

Roman Citizenship of Italian **Augustales*. Evidence, Problems, Competitive Advantages

Lindsey VANDEVOORDE
Ghent University

Introduction*

Although the first academic discussion of ‘the’ *augustales* dates back to the mid-nineteenth century,⁽¹⁾ the difficulty of fully comprehending this socially ambivalent group – wealthy and prestigious but very often with a servile background – remains. Most scholars agree on the basics: the title *augustalis* (and all its local variants) was used during the first three centuries A.D., and refers to an honorary position in local society. It was mostly bestowed on wealthy freedmen who, because of their servile birth, could not partake in the official *cursus honorum*. Both the nomination itself and the bestowal of any further privileges or honours connected to it were done by the city council. Two elements, however, complicate the matter. Firstly, we know of over forty variants on the *augustalis* title. Duthoy introduced his asterisk (*) to cover the wide variety of titles: *sevir*, *sevir augustalis*, *augustalis*, *magister augustalis*, *Herculaneus*, *quattuorvir*, *quinquevir*, *octovir*, and so on. Secondly, at the same time, Duthoy’s asterisk amalgamates a tri-institutional reality consisting of annual officers, broader associations of former officers and co-opted members, and former officers who were not ‘incorporated’ as members of the association, but who could continue to bear the title honorifically.⁽²⁾

Although a minimal definition of ‘the’ **augustalis* is possible – Duthoy’s ‘**augustalis* moyen’⁽³⁾ – **augustales* have never formed a single unified

* I am greatly indebted to J. Sargeant and N. King for their invaluable help with English spelling and phrasing. All errors of fact and interpretation are mine alone.

(1) EGGER, 1844, p. 1-59. Some inscriptions were already described in the 17th century by Noris (1681), in the 18th century by Morcelli (1780) and in the 19th century by Orelli and Henzen (1828), Borghesi (1860) and Aldini (1831). Egger’s account is the first attempt to describe the phenomenon and offer some explanations that did not emanate from a mere antiquarian interest.

(2) DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1254.

(3) DUTHOY, 1974, p. 150: ‘L’**augustalis* moyen est un affranchi, assez fortuné mais exclu du décursionat et des magistratures officielles à cause de son passé d’esclave. Cet **augustalis* a fait fortune en exerçant une activité mercantile ou artisanale et jouissait, grâce à sa fortune, ses activités et ses largesses, d’un certain prestige auprès de ses citoyens qui le choisissaient pour des fonctions honorifiques dans une association professionnelle ou l’honoraient en tant que bienfaiteur de la ville ou d’une association quelconque.’

category. Diversity was the norm, as the geographical spread of the institution, the local organizational signatures and the many local varieties in terminology (all included in Duthoy's asterisk) demonstrate. I have chosen not to discard the asterisk since it is extremely useful as an indicator for the general phenomenon, without undermining either the diversity or local signatures. It leaves room for interpretation and variety.

Few scholars, however, have attempted a discussion of the civic status of **augustales*; it was mostly taken for granted that they were freedmen and Roman citizens. As Roman citizens, **augustales* would have enjoyed electoral and legislative rights (*ius suffragii*) and could stand for office (*ius honorum*). They would also have had the right to make contracts and own property (*commercium*) and to conclude a lawful marriage (*conubium*). The **augustalitas* has often been referred to simply as a 'freedmen organisation'. The civic status of its members was not considered an issue that needed addressing.⁽⁴⁾ This seems to be the position taken by Abramenko's as well.⁽⁵⁾ Sometimes the *tria nomina* was introduced – wrongly, as we will see below – as evidence to support the claim of Roman citizenship, but most of the time no proof was offered at all.⁽⁶⁾ Palmieri noted that the *tria nomina* was not a marker of free birth and did not link this to a civic status of **augustales*.⁽⁷⁾

Discussions on the presumed link between **augustalitas* and Roman citizenship were elaborated upon after the discovery of the so-called 'Venidius archive' in 1939. Arangio Ruiz, Pugliese Carratelli, Camodeca, and Pagano considered all **augustales* to be Roman citizens.⁽⁸⁾ They based this on five

(4) e.g. MOURLOT, 1895; MOMMSEN, 1878; SCHNEIDER, 1891; NESSLING, 1891; VON PREMIERSTEIN, 1895; TAYLOR, 1914; TAYLOR, 1924; NOCK, 1934; ALFÖLDY, 1958; TUDOR, 1962; ALBERTINI, 1973; AUSBÜTTEL, 1982; PAULICELLI, 1986; CHRISTOL, GASCOU, JANON, 1987; SERRANO, 1988; DEMOUGIN, 1988; DE FRANCISCIS, 1991; RODÀ, 1992; BUONOCORE, 1995; MOLLO, 1997; MENELLA, 1999; FABIANI, 2002; JORDAN, 2003; GUADAGNO, 2007; LINDERSKI, 2007; DA SILVA FERNANDES, 2007; AMIRI, 2010; CORAZZA, 2010; MAYER I OLIVE, 2010.

(5) Although MOURITSEN (2011, p. 252) claimed that Abramenko took the freeborn *seviri Augustales* as 'proof that the institution was not invented specifically for freedmen but remained open to all citizens', a careful lecture of Abramenko's work left me with a different impression. In his conclusion, ABRAMENKO (1993, p. 311) argued that rather than being a freedmen organisation 'pur sang', the **augustalitas* was an organisation that was part of the 'munizipalen Mittelstand'. He did not mention citizenship of any kind.

