

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

**VOL. XLI**

HELSINKI 2007

## INDEX

CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Ostienses and Ostians in Three Inscriptions from Rome's Port</i>	9
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Cities and Courtesans</i>	21
PETER KRUSCHWITZ & HILLA HALLA-AHO	<i>The Pompeian Wall Inscriptions and the Latin Language: A Critical Reappraisal</i>	31
FABRICE POLI	<i>Notes d'épigraphie latine rémoise: au sujet de deux inscriptions du Musée Saint-Rémi (Reims)</i>	51
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Asinnii, Licinnii, etc. in the East</i>	59
KAJ SANDBERG	<i>Polybius on the Consuls: An Interpretation of Histories 6,12,4</i>	75
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXXXVII–CCXLIII</i>	89
DAVID WOODS	<i>Tiberius on Caligula the Snake and Other Contextual Problems</i>	117
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	129
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	195
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	199
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	215

## OSTIENSES AND OSTIANS IN THREE INSCRIPTIONS FROM ROME'S PORT<sup>1</sup>

CHRISTER BRUUN

In this paper I discuss three Ostian inscriptions that have caught my attention recently, while I have been engaged in research on the "middle class" of Rome's port, in this case municipal and other freedmen and the *Augustales*. The first inscription presents a previously misunderstood *libertus coloniae*, while a new reading of the second text shows that the successful *decurio* whose achievements it records was after all not called Ostiensis and therefore has no connection to municipal freedmen. The third text, again fragmentary, was erected by a woman for her husband (a *sevir Augustalis*), her daughter, and several freedmen. A new interpretation of the text shows the woman as patron of one of the freedmen. The *gentilicium* of the *Augustalis* is unknown; a suggestion based on onomastic probabilities is presented.

### 1. The public freedman Euanthes

D. M.  
L·Euan·Then  
liberto·colo-  
niaes·fecit·  
coiugi·san-  
ctis·si·mo (CIL XIV 440)

---

<sup>1</sup> The current study was carried out as part of a project entitled "The Civic Identity of Roman Ostia", supported by a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This support is gratefully acknowledged. I am indebted to my Research Assistant Jaclyn Neel for improving my English, and to Mika Kajava and Heikki Solin for helpful suggestions; remaining errors of language and substance are my own. The two photos were provided by the Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, and I am most grateful to the Soprintendente ad Interim Maria Antonietta Fugazzola for the permission to publish them. Many thanks are due to Paola Germoni, Paola Olivanti, Elvira Angeloni, and Maria Letizia Caldelli, who assisted me in procuring the photographs. Abbreviations: *IPO* = H. Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port d'Ostie*, Lund 1952; *ScO* = *Scavi di Ostia*.

The above Ostian inscription does not seem to have been properly interpreted so far. In the most recent treatment, by Alexander Weiß in his commendable monograph on municipal slaves and freedmen in the Roman world, the text is published precisely as given above, without comment, in the list of municipal freedmen.<sup>2</sup> Thus this particular *coloniae libertus* seems to bear the *gentilicium* Euan(-), which seems odd for a municipal freedman. The usual pattern is that *liberti* of Roman towns adopted a *gentilicium* that was directly derived either from the name of the town (*Aquileiensis*, *Ostiensis*, *Saepinius*) or from the full name of the *colonia*, as is the case with the *Venerii* in Pompei (*colonia Cornelia Veneria Pompeianorum*). Another solution, quite widespread, was to adopt the family name *Publicius* (from *servus/libertus publicus*).<sup>3</sup>

Euan(-) does not fit this pattern, and in fact a Latin family name beginning with Euan(-) is unknown.<sup>4</sup> In reality, we must be dealing with the Greek cognomen *Euanthes*, which appears in nine inscriptions at Rome.<sup>5</sup> In one of these texts, the name appears in the form *Euantheni* (*CIL VI 17521*), which agrees completely with what we have in the Ostian inscription. We ought therefore to read *D(is) M(anibus) Euanthen(i) liberto coloniaes...*

The fact that the text apparently includes a marker of word division between *Euan* and *then* may have led previous observers astray, but clearly such markers were placed erroneously in the text, as indeed two markers divide the word *sanctissimo* in three parts.

