

Introduction

Character of the inscriptions and some notes on their dating

Uppsala University has in its possession 24 inscribed stones from classical antiquity, 18 of which carry Latin inscriptions, and six inscriptions are in Greek. Like in most epigraphic collections, the majority of the inscriptions in Uppsala are epitaphs, preserved in their entirety or as fragments. But there are also three inscriptions that belong to other genres, two of them quite remarkable. One (no. 23) is a fragment of a synodal decree from Ptolemaic Egypt, an inscription of the same type as the one of the Rosetta Stone, but the inscription to which the fragment in Uppsala belongs is among the earliest inscriptions recording a Ptolemaic synod, dating to 243 BC and thus nearly 150 years older than the Rosettana. It is also, by rather a wide margin, the oldest inscription in the collection. No. 24 is a dedicatory inscription to Apollo, cut on the base of a statuette of the god and dating to the reign of Tiberius. The statuette was presented as a gift to a synod; not, however, the kind of gathering of priests that made the decree in no. 23, but a smaller cultic association. This is the second oldest inscription among those that are securely datable. Finally, no. 22 is a list of officials of a

collegium funeraticium consisting of slaves and freedmen at the court of Claudius and Nero; it is sometimes referred to as the *Fasti incertae originis ministrorum domus Augustae*. Like no. 23, this inscription is remarkable, as there are fewer than ten inscriptions of this kind preserved from Roman antiquity.

As the epitaphs and the fragments have several points in common both as concerns contents and dating, it will be convenient to consider some of these points in the introduction. Some further particulars that concern the epitaphs of soldiers will be examined in the introductory note preceding the commentary on no. 10, and matters of relevance to each of the three inscriptions that belong to other genres, viz. the *Fasti incertae originis ministrorum domus Augustae* and the two Greek inscriptions from Egypt, will be discussed in the introduction to the respective inscription.

EPITAPHS

Most Roman (and Graeco-Roman) epitaphs are short, plain and with no aspiration to literary merit. And even if one generally does well not to belittle epitaphs as such—some are both long, complex and of high literary value¹—they

¹ The best instance is the epitaph of Lucceius Nepos (*CIL* VI 21521), written in elegiac distichs amounting

tend to express themselves in formulas according to a relatively stereotypical pattern.

The epitaphs in the Uppsala collection all conform to this description: they are plain texts, extending from typical “standard” epitaphs such as no. 3 to the extremely simple, such as the three words of no. 9, an early Christian epitaph wishing for God’s peace to Terentia, or the four word epitaph of Albanus (no. 7). They are all—with the possible (and notable) exception of no. 9—cut using “freehand capitals”, a type of letters produced by cutting according to a pattern that has been sketched on the surface of the stone without the aid of a ruler, compasses, and plumb bobs, instruments which were otherwise used to make the letters straight and symmetrical.² This type of lettering (of which no. 10 offers the most extreme instance in this collection) was naturally cheaper as the letters could be produced much faster than so-called “guided capitals”, the Roman monumental script used in the odd epitaph but above all in more palaeographically refined inscriptions, such as those attached to official monuments; the average Roman did not, and in many cases certainly could not, spend that kind of money on an epitaph. Stone was also expensive, and in the interest of keeping texts as compact as possible, many words were divided—sometimes rather startlingly—at line-breaks. This phenomenon, which is avoided in carefully executed high-quality inscriptions, occurs very frequently in the epitaphs and can be seen in several of the Uppsala inscriptions. Obviously, it took a more careful planning of the layout of the text on the stone to avoid breaking words in this manner (and thus potentially also a bigger piece of marble); naturally, such an inscription

to 46 lines of admirable quality. In prose there is, for example, the so-called *Laudatio Turiae* (CIL VI 37053).

² The process of laying out the text on the stone is usually referred to as *ordinatio*, see Susini 1973, 30–38.

would have been more expensive, both in terms of work and of material.³

The stones may, however, sometimes surprise and communicate their memorial message in a quite original manner, while still clinging to the basic pattern. Witness inscription no. 1, which commemorates two persons attached to a funerary association of a kind similar to that whose officials are recorded in no. 22. In little more than five lines, it gives a glimpse of the procedure when a member of the association died. No. 4 is conspicuous because of the adjective *impius*, “impious”, used here to describe the dead son, though much more so to us than to the Romans, who understood that the word was not meant to reflect the son’s character when alive; his sole act of impiety consisted in dying away from his mother. Rather remarkable is also no. 8, which seems to present us with Sunshine and the Flower Man, the latter in the form of the nickname *Florius*, which is

