

# Text, translation, and commentary

## General epitaphs

### I. UAS 2460

L. Caecilio L(uci) l(iberto) Hymno. L. (?) [Caecilius (?)] | Prates magistro d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) [cur(am) sepul(turae)] | egit. Faustus l(ibertus) de suo f[ecit] titu[m]. Diis Manibus. L. Ca[ecilio] | <sup>s</sup>Fausto f(ecit) Titia Sperata c[on]iugi | benemerenti.

For L. Caecilius Hymnus, freedman of Lucius. L. Caecilius Phrates took care of the funeral for the magister according to the decree of the decurions. His freedman Faustus had the inscription made at his own expense. To the divine Manes. To L. Caecilius Faustus. Titia Sperata made this for her well-deserving husband.

*Findplace:* Rome or the *ager Romanus* (according to Armini).

*Physical description:* marble tablet, broken to the right, other edges straight and in good condition, slight incrustation on surface. Clear guidelines at the top and bottom of each line.

*Dimensions:* 13.5–13.7 × 24.1–26.5 × 2.6–2.8 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.4, w. 23.9, line 2: h. 1.5, w. 23.4, line 3 h. 1.4–1.5, w. 25.5, line 4 h. 1.5, w. 26.3, line 5: h. 1.5, w. 26.5, line 6: h. 1.5, w. 16.6 cm. Height of *i longa* in line 4 1.8 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 1–5 even left margin (right margin lost), line 6 indentation ca 1 letter.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals that tend towards guided capitals, quite round O:s, no “ears” on M, serifs throughout, but letters are a little bulky and not so graceful. A in line 5 FAVSTO lacks horizontal.

*I longa, apex, nexus: i longa* line 4 *diis*.

*Interpuncts:* interpuncts between all words except in line 2 PRATES MAGISTRO and 3 DE SUO. The shape is generally triangular (of various orientation), but the interpunct between L and CAECILIO in line 1 is rather a dot, and the one between CAECILIO and the following L like a comma.

*Date:* late 1st or (slightly more probably) 2nd century AD.

*Transcription:* CH, 19 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Armini 1923, 5–6; Thomasson 132.<sup>28</sup>

*Inventory number:* UAS 2460 (written in ink on the back; no further numbers).

This marble tablet is cut with a double epitaph, first for the freedman L. Caecilius Hymnus, then for a freedman of his, L. Caecilius Faustus. The characterization of Hymnus as *magister*, together with a reference to a decision by the *decuriones*, shows that the people mentioned in the inscription were members of a *collegium* (see the introduction to no. 22), in this case most likely a funerary *collegium* for the slaves and freedmen of the *gens Caecilia*.<sup>29</sup>

**1. L. Caecilio L(uci) l(iberto) Hymno:** the deceased was a freedman within the plebeian *gens Caecilia* and bore the cognomen *Hymnus*, a transcription of the Greek noun ὕμνος (“ode in praise of gods or heroes”). It occurs as a name also in Greek sources, though very sparingly, and mostly on Italian soil; the *LGPN* has 38 instances, of which seven are from Italy. Solin lists 26 slaves or freedmen in Rome called Hymnus, none later than the 2nd century AD.<sup>30</sup>

**L. (?) [Caecilius (?)]:** as the original width of the stone may be guessed from line 4 in

which the supplement *Ca[ecilio]* is certain,<sup>31</sup> the missing part to the right edge is just wide enough to accommodate the name *Caecilius*. This seems like a rather safe conjecture here, with the cognomen *Prates* following in the next line. Just before the fracture, the left part of a serif is visible at the bottom of the line, and there is a faint trace of another serif at the top. This is consistent with the letter L, which is likely *Prates*’ praenomen.

**2. Prates:** i.e. *Phraates* (Iranian Farhād, Gr. Φραάτης), a name borne by five Parthian kings during the 2nd and 1st centuries BC; Phraates V, who ruled from 2 BC to AD 4, was known as Phraataces, “little Phraates”. Being originally an Iranian name (meaning “elation”, “happiness”), it was not used as a name at all in Greece, but when it appears in Latin sources (which happens very rarely), the Greek version of the name is used. I know of three further instances, all of which are spelled *Phrates*, with a single *a* and with the usual classical *ph* for Greek φ, not, as here, the popular unaspirated variant;<sup>32</sup> see *CIL* XIV 427.1–3 *C. Tuccius M[ - - - ] l(ibertus) Eutyclus Aug(ustalis) f[ecit sibi et]* | *C. Tuccio Phrati pat(rono)*, *AE* 1972, 134 *C. Avius Rufus IIIvir | quinq(uennalis) vix(it) ann(os) XXX | T. Flavius Phrates fec(it) filio pientissimo | et Avia Apate* and *Supplementa Italica* 5, *Superaequum* (Rome, 1989), 20 = *AE* 1984, 291 *Attice | P. Timini | Serani anc(illae) | vix(it) a(nnos) XV | Phrates dis(pensator) | conservae*

<sup>28</sup> A propos of Thomasson’s reading, Korhonen (1997, 236) remarks that “L’andamento del testo non è chiaro. Sembra che *Diis Manibus* cominci una nuova frase”, Solin (2002, 128) adding that “der Textverlauf ist bizarr und der vom Editor gebotene Wortlaut kaum in jedem Punkt richtig”. Thomasson’s text is, however, correct as such; it is the absence of punctuation that makes it seem odd.

<sup>29</sup> It may be noted that also other types of associations often took care of the burial of their members without being *collegia funeraticia* proper. Such services were often cared for also by associations based on ethnicity, a shared profession or worship of the same deity; see, e.g., Rives 2007, 125.

<sup>30</sup> Solin 1996, 547.

<sup>31</sup> It is true that most of line 4 was added later, as the epitaph of Faustus was cut, but there seems to me to be no reason to suppose that this line should not have been made as long as the ones preceding it.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Leumann 1977, 124.

*p(osuit) | have et tu*. When the spelling *Phraates* occasionally is found, it concerns the kings themselves, like in *CIL VI 1799 Seraspadanes Phraatis | Arsacis regum regis f(i)lius | Parthus | Rhodaspes Phraatis | Arsacis regum regis f(i)lius | Parthus*.

**magistro**: this is the title of L. Caecilius Hymnus, indicating that we are dealing with members of a *collegium*. As in the case of no. 22, this is most likely a *collegium funeraticium* made up of members from one and the same household, who took care of each other's funerals; see the introduction to no. 22.

The *collegia* were organized on the pattern of civil society, where the members as a whole were the *populus* or *plebs collegii*. The *magisterium* was the highest office, the holders of which were the *magistri* of the *collegium*. They were elected among the members for a fixed period of time, often on the basis of age and experience. The number of such *magistri* was different in different *collegia* (some could have as many as twelve), and their duties varied depending on the number of lesser officials in a *collegium*; typically, they assembled and led the meetings of the *collegium*, wielded the executive power, supervised the funds, and acted as its representatives. In funerary *collegia*, the *magistri* supervised the placing of urns in the tombs (but cf. the following note on *decuriones*) as well as the distribution of funerary expenses (the *funeraticium*). It is also possible that the office may have had some religious significance.<sup>33</sup>

**d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)**: the members of a *collegium* were divided into *decuriae* (or *centuriae*; these units did not necessarily consist of the number of people indicated by their names), headed by a *decurio* elected from and by its respective members. Their offices in some cases seem to have overlapped that of the *magistri*; thus, the *decuriones* of *collegia funeraticia* could evidently commission the *magistri* to

<sup>33</sup> See further Liebenam 1890, 203–204.

decide about the allocation of room for the cinerary urns in the tombs; see *CIL VI 10257 Eutychie | Fortunatus | karissimae | fecit et sibi et suis | libertis libertabusque | posterisque eorum | loco adsignato ex decreto | decurionum a mag(istratibus) q(uin)q(uennalibus) collegi familiae | Iulianae (1–9)*; compare also *VI 10356 Iuliae Plebeiae | in honorem | Alexandri et Deme|tri Caesaris Aug(usti) l(iberti) | ex decreto decur(ionum) | olla publice data est*.<sup>34</sup>

2–3. [**cur(am) sepul(turae)**] | **egit**: Armini conjectured [*curam sep(ulturae)*] *egit*, a phrase which finds support in the general rarity of the word *egit* in the epitaphs as well as in *CIL VI 2613 curam egit sepulturae | C. Varius Optatus (6–7)*. Having overlooked that inscription, Armini compares four other stones, of which the most interesting is *CIL VI 9384*, which distinguishes between those who arranged and paid for the burial (for which it uses the verb *fecerunt*) and the slave who was responsible for its execution, *egit curam: D(is) M(anibus) | Sex(to) Cornelio Vitali|oni exoneratori ca|lcariario homini dul|cissimo college sui pr|o sua pietate bene mere|nti fecerunt cura|m egit Iconius*; also *VI 6719 L. Marcio Mamae | ex d(ecuria) V decuri|ales de suo | egerunt cura, 6215 Statilia Ammia hic | sepulta est quous sepul(turae) | curam egerung conleg(ae) | commorient(es) Cerdo insul(arius) | vir eius Bathyllus atriensis (etc) and 5932 Libertorum | Arruntiae Camilli | filiae Camillae | curante | Arruntio Firmo*.

Assuming that Armini's conjecture is correct, there is some doubt about the manner of the abbreviation. In this inscription, R and M are very wide letters, making it difficult to fit CVRAM SEP into the stone within the assumed margins. *Cur(am) sepul(turae)* seems easier to accommodate, even though this is equally hypothetical.

<sup>34</sup> See Liebenam 1890, 191–193.

3. **Faustus I(ibertus)**: the present individual was presumably the freedman of the deceased; his full name, L. Caecilius Faustus, appears (albeit fragmentary) in lines 4–5 below. For the cognomen *Faustus*, see discussion on 22.36.

3–4. **de suo f[ec]it[ur] titu]lum**: Faustus had the inscription made at his own expense. Armini supplies *f[ec]it[ur] titu]lum*, but there seems to be have been enough space on the stone for the verb to have been written out in full. Following the initial F, the serif of the E is visible at the bottom of the line. There is also a hole between L and V at the beginning of line 4 for the cramp used to fasten the tablet.

4. **Diis Manibus**: here begins the epitaph of L. Caecilius Faustus, cut by the same hand though reasonably at a later date. It is remarkable for a new epitaph to begin like this in the middle of the stone, but once it was decided to cut Faustus' epitaph on the same tablet as his former *patronus*, the most had to be done with the space available.

The word *Diis* has been cut both with a double i, of which the latter is also an *i longa*, DIIS. The double *i* is not infrequent in the epitaphs, though far less common than the normal spelling *dis*; *CIL* VI, for instance, has 2,566 instances of *dis*, and 514 of *diis*. The oldest form attested in Latin is *deiuei*, where *u* was lost between identical vowels, resulting in *dei*. This was treated as a monosyllabic *i* by the early 2nd century BC (as appears from the plays of Plautus and Terence), but the spelling was still discussed by the post-classical grammarians, indicating that there was some uncertainty about which was the correct form in writing (perhaps under the influence of restored forms such as the disyllabic *dei* in Ov. *Met.* 2.389).<sup>35</sup> When inscriptions occasionally add an *i longa*, this is rather to be considered a purely graphical (almost ornamental) feature. While the second *i* is most naturally made long, there are instances

of the first (*CIL* VIII 22790 *diis*) and even of both (*CIL* XIII 8203, of AD 164, *diis*; VIII 22982).<sup>36</sup> The presence of the *i longa* indicates that the stone probably belongs to the 1st or 2nd century AD, a period that has the highest frequency of this letter. Arthur and Joyce Gordon have no instances later than AD 256,<sup>37</sup> and while there are instances also in the last century BC, the presence of the formula *Dis Manibus* (see above) means that the stone is not earlier than Augustus. This dating is narrowed somewhat by the phrase *benemerenti* in line 6 which is found written as one word approximately from the early 2nd century (see the introduction, p. 14). Accordingly, a dating to the 2nd century AD seems likely.

5. **Titia Sperata c[on]iugi**: *Titius* is a nomen gentile formed on the praenomen *Titus* and attested from the last century BC onwards. Relatively common, and appearing in inscriptions from various locations, there is generally no possibility of nor any reason to establish a relationship between the various bearers of the name.<sup>38</sup>

The cognomen *Speratus*, belonging to the category expressing “the attitude of parents to the birth of a child”, is rather well represented among slaves and freedmen. Of the 265 instances gathered by Kajanto, 45, or about 17%, were slaves and freedmen, though it may be going a bit too far to refer to *Speratus* as a “common slave name”:<sup>39</sup> compare the names on Solin's top ten of slave names from the city of Rome, in which the name ranking 10th (*Primus*) has 184 instances in Rome alone.<sup>40</sup> Thus, while the cognomen is not enough to determine whether or not this Titia Sperata was a freedwoman, her

<sup>35</sup> See Sommer 1914, 347–348.

<sup>36</sup> See *TLL* V.1 (1912), 886, 13–18 s.v. *deus* (Gude-man).

<sup>37</sup> Gordon & Gordon 1957, 216.

<sup>38</sup> See *RE* R. 2 VI.2 (1937), 1554 s.v. *Titius* (F. Münz-er).

<sup>39</sup> Kajanto 1965, 77.

<sup>40</sup> Solin 1996, 680.

appearance on a stone in the company exclusively of freedmen argues that she was.

As a curiosity, it may be noted that there is at least one further woman attested with exactly this name. She was the wife of one P. Aelius Iunianus, *navarchus* at Misenum, and is mentioned in *CIL* X 3350. There is also an inscription from Dalmatia (*ILJug* 2.743) mentioning one [ - - - ]*tia Spe[rata]*; the appearance

of the *gentilicium Titius* in the same inscription makes it likely that she too was a [*Ti*]*tia*.

*c[oniugi]* is Armani's conjecture. It may be considered certain not only because of its general plausibility, but also because the word would have fitted into the stone, and as the left-most part of a curved stroke (like that of a c) is preserved just before the fracture.

## 2. UAS 1384 (CIL VI 19219)

D(is) M(anibus). | Elpidiae, quae | vixit annis XVIII, | d(iebus) VIII. Sallubia alu|<sup>5</sup>mne suae pientissi|me vene merenti | fecit.

To the divine Manes. For Elpidia, who lived 18 years and eight days. Salluvia (made this) for her most pious and well-deserving foster-child.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* marble tablet, broken in two pieces slightly to the right of the middle (now joined together); incrustation on most of the area of writing, only right and bottom edges completely free, some incrustation on left edge. Tablet otherwise in good condition; edges obviously intact. Traces of guidelines (top and bottom) can be seen in all of lines 2–6. On the back, there is a circular hole to the right, slightly below the middle.

*Dimensions:* 22.6–22.8 × 27.1–27.5 × 2.3–2.7 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 2.7–2.8, w. 16.5, line 2: h. 2.5–2.7, w. 26.0, line 3: h. 2.5–2.6, w. 26.0, line 4: h. 2.5–2.7, w. 26.0, line 5: h. 2.5–2.9, w. 25.5, line 6: h. 2.5, w. 25.5, line 7: h. 2.5, w. 10.4 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 1 and 7 centred, 2–6 even left margin.

*Lettering:* typical simple freehand capitals, with “ears” on m but otherwise showing a resemblance to guided capitals in terms of serifs etc.

*I longa, apex, ligatures:* –

*Interpuncts:* interpuncts in the shape of pyramids are found between all words and at the end of line 7.

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 18 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 19219 (transcribed by Häggström, checked from a squeeze by Henzen); Thomasson 142.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1384; previously 1059 and vps. MVS. B. 5 (written in ink on the back).

Epitaph of Elpidia, set up by her foster-mother Salluvia (here spelled Sallubia). It is a typical, simple epitaph with several instances of orthography reflecting pronunciation, also giving occasion to reflect on the seemingly haphazard variation between *ae* and monophthongized *e*.

**2. Elpidiae:** a name formed on the Greek noun ἐλπίς, “hope”, but obviously first used as a name in imperial times; the LGPN has twelve instances of the name, all of which post-date the 1st century AD. In Latin, the name was quite rare; including the masculine *Elpidius*, CIL VI gives 13 instances from Rome, of which eight are spelled *Helpidius*.<sup>41</sup> For Elpidia’s status and relation to Salluvia, see below on *alumno*.

As if often the case in the epitaphs, there is no verb in the text that governs this dative (*fecit* in line 7 belongs to a different sentence); instead, it has a function similar to a heading and provides the most important information in the inscription, the name of the dedicatee.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> Aspiration of unaspirated *tenues* is very frequent in Roman names formed on Greek words, and *Help-* is actually the commoner spelling in Latin of names derived from ἐλπίς; for instance, the name *Elpis*, a direct transcription of the Greek noun, occurs 319 times (including genitive, dative and ablative) in CIL VI spelled as *Helpis*, only 39 spelled as *Elpis*. See Solin 1971, 115–116. The instances of (*H*)*Elpidius* can generally not be dated. Some inscriptions contain names in the form of full *tria nomina* with filiation and tribus (such as 8103.3–4 *M. Cocceius M. filius Vol(tinia tribu) Aprilis*), which points to a date that is at least not very late. Others, like the present, may well be even from the 4th century.

<sup>42</sup> Admittedly, *Elpidiae* may also be taken as a genitive, in which case it attaches itself to the preceding *D(is) M(anibus)*, meaning something like “to the blessed spirit of Elpidia”. Such genitives are occasionally

**3–4. annis XVIII d(iebus) VIII:** about half the number of Roman epitaphs give the age of the deceased, and in doing so, they are often strikingly precise. Harry Armini, who studied about 14,500 statements of age in the epitaphs, found that 53% gave the age in years only, 12% in years and months, as many as 33% in years, months and days and that 2% even added the number of hours (in a couple of extreme cases, even the minutes are recorded). There are a number of peculiarities and exceptions, but in giving the number of days, the present stone sorts with the second largest group.<sup>43</sup>

**4. Sallubia:** this is the gentilicium *Salluvia*;<sup>44</sup> the *-b-* for *-v-* is explained by the fact that Latin *v* could be pronounced as a semivocalic labiodental fricative with a sound value like *w* in English *wasp* (as appears from Greek transcriptions of Latin words, e.g. Οὐαλέριος = *Valerius*). In the 1st century AD, this resulted in a confusion with the bilabial *b* and gave rise to variant spellings such as Νέρουας and Νέρβας for the Latin *Nerva*. Towards the end of the 1st century, in the graffiti of Pompeii, this confusion can be observed also in Latin words (e.g. *baliat* for *valeat*) and is common in vulgar Latin inscriptions.<sup>45</sup>

The nomen gentile *Salluvius* (with the variant spelling *Salluius*) is not particularly widely

found in the epitaphs, but the dative is much more common.

<sup>43</sup> For the phenomenon as a whole, see Armini 1916, 5–13.

<sup>44</sup> Perhaps of Etruscan origin (Schulze 1966, 404) and thus probably not related to the Celtic tribe *Salluvi* who lived in south-eastern Gaul.

<sup>45</sup> See Väänänen 1982, 103–104.



attested in inscriptions.<sup>46</sup> Out of a total of 41 inscriptions in which members of the *gens* occur, 21 stones are found in Rome.<sup>47</sup> Most concern humble people, though some are freeborn with filiation and a couple of considerable social standing. Most prominent are C. Salluius C. f. Naso, who in 73 BC served as *legatus pro praetore* in Lucullus' war against Mithradates and figures in a bilingual inscription found in Nemi (*CIL* XIV 2218), and M. Salluius, who was *praetor aerarii* with one L. Calpurnius Piso as his colleague (*CIL* VI 40884); the latter office was created by Augustus in 23 BC and abolished by Claudius in AD 44, which gives *termini post* and *ante quos* for the inscription. Worthy of mention is also *AE* 1987, 292 (= 1990, 196, from Canusium), which mentions a Salluia who was married to one of Trajan's freedmen, M. Ulpius Aug. lib. Tiro (placing the inscription roughly in the mid 2nd century AD).

4–6. *alumne suae pientissime*: an *alumna* or *alumna* was a child who lived under the care of a foster-parent, sometimes as a slave (in which case there seems to have been a good chance for early manumission) or as a free individual, but to be distinguished from the person's biological children, *liberi naturales*; in terms of hereditary rights, they seem rather to have been equal to freedmen than to the

freeborn. An *alumna* of the age of 18 would be rather likely to have been manumitted, but as Elpidia appears in this inscription with one name only, her status remains uncertain.<sup>48</sup>

In *alumne* and *pientissime* the diphthong of the dative ending has been cut as the monophthong *-e*. Already Varro mentions the monophthongization of *-ae* to *-e* in the language of the peasants (*rustici*, *Ling.* 7.96), whereas the diphthong was certainly preserved among the educated until the 4th century AD. In the inscriptions of the common people it constantly gains ground from the 2nd century on, particularly in the case endings, and it is certainly not surprising in an inscription like the present, which has several instances of the interchange of *v* and *b*, a coarser vulgarism.<sup>49</sup>

Much more startling than the monophthong itself is its rather sudden changing with the diphthong here: *Elpidiae* and *quae* (not, it is true, a case ending) in line 2 and, particularly, *alumne suae pientissime* in 4–6; if the stonemason or the author could produce a diphthongized *suae*, then he ought to have been able to do so for the immediately preceding and following words. Now, it is a fact that the feminine genitive/dative of *suus* is among the forms least likely to be monophthongized; of 1,458 instances in *CIL* VI, only 40 (or 2.7%) are spelled *sue*. This may be compared to the corresponding forms of *alumna*: there are 109 genitives/datives of this word in *CIL* VI, of which 16, or 14.6%, are spelled *alumne*. It is true that *alumna* is a word that differs from *suus* both in length and in frequency, but these factors seem not to be relevant; a word like *dulcissima*, which is among the most common epithets in the epitaphs, occurs 670 times in the genitive/dative in *CIL* VI, of which 96 (14.3%) are monophthongized.

<sup>46</sup> I have assumed that *Salluius* and *Salluius* are one and the same nomen; see Leumann 1977, 135–136; in Solin & Salomies 1988, 161, *Salluius* and *Salluius* have separate entries.

<sup>47</sup> Apart from the present stone also *CIL* VI 9870 (= 37774), 9871, 10217, 22926, 25771, 25771A (set up by one Sallubia Helpis for Sallubius Agathon), 25772, 33457, 35399, 36288B, 36289, 36290, 36291, 37378, 38860, 38861, 40884, *AE* 1986, 56, 1995, 228, 2001, 569. Inscriptions not from the city of Rome are *CIL* II 316 (= 5220), V 398, 4660, *CIL* IX 1446 (*CLE* 159), 2323, 2335, 2413, 2414, *CIL* X 4768, 6805, *CIL* XI 7768, *CIL* XIV 2218, 1560, 3953, *InscrIt* 28 (Salernum), *AE* 1962, 284 (Africa proconsularis), 1977, 188 (Sinuessa), 1978, 119c (Herculaneum), 1982, 948 (Africa proconsularis), 1987, 292 (Canusium).

<sup>48</sup> For *alumni* in the inscriptions from Rome, see Rawson 1986, 173–186.

<sup>49</sup> See Väänänen 1982, 85 and Leumann 1977, 67–78.

Instead of the length or frequency of a certain word, it may be worthwhile to look at other instances of the present pattern, viz. the combination of diphthongized *suae*/monophthongized *sue* with a first declension headword denoting relationship; here, *filia*, *verna*, *patrona*, *liberta*, *conliberta* and *alumna* have been used. The tendency is very clear. Most common, of course, is the variant in which

both words preserve the diphthong. It is comparatively rare that one word remains diphthongized while the other is monophthongized, but when this does occur, it is nearly always the noun; in this material, there is only one exception to this rule. Likewise, it is very rare that both words are monophthongized. The figures are as follows:

	-ae -ae	-e -ae	-ae -e	-e -e
<i>filia sua</i>	123	0	0	2
<i>verna sua</i>	83	6	0	0
<i>patrona sua</i>	40	3	1	0
<i>liberta sua</i>	35	3	0	1
<i>conliberta sua</i>	23	0	0	0
<i>alumna sua</i>	16	7	0	0
Total	320 (93.3%)	19 (5.5%)	1 (0.3%)	3 (0.9%)

The present variant, then, is in line with a general rule saying that if *sua* qualifies a preceding first declension noun, if the expression stands in the genitive or in the dative singular and if monophthongization is involved, this nearly always occurs in the noun only. For some reason this rate is much higher for the noun *alumna* than for any other: in the cases of *alumna sua* in the genitive/dative, 30.4 % are spelled *alumne suae* (the corresponding figures are 7.7 % for *liberta sua*, 6.8% for *patrona sua*, 6.7 % for *verna sua*, and 0% for *filia* and *conliberta* respectively). This is not the place to get to the bottom of the problem of diphthongized forms combined with monophthongized; a broader study based on more instances would be required to establish whether there are in fact any discernable preferences or governing principles, but the tendency emerging here seems clear enough for such a study to be worthwhile.

The extremely high percentage for *alumne suae* is inexplicable and may perhaps depend on mere chance. However, the preference for

monophthongized noun while the pronoun remains diphthongized, rather than vice versa, seems to be conscious and may perhaps be explained as a mere graphical *variatio*; it seems absurd to assume any difference in the pronunciation.

The adjective *pientissimus* is a variant of *pi-issimus* that is distinctively epigraphic: appearing in inscriptions from the early Empire on,<sup>50</sup> it is completely unattested in literary text until the 6th century AD.<sup>51</sup> It is found 907 times as an epithet in the funerary inscriptions of *CIL* VI, 432 of which concern “dependants”, i.e.

<sup>50</sup> *TLL* X.1 (2005), 2230, 36–54 s.v. *pius* (Bl.), dates the earliest occurrences to the age of Augustus; however, the instances found in epitaphs concerning freedmen of the Claudian emperors (*CIL* VI 9003 and 14913) would be the earliest that are surely datable.

<sup>51</sup> The earliest instance seems to be in Eugippius’ *Commemoratorium de vita sancti Severini* 28.4 (6th century AD).



younger relatives, mostly sons and daughters. It is tempting to consider these instances as laying stress on the children's sense of duty towards their parents; however, according to Harrod, who has made the most thorough study of such epithets in the inscriptions, "pius piissimus and pientissimus are used much more often to express the tender love of parent for child than the dutiful love of child for parent".<sup>52</sup> There is nothing in the inscriptions themselves that would support such an interpretation, which must rest primarily on a "human" basis: there may be assumed to be a certain sentimental

inclination in a parent to consider a deceased child as having been *pius* regardless of the child's actual nature. Hence, it may be supposed, Harrod's focus on tender love of parent rather than dutiful love of child.

**6. vene merenti:** sc. *bene merenti*, with *v* for *b* as in *Sallubia* above. It is probably not surprising to find that the vulgar spelling *vene* is very rare in such a common formula. In *CIL* VI, there are 3,313 instances of *bene merenti* / *benemerenti* (2,258 + 1,055), of which a mere 21 are cut with an initial *v*.

### 3. UAS 1386 (CIL VI 22620)

D(is) M(anibus). | Mu(ciae) Rufine ma|tri. M. Mucius | Rufinus bene |<sup>5</sup>merenti fecit. | Vixit an(nis) XXXX, m(ensibus) III, | d(iebus) XVII.

To the divine Manes. To Mucia Rufina, his mother. M. Mucius Rufinus made this for the well deserving. She lived for 40 years, 3 months and 17 days.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* tablet of white marble with black veins, rather rough around the edges but probably not broken, left edge quite straight. No ornaments, no traces of guidelines. Some incrustation on the back.

*Dimensions:* 18.3–21.0 × 27.4–28.8 × 2.4–2.7 cm. The depth of the stone is markedly lower in the middle (the minimum being 2.1 cm) than at the edges.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 2.5–2.6, w. 13.2, line 2: h. 1.9–2.0, w. 21.8, line 3: h. 1.8–2.1, w. 21.7, line 4: h. 1.9–2.5, w. 21, line 5: h. 1.9–2.0, w. 23.4, line 6: h. 1.5–1.7, w. 22.7, line 7: h. 1.3–1.5, w. 5.0 cm.

*Arrangement:* line 1 has an indentation of about 1.5 letters; lines 2–6 even left margin; line 7 is cut in the lower right corner.

*Lettering:* rather crude freehand capitals with occasional but simple serifs, "ears" on M, top of T somewhat wavy. A in line 6 lacks horizontal. v tends towards a rounded bottom. D in lines 1 and 7

<sup>52</sup> Harrod 1909, 16.

unusually rounded, almost like an O. In the last line the two strokes of the number V do not connect at the bottom; however, the strokes of the II that follows do. These strokes are also marked as long in *CIL* (“numeric” *i longa*), but since the height of the letters and numbers in this line varies considerably, it is doubtful that these are intended to be particularly long.

*I longa, apex, ligatures:* –

*Interpuncts:* the text has a variety of interpuncts: line 1 D M (a leaf), line 2 MU RUFINE (stroke/oblong comma), line 3 TRI M (stroke) and M MUCIUS (leaf), at the end of line 5 (leaf), line 6 VIXIT AN (comma, point upwards) and AN XXXX (stroke). In the last line there is a stroke that connects the lower part of D to the leftmost top of the following X, probably a carelessly cut interpunct.

*Date:* 3rd century?

*Transcription:* CH, 18 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* *CIL* VI 22620 (transcribed by Häggström, checked by Henzen against a squeeze); Thomasson 143.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1386; previously 1057 and vps. mvs. B. 3 (written in ink on the back).

**2–4. Mu(ciae) Rufine matri. M. Mucius Rufinus:** in this case, mother and son share not only the same nomen gentile, *Mucius*, but also have the same cognomen, *Rufinus*.<sup>53</sup> In a Roman family of freeborn status, this pattern deviates somewhat from the norm, because husband and wife (i.e. father and mother) do not usually share a common gentilicium; as the son of a free father got his father’s gentilicium (and often also his praenomen and even cognomen), sons are very much more likely to be blueprints of their father than of their mother as far as their names are concerned. In a case like the present there are several possible explanations, each of them speculative, though some may be more plausible than others.

Most likely, perhaps, M. Mucius Rufinus was the son of freeborn mother (*Mucia Rufina*) and a slave father. According to the *ius gentium* (see *Gai. Inst.* 1.80 and 82), children followed the status of their mother; if she was free so were her children, regardless of the status of the father. A child born as a free Roman

would need a Roman gentilicium, but if the father was a slave, he would have no such name to pass on. In such cases, the child inherited the gentilicium of its mother. Even though there was a complete freedom of choice as regards cognomina, children would often inherit these too from their parents. Sons would also need a praenomen, which could be inherited from their maternal grandfather if their father was a slave, although praenomina too could naturally be chosen at will. Supposing that he was the son of a slave and a freeborn woman, M. Mucius Rufinus would automatically have got the same gentilicium as his mother, who also decided to give him her cognomen *Rufinus*. *Marcus* may have been the name of Rufina’s father.

Another possibility is that both parents of Mucius Rufinus were freed slaves who had once belonged to the same household, viz. that of a Mucius; when manumitted, they would have got the gentilicium of their former master, which they naturally passed on to their son. They would also have kept their slave names as cognomina, which means that as a slave, the mother was called *Rufina*. This alternative seems slightly less likely because the *Lex Aelia*

<sup>53</sup> *Rufinus*, like for example *Flavus*, is a name which alludes to the colour of the hair; Kajanto 1965, 229.

Sentia of AD 4 set an age limit of 30 for the manumission of slaves who would become full citizens.<sup>54</sup> If Mucia Rufina had been manumitted at the age of 30 and given birth to Mucius Rufinus after her manumission, he would hardly have been ten years old when his mother died and unlikely to have arranged her burial and had her epitaph cut. Moreover, *Rufinus/-a* is rare as a slave's name; Kajanto counts 843 individuals by this name in *CIL* (499 men and 344 women), of which only 13 (1.54%) were slaves or freedmen.<sup>55</sup>

It does remain a possibility that both parents were freeborn who happened to share the same gentilicium, but this is probably the least likely alternative. Even so, there are inscriptions with a naming-pattern that does only fit into the last two alternatives proposed here, like *CIL VI 20477.2–5 Iulia Fortunata | et Iulius Hermes | fecerunt | T. Iulio Fortunato filio piiss(imo)*: all have the gentilicium *Iulius*, and the son shares his mother's cognomen. However, the lack of weight of evidence for such instances is evident as soon as one considers the fact that—for all we know—T. Iulius Fortunatus may well have been the younger son of the couple; they may have had a first-born called T. Iulius Hermes. Perhaps, though, it is significant that the mother is mentioned first in the inscription.

As concerns the abbreviation *Mu(ciae)*, it is somewhat surprising that the gentilicium

of the deceased should be abbreviated when the dedicator has decided to have the entire formula *bene merenti fecit* cut unabridged. As the cognomen gradually became the most important name, there is a clear tendency for the gentilicia to appear in abbreviated form in the epitaphs (as in 19.1 below), but an abbreviated gentilicium does not necessarily argue for a late dating of an inscription. For instance, *CIL VI 10089* is an epitaph set up by one *Ti. Cl(audius) Aug(usti) lib(ertus) Philetus*, who obviously had been the slave of a Claudian emperor and thus cannot have been manumitted later than AD 68 (the year of Nero's death, last of the Claudian emperors); the inscription cannot reasonably be dated much later than AD 100. The present abbreviation of Mucia cannot be seen, however, as an instance of a general tendency to abbreviate common gentilicia. It is an isolated case (indeed the only instance of an abbreviation of Mucius), probably occasioned by nothing else than the limited space on the stone.

