

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. III

HELSINKI 1962 HELSINGFORS

# INDEX

Patrick Bruun	The Christian Signs on the Coins of Constantine . . .	5
Michael Ginsburg	The Hellenistic <i>προσβολή</i> and the <i>prosbul</i> . . . . .	37
Iiro Kajanto	On the Problem of »Names of Humility» in Early Christian Epigraphy . . . . .	45
Eino Mikkola	Die präpositionale Hypostase, Apostase und Meta- base im Lateinischen, Griechischen und Altindi- schen . . . . .	55
Henric Nordberg	On the Bible Text of St. Athanasius . . . . .	119
Paavo Numminen	Severa Mater . . . . .	143
Päivö Oksala	Das Aufblühen des römischen Epos. Berührungen zwischen der Ariadne-Episode Catulls und der Dido-Geschichte Vergils . . . . .	167
Teivas Oksala	Catulls Attis-Ballade. Über den Stil der Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Persönlichkeit des Dichters	199
Jaakko Suolahti	The Consul: — — — — —. N. CARVE — — in 458 B.C. . . . .	215
Henrik Zilliacus	Anecdota sepulcralia . . . . .	229

THE CONSUL: ————. N. CARVE — — IN 458 B.C.

Jaakko Suolahti

In *Fasti Capitolini* for 458, the second consul's name is preserved only in the form: [— — — — —] *n. Carve*[— — —] <sup>1</sup> The *Chronograph of 354* and *Diodorus* also mention him. The former gives as consuls of this year: *Rutullo (Rutullu in V.) et Carbetō*.<sup>2</sup> The latter has: Γάιος Νάύτιος Ῥουτίλιος καὶ Λεύκιος Μινούτιος (*Μινούκιος V, F*) Καροντιανός <sup>3</sup>. Other sources do not mention him at all. They have instead the suffect consul: *L. Minucius P. f. M. n. Esquilinus Augurinus* as the second consul, if any, in this year.<sup>4</sup> The *Fasti Hydatiani* and *Chronicon Paschale*, supporting the same tradition, give: *Nauto (Bauto S) et Atratino (Atractino)*, respectively: *Ναυτίου καὶ Ἀτρατίνου* <sup>5</sup>, but this may be a corruption of Minucius' second cognomen *Augurinus*. Some sources, at last, give only the name of dictator *L. Quinctius Cincinnatus*.<sup>6</sup> This confusion in our sources is very natural, because there were in all five chiefmagistrates in this same year, namely two consuls, a suffect consul, a dictator and his magister equitum, as given by the *Fasti Capitolini* <sup>7</sup>: 458: *C. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus II* [— — — — —. *f.*—]. *n. Carve* [— — —]

*in ma[g(istratu)]mortuus est. In eius l(ocum) f(actus) est*

*L. Minucius P. f. M. n. Esquilin(us) Augurin(us)*

*L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnat(us) dict(ator)*

*L. Tarquitius L. f. Flaccus mag(ister) eq(uitum) rei gerundae causa*

<sup>1</sup> A. DEGRASSI, *Fasti consulares et triumphales* (Inscriptiones Italiae XIII: 1), Roma 1947, pp. 24 f., Tab. XXVII, frg. 3; W. HENZEN—C. HÜLSEN, *Fasti consulares ad a.u.c. DCCLXVI* (Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum I<sup>2</sup>: 1, Berlin 1893), p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Th. MOMMSEN, *Chronica minora* I (Monumenta Germaniae. Auctores antiquissimi IX, pp. 19—76), p. 51; DEGRASSI, p. 362.

<sup>3</sup> DIOD. 11. 88. 1.

<sup>4</sup> LIV. 3. 25. 1; CASSIOD.; DIONYS. 10. 22. 1; 11. 20. 1; VAL. MAX. 5. 2. 2; ZON. 7. 17; DIO, fr. 23. 1.

<sup>5</sup> DEGRASSI, o. c., pp. 24, 362. MOMMSEN, *Chronica*, p. 206.

<sup>6</sup> DIO, fr. 23. 2; ZON. 7. 17; cf. DEGRASSI, o. c., pp. 362 f.; T. BROUGHTON, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association XV: 1) I, New York 1951, pp. 39 f.

<sup>7</sup> DEGRASSI, o. c., pp. 24 f.

Because consul: — — — — — — — — — — *Carve* — — —, it seems, died soon after his election to the consulship and left no traces of his activity in it, most sources have either left him without a mention or do not remember him. This is perhaps the best testimony for his historical existence. It is very unlikely that his kinsmen should afterwards have invented his consulship, which is shadowy. Therefore we may with good reason consider his name as a piece of old and reliable tradition.

His identification, however, is almost impossible, or at least there can be no absolute certainty. Several scholars, it is true, have attempted it, but none of their solutions is accepted unanimously. In the course of this study I shall analyze these more closely. They have all started from the variations in our sources, pointed out above, but this gives no positive evidence. Perhaps it will be worth while to study the political situation in the year concerned and the prosopography of this period. Some corroborative evidence may be found here. In any case such an analysis is likely to clarify the whole problem. We shall begin with the meagre evidence of — — *Carve* — — itself, then consider the other and in part contradictory evidence of this year, and finally study the historical and prosopographical limits of choice of *gentilicium* for — — *Carve*.

