



TYCHE

Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte
Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 19, 2004

2004

WOLZHAUSEN



**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

Band 19

2004


H O L Z H A U S E N

Herausgegeben von:

Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Gemeinsam mit:

Wolfgang Hameter und Hans Taeuber

Unter Beteiligung von:

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

Redaktion:

Franziska Beutler, Sandra Hodeček, Georg Rehrenböck und Patrick Sängner

Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien, Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.
Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden angezeigt.

Auslieferung:

Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

maggoschitz@holzhausen.at

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II² 2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490, und P.Vindob.Barbara 8.

© 2005 by Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Wien

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Bibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.ddb.de> abrufbar

Eigentümer und Verleger: Holzhausen Verlag GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Bernhard Palme, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber,
c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte und Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik, Universität Wien,
Dr. Karl Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien.

e-mail: hans.taeuber@univie.ac.at oder Bernhard.Palme@univie.ac.at

Hersteller: Holzhausen Druck & Medien GmbH, Holzhausenplatz 1, A-1140 Wien

Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

I N H A L T S V E R Z E I C H N I S

Hans T a e u b e r (Wien): Schriftenverzeichnis Peter Siewert	1
Stamatios B u s s è s (Bari): Euripides, <i>Phoenissae</i> 469 and a Consular Date (Tafel 1)	9
Livia C a p p o n i (San Marino): Petizione tolemaica contro furto e violenza (Tafel 2)	15
Gerhard D o b e s c h (Wien): Einige Beobachtungen zu Politik und Tod des Haeduers Diviciacus und seines Bruders Dumnorix	19
Armin E i c h (Passau), Peter E i c h (Köln): Thesen zur Genese des Verlautbarungsstils der spätantiken kaiserlichen Zentrale	75
Peter K o s (Ljubljana): The coin legend V·O·K·K = Caesar's <i>Voccio</i> ? (Tafeln 3–4)	105
Fritz M i t t h o f (Wien): Neue Papyrusurkunden zur <i>annona militaris</i> (Tafeln 5–7)	111
Victor P a r k e r (Christ Church, NZ): Two Notes on Early Athenian History	131
Robert R o l l i n g e r (Innsbruck): Cambodunum versus Augusta Vindelicum: Zur Frage des Statthaltersitzes der Provinz Raetien im 1. Jh. n. Chr.	149
Jacek R z e p k a (Warszawa): Philip II of Macedon and 'The Garrison in Naupactus'. A Re-Interpretation of Theopompus <i>FGrHist</i> 115 F 235 ..	157
Marta S o r d i (Milano): Le <i>staseis</i> di Turi e la guerra del Peloponneso ..	167
Jean-Yves S t r a s s e r (Confolens): Inscriptions grecques et latines en l'honneur de pantomimes (Tafeln 8–9)	175
Patrick T a n s e y (Sydney): The Consuls of 22 B.C. and the <i>fasti</i> of the Late Empire	213
Christian W a l l n e r (Graz): Der <i>Agon Minervae</i> : eine Dokumentation ..	223
Franziska B e u t l e r, Vera H o f m a n n, Ekkehard W e b e r (Wien): <i>Annona Epigraphica Austriaca</i>	237
Bemerkungen zu Papyri XVII (<Korr. Tyche> 505–521)	255
Buchbesprechungen	263
Reinhold B i c h l e r, Robert R o l l i n g e r, <i>Herodot.</i> Hildesheim u.a. 2000 (P. Siewert: 263) — Susanne F u n k e, <i>Aiakidenmythos und epeirisches Königtum. Der Weg einer hellenischen Monarchie.</i> Stuttgart 2000 (P. Siewert: 264) — Hilmar K l i n k o t t, <i>Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit.</i> Stuttgart 2000 (P. Sängner: 265) — Rebecca K r a w i e c, <i>Shenoute and the Women of the White Monastery. Egyptian Monasticism in Late Antiquity.</i> Oxford, New York 2002 (H. Förster: 267) — Gustav Adolf	

