Abstract: The name of the province *Epirus Nova Dalmatorum* thus read by N. Vulić in 11.7–8 of the inscription published in *Spomenik S.K.A.* 71 (1931) nr. 260 is here corrected in *Epirus Nova*, while the end of the inscription should be read as *d(evotus) n(umini) m(aiestatique) eorum*. The province was created between A.D. 293 and 311*.

* *Epirus Nova* followed by a determination *Dalmatorum* was read by N. Vulić in an altar dedicated to Emperor Constantius and his Caesar Constantius Gallus by Sofronius, *praeses* of the province1. Although unverified and attested nowhere else in that form, *Epirus Nova Dalmatorum* is accepted by the scholars2. The writer of this note even tried to explain that *Dalmatorum* was used as an equivalent for *Illyriorum*, in honour of Emperor Diocletianus, Dalmata, under whose rule the province was presumably created3. But, after the autopsy performed in the Ohrid Museum in August 19964, I found that the key word in the last line has been misinterpreted by Vulić5 and that 11. 6–8 (s. phot. nr. 1) should evidently read as follows:

---


4 During the revision of the inscriptions in western part of Macedonia, to be published in *Inscriptiones Graecae* X 2,4 (together with M. Riel, red. F. Papazoglou).

5 Who in l.c. reads *Dalmatorum* supposing ligatures *AL* and *MA*, while *eorum* and not *torum* can be seen clearly even on the photograph.
Sofronius v(ir) p(erfectissimus)
[pra]esis (!) prov inciae Nova(e)
[E]piri d(evotus) n(umin) m(aiestatique) eorum.

The closing formula is common on inscriptions from the time of Tetrarchy and later. New reading of 1. 8 testifies, clearly enough, that the name of the newly established province was Epirus Nova, while it seems that Epirus Nova Dalmatorum in all likelihood never existed. Besides, the first epigraphic testimony of Epirus Nova, allowed the conjecture of another inscription from Lychnidus: Domino nostr[o]/ Flab(io) Const(ans)[ii]/ nob(ilissimo) C[ae]sari/ Fl(avius) Hygin[us] / [p]raes(es) prov inciae [Epiri Novae]---6.

As regards reason for the erection of the altar, Sofronius might have done it in honour of the expected passage of the future empress Eusebia through Lychnidus, on her way from Thessalonike to Mailand, most likely following via Egnatia7. Her cortego to Mailand, where the wedding ceremony with Emperor Constantius took place in AD 353, was described by Iulianus as brilliant8. But, the reason for the two dedications found in Lychnidus, could also mean that the city was, for a period of time, the capital of the province Epirus Nova9.

However, there is a more important question which the two inscriptions from Ohrid raise, but do not solve, and that is the date of establishment of the new province. Epirus Nova was in point of fact taken out of the province Macedonia, while the already existing Epirus took the name Epirus Vetus. Both of them figure in two itineraries, Itinerarium maritimum and Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum. The first of the two is rather older and is supposed to date back to the time of Diocletian10, while Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum is dated precisely in AD 333–334. Scholars, therefore, could not decide between Diocletian and Constantine as the founder of Epirus Nova11.


7 Cp. M. Dušan­ić, l.c. 138.
8 Julian, Or. II 110 D (Bidez).
9 In the period after 314 when Dyrrachium was struck by an earthquake, as suggested by F. Papazoglu, Ohrid i ohridsko niz istorijata, Ohrid 1985, 114.
10 According to Kubitschek, Itinerarien, RE IX (1914) 2350–2351.
11 Already Th. Mommsen, Ges. Schriften V, 561–588 considers that Laterculus presents a review of provinces in Diocletian’s time. F. Papazoglu, Ohrid 113 and n.4 inclines to the later, as the only reliable date.
The two provinces are recorded in *Laterculus Veronensis* as well, which, as newly found papyri testify, reflects the organization in the eastern part of the Roman Empire in 314–324.\(^\text{12}\)

Fortunately, fresh epigraphic evidence helps to define more closely the period in which Epirus Nova was taken out. A dedication to Constantius Chlorus as *consul designatus* (AD 293) by praeses of the still integral province of Epirus, offers a *terminus post quem* for its reorganisation. The same find provided us with the epigraphic testimony of *Epirus Vetus*, and that from Licinius’ time.\(^\text{13}\)

Recently, near ancient Photike in Epirus a basis was found with the inscription, probably still earlier, dedicated, as M. Heil perspicaciously read,\(^\text{14}\) to Galerius:

\[\text{Fortissimo et piis/simo Caesari d.n./ Gal(erio) Val(erio) [Maximiano]/ p.f. inv[icto Augusto]}^5/ \text{Coronius Titianus v.p./ praes(es) prov(inciae) vet(eris) Epiri/ num(ini) eorum dicatissi/mus.}\]

Heil’s conjecture in 1. 4 is, in our opinion, correct, although it seems to lead to a controversy of whether Galerius bore the title of *Caesar*, or was he already *Augustus* at the time when the dedication was offered to him.

