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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“There is nothing to equal the beauty of a Latin votive or burial inscription: those few words graved on stone sum up with majestic impersonality all that the world need ever know of us.”¹ These are the words that Marguerite Yourcenar imputed to the emperor Hadrian in her Memoirs of Hadrian, one of my favorite novels. On the other hand, as a researcher, I often get frustrated by their fragmentary state of preservation and by the scarcity of information recorded in the epitaphs. Yet there they are: thousands of them found on a single site representing - most of the times - the only written evidence from the cities and towns of the Roman Empire; both applies to Salona, the capital of the Roman province of Dalmatia. This dissertation builds upon the recent trends in localized studies of epigraphic evidence in order to explore the commemorative culture and people who availed themselves of it in late antique Salona (from the mid-third through the first decades of the seventh century).

1.1 Topic of the Thesis

Inscriptions are often the only written evidence from the Roman provinces, and they, no matter how sketchy, inform us on various aspects of Roman history. More importantly, when epigraphic genre is conceptualized properly and their limitations are thus acknowledged, they provide us with a glimpse at the wider socio-economic sectors of a community, and are the indispensable source for writing the social history of Roman Empire at the local level. Inscriptions therefore present themselves as a supplement and often the corrective to the anecdotal evidence from literary sources.

Nevertheless, it has been recognized that the practice of setting up epitaphic monuments was socially and culturally contingent, whereby the main issue pertains to the usefulness of epitaphs for the

socio-demographic inquiry. Namely, the question is to what extent epitaphs, the source material inherently pertinent to socio-demographic analysis, reflect the demographic and socio-economic structures of an urban environment. The results have been largely negative: epitaphs neither represent a random sample of the population nor are certain categories of data recorded there accurate. Regarding the social composition of the “epitaphic population,” P. R. C. Weaver has succinctly addressed its relevance and the difficulty of illuminating it:

“Determination of status is at the heart of most problems that arise in the study of the sub-equestrian classes of Roman society under the Empire. Unfortunately, along with chronology, it is also the most intractable problem for these social levels.”

The question of the social distribution of epitaphs is essential for our understanding of the Roman epigraphic habit, and for the demographic and socio-economic urban history. This thesis examines two related topics, specifically the topic of the epitaphic culture, namely of the motivation to inscribe an epitaph in late antiquity, and that of the social profile of the epitaphic population in late antique Salona. I have based my analysis on the 188 sufficiently preserved epitaphs dated to from the mid-third to the beginning of the seventh century. The Appendix 2 tabulates the data from the sample across the categories of the commemorator and the deceased. The Appendix 3 brings the texts of the inscriptions. The remainder of the thesis is organized as follows. The second chapter engages with the debate over the character of epigraphy of the third to the seventh centuries, and explores the epitaphic culture of late antique Salona in the broader context of the Latin West. It re-examines the concept of “Christian epigraphy” and the proposed motivation for the epigraphic habit in late antiquity. The third chapter touches upon the topic of the cost of inscribed tombstones with the aim to raise the question of their affordability. The attested early- and high-imperial costs are put into perspective with the

---

model of wealth distribution. Given the scarcity and unreliability of the quantitative data from Roman antiquity, the question is raised merely to make us think about the order of magnitude of the costs of tombstones and to make us cognizant of the extent that the prices might have been prohibitive. The fourth chapter discusses the onomastic method for the assessment of the sociolegal status of the “epitaphic population.” It sets the stage for the analysis in the fifth chapter that examines the social significance of the two- and single-name forms in funerary and non-funerary epigraphy of late antique Salona. The chapter furthermore examines the prosopographical data in order to assess the social profile of the commemorated people. This survey chapter introduces the epigraphic corpus of Salona, the city and its burial grounds. It delineates the thesis topic and research principles.

1.2 Epigraphic Legacy of Salona

There are slight differences between the estimates of the number of inscriptions from the Greek and Roman antiquity. More recently, John Bodel has approximated the number of Greek and Latin inscriptions produced from ca. 800 B.C.E. to 700 C.E. at 600,000, Lawrence Keppie has estimated that there are over 300,000 Roman inscriptions, and Richard P. Saller and Brent D. Shaw approximated the total number of Latin inscriptions at 250,000, out of which epitaphs make up slightly more than two thirds, that is, 170-190,000. The number of late Roman Latin inscriptions has been moderately estimated at 50,000, out of which the ratio of epitaphs is even higher than in the early empire.

---


The territory of Salona and its environs has yielded a large corpus of inscriptions. A collection of ca. 6,800 Salonitan inscriptions is kept by the Archeological Museum of Split or can be found in situ or as spolia, from which ca. 50 Hellenistic and ca. 50 medieval inscriptions need to be deducted.\(^5\) There are therefore some 6,700 Roman, both Greek and Latin, inscriptions from the so-called ager Salonitanus, a good part of which seems not to have been published yet. Namely, The *Epigraphik - Datenbank Claus/Slaby* (EDCS) which claims to have compiled “almost all Latin inscriptions” and records 495,125 inscriptions,\(^6\) contains 4,878 Latin and Greek, Roman-period inscriptions from Salona.\(^7\) The *Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg* (EDH), which has so far compiled 72,500 Latin and bilingual inscriptions from the Roman provinces, offering revised readings of the inscriptions and including detailed meta-data about both inscriptions and monuments,\(^8\) contains slightly over 3,500 inscriptions from Salona and its environs.\(^9\) To get the sense of proportion of epitaphs in the entire epigraphic corpus, I inquired into the EDH inscriptions under the entry “Salonae:” out of the 3518 inscriptions, 2,958, that is, 84 percent, pertain to funerary texts.\(^10\) Finally, to get the sense of the order of magnitude of the epigraphic record from Salona, based on the numbers provided by EDCS, Salona and Aquileia

---


\(^9\) EDCS enters all inscriptions from Salona and its environs under the entry “Salona,” while EDH has elaborated its location entries, for example “Salonae,” “Clissa-Salonae, inter,” “Salonae, aus,” “Salonae, aus?” and a certain number of inscriptions can be found under the entries of both “Salonae” and “Salonae, aus,” therefore, I have not provided the exact figure. On differences between the entry policies of EDCS and EDH, and the concomitant difference in the respective number of inscriptions, that is, as to why the number of EDCS inscriptions is somewhat inflated, see Beltrán Lloris, “The ‘Epigraphic Habit’ in the Roman World,” at pp. 136-37.

fall in the same group of 4,000+ inscriptions per city, which is surpassed only by Rome (90,000+), Pompeii (13,000+), Carthage (6,000+), and Ostia (5,000+). When the Archaeological Museum of Split completes its revisionary work on its epigraphic collection, and the material gets published, Salona is expected to accordingly upgrade to the group of 6,000+ inscriptions per city, which it will share with Carthage, whereby they will be outnumbered by Rome and Pompeii solely.

A group of Croatian and French scholars has recently completed its rigorous epigraphic work on the late antique epigraphic record dated from the fourth to seventh centuries. Their two-volume publication of late antique inscriptions contains 742 Latin and 83 Greek inscriptions (Salona IV, 1-2: 1-742 and Salona IV, 2: 742-825 respectively), to which further 476 unintelligible sherds needs to be added. While the inscriptions of the fourth to seventh centuries comprise only ca. 12 percent of the total number of Roman inscriptions, the late Roman epigraphic record of Salona is comparatively still significant. Namely, when put into the perspective with late antique inscriptions from the Latin West, the corpus of Salona is surpassed by only Rome and Carthage. It is a platitude to say that inscriptions from antiquity are mostly preserved in their fragmentary state. Regarding the fragmentary character of inscriptions as a historical source, Francisco Beltrán Lloris has humorously remarked that

“One thus needs to be circumspect when told that the number of Roman inscriptions from a particular site or region runs into the thousands. Not every town provides enough epigraphic material for a doctoral dissertation, whatever the bare numbers seem to indicate.”

---

11 Beltrán Lloris, “The ‘Epigraphic Habit’ in the Roman World,” Table 8.3 at p. 140.
12 Nancy Gauthier, Emilio Marin, and Françoise Prévot, eds, Salona IV: Inscriptions de Salone Chrétienne IVe-VIIe siècles, 2 vols. (Rome: Ecole française de Rome; Split: Musée archéologique de Split, 2010). For the figures, see Denis Feissel, and Emilio Marin, “Contenu du recueil,” in Salona IV, at pp. 7-8. Regarding the character of inscriptions as historical source, given that they are regularly preserved too fragmentarily,
13 Charlotte Roueché has remarked that the “greatest epigraphic change from the third century onwards is the drop in the number of inscriptions.” Charlotte M. Roueché, “Benefactors in the Late Roman Period: The Eastern Empire,” in Actes du Xe congrès international d’épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992, eds. Michel Christol and Olivier Masson (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1997), pp. 353-68 at p. 353.
To sum up, the greater part of the epigraphic record from Salona still awaits revisionary epigraphic treatment latterly begun by the Archaeological Museum - Split. The most comprehensive collections of inscriptions from Salona are the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* vol. 3 (CIL 03 onwards), the three volumes of *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia repertae et editae sunt* (ILJUG), and the above-mentioned Salona IV; Salonian inscriptions have also been published in *L’Année épigraphique* (AE), the *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* (ILS), and the *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres* (ILCV), and various regional journals and archaeological site publications. The thesis will identify each inscription by its paper publication reference which will be followed by its on-line edition in order to facilitate the access to an inscription to a reader.

1.3 Historical Overview of Salona

Imperial Salona developed as an amalgam of Greek and Roman settlements situated on the coast and an indigenous hillfort settlement on Mt. Kozjak ca. 1.5 km away from the coastal communities. Given

---

19 *L’Année épigraphique* (1888 - ).
the scanty evidence, both textual and archaeological, and their discrepancy, there is scholarly
disagreement regarding the question of the origin of Salona. On the basis of literary evi-
dence, Grga Novak, Duje Rendić-Miočević, and recently Marjeta Šašel-Kos have argued that Salona was a
settlement, that is, an emporium of the “Illyrian Delmatae,” in which a community of the Issaean
Greeks lived alongside indigenous population from about the second half of the second century
B.C.E. On the other hand, Christoph W. Clairmont has archaeologically corroborated that coastal
Salona originated as an emporium of Tragurion founded in the first half of the second century B.C.E.
Nenad Cambi has located indigenous settlements in the Klis Pass or at the Donje Rupotine village on
the Mt. Kozjak approximately 1.5 km inland from coastal Salona, and has posited the existence of two
settlements named Salona: a coastal one of the Issaean Greeks and later the Romans, and an inland
one of the Delmatae. Salona came into possession of the Delmatae sometime between the late second
century B.C.E. and the year of 78 B.C.E. in which C. Cosconius commenced his two-year expedition
against the Delmatae and recaptured Salona.

---


25 Nenad Cambi, “Ilirska Salona,” [Illyrian Salona] Obavijesti HAD vol. 21, no. 3 (1989): pp. 37-41. Siniša Bilić-Dujmušić has recently lent support to Cambi’s hypothesis because it is unlikely that the Issaean Greeks, and later Italian and Roman merchants would have lived alongside the Delmatae. Siniša Bilić-Dujmušić, Oktavijanova kampanja protiv Delmate 34. – 33. god. pr. Kr. [Octavian’s Campaign against the Delmatae 34. – 33. B.C.E.] (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Zadar, 2004), at pp. 219 ff.

26 The Delmatae were attempting to gain control over the Issaean coastal sub-colonies of Tragurion and Epetion and surrounding territories, which seems to have provoked the successful campaign of L. Caecilius Metellus in 118-117 B.C.E., who celebrated a triumph de Delmateis and gained a surname Delmaticus. For the most recent discussions of the sources and scholarship, and the reconstruction of the events, see Šašel-Kos, Appian and Illyricum, at pp. 306-11, and Džino, Illyricum in Roman Politics 229 BC – AD 68 (Cambridge: CUP, 2010), at pp. 65-69. It is debated.
The campaign of Cosconius had far-reaching consequences for the development of Salona since it prompted the influx of traders and settlers from Italy, and by the mid-first century B.C.E. there was a *conventus civium Romanorum* in Salona (Caes. *b.civ.* 3.9), a self-organized community of Roman citizens but yet without defined municipal status and rights. It was debated whether Salona was granted the status of colony by Caesar or Octavian, or whether it was a double – Caesarian and Octavian – colony. The prevalent opinion now is that Octavian made it a colony in between 34/33 and 27 B.C.E. Salona subsequently became the capital of the Roman province of Dalmatia whose administrative organization was finalized in the late Augustan and early Tiberian reign. In literary sources, Salona is mentioned for the first time as a colony by Pliny the Elder (Pliny, *HN* 3,141). The votive inscription dedicated to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus and dated to 137 C.E. names Salona as *Martia Iulia Salona*. In the later empire Diocletian’s *nomen gentile* was inserted and the city’s expanded name was *colonia Martia Iulia Valeria Salona Felix*, as attested by the relief of the city’s Tyche that holds a banner with the inscription of the city’s full nomenclature. Nevertheless, the city was most
commonly referred to as the \textit{colon(ia) Salon(itala)} or \textit{colon(ia) Salon(itanorum)},\footnote{For example, CIL. 03, 2026+2087+p. 1030 = HD054750.} or just as \textit{colonia},\footnote{For example, as in …\textit{patrono coloniae}… CIL. 03, 2028+8753+p. 1030 = HD054776.} or as the \textit{res publica}.\footnote{For example, CIL. 03, 2117 = HD063051.}

The territory of Dalmatia was somewhat cropped by the Diocletian's provincial reorganization (its south-eastern part was incorporated into the newly-formed province of Praevalitana) and Salona remained the capital of the province. With the Theodosian division of the empire in 395, Dalmatia was included in the Diocese of Illyricum and the Prefecture of Italy, and yet in 437 Dalmatia was transferred to the Eastern empire. In the second half of the fifth century, Dalmatia and Salona were ruled by independent warlords Marcellinus and Julius Nepos,\footnote{PLRE II, s.v. “Marcellinus 6” at pp. 708-10; PLRE II, s.v. “Iulius Nepos 3” at pp. 777-78.} the latter recognized by the emperor Leo in 473 as the \textit{magister militum Dalmatiae}. Dalmatia was part of the Ostrogothic kingdom, and was administered by the \textit{comes Dalmatiae et Saviae}. There was an urban continuity in Salona until the first decades of the seventh century.

The whole city area was encircled by the walls – ca. 4,000 m in perimeter – that were built and fortified under Marcus Aurelius, with East-West axis of ca. 1,600 m and North-South axis of ca. 700 m. There were two attempts to estimate the population of Salona, here presented merely to get the sense of the possible order of magnitude:\footnote{For the critique of the following two methods for assessing the urban population size with further literature on the topic, see Andrew Wilson, “City Sizes and Urbanization in the Roman Empire,” in \textit{Settlement, Urbanization, and Population}, eds. Alan Bowman and Andrew Wilson (Oxford: OUP, 2011), pp. 161-96 at pp. 170-72.} William Gerber calculated that the capacity of the Salonitan aqueduct would meet the needs of ca. 40,000 inhabitants living in or near the city,\footnote{William Gerber, \textit{Forschungen in Salona I} (Wien: A. Holder, 1917): at p. 140.} while Dyggve quadrupled the maximum capacity of the Salonitan amphitheater and got the figure of 60,000 people living in the city and its territory.\footnote{Ejnar Dyggve, \textit{History of Salonitan Christianity} (Oslo: Aschenhoug; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1951), at pp. 4-5.}
1.4 Overview of the Burial Grounds of Salona and the Late Antique Inscribed Tombs

Burial grounds can be found throughout the city’s suburb and in the so-called *ager Salonitanus*. The western necropolis developed along the road (the *decumanus*) leading westwards toward Roman settlement of Tragurium (present-day Trogir), and it spread at least to Kaštel Sućurac, ca. two km away from the city walls. The northern burial zone developed along the road that vertically branched from the *decumanus*, bypassed northern city walls and then reconnected with the *decumanus* near the eastern city gates; Christian cemetery of Kapljuč evolved on part of this area. The Christian burial ground of Marusinac was situated ca. 500 m north-western of the city walls. The Christian cemetery of Manastirine developed off the road that headed towards Rupotine and Klis, and was situated just north of the city walls. The eastern necropolis was laid down along the eastern branch of the *decumanus*, which bifurcated near the eastern city gate, and it spread towards the spring of the river Salon (present-day Jadro). The south-eastern necropolis was laid down along the south-eastern branch of the *decumanus* that headed toward Roman Epetium (present-day Stobreč), and the burials seem to have started off from the so-called “Five Bridges” site. Numerous burials were found in the *ager Salonitanus*.

In all three, presumably exclusively, pagan necropolises the earliest burials are dated to the first century C.E., and the latest to the second or third decades of the fourth century in the western necropolis; the eastern burial ground seem to have been most exploited during the third century C.E., and burying in the south-eastern necropolis seem to have ceased at the turn of the third century. Locations in which Christian cemeteries evolved all had pagan history too, and in all of them extramural basilicas were built – first at Kapljuč in the mid-fourth century, and then at Marusinac and Manastirine in the first half of the fifth century.⁴⁰

The problems are that there have been few systematic archaeological excavations, the documentation is not adequate, and what has been unearthed has not been preserved and presented.\footnote{This paragraph is based on Cambi, “Salona und seine Negropolen,” pp. 251-81, and Nenad Cambi, “Uvod” (“Introduction”), in Antička Salona, ed. Nenad Cambi (Split: Knjizevni krug, 1991): pp. 21-26; Miletić, “Istočna i jugoistočna negropola Salone,” pp. 21-49; Miletić, “Sjeverna salonitanska negropola,” pp. 163-93.} The western and best researched necropolis was first excavated in the 1820s and the site was in effect pillaged for the Archaeological Museum of Split that had been founded only a couple of years earlier. Later on, Frane Bulić conducted an excavation in 1909/10,\footnote{Frane Bulić, “Escavi nella necropolis antica pagana di Salona detta Hortus Metrodori negli anni 1909 e 1910,” VAHD 32 (1919): pp. 3-66.} and Ante Rendić-Miočević over the period of 1969-72.\footnote{Ante Rendić-Miočević, “Salona – lokalitet III ‘in horto Metrodori’,” Arheološki pregled Vol. 12 (1970): pp. 113-18. For this excavation, I am not sure if it has been published in its entirety.} The last was a rescue excavation in 1986/87 conducted under quite difficult circumstances seeing that a highway was being constructed at the same time; the western necropolis has eventually been covered by the highway.\footnote{Branko Kirigin, Ivo Lokošek, Jagoda Mardešić, and Siniša Bilić, “Salona 86/87: Preliminarni izvještaj sa zaštitnih arheoloških istraživanja na trasi zaobilaznice u Solinu” [Salona 86/87: Preliminary Report on the Salvage Excavations Conducted on the Bypass at Salona], VAHD 80 (1987): pp. 7-56.} The eastern necropolis per se has not been excavated at all: when the early medieval church was excavated in the 1930s, numerous graves and tombstones were collateral findings, which have not been published yet. As for the south-eastern necropolis, Jagoda Mardešić has conducted rescue excavation at the location of the so-called Japirkova kuća, whose complete publication seems to be in the works.

The most useful and systematic survey of the development of burial grounds of the first to the beginning of the fourth centuries is up to this time the study by Nenad Cambi: he presented at the famous colloquium \textit{Römische Gräberstrassen} held in Munich in 1985, and first published his text in Croatian in the following year,\footnote{Nenad Cambi, “Salona i njene nekropole” (“Salona and its Necropolis”), RFFZd Vol. 25 (1986): pp. 61-107.} and then in German as the contributor to the publication following...
the conference.\textsuperscript{46} Cambi gave an insightful yet broad-brush account of the development and organization of the three main pagan burial grounds based on the architectural remains and information provided in inscriptions. Željko Miletić published two articles in which he mapped the burials and/or tombstones found in the northern, eastern, and south-eastern necropolises; while his study is a painstaking endeavor, it lacks of historical interpretation.

The excavation of the 1986/87 has confirmed the general picture of the organization, as well as the vertical and horizontal stratigraphy of the western necropolis that Cambi has maintained based on Bulić’s excavations. Moreover, it has provided more information regarding the archaeological context of burials and evidence of the funerary rites. A broad-brush presentation of the excavation results will suffice here to get an impression of the diachronic development of the western necropolis. Its main organizational characteristic is a series of tomb enclosures aligned along the road, which had a monumental boundary wall. The enclosures were entered from the side of the road as attested by doors, and a couple of paths between them have been found. Excavators have observed three archaeological strata. The earliest is dated to the early first through some time in the second century C.E. based on diverse small artefacts;\textsuperscript{47} nine walled lots belong to the first phase and they are characterized by cremation in the urns\textsuperscript{48} and funerary monuments, mostly altars and large stelae.

The second phase, characterized by the transition to the inhumation, ensued during the second century C.E.: out of 216 burials, leaving out burials in sarcophagi, 136 pertain to inhumation\textsuperscript{49} and 80 to cremation. Enclosures were reconstructed and enlarged in this phase, presumably to make them

\textsuperscript{46} Nenad Cambi, “Salona und seine Nekropolen,” pp. 251-81.
\textsuperscript{47} A bulk of small artefacts has been found: pottery, glass, fibulas, coins, as well as amber artefacts of exquisite craftsmanship. Kirigin et al., “Salona 86/7,” at p. 40.
\textsuperscript{48} 49 pottery urns, and 38 cylindrical and three rectangular stone urns were found. In most cases urns were individually buried, and majority of them were accompanied with an oil-lamp placed next to the urn, and some of them were also accompanied with the \textit{unguentaria} always found in the ash. These urns were in the corners of the lots since they were used through the fourth C.E. and the strata in the central position were heavily disturbed. Kirigin et al., “Salona 86/7,” at pp. 39-40.
\textsuperscript{49} There are all sorts of skeleton burials: without architecture, in the amphorae, under the tiles, in the walled grave vaults, wooden coffins, and in the sarcophagi.
more spacious for sarcophagi. They became the prevalent funerary monument in this phase; all were pillaged, some broken, and some bear inscriptions. A particularly significant finding was the family grave made of the stone slabs with the cover bearing a fully preserved inscription that says that Aurelius Lupus made the piscina to himself and his wife Iulia Maxima. In addition, two skulls, some bones, and a pin were found inside.

The third phase is dated to the second half of the third and the beginning of the fourth century; the lots were still used intensively, yet due to the lack of space, burials have spread horizontally out of enclosures towards the north. Burials under the tiles, in amphorae or directly in the ground dominate the picture, and most of them contained some artefacts (the most common findings were bottles usually placed near the legs, and rarely on the chest). Skeleton burials are conspicuously poorer than the cremated ones in terms of artefacts.

Christian burial grounds of Manastirine, Marusinac, and Kapljuč fare much better in terms of excavations, preservation, and publications. Frane Bulić had done most of the work at the site of Manastirine by 1890, with occasional, smaller-scale interventions through the 1910s together with Rudolf Egger. On the basis of Bulić’s reports and discoveries, Egger prepared a publication of findings with his historical study of Manastirine; the Forschungen II had remained authoritative until the Croatian and French archaeologists jointly undertook revisionary excavations, followed by their meticulous publication in 2000. A Danish expedition composed of Johannes Brøndsted, Ejnar
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50. AE 1989, 0603 = HD018324.
52. Kirging et al., “Salona 86/7,” at pp. 42-43.
Dyggve, and Frederik Weilbach systematically researched Kapljuč in the 1920s. Finally, Frane Bulić conducted large-scale excavations at the site of Marusinae in the period between 1890 and 1898, and subsequently Dyggve and Egger a smaller revisionary excavation in 1938 for their publication of the site which was then in the works.

Due to their well-preserved cemetery basilicas, these sites have enjoyed the interest of the international scholars from the very beginning. To illustrate, the first International Congress of Early Christian Archaeology was held in Salona/Solin in 1894. The national scholarship has mythologized the sites, while the international studies, on account of the architectural evidence for the development of the cult of saints, have turned them into the paradigmatic examples of the three-stage model of the martyrria: ordinary burials turned into modest shrines and finally into monumental, communal basilicas. One of the most influential books was Ejnar Dyggve’s History of Salonitan Christianity in which he provided the synthesis of the excavations and his historical interpretation of the Christian Salona; the book has widely publicized Salona and set the normative narrative regarding the development of the cult of saints and the martyrs’ shrines in the city.

Ann Marie Yasin has recently published an important article in which she persuasively challenged the given interpretative paradigm as applied to all three Christian burial grounds in Salona. Her most important reminder pertains to the methodology in as much as scholars tend to approach material evidence with preconceived notions framed by texts, and then attempt to fit the archaeological

56 Ejnar Dyggve and Rudolf Egger, Der altchristliche Friedhof/Marusinae (Wien: R. M. Rohrer, 1939).
57 Cf. “After Rome, Salona is the most important urban area on European soil for studies of early Christianity.” is the opening sentence of Ejnar Dyggve, History of Salonitan Christianity, at p. IX.
material into such narrative. Secondly, she argues against tendency to homogenize the situation on the ground: not just that there are regional variants but different architectural complexes within a single urban context very likely have different trajectories. Her third methodological point concerns the necessity to stay open to several substantiated reconstructions.

According to the interpretation by Brøndsted, the cemetery basilica at Kapljuč was dedicated to the five martyrs: presbyter Asterius and four military martyrs Antiochianus, Gaianus, Paulinianus, and Telius. Yet only Asterius is attested with certainty by the votive inscription inserted in the mosaic pavement, which Brøndsted dated to the beginning of the fifth century, i.e. the mosaic inscription postdates the construction of the church by ca. half a century.60 Regarding Kapljuč, she demonstrated that there is not enough evidence to plausibly argue for either case, namely, that the so-called tomb G did contain the remains of the four soldier martyrs and that the pit in the apse did hold the remains of Asterius, or that they did not.61

As for Marusinac, Yasin debunked the traditional and widely accepted narrative completely. Egger in his hagiographic study on Anastasius connected the matrona Asclepia, mentioned in Anastasius’ passio as the person who placed the martyr in her private family mausoleum, with the so-called mausoleum L. Namely, he thought that that was the place in which Asclepia had placed the corpse. Arguments such as the fenestella confessionis, burials ad sanctos, the seventh-century inscription of the priest Johannes in which he stated that he had been observing the cult of St. Anastasius, and that

---


61 According to the accepted view the so-called tomb with columns was considered holy and was respected by the mid-fourth-century basilica, namely, a funerary exedra with an altar was placed above it. Brøndsted, “La basilique des cinq martyrs à Kapljuč,” at pp. 38, 179.


63 CIL 03, 9527+p. 2139 = HD053167.
the mausoleum was integrated in a complex of the basilicae geminae built around 425 under “the bishop Paschasius (ca. 426-443)” were adduced to prove that the burial in the mausoleum L was considered holy.\(^6\) Yasin points out that there is no material evidence for the villa, the existence of Asclepia, the identities of the persons buried in the mausoleum L, the translation of a corpse to the presbytery of the newly-built south church, nor for the identity of the saint(s) buried in both the north and the south basilica. She also shows how difficult it is to date the passio itself, on which the whole reconstruction hinges, and states that it could have been forged in ca. seventh century to lay claims to the Christian past of Salona. Moreover, Yasin claims that the course of the events may have been inverse, namely that the architectural complex served as a source of inspiration for the passio. Finally, Yasin concludes that to dispense with the story of Asclepia and her burial of Anastasius does not affect the situation on the ground: old mausoleum obviously did play “an important role in shaping the perception and status of the saint’s cult.”\(^6\)

Recent revisionary work on the site of Manastirine has already redressed certain Egger’s interpretations. Yasin pushes the evidence a little further and calls into question the notion of the ad sanctos burials: the eleven radiating mausolea\(^6\) and the so-called area are thought to have been constructed around the so-called tomb O, which Egger had attributed to Domnio, the principal saint worshipped at Manastirine, and to the other martyrs.\(^7\) She proposed that the preceding structure,

\(^6\) Egger, *Forschungen in Salona III*, at p. 141; Dyggve, *Salonitan Christianity*, at p. 68. Cf. the below discussion of the historicity of the bishop Paschasius and of an epitaph that had been attributed it to him.

\(^6\) Yasin, “Reassessing Salona’s Churches,” at pp. 89-103.

\(^6\) The construction of the mausolea ceased around 360, although burying continued until the 430s, when a cemetery basilica was built, in whose transept both martyrs’ and bishops’ graves were incorporated. Noël Duval, Emilio Marin, with Miroslav Jeremić, “Conclusions,” in *Salona III: Manastirine*, at pp. 638-50.

\(^7\) Authenticity of Domnio is attested by his funerary mensa (S IV, 1: 71 at pp. 259-62 = HD034748), yet Gaultier thinks that his function of the first Salonian bishop might have been the fifth-century invention. Furthermore, two fragments of a damaged funerary mensa were reconstructed as to have recorded the names of five martyrs: presbyter Asterius and military martyrs Antiochianus, Gaianus, Paulinianus, and Telius, whose cult, Gaultier argues, was observed at Manastirine not Kapljuć (S IV, 1: 70 at pp. 256-59 = HD035250). Lastly, the third funerary mensa testifies that martyr Septimius was also venerated at this cemetery (S IV, 1: 79 at pp. 272-74 = HD034819). Gaultier, *La diffusion*, at pp. 51, 36-7.
against whose wall the mausolea were built, had determined the spatial arrangement of the mausolea, and that the clustering of episcopal burials north of the tomb O may have been governed by both the presence of martyrs and the bishops’ wish to be buried with their peers. Thus, the sarcophagus of Primus, the presumed second bishop of Salona and “nephew” of Domnio, may have been placed near the tomb O merely because of the familial relations.68 Yasin’s argument is, I think, somewhat less compelling regarding the ad sanctos burial at Manastirine; no model ever works perfectly but it seems that burials tend to gravitate towards what was considered a holy grave.

Coffins are the prevalent epitaphic monument type in late antique Salona; besides them, there are few stelae, vertical slabs, pavement slabs, mensae,69 the so-called piscinae,70 and floor mosaic epitaphs.71 Nenad Cambi has done the most systematic research on sarcophagi from both the early and late empire, and has synthesized funerary monument typology of the early empire; the following sketchy overview is based on the quoted studies.72 Three types of stone funerary monuments dominate the record: stelae, altars, and sarcophagi. The first two types were made in the local workshops of Salona from the high-quality local limestone quarried either north of the city in Tragurium (modern Trogir), or on the off-shore island of Brattia (modern Brač). Cambi has stated that stelae and altars of Salona are typologically similar to the Aquileian monuments. Stelae are the earliest type of Roman funerary monument whose production begins at the turn of the first century B.C.E., while the floruit of the monumental types was in the first century C.E.; over the course of the second and third centuries C.E. stelas shrunk in size and elaborateness, and according to Cambi they came to be used by people

---

71 See Appendix 1.
of the lower social status. The most common sculptural decoration of the monumental stelae are portrait reliefs.\(^{73}\) Production of the funerary altars seems to have started around the mid-first century C.E., and ceased around the second century C.E.

Sarcophagi began to be both imported and locally produced at the turn of the first century C.E.,\(^{74}\) yet they became much more widespread around the mid-second century C.E., when they became typologically standardized and mass-produced. Some 2,000 sarcophagi have been found in Dalmatia, most of which come from Salona and are locally produced. Regarding the imported sarcophagi, Attic are the most numerous ones with ca. 120 examples, of which approximately 70-80 are found in Salona, while the sarcophagi from Rome and Docimeum in Asia Minor are represented in a far smaller number. Sarcophagi have ceased to be imported in the first two decades of the fourth century: the last two imports are “The Crossing the Red Sea” and the “Sarcophagus of Hyppolitus and Phaedra,” both are from Rome and both are anepigraphic. Very few imported sarcophagi bear inscriptions. For example, Attic sarcophagi are preserved in a very fragmentary state, and to my knowledge only one Salonitan contains an epitaph.\(^{75}\) Finally, there are very few early imperial mausolea and the great majority of funerary monuments were standing sub divo. The situation somewhat changed on the late antique burial grounds, first with the mausolea built in Manastirine and Marusinae, and subsequently with the construction of basilicas in all three cemeteries when a number of sarcophagi was placed in mausolea or incorporated in church architecture.

---

\(^{73}\) For a typological study of stelae, see Sergio Rinaldi Tufi, Stele funerarie con ritratti di età Romana nel Museo Archeologico di Spalato, Saggio di una tipologia strutturale, Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche 16 (1971): pp. 87-166.

\(^{74}\) Rite of inhumation has never disappeared completely in Salona, as attested by the three skeleton burials, one of which is in wooden coffin; they were found in the earliest layer of the western necropolis, on the same height as urn burials, whose chronology seems further corroborated by the same artefacts found in both urns and a wooden coffin – that of the so-called Firma oil-lamp with the FORTIS stamp. Kirigin et al. “Salona 86/7,” at p. 39.

\(^{75}\) CIL 03, 2375+14246 = HD034426.
1.5 Methodological Approach and Research Questions

There are conceptual and terminological differences regarding the epigraphic material of the later Roman period. It has traditionally been referred to as the “Christian epigraphy,” and recently as the “late antique,” “later Roman” or “late Latin epigraphy,” concomitantly with the reconceptualization of the period and the establishment of the discipline of late antique studies (although the reconceptualization of the epigraphic record and the epigraphic discipline has been comparatively slow).76 Partly because of different notions regarding the character of the material, and partly because of the so-called “epigraphic curve,” epigraphic collections and studies based on the later Roman epigraphic record are variously chronologically delimited.

To illustrate, the starting date of the collection of Salona IV is 306, the year in which Constantine became emperor. The demarcation is determined by the emperor’s religious policy, and by the concomitant pervasiveness of the Christianization of society and of the epigraphic visibility of Christians.77 On the other hand, Géza Alföldy’s chronological division of the epigraphic record from Dalmatia follows the politically informed division of the imperial history, and he has thus dated the inscriptions to the früh Prinzipatszeit (FPZ), spä Prinzipatszeit (SPZ), and Dominatszeit (DZ), specifically from Augustus to 160 C.E., then from 160 to 285, and lastly from Diocletian’s reign that begun in 284 to the end of the imperial period, namely to the end of the sixth century in the case of Salona.78 In the same way, Benet Salway has chronologically delimited the field of late antique epigraphy by reference

to the period of late antiquity demarcated by the emperors Diocletian and Phocas, that is, from 285 to 610.⁷⁹

On the one hand, it may be objected that the epigraphic record might defy the politically defined categorization, while on the other, such categorization seems to be justified by the so-called epigraphic curve that squares with the classification of the history of the Empire. Ramsay MacMullen and Elizabeth A. Meyer have worked out the chronological curve of the epigraphic output from J.-M. Lassère’s and Stanislaw Mrozek’s studies on the chronological distribution of inscriptions from the Latin West.⁸⁰ Lassère has tabulated ca. 4,500 epitaphs from the seven North African sites, and has approximately dated them based on the combination of various criteria, such as the occurrence of the \( D(\text{is}) M(\text{anibus}) S(\text{acrum}) \) formula, monument typology, onomastics, and paleography.⁸¹ MacMullen has divided those epitaphs that had been broadly dated by (half)-century into periods of 20 years and chronologically charted the number of epitaphs produced from the first through the third century C.E.⁸² Similarly, Mrozek used ca. 4,500 both public and private inscriptions from the Latin West in order to chart the number of inscriptions produced per year during the rule of each emperor from the first through the third century C.E.⁸³ Their results suggest that the production of epitaphs gradually increased over the first and second centuries C.E., markedly peaked under the Severans, namely at the

---

⁷⁹ Salway, *Late Antiquity*, at p. 364.


⁸² According to the graph, two rises in production appear to have occurred: 30 and 60-80 epitaphs were produced per year during the periods of 100–120 and 190–210 C.E. respectively. MacMullen, “The Epigraphic Habit,” at pp. 242-43.

⁸³ Mrozek’s chart has shown that from the low point of three inscriptions per year during the rule of Titus and Domitianus, there was a steady growth until Commodus when the production reached ten inscriptions per year; then a sharp increase occurred with a peak of 18 inscriptions per year during the rule of Septimius Severus, after which an abrupt decline came about with a low point of six inscriptions per year during the rule of Alexander Severus. Stanislaw Mrozek, “À propos de la répartition chronologique des inscriptions latines dans le Haut- Empire,” *Epigraphica* 35 (1973), 113-18.
turn of the second and third centuries C.E., and then precipitously dropped in the second and third decades of the third century C.E. Both curves suggest that the low levels of epigraphic production reached at ca. mid-third century C.E. were maintained until the end of the century, which is the upper end of the period these studies have covered.

David Cherry has levelled criticism at their methods and results, and has argued that a sound epigraphic curve cannot be established at all. Cherry has pointed to the conjectural and circular quality of Lassère’s dating methods with the effect that he appears to have charted the modern dating techniques rather than the inscribed monuments. With respect to MacMullen’s curve, Cherry has also shown the faultiness of merging and charting together the material Lassère dated more precisely, which is scant, and the one he dated loosely to a period of a century or two, which is much more abundant. Namely, the dated epitaphs - however conjecturally dated - and not the averaged undated ones, determine the shape of the curve, and thus bias the remainder of the material, despite its quantitative prevalence.84

Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho has also attempted to determine the chronological parameters of the “Christian epigraphic revival,” that is, of the epigraphic output in late antiquity, and based his argument for the spread of Christianity on the chronological distribution of funerary inscriptions.85 His curves suggest that there was a somewhat late revival of the late antique epigraphic output. Specifically, it first began to increase in Rome and Belgica I (that is, in Trier, which was one of the imperial residences in late antiquity) only around the mid-fourth century, whereby the epigraphic production seemingly steeply peaked in the last quarter of the fourth century in Rome, while it maintained an even level throughout the fifth century and gradually declined over the sixth and seventh centuries in Trier. In Carthage, the habit enjoyed comeback in the first half of the fifth and again in the first half of the sixth

century. In Spain and Viennensis, the curve peaked in the first half of the sixth century, while the North African towns of Maktaar, Haïdra, and Sbeitla experienced the revival the latest, that is, in the latter decades of the sixth century.\textsuperscript{86}

Along the lines of Cherry’s objection to Lassère’s and MacMullen’s method, it should be pointed out that Galvão-Sobrinho has worked with internally dated and externally datable Christian epitaphs that make up part of the total of Christian inscriptions, and the disparity between the figures of dated/datable and undated epitaphs is most pronounced in the case of Rome’s catacomb inscriptions, whereby the dated ones comprise less than 10 percent of the total.\textsuperscript{87} Christian epitaphs are comparatively easier to date than the pagan ones because one’s day of death is thought of as one’s \textit{dies natalis} into the eternal life, and Christians tended to record it.\textsuperscript{88} Galvão-Sobrinho has worked with is 2178 dated inscriptions from Rome, and his curve hinges on the occurrence of dating formulae whose usage was not spread evenly throughout the period of more than three centuries (from the late third through the sixth century), but rather subjected to the local fashion of recording the day of one’s death.\textsuperscript{89} Carlo Carletti has estimated that there are ca. 2500 Christian epitaphs from Rome which are dated \textit{ad annum} mostly by means of consular dating.\textsuperscript{90} Carlo Carletti’s figures of the chronological distribution of internally dated epitaphs per century square with Galvão-Sobrinho’s curve of the production of epitaphs in Rome. Namely, out of ca. 2,500 epitaphs dated \textit{ad annum}, 2 percent belong to the third century, 55 percent belong to the fourth, 34 percent to the fifth, and 9 percent to the sixth century.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{86} Galvão-Sobrinho, 	extit{Funerary Epigraphy and the Spread of Christianity in the West}, at pp. 458-62, with Figures 1-7.

\textsuperscript{87} Galvão-Sobrinho, 	extit{Funerary Epigraphy and the Spread of Christianity in the West}, at pp. 437-45 for the discussion of the epigraphic evidence from the late antique Latin West.


\textsuperscript{89} Galvão-Sobrinho, 	extit{Funerary Epigraphy and the Spread of Christianity in the West}, Figure 1. Compare to Carletti, Nascita e sviluppo del formulario epigrafico cristiano, n. 46 at p. 163.

\textsuperscript{90} Carletti, Nascita e sviluppo del formulario epigrafico cristiano, n. 46 at p. 163.

\textsuperscript{91} Carletti, Nascita e sviluppo del formulario epigrafico cristiano, at p. 151.
The zoomed-in distribution of the occurrence of the dating formula over the course of the fourth century would very likely account for the steep rise of the curve in the last quarter of the fourth century when the number of epitaphs doubled from ca. 300 epitaphs over the period of 350-375 and 400-425 to ca. 600 epitaphs over the period of 375-400, which is otherwise difficult to explain historically.

As for Salona, the trend to record one’s day of death came somewhat later than in Rome, namely in the second half of the fourth century and enjoyed its *floruit* in the fifth century. One’s death was dated either by consuls or by indiction. The former dating system, of which there are 89 examples, was in use from 358 to 539, with 27, 54, and 8 instances in the second half of the fourth, throughout the fifth and in the sixth century respectively. On the other hand, there are 46 examples of dating by indiction, of which 17 are surely and 14 probably from the fifth century. Thus, the dating formulae in Salona are observably concentrated in the fifth century: 54 out of 89 examples of consular dating and ca. 31 out of 46 instances of dating by indiction belong to the fifth century.

Galvão-Sobrinho’s curves may thus not be a reliable chronological index neither for the revival of the epigraphic habit nor for the spread of Christianity, but he may have charted the trend to record one’s day of death with the result of misleadingly taking the curve as the evidence for the fluctuations of the epigraphic output. Compare that Galvão-Sobrinho left out ca. 500 pre-Constantinian catacomb epitaphs, which are stratigraphically more precisely dated for his sample not to be biased towards earlier dates; while at this point aware of the sampling bias, he nevertheless slipped into the methodological faultiness.

The resultant chronological distribution of the production of inscriptions over the first six centuries C.E. has chopped the third century and divided it between the traditional fields of “Roman”

---

92 Salona IV, at pp. 104-07.
94 Galvão-Sobrinho, *Funerary Epigraphy and the Spread of Christianity in the West*, at p. 442.
and “Christian epigraphy,” with the interim in which there was barely any production.\textsuperscript{95} Barbara E. Borg has thus remarked that “the third century seems to have no existence of its own” with respect to the publications of archaeological evidence and of epitaphs, since funerary monuments that resemble the second-century ones are automatically dated to the beginning of the third century and discussed in the context of the high empire, while those that resemble the fourth-century monuments are dated to the Tetrarchy at the earliest and treated in the context of late antiquity, and she has sought to redress the traditional method in her study dedicated to the third-century funerary monuments from Rome.\textsuperscript{96} Borg’s objection is valid, but until the systematic treatment of Salona’s epigraphic heritage, namely of its greater part belonging to the first through the third centuries will have been completed, the present thesis will of necessity work within the framework of the more traditional chronological parameters of late antique epigraphy, and will set its lower limit at ca. 250 while the upper limit is self-determined at the beginning of the seventh century when the last inscribed stone funerary monuments were set up.\textsuperscript{97} I have read a little less than 5,000 published inscriptions from Salona and its territory, and I have selected those that scholars have dated to the specified period. As noted above, Croatian and French scholars have recently published their ca. 20-year work on the epigraphic record of the fourth to the seventh centuries.\textsuperscript{98} Salona IV is a valuable epigraphic corpus in which each inscription is provided with a thorough commentary. Other comprehensive studies of the inscriptions and inscribed

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{95} Benet Salway has correlated the sharp decline of the epigraphic output from the 240s to the 270s with the “most acute period of the “third-century crisis.”” Salway, \textit{Late Antiquity}, at pp 264-65.
\textsuperscript{96} Barbara E. Borg, \textit{Crisis and Ambition, Tombs and Burial Customs in Third-Century C.E. Rome} (Oxford: OUP, 2013), at pp. 1-3, quote at p. 2. Alföldy has also remarked that the epigraphic record would better serve us divided into individual centuries, but that inscriptions from Dalmatia cannot be so precisely dated. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, at p. 22.
\end{flushleft}
monuments are Géza Alföldy’s onomastic manual based on the Roman inscriptions from Dalmatia, in which Salona occupies the most prominent place due to the sheer size of its corpus. Nenad Cambi has done the most systematic work on the sarcophagi from Salona and Dalmatia, and since sarcophagus is the prevalent type of the epitaphic monument in the late antique Salona, the thesis drew on his catalogues and studies of sarcophagi. Finally, the Epigraphic Database Heidelberg was a valuable research tool and reference source for the inscriptions from Salona. The thesis has selected epitaphs as dated in the listed comprehensive publications, and the individual articles to which the thesis will refer in its further discussions.

It is essential to keep a diachronic perspective for the productive analysis of social groups as recorded in epitaphs, the topic which the third chapter tackles. Nevertheless, the epitaphs are, as the standard expression goes, “notoriously difficult to date,” and the dating methods have been labeled as arbitrary. The problem of dating epigraphic material, already raised in the discussion of the epigraphic curves, is inherent in the source material, and despite the introduction of the date of one’s death as the new element in epitaphs of Christians, it remains difficult to date late antique funerary monuments more narrowly. Namely, suggested dates of the monument production often range the timespan of a century, and even such broad dating in some cases may be contested.

---

Given the comprehensiveness of his onomastic study of Roman Dalmatia, and the lack of the thorough epigraphic treatment and publication of most of the inscribed monuments, Alföldy has assigned the inscriptions to the FPZ, SPZ, or DZ based mostly on their content, specifically on the nomenclature and (epitaphic) formulae. Salona IV has employed more comprehensive criteria that, besides the epitaph content, include paleography, stratigraphy if a monument was found in situ, and monument characteristics. Cambi’s approach, on the other hand, is rather archaeological and art-historical, and he has dated coffins predominantly based on their characteristics. Attempts to distinguish between the pre- and post-300 C.E. inscribed monuments seem to be comparatively more controversial for a twofold reason. On the one hand, there is a continuity of the two-name system, the epitaph formulae, and the sarcophagus as the typical monument type through the third and fourth centuries, while on the other, there is an underlying tendency to assign pagan monuments to the third century and those containing an element that can be interpreted as Christian to the fourth century. The latter scholarly bias will be the topic of the second chapter. The following examples ought to demonstrate problems pertinent to dating.

Authors of Salona IV have supposed that the formula b(enem)erenti disappeared at the beginning of the fourth century, and it is generally thought that the formula had currency in the high empire. They did not reason their assumption, but presumably based it on the fact that the formula does not appear in any of the precisely dated fourth-century epitaphs, which are in minority and for

---

102 Alföldy has worked with ca. 4100 enough-preserved inscriptions which recorded ca. 7,400 individuals. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, at p. 10.
103 For his dating criteria, see Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, at pp. 27-30.
104 For their selection criteria for the post-306 C.E. monuments, see Nancy Gauthier, “Critères de selection,” in *Salona IV*, at pp. 21-24. These are the dating principles observed throughout their catalogue whereby there is a brief reasoning for the suggested dates for each inscription.
105 See also Alföldy’s remark that the most problematic issue was to decide whether an inscription should be dated to the first or to the second half of the second century C.E., and before or after 285 C.E. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, at p. 22. Alföldy nevertheless did not attempt to date late Roman inscriptions more narrowly, but only to the three-century period of his *Dominatszeit*.
106 *Salona IV*, at p. 22.
107 Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, at p. 29.
the most part belong to the last decades of the fourth century, when the consular dating appeared in epitaphs as it was shown above.\textsuperscript{108} Nevertheless, there are ca. 3,000 attestations of the \textit{b(ene)m(erenti)} formula in the Christian epitaphs of Rome,\textsuperscript{109} and while the currency of formulae may have been highly localized, the fact that the \textit{b(ene)m(erenti)} formula appears also in the Christian context suggests that it should not be a priori taken as a criterion for the exclusion from the fourth-century corpus and dated to the third-century.

There are four exceptions to their systematic exclusion from their corpus of the epitaphs containing the \textit{b(ene)m(erenti)} formula, and the three of them will be discussed since they are illustrative of the scholarly bias.\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Suellius Septimius} set up a sarcophagus to his \textit{benemerenti} spouse \textit{Desidiena Profutura} and to his son \textit{Suellius Septiminus}; the tomb is one of the very few completely preserved sarcophagi, and it can be safely stated that neither the epitaph nor the coffin and its lid contain any pagan or Christian elements. Alföldy has dated the epitaph to the high empire, while Egger, followed by ILJUG, and Salona III and Salona IV, has dated it to the first half of the fourth century. More precisely, Egger has preferred an earlier date of the late third/beginning of the fourth century, whereas Salona III and IV have dated it to the somewhat later decades of the fourth century.\textsuperscript{111} What matters

\textsuperscript{108} CIL 03, 9597+p. 2140 = HD034756. ILJUG 2590 = HD035029 and ILJUG 2643 = HD035077 both dated to 385. ILJUG 0126 = HD018019, dated to ca. 313-324. CIL 03, 2654+8652 = HD054211 dated to 358. CIL 03, 9506 = HD034773. CIL 03, 9507+p. 2139 dated to 378. CIL 03, 9509+p. 2139 = HD034776 dated to 385. CIL 03, 9508 = HD034778 dated to 382. CIL 03, 12861 = HD034780. CIL 03, 8921 = HD013953 dated to 301-330.

\textsuperscript{109} Carletti, Nascita e sviluppo del formulario epigrafico cristiano, at p. 151.

\textsuperscript{110} S IV, 1: 106 at pp. 326 and 220 at pp. 494-97; S IV, 2: 492 at pp. 863-65 and 666 at pp. 1046-47. The epitaph containing the \textit{benemerenti} formula has been included in the corpus on onomastic grounds, specifically the individual’s cognomen is Martyrius (CIL 03, 6393+p. 1510 = S IV, 1: 106 at pp. 326-27 = HD063455). The cognomen Martyrius seems to have been exclusively Christian name. Moreover, Nancy Gauthier has argued that it must have belonged to the “Peace of the Church,” which ensued Constantine’s promulgation of the Edict of Milan, as an homage to the “supreme testimony of the Christian faith.” Compare to that the fact that neither the text nor monument contain any pagan or Christian symbols. Nancy Gauthier, \textit{Salona IV}, at pp. 326-27. For the name Martyrius, Iiro Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage} (Helsinki: Helsingfors, 1963), at pp. 78 and 86, 98-99, 100, 114, 116-17.

\textsuperscript{111} CIL 03, 9028 = FS II: 78 at p. 74 = ILJUG 2356 at pp. 251-52 = S IV, 1: 220 at pp. 494-97. \textit{Salona III, Manastirine}, at p. 606. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Desidienus, Desidenus” at p. 81, “Septimius” at p. 53. Egger and Salona III read the archaeological context of the monument somewhat differently. Egger has seen it as contemporaneous to his \textit{Landhaus} and has dated it to the end of the third or the very beginning of the fourth century. Salona III has argued that its installation post-dated the construction of the so-called \textit{area}. The stratigraphy seems not to be clear, and does
more is the apparent rationale for its inclusion in Salona IV, that is, the coffin’s location in the “Christian site within the cemetery of Manastirine.” Along the same lines, the discrepancy between the religiously neutral coffin, and its location in the “Christian cemetery” has caused tension among the scholars, who have attempted to resolve it by reconstructing the letters of Aga[---] // D[---] inscribed in the lid acroteria as the Aga[pe], namely as Profutura’s Christian signum. The meaning of the letters is unclear, and neither ILJUG nor EDH have accepted such reconstruction, while Salona IV, unlike Salona III, seems somewhat reserved.

On the contrary, the sarcophagus set up by Cassia Decorata to her spouse Aurelius Aeneas, which shares the same characteristics with respect to both the formulae and the monument typology, was excluded. Alföldy has dated the epitaph to the high empire like the above-discussed one, ILJUG has dated the inscribed coffin to the later third century, and Salona IV has relegated it to the pre-fourth century period. Namely, the monument is neutral with respect to the religious affiliation of its occupants, and it was found ca. one kilometer westwards from Salona, near the road toward Tragurium. There was therefore no reason to group it with the monuments of the “aetas Christiana.” The traditional conception of the fourth century as the aetas Christiana and of Manastirine as the paradigmatic Christian cemetery developed in the fourth century seems to have influenced the reading and dating of Profutura’s epitaph so to make the coffin fit in the scholars’ mental image of the period and site. These two sarcophagi suggest above all that the chronological criterion for the corpus of late antique inscriptions cannot stem from the imperial religious policy as it dissociates monuments that belong to the same cultural milieu and thus ought to be studied together.

---

not provide firm grounds to opt for either Egger’s or Salona III’s dating. For the so-called *ana*, see Salona III, Manastirine, at pp. 534-54.

112 “…à cause de leur situation en un emplacement chrétien au sein de la nécropole de Manastirine, …” Salona IV, at p. 22.

113 Salona III, Manastirine, at p. 606.

Along the same lines of the search for the early Christians, two monuments that contain the formula *benemerenti* were included in Salona IV as commemorating Christians and thus dated to the period after 300 C.E., yet in both cases the interpretation of the evidence is overstretched. In the case of the fragmentarily preserved sarcophagus that *Maximi/[nix?]n(ust)* set up for his *benemerenti* spouse, both the elaborate decoration and figural reliefs on the front panel, and the wording, namely the *benemerenti* formula and the *memoria*, suggest the third-century date, yet the slightest and highly suspect possibility to read the name as the corrupt form of the name Martyria has led to the classification of the monument as Christian.115 The last three lines run as follows:

[ ]EMORIA POSVIT L
OCV CONCESSVM
ARTORIAM ERONTIMAM

Gauthier dissociates from the *concessum* its final -m of the accusative ending, and reads it as the first letter of the proper name in the accusative case of *Martoriam*, namely Martyria. EDH corrects the reading and offers a more plausible alternative reconstruction, specifically *l/ocu(m) concessum / Artoriam <F=E>ronti<n=M>am*. Another case is the tombstone, by now lost and of unknown typology, for which CIL has recorded that there were two doves below the text. Salona IV has straightforwardly taken this as the evidence of the patrons’ affiliation to Christianity.116

The authors of Salona IV have also adduced the statistical argument pertaining to the monument typology; namely, in cases in which the onomastics and formulae, in cases in which the onomastics and formulae did not have a peculiar mark and could alike be dated to the third and fourth centuries, they tended to assign the fourth-century date to the epitaphs originating from sarcophagi.117

115 CIL 03, 9226 = S IV, 2: 491 at pp. 863-65 = HD063426.
116 CIL 03, 9269 = S IV, 2: 666 at pp. 1046-47 = HD063427.
117 *Salona IV*, at p. 22.
There is a group of sarcophagi most of which spouses set up either jointly to themselves or individually to each other, the persons were typically designated with a two-name form, and there is a conspicuous lack of evidence for their religious affiliation in most cases. Alföldy has dated them to the high empire, and Salona IV has included them in the corpus as belonging to the early fourth century.\(^{118}\)

On the other hand, there are a couple of inscriptions which Alföldy, Ernst Diehl, or Otto Hirschfeld have dated to the later Roman empire, that is, but the authors of Salona IV have excluded them from the corpus as earlier than the fourth century adducing the statistical argument as well. Specifically, the tombstones in question are either stelae or slabs, and/or the epitaph is prefaced with the *D(is)M(anibus)* abbreviation, and both elements were rare in the fourth century, as the reasoning goes.\(^{119}\)

They have dated several vertically standing slabs and 8 stelae, and a few attestations of the *D(is)M(anibus)* formula to the fourth century. With respect to these exceptional instances, the slab and the formula *beneficenti* are overruled by the name Martyrius, which seems to date the monument to the fourth century,\(^{120}\) or the epitaph content dates the funerary stela to the first decades of the fourth century as in the case of the tombstone of *Aurelius Valerinus*.\(^{121}\) Yet in some instances it is unclear why some monuments were included, such as the stela of *Aelia Iobina!*\(^{122}\), whose epitaph moreover contains the invocation to the Manes,\(^{122}\) or the stela of *Aelia Eupateria*,\(^{123}\) seeing that the analogous

\(^{118}\) CIL 03, 2108 = S IV, 2: 397 = HD063059; CIL 03, 2217+8609 = S IV, 2: 390 = HD062200; CIL 03, 2206+p. 1031 = S IV, 2: 396 = HD062884; CIL 03, 8712+p. 1510, 2135 = S IV, 1: 378 = HD034741; CIL 03, 8823 = S IV, 2: 484; CIL 03, 8924 = S IV, 1: 380 = HD063459; CIL 03, 14751 = S IV, 1: 379 = HD061427; ILJUG 2129 = S IV, 2: 392 = HD064624; ILJUG 2757 = S IV, 1: 376 = HD035184.