³ Whereas it is easy to dismiss such breaks as merely indicative of carelessness in production, it is interesting to note that there is actually a clear tendency among stonecutters concerning at which point the words are divided. On the basis of an examination of a vast quantity of inscriptions from Italy with regard to word-breaks, Walter Dennison observed that when word divisions occur in groups of two different consonants, the division is usually made between the consonants (Dennison 1906). Among his 2,267 (preserved and therefore verifiable) instances of word division in such groups, 1,816 (80.1%) occur between the consonants; see his table on p. 52. It is one of the curiosities of Roman inscriptions that in the combination *mn*, words are divided before *m* almost as often as between *m* and *n*, which is unique: according to Dennison (1906, 62), *mn* is divided between the consonants in 56% of the cases, whereas for other groups, the numbers are *ct* 74%, *gn* 75%, *pt* 72%, *sc* 84%, *st* 85%, *str* 95%. The present division of *alu|mne* is one of the instances that make *mn* a special combination (as noted by Dennison 1906, 55). The division seen in *pietissi|me*, which involves a single consonant *s*, on the other hand, quite in line with the general pattern; in 7,153 of Dennison’s 8,622 cases in preserved inscriptions, the consonant attaches itself to the following vowel and is placed after the line-break (Dennison 1906, 52).

probably the earliest known instance of a “detached signum”. Furthermore, this stone is architectonically interesting as being a miniature version of a funerary altar.

Also the seemingly uninteresting inscriptions may, on closer inspection, prove to hold certain points of interest. The typical, simple epitaph of Elpidia (no. 2), which has several instances of orthography reflecting vulgar pronunciation, suggests that the seemingly haphazard variation between *-ae* and monophthongized *-e* did actually, or at least could follow certain rules. No. 5, the epitaph of one Caelia Victoria, would be unremarkable in the extreme were it not for the fact that her age at death is recorded as 80 years; this would count as an advanced age in modern society, but in ancient Rome, it may have been nearly four times the mean life expectancy. Sometimes, an epitaph that seems to offer nothing at all of interest gives an instance of a name that is extremely rare, as is the case with Charitus in no. 6.

A peculiar feature of the Uppsala collection is that three of its 24 inscriptions concern, or very likely concern, marines of the imperial Roman navy. One of these plainly states itself to be the epitaph of a marine, the Syrian C. Anthestius Niger, and to have been set up by his brother in arms L. Lucceius Aquilas (no. 10). From the names of their respective ships, it can be deduced that Anthestius and Lucceius were stationed at the naval base of Misenum on the Bay of Naples. For reasons that will be discussed in detail below, Iulius Diadochus of Alexandria (no. 11) and the Cappadocian Aelius Aelinus (no. 12) may also be assumed to have been marines serving in the fleet at Misenum.

There is also a fourth inscription that involves a military context. The stone in question is no. 13, the epitaph of Antonius Heraclides. This stone is adorned by a relief that, although fragmentary, shows a very striking similarity to those found at the necropolis of Nicopolis outside Alexandria in Egypt. The epitaphs from

Nicopolis to the greater part concern people associated with the *legio II Traiana* which was stationed there from the early 2nd to the 5th century AD, whether the legionaries themselves or members of their families. The similarity in style and workmanship between these stones and no. 13 is such that a common origin seems fairly certain.

FRAGMENTS

Seven stones in the collection are fragments preserving only part of the original inscription, too small to allow any opinion about the reading of the text in its entirety. Three of them are opistographs, which means that inscriptions have been cut on both sides of the stone. In all three cases, it is a matter of reusing the stone to cut a new text on the back, the inscriptions on each side being quite separate pieces.⁴ Four of these stones have Latin texts (nos. 15–18) and three Greek (nos. 19–21), the opistographs being nos. 17, 20, and 21. These seven stones consequently carry ten inscriptions in all.

It is very likely that all are epitaphs. Four inscriptions clearly reveal themselves as such through the presence of key words such as *vixet a[nnos - - -]* (16.3), *D(is) M(anibus)* (15.1), *Λολλία ... βιώσασα* (21), or through typical phrases such as *Ἀὐρ(ήλιος) Δάφνος ... αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ ... Πρίμα* (19). These three inscriptions also preserve what would have been the name of the deceased: apart from *Lollia Ar[- - -]* of no. 21 and *Aurelius Daphnus* of no. 19, there is one *Trae[- - -]* Chrysopolis in no. 15. No. 16 seems to be the epitaph of a girl or a woman because of the presence of the ending

⁴ In most cases, particularly those that are both relatively simple and not preserved in their entirety, it is naturally a matter of speculation which text is the older; for this reason, the terms *recto* (suggesting the “front”) and *verso* (the “back”) have to be used in a somewhat arbitrary manner. The present edition designates the different texts simply as “A” and “B” without making any assumptions as to which one was cut first.

-ae in line 2. The rest of the fragments remain anonymous.

