is particularly difficult to know how many people were able to read and write, and at what level, in the ancient world, even in a single language.²⁹ Statistics on this point are bound to remain unattainable – Harris (1989) estimates that 10–20% of the population was literate –, particularly because the sources refer to the educated elite, and never to the illiterate. Even if the Imperial Roman period saw a renewed importance of public writing³⁰ and a definite expansion of literacy for everyday activities, as shown, *inter alia*, by the Egyptian papyri (Depauw 2012), the graffiti of Pompeii (Franklin 1991), the Vindolanda tablets (Bowman 1994) or the specific case of the *instrumentum domesticum* (Harris 1995; Woolf 2009), the range of possibilities

in the practice of writing and reading was as huge as the supports of writing were diverse.

The case of epigraphy is specific in this matter. Inscriptions were not necessarily understood by everyone, especially Latin inscriptions in the Greek-speaking East. This raises the question of the capacity of the local stone-cutters to write/engrave inscriptions in Latin (textual approach), and of the recipients to read the messages they conveyed (meta-textual approach) (Bodel 2015; Cooley 2002; Corbier 2006; Harris 1983). Moreover, the ability to comprehend Latin inscriptions also required skills in decoding abbreviations and a contextual knowledge of Roman realities such as the *cursus honorum*: in the specific case of official inscriptions, literacy was therefore also based on an almost specialised 'epigraphic culture' or 'epigraphic literacy', and not just on an understanding of the language – a problem which also arises in the cases of transcription of Latin words in Greek, as we shall see below, and of translation from Latin to Greek in the bilingual inscriptions.

Cases of bilingualism in Cyrenaica have been explored in several studies by C. Dobias-Lalou (2008a), mainly based on the documents relating to Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus in 67 BC (P. 100–101), the *restitutio agrorum* boundary-markers (also Dobias-Lalou 2008b) and the edicts of Augustus (C.101), looking at loanwords (Dickey 2023), borrowings, variations and a number of linguistic features between Greek and Latin, and there is no

point in dwelling on these aspects here. I will just focus very briefly on three topics: the poor command of Latin (such as incorrect cuts, abbreviated translations or grammatical errors) that can be seen in some documents; a few examples of Latinisms in the Greek inscriptions of Cyrenaica; and the relationship between dialect, *koine* and Latin in the region.

In the corpus, there are indications that local stone-cutters did not necessarily understand the Latin they were engraving. Sometimes, the layout involves an awkward division of the words, certainly due to a poor command of the new language. The dedication of the theatre at Apollonia at the time of Domitian is a good example thereof (A.48). The inscribed blocks, arranged in two registers, were distributed in seven bays interrupted by pilasters. The words are cut irregularly, especially the first ones, the last letter of a word being sometimes inscribed on the next block: *Imp(erator) Caesa[r diui] Vespasian[i] f(i)lii* [Domitianus] | [Aug(ustus)] etc., ‘Emperor Caesar Domitian Augustus, son of the deified Vespasian’. A fragment of an imperial titulature from Berenice shows the same irregularity (B.42). It must have been a consequence of miscalculation of word length and letter size by stone-carvers; the blocks were nevertheless used on the theatre façade, a sign that the inhabitants of Apollonia may have had little understanding of the meaning of the dedication, or, at any rate, were not offended by such clumsy Latin.

In other cases, translations can be approximate or incomplete: a dedication to Hadrian (C.102) gives his full imperial titulature in Latin, but not in Greek: Nerva is not designated as *diuus*, Hadrian’s titles (*Augustus, pontifex maximus, consul*) as well as his tribunician power have been omitted and the dedicating power, in this case the city of Cyrene, is not mentioned – although we cannot rule out a desire simply to shorten the Greek section.

Grammatical mistakes can also occur. One example is the already mentioned bilingual epitaph of the *libertus* G. Cascellius Mommus, in which the *cognomen* is rendered as Μωμμους instead of Μωμμος, which was expected in Greek for an anthroponym in the nominative: here the name has been transliterated purely phonetically, without understanding that Mommus was in the nominative case in Latin. Other transcription errors, spelling mistakes and translation variations can be found in the corpus, but it would be tedious to list them all.

Influences from Latin epigraphic habit can be found in the Greek inscriptions of Cyrenaica. The clearest case is that of abbreviations: δ(ήμω) Ρ(ωμαίων) for *p(opulo) R(omano)* in several cippi of *restitutio agrorum*; ψ(ηφίσματι) β(ουλή)ς for *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* in P.145; λεγ(ιώνος) for *leg(ionis)* in M.215; and more generally for Latin *praenomina* or for imperial titulatures inscribed in Greek. More generally, Greek inscriptions show new linguistic features under the influence of Latin, such as strong variations in the Greek transcription of Latin anthroponyms (Dobias-Lalou 1998a and 2008a, 159–60). However, this was in no way original in the context of the Eastern Roman world, where Greek simply adopted Latin traditions or was influenced by them.

Some documents issued by the imperial chancellery were obviously written in Latin and then translated into Greek locally. In the dossier of imperial letters and documents (C.163), there is a noticeable difference between those emanating from Hadrian, the Philhellenic emperor, which are in good Greek because he may have dictated them directly in that language, and those from Antoninus Pius, in which Latinisms are much more prevalent (Dobias-Lalou 2008a, 156 n. 2) – this may also be due to the fact that different *ab epistulis Graecis* were involved, Pius’ not being quite as good at producing idiomatic Greek as Hadrian’s.³¹ Indeed, there are quite a few Latinisms in the Greek inscriptions from Cyrenaica, for example in the boundary-

markers of *restitutio* with the removal of the Greek article under the influence of Latin (Dobias-Lalou 2008a, 164).

It is not uncommon either to find transliterations of Roman realities directly into Greek,³² for example, κένσωρ (*ensor*, M.199), κορούλης (*curulis*, C.223), κεντυρίων (*centurio*, M.5, M.11, M.18), λεγίων (*legio*, C.573; cf. λεγ(ιώνος) Ειταλικής for *leg(ionis) Italicae*, M.215), βενεφικιάρης (*beneficiarius*, P.380), βιξίλλατιών (*uexillatio*, M.55), κουράτωρ (*curator*, M.49?, M.55), δεκ(ουρίων) (*decurio*, C.195?), στράτωρ (*strator*, M.3, M.48?), βετρόνος/όετρόνος (*ueteranus*, C.158, C.573, M.28, M.215, P.265), ινδικτιών (*indictio*, in the Christian inscriptions M.134, M.135, M.241) or πρηπότης which captures the Latin *praepotens* (B.76, l. 6). Here again, these transliterations are in no way original to other Greek inscriptions from the Roman East.

