

dies, Haemon will die,¹¹ nevertheless he has no reason to fear that Antigone is in any immediate danger. A delay of a few minutes or even of several hours could hardly be expected to endanger her life.¹²

What Jebb believes to be the "natural order" of events does not seem natural to Creon. The language of the text (1108–12) and the implications in the story incidents make it clear that Creon in the performance of his two tasks follows the same sequence which he had originally intended and expressed. Thus those scholars who have perpetuated Jebb's belief in a discrepancy between Creon's expression of the order of events and his perfor-

mance of them have attempted to explain away an inconsistency that does not exist.¹³ In so doing they have obscured Creon's fundamental motive. Furthermore, since the discrepancy is nonexistent, the play, of course, lacks the dramaturgical flaw which Jebb and Waldo note. In fact, if Creon had thought and acted otherwise—considered the release of Antigone first—both the expression and performance of this order of events would have been inconsistent with his character and would have represented a real blemish in the play.¹⁴

JOSEPH S. MARGON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

11. Haemon had said to Creon during their quarrel: ἡδ' οὖν θανέιται καὶ θανοῦσα' ἀλεῖ τινά (751). Haemon's "someone else" had been ambiguous. Tiresias' prophecy (1065–71), however, had clarified the ambiguity, and Creon must now realize that Haemon had meant himself. The description in vss. 1206–30 of Creon's apprehension when he hears cries of wailing as he approaches the cave in which Antigone is immured gives further substantiation of his awareness of the nexus between the fates of Haemon and Antigone. Cf. Adams, p. 57.

12. Cf. Kitto, p. 175; Linforth, pp. 240–41.

13. See n. 3 above.

14. One might raise the objection that if, as it actually appears, Creon has expressed a preference to bury Polynices

first (1108–12), the Chorus, which has told him "to free the maiden and bury the dead" (1100–1101) in that order, might be expected to remonstrate and to remind him not to postpone rescuing her. But the Chorus, too, must realize that Antigone is in no immediate danger, and their statement of the desired order of events (1100–1101) can be understood as a natural expression of their uppermost feeling at the moment rather than as an imperative injunction to Creon. Accordingly, when Creon states the reverse order of events, there is no need for them to be alarmed. In the excitement, moreover, of Creon's sudden conversion, it is even possible that his reversal of the order of events escapes their notice. Certainly, the joy and exaltation which they display in the Ode that follows (1115–54) give no indication that they have any misgivings or fears about the future.

PRAEFECTUS MESOPOTAMIAE ET OSRHOENAE: A POSTSCRIPT

An inscription from Puteoli¹ published by the present writer revealed the existence of an equestrian prefectship of Mesopotamia and Osrhoene in the early third century A.D. Though it was previously supposed that Mesopotamia and Osrhoene were always ruled by separate governors, this inscription showed that the provinces were at one stage joined as a single command, and so offered grounds for inferring that Osrhoene was added to the province of the prefect of Mesopotamia when Caracalla suppressed the Abgarid kingdom of Edessa in 212/3. The kingdom of Edessa was revived in 240 (though only for two years), and records of two subsequent careers show that Osrhoene

henceforth ceased to appear in the titulature of the prefect of Mesopotamia, probably thus reverting to separate status under the rule of a procurator.

The period of office of the prefect of the two provinces buried at Puteoli (L. Valerius Valerianus) evidently therefore fell between 212/3 and 240, though his epitaph provides little on which to base a more precise date. Valerianus' previous offices could only be conjectured, though parallels suggested that they probably included several military commands, with a possibility of a previous function or functions in a subordinate capacity in Mesopotamia. By a surprising coincidence,

1. *CP*, LXIV (1969), 229–33. For fuller references together with the text of the Puteoli inscription the reader is referred to that article, denoted here as *PMO*.

a new inscription from Caesarea in Palestine² (which was unknown to the writer at the time when the commentary on the Puteoli text was written) has revealed most of Valerianus' earlier career.³ It fulfils previous expectations

in that his career is shown to have a strong military content, and includes a previous office in Mesopotamia.

With Fitz's restorations, the inscription reads as follows:

L.Valerio Valeriano [proc(uratori) provin(ciae)]
Syr(iae) Palaest(inae), provin.
praeposito summ(a)e [rationis *or* ration(is) priv(atae)]
Mesopotamenae ad [centena *or* HS C mil(ia) num(mum)]
praepos(ito) vexil(lationis) felicis[simae expedit(ionis)]
urbic(ae) itemq(ue) Asiana[e adversus]
hostes publicos p(opuli) R(omani) [et cohortium]
peregrinarum ad u[r]bem defend(endam)?]
proc(uratori) Cypri, praef(ecto) a[lae I Hispan(orum)]
Campagonum in Dac[ia, trib(uno) coh(ortis) I]
miliariae Hermese[norum c(ivium) R(omanorum) in]
Pan(n)onia, praef(ecto) c(o)ho(rtis) [V Callaecor(um)
Lucen(sium)] in Pannonia,
[M.] Mevius Romanus (centurio) [leg(ionis) VI Ferra-
tae] f(idelis) c(onstantis) Antoniniana[e (ex corni-
cula)r(io) eius viro [egregio pat-
rono incompara]bili [ob merita]

The career has already been discussed in detail by Fitz,⁴ but its main features can be considered briefly here. After three *militiae* held in major provinces (Pannonia and Dacia), evidently in the reign of Commodus, Valerianus became sexagenarian procurator of Cyprus. When Septimius Severus marched on Rome in 193, Valerianus served as *praepositus vexillationis* in the victorious army. Evidently he proved his worth as one of Septimius' officers, since he was employed in the same capacity in the subsequent campaign against Niger in the East which ultimately led to the setting up of the province of Mesopotamia. Valerianus was one of those whom Septimius left in charge to organize the administration of the new province: his office was that of "praepositus summ(a)e rationis *or* rationis

privatae Mesopotamenae" (following Fitz's restorations). The fact that the title was that of *praepositus* and not that of *procurator* seems to imply that this was a special appointment made at the inception of the new province. Valerianus' financial employment in Mesopotamia was followed by the procuratorship of a province (perhaps also in the East) whose name is lost; and then by the procuratorship of Syria Palaestina (a ducenarian post), which is the final office recorded in the Caesarea inscription.