No. 20 A seems to mention Hades (Αἰδης), which suggests a funerary context, and 21 B, while having no legible letters at all, appears to have the image of a fish, which may or may not be suggestive of a Christian context. Nos. 17 A and 18 can (very hypothetically) be conjectured as epitaphs, whereas 17 B and 20 B are simply too fragmentary for anything at all to be said about them. It is more than a fair guess, however, that these too are epitaphs.

DATING

While the three inscriptions that are clearly not epitaphs date themselves by referring to consuls (no. 22), to the reigning king (no. 23) or to the emperor (no. 24), epitaphs are notoriously difficult to date with any accuracy. The chief problem is naturally that the information they provide is usually extremely scanty, sometimes even restricted to nothing more than the name of the deceased. Other available criteria are very vague and usually can do little more than suggest that a stone belongs to a certain century. However, by combining several blunt criteria of this kind, it is sometimes possible to arrive at a more precise dating. And this is where the presence even of very simple fixed formulas may become important.

Except for nos. 4 and 7,⁵ all of the epitaphs in Uppsala include the commonest formula of all, the dedication to the *Di Manes*, the divine Manes. This habit of dedicating Roman burials to the *Di Manes* (in such dedications usually put in the dative, *Dis Manibus*) began in the reign of Augustus and became increasingly common during the 1st century AD. From the reign of the Flavian emperors (roughly after

⁵ In the case of no. 6, the beginning of which is missing, we cannot know if there was a *D. M.* or not; for obvious reasons, this applies to the fragments 17 and 18 as well.

AD 70), it appears abbreviated as *D. M.*, an abbreviation that becomes extremely common from the 2nd to the 4th centuries.⁶ Similarly, the formula *bene merenti* (found in 2.6 and 3.4–5) also belongs with those occurring most frequently in Roman epitaphs, appearing from the 1st century AD on. From the second half of the same century, it is found abbreviated as *b. m.* (as in 8.7, 10.7, and 12.5–6), and then written as one word, *benemerenti* (as in 1.6).⁷

With the aid of such features, sometimes combined with nomenclature and certain palaeographical details such as the use of tall I (the so-called *i longa*), the Latin epitaphs in the collection may be dated from the early and mid-1st century AD to the 3rd century.⁸ Some stones belong to the 2nd century,⁹ while some may belong either to the 2nd or to the 3rd.¹⁰ For the remaining Roman inscriptions, it is impossible to say anything more than that they are of imperial date. As regards the six Greek epitaphs, one of the very few letters preserved on no. 20 A happens to have a trema above it (line 4 αῖδ+[- - -]) which makes it possible to date this inscription, with reasonable certainty, to the 2nd century AD. No. 19 is from the 2nd or 3rd century AD, while nos. 9 and 21 B are probably from the 3rd. No. 21 A is likely impe-

⁶ The name of the deceased is usually treated as syntactically detached from this formula. Most often, it takes on the dative which is governed by an explicit or elliptical *fecit* (etc.), which is the case in most epitaphs in the present collections; see Schwarzlose 1913, 4 and Calabi Limentani 1991, 153–154. For an instance of the genitive, see no. 12.

⁷ See conveniently Pietri 1983, 526 with further references.

⁸ No. 7, which lacks a dedication to the *Di Manes*, may belong to the early 1st century. This is true also of no. 4, but the palaeography and general features of that stone speaks against such an early dating. No. 22 belongs to the middle of the 1st century, while nos. 3 and 12 are from the 3rd.

⁹ Nos. 1 and 8.

¹⁰ Nos. 10 and 13. For Schmidt's dating of the epitaphs from Nicopolis to the early 3rd century AD, see below.

rial, but lacks any features that would make a more precise dating possible.

Provenance of the inscriptions and history of the collection

THE 15 STONES IN THE MUSEUM OF SCANDINAVIAN ANTIQUITIES

The earliest evidence of Greek and Roman inscriptions in the possession of Uppsala University is given by a document entitled ‘Katalog öfver Upsala Universitets fornsakssamling. Bilaga B (med särskild nummerföljd). Katalog öfver samlingen af antiqviteter från den klassiska forntiden (romerska, grekiska etc.)’,¹¹ which is likely an appendix to a catalogue of the University’s Collection of Scandinavian Antiquities that was compiled in 1876. This document lists 15 inscriptions (nos. 2–6, 9–11, 22, 12, and 14–18 in this edition) together with a short physical description of each stone, its measurements, and a reading of the text (which is sometimes erroneously transcribed in the catalogue). To the first one (UAS 1388, no. 4 here), the following note is appended: “There is as little information concerning how this item came to the museum as concerning the rest of the marble tablets with inscriptions”.¹²

Ever since, this has been the prevailing view about these 15 stones, although there has naturally been speculation as to how they ended up

in Uppsala. When, in 1924, the newly appointed professor of Latin Håkan Sjögren made three of the stones the subject of his inaugural lecture,¹³ he could only point out that “our collection in Uppsala consists of 14 simple tablets, for the most part of marble, some intact, other fragmentary; when and how they came here is unknown, but it is tempting to consider Johan Henrik Schröder, who brought home so much of value from his journeys”.¹⁴ This is the first time that Schröder is mentioned in connection with the inscriptions, and it does seem to be more than just a qualified guess.