For the monophthongization in *Rufine*, see discussion on 3.4–6 *alumne suae pietissime*.

2–3. **matrī**: as crude as it may seem to divide such a short word over two lines, the division as such is impeccable: the mute and liquid are put together at the beginning of the latter line.<sup>56</sup>

6–7. **Vixit ... XVII**: for records of age in the epitaphs, see discussion on 2.3–4.

<sup>54</sup> On the circumstances of the manumission of slaves in Rome, see, e.g., Wiedemann 1985. The age problem can be avoided by considering so-called “pathetic” manumission before the age of 30, one of the reasons for which appears to have been the master's wish to marry a slave girl. We may then suppose that Mucius was Rufina's master, and that she married him on her manumission. In this model, this Mucius would be a likely candidate for Mucius Rufinus' father and probably the one who passed on the praenomen *Marcus* to him.

<sup>55</sup> Kajanto 1965, 229.

<sup>56</sup> This is actually the case with 70% of all words divided at mute and liquid in the inscriptions; see Denison 1906, 52.

#### 4. UAS 1388 (CIL VI 23123)

Cn. Numisius Valeria|nus vix(it) ann(is) VIII. | Epictesis mater filo | impio.

Cn. Numisius Valerianus lived for eight years. His mother Epictesis (made this) for her impious son.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* unadorned marble tablet in a fine state of preservation, markedly square and with practically no damage to the edges. The surface is smooth and shows no traces of guidelines. In the middle of the lower edge there is a small hole for fastening the inscription.

*Dimensions:* 22.9 × 26.4–26.5 × 2.8 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.5, w. 20.2, line 2: h. 1.5–1.6, w. 18.9, line 3: h. 1.5–1.6, w. 19.6, line 4: h. 1.5–1.6, l. 6.2 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 1–3 straight left margin, line 4 indentation of 5 letters (giving a centred impression).

*Lettering:* very elegant freehand capitals, almost like a bookhand, with wavy horizontals (including serifs); the whole text has a tendency to strike upwards to the right. The letter v is rather round at the bottom angle. I and L mostly lack top serifs (the I:s in line 4 have them), but the bottom serif of I is occasionally wide enough for the letter to resemble an L.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* interpuncts in the (very clear) shape of commas occur at every word ending and at the end of lines 2–4. They are closely attached to the preceding word, often with considerable space to the next.

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 18 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 23123 (transcribed by Häggström, checked by Henzen against a squeeze); Thomasson 140; Sjögren 1925, 243–245.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1388; previously 1055 and vps. mvs. B. 1 (written in ink on the back).

1–2. **Cn. Numisius Valerianus:** *Numisius* was the gentilicium of a rather large but not very prominent Roman *gens*; it is found in about 90 inscriptions in *CIL* VI, but only two consuls, both in the early 3rd century AD, bear the name as one of several gentilicia.<sup>57</sup> Among the members of lesser distinction were praetors (L. Numisius in 340 BC, C. Numisius in 177 BC), *legati legionis* (Numisius Lupus in AD 68/69, Numisius Rufus in AD 69/70) and a proconsul (Numisius Marcellianus, probably under Caracalla).<sup>58</sup>

The cognomen *Valerianus* is derived from the gentilicium *Valerius*. Cognomina of this type, usually formed with the suffix *-anus*, may be coined from the gentilicia of the mother (as in the case of the emperor T. Flavius Vespasianus, whose mother was called Vespasia Polla) or of another reasonably close relative, or may be suggestive of adoption, in which case the cognomen was derived from the person's gentilicium prior to adoption (like C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus). In the case of slaves and freedmen, such cognomina usually indicate that they had been the slave of another master before entering the service of their current (in the case of freedmen, last) master. It cannot be conclusively determined which of these alternatives applies to Numisius Valerianus, but if he had been adopted or manumitted (the latter being extremely unlikely given his age), we would have reason to expect another cognomen before *Valerianus*.<sup>59</sup> He was probably

<sup>57</sup> Degrassi 1952, 188.

<sup>58</sup> See *RE* XVII.2 (1937), 1398–1401 s.v. Numisius (F. Münzer *et al.*).

<sup>59</sup> Olli Salomies notes that adoptees' names consisting only of adoptive praenomen and cognomen (inherited from the adopting parent) followed by a cognomen in *-ianus* formed from the original nomen was primarily found in republican times, because nomenclature of this kind was mainly used when both the adoptee and the adopting parent lacked cognomina. As most persons during the Empire had a cognomen, there are very few instances of this type from that period; see Salo-

mieborn, then, but as his mother's gentilicium is not given, there is no way of knowing whence he got his cognomen.<sup>60</sup>

According to Kajanto, *Valerianus* is the third commonest cognomen in the category of names derived from gentilicia; he counted 425 instances, a number which is surpassed only by *Iulianus* (800) and *Marcianus* (561).<sup>61</sup>

3. **Epictesis:** this name is a Latin transliteration of the common Greek name Ἐπίκτησις (from the noun ἐπίκτησις meaning “further acquisition”, “fresh gain”; as a name, it would be a matter of a “new addition” to the family) of which there are 110 recorded instances in the volumes of the *LGPN* published so far. It is well attested also in Latin contexts with 61 instances in *CIL* VI, of which about a third are slaves or freedwomen.<sup>62</sup>

3–4. **filo impio:** sc. *filio*. It is hard to explain this curious spelling as anything else than a mere stonecutter's error; it occurs also in *CIL* VI 5175.3 *filo pientissimo*, III 3381.2 *Vervici filus* (but *filius* later in the same inscription), 5035.4 *Vibeno filo*, 6552.3 *filo inelicissimo* (sic), 11642.8 *Optato filo militi lig(ionis)* (sic) II, X 2330.6 *filo piissimo* (an otherwise entirely correct inscription), perhaps also in XIV 4808.3 *Prisco filo* and in *ISIS* 307 *Samus filus*.

To a modern reader it naturally seems harsh for a mother to call her deceased son “impious”. However, the collective evidence of the Romans' attitude towards the dead, particularly within their own family, makes an *ad litteram* interpretation of such epithets seem absurd.<sup>63</sup> What is “impious”, “cruel” etc. is

mies 1992, 23.

<sup>60</sup> Although appearing here with only one name, Epictesis would almost certainly have been a freedwoman (freeborn or manumitted), otherwise her son would be a slave too (see discussion on 3.2–4).

<sup>61</sup> See Kajanto 1965, 31–35.

<sup>62</sup> Solin 1996, 557.

<sup>63</sup> This is not to say that *impius* never means downright impious, but when it does, this is clearly emphasized by the inscription, as in *CIL* VI 13732 C. *Cae-*

rather Fate, blind Fortune or Death itself that severs parents from their sons and daughters. Einar Löfstedt suggested that epithets such as *iniquus*, *acerbus*, *crudelis*, *sceleratus* and *impius* had been transferred from such agents directly to the deceased (or to the survivors) without much consideration.<sup>64</sup> Seven years later, Harry Armini conclusively refuted Löfstedt's theory by advocating the opinion that the deceased is "cruel", "impious" and so on because he has left those who loved him and brought them grief.<sup>65</sup> The best support for the correctness of his thesis is given by an inscription that is actually not adduced by Armini:<sup>66</sup> *CIL VI 18905.4–5 hos*

*duo testa tegit coniecta in un[um] | crudelis quia deseruere patr[em];* among the instances which he does produce are *CIL XI 655* (for Valeria Gemellina) *filiae pi|entissimae | usque hoc, XIII 2279.8–9* (for Suttia Anthis) *que (sc. quae) dum | nimia pia fuit facta | est inpia*, and *ICUR VIII 23529.1–3* (a Christian verse epitaph) *heu cui me miseram linqvis karissime coniunx / quid sine te dulce rear quid amabile credam / cui vitam servo quod non sequor improbe funus.*<sup>67</sup> To these instances may be added *CIL V 1686.10–13* (Christian) *parentis (sic) | ex dolentiae | posuerunt fil|iae inpiae.*

---

*cilius Felix | et C. Caecilius Urbicus ... sibi et | C. Caecilio Rufino et C. Caecilio Materno et | libertis libertabusque posterisque eorum | excepta Secundina liberta inpia | adversus Caecilium Felicem patronum suum* (lines 1–2, 5–9).

<sup>64</sup> "es ist, als ob es für die naive Volkssprache die Hauptsache wäre, dass diese allgemeine Begriff zum Ausdruck kommt, mehr nebensächlich dagegen, zu welchem Satzteil das entsprechende Epithet gefügt wird"; Löfstedt 1913, 76.

<sup>65</sup> Armini 1919–1920, 49–50.

<sup>66</sup> The inscription is mentioned in a slightly different context in Tolman 1910, 31.

---

<sup>67</sup> These are the only instances mentioned in the *TLL VII.1* (1937), 621, 47–60 s.v. *impius* (Rehm). In his paper, Armini also discussed the cases in which epithets like *crudelis*, *sceleratus*, *impius* etc. are applied not to the deceased but to the survivors. With reference to *CIL XIV 1467.9–10 se|t ego inpia que (sc. quae) pos (i.e. post) | te vivo*, his conclusion that they call themselves "loveless" because they live on in the world instead of following their loved ones in death (p. 51) seems highly plausible. A few additional instances are given in Armini 1924, 44. The fact that Armini wrote these papers in Swedish had the effect that they went largely unnoticed by international scholars (the former is even erroneously referred to as "Encore la phraséologie des inscriptions romaines" in Pietri 1983, 587). For instance, Lattimore (1942, 181) noted that "In three inscriptions from Numerus Syrorum, Africa, the dead are called *crudelis*" without discussing the matter further. He continues "An odd inversion of the proper sense, apparently, appears in the use of the terms *mater* (or *pater*) *scelerata*; *mater inpia*, *crudelis inpia mater*. Evidently the implication is that it is unjust for the parents to survive their children; therefore, though not responsible, they must in some way be guilty; or else the true meaning of the words has been misunderstood". In his review of Lattimore's book, Harold Mattingly considered it "a natural turn of thought to call the beloved dead cruel for leaving their friends" but thought it "rather strange when the epithet 'cruel' is applied to the survivors." (Mattingly 1946).



## 5. UAS 1389 (CIL VI 13917)

D(is) M(anibus). | Caeliae | Victoriae, | quae vix(it) | <sup>5</sup>ann(is) LXXX.

To the divine Manes. To Caelia Victoria, who lived for 80 years.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* unadorned marble tablet, edges rough at top and bottom, bottom perhaps broken; the sides are straight, particularly so the right. There are no traces of guidelines in the text, but above the text runs a line that may have had some such purpose, unless it is meant to define the area of writing. The surface is flat but covered by incrustation (less at the edges).

*Dimensions:* 16.3–19.1 × 23.4–23.5 × 2.8–3.3 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 2.0, w. 11.6, line 2: h. 2.0–2.2, w. 14.7, line 3: h. 2.1–2.6, w. 16, line 4: h. 2.0–2.4, w. 14.9, line 5: h. 2.0–2.3, w. 16.2 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 2–5 have an even left margin; line 1 indentation ca 0.5 letter.

*Lettering:* simple freehand capitals with rudimentary serifs (top serifs of A and M are simply continuations of the rightmost diagonals continuing above the letter, sometimes ending in a curve to the left).

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* crude interpuncts like holes/dots between the words in line 1 and perhaps 4. Apart from these, there are three marks on the surface; the biggest one is round, very much like the interpunct in line 1, and found between V and I in line 3 VICTORIAE, the other two have the appearance of thick, short strokes, one of them curved, and appear below the interpunct in line 1. Their existence is probably due to damage, but makes the interpunct in line 4 seem somewhat suspicious.

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 18 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 13917 (transcribed by Häggström, checked by Henzen against a squeeze); Thomasson 145.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1389; previously 1060 and VPS. MVS. B. 6 (written in ink on the back).

2–3. *Caeliae Victoriae*: the originally plebeian *gens Caelia* is well attested during the late Republic, but does not seem to have been particularly large; in *CIL VI*, it only appears in 122 inscriptions.<sup>68</sup>

The cognomen *Victoria* is sorted by Kajanto into his category of “wish-names”, i.e. names that may be expected to express the “commonest parental hopes” in a child.<sup>69</sup> But as the concept of victory is naturally also manifested in the goddess *Victoria*, the name balances on the verge between such “wish-names” and cognomina acquired from divine names (gathered by Kajanto on 215–216). There is, of course, an exact Greek parallel in the name Νίκη, which is common as a woman’s name both in Greek (210 instances in *LGPN*) and Latin sources (several hundred instances only in *CIL VI*).<sup>70</sup>

5. *ann(is) LXXX*: 80 years is an advanced age by any standards. In ancient Rome, it must have been quite noteworthy, given that the average length of life of the Romans was significantly lower than that of modern Europe. In his comment on Plin. *Ep.* 1.12.11,<sup>71</sup> Sherwin-White recounts a note from Pliny the Elder, according to which 85 male citizens of ages 100 and above were recorded in Vespasian’s census in the early 70s AD. Given that this number includes all citizens empire-wide, 85 is not many.

It should be admitted, though, that our possibilities of knowing anything even remotely certain about Roman life expectancy are very limited. As far as epitaphs are concerned, something that has been selectively produced as well as randomly preserved cannot really tell us much about the population as a whole. Besides, there is a potential problem of age exaggeration. Roman North Africa, for instance, has a very high percentage of epitaphs commemorating extremely old people; is this exaggeration or a reflection of reality?<sup>72</sup> It has also been noted that “a suspiciously high percentage” of people seem to have died at ages that are divisible by five, suggesting that “age-rounding (a common phenomenon in societies where accurate birth-records are not kept systematically) ... probably further distorts the picture”.<sup>73</sup>

The discussion up to the early 1960s is summarized by Henric Nordberg;<sup>74</sup> in a recent assessment of the entire issue, Walter Scheidel concluded that “Thirty-five years after the publication of Keith Hopkins’ seminal critique of earlier attempts to reconstruct Roman age structure, we have not been able to advance beyond his guesstimate that mean life expectancy at birth in the Roman world probably fell in a range from twenty to thirty years”.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>68</sup> Based on a search for nominative, genitive or dative forms of the name, as well as the abbreviation *Cael.* The corresponding number for a large *gens* like the *gens Iulia* is 2,909.

<sup>69</sup> Kajanto 1965, 72.

<sup>70</sup> The name is thus actually more frequent than *Victoria*; see Kajanto 1965, 278.

<sup>71</sup> Sherwin-White 1966, 113–114.

<sup>72</sup> Tim Parkin considered “the number of alleged centenarians in Roman Africa ... a gross exaggeration” (Parkin 1992, 106); in his review of Parkin’s book, Brent Shaw countered by claiming that “the number’ is not (the individual cases do indeed exist)—it is the proportion of them that is ‘exaggerated.’ Even so, there is no ‘demographic reason’ to call into doubt the legitimacy of the attested cases: it is simply the case that, for their own peculiar cultural reasons, north Africans liked to select and emphasize the old, indeed the very old, at the expense of the young.” (Shaw 1994, 192).

<sup>73</sup> Bodel 2001, 35. Bodel’s remark concerns “those who lived neither very long nor only into adolescence”, but may be supposed to be applicable also to those who died at an advanced age.

<sup>74</sup> Nordberg 1963, 38–48.

<sup>75</sup> Scheidel 2001, 25.

## 6. UAS 1395 (CIL VI 22123)

[ - - - - - ] | Marcia Charitus | liberta et heres | bene mer(enti) fecit. |

To [ - - - - - ]. Marcia Charitus, freedwoman and heir, made this for the well-deserving.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* lower part of marble tablet, broken off along top and somewhat on the left side, right side and probably also bottom intact, though the latter is rough. Surface even but coarse (from incrustation?), extremely shallow cutting. No ornaments, no guidelines. Back very rough.

*Dimensions:* 17.7–20.3 × 29.6–33.7 × 1.7–2.5 (left depth), 3.2–4.1 cm (right depth).

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. c. 26, w. 28.6, line 2: h. 2.5–2.6, w. 26.6, line 3: h. 2.4–2.5, w. 25.5 cm.

*Arrangement:* line 2 has an indentation of 0.25 letter, line 3 of 0.5 letter compared to line 1.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals, extremely hard to read due to the very shallow trench. Simple letters, though serifs are visible particularly on the verticals.

*I longa, apex, ligatures:* –

*Interpuncts:* triangular interpuncts (sometimes hardly discernable and tending towards rectangles) between each word on lines 2 and 3.

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 19 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 22123 (Henzen); Thomasson 131.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1395; previously 1066 (written in ink on the back) and VPS. MVS. B. 9 (in ink of the right edge).

1. [ - - - - - ]: at least one entire line must be missing here, giving the name of the deceased. As he or she was the former master of Marcia Charitus, the latter inherited her gentilicium from this person; hence, part of this line must have read *Marcio* or *Marciae*.

2. **Marcia Charitus:** the gentilicium *Marcus/-a* belongs to a large *gens* first attested in the mid-4th century BC, and is very frequently attested in the inscriptions. *Charitus*, on the other hand, is a very rare name probably formed on the stem *χαριτ-* (as in the noun *χάρις*, “grace”, and the corresponding adjective

*χάριτος*) with the addition of the suffix *-οῦς*, so that the name would have been *Χαριτοῦς* in Greek. This particular name is unattested in Greek sources, but there are similar formations of both masculine and feminine names, such as *Θαμοῦς* in Plato’s *Phaedrus* p. 274, d, and the feminine *Ἐπαφροῦς* in an inscription from Crete.<sup>76</sup> In Latin inscriptions, the name

<sup>76</sup> See K–B 1, 495 and 2, 583 (remarking, apropos of the latter, that there are “viele Bildungen derart in den pontischen Inschr.”).

occurs with certainty only in three further inscriptions, viz. *CIL* X 2240 (Puteoli) *Octavia Charitus*, XII 3651 (Nimes) *Sammia Charitus*, and (with loss of the final *-s*) *CIL* VIII 1911 (= *ILAlg* I 3184, Tebessa in Africa Proconsularis, present Algeria) *Audasia Charitu*. One inscription from Rome preserves what seems to be a Latinized genitive, *CIL* VI 8930 (= VI 33754a) *Charitudis reliquias* (2nd century AD; the Greek genitive would be *Χαριτοῦ*).<sup>77</sup>

3. **liberta et heres**: this appears to be a fixed phrase; it always appears as *libertus/-a et heres* or *liberti et heredes*, never the other way around. Exact parallels to the phraseology of this inscrip-

tion are found in *CIL* VI 15827.6–9 *MM Clodi Hermes | et Felix liberti et heredes b(ene) m(erenti) | fecerunt*, X 2029.4–7 *Aerulli(us) verna | et Firmilla et | Felicitas liberti | et heredes b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecerunt)* and X 3516.5–8 *Annia | Dionysias liberta | et heres | bene mer(enti) fecit*.

The information as such is of interest, because freedmen and -women were not automatically heirs of their *patronus* or *patrona*, but had to be nominated as such in his or her will; even if they were slaves when their master died, they could be simultaneously manumitted and appointed heirs in the will.<sup>78</sup>

## 7. UAS 2461 (AE 1997, 1749)

Albanus | Q. Vitelli | horrearius.

(Here lies) Albanus, Q. Vitellius' manager of the storeroom.

*Findplace*: Rome.

*Physical description*: marble tablet in good condition. Inscription set within a *tabula ansata* framed by a simple cornice; there are two curved ornamental lines inside the *ansae*, and a line cut above and below the text respectively. A piece is missing from lower right edge. Faint guidelines at top and bottom of lines, hardly visible in line 2. The back is rather flat, with small chisel marks.

*Dimensions*: 11.0–11.1 × 19.9–20.0 × 2.7–3.0 cm.

*Height and length of lines*: line 1: h. 2.4–2.7, w. 15.2, line 2: h. 2.1–2.2, w. 11.2, line 3: h. 1.9, w. 14.2 cm.

*Arrangement*: lines 1–2 centred; line 3 has an even left margin with line 2, and runs all the way to the right margin.

*Lettering*: very good freehand capitals that seems to imitate guided. Fine serifs on all letters; line 3 a little crowded towards the end due to lack of space.

*I longa, apex, nexus*: *i longa* line 2 *Vitelli*.

<sup>77</sup> *CIL* VI 19182 has the dative *Caeciliae Cha[ri]tudini*, which suggests a nominative *Charitudo* on the pattern of *virgo, -inis* or *imago, -inis*; see Leumann 1977, 360.

<sup>78</sup> See Kaser 1955, 576.

*Interpuncts*: interpunct in the shape of a pyramid between Q and VITELLI in line 2.

*Date*: early 1st century AD (?)

*Transcription*: CH, 19 August 2008.

*Printed sources*: Carlander 1911, 107, no. 22; Thomasson 133; *AE* 1997, 1749.

*Inventory number*: UAS 2461 (written in ink on the back; no further numbers).

**1. Albanus**: for the name, see discussion on 22.37. This individual evidently died a slave.

**2. Q. Vitelli**: the *gens Vitellia* enters history as legendary figures of the Roman kingdom in Livy's history. That these really were nothing more than simply legends is demonstrated by the fact that there are no inscriptions that mention the family until the late Republic, and then only in Ostia. The name becomes increasingly more common during the Empire, particularly, of course, after the short reign of A. Vitellius in AD 69.<sup>79</sup>

We know of some Vitellii with the praenomen *Quintus*. Two (probably uncle and nephew) were senators during the early Empire, the latter *quaestor* under Augustus and expelled from the senate under Tiberius, having become impoverished (*Tac. Ann.* 2.48.3). Even though there is nothing that would actually suggest that one of these would be the Q. Vitellius of this inscription, the dating is entirely possible, as the lack of the formula *Dis Manibus* may point to an Augustan (or earlier) date.

Not much can be made of the *i longa* in *Vitelli* by way of a dating, but at least, it does not argue against an Augustan dating; see the introduction, 1.3. It may be noted, too, that Q. Vitellius is not a common name in *CIL* VI, being found in a mere five inscriptions.

**3. horrearius**: Albanus was the “manager of the storeroom” of Vitellius, which most likely does not mean that he supervised a large granary for the storage of corn and other food, but rather Vitellius' *horreum privatum*, i.e. the storeroom in his private house, in which was kept just about anything that the owner needed to stow away. Thus, he would have belonged to the private *familia* of Vitellius' *domus*, rather than the large *familia* of a country villa. Other such *horrearii* appear, e.g., in *CIL* VI 7289 (the *horrearius* of one Q. Volusius) *Dis Man(ibus) | Felici Q. Volusi | Saturnini | horeario | Q. Volusius Fortun|atus b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit) et sibi* and in *CIL* VI 6292–6295 (*horrearii* of the family Statilius).<sup>80</sup>

<sup>79</sup> See *RE* R. 2 IX.1 (1961), 383–384 s.v. Vitellius (H. Gundel).

<sup>80</sup> On Roman *horrea*, see *RE* VIII.2 (1913), 2458–2464 s.v. horreum (Fiechter).

## 8. UAS 2462

*Front:*

D(is) M(anibus). | P. Aelius Felix | Aug(usti) lib(ertus). | Flori!

*Right side:*

<sup>5</sup>Auge | patrono | suo b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).

To the divine Manes. (Here lies) P. Aelius Felix, freedman of the emperor. Florius! Auge made this for her well-deserving patron.

*Findplace:* Rome, outside Porta Salaria (Engström).

*Physical description:* small altar of white marble, showing the usual features of larger altars. From bottom to top, there is a rectangular base, a moulding, a dado (body), a moulding and a gable. On the front of the dado is a simple cornice framing the inscription; there is no cornice around the right side inscription. There is some incrustation, though rather thin. Front and right side are plain and flat. The left side has the same features as the front and the right side, but its surface is rough; the back is flat but rough, bottom similar. No guidelines on front; on the right side some serifs continue leftward in a manner that seems to follow a guideline (line 1 A bottom, V top, E bottom; line 2 P bottom, line 3 tops and bottoms, F top and bottom). There is a drilled hole right through the altar from top to bottom (Ø top 5, bottom 6 cm). Each corner of the top has a “volute”.

*Dimensions:* height 21.2–22.5; width at gable 16.9, top moulding 17.4, dado: 16.4–16.6, bottom moulding 18.4, base 18.7 cm; depth at gable 15.5, top moulding 16, dado 15.1, bottom moulding 16, base, 16.4 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* Front: line 1: h. 1.4–1.5, w. 8.4, line 2: h. 1.0–1.2, w. 13.4, line 3: h. 1.0–1.1, w. 11.8, line 4: h. 1.0–1.1, w. 10.6. Right side: line 1: h. 1.4, w. 9.4, line 2: h. 1.4, w. 12.3, line 3: h. 1.2–1.3, w. 12.3 cm. Size of area of writing on the front: 8.1–7 × 14.2–4 cm.

*Arrangement:* Front: line 1 roughly centred, lines 2–3 even left margin, line 4 indentation one letter; right side: line 1–2 centred, line 3 perhaps intended as centred but extending to the right margin.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals, but tending towards guided, particularly on the right side, which has clearer letters with more elaborate serifs. On the front are traces of red in line 1 D, line 2 L and I.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* triangular interpuncts between all words. On front is a *virga* after line 3, and one on each side of line 4 (slanting outward; the one to the left is almost horizontal).

*Date:* mid or late 2nd century AD.

*Transcription:* CH, 26 August, 2008.

*Printed sources:* Engström 1910, 109–111; Thomasson 138.

*Inventory number:* UAS 2462 (written in ink on the back; no further numbers).



A miniature funerary altar, i.e. a tombstone in the shape of an altar, but unlike altars to the gods it has no hearth and is not intended for sacrifice other than libation. Some larger altars have furrows on the top, evidently meant to lead wine poured on the altar down its sides; in this small altar, there is a drilled hole right through, which may have served the same purpose—unless it is simply meant for a pole holding the altar in its place,<sup>81</sup> but in such a case, it would hardly have been continued all the way through the stone. Thomasson refers to it as an “ash-hole”, meaning, I suppose, a hole destined to receive the ashes of the deceased, but it seems rather small for such a purpose. The altar also lacks a principal feature of larger altars, viz. the reliefs of an *urceus* and a *patera* that usually adorn their sides. In this case, the left side, which lacks an inscription, has not even been polished.

The altar is inscribed with the epitaph of P. Aelius Felix, the only imperial freedman in the collection, and was commissioned by his freedwoman Aelia Auge. The text is quite simple but not without interest, mainly because of *Flori* in line 4, which is very probably the earliest known instance of a “detached signum”.

**2–3. P. Aelius Felix | Aug(usti) lib(ertus):** this P. Aelius Felix was a freedman of an emperor (in formulas such as this, *Augustus* is a title, “the exalted one”), and as he would have inherited his former master’s praenomen and gentilicium on his manumission, the emperor in question must have been called P. Aelius. Fortunately, there is only one such emperor, viz. Hadrian, whose full name from birth was P. Aelius Hadrianus; consequently, Felix must have been manumitted during Hadrian’s reign, somewhere between AD 117 and 138. Due to the complete lack of further information, it is

<sup>81</sup> Engström 1910, 110 considers both variants possible.

impossible to date the stone with greater precision than roughly to the middle of the 2nd century AD.

*Felix*, of the category “wish-names”, is on the whole the commonest Latin cognomen; Kajanto counts 3,716 occurrences. It was also a name that was particularly frequent among slaves.<sup>82</sup>

It may be noted too that the title *Augusti libertus*, being somewhat bulky, is very rarely written out in full in the inscriptions. The well-balanced abbreviation *Aug. lib.* dominates completely, with 796 instances in *CIL VI* against a mere nine of the complete phrase. Other, less well-balanced abbreviations are even rarer: there are only two instances of *August. lib.*, three of *Aug. libert.* and none, apparently, of *August. libert.*<sup>83</sup>

**4. Flori:** this is the name *Florius*, but it stands completely detached from the proper name of the deceased, and in the vocative; it is an acclamation, and *Florius* a *signum*, a “distinctive mark”, of Felix, like an unofficial name; as it stands apart from the name itself, without any words joining the two, Kajanto called such *signa* “detached signa” and placed the earliest datable detached signum in AD 202,<sup>84</sup> which is a date that is very likely too late for the present inscription. We do not know when this Felix was manumitted, nor at what age, and we are left with no information about his age at death. But assuming that he was manumitted at the latest date possible, in AD 138, and that he then was between 30 and 40 years of age,<sup>85</sup> he

<sup>82</sup> Kajanto 1965, 29 (cf. 72 and 273), 73 and 134.

<sup>83</sup> For a thorough investigation of the title *Augusti libertus* and its various variants and abbreviations, see Chantraine 1967, 147–170.

<sup>84</sup> Kajanto 1966, 57–75.

<sup>85</sup> Most manumissions from the imperial household took place between the age of 30 and 40 (Weaver 1972, 100–104), thus in practice conforming to the age limit of 30 for the manumission of slaves set by the Lex Aelia Sentia (see discussion on 3.2–4). On the other hand, the emperor was naturally free to manumit anyone at

would very likely have been dead at AD 180, if not earlier. Still, there is no doubt that this is an instance of a detached signum, which means that there may be reason to date their origin a couple of decades before AD 200.

From Kajanto's study, it appears that these detached signa began life as misinterpretations of vulgar Greek imperatives; he makes a case of instances like *Gregori*, which can be (and in some epitaphs may have been) the imperative of the verb γρηγορέω ("to be or become fully awake, watch", spelled with an ι instead of an ε), but which can also be the purely Latin vocative of the name *Gregorius*. Such acclamations to the deceased would, through misinterpretation, have given rise to the detached signa in *-ius*, with a vocative ending corresponding to the vulgar imperative in ι. Many such signa were formed on existing cognomina with the addition of *-ius*.<sup>86</sup> In such a manner, *Florius* may have been formed on the name *Florus*, but why Felix was given this particular name is purely a matter of speculation. In some cases, the detached signum was chosen because of the meaning of the word on which it was formed. A good instance is *CIL IX 2105*,<sup>87</sup> the epitaph of one L. Pullidius Phoebianus set up by his wife, and containing the acclamations *Amanti mendax vale* and *Amanti χαίρει*;<sup>88</sup> here, the "constructed" name *Amantius* has been chosen no doubt to underline the affectionate relationship between husband and wife.

If the same mode of reasoning is applied to *Florius*, the important thing is the meaning of the stem *flor-*, i.e. "blooming" etc. This may be considered together with the frequent use in the epitaphs of flowers growing from

the tomb as a metaphor for the continuing life of the deceased, whose ashes, returned to the earth, join with the creative force of the Earth Mother.<sup>89</sup> One of the best instances is *CIL VI 18385.17–23* *O, mihi si superi vellent praestare roganti | ut tuo de tumulo flos ego cerna novum | crescere vel viridi ramo vel flore amaranti | vel roseo vel purpureo violaeque nitore, | ut qui praeteriens gressu tardante viator | viderit hos flores, titulum legat et sibi dicat | "hoc flos est corpus Flaviae Nicopolis"*.<sup>90</sup> Perhaps, *Florius* was a "name" attached to Felix on his tombstone only (one of the "signa which were coined ... at the moment of setting up the stone"),<sup>91</sup> expressing a wish that he would continue to "bloom" in life beyond the grave. Rather similar is *CIL VI 38082a*, epitaph of one Saturninus, dead at the age of four, which has the vocative *Aetheri anima dulcis*; Kajanto concludes that "the acclamation probably implies the wish that the dead child will be an *aetherius*, an inhabitant of the Upper World".<sup>92</sup>

**5. Auge:** this name comes from the Greek noun ἀυγή, meaning "sunlight". It is rare as a name in Greek (and most of the 35 instances in *LGPN* stem from Roman contexts), but quite frequent in Latin, with about 80 instances in *CIL VI* alone. As this woman refers to the deceased as her *patronus*, she would have been his freedwoman and her full name consequently Aelia Auge. There is, in fact, an epitaph of one Aelia Auge who was married to a freedman of Hadrian, viz. *CIL X 7264* (from Partinico on

---

any age that he might choose, which means that such considerations are usually futile in the case of the imperial household.

<sup>86</sup> Kajanto 1966, 63.

<sup>87</sup> Kajanto 1966, 64.

<sup>88</sup> *Mendax* in the sense "you who have cheated me by dying first and leaving me alone".

---

<sup>89</sup> The basic principle is *sum cinis, is cinis terrast, | sein est terra dea ego sum dea mortua non sum* (*CIL VI 35887.2–3*).

<sup>90</sup> "Oh, if the gods at my asking would grant to me, that from your tomb I would see a tender flower grow with either a lush sprig or the flower of the amaranth or with the beauty of the rose or of the purple of the violet, so that the wanderer, who with lingering pace sees these flowers as he passes by, may read this inscription and say to himself: 'this flower is the body of Flavia Nicopolis'."