Therefore we are likely dealing with someone called L. Ostiensis Euanthes (the family name *Publicius* cannot be excluded but is much less likely). Indeed, a number of *Lucii Ostienses* appear in Ostian inscriptions, for instance in *CIL XIV 1428* and *1432*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> A. Weiß, *Sklave der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Sklaverei in den Städten des römischen Reiches*, Stuttgart 2004, 236. A similar reading was given already by L. Halkin, *Les esclaves publics chez les Romains*, Bruxelles 1897, 244: L. Euan ... Then ... libertus publicus. The man is listed in the same fashion, under the letter E, in the index of gentilicia in *CIL XIV*, p. 512.

<sup>3</sup> Weiß (above n. 2), 236–45 for freedmen of Roman towns; for *gentilicia* derived from the names of towns, i.e. probably originating from municipal freedmen, see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Göttingen 1904 (repr. Zürich – Hildesheim 1991), 524–28.

<sup>4</sup> H. Solin – O. Salomies, *Repertorium nominum gentilium et cognominum Latinorum*<sup>2</sup>, Mainz 1994.

<sup>5</sup> H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom. Ein Namenbuch II*<sup>2</sup>, Berlin – New York 2003, 1161–62.

<sup>6</sup> On public freedmen in Ostia and Ostienses in general see my "La familia publica di Ostia antica", to appear in M. L. Caldelli, G. L. Gregori, S. Orlandi (eds.), *Epigrafia 2006*, Roma 2008.

We now have a much clearer understanding of the inscription, although there seems to be something missing, namely the subject of *fecit*. The rest of the inscription is clearly in the dative, and although the word order is somewhat awkward, with *fecit* among the epithets referring to the deceased, the best solution seems to be to postulate the name of the spouse on a missing line.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. A decurion but hardly an Ostiensis

Some years ago Alfredo Marinucci presented a rich crop of previously unedited Ostian inscriptions, among them the following epitaph, inscribed on a fragmentary marble plaque intended as the cover of a funerary niche ("lastra di loculo") (see Fig. 1):<sup>8</sup>

[...] *Ost. Atia-*  
*[no d(ec.) co]l. Ost. hono-*  
*[rib. f(uncto)] dee (ensori) rei p.*  
*[Laur(entium)] vic. Aug(ustano)*  
*[-]to qui vixit*  
*[ --- ]*



Fig. 1. The inscription published by Marinucci (below n. 8), 203 no. 31 = Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, inv. no. 749 (published by permission).

<sup>7</sup> A similar structure, in which *fecit* precedes the dedicator and subject of the sentence, is found in, for instance, the following inscriptions: [---] / *classe praetoriae (sic) / Misenensium / militavit ann. XL fecit / coniunx sua* (CIL XIV 243); *D. M. M. Ulpi Victoris vixit an. I m. I d. XII fec. Ulpus Apollonius pater* (CIL XIV 1791).

<sup>8</sup> A. Marinucci, "Ostia, iscrizioni municipali inedite", *MGR* 13 (1988) 181–216, esp. 203 n. 31. The text is not included in *AE* 1988–2003.