L e h m a n n, *Demosthenes von Athen. Ein Leben für die Freiheit*. München 2003 (O. Schmitt: 268) — Dieter M e r t e n s, *Selinus I. Die Stadt und ihre Mauern*. Rom 2003 (A. Sokolicek: 269) — Helmut M e y e r, Peter R. F r a n k e, J. S c h ä f e r, *Hauschweine in der griechisch-römischen Antike. Eine morphologische und kulturhistorische Studie*. Oldenburg 2004 (G. Dobesch: 271) — Annapaola M o s c a, *Ager Benacensis. Carta archeologica di Riva del Garda e di Arco*. Trento 2003 (M. Pedrazzi: 273) — Sigrid M r a t s c h e k, *Der Briefwechsel des Paulinus von Nola. Kommunikation und soziale Kontakte zwischen christlichen Intellektuellen*. Göttingen 2002 (M. Zelzer: 274) — Meret S t r o t h m a n n, *Augustus – Vater der republica. Zur Funktion der drei Begriffe restitutio – saeculum – pater patriae im augusteischen Principat*. Stuttgart 2000 (G. Dobesch: 276) — Christoph U l f (Hrsg.), *Ideologie – Sport – Außenseiter. Aktuelle Aspekte einer Beschäftigung mit der antiken Gesellschaft*. Innsbruck 2000 (P. Siewert: 279) — Terry W i l f o n g, *Women of Jeme. Lives in a Coptic Town in Late Antique Egypt*. Ann Arbor 2002 (H. Förster: 281)

Indices 283

Eingelangte Bücher 287

Tafeln 1–9

PATRICK TANSEY

The Consuls of 22 B.C. and the *fasti* of the Late Empire

The heterogeneous literary *fasti consulares* of the late empire are a source of delight and perplexity. Delight because they sometimes fill lacunae in the record. Perplexity because they are replete with baffling anomalies. However, with careful handling even these anomalies can sometimes prove instructive.

One such anomaly occurs in respect of the consuls of 22 B.C. In that year, as numerous testimonia establish, M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus was consul with L. Arruntius. Yet a number of the late antique literary *fasti* record two additional names between the names of Marcellus and Arruntius and the names of the consuls of 21 B.C. (M. Lollius and Q. Aemilius Lepidus). The readings are as follows:

*Descriptio consulum*¹

Aesernino et Aruntio
Celso et Hiberio

*Fasti Vindobonenses priores*²

Aruntio et Marcello
Celso et Tiberino

*Chronicon Paschale*³

Ὀκταβιανοῦ Αυγούστου τὸ ιβ' καὶ Ἀρουντίου
Κέλσου καὶ Τιβερίου

*Fasti Vindobonenses posteriores*⁴

Aruntio et Marcello
Celsino et Tiberio

*Barbarus Scaligeri*⁵

Aruntio et Marcellio
Celso et Tiberio

I would like to express my gratitude to R. W. Burgess who offered valuable advice on a draft of this paper.

¹ Th. Mommsen (ed.), *Chronica Minora* vol. I (= *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctorum Antiquissimorum* vol. IX), 218; R. W. Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana*, Oxford 1993, 225. The *Descriptio consulum* is otherwise variously known as the *Consularia Constantinopolitana*, or *Fasti Hydatiani*. I have adopted the title *Descriptio consulum*, preferred by Burgess (*ibid.*, and 'Non duo Antonini sed duo Augusti' *The Consuls of 161 and the Origins and Traditions of the Latin Consular Fasti of the Roman Empire*, ZPE 132 [2000] 259–290), which is found in the MS).

² *Chron. Min.* 1, 276 § 47.

³ *Chron. Min.* 1, 218.

⁴ *Chron. Min.* 1, 276 § 47.

⁵ *Chron. Min.* 1, 276 § 47.

Apart from the erroneous reference to Augustus and the consequent omission of Marcellus in the *Chronicon Paschale*, the correspondence between these sources is patently very close and becomes closer still when two facts are digested. The *Celsino* of the *Fasti Vindobonenses posteriores* is a corruption of the *Celso* favoured by the other four sources and is to be discarded⁶. Equally, the *Tiberio* of the *Fasti Vindobonenses posteriores* and *Barbarus Scaligeri*, the *Τιβερίου* of the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Tiberino* of the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* are instantly recognizable as corruptions of the rare and unfamiliar *Hibero* correctly preserved in the *Descriptio*⁷.

How then are we to explain the apparently intrusive cognomina *Celso et Hibero*?⁸ Mommsen, when cataloguing and categorising various errors and anomalies to be found in the *Descriptio*, considered this entry *sui generis* and inexplicable⁹. Burgess was initially disposed to regard it as an instance of names that were either badly corrupted or fabricated¹⁰. More recently he suggested the names probably belong to an otherwise unrecorded pair of suffect consuls of 22 B.C.¹¹.

None of these explanations is satisfactory.

The notion that the entry is a corruption of the names of Marcellus and Arruntius is not attractive — the dissimilarities are too profound. Nor should the evidence be dismissed as a fabrication merely because it is not immediately intelligible to us¹². For all their manifest faults, these *fasti* occasionally preserve valuable information not recorded in other sources — albeit often obscured by confusion or corruption. Moreover, if the anomaly is explained in this way it is unique as there is no comparable instance in the *Descriptio* or *Chronicon Paschale* of a consular pair that is wholly ‘fabricated’ or corrupted beyond all recognition.

