

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXVII

HELSINKI 2003

INDEX

EUGENIO AMATO	<i>Note esegetiche e testuali alla Descriptio orbis di Dionisio d'Alessandria (II)</i>	9
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Velia, Quirinale, Pincio: note su proprietari di domus e su plumbarii</i>	27
LAURENT CHRZANOVSKI	<i>Le photophore autophore</i>	49
ZBIGNIEW FIEMA	<i>Observations on the Byzantine Church at Jabal Haroun near Petra, Jordan</i>	53
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Inscriptions at Auction</i>	69
MARTTI LEIWO	<i>Both and All Together? The Meaning of ἀμφοτέροι</i>	81
UTA-MARIA LIERTZ	<i>Isis und ihre nordischen Schwestern</i>	101
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	<i>A Piece of Dionysian Hilarity</i>	115
ERJA SALMENKIVI	<i>A Note on the Ptolemaic ἐπὶ τῶν προσόδων</i>	123
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>A Study of CIL XIV 375, an Interesting Inscription from Ostia</i>	133
RAIJA SARASTI-WILENIUS	<i>Latin, Swedish and French – Some Considerations on the Choice of Language in the Letter Collection of the Gyldenstolpe Family</i>	159
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCVII–CCXV</i>	173
ANTERO TAMMISTO	<i>Swamp-Hens (Porphyrio spp.) and Ducks (Anatidae) in the Tomba di Morlupo and Other Republican and Early Augustan Romano-Campanian Mosaics and Wall Paintings</i>	207
HOLGER THESLEFF	<i>A Symptomatic Text Corruption: Plato, Gorgias 448a5</i>	251
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	259
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	308
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	310
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	313

A STUDY OF *CIL* XIV 375, AN INTERESTING INSCRIPTION FROM OSTIA*

OLLI SALOMIES

Among the Ostian inscriptions making reference to members of the family of the Lucilii Gamalae, belonging to the local nobility, there is one which presents features of especial interest, *CIL* XIV 375 (cf. p. 482), a lengthy text set up in honour of a certain P. Lucilius Gamala, son, grandson and great-grandson of men also called Publius. The inscription has not been preserved, but is known from copies made by scholars between the 16th and the early 18th centuries; on the basis of these copies the text of the inscription can be reconstructed as follows:

P. Lucilio / P. f. P. n. P. pro/nep. Gamalae / aed(ili) sacr(is) Volk(ani), / [a]edili d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) allecto / [g]ratis decurioni, / [p]ontifici, / [i]vir(o) censo/riae pot(estatis) quinquennal(i), / in comiti(i)s facto cura- / ⁽¹⁰⁾[tor]i pecuniae publicae exigen/[d]ae et adtribuendae. / [Hic i]n¹ ludos cum accepisset public(e) / lucar, remisit et de suo erogati/onem fecit. / [Id]em sua pecunia viam silice stravit, / [q]uae est iuncta foro ab arcu ad arcum; / [id]em epulum trichilinis CCXVII / colonis dedit; / [id]em prandium sua pecunia coloni[s] / ⁽²⁰⁾Ostie(n)sibus bis dedit; / [i]dem aedem Volcani sua pecunia restituit; / [i]dem aedem Veneris sua pecunia constituit; / [id]em aed(em) Fortunae sua pecunia constituit; / [id]em aed(em) Cereris sua pecunia / constituit; / [id]em pondera ad macellum / ⁽³⁰⁾

* Warm thanks are due to Dr. Giorgio Filippi of the Vatican Museums (see n. 4).

¹ For the addition of *hic* here, see below at n. 21. – Throughout this paper, I have used with great benefit the *Packard Humanities Institute* Latin corpus CD-Rom, and the online epigraphical data banks of Eichstätt, Heidelberg and Frankfurt (Claus / Slaby) which one finds listed under "fonti epigrafiche" by A. Cristofori in his enormously useful *Rassegna degli Strumenti Informatici per lo Studio dell'Antichità Classica* (<http://www.rassegna.unibo.it/epigrafi.html>).

cum M. Turranio sua pecu/niā fecit; / [idem] aedem Spei sua pecunia / [cons]tituit; / [id]em tribunal in foro mar/moreum fecit. / [H]uic statua inaurata d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) / p(ecunia) p(ublica) posita est, / [i]tem ahenea d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) p(ecunia) p(ublica) posita / [p]roxume tribunal quaes(toris), / ⁽⁴⁰⁾ [propt]erea quod, cum res publica / [p]raedia sua venderet ob pol/[l]licitationem belli navalis, / HS XV (milia) CC² rei publicae donav[it]. / [Hu]nc decuriones funere pu/[b]lico effere[ndum] cen[s]uerunt.

Another inscription from Ostia also honouring a P. Lucilius P. f. P. n. P. pron. Gamala who had held high offices, *CIL XIV 376*, is quite similar. In this text, too, there is long section dealing with the honorand's benefactions consisting of short sentences introduced by *idem*, and there is talk of statues, etc. Because of the striking similarities, there have been scholars who assumed that the two inscriptions referred to the same man; as the latter inscription (*CIL XIV 376*), referring to *Divus Pius*, has a *terminus post quem*, AD 161, this would have settled the question of the date of the activities and events described in *CIL XIV 375*; the *bellum navale* would have been a battle on the Rhine or on the Danube during the Marcomannic wars (the position of Mommsen). However, there are marked differences in the two texts, and from the late 19th century onwards the view dominating in scholarly literature has been that we are dealing with two different men.³

² This is the text of our editions, but something seems to be wrong, as the sum seems incredibly low. (Contrast, e.g., the cost of the funerary monument of the sevir L. Numisius Agathemer in *CIL XIV 397*, which seems to have been HS 100,000.) I do not think that the problem is solved by assuming that this is not the whole sum that was needed but that Gamala just supplied the part of the total that was missing (thus F. Zevi, *MEFR* 85 (1973) 576), or that there is not talk of war preparations at all in the inscription (cf. below). The problem as I see it is in the wording of the inscription: the (*statua*) *ahenea* of Gamala, the selling of the *praedia*, and Gamala's donation are clearly represented as interrelated incidents, and to me it seems quite inconceivable that (a) the city of Ostia would had been considering selling some *praedia* to get this money, and that (b) someone should have been honoured with a statue *only* for having donated the modest sum of 15,200 sestertii. As the text cannot be considered as certain (cf. Zevi, *ibid.* 556 n. 1), it seems advisable to assume that the sum has not been transmitted correctly. (But note that, e.g., in R. Duncan–Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (²1982) 217 no. 1334, the sum is taken for granted, in spite of the fact that this is by far the lowest sum under its heading.)

³ For an exposition of the history of the interpretation of the two texts cf., e.g., R.

On the other hand, it is clear that the two texts must belong to the same archaeological context for, in addition to other similarities, they seem to have had about the same format. Inscription 376, now in the Galleria Lapidaria in the Vatican inserted in the wall, is a remarkably small oblong stone only 20 cm. in breadth and (as preserved) 58,5 cm. high.⁴ Inscription 375, also inscribed with many short lines, must have been very similar in appearance; its height is given by Pighius as 4 feet. There are only 30 inscribed lines in 376, as against 45 in 375, but originally the text in 376 must have run for many further lines (see n. 4). In any case, it seems certain that the two inscriptions must come from the same monument, no doubt somehow meant to honour the Gamala family (cf. below at n. 19). Normally it is assumed that the formulations of the later text 376 (with archaic details such as *L. Coilio* in line 25) are due to imitation of the earlier text 375.

Separating the Gamala in 375 from that in 376 of course leaves open the date of the man in 375. A normal epigraphist reading 375 without taking

Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* (1960) 493ff., cf. 584; F. Zevi, *MEFR* 85 (1973) 557ff.; J. Krummrey in his note on *CIL* I² 3031a. The opinions of scholars in the 19th century are well covered by J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 143ff.