(6) EGGER, 1844, p. 45: 'on voit un citoyen porter ce titre'; Etienne, 1958, p. 265: 'les *seviri augustales* portent les *tria nomina*: seuls, ils sont fils d'affranchis et prêts à recevoir la citoyenneté'; DUTHOY, 1974, p. 150 (cited above); OSTROW, 1985, p. 70-71: 'The freed Roman slave, though a citizen'; HACKWORTH-PETERSEN, 2006, p. 80: 'He appears not as a social climber but as a citizen'; GALLEGO FRANCO, 1997, p. 101: 'el *tria nomina* parece evidenciar el deseo de estos individuos de hacer ostentacion de su romanidad y de una posicion social privilegiada, que les situa por encima de otros conciudadanos.'; MOURITSEN, 2011, p. 259: 'The *seviri Augustales* can thus be seen as an attempt to create a permanent framework for both outlays and symbolic returns, which any citizen irrespective of status could buy into.'

(7) PALMIERI, 1980, p. 454-455.

(8) ARANGIO RUIZ and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1955, p. 448-477; ARANGIO RUIZ, 1959, p. 9-24; CAMODECA, 2002, p. 259-260; CAMODECA, 2004, p. 189-211; PAGANO, 2002, p. 257-280.

exceptional documents. Firstly, two wax tablets (dated A.D. 62)⁽⁹⁾ record how the Junian Latin (i.e. an informally freed slave) L. Venidius Ennychus successfully claimed Roman citizenship, as laid down by the *lex Aelia Sentia*. According to Gaius, Junian Latins could obtain citizenship by marrying a Roman citizen or another Latin and having a child that reached the age of one year old. The marriage itself had to be put on record and testified by seven witnesses. Seven more Roman citizen witnesses had to be produced for the second declaration that legitimised the child and the marriage making both the couple and the child Roman citizens. This procedure is known as *anniculi causae probatio*.⁽¹⁰⁾ Two other tablets (dated before A.D. 63/64)⁽¹¹⁾ record how a man called Rufus challenged Venidius' right to stand for an unnamed office because he was 'unsuitable' for the position. After an intricate legal procedure that included drawing up a list of ten men of standing (i.e. city councillors and *augustales*) from whom his adversary might choose a *disceptator*, a judge, Venidius was cleared of all charges. On what basis these allegations were made remains uncertain.⁽¹²⁾ Arangio-Ruiz suggested that the honorific position referred to was the *augustalitas*.⁽¹³⁾ We know from the 'archive' of L. Cominius Primus (a very similar collection of Herculanean wax tablets) that Venidius was still alive in January of A.D. 69.⁽¹⁴⁾ This means he was about forty years old when he obtained Roman citizenship and that he was in his mid-fifties when we last hear of him in A.D. 69.

Secondly, fragments of a long list of names discovered at Herculaneum also featured Ennychus.⁽¹⁵⁾ These fragments were originally identified as remnants of an *album* of the Herculanean *augustales*.⁽¹⁶⁾ Since the franchise seems to have pre-dated the inclusion of Ennychus' name on the presumed *album augustalium*, it was concluded that Roman citizenship was necessary to obtain the **augustalitas*.⁽¹⁷⁾

Two major arguments contest this interpretation, however. Firstly, Garnsey and De Ligt argued that the date of the *album*, as well as the date when Venidius' name was added to the list is uncertain, as is Venidius' civic status at the time of his inclusion.⁽¹⁸⁾ To *assume* that the chronological order fits the suggested interpretation is circular. Secondly, as more fragments of the list were excavated it became clear that the original interpretation was flawed.

(9) *Tab. Herc.* 5 and 89. (ARANGIO-RUIZ and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1955.)

(10) *Gai., Inst.* 1, 29.

(11) *Tab. Herc.* 83 and 84 (ARANGIO-RUIZ and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1955.). Dated *ante quem* A.D. 63/64 by CAMODECA, 2002, p. 262.

(12) The suggestion that Venidius was suspected of not holding Roman citizenship would fit the scope of this paper perfectly, but nothing can be said with any certainty.

(13) ARANGIO-RUIZ, 1959, p. 12. Later also GARDNER, 1993, p. 18.

(14) *Tab. Herc.* 77, 78, 80, 53, 92. Venidius is mentioned among a list of witnesses. (ARANGIO-RUIZ and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1955.)

(15) *AE* 1978, 119 a-d; 1992, 286 a-d; *CIL* X, 1403.

(16) The Herculanean album was published in 1883. The 'Venidius archive' – a phrase coined by Arangio Ruiz and Pugliese Carratelli in 1955 – was found in 1939 in the luxurious 'Casa del Salone Nero', on the crossroads of the Decumanus Maximus and Cardo IV.

(17) This was first suggested in 1959 by Arangio-Ruiz.

(18) GARNSEY and DE LIGT, 2012, p. 82.