That the names reflect the existence of suffect consuls may be firmly ruled out. Burgess demonstrated that while these *fasti* do not usually name suffect consuls, on occasion the names of suffects do intrude¹³. And there exists a partial parallel to the circumstance contemplated by Burgess — i.e. two suffects named in addition to the ordinarii of the year, but without any indication that they are suffecti. Under the year

⁶ *Celso* becomes *Celsino* in the *Fasti Vindobonenses posteriores* on more than one occasion, see for example A.D. 113 (*Chron. Min.* 1, 285 § 207) and A.D. 129 (*Chron. Min.* 1, 286 § 226).

⁷ The corruption which is paleographically simple recurs in the case of Antonius Hiberus (cos. A.D. 133) where the *Descriptio* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 224), *Chronographer* of 354 (*Chron. Min.* 1, 58) and *Chronicon Paschale* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 224) accurately preserve the cognomen, while in the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* and *posteriores* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 286 § 230), Prosper’s *Epitoma Chronicon* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 423), the *Cursus Paschalis* of Victorius of Aquitania (*Chron. Min.* 1, 694) and Cassiodorus (*Chron. Min.* 2, 142 § 784) *Hibero* is transformed into *Tiberio/Tiberius*.

⁸ Throughout I will refer to cognomina and avoid the late distinction between cognomina and agnomina.

⁹ *Chron. Min.* 1, 200.

¹⁰ Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius* (n. 1) 225.

¹¹ Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1) 263, 266–267.

¹² Particularly as it is not at all clear why anyone should bother to perpetrate so enigmatic and purposeless a fabrication.

¹³ Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1) 263.

12 B.C. the *Descriptio*, the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* and *Chronicon Paschale* list the ordinarii (*Messala et Quirino*) and then name two of the suffecti appointed in 12 (*Robellio et Saturnino*) as though they were the ordinarii of 11 B.C.¹⁴. Nevertheless, this solution must be discounted as an explanation of the anomalous entry for 22 B.C. Of the numerous literary and epigraphic testimonia on the consuls of 22 B.C., most are sources which, like our *fasti*, do not normally name suffect consuls¹⁵. However, the *Fasti Capitolini*, *Fasti Colotiani*, and *Fasti Magistrorum Vici* do habitually record suffect consuls and yet name no suffecti for the year 22¹⁶. The fact that these sources, which regularly record the names of suffect consuls, do not name suffecti for the year 22 precludes the possibility that suffect consuls were appointed in that year. Hence Celsus and Hiberus cannot be otherwise unattested suffect consuls of 22 B.C.

For the sake of completeness one other possibility should be raised, though it can rapidly be eliminated as an explanation of the appearance of the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus. In some instances in our *fasti* the names of consuls have been erroneously transposed from their correct place¹⁷. Thus for example the *Descriptio* lists the ordinarii of A.D. 12 between the consuls of A.D. 6 and 7 as though they had occupied some intermediate year¹⁸. But it is implausible that *Celso et Hiberio* represent a case of transference. For one thing, in no case of transference do all our sources exhibit the unanimity witnessed with *Celso et Hiberio*¹⁹. For another, in instances of transference the false entries have usually been transposed from a year nearby whereas *Celso et Hiberio* do not occur anywhere else in our *fasti* and none of the ordinarii or suffecti in the years proximate to 22 are otherwise credited with the cognomina Celsus or Hiberus²⁰.

Consequently a new explanation of the puzzle is required.

The answer may have been 'hiding in plain sight'. The cognomina Celsus and Hiberus may belong to Marcellus and Arruntius.

¹⁴ *Descriptio* and *Chronicon Paschale* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 218), *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* (*Chron. Min.* 1, 277 § 60, 61). *Robellio* is a corruption of the cognomen of C. Caninius Rebilus. The actual ordinarii of 11 B.C. are then duly registered after '*Robellio et Saturnino*'. The remaining suffect of 12 B.C., C. Valgius Rufus, is completely ignored.

¹⁵ This is equally true of Cassius Dio, the *Chronographer* of 354, and Cassiodorus and most of the epigraphic sources on the consuls of 22 (*Res Gestae divi Augusti* 5.1; CIL V 7376; VIII 22640, 6 and 7; X 5055; cf. AE [1982] no. 236).

¹⁶ All three sources are fragmentary, but in each case it is clear that no suffecti were recorded in 22 (see *Inscriptiones Italiae* XIII 1. *Fasti consulares et triumphales* (ed. A. Degrassi), Rome 1947, 58–59, 273–274, 284). The *Fasti Gabini* also apparently recorded suffecti and refers to the consuls of 22, but is too fragmentary to be of use for present purposes (see *Insc. Ital.* XIII 1, 257).