We are clearly dealing with a member of the local elite, someone who had been a decurion, for *Ost. hono-* in l. 2 must refer to decurional status in Ostia.<sup>9</sup> Marinucci rightly pointed out that the man in the inscription also had exercised a function in the neighbouring community called Vicus Augustanus (l. 4 *vic. Aug.*).<sup>10</sup> The rest of the editor's comments concerned l. 3: "*dee per def(ensori)*, cioè patrocinatoro di un processo civile degli interessi di una comunità. In tal caso il *titulus* appare anteriore alla riforma radicale promossa da Valeriano (sic) I nel 364."<sup>11</sup> Marinucci evidently interpreted the office in the inscription as that of a *defensor civitatis*, an office which underwent considerable changes in the 360's under Valentinian I (not Valerian) and Valens. The two emperors stated in an edict from 364, which concerned the protection of commoners (*ut plebs omnis Inlyrici officii patronorum contra potentium defendatur iniurias*, *CTh* 1.29.1), that those in charge (here in fact called *patroni*, not *defensores*), should not be chosen from among the decurions but from persons of higher rank.<sup>12</sup> The fact that our man is a local dignitary therefore indeed points to a date before 364, even though he is not called *defensor civitatis* but *defensor rei publicae*. There are less than a handful of other *defensores rei publicae* known from Italy and the West, they are all of merely local distinction, and they seem to be precursors to the later *defensores civitatis*.<sup>13</sup> One *defensor r. p.* is attested in Brixia (Brescia) already during the

<sup>9</sup> A more common formula is *omnibus honoribus functus* (*CIL* XIV 294, 335, 354, 359, 4653), which R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, Oxford 1973<sup>2</sup>, 179, 513 considered to include local offices up to and including the duovirate. Meiggs 179 is probably right that a mere *honoribus functus* indicates a less illustrious career which did not include the duovirate; the expression occurs in *CIL* XIV 401, with a new case in Marinucci (above n. 8), 191 no. 14 = *AE* 1988, 188. The latter (*ibid.*, 192) seems to regard *honoribus functus* as merely an abbreviation of the longer expression, which is doubtful.

<sup>10</sup> For epigraphic references to Vicus Augustanus, see G. Simonazzi Masarich, "Vicus Augustanus Laurentium", *MonAnt* 48 (1973) 287–307, esp. 292–93. Marinucci pointed out that this inscription provides the first instance of the term *res publica* used in relation to the locality.

<sup>11</sup> Marinucci (above n. 8), 203, with reference to G. Mancini, *DizEp* II.2 (1910) 1554–58 s.v. "defensor civitatis". The emperor who reformed the office of *defensor civitatis* was of course Valentinian I.

<sup>12</sup> See Mancini (above n. 11), 1555; O. Seeck, *RE* IV.2 (1901) 2365–71 s.v. "defensor civitatis", esp. 2366; R. M. Frakes, 'Contra potentium iniurias'. *The 'defensor civitatis' and later Roman Justice*, München 2001, 87–88. F. Pergami, "Sulla istituzione del *defensor civitatis*", *SDHI* 61 (1995) 413–31, suggested that the date of the edict in *CTh* 1.29 be changed to 368 CE; for our purposes that makes little difference.

<sup>13</sup> See *CIL* IX 2354 (Allifae), V 4559 (Brixia), XI 4389 (Ameria). They are listed by Mancini (above n. 11), 1557–58; while Frakes (above n. 12), 21 takes his data from Seeck. There are also a number of other epigraphically attested *defensores*, who do not add the formula *rei publicae*

second century CE (if not before),<sup>14</sup> and thus one cannot exclude that our Ostian *defensor* belongs to a period much earlier than the 360s.

Less convincing is Marinucci's reading of the name of this man. As is evident from the photo, there is no word division between the letters on the fragmentary first line; the text simply reads OSTATIA. While it is not unheard of to abbreviate a common *gentilicium*, and Ostiensis/ius must be considered one in this local context, I wonder whether there might not be a more satisfying reading of the name. The name Ost(iensis) Atia[nus] might at first sight seem beyond criticism, but if one focuses on the cognomen Atianus some doubts appear.