The vast number of names on the list (450 are preserved, but originally it must have recorded over a thousand names)⁽¹⁹⁾ would be – if we were actually dealing with an *album augustalium* – completely disproportionate for a city like Herculaneum, which only had about 4,000 to 5,000 inhabitants, including slaves.⁽²⁰⁾ It was probably a list of citizens who were entitled to vote locally.⁽²¹⁾

In short, the only certainty is that L. Venidius Ennychus was a Junian Latin who obtained Roman citizenship in accordance with the *lex Aelia Sentia*. As a consequence, he was named among the *cives* of the city in the long lists found near the crossroads of *Cardo III* and the *Decumanus Maximus*. This has major implications for the consensus view that all **augustales* held Roman citizenship. Neither of the documents that record Venidius Ennychus prove that Herculanean *augustales* had to be Roman citizens, nor that others (e.g. Junian Latins, see below) were excluded from this honour.

We find ourselves in a rather curious situation: the academic consensus on the civic status of Italian **augustales* seems to be based on a broadly refuted interpretation of five documents concerning one exceptional case. The presumed generalised Roman citizenship of Italian **augustales* was never questioned.⁽²²⁾ Since the interpretation of this set of Herculanean sources has to be refuted, what information remains on the civic status of **augustales*?

This paper addresses three questions: (1) What (potential) evidence do we have for the civic status of Italian **augustales*? (2) How do we evaluate and work with the information and figures obtained in this? (3) If only some of the **augustales* were Roman citizens, did this offer them a competitive advantage vis-à-vis their fellow **augustales* who were not, and is this recorded in epigraphy?

(19) WALLACE-HADRILL, 2011b, p. 138: ‘There must have been at least six panels, each measuring about 3x5 Roman feet; there was space for three columns of names on each panel, each about sixty-six names long. Six panels with 200 names each suggest 1,200 names, and of course there is no guarantee that there were no other panels.’

(20) This is the estimate of Camodeca, based on an analogy with the *Tab. Herc.* (CAMODECA, 2008, p. 87-103.) Wallace-Hadrill agreed on this figure of 4,000 – 5,000 inhabitants for Herculaneum (WALLACE-HADRILL, 2011b, p. 138.) Because of the partial excavation of the site, all estimates of the size of the city population cannot be more than educated guesses. Many variables remain unknown: there are doubts about the northern limits of the city, the forum was not excavated, and it is unclear whether there was a *suburbium* or not (WALLACE-HADRILL, 2011a, p. 121-160.). On the size of cities, roman city populations, and urbanization rates for a wide range of provinces, see WILSON, 2011, p. 161-195.

(21) PAGANO, 2000, p. 86; PESANDO, 2003, p. 331-337; WALLACE-HADRILL, 2004, p. 109-126; 2011a, p. 138-143; CAMODECA, 2008, p. 87-103.

(22) The argument that Ennychus was an *augustalis* and Roman citizen was repeated in 2005 by Butterworth and Laurence in their book on Pompeii (p. 190-191, reprinted in 2011, and the passage on Ennychus was unchanged), and even in the 2014 edition of the Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy (p. 313). It must be noted that Janon argued in 1994 that an exceptional situation presented itself in first century Nîmes. Based on the strange nomenclature of four individuals, that seems to copy the Celtic naming system (personal name followed by a genitive of the father’s name), commonly associated with *peregrini*, he concluded that ‘[l]a présence à Nîmes d’affranchis de pègrins parmi les sévirs augustaux indique que la citoyenneté romaine n’a pas été une exigence universelle de recrutement, au moins au I^{er} siècle.’ (p. 81)

Evidence

What proof do we have for the Roman citizenship of **augustales*? In the first section, I review two positions that were connected to the imperial level of governance: imperial freedmen and *accensi*. The second section focuses on onomastic data gained from inscriptions: *tria nomina*, *tribus* indications, patrilineality, and filiation.

Imperial Power

Two questions are addressed here. Were imperial freedmen (and their descendants) Roman citizens? Can this be conjectured of *accensi* as well? No grants of citizenship to Italian **augustales* are known, which is perhaps an *ex silentio* argument – though purely conjectural – in favour of their universal Roman citizenship.

*

Imperial freedmen and descendants – There were three prerequisites for formal manumission: (1) the slave must be over thirty years old, (2) the owner must be over twenty years old, and (3) the slave must be freed *vindicta*, *censu*, or *ex testamento*.⁽²³⁾ In cases where either the slave was younger than stipulated or where the freedom was granted informally (e.g. *inter amicos*),⁽²⁴⁾ the slave did not acquire Roman citizenship but instead became a Junian Latin.⁽²⁵⁾ Roman citizenship could be accorded to this freedman at a later date, by means of a formal re-manumission, a so-called *iteratio*, when the freedman reached the age of thirty.⁽²⁶⁾

Imperial freedmen were a crucial part of the imperial bureaucracy. They were an ‘élite status-group in the slave-freedman section of Roman imperial society’.⁽²⁷⁾ Their former master, the Emperor, held the highest authority in the Empire and he could easily free his slaves formally. If the slaves were younger than thirty, an *iteratio* would be easily accessible. Therefore, I suggest that all imperial freedmen were Roman citizens, as were their descendants. We know of ten imperial freedmen who were **augustales* in Italian cities.⁽²⁸⁾

Names that include the *praenomen* and *nomen* of Emperors without specifying a *libertinatio*, like *Augusti-* or *Caesaris libertus*, cannot be taken

(23) Gai., *Inst.* I, 17.