¹⁷ See Mommsen, *Chron. Min.* 1 (n. 1) 200 and Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius* (n. 1) and Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1).

¹⁸ *Chron. Min.* 1, 219; Burgess, *Chronicle of Hydatius* (n. 1) 226.

¹⁹ Thus the transposition of the consuls of A.D. 12 in the *Descriptio* is not replicated by any of the other *fasti* apart from the *Chronicon Paschale*.

²⁰ And in case the thought be entertained, the continuous and comprehensive record for the years around 22 B.C. provided by the *Fasti Magistrorum Vici* precludes the invention of a hypothetical pair of previously unknown consuls in the period.

Relatively little is known about Arruntius, but one fact stands out — he was renowned as a man of principle (a trait that must have been all the more remarkable in a veteran of the civil wars). Velleius recounts that it was only the *fides* of Arruntius, a man famous for his old-fashioned austerity (*prisca gravitate celeberrimus*), that saved C. Sosius (cos. 32 B.C.) from the wrath of Octavian after Actium²¹. Seneca characterized Arruntius as having an unusually sober disposition (*vir rarae frugalitatis*)²². Tacitus makes C. Silius single out the orators Arruntius and Aeserninus for having attained great heights without besmirching their lives or talents (*ad summa provectos incorrupta vita et facundia*)²³. Opinion is divided whether this reference pertains to the consuls of 22 B.C., or to L. Arruntius (cos. A.D. 6) and Marcellus Aeserninus (praetor A.D. 19)²⁴. The latter is surely to be preferred²⁵. L. Arruntius (cos. A.D. 6) no less than his father earned praise for his noble character²⁶. Given his virtuous reputation, the cognomen Celsus, which denoted a person of great integrity, would have been a fitting sobriquet for L. Arruntius (cos. 22 B.C.)²⁷.

Marcellus may have acquired the cognomen Hiberus, the ‘Spaniard’, as a result of dramatic events early in his career²⁸. When quaestor in Spain in 48 Marcellus played a leading role in the popular rebellion against his own superior the Caesarian governor Q. Cassius²⁹. Accounts differed as to whether he did so voluntarily or under compul-

²¹ Vell. 2.86.2.

²² Sen. epist. 114.17. The historian is usually identified with the consul of 22 B.C. rather than his son the homonymous consul of A.D. 6 (see H. Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, Stuttgart 1967, vol. II, LVIII–LVIII; E. Groag, PIR² A 1129; P. von Rohden, *Arruntius* 7, RE 2 [1896] 1262; M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Munich 1935, II 327–9; R. Syme, *Tacitus*, Oxford 1958, I, 200, 382).

²³ Tac. ann. 11.6.2. The magnanimity of Arruntius and Aeserninus is also mentioned (Tac. ann. 11.7.2).

²⁴ Compare Rohden, *Arruntius* (n. 22) 1262 and E. Klebs, PIR¹ C 741 who favoured the former with E. Groag, *Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus* 234, RE 3 (1899) 2771, PIR² A 1130, C 928 who preferred the latter.

²⁵ See E. Koestermann, *Cornelius Tacitus Annalen*, Heidelberg 1967, III 38.

²⁶ Tac. ann. 6.7.1 praises the irreproachable character (*sanctissimae artes*) of Arruntius.

²⁷ On the cognomen Celsus see ThLL, Leipzig 1907, III 772–775, ThLL, Onom., Leipzig 1909, II fasc. I 306–8 and I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 28, 65, 230. Celsus can of course also signify someone of tall stature. The grammarian Arruntius Celsus (RE no. 16, PIR² A 1141) belongs to a later epoch.

²⁸ On the cognomen Hiberus see Kajanto, *Cognomina* (n. 27) 199.

²⁹ See MRR II 274. The identification of the quaestor and the consul while not certified is usually assumed and is favoured by the evidence (see E. Groag, PIR² C 926; F. Münzer, *Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus* 232, 233, RE 3 [1899] 2771; G. V. Sumner, *The Lex Anagninis under Caesar*, Phoenix 25 [1971] 257, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto 1973, 91–93; R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 41, 43, 250). The protracted delay between the quaestorship and the consulship fits with Dio's reference to the disgrace and later rehabilitation of the quaestor (Cass. Dio, 42.16.2). Moreover, it is difficult to position another individual in the stemma of the Aesernini if the quaestor and consul are distinguished. The consul clearly cannot have been a son of the quaestor (the generation gap is impossibly short). The quaestor and consul were homonyms so the former cannot have been the younger brother of the latter. And the evidence does not

sion³⁰. When the character of the rebellion, initially a reaction to the avarice and cruelty of Cassius, was transformed by the polarization of Spanish politics between Caesarians and Pompeians, Marcellus endeavoured to conduct himself in such a way as not to incur the enmity of either faction³¹. Yet as Dio informs us, when Caesar was victorious Marcellus was banished and only later restored and honoured — a fact which explains the long delay between his quaestorship and consulate³². Unlike the cognomen Hispallus/Hispanus borne by a branch of the Scipiones in commemoration of military victories in Spain, the cognomen Hiberus may have been intended as a caustic reminder that Marcellus had ‘gone native’ when quaestor in siding with the locals against their Roman governor³³.