There are in fact several reasons for instead suggesting to read the beginning of the preserved text as

[-]o Statia-/[no]

First, there is the question of names. The first publisher read "Atianus", which happens to be a very unusual name. Kajanto in his standard work on Latin cognomina in fact does not register *Atianus* at all, while his investigations turned up *Attianus* 40 times.<sup>15</sup> Both cognomina are derived from *gentilicia*, from *Atius* and *Attius*, respectively. *Atius*, to be sure, is a respectable *gentilicium* (Augustus' mother was an Atia, for instance), but it is not widespread. That both *Atius* and *Atianus* are so rarely seen may also be due to ancient stonecutters who through assimilation wrote the names with two Ts, and to modern scholars who in their indices tacitly include *Atianus* under *Attianus* assuming an orthographic error. Be that as it may, the computer index to *CIL* VI shows no case of *Atian-* among the thousands of inscriptions from Rome, but *Attianus* occurs in a handful of cases.<sup>16</sup> In the indices to *CIL* XIV and XIV Suppl. the cognomen *Atianus* does not appear, nor does *Atius* turn up in Ostia at all (there are however some twenty *Atii* in *CIL* XIV 2179–80 from the *ager Albanus*).<sup>17</sup> *Stadius*, on the contrary, is found about ten times in Ostia.<sup>18</sup>

---

to their titles; they may have had identical tasks. The *defensores civitatis* known from Italy are distinct from the *defensores r. p.*, as they are consistently of higher rank; see the discussion in Frakes (above n. 12), 63–66 and the Appendix on p. 231–33.

<sup>14</sup> G. L. Gregori, *Brescia romana. Ricerche di prosopografia storia sociale II. Analisi dei documenti* (Vetera 13), Roma 1999, 245, 329 on M. Publicius Sextius Calpurnianus, *defensor rei publicae* in *CIL* V 4559 = *Inscr. It.* X 996.

<sup>15</sup> I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 141.

<sup>16</sup> See *CIL* VI 7.1.

<sup>17</sup> There is no *Atius*, *Atianus*, or *Attianus* in *IPO* or in *ScO* III or *ScO* XII. In *NSA* 1953, 289 no. 50 one C. Attius Attianus is recorded.

<sup>18</sup> *CIL* XIV 249.2, 895, 1293, 4569 dec. x.19, 4669, 4874, 5125–26; in addition the name



That the stonemason intended to write *Atianus* can obviously not be excluded, but reading the name as *Statianus* is surely much more plausible. Kajanto recorded the latter name 29 times in his survey,<sup>19</sup> and while the name does not appear in *CIL* XIV, one instance is known from the Isola Sacra cemetery (*IPO* A 90: *Sentius Statianus*<sup>20</sup>). *Statius*, from which it is formed, is not uncommon in Ostia, as we just saw.

Second, considering the composition of the inscription, the reading [-] *Ost. Atia-* on line 1 is unsatisfactory. If we assume that the space reserved for the inscription was fully used on every line, we simply need to be able to include more text on l. 1. In Marinucci's version, all that can possibly come in the gap to the left is, perhaps, *D(is) M(anibus)*, and a one-letter praenomen (Ostienses normally use the praenomina *Gaius*, *Lucius* or *Publius*, but never *Sextus*<sup>21</sup>). On l. 2, in a space of similar length, one needs to find room at least for the end of the cognomen, *NO*, the abbreviated word *COL* which plausibly precedes *Ost.* in Marinucci's reading, and probably something denoting the man's position in the *colonia* – a mere *D* for *d(ecurio)* is suggested in the first edition.<sup>22</sup> Conceivably that office may be left out, so that *col. Ost.* takes on a locative function instead and goes with *hono[rib. functo]*, but in any case we must count with five letters, and possibly with six or more (*f.* for *functo* is rather minimalistic). This should be compared with the three letters we had in Marinucci's version for l. 1.

Similar problems of space will appear on l. 3, where the tight space of l. 1 demands the abbreviation *hono- / [rib. f(uncto)]*, which is possible, but by no means necessary or particularly convincing.

The fragmentary plaque which contains the inscription does not provide certainty about the original width of the inscribed space. Marinucci's restoration tends to make the space more narrow than it is high; a somewhat wider text would reverse these proportions and make the inscribed area more in line with what one

---

appears as cognomen a few times.