Johan Henrik Schröder, librarian and professor of archaeology and history of literature in Uppsala from 1830, was an eager collector of art and antiquities (in the latter case particu-

¹³ The lecture was subsequently published; see Sjögren 1925.

¹⁴ Sjögren mentions “14 simple tablets” as he did not count the Greek inscription, no. 9. The entire paragraph reads: “Vår samling i Uppsala består av 14 enkla tavlor, mest av marmor, somliga hela, andra i fragment; när och hur de kommit hit, är ej bekant, men det ligger nära till hands att tänka på Johan Henrik Schröder, som hemförde så mycket av värde från sina resor. Inskrifterna synas i alla fall härstamma från Rom och tillhöra—att döma bl. a. av bokstävernas form och språket—kejsartiden, d. v. s. de första århundradena av vår tidräkning. Detsamma torde gälla om den enda grekiska inskriften i samlingen; den synes härstamma från katakomberna. Till Göteborg förvärvades för några år sedan en samling inskrifter från Rom; de äro ungefär av samma slag som våra. De allra flesta av de i Sverige befintliga inskrifterna äro gravinskriftioner; de i Stockholm och Uppsala äro publicerade i VI:e bandet av samlingen *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, dit uppgifterna på sin tid meddelades av prof. FW. Häggström i Uppsala”. Nordquist (1978, 11) repeats the attribution to Schröder: “This small collection of classical antiquities [*viz. in the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities*] ... numbered 57 pieces. They included 14 inscriptions, for the most part in Latin, which, together with some other objects—a few fragments of terracotta figurines, some Roman terracotta lamps, a few bronze objects, fragments of Roman mosaics and of worked marble, etc.—may have belonged, at least partly, to the art collection of Professor Johan Henrik Schröder (1791–1857), which at his death came into the possession of the University”.

¹¹ ‘Catalogue of Uppsala University’s collection of antiquities. Enclosure B (with special numbering). Catalogue of the collection of antiquities from Classical antiquity (Roman, Greek etc.)’. This document (UAS A3b) is kept in the archives of the Collection of Classical Antiquities.

¹² The original reads “Om denna, lika litet som om de öfriga marmorskifvorna med inskrift, finnes ingen uppgift, huru den kommit till museet”. All of these inscriptions are marked, usually on the back, with an inventory number in the format “VPS. MVS. B. 5”, where the number corresponds to that attached to the respective inscription in the “Bilaga B” just mentioned.

larly such from Scandinavia) and made a major donation to Uppsala University of his entire collection of manuscripts, printed books, and antiquities. Some of these, particularly from his large collection of Scandinavian antiquities, were transferred to the University during his lifetime. The remaining objects were bequeathed through a deed of gift on his death in 1857. In it, Schröder writes: “The few Greek and Roman antiquities, antique and modern busts, statuettes, plaster-figures, together with some drawings made by hand, copperplates, lithographs etc., also belong to the Museum of the Academy, unless I have gladly presented them myself.”¹⁵

While there is no specification whatsoever as to which these “few Greek and Roman antiquities” may have been, it seems quite plausible that among them were the 15 stones originally kept in the University’s Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities, which Schröder would have had the opportunity to acquire when he, in 1834–35, made a journey through central Europe as far as Naples. Furthermore, if these stones came from Schröder’s collection, this would explain their otherwise curious inclusion in a museum with an essentially different focus: for the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities was entirely founded on Schröder’s donation of antiquities from the Nordic countries.

Evidence of Schröder’s interest in Greek and Roman inscriptions is given also by a notebook, now kept with his schedae in Uppsala University Library, and which contains transcriptions of Greek and Latin inscriptions from “Kgl. Museum”, i.e. the Royal Museum

¹⁵ “De få Grekiska och Romerska Antiquiteter, antika och moderna Buster, Statuetter, Gipser, jemte några få handteckningar, Kopparstick, Lithografier o. s. v. tillhöra ock Akademiens Museum, ifall jag ej dem med varm hand öfverlemnar”; Schröder’s deed of gift, 1, § 1, 5:0; reproduced in S. Karlsson, *Johan Henrik Schröders donation av konst till Uppsala universitet*, unpublished master’s thesis, Department of History of Art, Uppsala University, 2003, 193–196.

in Stockholm. Schröder suggested the inscriptions in Stockholm as the subject of a joint dissertation by two of his students, Jakob Sjöstedt and Andreas Fredrik Björlin, submitted at Uppsala in 1836 under the title *Inscriptiones Latinae Musei regii Holmiensis*.¹⁶

While it seems plausible that Schröder was the one who acquired some of these 15 stones and brought them to Uppsala, this cannot be true of all of them. For in one case, we have not only a verified findplace, but also a date of the find. This concerns no. 12, the epitaph of Aelius Aelinus, which was found in Cumae in 1844,¹⁷ and which cannot, therefore, have been bought by Schröder in 1834–1835. This shows that prior to 1876, there has been a certain influx of inscriptions into the collection also from other sources, the identity of which cannot be known.