If the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus do belong to Arruntius and Marcellus, the single entry for the year 22 has at some point evolved into two distinct entries. A number of other duplicate entries, or geminations, occur in our *fasti*³⁴. Some are the result of the aberrant inclusion of suffect consuls in addition to the ordinarii³⁵. Some are simple dittographic errors³⁶. Others derive from the misinterpretation of unusual formulae used to denote consular colleagues who shared some item of nomenclature³⁷. Yet clearly none of those instances of gemination is comparable to the sort of duplication being proposed here. There is, however, one duplicate in the *Descriptio* and *Chronicon Paschale* that provides a close parallel — the entry for the year 79 B.C.³⁸. In that year P. Servilius Vatia and Ap. Claudius Pulcher were consuls, but in the *De-*

support a rammified stemma thereby ruling out other more distant relationships between the quaestor and consul.

³⁰ Bell. Alex. 57.

³¹ Cass. Dio 42.15–16.

³² It is not necessary to look far to discover contemporaries who had suffered comparable delays. Compare: L. Sestius Quirinalis Albinianus (3) quaestor 44, consul suffect 23; Cn. Calpurnius Piso (95) quaestor before 49, consul suffect 23 (MRR III 47–48); M. Appuleius (13 cf. 14) quaestor 45, consul 20 (though the quaestor of 45 and consul of 20 may be distinct see MRR III 20); and Q. Lucretius Vespillo (36) quaestor before 49, consul 19 (MRR III 130). And Marcellus’ colleague Arruntius, who was proscribed in 43 (App. civ. 4.46; Vell. 2.77.2–3), was no stripling either.

³³ As Marcellus’ military exploits were of a minor nature and his activities took place in southern Spain around Corduba and Ulia it seems most unlikely that the cognomen was a genuine triumphal name or that it bore any connection with the river Hiberus (i.e. the Ebro).

³⁴ See Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1) 273–279.

³⁵ See for example the year 12 B.C. (mentioned above) in the *Descriptio* and *Chronicon Paschale*.

³⁶ See Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1) 275, 288 on the repetition of the consuls of 297 and 296 B.C. in the *Descriptio*.

³⁷ See Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1) 275f. Thus for instance the colleges of 18 B.C. (P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus), A.D. 14 (Sex. Appuleius and Sex. Pompeius), and A.D. 29 (C. Fufius Geminus and L. Rubellius Geminus) have all resulted in geminations. These duplicates derive from references of the type *duobus Sextis, Pompeio et Apuleio cons.* (Suet. Aug. 100.1) which were later misunderstood as denoting two pairs of consuls not one.

³⁸ *Chron. Min.* 1, 214; Burgess, *The Chronicle of Hydatius* (n. 1) 224 and id., *Consuls* (n. 1) 275.

scriptio and *Chronicon Paschale* Vatia and Pulcher have been transformed into four consuls viz.:

Descriptio:

Vitia et Pulcro
Claudio et Servilio

Chronicon Paschale:

Βιτία καὶ Πούλχρου
Κλαυδίου καὶ Σερβιλίου

Perhaps then in similar fashion, at some point early in the tradition, two distinct entries were erroneously created out of the nomina of Marcellus and Arruntius³⁹. It is worth noting that in this instance the anomaly of gemination is compounded by the curious chiasitic form in which the cognomina and nomina gentilicia of the consuls of 79 B.C. are registered (A et B, B et A). It will also be noted that if the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus do belong to Arruntius and Marcellus, the same chiasitic format is replicated in the case of the consuls of 22 B.C. in the *Descriptio* and *Chronicon Paschale* (although in the *Chronicon Paschale* Augustus has taken the place of Marcellus).