\(^{119}\) Salona IV*, pp. 122-24. CIL 03, 2296 = HD062834; CIL 03, 2612 = HD062494; CIL 03, 2623+1510 = HD062498; CIL 03, 8754+p. 1510 = HD034747; CIL 03, 8759 = HD062555; CIL 03, 8862 = HD054538; CIL 03, 8918+p. 1510, 2136; CIL 03, 9240 = HD063395.

\(^{120}\) CIL 03, 6393 = S IV, 1: 106 = HD063455.

\(^{121}\) ILJUG 0126 = S IV, 1: 136 = HD018019.

\(^{122}\) CIL 13917 = S IV, 1: 134 = HD063370.

\(^{123}\) CIL 03, 12949 = S IV, 1: 135 = HD063460.
cases, such as the tabula of Numeria Irene\textsuperscript{124} or the monument of Ulpius Paulinus, were left out.\textsuperscript{125} The thesis has included these epitaphs among its group of inscriptions dated approximately to the latter half of the third century, and they will be analyzed together with the sarcophagi, stelae, and slabs that Salona IV has assigned to the early fourth century, as they seem to form an organic unity.

Besides few epitaphs which scholars have more precisely dated to the second half of the third century,\textsuperscript{126} few epitaphs dated variously to the third and fourth centuries have been included.\textsuperscript{127} Also, the above-mentioned sarcophagus of Aurelius Aeneas and the sarcophagus of Aur(elia) Vernilla have been included because they are analogous to the examples which Salona IV has dated to the beginning of the fourth century except for the benemerti formula in the case of the epitaph of Aeneas.\textsuperscript{128} The formula is comparatively rare yet it is attested in the fourth-century epitaphs, and the thesis has thus included the monument among the later-third century group.

Moreover, the thesis has included two epitaphs which have been published only in CIL, and which Alföldy has assigned to the DZ and EDH has accepted it.\textsuperscript{129} In neither instances the monument type is known, yet the epitaph of Aurelius Eutichianus(!) seems to be inscribed on a stela or a vertical

---

\textsuperscript{124} CIL 03, 9240 = HD063395.
\textsuperscript{125} CIL 03, 2612 = HD062494.
\textsuperscript{127} CIL 03, 2296 = HD062834: Salona IV, at pp. 122-23 has excluded it as earlier than the fourth century; Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Considius” at p. 77 has dated it to the DZ, and EDH dates it to 201-400. AE 2006, 1011 = HD056708. CIL 03, 09240 = HD063395: Salona IV, at pp. 123-24 has excluded it as earlier than the fourth century; Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Numerus” at p. 1-3 has dated it to the DZ, and EDH to 151-400.
\textsuperscript{128} CIL 03, 02117 = HD063051: Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Vernilla” at p. 325 and EDH have dated the coffin of Aur(elia) Vernilla to the DZ (300-600); Salona IV has not made mention of it. IIJUG 2125 = HD021989.
slab based on the layout of the text. Both funerary texts are prefixed with the D(is)M(anibus) invocation, the commemorative formulae are not specific and are alike common in the (earlier) third and fourth centuries. Four individuals are recorded and they are designated with the two-name form, of which three individuals carry imperial nomina of Aurelius and Flavius, The currency of their cognomina of Carosus and Ursacia, and Eutychianus and Gr(a)ecio point to somewhat later high-imperial and late antique period.\textsuperscript{130} The inscriptions could be plausibly assigned to the first half of the third century, yet the thesis has concurred with Alföldy and EDH, and has grouped them with other later third-century epitaphs. Finally, the funerary monument which \textit{Aur(elius) Candianus ex col(legio) Veneris} set up to himself and his (family) is included.\textsuperscript{131} Only CIL has published the epitaph, and the data about monument typology and its characteristics are lacking. Alföldy has dated it to the high empire and EDH to 171-300. Salona IV has not considered it, although it has included analogous funerary inscription of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[130] The names coined with the suffix -osus/sa originated in North Africa at a “comparatively late date.” Such name-formations were common in “Christian times” when they “passed into general use elsewhere.” Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, at p. 122. Also, Kajanto has stated that while cognomina coined with suffix -osus/sa were common in the later empire, they cannot be thought of as exclusively Christian nor that some were “coined to embody Christian ideas,” specifically that some were Christian “names of humility.” Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions or Rome and Carthage}, 1963, at pp. 66-67. For the distribution of the cognomen Carosus/-sa, see Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, at p. 284, and OPEL II, s.v. “Carosus” at p. 38. This is the only attestation in Salona and Dalmatia. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Carosus” at p. 171. The name Ursacius/ia appears to have been nearly two times more attested in the epitaphs of Christians. Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, at p. 329. In Dalmatia, the name is attested four times exclusively in Salona. The earliest attestation of the name was the soldier of the \textit{cohors VIII voluntariorum} whose funerary monument can be safely dated to the first half of the third century (CIL 03, 2002+p. 1030 = HD054183). For the \textit{cohors VIII voluntariorum} in Dalmatia, see Ivan Matijević, \textit{“Cohors VIII Voluntariorum civium Romanorum i neki njezini pripadnici u službi namjesnika provincije Dalmacije,”} (\textit{Cohors VIII Voluntariorum civium Romanorum and some of its Members Employed by the Consul of the Province of Dalmatia, Tusculum 2 (2009)}): pp. 45-58, esp. at pp. 47-48 with summary in English at p. 58. Besides the case under consideration of Attigia Ursacia, two other examples are included in Salona IV as belonging to the later Roman period (CIL 03, 14893 = S IV, 2: 434 = HD035128; CIL 03, 2108 = S IV, 2: 397 = HD063059). Next, cognomina coined with suffixes -anus and -ianus were also characteristic of the later empire, specifically the cognomen Eutychianus is ubiquitous in the Christian record. Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions of Rome and Carthage}, at pp. 62-63. Besides the present case, the name Eutychianus is also attested in the sarcophagus dated to ca. 351-450 in Salona (CIL 03, 6400 = S IV, 1: 227 = HD063456). In Dalmatia, outside of Salona, the name is twice attested on the small-size funerary stelae, and in both instances men were identified with the three-name form (CIL 03, 1881 = HD053594, and CIL 03, 2851+p. 1037 = HD056757). Their name-form seems to indicate a comparatively earlier date than the one suggested for Aurelius Eutychianus. See also, Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Eutychianus, Euticianus” at pp. 198-99. This is the only attestation of the name Gr(a)ecio. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Graecio” at p. 212; Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, at p. 204; OPEL II, s.v. “Graecio DAL 1” at p. 169. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Candianus” at p. 170.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Aur(elius) Ursacius Salonitanus ex collegio Veneris, which Alföldy has also dated to the high empire and EDH to 201-400. Salona IV has included it because the monument in question is a sarcophagus, and because the collegium fabrum Veneris is attested in the honorific inscription which the association dedicated to the Caesar Flavius Constans in between 333-337, and in the three other funerary inscriptions datable to the late third and fourth centuries. On analogy with the given four epitaphs and the honorific inscription, and since the nomenclature, simplicity of commemorative formula, the lack of the D(is)M(anibus) dedication fit very well in the group of the later third and early fourth century funerary inscriptions, the thesis has included it among the late antique inscriptions.

I felt obliged to justify the material which I have selected as assignable to the latter half of the third century, because the systematic treatment and publication of the pre-fourth-century inscriptions is missing. As for the inscriptions of the fourth to the early seventh centuries, the thesis mostly adheres to the dates suggested by Salona IV, and occasionally suggests nuanced dating.

The discussion of the dating principles which scholars differently determined as regards the late antique record of Salona shows that the recurrent critique of the attempts to date the bulk of inscribed funerary monuments as conjectural is too an extent valid. The arbitrariness is above all due to the essential quality of the source material, and occasionally to the preconceived notions of the epigraphic typicality of a certain period, and to the (religious) bias of scholars. The diachronic perspective is nevertheless crucial for the historical analysis of the epigraphic record, and the thesis

---


133 Salona IV, 2: 397 at pp. 714-15, especially at p. 715. For the honorific inscription to the Caesar Flavius Constans: CIL 03, 1981+p. 1509 = S IV, 1: 4 at pp. 145-46 = HD000677 = LSA 1145. Three more members of the given college were commemorated in funerary inscriptions: S IV, 2: 417 at pp. 753-54 = HD018330 (Salona IV has dated it broadly to the fourth century, and EDH to 271-330), S IV, 2: 468 at pp. 837-38 = HD064350 (both have dated it to the fourth century), CIL 03, 8824 = S IV, 2: 650 at pp. 1028-29 = HD062983 (both have dated it to the fourth century). There is yet another inscription which mentions the collegium Veneris, too fragmentarily preserved for its function to be determined (AE 2006, 1019 = HD056694 = Ivan Matijević, “Neobjavljeni natpisi iz Žrnovnice i Salone,” [Unedited inscriptions from Žrnovnica and Salona], *VAHD* 99 (2006): pp. 145-52 with summary in English at p. 152, no. 3 at p. 150. Ivan Matijević has dated it to the second half of the third century on analogy with the mentioned epitaph of Aur(elius) Ursacius Salonitanus and the epitaph under consideration of Aur(elius) Candianus.
will attempt to keep it. Thus, the selected later-third century epitaphs will be analyzed together with the sarcophagi, stelae and slabs that Salona IV has assigned to the early fourth century as they seem to form an organic unity. Also, the epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries will be grouped together because they display similar characteristics with respect to the monument typology, nomenclature and formulae.

Although the focus of the thesis is on the late antique epigraphic record, along the lines of the view that “early imperial debate has obvious implications for late Latin epigraphy,” the later Roman epitaphs, part of which commemorates Christians, will be considered in perspective with the inscribed funerary monuments of the preceding two centuries. Likewise, the subject of the late antique epigraphic habit, discussed in the next chapter, and the topic of the patterns of epitaphic commemoration and its implications for the social history-writing will be discussed in their longue durée.

The third chapter also takes a closer look at the methods and issues pertinent to the socio-demographic history of the first through the third centuries, which ought to set the stage for the analysis of social groups as recorded in late antique epitaphs. Thereby, the thesis attempts not to revolve its discussions around the axis of pagan versus Christian funerary commemoration, and seeks to evade the traditional scholarly divide between Roman (that is, early and high imperial) and Christian (that is, late imperial) epigraphy, in order not to make the latter “virtually a field unto itself.”

---

134 Cf. Charlotte Roueché concluding remark on her attempt to date the late antique inscriptions from Aphrodisias: “Despite these difficulties, I have suggested dates for as many texts as possible, in the belief that this provides a more useful framework. Some of these are likely to be challenged... nevertheless, I feel that it is preferable to run this risk than to offer the description fourth to sixth century so frequently attached to material of this period.” ala2004 Introduction, paragraph 9.
The next comment on the thesis’ approach to the epigraphic material concerns the state of preservation of inscriptions as regards the pertinent pieces of information so that they are useful for historical analysis. To avoid to write “history from square brackets,”¹³⁸ the thesis has not worked with epitaphs whose reconstructed text is too hypothetical and whose reconstruction reflects scholars’ bias. For example, the epitaph inscribed on a slab, which served as the cover for sarcophagus set up at Marusinac, is dated to 443. Emilio Marin has most recently edited and published the inscription in Salona IV, whereby he has accepted the reconstruction suggested by Frane Bulić and Josip Bervaldi, and taken over by Ernst Diehl.¹³⁹

\[
[D]ep(ositio) sanc(tae) m(emoriae) [Paschasi? ep(isopi)] / \\
die XVII k[al(endas) ……] / \\
cons(ulibus) Maximos iterum / \\
et Paterio v(iris) c(larissimis)
\]

On the contrary, Rudolf Egger, followed by ILJUG, has treated the identity of the deceased with more skepticism and has not substituted the person’s name; nevertheless, he has not expressed doubt about the person’s episcopal title. The pertinent part of Egger’s edition runs as follows \([D]/ep(ositio) sanc(tae) m(emoriae) […] ep(isopi)]\).¹⁴⁰

Firstly, both the deceased’s proper name and title are missing. The latter was substituted on account of the phrase \(sanc(tae) m(emoriae)\) without reservation; namely, the reconstructed title is not followed by a question mark, although the phrase was not exclusive to bishops.¹⁴¹ The alleged bishop was subsequently identified as Paschasius, because Frane Bulić and Josip Bervaldi have filled the gap

¹⁴¹ For example, …s(an)c(tae) memoriae presb(yteri) [Anasta]si… (Salona IV, 1: 237 = HD035026). Elsewhere, the phrase was variously applied to laypersons as well. To illustrate, \(Hic requiescit sanct(a)e memoriae Leontia qua(que) vixit\ldots\) (AE 1981, 0266 = HD004944) or \(Requiescit in pace st(an)c(tae) m(emoriae) Iuctus(l) qui vixit\ldots\) (AE 1981, 0255 = HD004932).
between the attested bishops Hesychius (ca. 406-426) and Iustinus (ca. 460-473) with the bishops Paschasius and Caesarius in their tentative reconstruction of the line of episcopal succession in Salona. On the contrary, Milan Ivanišević has rejected Bulić and Bervaldi’s reconstruction as regards Paschasius and Caesarius, and has left them both out of his study of Salonitan bishops; namely Paschasius is not attested in any contemporaneous source and the reference to Paschasius by Daniele Farlati in his 18th-century Illyricum sacrum is considered unreliable. Irrespective of all the problematic assumptions concerning the historicity of Paschasius and the given epitaph, Marin finishes off his discussion with a brief debate on how the name was likely written, namely whether as Paschasius or Pascasius.

Finally, neither the monument type nor the location support the reconstruction. To the extent that funerary inscriptions allow to locate episcopal burials, the late fourth- and fifth-century bishops were clustered at Manastirine, most of whom seem to have been buried in anepigraphic coffins, which were marked with the funerary mensae around 425 when the burials of predeceased bishops were covered by the monumental platform. Thus preserved are the mensae of the bishops Gaianus (ca. 381-391), Symferius (ca. 391-405), and Hesychius (ca. 405-426), whose precise episcopacy dates are not recorded but for whom reliable pieces of information are preserved to establish their line of succession over the course of the last two decades of the fourth and the first quarter of the fifth

---

142 Bulić and Bervaldi, Kronotaksa solinskih biskupa [The Chronotaxis of Salonian Bishops], at pp. 123-26.
144 Salona IV, 1: 94, at p. 304.
146 CIL 03, 13134+14663,1 = Salona IV, 1: 73 at pp. 263-65 = HD034815.
147 CIL 04, 9550+13153+pp. 2261, 2328,126 = Salona IV, 1: 76 at pp. 268-69 = HD034822.
148 CIL 03, 9549+p. 2328,126 = Salona IV, 1: 72 at pp. 262-63 = HD034863.
Yet another _mensa_ found at Marusinac commemorates the bishop Iustinus (ca. 460-473); Salona IV has dated the _mensa_ to ca. 475, but it is unclear to what extent their proposed dates are informed by the dates of Iustinus’ episcopacy as tentatively reconstructed by Bulić and Bervaldi. The explanation of why Paschasius was not buried among his peers at Manastirine is that the bishops Paschasius and Iustinus were temporarily buried at Marusinac while the cemeterial basilica at Manastirine was under construction, whose dating, however, is disputed and does not seem to uphold the explanation. Egger has dated the construction of the cemeterial basilica at Manastirine to around 400, while Salona III tends to push it to ca. 435, although allowing for the possibility of earlier dates. Moreover, Salona III dates the construction of the platform, which covered the earlier anepigraphic coffins attributed to bishops and which would later become the transept of the cemeterial basilica, and the setting up of the funerary _mensae_, which marked the below-placed burials, to around 420s. In either scenario, a bishop who died in 443 could have been buried among his predeceased peers. To conclude, there are comparatively few episcopal epitaphs in Salona, and, regardless of Paschasius’ historicity, the fact that episcopal epitaphs are an exception both at Manastirine and in other burial grounds of Salona, leads us to discard the theory as ill-founded.

---

149 For the sequence of Salonitan bishops, see Bulić and Bervaldi, _Kronotaksa solinskih biskupa_, and Ivanišević, “Salonitanski biskupi,” pp. 223-52. Two more _mensae_ were found at Manastirine, one of which commemorates the translation of a bishop and it is likewise dated to ca. 425 (CIL 03, 14899 = IIJUG 2258+2434 = Salona IV, 1: 78 at pp. 271-72 = HD034817), and the other one honors the martyr _S[/epti]mius_ (CIL 03, 9545+9650+12864 = IIJUG 2436 = Salona IV, 1: 79 at pp. 272-74 = HD034819).

150 CIL 03, 14895 = Salona IV, 1: 75 at pp. 267-68 = HD035129.

151 The fragments of three more _mensae_ were discovered at Marusinac. Two are so fragmentarily preserved that it cannot be known whether they mark a burial or commemorate the translation of a bishop and even the text’s attribution to a bishop is too hypothetical in the second instance (CIL 03, 14895 = IIJUG 2700 = Salona IV, 1: 77 at pp. 270-71 = HD007896; Salona IV, 1: 80 at pp. 275-76). Marin attributes the fragments of the third _mensa_ to the late fifth- and early sixth-century bishop Honorius I. Nevertheless, the five tiny fragments do not permit anything close to a founded interpretation of the text, and I have thus left it out of the discussion. The text runs as follows: _Depositio s[anctae] m[emoriae] H[ono]ri episcopi_ —— (IIJUG 2701 = Salona IV, 1: 74 at pp. 265-67 = HD035131). Neither the reconstruction of the phrase of _sanctae memoriae_, nor the reconstruction of the episcopal title is unproblematic. Even if the reconstructions of the two elements were correct, the decision to attribute the _mensa_ to the bishop Honorius I, and not to Honorius II (died in 547), is likewise unjustified.

152 Marin, _Civitas splendida Salona_, at p. 58-59.

153 Egger, FS II, at p.
Likewise, in the following epitaph, Dino Demicheli has tentatively reconstructed the word ending in -r and preceding the deceased’s proper name as *presbyter* although there is not the slightest ground for such reconstruction, and one can think of numerous words ending in -r that could be equally (im)plausible reconstructions.
It is thus important to be conscious about the epigraphic foundation for the historical analysis and interpretation, and the present thesis will limit itself to the sufficiently preserved texts and solid reconstructions.

The most productive methodological shift in the study of inscriptions has been their incorporation into the monumental and archaeological context, and, as Valerie Hope has put it, the four dimensions should ideally be taken into consideration: verbal, pictorial, physical, and locational. Given the main research question of what social groups set up the inscribed tombstones, the present thesis will privilege the text itself. Yet it will strive not to disregard the text's monumental and archaeological context, if it is known: the monument type, material, visuals, craftsmanship, and location will be considered if pertinent to the argument. Finally, both the anepitaphic funerary monuments and the two other types of inscriptions, that is, the honorary and votive texts, will be taken into consideration to contextualize epitaphs.

Commemoration with inscribed funerary monuments lies at the intersection of its affordability and its quality of being socially and culturally contingent. For the early and high empire, the debate revolves around the socio-legal status of people recorded in epitaphs, and how the “epitaphic population” relates to the social make-up of an urban community, that is, of those people who could afford an inscribed stone funerary monument. Pertinent to it is the question of the motivation that

---


prompted people to set up funerary monuments, and of the nature of both commemorative and epigraphic culture. At stake is, above all, the method for assessing one's socio-legal status, which relies on Roman onomastics and heavily hinges on a person's cognomen. In other words, the method presupposes that Greek cognomina and certain Latin “servile” ones indicate the individual's socio-legal background.156 Regarding the late imperial, “Christian epitaphs,” the topic of social composition of epitaphs has not been systematically tackled in recent scholarship, and the assessments of the social status of “epitaphic population” are oftentimes somewhat impressionistic and boil down to whether the commemoration went further down or up on the social scale in comparison to the early and high imperial period.157

The two main lines of inquiries are the analysis of the motivation to inscribe epitaphs in late antique Salona and the analysis of the social groups commemorated with the inscribed monuments. Given that we “must be wary of overestimating the pervasiveness of even widespread epigraphic trends,”158 the thesis sets out to reconsider and apply the debates, paradigms, and methods current especially in the English-speaking scholarship to the epigraphic record from Salona. On the other hand, Dalmatia and Salona unjustifiably present gaps in the study of Roman epigraphic cultures of the Latin West, and the aim of the thesis is to increase the visibility of Salona on the map of the social and

157 Cf. Peter Brown’s remark regarding assertions on social origins of the fourth-century clergy, which draw on epigraphy and which have been “delivered in passing and in somewhat impressionistic manner...” Peter Brown, Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), at p. 36.
158 Bodel, Epigraphy and the Ancient Historian, at p. 9.
cultural diversity of the Roman provinces and thus to make a step forward towards redressing the rather neglected status of Roman Dalmatia in the international scholarship.
CHAPTER 2: THE EPITAPHIC HABIT IN LATE ANTIQUITY

2.1 Epigraphic Habit during the First Three Centuries C.E.: Its Interpretations and Their Problems

In the 1980s a shift in the approach to the epigraphic evidence occurred, when it came to be conceptualized as a cultural phenomenon with its own dynamics, which therefore does not render itself to the literal readings and cannot be solely mined for the pieces of historical information. With respect to that, Ramsay MacMullen’s article has been seminal: he has introduced the concept of the “epigraphic habit,” worked out its chronological parameters, and pointed to the “sense of audience” and “psychological disposition” that governed the habits’ dynamics.159

Elizabeth A. Meyer and Greg Woolf have also tackled the “epigraphic habit” of the early and high empire, and Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho the one of the later empire.160 MacMullen’s and Meyer’s interpretations of the “epigraphic habit” heavily hinge on the chronological curve of the epigraphic output, which they have worked out from J.-M. Lassère’s and Stanislaw Mrozek’s studies on the chronological distribution of inscriptions from Latin West. The introductory chapter tackled the topic of the epigraphic curves, and here a sketchy outline shall suffice: their results suggest that the production of epitaphs gradually increased over the first and second centuries C.E., markedly peaked at the turn of the second and third centuries C.E., and then precipitously dropped in the second and third decades of the third centuries C.E. Both curves suggest that the low levels of epigraphic

production reached at ca. mid-third century C.E. were maintained until the end of the century, which is the upper end of the period these studies have covered.\(^{161}\)

While MacMullen has not elaborated his “sense of audience” and its “psychological disposition,” changes of which would account for the rise and fall of the “epigraphic habit,” Meyer pushed the evidence towards the obligatory aspect of commemoration, and developed an argument that embeds the rise and fall of the production of epitaphs in the process of Romanization. Meyer sees the deceased-commemorator as a typical Roman style of epitaph and argues that the desire of a deceased to display his/her Roman citizen status was a main drive behind the “habit of epitaphs.” Namely, a Roman citizen’s prerogative to make legal wills, which obliged an heir to put up a funerary monument, was manifested in epitaphs by the heirship relationship between the deceased and a commemorator.\(^{162}\) In order to account for the sharp decline of the production of epitaphs, she draws on Aubrey Cannon’s model of an alternating pattern of competitive display and restraint in mortuary behavior and funerary monuments.\(^{163}\) Roman citizenship was eagerly sought after and flaunted throughout the second century, yet after its inflation caused by Caracalla’s grant of citizenship to all free people, “a personal announcement of it [became] redundant, even distasteful.” Thus, “the audience…would have been perceived to be uninterested.”\(^{164}\)

In his response to Meyer, David Cherry challenged her two main premises, and convincingly argued that a sound epigraphic curve cannot be established at all, but that MacMullen and Meyer are

---

\(^{161}\) Lassère, “Recherches sur la chronologie des épitaphes païennes de l’Africă,” pp.7-152, Tables at 133-151.

\(^{162}\) MacMullen, “The Epigraphic Habit,” at pp. 242-43.


\(^{165}\) Meyer seems to have been influenced by a brief discussion by Richard. P. Saller and Brent D. Shaw who also posed the question of the motivation for commemorating the deceased. Their conclusion though was more nuanced: they acknowledged that the “patterns of commemoration” reflect the “patterns of heirship, as well as of a sense of family and affection,” and that it is both impossible and artificial to assess which factored the most since “they must have very often coincided.” Saller and Shaw, “Tombstone and Roman Family Relations,” at pp. 126-7.


piling up hypotheses and are instead charting modern dating techniques. He also showed that a relationship between the deceased and a commemorator was rarely one of heirship, and that it “seems to have been shaped mainly by sentiment and family affection.”

Finally, with respect to Meyer’s method to build her model, there is a tendency to assign the inscriptions to the secondary rank, and to give primacy to the literary sources. Meyer thus constructs her interpretative framework from both the narrative texts of Cicero, Pliny, and Cassius Dio, and juridical commentaries of Ulpian and Papinian, and given their authoritative evidence, the legal relationship between the deceased and commemorator “should be understood to be present even when not explicitly stated.” Expectedly, Meyer’s body of North African funerary evidence resists to fit in her model even nearly seamlessly: for example, only in the cases of Theveste and Maktar there is a correlation between the grant of a colony status and the increase in the number of epitaphs, with further qualification that a very few epitaphs in Maktar are of a deceased-commemorator type, while in Ammaedara, and Cirta and Carthage the growth in the production of epitaphs occurred at least 100 and 200 years respectively after their promotion to the status of colony.

Ian Morris’s *Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity*, a methodology book with a chapter on funerary inscriptions, introduces a novel theoretical framework in the ancient history-writing for understanding and studying burials. His aim is through investigation of burials to elucidate social structures of Greeks and Romans, for which he draws on the Anthony Giddens’s theory of structuration, and anthropologically informed theories of ritual as a symbolic action. One of the main

---

165 Regarding the heirship issue, Cherry took a closer look at the deceased-commemorator type of epitaphs from Lambaesis and Theveste, and demonstrated that, while only 7.5 percent of commemorators are qualified as heirs, the half of commemorators, such as fathers, wives, and husbands, are not likely to have been heirs. Granted, some of the children, who make up 20 percent of commemorators, may have been heirs, but to go beyond acknowledging that would be purely speculative. Cherry, “Re-Figuring the Roman Epigraphic Habit,” pp. 143-156, the discussion of the relationship between the deceased and the commemorator, at pp. 151-56.
166 Meyer, “Explaining the Epigraphic Habit,” nn. 14 and 15 at pp. 76, nn. 18, 19, 21, 22 at pp. 77, nn. 37 and 39 at p. 80, n. 40 at p. 81.
emphases is that the mortuary archaeological material was created in and for the funerary ritual, which is - as any ritual - a symbolic action essential for the constitution of society through which it either recreates or challenges its structures. Archaeological evidence is equally imbued with symbolism, and in assessing it, it is wrong to assume a direct correlation between the material remains of death-rituals and social structures we want to get an insight in. Nevertheless, Morris starts his discussion of the usefulness of inscribed funerary tombstones for illuminating either ritual or social structures with pronounced skepticism:

“By examining ancient decisions to inscribe or not to inscribe a monument and then what to say on it, we should be able to enlarge substantially our understanding of the symbolic construction of society that took place in funeral rituals. But on the whole, this has proved extremely difficult to do so.”

Therefore, Morris dedicates most of his chapter to the discussion of some of the recent literature on Roman epitaphs, instead of applying his method to the funerary monuments themselves. To invoke the ritual as an all-accommodating answer occasionally seems nothing but a formal change of explanatory paradigms. In a similar vein, in an otherwise insightful discussion on the tension between the funerary status symbols in late antique Rome, Morris adduces Cannon’s model, changing rituals, changing religion, and changing social structures as these are all forces that should be at work in his model of changing patterns in funerary archaeological record. Yet he does not explain what change there was in either funerary ritual or social structures, and it remains unclear why we need to assume these changes as necessary to account for the shift from a tombstone to a location, that is a burial ad

---

168 Ian Morris, Death-Ritual and Social Structure in Classical Antiquity (Cambridge: CUP, 1992): at p. 156. One of the major problems, apart from the fact that the texts themselves are slight and formulaic, is that we lack of any contextual information in most cases.

169 For example, when he discusses Keith Hopkins’s work on demography, Morris states that Hopkins “did not try to explain why the observed data deviated so far from what he expected to find;” Morris finds the reason obvious: “epitaphs were created to satisfy the needs of ritual performers,” and they tell us “about what Roman buriers thought ought to be said in such a context.” Morris, Death-Ritual, at pp. 158-59. I should add, in Hopkins’s defense, that he did explain his findings in terms of socio-culturally contingent customs of commemoration. Keith Hopkins, “On the Probable Age Structure of the Roman Population,” Population Studies Vol. 20, No. 2. (1966): pp. 245-64.
sanctos, as the most important funerary status symbols. Éric Rebillard has shown, for example, that a “Christian funerary ritual” did not exist in late antiquity, especially not the one imposed and conducted by the Church. Nevertheless, Morris’s reconceptualization of inscribed funerary monuments as part of burial and funerary ritual is an important redress of methodology.

Lastly, Greg Woolf also sought to find a blanket model that explains epigraphic culture in the early and high empire. Woolf focuses on the aspect of monumentality and its inherent qualities of durability and expense that work to fight change, insecurity, and anxiety about one’s future. Woolf argues that the social mobility of the early and high imperial society “provides one of the most important contexts for personal monumentality and the creation of an epigraphic culture.” His approach to monumentality is anthropologically informed, and to justify its applicability to the Roman epigraphic culture he invokes Horace’s famous *Exegi monumentum* ode, and brings in anecdotal evidence from Pliny and legal excerpts from the *Digest*, yet he does not look closely at, or even make a reference to a single inscription. As for the expansion of the epigraphic culture, it is a function of the expansion of the Roman society: namely, the phenomenon is characteristic of the highly urbanized western Mediterranean, especially of the cities that received the status of a colony during the time of Caesar or Augustus, and militarized regions. Woolf’s model accommodates with difficulty the abrupt decline in the first half of the third century: the fluidity of social structures and anxiety it caused were equally present then and in the later empire. He assumes that what changed is not a psychological disposition but people’s response that shifted towards privatization of the status display: it came to be expressed now through “urban and rural residences and elaborate art works of silver plate and ivory.” The problem is, however, that these means of displaying one’s wealth and status were exploited in the early

---

empire as well, and did not function as compensation for the decline in setting up new civic monuments in late antiquity.

These studies are concerned with the rise and fall of the early and high imperial epigraphic culture; even if authors do mention its revival in the fourth century, they state it is out of their purview. Nevertheless, an overarching concept as Woolf’s, which is built on such general premises of social mobility and anxiety, and negating and overcoming them through the means of erecting monuments, should be able to account also for the late antique epigraphy. Indicative of scholarly attitude is his excuse for leaving them out: “they represent new and distinctive epigraphic cultures, drawing on early imperial examples, but modifying them to suit new cultural logics of their own.”

This clear-cut division stems from the 19th-century formation of distinct academic disciplines of classical and Christian archaeology, yet the relatively recent re-categorization of the post-Constantian period should entail the re-conceptualization of the “Christian epigraphy” as an integral part of the Roman epigraphic culture. The next section will discuss the topic of the “Christian epigraphic habit” with the particular reference to the model elaborated by Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho.

There are two major problems with these studies: Henrik Mournitsen has criticized their generality “in scope and application,” and has argued for turning to the evidence itself, instead of being preoccupied “with the modern concept of the epigraphic habit, which has taken on life of its own within the scholarly discourse detached from the actual inscriptions.” In the same vein, scholars have been emphasizing the regional diversity of epigraphic cultures, and the necessity of conducting localized research as opposed to generalizing even the widespread epigraphic trends. John Bodel has furthermore observed that it is improbable that a single force could have decisively factored in both

176 For example, see Cooley, The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy, at pp. 143-44, on the diversity of epigraphic cultures within a province; Bodel, Epigraphy and the Ancient Historian, at pp. 9-10.
shaping the epigraphic culture and accounting for its demise, such as a political act of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* and a common psychological impulse to determine one’s place in a community. He has concluded that various forces, such as economic, demographic, social, and probably psychological and political, have rather jointly factored in forming the epigraphic culture in a certain locality.177

### 2.2 “Christian” or “Late Antique” Epitaphic Habit (ca. 250-600 C. E.)

There is the conceptual and terminological ambiguity regarding the late Roman epigraphic material,178 which has traditionally been referred to as “Christian epigraphy,”179 and which is, as John Bodel has put it, “virtually a field unto itself.”180 The conceptualization and definition of the “Christian epigraphy” is the corollary of the separation between the disciplines of Classical and Christian archaeology and their respective fields of study that came about in the second half of the 19th century. It is concomitant with the formation of the scholarly discipline of Christian archaeology which had its origins in the research of catacombs of Rome, which was directed and published by Giovanni Battista de Rossi and heavily sponsored and supported by the Pope Pius IX.181

The concept of “Christian epigraphy” follows in the footsteps of the nineteenth-century scholarly paradigm that cuts the ancient world into the *aetas Romana* and the *aetas christiana*. The attendant quest for the evidence of ancient Christianity and the early Christians over-emphasized the

---

178 This thesis uses the terms “late Roman” and “late antique” interchangeably.
given evidence as recorded in inscriptions which has had determinative bearing on the definition of what a “Christian inscription” is, and thus on the principles that governed the scope of epigraphic corpora. The definition of what makes an inscription “Christian” has been formulated by Giovanni Battista de Rossi in the first volume of ICUR and taken over by Wilhelm Henzen in the sixth volume of CIL which collects the inscriptions of Rome. Contemporary scholarship likewise adopts the definition word for word without reconsideration.

“I call Christian inscriptions those inscriptions which were set up by Christians for the sake of religion. And indeed, for the sake of religion not just those inscriptions were made, which testify to the churches, chapels, and altars having been constructed and dedicated; which testify to the vows fulfilled, to the donations donated, to the sacra indicta; which extol the merit of martyrs and holy men; which can be read inscribed on sacred objects of every kind; but also each and every single epitaph of the Christians, since the things which pertain to the graves are a matter of religious worship specific more to the Christians than to the pagans themselves and are a matter consecrated to the solemn religion.”

The major problem is that the nineteenth-century paradigm has framed the way in which scholars still tend to look at and interpret the epigraphic record of late antiquity. The manner in which the catacombs have been conceptualized and studied has bearing on the scholarly approach to catacomb epitaphs, and given their quantitative prevalence, on the conceptualization of the epigraphic record of the late antique period. Amy K. Hirschfeld has emphasized the extent to which the catacombs are exceptional as a “subject of archaeological study in their almost inextricable relationship to a living

---

182 Giovanni Battista de Rossi, “Praefatio,” in ICUR I, at p. 37, and Wilhelm Henzen, “Praefatio,” in CIL VI.1, at p. V.
184 Translated by Dora Ivanišević. Christianos titulos appello inscriptiones eas, quae a Christianis religionis causa positae sunt. Religionis scilicet causa non modo ii omnes facti sunt tituli, qui templum, sacella, altaria exculta et dedicata; qui vota soluta dona data, sacra indicta testantur; qui martyrum et sanctorum virorum laudes celebrant; qui sacro omnis generis instrumento leguntur inscript; verum omnia quaque et singula Christianorum epitaphia, quippe quae ad sepulcrum pertinent, rem Christianis magis, quam ipsis ethnics religiosi cultus propriam et religione sollemne consecratam. Rossi, “Praefatio,” in ICUR I, at p. 37, and Henzen, “Praefatio,” in CIL VI.1, at p. V.
religion that has primarily been in control of their study and guardianship,” with the effect that they have been mostly studied in a political manner to support the ingrained notions regarding the religious history. In his attempt to redress the religiously based approach and method, John Bodel has conducted comparative investigation of the columbaria and catacombs as typologically similar and thus comparable burial grounds, and has questioned the axioma running in both scholarly and popular literature that catacombs originated as exclusively Christian burial grounds in order to meet their idiosyncratic religious and social aspirations. Bodel has concluded that there is little evidence to substantiate such claim, and that even the earliest phases of the catacombs, which have traditionally been described as egalitarian with respect to both the tombs and epitaphs, suggest “a heterogenous mixture of persons of different wealth and status with no distinctively unifying beliefs about the representation of privilege in burial.”

Nevertheless, the traditional notions are deep-seated and the paradigm shift has not been widespread. To illustrate, in the most recent synthetic publication on the catacombs and regarding the issue of the origins of catacombs, Vincenzo Fiocchi Nicolai has reasserted that “In reality, as is well-known, the catacombs were exclusively funerary areas used for the burial and funeral rites of members of the Early Christian communities.” Along the same lines, Fiocchi Nicolai has attempted to detect “already in the oldest areas of the catacombs, completely the innovative characteristics…that distinguish them from non-Christian hypogea.” The decisive differentiating characteristic is a “much greater extension of the space, constituted by series of interconnected galleries;” moreover, the original architectural design

---

anticipated later expansion.\textsuperscript{188} Nevertheless, the early third-century smaller pagan hypogeae were essentially family burial grounds,\textsuperscript{189} namely the underground architectural complexes designed to accommodate the burials of a single family and/or its household. As for the third-century nuclei of Roman catacombs, instead of anachronistically project onto them the fourth-century situation as regards to the religious affiliation of their occupants that was the corollary of the progressive Christianization of the inhabitants of Rome, the alternative and more evidence-based way to look at their “invention” is as the response to the “demographic need created by a limited amount of land on the outskirts of Rome.” The common denominator of people buried in catacombs appears to have been the universally shared desire for an identifiable burial and for the regular ritual commemoration of the deceased.\textsuperscript{190}

Scholarly discourse regarding Manastirine, the main “Christian” cemetery of Salona, is likewise imbued with religious tones. Few recent examples shall suffice to demonstrate the scholarly bias. The cemetery of Manastirine is regularly entitled as the \textit{coemeterium legis sanctae christianae};\textsuperscript{191} however, the phrase is nowhere recorded. The source for the title is the epitaph in which the \textit{curator rei p(ublicae)} \textit{Fl(avius) Theodotus} stated that he laid (\textit{collocabi(!)}) his son \textit{Peregrinus} “in the holy Christian law” (\textit{in lege sancta}

\textsuperscript{188} Vincenzo Fiocchi Nicolai, “The Origin and Development of Roman Catacombs,” in \textit{The Christian Catacombs of Rome: History, Decoration, Inscriptions}, eds. Vincenzo Fiocchi Nicolai, Fabrizio Bisconti, and Danilo Mazzoleni (Regensburg: Schnell & Steiner, 2009), pp. 9-70, quotes at pp. 12 and 16-17, and \textit{passim} for the same ideas. Fiocchi Nicolai follows in the footsteps of Philippe Pergola’s distinction between the “closed” and “open” hypogeae, whereby the former were not meant to be expanded and Pergola attributes them to pagans, while the latter were planned to be expanded to accommodate the burials of prospective dead Christians. Philippe Pergola, \textit{Le catacombe romane: storia e topografia} (Rome: Carocci, 1998), esp. at pp. 60-62.

\textsuperscript{189} The attribution of a small-size hypogeum is occasionally hindered by the lack of the \textit{titulus}, in which cases Brabara E. Borg carefully assumes that because of the similar size and layout unidentifiable hypogeae were likely family hypogeae, although the “collective ownership by a small group of people cannot be excluded as their tituli are lost.” Borg, \textit{Crisis and Ambition}, at pp. 59-72, quote at p. 62.

\textsuperscript{190} Bodel, “From Columbaria to Catacombs,” esp. at pp. 189-95, with quote at p. 194. Borg has thoroughly analyzed the early third-century hypogeae that would later develop into Roman, namely Christian, catacombs, and while she affirmed that certain hypogeae likely originated as exclusive burial grounds of Christians, such as Area I Callixtus, Novatanianus, Calepodius, most of the hypogeae had diverse patrons and accommodated burials of individuals and groups of different social background (such as the \textit{collegia}, \textit{large familiae}, the imperial slaves and freedmen). Borg, \textit{Crisis and Ambition}, pp. 59-118.

\textsuperscript{191} For example, Marin, “\textit{Civitas splendida Salona},” at p. 46; \textit{Salona III, Manastirine}, at p. 88; Matijević, “Anepigraphic Sarcophagi in situ in the Basilica at Manastirine,” at p. 87.
cristiana); Peregrinus, namely Domnio, was buried on November 29, 382 (depositio Domnionis die III Kal(endas) Dec(endas) con(sule) Antonio).\textsuperscript{192} De Rossi and Egger understood that the intended meaning of the phrase was in covemterio legis sanctae cristianae, and given the intellectual milieu they belonged to, de Rossi interpreted it as the designation of the cemetery of Manastirine as the exclusively Christian cemetery in opposition to the Jewish burial ground (the “covemterium legis indaicae”), while Egger thought that it more likely stood in the opposition to the Arian burial ground (the cemetery of the “lex ariana”); the contemporary Croatian scholarship, as noted above, and Salona IV subscribe to the interpretation. The expression does not seem to have been epigraphically attested elsewhere.

Firstly, the more recent scholarship has rectified the traditional readings of a few passages in the texts of Christian apologists and Church Fathers, which were usually taken to support the contemporary claims for the normative separation of pagans, Christians, and Jews in death. The revised interpretations have suggested that there were no official bans against mixing of pagan, Christian, and Jewish graves, and archaeological evidence has shown that they shared tombs and burial grounds in the fourth century.\textsuperscript{193} Moreover, the demographic exercise below will suggest that by the second half of the fourth century virtually all inhabitants of a city, namely of Salona, were Christian Romans; that is not to say that there were no individuals of other religions, but that the majority of city-dwellers were Christians and that all burial grounds were by default “Christian.” Finally, there is no reason to assume that in the second half of the fourth century in Salona, there was a large group of non-Christians against whom the prevalent Christian inhabitants would have needed to identify the city cemeteries as specifically Christian.

\textsuperscript{192} CIL 03, 9508 = FS II, no. 114 at pp. 83-84 = ILCV 383SC = ILJUG 2393 = S IV, 1: 163 at pp. 410-12 = HD034778.
To compose an epitaph was an individual and personal initiative, and it is difficult to reconstruct individual histories and personal experiences based on somewhat exceptional wording of the funerary text. Theodotus emphasized the religious affiliation of his son Peregrinus and of himself in three ways: the threat against potential violators specified the Church as the recipient of the monetary fine (*inferet ec(c)lesiae argenti p(ondo) X*), through the controversial phrase *in lege sancta christiana*, and by the Peregrinus’s alternative, assumingly baptismal name of Domnio, after the local patron martyr. The word *lex* may have stood for the word *fides*: the word had much wider currency in epitaphs (and it was otherwise the standardly used word to denote faith), and the syntagm *fides sancta* is attested in epitaphs. The *lex christiana* may also mean the “Christian religion” and the “Christian faith,” whereby the phrase *in lege sancta christiana* should be taken to designate Peregrinus’s religious affiliation rather than to denote the cemetery in which he was buried. The phrase may be taken to periphrastically stand for the *fidelis* or *fidelis christianus*. The family may have been simply very devotional, and the triple emphasis on the Christian faith might indicate the father’s attempt to find solace having buried his predeceased son. It is thus ripe time to redress paradigms inherited from the nineteenth-century scholars and their cultural and intellectual milieu.

The debate over the prospective title of Salona IV is indicative of the religiously based approach to the late antique epigraphic record, which is proven to be hard to eradicate. The first intention of the authors of Salona IV was to dedicate the collection to the “Christian inscriptions” of Salona, yet it had been thwarted by the realization that a significant number of inscribed tombs dated to from the fourth to the seventh centuries does not display tokens of the occupants’ affiliation to Christianity,
either because the tombstones are too fragmentarily preserved or because they did not contain them in the first place. To specify, less than 50 percent of Latin and Greek inscriptions can be ascribed to Christians.\footnote{Salona IV, at pp. 83-84.} The authors nevertheless strongly wanted to acknowledge the impact Christianity made on “the city of the martyr Domnio” and on its inhabitants, so they were compelled to settle on the “inscriptions of the Christian Salona,” and the title runs as the \textit{Inscriptions de Salone chrétienne}, \textit{IVe-VIIe siècles}.\footnote{Emilio Marin and Françoise Prévot, “Avant-propos,” in \textit{Salona IV}, at p. XIII.} Along the same lines, the visibility of Christians in epigraphic record accounts for the decisive criterion for the inclusion of an inscription in the corpus. The start date of the collection is 306 C.E., the year in which Constantine became emperor, which the authors decided upon due to the emperor’s religious policy.\footnote{Salona IV, at pp. 7, 21.} The authors conceptualized late antique epigraphy in religious terms which bring us to the topic of “Christian epigraphy.”

The presumed religious character of the archaeological context of the majority of late antique inscriptions has been decisive for the interpretation of the given epitaphic record. For example, around 70-80 percent of the early catacomb epitaphs of the first half of the third century are religiously neutral, and it is the archaeological context of “Christian” catacombs that make them “Christian epitaphs.”\footnote{For the discussion of the content and style of the early catacomb epitaphs, see Carletti, “Epigrafia Cristiana,” ‘epigrafia dei cristiani,” at pp. 118-35.} Thus, because of the tendency to date the seemingly late antique yet pagan inscriptions to before the fourth century, and because of the selection and publishing criteria of the nineteenth-century epigraphic corpora, the number of late antique inscriptions from the Latin West is difficult to assess.\footnote{Cf. a remark by Beltrán Lloris, “The ‘Epigraphic Habit’ in the Roman World,” at pp. 140-41.} Christian inscriptions from the Latin West have been long estimated at 50,000, of which ca. 40,000 come from Rome, the overwhelming majority of which, namely some 35,000, pertains to funerary inscriptions from catacombs dating from the late second/beginning of the third through the beginning of the fourth century.
of the sixth century.203 A number of late antique inscriptions, which were not labeled as Christian and have thus been published in CIL VI (Rome), needs to be added.204 Considering that the bulk of “Christian inscriptions” from Rome dominate the epigraphic record of both the City and the Latin West, and that the politicized concept of “Christian epigraphy” was modeled on the epigraphic evidence from Rome’s catacombs, it happened that the notion of “Christian epigraphy” has overshadowed the rest of the late antique epigraphic record and has subsumed its totality.

That the “Christian epigraphy” has unwarrantably come to mean the “late antique epigraphy” is well illustrated by the differing stand and conceptualization put forward by the two most recent handbooks of Roman epigraphy in the English-speaking scholarship. Alison E. Cooley has argued that Christianity brought about new epigraphic culture, and that to conceptualize inscriptions from the third to the late sixth century as “Christian epigraphy” is justifiable. Cooley has brought up the “Christian epitaphs,” graffiti on the walls of holy places, mosaic building inscriptions, the mensae martyrum and inscribed slave-collars, which are peripheral epigraphic phenomenon. While the discourse of different types of inscriptions was to various extent and at various pace Christianized, none of these types of inscriptions, their mediums and contexts was specific to Christian Romans but had been part of the ancient epigraphic culture in funerary, religious and secular context. On the contrary, Ann Marie Yasin has embedded her analysis of the practice of Christians to scratch devotional graffiti on the walls of their holy places in the accustomed practice of scrawling graffiti on the Greco-Roman shrines: their content was similar, namely most consisted of the name of a god and of an individual who scratched the graffiti, and they had similar purpose of an individual to assert one’s membership in the devotional

203 For the estimate of the number of Christian inscriptions from the Latin West, see Cabrol and Leclercq, Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, s.v. “Inscriptions Latines chrétiennes,” and Galvão-Sobrinho, “Funerary Epigraphy,” at p. 434-35. For the number of Rome’s Christian inscriptions, see Inscriptiones christianae urbis Romae: Nova series whose ten volumes contain more than 40,000 inscriptions. For the number of the Rome’s catacomb inscriptions, see Carlo Carletti, Iscrizioni cristiane di Roma. Testimonianze di vita cristiana (secoli III–VII) (Florence: Nardini Editore, 1986), at p. 11 and Carletti, Epigrafia dei cristiani in Occidente dal III al VII secolo. Ideologia e prassi (Bari: Edipuglia, 2008), at p. 19.
community and of marking the place as an active and effective religious and cultic space. The *mensae martyrum* are the subset of the funerary *mensae*, which had their both epigraphic and feasting function in the pagan and wider Christian funerary context, namely the later Roman *mensae* from North Africa alike carry texts that contain and are devoid of the Christian tokens.206

On the other hand, Cooley has not taken into consideration that there may be more to the epigraphy of late antique period other than the tokens of one’s affiliation to Christianity. Regarding that point, only 40 percent of Rome’s catacomb inscriptions displays biblical symbols.207 She has neither discussed contemporaneous inscriptions which lack of the evidence of Christianity in order to probe the possibility that some epigraphic changes and features were late antique rather than Christian. Namely, not all changes in different categories of inscriptions are attributable to Christianization of society. For example, Carlos Machado has examined the statue-habit, that is, the practice of setting up honorific inscriptions in late antique Rome and Italy where the habit experienced the revival in the fourth century unmatched elsewhere in the Mediterranean. The practice has nevertheless tapered off and disappeared even in Rome throughout the fifth century. The statue-habit was the product of and monumentalized social and political relationships in an urban context, and changes in patterns of setting-up statutes thus signaled the changed political dynamics and civic culture. The late fourth and early fifth centuries mark a watershed in the socio-political actors involved in the statue-habit. Namely, the classical civic practice of setting up honorific statues which was generated by city councils, local

---


207 Carletti, Epigrafia dei cristiani in Occidente, at pp. 19-20.
communities and *collegia* gave way to senators in official positions who thereby manifested their political influence over the communities and their aristocratic competition.\(^{208}\) In sum, while Cooley has indeed referred to precedent epigraphic practices for which she has, I think, unconvincingly argued that Christians transformed them into a distinct epigraphic culture. What Cooley has instead showed is that the discourse of inscriptions of various genre, most notably of epitaphs, was gradually Christianized, but not that “the rise of Christianity produced over time new attitudes to and new uses for inscriptions.”\(^{209}\)

Contrary to Cooley, Jean-Marie Lassère did not conceptualize “Christian inscriptions” as a separate epigraphic culture and a distinct field of study, but has instead treated altogether Roman inscriptions with respect to their function and historical topic they illuminate, for some of which religious affiliation may be entirely irrelevant. In cases in which the religion had bearing on the epigraphic genre and the historical theme, inscriptions set up by Christians are analyzed alongside their pagan and Jewish counterparts in their both diachronic and synchronic perspective, which serves us better to assess both their shared features and continuities, and their idiosyncratic elements.\(^{210}\) Neither has OHRE dedicated a special chapter to “Christian epigraphy” but to the epigraphy of late antique period, in which Benet Salway has called for unification of all epigraphic material from ca. the mid-third to the beginning of the seventh century, whether “Christian” or “pagan,” in order to delineate the late antique corpus of inscriptions and thus to be able to appreciate the distinctiveness of late


\(^{210}\) To illustrate, the chapter on funerary inscriptions is divided into three main parts, each dedicated to the pagan, Jewish and Christian epitaphs, while the section on the verse and philosophical epitaphs discusses both pagan and Christian texts. The topic of benefaction is divided into the benefactions in the classical city, Jewish and Christian dedications, and the imperial benefaction that deals with pagan and Christian emperors alike. Lastly, the theme of crafts examines early and late imperial inscriptions indiscriminately. For the programmatic statements, see Jean-Marie Lassère, *Manuel d’épigraphie romaine* (Paris: Picard, 2005), at pp. VI and 12, and the selected examples, at pp. 220-290, 429-39, 513-36.
antique epigraphic habit. Salway has thus focused on the formal aspects of inscribed monuments irrespective of their types and religious affiliation, such as the materials commonly used and the increased practice of re-using earlier monuments, conventions in the presentation of the text, variation in the style of script, the introduction of the scroll-looking symbol to mark the abbreviation and the usage of a cross as the punctuation mark, namely a counterpart of the earlier hedera. Likewise, Dennis E. Trout has called for the secularization and de-ghettoization of “Christian epigraphy.” That is, the “late Latin epigraphy” should be aligned with the early imperial Latin epigraphy, namely “Roman epigraphy,” and the topics pertinent to the latter should be discussed in their longue durée since the “early imperial debate has obvious implications for late Latin epigraphy.”

The model elaborated by Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho, which attempts to explain the revival of the “Christian epigraphic habit,” presents the consummated form of the nineteenth-century definition of a “Christian inscription.” Considering that his account exemplifies the given concept and its implications in the extreme, and given its reception by the authoritative scholars with the few questioning his conclusions, Galvão-Sobrinho’s argument merits thorough discussion. Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho has singled out the “statements of faith” as the essential element of Christian funerary texts and has posited “the connection between writing an epitaph and being a Christian.”

---

211 Salway, “Late Antiquity,” pp. 364-96. Along the same lines, in the workshop on the late antique epigraphic cultures Claire Sotinel has argued that the definition of “Christian epigraphy” as a distinct genre and field of study is neither straightforward nor useful. See the review by Christian Witschel, “The Epigraphic Culture(s) of Late Antiquity,” Heidelberg: Seminar für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik, Universität Heidelberg: Epigraphische Datenbank Heidelberg; Internationales Wissenschaftsforum Heidelberg, 26.06.2009-27.06.2009. (http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=27361 May 2016).


Epitaphs were a “very important” medium for believers to define themselves as Christian “before the eyes of God” which “played a crucial role in securing salvation” to them. Galvão-Sobrinho has ultimately taken dated and datable funerary monuments as the proxy evidence for the widespread Christianization of the Latin West.

There are a couple of problematic assumptions that structure his argument. As discussed above, the underlying premise that the epigraphic culture of a period was driven and given form by a single motivating factor unique to the period is in itself untenable. Galvão-Sobrinho has accepted Elizabeth A. Meyer’s explanation for the rise and decline of the early imperial epigraphic habit, and has replicated her method that seeks to determine the fundamental element of epitaphs and then argues that the motivation to display it accounts for the spread of the epitaphic and by extension of the epigraphic culture. From the first through the beginning of the third century it was the deceased’s Romanitas, while from the fourth through the late sixth century it was the deceased’s Christianitas that gave impetus to inscribing (funerary) texts. Galvão-Sobrinho has thus concluded that it was the “fortuitous combination of the spread of Christian beliefs about the death and afterlife and an ideologically unstable world that drove the habit,” and that only when the urban population became overwhelmingly Christianized “would the motivations for writing epitaphs become less acute and the practice decline.”

Galvão-Sobrinho has not considered the possibility that the forces other than Christianization may have factored in the revival of the epigraphic output in the fourth century and in its final contraction in the sixth and seventh centuries hence his misformulated question of “Why should not commemoration have continued customary at about the same relatively low level set in 250 or 300?”

---

Compared with more than two centuries of flourishing epigraphic production, and with our benefit of hindsight, its most acute decline in the decades around the mid-third century, which scholars have correlated with the period of the “third century crisis”, cannot be thought of as “customary,” but rather disruptive. Contrary to Galvão-Sobrinho, other scholars gave priority to political and economic factors rather than to the cultural in their account of the curve of epigraphic output.

If, on the one hand, the political stability and peace ushered in by Augustus, and the concomitant intensification of the economic growth, which begun in the last decades of the first century C.E. and were maintained throughout the first two centuries C.E., and on the other hand, the innovative and exemplary epigraphic practices of Augustus and of the city of Rome, paved the way for the spread of the epigraphic culture in the provinces and across different social groups, then it is reasonable to expect that the model should work the other way around. Bryan Ward-Perkins has drawn on probably the most influential and persuasive model of the economic growth in the Roman empire elaborated by Keith Hopkins in 1980, in his attempt to account for the political, economic and cultural decline that occurred in the Latin West from the third through the sixth centuries; it goes without saying, that the course of developments was neither straight nor steady, nor occurred to the same extent throughout the empire.

---


220 Beltrán Lloris, “The ‘Epigraphic Habit’ in the Roman World,” at pp. 141, 144; Salway, “Late Antiquity,” at pp. 364-65. Charlotte Roueché has not provided the explicit explanation for the significant contraction of the epigraphic output in late antiquity, yet she seems to be inclined towards the economic cause. She assumes that the “professional epigraphic stoncutters could perhaps no longer earn a livelihood” in late antiquity which partly accounts for the characteristically late antique style of the epigraphic script, namely its lack of uniformity and consistency. ala2004 1 Introduction.10.

extent and at the same pace in different provinces of the West. Observable is the correlation (or causation) between the regions in which the economies still flourished under the late empire and in which the epigraphic production displayed more vitality (although the number of produced inscribed monuments everywhere dropped in comparison with the early and high empire): firstly in between the eastern and western empire, whereby the archaeological evidence points to the widespread urban and rural prosperity in the Greek East, and the epigraphic production in the East was comparatively more resilient. In the western empire, the regions which were economically more prosperous, and which displayed more urban and monumental vitality and continuity of the Roman, classical type of civic lifestyle in the fourth and part of the fifth centuries were North Africa, much of Italy, south Spain, Provence and Dalmatia. These regions were also epigraphically comparatively more active. To conclude, rather than to posit that the partial epigraphic recovery in the fourth century was motivated by the desire to display one’s faith in order to make it clear to God and to one’s co-inhabitants who the Christian was, it seems more plausible that it was due to certain political stability imposed by Diocletian and Constantine, and concomitant with the partial economic and monetary recovery. Nevertheless, the fourth-century Romans were also Christians, whose idiosyncratic notions of the afterlife would naturally find their place in epitaphs, since the funerary context was inextricably connected with one of the main tenets of the Christian doctrine, namely salvation.