## I

Our only evidence with regard to the second consul in 458 is five or six letters of his cognomen. From BORGHESI<sup>1</sup> onwards most scholars<sup>2</sup> have seen six letters, as follows: — — — — — — — — — — — CARVEN — —. After a scrupulous investigation DEGRASSI, however, was obliged to deny the possibility of seeing the sixth letter N,<sup>3</sup> and BROUGHTON<sup>4</sup> follows him. With close scrutiny it is, indeed, possible to see traces of the letter following E, ie. its lower vertical part. It is impossible, however, in the present condition of the *Fasti Capitolini* to say which letter it is of M, N, I, R, T, P, F, H, but possibly BORGHESI and the earlier scholars could see more than we. The main reason for identifying this trace of a letter of N might, however, have been that the only known cognomen with the beginning CARVE is *Carve(n)-*

<sup>1</sup> B. BORGHESI, *Nuovi frammenti dei fasti consolari Capitolini illustrati (Oeuvres complètes IX, Paris 1893, pp. 1—251), pp. 15—25.*

<sup>2</sup> C. FEA, *Frammenti dei fasti consolari e trionfali ultimamente scoperti nel Foro Romano e altrove*, Roma 1820, p. 458; HENZEN-HÜLSEN, o.c., pp. 16, 30.

<sup>3</sup> DEGRASSI, o.c., pp. 24 f., 92 f.

<sup>4</sup> BROUGHTON, o.c., pp. 39, 40 fn. 1.

SP. OSTUMIUS AFINALIVS REGI	466
Q. FABIVS . MF . KN . VIBULAN	465
A. POSTUMIVS AFINALIVS REGILL	464
CCCG. P. SERVILIUS SP. F. N. PRISC	463
L. VCRETIVS . TFFN . TRICIPITIN	462
P. VOLVANTIVS MFMNAMINTINGALIVS	461
P. VALERIVS P. F. VOLVSN . P. P. LICOLA II	460
INMAGMORTVVS ESTINEIVS SEST	459
L. QVINCTIVS SP. F. N. CINCINNATVS	458
Q. FABIVS . MF . KN . VIBULANVS . III	
C. NAVTIIVS SP. F. ST. N. RVTIIVS II	
L. QVINCTIVS SP. F. N. CINCINNAT	
LTARQVITIIVS LF . TACCVS	
CHORATIVS MFMN . P. VILLIVS II	
M. VALERIVS NYE . VOLVSN . MAXVIVS	
TR. OMILIVS TFFN . ROCVS . VATICINVS	
SP. TARPEIVS MFMN . MONTANCA . TOLLIN	
CCC. SEX. QVINCTILIIVS . SEX. F. N.	
P. SESTIVS . Q. VIBVNCAMTO	
INMAGMORTVVS ESTINEIVS SEST	
L. MINVCIIVS P. F. M. N. S. Q. VITIVS NAVGVAN	
DICI . R. NIGERVNDIA . CAUSA	
MAG. EQ. R. NIGERVNDIA . CAUSA	
Q. MINVCIIVS P. F. M. N. ESCVITIVS	457
SP. VERGINTIVS ATAVS . TRICOSTA . L. MONTI	456
CVETVRIIVS . P. CICVRINIVS	455
A. ATERNIVS . ARVS . FONTINATIS	454
PCVRIATIVS . HISTVSTRIGEMIN	453
TMENIVS . FAGRIPIIVS . LANATVS	452

Fasti Capitolini 466—452 B.C (DEGRASSI, *Fasti consularcs* p. 24).

tanus.<sup>1</sup> It is derived from the name of a small Latin town *Carventum*, which disappeared very early.<sup>2</sup> DIONYSIUS mentions it in 499 before the battle of Lake Regillus as one of those cities which signed the treaty against Rome.<sup>3</sup> It had prominent place in the war against the *Aequi* in 410, but was then only a citadel and had already lost its independence, if such ever existed.<sup>4</sup> It was perhaps one of the numerous pagi in the *ager Romanus*. Its situation is unknown, but from the description of the war by LIVY in 410 we may with some probability place it in the frontier area of *Aequi* and *Hernici* near the mount *Algidus*.<sup>5</sup> If it was conquered, as is likely, soon after the battle of Lake Regillus in 499, it is quite natural that it should give the cognomen to a patrician gens deriving from it, migrating to it or in some way concerned with it.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. Supplementum. Onomasticon* II, Lipsiae 1910, p. 219; W. SCHULZE, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen NF. 5) Berlin 1933, pp. 533, fn. 7, 535.

<sup>2</sup> HÜLSEN, *Carventum* (RE III, 1899, pp. 1628 f.).

<sup>3</sup> DIONYS. 5. 61. 5: οἱ δ' ἐγγραφάμενοι ταῖς συνθήκαις . . . ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἄνδρες Καρουντανῶν.

<sup>4</sup> LIV. 4. 53. 3: *repente nuntiatur arcem Carventanam ab hostibus occupatam esse*; 4. 53. 9: *Ductus exercitus ad Carventanam arcem . . . arcem recipit*; 4. 56. 4: *Volscos deinde et Aequos, seu Carventana arx retenta in spem seu . . .*

<sup>5</sup> HÜLSEN, *Carventum*, p. 1629; cf. W. GELL, *Topography of Rome and its Vicinity* II, London 1834, p. 374; A. NIBBY, *Analisi storico-topografico-antiquaria della carta de' dintorni di Roma* III, Roma 1833, p. 17: Rocca Massima.

<sup>6</sup> MOMMSEN, *Fabius und Diodor* (ID., *Römische Forschungen* II, Berlin 1879, pp. 221—296), p. 292 fn. 107; A. SCHWEGLER, *Römische Geschichte im Zeitalter des Kampfes der Stände* II, Tübingen 1856, p. 326 fn. 3.