The simultaneous presence in Roman Cyrenaica of an epichoric dialectal Greek that is still very much present whenever an initiative emanates from the city (Dobias-Lalou 1987b; 1994), of the *koine* – which became the majority language in the region’s inscriptions in the first and second centuries AD –, of general developments specific to the Greek language (iotacisms, etc.), as well as of Latin, created a particularly diversified and fertile linguistic landscape during the Empire. Even if the use of a particular idiom is generally restricted to specific categories of texts (Latin mainly for official documents, for example, as seen above in section II), this complexity nonetheless makes the interpretation of certain linguistic features sometimes problematic (Dobias-Lalou 2008a, 156–59, on the edicts of Augustus C.101). Some texts could even be described as ‘hybrid’. A catalogue of priests of Apollo which includes the *cursus honorum* of P. Sestius Pollio is interesting in this respect. This individual, who belonged to the only senatorial family from Cyrenaica,³³ became legate of the province around AD 100, then held the eponymous priesthood of Cyrene in AD 111/2:

IR Cyrenaica 2020 C.223, ll. 8–13:

(ἔτους) ρμβ΄ Π(όπλιος) Σήστιος Πωλλίων Γ(άιου) Σηστίου Φλώρου υἱὸς ἄμναμμος Μ(άρκου) Ἀντωνίου Φλάμμα ἱερεὺς Ἀπόλλω[νο]ς συνκλητικὸς καὶ ταμίας Ῥώμης ἀγ[ορα]νόμος κορούλης στρατηγικὸς πρ[εσβε]υτῆς καὶ ἀντιστράτηγος Κρή[της] κ[αὶ] Κυρήνης

‘Year 142. P(ublius) Sestius Pollio, son of G(aius) Sestius Florus, grandson of M(arcus) Antonius Flamma, priest of Apollo, of senatorial rank and quaestor of Rome, curule aedile, of praetorian rank legateus pro praetore of Crete and Cyrene.’

In this text, the Roman magistracies (*quaestor* = ταμίας, *aedilis* = ἀγορανόμος, *legatus* = πρεσβευτής) are translated with the Greek official equivalent, except for the adjective κορούλης (*curulis*) which is transliterated from Latin although a well-attested Greek equivalent existed.³⁴ It is also worth noting that the Greek text uses the very local Cyrenaean word ἄμναμμος for ‘grandson’ (Dobias-Lalou 1998b), although the rest of the text is in *koine*. This *cursus* illustrates the many ways in which different realities can be transcribed, depending on how each individual wishes to reflect his identity – and it also mirrors the hybrid ‘epigraphic habit’ of Cyrenaica itself.

The possibilities are actually manifold. Greek terms are found in Latin texts, for instance *choria* (Greek χωρία) in A.54, ca. AD 75 (Dobias-Lalou 2008a, 165). In the opisthograph stele bearing the dedication of the cisterns by the proconsul [Q.] Pomponius Naeuianus and the quaestor Silius Haterianus around AD 165, the Latin text on side (a) is translated into *koine*, as it emanates from the Roman authorities, whereas on side (b), dialectal Greek is used, as it is the city of Cyrene that is presented on this side of the stone as the instigator of the construction

(C.166–67). Even if C. Dobias-Lalou observes that reciprocal influences are fairly limited, these few examples nevertheless show how inscriptions can develop a ‘hybrid’, almost ‘trilingual’ (*koine*/dialect/Latin), character that can be further accentuated by influences from other parts of the Roman world.

V. Vocabulary peculiarities and external influences

The serialisation of documents of a similar or identical typology, thanks to the online corpus, makes it possible to identify here and there a few peculiarities in the Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica and to detect influences from the epigraphic habit of other Roman provinces. A first example is the dating formula used by one of the province’s governors.

A milestone discovered in 1947 in the southern necropolis of Cyrene, at the start of the road leading to the sanctuary of Asklepios at Balagrae, gives the name of the proconsul of the year AD 46/7:³⁵

Ti(berius) Claudius | Caesar Aug(ustus) | Germanicus | p(ontifex) m(aximus) trib(unicia) pot(estate) V[II ?] | imp(erator) XI p(ater) p(atriciae) co(n)s(ul) [III] | designat(us) IIII | restituit ann[o] | - C]aeserni Veinton[is] | proco(n)s(ulis) | [- -] | I.

‘Ti(berius) Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, chief priest, holding tribunician power for the sixth (?) time, acclaimed imperator eleven times, father of the country, consul [for the third time], designated for the fourth time, restored (*scil.* the road) in the year [...] when Caesernius Veiento was proconsul (*scil.* of Crete and Cyrene). (*scil.* mile) one.’

The dating of Caesernius Veiento’s government is introduced by the formula *annus* followed by the anthroponym in the genitive and then the title *proconsul*, also in the genitive. This formulation is an *unicum* in the Cyrenaican documentation on governors and, to my knowledge, is known only in inscriptions from the African provinces. Examples can be found in the second century AD in Hippo Regius,³⁶ in the *ciuitas Vcres*,³⁷ in Thugga,³⁸ in the *municipium Mactaritanum*,³⁹ in modern Kairouan⁴⁰ or in Limisa.⁴¹ The question arises as to whether this formula has any particular significance. For R. Syme (1968, 100), the different forms of dating were variable and of little importance. According to J. Kolendo (1982, n. 34), the purpose of the dating form is only to identify a particular event. M. Dondin-Payre (1990, 343 and n. 40), on the other hand, believes that these different formulas were not chosen at random, that they went beyond simple dating and that they therefore possessed a more important meaning by expressing the power of the proconsul and his direct participation in the dedication. For X. Dupuis (*apud AE* 2004, 1675) the formula, when associated with an imperial titlature as in our inscription, suggests that the governor’s activity should be dated to the end of his term of office. These debates are not resolved by the Cyrenaican inscription, which nevertheless shows that the official epigraphy of the region was influenced early on by that of the African provinces. It is possible that Caesernius Veiento held an official position in Africa before becoming governor of the province; some African members of his *consilium*, for instance the *accensus* or scribes, could have accompanied him to Cyrene and thus reproduced the epigraphic habit of *Africa Proconsularis*.

A second example of the influence of epigraphy from the western provinces can be found in the epitaphs of soldiers from the Roman army. Two funerary stelae from Cyrene read as follows:

IR Cyrenaica 2020 C.552 (Reynolds 1980–1981, 51, no. 3, from the northern necropolis):

T(itus) Pompeius Ligyrus Autric(o) ann(or)um XL, eques [e]x cohorte Hispanor(um), aer(um) XX, h[ic] situs, Cleme(n)s pat[r]ono, T(itus)

Pompeius Ligyrus, from Autricum, aged 40, cavalryman of the cohort of the Spaniards, having served 20 years, lies here; Clemens, for his patron.’

IR Cyrenaica 2020 C.726 (Reynolds 1980–1981, 50–51, no. 2, from an unrecorded findspot, but certainly one of the Cyrene necropoleis):

*M(arcus) Aemiliu[s] M(arci) f(ilius) Macer Turanicu[s] IARI, me(n)s(or) c(o)h[ort]is Hispanorum, an(n)o[r]um XXXX, aera XIIIX, fra[ter] hic [posuit], M(arcus) Aemilius Macer Turanicus, son of M(arcus), mentor of the cohort of the Spaniards, aged 40, having served 18 years. His brother placed (*scil.* him) here.’*

The general habit of mentioning years of service by *stipendia* is replaced in these two texts by the plural *aera*, which was particularly common in the Hispanic provinces in the first century AD.⁴² The two soldiers precisely belonged to a *cohors Hispanorum* – most probably the *cohors I Hispanorum equitata Cyrenaica* – which had been levied in Hispania and sent to Cyrenaica, perhaps after the first Jewish revolt instigated by Jonathas and crushed by the proconsul Catullus around AD 73–75.⁴³ T. Pompeius Ligyrus and M. Aemilius Macer Turanicus must therefore have been Spaniards who had brought with them the epigraphic habits of Hispania in Cyrenaica.⁴⁴

VI. Private epigraphy and multiple identities: a case study of the Latin funerary inscriptions of Cyrenaica

Examination of Latin epitaphs provides interesting information about Cyrenaican society in the High Empire and the concrete funerary practices of the population, even if the sample is very limited with just over 20 texts (Table 2).