Given the scarcity and unreliability of quantitative data from Roman antiquity, any such study is fraught with all sorts of problems. The following should simply serve to suggest that the fact that

223 For the more favorable political and military, and more flourishing economic conditions in the late eastern empire, see Ward-Perkins, The Fall of Rome, at pp. 41-42, 46-48, 58-62. Also, for the more prosperous urbanism in the late East, see J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, The Decline and Fall of the Roman City (Oxford: OUP, 2003), at pp. 29-74. For a comparative more abundant epigraphic production in the Greek East, see Salway, “Late Antiquity,” at p. 365, and for a brief survey of the epigraphic production in the late Asia Minor, see ala2004 I Introduction 3 and 4.
224 Summarily on the different trajectories in different regions of the West, Ward-Perkins, The Fall of Rome, at pp. 128-32. On the varied urban situation in the late West, see Liebeschuetz, The Decline and Fall of the Roman City, at pp. 74-103.
the fourth- and fifth-century epitaphs commemorated Christians is not significant with respect to the epitaphic revival. The sociologist of religion Rodney Stark has attempted to calculate the growth of Christianity from its beginnings to the mid-fourth century by assuming its exponential growth at the rate of 40 percent per decade: the starting number was 1,000 Christians in the year 40 in the empire of 60,000 people. According to Stark’s calculus, ca. 56.5 percent of the empire’s population would have been Christianized by the mid-fourth century. Given that the majority of the empire’s population were rural inhabitants, and that Christianity was first and foremost an urban phenomenon, it is then likely that the majority of the city inhabitants and thus of the “epitaphic population” would have been predominantly Christian in the second half of the fourth century. To support the idea, Bodel has calculated the hypothetical number of Christians in the city of Rome in the fourth century. The consensual number of the inhabitants of the third-century Rome ranges in between 750,000 and 1,000,000, and the estimated size of the early third-century Christian community is 7000, which means that, according to Stark’s suggested growth rate of the 40 percent per decade, virtually all inhabitants of the city of Rome would have been Christian by 350. Accordingly, “the notion of purely “Christian” catacombs becomes unproblematic,” which applies to other types of urban burials.

The thesis furthermore wishes to address another methodological problem regarding the tendency to give primacy to textual sources: the narrative and normative texts are valued over inscriptions, as it was shown on the example of Meyer’s and Woolf’s interpretation of the epigraphic habit, and the epitaphic tombs overshadow the uninscribed ones. The point is that Galvão-Sobrinho has overly focused on the funerary texts in isolation from their monumental and burial context. It is legitimate for epitaphs to be the first and foremost object of an analysis, yet it should be borne in mind

226 Bodel, “From Columbaria to Catacombs,” at pp. 183-84, with quote at p. 184.
that the inscribed gravestones make up part of the monumental funerary culture, which includes anepitaphic tombs as well. The noted proportions of the inscribed and uninscribed tombs should serve to moderate Galvão-Sobrinho’s statements regarding the extent of the “Christian revival of the epigraphic practice,” such as the “spectacular revival,” “impressive revival,” “an explosion of funerary writing,” or that Christian epigraphic record is “embarrassingly vast.” Consequently, the verbiage regarding the desire to set up an inscribed marker would need to be toned down and the presumed effect that the text was thought of to have had needs to be reconsidered.

With the appreciation of the bulk and historical value of Roman epitaphs, they still need to be considered within their wider burial context. To begin with, John Bodel has estimated the number of the known burials of any type at Rome from 25 B. C. E. to 325 C. E. at one and a half percent of the presumed total of those who died during the period (150,000 out of 10,000,000) in order to raise our awareness of the “tiny percentage…of those for which we have any evidence at all.” As for the proportion of epitaphic and anepitaphic tombs within a single burial context, the catacombs of Rome represent the most illustrative example as the number of their epitaphs is unsurpassably vast yet only ca. four percent of all graves were marked with inscriptions, that is ca. 35,000 out of ca. 875,000 burials. The zoomed-in picture of the two burial sectors found intact in the 20th century remains similar: out of the 650 burials on the via Ostiensis, which grew out of the so-called cubiculum of Leo and was connected to the catacombs of Commodilla, only 41 burials (six percent) were marked with inscriptions. Likewise, out of the 325 loculi in the galleries A13-A24 of the catacombs of Pamfilius on

---

228 John Bodel, “From Columbaria to Catacombs,” at pp. 235-42. Less pertinently to the remark on Galvão-Sobrinho’s method, yet still illustrative of how an extremely small percentage of people left epigraphic traces. Regarding the “epigraphic population” in Dalmatia during the Principate, J. J. Wilkes has estimated that we have a written record of ca. 0.1 percent of the people who inhabited the province, that is, there are some 7,000 individuals recorded in ca. 3,900 inscriptions out of the presumed total of 7,000,000. J. J. Wilkes, “The Population of Roman Dalmatia,” in Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, Vol. II. 6. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), at pp. 751-53.
the via Salaria vetus only 10 (three percent) were identified with epitaphs. In the catacombs of s. Agnes on the via Nomentana and of ss. Marcellinus and Peter on the via Labicana the proportion is somewhat higher: in the former catacombs, out of 5,753 burials 826 were epitaphic (14 percent), and in the latter ones, 2,200 were epitaphic out of 22,500 burials (ten percent).  

The proportion seems to have been significantly different in cemetery basilicas. For example, 586 out of ca. 1,000 burials in the basilica Apostolorum were marked with epitaphs (ca. 59 percent), all of which were inscribed in stone monuments with the high level of craftsmanship. Carlo Carletti has interpreted the disparity between the respective ratios of inscribed and uninscribed monuments in catacombs and cemetery basilicas in terms of the higher socio-economic status and cultural pretensions of the latter occupants.

With respect to the main municipal cemetery at Salona, the Figures 3a and 3b in the Appendix 1 illustrate the proportion of the sarcophagi and the graves under tiles at Manastirine: the latter are expectedly significantly more numerous. As for the proportion of the epitaphic and anepitaphic sarcophagi found at the cemetery of Manastirine, the figures are not readily measurable because of the unlike criteria used to count them. Namely, Ivan Matijević has taken into consideration the fully preserved uninscribed sarcophagi found in situ of which there are 68, while Salona IV has collected 199 sarcophagi inscriptions in both Latin and Greek which have been fragmentarily preserved for the most part. Although the ratio of 25 to 75 may not be representative of the situation on the ground but biased towards the inscribed sarcophagi, it is the only assessment we can get at if for no other purpose but to contextualize the inscribed monuments.

---

231 Carletti, “Un mondo nuovo,” at p. 46.
233 I have surveyed Latin and Greek sarcophagi inscriptions gathered in Salona IV, at pp. 387-1026, and at pp. 1148-1209 and I have counted those that certainly come from Manastirine.
The situation on the ground defies extrapolation of an overarching explanation for the pattern of the epitaphic and anepitaphic catacomb loculi, and stone funerary monuments. A few observations are still in order. Not to mark a burial with inscription was the norm in Rome’s catacombs which both lends importance to the act of writing an epitaph and calls into question the purpose ascribed to it. As for the former point, Galvão-Sobrinho is right on target by emphasizing the exceptionality and value of the written word, although his picturesque wording resonates with the romanticized view of the way in which the early Christians acted in the catacomb setting. Thus “hastily painted or scribbled…or simply scratched” epitaphs reveal the “frustrated attempts to spell names and words” of a “large number of illiterate and semi-literate Christians,” which altogether testifies “to the strong desire of an underclass to put up epitaphs.”234 On the other hand, if the idea that epitaphs played a role as fundamentally important as helping to secure salvation so pervasively penetrated popular imagination, a reasonable assumption is that such epitaphs, which required either small or no outlay and no brushed-up skill, and little time and work, would be significantly more numerous raising the percentage of the epitaphic loculi well beyond the four percent. On that note, in his discussion of the low ratio of inscribed loculi in catacombs, Danilo Mazzoleni has pointed out that “…it is also true that, if one really desired a written dedication, a short and economical graffito…would have been sufficient.” Mazzoleni has connected the lack of an inscription with the illiteracy of occupants rather than to the cost of such epitaphs.235

Regarding the sarcophagi as the most frequent monumental tomb in later Roman Salona, the consideration of their two elements is in place in the discussion of the late antique epitaphic habit. Firstly, vocabulary used in epitaphs to refer to tombstones and tombs may be suggestive of how they

---

were conceptualized; the analysis of vocabulary suggests that their functional aspect of the container for the remains of the dead overshadowed their monumental, representative aspect. Secondly, the content of epitaphs may provide hints about the process of preparing sarcophagi and about at what stage in the trajectory the inscribing of texts took place. That should also serve to somewhat moderate our emphasis on the relevance of the written word in the overall tomb scheme.

In the first three centuries C.E. in Salona, the two words most commonly used in epitaphs to refer to a tombstone were the *monumentum* and *titulus*, and the standard expression with the meaning of “to set up a tombstone” was the *monumentum* or *titulum posuit/posuerunt*, whereby *pono* was occasionally interchanged with *facio*. Indeed, the formula most commonly appears in its elliptical form in which either the object of *monumentum* or *titulum*, or both the object and predicate of *posuit/posuerunt* were omitted as understood. The verb *facio* most commonly appears in the formula of *vivus/-a fecit* or *vivi fecerunt sibi (et)*.

To the extent to which it is possible to trace the word usage due to the ellipsis, the word *monumentum* seems to have been all-encompassing, that is, it was applied to tombstones and monuments of various types and sizes, yet only very exceptionally to coffins. On the other hand, the *titulus* appears to have been monument-specific and was metonymically applied only to inscribed stelae and vertical slabs, and particularly to the smaller and simpler ones. In these cases, the inscribed text was obviously the dominant feature of a tombstone and it took precedence over its monumentality in people’s imagination. To note is that there are instances in which the word *titulus* is used in its literal meaning of an “inscription” yet these are comparatively rare in epitaphs and are not pertinent to the

236 The following were the stock formulae commonly used in epitaphs in the Latin West. This survey is based on the careful reading of the funerary, honorary, and votive inscriptions from Salona of the first to the seventh centuries. Besides to sarcophagi, the word *monumentum* is applied ubiquitously so I have not listed its examples.

present consideration of the conceptualization of tombstones.\textsuperscript{238} The tombstones, most commonly stelae and slabs, were occasionally metaphorically referred to as the \textit{memoria}, whereby the emphasis was on their additional function to preserve the memory of the dead.\textsuperscript{239} As for the Greek epitaphs, a single stela inscription might contain a reference to the monument. Denis Feissel has interpreted the word τὸ πομνήμα in the phrase ἐποίησεν τὸ πομνήμα as the vulgarism of the τὸ μνημεῖον, namely, as the “monument, memorial.”\textsuperscript{240} Some of the earliest sarcophagi epitaphs in Salona employ the elliptical formulae and do not reference the coffin itself.\textsuperscript{241} The two earliest hints at how coffins were conceptualized and referred to are also proved to have been exceptions to what became the standard coffin-specific phrasing. The sarcophagus epitaph dated to from the 130s to the end of the second century employs the formula

\textsuperscript{238} The word \textit{titulus} in its literal meaning: \textit{iste tuum loquitur Petronia nomen iam titulus} (CIL 03, 9610 = S IV, 2: 460 at pp. 826-29 = HD034796), \textit{qui legis hic tuum titulum} (CIL 03, 14855 = HD060780).

\textsuperscript{239} Ulpian summarized the legal definition of the \textit{monumentum} (not exclusively of a funerary monument): \textit{Monumentum est quod memoriae servandae gratia existat} (Ulp. Dig. 11.7.2.6). For the essential aspect of the various above-ground funerary monuments from the late Republic and Principate to preserve an individual’s memory, see Maureen Carroll, \textit{The Spirits of the Dead}, at pp. 30-59; and for a survey of the concept of memory in contemporary scholarship and how Romans thought of it, see Valerie M. Hope, “Introduction,” in \textit{Memory and Mourning, Studies on Roman Death}, eds. Valerie M. Hope and Janet Huskinson (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2011), pp. xi-xxiv. \textit{Memoria} CIL 03, 2007 (stela or slab), 2296 (stela or slab), 2416 (stela or slab), 8862 (slab), 8935 (slab), 8986 (slab), 9024, 9226 = S IV, 2: 492 at pp. 863-65 (sarcophagus), 9578 = S IV, 2: 437 at pp. 785-87 (sarcophagus).

\textsuperscript{240} Salona IV, 2: 765 at pp. 1143-44, with a discussion of the word at the p. 1144.

\textsuperscript{241} Nenad Cambi dates the two earliest locally produced coffins to the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. In one case, \textit{Cassia Pallas} set up the coffin to her patroness \textit{Cassia T(iti) f(ilia) Pomponilla} (CIL 03, 12964 = HD063940; Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Pomponilla” at p. 269 and “Pallas” at p. 258 and EDH date the inscription to the high empire). In another case, \textit{Liguria Procilla quae et Albucia} set up the coffin to herself, and to her husband and two sons, who were decuriones of Salona and Issa (CIL 03, 2074 = HD057001; Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Menippus” at p. 246, “Procilianus” at p. 274, and “Procilla” at p. 274 dates the inscription to the high empire, and EDH dates the inscription to the second half of the second century). Cambi, \textit{Die Sarkophage der lokalen Werkstätten in römischen Dalmatien (2. bis 4. JH. n. Chr.)}, cat. no. 57 at p. 108, and cat. no. 189 at p. 135. Yet another early epitaphic coffin commemorated \textit{T(itus) F(lavius?) T(iti) f(ilius) Trofimas Smyrnaeus} (ILJUG 128 = HD032950); Cambi dates the coffin to the early second century, EDH dates the inscription to the second half of the second century, and Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Trophimus, Trophimas, Trofimas,” at p. 314 dates the inscription to the high empire. Other earlier examples of locally produced sarcophagi are the coffin of \textit{Albia Cale} (ILJUG 2709 = HD035139; Cambi, \textit{Die Sarkophage}, cat. no. 41 at p. 105 dates it to the mid-second century, ILJUG 2709 at p. 362 dates it more broadly to the second century, while Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Albius” at p. 57, “Cale” at p. 168, “Hermes” at p. 215 and “Marinus” at p. 239 dates it to the high empire), the coffin of the spouses \textit{Livius Primitivus} and \textit{Iulia Firma} (ILJUG 2730 = HD035159; Cambi, \textit{Die Sarkophage}, cat. no. 42 at p. 105 dates it to the mid-second century, Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Firmus” at p. 204 and “Primitivus” at p. 271 dates it to the high empire), and the coffin of the spouses \textit{Maria Helpis} and \textit{Aur(elius) Secundus} (CIL 03, 13007 = HD063980; Cambi, \textit{Die Sarkophage}, cat. no. 60 at p. 109 dates the coffin to the mid-second century, and Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Elpis, Helpis” at p. 192 and “Secundus” at p. 292 and EDH date the inscription to the high empire).
vivus fecit in its elliptical form then followed by the formula \( h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur) \). These were stock phrases used for funerary monuments of the first and second centuries, namely stelae and slabs (especially the large and/or marble ones), arae, base statues, and architectural elements, but they were exceptionally applied to coffins in these two early instances, before the particular notions about coffins and the sarcophagi-specific formulae were crystallized. On the same note, the sarcophagus dated to the first half of the fourth century was also figuratively conceptualized: the expression used was \( fecit memoria(m) \). Finally, although not a comparable instance because the vocabulary expresses the ideas about the afterlife and grave rather than the conceptualization of a tombstone – as is nicely flesh out by the third-century sarcophagus epitaph which imagines the given arca as the domus aeternalis – an another fourth-century coffin was metaphorically referred to as the domus aeterna keeping alive the pagan imagery and vocabulary of the hereafter.

Besides these exceptional instances, coffins were standardly referred to as the arca or less often as the sarcophagus: to illustrate, in the inscriptions collected by Salona IV, the word arca is attested in 91 and sarcophagus in 22 instances. The usage of the word arca was earlier too. The earliest attestation appears in the inscription of T(itus) (A)el(ius) Pasiphilus set up the monument to his spouse Iulia Gemella and his son Petronius Staphylus. AE 1989, 0604 = HD018327. Kirigin et al., “Salona 86/7,” at p. 42.

Yet another one, datable to the second century, refers to the coffin as the monumentum (em[it] monimentum), and employs the formula \( in f(ronre) p(edes) XIIX \) in \( a(gr) n(o) p(edes) XIIX \). The following are the illustrative cases. Stelae: CIL 03, 2004+p. 2328,125, and 8762; ILJUG 2097, and 2182. Slabs: CIL 03, 2060 = HD054185, 2083+p. 1509 = HD055643, and 2497+p. 1032 = HD062163; ILJUG 0682 = HD034094, and 2098 = HD034439. Statue on base: CIL 03, 8713 = HD062428. Altar: CIL 03, 8764+p. 1475 = HD062460, and 8786 = HD062647. Architectural element: CIL 03, 8806 = HD062950; ILJUG 0682 = HD034638, Cambi also remarked that this is the only instance in which the formula in (ronre) in a(gr) was applied to a coffin. Cambi, Sarkofazi na istočnoj Jadranskoj obali, III-VII st. n. e., at p. 298.

\[242\] T(itus) (A)el(ius) Pasiphilus set up the monument to his spouse Iulia Gemella and his son Petronius Staphylus. AE 1989, 0604 = HD018327. Kirigin et al., “Salona 86/7,” at p. 42.

\[243\] ILJUG 2185 = HD034638. P(ublius) Mescenius Dorus bought the monument for himself and his wife Statia Epiteuxis.


\[245\] Cf. Referencing ILJUG 2185 = HD034638, Cambi also remarked that this is the only instance in which the formula in (ronre) in a(gr) was applied to a coffin. Cambi, Sarkofazi na istočnoj Jadranskoj obali, III-VII st. n. e., at p. 298.

\[246\] CIL 03, 9578 = S IV, 2: 437 at pp. 785-87 = HD034746.

\[247\] Ulpius Gorgonius composed the epitaph for his spouse Ulpia Celerina. CIL 03, 14292 = S IV, 1: 224 at pp. 505-10 = HD061693. For the motif of domus aeterna in Latin epitaphs see, Richard Lattimore, Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1942).

to have been in the threat formula against the tomb violation as recorded in the early third-century sarcophagus which the aug(ustalis) L.(ucius) Pomponius Draco set up for himself and his spouse Iulia Annia.250 Other early attestations of the word *area* comprise two coffins dated to the first half of the third century which the spouses Aelia Messiana and Aurel(ius) Saturninus,251 and the spouses Calpurnia Pitian(a) and Publius Claudius set up to themselves:252 the word *area* is the object in the formula *vivus sibi*.

The words *area* and *sarcophagus* were regularly attested in the epitaphs of the fourth and fifth centuries as the formulae of setting up and acquiring a coffin increasingly tended to be written in full, and the menace formulae against the tomb violation became pervasive.253 Moreover, the characteristic sixth-century formula stating whom the coffin was set up to began with the word *area* followed by the occupant’s name in the dative case.254 Likewise, Greek epitaphs refer to the coffin as the ἡ *σορός* and ἡ *ἀρκα*, the latter being the transcribed loanword of the Latin term.255

The most common verb used to denote “to set up a coffin” was *pono*, while the verb *facio* is conspicuously missing, the two instances of which – as noted above – appear conjoined with the words

---


251 ILJUG 2102 = HD028027; ILJUG 2102 at p. 203 dates the inscription to the first half of the third century, which EDH has accepted, and Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, s.v. “Messianus” at p. 246 and “Saturninus” at p. 288 dates the inscription to the high empire.

252 ILJUG 2714 = HD035144.

253 CIL 03, 2043+pp. 1030 and 1509 = HD063417; 2207 = HD061150; 2108 = HD063059; 2226+p. 1031 = HD062884; 2223+8559+8563+13891+pp. 2323 and 2328,125 = HD034749; 2240 = HD062874; 2490 = HD062671; 2490 = HD062671; 2628+9259+12848 = HD062937; 2631 = HD062475; 2635+9673 = HD062936; 2654+865 = HD054211; 6399 = HD063418; 8727+p. 1510 = HD034742; 8742 = HD062536; 8869 = HD063293; 9487+12856 = HD062926; 9507+p. 2139 = HD034774; 9532+p. 2328,126 = HD034892; 9533 = 034891; 9546 = HD035252; 9568+12869 = HD034786; 9535 = HD059986; 9569+12870 = HD059876; 9585 = HD034793; 9597+p. 2140 = HD034756; 9621 = HD034757; 9663+9094+9572+12842 = HD034766; 12933+13896 = HD034763; 13142+p. 2326 = HD034901; 13151 = HD034753; 14306,5 = HD034743; 14924 = HD034797; 9565+p. 2140 = HD034784. ILJUG 2129 = HD034624; 2241 = HD034537; 2711 = HD035141. S IV, 2: 420 = HD064335; S IV, 2: 424 = HD064337; S IV, 2: 428 = HD064338; S IV, 2: 634 = HD064457. I have left out the texts that are too fragmentarily preserved.

254 For the formula and the list of the coffin epitaphs that employ it, see Nancy Gauthier, “Introduction,” in *Salona IV*, at pp. 44-45.

255 ἡ *σορός*: FS III, 29 = S IV, 2: 781; ILJUG 2040 = S IV, 2: 792; CIL 03, 9579 = S IV, 2: 796; S IV, 2: 814. ἡ *ἀρκα*: S IV, 2: 802, and 815. The Latin term *piscina* was also borrowed and transcribed as ἡ *φισκ*ῖ*νη* (CIL 03, 14894 = S IV, 2: 747).
of *monumentum* and *memoria*. For example, in contrast to the standard formula of *vivus/-a fecit*, which can be found on all other types of tombstones, the equivalent Latin and Greek expression used for coffins was *vivus/-a posuit* and ἔθηκεν τὰ· τὴν τὸν ὁσαφῶν respectively. Sarcophagi datable approximately to the second and third centuries employed the formula less often in its full form of *arcam posuit*, and more commonly in its elliptical form. By analogy with the cases in which the object was recorded, it is reasonable to assume that the coffin was thought of as the *arca* rather than as the *monumentum*.

Connected to the usage of the verb *pono* in relation to coffins, namely in relation to the rite of inhumation, is the issue pertaining to the religious significance of the words *depono*, *depositio* and *depositus/-a*. These words are commonly thought of as specifically Christian expressing their ideas of the burial as the temporary resting place before resurrection, and Salona IV has used it as the evidence of the religious affiliation of sarcophagi occupants. Carlo Carletti has likewise pointed out that the words are not specifically Christian and that they do not convey their ideas about the afterlife.

The currency of the words *depono*, *depositio* and *depositus/-a* became widespread in the late antique epitaphs, and it coincided with the pervasiveness of the rite of inhumation, and with the pervasive Christianization of society and their visibility in epigraphic record. Nevertheless, put into perspective with the vocabulary applied to coffins before the fourth-century, whereby the verb *pono* was exclusively used, *depono* simply appears to have been a late Latin counterpart of the earlier *pono* and means nothing.

---

256 ILJUG 2040A = S IV, 2: 792. Otherwise, Greek epitaphs rarely employ such formula.
257 The formulae appear in their full forms in: CIL 03, 2098+p. 1509. = HD056884, ILJUG 2102 = HD028027, and 2714 = HD035144. Besides the second-century coffins listed in the n. 37 at p. 10, in the following later second- and third-century coffins formulae appear in their elliptical forms: CIL 03, 2098+p. 1509. = HD056884 (the word *arca* though is attested in the threat formula); ILJUG 2103 = HD034443 (ILJUG 2103 at p. 203 dates it to the second century), 2125 = HD021989 (ILJUG 2125 at p. 208 dates it to the second century), 2135 = HD034629 (ILJUG 2135 at pp. 209-10 dates it to the third century), 2151 = HD034455, 2709 = HD035139 (ILJUG 2709 at p. 362 dates it to the second century), 2710 = HD035140, 2725 = HD035154, 2733 = HD035162.
more than that the remains, namely the bones, are “laid,” “placed down.” The funerary text, inscribed on a horizontal slab or an architectural member and set up in between 41-70, demonstrates the continuity of the usage of the verb depono and proves that it is conceptually connected with inhumation, namely with the bone remains of the deceased: the freedman C(aius) Iulius Sceptus “forbids that the bones be placed down in any other way in his monument” (in b(os) m(onumento) veto aliter ossua deponi quam Primae et nisi sunt); given the content of the text, he probably meant that he forbids that the bones of any other person besides those specified in the inscription be placed down, whereby aliter maybe stands for the genitive singular alterius rather than an adverb.²⁶¹

To sum up, the survey of the terms applied to sarcophagi was carried out to underline the fact that the literal language was used for them. That stands in the stark contrast to the figurative vocabulary and language used for all other types of the above-ground tombstones. That suggests that people thought differently of coffins on the one hand, and stelae, slabs, altars, cippi on the other, and accordingly put them in different mental categories. The difference likely stems from the definition of what constituted a tomb (sepulchrum) and what was defined as the res religiosa and the locus religious,²⁶² and these were the remains of the deceased. As Yan Thomas has put it: “The tomb was strictly defined as the space actually occupied by the deceased,” and “the act of burial gave birth to the tomb…which constituted the locus religious,” and it was solely the body that rendered the sepulcher “inviolable, inalienable and immune from seizure.” The legal quality of the funerary monument depended on its “contact and contiguity with the body that it contained.”²⁶³ Moreover, while the legal definition of what constituted the violatio sepulchri in the early and high empire did not include the reliquiae, because

²⁶¹ CIL 03, 2097+p. 2135+8585 = HD063871.
²⁶² For the Roman legal definitions of the res religiosa and the locus religious, Fernand de Visscher, Le droit des tombeaux romains (Milano: Giuffrè editore, 1963), at pp. 52-60.
once the entombed “body” becomes violated it immediately becomes “corpse,” in the fourth century the religious status of the tomb was supplemented by the laws that banned the “profanation of bodies themselves,” that is, the violation of the *reliquiae* also became the *violatio sepulchri.*

According to Verity Platt, specific to coffins is the “concern with the sarcophagus’s status as a practical and metaphorical frame.” The analysis of the vocabulary employed in sarcophagi epitaphs referring to the container, which shifted from the figurative language attested in a few early examples to the exclusively literal language, suggests that from the third century onward the sarcophagus’s functional aspect prevailed over its metaphorical, “monumental” aspect. Moreover, the correlation is observable between the increased “horror at the exhumation of corpses” noticeable from the beginning of the fourth century, to which the emperor Constantius II responded and legally defined as the *violatio sepulchri* in 357 C.E., and the pervasiveness of the fine threats against the tomb violation in the late Roman sarcophagi in Salona. Finally, it is observable the growing minimalism of its panels: firstly figural and ornamental decorations completely disappeared in the late fourth century and ultimately even the frame of an inscription field ceased to be carved (Figure 4, Appendix 1). The epitaphs were still inscribed on the blank panels (Figure 9, Appendix 1), but the complete simplification of the coffin panels might point to the way they were thought of, namely as the body containers. To sum up, the analysis attempted to understand how the sarcophagi in late antique Salona may have been

---

266 Idem a. ad populum. qui aedificia manium violant, domus ut ita dixerim defunctorum, geminum videntur facinus perpetuare, nam et sepultos spoliant destruendo et vivos polluunt fabricando. si quis igitur de sepulchro abstulerit saca vel marmora vel columnas aliamque quacumque materiam fabricae gratia sive id fecerit venditurum, decem pondo auri cogatur inferre fisco: sive quis propria sepulchra defendens hanc in iudicium querellam detulerit sive quicunque alius accusaverit vel officium nuntiaverit. quae poena prisciae severitati accedit, nihil enim derogatuum est illi supplicio, quod sepulchra violantibus videtur impostum. huic autem poenae subiacebunt et qui corpora sepultra aut reliquias contrectaverint. dat. id. iun. mediolano constantio a. viii et iuliano caes. ii conss. (CTh. 9.17.4, a. 357)
conceptualized, and the examination suggests that the functional aspect of sarcophagi may have prevailed over its metaphorical aspect. That is not to say that the funerary texts lost their relevance, but that their postulated effect of securing salvation should be reconsidered.

The attempt to moderate the importance that Galvão-Sobrinho has attached to Christian epitaphs, finds its support in the number of anepitaphic sarcophagi. As noted above, Matijević has numbered 68 examples of uninscribed sarcophagi preserved in situ in Manastirine. The question is whether the epitaphs were meant to be inscribed yet circumstantially they happened not to have been, or they were intentionally left blank. According to Matijević, few of them display the beginnings of stone dressing with finer tools but were never finished; in most cases, they seem to have been finished products.

The financial argument is not generally plausible explanation for the lack of decorations and inscriptions. Namely, the following chapter will suggest that costs as recorded in funerary inscriptions usually referred both to the monument and the epitaph, and not just to the text as scholars occasionally assume, which would make the addition of inscriptions overly expensive and prohibitive, and would make them symbols of one’s economic power more than anything else. To illustrate, the locally produced limestone sarcophagus from Salona dated to from the second half of the fourth to the mid-fifth century, which Severa set up to her husband, the protector Flavius Magnianus, cost 15 solidi, and since it is very likely that the smallest part of the total sum pertained to the inscription of the text, it is improbable that the price of an epitaph itself would be prohibitive to a person who could lay out an already significant amount on a blank sarcophagus.

269 Matijević, “Anepigraphic sarcophagi in situ in the basilica at Manastirine;” at pp. 91 and 110.
270 CIL 03, 8742 = S IV, 2: 404, at pp. 727-729. It was found at the very end of the 19th century in the secondary usage in the present-day Kaštel Lukšić, namely on the ager Salonianus. It was lost likely around the mid-20th century. For a list of recorded prices in late antique funerary monuments in Salona, see S IV, 1, at p. 51.
271 Although the issue is only partly comparable, Russell tends to dismiss affordability as the reason for leaving sarcophagi unfinished, specifically to leave portraits blank, and has asked “why go to all that effort only to leave your sarcophagus part-finished?” Ben Russell, The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade (Oxford, OUP, 2013), at p. 304.
Furthermore, there is the possibility that a sarcophagus was purchased and installed during one’s lifetime and that an epitaph was meant to be added upon one’s death. The following examination of funerary inscriptions attempts to find hints for the identification of the stage in the preparation process during which the texts may have been inscribed in order to understand whether the anepitaphic sarcophagi were intentionally left blank.

Without making consistent and clear distinction between different stages in the process, namely, between the acquisition of a monument, addition of the text, and its installation, epitaphs may contain information which allows us to make conjectures about the sequence of steps. The following are epitaphs representative of the cases in which the tomb, whether the piscina or sarcophagus, was acquired, set up and inscribed on a seemingly single occasion during clients’ lifetime; all inscribed monuments under consideration can be dated to the fourth century.


These epitaphs follow the same two-fold pattern: it is firstly stated that the tomb was acquired and/or set up during the couple’s lifetime (comparo, emo, pono, ordino, constituo), followed by the fine threat against the potential tomb violators. Most of these texts are the statements of one’s property ownership rather than the epitaphs proper. Since the deceased’s age or the day of one’s death or burial is commonly

---

272 CIL 03, 13137 = S IV, 1: 81. The parallel example: CIL 03, 9567 = S IV, 1: 82.
273 CIL 03, 2654 + 865. The parallel examples: CIL 03, 2043+pp. 1030, 1509; 2108; 2207; 9585, 9569+12870, 9663+9094=9689+9572+12842.
lacking, it seems that the tombs were acquired, inscribed and installed in a single instance, and those pieces of information were not added upon the occupant’s death.

There are exceptions to the pattern, such as the sarcophagus of the deacon Fl(avius) Iulius and his wife Aurel(ia) Ia[nua]ria upon whose death an additional text was inscribed on the already set-up monument recording the day of Iulius’ burial. Likewise, Fl(avius) Virgilianus and his wife Aur(elia) Ursilla commissioned the sarcophagus during their lifetime, but the text records Virgilianus’ age at death. It is possible to conceive a scenario in which the couple commissioned sarcophagus anticipating Virgilianus’ imminent death, and that the monument was set up and inscribed at the same time; it is also possible that sarcophagus was sitting blank for a while. Similarly, the epitaph of Constantius was inscribed upon his death on the already installed sarcophagus at the side of the inscription field which had been filled with the epitaph of his predeceased wife Honoria.

Two other epitaphs allow the possibility that the sarcophagi were purchased and installed during the patron’s lifetime yet were inscribed posthumously. The epitaph of Aurelia Victorina records that she bought a sarcophagus with her own funds, her age at death, and that her alumnus Fortunatus “made it upon her death according to his vow.” It was not stated what her alumnus exactly made, regarding which opinions differ. Nenad Cambi mentioned in passing that the alumnus Fortunatus had the epitaph inscribed upon Victorina’s death on the already prepared coffin, while Françoise Prévot understood that he had the monument set up from the scratch. It is nevertheless stated the she “bought the coffin” (emit arca(m)), and the verb employed for Fortunatus’ activity is fecit, for which it was shown that it barely ever appeared on coffins, and that it was never associated with the words arca

274 CIL 03, 2654+865 = S IV, 1: 152 at pp. 388-90.
275 CIL 03, 9506 = S IV, 1: 159 at pp. 401-04.
276 CIL 03, 9585 = S IV, 1: 221 at pp. 497-500.
277 CIL 03, 2240 = S IV, 2: 384.
and sarcophagus, namely the syntagma sarcophagum or arcam fecit/feecerunt does not occur in the sarcophagi epitaphs from Salona. The usage of the verb fecit may thus signal that it referred to the inscription whereby the object titulum, taken in its literal sense, would have been implied. Also, there are two instances which attest that the standard formulae stating that individuals provided in their wills for a sarcophagus to be set up for them still had currency. On the other hand, and in a less official manner, Fortunatus made a vow to fulfill the task of, as it is argued, inscribing the epitaph, the vow that was perhaps needed because to later add a text, once a sarcophagus was installed, seems to have been exceptional.

The same can be argued for the sarcophagus of Au(relius) Vindemius and his wife Lucia whose epitaph has two voices. It opens with the sentence in the third person singular stating that “Au(relius) Vindemius, who lived for 60 years, set up this sarcophagus for himself and his dearest wife Lucia,” and continues with the regular menace against tomb violators composed in the first-person singular (de herediibus meis). It is thus possible that Aur. Vindemius purchased his sarcophagus and had it installed, and gave provision for his epitaph to be inscribed posthumously, which contained precise instructions of who is entitled to burial in the sarcophagus, hence the stipulation was inscribed in the first-person singular as his own words seem to have been directly transferred onto the sarcophagus.

These epitaphs do not record how the tomb was obtained, but the assumption is that it was purchased straight from the workshop and stonemason, as is attested in the inscribed sarcophagus,

---

279 Valeria Hermogenia h(onesta) f(emina) die V Kal(endarum) / iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est viva se arcam / de suo poni iussit (CIL 03, 9621 = S IV, 2: 415 at pp. 748-49). [Aurelius Alexander(!) b(e)n(e)ficiarius(!) legio]nis XI Claudi(a)e v(i)e / sibi suo / ius(s)it testamento arcam / <p=R>oni (CIL 03, 8727 = S IV, 2: 419 at pp. 756-58). Both are limestone sarcophagi dated to the fourth century, found and still preserved in situ at Manastirine.

280 Au(relius) Vindemius qui vixit / annus! sexsaginta(!) arca(m) / sibi et coniugi su(a)e carissi/[m(a)e Luci(a)e] / qui aut/em de her[edi]bus meis se ipsum / vel alios [---] suorum su(a)e [---] / [-----] / [-----]rum posuerit here[d---] (CIL 03, 2226 = S IV, 2: 396 at pp. 713-14).

281 The illuminating example for the practice is the tomb inscription of C(aius) Popilius Heraclia from Rome, which explicitly states that the text was copied from his will, and the funerary text is accordingly written in the first-person singular (AE 1945, 0136 = AE 1949, 0196 = EDCS-15000127).
dated to 438 C.E. and found in the present-day Trogir situated some 20 km north-west from Salona, which Arpacianus bought from the stonecutter Proiectus for his deceased wife Maximilla. On the other hand, funerary inscriptions attest that the practice of donating, repurchasing or making over tombs by will from private individuals was common hence the emphasis by Aur(elius) M[ar]cius Iahin and his wife Aur(elia) Quintina that they set up the p[i]scina having bought it brand new. Regarding the tombs whose ownership changed hands, the question is whether the previous owner had installed them in a burial ground yet had left them blank, so that they were inscribed only later by the new proprietors. That seems to be a plausible assumption in the case of Aurelius Sextilius whom Quiriaca! (=Cyriaca) bequeathed her sarcophagus to, and in the case of the sarcophagus, donated to Aur(elius) Amurus and Aur(elia) Quinta, which was identified by its location in the (b)orto Metrodori needed because to later add a text once a sarcophagus was installed seems to have been exceptional. Otherwise, the purchase, adding inscription and installation were occasioned most commonly by the recent death of a family member and seem to have been done altogether in the same instance upon the death. To conclude, funerary texts suggest that to install a sarcophagus with the intention to add an epitaph later seems rarely to have been the case, and that the anepitaphic sarcophagi were more likely intentionally

---

282 Dep(ositio) Maximillae d(eae) II Non(as) Iun(as) / conss(ulibus) d(ominis) n(ostris) Theodosio XVI et Fau[s] / to vv(tris) cc(larissimi) comparavit ipsum / sepulc(rum) vir eius Arpacianus / a Proiecto lapid(ario). (CIL 03, 14929 = AE 1900, 0140).
283 CIL 03, 2207 = S IV, 2: 386, at pp. 699-700.
284 CIL 03, 9567 = S IV, 1: 82 at pp. 278-81.
286 CIL 03, 13137 = S IV, 1: 81.
287 CIL 03, 14306,5 = S IV, 1: 233 at pp. 528-30. Cf Pascale Chevalier and Françoise Prévot have suggested the same reconstruction of circumstances. S IV, 1: 233, at p. 530.
288 CIL 03, 2207 = S IV, 2: 386 at pp. 699-700.
289 Typical late third and fourth century examples are: Aur(eliae) Iulianae puell(a)e innocentissim(a)e qui(!) vixit ann/os dece(m) septe(m) mensis(!) undecim / dies duodecim Fl(avius) Iulius et / Aurelia Emerius arca(m) posu(erunt) fil(a)e d(eae) p(osita) d(ie) XVII [Kalendas] / Ian(uarias). (CIL 03, 2233 + p. 2328, 125 + 8559 + p. 2323 + 8563 + p. 2323 + 13891 = S IV, 2: 382 at pp. 692-94 = HD034749). Iuliae Aureliae Hilarae / quae vixit annis XXVIII / m(ensibus) VII d(iebus) II Aurel(ius) Hecatus / coniugi castissimae / et incomparabili posu(erunt) et sibi (ILJUG 2355 = S IV, 2: 408 = HD034744). Epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries are characterized by the formulae of depositio or depositus/-a, and arca followed by the occupant’s name in the dative case, and commonly do not record commemorators, nor the additional pieces of information as to the circumstances of preparing one’s tomb.
left blank, which would support the idea that to inscribe an epitaph was not as the essential aspect of funerary commemoration to Christians as Galvão-Sobrinho has it.

The consideration of the late Roman sarcophagi from Salona suggests that an epitaph was not the essential element of funerary commemoration. It seems that what mattered the most to Christians of Salona was to be entombed and protected from violation according to Roman law. Thus, the notion that the “statements of faith” were the essential feature of the “Christian epitaphic culture” is, as suggested, the unquestioned legacy of the nineteenth-century partisan scholarship and the political concept of “Christian epigraphy.” Galvão-Sobrinho’s statement that “a declaration of faith in resurrection and eternal life” are “one of the most striking features of Christian funerary epigraphy,” and that “virtually all Christian memorials” display it, needs to be redressed. 290

From the fourth century onward, Christian funerary discourse manifests itself in a variety of forms within the corpus from Rome itself and across the regions, and cannot be schematically outlined thus the opinions of what expressions dominate the funerary record remain somewhat impressionistic. Yet the overview of the Christian funerary themes and formulae suggests that the notions of the afterlife were most often summarily expressed in the sleep and rest formulae, while the topic of resurrection rarely figured in the content of epitaphs. 291 The words of Peter Brown nicely summarize the point of the chapter which aimed to question both the modern concept of “Christian epigraphy” and the interpretation for the revival of “Christian inscriptions” in the fourth century. “‘The Epitaphic Habit’ that characterized late antique Christian cemeteries conferred on the dead no more than the unproblematic, ascribed status of spirits ‘at rest.'” 292 Brown has emphasized that the “prayers,

292 Peter Brown, The End of the Ancient Other World: Death and Afterlife between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (The Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Yale University 1996), at p. 81.
almsgiving and offering at the Eucharist” were the actions that “had the power to alter the fate of the dead” and “not the fancy tombs.”²⁹³

CHAPTER 3: THE COST OF A STONE FUNERARY MONUMENT

Cost is the first and foremost eliminating factor leaving the stone funerary monuments, whether the inscribed or un-inscribed ones, beyond the means of a good number of people. Yet, historians disagree on the matter of affordability of inscribed funerary monuments. Richard Duncan-Jones has collected epigraphically attested costs in Africa and Italy, and has again discussed the costs of the funerary monuments in his book on the Roman economy; he has focused on the prices per se.\(^{294}\) The first issue is what these prices exactly referred to because it is unclear whether the amount referred to an inscription, a whole monument, and/or also a burial plot and a funeral.\(^{295}\) For example, in his discussion on the cost of late antique inscribed funerary monuments, Handley firstly acknowledges that it is unclear what a price exactly referred to, but later on focuses entirely on the text itself and accounts for the price differences between “epitaphs” and/or “inscriptions” with reference to the number of their lines and words.\(^{296}\) The topic of the cost of funerary monuments merits a thorough treatment on its own, and thesis here suggest that a cost, if not stated otherwise, referred to the monument in its entirety.

Literary and legal evidence for funerary arrangements of the late republican and early imperial western Empire comes from the Rome-based authors and the so-called *leges libitinariae* from the Campanian towns of Puteoli and Cumae.\(^{297}\) The ever-present concern of scholars is to what extent


\(^{295}\) Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128, n. 21, and Handley, *Death, Society and Culture*, at p. 37, and n. 27 at p. 37.


evidence from Rome and Italy is applicable to the rest of the Empire. John Bodel has made that point and warned against generalizing Campanian evidence. An example Bodel has adduced deals with the provision from the *lex Puteolana* (P. II, 7) that forbids employing tattooed workmen (i.e. with the criminal record) and operating in the night, while Martial (8.75.9-10) mentions tattooed corpse-bearers working in the night in Rome. Yet these two sources, a normative and a narrative one, possibly speak to the same reality in cities. Also, these seem to be details of comparatively lesser importance. Disposal of the dead was an important infrastructural concern of Roman municipalities. Given the standardization of the governance of Roman towns, and of the spatial separation of a town and its suburb, and given the structural similarity of Roman burial grounds, it is reasonable to envisage structurally similar municipal arrangement of the disposal of the dead throughout the Empire.

Total funerary expenditure would include three distinct outlays each paid to a different supplier: a funeral (*funus*) serviced by, for example, a funerary trade or voluntary association, a burial location (*locus*), and a monumental tomb, a tombstone (*monumentum, titulus, memoria, statua* etc.), and/or a marker.

---


298 Bodel, “The Organization of the Funerary Trade,” at p. 147.


301 The *leges libitinariae* attest to the funerary trade as an exclusive contractor of the Campanian municipalities in the time of Augustus, and the Lanuvium inscription (CIL 14, 2112 = EDR078891) attests to the voluntary association of the *cultores* of Diana and Antinous as responsible for carrying out a funeral (*funus*) of its members in 136 C.E. For a recent discussion of the inscription from Lanuvium, see Andreas Bendlin, “Association, Funerals, Sociality, and Roman Law: The *Collegium* of Diana and Antinous in Lanuvium (CIL 14, 2112) Reconsidered,” in *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen: Gemeinschaft und ihre Ordnung*, ed. M. Öhler (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), pp. 207-296. In defining the range of services provided by the trade, I will follow Bodel who takes the “undertakers’ purview as comprehending the entire sequence of mortuary rituals from the preparation of the body for viewing to the traditional close of mourning on the ninth day after the funeral.” Bodel, “The Organization of the Funerary Trade,” at p. 158. Even if the *cena novendialis* was not managed by the trade, if observed, catering for it would present an additional cost.
made from perishable material such as wood.\textsuperscript{302} Prices varied according to the scale of elaborateness of both the mortuary rituals and a marker, and the size and location of a plot. Nevertheless, not all the three outlays were indispensable – at the bare minimum, in the case of an individual burial a transfer to the burial ground together with cremation and interment was the only necessity.\textsuperscript{303}

Inscribed funerary monuments with recorded costs from North Africa (most of them come from Lambaesis) and Italy follow distinct regional patterns. The majority of epitaphs from Lambaesis finish off with a formula that occurs in slight variations: \textit{fecit/faciendum curaverunt/facere curaverunt ex XX nummum}, or in reverse order, \textit{ex XX nummum fecerunt/faciendum curaverunt/fecerunt et dedicaverunt}, which structurally corresponds to one of the most common closing formula of \textit{monumentum} or \textit{titulum fecit (fecerunt)/posuit (posuerunt)/faciendum or facere curavit (curaverunt)}. On the other hand, in Italy it was common to record the testamentary basis for setting up a monument and the formula takes form of \textit{ex testamento HS XX, ex testamento posuit HS XX, testamento fieri iussit ex/de HS XX} (and in the reverse order); as such it is an elaborated version of also one of the most widespread formulas of \textit{ex testamento},


\textsuperscript{303} The costs I will list serve exclusively to get a sense of an order of magnitude. On the basis of the prices mentioned in the \textit{lex Puteolana}, Bodel calculated that the simplest and cheapest mode of corpse disposal, which includes the corpse-bearers transporting the dead at the minimal distance and an \textit{ustor}, and which presumes public land designated for burying the poor, was HS 20. Bodel, “The Organization of the Funerary Trade,” at p. 160. The association of Diana and Antinous in Lanuvium at ca. mid-second C.E. provided its members with an allowance of HS 300 (\textit{funeraticium}) for a funeral (\textit{funus}) (HS 50 is supposed to be deduced and spent on the obsequies right on spot of the grave). It is reported that Nerva’s burial allowance (\textit{funeraticium}) for the plebs of Rome was HS 250. Regarding the allowances of HS 250-300, scholars usually state that they sufficed for a “decent funeral.” Based on four funerary inscriptions from Pompeii (Duncan-Jones, \textit{The Economy of the Roman Empire}, at p. 170, no. 620-23), Duncan-Jones stated that “HS 2000 was the amount of a standard funerary grant made to distinguished citizens of Pompeii.” Duncan-Jones, \textit{The Economy of the Roman Empire}, at p. 128. In effect, a figure is fully preserved in only two inscriptions (Duncan-Jones, \textit{The Economy of the Roman Empire}, at p. 170, no. 620-23): in both cases the Pompeian town council has decreed a location for burial and HS 2000 for the funeral to the aedile \textit{C(aius) Vesorius Priscus} (AE 1911, 72 = EDR072420), and to \textit{Septumia L(ucia) f(ilia)} (AE 1913, 71 = EDR072570). Moreover, Duncan-Jones mentions the allowance of HS 2000 for the deceased of the association of \textit{cornicines} at Lambaesis (ILS 2354 Duncan-Jones, \textit{The Economy of the Roman Empire}, at p. 80). However, Saller and Shaw argue, I think rightly, that the recorded sum of HS 2000 does not refer to the allowance for funerary costs, but rather represents a sum paid to a member upon his promotion or retirement, and in the case of a member’s death, the sum goes to his heir. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128, n. 21.
Thus a figure may stand instead of a direct object (monumentum/titulum) which was left out as implied and redundant, and because it was economical to omit it in terms of both writing space and price paid to a stonemaster. The testamentum formula without the recorded cost occurs in its full version which contains a direct object (monumentum/titulum), and more often in a shortened one in which direct object had been already eliminated as implied and superfluous to state it. In any of the cases, a figure is a supplement to the formula that refers to a funerary monument, and thus advertises the cost of a funerary monument.

When a sum of money was intended and spent for other than a monument, it was precisely recorded what were the things in question. Significantly, an epitaph from Lambaesis that states that sum was designated for a funeral and monument (cum sibi in funus / et mon<nt>um / HS II mil(ia) erogari ca/visset) to which his son and freedwoman added 500 sesterces out of their own pocket (adiectis de / suo D nummum). Similarly, when a city council decreed a deserved citizen any of the funerary honors upon the person’s death it was precisely stated whether she or he was granted a burial lot, a public funeral, a funerary monument and/or statue in a town; most of the times an honored person was granted a lot and a funeral, whereas a monument

---

304 There are examples of testamentum formulas with recorded costs in Lambaesis as well, for example, CIL 08, 2764 (at p. 954) = AE 2010: 1826 = EDCS-20800628; CIL 08, 4055 = EDCS-22700029 (at p. 1743).

305 CIL 08, 3079 = EDCS-21100082 (at p. 1740). Another example comes from Cremona and in similar wording states that a wife made a monument and that she paid out 30,000 denarii for the funeral and monument (in funus et memoriam erogavit (denariorum) XXX (milia)), CIL 05, 4100 = AE 2003: 29 = AE 2005: 630 = EDCS-04203155.

306 Just some of the examples: publice funus locasque sepulurae decretus est (with slight variations in wording): AE 1984, 188 = EDCS-08400135; AE 1992, 249 = EDCS-09400018; AE 2000, 354 = EDCS-20100109; CIL 11, 1806 = EDCS-22000158; AE 2000: 331 = EDCS-20100096; AE 1996: 653a = EDCS-03000317; AE 1996: 653b = EDCS-03000318; funus (locum) m(onumentum) posuit (CIL 02, 5684 = EDCS-05600859); honoratus[...][n] funus (locum) m(onumentum) posuit (CIL 03, 2919 = EDCS-28400170); funus publicum et statuam equestrem anum decr(evit) (AE 1897, 8 = EDCS-58000077); funus publicum et statuam equestrem auratum decr(evit) (CIL 05, 4441 = EDCS-04203493); and statuam auratum et funus publicum decretum (CIL 05, 4485 = EDCS-04203537); statuam funus locum publice decretum CIL 09, 0050; funus et statuas decreverunt (CIL 09, 0737 = EDCS-08201435); decuriones funus publicum statuam equestrem clipeum argenteum locum sepulurae decreverunt et urbani statuam pedestal (CIL 09, 2855 = CIL 05, 1066.3 = EDCS-14803853);
– potentially the most expensive of the three – was left to the private initiative and outlay.\textsuperscript{307} Such an arrangement compares well with the financial practice related to setting up honorific statues, namely “patrons and benefactors had traditionally paid for the statues dedicated to them by cities and assemblies.” The statues on bases were expensive, and benefactors obviously needed to spare clients and communities from extra costs.\textsuperscript{308}

The point is that these three things remained conceptually distinct, and were not put under a common denominator and referred to as such. Thus, when information about a cost supplemented the well-established formulae, which all referred to a monument, a figure pertained to an inscribed monument. Such a case makes up the majority of epitaphs with recorded cost, while on a few other occasions, it was made clear what the sum covered. The hypothesis finds support in the commissions and purchases of a funerary monument made during one’s lifetime: a veteran \textit{se vivo} set a monument up to himself and his wife for HS 4,000.\textsuperscript{309} Finally, since the money was paid out at a different place and time, and to different service suppliers, it is easier to envision that a stonemaster and commissioner, once she or he had decided on a monument type and text, settled on a price which was then transferred onto the monument. That is nicely flesh out in epitaphs with recorded costs: namely, some of the \textit{ex testamento} monuments from Italy state who the person(s) who selected a monument was (\textit{arbitratus}).\textsuperscript{310}

\footnotesize
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\textsuperscript{307} For example, the epitaph from Pompeii makes the claim explicitly and states that the council granted the deceased a lot and funeral allowance of HS 2000 while the deceased’s mother put up a monument at her own cost: \textit{locus sepulchrae datus et in / funere HS II (milia) / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) / Mulvia Prisca mater p(ecunia) s(ua) (AE 1911, 72 = AE 1913, 70 = EDCS-16400085).}

\textsuperscript{308} Carlos Machado, “Public Monuments and Civic Life,” at p. 251.

\textsuperscript{309} \textit{D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum) C(aius) Aemilius Victor veteranus se vi/vo sibi et Petroni(ae) Venust(ae) coniugi / ex HS IIIII(milibus) n(unnnum) idemque dedicavit} (CIL 08, 3025 = EDCS-21100028). Another example is a monument which was, as decreed in a will, supposed to be set up for both a husband and wife, yet the wife, who outlived her husband, acted as an arbiter of a monument (CIL 14, 0397 (at p. 615) = EDCS-05700397).

\textsuperscript{310} AE 1911, 0237 = EDCS-10100903; CIL 14, 3906 = AE 1974, 0151 = EDCS-05801906; CIL 14, 0397 (at p. 615) = EDCS-05700397; CIL 11, 3205 = AE 2003, 0029 = EDCS-22400119; CIL 10, 2402 = EDCS-11501340; CIL 09, 4731 (at p. 685) = EDCS-14805768.
Finally, as for whether the cost pertained to an inscription solely or to the entire monument, that the latter was the case can be borne out by the archaeological and art-historical investigation of the various stages of sarcophagi production most recently discussed by Ben Russell. Schematically put, there were three main stages: 1. Basic shaping and hollowing out of a chest and a lid done at the quarries; 2. Roughing out and shaping of the design done either at the quarries or at a local workshop; 3. Detailed finishing which might have included portraits and inscriptions done at a local workshop.\(^{311}\)

Therefore, since the greatest part of the cost pertained to the material itself, the labor of quarrying and shaping the stone, and to the transportation costs in particular,\(^{312}\) and since to inscribe the text was the final touch, so to say, in terms of the overall production trajectory, and even if we allow for the price exaggerations and stylizations, the figures are on average high enough so that it can be ruled out that the cost pertained only to the inscribed text.

To return to the costs collected by Duncan-Jones, there are 51 examples from Africa, the great majority of which come from Lambaesis and record the military personnel of various ranks, and 91 examples from Italy of wider both social and geographic distribution. The first caveat is whether the figures stated are real, or – at the very least – rounded approximations of the actual costs, or exaggerated and stylized numbers.\(^{313}\) For example, Duncan-Jones observes the clustering of the prices at the lower end in Lambaesis, and certain standardization at 1,000 and 2,000 sesterces with eight instances of each, and then at 1,200 sesterces with five instances; there is furthermore a single example of the monument cost of 800, 600, 500, 400, 200, and 96 sesterces.\(^{314}\) In Italy the discernible price

\(^{311}\) Russell, *The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade*, at pp. 256-310.

\(^{312}\) Russell shows that the transportation of stone was often the chief expense. As an illustration, he brings the example of the nineteenth-century wall construction whereby the ratios of the cost of material to labor to transportation are 1 : 1.8 : 3.75. Russell, *The Economics of the Roman Stone Trade*, pp. 95-140, esp. at pp. 95-6.

\(^{313}\) Walter Scheidel has surveyed the public and private monetary valuations found in narrative texts of various genres, and has dismissed them as conventional and highly stylized figures. With reference to the inscription and coin commemorating Hadrian’s tax remittance, he stated that the source genre and somewhat unconventional sum recorded do not guarantee that it is not a conventional sum. Walter Scheidel, “Finances, Figures and Fiction,” *The Classical Quarterly* 46/1 (1996): pp. 222-38.