(24) If the owner was not over twenty years old, the manumission was invalid and the slave remained a slave.

(25) See below for a more elaborate discussion of this status and its implications.

(26) Gai., *Inst.* I, 35.

(27) WEAVER, 1967, p. 5.

(28) *AE* 2005, 440; *CIL* V, 3404; IX, 344 (= ERCanosa 52 = D 5188); 3432; *CIL* XI, 3200 (= D 89); 3805 (= D 6579); *CIL* XIV, 2977 (= D 5194 = *SEG* 51, 1429); 4254 (= InscrIt 4-1, 254 = D 5191); *AE* 1902, 78 (=EE 9, 606); *Suplt*-5-RI, 16 (= *AE* 1975, 289 = *AE* 1995, 367).

as proof that these men were imperial freedmen.⁽²⁹⁾ Although Christol suggests the name ‘Iulius’ refers to the Augustan period, or at least to the first century,⁽³⁰⁾ the name could have been passed on from father to son for generations before it ended up in our epigraphic corpus. **Augustales* who bore imperial *nomina* (‘Caius Iulius’, ‘Tiberius Claudius’, ‘Titus Flavius’, or ‘Marcus Aurelius’) were not necessarily imperial freedmen. In many cases they were their descendants.

If, however, imperial freedmen acquired Roman citizenship, it stands to reason that their descendants were Roman citizens as well. Therefore, the **augustales* whose names are the *praenomen* and *nomen* of an Emperor, would be classified as Roman citizens. In total, thirty-one Italian inscriptions attest individual **augustales* bearing such imperial *nomina*: fifteen Cai Iulii, eleven Tiberi Claudii, and five Titi Flavii.⁽³¹⁾ These men were descendants of freedmen of the emperors Augustus, Claudius or Nero, and Vespasianus, Titus, or Domitianus respectively.

*

Accensi – Some **augustales* took up the office of *accensus*. Although *accensi* can be classified as magisterial *apparitores*, the status of an *accensus* was lower than that of the ‘real’ *apparitores*, who formed the *ordo scribarum*, *ordo lictorum*, *ordo viatorum* and *ordo praeconum*. Nevertheless, since the *accensi* served consuls and praetors, in Cicero’s description of Verres’ staff in Sicily, the *accensi* were listed in second place, after the *scribae*, but before the *lictore*s, *viatores* and *praecones*.⁽³²⁾ What an *accensus* lacked was the permanence of position (as soon as the magistrate resigned after his year of service, the *accensus* followed suit) and full public status (not appointed by the state and without a colleague).⁽³³⁾ As Cohen observed, the *accensus* ‘is a freed slave – in most cases the private freedman of the magistrate whom he had served all the years, and thus of course also during that year in which his patron won a consulate or praetorship’.⁽³⁴⁾ Again, it seems logical that these freedman *accensi*, who played a part in the entourage of high-end magistrates and who had to be able to act on behalf of their master, would have been freed formally and at the proper age and thus giving them Roman citizenship.

(29) WEAVER, 1972, p. 11: ‘The mere possession of an Imperial *nomen* (e.g. Iulius, Claudius), in the absence of other positive evidence, does not constitute a reason for inclusion.’

(30) CHRISTOL, 1992, p. 188.

(31) **Cai Iulii**: *AE* 1967, 60; 1988, 206; 2007, 565; *CIL* V, 3405; 4431 (= *InscrIt*-10-5, 821); IX, 20; 319 (= *ERCanosa* 57); 4692; X, 1879; 3948; XI, 128; XIV, 369; *D* 6500; *InscrIt*-10-1, 679; *SupIt*-5-S, 19 (= *AE* 1988, 448 = *AE* 1990, 238). **Tiberi Claudii**: *AE* 1981, 247 (= *AE* 1993, 537 = *AE* 1997, 372); *AE* 1998, 286; 1982, 165; *CIL* V, 3406; 4405 (= *InscrIt*-10-5, 199 = *D* 06721a); *CIL* IX, 4690; X, 6112; XIV, 329; 330; 386; 3656 (= *InscrIt*-4-1, 211 = *D* 6238); **Titi Flavii**: *AE* 1927, 128; *CIL* IX, 3681; 4696; *IETraiana*-A, 18 (= *AE* 1972, 140); *Paestum* 89 (= *AE* 1975, 253).

(32) Cic., 2 *Verr.* III, 154.

(33) COHEN, 1984, p. 23-60, 35, 37-38.

(34) COHEN, 1984, p. 37.

Eight inscriptions attest **augustales* who were *accensi*, linking them to important (equestrian or even senatorial) families.⁽³⁵⁾ The position of *accensus* was open to all well-connected and wealthy freedmen. **Augustales* would have been selected because of their wealth (economic capital), network connections (social capital), and proven reliability expressed by the **augustalitas* title (symbolic capital),⁽³⁶⁾ which implied an active involvement in the social and economic fabric of the city. Only a few **augustales* were sufficiently well connected to become *accensi* – a clear indication of an enormous differentiation in the ‘career paths’ of **augustales*.