First of all, we need to consider a number of military funerary inscriptions from Cyrene, Ptolemais and Taucheira (C.168, C.552, C.726, P.67, P.220, P.326, T.18, T.365), which were erected by soldiers or veterans of legions or auxiliary units of the Roman army. These deceased were either Cyrenaica-born soldiers who had returned to their homeland after their years of service, or soldiers from all over the Empire who had come to serve in the province, for example from the Iberian Peninsula (C.552, C.726; see above in section V). In the case of the Cyrenaicans, the use of Latin is probably a consequence of their time in the army, of the influence of the regions of the Empire where they were posted and of their new status as Roman citizens. For soldiers from the western provinces, Latin was the obvious choice, and a few texts even present distinctly Latin funeral forms, such as the invocation *Dis Manibus (sacrum)* (P.67, T.365).

A comparison between pre-Roman and imperial funerary inscriptions in Greek also reveals changes in the wording, which reflect the borrowing of Latin habits in Greek texts. The traditional local practice is to give only the year of death, the name often followed by the patronymic and then the age of death in the following sequence: L (= ἔτους) + anthroponym + L (= ἔτων) (the examples are numerous and can easily be found in the corpora *IG Cyrenaica* and *IR Cyrenaica 2020*). A few exceptions display also a verb and/or the name of the person who had the tomb built, but some formulas found elsewhere in the Greek world, for example ἐνθάδε κείμει/κεῖται, are absent from pre-Roman Cyrenaican epitaphs – except in epigrams, see *IG Cyrenaica Verse* 006. On the contrary, such formulas multiplied in the Roman period, without ever surpassing the minimum standards mentioned above. They can be found in several epitaphs such as C.185, C.607, ll. 1–6 (ἐνθάδε ἐτάφη), in the Christian inscriptions M.235 and C.568 and in several epigrams as well, e.g., *IG Cyrenaica Verse* 010, 011, 020, 043, 047. This might well be an influence of *h(ic) s(itus) e(st)* recorded in a few Latin funerary inscriptions (C.552, C.613, P.379[?]), but to draw

conclusions is all the more challenging as we can sometimes observe opposite influences: the bilingual funerary inscription C.614 presents a Latin form aligned with the traditional Greek one (anthroponym followed by the age of death), without Roman-style funerary formulas.

If we take these considerations a step further, we may well ask whether certain epitaphs that are particularly well-developed but written in Greek have been influenced by Latin epigraphy, particularly in the military field. Two veteran epitaphs (C.573 and another recently published in Chevrollier, Dobias-Lalou and Hussein 2021, 29–32, no. 3) show a Latin-style military ‘cursus’ very different from the simple local forms. Similarly, should we understand the formulas concerning the protection of tombs (C.605, C.735, P.295, P.404) as a Latin influence of the *iura sepulchrorum*?⁴⁵ The limited corpus makes it impossible to be positive on all these points: the influence of the army, in particular, is difficult to quantify and, in fact, may have remained quite marginal, as Cyrenaica was only guarded by auxiliary troops which were never very numerous (Paci 1994, 253).

The majority of Latin funerary inscriptions pertain to individuals possessing the *duo* (C.728) and the *tria nomina* (C.512, C.623, P.283, perhaps A.17 and those for the soldiers mentioned above), showing that they were mainly immigrant families from Italy or the western provinces. Others concern freedmen (P.281) who also had their origins abroad. It is more difficult to understand the status of bearers of the *tria nomina* with a Greek *cognomen* but who chose to inscribe their epitaph in Latin (M.258, P.390) or of certain individuals who were probably immigrants but who opted for Greek as their epigraphic language (C.731).

In the particular case of bilingual inscriptions, the order of the languages is of some importance. In official texts (boundary-markers, milestones, official building inscriptions and dedications), Latin naturally comes before Greek, since these are documents issued by public authorities. On the *restitutio agrorum* cippi, Greek often appears on a minor side, when the texts are inscribed on two (or three) different sides of the stone. Bilingual funerary inscriptions also generally have Greek preceded by Latin: see the epitaph of Mommus cited above, a very fragmentary text from Taucheira (T.18) or the inscription of P. Iodius Apol(-), who was however most probably of local origin (Dobias-Lalou, [in print](#)). In the northern necropolis of Cyrene, a burial of two brothers, freedmen of the same master (tomb N.11, cf. Thorn and Thorn 2009, 28), features two inscriptions: C.554 is bilingual with the Latin coming before the Greek, while C.555 is in Latin only and is for their sister who died later (her name was added by another hand). The Latin names and the use of this language show that this family probably originated in Italy and had settled in Cyrenaica for a long time, if we consider that several members of the household died there. Nevertheless, the use of Latin has endured and always comes first.

Again in the northern necropolis (Thorn and Thorn 2009, 141), the *Octauii* tomb features bilingual inscriptions (C.613) that are exact translations of each other, except for the formula *h(ic) s(itus) e(st)*, which is not translated into Greek (see also above on the formula). The case of the *Blaesii* tomb (C.614) seems a little different: only one of the inscriptions, that for L. Blaesus Rusticus, is bilingual, while those for two other members of the lineage are in Latin only. In all these examples, the use of Latin shows that it was indeed this language that prevailed among the commissioners of the epitaphs. The order of the languages, with Latin first and Greek in translation below, is not insignificant: it was certainly intended to emphasise the western (Italian?) origins of these families, some of whom had been living in the region for a long time, but also, as a consequence, to demonstrate a certain prestige and social differentiation through the use of an idiom that was certainly little

understood or at least poorly mastered by the majority of the population. However, translation into an epigraphic language (Greek) more widely understood locally was seen as essential from the moment that funerary practices required passers-by to be able to read aloud the inscriptions in the necropolis – this also related to the complementarity between literacy and orality in the ancient world, but these considerations are well beyond the scope of this paper.

Throughout its history, Cyrenaica has been home to funerary monuments that are unique to the region, including the faceless funerary busts from the Classical and Hellenistic periods, the ‘Roman-Libyan’ funerary portraits that replaced the former from the Roman period onwards (Belzic 2019) and the anthropomorphic stelae as well. The latter take the form of small, inscribed or anepigraphic limestone stelae on which a head, shoulders or a bust can be recognised, however sculpted in an unrealistic manner. They come from the hinterland, from the countryside surrounding the cities, and bear witness to populations less steeped in Graeco-Roman culture but who nevertheless sought to imitate it through sculpture and epigraphy. Funerary formulas are generally kept to a minimum, and include the name of the deceased, his or her age, sometimes the date of death and a verb (e.g., ἐτελεύτησε).⁴⁶ Many of these stelae have inscriptions in Greek, often badly engraved, indicating an imperfect command of writing and/or of the language. But it is particularly remarkable that two such stelae are inscribed in Latin. The first (P.390) comes from near Ptolemais and reads as follows: *C(aio) Papirio Diomedii Cornelia Polla amico*, ‘To G(aius) Papirius Diomedes, Cornelia Polla (*scil.* erected this), to her friend’. The woman has the traditional Roman onomastic formula while the deceased has the *tria nomina* with a Greek *cognomen*. The word *amicus* could refer to an informal marriage between the two. The second one (M.258) was discovered in the area of Limnias (modern Lamludah), east of Cyrene, and bears the following text: *C(aius) Iulius Epaphroditus uixit annos LXX*, ‘G(aius) Iulius Epaphroditus, lived 70 years.’ Here again, the individual has the *tria nomina* with a Greek *cognomen*. These two anthropomorphic stelae bear witness not only to the penetration of Latin into the countryside, but also to cross-cultural influences, in this case between a funerary monument in the Libyan tradition and the choice of Latin. It is possible that G. Papirius Diomedes and G. Iulius Epaphroditus were freedmen working on agricultural estates belonging to wealthy Roman citizens, or freedmen or descendants of veterans who adopted a local form – the anthropomorphic stela – for their tombs. The very vague date attributed to these documents (first–second centuries AD) makes it impossible to say for sure. But the choice of Latin by these two individuals with Greek *cognomina* or by their relatives for their epitaphs on a monument probably inspired by Libyan customs and erected quite far from the *poleis* says something about the ethnic and linguistic diversity of the region under the Empire, as well as the reciprocal cultural and linguistic influences between Libyan, Greek and Latin traditions.⁴⁷