This inscription, which was apparently erected during Valerianus' procuratorship in Syria, is dated to a period no earlier than 211 by the mention of the epithet "Antoniniana" for the *legio VI Ferrata*. The majority of editors have referred this epithet (which was

2. A valuable full-length edition of the Caesarea inscription, with restorations that supersede previous versions of the text, has now been provided by Dr. J. Fitz (*Latomus*, XXVIII [1969], 126–40). The inscription was first published by M. Avi-Yonah in *Israel Expl. Journal*, XVI (1966), 135–41, and in *Yediat. Bahaqirat Eretz-Israel Weatqoteha*, XXX (1966), 128–35. Other commentaries: S. Scheiber, *Arch. Eretsitö*, XCIV (1967), 59–61; L. Balla, *Acta Class. Univ. Scient. Debrecen*, III (1967), 85–87; *AE*, 1966, 495.

3. The identification of the individuals mentioned in the two inscriptions as the same man is not in serious doubt. It is unlikely that the procuratorial service in the East included

two senior men with the names L. Valerius Valerianus under the late Severi. The possibility of separate individuals who were father and son is largely excluded by the likelihood that the son of a ducenarian procurator would have entered the Senate, rather than following his father as a procurator (cf. A. Stein, *Römische Ritterstand* [Munich, 1927], pp. 213 ff.). The inclusion in the epitaph of a *signum* ("Dardanius") which does not appear in the honorific inscription from Caesarea is not significant, since the number of names attributed to one individual not infrequently varies from one inscription to another.

4. *Loc. cit.* (n. 2).

also indicated by an erasure in another inscription⁵) to the reign of Caracalla.⁶ This dating would still make the latter stages of the career described in the Caesarea inscription relatively slow, since the last three offices would appear to span a period of little less than fifteen years, from the mid-190's (when the province of Mesopotamia was being established), until some point in the reign of Caracalla. However, a strict interpretation of the evidence for the epithet "Antoniniana" could suggest that it was not Caracalla but Elagabalus who bestowed the title on the sixth legion, since this title is erased from the other inscription in which it appears,⁷ which belongs to the reign of a sole emperor whose name was also erased in full. Caracalla suffered no *damnatio*; and while "accidental" erasures of his name in mistake for that of Elagabalus (whose official names were identical with those of Caracalla) are not unknown, they form a very small proportion of the total number of inscriptions in which Caracalla was recorded.⁸ Thus it is possible that Valerianus was still procurator of Syria Palaestina as late as 218 or 219. There is of course no need to assume that his public employments had been continuous throughout the period covered by the inscription.⁹

The career which is most closely analogous, that of a near contemporary named C. Iulius Pacatianus,¹⁰ shows four posts held at not less than ducenarian level before the trecenarian prefectship of Mesopotamia was achieved. If a comparable sequence is assumed in the case of Valerianus, his prefectship could hardly fall much before the mid-220's. If

alternatively the appointment to Mesopotamia followed directly after the procuratorship in Syria, its date could be as early as 219/220. Thus the likely period of office in Mesopotamia falls at some point in the 220's. An early date is the more probable in view of the length of Valerianus' career, which must have begun at latest in the early years of Commodus.¹¹

Since his sarcophagus was found in Italy (at Puteoli) and not in the last province in which he served, it is not unfair to deduce that Valerianus was buried at his town of residence, and that he was therefore probably a native of Puteoli. The three instances at Puteoli of the rare cognomen Dardanus,¹² which seems to echo Valerianus' *signum* (Dardanius), lend support to this view. In face of the evidence of his place of burial, the hypotheses of Valerianus' origin from Pannonia¹³ (built on the offices given in the Caesarea inscription) appear doubtful. Two parallels may be cited for the employment in the equestrian service in the East of men from the Greek city of Puteoli.¹⁴ L. Bovius Celer served as military tribune in Egypt, and then as procurator of the gladiatorial establishment at Alexandria, probably in the late first century. And M. Artorius Priscillus Vicasius Sabidianus likewise served in Egypt, as "praefectus montis Berenicidis," perhaps under Trajan. If Valerianus was also a native of Puteoli, he appears to have been the most distinguished of the procurators whom this town produced, from the evidence which survives.¹⁵

R. DUNCAN-JONES

GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

5. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, XII (1946), 89, and Pl. XXVI (p. 87) = *AE*, 1948, 145.

6. Scheiber, p. 61, Balla, p. 86, Fitz, p. 137 (*loc. cit.*, n. 2); *AE*, 1966, p. 158.

7. N. S. Avi-Yonah, p. 141.

8. Cf. *CIL*, VIII, index, pp. 140-44.

9. Cf. R. Syme, *HSCP*, LXXIII (1969), 225.

10. *PMO* at n. 47.

11. Cf. Fitz, pp. 128-29 (*loc. cit.*, n. 2).

12. *PMO* at n. 13.

13. Avi-Yonah, p. 137; Balla, p. 87; Fitz, p. 129 (*loc. cit.*, n. 2).

14. H.-G. Pflaum, *Carrières procuratoriennes équestres* (Paris, 1960), Nos. 55 and 88.

15. *PMO*, n. 45.