DIODORUS seems to confirm that the cognomen of our consul was in fact *Carventanus*, because he gives the second consul as *Λεύκιος Μινούτιος Καρουντιανός*<sup>1</sup> We may perhaps suppose that *Καρουεντανός* is corrupted in the manuscripts to *Καρουντιανός* or, if only *εν* was dropped of *Καρουεντιανός* to *Καρουντιανός*. That there really existed such a cognomen as *Carventanus* is shown by some later inscriptions with the nomen *Carvetanus*.<sup>2</sup> These *Carvetani* have, however, no relationship with the patrician consul *Carve* — —. Either their name derives from that of the clientes of our *Carve*- or, which is more probable, directly from the citadel or pagus named by LIVY. The disappearance of the nasal N is a very common feature in Latin.<sup>3</sup>

DEGRASSI has,<sup>4</sup> however, stated that there is in the FASTI CAPITOLINI scarcely space for CARVE[NTANUS], or for six more letters. In the following lines there are indeed only 3—4 letters in the corresponding space. Near the edge of the stone there is perhaps space enough for six letters, but the text ends in every line some two centimeters before the edge. As a good deal of space is left vacant before the cognomen *Carve* — —, it is extremely improbable that the text should have continued abnormally to the edge, especially when CARVE- is in exceptionally big letters. From the same reason DEGRASSI denies the possibility of abbreviation in CARVENT(ANUS), saying that there are no analogies in this part of the FASTI. In the following line the cognomen of dictator *L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnat(us)* is, however, abbreviated despite the space vacant before his cognomen. One may suggest that the sculptor made abbreviation in conformity with the previous lines, where the abbreviation of [*L. Cornelius Ser. f. P. n.*] *Maluginensis Ur[itin(us)]* was truly necessary. DEGRASSI's suggestion that we should read instead of *Carve(ntanus)*, as in CIL, *Carve(tus)* seems not to be necessary. In any case, there is no such nomen as *Carvetus*, nor can it be derived from a known substantive or nomen. It is, however, possible that the sculptor erroneously inscribed *Carvetus* instead of *Carventanus*. This would explain why The Chronograph of 354 has: *Rutullo et Carбето*. It derives, as is known, very closely from the FASTI CAPITOLINI.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> DIOD. II. 88. 1; cf. STEPH. BYZ.: *Καρουεντός, πόλις Λατίων. Διονύσιος β: Ρωμαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας* (5. 61. 3). *ἐν τισι δὲ γράφεται Καρουεντός καὶ τὸ ἐθνικὸν Καρουντιανός.*

<sup>2</sup> CIL VI, 34787: *D. Carvetanus Priamus/decessit annorum XX/Iulia O. I. Nice/Prima Sabidia M. I.*; VI, 37390: *C. Carveta /C. Carvetanus/Plocamus.*

<sup>3</sup> V. VÄÄNÄNEN, *Le Latin vulgaire des inscriptions pompéiennes*, Helsinki 1937, pp. 117—119.

<sup>4</sup> DEGRASSI, o. c., p. 92.

<sup>5</sup> SEECK, *Chronograph vom J. 354* (RE III, 1899, pp. 2477—2481), p. 2479; F. CORNELIUS, *Untersuchungen zur frühen römischen Geschichte*, München 1940, pp. 9 ff.

The abbreviation *CARVENT* can, however, also be the original form of the corrupted *Carbeto*.

It therefore seems that the second consul in 458 had the cognomen *Carventanus*, even if it was abbreviated or perhaps written *Carb(n)etus* in the *FASTI CAPITOLINI* and the tradition deriving from it. Perhaps he had some connection with the early vanished town *Carventum* preserved in the family tradition when the compilers of the *Fasti* were ascribing cognomina perhaps about 300 BC to the *FASTI*.<sup>1</sup>

The cognomen *Carventanus* or *Carvetus* does not, however, help us in identifying the second consul of 458. There are no other magistrates in the *FASTI* or other sources with this cognomen and no known connection of any gens with *Carventum*. The two persons connected in the sources with the history of this city had other cognomina. The dictator and perhaps conqueror of *Carventum*, *A. Postumius Albus*, (1)<sup>2</sup> received his other cognomen, which became hereditary, from the battle of Lake Regillus, a deed immensely more important than the conquest of a small Latin town.<sup>3</sup> The consul of 410, *C. Valerius L. f. Vol. n. Potitus Volusus* (309) who celebrated an ovation after the reestablishment of a Roman garrison in the citadel of *Carventum*, lived a generation later than the consul of 458 and did not, it seems, take any surname for his somewhat obscure deed.<sup>4</sup>

Except for *Carve* — —, the *FASTI CAPITOLINI* give very little information. We can see from the remaining N. before *CARVE* — — that tradition, true or invented, knew the praenomina of his father and grandfather, and that they were Roman citizens. This, however, is natural, because all consuls before 366 B.C. were of patrician gentes dating from the regal period.<sup>5</sup>

Of the nomen there are no letters preserved in the *FASTI*, but something can be deduced from the place left for it. It is, very little. Calculating from the beginning of the line, as shown by other preserved lines in the same table, as far as the remaining letter N, there is space only for some 10—11 letters, of which at least three must be for patronyms and one for the praenomen. Naturally there may be more letters very close to each other, but the remaining N in any case is large. This should point to a gentilicium of six or seven

<sup>1</sup> DEGRASSI, *oc.*, p. XIV; CORNELIUS, *oc.*, pp. 9 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The numbers in brackets after the names refer to PAULY-WISSOWAS *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*.

<sup>3</sup> *Acta Triumphalia*, DEGRASSI, *oc.*, pp. 66 f.

<sup>4</sup> LIV. 4. 53. 11—12.

<sup>5</sup> B. KÜBLER, *Patres, patricii* (RE XVIII, 1949, pp. 2222—2232), pp. 2223 ff.

letters, praenomen, patronym and grandfather's name—in abbreviations of only one letter. In the last chapter of my study I shall try to analyse the known gentilicia which fulfil these conditions.