<sup>91</sup> Kajanto 1966, 64.

<sup>92</sup> Kajanto 1966, 64.

Sicily) *Aeliae Aug[e] | coniugi | sanctissimae | P. Aelius Aug(usti) lib(ertus) | [N]igr[i]nus [ - - ]*. Whether this is the same Auge as in this inscription is naturally purely a matter of speculation. One can but speculate, too, whether Auge's name has in some way influenced the choice of

the signum *Florius* for Felix. As the rays of the sun brings forth flowers from the darkness of the earth to a life in the world above, so will Auge, the sunlight, bring continuing life to Felix, the “flower-man”, through this epitaph. At least, the thought is fascinating.<sup>93</sup>

<sup>93</sup> Roman epitaphs can be quite creative when it comes to making puns on the name of the deceased. Some instances are *CIL* VI 19007 (epitaph of Gemina Agathe Mater, dead at the age of five), *Mater nomen eram, mater non lege futura*, “Mater was I called, but I will never be a mother by legal right” (line 2), *CIL* III 12987 (epitaph of one P. Gallius Celer) *a[d vitam] vo[lui] | celer[e]m te c[re]scere mater, | ad mortem ingemui | te celerem misera*, “as your mother, I wanted that you should grow swiftly (*celerem* in the Latin) to life, now I, wretched, have bemoaned that you grew swiftly to death” (lines 1–5), *ICUR* II 6018.9 *Turtura nomen (h)abis set turtur vera fuisti*, “you have the name Turtura but you were indeed a turtle dove”, and *AE* 1920, 83.1–2 (epitaph of C. Attius Maturus, dead at the age of 16) *Maturi nomine eram | maturus non aetate futurus* “I was called Maturus but would not be mature with regard to my age”. For a kindred play on a name involving a flower, see *CIL* XIV 1808.9–10 (epitaph of Q. Volusius Anthus) *hunc Antho tumulum male deflorentibus | annis ... composuere (sc. parentes)*, “this tomb his parents built for Anthus when his years piteously withered away” (*ἄνθος* is “flower” in Greek). In another poem (*CIL* VI 25427), a certain Rhodantion (“the rose flower”) has died, ripe of years, and is ironically said to have been “defeated” (in terms of longevity) by his wife Victoria (“the winner”); see further Sblendorio Cugusi 1980.

## 9. UAS 1390 (SEG XLVII 2208)

Τερεντία, | εἰρήνη σοί.

Terentia, peace to you.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* unadorned marble tablet in very good condition, with flat and very smooth surface. The text is set within a grid of guidelines that are still visible: there are guidelines at the top and at the bottom of the lines of writing, with vertical guidelines left and right of text. The horizontal lines frame a blank line below line 2. The back is much like the front, with very light incrustation.

*Dimensions:* 18.0–18.7 × 28.8–30.4 × 1.5–1.7 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 4.0, w. 26.9, line 2: h. 3.9, w. 27.5 cm.

*Arrangement:* even margins.

*Lettering:* exquisite guided capitals, very even and carefully executed, with a triangular trench; fine serifs. The impression is very like Latin guided capitals. Traces of red filling in most letters.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* triangular interpuncts after both lines; none between words.

*Date:* early 3rd century AD?

*Transcription:* CH, 25 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 139; *AE* 1997, 1752; *SEG* XLVII 2208.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1390 (written in ink on the left edge); previously 1061 and VPS. MVS. B. 7 (written in ink on the back).

Epitaph of Terentia, in its entirety consisting of a Christian acclamation in its simplest form with the name of the deceased in the vocative (Τερεντία) and a wish for God's peace to her. This is also the oldest form of such acclamations, corresponding to the Latin *pax tecum* (or, less common, *tibi*) seen in inscriptions like *ICUR* IV 9388 *Blastiane pax tecum*, *ICUR* IX 24461 *Paulina pax tecu(m)*, *ICUR* I 900 *Pax tecum Felix* etc. These early Christian inscriptions usually belong to the beginning of the 3rd century AD, many of them having been found

in the Catacomb of Priscilla on the Via Salaria.<sup>94</sup>

Note that the single name used in this inscription is the nomen gentilicium of the deceased, which may be somewhat surprising in a time when this name began to lose its significance in favour of the cognomen. This is not, however, unique; there are a couple of other comparable instances, such as *ICUR* IX 25332

<sup>94</sup> See Mazzoleni 2002, 152.

*Lucretia pax tecum | in d(e)o* and 25570 *Pax te|cum | Valeria*. Such instances do not necessarily imply that the women in question had no cognomina (which would be somewhat strange at such a late date), only that they, for whatever reason, were known by their gentilicia rather than by their cognomina, in spite of the latter being the more personal name.

The most striking feature, especially for an early Christian inscription, is the high quality of the letters: palaeographically, this inscription is without a doubt the best piece in the collection.<sup>95</sup> This emphasizes the social standing of Terentia; unlike most early Christians, her family was sufficiently self-assured and had the means to arrange a beautiful epitaph for her.

## Epitaphs of soldiers

A peculiarity of the Uppsala collection is the presence of three epitaphs that concern, or 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). For the other two, the epitaphs of Iulius Diadochus of Alexandria (no. 11) and of the Cappadocian Aelius Aelinus (no. 12), the evidence is circumstantial, though not necessarily less likely.

In imperial times, Rome kept several fleets stationed around the empire, the largest being the *classis praetoria Misensis*, whose main base was at Misenum on the Bay of Naples, and the *classis praetoria Ravennas*, stationed at

Ravenna. In the provinces, there was the *classis Alexandrina* in Egypt, organized by Augustus, and the *classis Syriaca*, set up during the 1st century AD, probably at Seleucia. On the Rhine and on the Danube were found the *classis Germanica* (based in Cologne), the *classis Pannonica* near Belgrade and the *classis Moesiaca* probably on the mouth of the Danube. In the Black Sea, the fleets of the kings of Pontus had been reorganized into the *classis Pontica*, and the English Channel was served by a *classis Britannica*, stationed at Dover and Boulogne from the time of Claudius' invasion in AD 43.<sup>96</sup>

In the epitaphs of Roman sailors, the fleet to which the deceased belonged is usually indicated by various abbreviations, e.g. *cl(assis) pr(aetoria) Mis(enensis)*, *cl(assis) pr(aetoria) Rav(ennas)* etc. It is true that such information is lacking in the present inscriptions, but it is still possible to assign Anthestius and Lucceius of inscription no. 10 to a certain fleet because they name the ships on which they served, the triremes Capricornus and Augustus. These two ships, as appears from other epitaphs, belonged to the Misenian fleet. There was a ship called Augustus also at Ravenna, but this was a quinquerem, not a trireme, and there is no Capricornus attested.<sup>97</sup>

In the case of Iulius Diadochus of no. 11, there are three factors that argue for a connection to the navy, particularly to that at Misenum, viz. his ethnic *Alexandrinus* (which follows, in abbreviated form, directly on Iulius Diadochus' cognomen), his father's cognomen *Marinus* (which inescapably leads to thoughts of the sea), and the concluding abbreviation *f(aciendum) c(uravit)*, which is actually more common in the epitaphs of soldiers than in those of civilians. The sea and soldiers are sug-

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Mazzoleni 2002, 150: "Although it is undeniable that the general quality of Christian gravestones was relatively low, texts incised with a certain elegance and regularity (apart from the significant exceptions of the epigrams of Pope Damasus) do exist, even if they are rarely comparable with the impressive Classical examples."

<sup>96</sup> An up-to-date survey of the Roman fleets may be found in Rankov 2007, 55–58. A short survey of the sailors is given in Reddé 2000.

<sup>97</sup> For the provincial fleets, the names of very few ships are recorded; see Spaul 2002, 74–83.

gestive of the navy in general and Alexandria of the *classis Misensis* in particular, of which Alexandria was the second largest source of recruitment.<sup>98</sup> Supposing that the context is that of the Misian fleet, it may be assumed that the father Iulius Marinus was a marine too and took, or was given, his cognomen as an appropriate name on enlisting.<sup>99</sup> And it is quite possible that the cognomen of his son, Diadochus, indicated that he actually was his father's *διάδοχος*, viz. his father's successor in service; the word is sufficiently rare as a name for at least some significance to be ascribed to it. This hypothesis presents us with a marine of the Misian fleet, burying his son who had walked in his father's footsteps and joined the navy, taking (or being given) a name as appropriate as was his father's. *Alexandrinus* likely indicates that Iulius Marinus was still in the navy himself; on discharge, Roman citizenship was granted not only to the marines themselves, but to their children and descendants, and a *civis Romanus* would perhaps be less likely to style himself as *Alexandrinus*.<sup>100</sup> It may seem peculiar that father and son should serve simultaneously, but considering that the contract was for 26 years,<sup>101</sup> a son aged 23 being in the navy with his father appears entirely plausible.

The third probable marine in this collection, Aelius Aelinus of no. 12, is also the least obvi-

ous. There are three points that argue in favour, viz. the fact that the inscription was found in Cumae (which is next to the naval base of Misenum), Aelinus' Cappadocian nationality, and the concluding phrase *heres be(ne) m(erenti) fecit*. Cappadocia was on the Anatolian peninsula, from which (as from Alexandria) many marines were recruited to Misenum. It is true that there are very few Cappadocians epigraphically attested in Campania—it is a matter of three men—but all of these are stated as having been *militēs classis praetoriae Misensis*. However, the best indication that we are dealing with the inscription of a soldier is provided, again, by the formula at the end, because *heres bene merenti fecit* is nearly exclusively used by military men. Besides, nearly half of the instances in *CIL VI* concern marines from Misenum.

In spite of the fact that C. Anthestius Niger clearly states himself to be a marine, no. 10 has usually been assumed to have been found in Rome, and as a consequence (in rather a routine fashion) been included in *CIL VI*. This has been the case also with no. 11, in which case the reason to suspect a military naval connection was still less obvious. For no. 12, however, there is actually a verified finding place: this stone was found in Cumae, as reported in 1846 by Camillo Minieri Riccio.<sup>102</sup> It should be pointed out that it is not impossible that nos. 10 and 11 were actually found in Rome, even if the men commemorated served in the navy at Misenum. For there was a large detachment of the Misian fleet stationed at Rome, perhaps as early as Augustus, sharing the quarters of the praetorian guard until the *castra Misinatium* was built, probably under Domitian.<sup>103</sup> The

<sup>98</sup> Starr 1941, 75; Spaul 2002, 71–72.

<sup>99</sup> For the nomenclature of the marines, see discussion on 10.2.

<sup>100</sup> Starr 1941, 89. This is naturally not conclusive. There are instances of people who display the full *tria nomina* with filiation—usually considered the mark of Roman citizenship—and still record a foreign “nationality”, such as *CIL VI 36324.2–7 C. Valerio C. f(filio) | Messeano nat(ione) | Frisao v(ixit) a(nnis) XVIII | C. Valerius Messor | pater filio faci(endum) curavit*.

<sup>101</sup> This was extended to 28 some time between AD 166 and 214–215; see *CIL X 7535*, epitaph of C. Iulius Aponianus, another Alexandrian, who lived for 49 years of which he served in the navy for 28: *in is | mil(itavit) in cl(asse) pr(aetoria) Mis(enati) an(nis) XXIIIX* (lines 4–5); Starr 1941, 81.

<sup>102</sup> Minieri Riccio 1846, 32.

<sup>103</sup> There was likewise a detachment of the fleet of Ravenna stationed in Rome, and it seems that the prime tasks of these sailors were to serve in the sea battles staged in the *naumachia Augusti* and in the Colosseum; given the situation of the *castra Misinatium*, the latter was probably the prime responsibility of the Misian



Misenian sailors stationed in Rome had their own tomb between the second and third milestones on the Via Appia, and the relatively large number of epitaphs of personnel from the Misenian fleet have been discovered in the vigna Cassini and the vigna Corsi/Del Pinto clearly indicates the existence of a common burial site in that area,<sup>104</sup> even though there are no longer any traces of a structure.

However, as there are three epitaphs that seem to commemorate marines in the collec-

tion, and as one of these has a verified provenance close to the naval base of Misenum, there is really no reason to assume that the other two would come from anywhere else. The most natural conclusion must be that these three stones were acquired together after 1846, and brought simultaneously to Uppsala. And knowing that Schröder visited Naples on his journey in 1834–1835, his acquiring these three inscriptions there is an attractive possibility.

---

sailors. From an (otherwise implausible) note in the *Historia Augusta*, it appears that they were also charged with manoeuvring the *vela*, the enormous awnings that sheltered the audience in the Colosseum from the sun (*SHA Comm.* 15.6).

<sup>104</sup> If Anthestius' epitaph, and perhaps also that of Diadochus, originate from Rome, it is very likely that they were found in this area, and Sjögren seems to consider this possibility only (Sjögren 1925, 243). From the vigna Cassini originate the epitaphs *CIL* VI 3093, 3101, 3104, 3106, 3107, 3110, 3123, 3124, 3126, 3128, 3131, 3137, 3139, 3147, and 7465; in the vigna Corsi/Del Pinto have been found *CIL* VI 3096, 3097, 3114, 3138, 3146 and 32771. Most of the finds were made in the 19th century. Additional epitaphs have been found in the nearby catacombs of St. Callistus (*CIL* VI 32761, 32763, 32782), and two across the Via Appia from the vigna just mentioned (*CIL* VI 32767, 32774); see Spera 1999, 158.

## 10. UAS 1385 (CIL VI 32776)

D(is) M(anibus). | C. Anthestius Niger | ex III Capricorno | natio(ne) Surus vixit | <sup>5</sup>an(nis) XXX,  
mil(itavit) an(nis) XII. | L. Lucceius Aquilas | ex III Aug(usto) b(ene) m(erenti) fec(it).

To the divine Manes. C. Anthestius Niger, from the trireme Capricornus, Syrian with regard to his nationality, lived for 30 years and made military service for 12 years. L. Lucceius Aquilas, from the trireme Augustus, made (this) for the well deserving.

*Findplace:* Campania or Rome?

*Physical description:* tablet of white marble without ornamentation; top, left and bottom edges intact, some damage along right edge. Top edge rounded. Very faint traces of possible guidelines to the left of line 7 (top and bottom of line). No incrustation on front. The back is rough but flat; incrustation.

*Dimensions:* 21.7–21.9 × 28.1–29.1 × 2.5–7.0 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.6–1.9, w. 14.0, line 2: h. 1.5–1.7, w. 23.1, line 3: h. 1.4–2.1, w. 20.5, line 4: h. 1.5–1.9, w. 21.1, line 5: h. 1.3–2.0, w. 22.2, line 6: h. 1.4–2.1, w. 22.5, line 7: h. 1.2–2.2, w. 21.7 cm.

*Arrangement:* paragraph style: lines 3–5 have an indentation of about 1 letter in relation to line 2, which gives the name of the deceased as a kind of “heading” for this paragraph. The next paragraph is marked by line 6 protruding into the margin about 0.5 letter to the left of line 2, while line 7 has the same indentation as 3–5. Line 1 gives a roughly centred impression.

*Lettering:* extreme freehand capitals, rather like the letters have been painted on the stone and then cut. The letters show a certain ambition within their type, and are not particularly carelessly executed. The following particulars may be noted:

Line 3: in the abbreviation of *trireme*, the latter two verticals have a horizontal stroke above them; the stroke has serifs and slants from the left downward to right. At the point where the latter two verticals end, the first one turns slightly to the left and continues upwards slanting slightly to the left.

Line 4: the first *v* in *SVRVS* has a stroke that slants very sharply downward from the right diagonal to the left; the second *v* has a similar stroke that slants slightly upward to the left across the whole letter; this latter stroke may be damage, but it emanates very clearly from the top of the right diagonal.

Line 5: the number *XXX* has a horizontal stroke above it that lacks serifs but that is “double” above the first letter (i.e. the horizontal makes a turn and proceeds backward). The number *XII* likewise has a horizontal stroke above it; this stroke, too, is double above the first *x*: a short, second stroke “climbs” the first one.

Line 7: the abbreviation of *trireme*, *III*, has a triangular mark pointing rightward above the middle *I* (a carelessly executed horizontal?). The *M* is strangely cut as a kind of ligature that looks like *AX*; it is perhaps intended to be *ME*, but in that case, the upper and lower horizontals of *E* have

been left out. After FEC, where the edge is somewhat damaged, there is a trace of what might have been a top serif; FECI would be strange, though, and there would hardly have been room for FECIT.

*I longa, apex, ligatures*: the first I:s in line 3 III and 5 XII have been drawn taller than the others, but since these are numbers and not letters, it is strictly not a case of *i longa*. The first in line 7 III terminates above the other two, but since its base is also higher up, the number as such is not particularly higher.

*Interpuncts*: triangular interpuncts (pointing downwards, sometimes drawn out) are found between all words except in lines 2 ANTHESTIVS NIGER and 7 M FEC. There is also an interpunct at the end of line 1. After line 3 is a stroke covering the upper part of the line; this may be a *virga*, but is perhaps only damage.

*Date*: 2nd or 3rd century AD.

*Transcription*: CH, 25 August 2008.

*Printed sources*: CIL VI 32776 (= EE 4, 924; transcribed by Häggström, checked from a squeeze by Henzen); Thomasson 141; Sjögren 1925, 242–243; Henriksen 2006, 87.

*Inventory numbers*: UAS 1385; previously 1056 and vps. Mvs. B. 2 (written in ink on the back).

**2. C. Anthestius Niger**: apart from the unconventional spelling *Anthestius*, in every other respect this is a perfectly normal Roman name of the *tria nomina* type carried by virtually all Roman citizens in the first centuries of the Empire. The odd thing about this man is that he was almost certainly not a Roman citizen. This fact will warrant short digression about the peculiar nomenclature of the sailors of the Roman navy.<sup>105</sup>

Unlike service in the legions, the imperial Roman navy did not require citizenship.<sup>106</sup> By the reign of Augustus the navy consisted largely of non-citizens (*peregrini*), a situation which apparently remained unaltered until the *constitutio Antoniniana* of Caracalla in AD 212 extended Roman citizenship to all free inhabit-

ants of the empire. This means that up to this date, the traditionally Roman *tria nomina* frequently displayed by their inscriptions are not a sign of citizenship in the case of the sailors of the imperial navy.<sup>107</sup>

The earliest datable instance of a sailor with this completely Roman nomenclature is found in a military diploma of AD 129; it has also been brought in connection with Vespasian, but firm evidence to substantiate such an early dating is lacking.<sup>108</sup> It is clear, though, that the decision to let the sailors of the fleets adopt the *tria nomina* is an indication of imperial favour that elevated the fleet above other arms that consisted largely of non-citizens, like the *auxilia*. There are more signs that point in the

<sup>105</sup> On the nomenclature of sailors, see Salomies 1996.

<sup>106</sup> *Civitas* was among the rewards for the 26 years of service awaiting those who enlisted as volunteers (which, without doubt, was the majority of sailors; Starr 1941, 78, assumes that “the papyri and inscriptions present only volunteers for the first two centuries of the Empire ... In any case, the emphasis on long-term service indicates a volunteer basis”).

<sup>107</sup> The *tria nomina* are in themselves actually not a sign of citizenship in any context; see Mócsy 1970.

<sup>108</sup> Vespasian has been regarded as a great benefactor of the fleets; for instance, he is often considered responsible for bestowing the fleets at Misenum and Ravenna with the honorific epithet *praetoria* (e.g. Starr 1941, 185–186; Rankov 2007, 57). However, Kienast 1966, 71–75, makes a strong case for Domitian as the one who conferred these titles (see below).

same direction. Some time before AD 114, the honorific epithet *praetoria* was conferred on the fleets at Misenum and Ravenna. And the sailors stationed in Rome itself were moved out from the barracks of the praetorians and got their own encampment, the *castra Misenatum*, situated between the thermae of Titus and the Basilica San Clemente, that is on the ground covered by Nero's *domus aurea* until this was demolished by Vespasian. The change in naming practice fits well into this general picture of a conscious attempt to make the fleet a counterbalance to the praetorians. If, as seems inescapable, these measures were taken by a Flavian emperor, Kienast is surely right in suggesting Domitian as the likeliest candidate,<sup>109</sup> his relation to the praetorian guard being notoriously tense.

An illustrative example of the way in which this naming practice worked is found in a famous early 2nd century papyrus from Philadelphia in Egypt (*BGU II 423*). This is a letter from one Apion, a young man who had left Egypt to enrol in the Roman navy and who writes home on his arrival assuring his father that all is well; although he had begun by saying Ἀπίων Ἐπιμάχῳ τῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ πλείστα χαίρειν, “Apion to Epimachus his father and lord, many greetings”, he concludes by stating ἔσ[τ]ι [δέ] μου ὄνομα Ἀντωνίος (sic) Μάξιμος, “my name is Antonius Maximus”.<sup>110</sup>

It is another matter how the names adopted by these *peregrini* were chosen. In Spaul's “Index of Marines” is found a number of gentilicia that are unattested elsewhere,<sup>111</sup> e.g., Acuius, Aeternius, Ammonius, Bifonius, Dinnius, Maecenius and Tarcunius; other gentilicia are such that are usually used as cognomina, like Apollonius, Demetrius and Iustus. Alongside these names

there are perfectly normal Roman gentilicia including the imperial gentilicia Aelius, Aurelius, Claudius, Flavius, Iulius and Ulpius. Regardless of gentilicium, though, their bearers are often manifestly *peregrini*; there are Syrians, Dalmatians, Pannonians, Egyptians, Bessi, Phrygians, Alexandrians, Sardinians etc., indicating that the new recruits could get names like Aurelius or Flavius just as well as Aeternius or Bifonius. The principles according to which these names were distributed or chosen are not clear. It would be easy to account for the presence of imperial gentilicia by claiming that these sailors took the name of the reigning emperor (as was the case with veterans in the *auxilia*),<sup>112</sup> but that would not explain why a sailor in the 2nd century AD was called C. Iulius Antullus (*CIL XIV 237*). The Roman name was probably mandatory once this practice had been established, and it would seem that in some cases, at least, the names were simply given to the recruit by the fleet command.<sup>113</sup> On the other hand, it is hard to see that the command would distribute gentilicia like Ammonius, Bifonius or Demetrius among its soldiers. Perhaps, the likeliest explanation for these is that the recruit was allowed at least to express his wishes regarding his soldier's name, in which case he could choose names that in some way reflected his origin; otherwise, he was simply furnished with a standardized Roman name.

The present sailor, a *peregrinus* from Syria, has the gentilicium Anthestius, which oth-

<sup>112</sup> Mócsy 1970, 294.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Kienast 1966, 27; given the example of Apion (and the existence of extremely plain names) it is somewhat difficult to agree with Mócsy (1986, 445) about the choice being entirely up to the soldier. His statement on page 446 (“Auffallend ist die Vermeidung der Kaisergentilizen. Es ist in dieser Hinsicht wohl nicht ohne Belang, daß der einzige Flottensoldat mit einem (allerdings früheren) Kaisergentiliz vier Kinder hatte, die völlich verschiedenen benannt wurden”) may apply to military diplomas but does not reflect the situation as presented by the epitaphs.

<sup>109</sup> Kienast 1966, 71–75.

<sup>110</sup> A good survey of the status and nomenclature of the sailors is found in Starr 1941, 66–74; important remarks are added by Kienast 1966, 26–29.

<sup>111</sup> Spaul 2002, 89–93.

erwise belonged to a plebeian *gens* (usually spelled *Antistius*) that was not particularly large. One of its members, C. Antistius Vetus, is known to have served as Caesar's *quaestor pro praetore* in Syria in 45 BC. Other *Antisti* also held offices in the region; for instance, L. Antistius Rusticus served as legate of the nearby Galatia-Cappadocia in the early 90s AD.<sup>114</sup> It seems unlikely, though, that C. Anthestius Niger had a connection to one of these men; had he been a freedman himself or descended from a freedman, he would not have to serve 26 years in the fleet to gain a citizenship which he already possessed.

While Anthestius Rufus likely got his gentilicium when first enlisting at Misenum, the curious spelling of the name likely originates from his native east. Apart from the classical spelling *Antistius*, there is also an older spelling *Antestius*, but Anthestius is a Latin transliteration of the Greek spelling of the name, Ἀνθέστιος. This is quite common in Greek inscriptions, but utterly rare in Latin; in the whole of Italy, it appears only in one other inscription, *CIL* XI 44, which happens to concern a soldier of the fleet at Ravenna: *D(is) M(anibus) | M. Barbi | Fronton(is) | III(triere) Cast(ore) | n(atione) Delm(atu)s | v(ixit) a(nnis) XLII | m(ilitavit) a(nnos) XXII | M. Anthesti(us) | Rufus | ex ead(em) her(es) | b(ene) m(erenti) p(onendum) c(uravit)*.<sup>115</sup> The fact that both the present and the inscription from Ravenna are connected to the imperial fleet must be coincidental. In the present case, it is a more plausible explanation that the spelling of the name is connected to the ethnicity of its bearer; being a foreigner

from the eastern part of the empire, he may well have brought the spelling with him when migrating to Italy (provided that it is his own and not the dedicator's—even though he may also be an Easterner).

*Niger*, on the other hand, is a completely Latin cognomen, found in 279 inscriptions, 273 of which refer to men.<sup>116</sup> Names that refer to colours have been assumed to relate to a person's physical appearance, particularly the colour of his or her hair.<sup>117</sup> Very probably, at Misenum Anthestius Niger was considered as having an unusually dark complexion.<sup>118</sup>

**3. ex III Capricorno:** sc. *ex triremi* (or *triere*) *Capricorno*. The numeral *III*, which has a horizontal stroke above it on the stone to distinguish it from the number *tres* etc., is the standard designation in epitaphs for the trireme. This is the warship most frequently used in the Roman fleet, with a size about 34 × 5.6 m and manned by a complement of some 250 men, and capable of taking as many legionaries.<sup>119</sup>

Spaul lists 49 triremes stationed at the Misenum base and 14 at Ravenna.<sup>120</sup> *Capricorno* is found in his catalogue of the Misene fleet as being recorded in the epitaphs of two of its *milites*, viz. *CIL* VI 3095 *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) | L. Annio Severo | mil(iti) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Misene(n)sis | ex Capricorno triere | fecit Corinthias lib(erta) | patrono bene merenti and X 3597 (from Misenum) D(is) M(anibus) | T. Laelio Crispo | milit(i) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Misene(n)sis | III Libertat(e) nat(ione) Bithynus | vix(it) ann(is) XL mil(itavit) ann(is) XVI | L. Sossius Dionysius III Capr(icorno) | heres b(ene)*

<sup>114</sup> The article *Antistius* in *RE* I.2 (1894), 2545–2560 (by Klebs, von Rhoden *et al.*), lists 62 members of the *gens*, where C. Antistius Vetus is no. 47. L. Antistius Rusticus' career appears from an inscription from Antiochia Pisidiae (*AE* 1925, 126; see the discussion in Stout 1926).

<sup>115</sup> The other instances all come from Greek territory, four from Dion in Macedonia (*SEG* 34.630–632, *RI-CIS* 1.113/207) and one from Cilicia (*AE* 1963, 2).

<sup>116</sup> Kajanto 1965, 228; 253 of these appear to be freeborn.

<sup>117</sup> Kajanto 1965, 64.

<sup>118</sup> On Syrians in the Roman world as a whole, see Solin 1983 (Syrians in Campania, 732; Anthestius Niger is mentioned on 672).

<sup>119</sup> Viereck 1975, 38.

<sup>120</sup> Spaul 2002, 75–79 and 81–82 respectively.

*m(erenti)*. Not only has Spaul missed the present inscription; *Capricornus* also appears in an epitaph from Arretium (Arezzo) in Etruria, *CIL* XI 1840: *D(is) M(anibus) | M. Aegnati- us Di|ogenes ex III Ca|pricorn(o) natio[ne] | Alexand(ri)ae vixit | annis XXI mi|litavit an- nis III | heres Camuli|us Claudia|nus ben(e) m(erenti)*. Consequently, we know of four members of the trireme *Capricornus*, L. An- nius Severus, C. Anthestius Niger, L. Sossius Dionysius and M. Aegnatus Diogenes, all pre- sumably *militēs*. For unspecified reasons, Spaul dates *CIL* X 3597 to the 2nd century AD and VI 3095 to the 3rd. If this is correct, then the present inscription and *CIL* XI 1840 must be placed within the same timespan (most prob- ably in the 2nd century, see below on *Augusto*).

4. **natio(ne) Surus**: the members of the Ro- man fleets, as did Roman soldiers in general, frequently recorded their nationalities in their epitaphs in much the same manner as their ori- gin was stated in the military diplomas which they received upon discharge. This statement of place of origin (for the sailors, a province is usually given) has no bearing on the question whether or not a soldier was a Roman citizen, because it is found in the epitaphs of those who died before receiving discharge and *civitas* (like Anthestius) just as well as in the epitaphs of those who died as *veterani* (and thus were full *cives*).<sup>121</sup> Moreover, the existence of these statements in the epitaphs—which, of course, were not in any way legal documents and did not strictly require this information—indicates that the nationality was included for personal reasons.<sup>122</sup>

<sup>121</sup> *Veterani* from the fleet at Misenum are found, e.g., in *CIL* X 3376.2–5 C. *Velonius Macer veteranus | ex class(e) praet(oria) Misen(ense) | militavit ann(is) XXVI vixit | annis LXI natione Bessus, 3516.2–5 C. Anni Draconis | veteran(i) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) | nation(e) Aegypt(i) | vixit ann(is) LX, 3673.2–4 C. Din- nio Valenti veter(ano) | class(is) pr(aetoriae) Mi(senensis) natione | Bessus.*

<sup>122</sup> “The true reason for mentioning the soldiers (is

The praetorian fleet at Misenum recruited more than half of its members from the Hel- lenized East, among which Egyptians and the Bessi (somewhat surprisingly, since they were a Thracian people of horsemen) constituted the largest groups.<sup>123</sup> Spaul (2002), who lists these men according to nationality on pages 67–73, counts 14 Syrians, which—again—does not include Anthestius and which in any case are too few. There are actually twelve Syrians in the Misenian fleet alone, while another five are attested in the fleet at Ravenna and two as be- longing to an unidentified fleet.<sup>124</sup>

---

there a possessive apostrophe in this quotation that has been missed out here, or was it never there – in which case a [*sic*] might be useful?) homes seems to be that a man is defined by his home.” (Speidel 1986, 474).

<sup>123</sup> Starr 1941, 77.

<sup>124</sup> Fleet at Misenum (apart from Anthestius Ni- ger): *CIL* VI 3138 *Valerio Maximo mil(iti) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Misen(ensis) III Rheno nat(ione) Syro, CIL* X 3414 (Misenum) *L. Iuli Valentis dupl(icarii) caementari(i) ex clas(se) pr(aetoria) Misen(en)s(i) natione Syri, 3652 (Misenum) M. Valeri Marcini III Venere nat(ione) Syr(us), 3407 (Misenum) M. Valerio Antonino armor(um) III Rheno nat(ione) Syrus, 3427 (Misenum) T. Iul(i) Proculi fabri principa[l(is)] III Concordia na[t(ione)] Sur(us), 3450 (Misenum) G. (sic) Iul[ium] Marinum nauphylace(m) III Augusto n[at(ione)] Syro, 3494 (Misenum) C. Publius Marinus mil(es) clas(sis) pr(aetoriae) Misen(ensis) sec(utor) tr(ierarchi) n(atione) Syr(us), 3546 (Misenum) P. Babbio Maturo milit(i) ex classe praet(oria) Miseniense III Fide Syro nation(e) Arabo, 3626 (Misenum) L. Sentius Zeno manip(ularis) III Minerva nat(ione) Surus, AE 1953, 26 (= 1955, 194) (Rome) C. Iulius Dionysius miles [classis] pr(aetoriae) Misenatium natione Surus, AE 1974, 248 (Puteoli) P. Aelius Lucius miles cl(assis) pr(a)et(oriae) Misenensium natione Surus.*

Fleet at Ravenna: *CIL* VI 3151 *M. Aur(eli) Romani mil(itis) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Rav(enmatis) III(treiere) Aug(usta) n(atione) Surus, 32774 T. Fla(vio) Candido militi clas(sis) pr(aetoriae) Raben(natis) III Hercu- lis natione Sirus, CIL* XI 36 (Ravenna) *M. Aur(elio) Protati m(iliti) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Antoninian(ae) Rav(enmatis) III(triere) Min(erva) n(atione) Syr(us), 43 (Classis) L. Baebio Silvan(o) vet(erano) ex naup(hylace) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Rav(enmatis) n(atione) Syr(us), 352 (Caesena) T. Gaius Eminens vet(eranus) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) R(avennatis) n(atione) Syr(us) (married to one *Cassia Martina natione Syra*).*



4–5. *vixit an(nis) XXX, mil(itavit) an(nis) XII*: Anthestius enrolled at the age of 18, which was at the younger end of the scale; Starr observes that the fresh recruits were usually between 18 and 23, with no-one being younger than 17 and the oldest 25.<sup>125</sup> When he died, he had nearly served half his time in the fleet (cf. above on line 1).

