

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLIV

HELSINKI 2010

INDEX

NEIL ADKIN	<i>Harts and Hedges: Further Etymologizing in Virgil's First Eclogue</i>	9
LUIGI ARATA	<i>Un litotrittico antico della medicina greca: il Lithospermum officinale, o colombina</i>	25
MIGUEL BOBO DE LA PEÑA	<i>A Note on Ptol. Harm. 102,6 Düring</i>	35
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Onomastics, Social History and Roman Lead Pipes</i>	41
MARGHERITA CARUCCI	<i>The Statue of Heracles Promakhos at Thebes: A Historical Reconstruction</i>	67
MAURIZIO COLOMBO	<i>Iovii Cornuti, auxiliarii miliarenses equites e Hiberi: Correzioni testuali ed esegetiche a tre epigrafi tardo-antiche di militari romani</i>	81
ANTONINO CRISÀ	<i>A Letter of Michele Schiavo Describing a Coin of Didia Clara (Palermo, 18th Century)</i>	99
GUILLAUME FLAMERIE DE LACHAPELLE	<i>L'image des rois hellénistiques dans l'oeuvre de Florus</i>	109
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Φλεγυῶν and the Phlegyans, with a Note on μόρφνος φλεγύας (Hes. Sc. 134)</i>	123
TIMO KORKIAKANGAS	<i>Neutro plurale e femminile singolare: il fattore grafico nell'interpretazione delle peculiarità della declinazione tardolatina</i>	133
TUOMO LANKILA	<i>Hypernoetic Cognition and the Scope of Theurgy in Proclus</i>	147
CARLO M. LUCARINI	<i>Osservazioni sul testo di Procopio di Gaza</i>	171
ELINA PYY	<i>Decus Italiae Virgo – Virgil's Camilla and the Formation of Romanitas</i>	181
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Aedilicius, Consularis, Duumviralis and Similar Titles in Latin Inscriptions</i>	205
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCLIX-CCLXIV</i>	231

JUHA-PEKKA TUPPI	<i>Traffic Bottlenecks in South Etruria? Comparing the Archaic Road Cutting Widths with Ancient Vehicles</i>	263
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	289
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	383
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	389
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	405

ONOMASTICS, SOCIAL HISTORY AND ROMAN LEAD PIPES*

CHRISTER BRUUN

The enquiries in this paper stem from the examination of the names appearing in a few inscriptions on Roman lead pipes (*fistulae*). These texts all share a connection to social history because of what they tell us about the individuals (previously unknown or neglected), their families, or their occupations.

1. A *plumbarius* found in a manuscript in the Vatican Library

In one of the *Codices Lanciani* in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. Lat. 13045*, there is a letter to the famous Roman archaeologist Rodolfo Lanciani from the equally famous expert on the Roman Campagna, Giuseppe Tomassetti, dated April 30, 1886 (words underlined as per original):¹

"Eccoti una primizia plumbaria
CHRONIVS FEC (palma) X

* This article was begun and partly written while I held a Fellowship at the Institute of Advanced Study at Durham University in the Fall of 2009, which is most gratefully acknowledged, as is the fact that my research has benefited greatly from a Standard Research Grant awarded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Further research was carried out with the help of a grant from the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut while enjoying ideal conditions at the Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik in München. This research is connected to my work on the publication of the inscribed *fistulae* in the *Musei Vaticani*; my thanks for kind assistance as always to Giorgio Filippi. For useful comments on the content I am indebted to Mika Kajava, Olli Salomies, and Heikki Solin. I am grateful to Carl Hope for improving my English; all remaining errors are my own.

¹ M. Buonocore, *Appunti di topografia romana nei codici Lanciani della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana IV. Codici Vaticani Latini 13044, 13045*, Roma 2001, 206 (f. 245v).

sopra 2 fistule aquarie trovate 3 giorni or sono a S. Biagio, un 62 chil. incirca sull'Appia antica ... Le fistule suddette sono in gran numero (22 pezzi) ma soltanto due scritte, come sopra. Speriamo di trovarle con qualche nome di proprietario! Addio."

As far as I know, this lead pipe inscription (or stamp) has remained practically unnoticed in modern scholarship. The text is not mentioned in any of the volumes of the *CIL*. It is only referred to in Tomassetti's own *Campagna romana*, but in that work fewer details are given.²

The discovery made by Tomassetti in San Biagio, which is situated near Cisterna in southern Lazio, thus provides us with the name of a previously unknown *plumbarius* operating in *Latium adiectum*. The cognomen *Chronius* is Greek, and there are other instances of the name being used in, for instance, Rome. In case the stamp seen by Tomassetti was incomplete (which is impossible to verify), one might consider also the name *Polychronius*, which at least in Rome was much more common than *Chronius*.³ A *plumbarius* called Polychronius is known in Rome, but there is nothing to show that he would have been active in the region of Cisterna.⁴

The significance of the numeral X which accompanies the stamp is uncertain. It could conceivably refer to the size of the lead pipe. In his *De aquaeductu urbis Romae*, Sex. Iulius Frontinus mentions the *denaria* fistula, which is defined as having a diameter of ten quarters of a *digitus* (≈ 4.6 cm) (Frontin. *aq.* 43). Yet an inventory of all the known occurrences of numerals on Roman *fistulae* shows that in many cases the numeral in question cannot have any relationship to the size of the lead pipe.⁵ The numeral X is, however, one of those most commonly

² G. Tomassetti, *La Campagna romana antica, medioevale e moderna II. Via Appia, Ardeatina e Aurelia*, Roma 1910–26 (repr. Sala Bolognese 1976), 393: "San Biagio, nel diverticolo moderno dell'Appia per Velletri, è un luogo degno di ricerche. Vi si trovano rovine di bagni. Io vi ho trovato 22 pezzi di fistole aquarie, due delle quali con la iscrizione CHRONIVS FEC."

³ See H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch*², Berlin – New York 2003, III 1117, for five instances of individuals called *Chronius*; and p. 1024 for 25 occurrences of *Polychronius*. The inverse index in Solin, *op. cit.*, shows that no other name ending in *-chronius* is known.

⁴ In 1895, west of the "chiostro" of the Lateran Basilica, a lead pipe was found carrying the stamp *d. n. Iuliae Mameae (!) A[-]*, and, "in parte aversa", *[-]lychronius Aug. lib. fec.* (*CIL* XV 7336).

⁵ See C. Bruun, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome. A Study of Roman Imperial Administration*, Helsinki 1991, 44–8, for the then known evidence. A numeral could also indicate the order in which the lead pipes were produced, the weight of the piece, or the number of the conduit

occurring in Central Italy, with at least eleven attestations prior to this discovery,⁶ which makes it more probable that the *fistula* was indeed a *denaria*.⁷

2. A suspected inscribed *fistula* of value

At the end of the section on lead pipe stamps from Rome in *CIL* XV 2,1, Heinrich Dressel included those cases that were too fragmentary for him to make good sense of their meaning ("tituli fracti dubiae interpretationis, exempla male excepta", *CIL* XV 7694–7734). Later discoveries have, it seems, made it possible to "salvage" some of these stamps, such as the rather cryptic S T NEPTV E (*CIL* XV 7729), which, to complicate matters, appears in mirror writing (except for the first letter). As I have argued elsewhere, it is most likely that we here have the *plumbarius* L. Titius Neptunalis, known from a very different stamp found in recent years (on which see below).⁸

Another case deserving of attention appears in *CIL* XV 7708. It was first presented by Rodolfo Lanciani in 1885, and Dressel quotes the following passage from his report: "nei disterri di villa Ludovisi prosegue a scoprirsi la condotta plumbea col nome della proprietaria Dovia Ilarità da un lato, e dello stagnaio Evelpisto dall'altro".⁹ Lanciani apparently never published the stamps properly,

branching off from a water main, to name a few possibilities. Since collecting this material, I have become aware of a few other instances which, however, do not significantly change the picture. A valuable body of new evidence has been presented by A. Parma, "Le fistule del ninfeo", in F. Maniscalco, *Ninfei ed edifici marittimi severiani del Palatium imperiale di Baia*, Napoli 1997, 115–25, esp. 116–7.

⁶ Bruun (n. 5) 45–8: three instances are known from Rome, five from Ostia, and three from elsewhere in Central Italy.

⁷ Why the size would have been indicated on the *fistula* is another matter. Frontinus' rules were intended for the *cura aquarum* in Rome, which tried to regulate the private water grants in many ways. What the situation at San Biagio was is not known – did the region have a publicly funded water supply? – and we might well be dealing with a wholly private installation, in which case there cannot have been any official need to stamp the lead pipes. It is of course possible that one private individual was allowing another to tap his resources, which also would have necessitated the definition of the size of the *fistula*.

⁸ See C. Bruun, "Iscrizioni trascurate su fistule acquarie di Roma e dell'Italia Centrale", *RPAA* 64 (1991–92) [1995] 235–49, esp. 247, proposing the reading: *L(ucius) T(itius) Neptu(nalis) f(ecit)*, or *fe(cit)* with FE in nexus. The proposal is cited in *AE* 1993, 437.

