

THE FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF CAMPANIAN *AUGUSTALES*:
A PRELIMINARY STUDY

WOJCIECH PIETRUSZKA

ABSTRACT: The article presents the results of a preliminary study on funerary monuments of Campanian *Augustales*. The author focused on the material objects (meaning objects upon which the text was inscribed and preserved tombs) – their typology, the material from which they were made, their size and accompanying iconographic representations – as well as on information left in inscriptions by their commissioners (regarding, i.a., social status, energetic activity and the familial ties of *Augustales*). As a result, a catalogue of funerary monuments of Campanian *Augustales* was created and a preliminary analysis (from a geographical and chronological perspective) was conducted. The author intends this article to be a preliminary study for further research on the specificity of funerary monuments of Campanian *Augustales*. These monuments will be discussed against the background of funerary monuments of inhabitants of other Campanian cities and, in a broader geographical context, against the background of funerary monuments of Italian *Augustales*.

ABSTRAKT: (Pomniki nagrobne kampańskich *Augustales*: badania wstępne): W artykule prezentowane są wyniki wstępnych badań dotyczących pomników nagrobnych kampańskich *Augustales*. Autor skupił się zarówno na ich materialnym komponencie (nośniki inskrypcji, a także zachowane w nielicznych przypadkach grobowce; omówiona została typologia pomników, materiał, z którego je wykonano, ich rozmiar i towarzyszące im przedstawienia ikonograficzne) jak i na informacjach zawartych w tekstach inskrypcji nagrobnych, które dotyczą m.in. pozycji społecznej, aktywności energetycznej i więzi rodzinnych *Augustales*. Rezultatem badań jest katalog pomników nagrobnych *Augustales*, które poddano wstępnej analizie (w ujęciu geograficznym i chronologicznym). W zamyśle autora artykuł ten ma być przyczynkiem do dalszych studiów na temat specyfiki pomników nagrobnych kampańskich *Augustales* – czy to na tle wznoszonych przez innych mieszkańców kampańskich miast, czy, w szerszym kontekście geograficznym, na tle pomników nagrobnych italskich *Augustales*.

KEYWORDS: Italy, Campania, *Augustales*, Principate, funerary monuments, sepulchral inscriptions

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Italia, Kampania, *Augustales*, pryncypat, pomniki nagrobne, inskrypcje nagrobne

When dealing with funerary monuments in Roman Italy, every researcher quickly realises a few things. The first is that the amount of literature on the subject is huge (but the problem, although quite “old”, is continuously being lively debated, as new questions are asked and old problems are still waiting to be convincingly resolved).¹ Second – there are some cities which are extremely useful for the purpose of such studies (notably the Vesuvian cities [especially Pompeii] as well as Rome and Ostia).² And, finally – Trimalchio, a well-known fictional protagonist from Petronius’ *Satyricon*, will appear somewhere in the text. Research concerning the funerary monuments of Italian *Augustales* also has its own history. Some scholars focus on the broad geographical perspective – it is worth mentioning here the unpublished PhD written by Ann Ch. Woods: *The funerary monuments of the Augustales in*

¹ See e.g. Carroll 2006, 20–21; Borg 2015, 13–16.

² E.g. Laird 2002; Campbell 2015; Borg 2019.

*Italy*³ – whilst others analyse the local context – a PhD, also unpublished, written by Margaret L. Laird: *Evidence in context: the public and funerary monuments of the seviri Augustales in Ostia*⁴ or Lauren Hackworth Petersen’s book *The freedmen in Roman art and history* – one of its chapters is titled: “The visibility of Augustales in Pompeii”.⁵ However, adopting a broad Italian perspective could be too general, while a one-city perspective, even one as well-documented as Pompeii, is too narrow. Taking this into consideration, I have decided to focus on one region, i.e. Campania. The reasoning behind the selection of Campania as the case-study are as follows. First – Campanian *Augustales* formed a coherent group, at least to some degree, and they were also quite numerous.⁶ Second, a few years ago Gemma Corazza published a book on the Campanian *Augustales*: *Gli Augustales della Campania Romana*, the main part of which is devoted to the epigraphic sources documenting *Augustales*.⁷ Corazza collected all inscriptions scattered in the main⁸ and local *corpora*⁹ and published them in a most detailed way (inscriptions published in *CIL*, but also in some modern *corpora*, are usually deprived of some important information – the place where the inscription was found, the dimensions of the monument, the material it was made of and so on). Finally – Campania provides some well-excavated cemeteries, where, importantly, several inscriptions have been found *in situ* (e.g. in Pompeii) and, therefore, they can be analysed in a specific context, and where some indirect evidence exists regarding tombs (the case of Misenum). To trace the geographical and chronological trends more carefully, I will divide Campania into three parts (looking from the east: the foothills border region, central Campania and coastal Campania)¹⁰ and, where necessary, I will distinguish three periods – *early* (from the reign of Augustus to

³ Woods 1991.

⁴ Laird 2002.

⁵ Hackworth Petersen 2006.

⁶ The term *Augustalis* relates to individuals who are referred to in inscriptions as *Augustales*, *seviri Augustales* and *magistri Augustales* (see also Pietruszka 2020, 10 note 46). Contrary to earlier statements, I treat *Augustalitas* not as a priesthood (devoted to the imperial cult), but more as a kind of office for those who were unable to become members of the *ordines decurionum*. However, one should mention the diverse role played by *Augustales* in different parts of the Empire (see e.g. Gradel 2002, 229–230, Mouritsen 2006, 244; Laird 2015, 7–8; for more on the discussion regarding this subject see Vandevoorde 2014, 83–85, 91–99). Moreover, the internal organisation of the *Augustales* also varied (for more see e.g. Duthoy 1978, 1277–1279; Vandevoorde 2014, 101–109; Corazza 2016, 53–62, Pietruszka 2020, 226–235). Hackworth Petersen (2006, 62) suggests that we do not know whether most Pompeian *Augustales* were *liberti* (and, therefore, she thinks that it is better to call them *incerti*). According to Hackworth Petersen, this means we should not compare them to Trimalchio (who was both a *sevir* and a freedman). Although this is not the place for a detailed discussion regarding this problem, in my opinion Hackworth Petersen’s doubts seem to be disputable.

⁷ Corazza 2016: *Schede epigrafiche e prosopografiche*. I should stress here that the *EDR* – an online epigraphic database of Italian inscriptions – which has been improving for years (especially in the case of Campania thanks to, i.a., Giuseppe Camodeca, Umberto Soldovieri and Corazza) is also a very useful tool for such studies.

⁸ *CIL IX, X*.

⁹ E.g. Capini 1999; Mancini 2005.

¹⁰ For more see Pietruszka 2020, 1–6.

Domitian), *late* (from the reign of Nerva until the end of the 3rd c. CE, when the colleges of *Augustales* ceased to exist) and *uncertain* (which mostly contains inscriptions dated to both periods, e.g. from the second half of the 1st c. CE. to the first half of the 2nd c. CE).¹¹

It is well known that Roman cemeteries were located just outside the city gates and sometimes stretched for miles along the roads that led out of the city, sharing the same space as villas, taverns and temples and subsequently forming a street of tombs.¹² Although, as Valerie M. Hope rightly suggests when commenting on the *Cena Trimalchionis*, cemeteries were places where people from the margins of society used to live, they were also, paradoxically, places where the deceased could memorialise their successes and achievements and, what is equally important, the deceased's heirs could strengthen their social position(s).¹³ Therefore, funerary monuments would seem to be good objects to research with regards to understanding the status and/or wealth¹⁴ of the *Augustales*, their family ties and the values found worthy of immortalization.¹⁵

It would be perfect if we could base our research on the well-excavated and well-preserved cemeteries, where all tombs were accompanied by an inscription(s). As Hope notes: “[t]he tomb uses various dimensions to communicate: it involves the visual, textual, spatial, and sheer scale” (obviously, Trimalchio, to whom Hope relates, was trying to use all of these dimensions).¹⁶ However, except in the case of Pompeii (where the picture changes dynamically due to the extensive excavations which have been, and are still being carried out),¹⁷ we have to rely solely on sepulchral inscriptions¹⁸ (or on tombs lacking epigraphic

¹¹ Regarding the chronology I follow Corazza (2016) except for a few cases (see Pietruszka 2020, Appendix 4).

¹² See e.g. Campbell 2015, 33–38; Keegan 2015, 50–56.

¹³ Hope 2009, 145–147; see also Eck 1984, 135; Vandevoorde 2014, 241–242; Laird 2015, 22–24 and Carroll 2006, 30–31. The latter refers to the ancient sources that concern the subject. One should not forget that private land (i.e. around the suburban villas) was also used for burials and served the same purpose as cemeteries (see e.g. Campbell 2015, 20).

¹⁴ There is a discussion among scholars whether funerary monuments mirrored the wealth or status of the deceased (see e.g. Virginia L. Campbell [2015, *passim*, e.g. 45] who opts for wealth and criticizes Henrik Mouritsen [2005]; Woods [1991, 22–24] briefly summarises the earlier discussion).

¹⁵ However, according to Mouritsen (2001, 2): “[i]n many respects inscriptions reflect people's hopes and aspirations more than their actual place in society”. Lindsey Vandevoorde (2014, 354) seems to share this view.

¹⁶ Hope 2009, 151.

¹⁷ See the last discoveries in Pompeii and the comment of Campbell on them: „[h]aving spent so many years investigating the funerary monuments of Pompeii myself, I am thrilled that new material is being excavated (even if it does make my book somewhat outdated. Hmm... second edition maybe?)”; quote: <https://pompeiietworks.wordpress.com/2021/08/19/the-tomb-of-marcus-venerius-secundio/>; last accessed 16.11.2021. Moreover, as Campbell (2015, 31) rightly points out, even the case of Pompeii is problematic, especially because not all the tombs have been excavated and, in addition, we do not know of cemeteries around other cities similar to Pompeii, so comparisons are difficult.