It was noted by Harry Armini that among the epitaphs that record the age of the deceased, the majority give the number of years only (see discussion on 2.3–4). It is an interesting observation that this is even more common in soldiers' epitaphs, of which a full 84% only have the number of years. Armini thinks that this is due primarily to a wish to keep the inscriptions short. But he adds also a second explanation: since many soldiers were non-Italians who died far away from their native provinces, the ones who buried them—friends, brothers in arms or spouses—may not have known their age with any greater exactness. In fact, the same tendency (and probably for the same reason) is apparent in the epitaphs of *peregrini*, where 88% have the age only.<sup>126</sup>

6. *L. Lucceius Aquilas*: the principles outlined on line 2 above apply to Lucceius' name as well. Like Anthestius, this man has a gentilicium that is completely Roman, relatively distinguished without being imperial and belonging to a *gens* that was not too large; the *Luccei*

---

Fleet not stated: *CIL VI 3114 Iuli(us) Apollinaris IIII Mercurio nat(ione) Surus* and probably *VIII 21017 (Caesarea, Mauretania Caesariensis) Antonio Avito militi ex n(atione) Surorum* (dedicated by his brother *Antonius Karus duplicarius classis*).

It may be noted that the same manner of stating nationality is sometimes used for women married or otherwise connected to soldiers; instances of Syrians are *CIL X 3467 (Misenum) Luciae natione Syrae* (set up by *Hammonius Aristo optio*) and *X 3540 (Misenum) Aureliae Tyche ... nat(ione) Syra* (sic), freedwoman of *M. Aurelius Fuscus man(ipularis) III Cerer(e)*, who himself was from Dalmatia.

<sup>125</sup> Starr 1941, 78 and 100, n. 44.

<sup>126</sup> Armini 1916, 9–10.

are recorded in some 90 inscriptions in *CIL VI* (more sporadically in volumes covering other areas, though generally more frequently in the Italian mainland than abroad).

*Aquilas* is the Latin name *Aquila* with the Greek suffix *-ας* and thus a kind of parallel to Lucceius' deceased comrade's Graecizing spelling of his gentilicium. Such use of *-ας* occasionally occurs also in other purely Latin names (*Agrippas, Barbas, Capras* etc.), but the present is the only epigraphic instance of *Aquilas* quoted by Kajanto.<sup>127</sup> There may, of course, have been more, but as the genitive and dative—forms just as or even more common than the nominative in the epitaphs—would not have been affected by the Greek suffix, it cannot be determined whether an *Aquila* or (admittedly less likely) an *Aquilas* in the nominative.

Likewise, it is impossible to determine the nature of Anthestius' relation to Lucceius. There was certainly a bond between officers of the same class serving at different ships and one *nauphylax* could well make another *nauphylax* his heir,<sup>128</sup> but Anthestius and Lucceius were probably rather common soldiers. Other connections must have existed, not least between soldiers of the same nationality, but in the present case, Lucceius—if he is responsible for the text—simply provides too little information. However, the Greek spelling of one name in each case does argue for an ethnic connection in this case.

7. *ex III Aug(usto)*: Spaul lists a trireme called *Augustus* in Misenum in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD,<sup>129</sup> but as he has missed this inscription, he does not mention Lucceius as part of its crew. If his datings of the triremes are correct, though, this inscription should date from the 2nd century AD.

---

<sup>127</sup> Kajanto 1965, 330; see also 130.

<sup>128</sup> See Starr 1941, 84.

<sup>129</sup> Spaul 2002, 75.

## II. UAS 1387 (CIL VI 19928)

D(is) M(anibus). | Iulio Diado|cho Alexan(drino), | qui vix(it) an(nis) <sup>^</sup>XXIII. | <sup>5</sup>Iulius Marinus | filio  
dulcissi|mo (*vac.* 2) f(aciendum) c(uravit).

To the divine Manes. To Iulius Diadochus of Alexandria, who lived for 23 years. Iulius Marinus had (this) made for his most beloved son.

*Findplace:* Campania or Rome?

*Physical description:* unadorned tablet of (Luna?) marble, guidelines visible throughout at top and bottom of lines, upper edge intact and rounded, other edges chipped but essentially intact. Surface smooth and polished, very slight incrustation. The back is also smooth and polished with slight incrustation; on the upper left quarter, there is a hole for fastening the inscription.

*Dimensions:* 24.5–25.6 × 21.2–25.7 × 1.8–2.1 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 3.5, w. 12.6, line 2: h. 2.5–2.9, w. 22.2, line 3: h. 2.5–2.9, w. 19.7, line 4: h. 2.8–3.0, w. 22.2, line 5: h. 2.5–2.7, w. 23.1, line 6: h. 2.3–3.2, w. 22.5, line 7: h. 2.1–2.8, w. 14.7 cm.

*Arrangement:* line 1 centred; lines 2–7 even left margin; the space between MO and F in line 7 gives F C a detached, centred impression.

*Lettering:* rather crude freehand capitals with serifs though practically lacking shading. A is sometimes cut with horizontal, sometimes without. The horizontal of H in line 3 is wider than the verticals of the latter, which is also the case in the second A in ALEXAN. V is sometimes markedly rounded at the bottom, particularly so in line 2. The sequence ANX in line 4 has been cut very closely together, and there is a horizontal stroke above it that extends halfway into the x. The F of FILIO in line 6 has a long slender stroke from the bottom of the stem slanting diagonally leftwards.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* in line 4 the two x of the numeral are in nexus, sharing the diagonal that slants downward to the right. This is a common way of joining rows of the number x, see Di Stefano Manzella 1987, 150.

*Interpuncts:* interpuncts in the shape of commas at the end of line 3 and in line 4 QVI VIX, in the shape of a hole / dot (careless comma?) in line 4 VIX AN. Between F and C in line 7 there is a larger interpunct with the basic shape of a comma, but the dot has been cut as a circle so that it somewhat resembles a leaf.

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 25 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 19928 (transcribed by Häggström, checked by Henzen against a squeeze); Thomasson 144.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1387; previously 1058 and vps. mvs. B. 4 (written in ink on the back).

2–3. **Iulio Diadocho Alexan(drino)**: the old and distinguished Julian name, the mark of membership in the *gens Iulia*, spread significantly after the reign of the Julian emperors Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, as is always the case with emperors' gentilicia. The freedmen of the imperial household, who were naturally many more than those of a private one, got the name on their manumission and handed it over to their sons and daughters, who passed it on in their turn; in the 2nd century AD, it indicates nothing more than possible descent from an imperial freedman a hundred years earlier.

More interesting are the following elements *Diadocho* and the abbreviated *Alexan*. The first is a regular cognomen, a Latin transcription of the Greek adjective διάδοχος, meaning someone “succeeding a person in a thing”. It is seldom used as a name in Greek (only five instances in the *LGPN*), and the instances in Latin sources are also few: I know of eight from the city of Rome and six elsewhere.<sup>130</sup>

As this inscription, like no. 10, arguably belongs to the context of the naval base at Misenum, the relative rarity of the name makes it quite likely that Iulius the son was given *Diadochus* as a cognomen when enlisting, and that the name very fittingly described him; with his father already serving in the navy, Iulius the younger quite obviously was his διάδοχος, his “successor”. There are a couple of other inscriptions in which the son of a marine has enrolled as a marine himself,<sup>131</sup> so *CIL X 3376* (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | C. Velonius Macer |*

<sup>130</sup> Rome: *CIL VI* 8146, 14997, 23885, 32429, 37928, *ICUR IX* 23886, 24646 and *LILKelsey* 366; elsewhere: *CIL II* 4270 (Tarraco), III 9120 (Salona), XII 1917 (Vienna), *ILAlg II* 1.3410 (Douar Guettara), *InscrIt IV* 1.316 (Tibur) and *AE* 1999, 530 (Aeae).

<sup>131</sup> As noted by Starr 1941, 105, n. 115, who observes that “The sons born and grown to maturity before the father’s discharge sometimes entered the fleet; more generally the second generation, improved in status, served, if at all, in the legions or the praetorian guard.” (95).

*(centurio) vetera|nus ex class(e) praet(oria) Misen(ensi) | militavit ann(is) XXVI | vixit | annis LXI natione Bessus | C. Velonius Macer miles ex eadem | classe et Valeria Velonia fili | patri pi-issimo fecerunt*, probably also 3592 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | ex III Cerere M. Iulius | Valens vixit ann(is) XXIII | militavit anni(s) II | M. Antonius Valens | filio b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)*. From Ravenna (Classis), there is *CIL XI 77 M. Marcio Sempronio | Ptoleleo except(ori) | dupl(icario) VVic(toria) | M. Marcius Menelaus | veteranus ex scrib(a) filio | dulcissim(o) et sibi | posuit*.<sup>132</sup>

The abbreviation *Alexan* should be dissolved as the ethnic *Alexan(drino)*.<sup>133</sup> Similar is *CIL X 7535 D(is) M(anibus) | C. Iulio Aponiano | Alexandr(ino) vixit | an(nis) XXXXVIII in is | mil(itavit) in cl(asse) pr(aetoria) Mis(enensi) an(nis) XXIX | Zosime uxor b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)*.<sup>134</sup>

<sup>132</sup> *Ptolemeus* may be a kind of ethnic rather than a second cognomen. There were Egyptians in the fleet at Ravenna too, though not as many as in Misenum (Starr 1941, 75).

<sup>133</sup> In his *CIL* edition, Henzen refrains from dissolving it at all, while Thomasson prints *Alexan(dro)*. The latter means that Alexander must be a second cognomen of Iulius Diadochus, a phenomenon that is not too common before Christian times; it is much more plausible that it should retain its full meaning “of Alexandria”. See Kajanto 1965, 16: “In the Imperial period, however, after the cognomen had become an established part of a full Roman name, an ethnic which follows a gentilicium should be considered a regular cognomen. But difficulties arise in the cases in which an ethnic follows a cognomen. Because double cognomina were not unknown in pagan nomenclature, though they became more frequent in later times (see *Onom. Stud.* 24 ff.), it is possible that the second name was a cognomen and not an ethnic. In most cases, however, the decision is made in favour of the second alternative, cf. *Aemilius Cantabrinus Sexsitanus II* 5495, *Flavinus Flavii Clovii f. Salditanus VIII* 21112, *M. Um. Nerullinus L. f. Chulitanus VIII* 6202, etc.”

<sup>134</sup> The full ethnic is spelled out in the epitaphs of two marines of the Misenian fleet, C. Antestius Longus (*CIL VI* 3096.4–5 *nat(ione) Alexandrinus*) and P. Artorius Pastor (*CIL XI* 3524.3–4 *n(atione) Alexandrinus*). For reasons that are not given, Mommsen dis-

5. **Marinus:** the cognomen of the father (and dedicator) is found 255 times in *CIL*, of which 192 are men including six slaves/freedmen, 63 women including two slaves/freedwomen; it is thus a name that would have had a “freeborn” ring to it. Kajanto considers it a cognomen denoting geographical origin (“of the sea”),<sup>135</sup> but this seems to be an unnecessary assumption; it may rather suggest someone connected to the sea in any way, for instance a sailor. There are at least four sailors of the Misenian fleet who chose (or were given) the cognomen *Marinus* on enlisting (cf. discussion on 10.2).<sup>136</sup> These instances are naturally too few to claim that the name was particularly popular with marines; but they do show that it was considered a proper name to choose and that in these cases, it more probably indicated “connection to” rather than “origin from”.

6–7. **dulcissimo:** this epithet is the third commonest among the “terms of endearment” in the epitaphs studied by Harrod, occurring 1,634 times in *CIL* VI. In 1,568 of these, it is used together with a noun indicating relationship between deceased and dedicator, 1,040

being children (including stepchildren and fosterchildren) of the dedicator.<sup>137</sup> It seems, then, that *dulcissimus* is the foremost epithet used by parents of deceased children, a tendency which is essentially confirmed by more recent studies. Hanne Sigismund Nielsen finds that *carissimus* and *dulcissimus* each have 12% of the total number of epithets in her material and that in the case of *dulcissimus*, 73.5% of the instances referred to sons and daughters, most below five years of age.<sup>138</sup> In a study by Margaret King of the epitaphs of infants, *dulcissimus* comes out as distinctively the commonest epithet of children below the age of four, accounting for 292 of 634 instances of epithets occurring in her material (46.1%).<sup>139</sup> Harrod, who based his study on the largest number of inscriptions, found that the average age of a *filius dulcissimus* is nine years and that only 62 of the 602 *fili* were over 17 years of age.<sup>140</sup> It seems, though, that there was really no limit to how old a son could be called *dulcissimus*; in *CIL* VI, there are men who died towards their forties and were still called *filius dulcissimus* in their epitaphs.<sup>141</sup> Parents are always inclined to refer to their children as *dulcissimi* regardless of their age. The fact that with rising age, there are steadily fewer *fili dulcissimi* commemorated in the epitaphs is easily explained when considering that fewer

---

solves the abbreviation *Alexandr.* in *CIL* X 7535.3 as *Alexandr(ea)* in his *CIL* edition.

<sup>135</sup> Kajanto 1965, 81 and 308.

<sup>136</sup> *CIL* VI 3699 (= 30946) *Iovi Dolichen[o] | C. Iulius Marinus | miles classis | praet(oriae) Misenensis | IIII Kal(endas) I[ - - ]*, *CIL* X 3456 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | Ti. Cl(audius) Marinus | nonagen(arius) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) | et Aelia Nicolais | coniux eius sibi | libertis | liberta|busq(ue) posterisq(ue) eor(um) | fecerunt*, X 3494 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | C. Publius Mari|nus mil(es) clas(sis) pr(aetoriae) | Mis(ensis) sec(utor) tr(ierarchi) | n(atione) Syr(us) stip(endiorum) IIII | v(ixit) ann(os) XX paren|tes b(ene) m(erenti) fecerunt*, X 3546 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | P. Babbio Maturo milit(i) | ex classe praet(oria) Misenense | IIII Fide Syro nation(e) Ana|bo milit(avit) annis IIII Ulpus | Marinus III Cerere et Claudi|us Marinus III Danuvio hered(es)*. There is also a wife of a sailor called Marina: *CIL* X 3414 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | L. Iuli Valentis dupl(icarii) | caementari(i) ex clas(se) pr(aetoria) | Misen(en)s(i) natione Syri | vixit an(nos) XL mil(itavit) an(nos) XXXI | Flavia Marina uxor | viro bene merenti*.

<sup>137</sup> Harrod 1909, 6–10, 48–49.

<sup>138</sup> Sigismund Nielsen 1997. Her study is based on “every fifth readable epitaph from *CIL* 6, excluding all *additamenta*” (p. 170).

<sup>139</sup> King 2000. King’s material is “approximately 39,000 inscriptions from the City of Rome published in volume six of *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*” (118–119).

<sup>140</sup> Harrod 1909, 9–10.

<sup>141</sup> 39 years: *CIL* VI 13224.1–6 *M. Aurelio | Secundo | filio dulcissimo qui vixit an|nis XXXVIII diebus | XLVIII* (probably Christian); 36 years: *CIL* VI 15823.1–5 *Clodia Libera | Clodio Marco | Ambrosio filio | dulcissimo qui | vix(it) ann(is) XXXVI*; 35 years: *CIL* VI 35159.2–6 *Aepigenes et Euhodia fecerunt | Niciati filio | dulcissimo be|nemerenti vix(it) | annis XXXV m[ - - ]*.

and fewer parents are likely to be alive to commemorate them. In this respect, then, Iulius Diadochus is not remarkable.

7. **f(aciendum) c(uravit)**: this formula is not infrequently used in the epitaphs instead of *fecit*. However, it has the peculiar tendency to occur in epitaphs that concern soldiers or veterans. Of 174 inscriptions in *CIL* VI that contain both the abbreviation *D. M.* and the formula *faciendum curavit* either written out

in full or abbreviated as *fac. cur.* or (most commonly) as *f. c.*, 94 (54%) mention soldiers from various branches; there may be more soldiers in the remaining 80 epitaphs, though they do not explicitly say so. This percentage is too high not to be taken as an indication that *faciendum curavit* was considered more at home, for some reason, in the epitaphs of soldiers than of civilians; did it, perhaps, have a more “official” ring to it than the usual *fecit*?

## 12. UAS 1393 (*CIL* X 1966)

D(is)M(anibus)|AeliAelinin(atione)Kap(padocis)|vix(it)ann(is)XXXII.|DeciusMenofi|<sup>3</sup>luseres  
be(ne) | m(erenti)f(ecit).

To the blessed memory of Aelius Aelinus, Cappadocian with regard to his nationality; he lived for 32 years. Decius Menofilus, his heir, made this for the well-deserving.

*Findplace*: Cumae (according to Miniéri Riccio).

*Physical description*: marble tablet without ornamentation; no traces of guidelines. Edges rough but probably not broken; clear traces of vertical chisel marks along right edge.

*Dimensions*: 17.4–17.8 × 21.7–25.9 × 2.4–3.1 cm.

*Height and length of lines*: line 1: h. 2.1, w. 14.6, line 2: h. 2.0, w. 21.0, line 3: h. 2.0, w. 17.0, line 4: h. 2.0–2.1, w. 19.7, line 5: h. 1.9–2.1, w. 19.4, line 6: h. 1.8–2.0, w. 8.7 cm. Distance between the two letters in line 1 10.2, in line 6 5.2 cm.

*Arrangement*: lines 1 and 6 centred, lines 2–5 even left margin.

*Lettering*: freehand capitals with some bookhand features, such as the straight lengthening of the right diagonals of M above the letter. The use of serifs is occasional and varies between instances of the same letter; in general, serifs extend only to the left (i.e. are not centred on the stem). Hardly any shading.

*I longa, apex, ligatures*: –

*Interpuncts*: there are interpuncts between all words except in lines 1, 4 and 6; the shape is basically triangular, though some rather resembles dots or strokes, whether from damage or carelessness in cutting.

*Date*: 3rd century AD.

*Transcription*: CH, 18 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL X 1966 (Mommsen); CIL VI 10636 (Henzen); Thomasson 147; Minieri Riccio 1846, 32.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1393; previously 1064 and vps. MVS. B. 8 (written in ink on the back).

2. **Aeli Aelini:** the genitive attaches the name of the deceased syntactically to the preceding *D(is) M(anibus)*, with the effect that this alludes to the individual soul of the deceased.<sup>142</sup> This variant is the least common in the epitaphs, in which the dative dominates completely, followed (at rather a large interval) by the nominative, both cases syntactically detached from the dedication to the *Manes*. The genitive, which has actually been suggested to have been original alongside the nominative, is decidedly the least common, although there are no exact figures for the Roman epitaphs as a whole.<sup>143</sup>

The gens *Aelia* is an old plebeian family which became politically influential at an early date and reached its peak with the emperor Hadrian, who was born P. Aelius Hadrianus. As all imperial gentilicia, it became very widespread after his reign, which is why it is safe to assume AD 117–138 as a *terminus post quem* for the inscription. The lack of a praenomen, both here and for Menofilus below, also point to a date in the 2nd century at the earliest, probably later still. In funerary inscriptions—where, after all, the name of the deceased is essential—the praenomen is sporadically left out by the early 2nd century, but this does not become common practice until about AD 200;<sup>144</sup>

a dating to the 3rd century is quite congruent with the overall physical appearance of the inscription; cf. below on *Menofilus*.

The cognomen has been read as *Aelini* by Minieri Riccio and by Häggström. Thomasson read *Aeliani* and comments “*Aeliani* with ligature of *AN*, although the horizontal stroke in the *N* is barely visible”. Having checked the stone very carefully for such a horizontal, I can only confirm that there is none. The horizontal lines of the other *A*:s in this inscription are clearly visible; the surface is somewhat rough between the first two strokes of the *N*, but there seems to be no horizontal.

Palaeographical arguments aside, the suffixes *-anus* and *-inus* are both well attested in cognomina formed on gentilicia, though the former was the more productive. Nevertheless, there is more than one instance in which a person has a cognomen in *-inus* that has been formed on his or her gentilicium; Kajanto mentions *Aelia Elina* (= *Aelina*), *Allius Allinus*, *L. Atticius Atticinus*, *Calpurnina* (daughter of one *Calpurnius*) and *L. Clodius Clodinus*.<sup>145</sup> Salomies notes that the *-inus* suffix “seems to be more common (viz. than *-anus*) in cognomina derived from one’s own nomen”,<sup>146</sup> which is relevant to this inscription; repeating our *Aelius Aelinus* from *CIL*, he adds *Antonius Antoninus*, *Catullius Catullinus*, *Marius Marinus*, *Modestius Modestinus*, *Rufius Rufinus*, *Secundius Secundinus*, (*Valerius*) *Valerinus*, *Flavia Flavina*, *Maria Marina* and *Septimia Septimina*.

<sup>142</sup> It is worth noting that also in a case like the present, the plural *Manes* is always used. Indeed, there is no singular, and it is characteristic of the vague concept of the *Manes* that the word, which mostly refers to the souls of the dead as a collective mass in which no individual is discernible, may also allude to an individual soul; see further Lattimore 1942, 90–95.

<sup>143</sup> See conveniently Pietri 1983, 523 with further references.

<sup>144</sup> See Salomies 1987, 399–401.

<sup>145</sup> Kajanto 1965, 36.

<sup>146</sup> Salomies 2008, 88, n. 80.



*Aelinus*, naturally, is a much rarer name than *Aelianus*, being recorded only twice (of which the present instance is one, *CIL* II 6253.1a = *ILCV* 4696 Aelia Elina the other), whereas *Aelianus* occurs 195 times.<sup>147</sup> One or two instances may be added to *Aelinus*, viz. *CIL* VIII 26158.4–5 *C. Mago|nius Ho|noratus | Aelinnus* and perhaps *CIL* XIV 2336.9, which has *Casperiae Aeline*; there are several other persons in the same inscription called both *Aelianus* and *Aeliane*, and *Aeline* is perhaps simply a stonemason's error.

Still, there is sufficient evidence that *Aelius Aelinus* is an entirely possible formation. The cognomen is very rare but it does occur, and the present must be accepted as one of *Aelinus*' few attested occurrences.

**n(atione) Kap(padocis):** Henzen (*CIL* VI) suggests that the adjective used is *Cappadox* (rather than *Cappadocius*, *Cappadocus* or *Cappadocicus*), which seems plausible with reference to the three inscriptions in which the declension can be determined, viz. *CIL* III 10540.3 *natione Capadox*, VI 3092.5 *nat(ione) Cappadox* (see below) and VI 37552.5 *n(atione) Cappadoces*; the Graecizing spelling *Kap-* occurs occasionally also in Latin inscriptions.

The statement of *Aelius*' nationality is crucial here. The only (and at any rate extremely few) Cappadocians who are recorded epigraphically with any kind of attachment to Campania are connected to the praetorian fleet based at Misenum, next to Cumae. It is a matter of three inscriptions, viz.:

*CIL* VI 3092 (Rome) *D(is) M(anibus) | Afranius | Zoilus | mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) | nat(ione) Cappadox | vix(it) ann(is) XXX | mil(itavit) ann(is) XIII | b(eres) f(aciendum) c(uravit).*

<sup>147</sup> Kajanto 1965, 35–36.

*CIL* VI 3140 (Rome) *D(is) [M(anibus)] | [Va]l(er)ius Neo[ - - - ] | cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) | [Mi]nerva n(atione) C(appadox) | [ - - - ]XXXII mil(itavit) a[nnis - - - ] | b(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit).*

*CIL* X 3571 (Misenum) *D(is) M(anibus) | Cyrilla nat(ione) Cappa(dox) | q(uae) vix(it) annis XXX | Valerius Vitalio | mil(es) cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) Mis(enensis) | coiugidulc(issimae) | b(ene) m(erenti) s(uae) or s(ibi).*

The Anatolian peninsula was one of the areas from which the fleet at Misenum recruited its sailors; counting *Cyrilla* (admittedly a sailor's wife), three Cappadocian sailors are recorded, 13 from Cilicia, three from Phrygia and Pontus respectively, six from Bithynia, one from Lycia and two from Isauria and Pamphylia.<sup>148</sup>

It may be argued, of course, that a Cappadocian may have died and been buried in Cumae without necessarily being a sailor in the imperial fleet, but what does prove *Aelius* as such is the concluding phrase *heres be(ne) m(erenti) f(ecit)* which is found almost exclusively in military epitaphs; see below.

In the Misenian fleet, eight other *Aelii* are recorded; only one of these, a Syrian, gives his nationality.<sup>149</sup>

**4–5. Decius Menofilus:** like in the case of *Aelius*, *Decius Menofilus*' praenomen is not stated in the inscription. His nomen gentile is that of the old and distinguished, originally plebeian *gens Decia*, but—as he probably was a sailor (see below)—this would have been a name acquired not by birth but chosen by or given to him when enlisting; see discussion on 10.2. His cognomen, a transliteration of the Greek Μηνόφιλος, literally “friend of Men” (i.e. of Μήν, the Moon-god), is usually spelled *Menophilus* in Latin. The habit of reproducing

<sup>148</sup> Spaul 2002, 69–70; see also the discussion on 10.4.

<sup>149</sup> Spaul 2002, 89.

the Greek aspirated  $\phi$  not by its Latin equivalent *ph* but by *f* (which is not the same sound) can be observed during the 1st century AD, e.g. in Pompeii, but does not become common until the 3rd and 4th centuries,<sup>150</sup> which fits well with the dating of this inscription (cf. above). The name indicates an eastern extraction, is well attested in Greek sources (523 instances in the *LGP*) and still rather frequent as a slave's name and as a cognomen in the Latin west; it occurs in about 51 inscriptions in *CIL* VI and in about as many in other publications.<sup>151</sup>

5–6. *heres be(ne) | m(erenti) f(ecit)*: this abbreviated formula is the strongest indication that Aelius Aelinus was a sailor on the fleet at Misenum, because there is a very clear tendency for it to occur particularly in inscriptions concerning soldiers. For instance, in *CIL* VI, there are 88 inscriptions that contain the formula *heres bene merenti fecit* written out in full or, more commonly, abbreviated as *heres* or the plural *hered(es) b. m. f.*, as *her. b. m. f.* or simply as *b. b. m. f.* Only five of these do not have an obvious military connection (which is not to say that there is none).<sup>152</sup> In the same material, there are 31 inscriptions that concern *militēs* from the Misenian fleet abbreviated with the standard abbreviation *cl(assis) pr(aetoria) Mis(enensis)*; 20 of these contain one of the abbreviations *b. b. m. f.*, *heres b. m. f.*, *heres b. m.*, *b. b. m.* or the closely related *h(eres) f(aciendum) c(uravit)*. Among the same 31 inscriptions, 19 give the nationality of the sailor abbreviated as *n.* or *nat.* The extremely high frequency of references to the *heres* in the epitaphs of soldiers (many of

whom are also attested as *peregrini*) may perhaps be explained with their being stationed a long way from their native lands. At home, a man's relatives would normally take care of the funeral; in a military camp in a faraway land, this may have become the task of the one of his comrades in arms who had been appointed his *heres*.

Although this short text lacks a direct reference to the *classis praetoria Misenensis*, it contains two features—the statement of the nationality of the deceased and the dedication by a *heres*—that are recurring in inscriptions concerning sailors from Misenum. To this may be added that it was found in Cumae very close to Misenum; the assumption that Aelius Aelinus was a *miles* in the praetorian fleet stationed there does not seem very far-fetched.<sup>153</sup> Roman sailors usually nominated their fellow soldiers as heirs,<sup>154</sup> in which case Decius Menofilus was very likely Aelius' brother in arms.

<sup>150</sup> Leumann 1977, 162.

<sup>151</sup> Among the occurrences in *CIL* VI, which include also the feminine form *Menophila*, 49 are spelled with *ph*, only two with *an*.

<sup>152</sup> The five inscriptions in question are *CIL* VI 11016, 11164, 13336, 15277, and 32803.

<sup>153</sup> There is at least one other inscription found at Cumae that concerns the fleet station at Misenum, viz. *AE* 1990, 145 [ - - - ] *cl(assis) pr(aetoriae) | [Mis(enensis) mil(itavit) ann(os)] III vix(it) | [ - - - ] h(eres) b(ene) m(erenti) f(ecit)*. In *CIL* X, there are at least 55 inscriptions from Misenum itself concerning soldiers in the *classis praetoria* that have both a designation of nationality (*n* or *nat*) and a statement saying that the *heres* took care of the burial: *CIL* X 3370, 3377, 3383, 3389, 3400a, 3402, 3403, 3407, 3423, 3427, 3445, 3450, 3454, 3464a, 3469, 3475, 3481, 3486, 3489, 3490, 3504, 3514, 3516, 3520, 3527, 3535, 3540, 3562, 3564, 3566, 3567, 3568, 3579, 3580, 3581, 3588, 3589, 3590, 3597, 3598, 3603, 3607, 3625, 3636, 3642, 3643, 3645, 3648, 3650, 3651, 3652, 3657, 3662, 3667, and 3668.

<sup>154</sup> Starr 1941, 83. One other soldier with the gentilicium *Decius* is recorded in the fleet at Misenum, a Decius (sic) Gemellus (*AE* 1913, 236 = 1954, 270; Spaul 2002, 90), unless this is actually another gentilicium; see Solin & Salomies 1988, 67.

## 13.VM 194

D(is) M(anibus). | Aurelius Heracl[ides (?)] | Antonio Heraclidi [ - - - ] | posui, qui vixit annum [ - - - ].

To the divine Manes. I, Aurelius Heracl[ides (?)], set up (this monument) for Antonius Heraclides [ - - - ], who lived a year [ - - - ].

*Findplace:* Nicopolis (Alexandria), Egypt (?).

*Physical description:* fragment of marble *stele*. Broken at top and right edge. Above the inscribed surface is a relief, in which can be seen the right foot of a standing figure and to the left of it a base, probably of a sacrificial altar. The surface is smooth and polished, with a little incrustation to the left. Guidelines along the top and bottom of the lines of writing are visible throughout. The back is smooth.

*Dimensions:* 9.4–18.5 × 23.3–26.3 × 2.7–9 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.5, w. 11.3, line 2: h. 1.4–1.5, w. 17.5, line 3: h. 1.1–1.4, w. 17.3, line 4: h. 1.4–1.8, w. 18.4 cm. Height of area of writing 9.8–11.8 cm.

*Arrangement:* line 1 centred, lines 2–3 even left margin, line extends one letter to the left.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals, with “ears” on A, M and sometimes on N. Occasionally simple serifs.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* the I:s of line 3 *Heraclidi* are rather long, but so is the initial H; it may be a matter of variation in height rather than of *i longa*. The right top of x in line 4 connects to the following I.

*Interpuncts:* –

*Date:* first half of the 3rd century AD.

*Transcription:* CH, 26 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Piehl 1888, 116; Thomasson 134; S. Waebens, *Picturing the Roman Army in Third-Century Egypt. Roman Tombstones from the Military Necropolis at Nicopolis* (forthcoming).

*Inventory number:* VM 194 (written in ink on a small piece of paper attached to the front; no further numbers).

This stone, which carries the epitaph of one Antonius Heraclides, is the fourth inscription in the collection that likely comes from a military context, because it shows a rather striking similarity to the funerary reliefs found at the necropolis of Nicopolis outside Alexandria in Egypt, where the *legio II Traiana* was stationed

from the early 2nd to the 5th century AD.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>155</sup> This important observation has been made by Sofie Waebens in her doctoral thesis *Picturing the Roman Army in Third-Century Egypt. Roman Tombstones from the Military Necropolis at Nicopolis*, submitted to the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven in 2012. Schmidt

The epigraphic habit of the legionaries of the *legio II Traiana* was quite distinct,<sup>156</sup> with a marked preference for funerary *stelae*, the surfaces of which are usually almost entirely occupied by a relief showing the deceased, mostly in standing posture, with a Latin (or occasionally Greek) inscription underneath. In the Graeco-Roman Museum of Alexandria, there are several *stelae* from this necropolis with a design that is entirely in line with the traces left on the present stone. Extremely similar is the *stèle* with inv. no. 22177,<sup>157</sup> the relief of which offers a frontal view of a standing legionary. In his right hand he holds a bowl above a pillar-shaped altar that sits on the ground just to his right. The base of the altar, which as a whole is rather crudely rendered, is significantly wider than the dado, so that the lower part of the altar is practically identical to the object that can be seen to the right of the foot in the relief of the stone in Uppsala. Below the relief, there is a three line Latin inscription. On the whole, the similarity between this fragment and inv. no. 22177 in the Graeco-Roman Museum of Alexandria is such that it makes a common provenance extremely likely.

As Antonius Heraclides died at the age of one year (but cf. discussion on line 4 below), he was obviously not a soldier himself. But the legionaries had their families with them, and epitaphs of their wives and children have been found in the nearby military necropolis or be-

tray themselves as belonging to that context by their design or the manner in which they have been executed. Judging from the stone in Alexandria just mentioned, Antonius Heraclides was probably depicted in the same manner as an adult, offering at an altar. But neither this would be entirely unique: there are instances from Nicopolis of other children presented as grown-ups, such as the son of M. Valerius Homuncio, who died at the age of seven months but appears on his tombstone as a mounted Roman *eques* (no. 117 in Schmidt's catalogue).<sup>158</sup> Another tombstone shows one C. Iulius Valerius (sic), son of the legionary C. Iulius Severus of the *legio II Traiana*, who died at the age of three years and is shown as sacrificing at an altar—an exact parallel to the present stone.<sup>159</sup>

There is actually yet another inscription from Nicopolis in Sweden, in the storerooms of Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (inv. no. NM SK 794; Thomasson 198), which was acquired in 1886, two years before Antonius Heraclides' epitaph was published by Piehl. Although nothing further can be said of the matter, it does seem very likely that the two stones were brought to Sweden together and were separated only after their arrival.