\(^{314}\) Duncan-Jones, “Costs, Outlays and Summae Honorariae,” at p. 62, with Table III at pp. 90-91.
standardization is at the levels of 20,000 sesterces with eleven instances, and of 2,000 sesterces with ten examples,\footnote{Duncan-Jones correlates this standardization at HS 2000 with the burial allowance of HS 2000 attested both in Lambaesis and Pompeii, what – in case that the price referred to a monument – cannot be maintained as the allowance was to cover funeral and location (see note 37 on the page 15). Duncan-Jones, The Economy of the Roman Empire, at pp. 79-80. On the other hand, Saller and Shaw argue, I think rightly, that the given sum of HS 2000 recorded in the charter of the collegium of cornicines at Lambaesis (ILS 2354) does not refer to an allowance for funerary costs, but that it is a sum paid to the member upon his promotion or retirement, and in the case of a member’s death, the sum goes to his heir. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128, n. 21.} there are furthermore ten instances of 10,000 and 100,000 sesterces, and six and five examples of 5,000 and 3,000 sesterces respectively.\footnote{For example, prices of seven funerary monuments commemorating centurions in Lambaesis range from HS 26,000 to 1,000; a sevir Augustalis and a negotiator from Ostia spent a huge amount of HS 100,000 on his tomb while two other seviri Augustales from Augusta Taurinorum and Tergeste spent HS 20,000; in Lambaesis a prefect of a legion, with the estimated pay of HS 80-134,000, spent HS 12,000 on his tomb, while a centurion, with the estimated pay of HS 20-33,000, spent HS 26,000; finally, a quotient of the annual salary and a tomb cost varies widely from 1.3/0.78 and 1.66/1.2 to 0.10/0.06 and 0.20 in Lambaesis and Italy respectively. Tables in Duncan-Jones, The Economy of the Roman Empire, at pp. 79, 99-101, 130, 166-171.} On the basis of Duncan-Jones’s tables it seems that the standardization of funerary monuments according to the social status, and the clear proportionality between the military rank (i.e. pay) and the monument cost did not take place.\footnote{Hopkins, “On the Probable Age Structure of the Roman Population,” at p. 247. Furthermore, Keith Hopkins, Death and Renewal (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), at pp. 211-17, discusses high prices of dying in Rome and Italy, and refers to “burial clubs” as a way for people of modest means to alleviate them. Yet it seems that the burial allowance was intended to cover the costs of burial and funerary rites, not of the stone monument itself (cf. my n. 74 at p. 19).}

On the basis of the Duncan-Jones’s tabulated prices, scholars have made somewhat impressionistic pronouncements on to what extent cost might have been prohibitive. Keith Hopkins thought that even the cheap monuments might not have been affordable as they approximately cost three months’ wages of unskilled labor.\footnote{It was put up by the Caecilia Sa[...], a veteran’s wife (CIL 8.3042).} Saller and Shaw stated that “the cost of modest memorials was not so high as to be prohibitive for working Romans,” and substantiated the claim by the lowest recorded cost of HS 96\footnote{Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128.} saying that the tombstones “typical of ordinary soldiers could be purchased for less than a hundred sesterces.”\footnote{Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128.} This needs to be qualified though: ca. three quarter of costs in Africa (36 out of 51) pertain to HS 2000 and below, with ten costs ranging from HS 800 to 200, and only a single instance of less than HS 100. They then adduced the evidence from Cirta, Thubursicu
Numidarum, Sicca Veneria and Thuga of plenty of tombstones even humbler than “the ordinary soldier’s, suggesting a price in tens of sesterces,” and concluded their discussion with the statement that “memorial stones were within the means of modest men.” Their article provoked a response of J. C. Mann who maintained that “the poorer classes throughout the empire could not in any case afford stone inscriptions.”

Little can be assessed if costs are treated almost in isolation, without comparative consideration of a monument type, dimensions and material assessed with respect to the local stone availability, and of a monument’s possible architectural and decorative elaboration, and its level of craftsmanship. Furthermore, the prices need to be put into the perspective of the social and legal status of a dedicator and dedicatee whenever it is possible to assess it. Since recent literature still refers only to Duncan-Jones regarding the issue of the cost of funerary monuments, the topic still awaits a proper scrutiny. What follows are preliminary observations so to get a sense of an order of magnitude of the monuments’ lower level prices for so to understand how prohibitive even the cheap ones might have been.

At Lambaesis, most of the funerary monuments’ prices pertain to the second- and early third-century stelae which would have been the least prohibitive stone funerary monument. The estimates

---

321 Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at p. 128.
323 Duncan-Jones has provided the heading of “identification,” without specifying whether a person is a deceased or a commemorator. After a reexamination of the inscriptions, I have concluded that Duncan-Jones has tabulated the deceased, although the commemorator is a more significant figure for the fashioning of the epitaphic culture (unless the monument is commissioned during one’s lifetime, or the commemorator acts on a will, which might have determined the specifics regarding the cost and tombstone). In the *sibi se vivo* cases, if there were more people who invested in the monument or were admitted to the tomb, Duncan-Jones recorded only who he found the most relevant figure, i.e. the military personnel. For example, the veteran C. Aemilius Victor put up a funerary monument *se vivo* to himself and his wife Petronia Venusta (CIL 08, 3025 = EDCS-21100028); the veteran P. Cerennius Severus, and his son P. Cerennius Primitivos, and his freedwoman Cerennia Hilara erected jointly monument and it is specified that the son and freedwoman contributed with HS 500 out of the total of HS 2500 (CIL 08, 3079 = EDCS-21100082).
324 For example, see the most recent handbook on epigraphy, Laura Chioffi, “Death and Burial,” in OHRE, eds. Christer Bruun and Jonathan Edmondson (Oxford: OUP, 2015), pp. 627-48, at p. 634.
of the minimum subsistence requirement range from 153 sesterces,\textsuperscript{325} 189.3-283.3 sesterces,\textsuperscript{326} up to 380 sesterces,\textsuperscript{327} which hardly measures up to the lowest levels of the recorded prices of simple stelae.

Some of the known salary figures are those for the army, and the basic legionary pay was 900 and 1200 sesterces per year in the first, and in the second and early third century respectively, whereby the annual legionary salary equaled or a little surpassed the lower-order and the most common tombstone cost in Lambaesis of 1,000 and 1,200 sesterces. Furthermore, the town charter of the Caesarian \textit{colonia Iulia Genetiva} of Urso (the so-called \textit{lex Ursonensis}) provides information on state civilian salaries: for example, the annual pay for clerks (\textit{scribae}) and lictors of the senior magistrates is 1200 and 600 sesterces respectively. A daily wage of a privately employed unskilled laborer in late Republican Rome was reported to have been 3 sesterces (Cic. \textit{Pro Rosc. Com.} 28) which translates into 1220 kg of wheat per year (at the price of HS 6/\textit{modius}), that is, two times subsistence level (cf. nn 31, 32, 33 at p. 9), in which case the grain dole was an economic necessity for unskilled dwellers in Rome given the city’s living costs.\textsuperscript{328}

\textsuperscript{325} Keith Hopkins has calculated the minimum subsistence level at ca. 250 kg of wheat per year per capita, plus additional one third of seed allowance, which totals in ca. 333.3 kg of wheat at what he thought to have been the most common early imperial wheat price of three sesterces per \textit{modius}. Keith Hopkins, “Economic Growth and Towns in Classical Antiquity,” in \textit{Towns in Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology}, eds. Philip Abrams and E. A. Wrigley (Cambridge: CUP, 1978): pp 35–77, esp. at pp. 66-67. Hopkins’s estimate has long been widely accepted and unchallenged, and some still accept it as the most persuasive assessment. Cf. Willem M. Jongman, “The Early Roman Empire: Consumption,” in \textit{The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World}, eds. Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris and Richard Saller (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 592-618.

\textsuperscript{326} Walter Scheidel and Steven J. Friesen have worked with and adjusted Raymond Goldsmith’s estimate, and have reached the mean annual total expenditure of 620 kg of wheat by combining variables of wheat and other food consumption respectively, private and public expenditure respectively, and investment expenditure. They prefer to express per capita GDP in real terms, that is, in equivalent wheat consumption because, they argue, the price of wheat of three sesterces per \textit{modius} is arbitrary, and varied regionally with the lowest price in Egypt and the highest in Rome. In order to convert mean annual total expenditure expressed in wheat consumption into its cash equivalent, they opt for a range of prices of HS 2, HS 2.5 and HS 3 per \textit{modius} of wheat which translates into 189.3, 236.6 and 283.9 sesterces respectively. Walter Scheidel, and Steven J. Friesen, “The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income in the Roman Empire,” \textit{JRS} 99 (2009): pp. 61-91, esp. at 64-69, with Table 2 at p. 68.

\textsuperscript{327} Raymond Goldsmith has calculated the mean annual expenditure per capita by combining the total food expenditure of 200 sesterces, non-food private expenditure of 150 sesterces, and government expenses of 30 sesterces. Raymond W. Goldsmith, “An Estimate of the Size and Structure of the National Product of the Early Roman Empire,” \textit{Review of Income and Wealth} 30 (1984): pp. 263-88, esp. at p. 268, with Table 1 at p. 273.

\textsuperscript{328} Dominic Rathbone, “Earnings and Costs: Living Standards and the Roman Economy (First to Third Centuries AD),” in \textit{Quantifying the Roman Economy: Methods and Problems}, eds. Alan Bowman and Andrew Wilson (Oxford: OUP, 2009), at pp. 310-17, with Table 15.2 at p. 311 and Table 15.3 at p. 315.
These are both chronologically and geographically scattered pieces of information, and the aim of the discussion was merely to put the lowest recorded costs of the fairly simple funerary stelae into perspective with the known salary and wage figures of the “ordinary” people such as legionary soldiers, and skilled and unskilled employees, even highest of which were below three times subsistence requirement, which is taken as a mark of prosperous economies in the pre-modern societies.\textsuperscript{329} The question is for how many people their living standard remained at the subsistence level, and for how many people their per capita income surpassed the subsistence level and to what extent. On the one hand, Willem Jongman has somewhat optimistically suggested that the per capita income, estimated at one and a half to two times subsistence level, was distributed among a good number of ordinary people in the first two centuries C.E., although the inequalities remained vast.\textsuperscript{330} By means of parametric modelling, Walter Scheidel and Steven Friesen have estimated that the economic elite comprised one and a half percent of the population, and that a little less than 90 percent of population lived close to the subsistence level, while the rest of six to twelve percent pertained to the non-elite civilian and military population who would have earned “middling” income.\textsuperscript{331} They have defined “middling” income as 2.4 to 10 times the so-called “bare bones” subsistence level, which equals 390 kg of wheat per year per capita.\textsuperscript{332} The maximum “middling” income would thus be 3900 kg of wheat per year per capita, which translates into ca. 1,500 sesterces at a notional conversion rate of 2.5 sesterces/\textit{modius} of wheat used by Scheidel and Friesen. Given that the most common recorded costs of funerary stelae at Lambaesis are 1,000, 1,200 and 2,000 sesterces and pertain to the lower-scale costs, it is reasonable to conclude that even comparatively less elaborate and less expensive type of a stone funerary monument was an expensive investment whereby the price might have been prohibitive even to the higher

\textsuperscript{330} Jongman, “The Early Roman Empire: Consumption,” at pp. 600 and 616.
\textsuperscript{331} Scheidel and Friesen, “The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income,” at pp. 84-85.
\textsuperscript{332} Scheidel and Friesen, “The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income,” at p. 84, with Table 2 at p. 68.
echelons of middling sector. On the contrary, more lavish funerary monuments were apparently a luxury item and a sole preserve of the economic elite. Recent scholarship has emphasized socio-cultural factors in explaining the prevalence of certain socio-legal groups in the epitaphic record especially in the early and high empire (discussed in the following section), but in the light of the extent to which a cost may have been prohibitive, it is probably financial aspect that mattered the most.
CHAPTER 4: SOCIAL GROUPS RECORDED IN EPITAPHS (Ca. 1-250 C.E.)

Commemoration with inscribed funerary monuments lies at the intersection of its affordability and its quality of being socially and culturally contingent. For the early and high empire, the debate revolves around the socio-legal status of people recorded in epitaphs, and how the “epitaphic population” relates to the social make-up of an urban community, that is, of those people who could afford an inscribed stone funerary monument. Pertinent to it is a question of the motivation that prompted people to set up funerary monuments, and of the nature of both commemorative and epigraphic culture. At stake is, above all, the method for assessing one’s socio-legal status which relies on Roman onomastics and heavily hinges on a person’s cognomen, that is, the method presupposes that Greek cognomina and certain Latin “servile” ones indicate the individual’s socio-legal background.333

Two social groups are said to be over-represented in funerary commemoration of early and high empire: soldiers and above all, freedmen in urban communities. With respect to the latter group, Tenney Frank has argued that nearly 90 percent of Rome’s population, and more than half of the population of municipalities in Italy, Narbonese Gaul and Spain, were of eastern provenance and of slave origin. As for the city of Rome, he has surveyed 13 900 epitaphs from CIL 6.2-3 (the so-called sepulcrales), and has grounded his argument on the nomenclature, that is on the prevalence of Greek and Latin “servile” cognomina.334 To the contrary, Mary L. Gordon has questioned and dispelled


334 In his discussion of the significance of Greek cognomina, Frank has considered three possibilities: that those people are either “ordinary immigrants” or freedmen and their descendants, or that Greek cognomina had become fashionable among Rome’s freeborn populace. He has opted for the Easterners of servile background, and has read the epitaphs in the light of literary sources, such as Tacit and Juvenal. Tenney Frank, “Race Mixture in the Roman Empire,” The American Historical Review Vol. 21, No. 4 (1916): pp. 689-708.
Frank’s premise that a Greek cognomen denotes a person from the Eastern Mediterranean. While Frank’s reading of the epigraphic record is literal, Taylor has made a crucial point that a direct correlation between the people as recorded in epitaphs and the social make-up of the city of Rome cannot be drawn. Taylor has examined epitaphs collected in CIL 6.2-4 (the so-called *sepulcrales*), that is, her sample overlaps with the Frank’s, and has also maintained mainly based on the onomastics that a ratio between freedmen and freeborn in the epitaphs of Rome is at least three to one. The problem is that a status designation is missing in the cases of ca. two thirds of individuals, whom Taylor labels as the *incerti*, and whom she then classifies as freedmen on the twofold basis of their nomina (for example, the individuals with the same nomen were presumably freedmen of the same household) and particularly of their Greek cognomina. Taylor explains the freedmen’s preponderance in Rome’s epitaphs in terms of social contingency of funerary commemoration: freedmen, namely, took pride in their newly acquired status, and wished to advertise their achievement by putting up inscribed funerary monuments.\(^{336}\)

\(^{335}\) Gordon has argued that the nationality of slaves was purposefully elusive, to which rare ethnica and the practice of Latinizing native names contributed. As for the preponderance of Greek slave names, she believes that it was mostly because the organized slave trade came to Rome from the East. Mary L. Gordon, “The Nationality of Slaves under the Early Roman Empire,” *JRS* 14 (1924): pp. 93-111.

\(^{336}\) Lily Ross Taylor, “Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome,” *The American Journal of Philology* Vol. 82 (1961): pp. 113-32. Archaeological and art-historical strand of scholarship has also unreservedly applied the method and has generalized the surviving evidence onto the whole corpus of pertinent material. The case in point are “freedmen” funerary group portraits from late Republican and Augustan Rome collected and discussed in two seminal studies by Paul Zanker and Diana E. E. Kleiner. Zanker and Kleiner worked with 125 and 92 monuments respectively, of which only ca. 50 still bear epitaphs, a good part of which – but certainly not all – record freedmen and their descendants as either commemorators or the deceased and yet the whole corpus has been labelled as a freedmen-specific group of funerary monuments. Paul Zanker, “Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener,” *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 90 (1975): pp. 267-315. Diana E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture: The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire* (New York and London, Garland Publishing Inc., 1977). See also Cooley, *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*, at p. 134. Particularly famous funerary monument and an illustrative example of scholars’ preconceived notions is the monument of the baker Marcus Vergilius Eurysaces. Although in three inscriptions that are still attached to the monument there is no indication of his socio-legal status, his servile past has been taken for granted on account of his Greek cognomen and the fact that he was a baker, and on account of his unparalleled funerary monument that has been labelled as ostentatious because his commissioner was presumably a freedman, while by circular reasoning, the assumed socio-legal status of the monuments’ patron informs how we look at and characterize the monument. For a revising reading of Eurysaces’ monument, see Lauren Hackworth Petersen, “The Baker, His Tomb, His Wife, and Her Breadbasket: The Monument of Eurysaces in Rome,” *The Art Bulletin* 85 (2003): pp. 230-57.
Henrik Mouritsen has recently tackled the same problem with respect to the epigraphic material from Ostia and Pompeii, and has essentially followed Taylor’s method and repeated Taylor’s conclusions, with statistical precision and interpretative elaborateness. Mouritsen follows three criteria for assessing one’s socio-legal status, that is, for distinguishing between freedmen and freeborn: 1. Filiation and pseudo-filiation as the only explicit and secure indicator of one’s status; 2. Greek and certain Latin “servile” cognomina; 3. Familial context which might point to one’s servile past. Since the (pseudo)-filiation overwhelmingly became omitted throughout the first and second centuries C.E., Mouritsen has likewise heavily relied on onomastic criteria, yet his somewhat cautious statement at the beginning of his article that the Greek and “servile” Latin cognomina “do not provide proof of servile origins, the increased likelihood that the carriers were freedmen means that the criterion should be taken into consideration when assessing material statistically” translates into “…virtually everybody who commissioned tombs and monuments appears to be associated with unfree birth.” His analysis yielded the following figures: in his sample from Ostia 83 percent of individuals are freedmen and the rest 17 percent pertain to their descendants and relatives, while freedmen make up 58 percent of population in his sample from Pompeii.

Mouritsen has argued that the epitaphs cannot be assumed to represent a cross-section of the population who could afford the monument, but that “inscriptions are the result of individual initiatives and personal motives that may not have been universally shared by all members of society.” Mouritsen firstly criticizes the interpretative paradigm of funerary commemoration as a
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338 Mouritsen, “Freedmen and Decurions,” at p. 41, and similar statements throughout the article.
340 Mouritsen, “Freedmen and Decurions,” at p. 47. Nicholas Purcell, to the contrary, seems to take the epigraphic record of late republican and early imperial Rome as a snapshot of its population, and the seeming preponderance of
fierce social competition yet later has recourse to it, and contrasts freedmen with the curial elite and argues that the deliberate withdrawal of the elite from the common burial grounds in the later decades of the first century C.E. was compensated with the status display in the forum which, as a central location of the city and its surroundings, remained the elite’s prerogative.\textsuperscript{341} Mouritsen though misses out to account for the complete lack of the freeborn of middling economic means from the funerary record, who, he argues, must have existed and substantiates his claim with the inscriptions of \textit{collegia}.

It is unclear why the middling freeborn would completely refrain from commemoration with stone monuments if they had equal means as a good number of freedmen to put up tombstones, and certainly some of them would have made provision for it in their wills, or would have had an urge to set it up as a response to the loss of family members.

Given the strong representation of freedmen in the epigraphic genre other than epitaphs in towns of central Italy, Mouritsen has more recently moderated his view on the correlation between the epigraphic record and urban social composition, and has thus concluded that freedmen obviously made up a substantial section of population in central Italy.\textsuperscript{342} The fact that there are local variations in the “epitaphic population” casts further doubt upon the conclusion that to set up an inscribed funerary monument was governed \textit{solely} by the “epigraphic habit” or by the group-specific motivation, freedmen in epitaphs as a reflection of Rome’s social composition. Nicholas Purcell, “Rome and the \textit{Plebs Urbana},” in \textit{Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 9: The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 B.C.}, eds. J. A. Crook, Andrew Lintott, and Elizabeth Rawson (Cambridge: CUP, 2\textit{nd} ed. 2006): at pp. 656-58. Michael Heinzelmann similarly reads epigraphic material of Ostia, and argues for the socio-economic dominance of freedmen in the city. Michael Heinzelmann, \textit{Die Nekropolen von Ostia: Untersuchungen zu den Gräberstraßen vor der Porta Romana und an der Via Laurentina} (München: Pfeil, 2000), esp. at pp. xx.\textsuperscript{341} Mouritsen, \textit{Freedmen and Decurions} at p. 45 and 53.\textsuperscript{342} Freedmen supposedly figure prominently in epigraphic genre other than epitaphs, for example in the \textit{collegia} inscriptions from Ostia, in the tablets of Iucundus and Sulpicii from Pompeii and Puteoli respectively, both the album and the wax tablets from Herculaneum, and the dedications from Misenum. Henrik Mouritsen, \textit{The Freedmen in the Roman World} (Cambridge: CUP, 2012), at pp. 129-30. Cf. John D’Arms has estimated that the ratio of freeborn to freedmen in the overall epigraphic record of Puteoli is 1:10 while their ratio in epitaphs is 1:16. As for the funerary record, he seems to think that all individuals without filiation are likely to be freedmen. John H. D’Arms, “Puteoli in the Second Century of the Roman Empire: A Social and Economic Study,” \textit{JRS} 64 (1974): at p. 112, with a n. 71 at p. 112.
and that it was completely unrelated to the socio-economic urban environment. Finally, while style of commemoration may differ across different groups, a wish to be properly buried and, if possible, commemorated is universal rather than particular.

Thus surveys of epitaphs from regions other than Latium and Campania have yielded notably lower, but in some places still disproportionally high percentages of freedmen. For example, Valerie Hope’s analysis of the social composition of epitaphs of Aquileia, Mainz and Nîmes has given the following proportions of the freeborn, freedmen and *incerti*: 20 : 32 : 40, 48 : 6 : 23, and 12 : 6 : 63 percent respectively. Hope is skeptical about the reliability of a cognomen as the indicator of one’s socio-legal status, and is thus reluctant to group a good number of the *incerti* together with freedmen. As for the social function of funerary monuments, Hope draws on the concept of status dissonance to interpret funerary monuments of freedmen, the auxiliary soldiers and gladiators, and to a lesser extent, legionary soldiers. Both eminent freedmen, that is the *seviri* and *seviri Augustales*, and humbler freedmen were epigraphically and visually prominent in death, since funerary display was their means to establish and advertise their newly acquired status, and comparative wealth and success, as a compensation for their somewhat marginal place in society during their lifetime.
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343 The category of freeborn comprises individuals with the *tria nomina* and filiation (or with praenomen and nomen, or nomen and cognomen), the category of freedmen includes persons explicitly specified as such, and as the *incerti* are classified all those with the *tria nomina* (or with praenomen and nomen, or nomen and cognomen) but without any specific designation of socio-legal status. Mainz was a Roman military base, and numerous legions and auxiliary units were stationed there, of which the *legio XXII Primigenia* was permanently based there up until the end of the third century. Nearly half of the individuals recorded in epitaphs were connected to the army which accounts for the high incidence of identifiable freeborn. Valerie M. Hope, *Constructing Identity: The Roman Funerary Monuments of Aquileia, Mainz and Nîmes* (Oxford: BAR International Series, 2001), at p. 21 and Table 1.5 at p. 98.

Furthermore, it was possible to assess the socio-legal status of approximately two thirds of ca. 1800 individuals epigraphically attested in Narbonne (the remaining third of individuals was unspecified): two thirds pertained to freedmen and a third to freeborn.\footnote{Gregg Woolf, {	extit{Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Organization in Gaul}} (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), at p. 99, with n. 56 on the p. 99.} Gregg Woolf explains the over-representation of freedmen in terms of their upward social mobility that made them more concerned with the status and susceptible to its expression, and, on the other hand, in terms of their proximity with the elite whose behavior they imitated also through funerary commemoration.\footnote{Woolf, {	extit{Becoming Roman}}, at p. 100.}

A few scholars have expressed doubts about the unqualified servile character of Greek and certain Latin cognomina, and concomitantly about the method that straightforwardly classifies individuals bearing given cognomina either as freedmen or as their descendants. P. R. C. Weaver has raised objections to the Taylor’s method, which equally apply to the Mouritsen’s, and has argued that the interpretation of one’s socio-legal status based on the onomastics and familial context is far from conclusive. He has repeatedly emphasized that it is methodologically crucial to keep chronological perspective and thus to establish control groups of dated epitaphs in order to examine temporal variation in the name fashion and inter-generational naming patterns.\footnote{P. R. C. Weaver, {	extit{Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor’s Freedmen and Slaves}} (Cambridge: CUP, 1972): at pp. 83-91.} Weaver, for example, has observed that the equestrians, and the imperial slaves and freedmen of the mid-to-late second century C.E. share their commonest cognomina, and has concluded that the social distinction that cognomina may have conveyed in the early-to-mid first century C.E. disappeared throughout the second century C.E.\footnote{Weaver, {	extit{Familia Caesaris}}, at pp. 89-91.} Furthermore, he warns that a Greek cognomen may indicate one’s provenance, and that individuals bearing one of the imperial nomina and a Greek cognomen may have been enfranchised
freeborn *peregrini* and their descendants, and not necessarily imperial freedmen and their freeborn
descendants.\(^{349}\)

Given that the sweeping onomastic studies have been mostly done on the epigraphic record
from Rome, Penelope M. Allison has questioned the applicability of their results, and particularly with
respect to the ethnic and socio-cultural significance of Greek cognomina, as regards Pompeii and its
epigraphic evidence for the city’s society. Her main point is that a local, pre-Roman ethnic and social
history, as well as the extent of Greek influence in a given area, need to be taken into consideration
when assessing epigraphic material, and that an onomastic model worked out from Rome’s evidence
cannot be replicated outside Rome without qualification.\(^{350}\) Allison’s argument is important, yet
adoption of Roman nomenclature was part of the acculturation, more pervasively effected in Roman
colonies, that went hand in hand with Roman socio-political rule. An instructive example is Neapolis
in which process of acculturation was slow, and the epitaphs of the first century B.C.E through the
first century C.E. were written in Greek, and the nomenclature was local Greek and Italic. In the latter
half of the first century and throughout the second century C.E., funerary and votive inscriptions were
composed in Latin, and the nomenclature was Roman; Greek cognomina of that period were rarely
the Classical and Hellenistic ones, but on average Roman Greek cognomina attested in Rome too.\(^{351}\)

\(^{349}\) Weaver has argued that 1. The size of the imperial household could not have “peopled the Roman world,” and
that the number of the enfranchised *peregrini* must have surpassed the number of the emperor’s slaves and freedmen
by at least several times, 2. The nuclear family of the imperial freedmen seems to have been small with on average
two children; 3. Regarding the respective average ages of marriage and procreating, and of the manumission, most
children would have been born as slaves, or would have carried their mother’s *nomen* if she was freeborn. Weaver,
*Familia Caesaris*, at pp. 85-86.

\(^{350}\) Penelope M. Allison, “Placing Individuals: Pompeian Epigraphy in Context,” *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*

\(^{351}\) Martti Leivo, “Some Neapolitan Families,” in *Roman Onomastics in the Greek East. Social and Political Aspects.*
*Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Roman Onoastics. Athens, 7-9 September 1993*, ed. Athanassios D. Rizakis
(Athens: Kentron Hellēnikēs kai Rōmaikēs Archaiotētos, Ethnikon Hidryma Ereunōn; Paris: Diffusion de Boccard,
1996), pp. 81-89.
Furthermore, Christer Bruun has recently raised the issue of social significance of Greek and Latin cognomina on the example of names of *vernae* in Rome and elsewhere in the Latin West. He has built on the research of Heikki Solin and Elisabeth Hermann-Otto that has shown the preference for Latin cognomina for *vernae*, with the ratio of Latin to Greek cognomina being 43.4 to 56.7 percent, whereas the proportion of Latin to Greek cognomina in general slave and freedmen population is 31.2 to 68.8 percent. Bruun has concluded that paradoxically a Latin cognomen can signify an individual of servile descent. Other than that, Bruun has announced to undertake a revisionist study on the use of Greek cognomina in Rome, whereby he sees a chronological dimension essential to a more sophisticated and productive investigation. The up-to-date research namely has been done by onomasticians working on a large corpus of inscriptions, and thus “the time has come to challenge some notions about Roman names that are widely accepted but which in fact has received insufficient examination by epigraphers themselves.”

There are three methodological problems regarding the assessment of the character of Greek and Latin cognomina respectively, and of the attitude of people towards them. Firstly, the Rome-based, late republican and early imperial narrative texts have provided the template for our interpretation of the significance of names as recorded in epigraphic texts. Notably, to provide the evidence from literary sources regarding the character of names is regularly the first methodological step followed by the interpretation of figures derived from surveys of inscriptions in bulk. Oft quoted are Suetonius on the freedman L. Crassicius Pasicles and Martial on Cinnamus who changed their cognomina to Pansa

355 Bruun, *Greek or Latin*, Table 3 at p. 28.
356 Bruun, *Greek or Latin*, at pp. 34-36.
357 Bruun, *Greek or Latin*, at pp. 20-21.
and Cinna respectively. The name of Pasicles is due to his Greek provenance from the Greek city of Taranto rather than to his servile status. Moreover, Suetonius’ lapidary remark that Pasicles changed his name is not at all suggestive as to whence the decision to change it. It may have been in order to sound “more Latin and Roman” rather than “less servile” so to say, namely a step that accompanied his adoption of the Roman name-form composed of the Latin praenomen and nomen. That could have alike been done by a freeborn Greek and other non-Latin inhabitant of the empire as part of one’s process of acculturation. The fact that Pasicles was a grammarian may additionally account for his sensitivity to words.

The case of Cinna(mus) is illustrative of the circular hypothesizing. It is asserted that Martial’s Cinnamus was freedman although Martial neither mentioned his status nor attempted to disrepute him on account of his status, which he did not fail to do in other instances of the people of servile background. If Cinnamus from the epigram 6.17 is to connect with Cinnamus from the epigram 7.64, in which poem Martial did not make a mention of Cinnamus’ status, he was “the most famous barber in the City,” and Martial attempted to discredit him on account of his unrefined ars, which he could not escape irrespective of the favorable yet short-lived twist of fate that brought him fortune and promotion to the equestrian order. Moreover, Martial did not rant on the topic of all the artes, nor maintained the connection between work and status. Namely, Cinnamus could not earn his living in a respectful manner as a rhetorician, grammarian, schoolmaster, philosopher or actor. Besides his

359 L. Crassicius, genre Tarentinus, ordinis libertini, cognomine Pasicles, mox Pansam se transnominavit. (Suet. Gramm. 18). Cinnam, Cinname, te iubes vocari: / non est hic, rogo, Cinha, barbarismus? / Tu si Furius ante dictus esse, / Fur ista ratione diceris (Mart. 6.17).
361 For example, Mart. 1. 84; 2. 18, 32; 7. 38.
362 The last four verses: Non rhetor, non grammaticus ludie magister, / non Cynicus, non tu Stoicus esse potes, / vendere nec vocem Siculis plausumque theatris: / quod superest, iterum, Cinname, tonsor eris (Mart. 7. 64. 7-10).
profession, Cinnamus’ servile background is asserted because of the “servile” character of his name, yet its association with slaves is far from straightforward. To illustrate, out of 82 individuals carrying the cognomen epigraphically attested and published in CIL, only 11 were of servile background and the rest were unspecified.363

To return to the Cinnamus who demands to be called Cinna, Martial did not deride his original cognomen nor hinted at it being connotative of the status and did not thus deride him because of his servile background, but he has ridiculed Cinnamus’ act of adjusting his cognomen as uncultured. Namely, in his attempt to make his name sound more civilized, Cinnamus slipped into vulgarity. Such reading seems to fit well with the epigram 7. 64 in which Cinnamus’ boorish profession is contrasted with the educated and literate professions of a rhetorician, grammarian, schoolmaster, philosopher and even of an actor. To conclude, somewhat more nuanced reading of literature seems to be needed, in addition to which the inscriptions should be allowed to speak for themselves, to the extent that it is possible to approach them without notions informed by the literary texts.

The second point relates to the fluidity of the Roman name-forms and name fashion,364 with the consequence that the same criteria based on nomenclature for the assessment of social status cannot be indiscriminately applied across centuries. Hence Weaver’s emphasis that the “control groups” of precisely dated inscriptions are essential for the productive analysis, and Bruun’s remark that chronological dimension is crucial for the reassessment of the significance of Greek cognomina.365 As it will be shown below, the high-imperial epitaphs from Salona seem to demonstrate that Greek cognomina were borne by the wider sectors of society, namely the (freeborn) urban general populace with a degree of Roman citizenship. The question is whether it was due to the politically improved

363 Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina, s.v. “Cinnamus” at p. 335.
365 Bruun, Greek or Latin? The Owner’s Choice of Names for Vernae in Rome, at p. 35.
standing and the spread of Greek language in the Latin West, which may have had bearing on the name fashion, or the change is only apparent because the freeborn commoners became more epigraphically visible over the course of the second century (or it was the combination of both). Regarding the former point, it seems that the imperial policy relaxed its grip on the preservation of a pure Latinity even in official contexts from the emperor Claudius onwards. Juvenal’s well-known rants regarding Rome turning into a Greek city having been flooded by the Greek-speaking Easterners point to the increased usage of Greek, and suggest that different groups of people carried Greek names so that they could gradually cease to be associated with a specific group of people, namely slaves.

That brings us to the third methodological problem of comparing two groups of people, and their naming practices, for which there is no basis for comparison, specifically slaves and freedmen on the one hand, and higher orders comprising senators, equites and municipal magistrates on the other. The comparison is validated by the assumption that the “freeborn below the elite” were imitating senators and municipal magistrates. Hence the “freeborn below the elite” are gone missing from the epigraphic record exactly because the incerti, whose cognomina are not exactly as those of senators and municipal magistrates, are classified as freedmen or at best the first-generation freeborn, namely of “servile descent.” Nevertheless, for a comparison to be tenable and productive similar categories ought to be compared.

Moreover, along the lines of the latter two objections to the method, most of the evidence which Mouritsen adduced to support his argument that Greek cognomina are slaves-specific dates to
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367 “… non possum ferre, Quirites, / Graecam urbem… (Juv. 3. 60-61; the whole section of 3. 58-125 is dedicated to complains about foreigners in Rome, the Greeks particularly); see also Juvenal’s complains about Greek language having become fashionable at Juv. 6. 185-200.

368 For the most recent elaboration and application of the method, see Mouritsen, The Freedmen in the Roman World, at pp. 123-30, Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy, pp. 38-63, and Freedmen and Freeborn in the Necropolis of Imperial Ostia, pp. 281-304.
the first century B.C.E. and first century C.E.: Cicero’s letters, the first-century C.E. album from Herculaneum, the magistrates and candidates from the first-century C.E. Pompeii, the list of pontifices from Sutrium dated to the Augustan or Tiberian period, and the Julio-Claudian equites. The only somewhat later source is the album of the magistri vicorum from Rome dated to 136 C.E. Suggestively, the proportion of Greek and Latin cognomina carried by the freedmen is nearly the same proportion (56 : 44 percent respectively). And most significantly, the onomastic evidence provided by the high-imperial album of decurions from Canusium dated to 223 C.E. supports the objections to the method and invites for its redress since it “reveals a much higher incidence of Greek cognomina in the local elite,” which is explained by the passing on cognomina across family generations. The family pattern of naming children is what needs to be reckoned with while assessing the social significance of both Greek and Latin cognomina from the later first through third centuries.

The following examples from Salona flesh out the methodological problems and suggest that its results are far from conclusive and unquestionable. Firstly, the Greek cognomen Trophimus (and its varieties) usually taken as the characteristically “servile name.” The marble funerary slab dated to the first century C.E. was set up by L. Publicius L. (i) liberti Trophimus, and the servus Trophimus dedicated a shrine to Silvanus in between 102 and 116 as the fulfillment of a vow for the emperor Trajan’s health. On the contrary, the sarcophagus dated to the early second century was dedicated
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369 The following sources are brought in by Mouritsen, *The Freedmen in the Roman World*, at pp. 124-26 with further literature on each evidence.
370 CIL 10, 1403.
371 CIL 11, 3254.
372 CIL 06, 975.
373 CIL 09, 338.
376 CIL 03, 2497+p. 1032 = HD062163.
377 CIL 03, 8684 = HD051847.
to *T(itus) F(lavius?) T(it) f(ilius) Trofimas Smyrnaeus.* Out of the three attestations of the name Trophimus all dated to the same chronological horizon of the mid-first through the first decade of the second century, in two instances it was borne by a freedman and a slave respectively, and once by the freeborn Roman citizen from the Greek city of Smyrna, one of whose ancestors, presumably his father, was enfranchised by an emperor of the Flavian dynasty.

On the one hand, there is an onomastic difference which points to its dissimilar socio-cultural significance. Namely, the people of servile status and background used the cognomen in its acculturated, Latinized form, while the native of Smyrna kept the name’s Greek form and inflection and had it only transcribed. On the other hand, the case of *Smyrnaeus* exemplifies the way by which the Greek names, to which no “shame” needed to have been attached since they were likewise borne by the freeborn *peregrini* some of whom were moreover Roman citizens, could enter the (predominantly) Latin West, become acculturated and adopted by the different sectors of society.

The stela was set up to *C(aius) Albucius Trophimus* by his *colliber(tus)* in the second half of the second century. *Aurelius Trophimus* and *Praecillia Thallussa(!)* set up a monument to their foster-son *A(urelius) Titianus,* *Iunia Trofime* to her five-year old *delicatus L(ucius) Iunius Epictetus,* *L(ucius) Publicius Trophimus,* having been appointed an heir by his wife *Val(eria) Philete,* set up a funerary *ara* to her and

---

380 CIL 03, 2166 = CIL 03, 8601 = HD001814. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen,* s.v. “Albucius” at p. 57.
himself,\textsuperscript{383} \textit{L(ucius) Publicius Trophimus} to his wife \textit{Stenia Secura},\textsuperscript{384} and \textit{Fl(avius) Castor} set up a sarcophagus to his spouse \textit{Oppia Trofima} and to himself.\textsuperscript{385}

The first remark concerns the lack of (pseudo)-filiation in all cases, and in a single instance the individuals’ socio-legal status is specified by the word \textit{collibertus}. The standard narrative maintains that the omission of pseudo-filiation first occurred among the freedmen from the last decades of the first century C.E. in their attempt to conceal their shameful servile background.\textsuperscript{386} Nevertheless, the disappearance of (pseudo)-filiation, which was typical of the nomenclature of the late first century B.C.E. through the first decades of the first century C.E., might not have been group-specific but rather wider phenomenon.

To illustrate, \textit{Liguria Procilla quae et Albucia} set up a sarcophagus to 1. her husband \textit{C(aius) Albucius C(ai) f(ilius) Tromentina Menippus dec(urio) Salon(is) aedil}, 2. her son \textit{C(aius) Albucius C(ai) f(ilius) Tromentina Procilianus dec(urio) Sal(onis) et Iss(ae) aedil} who died at the age of 29, 3. her other son \textit{C(aius) Albucius C(ai) f(ilius) Sergia / Menipp(us) dec(urio) Iss(ae) who died at the age of 19, 4. her brother \textit{C(aius) Lig(urius) Titian(us) who died at the age of 30.}\textsuperscript{387} The inscribed sarcophagus is variously dated: Nenad Cambi has dated it to the late first or early second century based on the coffin typology, Geza Alföldy has dated it to the high empire based on the epitaph content, and EDH to the second half of the second century.\textsuperscript{388} The coffin can be taken to belong to around the mid-second century or somewhat

\textsuperscript{386} Taylor, \textit{Freedmen and Freeborn in Imperial Rome}, at pp. 120-23. The case of the already mentioned \textit{L(ucius) Publicius L(uci) l(ibertus) Trophimus} runs counter the interpretation (CIL 03, 2497+p. 1032 = HD062163). Namely, he set up a funerary monument to himself and his nuclear family, and to his patron and his wife. He is the only person to have had his pseudo-filiation recorded, while the (pseudo)-filiation is lacking in other commemorands’ nomenclature. This and parallel cases invite us to rethink the interpretative paradigm.
\textsuperscript{387} CIL 03, 2074 = HD057001.
\textsuperscript{388} Nenad Cambi, “Sarkofaj Gaja Albucija Menippa,” I/\textit{AHD} 63/64 (1961-62) [The Sarcophagus of Caius Albucius Menippus], at pp. 99-111, and Cambi, \textit{Sarkofazij lokalne produkcije u rimskoj Dalmaciji (II. do IV. stoljeća) = Sarkophage der CEU eTD Collection CEU eTD Collection
later, that is, to the approximate period as the epitaphs under consideration; moreover, given the shared praenomen and nomen, the *colliberti* Cai Albucii Trophimus and Vitalis were likely the freedmen of the decurions Albucii. It is noticeable that the nomenclature of the decurions contains both the filiation and tribe, to which their status and municipal offices are added, while the name neither of Liguria Procilla’s nor of her brother Caius Ligurius Titianus includes filiation, and a tribe in Titianus’ case. The ensuing question is whether the omission of the given elements of nomenclature has implications for their socio-legal status, specifically whether they may have been freedmen as it is generally argued that the status designation first disappeared among them.

To fall back on the argument based on the character of cognomina, both Procilla and Titianus bear “respectable” Latin cognomina. The survey of inscriptions from Salona and Roman Dalmatia has shown that in no case was it borne by people whose servile background can be determined beyond doubt. To begin with, two Procillae were freeborn citizens, of which *Iulia Procilla* might have been the freedman’s daughter. In two other cases Procillae were members of the curial families whose fathers were the *duoviri* and *duoviri quinquennales*, namely the holders of the highest offices in municipal curia.
The four Titiani, whose status is recorded, comprised a freeborn citizen, and the three duoviri and duoviri quinquennales, again the highest municipal magistrates.\footnote{392} In three cases in which the status is not recorded, it may be assumed that a Procilla and the two Titiani belonged to the freeborn natives who, either themselves or their ancestors, obtained citizenship by imperial grants, specifically by Antoninus Pius in one instance and by the Caracalla’s \textit{Constitutio Antoniniana} in two other.\footnote{393} According to the accustomed methodological step, \textit{Ravonia Procilla} would have been classified as the freeborn: her epitaphic company is her daughter \textit{Valeria Pia} both of whom carry “respectable” Latin cognomina and do not share their nomen.\footnote{394} Yet another \textit{Iulia Procilla} is accompanied by her husband \textit{P(ublius) Publicius Onesimianus} and an \textit{Ael(ia) Corinthia}.\footnote{395} On the one hand, the latter two carry the Greek “servile”

\footnote{392}{Firstly, \textit{Aelia Maxima} set up a monument to her son \textit{Sextus Servilius Sexti fili/us Titianus} (CIL 03, 14284,1 = HD061701; Alföldy and EDH date the monument approximately to the high empire). Titianus was a freeborn citizen according to the filiation, as to whether the first-generation, it is impossible to say yet his parents did not share their nomen which decreases the likelihood that they were freedmen. In Roman Dalmatia, outside of Salona, the name was borne by three members of the curial elite: the \textit{duovir q(uin)/q(uennalis) Q(uintus) Rutili/us Q(uinti) f(ilius)} \textit{Titian/us} (CIL 03, 6371 = HD061017, dated by EDH to 171-300), and by the \textit{duovir q(uin)/q(uennalis) M(arcus) Aemil(ius) Titian/us} (CIL 03, 6341+p. 2255+8301 = HD057703).}

\footnote{393}{\textit{Aureli(i) Nepos} and \textit{Procilla} commemorated their daughter \textit{Aurel(ia) Procula} (CIL 03, 12770 = HD055949; the funerary stela is dated to the third century). In yet another instance, \textit{Aurelius Trophimus} and \textit{Procilla Thallusa(!)} buried their ca. 31-year old foster-son \textit{Aurelius Titian/us} (CIL 03, 14261,1 = HD061758). For neither of them are there status designations; the lack of praenomina and the nomen Aurelius may indicate that the family members were citizens who, either themselves or their ancestors, likely obtained the citizenship by the \textit{Constitutio Antoniniana}. Furthermore, \textit{Ael(i) Titian(us} and \textit{Aelianus} set up a funerary stela to their father \textit{T(itus) Aelius Scaevianus} (CIL 03, 6346+8313 = HD058994, ILJUG 1710 and EDH date it to 171-200), for neither of whom are there status designations. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Scaevianus” at p. 289 interprets the father’s cognomen as the Latinized form of the Illyrian Scaeva, who thus may have been the freeborn native who obtained the citizenship from the emperor Antoninus Pius, which then passed on to his sons.}

\footnote{394}{Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, s.v. “Pius/a” at p. 251. \textit{Ravonia Procilla} set up the funerary monument to her daughter \textit{Valeria Pia} (IIJUG 1895 = HD034213; IIJUG has dated the monument to the second century, Alföldy to the high empire). Their status is not recorded, but based on their names and family relationship, namely the mother and daughter do not share their nomen, there is no reason to assume anything but that they were freeborn citizens, specifically the daughter \textit{Valeria Pia}.}

\footnote{395}{The funerary stela which \textit{Iulia Procilla} set up to her husband \textit{P(ublius) Publicius Onesimianus} jointly with \textit{Ael(ia) Corinthia}, whose relation to the spouses is unspecified, provides another attestation of the cognomen (CIL 03, 2495+p. 1032 = HD062162). The inscribed monument can be approximately dated to the second half of the second and the beginning of the third century based on the monument typology and nomenclature. There are no indications of whether they were freeborn or freedmen. The monument has been also published in Rudolf Noll, \textit{Die griechischen und lateinischen Inschriften der Wiener Antikensammlung} (Wien: Kunsthistorisches Museum, 1986), at p. 86, no. 269.}
cognomina, while on the other, they do not share their nomen which decreases the likelihood that they were freedmen, that is, the wife was not her husband’s freedwoman nor were they freedmen of the same household. The discussion will return shortly to such cases.

As for Liguria Procilla and her brother C. Ligurius Titianus, the currency of their cognomina in Roman Dalmatia is suggestive of their free birth, and the question is whether the lack of filiation in their nomenclature is significant in the epitaph in which the name-system of the three decurions contained both the filiation and the tribe. The full official nomenclature of the decurions, of which the component of voting tribe became obsolete by the mid-second century, is best explained away

---


397 The following are examples of epitaphs from Salona that record individuals carrying the cognomina of Corinthius and Corinthus, and Onesimus and Onesimianus. Obultronia Corinthia commemorated her foster-son (flavus) Caecilius Quintianus (CIL 03, 2294 = HD053696, dated to the mid-second century); Secius Corinthi/us commemorated his spouse Valeria Valentina (IJUG 712 = HD034136). Honesimus(!) Septumi(!) servus was buried by his master (CIL 03, 2723+p. 2328,154 = HD054613; found at the legionary camp of Tilurium, and dated to the second half of the first century C.E.); Marcus Ulpius Onesimianus was commemorated by his parents Marcus Ulpius Onesimus and Aurelia Lucilla (CIL 03, 9427 = HD063144). Twice is Onesimus explicitly attested as a slave name (CIL 03, 2146+8598 = HD062188, and CIL 03, 8832 = HD062986). To judge based on nomina and family relationships, it was carried by the freedmen in two instances (CIL 03, 2163 = HD063003, IJUG 710 = HD034134). It was attested as a single name in three epitaphs, whereby other individuals in all three epitaphs are identified with a single name too with no status designations (CIL 03, 2305 = HD062828; CIL 03, 2492 = HD062659; CIL 03, 14269 = HD056855). They have been published only in CIL and before they receive thorough epigraphic treatment, their status is better to leave unspecified. While such cases tend to be classified as slaves, the (potential) social significance of a single name varied across time. Moreover, there are examples dated to the early Principate which warn us against straightforward classification based on a name-form. The dominus Celerinus set up a monument to his alumna and delicata Valentina, the daughter of his slave vilicus Valentio (CIL 03, 2130+p. 2135): the master, presumably the citizen, identified himself solely with his cognomen, the same way that his slave vilicus and his slave daughter were entitled to. Their social distinction and hierarchy was made explicit with words of dominus and servus, to which their nomenclature appears to have been secondary. The C(aius) Lucretius vet(ernus) leg(ionis) VII C(laudiae) p(iae) f(idelis) domo Verona set up a monument to himself, his son Provincialis and his freedwomen Firmilla and Tyche (CIL 03, 2041+p. 1509 = HD063843); dated to 42-100). While self-styled with full official nomenclature, not just that his freedwomen were identified solely with their cognomen, but also was his son, who ought to have held full Roman citizenship. Some other examples of freedmen identified solely with their cognomen: CIL 03, 1993+p. 1509 = HD054175; CIL 03, 2040+p. 1509 = HD063842; CIL 03, 2063+8581 = HD063266; CIL 03, 2159+p. 1509 = HD063057; AE 2009, 1015 = HD065346 (dated to 51-80); 398 A parallel example is the funerary stela which Flavia Procilla set up to her parents T(itus) Fl(avius) T(itil) fil(ium) Lucius dec(urio) mun(icipii) Bis(tiae) and Aurelia Procilla whereby only her father’s name contains filiation (CIL 03, 12765 = 055947; monument dated to 171-230).

399 The contemporaneous honorific inscription was dedicated to Marcus Ulpianus Marcus f(ilius) Sabinus (IJUG 2109 = HD054175; IJUG has dated it to the mid-second century). Sabinus obtained the equestrian rank and was a member of Salonitan curia whereby he was elected to the highest municipal judicial office of the duovir iure dicundo. From the earlier period comes another honorific inscription dedicated to Lucius Anicius Caesar ffilius Paetinas, the quattuorvir iure dicundo and quinquennalis (CIL 03, 14713 = HD031869).
by the emphasis given to their status and municipal political career, which was recorded in detail, and which was highlighted by their solemn nomenclature. The omission of filiation cannot thus be taken to have implications for the socio-legal status of Procilla and Titianus, who were likely (self)-referred to in accordance with the nomenclature prevalent at the time of which both filiation and pseudo-filiation have ceased to be regular components in funerary inscriptions. Procilla’s supernomen of *quaer et Albucia* emphasizes the common-parlance character of her nomenclature as she identified herself by the nickname that she was widely and familiarly known and addressed by.

The aim of the discussion of Procilla and Titianus was to show that the lack of (pseudo)-filiation in the nomenclature of individuals recorded in epitaphs was not specific to freedmen as their attempt to conceal their past, and accordingly that it needs not to be socially significant.\(^{400}\) The point can be further strengthened with the more political example so to say. The already-mentioned *L(ucius)* Publicius *L(uci) l(ibertus)* Trophimus set up a monument to himself, to his patron *L(ucius)* Publicius Iaso and his wife *Iulia Vendo*, to his own spouse *Publicia Gorge*, and to his children *Publicia Inventa* and *Publicius Taurio*.\(^{401}\) Trophimus did not shy away from explicitly identifying himself as freedman through his nomenclature, while he did not record the name of any other person with the (pseudo)-filiation, that is, others were named in a less official manner. Based on their different nomen, the spouses Iaso and

---

\(^{400}\) P. R. C. Weaver suggested that may be Junian Latins, that it, informally freed slaves without full citizenship. P. R. C. Weaver, “Where Have All the Junian Latins Gone: Nomenclature and Status in the Early Empire,” *Chiron* 20 (1990): 275-305.

Vendo were presumably freeborn citizens (other combinations are possible but it is not possible to more plausibly argue for any). Whether Gorge was either Iaso’s or Trophimus’ freedwoman, and whether Inventa and Taurio were either born in slavery and were Iaso’s or Trophimus’ freedmen, or were freeborn children, it is impossible to deduce. It is interesting to observe that while other individuals’ legal status was not recorded in an official way, Trophimus adhered to and perpetuated the social hierarchy through both his own nomenclature and the designation of Iaso as his patron.

To return to the examination of the social significance of cognomina on the example of the name Trophimus as attested in the above-noted epitaphs of the second and third centuries, there seems to be no grounds to categorize the individuals as “likely freedmen” or as persons of “servile descent,” with the corollary of maintaining that the habit of setting up inscribed tombs was prerogative of freedmen. The mingling of individuals, named with the two- and three-name form, who are mostly spouses not sharing their nomen, and their children carrying their father’s nomen, and whose cognomina may had been more typical for slaves and freedmen, or (upper) freeborn citizens respectively, became common in the high empire.\(^{402}\) They may be better interpreted as the urban

\(^{402}\) Selected examples from Salona: AE 1989, 603 = HD018324; AE 1989, 604 = HD018327; AE 1996, 1207 = HD039666; AE 1996, 1208 = HD039667; AE 2006, 1016 = HD056690. The first number prefixed with CIL 03 and the second with HD: 1992+p. 1030+8574=054174; 2001+054182; 2008+054352; 2015+p.2135=054711; 2021+p. 2135, 2328,125=054722; 2023+p.1030+8578=054724; 2027+p.1509=054759; 2046+p.1509=063845; 2047=063318; 2050=063272; 2051+p. 1030+8580=063846; 2052=065671; 2059=063267; 2061+p.1509=055648; 2066+p.1030=057518; 2078=063126; 2098+p.1509=056884; 2123=063044; 2136=063035; 2141=063030; 2143=063029; 2147+8599=062189; 2148=063026; 2149=062190; 2150=063025; 2154+p.1509=063054; 2157+2158+p.2325, 2328,12=062056; 2160=052023; 2169=062921; 2172+8602=062191; 2174=062918; 2175+p.1031,1509=062917; 2176+062916; 2180+8604=062193; 2183+p.1031=062912; 2184+p.1031+2450=062724; 2187+p.1509=062908; 2191+p.1031+8606=062195; 2193+8607=052025; 2194+p.1031=062905; 2196=062903; 2199=056497; 2201=062902; 2206=062897; 2210=062894; 2213+p.1031,1509=062893; 2214=062892; 2222=062886; 2224=062885; 2225=056499; 2228=062882; 2229=062881; 2232+8611=062203; 062877; 2237a+8612=055500; 2238=062875; 2241+p.1509=055501; 2243+p.1031,1509=062872; 2244=062871; 2245=062870; 2253+p.1031=062863; 2254=062862; 2255+8615=062205; 2256+8616=062207; 2261+p.2328,125=052090; 2269=062852; 2271+p.1509=052092; 2272+p.1509=062852; 2274+p.1031=062850; 2302=062830; 2303=062829; 2308+p.1031=062825; 2330=062809; 2342=062801; 2343a+1509=062800; 2349=062794; 2352=062793; 2359=056516; 2366=062784; 2372+p.1031=062778; 2373=062777; 2377+8626=062243; 2378=062774; 2380=062772; 2381+p.1509=055642; 2391+p.2328,125=062766; 2392=062765; 2393+p.1031=062764; 2396+p. 2328,125=062762; 2397+p.1031+8628=045398; 2399+p.1509=055588; 2400=057987; 2408=062760; 2410+p.1509=054543; 2413+p.1509,2328,125; 2424=062756; 2426=062745; 2431+p. 2328,125=062741; 2435=001763; 2436+p.1509=062737; 2437+p.1509-
general populace, either freeborn or who had obtained a degree of citizenship, yet to whom one’s legal status may have mattered less than in the upper social strata, who became epigraphically more visible throughout the second century, and among whom both Greek and Latin cognomina, whether “servile” or “respectable,” came to have currency during the second and third centuries.

One of the mechanisms for the diffusion of Greek and Latin cognomina among different social and legal groups, is the intergenerational naming patterns, which will be here analyzed with the particular reference to freedmen since it is maintained that they tended to give their children “respectable” Latin names in order to dissociate them from their shameful servile background. The following examples will show that their naming patterns were the same as among other social groups detectable in epitaphs, specifically political and social civic elite, soldiers, and what seems to have been general urban populace. Namely, freedmen alike gave their children cognomina, whether exact or derivative, which their pseudo-parents (patrons) carried and their own parental names. Moreover, the feeling of debt and gratitude for their master’s act of benefaction was strongly present among freedmen, and if it is to judge by the order of freedman’s children, predicated that the first male and female child is the oldest of its gender, it seems that the first one was named after the patron. Hence in most cases the Latin respectable cognomina among the freeborn people of servile descent. To sum

10=007927; 2443+p.2135=062731; 2444=062730; 2451=062723; 2457=062717; 2460+p.1510=055644; 2462+p.2325+2701=058583; 2463=062713; 2467=062710; 2474+p.1510=062705; 2475+8635=062282; 2476=030966; 2495+p.1032=062162; 2496=062657; 2501+p.1510=062669; 2513=062637; 2519=062622; 2520+8641=062310; 2522=062611; 2525+pp.2328,125=063860; 2526=062607; 2527=062604; 2530=062599; 2547=062584; 2549+p.1510=062661; 2552+ p.1032=062571; 2557+8645=062314;

403 Other expressions used are: the “freeborn commoners,” (Bruun, Greek or Latin?, passim), or “freeborn below the elite” (Mouritsen, Freedmen in the Roman World, passim).
404 Heikki Solin, Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1971), at p. 133-34.
405 “Manumission could therefore be conceptualized as a ‘birth’, through which the master became a quasi father who gave life and social existence to the slave.” For the relationship between a patron and his freedmen having been modelled on the father-son relationship, see Mouritsen, The Freedmen in the Roman World, at pp. 36-51, with quote at p. 38.
up, the intergenerational naming patterns further undermine the value of a cognomen as the criterion for assessing one’s status.