These examples chosen from the field of funerary epigraphy illustrate the interplay between languages, as well as lexical and formal borrowings, even if the small Cyrenaican corpus does not allow us to go beyond mere hypotheses. In the bilingual inscriptions, the choice to inscribe the Latin first certainly reflects a desire for prestige, while the anthropomorphic stelae of Libyan tradition engraved in Latin reveal the multiple identities of the inhabitants of ancient Cyrenaica. In this sense, private funerary epigraphy demonstrates the ‘ethnic and linguistic porosity’ (quoted from Sarrazanas 2023, 79, about Philippi) between groups of different traditions, as well as the complexity of multilingualism in ancient Cyrenaica.

Concluding remarks

The Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica come mainly from the cities and are documented between 67 BC and around AD 375, with periods of greater presence, for example in the Augustan-Tiberian and Hadrianic periods, although they never surpassed those written in Greek – like in the rest of the Greek East, Latin never became the dominant language of communication between the Roman government and the inhabitants of the provinces. Most of these texts are official documents from the Roman authorities: activities of proconsuls, dedications to emperors, documents relating to the imperial cult, boundary-markers and milestones.

From a general point of view, this survey confirms the conclusions of G. Paci (1994). However, my intention in this article was also to examine the Latin inscriptions of Cyrenaica in the light of more recent concerns which include, among others, the literacy of the population, the bilingualism and multilingualism of the region, the linguistic hybridity that can be seen in certain texts, the (unmeasurable) importance of the Libyc cultural background, the influence of neighbouring provinces on the language and the expression of identities through the choice of an epigraphic language. In this respect, funerary texts in Latin or bilingual, although scarce, are particularly interesting to study as the choice of a specific epigraphic language bears witness to the identities claimed by individuals, as well as to the cultural and linguistic permeability between the different linguistic groups that inhabited the region in Antiquity. The Latin inscriptions, which have been made considerably easier to consult thanks to the publication of the *IR Cyrenaica 2020* corpus, allow us to delve into the heart of Cyrenaican society in the Roman era, which remained largely Greek-speaking, but in which Latin played a significant role for more than four centuries.

This study also echoes the questions raised by historians about the presence of Greek in the Latin-speaking western provinces (Chausson, Hostein and Rossignol 2022) and, more broadly, about the many languages spoken in the Empire and their relationship with Latin and Greek (Bérenger-Badel 2004, 48–50; Coltelloni-Trannoy and Moncunill Martí 2022; Harris 1989, 175–90; Neumann and Untermann 1980). The specific case of Cyrenaica, with Greek in a numerically dominant position, Latin in a numerical minority but with a hierarchically superior position and both against the background of a ‘ghost language’ (Libyc), can also help us to better understand these crucial issues in Roman history.

Notes

1 The editors refer to the corpus as *IRCyr2020* (<https://ircyr2020.inslib.kcl.ac.uk/en/>, accessed on 26 April 2024) but the International Association of Greek and Latin Epigraphy (AIEGL) recommends using *IR Cyrenaica 2020* instead (see <https://www.aiegl.org/grepiabbr.html>, accessed on 26 April 2024). The latter abbreviation will be used in this article, bearing in mind that this was neither the initial intention nor the decision of the editors. In this article, I will only use the numbering of the inscriptions (e.g., A.1, C.1), without systematically adding the full title of the corpus (*IR Cyrenaica 2020*), which I consider implicit. On current research on inscriptions from Libya, see the Libyan Epigraphy Research Network website at <https://libyanepigraphy.org/> (accessed on 30 December 2023). This article is an opportunity to pay tribute to Joyce Reynolds (1918–2022), who was a pioneer and eminent specialist of the Roman inscriptions of Cyrenaica. Unfortunately, I never had the chance to meet her, but it is no exaggeration to say that her work greatly inspired me, and still does today. I would like to warmly thank Michèle Coltelloni-Trannoy and Catherine Dobias-Lalou for their input on this paper.

2 The second edition of *IG Cyrenaica* and *IG Cyrenaica Verse* has been published in April 2024 (<https://igcyr2.unibo.it/en/>, accessed on 24 April 2024). Here again, the editors refer to the corpora as *IGCyr* and *GVCyr* but the AIEGL recommends using *IG Cyrenaica* and *IG Cyrenaica Verse* respectively.

3 Dobias-Lalou 2013–2014; Reynolds 1989; Rosamilia 2014. With the resumption of French archaeological activities at Apollonia in 1976, it was agreed that the British would publish the texts from the Roman era and the French those from the Greek era. Despite the absence of a corpus at the time, it should be noted that Fraser and Matthews had benefited from J. Reynolds’ information for the preparation of *LGNP I*.

4 The presence of associations of *Italici* or *ciues Romani* is well attested in C.22 and C.688; cf. also A.47. On the spread of Latin in the Roman West for economic reasons, see Wilson 2023.

5 The role of the soldiers and veterans in the spread of Latin is debated among historians: Speidel 2023.

6 Also attested in other *poleis*, as evidenced for instance by the Sidi Khrebish graffiti, some of them being invocations to gods in a poetic form (B.4–6, B.27, B.33–35, B.40).

7 Considering that the Libyc from Bu Njem identified by R. Rebuffat belongs to this group, cf. Rebuffat 1992.

8 Around 1,300 inscriptions in Libyc have been discovered so far, using three different alphabets. The references are Chabot 1940–1941 and Galand 1966. The corpus has been updated by Rebuffat 2013. Inscriptions disappear in the third century AD, but the language is thought to have survived until the Arab conquest.

9 Marini 2018, 177, pls. VI–VII, studies inscriptions on which illegible signs have been engraved, which could belong to one of these unknown Libyc languages, but these rare examples would require further discoveries and a comparative linguistic study to support this conclusion. See also a pseudo-Libyc inscription brought by Vattier de Bourville in Paris: Letronne 1848, 280–81, who says that he himself destroyed the stone. From a linguistic perspective, the search for Libyan elements in the Greek dialect of Cyrenaica has proved nearly inconclusive: Dobias-Lalou 1987a. The supposed Libyan origin of the name of the first king of Cyrene, Battos, is in fact misleading as shown by Masson 1976, 84–87. Rebuffat 2016 finds an indirect mention of the Libyc language of Cyrenaica in a passage of the *Acts of the Apostles*, probably based on a Lagid document from the third century BC.