**2–3. Aurelius Heracl[ides (?)] | Antonio Heraclidi:** the fact that this man has had his name cut first in the inscription and that he has used the first person form *posui*, “I set up”, for the verb, the focus on this man becomes unusually strong, given that he is not the deceased but the one who dedicated the inscription. As we are likely in the context of the legionary camp at Nicopolis outside Alexandria, there is a good chance that he was a legionary himself; see further the introduction.

2003, 37 dates all of the tombstones in his edition to the early 3rd century, because of the adjective *Germanica* added to the name of the legion, an honorary epithet bestowed upon it after its participation in Caracalla's war in Germania in AD 213. Some inscriptions mention the legion with the epithet *Severiana*, placing them in the reign of Alexander Severus, AD 222–235.

<sup>156</sup> Schmidt 2003, 37 speaks of a “ikonographisch und handwerklich recht homogene Gruppe von Reliefdarstellungen”.

<sup>157</sup> Reproduced in Schmidt 2003, table 38, cat. no. 110. See also the fragments inv. nos. 21622 and 21623 on table 40, which, while lacking the altar, are also very similar to the Uppsala fragment.

<sup>158</sup> See Schmidt 2003, 39.

<sup>159</sup> This inscription is in the Brooklyn Museum, New York; see Herbert 1972, 45–47, no. 22, pl. 14. I am grateful to Sofie Waebens for drawing my attention to these stones.

Only half of Aurelius' cognomen is preserved, but as *Heraclides* is the name of the deceased, it is reasonable to assume that it was the name also of the dedicator and that the two were related to each other. A patronymicon meaning "son of Herakles", Ἡρακλείδης is a genuinely Greek name and very frequent in Greek as well as Latin sources.

As for the plebeian *gens Aurelia*, which climbed the *cursus honorum* already in republican times (the first attested consul is C. Aurelius Cotta, in 252 and 248 BC), it is extremely well attested in the epigraphic material; in *CIL* VI alone, there are more than a thousand instances. While the *gens* was undoubtedly large and must have had a substantial number of freedmen in the early Empire, the chief reason for the diffusion of the name is partly that a number of emperors were Aurelii (beginning with Antoninus Pius, born T. Aurelius Antoninus),<sup>160</sup> partly and above all the so-called *constitutio Antoniniana*. By this edict, promulgated in AD 212 by the emperor Caracalla (M. Aurelius Antoninus Caracalla), all free people in the Roman empire were granted Roman citizenship; as this in practice was equivalent to a giant adoption on the part of the emperor, all new citizens got his gentilicium (in the case of men, also his praenomen), and were called *M. Aurelius*.<sup>161</sup> For this reason, unless explicitly stated, an occurrence of the name in the 3rd century AD is not indicative of a freedman or descendants of a freedman of an emperor. The chances of encountering an Aurelius in the provinces is very much higher after the *constitutio Antoniniana* than before it, for which reason such an inscription can, at least tentatively, be dated to the 3rd century and most likely does not predate the reign of Antoninus Pius (AD 138–161).

<sup>160</sup> See *RE* II.2 (1896), 2431–2545 s.v. Aurelius (Klebs *et al.*).

<sup>161</sup> See *DNP* III (1997), 147–148 s.v. *constitutio Antoniniana* (Birley).

Aurelius Heraclides would have been closely related to the deceased Antonius Heraclides and, not least in views of their identical cognomina, he is most naturally regarded as the father. If so, it must be explained how it comes that the father is an Aurelius while the son belongs to the *gens Antonia* (which, like the *Aurelia*, was an old and illustrious plebeian family, but one that reached its peak of prominence 200 years earlier with Mark Antony the triumvir). Waebens plausibly suggests that *Antonius* may have been the father's "original" nomen, to which he added *Aurelius* after the proclamation of the *constitutio Antoniniana*, the son only getting the hereditary name *Antonius*. Such double gentilicia are well attested after the *constitutio*, particularly among soldiers; see Waebens, *ad loc.*

4. *posui*: the verb in the first person emphasizes the dedicator Aurelius Heraclides (cf. above in line 1), but it is otherwise comparatively rare for the dedicator to speak in the first person in an epitaph. The verb *facere*, which is by far the commonest verb associated with the setting up of an inscription, is found fully written out 9,104 times in *CIL* VI; of these, there are 7,277 instances of *fecit* and 1,732 of *fecerunt*, but only 95 of *feci*, which is just above 1%. *Ponere* is far less frequent, appearing unabbreviated in 597 inscriptions in the same corpus. The figures, though, are similar, with 464 instances of *posuit*, 115 of *posuerunt* and 18, or 3%, of *posui*. A verb like *curare*, which appears in phrases such as *faciendum curavit*, shows the same tendency. Out of a total of 95 instances, there are 80 *curavit*, 14 *curaverunt* and a single instance (again, a little more than 1%) of *curavi*.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>162</sup> There is, perhaps, the possibility that one or two of these instances should actually be considered as a third person ending with loss of final *-t*. But omission of final *-t* is actually quite rare, with only a few instances in vulgar inscriptions such as the graffiti of Pompeii (see Väänänen 1982, 131 and Leumann 1977, 223.).

**annum** [ - - - ]: only the leftmost diagonal of the M is visible, just before the fracture. The indication of age probably continued in the lacuna, with *menses* plus number or abbreviated *m(enses)* plus number and *d(ies)* plus number; if both months and days were given, there

would probably not have been enough space on the stone for *menses* and *dies* to be written out in full. There is a slight possibility that we should read *ann(os) V m[enses - - -]* here, but as there is no space whatsoever between ANN and V, perhaps *annum* is the more likely.

---

As regards epitaphs, the correct third person *fecit* etc. is so common that even the illiterate may be expected to have been familiar with it and able to reproduce it, which makes it even less likely that a *feci* in an epitaph should actually be taken as *feci(t)*. To my knowledge, there are no instances of *feci* that must be taken as *feci* (but a number of instances of *feci* that are demonstrably correct, occurring in inscriptions with other references to the first person), and particularly in an inscription such as the present, which has no other instances of vulgar forms and misspellings, there is no reason to assume such an anomaly.



## Fragments

### 14. UAS 1392 (CIL VI 25040)

[Dis Má]nibus | [ - - - ] Priscillae.

To the divine Manes. For [ - - - ] Priscilla.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* tablet of white marble with sporadic black veins, broken off along the left side; top, right edge and rightmost part of bottom intact. No ornaments, but a slight and very smooth increase in height along the top edge only, about 1.6 cm wide, like a simple cornice. No traces of guidelines, but along right edge, from the middle downwards, runs a fine vertical line (probably used when shaping the stone itself). Just below the cornice, there is a hole in the middle of the fragment that runs straight through it. In the middle of the bottom edge there is a similar hole. The reverse is flat, unpolished with some incrustation; along the top a thin marked ledge in relief (only ca 0.7 cm wide)

*Dimensions:* 24.4–27.3 × 14.5–16.7 × 2.8–3.4 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 2.7–2.8, w. 10.1, line 2: h. 2.2–2.3, w. 14.0 cm.

*Arrangement:* line 1 may perhaps have been centred. Line 2 runs almost to the very edge at the right.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals, relatively simple letters but not without artistic merit (witness R in line 2), small serifs throughout. V-shaped trench.

*I longa, apex, ligatures:* there are traces of an apex above n in line 1, which must have been centred on the preceding a.

*Interpuncts:* –

*Date:* 1st or 2nd century AD?

*Transcription:* CH, 20 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 25040 (transcribed by Häggström, checked from a squeeze by Henzen); Thomasson 146.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1392; previously 1063 and vps. mvs. B. 10 (written in ink on the back).

Epitaph of one Priscilla, preserved in a very fragmentary state, making it impossible to say much about it. Statistically, the deceased would have been a freeborn woman, as the name *Priscillus/-a* is much more common among the free than among slaves and freedmen/-women. Kajanto counts 132 free bearers of the name and only eight slaves and freedwomen.<sup>163</sup> There

are no freedmen recorded, which is quite in line with the division of the name over the sexes; among its free bearers, a mere six are men, the rest women.

There is no information about dating and provenance. The traces of an apex above *m* suggests that it belongs to the first two centuries AD.<sup>164</sup>

## 15. UAS 1396 (CIL VI 27564)

D(is) M(anibus). | Trae[ - - - ] | Cryso[po]llis.

To the divine Manes. Trae[ - - - ] Chrysopolis (lies here).

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* left part of tablet of white marble, broken off to the right while the top, left and bottom edges are intact; smooth surface, hardly any incrustation. No ornamentation, guidelines at bottom of each line (guideline also above line 1 and below line 4). A vertical line running from top to bottom about 0.8 cm from the left edge.

*Dimensions:* 13.4–5.0 × 10.0–15.3 × 1.1–1.5 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.7, w. c. 7.5, line 2: h. 1.5–1.8, w. –, line 3: h. 1.7–2.6, w. –, line 4: h. 2.3–2.6, w. 7.2 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 1–2 even (more or less) left margin, line 3 extending about 2 cm to the left of these, line 4 indentation about 0.5 letter. The irregular left margin indicates that the text may have been roughly centred.

*Lettering:* very simple freehand capitals with sporadic primitive serifs. *Y* in line 3 has a tendency towards being “palm-shaped”. The letters are filled with red.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* triangular interpuncts between *D* and *M* in line 1 and between *CRY* and *SO* in line 3.

*Date:* –

*Transcription:* CH, 20 August 2008.

<sup>163</sup> Kajanto 1965, 288.

<sup>164</sup> Gordon & Gordon 1957, 214.

*Printed sources:* CIL VI 27546 (transcribed by Häggström, checked by Henzen against a squeeze); Thomasson 148.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1396; previously 1067 and vps. mvs. B. 12 (written in ink on the back).

2. **Trae**[ - - - ]: the three horizontals of the letter E are clearly visible, but their terminations to the right have now vanished, which means that it would be possible for it to be read as a B. However, Henzen has printed the E as being clearly readable and conjectured *Trae[bia]*, to which Thomasson added the remark “perhaps for *Trebia*, a not uncommon *nomen*”. There are other possible solutions, such as *Traebicia* (= *Trebia*, VI 27595), which, however, would probably be too long to have fitted into the lacuna. If the E was really a B, a name like *Trabea*

would be possible, but as no conjecture can be regarded as certain, I refrain from printing a full name in the text above.<sup>165</sup>

3–4. **Cryso[po]lis**: *Cryso[po]lis* is Henzen’s suggestion, and as this name is well attested, it may be accepted as virtually certain. Formed on the Greek noun χρυσόπολις (“golden city”), there are twelve instances of the name in *LGPN* and 18 in *CIL VI*, the majority correctly spelled as *Chryso[po]lis*, two more as *Cryso[po]lis*, one as *Chrusopolis*. There is an erroneous interpunct between CRY and SO in line 3.

## 16. UAS 1394 (AE 1997, 1751)

⊂virga⊃ Dulc[ - - - ]|ae Cus[ - - - ]|vixet a[nnos - - - ]|feceru[nt - - - ]|<sup>5</sup>[-2?]-e!ita + [ - - - ]

For the most beloved Cus[ - - - ], who lived for [ - - - ] years. [ - - - ] made this.

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* tablet of white (Luna) marble, broken off at the left edge and along the bottom; surface smooth, polished, without incrustation; no ornaments except for a *virga* before line 1, starting slightly above the middle of the line and slanting somewhat leftwards. No traces of guidelines. The back is completely flat, but not polished. Solin 2002, 128 suggests that it is “wahrscheinlich eine stadtrömische altchristliche Grabtafel”.

*Dimensions:* 19.0–23.2 × 9.8–16.7 × 2.0–2.2 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 3.5–4.2, w. 13.6, line 2: h. 3.5, w. 14.6, line 3: h. 3.1–3.5, w. 14.8, line 4: h. 3.6–3.9, w. 12.5, line 5: h. 3.4, w. – cm.

*Arrangement:* right margin lost; lines 1–2 even left margin, line 3 protrusion into margin ca 0.5 letter, line 4 perhaps even with 1–2; 5 left edge lost.

<sup>165</sup> For all possible gentilicia in *Trae*-, *Tre*-, and *Trab*-, see Solin & Salomies 1988, 189–190.

*Lettering:* crude freehand capitals with rudimentary serifs (consisting only of strokes at 90° angle to stems); orientation of serifs vary on v: line 1 they point inward only, line 2 to the left only, line 3 inward. Line 1 L has a very steep horizontal, bending at perhaps 160° instead of 90°. A tends to have a continuation of right diagonal above letter (like an “ear”); A in line 3 has the horizontal drawn from the right diagonal only halfway through the letter.

*I longa, apex, ligatures:* –.

*Interpuncts:* –

*Date:* imperial.

*Transcription:* CH, 20 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 137; *AE* 1997, 1751.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1394; previously 1065 and vps. mvs. B. 11 (written in ink on the back).

1–2. *Dulc[ - - - ]|ae Cus[ - - - ]*: theoretically, this may be either the epithet *dulc[issim]|ae* followed by a name (a gentilicium or a slave’s name) in *Cus[ - - - ]*, or *dulc[issimae]* followed by a gentilicium *[ - - - ]ae* and a cognomen in *Cus[ - - - ]*. Given that the stone would have had to be rather wide for another name to fit between *dulc[issimae]* and *Cus[ - - - ]*, the former variant seems the likelier. Thomasson suggests *Cus[pidiae]*, which, as he admits, “is only one possibility”, and an unlikely one at that, since *Cuspidius* is an extremely rare gentilicium. Female names beginning in *Cus-* recorded in Rome are in fact rather few; I know only of the gentilicia *Cusinia* and *Cuspia* (of which *Cussia* in *CIL* VI 16699 probably is a misspelling; there is also a singular instance of *Cusoa* in *CIL* VI 17221, which may also be an error). Neither is common—there are 15 instances of *Cuspia* and eleven of *Cusinia*—but both would be better guesses than *Cuspida*.<sup>166</sup> It is worth noting that the situation does not change much if we assume that the name is not a gentilicium but a slave’s name or a cognomen. Kajanto lists only five cognomina beginning in *Cus-*,<sup>167</sup> and

Solin has one single slave’s name in *Cus-*, viz. *Custos*.<sup>168</sup> It may not even be a name in *Cus-* at all; Solin has elsewhere suggested the reading *Dulc[issimae T]|aecus[ae]*, as *T(a)ecusa* is a name attested elsewhere in the Christian inscriptions of Rome.<sup>169</sup>

Thomasson also remarks that *dulcissimae* occurs at the beginning of an epitaph also, e.g., in *CIL* VI 12560. This inversed order of name and epithet is indeed very rare in the epitaphs. Harrod makes no note of it for *dulcissimus*,<sup>170</sup> and it is hard to find any further instances. Some inscriptions that seemingly provide further examples involve actual names (particularly *Felicissimus*, as e.g. *CIL* VI 17801 *D(is) M(anibus) | Felicissimae | uxori | benae | merenti*), and in other cases, it is difficult to judge between name or epithet (as in *CIL* XIII 1585 *D(is) M(anibus) Dulcissimae quae vixit annum I*). The clear cases that can be found—like *CIL* V 8588 *D(is) M(anibus) | Pientissimae coniugi | Nicelle quae vixit | an(nos) XXV* and X 7563 *D(is) M(anibus) | Rarissimae et incomparabili | Faustinae*—are easily counted. The pattern

<sup>166</sup> For all possible gentilicia in *Cus-*, see Solin & Salomies 1988, 65–66.

<sup>167</sup> *Cusianus, Cusina, Cuspianus, Custa* (= *Costa*) and

*Custos*; Kajanto 1965, 388.

<sup>168</sup> Solin 1996, 69.

<sup>169</sup> Solin 2002, 128–129.

<sup>170</sup> Harrod 1909, 7.

seen in the inscription adduced by Thomasson, *CIL* VI 12560 *Dulcissimae Astniae | quae vixit annis tritinta octo*, is apparently extremely rare, as it does not even have the dedication to the Manes preceding the adjective.

*Dulcissimus* is the typical epithet of children; see discussion on 11.6–7.

3. *vixet*: sc. *vixit*. The spelling *e* for *i* reflects a pronunciation that was more open than the strictly closed *i* and that could be heard already in classical times, but was considered rustic; hence Cicero’s remark about “... our friend Cotta, whose broad pronunciation you sometimes imitate, Sulpicius, so that you get rid of the letter *i* and pronounce *e* extremely full, seems to me not to imitate the orators of old, but farmers”.<sup>171</sup> It is quite common in vulgar inscriptions, when the author has spelled the words as he pronounced them.<sup>172</sup> Thomasson, erroneously, prints *vixit* (repeated in *AE*).

The following *a[ - - - ]* may be supplied either as *a[nnos - - - ]* or as *a[nnis - - - ]*, but it is impossible to say which.

4. *feceru[nt - - - ]*: the bottom of the vertical and the right endings of the two horizontals are visible on the letter *F*. The subject, now lost, would have been the *parentes* of the deceased. Thomasson prints *egeru[nt - - - ]*, but this word is extremely rare in epitaphs, occurring only in the phrase *curam sepulturae egit / egerunt* (see discussion on 2.2–3), which would hardly have any place in a plain epitaph such as the present. The reading *fecerunt* has been suggested also by Solin (“zweifellos *feceru[nt]*”)<sup>173</sup> and in *AE*.

5. [ -2?-] *elita* + [ - - - ]: *filiae* Thomasson, commenting that “the fourth letter is more like

a *T*, but cf 1.3”. The reading *filiae* is, in my opinion, wishful thinking, although I am unable to present a certain solution.

At least one, perhaps two letters seem to be missing at the beginning of the line; there are traces of a top rounding, probably *C* or *G* rather than *R* (the serif of which stretches markedly backwards, at least in the preceding line). As the bottom is missing from the following letter, it could be an *F* as well as an *E*, but the completely straight horizontals are in line with other *E*:s in the inscription, not with the fragmentary *F* in line 4. There follows a vertical that could be an *I* but which bends at the bottom in a manner that does not seem to be a serif but looks like *L* in line 1. The following vertical lacks its lower end, but a vowel seems necessary, hence *I*. *T* and *A* are clearly readable, followed by a vertical stroke with a horizontal stretching to the left; the right part of this letter is missing.

If one disregards the possible traces of one or two letters before the *E/F* and change *I* and *L* around, it would be possible to read the name *Filtat[e]*, from the Greek *φίλατος*, “one’s nearest and dearest”, which occurs in eight inscriptions in *CIL* VI, and which has 15 instances in *LGPN* (nine masculine, six feminine). In this case, it would be the name of the mother. In such a case, we would expect her name to have been followed by that of the father, and the inscription probably concluded by the word *parentes* on the following line.

<sup>171</sup> ... *Cotta noster, cuius tu illa lata, Sulpici, non numquam imitaris, ut Iota litteram tollas et E plenissimum dicas, non mihi oratores antiquos, sed messorum videtur imitari*; Cic. *De or.* 3.46.

<sup>172</sup> See Väänänen 1982, 82.

<sup>173</sup> Solin 2002, 129.

## 17. UAS 1397

A:

[ - - - ]ecu[ - - - ] | [ - - - ]er + [ - - - ] | [ - - - ]i fe[ - - - ]

B:

[ - - - ] [ - - - ] | [ - - - ] + ius[ - - - ] | [ - - - ]

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* fragment of white marble tablet, cut on both sides (opisthographum). Broken on all sides. What remains is probably bottom of one (=A) and top of another (=B) inscription. Surfaces are even and polished on both sides. Along the top of B runs what may be traces of a guideline.

*Dimensions (viewed from B side):* 9.6–10.0 × 5.1–6.2 × 1.8 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* A: line 1: h. 2.3, w. –, line 2: h. 2.4, w. –, line 3: h. 2.1–2.4, w. – cm.

B: line 2: h. 2.1–2.4 cm.

*Arrangement:* –

*Lettering:* freehand capitals. The letter v in inscription B is a little more rounded at bottom; inscription A has large serifs, which on the top of v and r have the shape of a stylized seagull. The letters of A perhaps give the expression of a somewhat later date than those of B, which are more polished.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* A has one triangular interpunct following ER in line 2 and one, like a pyramid, between I and FE in line 3; B has an interpunct, or perhaps rather a kind of ornament, in the middle of the first line (which is otherwise blank); it is rather like a modern cursive minuscule v in shape.

*Date:* –

*Transcription:* CH, 19 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 129.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1397; previously 1068 and vps. mvs. B. 14 (written in ink on the edges).

A1–3. Assuming that this is an epitaph, line 1 would reasonably state the name of the deceased as, for instance, [praenomen D]ecu[mio cognomen].

A2. Following ER and the interpunct is a straight vertical stroke, which may belong to an I, E, F, P, R, B, D or H. In view of Thomasson's suggestion for the following line, [pat]er

i[nfelicissimus] or [mat]er i[nfelicissima] would be tempting conjectures, but the possibilities available are too many for speculation to be meaningful.

A3. [ - - - ]i fe[ - - - ]: as this seems to have been the final line of the inscription on this side of the stone, Thomasson's suggestion [ - - - benemerent]i fe[ci]t is extremely attrac-



tive, particularly as the I is preceded by traces of the rightmost serif of a top horizontal (not noted by Thomasson), as in T; it may perhaps have belonged to an F or an E, but as there are no traces of further horizontals below the one in question, the case for F or E is much weaker than for T.

**B1.** [ - - - ] [ - - - ]: these two lacunae are actually hypothetical; there may not have been any text at all, but the peculiar interpunct is likely to have separated two words rather than being entirely ornamental. These words may have been *D(is)* and *M(anibus)*, in which case this is the beginning of the inscription.

**B2.** [ - - - ]+ius[ - - - ]: the name of the deceased. Before I can be seen the rightmost serif of a bottom horizontal, perhaps from an L.

**B3.** [ - - - ]: only the very top of this line remains, showing traces of three letters. First there is a diagonal that slants upwards to the right (like the right diagonal of x or v), followed by a small curve, which is likely the top of an s; consequently, this may be the ending -vs. After this, there is another top serif, but it is impossible to say from which letter.

## 18. UAS 1398

[ - - - ]+ | [ - - - ]+lo | [ - - - ]e m | [ - - - ]ex | <sup>5</sup>[ - - - ]+nsu

*Findplace:* Rome?

*Physical description:* right fragment of marble tablet, broken off at top, left edge and bottom; right edge probably intact. Surface in good condition. No traces of guidelines. Line 2 ends in a rather large leaf (with stem). Some incrustation on the back, which otherwise appears to have been very smooth, even polished.

*Dimensions:* 14.8–16.5 × 7.8–11.7 × 1.7–2.4 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line: 1 h. 2.0–2.3, w. –, line 2: h. 2.5, w. –, line 3: h. 2.0–2.1, w. –, line 4: h. 2.1–2.3, w. – cm.

*Arrangement:* –

*Lettering:* freehand capitals with rather wavy horizontals.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* interpunct in the shape of a comma between E and M in line 2.

*Date:* –

*Transcription:* CH, 19 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 130.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1398; previously 1069 and vps. mvs. B. 13 (written in ink on the back).

1. [ - - - ]+: the letter marked by +, of which only the bottom is preserved, is likely to have been an *m*; the lower ends of the two diagonals and the point inbetween them are clearly visible. Hence, this is probably the heading *D(is) M(anibus)*.

2. [ - - - ]+lo: if the previous line read *D(is) M(anibus)*, then we would expect the name of the deceased here. *-lo* fits well into this picture as a dative ending. Of the preceding letter can be seen the bottom serif and a diagonal that slants to the right in the upper part of the letter, which is most likely a *γ*. This means that only a few names are possible, like *Astylus* (four instances in *CIL VI*), *Bacchylus* and *Staphylus* (ten instances each).

3. [ - - - ]e m: perhaps [*ben*]e *m(erenti)* (so Thomasson).

4–5. [ - - - ]ex | [ - - - ]+nsu: Thomasson thinks that “*ex* is almost certainly a preposition; note the ablative in the following line”. This ablative (*-nsu*), he conjectures as [*conse*] *nsu* or [*asse*] *nsu*. The chief problem is that the phrase *ex consensu*, which implies that something has been made in consent, hardly occurs at all in epitaphs. There are isolated instances such as *CIL IX 1511*, which states that a tomb has been made with the consent of all survivors: *P. Camurii | Modestus et Fortunatus | et Quin-*

*tina | fili ex consensu | parentibus pientissimis | fecerunt* (lines 4–9). The phrase also occurs in *CIL VI 13099*, a rather original epitaph which states that those who had built the tomb for themselves agreed in having it rebuilt when it had been demolished by a storm: *Dis Manibus M Aurelius Felix | et Aelia Vitalis ex consensu | eorum hoc monumentum | a tempestatem vexatum | reficiendum curaverunt | sibi et suis libertis liberatibus | quae posteris quae eorum*. These are both unique instances, but their existence implies that the phrase may have been found also in other epitaphs. However, it does not really feel like the present is one of them; if the conjectures suggested for the previous lines are at all correct, it gives the impression of a very basic epitaph, short and simple rather than verbose. Perhaps, *ex* is not the preposition but the number [*s*] *ex*, and +*nsu* the genitive plural [*me*] *nsu(m)*, so that this is the age of the deceased, stated according to the pattern *annorum sex et quinque mensum*. A numeral fully written out in this manner (whether for both years and months or only for the years) is not uncommon in the epitaphs. The chiasitic order year–number–number–month is unusual but not unparalleled; cf. *CIL XIV 1456 D(is) M(anibus) | Pescenniae vixit ann(os) | VI V mens(es) VIII dies*.<sup>174</sup>

<sup>174</sup> It is, of course, also possible to conjecture the final line as [*- - - me*] *ns(ibus) V*, in which case *ex* on the preceding line would probably have nothing to do with the age of the deceased. In such a case, any further conjecture of *ex* would be pure guesswork.

## 19. UAS 1370 (SEG XLVII 2206)

Αὐρ(ήλιος) Δάφνος [ - - - ] | αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ α[ὐτοῦ - - - Π]||ρίμα καὶ τοῖς [ - - - ] | [ - - - ]+[ - ]στορ[ - - - ]

Aurelios Daphnos (made this) for himself and for his [own - - - P]rima and for [ - - - ].

*Findplace:* the island of Plateia, off Tolo on the south coast of Argolis.

*Physical description:* fragment of a thick tablet of limestone, yellow due to incrustation. No ornaments, broken on right side and along the bottom sides. The surface in good condition, though not particularly smooth; the back is rough.

*Dimensions:* 9.6–12.5 × 18.8–18.9 × 6.4–7.0 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 1.9–2.2, w. 12.5, line 2: h. 2.1–2.2, w. 15, line 3: h. 1.9–2.4, w. 16.2, line 4: h. 1.8–2.0, w. 10.5 cm.

*Arrangement:* –

*Lettering:* freehand.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* nexus between Ω and Κ and between Τ and Η in line 2.

*Interpuncts:* triangular interpunct between Ρ and Δ in line 1.

*Date:* 2nd or 3rd century AD.

*Transcription:* CH, 25 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 136; *AE* 1997, 1750; *SEG* XLVII 2206.

*Inventory number:* UAS 1370 (written in ink on the right edge; no further numbers).

1. Αὐρ(ήλιος) Δάφνος: the Roman gentilicium *Aurelius* very firmly puts this stone in Roman times, and most likely in the 3rd century AD. In a relatively remote place such as Plateia, any Aurelius with a Greek cognomen is extremely likely to have become a Roman citizen under the *constitutio Antoniniana*; see discussion on 13.2. For Δάφνος, see discussion on 22.21.

In the 3rd century, it was quite normal for the nomen gentilicium to be abbreviated. This had been the tendency from the early 2nd century, as the gentilicium, whether inherited by birth, adoption or manumission, began to be

regarded as less personal than the cognomen.<sup>175</sup> In Greek as in Latin sources, Αὐρ. (*Aur.*) is the standard abbreviation for Aurelius (in the material of *CIL* VI more than three times more common than *Aurel.*).

2. αὐτῷ: as may be expected in an inscription of the 1st centuries AD,<sup>176</sup> this stone does

<sup>175</sup> See, e.g., Gordon 1983, 22, but cf. discussion on 3.2–4.

<sup>176</sup> The *iota adscriptum* was never regularly used, and is often left out also in Greek inscriptions of the Classical period. From the Hellenistic period onwards, it

not add an *iota adscriptum* to the dative ending, which means that the reading here is simply *αυτω*; naturally, the same is true of τῆ and Πρίμα below.

τῆ α[ύτοῦ: Thomasson reads TI+ (“TIA or TIA”) here, but the letters are very clearly TH in nexus, the H having the T as its left vertical. The letter following the H seems to begin with a diagonal stroke, like an A. My suggestion is therefore τῆ α[ύτοῦ, which would have been followed by a word like *γυναικί* or similar.

3. Π]ρίμα: the ending -ριμα is so utterly rare in Greek, being restricted to the noun *κρίμα* (“decision”) and perhaps a few more (like the epic adjective *ἄβριμος*, “mighty”, etc.) that

the Roman cognomen Πρίμα seems like a fairly safe guess (not least because its being the fifth commonest Latin cognomen, with 2,397 bearers).<sup>177</sup> The name may have been followed by *καὶ τοῖς [τέκνοις]* or similar.

4. [ - ]στορ[ - - - ]: the reading ΣΤΟΡ is certain, in spite of Thomasson’s ΣΤΟΙ. It may perhaps be part of the noun *στοργή* (“love”) which is found in Greek epitaphs, e.g., in the phrase *στοργῆς χάριν* or *ἔνεκεν* (“for the sake of love”), of *φιλοστοργία* as in *φιλοστοργίας χάριν* or *ἔνεκεν* (“for the sake of tender love”), or of a related adjective, such as *φιλόστοργος* (“loving tenderly”) etc. The top of a letter in the following line is visible below the O.

## 20. UAS 1952

A:

----- | [ - - - ]ση++ [ - - - ] | [ - - - ]σεν δεμε[ - - - ] | [ - - - ]+εχειν αλ+[ - - - ] | [ - - - ]+υ+ αιδ+[ - - - ] | -----

B:

----- | [ - - - ] [ - 2? - ] λι+[ - - - ] | [ - - - ]+ρθεν[ - - - ] | -----

*Findplace:* ?

*Physical description:* fragment of reddish-brown marble tablet; opistographum. No ornaments, no traces of guidelines; broken on all sides. The surface is in good condition on both sides, polished, and without incrustation.

*Dimensions:* 5.2–6.3 × 8.6–11.8 × 1.5–1.6 cm.

Height and length of lines: A: line 1: h. –, w. 5.7, line 2: h. 1.4, w. 10.1, line 3: h. 1.3, w. 10.5, line 4: h. 1.4, w. 7.7 cm. B: line 1: h. –, w. 8.5, line 2: h. 3.5, w. 10.0 cm.

*Arrangement:* –

*Lettering:* side A has tidy freehand capitals. On the letters that have a right diagonal (Α, Λ, Δ), this is prolonged above the letter (forms sporadically attested since the Hellenistic age, common during the Empire; Guarducci 1967, 379). Otherwise only sporadic serifs. “Lunate” ε and σ (cf. no. 24).

disappeared altogether as the diphthongs were monophthongized, so that α, η, and ω were simply cut as α, η, and ω; the *iota subscriptum* of literary texts was never used in inscriptions at all; see McLean 2002, 347–348.

<sup>177</sup> Kajanto 1965, 29–30.

The letters on side B are narrower and more oblong, the horizontal in Θ extending all the way to the sides of the circle (characteristic of the imperial period; Guarducci 1967, 381).

*I longa, apex, nexus*: trema above the I in A4.

*Interpuncts*: –

*Date*: 2nd century AD.

*Transcription*: CH, 20 August 2008.

*Printed sources*: Thomasson 127.

*Inventory number*: UAS 1952 (written in ink on side B; no further numbers).

**A1.** [ - - - ]ση++[ - - - ]: Thomasson has [ - - - ]σ++++[ - - - ] here, but the horizontal stroke on the H is visible in the fracture. Following the H is the lower end of three vertical strokes (M and another letter?).

**A2.** [ - - - ]σεν δεμε[ - - - ]: as there are no word divisions on this fragment, one cannot know if these would have been indicated by interpuncts, blank spaces, or not at all. The fact that all letters in this line cannot reasonably belong to one and the same word argues in favour of the latter model, in which case the most likely division would be [ - - - ]σεν δεμε [ - - - ].<sup>178</sup> In such a case, the ending -σεν would belong to a verb in the third person singular aorist, for instance [ἐποίη]σεν, “made (this)”, while δεμε- could be the beginning of a name such as Δεμέ[τριος] (with an ε, a spelling that is well attested in inscriptions for the usual Δημήτριος).