As for the date of this dedication, the editor associates it with those from Timgad, supposed to be from AD 305\(^\text{15}\) and concludes, „So liegt es nahe, auch die Inschrift aus Photike in diese Übergangszeit zu datieren“. But this conclusion does not necessarily hold, even if the date of cited inscriptions is correct\(^\text{16}\) and one could think of some other date and reason for the Photike inscription. Heil himself, after referring to examples where the title *Augustus* was (wrongly)


\(^{16}\) The Milestone from Spain, ... *nobilissimo (!) Caesari Caio / Galerio / Maximiano / [inv(icto)] Augusto / cos(u)i bono / rei publicae* nato is dated not c. 305, but between AD 305 and 311 in *AE* 1975 nr. 511. However, the title *cos.* undisputedly shows that the milestone was placed in AD 294, when both caesars, Galerius and Constantius, were consuls for the first time (cp. A. Degrassi, *I Fasti consolari*, n. 1047).
ascribed to a *Caesar*\(^{17}\), admits that it could be the case here too, and in consequence, the erection of this base could be dated between AD 293 and 305.

It does not seem possible as yet to claim with certainty which date is correct in this case, so that we can only discuss both possibilities. According to the habitual imperial titulature\(^{18}\), *nobilissimus Caesar* after emperor’s name – in contrast with the opening *Imp. Caes.* – means precisely that a ruler effectively bears this title. In our inscription, *Caesar* is placed before Galerius’ name – as a common noun – and the (conjectured) title *Augustus* comes after his name. Having this in mind, we need to take as more justified assumption that the date of the inscription was later than AD 305, when Galerius was already *Augustus*. But, apart from the beginning of the second Tetrarchy, one may think of other reasons for it, in particular the meeting at Carnuntum and the proclamation of Licinius as *Augustus*, AD 308. Therefore we should not exclude the possibility that the Photike dedication and the one to Licinius\(^{19}\), from Paleokastro, were even contemporaneous.

On the other hand, there is evidence – as pointed out by Barnes – testifying to the use of the title *Imperator* (equivalent with *Augustus*) even for *Caesars*, the title *Imperator* being held from the beginning of the Caesarship\(^{20}\). Together with ambiguous *ILS* 654 and the milestone *AE* 1975, 511, one might assume that in the Photike inscription the title *Augustus* could be assigned to Galerius as a *Caesar*, all the more so, when we compare it with *IGLS* 2771 (AD 286/7): *Liberatori orbis Romani, fortissimo ac piissimo invictissimoque d.n. Caio Aurel. Valerio Diocletiano...* The difference between the two is only that the title *Caesar* precedes *d.n. Galerio* in Photike inscription, while it is omitted before *d.n. Diocletiano* in *IGLS* 2771. This could mean that the dedication to Galerius is made while he was still a *Caesar*. If that is so, one can look for a possible reason for this dedication. As we know, Galerius’ main success as a caesar was his victory over Persians in AD 298, which he celebrated

---

\(^{17}\) Heil, l.c. 160–161 indicating examples gathered by F. Kolb, *Diocletian und die Erste Tetrarchie. Improvisation oder Experiment der Organisation monarchischer Herrschaft*, Berlin 1987, 50 n. 135; 85 n. 253, and citing the inscription from Africa, *AE* 1974, 692: *D. n. Flavio Valerio / Constantio nobilis[simo] Caes(ari) Aug(usto) nos(tri).* Here we can safely assume another (lost) base with a statue and a similar dedication to Maximianus. The end of Galerius’ inscription thus may be read *Caes(ari) Aug(usti) nos(etri).*

\(^{18}\) See T.D. Barnes, op.cit. 24.

\(^{19}\) Cp. * supra*, n. 11.

\(^{20}\) Barnes, op. cit. 25–27. In Galerius’ edict of 311 (Eus. *HE* 8, 17) he is αὐτοκράτωρ τὸ ἔννεακαιδέκατον, that is from AD 293; cp. and *ILS* 651 for Constantius Chlorus.
in triumph\textsuperscript{21}; after that, a triumphal arch was built in Thessalonike. The events before that, Galerius' war in Pannonia, and later, his operations on the Danube and the building of \textit{felix Romuliana}\textsuperscript{22}, in the interior of the Balkans, were of lesser importance for the Empire. Therefore, if the base was dedicated to Galerius as a Caesar, then it was probably to celebrate his victory over the Persian king Narses, the epithet \textit{fortissimus} being quite appropriate in the circumstances.

Thus, the assumed datation concerns only partly the question of the separation of Epirus Nova. Even if the inscription was dedicated to Galerius as \textit{Augustus}, since literary and epigraphic sources do not mention as yet his administrative reforms, the hypothesis that the province \textit{Epirus Nova} was created by Diocletian, after AD 293 still sounds more convincing.

\textsuperscript{21} We used the review of main dates from his biography, as well as of his residences from Barnes, op. cit. 61–64; cp. also W. Ensslin, \textit{Maximianus} nr 2, \textit{RE} XIV (1930) 2516–2528; id. \textit{Valerius} nr 142 (Diocletianus), \textit{RE} VII A (1948) 2438–2447.
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