¹⁸ In a broad sense – i.e. the text and object upon which this text was engraved.

documentation, but these, with regards to researching *Augustales*, appear to be useless¹⁹). According to Werner Eck, who analysed senatorial ways of self-representation, the object was much more important than the inscription.²⁰ Moreover, it is hard to claim that we could often place our evidence in a topographical context (like Laird, Petersen or Campbell did), because preserved inscriptions are found everywhere, but almost never in the ancient cemeteries. The problem becomes even more serious when we realise that some inscriptions were hidden inside tomb chambers or enclosed by walls and, therefore, were usually accessible only to members of the family or college.²¹ On the other hand Woods, based on the opinion of Eck, suggests convincingly that most sepulchral inscriptions recording *Augustales* had an “external” nature.²² Following the criteria proposed by Woods, we may try to analyse the object upon which the inscription was engraved – its typology, material, decorations and size, but also, on the other hand, we can make use of all the information contained in the inscriptions.²³

1. Sources

There are 123 preserved funerary inscriptions²⁴ that mention individual *Augustales* in the Campanian material. Most of these come from the coastal region (48) and the foothills border region (43), while we know of 32 inscriptions from central Campania. The chronological distribution of the material is uneven and whereas coastal Campania (thanks to the Vesuvian cities) and the central region are almost equally documented in the *early* and the *late* period (in the former the inscriptions are divided as follows: 24/20/4,²⁵ in the latter: 17/11/4), there is a substantial difference with regards to this spread in the foothills border region (31/5/7),

¹⁹ See e.g. Woods 1991, 92–93; Campbell 2015, 45; or Christer Bruun (2013, 20) who, referring to Paul Zanker (1975), advises cautions.

²⁰ Eck 1984, 132. However, as Vandevoorde (2014, 252) suggests, following Greg Woolf, text of inscription and iconography are “complementary”. For more on the importance of the text on funerary monuments see Carroll 2006, 21–26.

²¹ Fejfer 2008, 118.

²² Woods 1991, 95

²³ Woods 1991.

²⁴ Unless otherwise stated the numbers refer to inscriptions, not individual *Augustales*. However, it should be noted that in a few cases an *Augustalis* is mentioned in more than one sepulchral inscription (e.g. C. Munatius Faustus from Pompeii: *CIL* X 1030 = *ILS* 6373 = *Pompln* 51 = *AUGCr*, p. 329; *Pompln* 69 = *ImpPomp* 9ES = *AUGCr*, p. 328; *ImpPomp* 9ES). Sepulchral inscriptions which were set up in other (non-Campanian) cities, although an *Augustalis* performed his function in Campanian city (e.g. Q. Capitonius Probatas, *CIL* XIII 1942 = *ILS* 7029 = *AUGCr*, p. 355) are not taken into consideration in the general calculation. In the case of these individuals who were *Augustales* in two cities (as e.g. Q. Valerius Salutaris, *CIL* X 690 = *SIPSurrentum* 65 = *AUGCr*, p. 376), the city where he was buried mattered. All the sepulchral inscriptions recording *Augustales* are counted (even if they were only commissioners).

²⁵ The first number represents *early* inscriptions, the second refers to *late* inscriptions, and the third constitutes those that were difficult to date. The same recording method will be used later.

which makes it difficult to track any chronological changes in this area. When we narrow our perspective to just individual cities, there are certain *civitates* which are much better documented than others (Puteoli [20 inscriptions] and Pompeii [16]²⁶ in the coastal region,²⁷ Capua [13] in the central region, and Telesia [13] and Venafrum [11] in the foothills border region). It ought to be noted, however, that in all these cities the chronological distribution is uneven.²⁸

2. Object

a) Typology

As Woods noticed, when trying to establish the typology of the objects containing the inscriptions, researchers encountered the problem at the very beginning – when they were naming specific categories of objects.²⁹ This observation is also justified in the case of Campania, although Corazza’s publication brings a far-reaching unification in typology.³⁰ Most of the preserved objects are called *lastra* (or *tabula* in *Epigraphic Database Roma*; further *EDR*),³¹ which means that they are plates/slabs. There are 43 such plates, with most of them dating to the *early* period (27/13/3). Funerary altars (*ara*) are less popular in general (28 inscriptions); however; they were used quite often by *Augustales* in the *late* period (8/15/5). The other types are not so numerous. The so-called *blocco* (usually *in calcare*, in *EDR* as: *parallelepipedum*) can be found in seven cases (all but one of which derive from the *early* period, the other being too difficult to date). This category consists of objects which are usually poorly preserved; therefore, it is sometimes difficult to establish whether they constituted just a part of altars, plates or other types of objects.³² Not numerous are *columellae* (eight, almost all from Pompeii – 8/0/0), *cippi* (four – 2/0/2) and *stelae* (one – 1/0/0). We also know of two bases (*basis*) which were possibly altars (they are named *ara* in *EDR*)³³ or the bases for funerary statues (0/1/1), two sarcophagi (both from the *late* period – 0/2/0) and one object described as a

²⁶ I have added the recently excavated tomb containing the, still unpublished, inscription known from the photograph here (see <https://georgykantorblog.wordpress.com/2021/08/17/a-new-find-from-pompeii/>; last accessed 16.11.2021).

²⁷ One should add that more than 20 inscriptions of *Augustales* are known from Misenum, but only four could be categorised as sepulchral.

²⁸ Puteoli (4/13/3), Pompeii (16/0/0), Capua (2/8/3), Telesia (6/3/4), Venafrum (9/1/1).

²⁹ Woods 2011, 88–90. For more on the typology of tombs see e.g. Carroll 2006, 8–14.

³⁰ However, in some cases there are differences in the typology proposed by Corazza and the *EDR* (see e.g. inscription recording M. Cerrinius Restitutus, *CIL X 994 = PompIn 43 = AUGCr*, p. 326).

³¹ <http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php>; last accessed 16.11.2021.

³² Some of these objects are thin (similarly to plates – e.g. inscription from Abellinum: *AUGCr*, p. 129) whilst others are thick (more like altars, e.g. inscription from Allifae: *CIL IX 2367 = Allifae 85 = AUGCr*, p. 145). Moreover, sometimes the same objects could be named differently (see e.g. *CIL IX 4910 = Venafrum 87 = AUGCr*, p. 425, object named *lastra* by Corazza [2016, 425] and *blocco* by Capini [1999,96]).

³³ *CIL X 1209 = AUGCr*, p. 298; *CIL X 3907 = ILS 6313 = AUGCr*, p. 173.

THE FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF CAMPANIAN *AUGUSTALES*

part of an *epistylum* (1/0/0). It should be noted that quite a lot of the inscriptions (27) are known only from manuscripts or brief descriptions in the *CIL* (Telesia, which was not taken into consideration by Corazza, is a good example here); therefore, it is extremely difficult to ascertain what type of object they represent. Interestingly, most of them are dated to the *early* period (19/5/3). The general tendency is mirrored at the regional level. Plates provide the most numerous examples in all three regions (24 in the coastal region, ten in the central region, and nine in the foothills border region), followed by altars (13, nine and six respectively). Most of the uncertain types come from the foothills border zone (18), followed by central Campania (nine) and the coastal region (zero). Regarding the cities, the most “reliable” in such a statistical summary are those that provide the most numerous inscriptions related to *Augustales* – Puteoli, Pompeii, Capua, Telesia and Venafrum. The material in these cities constituted the following: Capua – six altars and two plates, Venafrum – two altars and two plates, Puteoli – nine plates and eight altars, Telesia – two plates and one altar, Pompeii – six plates and three altars. Despite the abovementioned numbers, the impression that a specific local character existed amongst the funerary habits of *Augustales* is misleading. With regards to the foothills border region, there are many lost or unspecified inscriptions which distorts the results (in Venafrum 45% of inscriptions are lost or called *blocco*, while in Telesia 61% of inscriptions are not specified) and in Capua most inscriptions are dated to the *late* period, while in Pompeii all are from the 1st c. CE. Moreover, plates and altars could both be used in the same funerary monuments (plates could be placed just above the entrance, whilst the altar could be placed inside the tomb chamber). Nevertheless, the low number (three) of altars in Pompeii (where the tombs of *Augustales* are well-excavated; two altars are huge and, therefore, untypical) and the relatively high number in Capua (it should be noted that they were also more popular in Puteoli in the *late* period – six altars to five plates – while there are three plates and only one altar in the *early* period) suggests that changes in the funerary habits of *Augustales* took place between the 1st and 2nd c. CE.

It would be interesting to compare the above-mentioned results with the statistical summary for Italy compiled by Woods. However, it should be noted that she proposed her own typology.³⁴ According to Woods, of the 280 identified objects, *cippi* account for 32%, panels 25%, urns 12%, altars 9%, bases 9%, *stelae* 7% and sarcophagi 2% (the rest are called “miscellaneous other forms”).³⁵ In the analysed material, after the rejection of the uncertain

³⁴ Woods 1991, 88–89. Moreover, in many cases Woods had to rely on publications from the *CIL*; therefore, the number of unspecified types of objects is relatively high (see Woods 1991, 93).

³⁵ Woods 1991, 93.

objects, plates account for c. 45%, altars c. 30%, *blocco* c. 7%, *columellae* c. 8%, *cippi* c. 4%, bases c. 2%, sarcophagi c. 2% and others c. 2%. The differences in the numbers can be explained in two ways. The more pessimistic is that since both typologies are quite different, we are trying to compare evidence that is incomparable. However, the second explanation seems to be more convincing. The differences between statistical data are quite visible (even if we assume that the altars and bases in Woods' statistical summary are in fact altars) due to the different local habits that existed at the time as well as (and it is hard to establish the importance of this factor) the randomness of the finds (*columellae* provide a good example here as almost all of them come from the archaeological anomalous city of Pompeii).

b) Material

Less controversial in terms of categorization is the type of material upon which the inscriptions were engraved.³⁶ In Campania there were two known types – limestone (*calcare*) and marble (*marmor*) – although there are differences in their description (e.g. white limestone [*calcare bianco*]³⁷ or just limestone [*calcare*],³⁸ sometimes a different colour of marble is noticed³⁹). In the coastal region all but one inscription appeared on marble, in central Campania the distribution is almost equal (ten limestone and eleven marble), while in the foothills border region most inscriptions were made on limestone, with only two inscriptions appearing on marble (one should not forget about the high number of lost and poorly described inscriptions in this area). The first impression one gets from these numbers is that in general a specific kind of material was used in different parts of Campania – marble in the coastal region (where it was easier to obtain this more expensive commodity due to having access to maritime commerce) and limestone in the foothills border region (situated away from the coast). Nevertheless, it is worth taking a closer look at the untypical cases.