**A3.** [ - - - ]+εχειν αλ+[ - - - ]: εχειν is likely the infinitive ἔχειν. This is preceded by a vertical stroke, but as the bottom is missing, it is impossible to say if it was an I, or the right vertical of H or N (if the letter is a I or a N, the word may have been a compound such as περιέχειν (“embrace”, “protect”) or ἀνέχειν (“lift up (as an offering)”, “hold up”). After λ is the ending of

a diagonal strike slanting upward to the right, that would have belong to an A, a Λ or a X.

**A4.** [ - - - ]+υ+ αιδ+[ - - - ]: only the tops of the four first letters are preserved, but the Υ is characteristic enough to be considered as certain. It is preceded by the top of a rounded letter, but it is not clear whether or not it was open to the right (like E and Σ) or closed (like O). After Υ follows a similar letter that is clearly open, hence E or Σ. Then comes a triangular top with the “ear” serif typical of A, Λ and Δ. The following I and Δ are clearly readable;<sup>179</sup> above the I is a trema in the form of two dots. This is followed by a straight vertical, on the middle of which a horizontal stroke extending to the right is visible just before the fracture; it may have been an H or a P.

Assuming this to be a funerary inscription, a form of Αἰδης (i.e. Hades, metonymically “the Underworld”) would be a plausible conjecture. The trema, a sign rarely found in inscriptions during the first two centuries AD, also provides a plausible *terminus post quem* in the 2nd century AD for this inscription.<sup>180</sup> It is used here, obviously, to separate the I from the preced-

<sup>178</sup> Other variants, like [ - - - ]ς ἐν δὲ [ - - - ] or [ - - - ]ς ἐν δε[ - - - ], would also be possible, but in such cases, the possibilities are so numerous that conjecture hardly is meaningful.

<sup>179</sup> Thomasson’s reading ἀλ is erroneous (which means that his suggestion αιλι—as in αἰλινος, “mournful”—is equally impossible); he has also missed the trema above the i.

<sup>180</sup> Trema is first attested in Greek papyri from Egypt as early as the 2nd century BC, but is rare also in papyri prior to the 2nd century AD; see Threatte 1980, 94–97.

ing A, thus achieving the trisyllabic epic form Αἰδῆς, which indicates that this may have been a metrical inscription. If, as seems reasonable, the inscription would have been (correctly) written in a dactylic metre, the syllable preceding the Α must have been long. One possibility would be the ending -ους, perhaps belonging to an elided feminine participle -ουσα, such as μολοῦσ' Αἰδῆν, “having gone to Hades” (cf. Eurip. *Alc.* 107, where the same verb βλώσκω is used with κατὰ γαίαν, “go beneath the earth” in the same sense).

**B1.** [ - - - ] [ -2?- ] λι + [ - - - ]: the Λ is preceded by the lower ends of three verticals, of

which the second and third are closer together than the first and the second; after I a diagonal slanting upwards to the right is visible in the fracture.

**B2.** [ - - - ] + ρθεν [ - - - ]: the Ρ here is preceded by the pointed top of a letter such as Α, which is quite in line with Thomasson's reading [ - - - ] αρθεν [ - - - ], although no horizontal can be seen on the α. In practise, though, both Δ and Λ are impossible as there are no words containing the sequences δρθεν and λρθεν, which means that αρθεν must be correct. Probably, what we have here is a form of παρθένος, or a name formed on this noun, such as Παρθένιος.

## 21. UAS 1953 (SEG XLVII 2210)

*A:*

----- | [ - - - ] ερσε + [ - - - ] | [ - - - ] ν Κούρη + [ - - - ] | Λολλία Ἄρ [ - - - ] | βιώσασα [ - - - ] |

*B:*

----- | [ - - - ] ++ [ - - - ] | ⊂fish⊃

[ - - - P ] erseph [ one (?) - - - ] [ - - - ] the daughter [ - - - ] Lollia Ar [ - - - ] having lived [ - - - ].

*Findplace:* ?

*Physical description:* fragment of a (white but discoloured) marble tablet, opisthographum, broken vertically at the right side, diagonally on the left and horizontally on the top (since there is text across the break on the reverse). What remains of the bottom seems intact. Surface smooth and polished, no incrustation.

*Dimensions:* 3.4–16.9 × 5.4–16.1 × 1.5 cm.

*Height and length of lines on A:* line 1: h. 2.4–2.6, w. 6.7, line 2: h. 2.1–2.3, w. 9.2, line 3: h. 2.4, w. 12.3, line 4: h. 2.4–2.6, w. 11.2 cm.

*Arrangement:* lines 3–4 on side A has an even left margin.

*Lettering:* side A has freehand capitals, plain though not careless, no serifs.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –



*Interpuncts:* –

*Date:* 3rd century AD?

*Transcription:* CH, 26 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Thomasson 128; *SEG* XLVII 2210.

*Inventory number:* UAS 1953 (written in ink on side A; no further numbers).

A1. [ - - - ]ερσε+[ - - - ]: in spite of Thomasson's [ - - - ]+ρσε+[ - - - ], this initial E is certain as its middle horizontal is clearly visible. After the final E there is a sharp angle (<) just before the fracture, which must have formed part of the following letter, most probably a Φ. As the combination -ερσεφ-, when occurring in inscriptions, practically always forms part of the name Περσεφόνη (Φερσεφόνη), this would be the most plausible conjecture here, all the more so as Persephone, wife of Hades, fits the context of a funerary inscription (particularly in view of the following Κούρη). This catachthonic royal couple is frequently mentioned alongside other inhabitants and topographical features of the underworld in Greek epitaphs as later in Roman, but almost exclusively in such in verse. This is unsurprising, as the epitaphs in these cases echo the concept of the mythic underworld as seen in Homer and Vergil. It may be supposed to have very little to do with the genuine beliefs of the ancient Greek or Roman,<sup>181</sup> but rather is a kind of decorative element of the poetic genre and, as such, alien to prose,<sup>182</sup> consequently, a mention of Persephone here likely indicates that this epitaph was written in verse.

<sup>181</sup> Cf. King 2000, 125.

<sup>182</sup> This is not to say that there are no instances in prose, and that no references to a catachthonic female goddess are to be taken seriously; in general, a reference to Hades and Persephone in prose may be expected to have less of an ornamental function and to be more sincere; on the whole issue, see Lattimore 1942, 87–90.

A2. [ - - - ]ν Κούρη+[ - - - ]: there must reasonably be a word division following N, so that the next word is ΚΟΥΡΗ. The word may naturally mean nothing more than “daughter”, but if the preceding line had a form of Περσεφόνη, this word more likely goes with the name as an epithet, as Κόρη (“the daughter of Demeter”) was the cultic name of Persephone in Attica (*LSJ*, s.v., B.). Moreover, as Κούρη is not the Attic but the Ionic/epic form, this is another strong indication that the inscription was metrical.

There is a faint trace of a letter following the H, but impossible to determine which. Pleket in *SEG* notes the letters P and H in Κούρη as being in nexus, even speculating if there is a I following the H, neither of which is the case.

A3. Λολλία Ἄρ[ - - - ]: this is either the name of the deceased or of the person dedicating the inscription. She belonged to the Roman gens *Lollia*, first attested in the 3rd century BC and more commonly from the early 1st century BC onwards. Ἄρ[ - - - ] is the beginning of her cognomen, of which there are too many possibilities for conjecture to be meaningful.

A4. βιώσασα [ - - - ]: this participle, corresponding to the Latin *vixit*, seems mainly to be attested in Greek inscriptions from the Roman era. It is sometimes followed by an indication of age (e.g. *IG* III 12825.1–3 ἐνθάδε κατοικί Τροφιμάς βιώ|σας ἔτη δεκατρία), sometimes by an adverb (*IG* III 12753.1–3 Σωτηρῶ Ἡρακλείωνος | Ζωσίμου γυνή καλῶς βιώ|σασα); the latter occurs in several Greek inscriptions from Rome, such as *IGUR* II 295, II 922 and IV 664.

**B:** Just below the fracture on this side are traces of letters. The lower part of the first looks something like a reversed J (likely the rightmost stroke of a letter with a curving serif at the end) whereas what remains of the second seems like the left part of an M. It is impossible to make anything out of them. Below is an extremely simple drawing which seems to depict a fish. The whole inscription could almost be taken for graffiti, were it not for the fact that there are traces of red in both the letters and in the fish. In front of the fish's mouth (which is open) is a very small part of a stroke that continues into the fracture.

If the drawing is actually meant to be a fish, this may suggest that this is a Christian inscription, the image of the fish being found in Christian inscriptions from Rome in the 3rd and 4th centuries, often in combination with the anchor, another early Christian symbol relating to the hope of salvation.<sup>183</sup>

The reason is, of course, that the Greek word for fish, ἰχθύς, was seen as an acrostic for Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Θεοῦ υἱὸς Σωτήρ; the idea is attested from around AD 200, cf. Tert. *De bapt.* *I sed nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθὺν nostrum Iesum Christum in aqua nascimur nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo salvi sumus.* However, the fish is often iconographically represented also in non-Christian sepulchral contexts as part of the food served at funerary banquets. The presence of such a fish on any kind of funerary monument, from simple inscribed tablets to sarcophagi, as an isolated image or in combination with bread, a *patera*, and *urceus* and similar utensils, means that it is actually impossible to categorize an epitaph as Christian simply on the basis of the image of a fish.<sup>184</sup>

<sup>183</sup> The anchor appears as a symbol of hope in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* 6.19–20: “We have this (hope) as a sure and steadfast anchor of the soul, a hope that enters into the inner place behind the curtain, where Jesus has gone as a forerunner on our behalf, having become a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek.” Epigraphically, it is attested as early as the end of the 1st century AD; see *RAC I* (1950), 441–443 s.v. Anker (P. Stumpf).

<sup>184</sup> On Roman sarcophagi, which allowed for more lavish decoration, anglers and fishing also occur in the so-called sea thiasus, a retinue of maritime creatures that are seen as accompanying the deceased to Elysium. On the fish in non-Christian and Christian epitaphs, see *RAC VII* (1969), 998–999 and 1064–1066 s.v. Fisch (J. Engemann).

## Fasti, synodal decree, dedication

## 22. UAS I 391+I 400 (CIL VI 8639 / X 6637)

*Column 1:*

[ --- ]§ Acratus [numm.] | [ --- ]rus tegularius numm. | [ --- ]ros structor (vac. 4) numm. | [ --- ]§ Metrodas (vac. 3) numm. | <sup>5</sup>[ --- L.] Vipstano Poplicola (vac. 2) co(n)s(ulibus) | [ --- ]+dius (vac. 3) Amarantus | [ --- ]+dius Epaphroditus | [ --- ]ctus (vac. 7) vilicus | [[ [ - - - - - ] ] ] | <sup>10</sup>[Q. Veranio] Ç Pompeio Gallo (vac. 4) co(n)s(ulibus) | [ --- ] (vac. 10) topiar(ius) | [ --- ] (vac. 10) aedit(uus) | [ --- ] (vac. 5) Amarantus | [ --- ] (vac. 7) Lini praef(ectus) | <sup>15</sup>[C. Antistio Ve]tere M. Suillio Nerulino co(n)s(ulibus) | [ --- ]ns (vac. 10) disp(ensator) | [ --- ]nus (vac. 9) disp(ensator) | [ --- ] (vac.) Cosmus | [ --- ]+tus | <sup>20</sup>[ --- ] co(n)s(ulibus) |

*Column 2:*

Ti. Claudius (vac. 12) Daphn+[ --- ] | [[ [M.] ] ] | Euphemus (vac. 7) atren[sis] | Claudia (vac. 9) Faust[ --- ] | <sup>25</sup>Altoria (vac. 9) Phlogi[ --- ] | Claudia (vac. 3) Hellas numm. [ --- ] | C. Luccio Telesino (vac. 3) C. Suetonio [ --- ] | Pannychus (vac. 11) [ --- ] | Sita (vac. 9) a valetudi[ --- ] | <sup>30</sup>A. Caecilius (vac. 7) a pisci[ --- ] | Claudia (vac. 8) Corin[ --- ] | [[ [ - - - - - ] ] ] | L. Iulio Rufo (vac. 15) [ --- ] | Claudia (vac. 7) Tyche [ --- ] | <sup>35</sup>Ti. (vac. 2) Claudius (vac. 2) Q. (vac. 3) Ponti[ --- ] | Antonius (vac. 5) Faust[ --- ] | Albanus (vac. 6) vilic[ --- ] | P. Galerio Trachalo (vac. 8) [ --- ] | Antonia (vac. 3) Musa | <sup>40</sup>Claudia (vac. 4) Zosime | Iulia Secunda numm[ --- ] | [ --- ] Sulpicio Galba II T. Vinio [ --- ] | [ --- ]+llus (vac. 15) [ --- ] | [ --- ]s (vac. 17) [ --- ] | <sup>45</sup>[ --- ]us (vac. 14) [ --- ]

*Type of inscription:* fasti.

*Findplace:* unknown.

*Physical description:* marble tablet, broken at the top, left edge and bottom, apparently sawn off along the right edge. The bottom right corner has been entirely broken off and then glued to the larger fragment; the bottom edge on the smaller fragment seems to be intact. Traces of guidelines (stretching only along the bottom of the line of writing) are visible particularly on the lower part of the fragment. To the right of the middle are two vertical lines 7.6 cm apart, running more or less from top to bottom, to mark columns. The front surface has no incrustation, being very smooth and polished, which is true also of the reverse.

*Dimensions:* the height varies from 35 (left) via 41 (middle) to 52 cm (right); the width is 54.8 at the top, 53.1 at the middle and 9.5 cm at the bottom; depth 2.0–2.9 cm.

*Average height of lines:* 1.2 cm, ranging from 0.6 (lines 24 and 31) to 1.9 cm (lines 10 and 15).

*Average length of lines:* 19.4 cm, ranging from 0.4 (line 44) to 25.7 cm (line 27).

*Arrangement:* the inscription is cut in two columns, and the text is arranged into paragraphs, one for each year, which are headed by the name(s) of the consul(s), followed by the names of the magistrates with an indentation of about seven letters.

*Lettering:* freehand capitals cut by several hands. Lines 1–20 (i.e. the entire left column) has the same hand throughout; typical freehand capitals, with “ears” on M, P open at lower curve, serifs sometimes a little clumsy. Some letters have traces of filling in red. Lines 21–31 are cut by a second hand with very thin, shallow and simple letters. 33–37 have been cut by a third hand, elegantly and with a wavy tendency on some serifs (note the beautifully slender long Y in *Tyche*); lines 38–41 are cut by a fourth, somewhat cruder hand, and 42–45 by a fifth, thinner and with large, wavy serifs.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* tall τ in lines 3 *strucTor*, 6 *AmaranTus* and 12 *aediT*. Tall s in line 8 *-ctuS*. Second O in line 5 *Poplicola* is elevated. The abbreviation *cos* in lines 5, 10, 15 and 20 tends towards having a large C and S, and a small o. The abbreviated praenomina in the consular datings of lines 27 and 33 are somewhat larger than the surrounding letters. Beginning from the I in line 15 *Suillio* is a stroke slanting slightly upwards to the right and extending also above the following L, probably an apex.

*Interpuncts:* given the very large gaps between some words, interpuncts tend to be placed after a word rather than between words. Lines 1–8 have triangular interpuncts after all words except after line 3 *structor*, 5 *Poplicola* and 8 [ - - ]*ctus*; no interpuncts at line endings. Lines 10–20 have triangular interpuncts after line 10 *Ç* and *Pompeio*, 13 *Amarantus*, 14 *Lini*, 15 *Ve]tere*, *M.* and *Nerulino* (the latter being placed very high, almost above the O), 16 [ - - ]*ns* and 17 [ - - ]*nus*. Lines 21–31 completely lack interpuncts, unless there is one after the first C. in line 27. Lines 33–45 have triangular interpuncts after line 33 *L.*, 38 *P.*, 41 *Secunda*, 42 *Galba* and *T.*

Note also that the number II in line 42 has a horizontal stroke above it.

*Date:* AD 47–69.

*Transcription:* CH, 22 August 2008.

*Literature:* *CIL* VI 8639 (transcribed by Gatti from a squeeze, checked by Henzen) and p. 3461 (reference to Mommsen and Hübner); *CIL* X 6637 (Mommsen from the same squeeze); *InscrIt* XIII 32 (Degrassi); Sjögren 1925, 245–247; Thomasson 149; Solin 2003b, 98–99. A new edition is being prepared by H. Solin for *CIL* X<sup>2</sup>.

*Inventory numbers:* UAS 1391 (large fragment, written in ink at the bottommost right; on the back 1062, vps. mvs. B 15), UAS 1400 (small fragment, written in ink at the bottommost right; on the back and on the top edge 1071, on the back vps. mvs. B 15).

This inscription, sometimes referred to as the *Fasti incertae originis ministrorum domus Augustae*, (“List of uncertain origin of the officials of the imperial household”), gives the names, year by year, of the officials (perhaps the *magistri*, see discussion on 1.2 above) of a *collegium* open to the emperor’s slaves and freedmen/-

women. The preserved fragments contain the entries for AD (47?) 48–50 and 66–69.

The *editio princeps* was made by Wilhelm Henzen in *CIL* VI, who included it in the volume of inscriptions from the city of Rome as it had been, as he writes, “ex urbe allata in museum Stockholmiense”. However, saying that the inscription had been brought from Rome

is not the same as to say that it had been found there; furthermore, the location of the stone to Stockholm being clearly erroneous casts doubt on the entire statement. Soon after Henzen's publication of the stone in *CIL* VI, it was included in *CIL* X by Theodor Mommsen, who had seen the rather striking similarity of this inscription to another list of similar officials, found by Cardinal Alessandro Albani in 1712 in Anzio and originating from the imperial villa on the same location (hence sometimes called the *Fasti Antiani*). The inscription found by Albani was edited by Mommsen in *CIL* X as no. 6638, the present one as no. 6637, although Mommsen made it clear that its origin was not known: "because this list is similar to the one from Anzio which follows and because it is not possible to make a proper investigation of it without studying the other, it has seemed right to provide room here also for this list, although it is clear that they do not originate from the same *collegium*, as the three years 48, 49 and 50 read differently in each".<sup>185</sup>

The list of officials in *CIL* X 6638 covers the years 31–51 with some gaps, and is drawn up in precisely the same way as the present; for each year there is a heading giving the name of the consuls, which is followed by a list of the officials with their titles. It is a mix of freedmen and slaves, with the very notable exception that there are no women at all; in the present inscription, women occur from the year 65 which has three female officials, Claudia Faustij[ - - - ], Altorja Phlogi[ - - - ] and Claudia Hellas (lines 24–26). The titles appearing in this inscription and in 6638 are also very similar, in some cases identical; particularly striking is the fact that the form *atrensis* for *atriensis* occurs in these

<sup>185</sup> "Cum fasti simillimi sunt Antiatinis qui sequuntur nec recte de his quaestio institui possit nisi adsumptis illis, iis quoque visum est hic locum dare, quamquam cum anni tres 48. 49. 50 in utrisque legantur diverse, non ab eodem collegio utrosque proficisci constat." (Mommsen in his notes on *CIL* X 6637).

two inscriptions and nowhere else, providing a rather compelling proof of their intimate connection. In both inscriptions, the gentilicia of the freedmen and -women clearly show the link to the imperial family; of the 13 gentilicia occurring in this inscription, there are seven instances of *Claudius*, the gentilicium of the emperor Claudius and of his successor Nero, one *Iulia*, the *gens* of their Julian predecessors Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, and two *Antonius*, who may perhaps stem from freedmen of Mark Antony. Only three cognomina lack an obvious imperial connection, viz. Altorja (25), Caecilius (30) and Ponti[us] (35). There is little doubt that the men and women listed here were part of the household of an imperial villa of Claudius and Nero.

The *collegium* as such appears to have been a *collegium funeraticium*, i.e. an association of people from similar circumstances with the purpose of taking care of each other's funerals (which need not have been the only purpose of the *collegium*).<sup>186</sup> Mostly, such *collegia* consisted of slaves and freedmen, often from the same household, who may not have had a family of their own, or only few relatives who could carry the cost and make the arrangements for a proper funeral.<sup>187</sup> The *collegia funeraticia* were of two kinds: those to which members paid a monthly fee and which then bore the cost, or part of it, for the funeral, and those who had a *monumentum* of their own, in which members were buried. The *collegia* also managed the cult of the dead for deceased members.

*Fasti*, or "lists of officials", of such *collegia* are very rare; there are fewer than ten inscriptions of this kind preserved. They are usually drawn up in the manner seen here, with the consuls of each year followed by a list of the officials,

<sup>186</sup> For a survey of various types of *collegia* in the Roman world, see now Perry 2011.

<sup>187</sup> A very clear indication of the familial character of (some of) these *collegia* is the existence of titles such as *matres* of *collegia*; see Perry 2011, 507.

*magistri*, of the *collegium*.<sup>188</sup> This inscription is interesting not least because of its relatively large number of titles belonging to various members of the staff in the imperial household, some of which are unattested elsewhere.<sup>189</sup> It is worthy of note, too, that it has been cut by no fewer than five hands (cf. above). The entries for the years AD (47) 48 to 50 (51) are cut by one hand, perhaps at one and the same occasion, which in such a case must have been in 51 at the earliest. The entries for the years 67 and 68, while by different hands, are also cut several years later, probably in 69 (see below, *ad loc.*).

In spite of Henzen's statement in *CIL* VI about the stone originating from Rome, and in spite of its obvious connection to the court of Claudius and Nero and to *CIL* X 6638, the exact provenance of the inscription must be considered unknown.<sup>190</sup> In 1902, another fragment of a similar list, found in the Cappella di San Gregorio near Frascati, was suggested by F. Grossi Gondi to derive from the same monument as the present, but this thesis cannot be maintained.<sup>191</sup> First, the fragment from Frascati is of bluish marble, whereas this one is white with thin black veins, probably Luna marble. Second, the fragment has a consular dating of AD 8, which is 40 years earlier than the first entry in this inscription.

1. [ - - ] § *Acratus* [numm.]: *Acratus* (from the Greek adjective ἄκρατος meaning "pure") is a name that is very rarely attested in the inscriptions.<sup>192</sup> In Greek, it was evidently not used as a name at all, while it is found a mere 16 times in Latin sources, seven of which are

from Rome.<sup>193</sup> There are traces of an *-s* preceding *Acratus*, noted by Degrassi but ignored by Gatti and Henzen, Mommsen and Thomasson.

The surface of the stone is damaged just after the name (the stone being chipped at the top edge), but traces of the bottom of the letters *numm* are visible.<sup>194</sup> The significance of this abbreviation, which is appended also to the following three names (and to two more below) has been subject to debate. In his edition in *CIL* X, Mommsen dissolved it as *numm(ularius/a)*, arguing that since there was no word for "giving", it could hardly stand for *numm(os)*. These *nummularii* would have been active strictly within the household and been able to combine this office with being *tegularii* and *structores*;<sup>195</sup> Mommsen's argument is

<sup>193</sup> Apart from the present also *CIL* VI 975, 6703, 9102, 27964, 28020, 29597, 32301. Elsewhere: *CIL* IV 6783 and 6864 (Pompeii), IX 301 (Bari) and 4929 (Monteleone Sabino), X 6561 (Velletri, with a connection to the imperial family: *Medullinae Camilli filiae*) | *Ti(beri) Claudii Neronis* | *Germanici sponsae* | *Acratus l(ibertus) paedagogus*) and 6562 (Velletri), XI 3345 (Civitavecchia), *AE* 1978, 119b (Herculaneum).

<sup>194</sup> These letters were observed by Mommsen and Degrassi, not, however, by Gatti and Henzen and Thomasson.

<sup>195</sup> "*nam quod item in mentem venit nummos dedisse hos ex nescio qua collegii lege vix videtur posse admitti, cum dandi vocabulum non adsit. Contra nihil impedit, quominus nummularii bi intra domum scilicet constituti (nam domus Augustae liberti publice sane nummularium negotium non exercuerunt), iidem tegularii structoresve fuerint et mulier quoque intra domum ei negotio vacaverit; omnino enim ii, fere ut quaestores collegiorum servilium, eo vocabulo non utebantur nisi ibi, ubi non tam coram populo, quam inter servos res agebatur*" ("because the thing that also crossed my mind, viz. that these had given coins because of I do not know which of the *collegium*'s rules, hardly seems acceptable as there is no word for 'giving'. On the other hand there is nothing to prevent that these *nummularii*, who were of course appointed within the household (for freedmen of the imperial house did certainly not act as *nummularii* in public), also were *tegularii* or *structores* and that also a woman practised this business within the household; because on the whole, rather like the *quaestores* of slave *collegia*, they did not use this title other than in such cases in which it was a matter not so much before the

<sup>188</sup> A full account of the *collegia* is given in Liebenam 1890; see also *RE* IV.1 (1900), 380–480 s.v. *Collegium* (Kornemann).

<sup>189</sup> For a suggested organization of the staff at an imperial villa, see Houston 1985, 187–191.

<sup>190</sup> Cf. Solin 2003b, 98.

<sup>191</sup> Grossi Gondi 1902, cf. Valenti 2003, 227, n. 546.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. Solin 1996, 411; as seen also by Solin 2002, 129, Thomasson's reading *Acrates* is erroneous.



repeated verbatim by Henzen in *CIL* VI, and *numm(ularius)* is printed also by Thomasson.

This interpretation has been criticized for quite some time. Herman Gummerus concluded that there is no evidence whatsoever that treasurers (“Kassierer”) of the imperial household were ever called *argentarii* or *nummularii* but rather *dispensatores*,<sup>196</sup> and in his article *Nummularius* in *RE*, Rudolf Herzog disregards this inscription, “weil die Abkürzung *numm.* bei einzelnen von ihnen (sc. of the persons mentioned in Herzog’s text) kaum als *nummularius* aufgelöst werden kann”.<sup>197</sup> With reference to Gummerus and Herzog, Degraffi wrote that “I should think that those people, like many *magistri* in the *collegium* of servants of the imperial household of Antium, gave money to get the office of *magister* and that the word *numm.* should be explained in this way”.<sup>198</sup> His solution to the problem is *numm(is)*, “with coins”, and even though it is not possible to confirm its correctness by comparison to similar inscriptions in which it

people as between slaves”).

<sup>196</sup> Gummerus does not discuss this particular inscription but a *nummularius* in *CIL* VI 3989: “Nicht so klar ist es, was der unter den Freigelassenen der Livia vorkommende *Ti. Iulius Iucundus nummularius* zu tun hatte. Vermutlich gehörte er zu der *familia monetaria*”; Gummerus 1915, 141.

<sup>197</sup> *RE* XVII.2 (1937), 1415–1455 s.v. *Nummularius* (R. Herzog), here 1450.

<sup>198</sup> “*Licet idem Mommsen abnuerit, ipse putem illos homines, ita ut complures magistri collegii Antiatidis ministrorum domus Augustae fecerunt ..., nummos dedisse ut magisterium susciperent et ita illud verbum numm. explicandum esse.*” In the Antium inscription *CIL* X 6638, there are several phrases of the kind *pro magi(stratu) ex d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) (sestertiis) MDC, [e]x d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) pro mag(istratu) (sestertiis) MDC* etc., which apparently must be interpreted in this way; Degraffi (*InscrIt* XIII 31.320) comments “*Decreto decurionum collegii fieri poterat ut summa quadam pecuniae (a sestertiis mille usque ad sestertium duo milia) vel quodam dono alius pro magistro adlegeretur*” (“With the decision of the *decuriones* of the *collegium* it was possible for another person to be elected *magister* for a specific sum of money or with some kind of gift”).

is written out in full, *nummis* does seem more probable than *nummularius*.

2. [ - - - ]*rus tegularius*: although practically only the ending of the diagonal is visible, the first letter following the lacuna seems to me to be an *R* (which is printed by Degraffi) rather than Mommsen’s (and Thomasson’s) *M*, particularly when compared to the *R* right below it; of course, this is not nearly enough even to attempt a guess at the name of the man recorded here. He was a tile-maker, probably producing tiles to be used in floors, in walls or in roofs.<sup>199</sup> His title, *tegularius*, is a word that is completely unattested in literature and extremely rare in inscriptions. Fully written out, it occurs only here, in *CIL* VI 7615.2 *Felix teglarius* (sic) and *CIL* X 3729.1–2 (Voluturnum) *P. Anicius P. l(ibertus) Eros | tegularius*. *CIL* X 6638 has *Anteros tegul(arius)*, and there are other sporadic abbreviations that should perhaps be read out as *tegularius* etc., so for instance *AE* 1903, 294 (Moesia Superior) *teg(ularii) leg(ionis) VII Cl(audiae)*.

3. [ - - - ]*ros structor*: this man, who obviously had a Greek name, had the position of *structor*, which may refer to either of two quite different offices, butler and carpenter or mason. *Structores* of the former kind were commonly applied in the large households of imperial times to supervise the laying of the table (hence the term, cf. *Serv. Aen.* 1.704 “*struere*” *ordinare, componere, unde et structores dicuntur ferculorum compositores*) and the slaves waiting on the guests, they decided the order of the courses to be served at a banquet and saw to it that they were presented in an attractive manner. The *structores* who were engaged in building work were carpenters or, in particular, masons; in Rome, they had their own *collegium*, the *collegium structorum* (mentioned in *CIL* VI 444).<sup>200</sup>

<sup>199</sup> Cf. Houston 1985, 187.

<sup>200</sup> See *RE* R.2 IV.1 (1931), 381–383 s.v. *Structor* 1–2 (Hug).

The scanty information available here makes it impossible to say which kind of *structor* is meant. However, with a *regularius* immediately preceding, the mason may seem the more likely.<sup>201</sup>

4. [ - - - ]§ **Metrodas**: this form, which is not attested elsewhere, is an instance of a type of abbreviation by which Greek made affectionate nicknames of existing, longer names. In Hellenistic times and later, this was primarily done by using the suffix *-ας* (regardless of whether or not the full name contained an *α*). In this case, the full name was probably *Metrodorus*; an exact parallel is *Θευδάς* for *Θεόδωρος*, and further instances of the same phenomenon in compound names with *-δωρος* are *Ἄρτεμᾶς* for *Ἄρτεμίδωρος*, *Ζηγᾶς* for *Ζηγόδωρος*, *Νυμφᾶς* for *Νυμφόδωρος* etc.<sup>202</sup>

5. [ - - - L.] **Vipstano Poplicola co(n)-s(ulibus)**: L. Vipstanus Poplicola was *consul ordinarius* in AD 48, for the first six months together with A. Vitellius (who was to become one of the three emperors of AD 69), from 1st July together with his brother L. Vitellius.<sup>203</sup> Had the name of his colleague been fully preserved, we would consequently have been able to date this entry to within half a year. In both *CIL* editions is found the conjecture [*A. Vitellio L.*] *Vipstano*, repeated also by Degraasi.

6. [ - - - ]+**dius Amarantus**: in this line and in the following, the clearly legible letters *DIVS* are preceded by traces of another letter right in the fracture; remaining of this letter is (in both cases) a right diagonal with a top serif, making it very likely that the letter is a *v*; the gentilicia may thus have been [*Cla*] *udius*, which is printed by Mommsen and Henzen. They add the abbreviation *Ti.* for the praenomen *Tiberius*, as any *Claudius* appearing in this inscription

is likely to be a freedmen of either of the emperors Tiberius, *Claudius* (born. *Ti. Claudius Drusus*) and *Nero* (whose name after the adoption by *Claudius* was *Ti. Claudius Nero Caesar*). Again, this is repeated by Degraasi.

*Amarantus*, from the Greek *ἀμάραντος* (“unfading”), emphasizes beauty as a desirable quality in a slave. It occurs sporadically as a name in Greek sources but becomes rather common in Latin, being found in 85 inscriptions in *CIL* VI (half of which have the hypercorrect spelling *Amaranthus*). There is even one *Ti. Claudius Amaranthus*, who belonged to the imperial household in the capacity of *Caesaris nomenclator*, but there is no reason to assume that he is the person mentioned here.

7. [ - - - ]+**dius Epaphroditus**: Mommsen and Henzen and Degraasi conjecture [*Ti. Claudius Epaphroditus*]. The cognomen goes well with the preceding *Amarantus*, being formed on the Greek adjective *ἐπαφρόδιτος* meaning “lovely, fascinating, charming”, and warrants at least the suspicion that *Amarantus* and *Epaphroditus* were named within the same context; they may have been born within the imperial household, and perhaps even were brothers.

8. [ - - - ]**ctus vilicus**: this man, whose name is unrestorable, was *vilicus* of the villa at which this *collegium* was based, supervising the staff employed there. Such *vilici* are known from Tiberius’ household on the Palatine and from the imperial palace built by Domitian (*CIL* VI 8655.3 *vilic(us) domus Au[gustianae]*). In the case of a villa, though, it is naturally possible that he was a *vilicus* proper, i.e. in charge of running the farm-estate (which also goes for the *subvilicus* mentioned in the inscription from the villa at Antium, *CIL* X 6638).<sup>204</sup>

9. [[ [ - - - - - ] ]]: this is the first erasure in the inscription (the others occur in lines 22 and 32), missed by Mommsen and Henzen but noted by Degraasi. The latter (p. 32) suggests

<sup>201</sup> This is also how Gummerus took it in his long article about ‘Industrie und Handel’ in *RE* IX.2 (1916), 1381–1535 (here 1458).