⁴ Its thickness is given as 14,3 cm. See the exhibition catalogue *Ostie. Port et porte de la Rome antique* (sous la direction de J.-P. Descœudres), Musée Rath, Genève 2001, where this inscription is described on p. 424 (XII. 2). It seems that the stone was taken off the wall in order to be transported to Geneva for the exhibition; but it was back in its original location in the Galleria Lapidaria in November 2003, when I was able to inspect it personally in the company of Dr. Giorgio Filippi of the Vatican Museums; I wish to thank Dr. Filippi for enabling me to inspect the inscription, for discussing the text with me, and for a copy of the squeeze. (About the same information on the appearance of the stone can be found in Dessau's note on *CIL* XIV 376 and in Meiggs' *Roman Ostia* (n. 3), in the annotation to Plate XXXVIII *d.*) For a good photo of this inscription see M. Fora, *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente romano* IV (1996), Tav. XVIII, fig. 2 and Tav. XIX, fig. 1. (There are photographs also in I. Di Stefano Manzella, *Index inscriptionum musei Vaticani. 1. Ambulacrum Iulianum sive "Galleria Lapidaria"* (1995) 257, fig. 56 (*GL* 45, 30), and in the exhibition catalogue mentioned above, 144 and 424.) It is important to note that the stone is broken below and that originally the text went on after line 29 (with *est*). The traces of letters in the beginning of line 30 are clear enough to produce the reading *hic HS XXX+ [---]*, where only the third X may be a bit uncertain. (Already Dessau in *CIL* seems to have read *HS*.) This reading is interesting because as a result we have another detail in which *CIL* XIV 376 imitates 375, a reference to a sum of money spent by the honorand now appearing after the mention of statues in both inscriptions. – For some further observations on *CIL* XIV 376 see below n. 63. (It is an error that *CIL* XIV 376 is referred to as not existing by G. Mennella, *Quaderni Catanesi di Cultura Classica e Medievale* 3 (1991–95) 160.)

note of 376 (or taking the latter inscription to have been formulated on the basis of 375) would probably turn her or his thoughts to the earlier empire. But the fact is that, as amazing it may seem, dates proposed for this inscription, or at least for the *floruit* of the honorand, vary from the time of Sulla to the time of Trajan; we are thus talking of a period of about two hundred years. As for the arguments presented in the discussion on the date, the variation in them is truly marvellous, although it must be admitted that not all arguments presented in favour of a certain proposed date seem equally impressive.⁵

In dealing with the text of *CIL* XIV 375, scholars have concentrated above all on two details mentioned in the inscription, namely on the *bellum navale* in line 42, and on the list of temples said to have been built by the honorand in lines 23–8 and 32–3. But almost all details mentioned in the inscription have been commented upon, for instance the *epulum* and *prandium* in lines 17–20 (introduced into the discussion by J.H. D'Arms in 2000, see below at n. 14), the fact that the colleague of Gamala in line 30 is called simply *M. Turranius*, the mention of the *tribunal quaes(toris)* in line 39,⁶ and the fact that the inscription was found in Portus where building began in the time of Claudius (not decisive and not often referred to nowadays).

It may be of some use to sum up briefly the discussion subsequent upon Meiggs's classic exposition published in 1960, beginning with Meiggs himself (who, as mentioned in n. 3, offers a most useful survey of the discussion regarding *CIL* XIV 375 and 376). His position is basically as follows (p. 499–501, cf. 566f.): the Gamala in 375 is to be assigned to the time of Augustus and the *bellum navale* in line 42 is the war against Sex. Pompeius of 38–36 BC. As he is here dismissing theories assigning the man to a much later period, he adduces at this point some aspects of the

⁵ The weirdest argument brought into play in favour of a certain dating may be that presented by V. Rosenberger, *Bella et expeditiones* (1992) 174f., who seems to say that 375 cannot be very much earlier than 376 because from this it would follow that the Lucilii Gamalae used the praenomen *Publius* (attested already for the great-grandfather of the earlier Gamala) for centuries. But this is exactly the kind of thing that was going on in Roman families.

⁶ This *quaestor* cannot be anyone other than but the *quaestor Ostiensis* (F. Zevi, *MEFR* 114 (2002) 37 n. 68); as this office was suppressed by Claudius (Meiggs (n. 3) 55; cf. W. Eck, *L'Italia nell'impero romano* (1999) 10), the mention of his *tribunal* would seem to furnish a *terminus ante quem* (J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 203).

inscription pointing to an early dating.⁷

The next significant stage in the discussion on the dating of the Gamala in *CIL* XIV 375 is the article by F. Zevi, 'P. Lucilio Gamala «senior» e i «quattro tempietti» di Ostia' (*MEFR* 85 (1973) 555–581 (esp. p. 562ff.)), prompted at least in part by the publication, in the same volume (p. 517–553) by M. Cébeillac, of a late Republican inscription of an Octavia M.f. (clearly of high social status), the wife of a (Lucilius) Gamala. Zevi dates the activities of the man in 375 (whom I shall refer to as Gamala Senior) to the late Republic. He bases his argumentation above all on the view that the four temples mentioned in the inscription as having been built (the term being *constituit*) by the honorand in lines 23–8 and 32–3 must be identical with the group of four temples, built on the same podium and identical in structure and size, known as the "Quattro tempietti" just to the west of the theatre, of which one is known to have been dedicated to Venus on the basis of an inscription found there (*CIL* XIV 4127).⁸ He goes on (p. 567f.) to observe that the temple of Venus was restored in the second century AD and by combining this with the fact that the later Gamala (in *CIL* XIV 376) had in fact restored the temple of Venus – a most suitable activity if the temple had been built by his ancestor. After having presented a number of other arguments pointing to an early date (but not necessarily all pointing to a date as early as the Republic), some of them good,⁹ some of

⁷ E.g., the fact that M. Turranius has no cognomen and the fact that the *macellum* (cf. line 29) was (according to Meiggs; but cf. F. Zevi. *MEFRA* 85 (1973) 564f. n. 5) restored under Augustus. He also notes instances of archaic spelling (*ahenea*, *proxume*, etc., at the same time correctly observing that 376 has *peq(unia)*) and style (singling out the use of *propterea quod* in line 40). – In the chapter "The New Evidence" attached to the second edition of *Roman Ostia* of 1973, Meiggs refers (on p. 584) to Zevi's views to be published in the same year, 1973; there he says that Zevi has "attractive arguments for a rather earlier dating", but prefers to leave the matter at that. – Meiggs' dating was accepted, e.g., by R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire* (2nd 1982) 217 no. 1334; E. Forbis, *Municipal Virtues in the Roman Empire. The Evidence of Italian Honorary Inscriptions* (1996) 119f. no. 59 (who also refers to the article of Zevi, without mentioning Zevi's dating).

⁸ The identification of the "Quattro Tempietti" with the temples built by Gamala was first proposed by A.W. van Buren, *AJA* 11 (1907) 55ff.; the view has since then been repeated by many scholars.

⁹ E.g., the fact that there is no reference at all to members of the imperial family or to imperial institutions: p. 565.

them less impressive,¹⁰ Zevi goes on to the analysis of the date of the temples and concludes (p. 570) this section by suggesting that they must be dated to the "Sullan" period (defined as 110–70 BC).¹¹ The logical conclusion, then, is that the *floruit* of this Gamala must be put in the late Republican period; a birth date in c. 115 BC is accordingly proposed on p. 575. But what about the *bellum navale*? If this Gamala was active in the time of Sulla, some other war than that with Sex. Pompeius must be meant; and Zevi is here able to produce (p. 575) Pompey's campaign against the pirates in 67 BC. This campaign is actually called *navale bellum* or *bellum maritimum* by Cicero, and pirates had in fact raided Ostia.¹² In scholarly discussion the date proposed by Zevi gained wide acceptance.¹³

¹⁰ For instance, it is hard to see why the definition *marmoreum* of the *tribunal* (line 34f.) would have seemed "del tutto pleonastica, e quasi ridicola, già dopo l'apertura delle cave di Luni in età augustea" (p. 562). It is quite normal to describe monuments as having being made of marble also in inscriptions of imperial date (cf., e.g., the material in *TLL* VIII 412, 72ff.); in some cases, the attribute might be explained by the wish to differentiate a certain *tribunal* from some other similar structure.

¹¹ The fact that the temple of Spes is mentioned only after the reference to the *pondera* (in lines 29–31) is explained (p. 572f.) by assuming that the fabrication of the *pondera* for the *macellum* took place between the dedication of the other three temples and that of the temple of Spes. (That the activities mentioned in the inscription must be in chronological order – taken for granted also, e.g., by J.H. D'Arms, *JRA* 13 (2000) 198 – is no doubt correct.) Zevi does not seem to comment upon the fact that the verb referring to the temple of Spes in line 32 has been restored and that the restoration [*res*]tituit might also come into question (a detail noted, e.g., by J.H. D'Arms, *JRA* 13 (2000) 192 n. 2). – Professor Heikki Solin tells me that the (unpublished) graffiti from the site leave the impression of being early.

¹² *Navale bellum* or *bellum maritimum*: Cic. *Manil.* 13. 28. 44. 58; also *Flacc.* 30 and Sallust, *Catil.* 39, 1; cf. below at n. 54, with a discussion of the relevance of this. Pirates: Cic. *Manil.* 33; cf. Meiggs (n. 3) 37f.