<sup>19</sup> Kajanto (above n. 15), 156.

<sup>20</sup> The inscription has now been republished, see H. Solin, "Zum Akkusativ als Universalkasus im Lateinischen", in J. Härmälä *et al.* (eds.), *L'art de la philologie. Mélanges en l'honneur de Leena Löfstedt*, Helsinki 2007, 251–56, esp. 254–5 with further bibliography.

<sup>21</sup> As stated by O. Salomies, "People in Ostia: Some Onomastic Observations", in C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma 2002, 135–59, esp. 147.

<sup>22</sup> *Decurio* is not superfluous in this context, although one might consider it to be included in *honoribus functo*, as is shown by *CIL* XIV 294: ... *equiti Romano decurioni omnibus honoribus functo in colonia Ostiense*; and *ScO* XII, A 28. ... *omnibus hono[rib. functo] dec. coloniae Ostie[nsis ...]*.



would expect. There are in fact a few comparanda which have a central inscribed space flanked by reliefs on both sides. In almost every case the text occupies either a square field or one which has larger horizontal dimensions.<sup>23</sup>

An alternative reading of l. 1 is presented below which, in my view, makes better sense onomastically and permits a more sensible text on the following lines. T. Flavius is inserted *exempli gratia*; C. Iulius, for instance, would be another common combination of *praenomen* + *gentilicium* of similar length:

D M T FLAVI]OSTATIA	15 letters
NO DEC CO]LOST HON O	14 + 1 letter in margin
RIB FVNCT ]DEE REIP	15
LAVRENT ]VIC AVG	13
BENEMERI]TO QVI VIX	16

It is likely, then, that the inscription does not present us with a man bearing the family name *Ostiensis* who was a city councillor in Ostia. This is the issue which triggered my interest in the first place. Our man would have been the first *Ostiensis* among the decurions in Ostia, but as it turns out, the only man by that name known to have advanced to the local elite remains that enigmatic *Ostiensis* Macedo, the *pontifex Volkani* who died in 105 CE.<sup>24</sup> He seems to appear from nowhere and – to judge from the currently known inscriptions – does not really leave behind anyone, descendant or freedman, even remotely as successful.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>23</sup> To my knowledge, there are relatively few "lastre di chiusura di loculo" of the type under discussion here fully preserved, but N. Agnoli, "Officine ostiensi di scultura funeraria", in C. Bruun – A. Gallina Zevi (eds.), *Ostia e Portus nelle loro relazioni con Roma* (Acta IRF 27), Roma 2002, 193–212, esp. 206 fig. 27, shows one in which the epigraphic space forms a square. Moreover, Agnoli (*ibid.*, 205) concludes that sarcophagus covers and "lastre di chiusura" were manufactured by the same workshops and that the plaques were heavily influenced by the sarcophagi: "al punto da poter definire la lastra una imitazione vera e propria della fronte di un sarcofago." Therefore, in order to better understand the aesthetics of the "lastre", it becomes relevant to study sarcophagi as well. Almost all the evidence shows that the inscribed space is either square or with wider horizontal dimensions; see, e.g., *IPO* II, A 150, A 247, B 216, B 249; *ScO* XII A28, B 38, B 39, B 42, B 43, B 44 (but the opposite dimensions in B 46).

<sup>24</sup> B. Bargagli – C. Grosso, *I Fasti Ostienses documento della storia di Ostia*, Roma 1997, 27, 35.

<sup>25</sup> For some thoughts on Macedo's origin see Bruun (above n. 6).



Fig. 2. Funerary inscription published by Marinucci (above n. 8), 194-85 no. 17 = Soprintendenza per i Beni Archeologici di Ostia, inv. no. 39970 (published by permission).