Around 1880, eleven of the Latin inscriptions were transcribed for publication in *CIL* by Frans Wilhelm Häggström, who was then professor of Latin at Uppsala.¹⁸ Three of the

¹⁶ The Museum regium Holmiense, or “Kongl. Museum”, was the immediate forerunner of Nationalmuseum. It was made up by objects acquired in Italy by King Gustavus III of Sweden, during his journey to Italy in 1783–1784, obviously through the agency of the sculptor Johan Tobias Sergel (as mentioned on page 4 in Sjöstedt’s and Björlin’s dissertation), who accompanied the king to Rome, and who was well versed in the artistic circles of the city, having spent twelve years (1767–1779) there as holder of a royal scholarship. Back in Sweden, in 1785 Gustavus III arranged for the establishment of a Museum of Antiquities in the Royal Palace of Stockholm, and when, in 1792, Kongl. Museum was established in honour of the recently murdered king, it incorporated much of the royal art collections; see further Leander Touati 1998, 23–78.

¹⁷ Minieri Riccio 1846, 32.

¹⁸ The inscriptions transcribed for *CIL* are nos. 2–6, 10–12, 14–15, and 22. Häggström is the first person whose name can demonstrably be connected with these inscriptions. It may be noted here that Häggström, like Schröder, also made a tour of Europe, visiting Germany, France and Italy in 1863–1864 in the official capacity of newly appointed lecturer at Uppsala University. It has, however, proved difficult to find any details about

fragments were disregarded, as was, naturally, the inscription in Greek. The inscriptions were included (rather mechanically, it would seem) in *CIL* VI, the volume made up of inscriptions from the city of Rome, probably as this was simply the best guess for their provenance.

However, as mentioned above, we now know that no. 12, the epitaph of Aelius Aelinus, was found in Cumae. As will be argued in greater detail below, on the epitaphs of soldiers, this Aelius Aelinus was a marine stationed at the naval base at Misenum. And as the same assumption can be made in the case of C. Anthesius Niger of no. 10 and of Iulius Diadochus of no. 11, these inscriptions too are likely to have been found in the area around Misenum. If this is correct, the presence of these three stones in the Uppsala collection cannot be merely coincidental; it seems to be a reasonable assumption that they were acquired together sometime between 1846 (when no. 12 was published by Minieri Riccio) and 1876, but exactly when and by whom is uncertain.

Häggsström's journey. There is nothing in the minutes of the Faculty of Philosophy at Uppsala, other than a letter dated 21 August 1863, from Häggsström's predecessor as professor of Latin, Per Johan Petersson, asking the faculty to appoint a substitute for Häggsström, who was then "stadd på utrikes resa i vetenskapligt ändamål" ("on a journey abroad for scholarly purposes"; the minutes in question are found in UUA, A Ia, 33.). In September 1864, Häggsström was back in Uppsala and attending the meeting of the Faculty on 13 September. Theoretically, he may have been the one who acquired no. 12 (and perhaps other inscriptions as well), but had he done so, he would obviously have known about its provenance from Campania and would consequently have reported it to the editors of *CIL*, who would then not have included it in *CIL* VI; he would also have been able to inform those who put together the 1876 catalogue of the stone's provenance. Consequently, Häggsström is likely not the one who brought this inscription to Uppsala and included it in the collection. The best, however short, biography of Häggsström is found in *NF* VII, 258 s.v. Häggsström, Frans Vilhelm. Further information on a more personal level is found in Vising 1939, 7–15.

There is, in a way, also a provenance for no. 22, inasmuch as this stone clearly originates from an imperial villa used first by Claudius and then by Nero. When it was in the process of being published in *CIL* VI, Theodor Mommsen had seen the remarkable similarity of this inscription to *CIL* X 6638, which lists the officials of a *collegium* of imperial slaves and freedmen employed at Nero's villa in Antium (now Anzio). And while it is clear that the two stones do not originate from the same *collegium* and likely not from the same villa, they do share a common imperial context.

THE COLLECTION OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES AND THE VICTORIA MUSEUM OF EGYPTIAN ANTIQUITIES

In 1921–1922, the Greek and Roman objects in the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities were transferred to the Collection of Classical Antiquities.¹⁹ This collection had begun life as a collection of material for the seminar of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, which had been founded in 1909. Sam Wide, the professor, kept the collection at home. A prerequisite for the transfer of the Greek and Roman objects was the fact that in 1920, the collection had found its permanent premises in Gustavianum, formerly the main building of the University situated just below Uppsala cathedral. The numbers 1055–1069 that are written on the inscriptions alongside the "VPS. MVS." number are the inventory numbers that were given to the respective items when incorporated with the Collection of Classical Antiquities.²⁰

¹⁹ The history of the Collection of Classical Antiquities is outlined by Nordquist 1978.