In the coastal region the only known exception comes from Puteoli. What is surprising about this example is that the inscription was most probably set up by an anonymous [*Augu*]stalis *duplicarius* (end of the Flavian period – beginning of the 2nd c. CE), thus an individual whose position in the *collegium* was above average.⁴⁰ On the other hand, the damaged object (described as *blocco*) was huge – it measured 57x137x72 centimetres⁴¹ (with letters measuring 6,5–8,7); however, if the proposed restoration of the damaged text is correct,

³⁶ Woods does not take this factor into consideration.

³⁷ E.g. Corazza 2016, 424.

³⁸ E.g. Corazza 2016, 425.

³⁹ E.g. Corazza 2016, 170.

⁴⁰ NSA 1932, 306 = *AUGCr*, p. 378. For more on *duplicarii* see Premerstein 1895, 850.

⁴¹ All the dimensions here and later are given in centimetres.

it was probably twice as long. The tomb must have been impressive;⁴² therefore, its grandeur could have perhaps been enough to prove the wealth of *Augustalis* and the use of marble was not needed in this case.

The use of marble in the foothills border region could serve as proof of the wealth and ambitions of the commissioner. One example comes from Abellinum, where the children and wife of an *Augustalis* – L. Cornelius ((mulieris)) lib. Euaristus – made him a funerary monument *ex testamento* (first half of the 2nd c. CE).⁴³ The high position of Euaristus in Abellinum is underlined by the phrase *l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)* (further as *LDDD*), which means that the monument was placed on public ground, most probably nearby the city gate.⁴⁴ Moreover, it is possible that Euaristus was closely connected to the city's magistrates.⁴⁵ We know of two other *Augustales* from Abellinum, whose sepulchral inscriptions contain the phrase *LDDD*.⁴⁶ Unfortunately, in both cases the inscriptions are now lost; therefore, the material is unknown. The other inscriptions from Abellinum were made of limestone⁴⁷ and the position of *Augustales* mentioned there is "typical" and nothing certain can be said about their familial ties with the members of the local *ordo decurionum*.⁴⁸ Another marble inscription comes from Telesia. As mentioned above, the information about the material from this city is very limited – out of 13 Telesian inscriptions one was marble and one was made of limestone (the rest are unspecified).⁴⁹ The marble inscription (from the 1st c. CE) was set up by Maevia Quinta and was dedicated to several individuals. An *Augustalis* named P. Satrius P. l. Inventus is mentioned third, after a certain P. Satrius P. f. Fal. Rufus, who achieved the position of *aedilis* and was most probably Inventus' patron.

In central Campania it is worth taking into consideration Capua and Nola.⁵⁰ In Capua white marble was used for the mid–2nd c. CE inscription Aelia Aphrodisia – the mother of *Augustalis* P. Aelius P. f. Philologus – set up for her son and herself.⁵¹ Philologus was not only an *ingenuus*, but also a *decurio* or, at least, someone who was decorated with

⁴² See Corazza (2016, 379), who describes this funerary monument as "monumentale".

⁴³ *AE* 2011, 237 = *AUGCr*, p. 126.

⁴⁴ For more on this subject see p. 75–76.

⁴⁵ See Corazza 2016, 127. However, this inscription is also the only one from Abellinum which is dated to the 2nd c. CE.

⁴⁶ *CIL* X 1146 = *AUGCr*, p. 123 and *CIL* X 1151 = *AUGCr*, p. 128.

⁴⁷ Or most probably limestone (*CIL* X 1149 = *AUGCr*, p. 131).

⁴⁸ In the case of D. Veturius D. l. Athenio (*AUGCr*, p. 129) Corazza (2016, 130) supposes such ties.

⁴⁹ I also count as unspecified the inscription set up by an *Aug(ustalis) Telesinorum et sevir*, L. Stennius Silvester, and his wife, Stennia Pyramis, to their prematurely dead son, L. Stennius Rufius (*CIL* IX 6439 = *AE* 1975, 206). This inscription is described by Paolo Cavuoto (1975, 255) as "cippo funerario di calcare locale" while in the *EDR* it is referred to as a marble altar (the photograph of the inscription, which appears in Cavuoto's publication [Tab. VIII.2], proves that we are dealing with an altar; however, on this basis I cannot qualify the material).

⁵⁰ Inscriptions from other cities are not numerous and were marble or unspecified.

⁵¹ *CIL* X 3904 = *ILS* 6311 = *AUGCr*, p. 170.

ornamenta,⁵² therefore he was without doubt an important individual among the local *Augustales*.⁵³ An anonymous *Augustalis*, the father of another *Augustalis* (L. Volusius Threptus) also had to be quite wealthy as his altar (only partly preserved) was made of marble.⁵⁴ Two other marble inscriptions are more difficult to explain. The large (155x103x58) funerary altar of M. Allius M. l. Blastus (1st – beginning of the 2nd c. CE) being one of them.⁵⁵ Blastus is described in the inscription simply as an *Augustalis*.⁵⁶ Moreover, we do not know of any *Allii* among the Capuan members of the *ordo decurionum*. However, the size of the precinct of his funerary monument was relatively large (due to the inscription it measures 50 *pedes* by 50 *pedes*),⁵⁷ so it is possible that Blastus was a rich (and important) member of the local college. The reading of the last marble inscription from Capua is so difficult to understand that any interpretations are groundless.⁵⁸ Moreover, this *lastra* is just a small slab (25x25) that was most probably hidden inside the tomb. Not much can be said about *Augustales* recorded in the inscriptions made of limestone, except that one of them may have been a descendant of or former city slave⁵⁹ and another was (indirectly?) connected with imperial freedmen.⁶⁰ The Nolan case should serve as a warning against arriving at conclusions that are too far-reaching. In Nola, the only marble inscription was set up by the *Augustalis* D. Septumuleius D. l. Atticus to himself and, i.a., his patron (as well as another *Augustalis*) D. Septumuleius D. l Athenio.⁶¹ This could be a similar case to that of L. Volusius Threptus and his father. On the other hand, another inscription from Nola – the one set up by the *Augustalis* – L. Calvidius Felix – to his son – L. Calvidius L. f. Clemens – at the same time (both are dated to the Julio-Claudian period), was made of limestone.⁶² It should be stressed that the inscription contains the phrase *LDDD*, and that the precinct of the tomb was huge (130 *pedes* by 25 *pedes*) – which is especially impressive when one considers that the tomb was built on public land, just outside the city gate, and third – the son is called *Iivir designatus* (and he died when he was 20, much earlier than he should achieved this position). Should we not also expect a marble inscription in such a case?

⁵² See Gregori 2008, 666, 668; Corazza 2016, 170–171; Pietruszka 2020, 236.

⁵³ Especially that his father could be an imperial freedman.

⁵⁴ *CIL* X 3951 = *RECapua* 11 = *AnalEpi* p. 223 = *AE* 1987, 253c = *RECapua* 11 = *AUGCr*, p. 186. We also know of another sepulchral inscription for his son (*CIL* X 3950 = *AUGCr*, p. 188) which is now lost.

⁵⁵ *CIL* X 3943 = *ILS* 6312 = *AUGCr*, p. 171.

⁵⁶ However, this should not be crucial (see p. 72–74).

⁵⁷ See p. 76–77.

⁵⁸ *AnalEpi* p. 212 = *AE* 1982, 178 = *AUGCr*, p. 188. According to Corazza (2016, 189), there was no such individual as Proius Epici f., an *Augustalis*, but the inscription mentions another *Augustalis* – Epictetus.

⁵⁹ L. Campanius Sosimens (1st–2nd c. CE; *CIL* X 3944 = *CECasapulla* 24 = *AUGCr*, p. 176).

⁶⁰ C. Iulius Antiochus (Julio-Claudian period; *CIL* X 3948 = *AUGCr*, p. 180).

⁶¹ *AE* 1971, 83 = *AUGCr*, p. 304.

⁶² *CIL* X 1268 = *AUGCr*, p. 300.

To sum up briefly our observations on the material used for inscriptions and objects. First – the role played by the local habit is quite important, which is very visible in the coastal and foothills border regions. It is worth mentioning that in local tradition the place of burial was more important than the location where an *Augustalis* grew up (or was active in). This is observable in the case of Q. Capitonius Probatas, who was a Roman (*domo Roma*) and *Augustalis* in Puteoli and Lugdunum.⁶³ He was buried in Lugdunum by his freedmen. His huge funeral altar was made of limestone (moreover, as Corazza points out, the text contains a phrase typical for Gallia – *sub ascia*).⁶⁴ However, in these regions, where marble was less accessible (as perhaps in the foothills border region), it could be used more often by those who wanted to underline their wealth and ambitions. On the other hand, the case of Nola shows that the reality could be more sophisticated. Finally, the Campanian sources do not indicate any connections between the use of marble and chronology.

c) Iconography

Decorations are important elements of funerary monuments. Reliefs were used to represent the personal achievements of the deceased or to embellish his/her tomb. It cannot be ruled out that they also served illiterate people, who otherwise would not understand the inscription's message.⁶⁵ Additionally, the text of the inscription might have been too small to be easily read and in such cases the iconography was what caught the eye of the passer-by. Researchers point out that in all cases, when the social status of the deceased was high enough, the motives drawn from public activities dominated over those taken from private or professional life.⁶⁶ Despite these facts, most of the discussed Campanian objects are usually highly standardised and they seldom contain traces of individualization. This is not surprising in the case of plates (which are usually limited to the epigraphic field only), but the lack of individual elements in altars is, at first glance, puzzling.

I will start with iconographic representations usually connected with *Augustales* – *fasces*, *coronae* and *bisellia*.⁶⁷ *Fasces* have been found in Venafrum (perhaps in three cases),⁶⁸ and

⁶³ *CIL* XII 1942 = *ILS* 7029 = *AUGCr*, p. 355.