⁹ See R. Lanciani, "Roma", *NSA* 1885, 341–4, esp. 341. Lanciani writes "prosegue", but he never reported on the initial stage of the discovery of this conduit. The *Notizie degli Scavi*

and thus Dressel gives the following inferred texts in square brackets:

[DOVIAE HILARITATIS] and [EVELPISTVS FEC] (*CIL* XV 7708)

He adds the following comment: "Sed alibi Lancianius huius fistulae non meminit et vereor ne error subsit, cum *Dovia Hilaritas* non aquae domina sed plumbaria occurrat in fistula n. 7557." Dressel was here referring to a lead pipe inscription which he published together with another one as *CIL* XV 7557 in the following way:

α) C VALIRI LAETI
in parte aversa
DOVIA HILARITAS FEC

β) C VALIRI LAETI

The lead pipe was said to originate "inter vias Labicanam et Latinam rep. in fundo *del Quadraro* a. 1780", and had apparently been seen in Rome "apud principem Praenestinum", though not by Dressel himself, but by Gaetano Marini, the remarkable eighteenth-century epigrapher who did so much for the collection of *instrumentum domesticum* inscriptions in and around Rome. Marini was a serious scholar and his observations are generally trustworthy, and thus there is no reason to doubt his report.¹⁰ Valerius Laetus was the owner of the lead pipe, while the manufacturer, or rather the owner of the enterprise that manufactured it, was named *Dovia Hilaritas*. Her *gentilicium* is "praeternaturally rare",¹¹ as

published monthly reports in those years, and this report was published under September. Lanciani had no report in the August fascicle, while in his July report he did mention the Villa Ludovisi excavations, but without any reference to the lead pipe (pp. 250–1).

¹⁰ Marini's observations were posthumously published as G. Marini, *Iscrizioni antiche doliari*, Roma 1884 (eds. G. B. De Rossi and H. Dressel), 516–7 no. 175–6. As pointed out by Dressel in his comment at *CIL* XV 7557 cited above, there is a typographical error in the printed work, which gives the *nomen* as *Doria*. He noted that the correct reading *Dovia* appears in *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 9110, as I have been able to verify (f. 195 no. 175). The right spelling of the name is found in R. Lanciani, *Le acque e gli acquedotti di Roma antica*, Roma 1975 (a reprint of his "Topografia di Roma antica. I comentarii di Frontino intorno le acque e gli acquedotti. Silloge epigrafica aquaria", *MemAccLinc* ser. III, 4 [1881] 215–616), 470 no. 338.

¹¹ As pointed out in C. Bruun, "Neue Forschungen zur Organisation der stadtrömischen Bleirohrherstellung im Lichte der *fistula*-Inschriften", *Specimina nova dissertationum ex instituto historico Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis de Iano Pannonio nominatae* 8 (1992) [1994] 3–16, esp. 16. A new case, a legionary soldier *Dov. Fortunatus*, appears in *AE* 1993, 1364 from *Novae* in Bulgaria. No instance of the name *Dovius* appears in *CIL* VI, but two *Duvii* are mentioned in *CIL* VI 17081. There was a consul L. *Duvius* in 56 CE, as pointed

Ronald Syme might have said, but Lanciani's excavation report from 1885, which concerns a different zone of Rome, seems to verify Marini's reading. The Villa Ludovisi covered the area just inside the northern part of the city wall (a region where today streets like Via Veneto, Via Sardegna and Via Sicilia can be found), while the tenuta del Quadraro was situated well outside the walls south-east of the city, at the fourth milestone of the Via Latina.¹² Therefore we must be dealing with two different water conduits.

Yet, as we saw above, Dressel had his doubts, based on the fact that Lanciani considered Dovia Hilaritas to be the owner, while one Evelpistus appeared as the plumber. Whatever else one thinks of this discovery, Evelpistus ought to be added to the number of lead manufacturers in Rome. The *cognomen* appears once among the known *plumbarii* from Rome and Italy,¹³ in the person of T. Flavius Euhelpistus from Ardea (*CIL* XV 7788 = X 6768), but nothing indicates that we might be dealing with the same individual.

The function of Dovia Hilaritas remains to be dealt with. Three interpretations seem possible to me.

1. That Lanciani's report – that the name of Dovia Hilaritas appeared in the genitive – was mistaken and the name was in reality written in the nominative case, as in *CIL* XV 7557. Since there is no reason to doubt the presence of the *plumbarius* Evelpistus (apparently on the very same piece of lead piping), this would mean that we had stamps of two different manufacturers on the same *fistula*. This is not impossible, for it is known that more than one *plumbarius* could be involved in the manufacture of a lead conduit, and in a few cases one even finds two names apparently belonging to manufacturers or entrepreneurs on the same piece of lead piping.¹⁴
2. That Lanciani's report was correct, for it seems somewhat superficial to dismiss his eyewitness report. The Italian archaeologist was, after all, no

out by W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin 1904 (repr. w. additions by O. Salomies, Zürich – Hildesheim 1988), 90, 460; H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*, Hildesheim 1988, 70; A. Mócsy, *Nomenclator provinciarum Europae Latinarum et Galliae Cisalpinae*, Budapest 1983, 107.

¹² See P. Baccini Leotardi, "C. Valiri Laeti praedium", in A. La Regina *et al.* (eds.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae. Suburbium V*, Roma 2008, 233–4 and zone E4 on the map.

¹³ For an inventory of all the known *plumbarii* of Roman Italy, listed alphabetically according to their *cognomen*, see my "Cognomina plumbariorum", *Epigraphica* 72 (2010) 297–331.

¹⁴ From Ostia, there is *CIL* XIV 5309.33, on which see Bruun (n. 5) 89–90, while a more recent discovery comes from Ponte Galeria between Rome and Ostia, see *AE* 1995, 249 and C. Bruun, "Imperial procuratores and dispensatores: new discoveries", *Chiron* 19 (1999) 29–42, esp. 36–7.

stranger to inscriptions on *fistulae*, having published, some five years before, an impressive "silloge epigrafica acquaria" containing practically all the *fistula* stamps known at the time.¹⁵ Additionally, Lanciani was continually making discoveries of new inscribed *fistulae* during the 1880s. Thus, it seems reasonable to trust him and to conclude that the inscription really did read *Doviae Hilaritatis*. We can safely assume that in most cases a name in the genitive on a *fistula* indicates the owner of the conduit, and we also know that possession of a water grant in Rome was an imperial privilege. The unusual aspect here is that one would not normally consider it likely that a *plumbarius* was well enough connected to receive permission for a private conduit (although this may in part be an *argumentum e silentio*).¹⁶ The case would be practically unique in Rome, and furthermore one cannot point to any powerful relations of Dovia Hilaritas who may have assisted her. Her *gentilicium* is exceedingly rare and is not borne by any known person of distinction.

3. That the name of Dovia Hilaritas in the genitive refers not to the owner of the conduit but to the owner of a lead workshop, for which sometimes the term *officina* was used. There are many *fistula* stamps bearing formulae such as *ex officina illius* or *ille officinator fecit*.¹⁷ Painstaking investigations have revealed that in some cases the names of such entrepreneurs are used, in the genitive, without the explanatory term *ex officina*.¹⁸ This need not surprise modern scholars. In their neighbourhoods, these individuals were known and there was no risk that the name of a lead-working *officinator*, albeit unaccompanied by any defining term, could be mistaken for something else. Needless to say, the simple genitive indicates the manufacturer

¹⁵ Lanciani (n. 10) 423–501.

¹⁶ For the social stratification among those who benefited from a private water grant, see W. Eck, *Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit. Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge* 2, Basel – Berlin 1998, 245–77: senators and especially ex-consuls seem to have been privileged. Yet I have always found it intriguing that many individuals are not identified and seem to be commoners. Some may have been owners of shops or businesses that had been allotted water, such as baths, for which see Bruun (n. 5) 72–6; C. Bruun, "Ownership of baths in Rome and the evidence from lead pipe installations", in J. De Laine – D. E. Johnson (eds.), *Roman Baths and Bathing 1: Bathing and Society* (JRA Suppl. 37), Ann Arbor 1999, 75–85 (though the evidence is less explicit than one would wish).

¹⁷ See Bruun (n. 5) 88–9, 355–6, and my "Roman Lead Working: the *officinae plumbariae*" (in preparation).

¹⁸ For the cases of the Roman *plumbarii* Roius Hilario and Popillius Hilario (the identical cognomina must be a coincidence, and they operated independently of each other), see C. Bruun, "Velia, Quirinale, Pincio: note su proprietari di *domus* e su *plumbarii*", *Arctos* 37 (2003) 27–48, esp. 36–43; Bruun (n. 5) 317. There is also the *plumbarius* Stallianus from Pompeii, on which see my "Stallianus, a plumber from Pompeii (and other remarks on Pompeian lead pipes)", forthcoming in *Phoenix*.

in many other sectors of Roman manufacture.¹⁹ Should this explanation be correct, we would still be dealing with the name of two manufacturers on the same piece of lead piping, that of the *officinatrix* Dovia Hilaritas and that of Evelpistus the *plumbarius*. Such a scenario is very rare but not impossible, and it seems to me the best solution if we give credence to Lanciani's report, as I think we should.