10 The closest inscriptions in Libyc are found in the territory of the Late-Antique province of Tripolitania (Bu Njem-Gholaia, Ghirza).

11 The debate as to whether the Libyc script originated in the Phoenician alphabet (Pichler 2007) or the Punic one (Kerr 2010) remains unresolved. Chaker and Hachi 2000 adopt a median position, believing that the alphabet developed endogenously, though contact with the Punic civilisation played a fundamental role in the emergence of writing and epigraphic practices.

12 It is sometimes thought that the Greeks of Cyrenaica had – consciously or unconsciously – established a cultural boundary with both Egypt and the rest of North Africa, so that the Libyc would never have penetrated this region (Ghaki 2022, 152); in my view, this conclusion is unlikely, given that the Greeks, like the Punic, lived mainly on the coast and never prevented the movement of ‘Libyan’ tribes in the south. This is, moreover, a rigid assessment inherited from the thesis of impermeability between Greeks and ‘barbarians’, whose relations were in reality more nuanced and complex; see, for instance, Gruen 2011.

13 Cyrenaica also had a large Jewish population until the great revolt that took place during the reign of Trajan, but I do not count it as a particular group since, linguistically speaking, this community expressed itself in Greek (Lüderitz 1983). No Hebrew inscriptions are known in Cyrenaica.

14 Eastern provinces in general: Harris 1989, 185–90. Palmyra: Yon 2008. Anatolia: Brixhe 2010. Sicily: Tribulato 2012. Gaul: Mullen 2013. It is obvious that bilingualism existed in the Greek world before the Hellenistic and Roman eras, but research on earlier periods remains scarce: see James 2024 for a recent reassessment based on Herodotus and Thucydides which, however, focuses on individual – and not collective – bilingualism. Cyrenaica experienced a Greek/Libyc bilingualism in the Archaic and Classical periods.

15 P.222, P.223 and P.395, listed as Latin when the database is filtered, have been removed from the list as they are in Greek. T.34 has been recorded here as two inscriptions (one building inscription and one ephobic name).

16 Having been found on a frontier monument, there is a possibility that these two texts relate to the governor of the neighbouring Late-Antique province of Tripolitania, even if the usage of Latin is not a sufficient argument to prove it, since Latin was also widely used in Ptolemais (then capital of the province of Cyrenaica).

17 <https://slsgazetteer.org/>, accessed on 30 December 2023.

18 I acknowledge here that the dossier of imperial documents of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius (C.163) was originally displayed in the monument.

19 But Latin inscriptions are known in other, non-religious buildings of the sacred terrace.

20 According to Dobias-Lalou 2008a, 161, who analyses some of the particular features of this translation into Latin.

21 G. Clodius Pulcher at the very beginning of the first century BC (C.47) and D. Iunius Brutus in 75 BC (C.62).

22 All the other contemporary decrees honouring benefactors are in Greek; see, for instance, *IG Cyrenaica* 066900; *IR Cyrenaica* 2020 B.1 and P.111.

23 At least ca. 63–61 BC; cf. Cic., *Pro Plancio*, 63, and probably as early as the bequeathing of Ptolemy Apion in 96 BC (Liv., *Per.* 70). On the *Italici*, see also n. 4.

24 But see endnote 16 on this text.

25 Another document dating from the Tetrarchy is C.122.

26 Emperor Gratian might be also mentioned in P.119. I give the Latin text and the translation of C.157 which is flawed in the *IR Cyrenaica* 2020 corpus.

27 But see endnote 16 on this text.

28 The dedication to the procurator G. Pomponius Cordus (C.183), which enables us to understand the evolution of Cyrenaica's administrative status during this period, that in honour of emperor Gordian (C.75), which is important for the military history of the region, a series of milestones from Philip I (M.195, M.197, M.201, perhaps M.160), as well as a dedication of a Roman *equus* at the *Asklepieion* at Balagrae (M.192) are worth mentioning for the third century.

29 Harris 1989 remains the reference on literacy in the Classical world. See also Woolf 2000 and Werner 2009 for recent developments on the subject. For a comparison with ancient Greece, see Thomas 1992.

30 Corbier 1987; Alföldy 1991 identifies an epigraphic revolution in the age of Augustus, with the spread of Latin throughout the provinces and a new symbolic and ideological significance for inscriptions, coinciding with the extension of Roman political control and cultural influences across the Mediterranean; cf. also MacMullen 1982. This can be compared with the contemporary diffusion of Latin literature in the provinces: Rochette 1997.

31 I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this point.

32 The fragments of copies of the edict of Anastasius (A.30, P.116, T.219) contain many Latin words transcribed into Greek and have not been included in this count.

33 On this point, see Reynolds 1982, 677–79 and 683.

34 Mason 1974, 5–6, 183. However, the distinction between the different *aedititates* was not always made explicit, either by ancient historians or in inscriptions; cf. for example, Famerie 1998, 67–68.

35 Goodchild 1950, 84–85, hence *AE* 1951, 207. In C.537, J. Reynolds indicates the presence of the two letters EN in the last line of the inscription, considered illegible by Goodchild. The name of the province [*Cretae et Cyren[en]arum*] might have been engraved here.

36 *AE* 1958, 142: *anno proco(n)s(ulis) L(uci) Cossoni [E]g[gi] Marulli c(larissimi) u(iri)*. *AE* 1961, 224: *anno Acili Glabronis proco(n)s(ulis) c(larissimi) u(iri)*.

37 *CIL* VIII, 1170 (*ILS* 413): *anno Corneli Anullini proco(n)s(ulis) c(larissimi) u(iri) et Valeri Festi leg(ati) eius*.

38 *ILAFr*, 513: *anno procons(ulis) II Aur(eli) Antioch[i]*. *CIL* VIII, 26566–67: *anno proco(n)s(ulis) Postumi Titiani c(larissimi) u(iri)* (late third century).

39 *ILAFr*, 200 (new edition with new fragments in *AE* 2018, 1913): *anno Sexti Laterani proco(n)s(ulis) c(larissimi) u(iri)*.

40 *ILAFr*, 80: *anno Ser(ui) Corneli S[cipionis] Saluidieni Orfiti proc(o)n(s)ul(is)*.

41 *AE* 2004, 1675: *anno P(ubli) Corneli Anul[lini] proco(n)s(ulis) c(larissimi) u(iri)*; cf. Benzina Ben Abdallah 2004–2005, 104–105, no. 3. This is the same governor as in *Vcres*; cf. endnote 37.

42 Christol and Le Roux 1985, 26–33; Gómez-Pantoja and Castillo Sanz 2014. But see the commentary on the last paper in *AE* 2014, 48 where it is said that the word *aera* in no way reflects a provincial identity but is a Roman archaism referring to the monetary metal in which the pay was valued.

43 Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, 437–40.

44 Therefore, the ethnic *Autricus* in C.552 must refer to the tribe of the *Autricones* in Cantabria.

45 On the *iura sepulchrorum* in the Eastern part of the Roman empire, see Ritti 2004; Harter-Uibopou and Wiedergut 2014.