¹³ See, e.g., L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses* (1982) 62f. (but with two 'si' –clauses being added); G. Mancinetti Santamaria, in M. Cébeillac–Gervasoni (ed.), *Les «bourgeoisies» municipales italiennes aux IIe et Ier siècles av. J.–C.* (1983) 129; C. Pavolini, *Ostia* (Guide archeologiche Laterza, 1983) 72; Id., *La vita quotidiana a Ostia* (1986) 143; J. Krummrey, in his note on *CIL* I² 3031a (p. 984); M.S. Arena Taddei, *Ostia repubblicana* (Itinerari Ostiensi I, 1987) 11–13; M. Cébeillac–Gervasoni, 'I magistrati della colonia di Ostia in età repubblicana' in: M. Pani (ed.), *Epigrafia e territorio. Politica e società. Temi di antichità romane* III (Bari 1994), 7–16, on p. 12 ("la sua carica di duovir negli anni 80"; Ead., *Les magistrats des cités italiennes de la seconde guerre punique à Auguste: le Latium et la Campanie* (1998) *passim* (e.g. 54, 118); Ead., in *Ostie. Port et porte de la Rome antique* (n. 4) 154; M.J. Kardos, 'Cicéron et Ostie républicaine', *BAGB*

In 2000, the question of the date of the Gamala in *CIL* XIV 375 was studied by J.H. D'Arms in an important article in the *Journal of Roman Archaeology* (vol. 13, pp. 192–200). After a survey of earlier views on the matter, the author proceeds to point out the importance of a passage not dealt with in depth by earlier scholars, namely that on the *epulum* in 217 *triclinia* and the *prandium* (said to have been 'given' by Gamala *bis*) in lines 17–22. He connects this with what is known of Caesar's activities in the mid-forties, namely that, after the African triumph in 46, Caesar is known to have offered the Roman people an *epulum* in 22,000 *triclinia*, and that, after the Spanish triumph in 45, he offered (according to Suetonius, *Iul.* 38, 2) *duo prandia* (see D'Arms p. 196). D'Arms observes that Gamala's offerings are so similar to those of Caesar in 46–45 that this cannot be coincidental. Accordingly, he concludes that Gamala must have been consciously imitating Caesar, this providing a *terminus post quem* for Gamala's feasts (on p. 198, the connection is called "virtually certain"). On p. 198, the author, who also makes an attempt at connecting Gamala's offices with certain benefactions, adds another *terminus post quem*, namely that no *Ilviri censoria potestate quinquennales* appear in the *Fasti Ostienses* the first fragment of which covers the years 49–44 BC; had the office existed at that time, the *quinquennales* would have had to be mentioned in 45 BC.¹⁴ The logical conclusion of this is (p. 199) (a) that the *bellum navale* must be that with Sex. Pompeius; and (b) that the "quattro tempietti", if assigned to Gamala, must be dated not to the time of Sulla but a generation later. The *bellum navale*, if dated to the mid-thirties, of course also provides a *terminus ante quem*, and D'Arms is required to date Gamala's quinquennial duovirate to 40, the (as it seems) earliest possible date. As the author himself admits (p. 199), the result is that "the full list of Gamala's activities needs to be fitted within an extremely narrow time-span". This result includes some undesirable elements, and the mood of the author at the end of the article seems to be characterised by some hesitation, and there is a reference to the need "to await definitive evidence".

1998, 235–49, on p. 244 (with explicit identification of the *bellum navale* with Pompey's operations in 67). On the other hand, E. Gabba in P. Zanker (ed.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* II (1976) 375 says that, with the *bellum navale*, either the war against pirates or "più probabilmente" that against Sex. Pompeius is meant. (Note also that Zevi actually says in his article of 1973, p. 576, that he would not like to rule out completely the war against Sex. Pompeius.)

¹⁴ Observation already appearing in Meiggs, *op. cit.* p. 175.

The paper of D'Arms, not the published version but one presented in advance of publication in various seminars (note the abstract of one version published in *AJA* 103 (1999) 325), is commented upon by M. Cébeillac–Gervasoni and F. Zevi in a publication also of 2000.¹⁵ The authors, while admitting that the new evidence on the chronology of the city walls of Ostia, dated previously to the time of Sulla, may also allow lowering the date of the "quattro tempietti",¹⁶ criticize, in my view with some justification, above all D'Arms' chronological framework resulting in the cramming of Gamala's activities into a span of only a few years. They also express doubts about the significance of Gamala's feasts, noting that banquets of this kind were "répandues de longue date dans la partie orientale de la Méditerranée"(p. 15).¹⁷ The authors end by saying that they prefer to stick "provisoirement" to the Sullan date until they see D'Arms' paper in print. F. Zevi comes back to the matter rather in passing in his paper on 'Appunti per una storia di Ostia repubblicana' (*MEFR* 114 (2002), esp. p. 35–38); his bottom line here seems to be that the Gamala in *CIL* XIV 375 can be dated either to the period of Sulla or to a period ending in the thirties BC, the date depending "in primo luogo dalla identificazione del *bellum navale* menzionato nel testo (perciò la guerra contro i pirati o quella contro Sesto Pompeo" (p. 35f.). His reference to the "lunga attività" of Gamala (p. 35) may perhaps be interpreted as a criticism of D'Arms' tight chronological framework.¹⁸

¹⁵ M. Cébeillac–Gervasoni and F. Zevi, 'Pouvoir local et pouvoir central à Ostie', in M. Cébeillac–Gervasoni (ed.), *Les élites municipales de l'Italie péninsulaire de la mort de César à la mort de Domitien entre continuité et rupture* (Coll. ÉFR 271, 2000); the section on this Gamala is on p. 12–15.

¹⁶ See p. 15, with references to important recent work by Zevi in n. 46. As for the date of the "Quattro tempietti", note now the exposition of L. Sole, *Arch. Class.* 53 (2002) 165ff. which ends (p. 178) with a date "dall'inizio del I. sec. a. C. alla fine della repubblica" being proposed for the temples.

¹⁷ But in *MEFR* 114 (2002) 36 n. 66, Zevi seems to take a more favourable view of the chronological significance of the feasts (although there still remain "perplexità").

¹⁸ In n. 66 (on p. 36), Zevi criticizes scholars (G. Wesch–Klein, V. Rosenberger and S. Panciera) who have recently proposed an imperial date for this Gamala. In a note on this inscription, Panciera (in M. Christol & O. Masson, *Actes du X^e congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine* (1997) 260 n. 43) observes *inter alia* that the *adlectio [g]ratis* implies that normally one had to pay, for which there is, however, no Republican parallel. That this inscription cannot be dated to the Republic is the position also of H. Mouritsen, *Chiron* 28 (1998) 251f. n. 70, who suggests the first half of the first century

It seems, then, that at least in Ostian scholarship there is wide agreement as to the fact that the Gamala of *CIL* XIV 375 is a Republican or at the latest a Triumviral person, and that the exact date depends on the identification of the *bellum navale* mentioned in the inscription. Now it seems quite possible to me that the man is in fact to be dated to this period, for there is indeed much that speaks for the identification of the four temples mentioned in the inscription with the complex consisting of the "Quattro tempietti", whatever their exact date. If they could be dated to the triumviral or early Augustan period, this would produce an early Augustan Gamala Senior, a result most scholars would probably find acceptable and satisfactory. On the other hand, I am not at all happy with the notion that a specific war should be meant with the *bellum navale*, and there seem to remain some other things to be said about the inscription, especially its nature and its style. Accordingly, I shall now proceed to an evaluation of these aspects.

Let us start with some thoughts on the nature of this inscription. First of all, it should be remembered that the reference to the *funus publicum* in lines 44f. shows that the inscription belongs to a monument set up after the honorand's death. The important consequence of this is that there is no need at all to identify the date of Gamala himself with that of the inscription; in fact, the inscription may well have been formulated quite some time after Gamala's death (cf. J. Krummrey, on *CIL* I² 3031a, p. 984; *Fora* (n. 4) p. 64). It is thus clearly pointless to contribute to the discussion about Gamala's date by observing that the inscription cannot be of Republican date, although this observation as such may be (and in my view is) correct.

As for the monument to which this inscription belonged, in considering it one must take into account the existence of *CIL* XIV 376, the second-century inscription clearly imitating 375 (cf. above at n. 4). As we saw, it is quite certain that the two inscriptions, of similar shape and appearance, belong to the same archaeological context, which may well have included further inscriptions, now lost, referring to members of the family. Inscription 376 must also have been set up after the death of the honorand; there is nothing in the text (as preserved) to prove this, but, as in the case of 375, the long list of various benefactions and honours very much leaves the impression of being the summary of a successful, but already

AD. – Cf. also G. Mennella, *Quaderni Catanesi di Cultura Classica e Medievale* 3 (1991–95) 171.

terminated, career.¹⁹ Now this takes one's thoughts to an idea mentioned in passing by F. Zevi in *MEFR* 85 (1973) 580, namely that we may be dealing with a funerary monument; this could then have been a monument with several inscriptions, possibly (but not necessarily) fabricated at about the same time, commemorating significant members of the family (one could then adduce, e.g., the monument of the Plautii [cf. n. 23] near Tibur as a sort of parallel). The fact that *CIL* XIV 375 consists of 46 short lines seems to rule out the possibility that we would be dealing with a statue base, and the monument is described in the 16th- and 17th-century descriptions, in addition to being "marmor quadratum", as "columna quadrata" (Pighius) and "pilastrata" (Ligorius), which seems to point to a long and narrow marble slab, something which one would expect to find affixed to a wall. And *CIL* XVI 376, now inserted into a wall in the Vatican, is clearly of the same type (see n. 4). Now if these inscriptions belong to a private context in a mausoleum of sorts, this could explain the *ordinatio* (with many short lines) of the inscriptions, the small size of *CIL* XIV 376, the great variation in the quality of lettering in this inscription (see Dessau's note), not really acceptable in a public inscription, and perhaps also the fact (of course, not necessarily of any significance) that *CIL* XIV 375 was said to have been found in Portus.²⁰ And doubtless also the formulations of the inscriptions

¹⁹ Thus also, e.g., J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 163. Note also that the inscription has not been preserved after line 30 (see n. 4), and that a *funus publicum* may well have been mentioned in the part now missing.