⁶⁴ Corazza 2016, 356. Perhaps another inscription could serve as an example – the one of L. Cocce[ius – – –] from the Neronian period, found in Interamna Lirenas and made of limestone (*CIL* X 5369 = *ILS* 6327 = *AE* 1973, 172 = *AUGCr*, p. 358). Unfortunately, it is not clear what kind of inscription it is (*honorarius*, as suggested by the *EDR*, or sepulchral, as per Corazza[2016, 358]).

⁶⁵ Vandevorde 2014, 258–259.

⁶⁶ Woods 1991, 96.

⁶⁷ Regarding the *fasces*, researchers debate whether it was legal to place them in inscriptions of *Augustales* and, if so, who exactly could engrave them at the tomb (every *Augustalis*, only collegial officials or individuals rewarded with the *fasces* for presiding over the games – *pro magistratu*; see e.g. the discussion in Woods [1991, 120–122] or Vandevorde [2014, 227–229, 231–233]). Moreover, some scholars warn that *fasces* are sometimes

Telesia (one case).⁶⁹ *Bisellium* appeared in three inscriptions – two Pompeian⁷⁰ and one Venafran (the latter also contains *fasces*).⁷¹ What is of interest here is that *bisellium* was not mentioned in the text from the Venafran inscription (contrary to the Pompeian cases). In the abovementioned two Pompeian and two Venafran inscriptions *bisellia* and/or *fasces* are combined with *coronae*.⁷² *Corona vittata* alone is engraved in a richly decorated altar of the Misenian *Augustalis* M. Antonius Ianuarius (end of the 2nd – beginning of the 3rd c. CE).⁷³

Not much could be said about the iconographic representations of the public and professional activities and the private life of *Augustales*. Besides the ambiguously interpreted reliefs from the altar of the Pompeian *Augustalis* C. Munatius Faustus, which depict the distribution of grain⁷⁴ and a sailing ship (which could symbolise maritime commerce as the source of income, or, alternatively, the passing from the world of the living to the world of the dead),⁷⁵ the Campanian inscriptions lack any other decoration of this type. Some Pompeian tombs also contain portraits of the deceased. A small bust of Naevoleia Tyche, the commissioner of the tomb and wife of the *Augustalis*, is placed in the above mentioned altar of C. Munatius Faustus.⁷⁶ In the tomb of M. Cerrinius Restitutus, in the niche under the inscription, a (bronze?) *herma* representing the deceased as a winged Mercury was placed (this *herma* is now lost).⁷⁷ Three tufa statues, which represent the individuals mentioned in the

pure decoration that has nothing in common with *Augustales* (e.g. see Solin, when interpreting *fasces* in the inscription from Capua recording L. Ve[t]tius Felix [Solin 1998, 206, number 2 – *non vidi*, I quote after Corazza 2016, 182; inscription published as: *AnalEpi* p. 206 = *AE* 1977, 194 = *AUGCr*, p. 182). We do not know the social position of the latter, but due to the *fasces*, he is sometimes regarded as an *Augustalis* [such an identification is problematic and, therefore, L. Ve[t]tius Felix is not taken into consideration in this text]). *Bisellia* are usually interpreted as a reward for energetic activity (Woods 1991, 112–115; Vandevoorde 2014, 226–227); however, *bisellium* could be sometimes difficult to distinguish from *sella curulis* (Woods 1991, 115–119) and the latter, according to Vandevoorde (2014, 227), should be interpreted as an *insigne* of *Augustales* rather than a kind of privilege. And finally *corona*, which is also interpreted as a kind of reward (similarly to *bisellium*), could be nothing more than a wreath – a symbol typical for funerary rites (see e.g. Woods 1991, 111–112; Hackworth Petersen 2006, 63–65).

⁶⁸ Without doubt in the case of the inscription recording C. Marius ((mulieris)) l. Atys (*sexvir Aug(ustalis)*); first half of the 1st c. CE; *AE* 1989, 262 = *Venafrum* 84 = *AUGCr*, p. 420), and, possibly, inscriptions mentioning M. Volcius Speratus (*Augustalis*, Julio-Claudian period; *CIL* X 4912 = *Venafrum* 89 = *AUGCr*, p. 427) and [N. Papiu]s N. l. Menothemis with N. Papius N. l. Fortis ([*sexvir*]ir and *sexvir Aug(ustalis)*); 1st c. CE; *CIL* X 4908 = *Venafrum* 85 = *AUGCr*, p. 421). None of them is mentioned by Woods.

⁶⁹ C. Caesenus C. l. Pothus (*sevir Aug(ustalis)*), the inscription is difficult to date; *CIL* IX 2248).

⁷⁰ C. Calventius Quietus (*Augustalis*, c. 70–79 CE; *CIL* X 1026 = *ILS* 6372 = *PompIn* 49 = *AUGCr*, p. 324) and C. Munatius Faustus (*Augustalis et paganus*, c. 60–70 CE; *CIL* X 1030 = *ILS* 6373 = *PompIn* 51 = *AUGCr*, p. 329).

⁷¹ C. Marius ((mulieris)) l. Atys (see note 68).

⁷² Venafran inscriptions mention C. Marius ((mulieris)) l. Atys and M. Volcius Speratus (see note 68).

⁷³ *CIL* X 3675 = *AUGCr*, p. 245. The belief that we are dealing with a symbol of reward here, and not a typical funerary wreath, is strengthened by the text of the inscription – Ianuarius is called *Augustalis honoratus*.

⁷⁴ See e.g. Hackworth Petersen 2006, 67.

⁷⁵ See e.g. Hackworth Petersen 2006, 67–68.

⁷⁶ Campbell 2015, 173.

⁷⁷ *CIL* X 994 = *PompIn* 43 = *AUGCr*, p. 326; see also Woods 1991, 166–167; Campbell 2015, 152–153.

inscription (two men in togas and a woman in chiton) were placed in the frontal wall of the grave of P. Vesonius ((mulieris)) l. Phileros.⁷⁸ This picture is completed by two busts of *Augustales* (presented either alone – as in the abovementioned altar of M. Antonius Ianuarius – or with their wife – as in the case of M. Antonius Trophimus from Puteoli, *August(alis) Puteol(is) et Neapoli* and *negotiator sagarius* from the mid–2nd c. CE).⁷⁹

The rest of the iconographic representations were (most probably) used simply as decoration. Among those which are rare in monuments of Campanian *Augustales*, one can mention a Doric frieze from Abellinum,⁸⁰ two Puteolan altars – one with the reliefs of Eros and probably Psyche⁸¹ and another decorated with the head of Ammon and garlands of flowers and fruits,⁸² the richly decorated funerary altar of C. Calvenitius Quietus which contained mythological motives (i.a. depictions of Oedipus and Theseus),⁸³ and the poorly preserved Puteolan sarcophagus where the *clipeus* that contains the text is held by two winged *genii* accompanied by two *cornucopiae*.⁸⁴

It would be dangerous to make a far-reaching conclusion based on these limited and geographically dispersed sources. Nevertheless, a few comments can be made. First – *fasces* are noticeable (and relatively numerous) only in the foothills border region, especially in Venafrum, and most of them (if not all) are dated to the 1st c. CE. Woods, who studied the dispersion of *fasces* in Italy, suggests that one of the factors behind their popularity in northern Italy was the distance from the capital, which resulted in “less strict attention paid to social distinctions”.⁸⁵ The Campanian case fits perfectly into this observation. So far so good. However, one should question why *fasces* are absent in other cities from this region (especially Allifae and Abellinum). Moreover, *fasces* are to be found in Pompeii in the

⁷⁸ *Pompln* 77 = *AE* 1986, 166 = *AE* 2002, 335 = *AUGCr*, p. 339; Campbell 2015, 268.

⁷⁹ Trophimus: *CIL* X 1872 = *AUGCr*, p. 352.

⁸⁰ Partially preserved inscription of [– – –] M. l. Nysus – *Augustalis* from Abellinum (first half of the 1st c. CE; *CIL* X 1149 = *AUGCr*, p. 131). However, according to Corazza (2016, 131), this kind of decoration was typical for funerary monuments from the Augustan period.

⁸¹ Altar recording an *Augustalis* T. Marcius Taurus (end of the 1st – first half of the 2nd c. CE; *CIL* X 1884 = *AE* 1980, 237 = *AUGCr*, p. 366).

⁸² Altar commissioned by an *Augustalis* N. Naevius Moschus to his close relatives (Flavian period, *CIL* X 1807 = *AUGCr*, p. 368).

⁸³ Campbell 2015, 169.

⁸⁴ Sarcophagus of Q. Valerius Salutaris (who was an *Augustalis* in Puteoli and Cumae, second half of the 2nd – first half of the 3rd c. CE, *CIL* X 690 = *SIPSurrentum* 65 = *AUGCr*, p. 376) and Valeria Tryfenae (his wife?). Almost nothing more than the epigraphic field survived from the second Puteolan sarcophagus – of Cn. Haius Doryphorus – *Augustalis dupliciarius* and *purpurarius* (second half of the 2nd – first half of the 3rd c. CE, *CIL* X 540 = *InscrIt* I 1, *26 = *AUGCr*, p. 361). However, the usefulness of sarcophagi in tracing the achievements of the deceased is limited. As John R. Clarke (2003, 215) points out, the iconography of sarcophagi usually refers to mythological rather than biographical scenes.