### 3. A *sevir Augustalis* freed by Aulus and Gaius

Among the many previously unknown *seviri Augustales* presented by Marinucci in 1988, one appears in the following inscription, a funerary plaque ("lastra funeraria") damaged at the top and on both sides (see Fig. 2):<sup>26</sup>

[–]lib(erta) N[–]  
 [fe]cit sibi et  
 [–]lio A. et C. lib. Euchro  
 [sevir]o Augustali coniugi et  
 5 [collib.] suo bene merenti et  
 [–] Bassillae f. et Secundae lib. et  
 [–] Stephano Hermetis lib. mei lib.  
 [et Eutyc]hiaae lib. et Speratae lib. et Nomadi lib.

<sup>26</sup> Marinucci (above n. 8), 194–5 no. 17 = AE 1988, 191. After an empty space, suitable for two or three further lines, two more lines of text follow: [lib. li]b<e>rtabus posterisque eorum in fr. p. X[–]/ in agr. p. XXVs. This part of the inscription seems irrelevant for the present discussion.

The inscription is incomplete but the content is comparably easy to establish. A freedwoman – *lib.* can be read on l. 1, which contains her name – has erected the funerary inscription for herself and her *coniunx* who is also, as Marinucci plausibly suggests, her *collibertus* (which ties in with *lib.* in l. 1). The missing space to the left can be estimated from l. 4, where clearly [*sevir*] but nothing more needs to be inserted. Therefore it becomes impossible to insert, in l. 5, anything but the six letters in *collib.* – something like, for instance, [name + *filio*] *suo* is not possible – and moreover, if another person were mentioned, one would expect the plural *bene merentib.* to follow.

Other persons are mentioned in ll. 6–8. Marinucci does not make it clear how he thinks these individuals are related, except that he inserts two commas in l. 7 (see next paragraph) which are not likely to be correct.<sup>27</sup> In l. 6 the letter F for *f(ilia)* can be read, which means that the lost text must have contained her *gentilicium*, obviously the same as that born by her father and her mother (who were *colliberti*). The same *gentilicium* applies to the freedwoman *Secundae* as well, who seems to have been freed by the woman who commissioned the inscription.

Marinucci inserted two commas in l. 7, making the text read [-] *Stephano, Hermetis lib., mei lib.* It seems that he considered three individuals to have been mentioned there: Stephanus, an anonymous freedman of Hermes, and a likewise anonymous freedman of "myself" (i.e. the author or the text). More likely the text in l. 7 begins by giving the *gentilicium* of the freedman Stephanus, and continues by identifying his manumittor and patron, called Hermes.<sup>28</sup> The patron Hermes, in turn, was a freedman of the author of the inscription; she refers to him as *Hermes libertus meus*. Thus the full nomenclature of the deceased in l. 7 is "[*nomen*] *Stephanus Hermetis liberti mei libertus*".<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> The text was printed with identical punctuation in *AE* 1988, 191.

<sup>28</sup> The use of the manumittor's *cognomen* is not unknown in the nomenclature of freedmen in Ostia; it can be found in some 35 instances in *CIL* XIV: 53, 326–7, 329, 358, 361, 415, 482, 581 (2), 730, 819, 918, 943, 964, 986, 1138, 1242, 1290, 1608, 1641, 1647, 1748, 1804, 1810, 4563, 1a–b (6), 4865, 5062, 5165, 5322 (cf. *NSA* 1953, 499 no. 67), 5389 (2); *ScO* III, 155 no. 33; Marinucci (above n. 8), 190 no. 13. Many of these texts belong to the first century CE, but the same formula is often used by *seviri Augustales* (e.g. six times in *CIL* XIV 4563), and in these cases the date seems to be much later.

<sup>29</sup> The word order of *libertus meus* is the opposite of what normally occurs in inscriptions, where one finds *praenomen + lib.*, as well as *Aug. lib.*, etc. Perhaps, for some reason, the possessive pronoun caused a change of word order. A different interpretation would be to separate *Hermetis lib.* and *mei lib.* and argue that we are dealing with multiple ownership. and that what the author of the text intended to express was "*Stephanus Hermetis libertus et meus libertus*". The connective *et* is often left out in similar contexts, but in order to explain

Finally, in l. 8 it is clear that three individuals are mentioned; in each case the name is followed by the status indicator *lib.*, although no manumittor is referred to.