²⁰ This inventory is found in a black notebook begun around 1920 and written mainly by Axel Boëthius (UAS A2); Nordquist 1978, 16. It lists the inscriptions under the heading "Samling öfverförd från Museet för Nordiska fornsaker" ("Collection transferred from the Museum of Nordic Antiquities") but with no other

At about the same time as the Collection of Classical Antiquities, the University's Victoria Museum of Egyptian Antiquities moved into the Gustavianum. Previously, the Egyptian objects had also been kept in the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities, but as the collection grew considerably through donations made in particular by Karl Piehl, in 1889 it was decided to set up a separate collection of Egyptian antiquities and to name Piehl its director.²¹ By this time, two of the inscriptions (nos. 13 and 24) were obviously already in the collection, as they had been edited by Piehl in *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde* 1888, regrettably without any information about when and from where they came to Uppsala. No. 13 (which is the only Latin inscription in the Victoria Museum) has been suggested to originate from the necropolis of Nicopolis outside Alexandria, which seems to be a very plausible hypothesis (on which see further below). The provenance of no. 24, though, remains unknown.

No. 23, the fragment of the synodal decree from the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes, was edited by Torgny Säve-Söderbergh in 1945, which is the *terminus ante quem* for the inclusion of the inscription in the Victoria Museum. However, Säve-Söderbergh says that it had been in the collection "seit längerer Zeit", which demonstrates, at least, that it was no fresh acquisition. Interestingly, there are further fragments of the same stone in the Louvre, which are reported to have been found on the island of Elephantine in the Nile by Charles Clermont-Ganneau in 1908. It must seem likely that this provenance applies also to the fragment in Uppsala, but there is regrettably

information than "Inskrifter. 1055–1069. Grafskrifter. Nord Mus. 1–15" ("Inscriptions. 1055–1061. Funerary inscriptions. Nord Mus. 1–15"). UAS A2 is kept in the archives of the Collection of Classical Antiquities.

²¹ On the history of the Victoria Museum, see Starck 1974.

no information that says anything about how it got separated from the other fragments and ended up this far north.

LATER ACQUISITIONS

In 1932–1933, a fragmentary Greek inscription (no. 19) was donated by Professor Axel W. Persson. This stone had been found on the island of Plateia off the coast of Argolis, near Asine, where Persson had been conducting archaeological excavations since 1922, which means that this is the only Greek inscription in the collection that is known to have been found in Greece. Apart from the two Greek inscriptions from Egypt mentioned in the previous section, there is no provenance for the remaining three, nos. 9 and 20–21. No. 9, which was the only Greek inscription among the 15 stones in the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities, is entirely Roman in appearance and very probably comes from the city itself, while there is no information at all about nos. 20–21. These two stones completely lack any inventory number other than the UAS, which indicates that they were not catalogued before 1975, when the first complete inventory of the objects in the collection was made.²² It is difficult to know what to make of this, but nos. 20–21 were probably not among the stones transferred from the Museum of Scandinavian Antiquities, as it is reasonable to expect that they would have a "VPS. MVS. B." inventory number in that case. But the new inventory for the Collection of Classical Antiquities that was begun around 1920 does not number certain objects at all, which means that these two fragments may have been acquired after the transfer of the inscriptions from the collection of Scandinavian to Classical Antiquities.

When Harry Armini died in 1957, two Latin inscriptions (nos. 7–8) were donated by

²² For the inventories, see Nordquist 1978, 16–18.

his heirs. Armini, who had been senior master of Latin and Greek at the upper secondary school in Vänersborg, was among the students participating in Professor Vilhelm Lundström's course in Rome in 1909, when Lundström bought several Latin inscriptions. This deserves a short digression.

Vilhelm Lundström, who had studied and taken his doctorate under Frans Wilhelm Häggström in Uppsala, was 1907 appointed professor of Classical Philology at Göteborgs Högskola (which in 1954 joined with Medicinska Högskolan to become Gothenburg University). Lundström was a true enthusiast in many fields and a man of deed, two traits of character that would have played an active part in Lundström's decision to locate his teaching in April and May 1909 to Rome. Based on Via Farini 5–7 on the Esquiline, Lundström gave lectures and made excursions with his eight accompanying students between 6 April and 29 May. It was a small but illustrious number. Apart from Harry Armini, the number included the aforementioned Axel W. Persson (a student at the University of Lund at the time), John P. Boström, Sophie Carlander, Einar Engström, Einar Pontán of Helsinki, Olof Rydholm and Gunnar C:son Tingdal. From the end of April, the course was also attended by docent Einar Löfstedt, the future author of, among other works, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae, Syntactica* and *Late Latin*, and later rector of Lund University and member of the Swedish Academy.