⁸⁵ Woods 1991, 124.

funerary inscription of M. Arrius ((mulieris)) l. Diomedes – *magister pagi*.⁸⁶ If we take into consideration, that the above-mentioned C. Munatius Faustus was a Pompeian *Augustalis* and *paganus* (which means – *magister pagi*), we should not be surprised that the fictional Trimalchio, who was *sevir Augustalis* and was most probably active in the coastal region of Campania (Puteoli?),⁸⁷ had *fasces* in his room.⁸⁸ Thus, perhaps Vandevoorde is right and *fasces* should be treated as *insignia* of *Augustales*.⁸⁹ If so, not only *Augustales* were entitled to use them and their iconographic representation in the inscription had more in common with a local (even city) habit than anything else.⁹⁰ Second – Campanian *Augustales* were not eager to present their achievements, careers and even themselves in iconographic representations.⁹¹ But the overrepresentation of Pompeian monuments in the analysed material should alert us to another problem – perhaps we are looking in the wrong place and almost all individual (and not anonymous) iconographic representations were lost with the Campanian cemeteries.⁹²

d) Size

Although almost nothing has survived from the tombs of *Augustales* (except for those from Pompeii which will be briefly discussed later), we may try to say something about their size using the dimensions of the inscriptions and the size of the engraved letters. The preserved objects cannot be compared to the huge altars of Pompeian *Augustales* (neither that of C. Munatius Faustus nor that of C. Calventius Quietus).⁹³ However, several of them are quite impressive which means that the owners of the tombs were trying to show their richness through monumentality. The size of the inscription should correspond to the size of the tomb, especially with regards to plates.⁹⁴ At least one of them – from Teanum Sidicinum – should be taken into consideration.⁹⁵ Altars cause more problems since we do not know where they originally stood (inside or outside the tomb chamber and walled enclosure). Six of them were

⁸⁶ *CIL* X 1042 = *ILS* 6378 = *PompIn* 57; Campbell 2015, 177.

⁸⁷ Vandevoorde 2014, 314 (contra Duthoy 1988).

⁸⁸ *Petr.* 30.

⁸⁹ Vandevoorde 2014, esp. 231–233.

⁹⁰ Similarly Laird 2015, 44–46.

⁹¹ Campanian iconographic representations containing biographical motives are also poorly represented when compared to the rest of Italy (which is especially visible when one realises that known Campanian *Augustales* are quite numerous); see Woods 1991, 104–105.

⁹² See Fejfer (2008, 105–106) note on many „anonymous” funerary portraits.

⁹³ C. Munatius Faustus – dimensions: 242x227x184 (*CIL* X 1030 = *ILS* 6373 = *PompIn* 51 = *AUGCr*, p. 329); C. Calventius Quietus – dimensions: 225x173x141 (*CIL* X 1026 = *ILS* 6372 = *PompIn* 49 = *AUGCr*, p. 324).

⁹⁴ Of course that does not mean that small plates were not attached to huge monuments (as in the case of the Pompeian *Augustalis* A. Veius Atticus; *ImpPomp* 11ES = *AUGCr*, p. 338).

⁹⁵ The grave belonged to L. Laberi[us] L. l. Stabli[io] – an *Augustalis* – and his wife (in this case the tomb had to be monumental – the dimensions of the plate are as follows: 60x160x? and the letters measured 12–15 cm; first half of the 1st c. CE; *AE* 1988, 240 = *AUGCr*, p. 406).

much larger than the others – one from Telesia,⁹⁶ one from Cales,⁹⁷ one from Capua,⁹⁸ one from Misenum,⁹⁹ and two from Puteoli.¹⁰⁰ This list could be complemented by *blocco* from Puteoli,¹⁰¹ and *stela* from Venafrum.¹⁰² Neither a chronological nor a geographical pattern could be found here – the inscriptions come from both periods, *early* and *late* (there are more from the *late* period, but this results from the dominant presence of altars after the Flavian period), and from all regions. However, one regularity is observable – the larger inscriptions belong mostly to *Augustales*, who were usually not just average members of the college. Included among them are a father of a *decurio* (L. Stennius Silvester from Telesia), a probable freedman from a senatorial family (M. Ennius Cer[i]alis from Cales), an owner of some rewards (C. Marius ((mulieris)) l. Atys from Venafrum and M. Antonius Ianuarius from Misenum), an *Augustalis* in more than one city (M. Antonius Trophimus from Puteoli), *dupliciarius* (M. Claudius Tryphon and an anonymous individual from Puteoli), and the owner of a considerably sized tomb precinct (M. Allius M. l. Blastus from Capua).¹⁰³ As in the case of Faustus and Quietus from Pompeii – the monumentality of their tombs went hand in hand with the wealth (and possibly status) of *Augustales*.

2. Text

At this point we should turn our attention to the text of the discussed inscriptions, since they contain lots of important information about *Augustales* and, as Hanne Sigismund Nielsen rightly points out, they were never haphazard and every element was chosen carefully.¹⁰⁴ First, I will focus on the formal position the *Augustales* had in the cities and the colleges as well as their professional occupations, which, according to the tomb's commissioners, were worth commemorating.

⁹⁶ L. Stennius Silvester; dimensions: 152x81,8x73 (2nd c. CE; *CIL IX* 6439 = *AE* 1975, 206).

⁹⁷ M. Ennius Cer[i]alis, *sevir Augustalis*; dimensions: 148x64x54,5 (2nd c. CE; *CIL X* 4647 = *AUGCr*, p. 161).

⁹⁸ M. Allius M. l. Blastus; dimensions: 155x103x58 (second half of the 1st – first half of the 2nd c. CE; *CIL X* 3943 = *ILS* 06312 = *AUGCr*, p. 171).

⁹⁹ M. Antonius Ianuarius; dimensions: 142x79x68 (end of the 2nd – beginning of the 3rd c. CE; *CIL X* 3675 = *AUGCr*, p. 245).

¹⁰⁰ M. Antonius Trophimus; dimensions: 150x85x64 (mid-2nd c. CE; *CIL X* 1872 = *AUGCr*, p. 352) and M. Claudius Tryphon – *Augustalis dupliciarius* and *negotiator vascularius argentarius*; dimensions: 132,5x81,5x71 (2nd c. CE; *AE* 1996, 416 = *AUGCr*, p. 357).

¹⁰¹ Anonymous *Augustalis dupliciarius*, dimensions: 57x137x72 (perhaps half of the inscription is lost, so it was around twice as long; second half of the 1st c. CE – first half of the 2nd c. CE; *NSA* 1932, 306 = *AUGCr*, p. 378).

¹⁰² C. Marius ((mulieris)) l. Atys; dimensions: 140x64,5x35 (first half of the 2nd c. CE; *AE* 1989, 262 = *Venafrum* 84 = *AUGCr*, p. 420).

¹⁰³ Among all the *Augustales* mentioned, Stab[i]o from Teanum Sidicinum is the only one whose wealth and prestige is not indicated through other means besides his funerary monument.

¹⁰⁴ Sigismund Nielsen 1997, 169–170.

a) Formal position and professional occupation of *Augustales*

In many cities from the foothills border region almost the only thing we know about *Augustales*' formal position is that they belonged to the college(s). In Abellinum all of them are simply called *Augustales*¹⁰⁵ and in Venafrum *seviri* (however, one of them was *sexvir* twice [*bis*]¹⁰⁶ and another was also an *Augustalis* in Lugudunum¹⁰⁷) except one that was referred to as *Augustalis et patronus collegium*.¹⁰⁸ In Telesia there is a surprising lack of unity in the nomenclature, which is not affected by the passing of time. Therefore, we know of Telesian *Augustales*, *seviri Augustales*, *seviri* and also *Augustalis et sevir*. Only one individual is called *Augustalis* and *biselliarius* – a clear sign of his pride in receiving this distinction (interestingly – this is not the same individual whose funerary monument is decorated with *bisellium*).¹⁰⁹ We face a different situation in three other cities. In Allifae most of the *Augustales* (eight)¹¹⁰ underline the function they played in the *collegium (quaestor Augustalium)*, while three were also *magistri Iunonis*¹¹¹ (all known *magistri Iunonis* from Allifae were *Augustales*). In Caiatia an *Augustalis gratis*¹¹² was also the only known Caiatian *magister Apollinaris*,¹¹³ and in Cubulteria an *Augustalis* was also *scriba rei publicae* and the only known Cubulterian *magister fani Iunonae*.¹¹⁴

The situation in the central region is quite similar and “monotonous” – in Nuceria, Suessa Aurunca and Teanum Sidicinum all known individuals are called *Augustales*, in Cales *seviri Augustales* (except one *Augustalis*), while in Nola we find one *Augustalis* and five *magistri Augustales*; however, among the latter is one *quaestor (Augustalium)*¹¹⁵ and one *magister Mercurialis*.¹¹⁶ Even in Capua ten of the known individuals are simple *Augustales*, one called himself *Augustalis gratuitus* (he was also an *exactor operum publ(icorum) et theatri a fundamentis*),¹¹⁷ one was honoured with *ornamenta decurionalia* (or, less probably, he was a

¹⁰⁵ Two of them are *Augustales Claudiales* (CIL X 1146 = AUGCr, p. 123; CIL X 1151 = AUGCr, p. 128).

¹⁰⁶ CIL X 4913 = ILS 6516 = Venafrum 90 = AUGCr, p. 429.

¹⁰⁷ Venafrum 6A = AE 1999, 563 = AUGCr, p. 418.

¹⁰⁸ CIL X 4907 = Venafrum 83 = AUGCr, p. 417.

¹⁰⁹ CIL IX 2249 = AE 2006, 359.

¹¹⁰ Known from seven inscriptions.

¹¹¹ CIL IX 2362 = Allifae 78 = AUGCr, p. 137; CIL IX 2363 = CIL IX 6526 = ILS 6514 = Allifae 80 = AUGCr, p. 138; CIL IX 2365 = Allifae 81 = AUGCr, p. 139.

¹¹² The word *gratis* means that he was exempt from paying *summa honoraria*; most probably due to his beneficence toward the city or college of *Augustales*.

¹¹³ CIL X 4591 = IATrebula 57 = AE 1993, 487 = AUGCr, p. 154.

¹¹⁴ CIL X 4620 = IATrebula 96 = AUGCr, p. 191. Since the function of *scriba rei publicae* is listed first, it was without doubt more important to L. Fulvius Clemens, who commissioned an altar for his son, than membership of the *collegium*.

¹¹⁵ CIL X 1209 = AUGCr, p. 298.

¹¹⁶ CIL X 1272 = ILS 6351 = AUGCr, p. 302.