<sup>202</sup> See Blass & Debrunner 1961, § 125.

<sup>203</sup> Degraasi 1952, 14.

<sup>204</sup> See Carlsen 1995, 34–35.

that these are due either to a name having been entered in the list by mistake or to a *magister* having committed an offence in some respect and been excluded; Thomasson (p. 94) advocates the latter explanation.

10. [Q. Veranio] C. Pompeio Gallo co(n)-s(ulibus): C. Pompeius Longinus Gallus was consul *ordinarius* together with Q. Veranius in AD 49.<sup>205</sup>

11. *topiar(ius)*: the *topiarius* was a trained gardener. The title is attested in the imperial household as well as in those of prominent families like the Volusii Saturnini and the Stiltii; in the list from Antium (*CIL X 6638*), no fewer than nine *topiarii* are mentioned.<sup>206</sup>

12. *aedit(uus)*: *aedituus* was properly the term for a verger in a temple, but the word is often glossed as *custos domorum et templorum, templi vel aedis minister, aeditui: ostiarii* etc. An *aedituus* of a *collegium* is known from *CIL VI 5183b (C. Iulio Chrysanto aedituo collegi tabernaculorum)*, and there are two *aeditui* in the inscription from Antium, one *Lysimachus aedit(u)s vern(a) Ant(iatinus)* and another *Philetus aeditu(u)s Fortunarum [II]* (III 23 and 28 in Degrassi's edition); T. Flavius Abascantus, freedman of Domitian and Staius' most important channel into the imperial palace, evidently had a private *aedituus* (*CIL VI 2214 T. Flavius Epaphroditus aedituus Abascanti et Priscillaes patronor(um)*).<sup>207</sup>

13. *Amarantus*: see discussion on line 6 above.

14. *Lini praef(ectus)*: the significance of these words has been a matter of debate, although what is probably the correct explanation was proposed by Mommsen. In his note

on *CIL X 6637*, he argued that *praef.* would be a nominative with *Lini* as a possessive genitive and that the meaning would be "the substitute of Linus", "so that the *praefectura* appears to have had some place here too, as in real offices of state, and someone else to have served in the place of the slave Linus, who was *magister* in that year".<sup>208</sup> This interpretation, accepted by Degrassi and by Solin,<sup>209</sup> understands *praefectus* in the sense of "deputy" (which is the basic meaning of the word);<sup>210</sup> it is also supported by line 35 below, which seems to mention a man serving as the deputy of another (although the actual word *praefectus* has been lost in that case).

Other explanations have been proposed. One is based on the fact that *praefectus* is rather well attested as an office in certain *collegia*, particularly for the *collegia* of *fabri*, but also in other contexts; Liebenam, who mentions this inscriptions alongside a variety of *collegia* both of the *fabri* and others,<sup>211</sup> concludes that the *praefecti* of the *collegia* "wohl regelmässig auf eine quasi-militärische Organisation hindeuten". Moreover, the title of *praefectus* often occurs side by side with, and as a synonym to, that of the *patronus* in the guilds.<sup>212</sup> But if the present *praef.* is such a *praefectus*, then why is the name *Lini* in the genitive? One must conclude

<sup>205</sup> Degrassi 1952, 14.

<sup>206</sup> See Landgren 2004, 178–190.

<sup>207</sup> See *TLL I* (1902), 934, 40–47 and 935, 19–22 s.v. *aeditumus* (-imus) et *aedituus* (V.); *RE I.1* (1894), 465–466 s.v. *Aedituus* (Habel) (though not every epigraphic instance given at the end of his article actually refers to an *aedituus*).

<sup>208</sup> "A. 49 quarto loco videtur legendum praef(ectus), ut hic quoque, fere ut in vere magistratibus, praefectura aliquem locum habuisse videatur et Lini servi eo anno magistri alius quidam vices fecisse."

<sup>209</sup> Solin 2002, 129.

<sup>210</sup> See *TLL X.2* (1985), 620, 27–29 s.v. *praeficio* (van Leijenhorst).

<sup>211</sup> Liebenam 1890, 209, n. 3. See also *TLL X.2* (1985), 629, 53–66 s.v. *praeficio* (van Leijenhorst, who makes no mention of the present inscription), and the list of epigraphically attested *praefecti* in Waltzing 1900, 416–417 (which does mention this instance as "Praef(ectus), *parmi les magistri servorum Caesarum Antiatium*").

<sup>212</sup> *TLL X.2* (1985), 629, 53–54 s.v. *praeficio* (van Leijenhorst); the *patroni* could also be freedmen, see Liebenam 1890, 212–220 and cf. Waltzing's list (title in the preceding note).

that such a reading would point out a person just mentioned (but now lost) as the slave of the prefect Linus; but there are no other statements of such a kind in the inscription.

Thomasson, finally, wrote “*lini praefectus*” probably = *a lino*, ‘superintendent of the linen store.’ But, while there are quite a number of titles of the type *ab epistulis, a potione, a veste* etc. (not least in the administration connected with the imperial household),<sup>213</sup> there are no instances of a title *a lino*.<sup>214</sup> Moreover, there is as far as I can see not a single instance of one of these titles in the form *praefectus* with the genitive (*praefectus epistularum, p. potionis, p. vestis* etc.). For these reasons, I consider Thomasson’s suggestion unlikely.

*Linus* is a mythological name, attached to a figure who was variously considered as the prematurely dead son of Apollo or as a prominent singer, killed by the god for considering himself his equal in song. As a personal name, it is quite rare both in Greek and in Latin sources, with about ten instances in *CIL* VI. One of these, as it happens, is a *Linus Ti. Claudii Caesaris Aug(usti) corporis custos* (*CIL* VI 8804), but he died aged 20, apparently a slave, and would hardly be the man mentioned here.

**15. [C. Antistio Ve]tere M. Suillio Nerulino co(n)s(ulibus):** C. Antistius Vetus was consul for the second time in AD 50, his colleague being M. Suillius Nerullinus (usually spelled with a double *-ll*).<sup>215</sup> There only seem

to be two other inscriptions dated by this pair of consuls, the one being *CIL* X 6638 (the *collegium* at Antium), the other an epitaph from Grenoble (*CIL* XII 2234).

**16. [ - - ]ns disp(ensator):** the *dispensator* was a slave in charge of the administration of cash in a household or, in the case of very large houses, in a particular department, and consequently a slave who was high in his master’s trust. The appointment of a *dispensator* was naturally necessary only in wealthy families like those of knights and senators, and they are, of course, well represented as part of the staff of the imperial family. The household of the emperor himself must have occupied several *dispensatores*, and even the *familiae* of less prominent members of the family, like Augustus’ Livia and Agrippina the Younger, had at least a couple of *dispensatores*.<sup>216</sup> In *CIL* X 6638, there is one *Euphemus [P]allan(tianus) dispen(sator)*.

The first letter after the fracture is probably an N, but may perhaps be a V. Only two strokes are visible, viz. a rightmost vertical and a diagonal stroke slanting upwards towards the left from the base of the vertical in question; the angle of this diagonal is a bit too low for it to suit a V, hence I prefer to take it as part of an N.

**18. Cosmus:** a Greek noun (κόσμος) meaning “(good) order” etc.,<sup>217</sup> *Cosmus* is found used as a name in Greek (76 instances in the *LGPN*) as well as Latin sources; in *CIL* VI, it occurs in 57 inscriptions, one of which is the epitaph of one Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Cosmus, set up by his freedwoman Claudia Tyche (*CIL* VI 4741). Naturally, it is quite tempting to assume that this is the very same Claudia Tyche who is mentioned in line 34 in this inscription, and that this Cosmus was the imperial freed-

<sup>213</sup> In the index to Weaver 1972 are found the following titles: in the plural, *a codicillis, a cognitionibus, a commentariis, a copiis, a diplomatibus, ab epistulis, ab instrumentis, a iuencis, a libellis, a libris, a muneribus, ab ornamentis, a pinothecis, a rationibus, a studiis, a vinis, a voluptatibus*; in the singular *ab admissione, ab annona, ab argento, a bybliotheca, a cubiculo, a cura amicorum, a cyato, a memoria, a potione, a veste*.

<sup>214</sup> It may be noted that *CIL* X 6638 mentions one *Zelus Aug. lin[ - - ]*, which Degraffi conjectures as *lin[ti(o)]*, i.e. *linitextor* (cf. *TLL* VII.2 (1976), 1455, 51–54 s.v. *linitextor* (Kemper).).

<sup>215</sup> Degraffi 1952, 14.

<sup>216</sup> See Carlsen 1995, 147–158.

<sup>217</sup> I would rather think that this is the primary meaning of the name, and not the philosophical meaning “world-order, universe” etc., which is the heading under which the name is sorted in Solin 1996, 527.

man who was her patron, but this must remain speculative.

19. [ - - - ]+tus: Degrassi prints *Cautus* here, presumably because Mommsen reproduced the upper halves of the letters C and A, and the complete first v, in the drawing in *CIL X 6637*. The inscription itself does not, however, warrant such a reading. The final three letters TVS are preserved in their entirety. Preceding the T is an N (or possibly a V); only the rightmost two strokes are intact, and from the way they slant—the leftmost almost at 45° and the one to the right at a little more than 90°—they rather suggest an N than a V, as does the leftmost serif. Before this letter, there are traces of the very top of two further letters. The leftmost is a curve (thus a C?), the following a top serif, but it is practically impossible to say to which letter it once belonged.

20. co(n)s(ulibus): if the table continued chronologically, this line would give the consuls for AD 51, viz. the emperor Claudius (for the fifth time) and Ser. Cornelius Salvidienus Orfitus.<sup>218</sup> In the inscription from Antium (*CIL X 6638*), this dating reads *Ti. Claudio Augusto V Ser. Cornelio Orphito cos.*, and a similar variant was conjectured by Degrassi here, with abbreviation of *Aug.* Otherwise, the commonest version seems to have been *Ti. Claudio Caesare Augusto Germanico V Ser. Cornelio Orfito cos.* (*CIL II 4095*, VI 353, 1984, *AE 1973*, 157, *TPSulp 74* and 103), sometimes with abbreviation of *Augusto* and/or *Germanico*, but this would probably be too long to have fitted here.

21. Ti. Claudius Daphn+[ - - - ]: *Daphn[us]* Henzen and Mommsen, *Daphnu[s]* Degrassi, although it is impossible to read anything else than *Daphn* now. There is a faint trace of a stroke belonging to the following letter, and while not much can be made of it now, it is congruent with the lower end of the left diagonal

in the letter v found in *Daphnus* rather than, e.g., the I of *Daphnicus*.

*Daphnus* (Gr. Δάφνος) is a masculine form of the Greek noun δάφνη, “laurel”. While both forms are rather common as a name in Latin sources (there are about 80 instances of *Daphnus* in *CIL VI*), the feminine Δάφνη (unlike the masculine) is actually quite rare in Greek; the *LGPN* count 79 instances of Δάφνος (of which 21 in vol. III.A, which includes southern Italy), and 29 of Δάφνη (of which 16 in vol. III.A).

22. [[M.]] [[ [ - - - ] ]]: the second erasure (cf. above on line 9), noted by all editors. Some very shallow traces of letters still remain, of which the first is an M, i.e. the praenomen *Marcus*.

23. Euphemus atren[sis]: Euphemus (from the Greek εὐφημος, “uttering sounds of good omen”, hence “fair-sounding”, “auspicious”) is found as a name in Greek (123 instances in *LGPN*) as well as Latin sources (66 in *CIL VI*). This man, who was evidently still a slave, had the office of *atriensis*, once a very important position which incorporated the distribution of work among the other slaves in the household (as a kind of “butler”) and also the management of the private business of the *dominus*. By the end of the Republic, such tasks had been taken over by *dispensatores* (see above on line 16), while the *atrienses* were degraded to household slaves on the same level as cleaners or bakers. From Columella, it appears that in the early Empire, they could, for instance, be charged with maintaining the furniture: the *vilica*, he says, should see to it that the *atrienses* “put out the furniture to air” (*supellectilem exponant*; 12.3.9).<sup>219</sup>

The spelling *atrensis* with loss of *i* before *e* is found only here and in *CIL X 6638*,<sup>220</sup> thus constituting a strong and important link be-

<sup>219</sup> See Carlsen 1995, 142–147.

<sup>220</sup> Cf. *TLL II* (1903), 1099, 74–75 s.v. *atriensis* (Münscher).

<sup>218</sup> Degrassi 1952, 14.



tween the two inscriptions. It likely reflects pronunciation; Väänänen notes that antevo-calic *i*, *e* and *u*, when synizesis was prevented by a preceding consonant or groups of consonants, could sometimes be lost altogether, as for instances in *queti* (= *quieti*, an exact parallel), *febrarias* (= *februarias*) and *dodecim* (= *duodecim*).<sup>221</sup>

**24. Claudia Faustī** [ - - - ]: the cognomen of this freedwoman is unanimously conjectured as *Faustina* by the editors, although there are other possible names, like *Faustiana*, *Faustilla* etc. *Faustina* is, however, most common by far; Kajanto counts 238 bearers in *CIL*,<sup>222</sup> but it is worth noting that only six of these are slaves or freedwomen; the name must have had a distinctively freeborn ring to it.

**25. Altorīa Phlogi** [ - - - ]: this is a difficult name, which Henzen left untouched in *CIL* VI (printing only A TORIA, with a stroke resembling the diagonal of the letter R between A and T). Mommsen printed *Artoria*, Degrassi *Aetoria* (followed by a question mark) and Thomasson *Artoria* with a dot below the R. Having examined the stone, I can say that the letter in question is not an R, but looks rather like a disproportional L with a very long horizontal. If this is indeed an L, this is all the more puzzling as it looks entirely different from the other L:s in this hand, which have an extremely short horizontal and also a tiny serif on top of the vertical, which this letter lacks. It rather looks like a pure mistake, but the fact remains that it would be an explicable mistake if the stonemason intended to cut an L, but very hard to understand if he wanted to cut an R.

Still, while there is no attested gentilicium *Altorius*, *Artorius* occurs in 33 inscriptions in *CIL* VI. It does seem likely, then, that *Artoria* is the name intended here, in which case the use of L for R may perhaps again be occasioned by

pronunciation. There are instances of loss of either of the liquidae L and R in inscriptions (e.g., *Matialis, ducissimo, sepucru*),<sup>223</sup> which indicates that they could be weakly pronounced, particularly before a plosive. This may in its turn indicate that the letters could be hypercorrectly restored in writing, but whether or not this is applicable here remains, of course, uncertain.

The cognomen *Phlogi* [ - - - ] was restored as *Phlogi[s]* by Degrassi (followed by Thomasson). This name is attested once, in *CIL* VI 24149 (*Ossa | Phlogis Marcellaes | Cestus posuit*). There are also a couple of instances of the masculine *Phlogius*, viz. *CIL* VI 9621.3–4 *Phlogius | Q. Volusi ser(vus)* and *CIL* XIV 946.2 *A. Egrilius Phlogius*. None of these names are attested in Greek, but must be formed on the stem φλογ-, as in φλόξ, “flame, fire”. As no feminine variant of *Phlogius* is attested, *Phlogis* is the safer conjecture (perhaps with a small caveat considering the vulgar genitive *Marcellaes* that follows it in VI 24149).

**26. Claudia Hellas numm.**: *Hellas* was not used as a name in Greek. The Romans had a number of geographical cognomina of purely Latin extraction, but these were all adjectives, not nouns, which makes *Hellas* quite original. While a name like *Sabinus* was far more frequent among the freeborn than among slave and freedmen,<sup>224</sup> a name like *Hellas* would rather have been a name borne by slaves or freedmen (or persons of such extraction).<sup>225</sup>

For the abbreviation *numm.*, see above on line 1.

<sup>223</sup> Leumann 1977, 215.

<sup>224</sup> *Sabinus* is the commonest geographical cognomen and qualifies among the eleven commonest Latin cognomina of any type, with 1,452 bearers according to Kajanto's calculations (1965, 30, posing also the puzzling question why this name, and not *Romanus*, comes out on top).

<sup>225</sup> Solin 2003a, s.v., lists 29 instances, 16 of which are *incerti*, but twelve slaves of freedwomen and only one freeborn.

<sup>221</sup> Väänänen 1982, 98.

<sup>222</sup> Kajanto 1965, 272.



27. **C. Luccio Telesino C. Suetonio** [Paulino co(n)s(ulibus)]: C. Luccius Telesinus and C. Suetonius Paullinus were the consuls of AD 66.<sup>226</sup> They appear in the consular dating only of four more inscriptions, viz. *CIL* XI 395, *InscrIt* XIII 29.2, *RMD* 3.201b and Pais 417.

28. **Pannychus**: from the Greek adjective πάννυχος, “lasting all night”, probably used as a name in the sense of “waking” or similar. It occurs as a name in Greek sources, with 27 instances in *LGPN* and another three with the ending -ιος, which is actually the commoner form of the adjective. In Latin *Pannychus* is the only masculine form found (whereas there are two feminine variants, *Pannychia* and *Pannychis*, the latter being more frequent); Solin counts 14 instances in Rome, nine of which are confirmed or probably freedmen or slaves.<sup>227</sup> The present individual belonged to the latter category.

It may be noted that the horizontal of Η is extremely shallowly cut, and hardly can be seen at all.

29. **Sita a valetudi[nario]**: according to Solin, the name *Sita* is a man’s name of Thracian origin.<sup>228</sup> Apart from this instance, he lists only one more instance from Rome (*BullComm* 51, 1923, 93 no. 89). I know of only three other inscriptions which all come from the east, two of them from Moesia Superior, viz. *CIL* III 8242, reading *Scerviae|dus Sitaes | vix(it) ann(os) XXX | interfectus | a latroni|bus Sita Pa|sip(i) f(i)lius p(osuit)* (2–8) and *ILJug* 3.1435, which reads [ - - - ] | et Sitaefilio Sumi | cor(niculario) c(o)bor(tis) | pri(mae) Dar(danorum) v(i)xit an(nos) | XXXX b(ene) m(erenti) p(osuit). The third is from the province of Asia, *AE* 1978, 797.1–3 *C. Aruntiu[s] | Vel(ina) Arabu[s] | Sitaefilii* [ - - - ].

<sup>226</sup> Degrassi 1952, 18.

<sup>227</sup> Solin 2003a, s.v.

<sup>228</sup> Solin 1996, 610.

The fact that two of these four instances are found in Moesia Superior may indicate a connection of the name to this area, although there are far too few cases for any conclusions to be drawn. There is one word in Greek that matches the name exactly, viz. the plural σῖτα of σῖτος, meaning “grain”, but this seems a coincidence rather than anything else.

*Sita* was a slave *a valetudi[nario]* (the lacuna having been thus supplied since Henzen). Such *valetudinaria*, “infirmaries”, are first attested in the household of Livia, from which we know of two slaves *ad valetudinar(ium)*, one *Helpis* and one *Philargurus* (*CIL* VI 9084 and 9085); Schneider suggests that these were the managers of the wards for men and women respectively, and that the *valetudinarium* as such was an infirmary set up to care for the slaves of the household;<sup>229</sup> the same would be applicable for the *valetudinarium* mentioned here. From the early Empire, *valetudinaria* are found also in wealthy private houses, as appears from *Sen. Dial.* 3.16.4, *si intrassem valetudinarium exercitus aut domus divitis* (which also mentions the *valetudinarium* as a military hospital, likewise a type of institution current from Augustus on).

The title *a valetudinario* is only attested in one other inscription viz. *CIL* X 703, from the imperial villa at Surrentum: *Eutyclus Aug(usti) | ser(vus) a valetudin(ario) | vix(it) ann(os) XXXX*.

30. **A. Caecilius a pisci** [ - - - ]: Henzen, Mommsen and Thomasson read *Caecilius* here, whereas Degrassi has *Caecilius*. I and E are indeed very similar to one another in this hand, but the letter E always has a middle horizontal, even if this is just a very faint line hardly extending from the vertical at all. Here, though, there definitely is no such horizontal; the spelling is *Caecilius* with the original, archaic form of the diphthong for the classical *Caecilius*. Histori-

<sup>229</sup> *RE* R. 2 VIII.1 (1955), 262–263 s.v. *Valetudinarium*.

cally, *ai* had developed into *ae* by the 180s BC, which means that all later instances are archaisms. Leumann notes that *ai* “erlebte ... eine kurze Renaissance unter Kaiser Claudius”,<sup>230</sup> but since the present entry is for the year AD 66, this is hardly relevant here. Unless *Caicilius* should be attributed to a sudden wish to be archaic, it must reasonably be due to confusion of the stonemason.

*Caicilius*’ title is not attested anywhere else. In the notes to his *CIL* VI edition, Henzen conjectured *a pisci[na?]*, adding “nisi potius cognomen est”. Influenced, it seems, by Henzen’s doubts, Mommsen printed *Atisci[---]* in *CIL* X and was followed by Degrassi. Thomason reintroduced Henzen’s *a pisci[na]*, which seemed to him to be more plausible than a cognomen.

The problem is that  $\tau$  and  $\rho$  are extremely similar in this hand, the horizontal of the former hardly protruding to the left at all, while the latter is almost entirely open. However, there are no names beginning in *Atisci-* preserved in any inscription, making the theory of another name implausible.

*pisc[ina]* is a much easier supplement, implying a basin of some kind, usually for breeding fish or for swimming, but also for watering animals, for irrigation etc.<sup>231</sup> Pliny the Younger had such “swimming-pool *piscinae*” in his villas both in Etruria and in Laurentum. There are also numerous references to the fish-basins of wealthy Romans, and we know that Lucullus and Hortensius, among others, paid substantial sums of money for the erection of salt water basins for the cultivation of sea fish.<sup>232</sup>

<sup>230</sup> Leumann 1977, 67.

<sup>231</sup> See the various meanings listed in *TLL* X.1 (2003), 2202, 65–2205, 67 s.v. *piscina* (Spath).

<sup>232</sup> Cicero called those who indulged in such luxury fish-breeding *piscinarii* (cf. Kajava 1998–1999). On the subject of *piscinae* as a whole, see further *RE* XX.2 (1950), 1783–1790 s.v. *Piscina* (K. Schneider), and (on *piscinae* for fish-breeding) Higginbotham 1997.

31. **Claudia Corin[---]**: Degrassi supplied her cognomen as *Corin[thia]*, Thomason as *Corin[na]*. Both (as would be any supplement in a case like this) are naturally pure guesses, but *Corinthia*, which has 37 unabbreviated instances in *CIL* VI, is statistically much more plausible than *Corinna*, which has only four.<sup>233</sup>

32. [[ [----- ] ]]: the third and last erasure (cf. above on line 9), again noted by all editors. There are no traces of the letters erased in this case.

33. **L. Iulio Rufo**: L. Iulius Rufus was consul in AD 67 together with Fonteius Capito.<sup>234</sup> Nevertheless, the name of the latter seems never to have been incised on this stone. There is a space of a full 19 letters following Rufus’ name, and while there are other large spaces separating names in these *fasti*, *Fonteio Capitone* could hardly have been fitted onto the stone following so big a space. Consequently, it seems that Fonteius’ name was never included in the first place.

Following his consulship, Fonteius was the governor of Germania in AD 68, during which time he came to be considered by Galba as a threat substantial enough to require elimination; in his biography, Suetonius says of Galba *nec prius usum togae recipere quam oppressis qui novas res moliebantur, praefecto praetori Nymphidio Sabino Romae, in Germania Fonteio Capitone, in Africa Clodio Macro legatis*.<sup>235</sup> The omission of Fonteius Capito on this stone was set in connection with this event by Mommsen in his edition in *CIL* X, arguing that this entry must have been cut during the brief reign of Galba, when Fonteius’ name would have been omitted because of the emperor’s grudge against him—“not before the end of 68 ... and not much after; because after

<sup>233</sup> Cf. Solin 2002, 129.

<sup>234</sup> Degrassi 1952, 18.

<sup>235</sup> Suet. *Galb.* 11; similarly Plut. *Galb.* 15; see *RE* VI.2 (1909), 2846–2847 s.v. Fonteius 18.

the death of Galba, Capito's name regained its former place". Mommsen's explanation has won universal acceptance.

**34. Claudia Tyche:** it is perhaps no surprise to find that *Tyche* (Τύχη) is very common as a name in Latin sources; *CIL* VI has nearly 300 instances, and its frequency in Greek sources is also quite large (with 155 cases recorded in the *LGN*), particularly by comparison with its Latin equivalent *Fortuna*. Kajanto counts a total of 41 instances of *Fortuna* used as a name,<sup>236</sup> of which more than half the number (24) occur in Christian sources, and, quite conspicuously, 28 are found in Africa. The low frequency of the Latin name in non-Christian contexts is probably due to a reluctance of naming persons after Roman deities; after all, *Fortuna* had both cult and temple in Rome. The connotations of such a name, though, were naturally as desirable in Latin as in Greek, cf. the 2,430 instances of *Fortunatus*.<sup>237</sup> On Claudia Tyche, freedwoman of one Ti. Claudius Aug. lib. Cosmus, see above on line 18.

**35. Ti. Claudius Q. Ponti[ - - - ]:** another combination of uncertain significance. Mommsen (and Henzen) offer no comment. Degraffi thinks that Claudius would have been the *praefectus* ("deputy", see above on line 14, *Lini praefecti*) of Q. Pontius ("Ti. Claudium praefectum Q. Pontii fuisse existimo"), and consequently supplies *Q. Ponti [praefectus]*. Thomasson takes it simply as two names in the nominative, *Ti. Claudius* and *Q. Ponti[us]*, though he adds a question mark to the supplement.

The possibility of two names in the nominative on one and the same line seems unlikely, as there are no other instances of this in the inscriptions. Thus, the two names are probably of different cases, in which case the only reasonable solution is a nominative and a genitive. This

<sup>236</sup> Kajanto 1965, 273.

<sup>237</sup> Kajanto 1965, 273.

makes Degraffi's suggestion seem very likely, and also supports a similar interpretation of line 14 above.

The praenomen *Ti(berius)*, while clearly legible, is badly worn. Degraffi comments that "praenomen Claudii postea additum esse videtur", but it rather seems that someone has accidentally begun to erase it.

**36. Antonius Faustu[s]:** this is the only freedman in the inscription whose praenomen is not included. His cognomen is universally conjectured as *Faustu[s]*, which may be considered a safe guess, since other cognomina beginning in *Faustu-*, viz. *Faustulus* and *Faustullus*, are extremely rare.<sup>238</sup>

*Faustus* belongs to the category of names which Kajanto calls "wish-names" (implying a wish on the part of the parents that the child may enjoy the quality implied by the name). It is one of 18 cognomina listed by him as having more than 1,000 instances; with 1,279 bearers according to his calculations, it occupies the 13th position on the list.<sup>239</sup>

**37. Albanus vilicu[s]:** the name *Albanus* originally implied association with the town of Alba Longa (which according to legend was destroyed in the reign of Tullus Hostilius in the 7th century BC) south of Rome or with the Alban Mount. Kajanto counts 182 instances in *CIL*,<sup>240</sup> of which 138 are men and 44 women, 143 freeborn or freedmen/-women, and 39 slaves. This Albanus obviously belonged to the latter category. For the office of *vilicus*, see above on line 8.

**38. P. Galerio Trachalo [ - - - ]:** P. Galerius Trachalus was consul in AD 68 together with Silius Italicus, the future epicist. In a list of actions that would have been taken by Nero when the governor of Gallia Lugdunensis, C.

<sup>238</sup> Kajanto 1965, 272.

<sup>239</sup> Kajanto 1965, 29–30; though on p. 72 he claims that there are 2,021 examples to *Faustus*, including derivatives; cf. p. 272.

<sup>240</sup> Kajanto 1965, 181.

Julius Vindex, rebelled against him in March 68, Suetonius reports that Nero “stripped the consuls of their honour prematurely and alone entered the consulship in the place of both of them, as if it had been decreed by fate that the Gallic provinces could not be subdued except by a consul”.<sup>241</sup> However, Suetonius is alone in reporting this, and in *CIL* VI 9190, the consular dating includes both Nero and Trachalus (*Nerone V et Trachalo cos.*), indicating that only Silius had to yield his position to the emperor, who would have been *consul suffectus* for Silius.<sup>242</sup> In any case, the omission of Nero’s name from this list shows that the entry was cut after his death in June 68 and the subsequent *damnatio memoriae*. And if the above entry for the year 67 was cut in 69, this provides a *terminus post quem* for the present lines too.

**39. Antonia Musa:** another freedwoman from the *gens Antonia* (like Antonius Faustus above). *Musa*, belonging to a group which Kajanto calls “theophoric cognomina”, is actually used both for men and women, though with many more instances for the latter; Kajanto counts 174 women (of which 56 are freedwomen/slaves) and just 14 men (including three freedmen/slaves) in *CIL*.<sup>243</sup>

**40. Claudia Zosime:** the cognomen *Zosime*, formed on the Greek adjective ζῶσιμος meaning “viable, likely to survive”,<sup>244</sup> is a typi-

cal “wish-name” that may be expected to occur in a society with a high infant mortality. It is very frequent in Greek sources; *LGPN* lists no less than 1,187 male bearers and 255 female. In *CIL* VI, there are 104 instances of the female *Zosime* (and a further 27 spelled with a final *-a*), and 169 of the masculine *Zosimus*.

**41. Iulia Secunda numm.:** this woman is connected to the Julian family, which preceded the Claudians on the throne. She may be a freedwoman herself of Caligula or of Tiberius, or perhaps the freeborn daughter of a freedman or -woman.

*Secundus* (“second-born”) is an extremely common name. Kajanto mentions only *Felix* as more frequent (3,716 bearers),<sup>245</sup> whereas *Secundus*, according to his calculations, has 2,684 occurrences.

On *numm.*, see on line 1 above.

**42. [Ser. S]ulpicio Galba II T. Vinio [Rufino?]:** Servius Sulpicius Galba, now emperor, and his supporter T. Vinius were *consules ordinarii* for the year AD 69, Galba for the second time.<sup>246</sup> They were both killed on 15 January by the Othonians, which thus provides a *terminus ante quem* for this entry.

**43–45.** These lines all belong to the entry of AD 69; they are now too fragmentary for anything to be said about them.

<sup>241</sup> (*Nero*) *consules ante tempus privavit honore atque in utriusque locum solus iniit consulatum, quasi fatale esset non posse Gallias debellari nisi a consule* (Suet. *Ner.* 43.2; Degraffi 1952, 18).

<sup>242</sup> Gallivan 1974, 292.

<sup>243</sup> Kajanto 1965, 216.

<sup>244</sup> It is interesting to note that *LSJ* gives no instances of ζῶσιμος as an adjective with this meaning prior to the 3rd century AD. The only earlier instance is from the philosopher Philodemus (1st century BC), but according to the *LSJ*, the meaning in Philodemus is “pertaining to this life”, and it adds a question mark to this entry. In any case, the word must have been widely used in everyday language before it found its way into literature.

<sup>245</sup> Kajanto 1965, 29–30.

<sup>246</sup> Vinius’ cognomen Rufinus is not certain, see *RE* R.2 IX.1 (1961), 124–127 s.v. Vinius 5 (R. Hanslik).

## 23.VM 1757–1758 (SEG XVIII 628)

A:

Βασιλ[εύ]οντο[ς Πτολε]μαίου τοῦ Π[τολ]εμαίου κ[αὶ Ἀ]ρσιν[ό]ης, Θεῶν Ἀ]δελφῶν, ἔτου[ς  
π]έμ[π]του ἐ[φ]’ ἰ[ε]ρέως Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ Διοδότου | Ἀλεξά[ν]δρου κ[αὶ θεῶν Ἀδε]λφῶν κα[ὶ  
θε]ῶν Εὐεργε[τ]ῶν [κανηφόρου Ἀρσ]ιν[ό]ης [Φιλαδέλφου Ἰ]α[μνείας τῆς Ὑπερβάσσαντος,  
μηνὸς - - - ] | τρεῖςκ[αὶ]δεκάτη[ι, Αἰγυπτίων δὲ Φα]ωφὶ δωδεκάτη[ι ψήφι]σμα[ι] οἱ ἀρχ[ιερε]ῖς  
καὶ] προφ[ή]ται καὶ οἱ εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον εἰσπορευόμενοι πρὸς τὸν στολισμὸν τῶν θεῶν |  
καὶ πτε[ρο]φόροι καὶ [ἱερογραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ] ἄλλοι ἱερεῖς οἱ συν[α]ντή[σαντε]ς ἐκ  
[τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱερῶν - - - ] | ἵκαὶ Θεαδ[ε]λφείων [ - - - ] | Πτολεμα[ίου] καὶ Ἀρ[σιν]όης - - -  
ἐπι[μέλειαν] π[ε]ποίητα[ι - - - ] | καὶ τῆς κα[θεσ]τηκυ[ίας - - - ] | βασιλικ[ῆς - - - ] | <sup>10</sup>καὶ πο[ - - - ] | παρα  
[ - - - ] | [ - - - ] .. [ - - - ]

1: Βασιλ B1, οντο U, μαίου τοῦ Π, εμαίου κ, ρσι B2, δελφῶν, ἔτου B3, ἐμ B4. 3, φ’ i B10. 25. 2: Ἀλεξά B1, δρου κ, U, λφῶν κα, ῶν Εὐεργε, ῶν B2, ἰνός B3, α? 3: τρεῖςκ B1, δεκάτη U, ωφὶ δωδεκάτη, σμα B2, χιερε B10. 11, προφ B3. 4: καὶ πτεB1, φόροι καὶ U, ἰ ἄ, ν B2, ντή B10. 11, ς ἐκ B3. 5: καὶ Θεαδ B1, λφείων U. 6: Πτολεμα B1, καὶ Ἀρ U. 7: μέλειαν π B1, οίητα U. 8: καὶ τῆς κα B1, τηκυ U. 9-12 B1.