²⁰ For mausolea in Portus, see the report, by S. Keay and M. Millett, of the University of Southampton Survey Project 'Roman Towns in the Tiber Valley' at <http://www.arch.soton.ac.uk/Research/tiber%20valley/tv4.html#Portus>: "The most impressive discovery in this area [the zone between the Trajanic harbour and the Tiber to the east] was an immense canal, more than 1km long and 40m wide, which runs from the [sic] beside the south-eastern side of the hexagon of the Trajanic harbour to the Tiber in the east. (...) This canal is certainly one of those mentioned by the classical writers and must surely have formed part of the Trajanic scheme, although it may have had a Claudian predecessor. At the point where the canal joined the Tiber, the geophysics revealed the presence of a very large and elaborately decorated building of first century AD date. In its developed form, the canal ran in a straight line from the Tiber in the direction of the hexagon before deviating southwards to run parallel to its south-east side. Parallel to this and a short distance to the north was a Roman road, which ran from the south-eastern corner of the hexagon to the Tiber. Between this and the canal were discovered a series of warehouses, mausolea and other buildings that fronted on to the road. To the north of this, the geophysics located the line of an aqueduct that had previously been recorded by antiquarians". Cf. also O. Testaguzza, *Portus. Illustrazione*

may be interpreted as implying that they belong to a private context; contrast the inscription, both the formulations and the *ordinatio*, set up *dec(urionum) decr(eto) publice*, in honour of another distinguished Gamala, *AE* 1959, 254 (a photo in *Atti del terzo congresso int. di epigrafia greca e latina* (1959) tav. XXII).

Let us now go over to the structure and the style of the inscription, starting, however, by considering a detail. The mention of the benefaction in lines 12–14 (*[i]n ludos cum accepisset*, etc.) does not begin as one should expect it to begin if one takes into account the whole of the text. This problem is remedied by the insertion of the pronoun *hic* in the beginning of line 12; the advantages of adding *hic* here, introducing the section enumerating the benefactions of the honorand, characterized by the use of pronouns, are so clear that I regard this insertion as virtually certain.²¹

The structure of the text is unusual, to say the least. First there is a part in which offices and honours held by the honorand are enumerated in the dative. This is followed by a part in which the honorand appears in the nominative, his achievements being described in short sentences introduced first by *hic* and from line 15 onwards by the pronoun *idem*; altogether ten different statements beginning with *idem* are made (in *CIL* XIV 376 the number is seven). A new section begins in line 36, introduced by *huic*, where the two statues (grammatically the subjects of the respective clauses) set up in honour of Gamala are mentioned, this section being followed by an explanation introduced by *[propt]erea quod* (line 40). In this section, the

dei porti di Claudio e Traiano e della città di Porto a Fiumicino (1970) 201–5, 227–231. – Also Dr. Giorgio Filippi, in an unpublished paper, believes that the inscriptions may come from a funerary monument.

²¹ *[I]n ludos* in the beginning of line 12: H. Dessau in *CIL* XIV (and in *ILS* 6147) and (as far as I can see) all scholars quoting this text for some purpose. However, much can be gained by adding *hic* in the lacuna in the beginning of this line; the descriptions of this inscription are not so accurate as to exclude the possibility that something might be missing at the beginning of this line (and note that at least in one ms. copy, that of Achilles Stautius, this line is represented as “.. IN”, the dots implying that the author thought that something was missing in the beginning). As for the restoration *hic*, it must on the one hand be noted that epigraphical style requires a pronoun – which, then, must be *hic* – here at the point where the text moves on to the part where the honorand himself is the subject and where all other statements begin with a pronoun; on the other hand, there is a *hic* at exactly this point in *CIL* XIV 376, a text clearly inspired by, and in many places duplicating, 375. With the addition of *hic* in line 12, all sections coming after the initial part using the dative start with a pronoun (*hic*, *idem* ten times, *huic*, *hunc*).

enumerative style is abandoned for a moment, as the mention of the second statue (the *ahenea*) is not introduced by *huic* but linked to the previous statement with *item* (the only *item* in the text); furthermore, the word *statua* is not repeated and *posita* is not followed by *est*. As for the clause beginning with *[propt]erea quod*, I think that it is obvious that this clause is meant to furnish an explanation only for the erection of the latter statue (the *ahenea*), the *statua inaurata*, mentioned previously (in lines 36–7), having been accorded to Gamala for general reasons clear enough to the reader of the inscription.²² – The text ends with a short clause in which the honorand (*hunc*) becomes the object, the decurions, decreeing that the honorand should be accorded a *funus publicum*, now being the subject. As mentioned above, one deduces from this passage that one is dealing with a monument set up after the honorand's death.

As far as I can see, the structure of the inscription, combined with the use of all the pronouns, is without a parallel (except, of course, for *CIL XIV 376* modelled on this one). Even if the name of the honorand were in the nominative, this could not be considered an imitation of an *elogium*, for there is an important difference between the style of this inscription and that of an *elogium*, namely that statements in *elogia* are made without the use of pronouns.²³ As observed above, what one finds in *CIL XIV 375* is a passage

²² Accordingly, in my view, it is not correct to write "deux statues ont été dédiées à ce personnage ... parce qu'il fit un don à la *res publica* dans la situation difficile créée par une «guerre navale»" (M. J. Kardos, *BAGB* 1998, 244). For the possible significance of the topographical information given in line 39 see F. Zevi, *MEFR* 114 (2002) 37f.

²³ See the material collected by A. Degrassi, *Inscr. It.* XIII, 3 (cf. G. Alföldy – L. Chioffi, *CIL VI* 8, 3, p. 4839ff.); note, e.g., the *elogium* of Q. Fabius Maximus *ibid.* 89 (*ILS* 56): *Primo consulatu Ligures subegit, ex iis triumphavit. Tertio et quarto Hannibalem ... coercuit. Dictator ... et exercitui profligato subvenit et eo nomine ... pater appellatus est. Consul quintum Tarentum cepit, triumphavit. Dux ... peritissimus habitus est. Princeps in senatum duobus lustris lectus est.* A similar style is used in some funerary inscriptions of prominent senators which, in addition to the normal enumeration of offices, include sections giving more detailed information on the achievements of the honorand. The prime example is perhaps *ILS* 986 (but cf. also, e.g., Q. Veranius in *CIL VI* 41075) in honour of Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus cos. II 74 from the mausoleum of the Plautii near Tibur, in which a long section dealing with Aelianus' exploits in Moesia (*plus quam centum mill(ia) ... trānsdūxit; mōtum ... compressit; ignōtos ... réges ... perduxit* etc.) is introduced by *in qua, qua* referring to *Moesiae*. At the end, however, two clauses beginning with *hunc* are added. (By the way, it is notable that the inscription of Silvanus Aelianus uses the dative in the beginning whereas the inscriptions for earlier Plautii, *ILS* 921 and 964, use the nominative.)

in the dative in the beginning followed by clauses with various subjects introduced by pronouns, the sequence being [*hic*], *idem* (ten times), *huic*, *hunc*.²⁴ Clauses beginning with these pronouns are naturally familiar from honorific (and funerary) inscriptions. The nominative *hic* is normally used to introduce sections in which some extra information regarding the activities of the honorand is offered²⁵ whereas *huic*, in most cases, introduces descriptions of noteworthy or unusual honours accorded to the honorand.²⁶ The accusative *hunc* introduces sections with more or less the same purpose, but where verbs are used which require the honorand as the object.²⁷ As for the nominative *idem*, it is certainly more commonly used in inscriptions in which the person to whom reference is made appears in the nominative,²⁸ but there are also some instances of this pronoun being used to introduce special sections in honorific (or funerary) inscriptions.²⁹

It is true that one can find combinations of these formulations in inscriptions; note, e.g., a fairly recently found inscription of Trajanic date from Singilia in Baetica (interesting also because it shows that *item* could be used in about the same position as *idem*): *M. Valerio ... Proculino IIVir(o) ... cives et incolae ex aere conlato; hic in IIViratu ... dedit; item ... pervocavit; item ... praestitit; huic cives et incolae ... statuam ... dederunt; ordo ... locum eligere permisit* (*AE* 1989, 420; *CIL* II²/5, 789). Here, then, we find the combination of *hic* and *huic* (in fact, even a *hunc* could have been added

²⁴ In *CIL* XIV 376, we have *hic*, seven instances of *idem* which are followed not by *huic* and *hunc* but by *huic* and another *hic* (see n. 4); the rest of this inscription has not been preserved.