The servir Augustalis C(aius) Iulius Sceptus, the freedman of the imperial freedman Admetus, set up a tomb to himself and his current wife Iulia Coetonis, to his former predeceased wife Iulia |(mulieris) l(iberta) Pr[im]a, to his seven children, and to his deceased son-in-law, the imperial slave Niso.406 Three freeborn sons are first listed, first of whom is named Admetus after his father’s patron and the third one Sceptus after his own father, followed by the freeborn daughter Admetis, also named after his father’s patron. Three more children follow, all born as slaves and freed, one of whom is named Scepsis, after her father. To conclude, the freedman Sceptus named two of his freeborn children after his patron, a freedman himself, and another two, a freeborn and a freedwoman, after himself.407 The “servile” Greek names were passed on the first-generation freeborn citizens, and if they observed the same pattern of naming their children, their usage would have been perpetuated by the freeborn citizens with the consequence of losing their servile connotations. The third freeborn child’s name is Aquila, and the children born as slaves were Triumphalis and Romana.408 It seems that the name Aquila,

406 CIL 03, 2097+p. 2135+8585 = HD063871. The tabula is dated to 41-70 based on the inscription content.
407 Other examples of freedmen naming their children after themselves: CIL 03, 2131+p. 1031 = HD063038.
408 Kajanto, The Latin Cognomina, s.v. Aquila at p. 330: ten senators Aquilae are attested, while out of 95 individuals listed in CIL with the name, only three were slaves or freedmen; s.v. “Romanus/na” at p. 182: five males and a female of senatorial order, and there are 352 Romani and 169 Romanae in CIL of which 41 and 15 respectively are slaves and/or freedmen, and the rest are unspecified; s.v. “Triumphalis” at p. 278: 10 males or which three are slaves and/or freedmen, and two females in CIL. Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Aquila” at p. 155. Besides the given Aquila, two more are attested in inscriptions from Salona: Aur(elius) Aquila regarding whose status nothing more specific can be said but that he possessed a degree of citizenship (CIL 03, 2006 = HD054337), and Aur(elius) Aquila dec(urio) Patavisi(n)e(n)is negotiator ex provinciae Dacia (CIL 03, 2086 = HD058504), a decurion whose wife was likewise freeborn citizen. Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Romanus” at p. 283. Besides the given freedwoman Romana, three more are attested in Salona in the first and second centuries. C(aesia?) Romana set up a monument to her daughter Caesia |(lia) Ducatrix (CIL 03, 2252+p. 1031 = HD062864; Alföldy has dated the inscription to the early Principate, and EDH to 131-200) and if the reconstruction of her nomen is to accept, which she would then have shared with her daughter, Romana seems to have been the freedwoman. [O]bultronia M(arci) l(ibertae) Romana was a freedwoman (CIL 03, 14278, 1 = HD061712; Alföldy has dated the inscription to the early Principate which EDH has accepted). Caesidia Romana was buried by her husband Pomponius Crescens (CIL 03, 2254 = HD062862; Alföldy and EDH have dated the small-size funerary stela to the high Empire); the spouses seem to have belonged to the general urban populace discussed above. The name is twice more attested in the late antique epigraphic record and will be discussed in the fourth chapter. Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Triumphalis” at p. 314: the given is the only attestation of the name in Salona (and Roman Dalmatia).
in comparison with the cognomen Romanus, can be thought of as a more “respectable Latin
cognomen” in the period of the early Principate, and it thus stands somewhat out from among the rest
of children’s names; it cannot be traced to any of the family members as recorded in the inscription.
That freedman regularly named their children after themselves is confirmed by the epitaph of M(arcus)
Aurelius Hermogenes eq(ues) Rom(annus) set up by his father, the imperial freedman M(arcus) Aurelius
Augg(autorum) lib(ertus) Hermes, whose son’s name is the derivative of his own which is usually taken as
the typical slave name. Nevertheless, Hermes obviously did not think that the name would serve as
the embarrassing token of family background to his son among his peers in his anticipated political
career.

What the epitaphs of the sevir Sceptus and of the eques Romanus Hermogenes suggest, the above-
discussed epitaph of the decurions Albucii clearly demonstrates, namely that a Greek “servile name”
such as Menippus could be carried by a second-generation, and a member of the municipal political
and economic elite freeborn (he was at least the second-generation freeborn, it is not possible to assess
based on the inscription beyond that). His father Menippus was also a freeborn citizen, of which
generation it is impossible to speculate, and of his two sons, Menippus and Procilianus, one is named
after his father and the other after his mother.

\footnote{CIL 03, 2077 + p. 1030 = HD063258; inscription is dated to 161-200 based on the epitaph content and their
nomenclature. Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v. “Hermes” at p. 215. It is attested in two inscriptions dated to the early
Principate, of which an individual is defined as a freedman (CIL 03, 2429 = HD062743), and for the another one it
may be assumed that he was a slave based on the epitaph content but the legal designation is omitted (CIL 03, 2004
+ p. 2328,125 = HD054185, dated to 70-100 based on the epitaph content). In the high empire, the situation is more
varied: in one instance a Hermes was a freedman (CIL 03, 9023 + p. 2136 = HD063815), and in another that is a
valid assumption since the two children carry their mother’s nomen (ILJUG 2709 = HD035139). In neither of seven
other instances is there a status designation yet the epitaphic company is a spouse with a different name, or a child
with the father’s nomen, so the assumption is that they belong to the general urban populace of citizen status (CIL
03, 2144 = HD063028; CIL 03, 2218 = HD060090; CIL 03, 2288 = HD062839; CIL 03, 2349 = HD062794; CIL
03, 2444 = HD062730; CIL 03, 2457 = HD062717; CIL 03, 9174 = HD063577). Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s.v.
“Hermogenes” at p/ 216. Besides the given attestation, the name Hermogenes is attested in Greek inscriptions which
will be discussed in the fourth chapter.}
\footnote{CIL 03, 2074 = HD057001.
The naming pattern traced among freedmen compares well with the naming principle observed by the freeborn Roman citizens as attested by the funerary inscription, dated to the early Principate, which commemorates the three family generations of the freeborn citizens. \(L(ucius)\, Iulius\, C(ai)\, f(ilius)\) Tro(mentina) Clemens negotiator set up a funerary monument to himself, to his parents \(C(aius)\, Iulius\, C(ai)\, f(ilius)\) Tro(mentina) Maximus and Nonia Lacri f(ilia) Marulla, and to his three children \(L(ucius)\, Iulius\, L(uci)\, f(ilius)\) Tro(mentina) Maximus, Iulia L(uci) f(ilia) Marulla, and Iulia L(uci) f(ilia) Clementilla.\(^{411}\) The two of the children were named after their grandparents and the third one after her father. Again, if the sequence of children in the epitaph follows their birth line-up, first were the grandparents acknowledged by passing on their cognomina to children, the same way freedmen first honored their patrons as their pseudo-parents by naming their children after them.

\(^{411}\) CIL 03, 2125 + 8594 = HD062177. Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Clemens” at p. 178 and EDH have dated the inscription to the early Principate.
CHAPTER 5: LATE ANTIQUE INSCRIPTIONS AND SOCIAL HISTORY IN SALONA (CA. 250-600)

5.1 Methods and Problems

The topic of the social composition of epitaphs has not been systematically tackled in recent scholarship with respect to the late imperial epitaphs, and the assessments of the social profile of “epitaphic population” boil down to whether the commemoration went further down or up on the social scale in comparison to the early and high imperial period.\(^{412}\) Since the naming patterns and modes of (self)-identification changed, the deceased’s and commemorator’s legal status ceased to be the central issue examined. With respect to the (self)-identification and content of epitaphs, three major changes have taken place: 1. the *tria nomina* naming system has dissolved into a single-name system;\(^{413}\) 2. partly connected to it was the disappearance of the pseudo-filiation, and of the designations such as *servus, conservus, libertus, collibertus,* and *patronus;*\(^{414}\) 3. the commemorators have in general ceased to be recorded in epitaphs.\(^{415}\) As the second chapter pointed to, the concept of “Christian epigraphy” informed the way in which scholars tend to look at late antique inscriptions, and these changes were likewise attributed to Christian ideology, yet there is a question of whether these were specifically Christian or generally late Roman features.

\(^{412}\) Cf. Peter Brown’s remark regarding assertions on social origins of the fourth-century clergy, which draw on epigraphy and which have been “delivered in passing and in somewhat impressionistic manner...” Peter Brown, *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), at p. 36.


\(^{415}\) See for example, Brent D. Shaw, “Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Life in the Later Roman Empire,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Altere Geschichte* 33 (1984), at pp. 467 whose attempt to examine late Roman family configuration was nearly thwarted by the fact that the commemorators were not recorded.
Thus, Iiro Kajanto, while first cautiously commenting that “the aversion to designate a person as a slave or as a freedman” was not “simply due to the Christian ideal of equality,” falls back to the Christian ideology and Church’s attitude to slavery as explanations for the disappearance of servile status in epitaphs, and concludes that “it was considered un-Christian to reveal that the deceased was, or had been a slave.”

Brent Shaw also seems to think that the development was due to the Christian ideology and concomitant reconceptualization of the nuclear family. He has argued that the formal status distinctions were becoming blurred in the late empire as “servile persons have merged with the family, rather than being carefully distinguished from it,” while “the vocabulary of servile status is metathesized to a divine context” (e.g., as in phrases *servus Dei*).

Nevertheless, Lily Ross Taylor has traced the designation of status in the epitaphs of Rome from the republic through the early and high empire. She has observed that in the republic the socio-legal status is almost as a rule indicated by (pseudo)-filiation. It is firstly and predominantly in the cases of persons of servile background that the status designation as part of the name system becomes omitted – the number of the *inerti* grows during the first century C.E. and they constitute ca. 80 percent of the names recorded in epitaphs in the second century C.E., whereby the possible internal references to the *servus, conservus, libertus, collibertus,* and *patronus* become the only forthright evidence for an individual’s status. The decline of the usage of filiation in the cases of freeborn, both senators and general populace, takes place from the second half of the second century C.E. onwards.

Therefore, the disappearance of the indications of socio-legal status in epitaphs was a long-term and gradual

---

process that was consummated in late antiquity yet that was not induced and informed by Christian ideas.

Finally, one of the most noticeable changes between the early and high imperial (“pagan”) and late imperial (“Christian”) epitaphs is that a commemorator becomes quite rarely recorded in late antiquity. Shaw has explained this anonymity in terms of Christian ideology which shifted the focus from the secular horizontal relations to the vertical relations between the deceased (and related family) and God, as being the most important at death. In effect, that seems to stem from contemporaneous literary sources, and our Christianity-minded notions of essential differences between religiousness of Roman paganism and Christianity, and cannot be borne out by the funerary inscriptions themselves. Pagan epitaphs from the second half of the first century C.E. onwards almost invariably start off with a dedication “to the divine manes,” that is, the deified dead. On the other hand, Christian sleep formulae, which are most commonly used, speak to the future salvation of the deceased. They thus convey different concepts of the afterlife, and the difference is one of the substance, not of the form. Inscriptions therefore do not reflect restructuring of relations from the horizontal to the vertical ones, and the lack of commemorators in Christian epitaphs needs to be explained in different terms. Shaw himself gives a hint of what may have been more plausible reason: syntactically, sleep formulae (for example: *hic iacet*, *(re)quiescat*, *(re)cumbit*, *(ob)dormit*, *depositus*) are not conducive to expressing commemorators, and they are structurally the same as the pagan formula “here rests” (*hic situs est*) that accounts for the most of the “no commemorator known” epitaphs.

---

419 Brent D. Shaw, “Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Life in the Later Roman Empire,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 33 (1984), at p. 467-68. Shaw sees in disappearance of commemorators a deliberate and conscious refusal to note secular relationships, and dismisses socio-economic reasons, which, on the other hand, account for the brevity of earlier, pagan epitaphs.


Given thus the changed patterns of naming and socio-legal (self)-identification, the question of what social groups put up inscribed funerary monuments in the late empire, and how they relate to the early- and high-imperial ones, has not been systematically examined, but rather remarked upon in vague terms and in passing. While acknowledging that late Roman epitaphs also commemorate people of high social status such as the members of army, clergy and imperial bureaucracy, the late antique epitaphic population is defined as: “the general populace,” “the vast lower levels of society,” “the persons far down the social order,” but still not “the lowest orders of society,” “the ordinary persons,” “the great mass of common persons of the city,” “the social groups belonging neither among the destitute nor among the elite,” “the ordinary urban population,” and “men and women with banal existences and salaried jobs.” Finally, Brent Shaw and Carlos Galvão-Sobrinho concur that the culture of putting up inscribed funerary monuments went further down the social scale in late antiquity in comparison with the early and high empire. Opposite to them, Mark Handley has argued that the “epigraphic habit” in late antique and early medieval Gaul and Spain was almost exclusively the preserve of “the secular and ecclesiastical elite.”

Shaw, Galvão-Sobrinho and Handley all in effect follow the same method in order to assess the status of the people recorded in inscriptions: they list the inscriptions with recorded statuses and occupations, and assume that if the given evidence pertains either to the “ordinary people” and “lower levels of society,” or to the “secular and ecclesiastical elite,” that the rest of the unspecified individuals must have belonged to approximately the same social groups. Both Shaw and Handley acknowledge

---

423 Shaw, Latin Funerary Epigraphy, pp. 462, 466, n. 28 at p. 468.
426 Shaw, Latin Funerary Epigraphy, n. 28 at p. 468; Galvão-Sobrinho, Funerary Epigraphy and the Spread of Christianity in the West, at p. 437.
427 Mark A. Handley, Death, Society and Culture: Inscriptions and Epitaphs in Gaul and Spain, AD 300-750 (Oxford: Aechaeopress, 2003), at pp. 35-64, and especially at pp. 37, 39, 41, 45, 59.
that the proportion of inscriptions with statuses or occupations is very small: Shaw, for example, counts that only about 1.5 percent of the late antique (“Christian”) inscriptions from the city of Rome record them.\textsuperscript{428} Since the method overstretches the evidence, Handley grants that if the unspecified were not the elite proper, they were at least the sub-elite as conceptualized by Peter Brown.\textsuperscript{429}

Other evidence is adduced to support the conclusions: for Shaw that is the “nomenclature and type of burial” without further elaboration,\textsuperscript{430} and for Galvão-Sobrinho it is the poor craftsmanship of inscribed texts. He dismisses the lack of specialized workshops and the general cultural decline as accountable for the “rusticity” of “Christian inscriptions” but thinks it is because they commemorate “humbler Romans” than those of the “earlier, pagan” period.\textsuperscript{431} Handley emphasizes the social function of funerary monuments, namely, they both display and make an individual’s social status, “whether real or claimed.”\textsuperscript{432} There is nevertheless inconsistency in Handley’s argumentation: if funerary monuments “could make a person’s social status” – he gives the example of non-citizen auxiliaries who set up more elaborate funerary monuments than the citizen legionaries did\textsuperscript{433} – then those individuals without specified status may not have been by analogy the members of elite or sub-elite but could have as well attempted to make a claim to status by putting up inscribed funerary monuments, a possibility that Handley does not entertain.

\textsuperscript{428} Shaw, “Seasons of Death,” n. 34 at p. 108; Handley, \textit{Death, Society and Culture}, at p. 45 states that the “majority of the commemorands have no occupation or status recorded” without giving the exact figures.


\textsuperscript{430} Shaw, “Seasons of Death,” at p. 108.

\textsuperscript{431} Galvão-Sobrinho, \textit{Funerary Epigraphy}, at p. 450-51.


With respect to their method, there are two sets of problems: epigraphic and socio-historical one. As for the former, it first needs to be noted that while Shaw and Galvão-Sobrinho use predominantly epitaphs because they are the most numerous, Handley uses also graffiti and building inscriptions among others434 – without conceptualizing each category separately and without discussing possible differences in motivation and purpose, and thus status of those who put up inscribed monuments or scratched graffiti. These are sweeping surveys that privilege inscribed text over its immediate monumental context: as an example, the social profiles of the deceased and/or commemorators attested in sarcophagi epitaphs may differ from the social composition of the catacomb epitaphs, and since the catacomb epitaphs from Rome dominate the overall late antique epigraphic record of both Rome and the Latin West, the results derived from the given material easily may be taken as representative. For example, in his analysis of the social composition of people recorded in Christian sarcophagi inscriptions from Rome, who are premised to be of the higher social standing than the catacomb epitaphs population, Wolfgang Wischmeyer has observed the correlation between their elevated social position and the higher occurrence of the two-name form.435

The final point is related to the socio-historical problem of defining social groups, whereby closer attention should be paid to the urban social landscape as it can be reconstructed from various types of sources – epigraphic, as well as narrative and normative – in relation to the contemporaneous social composition of epitaphs, which mostly concerns how we interpret the Church hierarchy members’ visibility in epigraphic record since – to illustrate the point – an early fourth-century bishop

figured differently in the urban social landscape than a fifth-century one. Presbyters, (sub)-deacons, ostiarii, ianitores, famuli dei etc. do not straightforwardly translate into ecclesiastical let alone urban elite, as Handly tends see them.\textsuperscript{436} On the contrary, there are no grounds to classify Aurelius Felix, the \textit{ingenuus civis Romanus Carteiensis},\textsuperscript{437} as a person of low standing as Handly does, hypothesizing that he may have been of servile descent whence a reference to his free birth.\textsuperscript{438} Handley’s interpretation remains purely speculative, to which two objections can be raised: firstly, as in the case of Mouritsen’s analytical category of the “servile descent,” it is unclear what it exactly covers and implies, and furthermore to have been of the freed descent does not immediately translate into an individual of low standing. Handley, for example, does not explore the possible social significance of Felix’s two-name nomenclature, and especially of his nomen Aurelius.\textsuperscript{439} Finally, the statement of \textit{ingenuus civis Romanus Carteiensis} renders itself to another, perhaps a more plausible interpretation: Aurelius Felix was buried in Gades, that is, away from his home, hence the emphasis that he was a “\textit{civis Romanus}, a native of Carthage,” which would have been in line with the tendency to have one’s place of origin recorded when an individual gets buried away from home. These examples illustrate difficulties with precisely understanding inscribed texts, and the need to define late ancient social groups in a more nuanced way and how different groups mapped onto the urban social landscape.

\textsuperscript{436} Handley, \textit{Death, Society and Culture}, at pp. 39-44, with Figures 4.3 at p. 40 and 4.4 at p. 43.
\textsuperscript{437} ICERV, no. 138 = EDCS-38800063.
\textsuperscript{438} Handley, \textit{Death, Society and Culture}, at p. 40.
5.2 What’s in a Name?

It has been argued that late Roman nomenclature was marked by the reversal to the single name system, whereby a cognomen has become the essential and thus often the only recorded element of the three-name system characteristic of the late republican and early imperial period.\textsuperscript{440} Iiro Kajanto has worked out his model of the late Roman nomenclature on the basis of catacomb epitaphs mainly from Rome from the third through the sixth century; epitaphs from Carthage were less susceptible to his analysis due to their brevity in general and poorer state of preservation. While he acknowledges that the source genre might have accounted for the fact that in the most cases only a cognomen came to be recorded,\textsuperscript{441} he ascribes the emergence of the single name system predominantly to the onomastic reason. Kajanto draws a parallel between the disappearance of the praenomen and nomen gentile, namely the nomen gentile equally lost its distinctive function and became thus redundant in the late empire since the great majority of people shared a few, mainly imperial nomina of which Aurelius and Flavius were the most frequent.\textsuperscript{442}

Benet Salway has argued that the gentilicium lost its centrality due to the political and social causes, namely Caracalla’s \textit{Constitutio Antoniniana} enacted in 212 C.E. brought about the dissolution of


\textsuperscript{441} Kajanto states that the lack of a praenomen and nomen may be only apparent (Kajanto’s emphasis), for example, in order to save space in epitaph; yet he thinks that that explains the high percentage of single cognomina only in pagan epitaphs, and that “revolutionary changes in the Christian name system were accordingly a consummation of tendencies which were also operative in the pagan material.” Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies}, at p. 13-14.

\textsuperscript{442} Of the 1738 persons in his Christian material, 51 % shared eight nomina, six of which were imperial nomina of which Aurelius and Flavius were the most frequent with 411 and 149 instances respectively. The frequency of imperial nomina, Kajanto argues, was due to the emperor’s manumission of great number of slaves, and their enfranchisement of the \textit{peregrini}. Caracalla’s \textit{Constitutio Antoniniana} thus accounts for the great number of the Aurelii. Other somewhat less relevant factors might have been the weakening of the unity of the gens, influence of the nomenclature of the Hellenized urban population, and loosing of the official control on nomenclature previously exerted through the census. Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies}, at pp. 15-18, and Kajanto, \textit{The Emergence of the Late Single Name System}, at p. 426-27.
the two-name system of the high empire because it entailed the uncontrolled process of enfranchisement which in turn hindered cultural assimilation of the “New Romans,” that is, the post-212 C.E. Romans who then de-Romanized the Roman naming system. Namely, in the areas in which the New Romans prevailed, Aurelius became the gentilicium in default of any other for both the pre- and post-212 citizens and the gentilicium thus lost its individuating function and was easily omitted, whereas in the areas in which the Old Romans were dominant, they might have still kept their family nomen gentile.\footnote{Salway, *What’s in a Name*, at pp. 133-36. For differences in naming systems between the Old and New Romans as attested in official documents, Salway adduces the evidence of the *laterali* of praetorians of 227 C.E., papyri from Egypt of 229 C.E., and documents of the auxiliary cohors XX Palmyrenorum stationed at Dura from 229 C.E.}


It would be nevertheless more precise to refer only to Valerius and to Flavius in particular as “status nomina,”\footnote{Salway has shown how Constantine and his sons Crispus and Constantinus, during the Tetrarchic struggles with Maxentius, Maximinus, and Licinius, manipulated the elements of their full nomenclature, and through either the adoption or omission of the Diocletian’s gentilicum Valerius pretended the allegiance to the Tetrarchic arrangement or expressed pretensions to the sole rule respectively. Upon elimination of Licinius in 324, Flavius remained the sole imperial gentilicum, and replaced Valerius as the nomen indicating higher social status. Constantine’s gentilicum Flavius continued to be used by the emperors even after his dynasty came to an end with the death of Julian in 363. There is evidence that the emperors of the Heraclian dynasty used it until the early eighth century, and it was also used by the Germanic kings in the West. Keenan thus argues that the name became part of the imperial titulature. Salway, *What’s in a Name*, at pp. 138-39; Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 37-38.}

since Aurelius merely denoted a person or a descendant of a person enfranchised predominantly by the *Constitutio Antoniniana*,\footnote{For a problem with differentiating between the pre- and post-212 CE *Aurelii*, see Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at p. 42, with the n. 41 at p. 42, and Salway, *What’s in a Name*, at pp. 133-36.} and it was not indicative of one’s social standing specifically.
Andreas Mócsy has observed the correlation between one’s rank and office and the right to carry imperial nomen already under Diocletian as during his reign the *protectores domestici* and state officials tended to carry his gentilicum Valerius. The practice was taken over and more systematically implemented by Constantine in his attempt to constitute the “new Flavian aristocracy,” whereby the gentilicum Flavius expressed connection and loyalty to the emperor of those employed in military and civilian officia of central imperial government.\(^\text{447}\)

James Keenan has examined the topic the most systematically with respect to the late Roman society of Egypt as attested in papyri. Keenan has showed that the distribution of the gentilicia Valerius and particularly Flavius is more widespread and goes further down the scale of ranks and offices than Mócsy had observed. The Valerii were provincial governors and officials of their officia, imperial financial officials, civic magistrates and the *curatores civitatis* in particular, and soldiers of various ranks and veterans. The Flavii were likewise prefects of Egypt and governors of provinces, and officials employed in their staffs, the *curatores civitatis*, and soldiers from simple recruits to high military officials, and veterans. Keenan has confirmed Mócsy’s observation that municipal *curiales* were not Flavii as a rule, namely they were either Aurelii or bore their family gentilicia. Nevertheless, certain *curiales* were Flavii and it seems that high civic magistrates were entitled to the imperial gentilicia, which is most consistently attested among the *curatores civitatis* in the cases of both Valerii and Flavii.\(^\text{448}\)

In late Roman Egypt Aurelius was the most widespread gentilicium, and from the beginning of the fifth century gentilicia other than Aurelius and Flavius disappear. Egyptian Aurelii, in addition

\(^{447}\) Military Flavii included *protectores*, and *protectores domestici* in particular, soldiers with the rank of *centenarius* at the lowest, and veterans. Civilian Flavii were officials of central government, such as the *agentes in rebus*, *scriniarii*, *memoriales*, *palatini* etc.), and to a lesser extent officials employed in provincial bureaucracy. As for the Senate of Rome, from 327 until Constantine’s death in 337, one of the consuls bore the name Flavius whereas the other one did not, as a sign of Constantine’s compromise with Rome’s old senatorial aristocracy. By the end of the fourth century Rome’s consuls only exceptionally did not bear the gentilicium Flavius. Finally, municipal *curiales* were not Flavii as a rule. Mócsy, *Der Name Flavius als Rangbezeichnung*, pp. 257-63.

\(^{448}\) Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 44-51, 56-63. For the Flavii and Aurelii in the late Roman Egyptian curiae, see Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 290-94.
to the majority of the *curiales*, were craftsmen, merchants, laborers and farmers. The socio-economic divide was apparently so clear-cut that the Flavii regularly acted as lessors and creditors to the lessees and debtors Aurelii to the extent that loan contracts were drafted with already filled in gentilicia Flavius and Aurelius as lender and borrower respectively.

As for the hereditability of the gentilicium Flavius, Mócsy has argued that it was passed on in the family which for Mócsy explains the fact that lower-ranked civilian and military officials bore it as they had inherited it from their father. Keenan has significantly qualified Mócsy’s statement and argued that in general it was not passed onto the family members, whether wives or children, although the existence of a few Flaviae suggests that it might have been inherited if a father was of a high social standing. Salway has summarily stated that since the gentilicium was concomitant with the rank, it could be passed on to a wife or children when the rank itself was transferable.

Salway has pointed out that the adoption of the gentilicia Valerius and Flavius was never compulsory. They could be used instead of the inherited gentilicium, which was most often Aurelius in late Roman Egypt, or they could be acquired alongside one’s birth gentilicium. In the case of polyonymy, Valerius would normally be the lastly, and Flavius the firstly placed gentilicium in one’s nomenclature. Salway has thus maintained that the voluntary adoption of the imperial gentilicium was essentially an expression of gratitude for the imperial benefaction. On the contrary, and although there is no direct evidence for the mechanism through which the name was provided and adopted, Keenan has argued that an expression of loyalty and gratitude was not solely at stake, but that issuing

449 Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 51-56.
450 There were a few exceptions to the pattern whereby the *Aurelii* were economically and socially better placed than the *Flavii*, and accordingly acted as lenders to the common soldiers who were *Flavii*. Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 285-90, and Keenan, *An Afterthought on the Names Flavius and Aurelius*, pp. 245-50.
451 Mócsy, *Der Name Flavius als Rangbezeichnung in der Spätantike*, at p. 260.
454 Keenan, *The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations*, at pp. 40, 43.
of gentilicia was controlled and managed by the imperial government, and that the name change occurred during the process of admission to the service.⁴⁵⁶

To summarize the methodological issues, at stake is to what extent the nomenclature, which has a potential to indicate one’s social standing, was governed by both the widespread and localized onomastic trends, by the type of inscription under examination and by the local culture of setting up inscribed funerary monuments. For example, the chronological distribution of the two- and single-name systems respectively as attested by the dated catacomb epitaphs of Rome reveal the significant decline in the occurrence of the two-name forms: from 41 percent in the third century (and with 5 and 54 percent of the three- and single-name forms respectively), to ten, four and three percent in the fourth, fifth and sixth century respectively. Nevertheless, different socio-economic groups availed themselves of different tombs, and the tomb type should be taken into account in the consideration of the onomastic trends. Thus, in his analysis of the social composition of people recorded in Christian sarcophagi inscriptions from Rome, who are premised to have been of the higher social standing than the catacomb epitaphs population, Wolfgang Wischmeyer has observed the correlation between their elevated social position and the higher occurrence of the two-name form.⁴⁵⁷ Given their numerical dominance, catacomb epitaphs gave shape to what is taken as the onomastic standard in late antique Rome, namely the single-name system became the norm in epitaphs of Rome having been attested in 90+ percent of cases.⁴⁵⁸ At the other end of spectrum is Altava, a town in Mauretania Caesariensis, in whose late Roman epitaphs nearly every person recorded bore a gentilicium, and the two-name system was obviously the rule.⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁶ Keenan, The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations, at pp. 297-301.
⁴⁵⁸ I have calculated the proportions of occurrences of a single- and two-name systems for both men and women together based on Kajanto, Onomastic Studies, Table 6 at p. 12, which is gender specific yet for the present purpose differentiation between female and male name form is irrelevant.
⁴⁵⁹ Kajanto, The Emergence of the Late Single Name System, at pp. 424-25.
Furthermore, the type of inscription has bearing on the nomenclature too. Namely, it is regularly stated that the late antique aristocracy was keen on preserving the traditional two-name system and its disposition to polyonymy, and that it even developed a new system of polyonymy. Yet when the sources for their full nomenclature are epigraphic, they are almost never funerary, but mostly honorific and building-dedicatory inscriptions, and in late antiquity they were the prerogative of the top-level aristocracy employed in imperial government, such as governors of provinces, or senatorial aristocracy of Rome. Thus when the same person is commemorated in an epitaph as well, he or she is usually referred to by his or her cognomen solely. To illustrate, in an epitaph set up in Salona in 375 C.E., Constantius v(ir) c(larissimus) ex proconsule Africae was identified by his cognomen, rank and post. He is mentioned in three other inscriptions from Africa Consularis, of which one is preserved sufficiently enough and records his full name of Paulus Constantius, and the source in question is a building-dedicatory inscription. Likewise, the different name-forms are found in the honorific and funerary inscriptions respectively of the famous couple Sextus Petronius Probus and Anicia Faltonia Proba: in the former texts they are commemorated with their full names, whereas in the latter ones only by their cognomen.

Finally, the two-name form, with the default gentilicia Aurelius, and Valerius and Flavius in particular, as regards the people below the top elite is most consistently attested in the Egyptian papyri,
that is, in official documents. We have therefore the evidence that 1. different name forms can be found in the epitaphs inscribed on different types of tombs from the same epigraphically self-contained site, 2. different name forms appear to have been the norm in different places, and 3. the same individuals were differently named in different epigraphic contexts. This brings us to the question of the social implications of the two- and single-name forms respectively, and of the validity of the method that assesses one’s social profile based on nomenclature.

On the one hand, there is the tendency in scholarship to think of individuals who had only their cognomen recorded as people of the lower social standing. Kajanto thus in order to explain the difference in nomenclature of the early imperial pagan epitaphs, and of the third-century Christian epitaphs has argued for the difference between the social standing of the respective epigraphic population, namely Christians commemorated in the third-century epitaphs were “humble people.”

With respect to the overall catacomb epitaphs, Shaw has likewise asserted that “by the nomenclature and type of burial…most of the deceased were manifestly ‘ordinary persons’.”

On the other hand, the social significance of the single-name form apparently changed over time. It is commonly argued that it denoted servile status in the early- and high-imperial epitaphs. In the third-century catacomb epitaphs, scholars have likewise taken it as indicative of “slaves and humble people.” However, the single-name form cannot anymore be taken as suggestive of the lower social standing in the epitaphs of the fourth through the sixth centuries, when the disappearance of the gentilicium was gradually pervading upper social groups. That is to say, while the two-name system

466 Kajanto’s argument is circular: early Christians of Rome were humble people, which is manifested in their single-name form; at the same time, their single-name form is suggestive of their low social standing, since aristocracy was conservative in regards to the changes in name systems. Kajanto, Onomastica Studies, at pp. 12-13. The argument is repeated in Kajanto, The Emergence of the Late Single Name System, at p. 423.

467 At the same time, Shaw references few inscriptions which commemorate persons of senatorial (clarissimus/-a) and of equestrian rank (perfectissimus), of which, taking into account the examples in which the names are preserved, two had their gentilicium and cognomen recorded (ICUR 18503 and 13487), while four had only their cognomens inscribed (ICUR 23460, 221, 752, 13491) which invalidates his own premise. Brent D. Shaw, “Seasons of Death: Aspects of Mortality in Imperial Rome,” JRS 86 (1996): pp. 100-38, at p. 108, with n. 33 at p. 108.

468 Kajanto, Onomastica Studies, esp. at pp. 11-13; Kajanto, The Emergence of the Late Single Name System, at pp. 422-24.
might be indicative of one’s social standing, we should be careful not to make an argument from silence as the single-name form does not straightforwardly translate into people of the low(er) social standing.

5.3 Non-Funerary Epigraphy: People and Nomenclature

To contextualize the naming patterns as found in epitaphs, the nomenclature as attested in other types of inscriptions will be surveyed. The late antique epigraphic habit in Salona is largely reduced to epitaphs whereby it is harmonized with the epigraphic trends in the late Latin West. Thus, there are only few votive, honorific and building-dedicatory inscriptions. The soldier Val(ериус) Valerianus erected a votive base to Hercules Aug(устус) in between ca. 308-316, and the notarius Dassius dedicated a votive base to the Fortuna Conservatrix for the health of the governor of Dalmatia, Marcus Aurelius Iulius in between ca. 316-350.469 The governor of Dalmatia Fl(авиус) Iul(ий) Rufinus Sarmentius set up altogether six honorific and building-dedicatory inscriptions in between 337-361 in Dalmatia, four in Salona and two in other provincial towns. Yet another governor of Dalmatia, Apollonius Foebadius erected either an honorific statue base or had a building-dedicatory inscription inscribed in between 401-530.470 Five texts inscribed on two monuments commemorated the rites performed ad Tritones by the members of an unspecified college.471 There are altogether 56 individuals, whose names are sufficiently well preserved, recorded in these five inscriptions, and all were identified with their nomen and cognomen. Finally, a mosaic floor inscription commemorated the construction of the episcopal church in ca. 401-425 by stating that Synferius(?) and Esychius(?) built it together with the clergy and people; other

469 CIL 03, 10107 = S IV, 1: 13 = HD056616. CIL 03, 1938+8565 = S IV, 1: 12 = HD053738.
470 Sarmentius: CIL 03, 1982 = S IV, 1: 6 = HD053423; CIL 03, 1982 = S IV, 1: 7 = HD064574 = LSA-1143; CIL 03, 1983 = S IV, 1: 8 = HD064575 = LSA-1144; CIL 03, 8710 = S IV, 1: 9 = HD052768 = LSA-1136 (Salona); CIL 03, 14333 = HD032856 (Senia); CIL 03, 2771+p. 1624 = HD053425 = LSA-1481 (Rider). Foebadius: IIJUG 2074A = S IV, 1: 14 = HD027930.
epigraphic and narrative texts inform us that they were bishops of Salona in the late fourth and the early fifth centuries.472

Before I proceed with the summation of the onomastic trends in the non-funerary epigraphy, I will first reconsider the inscriptions that record the members of an association. Namely, an alternative historical interpretation of these texts will be offered, which has bearing on the socio-onomastic examination. I will then consider the nomenclature of the three governors of Dalmatia who left epigraphic traces in late antique Salona; I will focus on their attitude towards the adoption of the imperial nomen Flavius in order to contextualize the given practice among the lower-level officials employed in the imperial service as attested in funerary texts.

The two monuments that commemorate the ceremonies performed by the members of an association have not received much scholarly attention. Christophe Goddard has most recently treated them epigraphically in Salona IV and has proposed historical explanation of the inscriptions and a college; Françoise Prévot has also tackled the topic in Salona IV with the acceptance of Goddard’s interpretation.473 According to them, these inscriptions list the members of the collegium Ad Tritones who participated in the annual ceremonies of the association. Goddard has argued that the college gathered the sailors who served on the type of liburna called triton.474 The collegium Ad Tritones has not been otherwise and elsewhere attested, and the Salonitan association would have been a unique case of the collegium Ad Tritones. While I agree that these inscriptions record the members of a college who participated in the annual convivial and religious practices of their association, I disagree with

472 ILJUG 2258A = S IV, 1: 63 = HD031239.
Goddard’s identification of the collegium Ad Tritones, namely neither of the five preserved inscriptions actually mentions it. It is suggested that the college in question is likely the collegium fabrum, which is otherwise abundantly attested in the late third- and early fourth-century funerary and honorific inscriptions in Salona.\footnote{An honorific base for statue set up by the collegium fabrum Veneris to Constans, 333-337 (CIL 03, 1981+p. 1509 = S IV, 1: 4 = HD000677 = LSA-1145). Epitaphs: S IV, 2: 417 = HD018330; CIL 03, 8824 = S IV, 2: 650 = HD062983; S IV, 2: 468 = HD064350; CIL 03, 2108 = S IV, 2: 397 = HD063059; CIL 03, 2106 = HD063061.} A clarification is thus in place.

One monument was lost after its publication in CIL, in which its typology was not specified. Two distinct inscriptions commemorated the participants of the ceremonies dated by the consuls to 302 and 316;\footnote{CIL 03, 1967 = S IV, 1: 16 = HD062448.} the later text was nevertheless barely preserved. The preserved “inscription a” lists eleven individuals: the prefect of a college Aur(elius) Valentinianus, and the participants Volus(ius) A[itor, Aur(elius) Asiaticus, Aur(elius) Armentius, Aur(elius) Vates, Aur(elius) A[r]t[ianus, A]ur(elius) Ursilianus, Aur(elius) Luc[i][anu[s], Aur(elius) Lapn(is)?, Aur(elius) Dalmatius, Aur(elius) Mercurius?].

Another monument is a rectangular base (or an altar) that carries four distinct inscriptions each laid out on a separate side. All four inscriptions commemorated certain rites performed by the members of an association, of which the three are dated by the consuls to 303, 319, and 320 (according to Goddard and followed by the EDH, these are the “sides a, b, and c”).\footnote{CIL 03, 1968+8568+p. 2135 = S IV, 1: 17 = HD062448.} Goddard’s “surface d” is not dated yet it is arguably the earliest and should thus be placed first in the publication of the monument. The first inscription (Goddard’s “inscription d”) lists eight ministri and the patron of the college: Ael(ius) Valerianus, Var(ius) Sabinius, Iul(ius) Silvius, Aur(elius) Fortunius, Papirius Crescent(i…), Claud(ius) Barbari(us), Dirru(tius) Crescent(i…), Ael(ius) Dalma(tius), and the patron Nocturnius Novellus. The second inscription dated to 303 (Goddard’s “inscription a”) lists eleven individuals: the prefect of the college the v(ir) p(erfectissimus) Aur(elius) Valentinianus, and the members Aur(elius) Mercurius, Aur(elius)

Regarding the chronology of the undated inscription, Alföldy did not make chronological distinction in between four inscriptions, and dated the whole monument to DZ; moreover, he seems to have considered the “inscription d” as dated to 320, together with the “inscription c.” Goddard has considered his “inscription d” as likely the earliest inscribed text, but at the end of his discussion of the monument allows for the possibility that the “inscription d” was written last on the occasion other than the (religious?) rites performed on February 1 in 303, 319, and 320 and recorded in the “inscriptions a, b and c” respectively.480 It is argued here that the “inscription d” is undoubtedly the earliest inscription.

The “surface d” is the only polished surface, that is, the only which was originally planned to be inscribed and was thus prepared for the text. The inscription is neatly laid out within the boundaries

478 Goddard reconstructs the cognomen as Senatus?, Goddard, “No. 17,” in Salona IV, at p. 173; Alföldy, EDH and OPEL as Senator; Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Senator” at p. 293; HD062448; OPEL 4 s.v. “Senator.” Moreover, according to OPEL, “Senatus” is not attested as the either nomen or cognomen.
479 Alföldy, Die Personennamen, s.v. “Nocturnius” at p. 102 and “Novellus” at p. 254.
480 Goddard, “No. 17,” in Salona IV, at p. 175.
of the main field on the monument’s body, that is, the monument dimensions are customized so that the intended text can fit. The “inscriptions a, b, and c” are longer than the field of the monument’s body, and the texts are inscribed on the monument’s crown and base alike. Although paleographic features are similar, the craftsmanship of the “inscription d” is of the higher order.481

Secondly, the formulae set it apart from the rest three inscriptions, and from the text inscribed on another monument, which commemorated the rites held in 302. The latter four inscriptions open with consular dating, followed by the name of the prefect of the college under whom the ceremonies were observed, followed by the verb menest[ra]bit(!) (=ministravit) or menestravimus(!) and menestrabimus(!) (=ministravimus) and the list of participants. The Goddard’s “inscription d” opens with the designation of who the listed individuals are, namely ministri ad Trit(ones), followed by the list of participants, and concludes with the statement that the unspecified activity, presumably certain rites, was performed with the permission of the patron of the college. As regards the language, the “texts a, b, and c” contain the so-called vulgarisms. The linguistic feature directly comparable between the “inscription d” and the “inscriptions a, b and c” is the syntagm ad Tritones which due to the consonant assimilation has become at Tritones in the latter group of texts, namely [d] in ad has become [t] before yet another [t] in Tritones. Moreover, the betacism occurs in the above-mentioned third person singular and first person plural indicative perfect active of the verb ministro, which reflects the sound change whereby the pronunciation of [b] shifts to [v].

Lastly, there is the conspicuous onomastic difference that points to different temporal and social context. Namely, there is a single Aurelius in the “inscription d” and eight individuals carry the nomen other than Aurelius. On the contrary, in the “inscription a” ten out of eleven men are the Aurelii, in the “inscription b” nine out of nine men whose names are fully preserved are the Aurelii,
and in the “inscription c” 13 out of 15 individuals are the Aurelii. The monument is typologically
similar to the above-mentioned bases carrying the votive inscriptions of Valerius Valerianus and M.
Aurelius Iulius respectively, both of which are datable to the first quarter of the fourth century (Figures
6 and 7 in the Appendix 1), and the similar script is used in the all four “texts a, b, c, and d.” I cannot
suggest with confidence the absolute dates for the initial setting-up of the monument and its
“inscription d,” but I consider the “inscription d” as undeniably the earliest of the four texts. The “text
d” is perhaps a generation earlier than the earliest dated inscriptions of 302 and 303, and it might have
belonged to the 270s or so.

The discussion moves to the issue of the identification of an association. The phrases which appear are the ministri ad Tritones (in the earliest inscription tentatively dated to ca. 270s), qui menest[ra]b
at Tritones (302), menestravimus at Tritones (303), and menestrabimus at Tritones (319) or just at Tritones (320).

That the listed individuals were members of a college is made clear only in the earliest yet undated
inscription which stated that the patron of the college had given his authorization without specifying
for what activity (ex permissu Nocturni Novelli patroni colleg). The phrase collegium ad Tritones, namely “collège
Ad Tritones” as Goddard and Prévot have it, does not appear anywhere. Moreover, that would have
been unparalleled phrasing to refer to the collegium or collegiati. Jean-Pierre Waltzing has listed all colleges
attested in Rome, and Italy and provinces: they are commonly referenced by the nominative plural
form of a noun denoting a professional (for example, the centonarii, fabri, navicularii, to which an attribute
can be added to specify the profession as in the fabri ferrarii or fabri navales), and by the nouns collegium

---

482 Jean-Pierre Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu’à la chute
de l’Empire d’Occident, Tome IV, Indices. Liste des collèges connus, leur organisation intérieure, leur caractère religieux, funéraire et
public, leurs finances (Louvain: Charles Peeters, 1900), at pp. 4-128.
483 There is a question of whether the nominative plurals denote a formally structured and authorized association, or
the loosely grouped individuals of a specific occupation. Liu, Corpora centonariorum, at p. 10, and n. 35 at p. 10. The
mention of the magistrates of a college in connection to the “nominative plurals” points to a formal association.
Furthermore, the chronological dimension may be suggestive of the organizational level of men of a specific
occupation referred to with the nominative plural. Liu examines the issue with respect to the fullones in Pompeii.
Collegia started to proliferate in the West only in the late first century C.E., and she thus allows for the possibility that
often found as conlegium) or corpus with the genitive plural form of a noun specifying a professional (for example, the collegium centonariorum, corpus coriarum, collegium fabrum tignuariorum). Furthermore, while Waltzing was familiar with the inscription and has referenced it elsewhere in his volumes,\textsuperscript{484} he has not listed the association Ad Tritones in his list of all attested colleges.

The verbiage of minister and ministro is not entirely clear, but it seems that here the words minister and ministro do not have connotations of (social) subordination so that the people listed could be understood as “assistants, servants, aiders, helpers,” as it was the case in the collegia inscriptions of the late republican and early imperial Rome and Italy, which distinguish between the magistri and ministri whereby the latter were often slaves.\textsuperscript{485} The inscriptions dated to 302, 303, 319 and 320 all stated that the activity took place on February 1st (kal(endis) febraris was the common orthography), and the recurrent date and the vocabulary of minister and ministro point to the annual convivial and religious activities of a college for which a specific day in a year was stipulated and which were of the “central importance... in the collective life of collegia.”\textsuperscript{487} It may be that the ministri, and ministravimus approximates the function and tasks of the selected magistri cenarum famously attested in the bylaws of

\textsuperscript{484}Waltzing, Étude historique, Tome III, Recueil des Inscriptions greques et latines relatives aux Corporations Romains, at pp. 95-97, nos. 283 and 284.


\textsuperscript{486}Jean-Pierre Waltzing, Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains depuis les origines jusqu’à la chute de l’Empire d’Occident, Tome I, Le droit d’association à Rome. Les colleges professionnels considérés comme comme association privée (Louvain: Charles Peeters, 1895), at p. 422. To illustrate: Conlegia aerarior(um) / Forte Fortunae / donu(m) dant mag(istri) / C(aius) Carvilius M(arci) l(ibertus) / L(ucius) Munius L(uci) l(ibertus) / [---]ḷacus / minis(tri) Titi Mari Carvii( )m(agistri) / [---]stimi D(ecimus) Quincti(us) (EDR072040, further references provided by EDR); Cisirii Praenestini F(ortunae) P(rimigeniae) d(onom) d(ant) / mag(istri) cur(ae) / T(itii) Osenianus L(uci) l(ibertus) / Licin(nus) / M(arius) Pompeius Felisid(orus) / ministri: Nicephorus C(ai) Talabarii s(ervus) / Nicephorus Mitrei〈:servus〉 (EDR118884, further references provided by EDR).

the college of the worshippers of Diana and Antinous (cultores Dianae et Antinoi) in Lanuvium in 136 C.E., or of the curatores attested in the regulations of the college of the merchants of ivory and citrus wood (negotiatores eborarii and citriarii) in Rome in between 117-38. The terminology was not consistent across different collegia, and across time and regions of the empire; the transferred meaning of the verb ministro is “to take care of, manage, govern, direct; to provide, furnish, supply, give, afford.” Jinyu Liu has observed that these seem to have been liturgies, and it is thus possible that these inscriptions honor members of the college, the ministri who provided for and conducted the annual feasting and religious ceremonies.

Regarding the expression of ad / at Tritones, the opening of the four dated inscriptions follows the same pattern: the consular dating of the event, the annual prefect under whom the event took place, the precise day of the event (the kal(endis) febraris) and at Triton(es). It seems to me that the phrase at Tritones is a topographical reference to the location in which the event took place. The opening formula would have mirrored the standard pattern to locate the banquets and religious activities in time and space attested in numerous inscriptions elsewhere. I have not come up with the idea of what specific location ad Tritones might have stood for.

---

488 Magistrì cenarum ex ordine aL ai fao ti qu (oqu?) or ordine hominum quaterni ponere debeli (unt): vini boni amphoras singulas, et panes a(ssium) II qui numerus collegi fuerit, et sardas n (a)= mero quattuor, sationem, caldam cum ministerio (Lines 14-16; CIL 14, 2112 = EDR078891).
489 et a curatorib(us) praestari pl[a]c(uit) [panem et] vinum et caldam passive iis, qui ad tetrastyllum epulati fuerint (Lines 10-11; CIL 06, 33885 = EDR147622).
490 Lewis and Short, A Latin Dictionary, s.v. “ministro, avi, atum, 1.”
491 Liu, Collegia centonariorum, at p. 252.
492 For example, the openings of one of the many preserved annual protocols of the fratres Arvales in Rome: (Ti(berio) Iulio Candido Mario Celio II), / (C(ai) Antio A(unlo) Isilio Quadrato II co(n)s(ulibus) / magiste[r]o / M(arci) Valeri Tr[ibi] Decia[n] / (columna II) / (ante diem) III non(as) Ianuarias / in Capitolio… (CIL 06, 02075 = CIL 06, 32372 = EDR029375); C(ai) Publio Marcello, L(ucio) Rutilio Propinquo co(n)s(ulibus) / (ante diem) VI kal(endas) Ianuarias / in domum C(ai) Vitori H(o)sid Getae magistri fratres Arvales convenuerunt… (CIL 06, 02080 = CIL 06, 32375 = EDR029380); C(ai) Bellico Natale Tebaniano, C(ai) Ducenio Proculo co(n)s(ulibus) / (ante diem) VIII kal(endas) Ianuarias / in luco deae Diae, magisterio C(ai) Iuli Silani, curam agentis C(ai) / Nonio Basso Salvio Liberale… (Columna II, lines 15-17; CIL 06, 02065 = CIL 06, 32367 = EDR029367).
The final point relates to identifying the college in question. Approximately 20 inscriptions of various types mention occupationally based colleges in Salona from the second through the fourth centuries, among which the *collegium fabrum* was epigraphically the most prominent (*fabri* were smiths, builders and carpenters). The name of the college adopted the name of its patron deity Venus, and it is also known as the *collegium fabrum Veneris* and the *collegium Veneris*. It was attested in ca. 17 inscriptions and it was the only association which was attested in the later third and fourth centuries. Specifically, the *[coll(egium)] fabrum Veneris* set up an honorific inscription to the Caesar Constans in between 333-337, and the five members of the college availed themselves of funerary commemoration: *Varius Sabin(us) Salon(itanus) ex colle(gio) fabro(rum), Aur(elius) Candidanus ex col(legio)*

---

493 *Collegium saccariorum* (ILJUG 2126 = HD025705; an urn epitaph dated to the third century. *The saccarii* were porters. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles*, Tome IV, *Liste des collèges connus*, at p. 117, and Liu, *Collegia centonariorum*, at p. 110; *collegium dendrophorum* (CIL 03, 8823 = S IV, 2: 484 = HD062982; a sarcophagus epitaph variously conjecturally dated. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen*, s.v. “Maximianus” ad p. 241 and EDH have dated the inscription, I think rightly, to the high empire, while Salona IV has included it among the fourth-century monuments. The thesis follows Alföldy and EDH. The occupation of the *dentrophori* is not entirely clear: the word means the “treat-bearers,” and Waltzing sees them as wood-merchants; their close connected to the cult of Magna Mater and Attis is well attested. For a brief most recent overview on the *dentrophori*, see Liu, *Collegia centonariorum*, at pp. 52-54; Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles*, Tome IV, *Liste des collèges connu*, at pp. 15-16 and 59-64; *collegium lapidariorum* (CIL 03, 8840 = HD062993; too fragmentarily preserved epitaph which EDH has broadly dated to 1-300. The *lapidarii* were the stonemasons. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles*, Tome IV, *Liste des collèges connu*, at pp. 95-96).

494 For the practice of associations to include the name of their patron deity in their nomenclature and for their worship of their patron deities, see Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles*, Tome I, *Le droit d’associations à Rome*, at pp. 203-05, and Liu, *Collegia centonariorum*, at pp. 253-55.

495 Two honorific statue bases were set up to *L(ucius) Anicius L(uci) f(ilius) Paetinas* in the first half of the first century C.E. whose *cursus honorum* contained the position of the *praefectus fabrum* (CIL 03, 14712 = ILJUG 0124 = HD031866; CIL 03, 14713 = HD031869). Likewise, an honorific statue base was set up to *D(ecimus) Campanus P(ubli) f(ilius) Tro(entina) Varrus* in the first century C.E. whose *cursus* contained the position of the *praefectus fabrum* (CIL 03, 8878 = HD062648). An epitaph or an honorific inscription commemorated *--- Cor(nelius C(ai) f(ilius) Tro(entina) N--- praefectus fabr(um)* (CIL 03, 2018 = HD054719). The *coll(egium) fabr(um)* set up a statue base with two honorific inscriptions dedicated to their patrons *T(itus) Flavius T(itii) f(ilius) Tro(entina) Agricolae* and *T(itus) Vettius Augustalis* in between 71-150 (CIL 03, 2026+p. 1030 + 2087 = ILJUG1961 = HD054750). The *coll(egium) fabr(um)* set up an honorific statue base to their joint patron *M(arius) Ulpius M(arii) f(ilius) Sabinus* in between 131-170 (ILJUG 2109 = HD025108). The *coll(egium) fabr(um)* set up an honorific statue base to their patron *T(itus) Fl(avius) Herennius Iaso* probably in the late second century (ILJUG 0678 = HD034119). There is an epitaph which commemorates a prefect of the *fabrum* *Antonius L(uci) f(ilius) Tro(entina) Firmus* datable to the second half of the first and the first half of the second century (CIL 03, 2075+p. 1030 = HD063259), and there are four epitaphs datable to the high empire which commemorate the members of the *collegium fabrum* and of the *collegium tign(ariorum) fab(rum)* (CIL 03, 8837 = HD062999; CIL 03, 14231 = ILJUG 2030 = HD025720; CIL 03, 8841 = HD062994; CIL 03, 14641 = HD028357).

496 CIL 03, 1981 = S IV, 1: 4 = HD000677 = LSA-1145.
Since the collegium fabrum is the only association epigraphically attested, and abundantly so, in the same period to which the two monuments under consideration belong, it seems reasonable to firstly entertain the idea that an unspecified college may have been the collegium fabrum Veneris. According to Prévot, the fact that a disputed college was presided by a prefect speaks against its identification with the collegium fabrum, since a prefect would have been better suited to the military association such as of the sailors serving on the ship Triton. Nevertheless, the praefectus fabrum and the praefectus collegi fabrum is attested in nine inscriptions dated to the early and high empire as the sole presidential title of the association, and therefore the prefects of the disputed college are completely in line with the attested hierarchy of the collegium fabrum.

Two homonymous men are attested in two inscriptions datable to the same period, namely Varius Sabinus is one of the ministri of the collegium listed in the earliest inscription, which the thesis tentatively dated to ca. 270s-280s, and Varius Sabin(us) Salon(itanus) ex colle(gio) fabro(rum) set up a sarcophagus that Salona IV dated to the later third or the beginning of the fourth centuries; the script of the respective inscriptions is similar and confirms us that the monuments were erected close in time. The identification of the minister Sabinus with the Sabinus ex collegio fabrorum seems thus possible and plausible. Besides these two instances of the nomen Varius, the gentilicium was attested only once more in the late antique epigraphic record, namely Varius Terentianus was one of the ministri in the inscription of 320, and he might have been the son of Sabinus. The cognomen Sabinus was also

497 CIL 03, 2106 = HD063061 (Candianus); CIL 03, 2108 = S IV, 2: 397 = HD063059 (Ursacius); CIL 03, 8824 = S IV, 2: 650 = HD062983 (Polier(ates)]; S IV, 2: 417 = HD018330 (Sabin(us)); S IV, 2: 468 = HD064350 (Valent[---]). Yet another fragmentary inscription of an unspecified type mentioning colleg(ie-) Veneris has been published recently (AE 2006, 1019 = HD056694).
498 Prévot, Un cas unique: le college Ad Tritones, at p. 75.
499 CIL 03, 14712 = HD031866; CIL 03, 14713 = HD031869; CIL 03, 2018 = HD054719; CIL 03, 2026 = 2087 = HD054750; CIL 03, 8737 = HD062532; CIL 03, 8787 = HD062648; CIL 03, 2075 = HD063259; ILJUG 2109 = HD025108; ILJUG 0678 = HD034119.
uncommon in the period, specifically there was only one another instance of it.\textsuperscript{500} The currency of the nomen and cognomen favors the identification of the two individuals as the names were exclusive rather than generic in the later third and early fourth centuries as attested in inscriptions. It is thus suggested that the two disputed monuments which commemorate annual ceremonies of an association, record the annual rites of the \textit{collegium fabrum Veneris}. The association was consistently attested in inscriptions across time and it was obviously the longest-lived and the most prominent college in Salona, which seems to have been flourishing and was epigraphically lively in the late third and early fourth century in Salona.\textsuperscript{501}

It might be possible to identify another minister with a homonymous person that erected a funerary stela, but with less plausibility than in the case of Var. Sabinus. Firstly, a homonymous person, specifically \textit{Aur(elius) Fortunius}, was listed as a minister in the earliest inscription and in the text of 320. As it was suggested above for Var. Sabinus and Var. Terentianus, the Fortunius of 320 may have been the son of the older Fortunius. The cognomen Fortunius had weak currency in the late antique epigraphic record of Salona, which speaks in favor of the suggestion. Besides these two instances, there is only one more attestation of it, namely \textit{Aur(elius) Fortunius} set up a funerary stela to himself, his wife \textit{Aur(elia) Vernantilla}, his sister \textit{Ursa}, and his son \textit{Ver<n=M>atianus}.\textsuperscript{502} It is tempting to identify Aur. Fortunius, who erected a funerary monument, with Aur. Fortunius, the minister of 320. On the one hand, the stela can be narrowly dated to the 320s and 330s. As for the lower chronological limit, the Church is the recipient of the fine in the case of tomb violation, and as for the upper limit, the monument typology and the rich tendril decoration that frames the inscription suggest the dating to the first decades of the fourth century. Therefore, the stela and the last text that commemorates the

\textsuperscript{500} \textit{Iulia Sabina} (CIL 03, 14873 = S IV, 2: 418 = ILJUG 2760 = HD035187).
\textsuperscript{501} The \textit{collegium fabrum} was one of the most respectable types of colleges. Liu, \textit{Pompeii and Collegia}, at p. 62 and n. 59 at p. 62 for the laws granting exemptions to the members of the \textit{collegium fabrum}.
\textsuperscript{502} ILJUG 2467 = S IV, 1: 141 = HD034889.
ministri were produced at about the same time. On the other hand, Fortunius did not style himself as the collegiatus; the funerary text is nevertheless peculiar and does not employ the accustomed epitaphic formulae. The opening sentence runs as follows *Aur(elius) Fortuni(us) pet(i)tu(s) a con/iuge sua Aur(elia) / Vernantilla / sorori su(a)e Urs(a)e / qu(a)e vixit ex cari/tate eorum sene(!) ullo / devitum(!) Aur(elius) Fortuni/us concessit locu(m)...*, which might account for the lack of his occupation designation that can be found in other fourth-century epitaphs of the collegiati (ex coll(egio) fabrorum/fabrum/Veneris). The reconstruction is speculative but not improbable given that the collegiati belonged to the group of “chatty” people who could afford funerary commemoration and were epigraphically fairly visible in late antique Salona.