That the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus are not found in any of the other testimonia on the consuls of 22 B.C. is not as surprising as it may seem at first sight. In point of fact we ought not to expect that Celsus and Hiberus would inevitably appear in these sources which neither fully nor systematically record cognomina. The majority of the epigraphic sources on the consuls of 22 B.C., including the *Res Gestae* and most epigraphic *fasti*, provide only shorthand references citing two names per consul (praenomen and gentilicium or praenomen and one cognomen). Understandably, therefore, they normally record the two most familiar or recognizable names so that Marcellus and Arruntius typically feature as M. Marcellus and L. Arruntius, or M. Claudius and L. Arruntius⁴⁰. The one exception among the epigraphic *fasti* is the *Fasti*

³⁹ Since the duplicate entry evidently originated not with the *Descriptio*, the *Chronicon Paschale*, the *Fasti Vindobonenses priores* and *posteriores*, and the *Barbarus Scaligeri* but with an earlier lost source, it is impossible to establish how and when the error originally came about. For a detailed discussion of the textual tradition and interrelationships of the *Descriptio*, *Fasti Vindobonenses*, *Barbarus Scaligeri*, and *Chronicon Paschale* see Burgess, *Consuls* (n. 1).

⁴⁰ *Res Gestae divi Aug.* 5.1: [M. Marce]llo e[t] L. Ar[runtio] consulibus | M[άρκ]ωι [Μ]αρκέλλωι καὶ Λευκίωι Ἄρρουντίωι ὑπάτοις. The *Res Gestae* uniformly cite two names for the consuls see: 1.2 (43 B.C.), 6.1 (19, 18 and 11 B.C.), 8.2 (28 B.C.), 8.3 (8 B.C.), 8.4 (14 A.D.), 10.2 (12 B.C.), 11 (19 B.C.), 12 (19 B.C.), 12.2 (13 B.C.), 16 (14 B.C.), 16.2 (7, 6, 4, 3, and 2 B.C.), 17.2 (6 A.D.), 18 (18 B.C.), 22.2 (17 B.C.). It deviates from this practice only twice (6.1, 16). In the former case the tria nomina of Paullus Fabius Maximus (cos. 11 B.C.) is cited because the alternatives (Paullus Maximus or Paullus Fabius) were equally unpalatable. And at 16 Cn. Lentulus the Augur (cos. 14 B.C.) is equipped with the additional cognomen to distinguish him from the myriad of other Lentuli then in existence.

The epigraphic *fasti* which preserve a record of the consuls of 22 B.C. are the *Fasti Gabini*: M. Mar[cellus] L. Arruntius], the *Fasti Colotiani*: M. Claudius M. f. L. Ar[runtius] L. f.], the *Fasti Magistrorum Vici*: L. Arrun[tius] M. Claudius] and the *Fasti Capitolini* (vide infra).

Capitolini which regularly cites full nomina. But even in the *Fasti Capitolini* the entry for 22 B.C. was unusually terse — Marcellus was not even accorded the cognomen Aeserninus⁴¹. Hence Hiberus was hardly to be hoped for. And if the *Fasti Capitolini* could deprive C. Laelius (cos. 140 B.C.) of the celebrated cognomen Sapiens, the failure to register the cognomen Celsus in the case of Arruntius seems unremarkable. The omission of the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus from the *fasti* of Dio, the *Chronographer* of 354 and Cassiodorus is also explicable⁴². Whereas the indices of Dio contain relatively full citation of consular nomina, the *Chronographer* and Cassiodorus, only supply abbreviated *fasti*⁴³. Dio often reports up to four names for each consul (praenomen, gentilicium and up to two cognomina), while the *Chronographer* cites a single name (almost invariably a cognomen where one existed) and Cassiodorus two names (most often praenomen and gentilicium, but not infrequently praenomen and cognomen)⁴⁴. Since Cassiodorus often records gentilicia in preference to cognomina, his failure to register the cognomen Celsus is neither surprising nor telling. The omission would be more exceptional in Dio and the *Chronographer*, but it would not be entirely without parallel as there are other instances in both sources where even well attested cognomina are omitted in favour of a bare gentilicium⁴⁵.

The other epigraphic evidence includes four consular dates: CIL V 7376: [M. Claudio Mar]cel[lo] et L. Arr[un]tio cos; CIL VIII 22640, 6: L. A[r]run. M. Marcel. cos; CIL VIII 22640, 7: Ma[r]c[ell]o cos; CIL X 5055: L. Arruntius L. f. cos; the *acta* of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C. CIL VI 32323 line 45: L. Arruntiu[s], line 151: L. Arruntius ... M. Marcellus, and line 168: M. Mar[cellus]; and finally AE (1982) no. 236: [M. Clau]dio M. f. [Marcello Aeser]nino (assuming that inscription does refer to the consul of 22 and not his homonymous grandson the praetor of A.D. 19).

⁴¹ [M. Claudius M. f. M. n. Marcellus L. Arruntius L. f. L. n. — see Degrossi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII 1, 58–9, 137, 514–5.

⁴² The consuls of 22 B.C. are registered in Cassius Dio index 54 as: M. Κλαύδιος Μάρκελλος Αἰσερνίνος and Λ. Ἀρρουντίος; by the *Chronographer* as: *Marcello et Arrutio* (sic); and by Cassiodorus as: *M. Marcellus et L. Arruntius*.