3. L. Titius Neptunalis and son once again

The suggested improvement of the cryptic fistula inscription S T NEPTV E (*CIL* XV 7729) mentioned above was inspired by the discovery of a new stamp near modern Alatri and published in 1987 as:²⁰

L TITIVS NEPTVNALIS PLVB
CONSVOFILIO FECIT (ramus)

The first publisher of the inscription, Maria Concetta Laurenti, interpreted the text as *L. Titius Neptunalis plu(m)barius con suo filio fecit*, "Titius Neptunalis made (the lead pipe) with his son". The first editor also mentioned, but rejected, an alternative interpretation, namely to read the second part as *Consuo filio fecit*, "he made it for his son Consuus". This reading seems more plausible to me, for reasons which I have presented in the past,²¹ although they do not seem to have convinced the editors of the *Supplementa Italica* fascicle in which the inscriptions from *Aletrium* were published about a dozen years ago.²² The present context may be suitable for bringing up the issue again, bolstering it with a few additional arguments.

Whichever interpretation one prefers, one will have to accept certain irregularities, as will presently become clear. Laurenti met the problem caused by

¹⁹ As already pointed out by Bruun (n. 5) 89 n. 54. Fish sauce amphorae and bronze vessels are only two of many such examples.

²⁰ M. C. Laurenti, "Brevi note su alcuni rinvenimenti a Monte Daielli di Alatri", *Archeologia Laziale* VIII, Roma 1987, 302–6. As shown by a photo (cf. n. 22 below), there is no interpunctuation or space between the words, which does not impact our understanding of the text except for the beginning of line 2, where on purpose I have not separated the words.

²¹ Bruun (n. 8) 243–7.

²² See L. Galli – G. L. Gregori, "Regio I. Latium et Campania. Aletrium", *SupplIt* 16, Roma 1998, 13–90, esp. 85–6 (with photo).

the preposition written *con* instead of *cum* by pointing to several cases of such "vulgar" Latin, for instance in the inscriptions from Rome.²³ Certainly *con* can be found in some cases in Rome, but there we are mostly dealing with common funerary inscriptions which abound in errors of many kinds, and which sometimes belong to later centuries, when the classical rules were losing their hold. Moreover, it seems to me that the process of cutting the stamp used to create the text on the *fistula* (in high relief) was somewhat different from scratching a text on a travertine plaque or the like. The commissioning and cutting of the die ought to have provided a better guarantee against typographical errors, and in particular as the letters were extremely neatly cut, as the photo in *SupplIt* shows (see n. 22). This is not a hasty job carried out by semi-competent workmen.

But can one therefore definitely exclude the use of the vulgar form *con*? Probably not; in my experience, although *fistula* stamps are largely formulaic, one never ceases to be surprised by the wording exhibited on new discoveries. Indeed, the stamp from Alatri contains several quite or almost unique features, and one ought to consider all of these before settling on any specific interpretation.

First of all, it is extremely unusual that a lead pipe stamp not intended for imperial use runs over two lines.²⁴ This indicates a certain wish for monumentality. Second, our text represents one of the very few known cases in which a Roman plumber uses the term *plumbarius* on a lead pipe to indicate his profession.²⁵ It was obviously unnecessary, as the verb *fecit*, which normally follows the plumber's name, already revealed the situation. Again, one may wonder if there is a particular reason behind this apparent flaunting of the profession of Titius Neptunalis, the main individual of the inscription.

²³ Laurenti (n. 20) 304.

²⁴ A survey of the roughly seven-hundred stamps published in *CIL XV*, with the addition of a few more recent finds, which should be a sufficiently representative collection, showed that while imperial stamps regularly run over two lines, very few others do so. In two cases we are dealing with stamps mentioning officials or concerned with official business: *CIL XV* 7808, 7892. Stamps of private owners, which then normally number more than one, run over two lines in: *CIL XV* 7393, 7414, 7476, 7487, 7504, 7518, 7517, 7536b, 7549, 7780, 7848a; *Epigraphica* 13 (1951) 22 no. 26 (owner + plumber), 23 nos. 33–4. A single *plumbarius* is mentioned on two very brief lines in *CIL XIV* 5309.8 from Ostia (the *fistula* is a gigantic water main). The closest parallel is perhaps *CIL XV* 7832 *Aurelius Alexander prox. ab / epistul. Lat. Digitius fecit*, although Aurelius Alexander may here appear in an official capacity, see Bruun (n. 5) 84–5.

²⁵ Another case is the stamp *ex off. Martini plumbari*, which appears in both *CIL XV* 7647 ("aet. labentis") and *XV* 7763. *Epigraphica* 13 (1951) 26 no. 49 presents a lead pipe stamp with the text *Domitianus plumb.*

A variety of other features in my mind speak strongly against the reading *con suo filio*. First, if "suo" is taken as a possessive pronoun, it is redundant. *Titius Neptunalis cum filio* is what one would expect to read, if we are dealing with a prepositional expression in the confined space of a *fistula* stamp.²⁶

Second, while one must acknowledge that in reality the possessive pronoun is commonly found joined to *filius* or *filia* in Latin inscriptions on stone, in the sequence *cum suo filio* the order is awkward. In Latin there was no definite rule about whether a possessive pronoun ought to precede or follow the main word,²⁷ but a survey of Latin inscriptions, which normally play a very minor role in the study of the language, shows that it was natural to place the possessive pronoun after the relation and to use expressions such as *cum filio suo*, *cum filia sua*, *cum coniuge suo/a*, and so on.

If one proceeds methodically through the cases listed in *CIL VI.7,4*, which lists the various forms and occurrences of the possessive pronoun *suus*, the first form of the possessive pronoun one encounters is *sua*. It turns out that only one case of "sua + family relation" can be found. Against this, there are 48 cases of "family relation + sua". This means that the word order allegedly present in the stamp from Alatri can be expected in only 2 % of such cases.²⁸ Moreover the only inverse case, the sequence *cum sua filia* in *CIL VI 36710*, which is parallel to the formula which has been suggested for the *fistula*, turns out to be a metric inscription, wherefore it lacks any relevance. Thus, there is no support in this sample for Laurenti's case.

A survey of "suo" (to take one more example) shows a similar picture. There are over 2,000 occurrences of *suo* on pp. 5498–5520 in *CIL VI.7,4*, among which one finds a mere fifteen cases of "suo + family relation".²⁹ Eight of these were of the type "suo co(n)iuge/i". Against this there are over 800 instances of "coniuge/i suo/suae".³⁰

²⁶ *Filius/a* or a plural form appear in three lead pipe stamps, each time without a possessive pronoun, see *CIL XV 7393, 7517, 7525*.

²⁷ See H. Menge, *Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik* (völlig neu bearbeitet v. Th. Burkard – M. Schauer), Darmstadt 2000, 99–102. There is nothing on the place of the possessive pronoun in A. M. Devine – L. D. Stephens, *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information*, Oxford 2006.

²⁸ This point was made in Bruun (n. 8) 245, based on a survey of pp. 5418–21.

²⁹ These are: *alumnus, avunculus, collibertus, coniunx, contubernalis, filius, frater, nepos, pater, patronus*.

³⁰ See *CIL VI.7,1* pp. 1211–20.

A survey focusing on *filius* and *filia* produces a similar result. There is no instance of "*suae filiae*" in *CIL* VI, but over 120 instances of "*filiae suae*".³¹ As for *filius*, there are some 230 instances of "*filio suo*", while the order "*suo filio*" appears only once.³² The relevant inscription, *CIL* VI 27445, is published in a way which reproduces the original layout on the stone (it was seen by the editor). This shows that in reality *suo* was written in between two lines, to the right of *filio*, indicating that the intended word order was in fact *filio suo*. One could continue this research, but I doubt that the picture would change.

Third, one may hold, despite this overwhelming evidence, that due to the addition of the preposition *cum*, the possessive pronoun behaves differently and is placed between *cum* and the term of relation. Therefore a final survey of sequences initiating with *cum* was conducted on the material in *CIL* VI. Six sequences of "*cum* + poss. pron. + relation" were found, against at least thirty containing the order "*cum* + relation + poss. pron."³³ The deviating cases refer to an *alumnus*, a *coniunx* (twice), a *nata* (poetic), *parentes*, and a *filia*, though the latter, as already mentioned, is a metric inscription and not relevant.