²⁵ Cf. *ILS* 1011. 1048. 1393. 1401. 1554. 2544. 2666. 2689. 2691. 5012. 5058. 5063. 5502. 5689. 5877. 5878. 6146. 6228. 6271. 6496. 6584. 6999. 9200.

²⁶ Cf. *ILS* 921. 984. 985. 1022. 1056. 1098. 1100. 1112. 1240. 1244. 1250. 1326. 2071. 2666. 2942. 2950. 4946. 5056. 5057. 5062. 5178. 5194. 5233. 5489. 5490. 5491. 5492. 5500. 5501. 5507. 5698. 6138. 6149. 6166. 6296. 6313. 6334. 6366. 6372. 6473. 6595. 6655. 6752. 6905. 6906. 6915. 6920. 6972. 6998. 7157. 9502.

²⁷ Cf. *ILS* 967. 986. 988. 6136. 6148. 6447. 9390. (Cases in which the 'honorand' is in the nominative: 6638. 8963. 9389.)

²⁸ E.g., *CIL* X 6649 = *ILS* 5426 *Germanico Caesari ... C. Iulius Chimarus; idem statuas ... refecit, sedes ... posuit*; *CIL* XI 4815 = *ILS* 6638 *C. Torasius ... Severus ... fecit* (probably baths); *idem ad celebrandum natalem fili sui* etc.

²⁹ Note *ILS* 2709. 6643; *CIL* V 7021 (?). (With a part of the nomenclature of the honorand being added: *ILS* 5075. 6839, 2; *AE* 1960, 214.). *Hic idem*: *ILS* 5689 (cf. also *CIL* X 1824).

between *dederunt* and *ordo*), a combination also found in other texts.³⁰ A combination of *hic* and *hunc* can be found, e.g., in *CIL* VIII 12536 = *ILS* 988, that of *huic* and another *huic* in *CIL* II 2026 = II²/5, 792 = *ILS* 6915, that of *hunc* with another *hunc* in the inscription in honour of Silvanus Aelianus which also includes a long section in *elogium* style (n. 23). Moreover, one can observe *hic* being combined with other cases of the same pronoun, and *huic*, *hunc* and *idem* combined with clauses introduced with relative pronouns referring to the honorand.³¹

But to have these formulations all combined in a single inscription is certainly very striking – and not just in the case of a text of supposedly Republican date, but also if one takes into consideration all Latin inscriptions of all dates. Although one could say that the inscription in honour of Valerius Proculus (cf. above) would be comparable if the pronoun *idem* were used instead of the conjunction *item*, and a *hunc* added at the end, it is in any case clear that the absolute uniqueness of this inscription cannot be overemphasized.

The uniqueness in structure is also reflected in the vocabulary of the inscription where one observes terms such as *lucar*. One also notes the consistent use of *constituit* when reference is made to the building of temples whereas *fecit* is used of other works (*pondera, tribunal*).³² But without a doubt the most interesting formulation of the inscription is *ob pollicitationem belli navalis*, and the rest of this paper will be devoted to the interpretation of these words.

The scholars quoted above, and in fact many other scholars from

³⁰ *CIL* X 688b = M. M. Magalhaes, *Storia, istituzioni e prosopografia di Surrentum romana* (2003) no. 14; *CIL* IX 2860 = *ILS* 5178; *CIL* II 2344 = *CIL* II²/7, 799. The dative precedes the nominative in *CIL* XI 5693 = *ILS* 2666 and in *CIL* X 6012 = *ILS* 5062 of AD 249 (but here a clause beginning unusually with *is* is inserted in the middle).

³¹ *CIL* X 5853 = *ILS* 6271 (*[hu]ius + hic*); *CIL* X 3704 = *ILS* 5054 (*qui + huic*); *CIL* XII 1357 = *ILS* 2709 = *AE* 1992, 1208 (*qui + idem*); *CIL* XIV 353 and 4642 (inscriptions of Fabius Hermogenes; *hunc + eique*, with a relative clause not referring to the honorand – *in cuius* [scil. Divi Hadriani] *sacerdotio* – preceding). If one takes into account also inscriptions in which the person to whom reference is made appears in the nominative, one can find some further combinations; note *CIL* XI 4815 = *ILS* 6638 (*idem + hunc*, with a clause introduced by *item* in the middle), *CIL* III 6687 = *ILS* 2683 (*idem + idem*), *CIL* XI 5400 = *I. Assisi* 41 = *ILS* 7812 (four clauses introduced by *hic*).

³² For *constituo* cf. *TLL* IV 512, 57ff.

Mommsen onwards,³³ have taken these words to mean that the *res publica* of Ostia had promised to sponsor in cash the operations of the Roman government (or of someone representing, with justification or by usurpation, the Roman government) in a 'maritime' war, the problem being only the identification of the war.³⁴ But, to say the least, the phrase used in the inscription is a very odd way of expressing this thought (in fact, the only unproblematical word here is *ob*). As far as I can see, we have here three problems:

- (a) the meaning of *pollicitatio*;
- (b) the relation between *pollicitatio* and the genitive *belli navalis*; and
- (c) the meaning of *bellum navale*.

Before I proceed to an examination of these problems, I must point out that there is a school of thought according to which there is no talk here of a war at all, but of a *naumachia*, a mock naval battle arranged in a suitable site. This was the view of C. Cavedoni in 1858,³⁵ and it was reformulated L.R. Taylor in 1936; Taylor, identifying the restoration by Gamala of the temple of Vulcan (*CIL* XIV 375, line 21–2) with that recorded in the *Fasti Ostienses* in AD 112, dated the man to this period and connected the *bellum navale* with the *naumachia* mentioned in the same *Fasti* as having been built by Trajan in AD 109.³⁶ This view was accepted by some scholars, e.g., by H. Thylander in 1952, who adds some details to

³³ For presentations of the history of the interpretation of this inscriptions, see the scholars referred to in n. 3.

³⁴ F. Jacques, *Les cités de l'occident romain* (1990) no. 68 (a) translates the passage as follows: "(alors que la commune vendait ses biens) à cause de la promesse faite lors de la guerre maritime". Note 'lors!': according to Jacques, the *pollicitatio* was made not in anticipation of, but during, a war. (He accepts the view that this refers to Sex. Pompeius.)

³⁵ *Bull. Arch. Napoletano* 6 (1857–58) 193–6 (not available to me); J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 203 n. 3, quotes the relevant passage on p. 195f.: "La promessa fatta dai magistrati Ostiensi di offrire lo spettacolo d'una simulata guerra o pugna navale all'Imperatore Antonino [Cavedoni thought that the inscription belonged to the Antonine period] onde solennizzare la dedicazione delle terme".

³⁶ L.R. Taylor, *AJPh* 57 (1936) 183–9. The problem with this suggestion is that this *naumachia* is no doubt to be located in Rome, not in Ostia (cf. Meiggs 498; L. Vidman, *Fasti Ostienses* (1982) 104f.; B. Bargagli – C. Grosso, *I fasti Ostienses. Documento della storia di Ostia* (1997) 38).

Taylor's exposition,³⁷ in 1959 by F. Grosso and in 1992 by V. Rosenberger.³⁸ That no real war, but a show is meant is also the opinion of G. Wesch–Klein.³⁹ For my part, I firmly believe that no other interpretation can be possible. The rest of this paper will be devoted to the presentation of evidence favouring this interpretation.

On the basis of what has been said above, we may distinguish between two translations of the passage *ob pollicitationem belli navalis*: (a) 'because of the promise the community (*res publica*) had made in view of (or 'because of' etc.) the maritime war'; or (b): 'because the community had promised a maritime battle spectacle'. Let us now have a look at the term *pollicitatio*. This term, for which only the translation 'promise' is given in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* but which also seems to be used in a sense which might be rendered as, e.g., 'the making of a promise' or 'the activity of promising', is used in mainly two contexts, depending on the nature of the source. In literary sources, the word (appearing often in the plural) is typically used of promises, often empty, made to people (often members of military units, etc.) in order to persuade them to do something the attractions of which need some pointing out, e.g., to join the other side in a confrontation between two opponents.⁴⁰ But in epigraphical sources the term

³⁷ H. Thylander, *Inscriptions du port d'Ostie* (1952) B 336, in the commentary; Id., *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine* (1952) 7–9. Here the author adds the useful observation, based on material in the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, that *bellum navale* can be taken to mean a *proelium natale*, as *bellum* is quite often attested as being used in the sense of *proelium* (p. 8f.: *TLL* II 1824, 69ff.). On the other hand, I do not think that material in the *Corpus glossariorum* can be adduced to prove that *bellum navale* can have the meaning of *naumachia* (p. 9), for ναυμαχία (given as translation of *bellum navale*) can have its original meaning in the glossaries.