## II

There is some contradictory evidence, as seen, concerning the magistrates of this year. Taking it as a basis, some scholars have tried to find the lacking gentilicium. BROUGHTON has hesitatingly made the suggestion that CARVE — — may have been a Sempronius, because FASTI HYDATIANI and CHRONICON PASCHALE have as second consul ATRATINUS, which is the cognomen of the SEMPRONII. As he says, the space is, however, too short for a name as long as *Sempronius*<sup>1</sup>. Therefore it is safer to consider this *Atratinus* as a corruption of the suffectus consul *Minucius*' second cognomen *Augurinus*. This would be a natural mistake, because there were many *Atratini* and *Augurini*, both in the early republic and later in the imperial period<sup>2</sup>. It may be mentioned that the tradition in FASTI HYDATIANI and CHRONICON PASCHALE is very confused in these years, eg. in 457 they show,<sup>3</sup> instead of *Horatius Pulvillus* and *Minucius Esquilinus:Publilio (Publio S) et Hilario (hylario S)*, respectively: *Πουβλιλλίου καὶ Ἰλαριανοῦ*. Diodorus' statement that the second consul in 458 was: *Λεύκιος Μινούτιος (Μινούκιος) Καροντιανός* has given some scholars cause to suggest that we must supply CARVE — — in FASTI CAPITOLINI with the gentilicium MINUCIUS.<sup>4</sup> In ZONARAS: *Μάρκον Μινούκιον στρατηγούντα* G. COSTA finds support for the assumption that the second consul was *M. Minucius Carventanus*.<sup>5</sup> In the following chapter we shall see his arguments taken from the political events of this year.<sup>6</sup> Now it is enough to note that there is, despite his calculations, not space enough in FASTI CAPITOLINI for MINUCIUS.<sup>7</sup> Therefore it is better to see in DIODORUS' consul *Λεύκιος Μινούτιος Καροντιανός* a confusion of the names of the second and suffect consuls

<sup>1</sup> BROUGHTON, OC. I. p. 40 fn. 1.

<sup>2</sup> GROAG—MÜNZER—FLUSS, 19—27) Sempronius Atratinus (RE II A, 1923, pp. 1364—1368).

<sup>3</sup> DEGRASSI, OC., p. 362.

<sup>4</sup> G. COSTA, *Studio delle fonti dei fasti consolari romani* (I fasti consolari romani dalle origini alla morte di C. Giulio Cesare I: 1), Milano 1910, pp. 275—280.

<sup>5</sup> ZON. 7. 17.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. page 222.

<sup>7</sup> COSTA, OC. p. 280.



which were in two lines following each other in FASTI CAPITOLINI.<sup>1</sup> The same difficulty of space is found when considering the suggestion of FRUIN that the second consul should have been the consul of 469, *T. Numicius (Carventanus) Priscus*.<sup>2</sup> Other possible distortions of *Minucius* to *Genucius*, *Menenius* are impossible because there is not space enough in the Fasti.<sup>3</sup> At last there is the tradition of FLORUS of a consul MANILIUS or MANLIUS: *Pervicacissimi tamen Latinorum Aequi et Volsci fuere et cotidiani, ut sic dixerim, hostes. Sed hos praecipue Titus Quinctius domuit, ille dictator ab aratro, qui obsessa et paene iam capta Manili (B. O; Manlii I, L) (Marci Mamili, N) consulis castra egregie victoria recuperavit*.<sup>4</sup> As may be seen from the varying tradition of manuscripts, there is no certainty that FLORUS wrote originally MANLIUS, which in any case may be derived from the name of suffect consul MINUCIUS, whom the tradition concerns, and not the second consul ordinarius CARVE — —. So the contradictory tradition gives no clue to the gentilicium of the second consul.

### III

We have very little reliable information on events about 458 BC. There are, it is true, narratives of some length by historians, like LIVY and DIONYSIUS, but these are constructed around the very meagre data which the historians of the second and first centuries before Christ had at their disposal.<sup>5</sup> Moreover there are some falsifications, fictions or at least embellishments deliberately included to make the original history more glorious and thrilling. The main features and trends of evolution can at all events be seen. The external history of Rome in the fifth century is a continuous, endless war against neighbours in the south-east and south, the belligerent *Aequi* and *Volsci*, who were mainly victorious.<sup>6</sup> The Roman historians, however, give a very embellished and favourable picture of the meagre successes of their forefathers.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. F. UNGER, Die Glaubwürdigkeit der capitolinischen Consulntafeln III—IV (Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie 37, 1891, pp. 465—496), p. 486; MÜNZER, 40) L. Minucius Esquilinus Angurinus (RE XV, 1932, pp. 1950—1955), p. 1950.

<sup>2</sup> R. FRUIN, Beiträge zur Fastenkritik (JCP, 40. 1894, pp. 106—118); MÜNZER, Numicius (RE XVII, 1937, pp. 1341 f.); ID., Carventanus (RE Suppl. I. 1903. p. 276).

<sup>3</sup> FRUIN, oc. pp. 107 f.

<sup>4</sup> FLOR. I. II. 11—12.

<sup>5</sup> Eg. K. J. BELOCH, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege*, Berlin 1926, pp. 95 ff.

<sup>6</sup> IBID, pp. 293—296.