It must also be pointed out that the sequence "*cum suo/a* + " is quite common in connection with inanimate objects, as in *ara cum suis maceris* (*CIL* VI 1969) or *statua marmorea cum sua basi* (*CIL* VI 31151). Here we are clearly dealing with a different situation, a different concept of "belonging", one which Menge characterizes as "prägnante Bedeutung, die im Deutschen mit Ausdrücken wie ‚passend, gebührend, angemessen, berechtigt, gesetzlich, günstig, richtig, üblich, usw.‘ wiedergegeben wird".³⁴

Fourth, the reading "*cum suo filio*" is quite implausible also because this is not how manufacturers indicate cooperation. Normally, the copulative conjunction *et* is used, as in *PP. Novi Helius et Tyridas fecerun[t]* (*CIL* XV 7651).³⁵

³¹ See *CIL* VI.7,4 p. 5433 and *CIL* VI.7,2 pp. 2488–90, respectively.

³² See *CIL* VI.7,2 pp. 2511–14 and *CIL* VI.7,4 p. 5515, respectively.

³³ See the cases listed in *CIL* VI.7,1 pp. 1317–9 and 1327–8. In regular order one finds *filia*, *filius* or *fili* (ten times), *coniunx* (ten times), *cohaeredes* (twice), *compar* (twice). There are also four cases of *cum* + name + *filia sua* in *CIL* VI.7.2 p. 2478. The number of exceptions given in Bruun (n. 8) 245 is incorrect (too large). It may be added that cases where *cum* is written "*con*" are very few, as appears from *CIL* VI.7,1 p. 1163–4. The only relevant instance here is *con suo coiuge* in *CIL* VI 18542.

³⁴ Menge (n. 27), 100.

³⁵ The following fourteen instances constitute the examples of cooperation among *plumbarii* as recorded by means of a stamp in *CIL* XV. All but the last two cases are from Rome: *CIL* XV 7284 *fec. Martialis et Alexander ser.*; 7343B *Aur. Hilarus et Aur. Gaiane preb.*; XV 7411 *Aur.*

Finally, the son has no name in Laurenti's reading, which also makes no sense. Why refer to his contribution if he was not identified? To point to firms such as "Dombey and Son", of Charles Dickens fame, is anachronistic, and equally weak is the argument that the son may have had a name that was too long for the die. Even if the die had to be kept at 28 cm (it seems that Roman *plumbarii* rarely used stamps above one Roman *pes*, ca 30 cm, in length³⁶), it would still have been possible to fit in a name by removing some words that were not strictly speaking necessary, or, at any rate, less important than the name of the son.

The above arguments do not mean that Laurenti's view is impossible, but they make it seem quite unlikely. The alternate explanation is to read the text *Consuo filio fecit*. The omission of the *gentilicium* is obviously not a problem, as the father's family name was mentioned in the previous line, but the cognomen *Consus* is extremely rare; Kajanto listed only one occurrence.³⁷ The proper dative is, however, not *Consuo* but *Conso*, and thus even in this explanation one has to accept a certain irregularity. A mistake may have been made, influenced by the several cognomina ending in *-uus*, which obviously have a dative in *-uo*.

Yet, it will be obvious from the above argument that overall I prefer to read *Consuo filio fecit*. Such a statement of the son's privileged position (surprising in view of the fact that his father was a mere *plumbarius*) – for the son was influential enough to have secured a private water conduit for himself, or in any case wealthy enough to have the need for and the means to install one – would also fit in much better with the carefully crafted and almost "monumental" stamp.

Telesfori et Aelia Lucilla utrisque fecer.; XV 7472 *Veturia Polla et Asclepiades fec.*; XV 7532 *Sep. Procilla et Sep. Dativus fecc.*; XV 7546 *Aemiliorum Luci et Karici fecerunt*; XV 7605 *Aur. Cyminus et Hilarus pre[b.]*; XV 7607 *Aur. Hylas et Lucius soc.*; XV 7613 *Calp. Euphrosynus et Nicias fec.*; XV 7651 *PP. Novi Helius et Tyridas fecerun[t]*; XV 7684 *[-]i Felicianus et Felicissimus fec.*; XV 7689 *[-]us et Peregriana fecc.*; XV 7819 *... fec. Esychus et Hermeros ser.*; XV 7860 *Ti. Cl. Primit. et Corn. Chryser. fec.*

³⁶ See my "Uniformità e prassi quotidiana nella manifattura dei bolli per le fistule plumbee" (in preparation). The length of the stamp ("campo epigrafico") is given as 28 cm in Galli – Gregori (n. 22) 85.

³⁷ I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 216. The form *Consi* appears in *CIL IX 2845 = ILS 915* from Histonium in Samnium. Possibly the not uncommon *gentilicium Consius* may have been intended (*ibid.*, 14). O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki 1987, 308, calls *Consus* in *CIL IX 2845* an "Individualcognomen".

4. Was there a Roman *plumbarius* called Ismal(ianus)?

Some individuals in Rome carried the Greek cognomen *Ismarus*, which probably was inspired by the city of Ismaros (sometimes Ismara) in Thrace, destroyed by Odysseus (Hom. *Od.* 9.140), but mentioned by Ovid, Propertius, Strabo, and Vergil because of, among other reasons, the good wine produced in the region.³⁸ Heikki Solin in his repertorium of Greek personal names in Rome registered altogether eleven instances of *Ismarus* among personal names derived from geographical ones.³⁹ One of them is in a slightly different form, however, namely *Ismalus* with an L in place of the R; his name appears on a lead pipe (*CIL* XV 7319). This is arguably no cause for concern, as spelling errors in Roman inscriptions are not uncommon. This is easy to verify just by reading through the lists of names in Solin's monumental work, which has the great virtue of quoting every name exactly as it appears in the original source.⁴⁰

Yet in the case of our Ismal(us) we are not dealing with a poorly executed funerary inscription, commissioned by a person who possibly was only semi-literate, and executed by a stonecutter having a similar (lack of) education – as is often the case when one encounters errors in spelling or grammar. On the contrary, Ismal(us) is mentioned in a lead pipe inscription which reads *Imp. Caes. Aureli Antonini et Aureli Veri / sub cura Caecili Dextriani pro(c.) Ismal. f(ecit)* (*CIL* XV 7319). This inscription or stamp adheres to a common pattern for imperial *fistulae*, in that it first cites the emperor(s) in the genitive case, followed by the name of an imperial official, here the procurator Caecilius Dextrianus, and followed by the name of the manufacturer, the *plumbarius*. Since the execution of the commission, including arrangements for the inscription (i.e. having an appropriate die cut) to appear on the lead pipe, was the business of the *plumbarius*, one might have expected that a certain care would have been taken in regard to the spelling of his own name. But apparently this was not the case (and errors are not unheard of in *fistula* inscriptions, although they are quite rare⁴¹).

³⁸ See *RE* IX.2 (1916) 2134–35: entries on "Ismara 1" (Vulic) and "Ismaros 3" (Oberhummer).

³⁹ Solin (n. 3) I 650.

⁴⁰ An excellent example can be found in Solin (n. 3) I 650, on the same page as the entry for *Ismarus*. The three instances of the name *Thraecida* are all spelled in different ways: *Thraecida*, *Traechida*, and *Trhaecida*.

⁴¹ One finds the word *officina* misspelled in several ways, such as *oficina* (*CIL* XV 7594, 7604), or *hoficina* (*CIL* XV 7611), but these are late texts. As for names, a survey of the inscriptions in *CIL* XV 7367–7567, which contain the names of the conduit owners and frequently also name a *plumbarius*, shows only a few rather predictable spelling errors: *Sebera* (7415),

Now, however, there is another instance of *Ismal(us)* to take into account. In 1984 an inscription which had been found in the 1950s during excavations in front of the Stazione Termini railway station (Piazza dei Cinquecento) was presented as *CXX Imp. Antonini Aug. Pii [sub cura] Caecili / Dextriani proc. Aug. Ismal[---]anus lib. fec.*⁴²

Until very recently, this inscription had gone virtually unnoticed in scholarship.⁴³ What is immediately apparent is the fact that the same procurator and the same *plumbarius* from the stamp we saw earlier appear here too.⁴⁴ Once again we find the name form *Ismal[-]*. The onomastic formula is longer on this stamp, though, because some letter(s) seem to be missing, after which comes the end of a name, *-anus*, followed by the status indicator *lib(ertus)* and by the abbreviated verb *fec.* From the given information it is difficult to judge how much is missing from the name of the plumber. Currently a maximum of thirty-one letters are present or can be restored in line 1, not counting the numeral *CXX* which was probably written separately and not included in the stamp.⁴⁵ In line 2, the same number of letters, thirty-one, can be read at present, but something is missing between *ISMAL* and *ANVS*. It is of course possible that the letter size was smaller in line 2 (the opposite is not possible, as the emperor's name appears in line 1), so that there was space for more letters. Yet one may compare the other stamp mentioning *Ismal.* (*CIL XV 7319*), cited above, on which there are thirty-three letters in line 1, while in line 2 there are thirty-two.

Cerboniae (7431), *Balentin[-]* (7455), *<H>ateri* (7461), *Bitalion*, *Hortesi*, and *Cartili<u>s* (7469), *Ponpei* (7475), *Fulbi* (7483), *Cetegill[-]* (7537), *Valiri* (7557, cf. above), *Umidiae* (7567). Additionally there are a few cases of E for AE. I am not counting as spelling errors the relatively frequent cases of the first declension genitive ending in *-es* or *-aes*, which I intend to discuss separately since this is more of a linguistic phenomenon.