³⁸ F. Grosso, in *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina* (1959) 140 n. 38; Rosenberger (n. 5) 173–5. It is not altogether clear to me whether the latter author also accepts the connection of this inscription with the *Fasti Ostienses*, proposed by Taylor, but he certainly strongly favours the view that a show, not a war is meant.

³⁹ G. Wesch–Klein, *Funus publicum* (1993) 128–130; the author proposes an imperial date for the inscription, but not later than the time of Claudius (p. 130; this date is based not on the *tribunal* [cf. n. 6] but on the nomenclature of *M. Turranius* and on other things).

⁴⁰ E.g., Caes. *Gall.* 3, 18, 2 *huic magnis praemiis pollicitationibusque persuadet uti ad hostes transeat*; *ibid.* 6, 12, 3; 7, 1, 5; 7, 31, 1; *civ.* 1, 56, 3; 3, 9, 2; 3, 108, 3; *Bell. Afr.* 134, 2; 40, 5; Cic. *Fam.* 10, 32, 4; Sall. *Iug.* 20, 1; 61, 4; Liv. 42, 38, 3; Nep., *Eum.* 2, 4; Vell. 2, 18, 2; Sen. *Benef.* 3, 19, 3; 4, 1, 2; Plin. *Nat.* 7, 124; Suet. *Nero* 13, 1; *Otho* 6, 3;

pollicitatio has a different meaning; in these the term is used almost exclusively in a municipal context to refer to 'promises' of various acts of euergetism pertaining to the municipal sphere – one 'promises' to arrange games or to set up a statue (cf. n. 43). This use also appears in literary sources dealing with municipal affairs⁴¹ and in the jurists; the chapter *De pollicitationibus* in the *Digesta* seems to deal exclusively with municipal matters.⁴² As for inscriptions, the instances are numerous, especially in Africa; along with the noun *pollicitatio*, the verb *polliceor* is used to convey the same idea.⁴³

The bottom line here is that neither of the two main uses of the word *pollicitatio* fit into the scenario if one assumes that there is a reference to war preparations in *CIL* XIV 375, lines 41–3. I do not want to be interpreted as saying that the use of this expression in this context would be completely impossible, but certainly this word would be far more suitable if one

Dom. 2, 2; *Hist. Aug. Did.* 4, 6. The fact that the term *pollicitatio* is often used in contexts in which some form of cheating or foul play also has a role appears very clearly from the definition given in *Rhet. Her.* 3, 3 *dolus consumitur in pecunia, pollicitatione, dissimulatione, maturatione, mentitione et ceteris rebus de quibus magis idoneo tempore loquemur*. For a negative context, note also *Ter. Phorm.* 857. – The verb *polliceor* is used somewhat differently; it can be used in contexts similar to that of *pollicitatio* (e.g., *Bell. Afr.* 71, 1), but more often it has a positive connotation (e.g., *Caes. Gall.* 4, 19, 1 *his auxilium suum pollicitus, si ab Suebis premerentur*).

⁴¹ *Plin. epist.* 10, 39, 3.

⁴² *Dig.* 50, 12. Note also, e.g., *Dig.* 26, 7, 46, 1; 35, 2, 5 pr.; 50, 4, 6, 1 and, e.g., the definition of the term *pollicitatio* in A. Berger, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law* (1953) s. v.

⁴³ The noun *pollicitatio* in the above context in inscriptions outside Africa: e.g., *CIL* X 5808 = *ILS* 6875 (Aletrium); *CIL* X 8318 (Melita); *AE* 1993, 468 = *AE* 1994, 426b (Misenum); *CIL* XI 3137; *polliceor*: *CIL* I² 3173 (Brundisium); *ILS* 6468 (Petelia); *CIL* X 1788; *CIL* XII 697 = *AE* 1965, 270; *CIL* II 5489; *AE* 1978, 100 = 1987, 241 = 1990, 140 (Interamna Lirenas); *AE* 1983, 522 (Italica); *AE* 1993, 1791 (from Italy?); *AE* 1995, 586 (Concordia). In African inscriptions, the material is huge; for instances of services and building operations being 'promised' note, e.g., temples (*CIL* VIII 12006), amphitheatres (*CIL* VIII 7983 = *ILAlg* II 1, 34), arches (*CIL* VIII 7105 = *ILAlg* II 1, 683), statues (*CIL* VIII 7123 = *ILAlg* II 1, 696; *CIL* VIII 10867 = *ILAlg* II 1, 487; *CIL* VIII 17258 = *ILAlg* I 951; *ILAlg* I 1236; *ILTun* 769), a *munus gladiatorium* (*IRT* 396 = *AE* 1991, 1619; cf. *Apul. met.* 10, 18, 1). Note also, e.g., a woman being honoured with a statue *ob insignem liberalitatem pollicitationis eius* (*CIL* VIII 5365 = 17495 = *ILAlg* I 286), and see in general P. Garnsey, 'Taxatio and *pollicitatio* in Roman Africa', *JRS* 61 (1971) 116–129.

assumes that some municipal event is meant. In any case, there remains one interesting point to be made about the expression. Normally, it is an individual who makes a *pollicitatio*. But in this case it seems clear that we must be dealing with a 'promise' made by the community or at least by organs of the community, for otherwise one could not really explain why the *res publica* had to sell some *praedia* in order to get the money that was needed. *A priori*, this might seem a problem. However, it appears that *pollicitationes* in the municipal sense could also be made by organs of a community, for this is exactly what we see happening in Aletrium where we find a statue being erected in the time of Augustus *ex decreto decur(ionum) Aletrinat(ium) et ex ... pollicitatione sevir(orum) et municipum et incolar(um)* (CIL X 5808 = ILS 6267). The fact that this phenomenon (which possibly might deserve some further study) does not seem to be attested very often may depend on the fact that references to *pollicitationes* are normally found in honorific inscriptions which represent a type of source which exists only in the case of individuals. In any case, if an emperor could 'promise' to sponsor the building of a bathing establishment in Ostia (CIL XIV 98 = ILS 334), it is hard to see why an Ostian body, or even the city of Ostia itself, could not have 'promised' to arrange, on a suitable occasion, a naval spectacle.

Let us move on to the relation between the *pollicitatio* and the *bellum navale*. The verb *polliceor* is transitive; what is being promised thus appears as its object. If a noun is formed from such as verb, the object takes the form of an objective genitive. Thus we say *laudare Caesarem* but *laudatio Caesaris*. Now *pollicitatio* is derived via the frequentative form *pollicitor* from *polliceor*, and if a genitive is attached to this noun, the word in the genitive expresses what is being promised. It follows that *pollicitatio belli navalis* means that someone is promising a *bellum navale*. If something is promised for a *bellum navale*, or during a *bellum navale*, this should be expressed in some other way. As far as I can see, this problem has not been discussed very often. Meiggs, op. cit. (n. 3) 499 says that "there is no great difficulty in understanding *belli navalis* as a substitute for a prepositional phrase which would have been less elegant, the promise arising from, associated with, or in the time of the naval war". This is illustrated with two quotations from Cicero.⁴⁴ Now the statement that the genitive may be used

⁴⁴ Ibid. n. 2 (where G.W. Williams is thanked for the elucidation of this matter): *deorum opinio* (= *de deis*), *Tusc.* 1, 30; *expectatio Galliarum* (interpreted as meaning the same as

to replace a prepositional phrase is basically true; the most useful treatment of this point seems to be that in K. Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*.⁴⁵ One learns that "so werden öfter Genitive zu Substt. verbal. gesetzt, deren Verba nicht einen Akkusativ regieren sondern *de*". This is illustrated with a representative number of examples from Cicero, e.g., *coniecturam totius provinciae facere* Cic. *Verr.* 2, 3, 121; *dubitatio damnationis* *ibid.* 70.⁴⁶ Now it is important to note that the possibility of substituting a genitive for a prepositional phrase seems to apply mainly to those cases in which the preposition is *de* – a preposition which in any case shares some functions with the genitive.

This having been said, let us come back to our inscription. Unlike *dubitare* or *dimicare*, etc., *polliceor* and *pollicitatio* are not expressions which can be followed by a construction introduced by *de*;⁴⁷ there is no such construction as **pollicitatio de bello navali*. Accordingly, *pollicitatio belli navalis* cannot be interpreted as a substitute for a prepositional phrase, and we are left with the fact that the genitive *belli navalis* indicates what is being promised. Now there are not many situations in which one can promise someone a maritime war without getting into some kind of trouble. Therefore, we must now turn to the exact meaning of the expression *bellum*

de Galliis quid decernatur) *fam.* 8, 8, 4 (Caelius). This explanation is accepted by J. Krummrey in his note on *CIL* I² 3031a (p. 984). Th. Mommsen, in his study of the Ostian inscriptions of 1877 (*Gesammelte Schriften* VIII (1913) 343) observes that "*pollicitatio belli navalis paullo durius dicitur ea quae fit ob bellum navale*", and goes on by saying, unhelpfully, "taliam enim si non laudanda, tamen ferenda sunt".