The ineffectiveness of the Roman armies resulted, it seems, in some degree from the internal struggle between the patricians and plebeians, which culminated in the decemviral legislation of 451—449 BC. The patrician gentes had a somewhat different attitude to this struggle, and probably formed various shifting groups for their own purposes in the elections. F. CORNELIUS has tried to examine these groups, but the results are extremely uncertain.<sup>1</sup> He supposes that a large group of gentes like the *Minucii*, *Servilii*, *Postumii*, *Aebutii*, *Veturii*, *Sulpicii*, *Verginii* was dominant in the years 466—455. There are in the FASTI, however, in these years several other gentes in prominent positions, too. Therefore it is perhaps better to examine the connections which the persons involved in our present study have with other gentes.

The year 458 is very typical in the historiography of the early republic. In the previous year the consuls *Q. Fabius M. f. K. n. Vibulanus* (165) and *L. Cornelius Ser. f. P. n. Maluginensis Uritinus* (256), so tradition reports, had celebrated triumphs over the *Aequi* and *Volsci*,<sup>2</sup> while in Rome there was a struggle between the patrician quaestors *A. Cornelius* (12) and *Q. Servilius Structus Priscus* (28) and the plebeian tribunes *A. Verginius* (13) and *M. Volscius Fictor* (6\*).<sup>3</sup> In spite of the previous years' successes, the *Aequi*, breaking the treaty and ignoring the complaints of a Roman embassy, succeeded in trapping at *Algidus* the army of consul *L. Minucius P. f. M. n. Esquilinus Augurinus* (40), who, according to FASTI CAPITOLINI, was a *suffectus*.<sup>4</sup> Some scholars<sup>5</sup> have thought that he fell in the battle as an ordinary consul and that, to conceal this fact, later tradition created the suffect consul and let him suffer a temporary misfortune, from which he was saved by the dictator *L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnatus* (Cin. 1\*), named by the other consul *C. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus* (5).<sup>6</sup> The account of *Cincinnatus*, one of Rome's national heroes, is very embellished, but may be true in essence.<sup>7</sup> It is, however, extremely improbable that tradition should have created a *suffectus* to conceal the death of an ordi-

<sup>1</sup> CORNELIUS, OC. pp. 113—121.

<sup>2</sup> LIV. 3. 22. 1—23. 7; DIONYS. 10. 20—21; ACTA TR.; DEGRASSI, pp. 66 f., 537.

<sup>3</sup> LIV. 3. 24. 3—7; 3. 29. 6; VAL. MAX. 4. 1. 4.

<sup>4</sup> LIV. 3. 25. 5—26. 6; DIONYS. 10. 22. 1—23. 4.

<sup>5</sup> COSTA, OC. pp. 275 ff.

<sup>6</sup> FASTI CAP.; DEGRASSI, 24 f., 92. 362 f.; 67, 537; ACT. TR.; LIV. 9. 26. 6—29. 7; DIONYS. 10. 23. 4—25. 3; 10. 27. 1; CIC. fin. 2. 12; ID. rep. 2. 63; ID. sen. 56; VAL. MAX. 2. 7. 7; 4. 4. 7; 5. 2. 2; PERS. 1. 73—75; COLUM. 1. Praef. 14; PLIN. nh. 18. 19; FLOR. 1. 5. 12; DIO. fr. 23; EUTR. 1. 17; V. ILL. 17; VEGET. rm. 1. 3; AMPEL. 18. 4; OROS. 2. 12. 7—8; ZON. 7. 17; LYD. mag. 1. 38.

<sup>7</sup> BELOCH, RG. pp. 8, 64.

*narius*. *Minucius* trapped and saved by a dictator is not more honorable for the Romans than a consul slain on the battlefield, which seems to be a common occurrence in Roman history. The silence of other sources concerning the second CARVE — — suggests rather that he died just before or after entering on his consulship. He may have fallen on the battlefield, but there were even in Rome some who died naturally of disease or for other reasons.

## IV

Further, there are no clues in the political situation as to the nomen of this CARVE — —. It is, however, interesting to note with which gentes the other consul of the year *C. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus* (5) is connected in the FASTI. The father of our consul *Sp. Nautius Sp? f.—n. Rutilus* (8) was consul in 488 with *Sex. Furius —f.—n. Medullinus? Fusus* (26). The consuls of the previous year, one of whom had held the elections for the year 488, were *C. Iulius C. f.—n. Iullus* (293) and *P. Pinarius —f.—n. Mamertinus Rufus* (13), those of the following elected by *Nautius* or *Furius* were *T. Sicinius —f.—n. Sabinus* (13) and *C. Aquillius —f.—n. Tuscus* (8).<sup>1</sup> Our NAUTIUS had been consul already 475 with *P. Valerius P. f. Volusi n. Poplicola* (301). The consuls of the previous year were *A. Verginius (Opet? f. Opet? n.) Tricostus Rutulus* (12) and *Sp. Servilius P. f?—n. Structus* (85), and those of the following *L. Furius —f.—n. Medullinus* (64) and *A. Manlius (Cn. f. P. n.) Vulso* (89).<sup>2</sup> In 424 *Sp. Nautius Sp. f.—n. Rutilus* (9), perhaps the nephew of our consul, was military tribune with consular power. As colleagues he had (*Ap*). *Claudius Ap. f. Ap. n. Crassus* (121), who held the elections for the following year, *L. Sergius C. f. C. n. Fidenas* (25) and *Sex. Iulius —f.—n. Iullus* (300). The previous year's consular tribunes were *A. Sempronius L. f. A. n. Atratinus* (22), *L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnatus* (Cin. 3\*), *L. Furius Sp. f.—n. Medullinus* (65) and *L. Horatius M. f. M. n. Barbatas* (7).<sup>3</sup> In 419 we have again a *Sp. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus* (10) as consular tribune, with *Agrippa Menenius T. f. Agripp. n. Lanatus* (13, 14), *P. Lucretius Hosti f.—n. Tricipitinus* (29) and *C. Servilius Q. f. C. n. Axilla* (37). In the previous year *L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnatus* (Cin. 3\*) or *T. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Poenus Cincinnatus* (Cin. 4\*), *L. Furius Sp. f.—n. Medullinus* (65), *M. Manlius —f.—n. Vulso* (96) and *A. Sempronius L. f.*

<sup>1</sup> BROUGHTON, OC. pp. 18 f, where further references to the sources.