⁴³ In Dio's narrative names are more summarily reported — Marcellus is at first M. Marcellus Aeserninus (42.15.3), but thereafter simply Marcellus (43.1.3, 43.29.1).

⁴⁴ Occasionally Cassiodorus equips a consul with praenomen, gentilicium and cognomen, and once or twice with a praenomen and two cognomina.

⁴⁵ In the index of book 54 Africanus Fabius Maximus (cos. 10 B.C.) is stripped of his cognomen. In the index to book 55 M. Servilius the consul of 3 A.D. lacks a cognomen. Servilius is equipped with the cognomen Nonianus in the *Descriptio* and by Epiphanius (K. Holl and J. Dummer (eds.), *Epiphanius II. Panarion*, Berlin 1980, 290.11), but it is sometimes queried whether it properly belongs to him or only to his son M. Servilius Nonianus (cos. 35 A.D.). Decisive evidence is lacking (see H. Dessau, *PIR*² S 419, 420; H. Aigner, *M. Servilius Nonianus, cos. 35 n. Chr.: ein Servilius oder ein Nonius?*, *Historia* 21 (1972) 507–512; and R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 95–96). Included among the cases where the *Chronographer* reports gentilicia rather than cognomina are: C. Iulius Iullus (cos. 447, 435 B.C.); M. Popillius Laenas (cos. 359 B.C.) where the corrupt *Rotillo* probably reflects the gentilicium *Popillio*; C. Laelius Sapiens (cos. 140 B.C.); Q. Lucretius Vespillo (cos. 19 B.C.); M. Servilius (Nonianus?) (cos. A.D. 3); L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus (cos. A.D. 32); and P. Marius Celsus (cos. A.D. 62). Note also C. Servilius Geminus (cos. 203 B.C.) where the corrupt *Tervillo* has evidently replaced *Servilio*; and T.

Where a consul bore multiple cognomina, Dio sometimes preserves up to two cognomina, but omits any additional cognomina above and beyond that number⁴⁶. The cognomen Hiberus would have been Marcellus' third and final cognomen and so would not have made the cut. For the *Chronographer* and Cassiodorus the existence of multiple cognomina posed a dilemma — which cognomen should be retained and which excluded? The *Chronographer's* response was inconsistent, sometimes he preserves the first cognomen and sometimes the hindmost⁴⁷. In Marcellus' case it so happens that he opted for the former, but that no more proves Marcellus lacked the cognomen Hiberus than it proves he lacked the cognomen Aeserninus⁴⁸. Cassiodorus, on the other hand, habitually cites only the initial cognomen, so Hiberus was not to be expected⁴⁹. It follows that the absence of the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus in most of the surviving testimonia on the consuls of 22 B.C. cannot be considered conclusive. In fact there are other instances where the *Descriptio* and *Chronicon Paschale* accurately preserve cognomina that are otherwise poorly attested⁵⁰. Where the *Descriptio* and *Chro-*

Vinius Rufinus (cos. A.D. 69). But it is sometimes disputed whether Servilius and Vinius actually bore these cognomina.

⁴⁶ Witness for example the following instances where the italicized names are omitted in the indices of Dio: Q. Caecilius Metellus *Pius* Scipio *Nasica* (cos. 52 B.C.); M. Valerius Messalla Barbatu*s* *Appianus* (cos. 12 B.C.); Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticu*s* *Silanus* (cos. 7 A.D.); and T. Quinctiu*s* Crispinu*s* *Sulpicianus* (cos. 9 B.C.). Sometimes only three names are recorded — observe for example the following where the neglected names are italicized: M. Pupiu*s* Pisu*s* *Frugi* *Calpurnianus* (cos. 61 B.C.); L. Calpurniu*s* Pisu*s* *Caesoninus* (cos. 58 B.C.); M. Valeriu*s* Messalla *Rufus* (cos. 53 B.C.); L. Corneliu*s* Lentulu*s* *Crus* (cos. 49 B.C.); and M. Aureliu*s* Cotta *Maximu*s** *Messallinu*s** (cos. 20 A.D.).

⁴⁷ Thus for example P. Corneliu*s* Lentulu*s* Spinther (cos. 57 B.C.) is *Lentulo*, but Cn. Corneliu*s* Lentulu*s* Marcellinu*s* (cos. 56 B.C.) is *Marcellino*. This type of inconsistency, along with other anomalies, may be the result of the process of editing what was once a more complete list.