⁴² R. Egidi, "Piazza dei Cinquecento", *BullCom* 89 (1984) 67–8, esp. 67. The number *CXX* was written in mirror writing.

⁴³ My attention was drawn to this text by Edoardo Gautier, whom I thank for an offprint; see E. Gautier de Cofiengo, "Il Quartiere di *Porta Viminalis*. Un contributo alla carta archeologica dell'Esquilino", *BullCom* 108 (2007) 221–45, esp. 230 n. 63. The text was not included in Bruun (n. 5) nor in any other of my studies of imperial procurators.

⁴⁴ I intend to discuss the procuratorship of Caecilius Dextrianus in another context.

⁴⁵ Among almost ninety stamps in *CIL XV* naming the emperor or, sometimes, a member of the imperial family (7262–7348), there are sixteen cases in which also a numeral is present. It is either not part of the imperial stamp or is written over two lines, see *CIL XV* 7268, 7280, 7284 (several different cases), 7287, 7295, 7297, 7302, 7309 (two cases), 7314, 7317, 7319, 7330, 7334, 7336, 7339 (?), 7341.

This evidence suggests that very few letters should be added in line 2 on our new stamp, and that the missing portion of the plumber's name was very short. Even if, contrary to usual practice, the numeral *CXX* had been included in the stamp and line 1 thus contained thirty-four letters, it is difficult to believe that line 2 named two *plumbarii*, as in *Ismal. [et -]anus fec.* At least five or six more letters ought then to be added, even for short cognomina such as *Maianus*, which would bring the letter total to thirty-six or thirty-seven at least. Therefore the ending *-anus* is likely to be either a second cognomen of the same plumber or the final part of one name. If the former, again the name has to be very short, *Livianus*, *Maianus*, *Seianus*, or the like. Furthermore, no freedman *plumbarius* currently known ever signed with two cognomina, wherefore this reconstruction seems improbable. It remains to suggest that *Ismal* and *anus* were parts of the same name, and the most natural solution seems to me to be *Ismal[i]anus*. One can therefore tentatively reconstruct the stamp in the following manner, with the numeral immediately preceding the main stamp:

CXX IMP ANTONINI AVG PII [SVB CVRA] CAECILI
DEXTRIANI PROC AVG ISMAL[I]ANVS LIB FEC

We may now dedicate some further attention to the plumber *Ismal(ianus)*, a freedman (quite possibly an imperial one), whose name, at least according to the current view, ought to have been spelled "Ismarianus". In view of the two different lead pipe stamps with the spelling *Ismal-*, however, it seems legitimate to ask whether this may not be the intended spelling after all (this argument is not affected by the fact that one imperial freedman bearing the cognomen *Ismarianus* is known⁴⁶). It is quite uncommon to find L written instead of R by mistake, at least to judge from the inscriptions in *CIL VI*.⁴⁷ What name might we, then, be dealing

⁴⁶ *CIL X* 8059.33, a *signaculum* of unknown provenance, contains the text *Amem[p]tus Aug. Ismarianus*, for which see H. Chantraine, *Freigelassene und Sklaven im Dienst der römischen Kaiser. Studien zu ihrer Nomenklatur*, Wiesbaden 1967, 318. It cannot be established from where his cognomen was derived, but there are two *Augusti liberti* with the name *Ismarus* during the Julio-Claudian dynasty, see *CIL VI* 3980, 5194 with Solin (n. 3) I 650. They obviously have no connection to our *Ismal.*, who is much later, and either of them may have been a previous owner of the *Ismarus* in the *signaculum* (on the assumption that the emperor was among the heirs of his freedmen).

⁴⁷ See A. E. Gordon – S. J. Gordon, *CIL VI.6,3*, p. 277–8, for the cases in which L was written instead of another letter. Most commonly, L is written for E, I, or T (twenty or more cases each). In only five cases, in all of *CIL VI*, does L appear instead of R: twice in ordinary words (*CIL VI* 2104 a17, 2120.29), and three times in names (*CIL VI* 4882 *Ploplasteni*, 11455 *Alfocra[tion]*,

with? Perhaps the Old Testament name *Ishmael* or *Ismael*, given to Abraham's son with the slave woman Hagar and meaning "God will hear" (*Gen.* 16.11, 15). *Ismael* in fact is a name born by six individuals in the Old Testament.⁴⁸ While the use of this Semitic name cannot be documented in inscriptions from the western parts of the Roman empire, there are numerous instances of its use in Palestine and Egypt during the first and second centuries CE.⁴⁹ In addition, Abraham's son is said to have given origin to the tribe or people of the Ismaelites who settled to the south of Palestine, in regions where no traces of written language remain, and perhaps nothing was written at the time. That the name *Ismael* was not forgotten is shown also by the fact that he became an important figure for the Arabs, and the prophet Mohammed claimed descent from him.⁵⁰ One may hold that this name, if that is what we are dealing with in Rome, should properly be written *Ismael*-, yet this argument is not particularly strong since epigraphic evidence shows the many variations which Jewish names in particular exhibit.⁵¹

If the Jewish/Semitic nature of the name *Ismael(i)anus* is considered plausible, one must also ask how it came about that a plumber with this background is found working with an imperial work crew laying out *fistulae* in Rome. An im-

13472 *Clegorio*). There is little resemblance between L and R in Roman capitals, and they are quite different also when written in a cursive alphabet.

⁴⁸ For persons named *Ismael* in the Old Testament, see W. Smith – J. M. Fuller, *A Dictionary of the Bible* I.2, London 1893, 1475–80 (six individuals); O. Odelain – R. Séguineau (eds.), *Dictionnaire des noms propres de la Bible*, Paris 1978, 182–3, with five individuals (the name is mostly spelled *Yishmael*).

⁴⁹ In H. Solin, "Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt. Eine ethnisch-demographische Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der sprachlichen Zustände", *ANRW* II 29.2, Berlin 1983, 587–789, 1222–49, esp. 758, the only name reminiscent of "*Ismael(-)*" is the female *Ismaimilla* in *CIL* XIII 3099 (Gallia Lugdunensis), dated to late antiquity. Neither the name nor any form of it appears in D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe I. Italy (excluding the city of Rome), Spain and Gaul*, Cambridge 1993. For an early instance in the Near East, see M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1928, 248 no. 766 (a seal). See above all T. Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity I. Palestine 330 BCE – 200 CE*, Tübingen 2002, 177–9 (31 cases in the period 74 – 135 CE); T. Ilan, *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity III. The Western Diaspora 330 BCE – 650 CE*, Tübingen 2008, 133 (5 instances from Egypt, of which two from the second century CE).

⁵⁰ Thus Smith and Fuller (n. 48) 1477–8; L. F. Hartman – A. van den Born, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, New York – Toronto – London 1963, 1084–5: "Ismaelite beduins of the Negev".

⁵¹ One example are male "Sabbath" names, such as *Sabbatius*, the various spellings of which are shown and discussed by Noy (n. 49), 113, 212 (see nos. 68, 85, 126, 158).

portant addition to our knowledge is provided by the new stamp, which identifies Ismal(-) as a *libertus*, presumably an imperial freedman.⁵² Indeed if we read his cognomen as *Ismalianus*, this perhaps also explains the name, as it may indicate that the plumber had originally been the property of someone by the name of Ismalus, but subsequently, through donation or inheritance, ended up in imperial possession.⁵³ In such cases, an *agnomen* (an individual cognomen) was often created which referred to the previous owner.⁵⁴ This seems to me more plausible than the name *Isma(e)lianus* being given to an imperial slave straightout, since the *cognomina* in the so-called *familia Caesaris* are practically all Greek or Latin.⁵⁵

One last point: if the occurrence of the Semitic name *Ismalianus* seems unlikely, and if one wants to avoid the simple but unconvincing explanation of a die-cutter's error (repeated twice), one may consider this a case of impeded speech. "Lallation" is the term used in phonetics for the substitution of L for R, and should this be the case here, the plumber would in fact have called himself Ismalianus, though *Ismarianus* was intended originally.⁵⁶

5. The Sexti Flavii – from the depths of Roman society?

It is a truism that the Roman epigraphic record, rich as it may be in bare numbers, normally only provides information about the higher levels of society. Yet, due to certain particular circumstances, inscriptions may occasionally allow us to catch a glimpse of sections of Roman society that do not normally appear in our written sources.

As a starting point for the following considerations I take an observation once made by Attilio Degrassi in a study of the members of the *collegium* of *fabri tign(u)arii* in Rome: "Frequenti nei nomi dei magistri i gentilizi poco comuni *Isti-*

⁵² This seems normally to have been the case: see Bruun (n. 5) 351–2.

⁵³ Confiscation or sale are other possibilities, but one wonders if the slave would then have been given a name which referred to the previous owner.