46 The reference on the stelae is Bacchielli and Reynolds 1987. The two artefacts presented here are recorded in the catalogue under nos 22 and 33. Recently published stelae (in Greek) can be found in the articles by Alshareef *et al.* 2021, 58–59, no. 2, and by Emrage *et al.* 2022, 149–50, no. 1.

47 However, it is not possible to understand when or how the Libyan populations adopted Latin, or at what level (if at all), as the names on the

anthropomorphic stelae are not those of Libyans. For a comparison, see Brélaz 2015, who indicates that the Thracians adopted Latin for their funerary and votive inscriptions as early as the middle of the first century AD – even if the cases of Thrace in general (an area poorly hellenised at the moment of the Roman conquest), and Philippi (as a Roman *colonia*) in particular, are very different from that of Cyrenaica. More generally, no study can be made of the Latin transcription of Libyan names, as the only example seems to be Arimmas/Arimman in P.100, ll. 7 and 13.

References

- Adams, J.N. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Adams, J.N. 2007. *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC–AD 600*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Adams, J.N., Janse, M. and Swain, S. (eds) 2002. *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Text*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Alföldy, G. 1991. Augustus und die Inschriften: Tradition und Innovation. Die Geburt der imperialen Epigraphik. *Gymnasium* 98: 289–324.
- Alshareef, H., Chevrollier, Fr. and Dobias-Lalou, C. 2021. New inscriptions from rural Cyrenaica. *Libyan Studies* 52: 54–66.
- AE. *L'Année épigraphique: revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité romaine*. Paris 1888–.
- Bacchielli, L. and Reynolds, J. 1987. La scultura libya in Cirenaica e la variabilità delle risposte al contatto culturale greco-romano. Appendice: catalogo delle stele funerarie antropomorfe. *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 12: 459–522.
- Baldwin Bowsky, M.W. 2006. Highways and byways of Roman Hierapytna (Crete): four new Claudian road inscriptions. *Annuario della scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in Oriente* 86: 551–80.
- Belzic, M. 2019. Des 'divinités funéraires' aux portraits funéraires. In: D. Boschung and Fr. Queyrel (eds), *Das Porträt als Massenphänomen. Le portrait comme phénomène de masse*. Wilhelm Wink Verlag, Leiden: 75–106.
- Benzina Ben Abdallah, Z. 2004–2005. Catalogue des inscriptions latines inédites de Limisa (Kasr Lemsa). *Antiquités africaines* 40–41: 99–203.
- Bérenger-Badel, A. 2004. Formation et compétences des gouverneurs de province dans l'Empire romain. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 30/2: 35–56.
- Bérenger, A. 2023. La justice du gouverneur de province à l'épreuve du multilinguisme dans l'Empire romain. In: R. Roure (ed.), *Le multilinguisme dans la Méditerranée antique*. Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, Pessac: 53–64. Available at <https://una-editions.fr/la-justice-du-gouverneur-de-province/> (accessed on 27 December 2023).
- Bodel, J. 2015. Inscriptions and literacy. In: Ch. Bruun and J. Edmondson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 745–63.
- Bowman, A.K. 1994. The Roman imperial army: letters and literacy on the northern frontier. In: A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 109–25.
- Brélaz, C. 2015. La langue des incolae sur le territoire de Philippes et les contacts linguistiques dans les colonies romaines d'Orient. In: F. Colin, O. Huck and S. Vanséveren (eds), *Interpretatio. Traduire l'altérité culturelle dans les civilisations de l'Antiquité*. De Boccard, Paris: 371–405.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2010. Linguistic diversity in Asia Minor during the Empire: koine and non-Greek languages. In: E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Wiley, Malden, MA: 228–52.
- Camps, G. 2002. Liste onomastique libyque. Nouvelle édition. *Antiquités africaines* 38–39: 211–57.
- Chabot, J.-B. 1940–1941. *Recueil des inscriptions libyques (RIL)*. Imprimerie nationale, Paris.
- Chaker, S. (2008). Libyque: écriture et langue. In: *Encyclopédie berbère* 28–29: 4395–409.
- Chaker, S. and Hachi, S. 2000. À propos de l'origine et de l'âge de l'écriture libyco-berbère. In: S. Chaker (ed.), *Études berbères et chamito-sémitiques. Mélanges offerts à K.-G. Prasse*. Peeters, Paris-Leuven: 95–111.
- Chausson, Fr., Hostein, A. and Rossignol, B. (eds) 2022. *Pratiques du grec dans l'épigraphie de l'Occident: contextes, origines et pratiques culturelles*. Ausonius éditions, Bordeaux.
- Chevrollier, Fr. 2019. Pour une archéologie de la rébellion. Bilan matériel et bilan humain de la révolte juive de Cyrène à la fin du règne de Trajan. In: E. Nantet (ed.), *Les Juifs et le pouvoir dans l'Antiquité. Histoire et archéologie*. Presses universitaires de Rennes, Rennes: 189–207.