¹¹⁷ CIL X 3907 = ILS 6313 = AUGCr, p. 173.

decurion)¹¹⁸ and one (and the first one in this list who mentions his profession) was also a *negotiator calcararius*.¹¹⁹

Many cities from coastal Campania are no different from those in the hinterland with regards to analysing the formal position of *Augustales*. In Herculaneum, Liternum, Salernum and Surrentum we find just *Augustales*, and in Pompeii ten individuals are called *Augustales* (with one *gratis* and one *paganus*),¹²⁰ one is *magister Augustalis*¹²¹ and one *aedituus Veneris Augustalis et min(ister) eorum*.¹²² In Cumae, besides two *Augustales* and one *Augustalis primus*, an inscription documents one *curator Augustalium Cumanor(um) perpetuus itemque Augustalis dupl(iciarius) Puteolanor(um) et curator perpet(uus) embaenitariorum III pisciniensium*.¹²³ In two other cities we face a more diverse reality. Although in Misenum all four individuals are called *Augustales*, one of them is *honoratus*,¹²⁴ another *corporatus*¹²⁵ and the third *immunis*.¹²⁶ In Puteoli, apart from seven simple *Augustales*,¹²⁷ we may find five *dupliciarii*,¹²⁸ one *quaestor Augustalium*,¹²⁹ one *decurio, dendrophorus* and *dupliciarius*,¹³⁰ one *accensus consulis* (and *Augustalis* in Puteoli and Venafrum),¹³¹ four *Augustales* whose professions are known – three *dupliciarii* (among them *marmorarius*,¹³² *purpurarius*,¹³³ *negotiator vascularius argentarius*¹³⁴) and an *Augustalis* in Puteoli and Neapolis who was also *negotiator sagarius*¹³⁵ – and the last one, who was *Augustalis* in Puteoli and Cumae.¹³⁶

It is clear that for most *Augustales* and their heirs it was enough to state their *collegium* membership and, at least sometimes, the internal (important) position they held (see especially the numerous 1st c. CE *quaestores Augustalium* from Allifae). In the foothills

¹¹⁸ CIL X 3904 = ILS 6311 = AUGCr, p. 170; see p. 65–66.

¹¹⁹ CIL X 3947 = ILS 7537 = AUGCr, p. 179.

¹²⁰ ImpPomp 110S = AUGCr, p. 321; CIL X 1030 = ILS 6373 = PompIn 51 = AUGCr, p. 329.

¹²¹ CIL X 1055 = ILS 6374 = AUGCr, p. 332.

¹²² <https://georgykantorblog.wordpress.com/2021/08/17/a-new-find-from-pompeii/>; last accessed 16.11.2021.

¹²³ NSA 1897, 12 = ILS 6339 = AE 1897, 54 = AUGCr, p. 199.

¹²⁴ CIL X 3675 = AUGCr, p. 245.

¹²⁵ CIL X 1870 = ILS 8300 = AUGCr, p. 244.

¹²⁶ CIL X 3676 = ILS 6059 = AUGCr, p. 247.

¹²⁷ One of them *coluit annis XXXXV* (CIL X 1877 = ILS 6329 = AUGCr, p. 362). According to some scholars, he had to be owner of the land or lessee (see e.g. Camodeca 1993, 42); however, this is not the only possibility (see Pietruszka 2020, 50–51).

¹²⁸ CIL X 1875 = AUGCr, p. 359; AE 1988, 344 = AUGCr, p. 368; CIL X 1886 = AUGCr, p. 370; CIL X 1871 = AUGCr, p. 377; NSA 1932, 306 = AUGCr, p. 378.

¹²⁹ NSA 1902, 381 = AE 1902, 206 = AUGCr, p. 365.

¹³⁰ Or, less probably, he was rewarded with *ornamenta decurionalia* or was a *decurialis* (CIL X 1790 = ILS 6332 = AUGCr, p. 351).

¹³¹ Venafrum 5A = CIL X 1889 = AUGCr, p. 374.

¹³² CIL X 1873 = ILS 6331 = AUGCr, p. 353.

¹³³ CIL X 540 = InscrIt I 1, *26 = AUGCr, p. 361.

¹³⁴ AE 1996, 416 = AUGCr, p. 357.

¹³⁵ CIL X 1872 = AUGCr, p. 352.

¹³⁶ CIL X 690 = SIPSurrentum 65 = AUGCr, p. 376.

border region the title of *magister* (*Iunonis* or *Apollinaris*) was also quite popular. The combining of such functions (*magister* and *Augustalis*) was most probably characteristic for those who were rich and influential in society (in the foothills border region two *magistri* were freedmen of a senatorial family,¹³⁷ one held the prestigious post of *scriba rei publicae* and one was a benefactor). All of the inscriptions that mention the professional activities of *Augustales* came from Puteoli, Capua and, perhaps, Cumae.¹³⁸ Moreover, all are dated to the post-Flavian period. Puteoli is especially valuable here due to the high percentage of “professionals”. The city was an important Roman trading port and, therefore, such a large representation of artisans (or rather owners of workshops) and traders is not surprising. It should be noted here that none of the individuals were simply “average” *Augustalis* (they were *duplicarii* or performed a function in more than one city). On the other hand, none of them were benefactors, none held the most important position in the *collegium* and none were granted with *ornamenta*.¹³⁹ However, two things should be underlined here. First – other types of inscriptions recording *Augustales* (mostly honorary and *alba*)¹⁴⁰ reveal that the internal organization of the colleges, at least in the coastal region from the late-Flavian period, was quite sophisticated, an aspect which is rarely mirrored in the sepulchral inscriptions. And second – there are very few traces of benefaction and special awards given to *Augustales* in funerary monuments (which will be discussed below).

b) Euergetic activity of *Augustales*

Sometimes the funerary inscription becomes the only medium, which could commemorate the euergetic activity of *Augustales* (the important public places – like the *fora* – were quite often reserved for the emperor and his family, imperial aristocracy and local notables).¹⁴¹ Surprisingly, it is difficult to find much information on beneficence in the sepulchral inscriptions of *Augustales*. We know two benefactors from Telesia – [L. Cocc]eius Castor (who was rewarded with *bisellium*) organised *munus gladiatorium*,¹⁴² and L. Manlius Rufio paid for *ludi scaenici* and gave *epulum* (for *coloni* and their children) and *crustum et mulsum*

¹³⁷ See Corazza 2016, 138–142.

¹³⁸ For more on the professional activity of Cumean *Augustalis* and *curator perpetuus embaenitariorum III pisciniensium* see Pietruszka 2020, 66.

¹³⁹ See Vandevoorde (2015, 3–7), who observes the same regularity analysing the evidence of occupational titles among *Augustales* from Italia and Gallia in general.

¹⁴⁰ See e.g. AE 2001, 853 = *SupIt* 25, L, 16 = *AUGCr*, p. 227.

¹⁴¹ Fejfer 2008, 9, 434. It cannot be ruled out that, at least in some cases, a sepulchral inscription was not the only way in which the beneficence of an *Augustalis* was commemorated and that the same euergetic activity was also immortalized via a honorific monument set up on public or semi-public (*collegium*) land. However, in the case of Campanian *Augustales* at least, we do not know of any such case.

¹⁴² *CIL* IX 2249 = AE 2006, 359 (2nd c. CE).

(for *incolae*).¹⁴³ In Venafrum the *munera gladiatoria* were organised twice by an anonymous *Augustalis*.¹⁴⁴ In Capua Q. Annius Ianuarius became an *Augustalis gratuitus – ob merita eius*.¹⁴⁵ Even in the coastal Campanian region commemorations of euergetic activity are documented only twice. In Pompeii M. Venerius coloniae lib. Secundio *solus ludos Graecos et Latinos quadriduo dedit*.¹⁴⁶ We may also add the previously discussed case of C. Munatius Faustus, who was rewarded with *bisellium – ob merita eius*. It cannot be excluded that his reward was somehow related to the distribution of grain (as the iconography from his funerary altar suggests).¹⁴⁷

The euergetic activity and the high position held by an individual in local society could also be commemorated indirectly. Everyone who wanted to become an *Augustalis* had to pay *summa honoraria* (similar to candidates for the *ordo decurionum*). Some *Augustales* were exempted from this fee, most probably as a reward for their beneficence towards the city and its inhabitants or (at least) the *collegium* of *Augustales*. We have three testimonies of such individuals.¹⁴⁸ Sometimes the benefactors, who could not become members of the *ordo decurionum* due to their slave past, were rewarded with *ornamenta (decurionalia or duumviralia)* – one such case is known from Campania¹⁴⁹ – *bisellium* – a few cases from Campania are known, all of which have been previously discussed¹⁵⁰ – and *corona* (one case from Capua, also previously discussed).¹⁵¹ Finally, the phrase *locus datus decreto decurionum* (usually abbreviated as *LDDD*) meant that the public land was received in order to place a tomb there. No matter if the ground was paid for by decurions or was only granted by them (and it had to be paid by the owner of the tomb or his/her heirs), it served as a kind of

¹⁴³ *CIL* IX 2252 (1st–2nd c. CE).

¹⁴⁴ *CIL* X 4913 = *ILS* 6516 = *Venafrum* 90 = *AUGCr*, p. 429 (1st–2nd c. CE).

¹⁴⁵ *CIL* X 3907 = *ILS* 6313 = *AUGCr*, p. 173 (2nd c. CE). We could presume that every *Augustalis gratis/immunis* received his immunity (exemption from *summa honoraria*) as a reward for his beneficence towards the city and its inhabitants or the *collegium* of *Augustales* – the case of Ianuarius is the only known example where such information appears (at least directly) in the text of the inscription.

¹⁴⁶ <https://georgykantorblog.wordpress.com/2021/08/17/a-new-find-from-pompeii/>; last accessed 16.11.2021.

¹⁴⁷ See p. 68.

¹⁴⁸ M. Antonius Iulianus from Misenum (end of the 2nd – beginning of the 3rd c. CE; *CIL* X 3676 = *ILS* 6059 = *AUGCr*, p. 247), P. Servilius P. l. Successus from Caiatia (end of the 1st c. CE – beginning of the 2nd c. CE; *CIL* X 4591 = *IATrebula* 57 = *AE* 1993, 487 = *AUGCr*, p. 154) and Cn. Alleius Mai Lib. Eros from Pompeii (*ImpPomp* 110S = *AUGCr*, p. 321). The latter was also rewarded by the *Augustales* and *pagani* with one thousand sesterces for his funeral.

¹⁴⁹ P. Aelius P. fil. Philologus from Capua; however, his case is problematic (see p. 65–66). I do not think Q. Aemilius Helpidephorus from Puteoli was rewarded with *ornamenta* (see Pietruszka 2020, 177).