⁵⁴ As in *Eglectus ser. Atimetianus* in the stamp *CIL XV 7289*. For over 350 imperial slaves or freedmen with an *agnomen* ending in *-anus* see Chantraine (n. 46) 295–344.

⁵⁵ See Chantraine (n. 46) 139, who found no difference comparing these to the names of private slaves and freedmen.

⁵⁶ The theory of "lallation" will only work for one of the three names cited in n. 47 above, *Ploplasteni*.

mennius, Aius, Abius, Fictorius, Dullius, Aedinius: evidentemente i *fabri tignarii*, come gli altri artigiani, appartenevano nella grande maggioranza a famiglie immigrate ...".⁵⁷ He thus offered as an explanation for the relative rarity of some of the names among the *fabri tignarii* their foreign origin. (It is not clear, however, if by "famiglie immigrate" he meant individuals who had come from other parts of the Italian peninsula, maybe only from as far away as somewhere in Central Italy, or if he meant immigration from much further away in the Mediterranean lands.) Other examples of unusual *gentilicia* among Roman artisans, which do not appear in the Roman elite, are not difficult to find, for instance *P. Deloreius*, *P. Hertorius*, or *L. Iegidius* in Arretine pottery stamps.⁵⁸

It also appears that lead pipe stamps can sometimes provide insights into sectors of Roman society that are normally denied us. This was certainly the outcome of an investigation of the individuals bearing the family name *Ostiensis* in Rome's harbour town Ostia, carried out a few years ago.⁵⁹ Were it not for the lead pipe stamps, the picture of how the *Ostienses* were situated in Ostia's economic life would be fairly bleak. Yet in the lead manufacturing business *Ostiensis* is a name better represented than any other *gentilicium*, and while funerary inscriptions do provide some information about various *Ostienses*, the lead pipe stamps showed how a number of them were professionally occupied and revealed a reality that would otherwise have gone unnoticed.

In this section it is once again a lead pipe stamp which provides the inspiration for the discussion. From *Fulginiae* in Umbria (trib. Cornelia, near modern Foligno) the following text was reported in *CIL XI* by Bormann, who himself had studied the *fistula*:

AVGVSTAE AQVAE
ab altera (parte)
SEX FLAVIVS PHLOCALVS FECT
(*CIL XI* 7999)

⁵⁷ A. Degrassi, "Epigrafia romana – I. Roma (1937–46)", *Doxa* 2 (1949) 47–135 = *Scritti vari di antichità I*, Roma 1962, 315–413, esp. 379.

⁵⁸ See the index in A. Oxé – H. Comfort – Ph. Kenrick, *Corpus Vasorum Arretinorum. A Catalogue of the Signatures, Shapes and Chronology of Italian Sigillata*², Bonn 2000. None of these *gentilicia* are found in the index to *CIL VI*.

⁵⁹ For this and the following, see C. Bruun, "La familia publica di Ostia antica", in M. L. Caldelli – G. L. Gregori – S. Orlandi (eds.), *Epigrafia 2006* (Atti della XIV Rencontre sur l'épigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera con altri contributi di colleghi, allievi e collaboratori), Roma 2008, 537–56.

Here we find an unusual combination of *praenomen* + *gentilicium*, namely Sextus Flavius. The vast numbers of individuals from the imperial period who carry imperial names such as Gaii or Tiberii Iulii, Titi Flavii or Marci Ulprii, are usually to be connected with the imperial freedmen and their descendants and freedmen, or with new citizens who for one reason or another had earned the *civitas Romana*. Such a background is likely also the reason for their success in life, such as it was, and the fact that they received a commemoration or appear in some other epigraphic document. Many other individuals bear *gentilicia* which belonged to powerful imperial or local families (for instance the Statilii in Rome or the Egrilii in Ostia). Although in these cases it is always possible that an individual belonged to a branch which had already separated from the dominant family during the Republic, one is generally entitled to suspect a connection, strong or weak, with the successful individuals bearing the family name in question.⁶⁰

It is also important to remember that during the imperial period the *praenomen* was still regularly in use during the first centuries, and while it often had an individual character during the first century CE (one son was given his father's *praenomen*, the others not), from the second century onwards the same paternal *praenomen* more regularly tended to be given to every son (scholars speak of an "inherited *praenomen*").⁶¹ It is against this very briefly sketched background that the case of the plumber Sex. Flavius Philocalus may be considered. What is known about Sexti Flavii in the Roman world? Is our plumber someone who plied his trade, apparently to some success, completely independently of the thousands of Titi Flavii who appear in countless inscriptions? Is he truly a representative of a perhaps large, unknown substratum? Or can one find a less well-known strand of Sexti Flavii, with which he may have some connection that could explain his relative success as a professional? Additionally, Bormann, the editor of *CIL* XI 7999, pointed out that the stamp belonged to a series of inscriptions which was thought not to be from Umbria originally, but to have been brought there from Rome. Is there any way to clarify this matter?

⁶⁰ Such a connection was suggested in Bruun (n. 11) 14–5, for the Roman *plumbarius* Sex. Marius Eros, in whose case the unusual combination Sextus Marius indicated connections to Spain. One must of course avoid using the term *gens* when dealing with the imperial period, as it has little meaning in a world where so many millions had Roman citizenship.

⁶¹ Salomies (n. 37) 378–88, with the *caveat* on p. 381 n. 105 that his analysis excludes descendants of freedmen and newly enfranchised foreigners (who likely were less prone to choosing a different *praenomen*).

No general investigation of the occurrences of the *nomen Flavium* is known to me,⁶² and indeed our sources may be thought to contain few surprises, so ubiquitous are the *duo nomina* "Titus Flavius". In the following, the results from a survey of Flavii in the indices of the ten most relevant volumes of the *CIL* are presented:⁶³

Table 1. The frequency of the various praenomina among bearers of the family name Flavius in chosen volumes of the *CIL* (II, III, V–VI, VIII–XII, XIV).

<i>CIL</i>	Sex.	L.	C.	M.	P.	Q.	Cn.	A.	Ti.	D.	Sp.	other	T.	total
II	2 = 5.6%	15	7	2	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	-	7 = 19.4%	36
III	1 = 0.5%	13	7	8	2	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	160 = 82%	195
V	- = 0%	4	11	10	7	5	2	-	1	5	1	-	16 = 25.8%	62
VI	6 ≈ 0.6%	52	33	32	24	22	8	10	4	3	1	-	860 = 81.5%	1,055
VIII	1 = 0.4%	13	17	16	11	10	1	-	-	-	-	-	161 = 68,2%	230
IX	3 = 5.1%	8	8	2	1	5	-	1	1	-	-	Sal.: 1	29 = 50%	59
X	- = 0%	9	11	8	4	5	1	-	-	-	-	-	88 = 69.8%	126
XI	1 = 1.3%	6	6	2	10	6	-	-	1			M': 1	44 = 57.1%	77
XII	1 = 2.8%	2	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23 = 65.7%	35
XIV	7 = 5.0%	5	14	6	15	9	-	-	-	-	1	-	84 = 59.6%	141
Σ	22 = 1.1%	127	119	90	74	63	13	12	11	8	3	2	1,472 = 73,0%	2,016

⁶² There is H. Gallego Franco, *Nomina imperatoria. Onomástica imperial en la sociedad de las provincias romanas del alto y medio Danubio*, Valladolid 2001, 76–141 and 328–32, who traces all the Flavii in the provinces of Raetia, Noricum and Pannonia Superior, but his list shows no Sexti Flavii, and he does not record the *praenomina* of fathers or patrons, which means that for my purposes this material is incomplete.

⁶³ There are no Flavii at all in *CIL* IV, see the indices in Suppl. I–II. *CIL* I (Republican inscriptions), VII and XIII were not included, as both Britannia and Germania seem too distant to have much relevance for our discovery from Central Italy. There are no Sexti Flavii in the brick stamps from Rome, see H. Bloch, "Indices to the Roman brick-stamps published in volumes XV.1 of the *CIL* and LVI–LVII of the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*", *HSCP* 58/59 (1948) 1–104; M. Steinby, *Indici complementari ai bolli doliari urbani (CIL XV,1)* (Acta IRF 11), Roma 1987. In collecting evidence for the *praenomina*, I have counted the *praenomina* that were part of the *tria nomina*, and also the names of fathers mentioned in an individual's filiation, as well as the names of patrons referred to by freedmen. The names of senators were excluded. I have tried to avoid counting any individual more than once, but the situation was not always clear; I have throughout relied on the index in question and not made controls of the actual texts. Due to such issues a new count would probably result in somewhat different figures, especially for the Titi Flavii; for the other *praenomina* the figures should change only minimally.