B:

[ - - - ] ἰ[ - - - ] γ[ - - - ] | [ - - - τῶ] γ ἱερῶν γίν[ - - - ] | [ - - - ] τὸν ἐπάνω [ - - - ] | [ - - -  
π]ροσκεῖσεται[ι - - - ] | <sup>5</sup>[ - - - ] ου, ἐν ἡ ἄγετα[ι - - - ] | [ - - - ] τὸν καταπλέ[οντα - - - ] | [ - - - ] ς καὶ  
τὴν παρα[ - - - ] | [ - - - ] ἰς ὁμοίως δε [ - - - ] | [ - - - ] αὶ σπονδ[ - - - ] | <sup>10</sup>[ - - - ] ἰαν[ - - - ] |

In the fifth year of king Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, the Divine Siblings, when Aristoboulos son of Diodotos was priest of Alexander and of the Divine Siblings and of the Divine Benefactors and Iamneia daughter of Hyperbassas was basket-carrier of Arsinoe Philadelphus, on the 13th of the month [ - - - ], on the 12th of Phaophi of the Egyptians. Decree: the arch-priests and the prophetai and those who enter the inner sanctuary for the dressing of the gods and the feather bearers and the sacred scribes and the other priests who have gathered from the temples throughout the land ... and at the Theadelphia [ - - - ]

*Findplace:* Elephantine (?), Egypt.

*Physical description:* two fragments of a *stèle* of speckled red/black granite, both broken on all sides and not preserving any margins. The area of writing is smooth and polished, the back rough and rather uneven.

*Dimensions:* A: 25.0 × 13.0 × 3.9 cm, B: 19.0 × 12.5 × 5.4 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* A: line 1: h. 1.3, w. 5.0, line 2: h. 1.2, w. 5.8, line 3: h. 1.2, w. 6.8, line 4: h. 1.2, w. 7.4, line 5: h. 1.1, w. 6.1, line 6: h. 1.0, w. 3.7, line 7: h. 0.9, w. 4.0, line 8: h. 1.0, w. 3.0 cm. B: line 2: h. 0.8–1.0, w. 7, line 3: h. 1, w. 8.4, line 4: h. 1, w. 9.7, line 5: h. 0.9–1.0, w. 10.4, line 6: h. 1.0, w. 10.9, line 7: h. 1.0, w. 11.0, line 8: h. 0.9–1.0, w. 10.8, line 9: h. 0.9–1.0, w. 9.9, line 10: h. 1.0, w. 2.9 cm; too little is preserved of line 11 for any measures to be taken.

*Arrangement:* –

*Lettering:* very tidy freehand capitals. The letters on the opening lines on A are somewhat larger than the following on the same fragment and on B, which are all remarkably even in height. The first two lines, like the fragment of Demotic script that precedes them, have been filled with red.

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* the text has been cut on the stone virtually without spaces between words.

*Date:* 243 BC.

*Transcription:* Säve-Söderbergh (checked by CH).

*Printed sources:* Säve-Söderbergh 1945, 39–53; *SEG XVIII* 628 (the Uppsala fragment) and *XLII* 1555 (the joint fragments); *SB* 10036; Schwartz 1992; Bingen 1992; cf. A. Bernand, *De Thèbes à Syène* (Paris, 1989), no. 240.

*Inventory numbers:* VM 1757 (B) and 1758 (A).

Two fragments of a synodal decree from the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes I (246–221 BC). The stone has been in the Victoria Museum probably since the first decades of the 20th century, but it is not known precisely when or how it was acquired, nor from what source; likewise, the provenance of the fragments is unknown. The text of the Uppsala fragments was edited separately by Säve-Söderbergh in 1945 with supplements based on the corresponding section of the so-called Kanopos decree (*OGIS* 56).

Only in 1992, Jacques Schwartz realized that these fragments (or at the very least the A fragment) belong to a stone of which the greater part is now in the Louvre, broken into no fewer than 56 fragments of red granite with black dots. These were published in 1992 by Étienne Bernand, who mentioned the fragments in Uppsala, however without making a connection.<sup>247</sup> It is obvious, though, that Bernand's fragments 1–4 belong to the first eleven

lines of the stone from which comes the Uppsala fragment A; this was confirmed by Jean Bingen, who had seen both the Louvre and the Uppsala fragments.<sup>248</sup> Bingen also suggested the insertion of other fragments at various points in the first four lines, arriving at a reading that seems to be as certain as the difficult circumstances would allow; it also shows that the majority of the supplements made by Säve-Söderbergh in 1945 were correct. As it seems impossible to improve on Bingen's reading, his suggestion is printed in the text above (with the exception of line 5, see below). The number of the fragment to which each preserved piece of text belongs is noted in the apparatus above (where B = Bernand and U = the Uppsala fragments).

The provenance is well attested for the Louvre fragments: they were excavated on the island of Elephantine in the Nile by Charles Clermont-Ganneau in 1908.<sup>249</sup> It is impossible to speculate how some fragments of the same stone ended up in Uppsala, but it was not through the agency of Professor Karl Piehl, who had died in 1904.

<sup>247</sup> Bernand 1992, 7–17, no. 2. On page 17, Bernand says “On connaît d'autres décrets de l'époque de Ptolémé III Évergète qui nous sont parvenus dans un état particulièrement délabré”, adding in note 1: “Par exemple, *SEG XVIII*, 628 (*Musée d'Uppsala*)...”

<sup>248</sup> Bingen 1992.

<sup>249</sup> Bernand 1992, 7.



There has been debate about the dating, which was set by Schwartz to the eleventh year of Euergetes' reign, but which has been conclusively corrected by Bingen to year five of the same reign, i.e. 243 BC; see below on lines A2–3.

A1. Βασιλ[εύ]οντο[ς Πτολε]μαίου . . . Διοδότου]: the Greek text begins with the dating of the decree, which continues into the following line and states the year or the reigning king and, on the pattern of Hellenistic honorary decrees,<sup>250</sup> those of the eponymic priest and priestess. The inclusion of the latter two, the names of which are entirely lost on this stone, finds support in *OGIS* 56, in which the year is followed by ἐφ' ἱερέως Ἀπολλωνίδου τοῦ Μοσχίωνος Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν καὶ θεῶν Εὐεργετῶν κανηφόρου Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου Μενεκρατείας τῆς Φιλάμμωνος (“when Apollonides son of Moschion was priest of Alexander and of the Divine Siblings and of the Divine Benefactors and Menekrateia daughter of Philammon was basket-carrier of Arsinoe Philadelphus”).

In this formula, τοῦ Πτολεμαίου καὶ Ἀρσινόης, Θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν is the filiation of the reigning Ptolemy. He was actually the son of Ptolemy II Philadelphos and his first wife Arsinoe, daughter of Lysimachus, general of Alexander the Great and one of the Diadochi. However, Ptolemy II divorced her in 281 BC, and the Arsinoe mentioned here is Arsinoe II, daughter of Ptolemy I and Berenice and thus sister of Ptolemy II. Having previously been married to Lysimachus, father of Ptolemy's first wife, she went into exile after his death and, after a couple of years on Samothrace, went to Egypt probably in 279. Ptolemy II married her at an unknown date and for reasons that are not clear,<sup>251</sup> and she adopted the children of her

<sup>250</sup> Pfeiffer 2004, 71.

<sup>251</sup> Ameling suggests dynastic cohesion or the 1st Syr-

predecessor; hence, Ptolemy III is here referred to as the son of Arsinoe II.

Θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί, “the Divine Siblings”, was the cultic name of Ptolemy and Arsinoe when venerated as gods, a cult that in 272–271 BC was added to the eponymic cult of Alexander.

ἔτου[ς π]έμ[πτου], “in the fifth year”, is Bingen's conjecture, which rests primarily on his argumentation about the dating of the decree; see further on lines A2–3 below. It is found on frg. B4.3, which has traces of Demotic letters along the top and therefore must belong to the first line of the Greek text.<sup>252</sup> Bernand read it as [ - - - ]εἰ[ - - - ], but Bingen notes that three elements are visible on frg. B4.3,<sup>253</sup> viz. the right ending of a horizontal (or diagonal) stroke, an E and an incomplete letter that seems to be N or M, and concludes that “En raison de l'interligne large entre le démotique et le grec, ce fragment se situe obligatoirement entre ἔτου[ς et ἐ]φ' ἱερέως”. As his reading allows for it, Bingen advocates the conjecture π]έμ[πτου],<sup>254</sup> which is in line with the reference to months found in the following lines.

The conjecture ἐ]φ' ἱερέως Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ Διοδότου], “in the priestship of Aristoboulos son of Diodotos” is based entirely on the dating to year five of Ptolemy III.<sup>255</sup>

A2. Ἀλεξά[ν]δρου . . . Ὑπερβάσσαντος: the line begins with the title of the priest of Alexander, the ἱερεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου, whose name was included in the clerical dating and who, through the addition of the Divine Siblings to the cult of Alexander, became the ἱερεὺς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ θεῶν Ἀδελφῶν.<sup>256</sup> In his fifth year as king,<sup>257</sup> Ptolemy III Euergetes also add-

ian War as possible reasons; see *DNP* II (1997), 38–39 s.v. Arsinoë II 3 (W. Ameling).

<sup>252</sup> Bernand 1992, 8.

<sup>253</sup> Bingen 1992, 323.

<sup>254</sup> Bingen 1992, 324.

<sup>255</sup> Bingen refers to Clarysse & van der Veken 1983, 10–11, no. 48.

<sup>256</sup> See Plaumann 1913, 1429.

<sup>257</sup> Bingen 1992, 326.

ed the cult of himself and his wife Berenice, the Θεοὶ Εὐεργέτοι, to the Alexander cult, which consequently finds one of its earliest mentions on this stone.

As indicated by the letters *ινός* on frg. B3, in the dating was also included the *κανηφόρος Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου*, the “basket-carrier of Arsinoe Philadelphos”, the title of the priestess of Arsinoe in the cult that was established immediately after her death in 268 BC, the title being first attested in 267–266;<sup>258</sup> this entirely conforms to the pattern of *OGIS* 56, which reads *κανηφόρου Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου Μενεκρατείας τῆς Φιλάμμωνος* here. According to the same principle as in the preceding line, Bingen identifies her as one Iamneia daughter of Hyperbassas, which would find some (albeit very weak) support in a fragment reading ]α[; however, I cannot see that Bingen actually says which of Bernand’s fragments has this α.

A2–3. *μηνός - - - ] | τρεῖσκ[αί]δεκάτη[ι, Αἰγυπτίων δὲ Φα]ωφί δωδεκάτη[ι*: these lines give the dating: the decree was made on the 13th of a Macedonian month, the name of which is lost, but which corresponded to the 12th of the Egyptian month Phaophi. The pattern is the same as in *OGIS* 56, which has *μηνός Ἀπελλαίου ἐβδόμη, Αἰγυπτίων δὲ Τυβί ἐπτακαίδεκάτη* (“on the 7th of the month Apellaios, on the 17th of Tybi of the Egyptians”).

The correspondence of dates in the Egyptian calendar to those of the Macedonian is a vexed problem, but Bingen arrives at the same conclusion as Lancier before him, viz. that the only possible year in which the 12th of Phaophi coincided with the 13th of a Macedonian month—which happened every 25th year—is the fifth year of Ptolemy III. Lancier even specifies the Macedonian month as Gorpiaios, which is considered likely also by Bingen and accepted by Huß.<sup>259</sup> In the fifth year (243 BC)

of Ptolemy III, the month of Phaophi began on 22 November, which means that the 12th fell on 3 December,<sup>260</sup> which would then be the date for this decree.

A propos of the dating, Schwartz wrote that “La date est l’an 11 (l.1), le 13 d’un mois macédonien perdu, correspondant au 12 Phaophi du calendrier égyptien (l.3)”. This would be the year 235 BC. But his reference to line 1 to support this dating is not helpful, as he does not provide a conjecture, and his at any rate rather awkward suggestion was firmly and conclusively refuted by Bingen.

A3. *[ψήφι]σμα . . . [τῶν θεῶν*: as in *OGIS* 56, the word *ψήφισμα* signals the beginning of the actual decree, which is then followed by a list of priests, apparently according to an hierarchic order, from the *ἀρχιερεῖς* to the *οἱ ἄλλοι ἱερεῖς*. The list is, again, evidently identical to that in *OGIS* 56.<sup>261</sup>

The *ἀρχιερεῖς* are the high priests of specific temples in Egypt rather than high priests of a cult on a national level (like the *ἀρχιερεῖς τῆς νήσου* attested in Hellenistic Cyprus).<sup>262</sup> In *OGIS* 56, the title is rendered as *mr. w gs. w-pr. w*, “head of the temple”, in the hieroglyphic version and as *n3 mr-šn. w* in the Demotic, the latter usually being rendered as *Lesonis*, i.e. a priest who was elected on a yearly basis as leader of a temple.<sup>263</sup>

Below the *ἀρχιερεῖς* in the clerical hierarchy came the *προφήται*, a title which translates the Demotic *hm-ntr. w* (“servant of God”) without being necessarily associated with an oracular

<sup>260</sup> This can be conveniently gathered, e.g., from Chris Bennett’s tables at the webpage of Tyndale House in Cambridge, <http://www.tyndalehouse.com/Egypt/ptolemies/chron/chronology.htm> (accessed on 4 August 2010). For the use of the Macedonian calendar in Alexandria, see now Bennett 2011 (73–76 for the calendar under Ptolemy III).

<sup>261</sup> See Pfeiffer 2004, 76.

<sup>262</sup> See *RE* II.1 (1895), 471–472 s.v. *Ἀρχιερεύς* (Brandis).

<sup>263</sup> See Pfeiffer 2004, 76.

<sup>258</sup> Ameling, loc. cit.; Plaumann 1913, 1431–1432.

<sup>259</sup> Lancier 1991; Huß 1991, 190.

divinity, which was usually the case in Greece. The *προφήται* could supervise the cult of smaller shrines themselves, whereas in the larger temples of Egypt, they were subordinate to the *ἀρχιερείς*.<sup>264</sup> Nothing more is known of their function than what is said by Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 6.4.37.1), that among the Egyptians the *προφήται* were responsible for the distribution of the income of a temple.<sup>265</sup>

The next office is lost in its entirety on the stone, but the order of *OGIS* 56 appears to have been continued, as shown by the beginning of the following line. Thus, here would have been mentioned the *στολισταί*, a pre-Ptolemaic office which *OGIS* 56 refers to as *οἱ εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον εἰσπορευόμενοι πρὸς τὸν στολισμὸν τῶν θεῶν*. As appears from this rather circumstantial description, the *στολισταί* supervised the clothes and ornaments of the statues of the gods, and were probably in charge of the *στολιστήριον*, a storeroom in the temple where the clothes were kept alongside with other cultic objects.<sup>266</sup> In the Demotic and hieroglyphic texts of *OGIS* 56, they are referred to as “priests, who enter the adyton to dress the gods” and “guardians of the secret, the purifiers of the gods, who array the images of the gods with their ceremonious clothing”.<sup>267</sup>

A4. καὶ πετε[ρο]φόροι . . . [ιερώων - - - ]:  
the list of priests continues in accordance with *OGIS* 56, which has *καὶ πτεροφόροι καὶ ἱερογραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἱερεῖς οἱ συνα]ντήσαντες ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱερώων*; the preserved fragments support the same reading in the present case.

The word *πτεροφόροι*, “feather-carrying”, is used in the Kanopos decree to render the hieroglyphic “scribe of God’s book” in the Egyptian. According to Clement of Alexandria,

these priests wore feathers on their heads and carried a book, a vessel containing black paint, and a blade of rush with which they wrote. Diodorus Siculus relates a tradition according to which “in primitive times a hawk brought to the priests in Thebes in a book wrapped about with a purple band, which contained written directions concerning the worship of gods and the honours due to them; and it is for this reason, they add, that the sacred scribes wear on their heads a purple band and the wing of a hawk” (1.87.8).<sup>268</sup> Although Diodorus uses the word *ἱερογραμματεῖς* for these priests, what he describes is obviously the Egyptian priests known as *ḥrj-ḥb*, whose task it was to lead the ritual and who are depicted with two feathers on their heads.<sup>269</sup>

The *ἱερογραμματεῖς*, “sacred scribes”, of *OGIS* 56 are rendered as “learned priests” in the hieroglyphic. Their task was to compose and write down the ritual texts; at the end of the Kanopos decree, they are entrusted with the composition of the hymns for Berenice.<sup>270</sup>

It is not entirely certain what is missing after *ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἱερώων*. Based on the corresponding section of the Rosettana,<sup>271</sup> Säve-Söderbergh suggested *εἰς + Ort πρὸς τὴν πανήγυριν ? τῶν*,<sup>272</sup> i.e. the place and the occa-

<sup>264</sup> *RE* XXIII.1 (1957), 800–802 s.v. Prophetes (M.C. van der Kolf).

<sup>265</sup> Pfeiffer 2004, 76–77.

<sup>266</sup> *RE* R.2 IV.1 (1931), 62 s.v. στολιστής (E. Kießling).

<sup>267</sup> Pfeiffer 2004, 77.

<sup>268</sup> The Greek reads *τινὲς δὲ φασιν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις χρόνοις ἱέρακα βιβλίον ἐνεγκεῖν εἰς Θήβας τοῖς ἱερεῦσι φοινικῶ ῥάμματι περιειλημένον, ἔχον γεγραμμένας τὰς τῶν θεῶν θεραπείας τε καὶ τιμὰς. διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἱερογραμματεῖς φορεῖν φοινικῶν ῥάμμα καὶ πτερόν ἱέρακος ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς.*

<sup>269</sup> *RE* XXIII.2 (1959), 1499 s.v. Pterophoroi (W. Helck); cf. Pfeiffer 2004, 78.

<sup>270</sup> Pfeiffer 2004, 78–79.

<sup>271</sup> The Rosettana (*OGIS* 90) has *ἀπαντήσαντες ἐκ τῶν κατ[ὰ τὴν χώραν] ἱερώων εἰς Μέμφιν τῷ βασιλεῖ πρ[ὸς τὴν πανή]γυριν τῆς παραλήψεως τῆς βα[σιλείας τῆς] Πτολεμαίου αἰωνοβίου*, “travelling from the temples throughout the land to Memphis to meet the king on the occasion of the festival of the accession to the throne of Ptolemy the ever-living”.

<sup>272</sup> The concluding *τῶν* in Säve-Söderbergh’s suggestion is erroneous, as frg. B1 has the following line beginning with a *καὶ*.

sion of the assembly. The Kanopos decree has a slightly different reading, beginning with the dating of the assembly (εἰς τὴν πέμ[π]την τοῦ Δίου, “on the fifth of Dios”) followed by the occasion (ἐν ἣ ἄγεται τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ εἰς τὴν πέμπτην καὶ εἰκάδα τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός, ἐν ἣ παρεβάλεν τὴν β[α]σιλείαν παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, “on which is celebrated the birthday of the king, and on the 25th of the same month, on which he took over the kingship from his father”). Something along the same line would have stood here, though probably not as extensive as on the Kanopos decree. Judging from lines 1 and 3, which can be supplied in their entirety with a reasonable amount of certainty, the lines on the stone had somewhere between 100 and 123 letters each. Including the supplements suggested, the present line has 86, which means that there would have been space enough for ca 40 letters, which is about as many as on the Rosettana.

**A5. Θεαδ[ε]λφείων:** the Θεαδέλφεια is a festival that is very sparingly attested, known only from one other source, the papyrus *PSI* 431;<sup>273</sup> Schwartz adds *P. Cairo Zen.* IV 59820. Consequently, Säve-Söderbergh was understandably in doubt here as to whether this referred to the Theadelphia or to the Philadelphia, until frg. B1 provided the letters necessary to remove any doubts. For reasons that are not stated, Bingen leaves out the preceding καὶ in his restored text on page 325 (and on 323); however, as he states on page 322 “je lis ce début de ligne καὶ Θεαδελφείων”, the missing καὶ seems to be a mere error. In his text, he also (somewhat unorthodoxly) uses a vertical line to indicate the division between the fragments (Θεαδ[ε]λφείων), and indicates the second ε as readable within

the context by adding a dot below it; however, on the fragment in Uppsala, there are no traces of an ε before the λ.

*OGIS* 56 continues συνεδρεύσαντες ταύτη τῇ ἡμέρῃ ἐν τῷ ἐν Κανώπωι ἱερῷ τῶν Εὐεργετῶν θεῶν εἶπαν (“have on this day, having held council together, in the temple of the Divine Benefactors in Kanopos said the following”). Säve-Söderbergh assumed a similar wording here. It seems certain that the phrase, whatever it was, led up to a final εἶπαν, which is found both in *OGIS* 56 and 90. In both cases, the word is followed by the phrase ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος, which in *OGIS* 56 is followed by the same filiation as in line 1. As the words preserved in line 6 evidently are fragments of the same filiation, the phrase ἐπειδὴ βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος must have occurred in this inscription too.

**A6–7. [ἐπι]μέλειαν:** the conjecture [ἐπι]- is certain; there is no noun μέλειαν, and the noun ἐπιμέλεια, “care”, occurs in *OGIS* 56.10 with the same verb ποιέω. In that case, it forms part of the list of benefactions of the king and queen, who “in every respect have shown their care for Apis and Mnevis and the other esteemed sacred animals in the land” (τοῦ τε Ἄπιος καὶ τοῦ Μνήμιος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐνλογίμων ἱερῶν ζώων τῶν ἐν τῇ χώρῃ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν διὰ παντὸς ποιῶνται). Bingen makes the same conjecture.

**A8. τῆς καθ[εστ]ηκυ[ίας] - - - :** a feminine form of the perfect participle καθεστηκώς (from the verb καθίστημι) is virtually the only form possible of a word beginning with καθ and containing the sequence τηκυ. *OGIS* 56. 73 speaks of ὁ δὲ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱερῶν καθεστηκώς ἐπιστάτης καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς, “the one who has been appointed superintendent and archpriest in each of the temples”;<sup>274</sup> by analogy, the refer-

<sup>273</sup> Cf. Fraser 1972, Vol. 1, 232: “One papyrus refers also to a festival called the Theadelphia, which is not necessarily Alexandrian; it was presumably established in honour of the Theoi Adelphoi, whose Alexandrian sanctuary is mentioned by Herodas”, and Vol. 2, 382, n. 339 (“The date is uncertain.”).

<sup>274</sup> This person is entrusted with the task of, together with the scribes of the temple, setting up the decree cut on a stele of stone or bronze with holy letters (i.e. hieroglyphs), Egyptian (i.e. Demotic) and Hellenic (i.e. Greek): ὁ δὲ ἐν ἐκάστῳ τῶν ἱερῶν καθεστηκώς

ence here may be to a priestess who has been appointed to something, although it is not clear to what. Again, Bingen makes the same conjecture.

**A9–12.** βασιλις? [ - - - ]: Schwartz guessed at βασιλι[σσ - - - ] here, which is impossible if Bingen is correct in reading βασιλις [ - - - ]. This is obviously a form of the adjective βασιλικός, but as with lines 10–12, further conjecture is not meaningful.

**B2.** [ - - - τῶ]γ? ἱερῶν γίν? [ - - - ]: Säve-Söderbergh suggests γίν[εσθαι] (or similar), adding that it is “selbstverständlich nur ein sehr unsicherer Vorschlag (etwa Infinitiv nach einem vorhergehenden ἔδοξεν der Einleitung der Beschlusses: vgl. Kanopos Zeile 54, aber auch Rosettana Zeile 41 ff.”

**B3.** [ - - - ] τὸν ἐπάνω [ - - - ]: the reference to “the above” shows, as noted by Säve-Söderbergh, that this text cannot have stood at the beginning of the document. Even if this is no conclusive argument in favour of this fragment’s being part of the same inscription as A, it is at least a sign in that direction.

**B4.** [ - - - π]ροσκεισεται [ - - - ]: apropos of this verb (“shall be added”), Säve-Söderbergh compares *OGIS* 90. 43 (about the wooden statue of the king): ὅπως δ’εὔσημος ἦι νῦν τε καὶ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον, ἐπικεῖσθαι τῶι ναῶι τὰς τοῦ βασιλέως χρυσᾶς βασιλείας δέκα αἰς προσκεισεται ἀσπίς (“And in order that it may be easily distinguishable now and for all time, there shall be set upon the shrine the ten gold diadems of the king, to which shall be added a *uraeus*”). Being in doubt as to whether the context of this fragment is similar to that in the Rosettana, he adds that the words seem to

him “besser zu dem eigentlichen Beschluss als zu dessen Begründung zu passen”. Huß remarks that it is not known when such cultic honours were first given, but still suggests a chronology for this inscription on the following grounds: as there are decrees of 243–241 and 238 BC that discuss honours of this type, and as before the Kanopos decree (*OGIS* 56) there appears to have been only one decree that contained directives for cultic matters related to Ptolemy III, this stone should probably be dated after 238.<sup>275</sup> It should be noted that in writing this, Huß was not aware of the fact that the Louvre fragments (which he too dates to 243 BC) and this stone are one and the same.

**B5.** [ - - - ]ου, ἐν ἡι ἄγεται [ - - - ]: Säve-Söderbergh notes that this line (“obwohl das γ ... mehr nach einem π aussieht”) recalls the dating of *OGIS* 56. 5 εἰς τὴν πέμ[π]την τοῦ Δίου, ἐν ἡι ἄγεται τὰ γενέθλια τοῦ βασιλέως (“to the fifth of Dios, on which is celebrated that birthday of the king”). What is lacking here would consequently be the Greek month (Gorpiaios? see above on A2–3) and the festival, which would be the Theadelphia.

**B6.** [ - - - ] τὸν καταπλέ[οντα - - - ]: Säve-Söderbergh’s note may be quoted here in full: “καταπλεῖν hat zu dieser Zeit in Ägypten fast immer die Bedeutung «nach Alexandria fahren», und man denkt in diesem Zusammenhang zunächst an die jährliche Reise der ägyptischen Priester nach Alexandria, von der sie durch das Rosettana-Dekret (Zeile 17 ff.) befreit wurden. Diese alljährliche Reise der Priester zur Hauptstadt wird auch in dem Kanopos-Dekret erwähnt (Zeile 48), und ein etwaiges Vorkommen diesbezüglicher Bestimmungen würde auch gut zur Datierung unseres Dekretes unter Ptolemaios III. Euergetes I. passen, also in die Zeit vor der Befreiung von der κατάπλους”.

ἐπιστάτης καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ | γραμματεῖς ἀναγραφάτωσαν τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην λιθίνην ἢ χαλκῆν ἱεροῖς γράμμασιν καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις καὶ Ἑλληνικοῖς (“The appointed *epistates* in every temple and the arch-priest and the scribes of the temple shall engrave and set up this decree on a stele of bronze or stone in sacred script and in Egyptian and Greek”).

<sup>275</sup> Huß 1991, 193.



**B8–9.** ὁμοίως . . . σπονδ[ - - - ]: ὁμοίως, “in like manner”, is found in two instances in *OGIS* 56, and σπονδαί, “libations”, “werden nicht selten bei den Anordnungen betreffs der beschlossenen Kulthandlungen erwähnt” (Säve-Söderbergh). Otherwise, not much can be said about the final lines of the fragment.

## 24.VM 2270 (*IGR* I, 5 1320)

Ἀπολλῶ[ - - - ] | θηκε Δημήτρ[ - - - ] | ἡ συνόδῳ Λι[Τι]|βερίου Καίσαρος |<sup>5</sup>Σεβαστοῦ Παῦνι | λ

Deme[trios?] dedicated (this statuette of) Apollo to the synod, in the tenth year of Tiberius Caesar/Augustus, on the 30th of Payni.

*Findplace:* Egypt.

*Physical description:* almost cubic piece of reddish granite with black/grey veins. Two holes on the top (for fastening the statuette). Inscription on front, bottom somewhat rough, other sides plain, smooth and polished.

*Dimensions:* 7.6–7.7 × 12.2–12.5 × 10.4–10.6 cm.

*Height and length of lines:* line 1: h. 0.8–0.9, w. 7.3, line 2: h. 0.7, w. 8.5, line 3: h. 0.7–0.9, w. 8.7, line 4: h. 0.7–1.0, w. 11.2, line 5: h. 0.8–1.0, w. 11.1, line 6: h. 0.9, w. 1.0 cm.

*Arrangement:* even left margin, indentation on line 1 about 0.5 letter.

*Lettering:* simple freehand letters without serifs, shallowly cut; E and Σ are rounded (“lunate”, E and C, common forms since the 2nd century BC; Guarducci 1967, 377).

*I longa, apex, nexus:* –

*Interpuncts:* –

*Date:* AD 24.

*Transcription:* CH, 25 August 2008.

*Printed sources:* Piehl 1888, 116–117; de Ricci 1903, 431, no. 12; *IGR* I, 5 1320; *SB* 8838; Thomasson 135 (cf. *SEG* XLVII 2270).

*Inventory number:* VM 2270 (written in white on right side).



Cubic base for a dedicatory statuette of Apollo, with two holes on the top for fastening the now lost statuette. The stone may have been donated to Uppsala University's Victoria Museum of Egyptian Antiquities by Karl Piehl, who made the first edition of it. The exact provenance is unknown.

1–2. Ἀπόλλω[ - - - ]|θηκε Δημήτρ[ - - - ]: the final τ in δημητ was read by Piehl, but can no longer be seen on the stone. de Ricci supplies Ἀπόλλω[να ἀνέ]|θηκε Δημήτρ[ριος], “Demetrios dedicated (the statue of) Apollon”, which may be regarded as more or less certain, as the verb ἀνατίθημι fits the context well and is extremely common in dedicatory inscriptions. The objection is, perhaps, that the text at the end of the first line must have been quite dense to accommodate the supplement [να ἀνέ]. For this reason, Thomasson suggests Ἀπόλλω[νι, which, however, is somewhat awkward syntactically (see the following συνόδω).

3. ἡ συνόδω: [τ]ῆ συνόδω de Ricci, which reasonably must be correct, but as the Η stands nearly at the leftmost edge of the stone, there cannot have been room for the Τ before it. As it is hard to imagine that there would have been a line division between the letters of a word that only has two, Thomasson's suggestion about Τ and Η in nexus is attractive, even though no trace of it can be seen on the stone now.

Σύνοδος (“assembly”) is a very wide term that can refer to just about any kind of association,

but for Hellenistic Egypt, it usually designates a cultic association and is often combined with the name of the respective divinity in the genitive, such as ἡ σύνοδος τοῦ Ἡρακλείου, σύνοδος Ἀμενώτου θεοῦ, as an adjective ἡ Ἀπολλωνιακὴ σύνοδος etc. The members of such συνόδοι were not only priests but also laymen, who were admitted for various cultic offices.<sup>276</sup>

3–5. Λι[Τι]|βερίου Καίσαρος | Σεβαστοῦ: the symbol Λ stands for ἔτους, genitive of ἔτος, “year”, for “time within which”, the following Ι being the numeral 10, “in the tenth year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus” (in which the adjective Σεβαστός is a direct translation of the Latin *Augustus*). As Tiberius succeeded Augustus in AD 14, this is the year AD 24. Thomasson notes that there is room at the end of the line for the diphthong Τει, but considering that the spelling Τιβέριος is much commoner than Τειβέριος, not least in inscriptions from Egypt, the latter spelling need not be considered here.

The spelling Σεβαστοῦ with a double Σ is occasionally found in inscriptions from imperial times in various locations. It probably reflects nothing more than an uncertainty as regards when and when not to use geminatae.<sup>277</sup>

5–6. Παῦνι | λ: Λ, which has a horizontal stroke above it, is the number 30, and Παῦνι the Greek transcription of the month *pa-n-in*, the tenth month of the Egyptian calendar. Since Payni in the early Empire began on 26 May, and since each month had 30 days, 30 Payni would have fallen on 25 June.<sup>278</sup>

<sup>276</sup> See *RE* R.2 IV.2 (1932), 1430–1432 s.v. Σύνοδος (Poland); Otto 1905, 125–133.

<sup>277</sup> Cf. Blass & Debrunner 1961, 7–8.

<sup>278</sup> For the Egyptian calendar in Hellenistic and Roman times, see Samuel 1972, 145–151.