<sup>2</sup> IBID., pp. 26—28.

<sup>3</sup> IBID., pp. 67—69.

*A. n. Atratinus* (22), in the following *L. Sergius C. f. C. n. Fidenas* (25), *M. Papi-rius L. f.—n. Mugillanus* (68) and *C. Servilius Q. f. C. n. Axilla* (37)<sup>1</sup> were con-sular tribunes. Three years later 416 *Sp. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus* (10) was military tribune again with *A. Sempronius L. f. A. n. Atratinus* (22), *M. Papi-rius L. f.—n. Mugillanus* (68), and *Q. Fabius Q. f. M. n. Vibulanus* (46). The consular tribunes of the previous year were *P. Lucretius Hosti f.—n. Tricipi-tinus* (29), *Agrippa Menenius T. f. Agripp. n. Lanatus* (13), *C. Servilius Q. f. C. n. Axilla (Structus)* (37) and *Sp. Rutilius Crassus* (14) or *Sp. Veturius Sp. f. Sp. n. Crassus Cicurinus* (14), those of the following *P. Cornelius A. f. P. n. Cossus*, *C. Valerius L. f. Volusi n. Potitus Volusus* (309), *N. (or M) Fabius Q. f. M. n. Vibulanus* (163) and *Q. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnatus (Cin. 5\*)*.<sup>2</sup> In 411 he was consul with *M. Papi-rius L. f.—n. Mugillanus (or Atratinus)* (30, 68), the consuls of the previous and following years being *Q. Fabius —f.—n. Ambustus Vibulanus* (46, 166) and *C. Furius —f.—n. Pacilus* (74) respectively *M'. Aemi-lius Mam. f. M. n. Mamercinus* (98) and *C. Valerius (L. f. Vol. n.) Potitus Volusus* (309).<sup>3</sup> And at last he was again in 404 consular tribune with *C. Valerius L. f. Vol. n. Potitus Volusus* (309), *M'. Sergius L. f. L. n. Fidenas* (27), *P. Cornelius (M. f. M. n.) Maluginensis* (250), *Cn. Cornelius P. f. A. n. Cossus* (117) and *K. Fabius M. f. Q. n. Ambustus* (42). In the previous year *T. Quinctius T. f. L. n. Capito-linus Barbatus (Cap. 2\*)*, *Q. Quinctius (L. f. L. n.) Cincinnatus (Cin. 5\*)*, *C. Iulius Sp. f. Vopisci n. Iullus* (295), *A. Manlius A. f. Cn. n. Vulso Capitolinus* (100), *L. Furius L. f. Sp. n. Medullinus* (65), *M'. Aemilius Mam. f. M. n. Mamercinus* (98), in the following *M'. Aemilius Mam. f. M. n. Mamercinus* (98), *L. Valerius L. f. P. n. Potitus* (307), *Ap. Claudius P. f. Ap. n. Crassus Inregillensis* (122), *M. Quinctilius L. f. L. n. Varus* (2\*) and *L. Iulius Sp. f. Vopisci? n. Iullus* (297), *M. Furius—f.—n. Fusus* (60), *M. Postumius* (16) were consular tribunes<sup>4</sup>, and *M. Furius L. f. Sp. n. Camillus* (44) and *M. Postumius A. f. A. n. Albinus Regillensis* (50) censors.

One (*Sp.*) *Nautius* (1) or *Antius* (6) was killed as legate of the senate to to the Veientan king *Lars Tolumnius* with *C. Fulcinius* (1), *Cloelius Tullus* (6) and *L. Roscius* (4) in 438, when *Mam. Aemilius Mamercinus* (37) and *L. Quinctius L. f. L. n. Cincinnatus* (3\*) were consuls.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BROUGHTON, *oc.* pp. 70—72, where further evidence.

<sup>2</sup> *IBID.* pp. 73 f.

<sup>3</sup> *IBID.* pp. 76 f.

<sup>4</sup> *IBID.* pp. 80—82.

<sup>5</sup> BROUGHTON *I.* p. 58.

After 404 a century passes before we meet the name *Nautius* again. In 316 *Sp. Nautius Sp. f. Sp. n. Rutilus* (11) was consul with *M. Popillius M. f. M. n. Laenas* (2\*, 1). The consuls in the preceding year were *C. Iunius C. f. C. n. Bubulcus Brutus* (62) and *Q. Aemilius Q. f. L. n. Barbula* (34), those of the following. *L. Papius Sp. f. L. n. Cursor* (52) and *Q. Publilius Q. f. Q. n. Philo* (11).<sup>1</sup> Perhaps his son was *C. Nautius —f.—n. Rutilus* (6), who was consul in 287 with *M. Claudius (M. f. C. n.) Marcellus* (219). The consuls of the previous year were *M. Valerius M. f. M. n. Maximus Corvinus* (244) and *Q. Caedicius Q. f.—n. Noctua* (10), those of the following *M. Valerius —f.—n. Maximus (Potitus)* (22\*) and *C. Aelius —f.—n. Paetus* (97).<sup>2</sup> In the same period was *Sp. Nautius* (4), who was legate of the consul *L. Papius L. f. Sp. n. Cursor* (53) in 293.<sup>3</sup> The last known *Nautius* (1) served as military tribune under the consul suffectus *M. Atilius M. f. L. n. Regulus* (51) in 256.<sup>4</sup> Put in the form of a list, we have the following coincidents of *Nautius* and *Furius*:

489	C. Iulius Iullus (293)	P. Pinarius Mamercinus (13)
488	Sp. Nautius Rutilus (8)	Sex. Furius Medullinus (26)
487	T. Siccus Sabinus (13)	C. Aquillius Tuscus (8)
476	A. Verginius Tricostus (12)	Sp. Servilius Structus (85)
475	P. Valerius Poplicola (301)	C. Nautius Rutilus (5)
474	L. Furius Medullinus (64)	A. Manlius Vulso (89)
459	Q. Fabius Vibulanus (165)	L. Cornelius Maluginensis Uritinus (256)
458	C. Nautius Rutilus (5)	CARVE. Suff. L. Minucius Esquilinus
dict.	L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (1*)	mag. eg. L. Tarquinius Flaccus (6)
457	M. Horatius Pulvillus (13)	Q. Minucius Esquilinus (41)
438 leg.	C. Fulcinius (1), Cloelius Tullius (6),	Sp. Nautius (1) L. Roscius (4)
425 cp.	A. Sempronius Atratinus (22)	L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (3*)
	L. Furius Medullinus (65)	L. Horatius Barbatus (7)
424 cp.	Ap. Claudius Crassus (121)	Sp. Nautius Rutilus (9)
	L. Sergius Fidenas (25)	Sex. Iulius Iullus (300)
423	C. Sempronius Atratinus (24)	Q. Fabius Vibulanus (46, 166)
420 cp.	L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (3*, 4*)	L. Furius Medullinus (65)
	M. Manlius Vulso (96)	A. Sempronius Atratinus (22)
419 cp.	Agr. Menenius Lanatus (13, 14)	P. Lucretius Tricipitinus (29)
	Sp. Nautius Rutilus (10)	C. Servilius Axilla (37)
418	L. Sergius Fidenas (25) M. Papius	C. Servilius Axilla (37)
	Mugillanus (68)	
417 cp.	P. Lucretius Tricipitinus (29)	Agr. Menenius Lanatus (13, 14)
	C. Servilius Axilla (v. Structus) (37)	Sp. Veturius Crassus Cicurinus (14)
416 cp.	A. Sempronius Atratinus (22, 2)	M. Papius Mugillanus (68)
	Q. Fabius Vibulanus (46, 166)	Sp. Nautius Rutilus (10)

<sup>1</sup> IBID. pp. 155 f.

<sup>2</sup> IBID. pp. 184 ff.

<sup>3</sup> IBID., p. 181.

<sup>4</sup> IBID., p. 209.

415 cp.	P. Cornelius Cossus (118)		C. Valerius Potitus Volusus (309)
	N(M?) Fabius Vibulanus (163)		Q. Quinctius Cincinnatus (Cin. 5*)
412	Q. Fabius Ambustus Vibulanus (46)		C. Furius Pacilus (74)
411	M. Papirius Mugillanus (30, 68)		Sp. (C.) Nautius Rutilus (10)
410	M. Aemilius Mamercinus (98)		C. Valerius Potitus Volusus (309)
405 cp.	T. Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatus (Cap. 2*)		Q. Quinctius Cincinnatus (Cin. 5*)
	C. Iulius Iullus (295)		A. Manlius Vulso Capitolinus (100)
	L. Furius Medullinus (65)		M'. Aemilius Mamercinus (98)
404 cp.	C. Valerius Potitus Volusus (309)		M'. Sergius Fidenas (27)
	P. Cornelius Maluginensis (250, 39)		Cn. Cornelius Cossus (117)
	K. Fabius Ambustus (42, 39)		Sp. Nautius Rutilus (10)
403 cp.	M'. Aemilius Mamercinus (98)		L. Valerius Potitus (307)
	M. Quinctilius Varus (2*)		Ap. Claudius Crassus Inregillensis (122)
	M. Furius Fusus (60)		L. Iulius Iullus (297)
			M. Postumius (16)
	ces. M. Furius Camillus (44)		M. Postumius Albinus Regillensis (50)
317	C. Iulius Bubulcus Brutus (62)		Q. Aemilius Barbula (34)
316	Sp. Nautius Rutilus (11)		M. Popillius Laenas (21)
315	L. Papirius Cursor (52)		Q. Publilius Philo (11)
293 leg.	Sp. Nautius (4)	of consul	L. Papirius Cursor (53)
288	Q. Marcius Tremulus (106)		P. Cornelius Arvina (56)
287	M. Claudius Marcellus (219)		C. Nautius Rutilus (6)
286	M. Valerius Maximus (Potitus) (22*)		C. Aelius Paetus (97)
256 tr.	Nautius (1)? tr.m. of cos suff.		M. Atilius Regulus (51)

As seen from this list, only two gentes are connected more regularly with the *Nautii*, i.e. the *Iulii* and *Furii*, and of these the *Furii* are mentioned with every *Nautius* in office as colleagues, predecessors or followers, except in 459—457, 417—415, and after 367, when there was only one patrician consul every year. So in 488 *Sex Furius Medullinus* (26) was colleague of *Sp. Nautius Rutilus* (8), in 474 *L. Furius Medullinus* (64) followed as consul *C. Nautius Rutilus* (5), in 425 *L. Furius Medullinus* (65) preceded as consular tribune *Sp. Nautius Rutilus* (9) and in 420 *L. Furius Medullinus* (65) in the same office *Sp. Nautius Rutilus* (10). In 412 *C. Furius Pacilus* (74) preceded as consul *Sp. (or C.) Nautius Rutilus* (10), and in 405 *L. Furius Medullinus* (65) as consular tribune the same *Sp. Nautius Rutilus* (10), who in his turn was followed in this post by *M. Furius Fusus* (60) and *M. Furius Camillus* (44), who, however, was probably censor. It may be a coincidence only, because there are numerous *FURII* in this fifth century, but it may be noted that the nomen *Furius* is short enough—six letters—to fit the year 458 in *FASTI CAPITOLINI* before *N. CARVE* — —. The same is, however, true of the name *Iulius*, which name is connected with the history of *Nautii* in the beginning; *Unde Minervae sacra non Iulia gens habuit sed Nautiorum*.<sup>1</sup>

In 459 the consuls, one of whom presided over the elections, were *Q. Fabius*

<sup>1</sup> SERV. Aen. 2. 166: both were Alban gentes.