Onomastics

This second section is based on onomastic evidence. All the below discussions are based on an epigraphic corpus of 1215 inscriptions, which attest 1325 individuals. For 1217 of these individuals, we know at least a part of their names. The other 108 are anonymous. The geographical spread is enormous: these 1215 texts stem from no less than 355 cities. Many cities produced few attestations of **augustales*. In fact, 31 cities account for 694 of the inscriptions, in each of the remaining 324 cities less than ten records of **augustales* are preserved.

*

‘Unlike the average man in the freeborn population, they had something to record [...]. The freedmen had won the *tria nomina* of the Roman citizen, and the inscription of their names is, I suggest, a memorial of their citizenship.’⁽³⁷⁾

Tria nomina – Practically all (freeborn and freed) **augustales* bear the *tria nomina*, but this is an ambiguous indication of citizenship – something on which Taylor did not elaborate in the above quotation. Informal manumission created neither citizens nor slaves. Since a *Lex Iunia* had given informally manumitted freedmen Latin status in 17 B.C., they were known as ‘Junian Latins’, *Latini Iuniani*. The fifth century Christian author Salvianus claimed that ‘the Junian lives like a free man, but dies as a slave’.⁽³⁸⁾ Often repeated,

(35) *AE* 1904, 186; *CIL* V, 3120 (= *AE* 1997, 716); 3354 (= *D* 1950); 8142 (= *InscrIt*-10-1, 114); X, 531 (= *InscrIt*-1-1, 11 = *D* 3593); 1889 (= *Venafrum*-A, 5); 5185; *InscrAq*-1, 516 (= *IEAquil* 64).

(36) BOURDIEU, 1979, p. 128-144. The capital metaphor refers to the co-existence of economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital. These different forms of capital are convertible, which allows material forms of capital – economic in the restricted sense – to be presented as immaterial forms of social, cultural or symbolic capital and vice versa. Economic capital is crucial as the necessary basis for a potential transubstantiation into higher forms of capital. Social capital ranks higher, but the most powerful conversion to be made is to symbolic capital, for it is in this form that the different forms of capital are perceived and recognised as legitimate.

(37) TAYLOR, 1961, p. 129-130.

(38) Salv., *Ad Eccl.* III,7,34: *Ita ergo et tu religiosos filios tuos quasi Latinos iubes esse libertos, ut vivant scilicet quasi ingenui et moriantur ut servi [...]* (G. Lagarrigue, *Sources Chrétiennes* (1971)).

this quotation summarises what Gaius wrote in the second century: these freedmen equated their status to that of freeborn Roman colonial Latins.⁽³⁹⁾ We know, *inter alia*, from a letter Plinius wrote to Emperor Trajanus in A.D. 111 that these Junian Latins were permitted to bear the *tria nomina*.⁽⁴⁰⁾ In short, this Roman naming practice does not offer any conclusive proof: it is possible that **augustales* who bore the *tria nomina* were Roman citizens, but it is in fact equally possible that they were informally freed Junian Latins.⁽⁴¹⁾

*

Tribus – the indication of a *tribus*, a Roman voting district, is without doubt a mark of Roman citizenship and an essential part of the citizen's official name.⁽⁴²⁾ From the beginning of the Empire onward, indications of tribe became increasingly rare.⁽⁴³⁾

Most of the *tribus* indications are recorded in inscriptions of *seviri augustales* (48%) and *augustales* (26%). These percentages are in line with the general spread of these titles throughout Italy (almost 65% and just over 28% respectively). *Tribus* indications simply occurred more often among *seviri augustales* because this variety of the **augustalitas* was more common. There is great diversity in the geographical spread of these inscriptions.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Among the Italian **augustales* whose tribe is known (most of whom come from northern Italy), the number of *ingenui* is seven and a half times higher than average:⁽⁴⁵⁾ thirty-six out of forty-six (or just over 78%) were freeborn **augustales*, eight were freedmen and two were *incerti*.⁽⁴⁶⁾

It would seem that all Italian **augustales* who belonged to the Palatina tribe were freedmen, and all who were part of the Camilia, Menenia, Oufentina, and Stellatina tribes were freeborn. Perhaps the Fabia tribe counted only *ingenui*, but the status of two of the **augustales* is uncertain. This is consistent with the divide found in Italian communities: the urban *tribus* Palatina enlisted the *liberti*; the rural tribes counted the *ingenui* among their ranks. Since **augustales* were mostly freedmen, their presence in the Palatina tribe is hardly surprising; freedmen, illegitimate sons and men under a penalty were mostly assigned to an urban tribe.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Enrolment in the *tribus* Palatina was 'one of the enduring indicators of freed slave status'.⁽⁴⁸⁾

(39) Gai., *Inst.* III, 56: [...] *atque si essent cives Romani ingenui qui ex urbe Roma in Latinas colonias deducti latini coloniarii esse coeperunt.*

(40) Plin., *Epist.* X, 104: *Valerius, domine, Paulinus excepto Paulino ius Latinorum suorum mihi reliquit; ex quibus rogo tribus interim ius Quiritium des. Vereor enim, ne sit immodicum pro omnibus pariter invocare indulgentiam tuam, qua debeo tanto modestius uti, quanto pleniorum experior. Sunt autem pro quibus peto: C. Valerius Astraeus, C. Valerius Dionysius, C. Valerius Aper.* (cf. SHERWIN-WHITE, 1966, p. 714-715).