Back in Sweden, Lundström published an account of the journey, together with some essays by the participants, in a book entitled *Göteborgs Högskolas kurs i Rom 1909* (Göteborg, 1911). Relevant here is the chapter “Nyförvärfvade latinska inskrifter utgifna af Gunnar C:son Tingdal, Harry Armini, John P. Boström och Sophie Carlander” (93–108). Here is found the *editio princeps* of 23 Latin inscriptions, among which is no. 7. There is also the following notice about their acquisition:

“During the stay in Rome, the leader of the course bought some Latin inscriptions to be used as material for teaching and for seminars. The sellers usually claimed that they had been found ‘outside Porta Salaria’, a piece of information which, as is well known, is used almost stereotypically by the Roman antique dealers and which therefore must be considered with the greatest caution in each individual case. All inscriptions likely come from Rome or the surrounding area.”

Not included in that paper, but obviously bought by Lundström during the course in question, is no. 8, which was published by another of the participants, Einar Engström (Engström 1910).

While most of the inscriptions acquired by Vilhelm Lundström are still at Gothenburg University, nos. 7 and 8 had somehow passed into the possession of Harry Armini, probably as a gift from Lundström to his epigraphically interested student. The donation to Uppsala University following Armini's death was made at the instigation of another student of Lundström's, Tönnes Kleberg, who was then head librarian at the Uppsala University Library.

A third inscription, no. 1, was once in Lundström's possession and edited by Harry Armini, not, however, until 1923, which makes it unclear whether this stone was bought in 1909 or at a later date. Inscription no. 1 is the last epigraphical addition to the collection, having been donated in 1966 by the same Kleberg. In a letter of 2 May 1966, he wrote to Arne Furumark, then professor of Classical Archaeology: “Brother Arne, with this letter please allow me, in accordance with our agreement of some months ago, to present your department with the enclosed Latin epitaph as a humble gift. I got it myself in September 1932 from my old friend and teacher Vilhelm Lundström by way of thanks for my assisting him to move his large library when he broke up his old home. When and where Lundström acquired it I cannot say with certainty. But I am sure it was done

in Rome during one of his more or less yearly travels there in the years before the first world war. The inscription has been edited by Harry Armini in his *Conlectanea epigraphica*, Göteborg 1923 /GHÅ 1923: 4/, p. 5 f. With kind regards, your loyal friend Tönnes Kleberg.²³

THE ERROR IN *CIL*

As has already been mentioned above, eleven Latin inscriptions (nos. 2–6, 10–12, 14–15, 22) were included in *CIL* VI, parts 2 (1882) and 3 (1886). All of these were edited on the basis of transcriptions made by Professor Frans Wilhelm Häggström, except for no. 22, which was edited by Giuseppe Gatti from a squeeze sent to *CIL* by Häggström. The published volumes claim that all of these stones were at the time in the “Museum Publicum” in Stockholm, i.e. the Nationalmuseum.²⁴ This may theoretic-

cally have been the case. As soon as one investigates the matter, though, the statement proves to be impossible to maintain. First, none of these inscriptions can be attested at any time in Nationalmuseum. There is no sign of them in the archives of the museum,²⁵ and they are not included in Schröder’s 1836 thesis *Inscriptiones Latinae Musei regii Holmiensis* (see above). Most importantly, they are not listed in Nationalmuseum’s printed catalogue of Classical Antiquities of 1883,²⁶ precisely the period when they would have been transcribed by Häggström, although all other inscriptions published in *CIL* VI that actually were in Nationalmuseum are listed in the catalogue.²⁷

²³ The Swedish original (UAS A43) reads “Broder Arne, härmed ber jag enligt överenskommelse för några månader sedan att få till Din institution överlämna bifogade latinska gravskrift som en ringa gåva. Självt fick jag den i september 1932 av min gamle vän och lärare Vilhelm Lundström som tack för att jag hjälpt honom att flytta hans stora bibliotek i samband med att han bröt upp sitt gamla hem. När och var Vilhelm Lundström förvärvat den kan jag inte med bestämdhet säga. Men det har säkert skett i Rom vid någon av hans nästan årliga resor dit under åren före första världskriget. Inskriften har utgivits av Harry Armini i hans *Conlectanea epigraphica*, Göteborg 1923 /GHÅ 1923, 4/, s. 5 f. Med hjärtlig hälsning Tillgivne vännen Tönnes Kleberg”.