It turns out that *Sextus* is not the rarest *praenomen* found among individuals called Flavius; in Italy it is even rarer to encounter a Flavius carrying the *praenomen* *Gnaeus*, *Aulus*, *Tiberius*, *Decimus*, *Spurius*, or *Manius*. It is clear, however, that the popularity of these names are of a different magnitude than is the case with the five names *Lucius*, *Gaius*, *Marcus*, *Publius*, and *Quintus*. And then again, compared to these frequent five, *Titus* is in a league of its own, with the notable exception of Northern Italy and above all the Iberian Peninsula.⁶⁴

The total in the *CIL* indices amounts to 1,472 instances of *Titus Flavius* and 544 instances of another *praenomen* coupled with *Flavius*.⁶⁵ Of these other *praenomina*, twenty-two are *Sexti*, or some 1,1% of the total of 2,016 Flavian *praenomina*. To these cases can be added six other *Sexti* who have been published in the *l'Année épigraphique* (including the 2006 issue) after the *CIL* volumes appeared, three from Rome (*AE* 1946, 130; 1960, 28), two from *Minturnae* (*AE* 1989, 150), and one from *Venosa* (*AE* 2003, 445; early Augustan).

A next step ought to be to investigate whether our sources allow us to say anything in particular about the *Sexti Flavii*. Can any relationship be established between at least some of them, or should they be regarded as isolated phenomena that appeared independently of each other? As for the latter possibility, as previously mentioned it is the case that while Romans by the second century CE increasingly tended to inherit the *praenomen* of their father, during the late Republic and early Empire sons were commonly given different *praenomina*.⁶⁶ The following inscription from *Venosa* is a good example of this: *L. Sex. Flavies / Q. f. Pol(lia tribu) / in fro. p. XII / in agr. p. XIV* (*AE* 2003, 445).⁶⁷ Here we have the tomb of two *Flavii*, both enrolled in the *tribus Polllia* but neither carrying a cognomen. Their father was a *Quintus*, while one son was called *Lucius*, the other

⁶⁴ Salomies (n. 37) 311 remarks that on the Iberian peninsula, the six most common non-imperial *gentilicia* alone represented one quarter of the total; this may be another dimension of the unusual onomastic situation.

⁶⁵ For the present purpose, it did not seem meaningful to go beyond the *CIL* indices in investigating the overall occurrence of other Flavian *praenomina* besides *Sextus*. Just to offer a glimpse of the situation in other contexts: a survey of the material collected by A. B. Tataki, *The Roman Presence in Macedonia. Evidence from Personal Names* (Meletemata 46), Athens 2006, 220–32, gives the following result regarding the use of Flavian *praenomina*: *Titus* 46, *Gaius* 4, *Lucius* 4, *Tiberius* 3, *Quintus* 2 (I did not include inscriptions of Macedonians found outside the region). Here *Titus* represents 78 % of all instances of *praenomina*.

⁶⁶ See Salomies (n. 37), 378–88.

⁶⁷ See M. Chelotti, "Regio II. Apulia et Calabria. Venosa", *SupplIt* 20, Roma 2003, 11–334, esp. 212–3 no. 127.

Sextus. It is an early inscription (dated to the Augustan age by the editor), and the lack of a cognomen will have created an impetus to vary the *praenomen*.⁶⁸ We may in this text see the genesis of a line of Sexti Flavii. On the other hand, the *praenomen* could obviously also be inherited in this period, in any case by one son, as is shown by a more recently discovered text from Suio near *Minturnae*: [-Val]erius M. f. Paetus, Sex. Flavius Sex. f. / [-]vius L. f. theatrum aedificandum / [c]oeravere ex pecunia Martis HS 12,000 / [c]eterum pecuniam pagus Vescinus contulit (*AE* 1989, 150). In this text, again dating to the Augustan period and concerning a township called *pagus Vescinus* (somewhat upstream from *Minturnae* along the *Liris* river), we find the local notable Sex. Flavius Sex. f. engaged in overseeing the construction of a theatre.⁶⁹

The other inscriptions mentioning Sexti Flavii are of later date. Some of them are too fragmentary or too short to make much sense of.⁷⁰ Others are simple funerary inscriptions without any further useful information.⁷¹

It is almost exclusively from Ostia and Rome that we find inscriptions which contain more information, as in the Ostian *CIL* XIV 749, the epitaph of the child L. Calpurnius Helpidianus, erected by his father L. Calpurnius Eucharistus, with the remark *locus datus a Sex. Fl. Iustino*, which indicates a certain influ-

⁶⁸ Other cases showing the choice of a new *praenomen* include *CIL* VIII 2869 P. Flavius T. f. Clemens; IX 5584 T. Flavius Sal. f., and, among the numerous Flavii in *CIL* VI, only L. Flavius T. f. Quir. Secularis (!) (3520), T. Flavius Sp. f. Eutyches (18059), T. Flavius L. f. Cirpinus Expectatus (34839), and Ol(us) Flavius T. l. Antiochus (!) (38363). Overall, it is a fairly rare phenomenon in Rome, which is easily explained when the filiation contains the name *Spurius*. Further examples from the provinces are provided in Salomies (n. 37) 424, 427.

⁶⁹ There is a short comment on the text by L. M. Proietti in F. Coarelli (ed.), *Minturnae*, Roma 1989, 162–3 no. 35.

⁷⁰ *CIL* II 4367 from Tarraco is fragmentary and only records the name of [S]ex. Flavius [S]ex. [l.?] Plutus; *CIL* III 8191 from Scupi in Moesia Superior, is possibly a dedication mentioning a Sex. Fl. F[la]mina[lis]; *CIL* VI 1057 v.96 names the *vigil* S. Flavius Agathop(us), who also appears in the *laterculus* VI 1058 vi.25; *CIL* XII 4821 from Narbo: Sex Flavio [-] Fuficia Ae[-]. In *CIL* XIV 4928 one can barely make sense of the name [Se]x. Flaviu[s] but not much more.

⁷¹ From Rome come *CIL* VI 18105 Sex. Flavius Sex. l. / Hilarus / Furia (mulieris) l. Nice; 18145 Sex. Flavi / Nervae M[?]; 18405 (theta) Flavia Primigenia / Sex. Flavius Zmaragdus / Cn. Tetrinius Hilarus / fecit; 21109 Dis. Mani. / D. Laelio Aechioni / Sex. Flavius Ter- / tius f. b. m. There is also the North-African *CIL* VIII 220 from Cillium: D. M. / Sex. Fla/vio Fel/ici; *CIL* IX 3230 from Corfinium: Flaviae T. l. / Pergamioni / Sex. Flavius Primus uxori / p.; *CIL* IX 3467 from Peltuinum: Sex. Flavio / Sex. l. Tertio / Pescennediae / Daphnidi / Hilario patr. / et matri p.; and lastly, from Ostia, *CIL* XIV 1031 [-]et Heracli[-] qui vix. a. XII m. [-] / Sex. Fl. Flavianu[s] / filio dulcissimo [-], and XIV 1036 D. M. / Sex. Flavi / Secundi / Sextia Flora | coniugi / optimo.

ence on the part of Sex. Flavius Iustinus. Similarly, some power must have been wielded by Sex. Flavius Phe[-],⁷² as evident from the formula *locus concessus a Sex. Fla[vio] Phe[?]* in *CIL* XIV 1624, the epitaph of Sextia Panthia, erected by her husband Bellius Eutyches Sallustius. Similarly, one Sex. Flavius is involved in the transfer of property in the following inscription from Rome: *Postumia Myrias / hemit (!) m[on]umentum a Sex. Flav[i]o Heraclida / auctore L. Pituanii Primig[eni] / in quibus (!) fundo agitu[r] / itaque Postumia Myri[as] ded- / it L. Postumio Agatho[-] / conliberto suo indulgentis[simo] ...* (*AE* 1946, 130).⁷³ Sex. Flavius Heraclida seems to have reached a certain position in his community, as he was the *auctor* of the real estate owner Pituanus Primigenius.⁷⁴

A fragmentary dedicatory inscription from Ostia to a man who is also called a *patronus*, points to a Sex. Flavius in a prominent social context: *Sex. Fl. Sex. [f. ?] / Bellicio M[- - -] / primo omn[ium] prae- / textato vo[- - -] / patrono fo[- - -]* (*CIL* XIV 4649, a marble plaque).⁷⁵ There is no doubt that Sex. Flavius Bellicius was a man of some distinction. The inscription was erected in his honour, as the dative case shows, and he had accomplishments to be proud of, being *primus omnium praetextatus*, probably in some special context such as a specific action; Vaglieri suggested that Vo[lcanus], the main deity of Ostia, was mentioned.⁷⁶

Finally, the most successful of all known Sexti Flavii is named in a funerary inscription found in a private collection located in the outskirts of Rome. It

⁷² This name is enigmatic, for Solin (n. 3) III 1403, comments that there are very few Greek male names beginning in *Phe-*. The names *Phemio* and/or *Phemius* are known in three instances only, see Solin, *ibid.*, I 571. *Phaedimus* is more common with twelve attestations, and could, as one can see in Solin, *ibid.*, I 570–1, also be spelled *Phedimus*.

⁷³ Published by A. Ferrua, "Analecta romana I. S. Sebastiano", *Epigraphica* 4 (1942) 41–68, esp. 63–64 no. 57. The inscription is dated to the second century CE by Solin (n. 3) II 776, 1124.