⁴⁸ Alternatively, given the often close agreement of the *Chronographer* with the *Fasti Capitolini* is usually taken to indicate the *Chronographer's* reliance on the *Fasti Capitolini* as a source, or else their mutual dependence on a common source, (Mommsen, CIL I² p. 81f., *Römische Chronologie*, Berlin 1859, 107f.; C. Cichorius, *De fastis consularibus antiquissimis*, Leipziger Studien 9 [1887] 242–245; O. Seeck, *Chronograph vom J. 354*, RE 3 [1899] 2478f.; Degrassi, Inscr. Ital. XIII 1, 346), and given the *Fasti Capitolini* also failed to register the cognomina Aeserninus, Celsus and Hiberus, it may be that the absence of these cognomina from the *Chronographer* reflects their absence from the common tradition followed by the *Fasti Capitolini* and the *Chronographer* rather than being the result of the sometimes seemingly haphazard editorial choices of the *Chronographer*.

⁴⁹ Cassiodorus deviates from this practice in only a very few instances. In the case of P. Corneliu*s* Scipio Africanu*s* Aemilianu*s* (cos. 147, 134 B.C.) he cites the second of three cognomina (i.e. 'P. Africanu*s*'), he equips P. Corneliu*s* Scipio Nasica (cos. 191 B.C.) with both cognomina (i.e. 'P. Scipio Nasica'), and in 162 he accords P. Corneliu*s* Scipio Nasica Corculu*s* (cos. 162, 155 B.C.) the first two cognomina but omits the third (i.e. 'P. Scipio Nasica').

⁵⁰ Marcellus' other cognomen Aeserninus is itself only preserved by the *Descriptio*, Cassius Dio and AE (1982) no. 236 (assuming that inscription does pertain to the consul of 22 and not his grandson). Some other examples drawn from differing periods include: the cognomina Rocus belonging to T. Romiliu*s* Vaticanu*s* (cos. 455 B.C.), Varu*s* belonging to A. Aterniu*s* Fontinalis (cos. 454 B.C.), and Fistu*s* belonging to P. Curiatiu*s* Trigeminu*s*

nicon Paschale happen to be the sole authority for consular nomina those names tend to be regarded as suspect — but that is mere presumption and not a valid argument against their authenticity. It is worth recalling that some far better known cognomina are even less well documented⁵¹. It may also be that Celsus and Hiberus are not more widely attested because they were never in common usage. We must make due allowance for the “fluidity and ambiguity” of cognomina⁵².

In sum, if the foregoing argument is accepted, the effort expended in deciphering the anomalous appearance of the cognomina Celsus and Hiberus has paid modest dividends. The inquiry has added to our knowledge of two otherwise elusive individuals who occupied the consulate in a pivotal year in the evolution of the Principate (the first year since 32 B.C. in which Augustus declined the consulship). The attribution of the cognomen Celsus to L. Arruntius (cos. 22 B.C.) puts a human face to an important but shadowy figure of the Triumviral and Augustan epochs. While the assignment of the cognomen Hiberus to M. Claudius Marcellus Aeserninus (cos. 22 B.C.) vindicates the commonly assumed identification of the quaestor of 48 B.C. and the consul. Given their past histories Arruntius and Marcellus were an interesting choice for the consulship at this juncture (as indeed were the high profile ex-Republican consul suffects of the previous year Cn. Piso and L. Sestius)⁵³. The inquiry has also established once again the value of these much maligned sources and reinforced the conclusion that we must be wary of hastily condemning entries that are not readily explicable.

Sydney University
30 Eden Avenue
Turramurra NSW 2074
Australia
E-mail: Tanseyat30eden@ozemail.com.au

Patrick Tansey

(cos. 453 B.C.) all of which are otherwise only attested in the *Fasti Capitolini*, the cognomen Ruga of Sp. Carvilius Maximus Ruga (cos. 234, 228 B.C.) otherwise only attested in Gellius (4.3.2, 17.21.44), and the *Descriptio* is one of a very few sources to accord M. Valerius Messalla and M. Pupius Piso, the consuls of 61, the cognomina Niger and Frugi (Inscr. Ital. XIII 1, 490–1).

⁵¹ Thus for instance C. Laelius (cos. 140 B.C.) is not equipped with the cognomen Sapiens in any of the *fasti* (see Degrassi, Inscr. Ital. XIII 1, 52–3, 125, 468–469). The *Chronographer* of 354 is often the sole surviving source for particular consular cognomina.

⁵² See E. Badian, *The Clever and the Wise: Two Roman Cognomina in Context*, in: N. Horsfall (ed.), *Vir bonus discendi peritus. Studies in celebration of Otto Skutsch's eightieth birthday*, London 1988, 6–12.

⁵³ Though R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, 338f. dismissed their election as just another sham demonstration of the alleged restoration of the Republic.