- Chevrollier, Fr. 2020–2024. Review of Marini 2018. In: *Karthago* 32: 213–23.
- Chevrollier, Fr., Dobias-Lalou, C., Elhaddar, K. and Al-Abdali, H. 2023. Inscriptions inédites de Bersis (Cyrénaïque occidentale, Libye). *Libya Antiqua* N.S. 16: 81–89.
- Chevrollier, Fr., Dobias-Lalou, C. and Hussein, A.A. 2021. Five inscriptions rescued from Eastern Libya. *Libya Antiqua* N.S. 14: 23–42.
- Christol, M. and Le Roux, P. 1985. L'aile *Tauriana Torquata* et les relations militaires de l'*Hispania* et de la Maurétanie Tingitane entre Claude et Domitien. *Antiquités africaines* 21: 15–33.
- Clackson, J. 2015. *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Cooley, A.E. (ed.) 2002. *Becoming Roman, Writing Latin? Literacy and Epigraphy in the Roman West*. *JRA* Suppl. 48, Portsmouth.
- Coltelloni-Trannoy, M. 2015. Plurilinguisme: Antiquité. In: *Encyclopédie berbère* 38: 6284–94.
- Coltelloni-Trannoy, M. and Moncunill Martí, M. (eds) 2022. *La culture de l'écrit en Méditerranée occidentale à travers les pratiques épigraphiques (Gaule, Ibérie, Afrique du Nord)*. Peeters, Leuven.
- Coltelloni-Trannoy, M. and Veisse, A.-E. (eds) 2007. Plurilinguisme et contacts culturels dans l'Afrique antique. Table-ronde organisée à l'université de Marne-la-Vallée le 18 novembre 2005. In *Ktéma* 32: 191–291.
- Corbier, M. 1987. L'écriture dans l'espace public romain. In: *L'Urbs. Espace urbain et histoire (I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.–III^e siècle ap. J.-C.)*. École française de Rome, Rome: 27–60.
- Corbier, M. 2006. *Donner à voir, donner à lire: mémoire et communication dans la Rome ancienne*. Éditions du CNRS, Paris.
- Corbier, M. 2008. Rome, un Empire bilingue. In: L. Villard (ed.), *Langues dominantes, langues dominées: à la mémoire de G. Dallez*. Publications des universités de Rouen et du Havre, Mont-Saint-Aignan: 29–55.
- CIL. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. 1863–.
- Depauw, M. 2012. Language use, literacy, and bilingualism. In: C. Riggs (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 493–506.
- Desanges, J. 1962. *Catalogue des tribus africaines de l'Antiquité classique à l'ouest du Nil*. Université de Dakar, Dakar.
- Dickey, E. 2023. *Latin Loanwords in Ancient Greek: a Lexicon and Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1987a. Noyau grec et éléments indigènes dans le dialecte cyrénéen. *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 12: 85–91.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1987b. Dialecte et *koinè* dans les inscriptions de Cyrénaïque. *Verbum* 10: 29–50.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1994. Langue et politique: à quoi sert le dialecte dans la Cyrénaïque romaine? *Libyan Studies* 25: 245–50.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1998a. Sur quelques noms latins en Cyrénaïque. In: B. Bureau and Chr. Nicolas (eds), *Moussyllanae. Mélanges de linguistique et de littérature anciennes offerts à Claude Moussy*. Peeters, Leuven-Paris: 206–12.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 1998b. ἈΜΝΑΜΜΟΣ, nom cyrénéen du 'petit-fils'. *Revue des études grecques* 111: 403–17.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2008a. Sur quelques faits de bilinguisme gréco-latin dans le corpus épigraphique cyrénéen. In: F. Biville, J.-C. Decourt and G. Rougemont (eds), *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie. Actes du colloque organisé à l'université Lumière-Lyon II les 17, 18 et 19 mai 2004*. Maison de l'Orient et la Méditerranée, Lyon: 155–68.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2008b. Ὅποι / fines : un cas de bilinguisme? In: Cl. Brunet (ed.), *Des formes et des mots chez les Anciens. Mélanges offerts à Danièle Conso*. Presses universitaires de Franche-Comté, Besançon: 63–73.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2012. Samphodion, notable homérisant dans la Cyrénaïque du Bas-Empire. In: S. David and E. Geny (eds), *Troika. Parcours antiques. Mélanges offerts à Michel Woronoff*, vol. 2. ISTA, Besançon: 127–36.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. 2013–2014. Une décennie de travaux épigraphiques en Cyrénaïque: bilan 2005–2014 et projets. *Libya Antiqua* N.S. 7: 185–96.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. In print. Five funerary inscriptions from Cyrenaica. Forthcoming in *Libya Antiqua*.
- Dobias-Lalou, C. and Elhaddar, K. 2018. Deux nouvelles inscriptions chrétiennes de Cyrénaïque, *Libya Antiqua* N.S. 11: 163–72.
- Dondin-Payre, M. 1990. L'intervention du proconsul d'Afrique dans la vie des cités. In: *L'Afrique dans l'Occident romain, I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.–IV^e siècle ap. J.-C. Actes du colloque de Rome (3–5 décembre 1987)*. École française de Rome, Rome: 333–49.
- Dubuisson, M. 1992. Le contact linguistique gréco-latin : problèmes d'interférences et d'emprunts. *Lalies* 10: 91–109.
- Emrage, A., Alshareef, H., Chevrollier, Fr. and Dobias-Lalou, C. 2022. The archaeological site of Siret Qullab (Siret ar-Rmailat, Cyrenaica, Libya) and its funerary inscriptions. *Libya Antiqua* N.S. 15: 141–54.
- Famerie, E. 1998. *Le latin et le grec d'Appien. Contribution à l'étude du lexique d'un historien grec de Rome*. Droz, Genève-Paris.
- Franklin, J.L. 1991. Literacy and the parietal inscriptions of Pompeii. In: M. Beard et al. (eds), *Literacy in the Roman World*, *JRS* Suppl. 3: 77–98.
- Galand, L. 1966. Inscriptions libyques. In: L. Galand, J. Février and G. Vajda, *Inscriptions antiques du Maroc*. Éditions du CNRS, Paris: 1–88.
- Gasperini, L. 1996. Note di epigrafia Cirenea. In: L. Bacchielli and M. Bonanno Aravantinos (eds), *Scritti di antichità in memoria di Sandro Stucchi, Studi Miscellanei* 29. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome: 143–56 (reprinted in Gasperini, L. 2008. *Scritti di epigrafia greca*, eds A. Arnaldi and S.M. Marengo. Tored, Tivoli: 361–85).
- Ghaki, M. 2022. Langue et écriture libyco-berbère : extension géographique et évolution historique. In: A. Gori and F. Viti (eds), *L'Africa nel mondo, il mondo in Africa*. Accademia Ambrosiana, Milan: 151–72.
- Giambuzzi, G. 1971. Lessico delle iscrizioni latine della Cirenaica. *Quaderni di archeologia della Libia* 6: 43–104.
- Gómez-Pantoja, J. and Castillo Sanz, F.J. 2014. Una fórmula epigráfica fracasada: *aera*. In: F. Cadiou and M. Navarro Caballero (eds), *La guerre et ses traces. Conflits et sociétés en Hispanie à l'époque de la conquête romaine (III^e–I^{er} s. a.C.)*. Ausonius éditions, Bordeaux: 507–18.
- Goodchild, R.G. 1950. Roman milestones in Cyrenaica. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 18: 83–91.
- Goodchild, R.G. 1976. *Libyan Studies. Select papers of the late R. G. Goodchild*, edited by J. Reynolds. Paul Elek, London.
- Gruen, E.S. 2011. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton University Press, Princeton-Oxford.
- Harris, W.V. 1983. Literacy and epigraphy, I. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 52: 87–111.
- Harris, W.V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Harris, W.V. 1995. Instrumentum domesticum and literacy. In: H. Solin, O. Salomies and U.-M. Liertz (eds), *Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini*. Societas scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki: 19–27.
- Harter-Uibopuu, K. and Wiedergut, K. 2014. 'Niemand anderer soll hier bestatten werden...' Grabschutz im kaiserzeitlichen Milet. In: G. Thür (ed.), *Grabrituale: Tod und Jenseits in Frühgeschichte und Altertum. Akten der 3. Tagung des Zentrums Archäologie und Altertumswissenschaften an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 21.–22. März 2010*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna: 147–72.
- ILAFr. 1923. *Inscriptions latines d'Afrique*, R. Cagnat, A. Merlin and L. Chatelain (eds). Paris.
- James, D. 2024. Bilingualism and Greek identity in the fifth century B.C.E. *The Classical Quarterly* 73: forthcoming.
- Kerr, R. 2010. Some thoughts on the origin of the Libyco-Berber alphabet. In: H. Stroomer, M. Kossmann, D. Ibrizimow and R. Voßen (eds), *Études berbères V. Essai sur les variations dialectales et autres articles*. Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Cologne: 41–68.
- Kolendo, J. 1982. L'activité des proconsuls d'Afrique d'après les inscriptions. In: S. Panciera (ed.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio. Atti del colloquio internazionale dell'AIEGL, Roma, 14–20 maggio 1981*, vol. I. Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Rome: 351–67.
- Laronde, A. 1987. *Cyrène et la Libye hellénistique*. *Libykai Historiai de l'époque républicaine au principat d'Auguste*. Éditions du CNRS, Paris.
- Leiwo, M. 1995. The mixed languages in Roman inscriptions. In: H. Solin, O. Salomies and U.-M. Liertz (eds), *Acta colloquii epigraphici Latini*. Societas scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki: 293–301.
- Letronne, J.-A. 1848. Quelques notes sur la lettre de M. de Bourville, relative à l'exploration de la Cyrénaïque. *Revue archéologique* 5: 279–81.
- Lüderitz, G. 1983. *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika*. Reichert Verlag, Wiesbaden.
- Luni, M. 1992. Strutture monumentali e documenti epigrafici nel foro di Cirene. In: A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana. Atti del IX convegno di studio, Nuoro, 13–15 dicembre 1991*. Gallizzi, Sassari: 123–46.
- Luni, M. 2007. La basilica nel foro di Cirene. In: L. Gasperini and S.M. Marengo (eds), *Cirene e la Cirenaica nell'Antichità. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Roma-Frascati, 18–21 dicembre 1996*. Tored, Tivoli: 377–400.
- LGPN I = Fraser, P.M. and Matthews, E. 1987. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. 1. The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.