⁴⁵ Chr. K. Reisig, *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft. Mit den Anmerkungen von Fr. Haase, neu bearbeitet von J.H. Schmalz und G. Landgraf. Dritter Band* (1888) 577 n. 535 (this note being due to Haase). In other expositions, this phenomenon is not distinguished with sufficient care from cases of normal objective genitives. E.g., in R. Kühner – C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache* II² (1912) 415f., one finds relevant instances interspersed with irrelevant ones such as *furere luctu filii* (Cic.), *trium ... bellorum victor* (Liv.).

⁴⁶ For other instances (*iuris dubitatio; dimicatio capitis, famae fortunarumque* etc.), see Haase's note (the passage from *Caec.* is in fact § 9, that from *Rab. perd.* § 5; as for *Catil.* 4, 20 [referred to as IV. 10], editors now tend to read not *conservatae rei p. gratulationem*, but *conservata re*).

⁴⁷ Of course it is possible that a *de* is used in connection with *polliceor* or *pollicitatio* to indicate the sphere of the activities which are being promised as, e.g., in Nepos, *Them.* 10, 4, *cum se, quae regi de Graecia opprimenda pollicitus esset, praestare posse desperaret*. But the object of *pollicitus* is, of course, *quae*.

navale.

As mentioned above, according to the doctrine now prevalent – at least in scholarship dealing with Ostia – this is a reference either to Pompey's war against pirates in 67 BC or to the war against Sex. Pompeius in the thirties BC. It seems striking that Actium does not seem to play a role in the discussion; most often it was described not as a *proelium* but as a *bellum*,⁴⁸ and a contemporary, although using the expression *proelium*, thought of it as *navale*.⁴⁹ In fact, later authors call Actium a *bellum navale*.⁵⁰ But let this pass. The essential question here is: is it likely that a real war, even if mainly consisting of naval operations, could be called, in a context like this, simply *bellum navale*, without any further specification of the type *piraticum* or *cum Sex. Pompeio* or *ad Actium*? I think the only reasonable answer must be no.

It must be admitted that Latin literature can produce many instances of the phrase *bellum navale* (or *bellum maritimum*). But in these cases the reference is not to a specific war fought in a specific year (or years) which is otherwise left undefined, for one does not find a *bellum Navale* between (say) a *bellum Mithridaticum* and a *bellum Gallicum*. The reason is, of course, that, in Rome, wars were normally named either after the opponents (*Punicum*, *Mithridaticum*, etc.) or after the place where the fighting took place (*Alexandrinum*, *Hispaniense*, etc.).⁵¹ Normally, the term *bellum navale* (or *maritimum*) is used either when there is talk of naval war or warfare as a general phenomenon or (more commonly) simply of naval battles.⁵² But let us now have a look at the nomenclature of those wars which have been identified with the *bellum navale* of our inscription.

First, Pompey's war against the pirates. This is called normally *bellum piraticum*, but one also finds *bellum praedonum* or τῶν ληστῶν πόλεμος

⁴⁸ Rosenberger (n. 5) 59–63.

⁴⁹ ILS 2243 (Ateste): *M. Billienus M. f. Rom. Actiacus* (note the *cognomen* formed from the name of the battle) *legione XI proelio navali facto in coloniam deductus*.

⁵⁰ Amm. 22, 16, 24; Serv. auct. *Aen.* 8, 714; cf. below at n. 57.

⁵¹ See the material in Rosenberger (n. 5).

⁵² Naval war(s) as a general phenomenon: e.g., Liv. 5, 6, 4; 32, 21, 27; 33, 3, 3; *Hist. Aug. Gall.* 12, 6. Naval warfare: e.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2, 5, 136; Nep. *Them.* 2, 3; Liv. 31, 28, 4; Lucan. 3, 513. 569; Flor. 1, 11, 10, cf. 4, 8, 6. Naval battle: e.g., Pomp. Trog. *prol.* 14; Frontin. *strat.* 4, 7, 9; Flor. 3, 5, 18; 3, 10, 5; Ampel. 15, 18; Porph. *Hor. ep.* 2, 1, 192.

(Rosenberger 163).⁵³ But the natural setting of the activities of pirates makes it clear that the operations against them must have been of a maritime nature, and so it is understandable if one also finds the terms *maritimum* or *navale bellum* applied to this war. But a nomenclature of this kind is, of course, used exclusively in contexts where there is talk of Pompey's operations, so that there could be no doubt that the war of Pompey against the pirates, not some undefined maritime war, was meant.⁵⁴

The war against Sex. Pompeius, who had based himself in Sicily (and on other islands) and who had to be driven out of there, was actually not a maritime war at all for, in addition to the naval battles, it also included a great number of operations on land.⁵⁵ Thus it is correct to speak of a *bellum Siculum* as the whole and of *navalia proelia* as its parts (e.g., Liv. *per.* 128f.); *bellum Siculum* (or something on these lines) is in fact the normal designation for this war, a more rarely used alternative being something like *bellum cum Sex. Pompeio*.⁵⁶ But the main battles fought during the war were indeed naval battles, and this lends a maritime character to the whole; thus it is not odd if a contemporary calls the war *classica bella* (Prop. 2, 1, 28) – but this comes after Mutina and Philippi and *classica bella* is collocated

⁵³ Add *bellum piraticum*, the heading of Florus 3, 6.

⁵⁴ Cic. *Manil.* 13. 28. 44. 58; *Flacc.* 30; Sall. *Catil.* 39, 1. In a speech dealing with the *imperium* of Cn. Pompeius (= *Manil.*) there could of course be no doubt (note especially the summary of Pompey's wars in *Manil.* 28: *civile, Africanum, Transalpinum, Hispaniense mixtum ex civibus atque ex bellicosissimis nationibus, servile, navale bellum*), and the same goes for the passage from the *pro Flacco* (*gloria divina Pompei, ... praedones eos qui tum cum illi bellum maritimum gerendum datum est toto mari dispersi vagabantur redactos esse ...*) and that of Sallust (*postquam Cn. Pompeius ad bellum maritimum atque Mithridaticum missus est*). Note also the the passage in *prov. cons.* 27, *confectis* (by Pompey) *omnibus maritimis terrestribusque bellis*.

⁵⁵ This is clear from the accounts of the war, above all those of Appian and Dio (note especially the narratives of the events of 36 BC in Appian 5, 103–127 and Dio 49, 5–11). Note that, in the summer of 36 BC, Octavian's troops in Sicily consisted of 21 legions and 20,000 cavalry (Appian. 5, 116; for the numbers at the conclusion of the war – 45 legions, etc. – see *ibid.* 127). For a fairly recent exposition of the sources for Sex. Pompeius, see F. Senatore, 'Sesto Pompeio tra Antonio e Ottaviano nella tradizione storiografica antica', *Athenaeum* 79 (1991) 103–139.

⁵⁶ Rosenberger 58f. (where, however, the passage from Liv. *per.* is not mentioned; add also *bellum in Sicilia* Eutrop. 7, 4). For *bellum cum Sex. Pompeio*, see the heading in Florus 4, 8, comparable to *bellum contra Sex. Pompeium* Liv. *per.* 129 and *contra Pompeium bellum* Vell. 2, 80, 1.

between *Siculae ... fugae*,⁵⁷ the reference to the war against Sex. Pompeius is thus clear enough. Moreover, as we have *bella* used in the plural, the word is here used in the sense of 'battle', the battles being substituted, as *partes pro toto*, for the whole war. In any case, certainly this passage cannot be used to show that *bellum navale*, without any further definition, could mean the Sicilian war.

Although Actium does not seem to appear in the literature on *CIL* XIV 375 as a war possibly to be identified with the *bellum navale*, let us note here that (as mentioned above, cf. at n. 48) it was a *bellum* which is normally called *Actiense* or *Actiacum*. A reference to the fact that the war consisted chiefly of the famous naval battle itself is sometimes found, but only in addition to a mention of the place or the opponent; thus one observes *bellum Acties(e) class[icum]* in the *Fasti Amiternini, apud Actium bello navali* in Ammian (22, 16, 24), *exercitus qui Antonium vicerat navali bello* in Servius auctus (*Aen.* 8, 714).⁵⁸

We have now seen (a) that the term *pollicitatio* is most likely to mean a 'promise' made within a municipal context, and (b) that the *bellum navale* must be what (not 'for what' or 'during what', etc.) is being promised, and, finally, (c) that it is quite inconceivable that a phrase consisting of only the two words *bellum navale* could have been used to denote a clearly defined historical war. It follows that we are dealing with the case that a *bellum navale* had been promised in Ostia and so we must return to the view of the scholars mentioned above (at n. 35ff.) that a *naumachia*, a mock naval battle must be meant.