¹⁵⁰ See p. 68.

¹⁵¹ See p. 68.

reward.¹⁵² We know five such cases from Campania, and, interestingly, three of them come from Abellinum.¹⁵³ The remaining two are from Nola¹⁵⁴ and Pompeii.¹⁵⁵

In total, only six inscriptions record benefactions directly and twelve indirectly (including those where such activity is documented by iconography only), which represents around 14% of all known funerary inscriptions of *Augustales*. The low number of direct testimonies could infer that *Augustales* were often not interested in memorising their beneficence in funerary contexts and that public or semi-public places in the city were more appropriate for them (the case of the well-excavated *sacellum Augustalium* in Misenum lends weight to this argument). However, further research must be conducted to verify this hypothesis. It is difficult to observe any chronological or geographical dependence with regards to the distribution of the epigraphic material – benefactions from both the *early* and *late* period are documented in all three regions. Organisation of *ludi* and *munera* are most popular; however, the numbers involved are so small that any far-reaching conclusions should not be attempted.

c) Size and cost of monuments

The phrase *LDDD* provides indirect evidence about the localization of the tomb, but several inscriptions also mention the size of the tomb's precinct. Three of them are listed below: one from Telesia (unfortunately, only one dimension is preserved – 12 *pedes*),¹⁵⁶ one from Capua (50 *pedes* by 50 *pedes*, so around 219 sq. meters)¹⁵⁷ and one from Nola (130 *pedes* by 25 *pedes*, so around 284 sq. meters).¹⁵⁸ The Capuan and Nolan tombs' precincts are much larger than most other tombs known from those cities. Woods recommends caution when precinct dimensions are taken into consideration, since, as she rightly points out, we do not know exactly where such tombs were localized (and rural tombs could be much larger, but also much simpler and cheaper than the smaller tombs found in crowded urban cemeteries), nor do we know their height.¹⁵⁹ The preserved Pompeian graves provide researchers with more information, although the inscriptions lack information concerning dimensions. According to Woods, the precinct of the tomb of C. Munatius Faustus measured 55,3 sq. meters while, on

¹⁵² For more on the subject, see Campbell 2015, 85–98.

¹⁵³ *CIL* X 1146 = *AUGCr*, p. 123; *AE* 2011, 237 = *AUGCr*, p. 126; *CIL* X 1151 = *AUGCr*, p. 128.

¹⁵⁴ *CIL* X 1268 = *AUGCr*, p. 300.

¹⁵⁵ *CIL* X 994 = *PompIn* 43 = *AUGCr*, p. 326. The case of C. Muntius Faustus, who was *Augustal(is) et pagan(us) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)*, is disputable (see Campbell 2015, 106–107, note 8).

¹⁵⁶ *CIL* IX 2256. What is surprising, and seems to be a sign of regularity in at least one Telesian cemetery, is that every tomb precinct mentioned in the inscriptions (there are four known examples) measured twelve *pedes* (in both directions, where both are known; *CIL* IX 2276 = *AE* 2014, 378; *CIL* IX 2278; *CIL* IX 2292).

¹⁵⁷ *CIL* X 3943 = *ILS* 6312 = *AUGCr*, p. 171; Woods 1991, 77.

¹⁵⁸ *CIL* X 1268 = *AUGCr*, p. 300; Woods 1991, 77.

¹⁵⁹ Woods 1991, 74–75, 81–82.

the other hand, M. Cerrinius Restitutus' precinct measured only 11 sq. meters (however, we should not forget the latter was situated on public land).¹⁶⁰ These precincts were much smaller than those from Capua and Nola, which suggests that the monuments documented in those cities were either built far from the settlement, or they represented the opulence of their commissioner. The Nolan *Augustalis* L. Calvidius L. I. Felix had to belong to the second group since his monumental tomb was placed on public land. It should not be surprising, therefore, that his prematurely dead son was an *Ilvir designatus*.

The text of an inscription could also reveal another piece of information indicating the opulence of the tomb – the amount of money spent on its construction. [M(arcus) Aediu]s Serviliae I. Pylade[s] left 20 thousand sesterces in his testament for his (and his father's) monument.¹⁶¹ This sum corresponded with the high position Pylade[s] held in the city,¹⁶² as it was much higher than the average amount spent on monument construction, which, according to data derived from the inscriptions, was ten thousand sesterces.¹⁶³ The financial aspects of tomb maintenance also appear in an inscription honouring Q. Cominius Abascantus from Misenum.¹⁶⁴ Despite the fact that this was a *titulus honorarius* which was placed in the Misenian *sacellum Augustalium*, it contains, surprisingly, quite important information concerning the subject in question (and, therefore, it is used by me). According to the epigraphic source, Abascantus planned what should be done at his grave (and when) in detail, which besides instructions concerning how the grave and its décor should be cared for and maintained, also included the staging of banquets and wrestling matches. For this purpose, Abascantus left ten thousand sesterces in his testament. Incidentally, the inscription reveals that his funerary monument was a *cepotaphion* (grave-in-a-garden)¹⁶⁵ with a *triclinium*. The presence of such detailed information in the honorary inscription shows how important it was for Abascantus to memorialise his name for eternity in his funerary monument, while the sum that was set aside for the maintenance of the tomb reveals how expensive the whole process was.

d) Family ties of *Augustales*

Funerary inscriptions shed light not only on the position of *Augustales* in their respective societies, but also on their family life. Obviously, one not should expect such simple

¹⁶⁰ Woods 1991, 77. The numbers given by Woods are slightly different than those of Campbell (2015).

¹⁶¹ *CIL IX 2365 = Allifae 81 = AUGCr*, p. 139.

¹⁶² See Corazza 2016, 138–142.

¹⁶³ Woods 1991, 85 (following data of Italian burial expenditure collected by Richard P. Duncan-Jones [1965]).

¹⁶⁴ *AE 2000, 344 = AUGCr*, p. 254.

¹⁶⁵ Purcell 1987, 35–36.

inscriptions to provide a detailed insight into such families.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, it is possible that they did not contain information about every close family member of the discussed individuals, but only those who were responsible for commemorating the deceased, or those with whom the *Augustalis* was obliged to behave in a socially acceptable manner towards.¹⁶⁷ But even just a quick “snapshot”¹⁶⁸ regarding family life and the cultural and moral obligations of its members could be useful to researchers. Two issues will be discussed below – who was responsible for constructing and financing the tombs, and who was buried there.

In the foothills border region 19 sepulchral inscriptions contain the phrase *sibi et...fecit* (or something similar), which points towards *Augustales* being the commissioners of the tombs (i.e. in 44% of inscriptions).¹⁶⁹ Surprisingly, the percentage of inscriptions that were set up by *Augustales* is lower in central Campania (eleven examples contain the phrase *sibi et...fecit*, which is around 34%) and even smaller in coastal Campania (ten examples, equating to 21%). However, before we draw conclusions based on this evidence, it should be noted that it is sometimes impossible to identify the commissioner of quite a few inscriptions. These include certain types of inscriptions that only mention the name of the deceased (e.g. *columellae* or small slabs under the niche in *columbaria*) and inscriptions that were severely damaged. Moreover, in some cases an *Augustalis* could not use the phrase *sibi et...fecit* since he commissioned the tomb for someone else (and for some reason does not want to be buried there or does not indicate such an intention). If we discounted them the results are as follows – foothills border region 49%, central Campania 39% and coastal Campania 28%.

The overall percentage for Campania is, therefore, around 37%, which is lower than the 46% computed by Vandevoorde for *Augustales* known from Italy and Gallia (or around 50% for Italy, as Woods indicates).¹⁷⁰ No doubt the strikingly low percentage from coastal Campania is “responsible” for this. Around 66% of inscriptions from this part of Campania come from Pompeii and Puteoli and these cities have the biggest impact on the final calculations. In Pompeii the results are distorted by the high number (around half) of

¹⁶⁶ Barbara E. Borg (2019, esp. chapter 3) points out that funerary monuments served not only nuclear (usually two-generation) families, but remained in use for many generations. Woods (1991, 64) thinks otherwise; however, she bases her hypothesis on earlier archaeological research.

¹⁶⁷ See Carroll 2006, 180; Borg 2019, 188.

¹⁶⁸ The word used by Borg (2019, 150).

¹⁶⁹ Inscriptions which were set up by an *Augustalis* to a deceased individual when the *Augustalis* does not inform us that he will be buried in the same place are not included (there are only four such inscriptions). The five inscriptions that contain the phrase *ex testamento* (erected by the will of an *Augustalis*) are also not included. Moreover, it should be noted that in inscriptions, in which several individuals are mentioned, and all of them are in Nominative or Dative case, we may only speculate as to who was responsible for erecting the monument – such cases raise the percentage number of tombs that were not commissioned by *Augustales* (although at least some of them probably were).

¹⁷⁰ Woods 1991, 66; Vandevoorde 2014, 242–243.

THE FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF CAMPANIAN *AUGUSTALES*

inscriptions where the commissioner is not known (usually the only individual mentioned is an *Augustalis*). In Puteoli the number of commissioners who were not close relatives (i.e. parents, siblings, wives, children) is in fact quite high (two freedmen, one *alumnus*, one *amicus*, two unnamed heirs). We may speculate that life in this part of the Campanian world was “faster” and, therefore, fewer *Augustales* thought about preparing their tombs (or erecting them) during their lifetime¹⁷¹ and, moreover, were ready to get married and have children.¹⁷² However, such a statement needs to be verified on a wider basis, especially that three of those six inscriptions inform us about the deceased wives of *Augustales*. Besides, close relatives of *Augustales* appeared quite often in inscriptions, both as commissioners of the tombs (seven times in the foothills border region, eight in central Campania, six in the coastal region) and in general.¹⁷³ In the latter case in the foothills border region three mothers, three fathers, two brothers, one sister, 18 wives, four sons and two daughters are mentioned, 46% of inscriptions do not mention close relatives. In the central region two mothers, one father, 15 wives, four sons and two daughters are mentioned, 41% of inscriptions do not contain close relatives. In the coastal region one mother, two brothers, 14 wives, two sons and three daughters are mentioned; 46% of inscriptions do not contain close relatives.¹⁷⁴ Apart from the very high number of wives commemorated in inscriptions in comparison to other close relatives (which is not surprising), it is noticeable that close relatives are almost equally frequently present in all the regions.¹⁷⁵

*

It may seem surprising that I have not concentrated on the Pompeian cemeteries that, as mentioned above, are quite useful for the research being conducted. However, those cemeteries and the *Augustales*' tombs have been the subject of many detailed studies and, since this text is nothing more than a preliminary study of funerary monuments that

¹⁷¹ Only one inscription from the coastal region contains the phrase *ex testamento*, but it comes from Misenum.