- MacMullen, R. 1982. The epigraphic habit in the Roman empire. *American Journal of Philology* 103: 233–46.
- Marengo, S.M. 1988. L'agorà di Cirene in età romana alla luce delle testimonianze epigrafiche. *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 100/1: 87–101.
- Marini, S. 2018. *Grecs et Libyens en Cyrénaïque dans l'Antiquité. Aspects et vicissitudes d'un rapport millénaire*. Riveneuve, Paris.
- Mason, H.J. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: a Lexicon and Analysis*. Hakkert, Toronto.
- Masson, O. 1974. Grecs et Libyens en Cyrénaïque, d'après les témoignages de l'épigraphie. *Antiquités africaines* 10: 49–62.
- Masson, O. 1976. Le nom de Battos, fondateur de Cyrène, et un groupe de mots grecs apparentés. *Glotta* 54/1–2: 84–98.
- Mei, O. and Antolini, S. 2019. Archeologia ed epigrafia a Cirene in tempi di crisi: nuovi rinvenimenti dalla *chora* e dalla Necropoli Sud. *Quaderni di archeologia della Libya* 22 N.S. II: 45–64.
- Millar, F. 1968. Local cultures in the Roman empire: Libyan, Punic and Latin in Roman Africa. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 58: 126–34.
- Mullen, A. 2013. *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean: Multilingualism and Multiple Identities in the Iron Age and Roman Periods*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mullen, A. and James, P. (eds) 2012. *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Neumann, G. and Untermann, J. (eds) 1980. *Die Sprachen im römischen Reich der Kaiserzeit*. Rheinland-Verlag, Cologne-Bonn.
- Paci, G. 1994. Le iscrizioni in lingua latina della Cirenaica. *Libyan Studies* 25: 251–57.
- Pichler, W. 2007. *Origin and Development of the Libyco-Berber Script*. Rüdiger Köppe Verlag, Cologne.
- Rebuffat, R. 1992. Bu Njem. In: *Encyclopédie berbère* 11: 1626–42.
- Rebuffat, R. 2013. *Recueil des inscriptions libyques 1940–2012. Supplément à J.-B. Chabot*. École normale supérieure-AOROC, Paris. Available at <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00841800/file/recueildesinscriptionsLibyques.pdf> (accessed on 28 April 2024).
- Rebuffat, R. 2016. *Le don des langues et le libyque. Actes des Apôtres, 2, 1–11*. École normale supérieure-AOROC, Paris. Available at <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01381505/document> (accessed on 28 April 2024).
- Rebuffat, R. 2018. *Recueil onomastique d'épigraphie libyque*. École normale supérieure-AOROC, Paris. Available at <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01707234v2/document> (accessed on 22 January 2024).
- Reynolds, J. 1962a. Cyrenaica, Pompey and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 52: 97–103.
- Reynolds, J. 1962b. Vota pro salute principis. *Papers of the British School at Rome* 30: 33–36.
- Reynolds, J. 1980–1981. Three soldiers of the *cohors Hispanorum* in Cyrenaica. *Libyan Studies* 12: 49–53.
- Reynolds, J. 1982. Senators originating in the provinces of Egypt and of Crete and Cyrene. In: S. Panciera (ed.), *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio. Atti del colloquio internazionale dell'AIEGL, Roma, 14–20 maggio 1981*, vol. II. Edizioni di storia e letteratura, Rome: 671–83.
- Reynolds, J. 1989. Twenty years of inscriptions. *Libyan Studies* 20: 117–26.
- Ritti, T. 2004. *Iura sepulchrorum* a Hierapolis di Frigia nel quadro dell'epigrafia sepolcrale microasiatica. Iscrizioni edite e inedite. In: S. Panciera (ed.), *Libitina e dintorni. Libitina e i luci sepolcrali. Le leges libitinariae campane. Iura sepulchrorum: vecchie e nuove iscrizioni. Atti dell'XI rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie*. Quasar, Rome: 455–634.
- Rochette, B. 1997. *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain*. Latomus, Brussels.
- Rochette, B. 2010. Greek and Latin bilingualism. In: E.J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Wiley, Malden, MA: 281–93.
- Rosamilia, E. 2014. Cent'anni di epigrafia a Cirene. In: M. Luni (ed.), *La scoperta di Cirene. Un secolo di scavi 1913–2013*. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome: 381–88.
- Rosamilia, E. 2021. Hadrian, foundation stories, and civic identities in second-century-CE Cyrene. In: L. Gallo and S. Gallotta (eds), *Ancient cities 2. Administration, Politics, Culture and Society of the Ancient City*. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome: 135–50.
- Sarrazanas Cl. 2023. Emprunts formulaires et lexicaux dans les inscriptions funéraires grecques et latines de la colonie romaine de Philippes (Macédoine orientale). In: R. Roure (ed.), *Le multilinguisme dans la Méditerranée antique*. Presses universitaires de Bordeaux, Pessac: 65–88. Available at <https://una-editions.fr/emprunts-formulaires-et-lexicaux/> (accessed on 27 December 2023).
- Speidel, M.A. 2023. Learning Latin in the Roman army. In: A. Mullen (ed.), *Social factors in the Latinization of the Roman West*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 133–58.
- Syme, R. 1968. The Ummidii. *Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 17/1: 72–105.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Thorn, D.M. and Thorn, J.C. 2009. *A Gazetteer of the Cyrene Necropolis from the Original Notebooks of John Cassels, Richard Tomlinson and James and Dorothy Thorn*. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Rome.
- Tribulato, O. (ed.) 2012. *Language and Linguistic Contact in Ancient Sicily*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Werner, S. 2009. Literacy studies in Classics: the last twenty years. In: W.A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (eds), *Ancient Literacies: the Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 333–82.
- Wilson, A. 2023. Latin, literacy, and the Roman economy. In: A. Mullen (ed.), *Social factors in the Latinization of the Roman West*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 78–98.
- Woolf, G. 2000. Literacy. In: A.K. Bowman, P. Garnsey and D. Rathbone (eds), *The Cambridge Ancient History vol. XI. The High Empire, A.D. 70–192*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge: 875–97.
- Woolf, G. 2009. Literacy or literacies in Rome? In: W. A. Johnson and H.N. Parker (eds), *Ancient Literacies: the Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 46–68.
- Yon, J.-B. 2008. Bilinguisme et trilinguisme à Palmyre. In: F. Biville, J.-C. Decourt and G. Rougemont (eds), *Bilinguisme gréco-latin et épigraphie. Actes du colloque organisé à l'université Lumière-Lyon II les 17, 18 et 19 mai 2004*. Maison de l'Orient et la Méditerranée, Lyon: 195–211.