(41) WEAVER, 2001, p. 102-104.

(42) TAYLOR, 1960, p. 12.

(43) WEAVER, 1990, p. 291; BARJA DE QUIROGA, 1998, p. 144.

(44) See appendix 1.1.

(45) Following Duthoy's percentage of about 10% *ingenui* among **augustales*. See DUTHOY, 1974, p. 136.

(46) See appendix 1.2.

(47) TAYLOR, 1960, p. 11.

(48) STEWART, 2013, p. 6854.

Thus, briefly put, most of the recorded *tribus* affiliations were of freeborn **augustales* from northern Italy. In the corpus of Italian **augustales* studied here, forty-six inscriptions mention the *tribus* of an **augustalis*. Only four can be dated – three to the first century and one to the third century.⁽⁴⁹⁾

*

Patrilineality? – When can we assume that an **augustalis* was a Roman citizen based purely on either the name he bore himself, or the name(s) his child(ren) took? If an **augustalis* took the name of his father, or if the son or daughter of an **augustalis* was named after his or her father, this indicates that the **augustalis* or his children respectively, were Roman citizens. In all other cases, a child took the name of the mother. If in one of these cases the mother was a Roman citizen, so would be the child. The father would have no *patria potestas* over the child, since he was not a Roman citizen. In other words: if an **augustalis* took the name of his mother, he would be a Roman citizen if she recorded a freeborn *filiatio* or if she was a Roman citizen married to Latin or *peregrinus*.⁽⁵⁰⁾ However, in another scenario, if a Roman citizen married a *Latina*, their children would follow the status of the mother, since she did not have *conubium*, and therefore neither the marriage nor the children were legitimate.

When reviewing the 1215 inscriptions of individual Italian **augustales*, ninety nine inscriptions record ninety eight family relations⁽⁵¹⁾ from which we can deduce that the family members involved were Roman citizens. In eight inscriptions, the father or both of the **augustalis*' parents are recorded and the patrilineality is clear. In all of these cases, the **augustalis* took the name of his father.⁽⁵²⁾ Although generally speaking most **augustales* were born as a slave, and were therefore not under the *patria potestas* of their natural father, none of the cases presented here concern libertine **augustales*. All eight record a freeborn filiation.⁽⁵³⁾ In the large majority of cases, i.e. in ninety one inscriptions, sons or daughters of **augustales* are recorded.⁽⁵⁴⁾ These children all took the *nomen* of their father. In over one third of these inscriptions (thirty eight in total), we also know who the wife of the **augustalis* was. In none of these cases did a child take the name of the mother, demonstrating the patrilineality even more clearly.

(49) First: *InscrAqu*-1, 522; *AE* 1976, 207; 1980, 489. Third: *CIL* XIV, 2972.

(50) Since the reign of Hadrian, a child of a Roman woman would always be a Roman citizen. Gai., *Inst.* 1,30 and 1,80; *Tit. Ulp.* 3,3.

(51) The *augustalis* L. Rennius L.l. Philodoxus and his son L. Rennius Proculus are recorded twice; once in Salernum (*CIL* X, 541) and once in Ostia Antica (*CIL* XIV, 407). The inscriptions are identical.

(52) *CIL* V, 2521 (Ateste, Venetia et Histria); 4456 (Brixia, Venetia et Histria); 7168 (Taurinorum, Transpadana); 7670 (Augusta Bagiennorum, Liguria); 7678 (Augusta Bagiennorum, Liguria); *InscrIt* 10-5-215 (Brixia, Venetia et Histria).

(53) Five other inscriptions attest identical naming practices, but since I cannot be sure of the legal status of the **augustales* mentioned (they were *incerti*), I chose not to include them in this paper. These are: *AE* 1994, 346 (Lanuvium, Latium et Campania); *CIL* V, 5286 (Comum, Transpadana); XI, 1445 (Pisae, Etruria); *AE* 2001, 686 (Ostia Antica, Latium et Campania); *CIL* IX, 4901 (Trebula Mutuesca, Samnium).

(54) See appendix 2.

We can be certain that the **augustales* named in these ninety nine inscriptions were Roman citizens. In all other cases, the situation is unclear. Sometimes the father and mother of an **augustalis* had the same name (as *colliberti*). It is uncertain whether the children took the name of the father or whether we are dealing with matrilineality or with a family freed by the same patron, all of whom took the patron's name. One example is the case of L. Titedius Valentinus from Alba Fucens, Samnium.⁽⁵⁵⁾ This *sevir augustalis* was married to Titedia Venusta, and they had two children, L. Titedius Valentinus and Titedia Fucentia. No *libertinatio* or *filiatio* is given and although the children may have taken the name of the father, it is impossible to know for certain. Whether Titedia Fucentia gave her name to these children or whether their common patron did, the onomastic result would be identical. Therefore, I have not taken these inscriptions into account. In other cases the names of the parents or children of an **augustales* were simply not given. Also the fragmentary preservation of many inscriptions impedes further research.