¹⁷² It is worth noting that in Cumae none of the four *Augustales* commissioned a tomb themselves, which could strengthen such a view. On the other hand, in Venafrum only two inscriptions were set up by *Augustales*.

¹⁷³ If an *Augustalis* is buried by or with a woman who shares the same *nomen* (sometimes called *colliberta*) or with a different *nomen*, and there is no indication of the relationship between the two, then we do not know whether she was his wife, daughter, freedwoman (or none of those). It is probable, therefore, that at least some of these individuals were close relatives.

¹⁷⁴ However, in the last calculation (inscriptions without close relatives) Pompeii has been excluded, since the specificity of its inscriptions could seriously distort the results (many relatives are probably “hidden” in the *columellae*).

¹⁷⁵ This numbers are similar to the overall Italian picture. According to Woods (1991, 67–68), around 54% of inscriptions that record *Augustales* also mention close relatives.

concentrates on cataloguing the sources and providing a short analysis, I felt it was unnecessary to repeat statements which take up hundreds of pages elsewhere in just a few lines (although, as the careful reader should have already noticed, Pompeian sources are referred to quite often in the text). For the same reason I did not take into consideration the *sacellum Augustalium* from Misenum, which, after the building work that was paid for by Cassia C. f. Victoria, could be treated as the symbolic tomb of her husband (L. Laecanius Primitivus – *curator Augustalium*) and herself.¹⁷⁶ All these places will be extremely useful in the next stage of the work. As far as now is concerned, I concentrated on Campanian *Augustales* and their funerary monuments, attempting to show the similarities and dissimilarities that existed in the local and regional habits of members of this college(s) and the research opportunities (as well as their limits). However, a full-scale analysis requires a broader perspective. First, a detailed comparison of the funerary monuments of Campanian *Augustales* with such monuments from other (but somehow similar) parts of Italy is necessary (e.g. the collation of Puteoli and Ostia). Second, and more importantly, comparisons need to be drawn between the habits of *Augustales* and local notables, as well as individuals from the lower echelons of society, in different Campanian cities.¹⁷⁷ However, this is a task for another paper.

Bibliography

Epigraphic sources (abbreviations)¹⁷⁸

AE = *L'Année Épigraphique*, Paris.

Allifae = N. Mancini, *Allifae*, Piedimonte Matese 2005³ (1st ed. in 1993).

AnalEpi = H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica 1970–1997*, Roma 1998.

AUGCr = G. Corazza, *Gli Augustales della Campania romana*, Napoli 2016.

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berolini 1863–.

IATrebula = H. Solin (ed.), *Le iscrizioni antiche di Trebula, Caiatia e Cubulteria*, Caserta 1993.

ILS = H. Dessau (ed.), *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, I–III, Berolini 1892–1916.

¹⁷⁶ For more on the subject see e.g. Laird 2015, 204; Pietruszka 2020, 77–80.

¹⁷⁷ Such comparisons were made, as far as I know, only in the case of Pompeii (e.g. Campbell 2015) and Venafrum (Diebner 1979; *non vidi*, quote after Woods 1991, 24).

¹⁷⁸ After *Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby* (https://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi.php?s_sprache=en), with some exceptions.

THE FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF CAMPANIAN *AUGUSTALES*

ImpPomp = *Un impegno per Pompei. Fotopiano e documentazione della Necropoli di Porta Nocera*, Milano 1983.

InscrIt = *Inscriptiones Italiae*, Roma 1931–.

NSA = *Notizie degli scavi di antichità*.

PompIn = A. Hüttemann (ed.), *Pompejanische Inschriften. Der heutige Bestand vor Ort im Stadtgebiet und in den Nekropolen. Lateinisch / Deutsch*, Stuttgart 2010.

RECapua = L. Chioffi, *Museo Provinciale Campano di Capua. La raccolta epigrafica. Le iscrizioni latine: cortili, sale, depositi*, Capua 2005.

SIPsurrentum = M.M. Magalhaes, *Storia, istituzioni e prosopografia di Surrentum romana. La collezione epigrafica del Museo Correale di Terranova*, Castellammare di Stabia 2003.

SupIt = *Supplementa Italica*, Roma 1981–.

Venafrum = S. Capini, *Molise. Repertorio delle iscrizioni latine, VII: Venafrum*, Campobasso 1999.

Literature

Borg B.E., 2019: *Roman tombs and the art of commemoration: contextual approaches to funerary customs in the second century CE*, Cambridge–New York.

Bruun Ch., 2013: “Greek or Latin? The owner’s choice of names for *vernae* in Rome”, [in:] M. George (ed.), *Roman slavery and Roman material culture*, Toronto 2013, 19–42.

Campbell V.L., 2015: *The tombs of Pompeii: organization, space, and society*, New York–London 2015.

Camodeca G., 1993: “La società e la attività produttive”, [in:] F. Zevi (ed.), *Puteoli*, Napoli, 31–47.

Capini S., 1999: *Molise. Repertorio delle iscrizioni latine, VII: Venafrum*, Campobasso.

Carroll M., 2006: *Spirits of the dead: Roman funerary monuments in Western Europe*, Oxford.

Cavuoto P., 1975: “Iscrizioni inedite di Telesia”, *MGR* 4, 215–280.

Clarke J.E., 2003: *Art in the lives of ordinary Romans: visual representation and non-elite viewers in Italy, 100 B.C. – 315 A.D.*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London.

Corazza G., 2016: *Gli Augustales della Campania romana*, Napoli.

Diebner S., 1979: *Aesernia–Venafrum: Untersuchungen zu den römischen Steindenkmälern zweier Landstädte Mittelitaliens*, Rome.

Duncan-Jones R.P., 1965: “An epigraphic survey of costs in Roman Italy”, *PBSR* 33, 189–306.

- Duthoy R., 1978: “Les **Augustales*”, [in:] *ANRW* II 16.2, 1254–1309.
- Duthoy R., 1988: “Trimalchiopolis: cité campanienne?” *Euphrosyne* 16, 139–154.
- Eck W., 1984: “Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period”, [in:] F. Millar, E. Segal (eds.), *Caesar Augustus: seven aspects*, Oxford–New York, 129–167.
- Fejfer J., 2008: *Roman portraits in context*, Berlin–New York.
- Gradel I., 2002: *Emperor worship and Roman religion*, Oxford.
- Gregori G.L., 2008: “*Huic ordo decurionum ornamenta...decrevit*. Forme pubbliche di riconoscimento del successo personale nell’Italia romana”, [in:] C. Berrendonner, M. Cébeillac-Gervasoni, L. Lamoine (eds.), *Le quotidien municipal dans l’Occident romain*, Clermont-Ferrand, 661–685.
- Hope V.M., 2009: “At home with the dead: Roman funeral traditions and Trimalchio’s tomb”, [in:] J. Prag, J. Repag (eds.), *Petronius: a handbook*, Malden (MA)–Oxford–Chichester, 140–160.
- Keegan P., 2015: “Reading epigraphic culture, writing funerary space in the Roman city”, [in:] G. Sears, P. Keegan, R. Laurence, *Written space in the Latin West, 200 BC to AD 300*, London, 49–64.
- Laird M.L., 2002: *Evidence in context: the public and funerary monuments of the seviri Augustales at Ostia*, Princeton University [PhD thesis].
- Laird M.L., 2015: *Civic monuments and the Augustales in Roman Italy*, New York.
- Mancini N., 2005: *Allifae*, Piedimonte Matese³ (1st ed. in 1993).
- Mouritsen H., 2001: “Roman freedmen and the urban economy: Pompeii in the first century AD”, [in:] F. Senatore (ed.), *Pompei tra Sorrento e Sarno. Atti del terzo e quarto ciclo di conferenze di geologia, storia e archeologia, Pompei, gennaio 1999–maggio 2000*, Roma, 1–27.
- Mouritsen H., 2005: “Freedmen and decurions: epitaphs and social history in imperial Italy”, *JRS* 95, 38–63.
- Mouritsen H., 2006: “Honores libertini: Augustales and seviri in Italy”, *Hephaistos* 24, 237–248.
- Pietruszka W., 2020: *The municipal elites of Campania during the Antonine-Severan period*, Wiesbaden.
- Premmerstein (A. von), 1895: s. v. “Augustales”, [in:] E. De Ruggiero (ed.), *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità romane*, Roma, 824–877.
- Purcell 1987: “Tomb and suburb”, [in:] H. von Hesberg, P. Zanker, *Römische Gräberstraßen: Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard. Kolloquium in München vom 28. bis 30. Oktober 1985*, München, 25–41.

THE FUNERARY MONUMENTS OF CAMPANIAN *AUGUSTALES*

- Sigismund Nielsen H., 1997: “Interpreting epithets in Roman epitaphs”, [in:] B. Rawson, P. Weaver, *The Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space*, Canberra–Oxford, 169–204.
- Solin H., 1998: *Analecta Epigraphica 1970–1997*, Roma.
- Vandevoorde L., 2014: *From mouse to millionaire: socio-economic positions, mobility, power relations, respectability and visibility of *Augustales in imperial Italy and Gaul*, Universiteit Gent [unpublished PhD thesis].
- Vandevoorde L., 2015: “Of mice and men: financial and occupational differentiation among *Augustales”, *Mondes anciens* 7, 2–24.
- Woods A.Ch., 1991: *The funerary monuments of the Augustales in Italy*, Los Angeles [unpublished PhD thesis].
- Zanker P., 1975: “Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassenen”, *JDAI* 90, 267–315.

Wojciech Pietruszka
Uniwersytet Wrocławski
wojciech.pietruszka@uwr.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0002-6726-4436