The *sevir Augustalis* of the inscription is previously unknown, for there is no Euchrus known from Ostia, as Marinucci pointed out. Even if the name Euchrus were known, though, it would be difficult to suggest an identification, as the *gentilicium* of the man is unknown, and *gentilicia* are altogether absent from the preserved text.

If one were to speculate, however, there are two likely possibilities for the *gentilicium*, due to the fact that Euchrus' two patrons are called Aulus and Gaius by *praenomen*. The key here is that the *praenomen Aulus* is rare in most families in Ostia,<sup>30</sup> and although it is found combined with some forty *gentilicia*, it is common in relatively few.<sup>31</sup> If we rely on Marinucci's reading of the family name as *-lius*, with the partially preserved letter being an L, the two *gentilicia Egrilius* and *Manlius* are by far the most probable. If we assume that the second man called Gaius did not bear the same *gentilicium*, which is possible, then *Egrilius* is definitely the most likely name. It is the most common family name in Ostia, and the Egrilii are known to have used one *praenomen* only, *Aulus* (there are also two senatorial Q. Egrilii; see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> E 46 and 49).

If we assume that both former owners bore the same family name, the occurrence of the *praenomen Gaius* in combination with the same *gentilicium* becomes another necessary condition for an identification. This reduces the

---

*mei* instead of *meo*, which the grammar of the inscription requires, influence from Greek needs to be postulated, cf. G. Galdi, *Grammatica delle iscrizioni latine dell'impero (provinciae orientali). Morfosintassi nominale*, Roma 2004, 316, 409–11 (similar errors appear in *CIL* III 3355, 14306.5, and in half a dozen other cases). All in all, the suggestion above in the text seems to be the simplest.

<sup>30</sup> O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki 1987, 158 shows that in Latium (and Etruria), *Aulus* represents 10% of the *praenomina*, while in other regions the percentage is under 5%. The proportion of *Auli* in Latium must partly depend on the many *Auli Egrilii* and *Auli Livii* from Ostia.

<sup>31</sup> See Salomies (above n. 21), 141, 147–50 for statistics relating to many of the most common family names in Ostia. From an inventory of the Ostian inscriptions in *CIL* XIV and several of the later publications of substantial collections of Ostian inscriptions, I am aware of *Aulus* being combined with the following *gentilicia* (the list is likely not exhaustive): *Aemilius*, *Annius*, *Atilius*, *Atinius*, *Avillius*, *Baebius*, *Caecilius*, *Caedicius*, *Caesennius*, *Caesius*, *Considius*, *Cornelius*, *Decimius*, *Decius*, *Egrilius*, *Fabius*, *Fabreinius*, *Fabricius*, *Fescennius*, *Gavius*, *Genucius*, *Granius*, *Herennuleius*, *Hortensius*, *Hostilius*, *Larcius*, *Livius*, *Manlius*, *Metilius*, *Mucius*, *Nonius*, *Ogulnius*, *Ostiensis*, *Petronius*, *Plotius*, *Pompeius*, *Rutilius*, *Sergius*, *Terentius*, *Vallius*, *Vestorius*, *Vitellius*, or 42 names in total.