⁷⁴ Ferrua (n. 73) 63 correctly refers to Sex. Flavius Heraclida as "agente or amministratore di Pituanio". though without further discussion or references. The *OLD*, s.v. "auctor 1. the principal in a sale, vendor, seller" does not cite anything similar to what we have here, namely an *auctor* representing an individual person (in the genitive), but E. De Ruggiero, "Actor", *DizEpigr.* I (1895) 766–7, esp. 767 provides a perfect parallel in *CIL* IX 2827 lines 14–7: ... *inter P. Vaccium Vitulum auctorem Histoniensium fundi Herianici et Titiam Flaccillam proauctorem Tilli Sassi fundi Vellani*.

⁷⁵ First published by D. Vaglieri, "Varietà epigrafiche", *BullCom* 38 (1910) 322–35, esp. 331.

⁷⁶ Vaglieri (n. 75) 331. It would require too much space to discuss the career of Sex. Flavius Bellicius here; I will return to it in another work, dedicated to the municipal *praetextati*. I do not find the text discussed or even mentioned in S. Mrozek, "Primus omnium sur les inscriptions des municipes italiens", *Epigraphica* 33 (1971) 60–9.

likely comes from the vicinity of the capital: *D. M. Sex. Flavio Sex. f. Quir. Quieto p(rimi)p(ilo) leg. XX V(ictoriae) V(ictricis) misso cum exer(citu) in exp(editione) Maur(ica) ab imp. Antonino Aug., praef. classis Brit(annicae). Varinia Crispinilla coni(u)g(i) pientissimo et Fl. Vindex et Quietus fil. piissimi* (AE 1960, 28, from Casale della Spizzichina on the Via Cassia, some 14 km north of Rome⁷⁷). Here we find an *eques Romanus* who had advanced to a very high military rank and had taken part in significant military events during the reign of Antoninus Pius.⁷⁸ He is also the only Sextus Flavius of the post-Augustan period to display his tribe, which was the *tribus Quirina*, the tribe of the Flavian emperors. It happens to be the third-most common tribe in Ostia, after the *Voturia*, the *colonia's* own, and the *Palatina*, which was also very common.⁷⁹

It may be possible to identify certain trends in the material. The *nomen* Flavius had old traditions in the Roman republic, as pointed out by Olli Salomies, and persons using a variety of *praenomina* are found.⁸⁰ A very early example is the Cn. Flavius *scriba* who assisted the censor App. Claudius Caecus in his reforms in 312 BCE and held elected office in Rome (Liv. 9,46), though no later Cn. Flavius ever advanced to similar heights, as far as we know, and the representation of Gnaei Flavii in the epigraphic material is modest indeed (Tab. 1 above). In the imperial period, senators named Flavius can be found using a variety of *praenomina*: besides *Titus* also *Gaius*, *Lucius*, *Marcus*, *Quintus*, and *Publius*.⁸¹ These names are the most common ones in our table, after *Titus*, but this may be due not only to the impact of the senatorial families using and spreading these names, but may depend also on the fact that these were in general the most common Roman *praenomina*.⁸²

⁷⁷ For the location, see H. Comfort, "Some Inscriptions near Rome", *AJA* 64 (1960) 273–6, esp. 273.

⁷⁸ He is absent from the survey of Roman military campaigns against the Mauri in G. Alföldy, "Bellum Mauricum", *Chiron* 15 (1985) 87–105 = Idem, *Römische Heeresgeschichte*, Amsterdam 1987, 463–81 (with Addenda). In V. Rosenberger, 'Bella et expeditiones'. *Die antike Terminologie der Kriege Roms*, Stuttgart 1992, 100, the campaign is dated to the reign of Antoninus Pius, so already in Comfort (n. 77) 274, who first published the inscription, accompanied by a clear photo (= AE 1960, 28). See also H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* III, Paris 1961, 978–80 no. 156 bis.

⁷⁹ Thus R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*², Oxford 1973, 190–1, 215.

⁸⁰ Salomies (n. 37) 248 n. 261.

⁸¹ See *PIR*² vol. III.

⁸² See the tables in Salomies (n. 37) 155, 158.

In the late Republic, the *gentilicium* Flavius was thus obviously not restricted to the region of Reate, the home of the future emperor Vespasian, and Sexti Flavii can be found particularly in southern Italy or in any case south of Rome, as shown by the inscriptions from Venosa and *Minturnae* cited above.

For the imperial period, there is little to say about the sporadic finds of Sexti Flavii outside of Ostia and Rome,⁸³ while these two neighbouring cities together account for 16 of the 28 attestations (in the *CIL* volumes and in the *AE*). In statistical terms, the proportion of Sexti among Flavii with a *praenomen* in Ostia is indeed well over the average, while in Rome the overall number of Flavii with a *praenomen* is so massive that the Sexti are still barely noticeable.

If one were to judge the situation merely based on these figures – but here one can talk only about a certain probability, nothing more – one would suggest that there were one or several families of Sexti Flavii thriving in Ostia and the neighbourhood of Rome's harbour town. In Ostia we find two Sexti Flavii who were wealthy enough to allot burial space to some fellow townspeople, while one Sex. Flavius was a *praetextatus* and was the recipient of an honorary inscription of some kind. One might even suggest that the most successful of all the Sexti Flavii, the high-ranking equestrian officer Sex. Flavius Sex. f. Quietus, had ties to Ostia, although this is but a loose hypothesis. His tombstone was apparently found in or near Rome, but one can agree with Hans-George Pflaum that this shows where he had settled, not necessarily his origin.⁸⁴ Quietus' tribe was the *Quirina*, the tribe of the Flavian dynasty. Yet also his father was called Sextus, and since Quietus was likely born around 100 CE (in order for him to hold a command in Mauretania in the 140s or early 150s⁸⁵), his father ought to have been born in the 70s CE. This family was evidently not enfranchised under the Flavian dynasty but constituted a separate line.

To return, finally, to the *plumbarius* Sex. Flavius Philocalus: this survey of Sexti Flavii in the Roman world does indeed support the doubts voiced by Bormann regarding the provenance of the *fistula* inscription. Judging, again, by probabilities, the plumber should have been active in Ostia or Rome. The unusual text on the lead pipe, *Augustae Aquae*, is not a hindrance for this, though it does not

⁸³ The low overall number of finds in *CIL* II and IX means that the percentages for those regions must be taken with some caution.

⁸⁴ Pflaum (n. 78) 980. He considered Sex. Flavius Quietus to be a self-made man who had advanced from the ranks ("sorti du rang").

⁸⁵ Rosenberger (n. 78) 99, dates the three *expeditiones* in Mauretania under Pius to the period from ca. 140 to ca. 155 CE.

necessarily contribute to the argument either. There were many *Aquae Augustae* in the Roman world; certainly several in Rome, while in Ostia the only known hydraulic feature with a similar "imperial" name is called the *Aqua Traiana*.⁸⁶

If the argument about an Ostian or Roman provenance for *CIL XI 7999* and *Sex. Flavius Philocalus* does not convince, one can at least conclude that having now established the great rarity of individuals called *Sextus Flavius* in the Roman world, and that persons with this name were particularly well represented in Ostia, another feature of the "onomastic profile" of Ostia has been identified.⁸⁷

Postscript

While in the process of reading the proofs, I was contacted by dott.ssa Anna Borzacchi from the university of Viterbo, who alerted me to a new lead pipe stamp she is in the process of studying.⁸⁸ The text mentions a *plumbarius* by the name of *Manturius Valentinus*. Here we are dealing with a very rare *gentilicium* indeed, which according to Solin and Salomies (n. 11) is known in only one instance previously, *CIL VI 38601* from Rome (a woman called *Manturia N[-]*, who appears in a common epitaph). This new discovery once again underlines that *instrumentum domesticum* inscriptions sometimes can reveal little known aspects of Roman society.

University of Toronto

⁸⁶ The most recent update on the occurrences of the name *Aqua Augusta* is in G. Alföldy, *Studi sull'epigrafia augustea e tiberiana di Roma*, Roma 1992, 61–2 n. 10 with earlier bibliography. On the *Aqua Traiana* at Ostia, see Bruun (n. 5) 285–6 (*CIL XIV 4326*). It is now clear that *Vespasian* built or restored an aqueduct in Ostia, see M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni – M. L. Caldelli – F. Zevi, *Épigraphie latine*, Paris 2006, no. 27, and M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni – M. L. Caldelli – F. Zevi, *Epigrafia latina. Ostia: cento iscrizioni in contesto*, Roma 2010, no. 27. We have no name for it, and the aqueduct might have been called *Aqua Augusta*.

⁸⁷ For the "onomastic profile" of Ostia, see O. Salomies, "People in Ostia. Some Onomastic Observations and Comparisons with Rome", in C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (*Acta IRF 27*), Roma 2002, 135–59.

⁸⁸ Email of 18 December 2010. I am most grateful to dott.ssa Borzacchi for sharing this information with me.