²⁴ The notes in *CIL* concerning the provenance and whereabouts of these inscriptions read as follows. No. 22: “*tabula marmorea ex urbe allata in museum Stockholmiense*” (similarly Mommsen in *CIL* X 6637 “*tabula marmorea, de cuius origine non constat; ex urbe allata in museum Stockholmiense*”); nos. 2 and 11: “*tabula originis incertae, Stockholmae in museo publico*”; nos. 3 and 6: “*tabula marmorea originis incertae Stockholmae in museo publico*”; no. 4: “*tabula originis incertae, Stockholmae in museo publico*”; no. 5: “*originis incertae, Stockholmae in museo publico*”; no. 10: “*tabula marmorea pessimis litteris Stockholmae in museo publico*”; no. 12: “*Stockholmae in museo publico*” (but cf. *CIL* X 1966, “*Cumis rep. 1844*”); no. 14: “*fragmentum tabulae marmoreae. Stock-*

holmae in museo publico”; no. 15: “*fragmentum tabulae marmoreae originis incertae, Stockholmae in museo publico*”.

²⁵ Documents that have been checked are “Nationalmusei nämndsprotokoll” (the minutes of the board of Nationalmuseum) from 1867 until 1920, which do not provide any information that can be connected with the inscriptions in question. There are notices like the following, from the minutes of 13 July 1870: “Förteckning öfver antika konstsaker och diverse föremål, som blivitt till National-Musei samlingar skänkta af Svensk-Norske konsuln i Smyrna, F. W. Spiegelthal ... 18–24. Fragment af marmorplattor; olika arter. Ej upptagna” (“List of antique works of art and of various objects, which have been donated to the collections of the Nationalmuseum by the Swedish-Norwegian consul at Smyrna, F. W. Spiegelthal ... 18–24. Fragments of marble tablets; various types. Not adopted”). It is, obviously, impossible to know what these “marble tablets” were. Furthermore, the file D11 (“Inventarium över antiksamlingen 1861–66”, an inventory of the Collection of Classical antiquities 1861–1866) has been checked without result. If anything is to be made of this, the inscriptions published in *CIL* would have been incorporated with the collections after 1866.

²⁶ *Förteckning öfver skulpturarbeten i marmor och brons samt modeller och skizzer afvensom gipsafgjutningar efter plastiska konstverk i National-museum, Stockholm, 1883*.

²⁷ The inscriptions are *CIL* VI 7275 (= 228 in the *Förteckning*), 10237 (= 237), 11162 (= 230), 11793 (= 186), 12219 (= 233), 16256 (= 239), 18189 (= 232), 22805 (= 187), 27029 (= 187), 29156 (= 235), 29237 (= 185), 29573 (= 189), 29852 (= 236), 31260 (= 195), 32777 a (= 239).

Moreover, none of the stones in Nationalmuseum were transcribed for *CIL* by Häggström, but seem generally to have been taken from the *Förteckning öfver skulpturarbeten* and from Schröder's thesis, and then checked in the museum by Wilhelm Wattenbach. In his inaugural lecture, Professor Sjögren made no indication at all that the inscriptions would have been in Stockholm prior to coming to Uppsala. While he mentions the *CIL* edition, he passes over the peculiar statement about their whereabouts with complete silence, perhaps because he knew that it was incorrect.

Most recently, the matter has been called in doubt by Professor Heikki Solin. Apropos of *CIL* VI 8639 (no. 22), he establishes that he has not been able to verify the provenance given by Henzen (and repeated by Mommsen in X 6637), "*ex urbe allata in museum Stockholmense*". Solin suggests that this is an error, occasioned by another error in the same note; for both Henzen and Mommsen state that Frans Wilhelm Häggström, who sent Henzen a squeeze of the inscription, was "*musei praeses*", apparently meaning that he would have been the director of Nationalmuseum, which Häggström never was. This error, whatever its cause, may have led Henzen into believing that the squeeze sent by Häggström was also in Nationalmuseum, when in fact it was, like Häggström, in Uppsala.²⁸ This error propa-

gated (out of negligence, it would seem) so that all inscriptions transcribed by Häggström were placed by *CIL* in the Museum Holmiense, in spite of their really being in Uppsala.

A note on this edition

In the present edition, the text of each inscription is followed by an English translation, except in the cases in which the inscription is too fragmentary for a translation to be meaningful. There then follows a summary of the physical aspects of the inscription, such as the type of stone used, its dimensions, and notable palaeographical features. Here is also found a suggestion of dating, a list of previous editions of the text, and information about inventory number and the current whereabouts of the inscription, whether in the Museum Gustavianum or in the storerooms. The summary is followed by a line-by-line commentary on the text of the inscription. Inscriptions of particular interest are provided with separate introductions that place them in a wider historical and social context. Because of the unusually complicated state of the fragments of no. 23 A, a sort of "apparatus" of the fragments has been appended to this text in order to provide a clearer picture of which fragment has a certain part of the text.

²⁸ Solin 2003b, 98.