In favour of the view that a *naumachia*, not a real war, is meant, both Taylor and Rosenberger cite passages in which *proelium navale* means a spectacle.⁵⁹ Taylor adds that, if a show lasted for several days, it could have been called a *bellum*, and Thylander (cf. above n. 37) observes that *bellum*

⁵⁷ Prop. 2, 1, 27f. *nam quotiens Mutinam aut civilia busta Philippos / aut canerem Siculae classica bella fugae* (*fuga* no doubt referring somehow to Sex. Pompeius' conduct at the conclusion of hostilities).

⁵⁸ See Rosenberger 59–63 (with p. 59 and 61f. on the *Fasti Amiternini*; however, something seems to be wrong with the declination of *frater* on p. 62).

⁵⁹ Taylor (n. 36) 185 n. 9, Rosenberger 175 (adding the reference to the *navales pugnas* in Suet. *Dom.* 4, 5); passages from Augustus' *Res gestae*, Pliny the Elder, Tacitus and Suetonius are being quoted.

could in any case be used for *proelium*.⁶⁰ And let me add that a *naumachia* is called *belli navalis imago* by Ovid (*Ars* 1, 171).

Thus, there is certainly no real problem if one interprets *bellum navale* in *CIL* XIV 375 as an entertainment event, especially as it cannot be interpreted otherwise. There seems to be no reason why naval shows (perhaps not as grand as those in Rome) could not have been arranged in Ostia. But there is one more thing to be said. It has been pointed out several times above that the other lengthy inscription in honour of a Lucilius Gamala, *CIL* XIV 376, partly reflects and partly imitates the earlier inscription. Now let us look at the items mentioned 376 from line 21 onwards. First, this later Gamala restores the temple of Venus built by his ancestor (21–2); then he 'makes' *pondera ad macellum*, reproducing the munificence of his ancestor, the same words being used as in the earlier inscription (22).⁶¹ Then the inscription goes on by saying *idem navale a L. Coilio aedificatum ... restituit* (lines 25–7; for line 26, see below n. 63). The usual and no doubt correct assumption is that *navale* means here what it normally means, 'shipyard'.⁶² But what if we have here the mention of another act of munificence of the later Gamala reflecting that of his ancestor? Let me conclude by proposing, with due caution, that this could in fact be the case. Observe the collocation of the reference to the *navale* after two other activities reflecting Gamala Senior and also the fact that the term *navalis* is so uncommon in honorific inscriptions that it would actually be more than surprising to find it used in both Gamalian inscriptions but only by chance and referring to quite different things. Therefore, if we assume that there is indeed a connection between the *bellum navale* of Gamala Senior and the *navale* restored by Gamala Junior, I think we may operate with two possibilities: either *navale* in the later inscription in fact means a *naumachia* – but it would be a *hapax* in this meaning – or, more probably, *navale* has its normal meaning but is relevant here because at least once it

⁶⁰ Cf. also above n. 52, and note that, according to Florus 3, 3, 21, a *gladiatorium munus* consists of a *spectaculum belli*.

⁶¹ But this later Gamala also made *mensuras ad forum Vinar(ium)* (for which see F. Coarelli, in A. Gallina Zevi & A. Claridge (eds.), *'Roman Ostia' Revisited* (1996) 105ff.), mentioned after the *pondera* in line 21f.

⁶² E.g., J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 214 (with a candidate for the identity of *L. Coilius*); Meiggs 501; the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s. v.

was used for a *naumachia*.⁶³ In either case we would be dealing with the

⁶³ For some interesting observations on the nature of *navalia*, see N. Purcell, in *'Roman Ostia' Revisited* (n. 62) 268f. The exact meaning of *navale* here cannot, I believe, be determined by what is inscribed in the beginning of line 26. What one sees here if one inspects the stone (cf. n. 4) is *extru[.] + tibus* (not *extru[.]ntibus*, as in the *CIL*). The *T* is preceded by a *hasta recta* (not really visible in the photo in Fora) which belongs to either an *I* or an *N* (for *N* cf., e.g., the *N* in *aenea* in line 28). As for the *V*, the upper part of the left *hasta* of what seems to be a *V* is visible, but it should be noted that a close inspection of the stone shows that apart from the top this letter may well have been vertical, and thus possibly an *I* with a tip pointing to the left (cf., e.g., the second *I* in *Coilio* in line 25) or an *E* (cf., e.g., the *E* in *reparavit*, line 20); on the other hand, if one ignores the traces apparently pointing to a vertical *hasta* (which one will have to do if one reads an *V*), this letter could even have been an *A*, a letter which comes in very many shapes in this inscription. But if one assumes that the reading *extru-* of all editors of *CIL* XIV 376 is indeed correct, what about the rest of the expression? Th. Mommsen (in *Gesammelte Schriften* 8, 341f.) reads *extru[en]tibus* (to be understood as *exstruentibus*, from *ex(s)truere* 'to build', 'construct') and offers a pretty complicated explanation which is based on the fact that *navale* could mean both a place where ships were built and a place where ships were kept (there is a reference to Servius, *Aen.* 11, 326); therefore "commode distinguuntur *navale extruentibus factum et factum subducentibus*". What he seems to say is that this *navale* was built for shipbuilders (and thus a shipyard) and that it was in this way differentiated from a *navale* meant for the "subducentes", i.e., for those who hauled up ships to be kept in shipsheds. This explanation seems to have been accepted by Meiggs who writes "the *navale* was for the building of ships" (p. 501; for further scholars who accept the reading *extru[en]tibus* or *extru[e]ntibus* note M.F. Petracca Lucernoni, *I questori municipali dell'Italia antica* (1988) 27 no. 12; Fora (n. 4) 62–4 no. 28; P. Sanchez, in *Ostie. Port et porte de la Rome antique* (n. 4) 152 no. 5). But to me this explanation does not seem plausible at all – to say the least (note H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom* I (1885) 438 n. 52: "sachlich und sprachlich halte ich *navale extruentibus* für unmöglich"). Who would have referred to a shipyard by saying "a *navale* (meant) for shipbuilders"? But the main problem with this explanation is that, if the Latin used here is of the normal kind, one should combine *extru[.] + tibus* not with what precedes but with what follows to form a colon *extru[.] + tibus fere collapsum* (thus correctly J. Carcopino, *MEFR* 31 (1911) 216. 218): clearly we have here *fere collapsum* somehow defined. But how? J. Carcopino (ibid.) proposed either *extru[den]tibus* (scil. "quelque chose comme *inundationibus aquam e ripis*") or (assuming that a few ligatures were used) *extru[s(is) stipi]tibus* (in this case "les eaux auraient emporté les pieux de ses estacades"); but both propositions seem equally implausible (and the latter far too long for the lacuna). One possibility could possibly be to accept *extru[den]tibus* but to assume that the verb is used intransitively, that *extrudentia* would mean something like protruding parts (of the building), and that we would be dealing with an *ablativus respectus*. (Note that P. Sanchez (cf. above) seems to be thinking on these lines, cf. his translation "l'arsenal construit par Lucius Coilius, dont les superstructures étaient sur le point de s'effondrer".) But *extrudere* is otherwise never used as a intransitive verb (*TLL*

actual site of the naval spectacle to the presentation of which Gamala Senior had contributed. Be that as it may, I think that a case can be made for regarding the mention of the *navale* in *CIL* XIV 376 as also pointing to the conclusion that no real war is mentioned in *CIL* XIV 375.

To conclude: I suggest that *CIL* XIV 375 may have been formulated some time after the death of the honorand and that it belongs to a private monument honouring deceased Gamalae. These circumstances would explain many of the exceptional features of the inscription. Furthermore, I suggest that the formulation *bellum navale* cannot possibly refer to a specific war and that, accordingly, it cannot be used for dating the inscription. In my view, the activities of Gamala Senior described in the inscription cannot belong to a period earlier than the Triumviral or, preferably, the early Augustan. If the "Quattro tempietti" can be dated to a period which fits this date, I think it is fairly likely that they can be identified with the temples built by Gamala Senior.

University of Helsinki

V 2, 2088–90), and, to tell the truth, there is hardly space in the inscription for supplying the three letters *DEN* in the lacuna. On the other hand, I am not in the position to offer a more suitable word beginning with *ex(s)tru-* and ending with *-itibus* or *-ntibus*, and things are not made easier by the fact that the reading could possibly be even *ex(s)tri-*, *ex(s)tre-*, or perhaps even *ex(s)tra-*. It seems, then, that the problem remains.— F. Jacques, *Les cités de l'occident romain* (1990) p. 131 no. 68 (b) translates this passage as follows: "il a aussi restauré le chantier naval construit par L. Coilius, presque effondré".