Altogether, the names of 56 members of the college have been preserved in five texts inscribed on two monuments, all of whom were identified with the two name-form. The earliest inscription displays the variety of nomina: one out of nine individuals bears the nomen Aurelius. The situation is quite the opposite in the rest four inscriptions dated to 302, 302, 319, and 320 in which all individuals were the Aurelii with four exceptions altogether. That seems to reflect the wider urban socio-onomastic change rather than to point towards the different social background of the fourth-century collegiati.

The proliferation of the nomen Aurelius was due to the mass enfranchisement that ensued the promulgation of the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, yet some three generations passed since its publication and the beginning of the fourth century, and while there may have been social differences between the “Old” and “New” Romans in their first generation, they would disappear in time. For example, the prefect in the years 302 and 303 was Aur. Valentinianus of the equestrian rank, and the prefect in 319 was likewise Aur. Xenon for the second time. The fact that the prefect in 320 was Quintilius Faintilius, and that the rest 14 ministri comprised 13 Aurelii and a single Varius does not seem to be socially significant. As it will be shown, similar socio-onomastic trends can be observed in contemporaneous epitaphs, namely diverse gentilicia are generally concentrated in the second half of the third and early
fourth centuries, and their currency alike tapers off in the later record. Naturally, the nomenclature is one of the dating criteria, which is important to be cognizant of in order not to slip into circular argumentation. Nevertheless, the monument typology and its visuals, script and occasionally the epitaph content all congruently speak in favor of the earlier dates of the funerary monuments whose patrons bear diverse nomina. Therefore, if the suggested date of ca. 270-280s for the earliest inscription is tenable, then these inscriptions are the evidence for the pace of the socio-onomastic change. Finally, the status distinctions are missing in all cases but one. Aur. Valentinianus was the prefect of the college in the years 302 and 303 whereby in the latter instance he was defined as the vi(r) p(erfectissimus), namely as a man of the equestrian rank. Not even the patron of the college Nocturnius Novellus was distinguished from among the rest with a designation of his social position.

The following discussion concerns the adoption of the imperial gentilicium Flavius by the top imperial aristocracy as it can be illustrated by the examples of the three provincial governors of the senatorial rank epigraphically attested in Salona. Their attitude towards the adoption of the imperial nomen Flavius will serve us to put into perspective the practice among the lower-level imperial officials as attested in epitaphs. The notarius Dassius set up a votive inscription for the health of his superior, the vi(r) c(larissimus) Marcus Aurelius Iulius, who was the augur and the praeses. The p(raeses) of Dalmatia, the vi(r) c(larissimus) Fl(avius) Iuli(us) Rufinus Sarmentius set up six honorific inscriptions in Salona and elsewhere in Dalmatia. Sarmentius’ name appears in the same way in all six inscriptions, specifically

503 CIL 03, 1938 + 8565 = S IV, 1: 12 at pp. 158-60 = HD053738. For Iulius, see PIR²-A 1540 and PLRE 1 Iulius 5 at p. 482.
as Flavius Iulius Rufinus Sarmentius that was apparently his official and full name. Lastly, the praeses v(ir) c(larissimus) Apollonius Foebadius set up an honorific inscription on a base (for statue?).

These inscriptions are the only source for the historical figures, and no other onomastic and biographical pieces of information are known beyond what is recorded in the inscriptions from Salona. Only Sarmentius’ governorship can be more precisely dated, namely to the rule of Constantius II (ruled as Augustus 337-361) and Constans (337-350). With respect to the topic examined, Iulius presents a problem because the dating of his votive inscription and thus of his governorship is conjectural. Frane Bulić, followed by John Wilkes and Emilio Marin, thought that he was the governor of Dalmatia under Diocletian, specifically during his persecutions of 209-304, in which case Iulius would not be analyzable for the present topic. Christophe Goddard has discarded their reconstruction and has pushed his governorship to after 316, namely to the rule of Constantine and his dynasty, mostly on account of Constantine’s administrative changes which would have had effect in Dalmatia after 316 when Constantine came into possession of the province. His case will thus be considered for the present discussion. Foebadius’ governorship can be likewise dated only conjecturally and broadly: PLRE has dated his governorship to the fourth and fifth centuries, while Bulić and Goddard have pushed it to a later date of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth centuries based on paleographic features of the inscription.

505 ILJUG 2074 A = S IV, 1: 14 at pp. 162-64 = HD027930. For Foebadius, see PLRE 1 Appolonius Foebadius at p. 368. For a list of the late Roman governors of Dalmatia, see Wilkes, Dalmatia, at p. 422.
508 For the war of 316-324 between Constantine and Licinius, see Timothy Barnes, Constantine: Dynasty, Religion, and Power in the Later Roman Empire (Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014), at pp. 101-106.
509 Goddard, “No. 14, Dédicace du clarissime Apollonius Foebadius, praeses provinciae D(almatiae), sur une base (Ve siècle ou premier quart du VIe siècle),” in Salona IV, at pp. 162-64.
To note is that Dassius had Iulius’ praenomen inscribed, and not even in abbreviated form but in full. The praenomina began to fall out of use and have ceased to be recorded in inscriptions with different pace among different social groups and in different types of inscriptions from the later first century C.E. Yet by the mid-third century its usage came to be overwhelmingly reduced to official contexts, such as birth certificates, whereby the obligation to record it in official documents was abolished around the year 300, after which it was a rarity even among the traditional senatorial aristocracy. Besides these three, the two other later-imperial governors of Dalmatia are epigraphically attested in 277 and 280, namely Aur(elius) Marcianus and M(arcus) Aur(elius) Tiberianus respectively: both were of the equestrian rank (the *viri perfectissimi*), and one had his praenomen recorded.

As for the fourth-century epigraphic record of Salona, M. Aurelius Iulius is the single individual whose praenomen was recorded in the private epigraphic context. Besides the two *clarissimae*, of which one was identified with the two-name form and another only with her cognomen, a single *clarissimus* was identified only with his cognomen. Out of the four men of equestrian rank, three were named with the two-name form, and one with his cognomen. The chronological dimension accounts for the three cases in which individuals were named only with the cognomen, namely they were commemorated at the very end of the fourth century when the tendency to omit one’s gentilicium from epitaphs was under way.

Outside of the epigraphic context of Salona, yet within the context of Iulius’ peers, namely of the provincial governors under Constantine, Iulius’ nomenclature appears likewise exceptional, as the survey of the diocesan *vicarii* and *comites*, and of the provincial governors, as compiled by Timothy

---

510 Kajanto, *Roman Nomenclature during the Late Empire*, at p. 103; Salway, *What’s in a Name?*, at pp. 130-31.
511 Marcianus: CIL 03, 8707 = HD053729; PLRE 1 Marcianus 18 = PIR² A 1549; attested in 277 in Salona. Tiberianus: CIL 03, 1805+p. 2328,119 = HD051067; PLRE 1 Tiberianus 5 = PIR² A 1620; attested in 280 in Narona.
512 CIL 03, 8712 = HD034741; CIL 03, 9523+13122 = HD034780.
513 CIL 03, 9506 = HD034773.
514 CIL 03, 6403 = HD 063458; CIL 03, 8712 = HD034741; CIL 03, 9540 = HD034754; IIJUG 0126 = HD018019.
Barnes, has revealed. A caveat regarding the sources for Barns’ list is in place: plenty of governors are attested only in the law codes as recipients of imperial promulgations in which they are commonly addressed only by their cognomen. That might have bearing on the low figure of governors whose praenomen is known. On the other hand, in the exceptional cases in which Constantine or his sons addressed the governor in their promulgation with yet another element besides cognomen, the element is the governor’s nomen, as in the case of Annius Tiberianus. That confirms the onomastic trends as observed in the epigraphic record, and emphasizes the conservativeness of the three-name system, and gravity and solemnity which such nomenclature ought to have conveyed. It is thus no wonder that the fourth-century sources for the three-name and polyonymous system (two or more gentilicia) are almost invariably honorific inscriptions.

Thus, three other provincial governors of the first half of the fourth century had their praenomen recorded. Namely, two governors of the equestrian rank styled themselves as M(arcus) Alfius Apronianus and Q(uintus) Aeclanius Hermias in an honorific inscription that each set up to Constantine in between 312-324 in Vienne and Corduba respectively, furthermore, the council of

516 Cf. Cameron, *Polyonomy in the Late Roman Aristocracy*, at pp. 172-73.
517 CTh 12.1.5 (ad Annium Tiberianum). PLRE 1 Tiberianus 4.
518 On that note, I have left out the members of the old senatorial aristocracy of Rome from the survey of the Barnes’s list, since their onomastic practices were deliberately conservative. As Salway has put it with respect to the adoption of the imperial name Flavius: “The independently-minded aristocracy of Rome were especially reluctant to use a nomen which not only behavied in a fashion unsanctioned by the mos maiorum but also implied a dignity dependent on imperial service.” The last person with his praenomen recorded came from “traditional milieu” of the senatorial aristocracy, namely Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus who was consul in 485. Salway, *What’s in a Name?*, at p. 131, and quote at p. 140. For example, Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus signo Mavortius (PLRE 1 Lollianus 5), L. Aradius Valerius Procules signo Populonius (PLRE 1 Procules 11), L. Crepereius Madalianus (PLRE 1 Madalianus), Amnius Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus signo Honorius (PLRE Paulinus 14), C Vettius Cossinus Rufius (PLRE 1 Rufius 15), L. Nonius Verus (PLRE 1 Verus 4), M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus (PLRE 1 Placidus 2), C. Caelsius Censorinus (PLRE 1 Censorinus 2). The source for their full nomenclature are invariably honorific inscriptions whose honorands they were in Rome and in other Italian towns.
519 Apronianus: CIL 12, 1852 = EDCS-08501575 = LSA-2656; PLRE 1 Apronianus 4. Hermias: CIL 02, 2203 = EDH028166 = LSA-1997; PLRE 1 Hermias 3.
Asisium set up an honorific inscription in 330 to *M(arcus) Aur(elius) Val(erius) Valentinus*.\(^{520}\) Therefore, both the nomenclature of M. Aur. Iulius and the epigraphic context of a votive inscription which recorded his name was exceptional both in Salona and among the top imperial aristocracy as attested empire-wide during the reign of Constantine and dynasty.

Another difference between the nomenclature of Iulius and Sarmentius, the governors under Constantine’s dynasty, provided that the dates for Iulius’ inscription and governorship of 316-350 as suggested by Goddard are accepted, is the lack of the imperial nomen Flavius in Iulius’ case, while Sarmentius bore it prefixed to his own family gentilicium Iulius. Two possible reasons may be entertained, of which the epigraphic context seems less probable. Sarmentius had the imperial nomen recorded alongside his patrilineal in the public and official context of honorific inscriptions that he set up to the members of the imperial family. To set up an honorific inscription to an emperor or a member of the imperial family was an ultimate expression of loyalty to the ruling emperor. As to the context-specific nomenclature, it has been observed that the old senatorial aristocracy of Rome reduced the usage of the imperial nomen Flavius to the official contexts while they avoided it elsewhere because it implied nobility dependent on imperial service. The status name would have assimilated them with the parvenus who did not sport a gentilicium other than Flavius as their family nomen would have likely been Aurelius.\(^{521}\) Nevertheless, the onomastic practice of the senatorial aristocracy of Rome does not readily compare with the naming patterns of the *clarissimi* with different social background. The private epigraphic context seems not to have affected Iulius’s nomenclature. Namely, considering that the *notarius* included even the obsolete element of the praenomen in Iulius’s full and official nomenclature, and the Iulius’s gentilicium is Aurelius, my assumption is that the imperial nomen Flavius would have been recorded, had Iulius been granted it.

\(^{520}\) CIL 11, 5381 = EDCS-12700049 = LSA-1639; PLRE 1 Valentinus 12.

\(^{521}\) Salway, *What’s in a Name?*, at p. 140.
The chronological dimension may account better for the lack of the status nomen Flavius in Iulius’s nomenclature. The survey of provincial governors under Constantine suggests that the practice of conveying the imperial nomen onto the holders of the top imperial offices such as the *vicarii*, *comites*, and the provincial governors began after his victory over Licinius in 324 when he became the sole ruler of the empire. The practice becomes observable after 324 also in those western territories, which Constantine had been ruling before 324 and whose governors had displayed allegiance to him, and not just in the recently acquired East.\(^{522}\) The vicar of the Spanish provinces Septimius Acyndinus set up an honorific inscription to the Caesar Crispus in Tarraco in between 317-326.\(^{523}\) The above-mentioned M. Alfius Apronianus set up an honorific inscription to Constantine in Vienne, which is dated to before 324 based on Constantine’s titles, namely the emperor was not styled as the *Victor* which he took over after his defeat of Licinius.\(^{524}\) P. Aelius Proculus, the governor of Campania of the equestrian rank, set up an honorific inscription to Constantine in Puteoli in 324.\(^{525}\) Neither of the three carried the imperial nomen Flavius although they were Constantine’s governors in the West in the late 310s and early 320s. In conformity with the general practice, the governor of Dalmatia M. Aurelius Iulius did not carry the imperial nomen Flavius, and his nomenclature may then provide the *terminus ante quem* for his votive inscription and governorship, namely the year 324. It seems that the Aurelii invariably upgraded their nomen to Flavius upon entering the imperial service with the consequence that no Aurelius is attested as a provincial governor after 324.


\(^{523}\) CIL 02, 4107 = EDCS-05503139 = LSA-1983; PLRE 1 Acyndinus 2.

\(^{524}\) CIL 12, 1852 = EDCS-08501575 = LSA-2656; PLRE 1 Apronianus 4.

\(^{525}\) AE 1969/70, 0107 = EDCS-09700879 = LSA-1922.
The last epigraphically attested governor in Salona, the vir clarissimus Apollonius Foebadius is attested in an honorific or a building-dedicatory inscription. Bulić has classified the monument as a slab, and thought that the notch on its top side was used to lift it, and to insert or to fix the slab onto a structure. Goddard, followed by EDH, has classified the monument as a statue base and the notch accordingly served to fix the statue. Nevertheless, note that the Last Statues of Antiquity Database (LSA) has not included the monument in its corpus of late antique statues. Bulić and Goddard agree that the inscription commemorates the architectural benefaction of the governor himself or of an emperor. According to Goddard, the text is not completely preserved and the building activity was recorded on another side of the statue base.

The inscribed monument renders itself to two more probable interpretations. Firstly, if we take it as an honorific inscription on the statue base, it is then more likely that the governor Foebadius awarded it to an honorand, namely an emperor, in which case the emperor may have been specified on another face of the rectangular block. Nevertheless, there are instances in which the subject of the honorific monument was not stated. For example, an honorific inscription inscribed on a small statue base provides the parallel instance with respect to the employed formula, and the subject was

---


527 Bulić, Apollonius Foebadius, at p. 7.

528 Goddard, No. 14, Dédicace du clarissime Apollonius Foebadius, at p. 163. EDH has followed Goddard and categorized it as the statue base (HD027930).

529 Bulić, Apollonius Foebadius, at pp. 9-10; Goddard, No. 14, Dédicace du clarissime Apollonius Foebadius, at p. 163. For the governor’s material benefactions, see Daniëlle Slootjes, The Governor and his Subjects in the Later Roman Empire (Leiden: Brill, 2008), at pp. 79-87.

530 To illustrate, two parallel, fourth- and fifth-century cases: D(ominus) n(oster) Valentinianus / omnia maximi v(ictor) / ac trium(t)or semper / et ubique victor erectus / est curante D(om(itio)) Eutropio / v(iro) c(larissimo) praeside Ciliciae. (CIL 03, 13619+p. 2316,7 = HD022286 = LSA-637; dedicated to Valentinian I or Valentinian II, Hierapolis Castabala, Cilicia I, 364-378); D(ominus) n(oster) Honorius, / florentissimo, / invictissimoq(ue) / principi, / (5) S(enatus) p(opulus)q(ue) R(omanus). / Curante Rufio Antonio/ Agrypnio Volusiano, / v(iro) c(larissimo), praef(ecto) urb(i) / iterum vice sacra / indicante. (CIL 06, 1194+p. 4334 = EDCS-00900447 = LSA-305; dedicated to Honorius, Rome, 417-418).
not recorded on any other side, or the statue base inscription erected by the governor of Campania Virius Lupus Victorius in the fourth or earlier fifth centuries. A caveat is in place. The given interpretation does not square easily with the dates of 401-530 that Bulić and Goddard assigned to it, since a single statue base is attested after the fourth century awarded by a provincial governor to an emperor, namely to Justin II (r. 565-574, d. 578). The Greek cross, which prefixes the text, and paleographic features speak against the fourth-century date that PLRE attributed to Foebadius. It seems furthermore that neither the fourth-century statue bases, nor the one dedicated to Justin II awarded to the emperors contained a cross or any other Christian symbol. Nevertheless, an honorific inscription on a statue base awarded by the city of Cyrrhus (Euphratensis) to the emperor Justinian in between 527-548 opens up with a cross.

On the other hand, if we take it as a building-dedicator inscription, then Foebadius as the imperial representative seemingly oversaw a public work. Nevertheless, other parallel instances state that the public work had been undertaken by or dedicated to an emperor, whereby Foebadius’s honorific-building inscription would then stand out because neither an emperor nor a benefaction was recorded. It is unclear which of the two possibilities is more probable, yet it seems that Goddard’s

---

531 Curante Chete/cio (!) Pelagio, vиро / praefectissimo(!) / curatore aedium / sacrarum (CIL 03, 37123+p. 4820,1 = EDCS-20000192 = LSA-1377; Rome, 280-340).
533 D(omino) n(ostro) Iustino, / felici semper / Aug(usto), dedicante / Lucio Map[---] / v(iro) c(larissimo), p(roconsuli (?)) P(rovinciae(??)) [---] / devota Carthago (??) (CIL 08, 1020 = LSA-2771).
534 LSA-2636.
535 An illustrative case: Imp(erator) Caes(ar) Fl(avius) Val(erius) Constantinus Pius Felix maximus Aug(ustus) / Aquas Iasas olime vii(!) ignis consumptas cum porticibus / et omnibus ornamentis ad pristinam faciem restituit / provisione etiam pietatis sui / Nundinas / die Solis perpeti anno constituit / curante Val(erio) Catullino v(iro) p(raefectissimo) p(rae?)p(osito?) p(rovinciae) P(annoniae) super(iors) (CIL 03, 4121+p. 2328,114 = HD064415; Aquae Iasae, 314-316). Another case in which a governor dedicates the building to an emperor are the above-discussed building-dedicator inscriptions of the governor Sarmentius. For the governor’s material benefactions, see Daniëlle Slootjes, The Governor and his Subjects in the Later Roman Empire (Leiden: Brill, 2008), at pp. 79-87.
combination of the statue base commemorating a building activity overseen by Foebadius is untenable.\textsuperscript{536}

As noted, Foebadius governorship is dated broadly to 401-530 by which time the senatorial rank was subdivided into three grades with the \textit{clarissimus} at the bottom.\textsuperscript{537} The comparison of Foebadius's nomenclature with the nomenclature of the contemporaneous imperial governors as listed in PLRE 2 would not be productive because the nomenclature is contextual, namely one's name-form may have varied across different source genre, and PLRE 2 compiled its list based on diverse sources without specifying them (unlike Barnes who specified the source for each governor under Constantine).

Therefore, the final observation is based on the survey of 46 honorific bases erected by provincial governors to emperors, and of ca. seven building-dedicationary inscriptions set up by provincial governors during the period of 325 to 530, whereby LSA and EDH have provided the respective samples of inscriptions.\textsuperscript{538} The naming patterns as attested in the two categories of inscriptions will be analyzed jointly, since no differences were observed across two contexts. On that note, Charlotte Roueché sees the category of building-dedicationary inscriptions as a sub-group of honorific inscriptions, and has accordingly analyzed benefactors in the later Roman East by taking indiscriminately into consideration honorific and building texts.\textsuperscript{539} The survey has not considered the inscriptions that commemorate building activity of the prefects of Rome because the office was largely occupied by the

\textsuperscript{536} Different are the cases of statue bases honoring a benefactor one of whose merits was provision for a building activity. See for example discussing mainly examples from the Greek East, Roueché, \textit{Benefactors in the Late Roman Period}, pp. 353-68. R. R. R. Smith, and Bryan Ward-Perkins, eds., \textit{The Last Statues of Antiquity} (Oxford: OUP, 2016).

\textsuperscript{537} Jones, \textit{The Later Roman Empire}, at pp. 528-30.


members of the old senatorial aristocracy of Rome whose nomenclature was idiosyncratic in particular with respect to their polyonomy and the usage of *signa*. On the other hand, the survey has shown that with respect to the usage of the imperial nomen Flavius, there was no difference between Rome’s senatorial aristocracy and governors whose nobility may have been obtained by the imperial service.

There are 32 governors who set up either an honorific or a building inscription in between 325-530, most of whom were the fourth-century *clarissimi* with several *perfectissimi* (some erected more than one monument hence the incongruity between the number of inscriptions and governors). Only two Aurelii are attested, both of whom were the governors under Constantine and his sons. Seven governors carried the imperial nomen Flavius: besides the above-discussed governor of Dalmatia, Fl. Iul. Rufinus Sarmentius, three governors had it also prefixed to their family nomen and three carried it as a single gentilicium. The rest of the governors carried their own family gentilicium or gentilicia, some of which were naturally imperial nomina such as Iulius, Aelius, Claudius, Ulpius. The only pattern that emerges is that six out of seven Flavii were governors under Constantine and his sons.

There are nevertheless five governors who erected honorific inscriptions to Constantine and his sons.

---

541 LSA-2242 = PLRE 1 Celsinus 4; HD011631.
542 Flavius Vivius Benedictus, 378 (LSA-1758 = PLRE 1 Benedictus 4); Flavius Ovidius Aphonius, 337-361 (LSA-2234); Flavius Lucretius Florentinus Rusticus, 351-400 (LSA-2219, 2220, 2221, 2222 = PLRE 1 Rusticus 1). Flavius Hyginus, 333-337 (LSA-1086 = PLRE Hyginus 4); Flavius Magnus, 354-359 (LSA-2086 = PLRE 1 Magnus 9); Flavius Augustianus 353-354 (LSA-2554 = PLRE 1 Augustianus 3).
543 Antonius Tatianus, 361-363 (LSA-197) and 364 (LSA-223); L. Caecilius Montius, 340-350 (LSA-291, 739, 744, 2079 = PLRE 1 Montius); Oecumenius Dositheus Asclepiodotus 382-383 (LSA-472, 770, 771, 950); Aelius Claudius Dulcitius, 361-363 (LSA-517, 713, 748 = PLRE 1 Dulcitius 5); Dometius Eutropius, 364-378 (LSA-637, 638 and 367-378 (LSA-636 = PLRE 1 Eutropius 5); Annius Antiochus, 355-361 (LSA-1692, 1718, 1719 = PLRE 1 Antiochus 11); Naeratius Scorpius, 375-380 (LSA-1728, 1870; PLRE 1 Scorpius); Sextius Rusticus Iulianus 371-373 (LSA-1839 = PLRE 1 Iulianus 17); Iulius Festus (Hymetus), 366-368 (LSA-1841 = PLRE 1 Hymetus); Helvius Vindicianus 379-382 (LSA-1882 = PLRE 1 Vindicianus 2); Iulius Aurelianus, 325-326 (LSA-1923 = PLRE 1 Aurelianus 7); Decimius Germanianus, 337-361 (LSA-1998 = PLRE 1 Germanianus 4); M. Valerius Quintianus, 364-378 (LSA-2063, 2064 = PLRE 1 Quintianus 4); Publilius Ceionibus Caecina Albinus, 364-367 (LSA-2235 = PLRE 1 Albinus 8); Ulpius Mariscianus 361-363 (LSA-2265 = PLRE 1 Mariscianus); Badius Macrinus, 324-337, probably 324-326 (LSA-1981, 1982) and 333-337 (LSA-2689, 2690 = PLRE 1 Macrinus 2); Antonius Dracontius 364-367 (LSA-2155, 2320, 2562, 2563 = PLRE 1 Dracontius 3); Pontius Asclepiodotus, 377 (HD065271 = PLRE 1 Asclepiodotus 4); Antonius Alypius, 371 (HD033698 = PLRE 1 Alypius 11).
but did not carry the nomen Flavius. It seems that to adopt the nomen Flavius by governors was most fashionable or strongly expected under the emperors who initiated the practice, yet the practice was obviously neither mandatory nor pervasive. In the second half of the fourth century, the gentilicium Flavius was either not adopted or not displayed in the context of honorific inscriptions. Thus, the nomenclature of both governors of Dalmatia, Sarmentius and Foebadius, fits into the general pattern.

The onomastic survey of the individuals attested in few non-funerary texts dated to the later third and fourth centuries has shown that the two-name form, namely the nomenclature composed of the nomen and cognomen, was the norm. The governor M. Aur. Iulius is a single instance of the tria nomina, and yet another governor Fl. Iul. Rufinus Sarmentius is a single case of the polyonymy, namely of the name system that contains two of more gentilicia.

5. 4 Funerary Epigraphy: People and Nomenclature

I have selected altogether 95 epitaphic funerary monuments approximately dated to from the mid-third to the end of the fourth century: 63 are the sarcophagi epitaphs, eleven are the stelae epitaphs, ten are the free-standing slab epitaphs, three are the slabs inserted in the pavement, two are the funerary tables (mensae), and in six instances the monument typology is unspecified (Appendices 2A and 3A). Commemorator is noted in 75 instances (79 percent); nine out of 20 epitaphs that do not record commemorator pertain to Greek epitaphs most of which employ the formula “here lies” (for example, ἐνθάδε χ<ετ>ται), which is not conducive to the noting of a commemorator.544

Epitaphs are the source genre inherently pertinent to the socio-demographic inquiries, and in the two pioneer studies on the Roman family, Richard P. Saller and Brent D. Shaw jointly, and Shaw by himself examined the types of the relationship between the deceased and a commemorator in order to assess the type of the Roman family during the Principate (the first through the third century) and the later Roman empire (the fourth through the sixth century) respectively.\textsuperscript{545} They have analyzed the deceased-commemorator relationships across three social groups of the “civilians,” “military” and “servile” populations.\textsuperscript{546} Their unit of counting was a relationship, and not an inscription as a self-contained item: for example, if there were multiple relationships recorded in an epitaph, they broke them down into the individual deceased-commemorator relationships and tabulated each into corresponding category. Dale Martin has levelled two criticisms against the method of Saller and Shaw. He has emphasized the limitations of both epitaphs as a genre and their method for reconstructing Roman family and household structures, and has pointed out that their study only shows that members of a nuclear family were socially and emotionally more important and dependent on each other than on extended family members, which does not say anything “about the existence of the extended family

\textsuperscript{545} They sought to engage in the cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural historical research of a family, and particularly to polemicize against the view according to which family types had an evolutionary three-stage trajectory from an extended, multi-generational family in ancient societies through an extended stem family to a modern nuclear family. Moreover, they sought to use epitaphs to outbalance the impression that both the legal concepts of \textit{familia} and \textit{domus}, and the normative and ideal projections of literary sources give that nuclear family was a minor phenomenon. Saller and Shaw read ca. 25,000 epitaphs out of which they selected and tabulated data from the 12-13,000 epitaphs, and Shaw used ca. 3,500 epitaphs out of ca. 15,000 that he surveyed from different regions of the western Empire. Saller and Shaw covered following regions: Rome, Ostia, Portus, Italy (Latium, Regio XI), Africa (Carthage, Lambaesis, Auzia, Caesarea), Gallia Narbonensis, Spain, Britain, Germania Inferior, Germania Superior, Noricum, Pannonias. Shaw covers the following regions: Rome, Gaul (Belgica Prima, Vienna), Africa (Carthage, Altava, Sbeitla, Castellum Celtiamum, Arcasal, Thubursicu Numidarum, Castellum Tiditianorum, Thibilis, Sicca-Ucubi, Thugga), Germania (middle Rhine), Spain. That is to say, both have left out Dalmatia and Salona. Saller and Shaw, Richard P. Saller and Brent D. Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers adn Slaves,” \textit{JRS} 74 (1984): pp. 124-56; Brent D. Shaw, “Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Life in the Later Roman Empire,” \textit{Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte} Bd. 33, H. 4 (1984): pp. 457-97.

\textsuperscript{546} Relationships are divided into following analytical categories: 1. Nuclear family relationships (with a further breakdown into conjugal, descending, ascending relationship and siblings); 2. Extended family relationships; 3. \textit{Heredes} (only non-kin heirs); 4. Amity relationships (\textit{amici}, \textit{commilitio}, \textit{communipulis}, \textit{contubernalis}, \textit{municeps}); 5. Servile relationships; 6. No commemorator known; 7. \textit{Sibi se vivo}. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” pp. 124-56, at p. 132.
or the perceived boundaries of the family.”

That is a valid and important contention, but a point of clarification is needed in Saller and Shaw’s defense, namely they were aware of the given limitations, and did not aim to delimit Roman family structures, but sought to determine the types of personal relationships as recorded on tombstones and their conclusion does not go beyond stating that the nuclear family was the primary focus of certain family duties.

To redress Saller and Shaw’s method, Martin has proposed to count tombstones as the self-contained unites. While Martin allows for the regional differences in epigraphic cultures and family structures, the problem with his argument is that he attempts to invalidate Saller and Shaw’s method by applying different method on different data set.

To test the validity of both methods, Jonathan Edmondson has applied them to the same corpus of funerary inscriptions from Lusitania, and has obtained nearly the same results.

Given the size of the sample, which comprises 75 epitaphs dated to ca. 250-400 that noted the commemorator, it was possible to conduct a bit more nuanced analysis that approaches an epitaph as a self-contained item. I have therefore distinguished between the epitaphs in which a single relationship is attested (62 instances) and those in which multiple relationships are attested (9 instances). There are another 4 epitaphs that contain a single commemorator-deceased relationship but the type of relationship is unspecified so I have left them out from this survey. Out of 62 epitaphs that contain a single relationship, 38 pertain to the conjugal, 13 to the nuclear descending, 3 to siblings, 1 to the

---


548 Saller and Shaw, “Roman Family Relations in the Principate,” esp. at pp. 124 and 125,145-6, and passim.

549 Martin’s most abundant samples come from Lycian Olympus and Termessus, and from Bithynian Nicomedia: the ratios of nuclear to extended family inscriptions are 25 to 75 percent, 69 to 31, and 68 to 32 respectively, that is, in the case of Olympus the result is reverse of Saller’s and Shaw’s for the western empire, while in the cases of Termessus and Nicomedia the incidence of nuclear family inscriptions approximates the western empire. Martin, “The Construction of the Ancient Family,” esp. at pp. 41-44 and 47-49, with the Table 1 at p. 48.

550 The incidence of nuclear family relations obtained by Shaw’s method is 77 and 78 percent for Emerita and Civitas Igæditanorum respectively, while the joint ratio of extended and multi-person epitaphs obtained by Martin’s method is 23 and 24 percent respectively. Jonathan Edmondson, “Family Relations in Roman Lusitania: Social Change in a Roman Province,” in The Roman Family in the Empire: Rome, Italy and Beyond, ed. Michele George (Oxford: OUP, 2005), pp. 183-229, esp. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 at pp 194-96, and Table 7.9 at p. 216.
nuclear ascending, 5 to the *sibi se vivo*, and 2 to a foster-child/foster-parent relationship. Out of 9 epitaphs in which multiple relationships are noted, 5 pertain to the combination of the conjugal and nuclear descending, 1 to the combination of conjugal and nuclear ascending, 1 to the combination of conjugal, nuclear descending, and extended lateral, and 2 to the combination of kinship and household type of relationships (a freedwoman to her patrons). In total, out of 71 epitaphs that noted and specified the type of relationships, the burial was the affair of the nuclear family in 62 instances (87 percent), the percentage that fits into the commemorative patterns that Saller and Shaw’s analyses have revealed for the Latin West (both studies have left out Dalmatia and Salona). As for the urban populace, Saller and Shaw’s findings have shown that the civilian commemorative patterns are characterized by the nuclear family relations with a continuity from the earlier to the later empire with the percentage stepping up from 75-90 to 96-98 respectively. Aristocracy is at the lower end of the percentage spectrum, while the (lower) urban social groups are at the upper end. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at pp. 134-39, with Tables I-IV at pp. 147-50, and Shaw, “Latin Funerary Epigraphy,” esp. at 469-70, 471-73, with Tables 7-14 at p. 487. As for the commemorative patterns of specific, military and servile, social groups, the *equites singulares* stand as an antipode to the civilians: only 29 percent commemorators were nuclear family members, while 55 percent were unrelated heirs and eight percent *amici*. On the other hand, military populations at Lambaesis, Spain and Pannonias resemble civilians with over 70 percent commemorators being nuclear family members. Servile populations are exemplified by the *familia Caesaris* of Rome and Carthage as “distinct servile communities,” otherwise though people of servile background were included in the category of the civilians; the *familia Caesaris* displays the same commemorative patterns as civilians with a little over 80 percent of close-kin commemorators. Saller and Shaw, “Tombstones and Roman Family Relations,” at pp. 139-45, with Table I at p. 151, and Tables I-IV at pp. 152-55.
I have selected 95 epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries: sarcophagus is again the prevalent monument with 72 examples, followed by 13 horizontally placed slabs and six tables (mensae), while the typology is unspecified in four cases. The commemorator is noted in merely 7 epitaphs of which the conjugal relationship is attested in 4 and the nuclear descending in 1 instance, the relationship is unspecified in 1 instance and there is a single case of the *sibi se vivo* type of the commemorative arrangement. In the latter case, the epitaph does not employ the accustomed formula, but it states that the prospective occupant purchased the sarcophagus during his lifetime. The ratio of the noted commemorators stands in the stark contrast with the epitaphs of 250-400, but in the harmony with the pattern found in the late antique epitaphs from the Latin West, most of which pertain to catacomb epitaphs from Rome. Namely, the disappearance of a commemorator was so pervasive that it nearly hindered Shaw’s attempt to analyze late Roman family relationships. As for the lack of commemorators, namely the formulae *depositus/-a* and *depositio* that are not conducive to noting a commemorator dominate the record of the fifth and sixth centuries.\(^{552}\)

The gentilicium is disputable in few instances that need be clarified, before I proceed with the analysis of the distribution of the name-forms and of the nomen as the central element of the nomenclature. To begin with, there are three liminal cases in which it is not clear whether the abbreviation AUR, when it prefixes the names of a husband and a wife, should be resolved as the Aurelii, in which case it would apply to both spouses, or as Aurelius, in which case it would stand only as the husband's nomen. For the purpose of the analysis, I will opt for to resolve the abbreviation as Aurelius rather than as Aurelii. The first example, which runs as follows *AVR MR[C]IANVS IIAHIN / CIVIS AFER ET QUINTINA / VXOR EI[ ]S VIVI SIBI*,\(^{553}\) is only apparently problematic, because

---

552 Shaw had recourse to Christian ideology and saw it as a deliberate and conscious refusal to note secular relationships, since the relationship with God became the most important one. Brent D. Shaw, “Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Life in the Later Roman Empire,” *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 33 (1984), at p. 467-68.

553 CIL 03, 13137 = ILJUG 2401 = Salona IV, 1: 81, at pp. 276-78 = HD034785.
Salona IV and EDH, namely its most recent editions, have omitted another letter R in the abbreviation. On the contrary, CIL and ILJUG had indeed transcribed the abbreviation correctly, and the text is still easily readable. The complete abbreviation is thus AURR, and it should be resolved unquestionably as the Aurelii, that is, Aurelius Marcianus and Aurelia Quintina.\(^5\)

Another two epitaphs run as follows: AVR GLYCON ET VALENTIA VIRGINI VIVI SIBI…\(^5\), and AV[ ] FLAVS ET CERS PAR…\(^5\) As for the former inscription, Salona IV has resolved the abbreviation as Aur(elius), while EDH and CIL have expanded it as Aur(elii). In the latter epitaph, the issue is further complicated because the final letter(s) R(R) in the abbreviation AVR(R) is not preserved. Salona IV has reconstructed the text and resolved the abbreviation as Au[r(elius)], while EDH and CIL have reconstructed it in the same way yet have expanded it as Au[r(elii)]. With respect to the space in between AV[ ] and FLAVS, the reconstruction is plausible, namely it seems that a single R was written down. As for how to understand the abbreviation AUR in the given two cases, a brief discussion is in place.

It might be argued that it is futile to expect that the name Aurelius would be consistently abbreviated in epitaphs either as AUR, when applying to a single person, or as AURR when referring to two individuals. The nomen was variously shortened as AVR or AVREL,\(^6\) and inconsistently written even within the same text, namely it could be written both in full and abbreviated as AVR.\(^7\) Such inconsistency nevertheless did not affect the meaning of an epitaph, and moreover, the name was abbreviated as AVR in the great majority of cases in which it was undoubtedly applied to an

---

\(^5\) As for the private inscriptions, I have found a single parallel instance in which the abbreviation AURR appears, and it is meant to apply to the two deceased individuals. The case in point is the Christian funerary monument from Savaria set up by a father to his two deceased sons (CIL 03, 4218 = ILCV 2208 = HD040193).

\(^6\) CIL 03, 2217 + 8609 = Salona IV, 2: 390, at pp. 703-04 = HD062200.

\(^7\) CIL 03, 8921 = Salona IV, 2: 232, at pp. 526-28 = HD013953.

\(^5\) AVREL: Salona IV, 1: 152 and Salona IV, 2: 381. Once it was abbreviated as AV but the stonemason apparently reached the end of the line and no space was left for the letter R, which he did not then transfer in the following line but started it off with the next word (Salona IV, 1: 82: AB AV / ALEXSIO).
individual. All the same, for editorial and research purposes, it needs to be decided on a more plausible solution and resolve the abbreviation systematically. CIL, in the cases in which it has edited or commented on an inscription, and EDH tend to expand it as Aur(elii), although the latter online database not consistently, while Salona IV resolves it as Aur(elius).

The CIL and EDH expand the abbreviated gentilicium AVR inclusively as Aur(elii) when spouses act together as the commemorators, which can be schematically represented as AVR X et Y vivi sibi or parentes. On the other hand, if the name of a husband and/or wife is followed by an apposition, EDH expands the abbreviation in its singular form whereby it applies only to a husband. Nevertheless, the case is attested in which the abbreviated gentilicium is in plural form while the appositions follow the names of spouses. The abbreviation AVR is taken as a shortcut to refer to both spouses, or otherwise related persons, while to avoid repetition and to save the space, and to reduce the stonemason’s workload and cost. It nevertheless seems that when the nomen was supposed to apply to two individuals, it was made clear either by the abbreviation AVRR or it was written in full, in the case of the non-empirical gentilicium. Also, the instances in which the abbreviation AVR is repeated, namely AVR X et AVR Y vivi sibi, are more numerous in the high- and late-imperial record from Salona. Furthermore, in the case analogous with respect to the content and syntax yet with the abbreviated gentilicium Flavius, both CIL and EDH resolve the abbreviation FLA as Flav(ius), namely

559 Aur(elius) Tiberianus pa/ter et Basilia <m>a/ter. CIL did not do any editorial interventions nor commented upon the inscription (CIL 03, 8926 = HD063493).
560 Aur(elii) M[a]rianus IL AHN / civis Afer et Quintina / uxor ei(u)s vivi sibi (CIL 3, 13137 = HD034785);
561 Aur(elii) M[a]rianus IL AHN civis Afer et Quintina uxor ei(u)s vivi sibi (CIL 03, 13137 = HD034785); Uvir is q(uinq)uennalibus) Aur(rellius) Maximus et Anno (votive inscription, 171-250, Novae, Dalmatia, CIL 03, 1910 = HD053687); Aur(elii) Elaini et Leonis (epitaph, fourth century, Savaria, Pannonia Superior, CIL 03, 4218 = HD040193); Baebilit(i) Eutyches et Iannarius liberti (epitaph, high empire, Salona, CIL 03, 8940 = HD063504). Baebilit(i) Satyrs et Prepasa (epitaphs, high empire, Salona, CIL 03, 8941 = HD063505).
562 Aur(elius) Ursacius Salonianus ex collegio Veneris et Aurelia Vitalia vivis sibi (CIL 03, 2108 = HD063059); Aur(elius) Peculiaris magister conjugalarius et Aur(elia) Urbica vivi sibi (CIL 03, 2115 + 8952 + p. 1030 = HD062175); Aur(elius) Anuro et Aur(eliae) Quint(a)e (CIL 03, 2207 = HD061150); Aurelius Castus et Aurelia Iuliane (CIL 03, 2210 = HD062894); Aur(elius) Iannarius milis(ei) co(i)ort(i) V III pat(e)r(e) e(u)s) Aur(elia) Ursina mater(e) (CIL 03, 8729 = HD062493); Aur(elius) Maximus et Aur(eliae) Gemella parentes (CIL 03, 8983 = HD063654); Aurelia Fortunata et Aurelius Saturninus (CIL 03, 14253 = HD057554).
Fla(vi)us Dalm[atius? et] Quiriace uxor.\textsuperscript{563} Indeed, Aurelius became the most widely shared gentilicium in the third and fourth centuries, which presumably increases the likelihood that a wife would also carry it. Flavius nevertheless follows Aurelius as the second most common gentilicium in the later empire,\textsuperscript{564} and women carried it in late antique Salona.\textsuperscript{565}

Having said all that, it may still be tempting to resolve the abbreviation AVR as Aur(elii) in the two debated epitaphs: \textit{AVR Glycon et Valentia} are followed by two appositions in the nominative plural, specifically \textit{virgini} and \textit{vivi},\textsuperscript{566} and \textit{AV[R] Flav(u)s et Cer(e?)s} by the \textit{parentes} and the cognomina of both of their two children are prefixed by the abbreviation AVR.\textsuperscript{567} Nevertheless, the gentilicium is not an adjective, and there are epitaphs in which either of the spouses lacks of the gentilicium, while the other one carries it, and in which a husband and a child but not a wife bear it.\textsuperscript{568} It seems therefore that there are no grounds to resolve the abbreviation AVR in the two disputable cases as AVR(elii), whereby I concur with the editorial work of Salona IV as opposed to CIL and EDH. Out of six individuals recorded in three epitaphs, four are named with the two-name form (Aur. Marcianus, Aur. Quintina, Aur. Flav(u)s, and Aur. Glycon) and two only with their cognomen (Cer(e?)s and Valentina).

An epitaph set up to OCTAVIA CARA DOMIN merits separate treatment with respect to the nomenclature of both the commemorand and her husband.\textsuperscript{569} The text is preserved in Boghetich’s

\textsuperscript{563} CIL 03, 9094 + 9689 + 9572 + 9663 + 12842, HD034766.

\textsuperscript{564} Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies}, at pp. 16-17.

\textsuperscript{565} Fl(aviae) Ta<l>asiae (CIL 03, 9507 + p. 2139 = HD034774); Flavi[ae] C[res]centiae (CIL 03, 9587 = HD034794); Fl(avia) Se[xta?] and Fl(avia) Regula (CIL 03, 9588 + p. 2140 = HDHD056856).

\textsuperscript{566} CIL 03, 2217 + 8609.

\textsuperscript{567} CIL 03, 8921.

\textsuperscript{568} I have brought in the examples in which spouses are syntactically on the same level: M(arius) Veratius Severus vet(ernus) leg(ionis) XXX Ulp(iae) vict(ricis) et Licinia vivi posuerunt fil(i)o suo et sibi (CIL 03, 2064 = HD063265); P(ublius) V(alerius) Zosimus fratri et Felicissima coniun(gi) (CIL 03, 2578 = HD062547); Aur(elius) Ianuarius mil(ites) leg(ionis) Ilia(iae) et Quirilla mater parentes (CIL 03, 8719 = HD062484); L(ae)io Barbio [--] vet(ernus) leg(ionis) XI C(laudiae) p(iae) f(idelis) et Quintiae matri Barbia Paulla pos(a)it (ILJUG 2095 = HD034433); [V]alerius Ens(o)ristus pate[r] et Valeria mater (ILJUG 2206 = HD034656). It is nevertheless possible that a single-name form in some instances might have had socio-legal implications, namely that a wife was a slave of freedwoman.

\textsuperscript{569} CIL 03, 8752 + p. 2261 = ILCV 280 = Salona IV, 2: 411, at pp. 739-42 = HD059984.
18th-century manuscript, the monument is lost, and neither its typology nor the circumstances of its finding are known. Alföldy has dated the epitaph to the high empire, and Salona IV, followed by EDH, to 301-330.\(^{570}\) There are five debatable points in the epitaph: 1. the nomenclature of the commemorand OCTAVIA CARA DOMIN; 2. the nomen gentile of Octavia’s husband Salonius Sabinianus signo Scammatius; 3. the EOR letters attached to Sabinianus’s signum Scammatius, which Mommsen has corrected to EQR and expanded as the eques Romanus; 3. the apposition of the commemorator Ulpius Asclepius CON[...]; 4. the sign that follows the apposition CON[...] and that looks like an X with a vertical line.

The name of the wife will be first considered. The first line of the epitaph commemorating Octavia runs as follows OCTAVIAE CARAE DOMIN /, and it is unclear whether Octavia is her gentilicium or cognomen, and whether CARAE is the cognomen or an adjective attributed to the dominae. Alföldy, ILCV, and EDH have interpreted CARAE as Octavia’s cognomen, while Emilio Marin has taken the word as an attribute of dominae.\(^{571}\) As for the onomastic argument, the cognomen Cara is attested only once in an early-imperial votive inscription in Salona,\(^{572}\) and the cognomen Octavia is attested also once in an high-imperial epitaph.\(^{573}\) On the other hand, the gentilicium Octavius was one of the commonest non-imperial nomina in Salona, Dalmatia, and the Latin West;\(^{574}\) it is also attested also in a fourth-century epitaph in Salona.\(^{575}\) The local currency of the cognomina Cara and Octavia does not speak in favor of either reading, but the currency of the nomen Octavius increases


\(^{575}\) CIL 03, 8879 + p. 1510 = S IV, 1: 377 (Octavi[...] Syagria) = HD034706 (Octavi[...] Eyagria).
the likelihood that the name here is the woman’s gentilicium as well. Moreover, the syntagm *cara domina* does not seem to be epigraphically attested, and the apposition *domina* is usually qualified with the superlative adjectives in inscriptions, such as *optima, sanctissima, and carissima*. The two adjectives in the epitaph are in their superlative form (*rarissima* and *summa*), and the *summa* is attributed to the both genitives of quality (*summae sanctimoniae* and *benignitatis*). Furthermore, two other individuals in the epitaph bear both gentilicum and cognomen. These parallelisms suggest that CARA should be understood as Octavia’s cognomen, while the adjective *rarissima* should be taken as an attribute of both *domina* and *tecusa*.

As for the gentilicium of Cara’s husband, Emilio Marin has changed it from Salonius Sabinianus to Antonius Sabinianus, although neither manuscript nor CIL indicate that the reading might have been problematic. Marin’s reasons are not epigraphic, but he attempted to fit the inscription into his larger historical narrative in which he has sought to identify Cara and Sabinianus with yet another couple attested in the fourth-century epitaph from Salona, namely the parents *Antonius S[a]binianus* and *Octav(i)a [E]yagria or [S]yagria* buried their daughter *Anton[i]a S[abin][a]* in a sarcophagus. Marin has thus modified the reading of Salonius into Antonius Sabinianus, and identified him and his wife Octavia with the spouses *Antonius Sabinianus* and *Octav(i)a [E]yagria or [S]yagria*. Firstly, Marin’s change of Salonius into Antonius seems purely arbitrary. Moreover, Marin argued that Octavia is the woman’s cognomen, and accordingly argued that CARA is an adjective so to be able to identify her with *Octav(i)a [E]yagria or [S]yagria*. The problem is nevertheless that in the latter case Octavia is the woman’s gentilicium and [E]yagria or [S]yagria her cognomen. The text cannot

---

576 Domina sanctissima, domina carissimae, domina optima (CIL 02, 957 = EDCS-05500967; CIL 05, 4438 = EDCS-05500967; CIL 06, 15106 = EDCS-16100154; CIL 06, 24532 = EDCS-13800780; CIL 11, 3829 = EDCS-22700783; CIL 02, 3437 = EDCS-05500280; CIL 06, 7968 = EDCS-18800009).

577 CIL 03, 8879 = Salona IV, 1: 377.
be verified, and Marin’s interventions seem un-called-for and groundless. The names seem therefore best to be read as Octavia Cara and Salonius Sabinianus.578

Regarding the CON[…] and a sign X cut with a vertical line, Luka Jelić, Ernst Diehl, and Emilio Marin have interpreted the sign as a christogram, which Boghtetich presumably had not recognized and had not transcribed correctly. They have reconstructed the text as the confrater in Christo. Alfred von Domaszewski has reconstructed the word as the contubernalis, and Otto Hirschfeld has commented that the monument might be Christian. Dating of the monument is disputable: Alföldy has dated it to the high empire, and Salona IV tentatively to the first quarter of the fourth century. Based on the content, the thesis favors earlier date of the late third or the turn of the fourth century. Marin does not specify what type of christogram he thinks that the sign should be interpreted as, but presumably as the Chi-Rho symbol since it is the only monogram discussed elsewhere in Salona IV. The christograms are comparatively rare in late antique epigraphy of Salona with ca. 30 instances altogether; the earliest example is dated to 360 C.E.579 Neither the chronology nor the local epigraphic context uphold Jelić’s, Diehl’s and Marin’s reading of the symbol. The reconstruction of the phrase is further weakened by the fact that the phrase confrater or confratres in Christo is not epigraphically attested, and that the word confrater does not appear in the early Christian literary texts. Their reconstruction appears thus unfounded.

Lastly, the nomenclature of A<lerena>Roma(na)/Aliena Romana (her name appears twice in the inscription) requires a brief discussion.580 She buried her husband Leontius ex optione officio magistri


579 CIL 03, 9504 = Salona IV, 1: 155; Salona IV, 1, at pp. 41, 94-96 = HD034768.

\textit{eq(nitum) et peditum} in a sarcophagus dated to the first half of the fifth century. The disputable point is whether Altena is the gentilicium or cognomen. The name Altena is a hapax in Salona and Dalmatia; the name \textit{Altenna} is attested once in the Latin West seemingly as the cognomen in a fragmentarily preserved epitaph. The cognomen Altinus/-a, originally the ethnics, is attested in a few instances, and Altena may be an orthographic version of Altinus.\footnote{Altena is attested in a badly preserved epitaph from Luca (P. Mencacci - M. Zecchini, \textit{Luca romana} (Lucca 1982), at pp. 127-28, 441, Table 88.2, with a photo = EDCS-64900565). Altinus/-a: CIL 06, 10541 = EDCS-16200413, CIL 06, 27906 = EDCS-14801861, AE 2005, 1238 = EDCS-35100006, Haidra 01, 86 = EDCS-13302829. and. For Altinus, see Kajanto, \textit{The Latin Cognomina}, s. v. “Altinus/na” at p. 196.} Since Altena is hapax, Alföldy has noted that it is not the cognomen but gentilicium, yet because it is also a hapax as the gentilicium, he has suggested that it should actually be understood as Alfena, namely a version of the gentilicium Alfinus.\footnote{Alföldy, \textit{Die Personennamen}, s. v. “Alfinus and Altena” at p. 57, and s. v. “Altenus” at p. 146.} Nevertheless, the name was twice written as Altena which decreases the likelihood that it is the stonecutter’s error.\footnote{In the first instance a stonecutter made a mistake and inscribed the name as ANTE, in the second instance the name was written correctly as ALTENAM. To an extent comparable case are two inscriptions commemorating the same Benigna, one inscribed on a sarcophagus and another one on a slab inserted in the pavement of the basilica at Manastirine marking the location of Benigna’s burial. Her name was written as BENINA in a sarcophagus epitaph presumably as the stonecutter’s – and not the single – mistake (CIL 03, 9533 = HD034891), while it was written correctly as BENIGNA in a slab inscription (CIL 03, 9532 = HD034892).} Salona IV and EDH have kept it as Altena and have taken it also as the gentilicium.\footnote{Salona IV, 2: 450, at pp. 811-13; \url{http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/edh/inschrift/HD063418} (the last time checked July 29, 2016).}

To differentiate between the gentilicium and cognomen is in some instances complicated by the inversion of elements in nomenclature, by the increased use of gentilicia as cognomina and by the spread of double cognomina in the later empire. Without the family context it may be impossible to distinguish between the elements with certainty.\footnote{Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies}, at pp. 18-31, and Kajanto, \textit{Roman Nomenclature during the Later Empire}, at pp. 104-05; Appendix III, Roman Onomastics, \textit{OHRE}, eds. Christer Bruun and Jonathan Edmondson, at pp. 801-02. Cameron has argued that the distinction between the \textit{tri nomina} had disappeared in the later empire, and has brought in the quote from the fifth-century grammarian Pompeius who stated that you could be laughed at if you asked a person which is one’s cognomen (Pompeius, \textit{Gramm. Latini} V. 140. 35). Cameron, \textit{Polyonymy in the Late Roman Aristocracy}, at pp. 171-74.} Therefore, the order of onomastic components is not a reliable criterion. The name Altinus/-a and Altena are nowhere attested as the gentilicium, but
only as the cognomen few times. Furthermore, the nine-line epitaph is exhaustive, and lists Leontius’ career achievements (ex optio officio magistri equitum et peditum) yet identifies him only with his cognomen. I might speculate that his gentilicium was Flavius, according to the late Roman socio-onomastic phenomenon reviewed earlier in the chapter. Namely, the magister peditum et equitum was probably the magister militum per Illyricum in whose officium Leontius was employed as an optio. Officials attached to the staffs (officia) of high military and civil officials bore the gentilicium Flavius without exception as evidenced in the papyri from Egypt. An official with the rank of optio has likewise been attested.\textsuperscript{586} Nevertheless, because gentilicia fell out of the common parlance, and were overwhelmingly left out in the fifth-century epitaphs in Salona, Altena Romana possibly decided to identify her husband only with his cognomen. As noted, the usage of double cognomina is characteristic of the later Roman onomastics, of which there is one more example in the late antique record of Salona, specifically Gratinus Eus[eb]ius who received burial in a sarcophagus in between 366-380.\textsuperscript{587} There are thus no grounds to interpret Altena as the gentilicium, and she was arguably identified with a single-name form.