*Vibulanus* (165) and *L. Cornelius Maluginensis* (256).<sup>1</sup> The name *Fabius* is connected in the FASTI with *Furius* in the year 481, when *K. Fabius Vibulanus* (160) and *Sp. Furius Fusus* (70) were consuls,<sup>2</sup> in 465—464 when *Q. Fabius Vibulanus* (165) preceded as consul *Sp. Furius Medullinus* (71),<sup>3</sup> in 442—441 when *M. Fabius Vibulanus* (162) preceded *C. Furius Pacilus Fusus* (76),<sup>4</sup> in 433 when *M. Fabius Vibulanus* (162) preceded as consular tribune *L. Furius Medullinus* (65),<sup>5</sup> in 421—420, when *Cn. Fabius Vibulanus* (163) preceded as consular tribune *L. Furius Medullinus* (65),<sup>6</sup> in 414—412, when *Q. Fabius Vibulanus* (46) preceded as consular tribune the consuls *A. Cornelius Cossus* (114, 112, 113) and *L. Furius Medullinus* (65), who were followed by *Q. Fabius Ambustus Vibulanus* (46, 166) and *C. Furius Pacilus* (74).<sup>7</sup> In 405—404 *L. Furius Medullinus* (65) was followed as consular tribune by *K. Fabius Ambustus* (42).<sup>8</sup> These gentes are connected in the FASTI later also. There are lesser connections between the *Cornelii* and *Furii*, because we do not know many *Cornelii* before 450, but they are connected until the second century.<sup>9</sup> It seems, at least, that there was some connection between the *Furii* and *Nautii*, *Fabii* and *Furii*, which perhaps confirms the assumption that the consul N. CARVE — — in 458 may have been a *Furius*. The Fasti can give no other support, because he is mentioned only here. He was in any case younger than his colleague *Nautius*, who had been consul already in 475, and died probably in his first consulship, because no space is left for iteration mark in the FASTI CAPITOLINI. There is, however, no space for the remark IN M(agistratu) M(ortuus) EST.

## V

It is naturally possible that the consul CARVE — — in 458 was of an otherwise unknown patrician gens, but as there are from 484 to 455 only four new gentes: *Manlii*, *Quinctii*, *Numicii*, *Volumnii*, it is not very probable, especially in the rather critical situation of these years. Then there remain some 44 consular gentes between 509 and 444. But of these only 10 have a

<sup>1</sup> BROUGHTON, *oc.* p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> *IBID.*, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> *IBID.*, p. 33 f.

<sup>4</sup> *IBID.*, pp. 54 f.

<sup>5</sup> *IBID.*, pp. 62 f.

<sup>6</sup> *IBID.*, pp. 69 f.

<sup>7</sup> *IBID.*, pp. 74 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *IBID.*, pp. 80 f.

<sup>9</sup> H. SCULLARD, *Roman Politics 220—150 BC.*, Oxford 1951, pp. 93, 141 fn. 1.

nomen of 6—7 letters, ie. short enough for the lacuna in the FASTI. Of these gentes we may with good reason eliminate the *Iunii*, *Larcii*, *Cassii*, *Tullii*, and *Sicci* which had already become extinct or were at least declining. There remain *Iulius*, *Nautius*, *Fabius*, *Furius*, and *Manlius*, of which *Nautius* is very improbable, as there would hardly have been two *Nautius* consuls in the same collegium. The *Iulii* and *Manlii* were rather few in this period and had only one or two cognomina—according to later tradition, *Iullus* and *Vulso* (*Capitolinus*). The *Fabii*, too, had only one cognomen *Vibulanus*. These three gentes flourished during the first century after Christ, and should perhaps have resumed the cognomen CARVENTANUS. There were many *Furii* in the fifth century with varying cognomina: *Medullinus*, *Pacilus*, *Fusus*. Of these *Medullinus* was derived from a little Latin town *Medullia*, which probably was situated near *Carventum*<sup>1</sup>. At all events the gens probably had its origin somewhere near *Tusculum*.<sup>2</sup> It may be noted further that *Carventum*, or *Arx Carventana* was lost to the *Aequi* when *L. Furius Medullinus* (65) was consul, and that he with his colleague besieged the town in vain.<sup>3</sup>

As seen above, it is impossible to identify with certainty the consul N. CARVE — — of 458. There is very little possibility that he was *Sempronius*, *Minucius*, *Numicius*, or *Quinctius*, as surmised by the scholars. The most probable names are *Fabius*, *Furius*, *Iulius*, *Manlius*, of which *Furius* seems to have the best arguments in its favour.

<sup>1</sup> PHILIPP, *Medullia* (RE XV, 1932, p. 117).

<sup>2</sup> MÜNZER, *Furius* (RE VII, 1912, p. 315); CIL XIV, 2700—2707.

<sup>3</sup> LIV. 4. 55. 4—8.