*gentilicia* that can be considered considerably, from some forty who use *Aulus* to less than fifteen who use both *Aulus* and *Gaius*.<sup>32</sup> Among bearers of these *gentilicia*, *Aulus* is particularly common among the Fabii and Manlii of Ostia, as is evident from the statistics compiled by Salomies. Among Fabii with a *praenomen*, 26.9% use *Aulus*, while 10.9% are called *Gaius*. Among the Manlii, the figures are 22.4% and 2.0%.<sup>33</sup> *Manlius* is the better fit if we take into account the traces of the letter L where the stone has been broken off.<sup>34</sup>

When *Egrilius* or *Manlius* is inserted in the spaces where the *gentilicium* is required, the inscription on the whole takes on a rather symmetrical appearance.<sup>35</sup>

MANLIA A?]LIB N[ ---  
 FE]CIT SIBI ET  
 MAN]LIO A ET C LIB EVCHRO  
 SEVIR]O AVGVSTALI CONIVGI ET  
 5 COLLIB] SVO BENEMERENTI ET  
 MANLIAE] BASSILLAE F ET SECVNDAE LIB ET  
 MANLIO] STEPHANO HERMETIS LIB MEI LIB  
 ET EVTYC]HIAE LIB ET SPERATAE LIB ET NOMADI LIB

<sup>32</sup> We are obviously dealing with an *argumentum e silentio*, and the following exploration must be considered tentative. The fact that *Aulus* so far has not been found combined with a certain *gentilicium* at Ostia obviously does not exclude that future discoveries could turn up such cases. In any case, the argument below will focus on common names frequently associated with *Aulus*. *Aulus* and *Gaius* are found combined with the following family names: *Aemilius*, *Annius*, *Baebius*, *Caecilius*, *Caesius*, *Considius*, *Cornelius*, *Fabius*, *Granius*, *Manlius*, *Ostiensis*, *Petronius*, *Plotius*, *Terentius*.

<sup>33</sup> Salomies (above n. 21), 141. Among the bearers of two other common *gentilicia*, which would fit the fragmentary inscription, both names are found as well, but the proportions are the opposite: among the Aemilii, there are 2.6% who are named *Aulus* and 15.8% *Gaius*, among the Cornelii the corresponding numbers are 2.8% and 17.3%.

<sup>34</sup> For what it is worth, several Egrilii and Manlii appear among the roughly four hundred *Augustales* known from Ostia; the author is currently completing a study of this part of the Ostian "Mittelschicht" (see my "The *Augustales* of Ostia", in progress). The complete list of family names which are known to be combined with both *Aulus* and *Gaius* and which appear among the *Augustales* includes all the names in note 32 except *Caesius*. In total some 145 *gentilicia* are encountered among the *Augustales*.

<sup>35</sup> The letter sizes as given by Marinucci are as follows, from lines 2 to 7: ca. 3.3 cm – 3.1 – 2.6 – 2.3 – 2.6 – 2.3. The letters in l. 8 are clearly smaller at 1.9 cm, which means that more text can be accommodated. An alternative would be to assume that no *gentilicium* was mentioned in ll. 6–7.



The restoration proposed here would result in all free individuals possessing the same *gentilicium*. Some of the *cognomina* mentioned in the inscriptions are quite rare, in particular *Bassilla* and *Nomas*, and so a search for other occurrences of the names could in theory be fruitful, if Egrilii, Manlii or bearers of some other suitable name turned up bearing these *cognomina*. Unfortunately this is not the case,<sup>36</sup> and thus the proposed restoration of the family name as *Egrilius* or *Manlius* has to remain hypothetical; a new discovery may bring a solution one day. What ought to be clear, though, is that the woman who was the author of the inscription was the patron (and former owner) of Hermes, who in his turn had freed his slave Stephanus.<sup>37</sup>

*University of Toronto*

---

<sup>36</sup> I have searched the indices of *CIL* XIV, *IPO*, *NSA* 1953, *ScO* III and XII and any other Ostian inscription or epigraphic collection known to me. There is a Fulcinia Bassilla in *IPO* A 121, a Valeria L.f. Bassilla in *CIL* XIV 1710 and *IPO* A 265, and a Pompeia Nomas in *CIL* XIV 899 and *IPO* B 54.

<sup>37</sup> She can thus be added to the list of women owning property in Ostia, which is currently being compiled by the present author (for first results I refer to my presentation at the annual convention of the American Philological Association in Chicago on January 5, 2008).