Names of 179 individuals are sufficiently well preserved in the epitaphs dated to from the mid-third to the end of the fourth century: 116 were identified with their gentilicium and cognomen (63 %), and 64 only with their cognomen (37 %). Out of 116 individuals named with the two-name form, 58 carried the nomen Aurelius/-a (51 %), 13 carried the nomen Flavius/-a (11 %), 5 the nomina Iulius/-a and Ulpius/-a respectively, 4 the nomen Valerius, 3 the nomen Aelius/-a, and 2 individuals carried the nomina Domitius, Coelius (=Quelius), Quintius/a, Septimius, and Suellius respectively. Other gentilicia are the non-imperial nomina carried by a single person: Aemilia, Antonius, Attigia, Cassia, Considius, Desidiena, Heren(n)ius, Numeria, Octavius, Quadratia, Rusticia, Salonius, Salvia, Suetonius, Varius. Onomastic pattern found in the epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries stands in

\textsuperscript{586} The Names Flavius and Aurelius as Status Designations in Later Roman Egypt, at pp. 48-49, and n. 71 at p. 49, and 58-59.
\textsuperscript{587} CIL 03, 13151 = S IV, 2: 412 = HD034753.
the stark contrast with the nomenclature of the second half of the third and fourth centuries. Out of 115 attested individuals, 109 were named with their cognomen and only six carried both gentilicium and cognomen, whereby there were 5 Flavii and an Ulpius (Appendices 2A and 2B).

To the extent that the dating of tombstones allows to nuance the chronological distribution of the name-forms, it seems that the duo nomina clusters in the earlier horizon of the later third and the first half of the fourth centuries, namely the ratio of individuals who were identified with the two-form in that earlier group of tombstones, and of those whose tombstones were produced around the mid-fourth and in the second half of the fourth century is 84 to 31 respectively. Particularly the gentilicia other than Aurelius and Flavius were concentrated in the earlier epitaphs. To that horizon belong the tombstones of Cassia Decorata and Aurelius Aeneas, Aurelius Lupus and Iulia Maxima, Aurelius Eutic(h)ianus(l) and Aurelius Gr(a)ecio, Aurelius Cандianus, Flavius Valens, Quintia C[---] and Quintius Germanus, Considius Viator qui et Gargilus, Coelius Euhippius and Numeria Irene, Aur(elia) Vernilla, Aur(elius) Lucius and Aur(elia) Stercoria, Athen(n)ius Capitolinus and Aemilia Max{x}imilla, Antonius Taurus and Ael(ia) Saturnina, Aurelia Athenodora, Aurelius S(b)ilvinus, Quadratia Urbana, and Aurelia Felicissima, Aurelius Vindemius, Domitius Vincen[tius] and Domitius

---

604 Salona IV, 2: 399 = HD034861.
605 CIL 03, 8752 = HD059984.
606 CIL 03, 9597 = HD034756.
607 CIL 03, ILJUG 2249 = HD034542.
608 Salona IV, 2: 417 = HD018330.
609 CIL 03, 9269 = HD03427.
610 CIL 03, 2509 = HD034752.
611 CIL 03, 13917 = HD063370.
612 ILJUG 0126 = HD018019.
613 CIL 03, 2406 = HD054464.
614 ILJUG 2467 = HD034889.
615 CIL 03, 9028 = HD034745.
616 CIL 03, 8921 = HD061150.
617 CIL 03, 2207 = HD063416.
618 CIL 03, 8938 = HD063416.
619 CIL 03, 2217 = HD062200.
620 ILJUG 2129 = HD034624.
621 CIL 03, 7621 = HD034757.
622 CIL 03, 14873 = HD035187.
623 CIL 03, 8727 = HD034742.
624 CIL 03, 8823 = HD062982.
625 CIL 03, 6393 = HD063455.
626 CIL 03, 14292 = HD061693.
Lupa, Atilius Primus, 629 Aelius Valtentinus, 630 Aur(elia) Eupateria, Aur(elia) Vera and Aur(elius) Iovinus, 631 Suetonius Iovi(nus), 632

With a few exceptions, the gentilicia Aurelius and Flavius are the only nomina attested in the tombstones that gravitate towards the mid-fourth century and that belong to the second half of the fourth century: Fl(avius) Iulianus and Aur(elia) Sapricia, 633 Se(p)t[imius] Maximianus, 634 Aur(elius) Peculiaris and Aur(elia) Urbica, 635 Fl(avius) Dalm(atius), 636 Fl(avius) Magnianus, 637 Fl(avius) Terentius and Fl(avia) Ta<l>asia, 643 Fl(avius) Theodotus, 644 Fl(avius) Virgilianus and Aur(elia) Ursilla, 645 Val(erius) Crescentius qui et Valentinus and Flav[i]a C[res]c[entia], 646 Aur(elius) Tegri[s] and Aur(elius) Maras, 647 Fl(avius) Pannonius, 648 A[ρ]ηγ[λ]α

629 CIL 03, 2108 = HD063059.
630 Salona IV, 2: 479 = HD027616.
631 CIL 03, 12949 = HD063460.
632 CIL 03, 6427 = HD020035.
633 CIL 03, 8741 = HD062535.
634 CIL 03, 9540 = HD034753.
635 CIL 03, 9585 = HD034793.
636 CIL 03, 9569+12870 = HD059876.
637 CIL 03, 9587 = HD034794.
638 CIL 03, 9572+12842 = HD034766.
639 CIL 03, 8742 = HD062536.
640 CIL 03, 8745 = HD062536.
641 CIL 03, 8746 = HD034753.
642 CIL 03, 13151 = HD034766.
643 CIL 03, 9507 = HD034774.
644 CIL 03, 9508 = HD034780.
645 CIL 03, 9585 = HD034793.
646 CIL 03, 9587 = HD034794.
647 CIL 03, 9569+12870 = HD059876.
648 CIL 03, 2326 = HD062813.
As for the chronological distribution of the single-name form, it seems that its occurrence was progressively increasing from the mid-fourth century. The ratio of the single-named individuals in the tombstones of the later third and the first half of the fourth centuries, and in the tombstones produced around the mid-fourth and in the second half of the fourth century is 24 to 40. The following individuals were identified only with their cognomen in the tombstones datable to the later third and the first half of the fourth century: Licinianus and Pr(a)etorina, Urbica and Alogius <q>ui et Saxxonius, Amandus signu(!) Simplicia, Aντ[ω]νιος Σαμβ[---] and Ακω[-]ας, [C]lementianus, Man[l(i)u[s], Valentiα, Luciα, [Graec?]ina and Proculina, Euassu and Valeriα, Memmi[an]u[s], Proserius, Vincentia, and Piruntia, Philetus, [R]usticianus, Ge[l]lia, Ursa and Ver<n=M>a(n)tianus. The following persons are attested in the tombstones that were produced at around the mid-fourth century and in
the second half of the fourth century: Bάσσας, Αξονίδις, Κυριάς (= Cyriaca), Severa, Gratinus Eius, Barbas, Hæraciæ(?) and Constantius, Bocontias(?) and Bocontius(?), Flavia, Flavianus and Archelais, Gaianus, Paternus, Petronia, Sofronia and Nerus, Maurentius and Concordia, Renata, Dulcitius, Valentinus(?) and Vetranio, Pergrinus, namely Domnia, Augustina, Anastasia qui(!) et Verula, Eutychianus and Artemia, Filetio, Maxentia, Maximinus, Δόμνα or Διόνυσία, Ανατόλιος, Εὐσεβία = Eufevia.

The gentilicium essentially vanished from the epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries. The status name Flavius is the only attested gentilicium. Three out of five instances are precisely dated to the first quarter of the fifth century, namely Fl(avius) Pauctianus, Fl(avius) Thalassius, and Fl(avia) TER

---
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Vita/[li]a,\textsuperscript{701} while the remaining two, specifically Fl(avius) Fidentius\textsuperscript{702} and [F]l(avius) Victo[rin]us,\textsuperscript{703} are broadly datable to the fifth century. There are three fragments of a slab epitaph dated to 428, which commemorated the v(ir) s(pectabilis) whose name Egger, followed by PLRE, has reconstructed as Vipsanianus, and Nancy Gauthier for Salona IV, followed by EDH, as [Ulp(ius)]? Anianus.\textsuperscript{704} Two of the three fragments have been lost, and the recent editions of the text are based on a drawing. I would therefore remain undecided, yet I have brought it in as possibly an instance of the gentilicium Ulpius attested in the fifth century. The rest 107 or 108 individuals were identified only with their cognomen.

With respect to the social implications of the nomenclature, the following analysis will examine the social relevance of the single-name form. As noted earlier in the chapter, on the basis of catacomb epitaphs from Rome, it has been maintained that the single-name form denoted individuals of humble origins.\textsuperscript{705} The hypothesis will be tested with respect to the epitaphic record of Salona, whereby the coffins were the prevalent monument type. The question of the social implications of the single-name form is most pertinent to the period of the later third and the first half of the fourth centuries, in which the two-name form was still prevalent in both the non-funerary and funerary epigraphy. As for the former, the analysis of five honorific inscriptions of an association, of altogether six honorific and building-dedicatory inscriptions set up by the governor of Dalmatia Sarmentius, and of two votive inscriptions, all datable to from the later third to ca. mid-fourth century, has shown that to identify an individual with both the gentilicium and cognomen was an exclusive pattern. As for the latter, the two-name form was likewise the prevalent name-form, namely the ratio between the individuals named

\textsuperscript{701} ILJUG 2789 = HD025117.
\textsuperscript{702} CIL 03, 1987 = HD054172.
\textsuperscript{703} CIL 03, 14704 = HD061538.
\textsuperscript{705} Kajanto, Onomastic Studies, at pp. 12-13; Kajanto, The Emergence of the Late Single Name System, at p. 423; Shaw, Seasons of Death, at p. 108, with n. 33 at p. 108.
with both the gentilicium and cognomen, and the individuals named just with their cognomen is 84 to 24. The question becomes less critical with respect to the nomenclature of individuals attested in the tombstones produced at around the mid-fourth and throughout the second half of the fourth century because the gentilicium was progressively getting omitted in funerary epigraphy in Salona. Specifically, the ratio of the persons named with the two-name and the single-name form is 31 to 40. Finally, the issue turns out irrelevant with respect to the people attested in the epitaphs of the fifth and sixth centuries, because the single-name form became nearly an exclusive naming pattern. The analysis will suggest that the *nomen singulum* was not status-specific in the fourth-century Salona, but that it was rather due to the changed notions of funerary monuments, the more personal style of epitaphs, and the intimate manner of addressing one’s family members. On the other hand, purely onomastic factor was also operative whereby the gentilicium lost its function due to the proliferation of the nomen Aurelius.

Of the 24 individuals named just with their cognomen that belong to the earliest horizon in corpus under consideration, for only two persons their socio-legal status can be ascertained by their internal reference as the *conservi*. *Licinius* set up a slab to the *conserv(a)e Pr(a)etorin(a)e*.\(^{706}\) That is moreover the only instance of the designation of the status of a slave (and a freedman) in the late antique epigraphic record of Salona, the disappearance of which is congruent with the pattern observed elsewhere in the western empire.\(^{707}\) As for the rest 22 persons, their family context and the patterns of commemoration may provide clues for an individual’s *nomen singulum*.

---


\(^{707}\) Kajanto has found a single instance of the designation of the status of slave and 16 of the freedmen in the “Christian” epitaphs of Rome, and none in the late Roman epigraphic record of Carthage. Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies*, at p. 6-9 with Tables 1 and 2 at p. 6.
The instances in which parents, self-identified with their gentilicium and cognomen, styled their children just with the cognomen, are least problematic. The common argument is that the children’s gentilicium may have been left out for economical reasons, namely, to avoid repetition, to save space, and to reduce the work-load and cost, and that it could have been derived from the gentilicium of their parents, specifically from the father’s gentilicium. That explains away the nomen singulum of the [filiae Grae?cina et Proculina, the Ge[l]li(a) filia dulcissima, the filius carissim[us Rus]ticianus, the filius mens V[er<n>a(n)ti]anus. The epitaph that Fl. Theodotus set up to the Pereg[rinus filius in 382, by which time the omission of the gentilicium had become pervasive, fits into that pattern. The epithets dulcissimus and carissimus, after the bene merenti, were respectively the second and the third most common epithets in Roman epitaphs. Dulcissimus was relationship- and age-specific, namely, it was an emotionally loaded epithet with the connotations of intimate relationship and youth, and was the most common epithet applied to younger children. Carissimus, while often applied to children, had somewhat wider scope and the carissimi were on average of older age than the dulcissimi. The age at death thus accounts for different epithets applied to Gellia and Rusticianus, namely, Gellia was 15 years, 9 months and 5 days old, and Rusticianus was 21. Furthermore, to note precisely the age at death was to publicly advertise parental love and care for the deceased children. These elements found in the epitaphs under consideration suggest that the children were addressed in an intimate and affectionate manner, hence the lack of their gentilicium.

708 For example, Kajanto, Onomastic Studies, at pp. 13-14.
709 CIL 03, 9597 = HD034756.
710 CIL 03, 6393 = HD063455.
711 CIL 03, 2509 = HD034752.
712 ILJUG 2467 = HD034889.
713 CIL 03, 9508 = HD034778.
The instances in which one of the spouses lacks the gentilicium might be socially more significant because the gentilicium of one spouse could not be deduced from the gentilicum of another. Namely, legitimate female children derived their gentilicum and socio-legal status from their father in whose patria potestas they would normally stay until their father’s death, regardless of their marital status. Upon their father’s death, women would become sui iuris, that is, legally independent. Married women would thus preserve their father’s gentilicium, which may be taken as the onomastic indicator of the fact that they were not under the legal power of their husbands.

There are four instances in which a wife was named with her gentilicium and cognomen, and her husband only with his cognomen. In three cases wife was the commemorator, and thus responsible for the composition of the epitaph, and husband in one. On the other hand, there are eight cases in which a husband was named with his gentilicium and cognomen, and his wife only with her cognomen. They acted together as commemorators twice (vivi sibi), husband was the commemorator four times, wife was the commemorator once, whereas in the last instance a third male party set up the monument.

---

716 The concept of the patria potestas maintained its centrality in Roman family law throughout the late empire. On it, see Antti Arjava, “Paternal Power in Late Antiquity,” JRS 88 (1998): at pp. 155-65.
717 This applies to the legally recognized marriage, the iustum matrimoniun, which citizens could contract. The manus marriage, in which a wife was transferred to her husband’s legal power, became obsolete by the Augustan period. Although a woman would become legally independent upon her father’s death, they would theoretically come under the guardianship of women, the tutela mulierum, whose consent she needed in case of certain legal and financial activities. The tutela mulierum disappears from legal sources by the end of the third century. Judith Evans Grubbs, Women and the Law in the Roman Empire, A Sourcebook on Marriage, Divorce and Widowhood (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), at pp. 20-46. As for the relevance of the legally recognized marriage and family, the disproportionately high visibility of freedmen in funerary commemoration in central Italy has recently been explained in terms of the freedmen’s upon-manumission obtained right and privilege to form legal families whose children would be protected under law. Hence the importance to commemorate family members, that is, the conjugal and parental relationships. Mouritsen, Freedmen and Decurions: Epitaphs and Social History in Imperial Italy, at pp. 60-62.
718 Constantine promulagated laws that curtailed the wife’s legal power, restricted the free woman – slave unions, and curtailed the wife’s grounds to require divorce. On the family laws in late antiquity, see Geoffrey Nathan, The Family in Late Antiquity, The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), at pp. 58-65.
to the spouses. Two observations are in order. Female and male commemorators alike tended to style themselves with their full nomenclature, and their (predeceased) spouse with her or his cognomen. The same explanation may be valid as has been suggested for children, that is to say, the (predeceased) spouses were addressed with familiarity and affection. On the other hand, the wife’s gentilicium was omitted even in the cases in which they had jointly prepared their tomb, and in which it seems that a husband independently provided for their prospective burial while his wife was still alive. In addition, there is an example in which a wife styled herself only with her cognomen and at the same time emphasized her independent economic capacity. In these cases, the gentilicium of a husband, and of yet another male individual mentioned in an epitaph, was Aurelius in four and Flavius in three instances, so it is plausible to assume that the wife’s gentilicium was likewise Aurelia. That may indicate that the process of omitting gentilicium first began with respect to the female nomenclature given the women’s comparatively subordinate legal, social, and economic position in the society and family, as well as their public representation that confined them to the domestic setting and foregrounded their uxorial and maternal roles and virtues.

---

720 Aur(elius) Glyson et Valentina virgini vici sibi possuerunt (CIL 03, 2217+8609 = HD062200). Fla(vius) Dalm(at)ius et Qutiaeae secor arca(m) nosis viv/is possens (ILJUG 2380 = HD034766). Aur(elius) [V]indemius qui vicit annus soccuginta(l) arca(m) [sibi et co]niugij su(a)e carissi[m(a)e] Loci[a]e (CIL 03, 2226 = HD062884). Fl(avius) Pannonius Massentium coniugem dulci(ssimam) (CIL 03, 2326 = HD062813). S(ep)t(terminus) Maximia[nus] vi(re) p(erfectissimus) prin(a)t(ulis) cop(oniae) [N]al(o)(tanorum) vix sibi et coniugij su(a)e dulci(ssim)a(e) (CIL 03, 9540 = HD034754). Aur(elius) Secundus qui compara(lbil) ab Aur(ello) Alecio(l) piscina(m) at(!) dua corpor(a[l]) depone(na) meum et co(n)iugem meam Renata(m) (CIL 03, 9567 = HD034762). Fl(avius) Magniano protectori compari carissimo Severa de proprio hunc sarcofagum compara bit (CIL 03, 8742 = HD062536). Aur(elius) Tegri[s] bu[n] sarcofagum do[n]avi[l] A ur(elius) Marati et uc[co](ri)l(e) File[t]us File[l]>ae (CIL 03, 9569+12870 = HD059876).

721 CIL 03, 2217+8609 = HD062200; ILJUG 2380 = HD034766;

722 CIL 03, 2226 = HD062884; CIL 03, 9540 = HD034754; CIL 03, 9567 = HD034762; CIL 03, 9569+12870 = HD059876.

723 CIL 03, 8742 = HD062536.

724 CIL 03, 9567 = HD034762; CIL 03, 9569+12870 = HD059876.

The last to be considered are the cases in which all family members were named with the *nomen singulum*, none of whom has a status designation. The early examples comprise a funerary slab that Urbica set up to her husband Alogius <q>ui et Saxxonius dated to the second half of the third century,\(^7\) a sarcophagus that Valeria dedicated to her husband Euassus dated to the first decades of the fourth century,\(^7\) and a sarcophagus of Vincentia and her mother Piruntia set up by Vincentia’s husband Urubicus in a sarcophagus made from Proconnesian marble, datable to the early third century (CIL 03, 13044 = HD063759). It was the name of a freeborn or freedwoman (\(\ldots\)virginia votissima mihi uno marito…). The name was borne by 98 persons. The Latin Cognomina *Urbicus*, *Urvicus*, at pp. 81 and 311. The name was borne by 98 persons. Constantius, self-styled as the *vir clarissimus* and *ex proconsule Africae*, defined his wife firstly as the *coniunx Constanti*, namely by the reference to himself, then as the *parvorum mater*, that is, as the mother of their children, while her proper name Honoria came in the third and last place (CIL 03, 9506 = HD034773). Along the same lines, women were regularly praised for the duration of their marriage, yet by the same token, men aimed to publicly establish themselves as well by rendering their wife and marriage to public scrutiny: *Constantiae quae vixit cum marito annis XX* (ILJUG 0704 = HD034113); *Iul(i)ae Valer(i)a(e) ex<q>n><i>ing<q>ui<q>ae v/ixit mecum concordi/ter* ter annis XVIII (CIL 03, 2406 = HD054464); *Fl(avia) Ta<q>niae…quaeque inlibatae mecum vixit annos XXXII* (CIL 03, 9507+p. 2139 = HD034774); *Ulp(i)us Gorgonius piissimus Celerin<q>ae conpari pientiss<q>a>e cum qua concorditer vixit* annos XXIII m<q>eses V die<q>s / XXV (CIL 03, 1492 = HD051693); *Aur(eliae) Urban<q>ae coniungi…cum qua concorditer vixit* (CIL 03, 8938+2136 = HD03416); *Octaviae Carae…coniungi Saloni Sabiniani…cum quo concura[r]e/ diter vixit ann(us) XXX* (CIL 03, 8752+p. 2261 = HD059984). There is an example of a wife commemorating her husband and recording for how long she “had served him:” *A<l>e(na) Rom(a)na(q)a servit annus XVI coniugi caro* (CIL 03, 6399 = HD063418).

\(^7\) CIL 03, 14738 = HD032301. The name Urbicus is attested in Salona in two high-imperial epitaphs: the imperial freedman Urbicus set up a funerary stela to his wife Apulavia(!) Primula (CIL 03, 2184a = HD062911), and Urbica set up a stela to her father Fronenus(!) (CIL 03, 2619 = HD062481). As for the late antique period, besides in the epitaph under consideration, the name is attested in the fourth-century epitaph from Salona: the spouses *Aur(elia) Ce

Proserius. The sarcophagus has been lost since its publication in CIL, and the metric epitaph has been dated to the late empire by Alföldy, and more narrowly, to the fourth century by Diehl and Salona IV.

Only Valeria and Euassus may be considered as Christians on account of the phrase *in pace.* Diehl has designated Piruntia, Vincentia and Proserius as the early Christians on the basis of the name Vincentia. While the name occurs with a higher frequency among the Christian Romans, it is one of the most frequent new cognomina in -ius/-ia found in the “pagan” record, so it can be conclusively discarded as the criterion for one’s religious affiliation. Moreover, the verse *et aeterno iungit pia membra cubili* is the topos in the “pagan” imagery of the tomb as the *domus aeterna* or *aeternalis* and of the afterlife as the *eternal* sleep. These are the only examples of the cognomina ALOGIUS, EUASSUS, PIRUNTIA and PROSERIUS in Salona and Dalmatia, and they were rare elsewhere in the West. The cognomen Valeria occurs with a high frequency in the high- and later-imperial epigraphic record of Salona, and to the extent to which is possible to deduce an individual’s socio-legal status and social milieu based on nomenclature and family relationships, it seems that it circulated among wider social sectors. In the earlier time horizon, it was carried by a freeborn citizen, the daughter of a veteran, and in the period of the later second and early third centuries, it was borne by a freeborn citizen whose family connections included a man of the equestrian rank, and by a freeborn citizen or a freedwoman whose

---

Euassus, of which this is the only attestation in Salona and Dalmatia. It is more common in the late Roman Africa and Spain. Cf. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen,* s.v. “Euassu,” at p. 196, and Salona IV, 2: 437 at p. 786.

Alföldy, *Die Personennamen,* s.v. “Piruntia,” at p. 265, “Proserius,” at p. 276 and “Vincentius,” at p. 328. ILCV 3698 = Salona IV, 2: 473 at pp. 843-44 = HD062671. These are the only examples of the name Piruntia and Proserius in Salona and Dalmatia, and the names are otherwise rare. Besides the given Vincentia, the name is attested two times more in Salona in the late Roman epigraphic material. Aur. Vincentius was one of the *ministri* listed in the already-discussed honorific inscription of an association dated to 319. *Vincentia* was buried in a sarcophagus in 446 (IIJUG 2254 = HD028042).


Cf. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina,* at p. 278: 36 males and 7 females with the name are attested in the “pagan” epitaphs, and 53 males and 32 females in the “Christian” epitaphs.

Kajanto, *Onomastic Studies,* at p. 74, with Table 19 at p. 74, at pp. 76-79; Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina,* at pp. 116 and 278.

spouse was an imperial slave. The late antique *Iulia Valeria* was commemorated by her husband *Quelius Evelpistus*(!) in the earlier fourth century.733 In the same period, the nomen *Coelius*, of which Quelius is an orthographic version, was borne by one of the *collegiali*.734 The cognomen *Vincentius/-a* is attested only in the late Roman period in Salona, and to the extent that an individual’s social standing is possible to determine, it was borne by one of the *ministri* of a *collegium* in the second decade of the fourth century. Finally, the name *Urbicus/-a* was borne by the imperial freedman in the high empire yet by Aur. Urbica, the wife of the *magister conqiliarius* Aur. Peculiaris. Therefore, although these seven individuals attested in three epitaphs were named only their cognomen during the period in which the *duo nomina* was still the prevalent name-form in epitaphs, there are no grounds to assume that they were of particularly different social or legal standing than of the rest of the contemporaneous “epitaphic population.” Only two individuals seem to have been Christianized, and the single-name form does not appear to have been motivated by the Christian idea of egalitarianism. These may be among the first instances in Salona that give evidence to the gentilicium having been omitted by the whole family.

Three other examples of an entire family self-styled only with their cognomina comprise a sarcophagus of the eight-year-old boy *Constantius* set up by his parents *Barbas et Haerchia*(!)735 a sarcophagus of the daughter *Petronia* for whom her parents *Nereus* and *Sofronia* composed a verse epitaph,736 and a sarcophagus of the *infans dulcissima Flavia*, who had lived for 3 years, 10 months and 7 days, and was buried by her parents *Flavianus* and *Archelais*.737 The production of the three sarcophagi seems to have been later than of the above-discussed three epitaphs, and it can be placed at around the mid-fourth century.738 Two families can be considered as Christian on account of their ideas of the

733 *Coelius F[---] (CIL 03, 2406 = HD054464).
734 Salona IV, 1: 18 = HD022448.
735 CIL 03, 2663 = Salona IV, 2: 431 at pp. 775-77 = HD062436.
736 CIL 03, 9610 = Salona IV, 2: 460, at pp. 826-29 = HD034796.
737 CIL 03, 9586 = Salona IV, 2: 442 at pp. 795-98 = HD034751.
738 Salona IV, 2: 431 at p. 777; Salona IV, 2: 460 at pp. 826 and 829; Salona IV, 2: 442 at p. 798.
present life and afterlife, while Flavia, Flavianus and Archelais declared themselves Christian. Thus, Barbas and Haeraclia stated that Constantius in ann(is) VIII caruit minas saeculi, while Nereus and Sofronia consoled their daughter and themselves with the hope of Heaven (tu tamen hinc spera caelum pia mente fidelis). The lid acroteria of Flavia’s sarcophagus hold christograms, and she is stated to have been baptized (quae...salutifero die Paschae gloriosi fontis gratiam consecuta est, supervixitque post baptismum sanctum...). These three epitaphs were composed by the grieving parents for their deceased young children, and the texts contain the already-discussed elements that convey the parental love and care, such as the emotionally loaded epithets and the age at death of their children registered in years, months and days. While only one is composed in verse, the content of none is boiled down to the accustomed dry formulae, that it, all three are idiosyncratically “verbose” and attempt to provide consolation for parents. The early-fourth-century “pagan” verse epitaph, composed by the carus maritus Proserius for his dulcis coniux(!) Vincentia, and her mother Piruntia, fits well into this group of epitaphs. Finally, a verse epitaph was composed a few decades later in which spouses were again named only with their cognomina, yet their titles precisely located their place in society. The thirty-year-old Honoria, the

730 Knott, “The Christian “Special Language” in Inscriptions,” at p. 75; Salona IV, 2: 431 at pp. 775-777. As for the occurrence of the phrase in literary text, it first appears in the text de laude martyrii of the Pseudo-Cyprianus (CPL 0058), dated to from the mid-third to fifth century, namely Veniat ante oculos nostros qui dies ille sit, cum spectante populo adeque intuentibus sanctis contra terrenas cruces et minas saeculi incomissa denario relucet... (TLL PS. CYPR. laud.mart. 25.1, http://clt.brepolis.net/LITA/pages/TextSearch.aspx?key=PCYP90058_). It was used by Augustine in his sermon on the New Testament (CPL 0284), namely quid est, puer est non babet diuitias interiores, quas martyres babuerunt, qui pro veritate ac fidei christi omnes minas saeculi contemperunt (TLL AVG. serm. 36.238, http://clt.brepolis.net/LITA/pages/TextSearch.aspx?key=PAUG_0284_).

740 As in the case of Honoria’s age, ages at death are mostly rounded figures chiefly divisible by five (after the age of 20) and rarely by ten (after the age of 70) – a cross-culturally attested phenomenon accompanied by other numerical distortions, such as exaggerations, which cumulatively result in large-order misrepresentations and are a function of illiteracy. Richard Duncan-Jones demonstrated that scale of age-rounding varied across categories of status and gender with the expectations of different levels of literacy in different social groups: rounding index of social groups like male civilian citizens (42.8), freedmen and slaves (49.5) was ca. three times bigger than that of town councilors and office-holders in Italy and Africa (15.1 and 17.5 respectively). Gender differences are more complex: for example, rounding index of female citizens and incerta from Puteoli and Carthage (34.2 and 33.1 respectively) is approximately twice as big as that of town councilors from Italy and Africa (15.1 and 17.5 respectively), while age-rounding index for both female and male citizens and incerta of Rome are ca. equal (48.9 and 48.4 respectively), that is, three times bigger than that of town councilors from Italy (15.1), while the age-rounding index of freedwomen and slaves in Rome (52.9 and 58.8 respectively) and Carthage (62.0) is somewhat higher than that of freedmen (ca. 48). Richard Duncan-Jones, Structure and Scale in the Roman Economy (Cambridge: CUP, 1990), pp. 79-92.
dulcibus eximie carissima, and Constantius, the v(ir) c(larissimus) ex proconsule Africae, were buried in 375 together with their predeceased parvula.\textsuperscript{741} Thus, the nomen singulum of all members of these five families is in harmony with the style of their epitaphs, which is exceptionally private, affectionate and consolatory. These epitaphs stand in a stark contrast with most of the contemporaneous funerary inscriptions, in which individuals - if not a wife and children, but the pater familias certainly - are named with the two-name form, and which are essentially statements of property ownership, of which the following is an illustrative example:

\begin{center}
\textit{Aur(elius) Aprilianus se vivo donavit(!) / arcum Aur(elio) Amuro et Aur(eliae) Quint(a)e qu(a)e / est in (b)orto Metrodori vibi sibi p/osuerunt II[---]arnum / quod si [quis p]ost morte[m eorum s]up[er] / [eos a]lia corp/ora velet(!) [in]p[oner] / [--- i]nforet! sol[idos ---}
\end{center}

It thus seems that the single-name form was not specific to certain (lower) social groups, nor was the omission of the gentilicium informed by Christian ideas. Rather, two other factors seem to have been at work. Namely, the changing ideas of the funerary monuments and tombs,\textsuperscript{743} and the fact that the nomen was losing its distinguishing function due to the proliferation of the gentilicium Aurelius.\textsuperscript{744} The process took hold widely over the course of the fourth century, and was consummated by the fifth century.

It cannot be adequately assessed whether the simplification of the nomenclature was specific to funerary context or whether epitaphs reliably reflect the pace and pervasiveness of the socio-

\textsuperscript{741} CIL 03, 9506 = Salona IV, 1: 159 at pp. 401-04 = HD034773.
\textsuperscript{742} CIL 03, 2207 = Salona IV, 2: 386 = HD061150.
\textsuperscript{743} In her analysis of the Isola Sacra necropolis, Ida Baldassarre has remarked that the notions of the death and tomb began to change in the first decades of the third century. Namely, the social function of monumental tombs began to be overshadowed by their functional aspect as containers of the remains of the deceased. Burying ceased to be embedded in wider social relations, and became a more intimate focus of a family. Ida Baldassarre, “La necropoli dell’Isola Sacra (Porto),” in \textit{Römische Gräberstrassen: Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard, Kolloquium in München vom 28. bis 30. Oktober 1985}, eds. Henner von Hesberg and Paul Zanker (Munich: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987), pp. 125-38 at pp. 137-38.
\textsuperscript{744} Kajanto, \textit{Onomastic Studies}, at pp. 9-18, and esp at pp. 16-17.
onomastic change. Namely, there are only two non-funerary inscriptions after the mid-fourth century in Salona. The building-dedictory mosaic pavement inscription commemorates the construction of the church, which “Synferius(!) began, and…Esychius(!) completed with the clergy and people.” Their episcopal titles were not noted. The construction of the church and the inscription are dated approximately to the first decades of the fifth century. The bishops were named in the same manner as in their funerary mensae dated to around 425-430, specifically just with their cognomen, and their nomenclature is in harmony with the contemporaneous naming pattern as attested in epitaphs. On the contrary, the governor of Dalmatia Apollonius Foebadius, who set up an honorific inscription dated broadly to the fifth century, styled himself with the two-name form, for which the analysis in the previous section of the chapter has shown that it was the standard practice among the top imperial elite in their building-dedictory and honorific inscriptions.

5.5 Funerary Epigraphy: The Titles, Offices and Occupations

Of 294 individuals attested in 188 sufficiently preserved funerary inscriptions dated to from the second half of the third to the beginning of the seventh century, 94 were defined with a title, office or occupation (25%), of whom 74 were laymen and 20 clergymen (Tables 1 and 2). The count that takes into consideration monument typology renders the following figures: of the 94 individuals with a social designation, 79 were buried in sarcophagi.

745 Nova post vetera / coepit Synferius(!) / (H)esychius eius nepos / c(u)m clero et populo / f(ecit) / baez munera / donus P(X)Christ)e / grata / ten(ue) (ILJUG 2258A = S IV, 1: 63 = HD031239).
748 Curante / Apollonio / Foebadio / v(iro) c(larissimo) p(raeside) p(rovinciae) D(almatiae) / [-?] (ILJUG 2074A = S IV, 1: 14 = HD027930).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Canusius</td>
<td>4th cent.</td>
<td>Veteranus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Candidian</td>
<td>251-300</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex collo[lego] Veneris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Valens</td>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>B(cen)t(cius) co(n)sil(ans) Pannon(nae) super(niens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinta C[--]</td>
<td>251-300</td>
<td>Stola(t)a femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Venilla</td>
<td>251-400</td>
<td>Plumbaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ael. Saturnia</td>
<td>L. 3rd/or 4th cent.</td>
<td>C(istrius) femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. Taurus</td>
<td>L. 3rd/or 4th cent.</td>
<td>Ex dux&lt;V&gt;us c(entenarius) decennarius post factus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Peculians</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Magister consularis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Iulianus</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Ex protectore et ex praepositus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Magnusian</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Protecteur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Valerianus</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>D(o)n (nomino) sagittarium c[entenarius]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S(cip)[femina]</td>
<td>ca. 350</td>
<td>V[ir] pr[udentissimus] pr[incipalis] col[oniis] [Sal(ate)n]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val. Hemogena</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Honesta femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacus Sabin(t)is Salone[ntus]</td>
<td>L. 3rd/or 4th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex collo[lego] fabro[rum]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Aurelius Alexandru]</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>B(e)n(e)n[i]t[us] leg(o)nius XI Claudi(a)e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[--][--]</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Ex corniculari[us] [--]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [--] Janae</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Honesta femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Maximinus or Maen(i)ius</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td></td>
<td>[-- collo] legio dendro[rum]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurentius</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Fabricensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux. Valerianus</td>
<td>313-524</td>
<td>Exceptor Imp(ri) er(atorum) in oficio memori(a)e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Iulianus</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Z[acens] (!) (= discors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>V[ir] [xa] ex[n] (naitust) ex proconsule Africi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Theodotus</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>Curator in public[a]e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustin(a)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>C(istrius) femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustachianus</td>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>V[ir] pr[udentissimus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anten(a)</td>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>Hon(est) or hon[aitrius] femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximinus</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>V[ir] p[raepustissimus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A]utor(a)</td>
<td>4th/or 5th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [--]</td>
<td>351-500</td>
<td>De numero At(a) col[tus]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dion[on]</td>
<td>426 or 430</td>
<td>Ancella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ulp[ius]] Anianus</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>V[ir] spectabilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcianus</td>
<td>Ca. 450</td>
<td>Memoria[lius]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigna</td>
<td>Ca. 450</td>
<td>Honesta femina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F[luvius] Pacianus</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>Domesticus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [--] Iannes</td>
<td>406 or 407</td>
<td>Ex tib(autos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>411 ?</td>
<td>Ex domesico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Thalassius</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>Ex corincilaclo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Clarissima femin[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorinus</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Advocatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Flavisius] ? [--] Jerus</td>
<td>431 or 432</td>
<td>V(ictoris) c[lassis]m(uis) prox(ocens) scion(i) tabulas [or] (um) Me(res) did[olor] ens(us)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>V(ictoris) spectabilis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>H(onestae) m(entionis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [--]</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>sub]aduva s&lt;inf&gt; eos in][uitus] p(acciectus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roemarus</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>V(ictoris) d(evotus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucius</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>Su[deo] acos(mus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audensius</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>Tosc[us] f(ori) Dalm[atici]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? [--]</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>[Togat[ius] f(ori) Dalm[atici]]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deogratia</td>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>C(lasius) f(eminus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausonius</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>V(ictoris) spectabilis comnis[us] saec[us] consistori et Dalm[aticum]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiana[lia]</td>
<td>Ca. 450</td>
<td>Q(uae) &lt;h&gt;ene laboacrit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Ex optione officio magistri equ(itum) et peditum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fl. Fidentius</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Ex corintibus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A[nphil]ianus</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>V(ictoris) c[lassis]m(uis) et sp(ectabilis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orhonis</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Anagha[lianus] (=Anag[rapham])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>Ca[poc]liar[ius] pa&lt;1&gt; a[i]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreas Diaconus</td>
<td>551-600</td>
<td>D(efensor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B[a]niamus</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Neg(osiator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be[n]ap[ius]</td>
<td>501-530</td>
<td>V(ictoris) d(evotissimum) cornubac[us]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epifanius[ius]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>[C]a[legarius] (=cal[agarius])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florentius</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>[--- de] numero Delmi sta(riam ---]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[io]nannes</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menat[---]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Defensor (=defensor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseaus[ius]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>V(i)nius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseius[us]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Categar[ius] (=cal[agarius])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturninus</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Miles Salonianus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarus</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sart[ius] (=sactor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>V(ictoris) d(evatu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Subdi(o) occ(ens)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoratus</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Categar[ius] (=cal[agarius])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Mac]cellinus</td>
<td>L. 6th c./ 7th cent.</td>
<td>V(ictoris) c[lassis]m(uis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. List of Clergy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italicus</td>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>π[ε]ραμβος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Iulius</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>Z[acens! ---] (= diaconus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H]esychius</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gais[jus]</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>[Ep(i)s(co)(opus)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iustinus</td>
<td>Ca. 475</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symp文创ius</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>Episc[(opus)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>451-500</td>
<td>[Episcopus]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciruscentianus</td>
<td>451-550</td>
<td>Diaconus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugenius</td>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>Chorepiscopus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>425-450</td>
<td>[P]roonat[io(ri)] e(c)lesf[a]e Saloni[t]nae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hononius</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Presbyter(ter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td>599 or 603</td>
<td>Presbyter(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfreta</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Dia(c)onus s(an)(c)(ae) ecclesiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius</td>
<td>L. 5th - E. 6th cent.</td>
<td>Lector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemellinus</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Presbyter(!) (=presbyter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanos</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>P[es]b[yer(!)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iohanna</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>Abbatissa(!) (=abbatissa)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are eleven persons of the senatorial status, of whom four are the clarissimae, three are the clarissimi and spectabiles each, and an individual was both the vir(c)larissimus and spectabilis. The spectabilis and clarissimus were in the early 370s formally classified as the second and third rank within the senatorial order. In most of these instances, it is not clear whether an individual of the senatorial status, inherited it through a family, attained through a high administrative office or was granted an

---

749 CIL 03, 8712 = HD034741; CIL 03, 9523 = HD034780; CIL 03, 9515 = HD011288; CIL 03, 9574 = HD034750.
750 The clarissimi: CIL 03, 9506 = HD034773; CIL 03, 9517 = HD054213; IlJUG 2771 = HD026958. The spectabiles: IlJUG 2693 = HD035124; Salona IV, 2: 426 = HD009275; IlJUG 2033 = HD027933.
751 Salona IV, 2: 422 = HD064336.
honorary title.\footnote{Cf. Christopher Kelly, “Bureaucracy and Government,” in The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine, ed. Noel Lenski (Cambridge: CUP, 2007), pp. 183-205, at p. 197.} For example, the \textit{v(ir) c(larissimus)} Constantius was the proconsul of Africa in 374 that was traditionally one of the most powerful posts.\footnote{Kelly, “Bureaucracy and Government,” at p. 47.} His nomen gentile Paulus is known from the building-dedicatory inscription from Africa Consularis;\footnote{The inscription from Africa Consularis that record his full name: EDCS-16700003; PLRE 1 Paulus Constantius 11.} given the fact that he did not adopt the status nomen Flavius, but rather kept and styled himself with his family gentilicium, and that he occupied the prominent post suggests that he might have been a member of an established aristocratic family. Ausonius was the \textit{vir spectabilis} and the \textit{comis(!) sacr[i] consistorii}, specifically the member of the imperial council, yet Ausonius could have obtained it as an honorary grant that did not require actual service.\footnote{The inscription from Africa Consularis that record his full name: EDCS-16700003; PLRE 1 Paulus Constantius 11.}

Altogether four men were of the equestrian rank, specifically there were two \textit{ducenarii} and \textit{perfectissimi} each.\footnote{Salona IV, 2: 426 at p. 768; Jones, The Later Roman Empire, at pp. 104-06, 526-28.} The \textit{perfectissimus} and \textit{ducenarius} were, in descending order, the two highest grades within the equestrian order.\footnote{The \textit{ducenarii}: CIL 03, 8712 = HD034741; ILJUG 0126 = HD018019. The \textit{perfectissimi}: CIL 03, 6403 = HD063458; CIL 03, 9540 = HD034754.} Aur. Leontius was the \textit{docen(arius)(!) and} the decurion of Salona in the first two decades of the fourth century,\footnote{The \textit{docen(arius)(!)}: CIL 03, 9540 = HD034754.} and \textit{S(e)p(timius) Maximianus} was the \textit{v(ir) p(erfectissimus)} and the \textit{princ(ipalis)} of Salona at about the mid-fourth century.\footnote{Arnaldo Marcone, “Late Roman Social Relations,” in Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 13, The Late Empire, A.D. 337-425, eds. Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 338-70, at p. 356.} While these two inscriptions attest that the traditional civic institutions persisted in Salona throughout the fourth century, the latter reveals that the hierarchization of the curial order occurred by the mid-fourth century, whereby the effective control of the city government came into the hands of the restricted group of persons, the so-called \textit{principales}.\footnote{Arnaldo Marcone, “Late Roman Social Relations,” in Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 13, The Late Empire, A.D. 337-425, eds. Averil Cameron and Peter Garnsey (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 338-70, at p. 356.} Aur. Leontius commemorated his son Aur. Valerinus who, although born in the family of the curial order, was pursuing his career in the imperial administration and was employed as a clerk of
the rank of the *exceptor* in the central imperial office of the *memoria* at the time of his death (*exceptor Imp(eratorum) in officio memorie*). Besides Leontius and Maximianus, yet another municipal functionary is attested, namely the *curator rei p(ublicae)* Fl. Theodotus. The *curator* Theodotus, like Marcianus, reveals the restructuring of the civic governance and administration. The traditional civic magistrates, elected from among the decurions, were replaced by the officials appointed by the imperial government, hence the Theodotus’s gentilicium Flavius. These officials were likely local men and locally elected but installed by the central government.\footnote{762}

There is a single *stolata femina*,\footnote{763} four *feminae honestae*,\footnote{764} and two *viri honesti*.\footnote{765} These were the unofficial titles applied to women and men who belonged to the municipal nobility.\footnote{766} The title *femina stolata* had currency in the third century, and is usually found applied to women who owned landed property and were married to men who belonged to the equestrian order, most commonly with the rank of the *centenarius* and *ducenarius*.\footnote{767} The title *femina honesta* or *honestissima* similarly designates a woman’s social prominence that she derived from her husband who was often of the equestrian rank or a local notable.\footnote{768} The later third-century *femina stolata Quintia C[---]* was married to the *b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis) Pannon(iae) super(ioris) Fl. Valens*; he was a lower-ranked official employed in the imperial provincial administration.\footnote{769} Three *honestae feminae* were commemorated together with their spouses,
who were the *ex cornicular[ius]*,\(^770\) the *memorialis*,\(^771\) and also the *v(ir) h(onestus) or h(onestissimus)*.\(^772\) The *cornicularius* was the higher-ranking official employed in the provincial administration. Moreover, two more *ex cornicularii* were commemorated with epitaphs,\(^773\) and it is plausible to assume that they were all employed in the *officium* of the governor of Dalmatia.\(^774\) The *memorialis* Fl. Marcianus was possibly employed in one of the *sacra scrinia*, that is, in one of the three central secretarial departments of *memoria, epistolae* and *libelli*.\(^775\) Finally, the lower-ranking clerk employed in the office of the *praefectus praetorio Italiae*, having died in Ravenna, was buried in a sarcophagus in Salona in 437 (\(<\text{sub}>)\text{adiuva officii inl(ustris) p(raefecturae)}.\(^776\) There are titles whose scope is broad, and the individuals's social position cannot be determined more precisely. For example, two *viri devoti* are attested in sarcophagi epitaphs:\(^777\) the unofficial title is applied indiscriminately to the *palatini* of various ranks and posts.\(^778\) In addition, there are two *defensores*,\(^779\) who might be the most prominent municipal official in charge of civic finances, the *defensores civitatis*, or the *defensores ecclesiae*. The titles of *protector, ex protectore* and *ex praepositis, domesticus, ex domestico* can denote officials employed in civil and military service, both central and provincial.\(^780\) In addition to that, the *protector* and *ex protectore* and *ex praepositis* were also honorary titles bestowed to the deserving veterans upon their *emerita missio*.\(^781\) Given that Salona was the provincial capital, these were likely local men employed in the civil administration of the province of Dalmatia.\(^782\) Other ten men

\(^770\) CIL 03, 9535 = HD059985.
\(^771\) CIL 03, 9532 = HD034892 and CIL 03, 9533 = HD034891.
\(^772\) CIL 03, 6400 = HD063456.
\(^773\) CIL 03, 9513 = HD034240; CIL 03, 9535 = HD059985.
\(^774\) Cf. Salona IV, 1: 183 at p. 438.
\(^776\) CIL 03, 9518 = Salona IV, 1: 201 at pp. 464-66 = HD034865.
\(^777\) CIL 03, 9519 = HD063071; CIL 03, 9556 = HD034788.
\(^778\) Salona IV, 1: 204, at p. 470.
\(^779\) CIL 03, 9560 = HD035242; ILJUG 2541 = HD035224.
\(^780\) CIL 03, 2656 = HD062441; CIL 03, 9511 = HD024229; CIL 03, 8741 = HD062535; CIL 03, 8742 = HD062536.
\(^781\) Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, at pp. 634-35.
\(^782\) Cf. Salona IV, 1: 181, at p. 435.
can more straightforwardly be classified as the soldiers and military officers of various ranks. They were named with the two-name form, all these men carried the imperial nomen Flavius. Lastly, the three legal officials employed in the provincial court are attested at around the mid-fifth century, the advocatus and the two to<g>(at) fori Dalm(atici). 

There are some fifteen examples of occupations. Altogether four collegiati were commemorated: the three members of the collegium fabrum and one of the collegium dendroforum. Furthermore, the following workers, craftsmen and traders are attested: the plumbaria (a plumber, a manufacturer of lead pipes, a metal workshop owner), the magister conquiliarius (a purple-dyer, a merchant of a purple pigment and of cloth), the fabricensis (an armorer, an armament manufacturer), the negotiator (a merchant), the three calegarii (a shoemaker), the sator? (a sower?), the vitriarius (a glass-blower, glasmaker, merchant of glass), the sartur(!) (a worker, repairer), the anaglifarius(!) (a jewelry-maker). Besides the collegiati, plumbaria and magister conquiliarius, other occupations are attested in the sarcophagi of the fifth and sixth centuries. Its was observed in Egypt’s official documents that the practice of identifying oneself by one’s trade and craft proliferated from the fifth through the seventh century.

---
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centuries, and it is thus possible that some Aurelii of the later third and fourth centuries who did not specify their place in society, pursued trades and occupations, like the *plumbaria* Aur. Vernilla and the *magister conquiliarius* Aur. Peculiaris. These occupational nouns fossilized over time into the modern European last names.

As for the members of the local ecclesiastical hierarchy, the most conspicuous group comprises six bishops, five of whom were commemorated with funerary *mensae* that were presumably set up to mark their burials, while Primus is a single bishop whose epitaphic sarcophagus has been found. The following are the clergy of various ranks and people employed in the Church of Salona: three deacons and two subdeacons, six presbyters, a chorepiscopus, a *lector*, [p]rocurator[e]ce(outia)e Saloni[ta]nae, nst[j]arius [...] ecclesiae(!) Saloni[ta]nae, and a monachos(!), and an abtissa(!).

To put into perspective the social profile of the “epitaphic population” of late antique Salona, the social profile of the occupants of Christian sarcophagi will be surveyed. Shaw has estimated that only ca. 1.5 % of persons attested in “Christian” epitaphs of Rome had their social status noted, which stands in contrast to the figure of 25 % obtained for Salonitan stone funerary monuments among which sarcophagi loom large. The figures are not comparable because the overwhelming

---
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majority of epitaphs from Rome pertain to catacomb inscriptions, and it underlines the methodological necessity of comparing like with like. Thus, there are altogether 320 Christian sarcophagi inscriptions from Rome; Jutta Dresken-Weiland has analyzed the social composition of the sarcophagi occupants. She has counted 88 individuals whose rank, office or occupation was recorded: the largest group comprises persons of senatorial order (46), followed by the equestrians (12), and the *viri bonesti* and *feminae bonestae* (11). There are six professionals, five military officials, six persons employed in the urban and imperial administration, and two clergymen.  

Rather than to posit that the occupants of late antique sarcophagi from Salona were of lesser social status than the occupants of Rome, which they were in absolute terms, and that they belonged to the “sub-elites,” which again they were in the empire-wide socio-political hierarchy, it seems better to attempt to understand how they figured on the local scene. Late antique epitaphs of Salona suggest that the empire-wide restructuring of civic and imperial governance and administration traced from the fourth through the sixth centuries was taking place at the same time in Salona. Aur. Valerinus, who was born into the family of decurial order and who died in the first of second decade of the fourth century, did not follow his father and pursue a career in the municipal curia, but found the escape route from the burdening financial requirements demanded of decurions by entering imperial administration. While this was a recurrent theme of the petitions lodged by the curiales, and of the imperial promulgations attempting to maintain the functional civic governance, it also reveals the recruitment base for the burgeoning central and provincial imperial apparatus. Namely, an emperor continued to rely and cooperate with the municipal elites. The *principalis* Maximianus, buried around the mid-fourth century, reveals the pace of the restructuring of the municipal political power, whereby

---

the curia became sharply stratified and the city governance came into the hands of a limited group of *principales*. Among the Flavii abundantly attested in the epitaphs of the second half of the fourth century, whose titles suggest careers in the central and, more commonly, in the provincial civil administration, we may see the former local *curiales* Aurelii now drafted into the imperial service. Their wives were commonly the *Aureliae* and some held titles of the *honestae feminae*. Some of the *clarissimae*, *clarissimi* and *spectabiles*, especially if their titles were not accompanied by the actual post they performed, may be the local *honorati* and *possessores*, namely the local landowning elite whom the emperor tended to grant the honorary senatorial titles.\footnote{811} Besides the well-salaried civil and military officials, and the landowners, the third group that looms large were the urban craftsmen who were obviously sufficiently affluent to afford the same type of funerary commemoration as the urban and provincial political and social elite. They were altogether the monied group of people who had access to the gold coinage and who could participate in the urban market economy.\footnote{812}


CHAPTER 6: CONCLUDING REMARKS

With respect to methodology, I have attempted to let inscriptions talk for themselves, rather than to fit them into the narrative woven from the literary texts, which tend to be given precedence over the epigraphic texts, or into the modern paradigms, which are informed by the contemporary concerns. While the focus of my thesis are the late antique inscriptions from Salona, I have sought to bridge the divide between the epigraphic record of the early and high empire, and that of the late empire, as well as of the respective disciplines of the Roman and Christian epigraphy. The second chapter revises the traditional concept of the Christian epigraphy that has been distorting our interpretation of the epigraphic record of the late empire. Galvão-Sobrinho’s model of the revival of the “Christian epigraphy” represents the consummated form of the 19th-century definition of what constitutes a “Christian inscription.” According to the scholar, the desire to declare oneself Christian and to secure salvation gave rise to the Christian epigraphic revival. My starting premise was that the wish for an individual and proper burial is a universal desire. The two most important conditions for the monumental commemoration were the urban infrastructure that enabled building activities, to which the production of sarcophagi and stone funerary monuments was closely associated, and one’s purchasing power. The funerary epigraphy is intimately related to the notions about life after death, and it is no wonder that the idiosyncratic Christian ideas of the afterlife would be expressed in epitaphs. “Pagan” epitaphs likewise display imagery related to the tombs and afterlife. What differs is the concept of the life after death, while the practice of composing epitaphs was virtually the same. As I have suggested in several discussions throughout the thesis, these “statements of faith,” as Gálvao-Sobrinho would have them, had a consolatory function and effect on the bereaved family. Their presumed purpose of defining the deceased as Christian before the co-inhabitants and God would become irrelevant as soon as in the fourth century, concomitantly with the proliferation of “Christian” inscriptions, as the majority of urban population would be Christian. The second chapter has also
suggested that the notions about the funerary monuments changed concomitantly with the pervasiveness of the rite of inhumation and the burial in sarcophagi. Namely, given the contiguousness of the sarcophagus and the remains of the deceased, its functional aspect of a container prevailed over its monumental and social purpose. The changed conceptualization was manifested in the idiosyncratic vocabulary applied to the sarcophagi, and was accompanied by the pervasive use of fine threats and menaces against the potential violators of the tomb. These were not an epigraphic peculiarity of the late antique epigraphic culture of Salona, but were equally common in the sarcophagi epitaphs of, for example, Concordia. The simplification of the sarcophagi decoration eventually led to the disappearance of the framed inscription field and resulted in blank panels.

The third chapter touches upon the theme of the cost of funerary monuments, and puts the known early- and high-imperial prices into perspective with the model of wealth distribution, most recently elaborated by Scheidel. The gloomy picture suggests that the overwhelming majority lived at the subsistence level, whereby dying was expensive, let alone the commemoration with stone monuments. Hence the emphasis of the occupationally and religiously based collegia on their logistic and financial assistance with the burial of their members. The late antique sarcophagi were even more prohibitive given their attested prices of, for example, 15 solidi in Salona, and given the general economic contraction that was taking place in the later empire. Nevertheless, the territory of Salona was among the regions in the West that fared comparatively better since it was not heavily affected by wars and Germanic invasions, and had a ready and easy supply of a quality limestone on its own territory, on the off-shore island of Brač. That largely accounts for its prosperous production of sarcophagi and lively epigraphic activity.

The fourth chapter sets the stage for the main thrust of the thesis, namely the analysis of the late antique epigraphic corpus with respect to the nomenclature and social composition of the attested
people. The third chapter touches upon the debate regarding the method that assesses one’s sociolegal status based on the cognomen. It has attempted to show that the diachronic perspective is indispensable because the name-form was fluid and the name fashion was subject to change. The onomastic discussion in the fourth chapter set the ground for the analysis of the social significance of the two- and single-name system in late antiquity.