Some inscriptions name two individuals who may have been father and son but the family relation is not stated explicitly. An example of such a situation is that of C. Pomponius C.l. Phileros, a *sevir augustalis* at Capua and the *decurio* C. Pomponius C.f. Teretina Capito.⁽⁵⁶⁾ It would fit a general pattern that the son of a freed *sevir augustalis* was a freeborn city councillor but since the familial link is not stated explicitly, I have also not taken into account this and other similar inscriptions.⁽⁵⁷⁾

*

Filiatio – After the Social War (90 B.C.), the *lex Iulia de civitate latinis danda* gave Roman citizenship to all freeborn Italians south of the Po.⁽⁵⁸⁾ In 49 B.C. Caesar conferred Roman citizenship on Cisalpine Gaul north of the Po,⁽⁵⁹⁾ so by Augustus' time Italy south of the Alps was unified under Roman citizenship. Therefore, in Italy the *filiatio* (e.g. *Luci filius*) was a marker of free birth, Roman citizenship and also a marker of the formal status of the marriage of the freeborn person's parents.⁽⁶⁰⁾ In other words, all the Italian **augustales ingenui* were Roman citizens. Thirty-four Italian **augustales* recorded a *filiatio* but did not mention a *tribus* affiliation, nor were they imperial freedmen, nor could we deduce Roman citizenship based on the patrilineality of their name. The *filiatio* is, for these thirty-four inscriptions, the only indication of their Roman citizenship that we have.⁽⁶¹⁾

(55) *CIL* IX, 3984.

(56) *CIL* X, 3919.

(57) Other examples of such inscriptions: *CIL* V, 336; 827; *CIL* IX, 816; 1694; 3942; *CIL* XIV, 417 etc.

(58) Appianus, *Bell. Civ.*, I, 4; Cic., *Balb.*, 8, 21; Velleius Paterculus, II, 16; 20.

(59) Dio, XLI, 36.

(60) I follow Weaver (1990, p. 286), who convincingly argued, based on a study of 300 families, that 'use of filiation, with or without tribe, by children [...] is probably an indication of citizen status used also to suggest the formal status of the parents' marriage.'

(61) *AE* 1961, 153; 1982, 178; 362; 1988, 565; 1993, 477; 1996, 295; 2004, 518; 2008, 475; *CIL* V, 3272; 3281; 3295; 3385; 3389; 3437; 4423; 5874; 6905; IX, 2704; 3182; 4124; 3904; *CIL* XI, 1161; 1162; 1225; 1939; 2631; 3011; 5426; 6126; 7484; 7831; XIV, 2637; 3014; *EE-8-1*, 236.

Another argument for the Roman citizenship of **augustales* in the provinces could be put forward: their involvement in the associations of Roman citizens known as the *conventus civium Romanorum*. These were absent from Italy, but six **augustales*, four from Germania Superior, two from Aquitania, are recorded as *curatores civium Romanorum*, i.e. heads of the association of Roman citizens.⁽⁶²⁾

Interpretation and Problems

Previously, the view that **augustales* held Roman citizenship was inferred from the three documents' that record the case of one individual (L. Venidius Ennychus). The conclusion was then generalised to fit the whole range of officers and associations of **augustales* (with an asterisk), a shorthand term first introduced by Duthoy. Although the value of these documents for the discussion of the civic status of **augustales* was dismissed, the presumed Roman citizenship of **augustales* inferred from them was not. Above, I have reviewed a number of epigraphically recorded aspects that may corroborate the theory that **augustales* held Roman citizenship. Perhaps an overview of the obtained figures is in order, so these can be evaluated more easily.

Imperial organisation	
Imperial freedmen and descendants	42
<i>Accensi</i>	8
Onomastics	
<i>Tria nomina</i>	(irrelevant)
<i>Tribus</i>	46
Patriliniality	99
<i>Filiatio</i>	34
Total	229

In total, we are fairly certain of 229 Italian **augustales* who were Roman citizens. We can reasonably calculate, therefore, that at least one in five Italian **augustales* held Roman citizenship.⁽⁶³⁾ However, we now come to the most speculative point of this paper. *If not all *augustales were Roman citizens, what is the alternative? Could *augustales have held Latin citizenship or Junian Latin citizenship?*

As discussed in the section on the reliability of *tria nomina* as an indication of Roman citizenship, a *Lex Iunia* dated to 17 B.C. gave informally freed individuals the status of 'Junian Latins'. Although they could use the

(62) *AE* 1946, 255 (Lousanna, Germania Superior); *CIL* XIII, 5026 (Lousanna, Germania Superior); *AE* 1976, 326 (Aventicum, Germania Superior); *CIL* XIII, 11478 (Aventicum, Germania Superior); *CIL* XIII, 1048 (= *CIL* XIII, 1074) (Mediolanum Santonum, Aquitania); *CIL* XIII, 1194 (Avaricum, Aquitania).

(63) Based on a corpus of 1215 inscriptions, 18,8% of **augustales* (n= 229) held Roman citizenship.

tria nomina, normally the mark of citizenship, they were not citizens. The informal nature of the manumission still had its consequences: when a Junian Latin died, the full inheritance went to his former master. In the *Institutiones* of Justinianus, the phrasing was almost poetic: as soon as a Junian Latin had drawn his last breath, he lost both his life and his freedom.⁽⁶⁴⁾

There are, however, two elements recorded in the epigraphic sources that suggest that **augustales* were *not* Junians: 1° their right to inherit and draw up testaments, and 2° their right to honorary tokens of office, so-called *insignia*.