The fifth chapter suggests that the gentilicum was losing its centrality gradually and that the two-name system was dissolving over the course of the fourth century. By the fifth century, the process was consummated in Salona, as is evidenced by the epitaphs. While the Constitutio Antoniniana, namely the mass enfranchisement of the freeborn inhabitants of the empire, caused the proliferation of the nomen Aurelius, onomastic reasons factored most in the final elimination of the gentilicum in the course of the later third and fourth centuries. The two-name system was still the standard in funerary and non-funerary epigraphy of Salona in the later third and early fourth century. Moreover, while the nomen Aurelius was the most common gentilicum, the epigraphy attests to the onomastic diversity in the earliest group of my sample. The pace of change seems to have been fast since already by the mid-fourth century and in the second half of the fourth century the gentilia other than Aurelius and Flavius had seemingly died out. The status name Flavius endured the longest, namely it is the only attested nomen in the fifth century yet with only a few examples. The imperial civil and military officials attested in epitaphs invariably carried that name. As for the social composition of the “epitaphic population,” the three groups are discernable: the individuals with senatorial, equestrian, and other lower-ranking honorific titles (the viri bonestis and feminae bonestae), the civil and military officials employed in the imperial central and provincial administration, and the craftsmen. Clergymen become epigraphically visible in the fifth century, but due to the “clericalization of the burial grounds” that also occurred elsewhere in the fifth century, they are somewhat less pertinent to the present analysis. Rather
than to assess this group of people with respect to the imperial aristocracy, they are better seen as the local political, social, and economic elite.
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# APPENDIX 2.a: SELECTED LATE ANTIQUE EPITAPHS FROM SALONA (ca. 250-400 C.E.) – DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. ID</th>
<th>Monument type</th>
<th>Monument Type</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Seri</th>
<th>Spouses</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Social status</th>
<th>Rank/Office</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UCU-217</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B00177</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B00189</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B00190</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B00047</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B00050</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B00051</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B00052</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B00053</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B00054</td>
<td>Tomb</td>
<td>Geographer</td>
<td>Sapper</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>GL 05, 02117, HDM 06861</td>
<td>251-400</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>Anni (ill)</td>
<td>Verrilli</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Forum Boaria</td>
<td>Lucius (ili)</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>GL 05, 22410, IV. 2, 384, HDM 02874</td>
<td>301-530</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Fortunatus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>IV. 2, 746, IV. 2, 748, HDM 3062</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IV. 2, 746, IV. 2, 748, HDM 22-45, HDM 02816</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>IV. 2, 733</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Slab</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>IV. 2, 747, IV. 2, 21-32, HDM 2033</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th c.</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>IV. 2, 793</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th c.</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>IV. 2, 768</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td>Arch(os)</td>
<td>Pepris</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>IV. 2, 768</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stein</td>
<td>Novios (= Novios)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Origio</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Ree(n)us</td>
<td>Capito(n)ius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Aenius</td>
<td>Max(ia)nella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SJV L. 378;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Adel(sia)</td>
<td>SaturnmA</td>
<td>C(M)enax(ma) Femina(sa)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Antony(nus)</td>
<td>Taurus</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Peto(n)usa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Peto(n)usa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>M[n]ex[s]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Api(n)anus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Amurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Pseudo(n)anus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>SJV L. 379;</td>
<td>L 3rd/4th</td>
<td>Acrophagus</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anti(n)ax</td>
<td>Urbana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>L. 3rd/4th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Aurelia</td>
<td>Lupa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Aurelia</td>
<td>Vintia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>[Dom]munus</td>
<td>Eufarius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>4th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Aurelia</td>
<td>Sestra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Pla[vius]</td>
<td>Marius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Aurelia</td>
<td>Septimia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Ulpianus</td>
<td>Aurelius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Septimia</td>
<td>Sab[a]rigina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th c.</td>
<td>S. steppagensis</td>
<td>Maximianus</td>
<td>Sab[a]rigina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomina + supernomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomina + supernomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9421; I I J UG 2357; S IV, 2. 415; HD936777</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Hermogena</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>H(onesta) (femina)</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Hermogena</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9376; S IV, 2. 442; I I J UG 2364; HD934714</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Hermogena</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>H(onesta) (femina)</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>Hermogena</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CEL 03, 14673; S IV, 2. 418; I I J UG 2376; HD935157</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Vaisio</td>
<td>Sabina(s) Sabina(s)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ex coll[e]go</td>
<td>Sabina(s) Sabina(s)</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>CEL 03, 8727; S IV, 2. 419; I I J UG 2353; HD934740</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>[V]i[ ]Jass</td>
<td>Alexander(?) (=Alexander)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>R(ig) (i) (Fontanis) leg(i) ius XI Claud(i) ius</td>
<td>[V]i[ ]Jass</td>
<td>Alexander(?) (=Alexander)</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CEL 03, 2414; S IV, 2. 429; HD902463</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Bocontus(?) (=V拣anus)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Bocontus(?) (=V拣anus)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CEL 03, 2465; S IV, 2. 431; HD902450</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Babia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Babia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9378; S IV, 2. 437; I I J UG 2357; HD934744</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Valeria</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Erasmus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9379</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Memmigianla</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>S IV, 2. 441; I I J UG 2384; HD934542</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Memmigianla</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9380; S IV, 2. 442; I I J UG 2364; HD934754</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Pavia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Flavia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CEL 03, 9381; S IV, 2. 443; I I J UG 2364; HD934754</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Suomphagos</td>
<td>Antelai</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9548 + pg. 2539, 2561; IV, 2, 443; ILVGUG 2401; &lt;br&gt; HKD0394</td>
<td>351-425</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CIL 63, 2438 + 15929, S IV, 2, 447; HKD0293</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9410; S IV, 2, 460; ILVGUG 2411; HKD0476</td>
<td>301-375</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Necora</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CIL 63, 14497; &lt;br&gt; S IV, 2, 462; ILVGUG 2560; HKD03463</td>
<td>301-550</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CIL 63, 2490; S IV, 2, 473; HKD03736</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Petronia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9453; S IV, 2, 477; HKD09995</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S IV, 2, 479; HKD0276</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>CIL 63, 8823; S IV, 2, 484; HKD02982</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>[—]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>CIL 63, 2943 + pg. 1590 and 1500; S IV, 2, 645; HKD03417</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Semonphagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Matrinas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9205; S IV, 2, 466; HKD03417</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>Sabia</td>
<td>Solernia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>CIL 63, 2509; SIV, 2, 467; IJUG 2365; HD061752</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>Rustina</td>
<td>Chlod[iana]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CIL 63, 13137; SIV, 1, 81; IJUG 2401; HD064785</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Mansa</td>
<td>Aure(dia)</td>
<td>M[²]r[ò]superius II[A]HN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9507; SIV, 1, 82; IJUG 2373; HD064762</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Mansa</td>
<td>Aure(dia)</td>
<td>A[l]exios(?) (= Alexius)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>SIV, 1, 89; IJUG 2590; HD060229</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Sub (inserted in pavement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>SIV, 1, 98; IJUG 2843; HD063077</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>Sub (inserted in pavement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>SIV, 1, 102; IJUG 704; HD064113</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>CIL 63, 6353; SIV, 1, 106; HD063455</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>Martialis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>CIL 63, 9403; SIV, 1, 111; IJUG 2397; HD064762</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Sub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>CIL 63, 1397; SIV, 1, 134; HD063370</td>
<td>301-350</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Aure(dia)</td>
<td>Castinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>CIL 63, 12049; SIV, 1, 135; HD063460</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Aure(dia)</td>
<td>Vera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Origo</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 136; IIJUG 126; HD0001019</td>
<td>313-324</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Leonatus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dio(nion)(ius) et dedicato</td>
<td>Salus(nion) non cum</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Valerius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2406; S IV, 1: 130; HD02464</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Quidius</td>
<td>Evropia(nio)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Iulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6427; S IV, 1: 130; IIJUG 259; HD000035</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 141; IIJUG 2967; HD000680</td>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>Stela</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Potuntius</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aus (dias)</td>
<td>Venerabilla</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Aus (dias)</td>
<td>Venerabilla</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ursus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Venerabilia et Var&lt;io = &gt;M&lt;io &gt;(&lt;) bi&lt;o&gt;tsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2654 - 652: S IV, 1: 152; HD004211</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z[er]acius</td>
<td>(= diaconus)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ausel(is)</td>
<td>I[n]p[ristis]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ausel(is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9100; S IV, 1: 159; IIJUG 2388; HD004773</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Constantin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Var(s)&lt;io &gt;M&lt;io &gt; (&lt;) bi&lt;o&gt;tsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CIL 03, 927 - p. 239; S IV, 1: 161; IIJUG 2390; HD004774</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>Tarcesius</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>Tarcesius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>Tarcesius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CEU eTD Collection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Monument type</th>
<th>Nomen gentile</th>
<th>Cognomen + supernomen</th>
<th>Origo</th>
<th>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Nomen gentile</th>
<th>Cognomen + supernomen</th>
<th>Origo</th>
<th>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CEII. 3, 9109 =</td>
<td>p. 2136; S IV, 1; 462, IJUG 2391; HED04776</td>
<td>Suemphagas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Vetusio</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 79 | CEII. 3, 9108; S IV, 1; 143; IJUG 2391; HED04770 | Suemphagas | Fl(avius) | Theodotus | / | / | / | / | Pergius / Domino | / | / | / | Nudeus dedit.
<p>| 80 | CEII. 3, 9120; S IV, 1; 170; IJUG 2391; HED04780 | Suemphagas | / | / | / | / | / | Angista(s) | / | C[lassis] [femina] | / | / |
| 81 | CEII. 3, 9120; S IV, 1; 220; IJUG 2356; HED04745 | Suemphagas | Secillus | Septimius | / | / | / | / | Deditisa | Prostna | / | / | Conjugal |
| 82 | CEII. 3, 9155; S IV, 1; 221; IJUG 2409; HED04792 | Suemphagas | P(avius) | Vigil[ianus] | / | / | / | / | Fl[avis]; Vigilianus | / | / | Conjugal |
| 83 | CEII. 3, 9197; S IV, 1; 223; IJUG 2410; HED04794 | Suemphagas | Flavius | C[lassis] [femina] | / | / | / | / | Val(eria) | Conventus qui et Vitell[ium] | / | / | Siblings |
| 84 | CEII. 3, 14293; S IV, 1; 224; HED06159 | Suemphagas | Ulpianus | Gregonis | / | / | / | / | Ulpia | Ot[enia] | / | / | Conjugal |
| 85 | CEII. 3, 6409; S IV, 1; 227; HED061456 | Suemphagas | / | / | / | / | / | Euryth[ianus] | V(arius) [fem Минус] | / | / | Conjugal |
|     |        |            |               |               |                          |       |                             |            |               |                          |       |                             |            |               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Monument type</th>
<th>Nomen gentile</th>
<th>Cognomen + supernomen</th>
<th>Origo</th>
<th>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Nomen gentile</th>
<th>Cognomen + supernomen</th>
<th>Origo</th>
<th>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9509; S IV, 1: 221; HED036876</td>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Teg(a)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Marsis</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>CIL 03, 8951; S IV, 1: 232; HED035953</td>
<td>301-330</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Aus(dius)</td>
<td>Saturnis</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Nephew descnd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>CIL 03, 21286; S IV, 1: 263; HED062813</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>Pl(orix)</td>
<td>Pamorixius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Marsua</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6482; S IV, 1: 264; HED062458</td>
<td>351-400</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9105 + p. 2189; S IV, 2: 760; IJUG 2868; HED036449</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Mithobol</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13123; S IV, 2: 749</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Maximius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 744; IJUG 2496; HED066669</td>
<td>351-450</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Bacchus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 785</td>
<td>4th/5th cent.</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Max&lt;BR&gt;Maximius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9379; S IV, 2: 796; IJUG 2363</td>
<td>ca. 350</td>
<td>Saurerhages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Eusebius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 469; ILJUG 2253; HD334661</td>
<td>301-500</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Valentina</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9558 + p. 2139; S IV, 2: 478; HD63940</td>
<td>351-500</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>de numero 11[ottosum]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9549 + p. 2126; ILJUG 2498; S IV, 1: 72; HD31863</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>Mensa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(H)ermaus</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13134 + 14665; S IV, 1: 73; ILJUG 2432; HD3815</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>Mensa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Gra[ius]</td>
<td>[Episcopus]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14095; ILJUG 2699; S IV, 1: 75; HD33515</td>
<td>Ca. 475</td>
<td>Mensa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Iustinus</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9530 + 13153 + pp. 2201, 2238; HD33822</td>
<td>Ca. 425</td>
<td>Mensa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Sym[en]us</td>
<td>Episcopus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14895; S IV, 1: 77; ILJUG 2700; HD007896</td>
<td>451-500</td>
<td>Mensa</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[Episcopus]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13128; S IV, 1: 91; HD00386</td>
<td>426 or 430</td>
<td>Sub (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Dux[o]&lt;s&gt;</td>
<td>Anolla</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13170 + 13125 + 13127 + 14229; S IV, 1: 92; ILJUG 2693; HD335124</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>Sub (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ul[pus]&lt;s&gt;</td>
<td>Anianus</td>
<td>V(e) de pec[tabilis]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9532 + p. 2226; S IV, 1: 101; ILJUG 2470; HD03-882</td>
<td>Ca. 450</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Marcius</td>
<td>Memorialis</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Benignus</td>
<td>Honesta femina</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9553; ILJUG 2459; S IV, 1: 225; HD03-889</td>
<td>425-450</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Benignus</td>
<td>Homo est, &lt;D&gt;(emina)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9576; S IV, 1: 100; ILJUG 2563; HD03292</td>
<td>401-500 ?</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>(Des)menia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CIL.03, 14915; S IV, 1: 112; HD037556</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Vitalko</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9511; S IV, 1: 177; ILJUG 2441; HD02420</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>F(ili)avis</td>
<td>Postianus</td>
<td>Domestans</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 170; ILJUG 2660; HD030894</td>
<td>406 or 407</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[--]anus</td>
<td>Ex trib(um)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CIL.03, 2656; S IV, 1: 181; HD02441</td>
<td>411 ?</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Leo</td>
<td>Ex domestibus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9513; S IV, 1: 188; ILJUG 2444; HD02420</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>F(ili)avis</td>
<td>Thalassium</td>
<td>Ex omnium</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9515; S IV, 1: 193; HD011288</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Clarissima f(amilia)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 194; ILJUG 2739; HD051117</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>sarcophagus</td>
<td>T(&lt;da&gt;secundo/suis)!</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>T(&lt;da&gt;)secundo/suis)!</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Sboi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9116, ILUG 2440; S IV, 1: 195; HD034864</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Vettius</td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9117 + 12858; ST IV, 1: 196; HD034213</td>
<td>431 ac 432</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[*P(a)v[iu]]?</td>
<td>[----]</td>
<td>[V(it) c]inestas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ST IV, 1: 198; ILUG 2033; HD037933</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>V(ict) p[erfectilis]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2677 + p. 1032, ST IV, 1: 199; HD062440</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Albius (=Albis)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ST IV, 1: 200; ILUG 2250; HD031995</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Lucius</td>
<td>[H]onesta m(emone)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9118; S IV, 1: 201; ILUG 2481; HD034865</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[----]</td>
<td>[ven]il(a)va o&lt;y&gt;io&lt;iv&gt;il &lt;n&gt;o&lt;vi&gt;ii p[erfectilisci]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2688 + p. 2135; ILUG 2452; S IV, 1: 202; HD048664</td>
<td>440/441</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[P(a)v[iu]]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9119 + 12859; S IV, 1: 204; HD06301</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>V(it) d(evotus)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9210 + 9211 + 12860; S IV, 1: 206; ILUG 2455; HD034860</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>Sarmophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Consumatius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Lucius</td>
<td>Sub[io&lt;iv&gt;ianus]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Thal[ius]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>CIL.03, 2659; S IV, 1: 209; HD062438</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Audennius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>To &lt; (atres) fns Dalm (atla)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 210; ILJUG 2254; HD028042</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Vicennia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9522; S IV, 2: 775</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Magos v(lkav)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 213; ILJUG 2770; HD026961</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[---]</td>
<td>[Togatius fns Dalm (atla)]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CIL.03, 6401 + 9006; S IV, 1: 222, HD063457</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Teozeitius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9574; ILJUG 2362; S IV, 1: 266; HD038510</td>
<td>401-650</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Desogatia</td>
<td>Claissima (femina)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 251; ILJUG 2649; HD030835</td>
<td>401-300</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Hanus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 278; ILJUG 2491; HD034011</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Quisae</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>CIL.03, 9539; S IV, 1: 297; ILJUG 2498; HD03-6917</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Vetrusius[vs]</td>
<td>[Bianjyos Mastorcom (un:60mm)]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 425</td>
<td>453-550</td>
<td>Samphragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 426</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ausonius</td>
<td>Var spectabilis oenisi</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14993; S IV, 2: 434; I IJUG 2698; HD035128</td>
<td>431-550</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Caesennius</td>
<td>Diaconus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14774; HD061361</td>
<td>Ca. 450</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ursata</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9547; I IJUG 2565; S IV, 2: 438; HD03251</td>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Eugenius</td>
<td>Chorogoniopus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 440</td>
<td>428-450</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Felix</td>
<td>[Pho(nas)loc(ius)] et/eff[u]e Salutis</td>
<td>Taliaae</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13129; I IJUG 2411; S IV, 2: 446; HD034783</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Honorius</td>
<td>Presbyter</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6359; S IV, 2: 450; HD063418</td>
<td>401-450</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>Ex optöne officio majoris equitatum et</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 453; I IJUG 2040; HD034350</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Sarophagus</td>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Maximus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>CIL 03, 3307; S IV, 2: 652; HDD54172</td>
<td>401-500 ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Flavius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14094; S IV, 2: 747; HDD603711</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Manta</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ἐλεαστης</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Εὐσεβεῖς</td>
<td>Νεκροῖς ἰδρυόν</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Νυστερος δεσιμ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CIG IV, 9429; S IV, 2: 750</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Περγεῖος</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 757</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Φιλικής</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2064; S IV, 2: 661; HDD602935</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Μαντα</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9620 + p. 2236; S IV, 2: 679; HDD602965</td>
<td>401-500 ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Βαλειαρις</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9527 + p. 2139; S IV, 1: 96; HDD603167</td>
<td>599 or 603</td>
<td>3 Slabs (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ιωάννης</td>
<td>Προμένων</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2061 + p. 1052; S IV, 1: 226; HDD603439</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Ευφιώτια</td>
<td>Δομικός</td>
<td>διάκολος ἀδελφος</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 237; ILIUG 2587; HDD053036</td>
<td>L. 6th c. 6th cent.</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[Anastatus]</td>
<td>Προσήρχος</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 238; ILIUG 702</td>
<td>L. 6th c. 6th cent.</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anastasios</td>
<td>Lectos</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 412</td>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Anastasius</td>
<td>V(d) c(λασίσμας) et s(p)erstabilis</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9524 + p. 2328; IJUG 2486; S IV, 2: 454, HDX04906</td>
<td>401-600</td>
<td>Samothragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Olibius</td>
<td>Anagniarius (Anagyniphasius)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>--- Reijiasta</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9563 + 12967; S IV, 2: 423; IJUG 2538; HDX05204</td>
<td>1. 5th/6. 6th cmt.</td>
<td>Samothragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Antenius Tr[——]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9566 + 13412 + p. 2326; IJUG 2481; S IV, 2: 469; HDX05901</td>
<td>1. 5th/6. 6th cmt.</td>
<td>Samothragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Invitus</td>
<td>Ut[——]iarius --- cf[——]iarius</td>
<td>Salone[——]ae</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9416; IJUG 2557; SV 2: 467; HDX05244</td>
<td>551-550</td>
<td>Samothragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 217; IJUG 2675; HDX05107</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>Samothragus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Andreas</td>
<td>Cae[——]l[——]iumius</td>
<td>p[——]v[——]r[——] /</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>IJUG 2531; S IV, 2: 759; 026674</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>N[——]i[——] — [——]</td>
<td>s[——]s[——]</td>
<td>E[u][——]i[——]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 731</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>E[——]s[——]t[——] [——]</td>
<td>θ[——]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 756; IJUG 2551; HDX06685</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Φουτος ο [——]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 756; IJUG 2552; HDX05240</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Slab (horizontal)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Θεοδοσιος ο [——]</td>
<td>Eπι[——] ματος Σ[——] Ευ[——]κατε[——]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supercognomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9623 + p. 2141; IV, 1: 229; ILJUG 2558; HD032345</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Alexandria</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Urrus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Conjugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9166; IV, 1: 238; ILJUG 2555; HD03242</td>
<td>551-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Andreas Dexionius</td>
<td>Defensor</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14903; IV, 1: 242; ILJUG 2497; HD03-916</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Basilianus(s) (= Valerianus)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eufemia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9586 + 12613 + p. 202826; ILJUG 2494; IV, 1: 248; HD034788</td>
<td>501-530</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Basilianus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>CIL 03, 8851, 9412, 12838; ILJUG 2471; IV, 1: 244; HD034883</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Castorius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>IV, 1: 250; ILJUG 2536; HD035214</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Epiphanes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[Caelianus(?)] (secularis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>IV, 1: 252; ILJUG 2477; HD034897</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Florus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[... de numero Delatis —]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9110 + 9554 + 9667 + 12832a; IV, 1: 253; ILJUG 2478; HD034898</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Geminianus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>[Sextarius] (= Sestryhn)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14903; IV, 1: 254; ILJUG 2497; HD034899</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samphrages</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Iohannes</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Sator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomen + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CIL.03.9601; S IV, l. 281; IIJUG 2483; HDO3-903</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Matrona</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>CIL.03.9602; S IV, l. 286; HDO32971</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Meronius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>S IV, l. 777</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Secundus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>CIL.03.14906; S IV, l. 259; IIJUG 2539; HDO3221</td>
<td>531-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Murellus de domo Valens</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>IIJUG 2541; S IV, l. 267; HDO3224</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Mercurius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>CIL.03.9542; S IV, l. 270; IIJUG 2487; HDO2-906</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Bona[q]</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>CIL.03.14205; S IV, l. 271; HDO32014</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Passapius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>CIL.03.9537; S IV, l. 282; IIJUG 2546; HDO35220</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Saturninus</td>
<td>Miles Salutaris</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>CIL.03.9612; IIJUG 2545; S IV, l. 281; HDO3228</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Samophagus</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Sabatius</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Monument type</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomina + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Nomen gentile</td>
<td>Cognomina + supernomen</td>
<td>Socio-legal status/Rank/Office</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>CIL 01, 9553; S IV, 1: 3474, HD060319</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pater/Episcopus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9014; S IV, 1: 345; II JUG 2547; HD030533</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patroclus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9555; S IV, 1: 332; II JUG 2531; HD032501</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>V(a) decoratus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-]</td>
<td>Sulpici(anus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2354 + p. 1051 + 8025 + 1439; S IV, 2: 445; HD002173</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horatio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Categarius</td>
<td>(?) (=categarius)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2601 + 6405 + 8050 + p. 2225; S IV, 2: 460; HD002227</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victorinus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sexulla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>CIL 03, 140489; II JUG 2771; HD020938</td>
<td>501-600</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td>6th c. 7th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Mar(@ellinus)</td>
<td>V(a) d(oi)槇 acumen)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 665; II JUG 2766; HD030191</td>
<td>6th c. 7th cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Petrus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mons(archos)</td>
<td>(?) (=archbishop)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9531 + p. 2135 + 13173 + p. 2320; S IV, 1: 219; II JUG 2567; HD042594</td>
<td>5612</td>
<td>Sarcophagus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johannes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archis(issa)</td>
<td>(=abbatissa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 3.a: SELECTED LATE ANTIQUE EPITAPHS FROM SALONA (c.a. 250-400 C.E.) – TRANSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ILJUG 2125; AE 1906, 0134; HD021989</td>
<td>Aurelius Lupus sib / (b) i et co(n)iugi suisae / Juliae Maxim(e)ae / pisciam fexit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AE 1989, 0603; HD018324</td>
<td>Aurelius Lupus sib / (b) i et co(n)iugi suisae / Juliae Maxim(e)ae / pisciam fexit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AE 1996, 1209; HD039969</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Pr(a)etorin(a)e / Licinius / pie(n/s)im(a)e / cons(c)ern(a)e / posuit / an(nor)um XXXXI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2007 + p. 1030; HD054346</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Aurelia Eutoci(i)a / an(nor)um / infelixissimum / / ex / ipsis et / tantum / posuit / mem(oria) / / posuit / et / /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2027 + p. 1509; HD054759</td>
<td>Aurelia Eutoci(i)a / an(nor)um / infelixissimum / / ex / ipsis et / mem(oria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2106, HD063061</td>
<td>Aurelia Eutoci(i)a / an(nor)um / infelixissimum / / ex / ipsis et / mem(oria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14738, ILJUG 2305; HD032301</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Allogoria / qu(a)n / ex / ipsis et / /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2273; p. 1510; ILJUG 2358; HD034747</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et / /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CIL 03, 02296; HD062834</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CIL 03, 09240; HD063395</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CIL 03, 02117; HD063051</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2240, S IV, 2: 384; HD062874</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 748; ILJUG 2127; HD063382</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 749; ILJUG 2245; HD063386</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 753</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 767; ILJUG 2132; HD063383</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 792, ILJUG 2040; HD063380</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 793</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 765</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 766; ILJUG 2351; HD063437</td>
<td>Aurelia Victonna / qu(a)n / ex / propria / posuit / et /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. ID</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Viviai (e)ae Gaudentiae (ae) in / comparabili / filiae / m(ensem) / VIII(II) Ulpius Part[h]e / noepeus / Iulia Sabina / parentis postum / m&lt;et&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Constantinssimaee, sibi post baptismum sanctum / mensibus quinque vi(nst) et memoria / ann(um) III m(ensem) / X(fest) VII / Flavianus et Ardelia parentes / s filiae / piasissae / depositio XV Kalendas September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Valeria Hermogenia (honesta) (femina) die V Kal(endarum) / Iuniarum quinquagesimo octavo / anno finita est vivae se acarum / de suo ponit umis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14897; S IV, 2: 462; IIJUG 2360; HD032463</td>
<td>Depositus Primi episcopus XII Kal(endas) Febr(uarias) ne/post Dominationes(!) martores(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2490; S IV, 2: 473; HD062671</td>
<td>Dulcis Proeni coniuix Vincentia quondam / sarcofago hoc tegitur caro condente mariito / hanc post bis quinos sequitur Pinsatia mater / annos et setemtum inregit pia membrum abilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 479; HD027616</td>
<td>Ad[e(n)s] Valen(fius) / [sibi? verus? pos]uit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>CIL 03, 8823; S IV, 2: 484; HD062982</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Au(d(ius)) Maximus(æ) nucus SAR[--] / [--- coll]e[gio]n[en] / [--] de uxor[--] / [---]O[---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2043 + pp. 1030 and 1509; S IV, 2: 645; HD063417</td>
<td>Mavrentius fabricant[is] / una cum Concordia / uxor s(uo) sarcofagum / vivi sibi ordinaveunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9269; S IV, 2: 666; HD063427</td>
<td>Phileto / Salvia Solle / minis mariito / bene mereti /i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2509; S IV, 2: 667; IIJUG 2365; HD034752</td>
<td>Rustus Clo(fianus) / filio omissin[o Rus] / t[ocano qui vix[dict] / an(nos) XXI / ego misae[a] / mater emi ex prop(ia) / fe meo petos(!) / fra/tes ne qui(!) alium [ponatis super]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13137; S IV, 1: 81; IIJUG 2401; HD034785</td>
<td>Au(d(ius)) M(anibus) IAL[AIN] / divis Afer et Quintina / uxor(eius) vivi sibi / han(c)pi[-]tisquam / virgines a se co[n]parat om(ina) / stitucent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9567; S IV, 1: 82; IIJUG 2375; HD034762</td>
<td>Au(d(ius)) Secundus / qui cun(parabdi) ab Au(d(ius)) / Alexio[ti] piscina(m) / at(ii) du(a) / corp(u)ra deponenda me/um et co(n)iu(c)gam(m) meam / Re/nata(ma) et nefas quadra[b] / bi nietobis parentibus / ut p&lt;on&gt; / e<a href="a">mus</a> / filiam nostram in (h)ap(c)isc(na(m) / sane / minuabare) / ut su pra[ir]g[iri]a[enion] / sua(m) mul[i] / jam alud corpus / inferarum? --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 89; IIJUG 2590; HD050529</td>
<td>[Hoc inae][&lt;] / Dulcius pleger[i] / divis / [--]erus qui visist annus(!) XXV / [menes(æ)] VI a&lt;co&gt;o ostis in pa&lt;ne&gt; / [fusus sub d(ic)] VI Idu s Aug[us]s(o) (ulato) / d(omeno) o(nsto) / A(cad)io e(t) Bantu&lt;n&gt; vi(ro) d[lissimo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 90; IIJUG 2643; HD050577</td>
<td>Valentinus[us hic] / quisoc(ud)quis(ud) / visist an[nos] LI m[naesasq(uv)] / [deq]estio coecum eu / [---] Idu s Aug[ustus] / [d(omeno) o(nsto) / A(cad)io e(t) Bantu&lt;n&gt; vi(ro) d[lissimo] cons(ulibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 102; IIJUG 704; HD034113</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Constantinæ / quod vixist am / / mariot annus XX / ... quisvis(que) in pare die / IIII Nonas Febru(arias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6393; S IV, 1: 106; HD063455</td>
<td>Iul(ius) Martyrus et Au(d(ius)) Protula / / parentes Ge<a href="a">llius</a> / filiae / d[u]rum / assu(mae) / quae / / visist annos / XV m(enses) VIII d(ies) / V bene merenti / / posuerant et sibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9605; S IV, 1: 111; IIJUG 2397; HD034782</td>
<td>Bon(a)e memoriae Monimo / Aca(e)m ox(o) / posuerit et sibi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13917; S IV, 1: 134; HD063370</td>
<td>D(is) M(anibus) / Au(d(ius)) Castinus / Ad(e) Iobin(a)Æ) uxori / sexissim(a) quae / / vixisti an(nos) XXVI si qui(is) autem voluerunt / super h(æ)cterae(c) cor(ora) / para ponere / / volui / / efferet / cor(uma) / deo(cro) / / (melle) / / c(nia) nostr(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>CIL 03, 12949; S IV, 1: 135; HD063460</td>
<td>Au(d(ius)) Eupatras / / qui(!) visist an(nos) XXIII / Au(d(ius)) Vera filii[a] / / posuerit Au(d(ius)) / / Io(n) no innov(is) tu(is) / / posuerit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 71 | S IV, 1: 136; IIJUG 126; HD018019 | Au(d(ius)) Vaino excepto / /匪 Imp(eratorum) in officio memnis[æ] / / qui / / aput(!) civitatem / / Non medians immat] / / manus compleverat / visisti(!) annis / / XXXII et / / VII / / me(n)stibus / Au(d(ius)) Leontius vir / / d(ec)em(um) / / dec(urio) col(on) in(anon) / / ex curatoibus / / civitatis / / filii / / visisti d[omini m] a[n] / / obserue / / entissimo pater / / infelix / / qui quod / / primo mili / / hoc facere debuerat e/ /go fed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2406, S IV, 1: 138; HD0045464</td>
<td>Tuli(a)e Valer(i)e co&lt;n&gt;ngi Qae/i/lus Euvelpistus(?) qu(a)e vixit memm concond(is) ter annis XVIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6427; S IV, 1: 139; ILJUG 239; HD020035</td>
<td>Titulum positum / [quest Suetonio Io(v)no do&lt;m&gt;e Dur(m)a[chio]?] an(norum) LX ovi(t) miense laetaneo III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 141; ILJUG 2467; HD034889</td>
<td>Auri(clus) Fortun/us petiti tu(s) a con iuge sua Auri(e) / Vernantilla / svostii su(a)e Urs(a)e / qu(a)e vixit ex cui/ tate eurum sene(!) ullo / devitum(!) Auri(clus) Fortun/us concepit locu(m) / si quis autem filio me(o) Ver&lt;n&gt;a&gt;(n)tiano post o/temm(!) comm Uana Ver/nantilla Fortunium quin/tum ponere voluit da/vit(!) eo(les)(i)a et argen(t)a no(ndo) V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9506; S IV, 1: 159; ILJUG 2388; HD034773</td>
<td>Constantii com[i]x parvorum / m[ater] Honoria dulcibus / eximiae casissima semper et una / concil(n)s ter denos quaet vitam / vixit annos martibus / adicta duci aet patria con/tra aperit prae[st es] tum[i]/ [f]osoria duos / deposita VII Kal(endas) Apules / <a href="clarissimus">Deposito Constantius v(i)</a> ex proconsul/ Apia die pri(de No/n(as) Iul(ius) post cons(ulatum) d(ominis) n(ostri) Gra/tiani Avg(usti) III et E/v(quit) vi(m) (clarissimi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9507 + p. 2139; S IV, 1: 161; ILJUG 2390; HD034774</td>
<td>Fl(avii)s Terentius Fl(avius) Ta&lt;l&gt;aesiae ob meruit et sede&lt;l&gt; statem / totique sacram etiam post iur(i) / casissima et sibi quam a parentibus ipsius suscepit / annos XVIII quaeque inlitaeae memem vixit annos XXXII / usitata sepultuam die Nonas Septembris d(ominis) n(ostri) / Valente VI et Va&lt;ne&gt;intiano ierund Avg(usti) cons(tibibus) / si quis vero sup&lt;er&gt;re duo co&lt;re&gt; ore nos&lt;s&gt;t&gt; ma diut/i / corpus voluerit ordinar(e) debit ita vivibus(!) argenti postum quindicem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9509 + p. 2139; S IV, 1: 162; ILJUG 2391; HD034776</td>
<td>--- / [--- Kall(endas)] Ap[n]ele[s] p(os)t / [cons(ulatum)] Auri[xoni et] Oliva va(n)ro(m) clarissimorum / [depositus] Usurio die pri(de) l(udus Avgustas) / [domino n(ostro)] Arr[c]udio Avgust(o) et Fl(avius) Baurton(e) v(ro) clarissimi cons(tibibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9508; S IV, 1: 163; ILJUG 2393; HD034778</td>
<td>Si qua(is) super hunc corpus alium / corpus ponere volueret(!) in fereb(ect) eii[lesiae argenti p(ondo)] X / Fl(avius) Theodotus curator re p(ubliae) / [Peregrinum] filiam in leg(e) / sancta christiana colo[abi(!)] num / deposit(osio)(ne) / Dominionis die III Kal(endas) De(g)c(enubis!) con(sule) Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9523 + 12861 + 13122; S IV, 1: 170; ILJUG 2395; HD034780</td>
<td>Deposito Avgustin[ae] / (clarissimae) f(eminae) die IIII Non(as) Iul(is) con(stitu)bilibus) / Olyb[r]ijo et Probin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9028; S IV, 1: 220; ILJUG 2356; HD034745</td>
<td>Aga[---] / D[---] / Desidien(ae) Profutus i(s)e co(n)n(i)g(i) cum / parabili Suellius / Septimius maritus / bene merenti posuit / et Suellio Septimino filio dulcissimo posuit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 82 | CIL 03, 9585; S IV, 1: 221; ILJUG 2409; HD034793 | Fl(avius) Virgilianus qui bixit(!) annus(!) / XXX et Auri(e) Ursilla oxor(!) eus qui / se vivi sibi uievalue(unt)(!) h)unc sae<co> ova/gum si quis autem voluerit super b(ace) d(ue) / [san]e(ce) / (clarissimae argenti libras quinque(m)]
CIL 03, 9587; S IV, 1: 223; IIJUG 2410; HD034794
Flavi(ae) C(eres) centiae frater et soror / Val(eria) Crescentius qui et Valentinus / vixit annos IIII me(n)ses XI dies XII / dep(ositio) X
Kal(endas) Iulias et Anastasia qui(t) et / Verula vixit me(n)ses XI dies VIII
dep(osita) I x Kal(endas) Au/gustas

CIL 03, 14292; S IV, 1: 224; HD061693
D(is) // M(anibus) // Ulpia Celestina dulces(!) habe(!) // Gorgonio tuo
aestissima / senper(!) annis simplicitas et / obsequentia laudatur et ama/tur
ubique et auis <,<<> onisill(i)s / nullas decepero anno(ce) aecatiam / que
domu(m) ut fecit superstes / maiustus sicm(a)et virginia vot(i)/ssam am(i)hi
uno manto et vos be/<,<> e vivendo h(a)ec saltem speare
/ de<,<>etn Ulpius Gorgonius / piissimus Celestinae(e) compis /
piestissimae aum qua conoct / de(uer) vicat(!) ann(os) XXIII m (ence)s V
dies / XXV vi<,<>i sibi postuerunt postseis / qu(is) eius

CIL 03, 6400; S IV, 1: 227; HD063456
Dep(osita)i(o) Eutychia ni vi(i)n (honestissimi) d(i)e III Idus / lun(ias) et
Artemiae com(mis) sue / hom(estissimae) fem(inae) d(i)e pind(i)e /
Kal(endas) Martis

CIL 03, 9569 + 12870; S IV, 1: 231; HD059876
Ant(dius) Tegisti hui[n]um isam / sargum dom(n) avertis(i)Ant(dius)
Ma/tati et
hui[n]um et n(i)m hui[nus] Fael<,<>e / si quis su[per h(a)ec] d(u)a alii(t)ur / par/pos
pon[i]e voluerint dicat ex / des(ai)---

CIL 03, 8921; S IV, 1: 232; HD013953
D(is) M(anibus) // Ant(dius) Satu(o) qui vixit / ann(os) VIII m (ence)s IIII
/ et Ant(diae) Max(ime) ei ae uae vi / xat ann(os) VI m (ence)s III III
piissimus An(i)t(i)l. Flavi(i)us et Cere(ri)se par(entes) et is(!) Vic(---)
Ursa consu(L) alii / max ima(s) uae P(---) / Hip(cetia)! ct

CIL 03, 2326; S IV, 1: 263; HD062813
P(asus) Pannonius Maximentam coningem du(n)issimam seput(e)<t(!)

CIL 03, 6403; S IV, 1: 264; HD063458
Py / dep(ositio) Maximini v(i)n / p(efectissimi) s/ub d(i)e Nonas
Augus/tas

CIL 03, 9505 + p. 2139; S IV; 2: 768; IIJUG 2385; HD036449
ν ὡς θατὲρ ὁ Μαθαίων καὶ ἔμεινα ἐν οὐκ Ἀρλίῳ ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν ἐν ἀνθίνα ἀνθίνα
δὲ δὲν ἔμεινα ἐν ἀνθίνα ἀνθίνα, ὡς θατὲρ ὁ Μαθαίων καὶ δὲν ἔμεινα ἐν ἀνθίνα
Αρλίῳ / ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν ἐν ἀνθίνα ἀνθίνα

CIL 03, 13123; S IV; 2: 769
Ἀβους(ος) Πιλάδος οὗτος Βαλεμβευ Λαμπάσσαν σοι ποιήσας ἐν ἀνθίνα / Φωνάκης δεμθυ
καὶ τὰς θέρετρας ἐπὶ ποτασματικήν / ὥς θατὲρ ὁ Μαθαίων καὶ δὲν ἔμεινα ἐν ἀνθίνα

S IV; 2: 794; IIJUG 2496; HD 036669
Οὐκ ὡς θατὲρ ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν σοι ποιήσας ἐν ἀνθίνα / ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν
δὲν ἔμεινα ἐν ἀνθίνα / καὶ τὰς θέρετρας ἐπὶ ποτασματικήν

S IV; 2: 795
Ἐπὶ τὰς θέρετρας ἐν ἀνθίνα σοι ποιήσας / ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν
Αὐτοκράτορι Καλέως τῆς Β' / αὐτοκράτορι Καλέως

CIL 03, 9579; S IV; 2: 796; IIJUG 2363
Ἐν διαθήκης νηνοθήκης Θρακίων θρακικῆς / ἔνεν θερίσοντας / δὲν ἔμεινα ἐνθέραν /
Εὐφημιὸς / ἔθησα λαμπάσσαν σοι ποιήσας / Φωνάκης δεμθυ / καὶ τὰς θέρετρας ἐπὶ ποτασματικήν /
### APPENDIX 3.b: SELECTED LATE ANTIQUE EPITAPHS FROM SALONA (c.a. 401-600 C.E.) – TRANSCRIPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 469; ILJUG-2253; HD034661</td>
<td>Aurea Valentina(s)e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9538 + p. 2139; S IV, 2: 478; HD063040</td>
<td>de numero Ata(tonitur) / [--] ans visit annos / --- deputit ies dic(itur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9549 + p. 2328; ILJUG 2448; S IV, 1: 72; HD034863</td>
<td>Depositio s(an)t(um) H(esychii episc(opi) die XIII Kal(endas) ---)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13134 + 14663; S IV, 1: 73; ILJUG 2432; HD034815</td>
<td>Deposito s(an)t(um) Gaia.mi ep(iscopi) die --- / Kal(endas) Sep(tem)bre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14895; ILJUG 2699; S IV, 1: 75; HD035129</td>
<td>[Dep(ositio)] s(an)t(um) [em(mozae)] Jnisti ep(iscopi) die II Non(as) Sept(em)bre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14895; S IV, 1: 77; ILJUG 2700; HD007896</td>
<td>[Dep(ositio)] s(an)t(um) [em(mozae) --- e]pisc(opi) die II Kal(endas) Aug(ustas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13124; S IV, 1: 91; HD060306</td>
<td>Hic requiescit in pace Duion(&lt;n&gt;) andilla Ba(lentes)(s) / sponda Dextri deposing est III / Iuids Septembris / (sunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13170 + 13125 + 13127 + 14239; S IV, 1: 92; ILJUG 2693; HD035124</td>
<td>[Dep(ositio)] Ulp(i)f. Aniani v(in) s(pectabilis) / Filii Lampa(di)di (sunt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14704; S IV, 1: 97; HD061538</td>
<td><a href="aio">F</a> Victo[r] / [n] duema(sio) / [e]x vexillum(aio) / n(que) equ(e)(um) / [e]n(t) [ann(um)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9532 + p. 2282; S IV, 1: 101; ILJUG 2470; HD034892</td>
<td>hic in pace quiescit / Benigna honesta fem(ina) qua fuit uxor / Marciani memoriae / filia vero Dextrae h(oneste) f(eminae) / pro quiu spiritum / manuit super acarum / tesellam fregit fect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9533; ILJUG 2469; S IV, 1: 225; HD034891</td>
<td>In hunc sarcofa(um) posita est Benini(gna) h(onesta) / [f]ex(mozae) / <a href="aio">F</a> / Marciani / memoriae(sio) qui(s) / vi(s) xer(au) / XXV si quis extraneus / potest det(cit) / fisco / ante l(ae) III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9576; S IV, 1: 103; ILJUG 2563; HD035249</td>
<td>[D]eposito(um) infantis / [Do)mniae VIII Kal(endas) / Octobres qua a Sirmio / Salona(s) adducta est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14915; S IV, 1: 112; HD057556</td>
<td>Deposito(um) Vitalioni(um) / innocentis qui vi / xit anno / in mensis(sio) / quattuor et die(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9511; S IV, 1: 177; ILJUG 2441; HD024229</td>
<td>[H]ic quiescit in pace / <a href="aio/icius">F</a> Paulianus dom(es) / tias via xerit in / xari(sio) / a(anno) XXV / deposito(um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 179; ILJUG 2660; HD035094</td>
<td>--- an x(e)(a)rib(nus) sub die(um) / --- consul(tatus) d(ominus) o(st(is) Ag(na) Aug(usti) VI et Prius(stus) (lae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2656; S IV, 1: 181; HD062441</td>
<td>Deposito(um) Leonis ex domes(tio) / die VIII Kal(endas) Decem(bres) / d(ominis) o(st(is) Theodosio / perpetuo &lt;V&gt; Aug(usti) cons(ul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9513; S IV, 1: 183; ILJUG 2444; HD034240</td>
<td>Deposito(um) Fl(aio) / Thalassae ex ori(n)italia die X Kal(endas) Ianua(stas) / post consul(tatus) Leo(stus) (lae) (lae)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9516; ILJUG 2449; S IV, 1: 195; HD034864</td>
<td>Deposītio Vicīnii advōcāt(i) die V[īnum] / Nonarum(m) Octōbris / Basso et Antidōci / cons(ul)ibus qui vis[i]t ann(ōs) XXX et mense(ōs) II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 198; ILJUG 2033; HD027933</td>
<td>Deposītio Alexandri vī(m) s(pectabilis) / die Nōmin(ā)l Novemb(ēs) / Aspāia[li] et As[iov]inde[li] cons(ulibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 200; ILJUG 2250; HD021995</td>
<td>[Deposītio Florae[--]] / [...] s sub die prid[ie --] / [...] s post cons(ulatum) Asp[āia] / et As[iov]inde[li] cons(ulibus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9518; S IV, 1: 201; ILJUG 2451; HD034865</td>
<td>[H]ic requiescit[lo] in pace P[er]?[--] sub[lo] / adiuva o&lt;ff&gt;ide i[n]l[stitus]s p(naefect[ae]ura) qui vis[i]t an(nos) [-- rees]/ sit Raven(ne) die XII Kal[endas] / Sept(e)mbre separ(is) / die Id(us) Octōbris Aetio e[st S[iguvul]} to vv(īs) cons(ulisse) cons(ulibus) ind(ictione) [VI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9520 + 9521 + 12860; S IV, 1: 206; ILJUG 2455; HD034868</td>
<td>D[p(eri)]ti Lυαan su(b)b(d(ison)) / VIII K(ē) alendas Septembr(ēs) / D[ō]cso[ro] v(iro) clausim(s) d(ep)osito / Thalas I(dibus) Aug(ustus) / Maximo II et / Patetio / Depos[ito] Cinact(e)i / VII Id(us) Septembr(ēs) / Indictio/ne XI qui vis(i)t annos / XVIII Dioscr(ō) v(iro) clausim(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2659; S IV, 1: 208; HD062438</td>
<td>Deposito d(uo) b(ōnæ) m(emoræ) Audent(u) adul(e)i c(entui) / to&lt;gg&gt;(att) fon / Dalm(atia) die III Kal[endas] Decemb(re)i / qu&lt;et&gt; vix(i)n an(nos) / XXIII m(enses) III d(ies) XXV / Maximo II et Patetio(ν) v(iris) clausim(s) cons(ulibus) / Indictio(ne) XII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 32 | S IV, 1: 210; ILJUG 2254; HD028042 | [Deposito --]æ Vincentiæ / [sub die -- K(alendas)] Mart(iis) / Indictio(ne) XIII / [Fl(avia) Aetio III et Q(uingo) Aurelio Sym]mac(hio v(iris) clausim(s)]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6401 + 9006; S IV, 1: 222; HD034357</td>
<td>Ara Treposti Cod hered(is) / Deposito Gaudentiae / sub XIII Kal[endaris]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9574, I/JUG 2362, S IV, 1: 246; HD034750</td>
<td>Deo gratias (lancias) i[temina] deposita die XVIII [Kal[endas] ---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 251; I/JUG 2649; HD035083</td>
<td>Flavius / innocens / [ec]t neofiti XP(Christi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 278; I/JUG 2491, HD034911</td>
<td>Ara Quinasetis / si quis voluerit / aperi(unt) i[re det arg/enti pondo quinque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14893; S IV, 2: 434; I/JUG 2698; HD035128</td>
<td>Dep[osito] boni(i) m[emoniae] diaconis Caesantis(i) / die VIII Kal[endarum] Octob(eri) / indicio(ter) V / dep[osito] bon(ae) m[emoniae]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14774; HD061361</td>
<td>---?] / Dasantilae [q] / [ue]x(it) an(n) / (plur)um [min]us XXX q[uae]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9547; I/JUG 2565; S IV, 2: 438; HD035251</td>
<td>Deposito Eugrafi / d(ie) X K(alendas) / Novembres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>CIL 03, 13129, I/JUG 2411; S IV, 2: 446; HD034795</td>
<td>[Depositio[re]] Honorii presbi[ter] / [.-.]ias consul(atu) / [.-.]II et / [.-.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>CIL 03, 6399; S IV, 2: 450; HD063418</td>
<td>Hicin pace iacet Leontius ex optione / officia magistra equituum) et peditum quem / terra estera duxit qui vixit annus(i) XL / vitam A&lt;ci&gt;te(n)as Romana qua e(a) servavit an(nus) XVI coniugi in qu(a) et ara si / quis omn suis &lt;et&gt; Altem Ramonam / dedens corpus do&lt;(e) / (e)clesiae paenam / (i) auris pondo duo depositum in die / VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 453; I/JUG 2040; HD034350</td>
<td>Deposito Maxentii et e&lt;e empres(i) et(i) coniugi die quarta Iudae Septembres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>CIL 03, 1987; S IV, 2: 652; HD054172</td>
<td>Fl(avius) Fidentius ex / comitibus Sirm(i)i(n)sis / hic est depositus / vixit an(nos) XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14894; S IV, 2: 747; HD063711</td>
<td>διὰ θυξίας / μετε Επιθείματα / θυριστρα Τερέσα Επιθείματα / συν θυκτος Απελαιων / λατεινα διαντοις της Συριας μεριτος / δια νοσημος άξων &lt;της&gt; των θυκτοις δεικνυθη / τυχε δια παράδοται δια θυκτος των θυθηματος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CIG IV, 9428; S IV, 2: 750;</td>
<td>Τζεννάρ / ξαφνικά ποιει ζωή / κατά της κατά &lt;α&gt; της κατά της</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 757</td>
<td>'Ενθα προσφέρεται ταξίων / Επικρατεῖ μεγάλη του του καθήκοντος ιδίως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2664; S IV, 2: 661; HD062435</td>
<td>Dep(osito) Maiæ / sub d(ie) XII Kal(endarum) / Octobris()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9620 + p. 2326; S IV, 2: 670; HD062965</td>
<td>Deposito Valerianii infantis / X Kalendis Augustas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9527 + p. 2139; S IV, 1: 96; HD053167</td>
<td>Hicicati(?) Johannes / peconas(?) et in/dignus presbiter(?) / Expleto annorum octo/aico quinto hunc(?) / sibi sepulcrum Io/hannii(?) condere iussit / Macellino suo praecox/sule nato germano praec being simul antennose(?) / / nepotes(?) omnibus tumulam (?) / mente fideli defunctus aces / it obser(?) una cum conosce natus / Anastasii servus severa(n) / limina s'(an)ti tertiop post dieum / Augusti numero mens(is) indic(iationis) &lt;P&gt; I bracc(entiis)(?)/ finivit saeculi diem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2661 + p. 1032; S IV, 1: 226; HD062439</td>
<td>Aeta Eufratiae / dia(oni) s'(an)ctae ecclesiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 237; ILJUG 2587; HD053026</td>
<td>Dep(osito) s'(an)ctae memoriae presb(enti) [Anastasii] sub d(i)e XV Kal(endis) Ianuas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 238; ILJUG 702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 422</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9524 + p. 2328; ILJUG 2486; S IV, 2: 454; HD034006</td>
<td>Cil[io]ii Anither filius Tr[io]-- / Vono(s) V diem Nomas Maias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9663 + 12867; S IV, 2: 423; ILJUG 2528; HD035024</td>
<td>Deposito Anither filius Tr[io]-- / Vono(s) V diem Nomas Maias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9666 + 13142 + p. 2326; ILJUG 2481; S IV, 2: 449; HD034901</td>
<td>Ego Iuvinus ust[i]arius [- - ec]/ disiae(?) Salonis[anthae] hand / a[ropum ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9616; ILJUG 2557; S IV, 2: 467; HD035244</td>
<td>Deposito bonae memoriae inf(an)(is) Thom(oi) c X Kal(endis) Oec[oe]br(enti) indicationem VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>S IV, 1: 217; ILJUG 2673; HD035107</td>
<td>Ara Andreae benemont(iae) / pa&lt;il&gt;at V Idus Mat(iae) indicationem X [pq]/ peto voto [clanissimo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 751</td>
<td>Ζωα Παναγια / Θεος Αγιος ανασαλησης / κυριος [Πα] αφο / σαμμουσου εως λ'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 756; ILJUG 2554; HD036685</td>
<td>Θαυδατες κε[ται]&lt;ται&gt; τον Φθωνι η τες μανυθαν ης / και / [ευθυνον δου] / της εωσα / και / δουχες δου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 758; ILJUG 2552; HD035240</td>
<td>Θαυδατες κε[ται]&lt;ται&gt; τον Φθωνι η τες μανυθαν ης / Ευθυνον δου / ινθους χρονους / και / δουχες δου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 69 | CIL 03, 9623 + p. 2141; S IV, 1: 229; ILJUG 2558; HD035245 | Deposito Ursi die XI Kal(endis) Novembris indicationem XV // Ursi tum<r>um cenis qui(quae) viator / quem inures <n>em rapit sors ultima / <p>sefeque ux(u)a / qui visum quinquaginta in annis heu musa / Al exandriae gemin decepta maui / qui est puita dul /<e>m viu <n>em rapit sors ultima <p>sefeque ux(u)a / qui visum quinquaginta in annis heu musa / Al exandriae gemin decepta maui / qui est puita dul /<e>m viu <n>em rapit sors ultima <p>sefeque ux(u)a / qui visum quinquaginta in annis heu musa /
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9560, SIV, 1: 239; ILJUG 2555; HD0355242</td>
<td>Draconti / depositio (bonae) m. (emonaec) Andiaceae de[ensonis] / die XXIII m. (ensis) N(o) (embris) indicationem XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14904; SIV, 1: 242; ILJUG 2497; HD034916</td>
<td>[(A)rc( Kai Bal(eriano)]) / [A]rc( Kai Bal(eriano) neg(ottiori) c(i) (vitate) Vim (inando) / [na]tro et Eufemiae iugalis (eius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9536 + 12865 + p. 2328; IIJUG 2404; SIV, 1: 243; HD034788</td>
<td>[Deposito] B[eni]gniano (v) (ai) (de) (evotissimi) comitiaci die II Nonas Felini [aias]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>CIL 03, 8851, 9412, 12838; ILJUG 2471; SIV, 1: 244; HD034893</td>
<td>[A]rc(a) Castorino (er) / et consugi eiuis Dulcitiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>SIV, 1: 250; IIJUG 2536; HD035214</td>
<td>[A]rc(a) Epifani[i] / [c]alegarii (ege) / [c]et recede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>SIV, 1: 252; IIJUG 2477; HD034897</td>
<td>[---? arca Florentio(? [---?] / [---? de] numero Delmiaturum [---?]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9110 + 9554 + 9687 + 12482a; SIV, 1: 253; ILJUG 2478; HD034898</td>
<td>Aroa Gemelli presbeter[i] ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14903; SIV, 1: 254; ILJUG 2479; HD034899</td>
<td>Aroa I[o]nanni s/ aton et [---]iae iu&lt;gu&gt; a/ eius / / [---]a cum an[gelis] ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9601; SIV, 1: 261; ILJUG 2483; HD034903</td>
<td>Aroa Matron[ai]e q/uecum (!) traduced(!) Solina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9603; SIV, 1: 266; HD062971</td>
<td>Aroa Messone[mi] cum con/ iugae sua Sevenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>SIV, 2. 777</td>
<td>Τευθευ ξηντιτ(α) Γεθοπονος Ταναξιακ ιοί Περεσου του Αξιονος διαιθομενους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14906; SIV, 1: 259; ILJUG 2539; HD035221</td>
<td>Aroa Marcell(æ) et de domo Valeni / defensoris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>ILJUG 2541; SIV, 1: 267; HD035224</td>
<td>Aroa Marcell[---] / defensur(æ) ! / et / Bonos[i]ae iugalis eius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9542; SIV, 1: 270; ILJUG 2487; HD034907</td>
<td>[A]rc(a) Pa[ci] [sic] o vitriano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>CIL 03, 14305; SIV, 1: 271; HD061613</td>
<td>Aroa Pascae calega / noio(!!) quem(!) vindicavit(!) ei Fab(h)j(us) / aracius (!) usteau(us) CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9537; SIV, 1: 282; ILJUG 2546; HD0355230</td>
<td>Aroa Saturniam / o militi Salaminum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9612; ILJUG 2545; SIV, 1: 281; HD0355228</td>
<td>Aroa Sabbatiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9552; SIV, 1: 284; HD063019</td>
<td>Aroa Stephanon p(ater)b(ych)terio(!!) et Martanae / iugalis eius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9614; SIV, 1: 285; ILJUG 2547; HD0355233</td>
<td>Aroa Suro sarturi(!) et Pahumb(a)e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9555; SIV, 1: 352; ILJUG 2531; HD035210</td>
<td>[Deposito] b[ene] (!) memonae / [---?] vi(um) d(evo) VIII Kal(endas) Mar(tiae) / [---] Aroa subd(ia) c(ono) / [---]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2354 + p. 1031 + 8625 + 14239; S IV, 2: 445; HD062173</td>
<td>Aera Honosato / calegario(!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>CIL 03, 2603 + 6405 + 8650 + p. 2325; S IV, 2: 646; HD062327</td>
<td>Aera Victoriae et Sex/tillae [f]atibus gem[a]n(is)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>CIL 03, 143689; IIJUG 2771; HD026958</td>
<td>[Depositio? Marcellini v(in) d(a)c(i)ssimi] [---] / [--- die] XVI Kal(endas) Nov(embres) in[dicione] ---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>S IV, 2: 665; IIJUG 2766; HD035191</td>
<td>&lt;Hi&gt;c in pace [---] / Petros mona[thus?] --- / ser[vel]i(?) s(an)ci(t)i Petri[s] --- / [-----]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>CIL 03, 9551 + p. 2139 + 13173 + p. 2328; S IV, 1: 219; IIJUG 2567; HD012294</td>
<td>Hic quiesat in pace / sanct(a) abissa Ioanna / Sermones qui bixit(!) annus(!) XL / die Veneris(!) exuit de corpore / IIII Idus Maias indictione qu[i]n(is)? / tadeom(a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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