Testaments and heirs

Gaius informs us that (under normal conditions)⁽⁶⁵⁾ Junian Latins could neither inherit nor make a testament, nor act as direct heirs or legatees. They did have the right to accept an inheritance under the terms of a trust (*fideicommissum*).⁽⁶⁶⁾ It was forbidden for a Junian Latin to make a will, to be included in the will of another, or to be appointed testamentary guardian.⁽⁶⁷⁾ This is a strong argument for **augustales* not being *Juniani*: Junian Latins could not inherit or draw up a testament but we know that **augustales* could.

First of all, the biography of Petronius' Trimalchio offers the best-known indication that it was common for **augustales* to act as heirs for their masters. Towards the end of the *Cena*, Trimalchio tells his guests how his master made him 'joint residuary legatee with Caesar'. This inheritance of 'an estate fit for a senator' was the basis of his wealth.⁽⁶⁸⁾

Secondly, thirty-seven inscriptions of individual **augustales* record a *testamentum*.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Thirty-six of these cases relate to a will drafted by the **augustalis* himself. In one instance, the **augustalis* was made an heir by testament.

Thirdly, forty other inscriptions record an heir (*heres*).⁽⁷⁰⁾ Only in one inscription is an *augustalis* named as one of two heirs responsible for erecting a grave monument. In thirteen cases, the heir (or heirs) of an Italian or Gallic **augustalis* is (are) named and was (were) made responsible for erecting a grave monument or tomb. The phrase found in these texts would either be *heres ponendum curavit* or *heredes ponendum curaverunt*. Another twenty-six inscriptions stipulate that the grave monument or tomb will not go to

(64) *Inst. Just.*, III, 7, 4: *qui licet ut liberi vitam suam peragebant, attamen ipso ultimo spiritu simul animam atque libertatem amittebant, et quasi servorum ita bona eorum iure quodammodo peculii ex lege Iunia manumissores detinebant.*

(65) In some cases a Junian Latin can make a will or inherit, but only if he becomes a Roman citizen. *Tit. Ulp.* 22, 3.: *Latinus Iunianus si quidem mortis testatoris tempore vel intra diem cretionis civis Romanus sit, heres esse potest: quod si Latinus manserit, lege Iunia capere hereditatem prohibetur.*

(66) *Gai.*, *Inst.* 1, 24: *Quod autem diximus ex testamento eos capere non posse, ita intellegemus, ne quid directo hereditatis legatorumque nomine eos posse capere dicamus; alioquin per fideicommissum capere possunt.*

(67) *Gai.*, *Inst.* 1, 23: *Non tamen illis permittit lex Iunia uel ipsis testamentum facere, uel ex testamento alieno capere, uel tutores testamento dari.*

(68) *Petron.*, 76: *Coheredem me Caesari fecit, et accepi patrimonium laticlavi.*

(69) See appendix 3.

(70) *Ibid.*

the heir of the deceased **augustalis*; *h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equetur)*. On average, 7% (n=1215) of the Italian individual **augustales* mention profiting from or making a testament or record being or having an heir.

Insignia

Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis* and a study of the reliefs found on funerary monuments strongly suggest that magisterial *insignia* were accorded to **augustales* who took up the yearly office in their cities.⁽⁷¹⁾

First of all, the *lictors* and *fasces* that are represented on a number of tombs of **augustales* were *insignia potestatis*, important and awe-inspiring symbols of power.⁽⁷²⁾ Schäfer considered lictors as 'ancillary staff' (Hilfspersonal) that lent the *fasces* arms and legs whilst escorting magistrates.⁽⁷³⁾ The right to have *lictors* and the meaning of the *fasces* they carried reflected the official status of the office. Also, the fact that **augustales* in office had *lictors* confirms that the office holders were appointed by the city council. *Insignia* expressed the official authority vested in them, authority created by their appointment. An association could not do this. It was perhaps this expression of magisterial *potestas* that explains in part the attractiveness and endurance of the **augustalitas*?

Secondly, wearing a *toga praetexta* was 'respectability on display' in the strictest sense. For Romans, 'differences in gender, age, class, political status, and religious role were often immediately visible from the type, colour, and decoration of their garments alone'.⁽⁷⁴⁾ It was a very visible element that distinguished those who had obtained the right to wear this toga from those who had not.

Finally, the *sella curulis* and the privilege of *bisellium* should be sharply distinguished from one another. *Bisellium* allowed someone to use a type of chair during public occasions (e.g. festivals and games) that took the space of two regular chairs, hence the name *bi-sella*. This was not an officially recognised magisterial *insigne* but a privilege that could also be accorded to *collegiati* for instance – as is elaborately attested in the epigraphic record.⁽⁷⁵⁾ It was, as Laird argued, 'bestowed to recognize an extraordinary act of civic

(71) See DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1268 for an overview of the evidence and some references to (partially outdated) studies. For the most recent discussion of the frequency and regional use of *insignia* on tombs of **augustales*, see Laird 2015, p. 41-69.

(72) DROGULA 2007, p. 432-433; SCHÄFER, 1989, p. 209.

(73) SCHÄFER, 1989, p. 206.

(74) DEBROHUN, 2001, p. 20-21.

(75) Specifically for **augustales* from Italy, twelve inscriptions attest the *bisellium*: *CIL IX*, 741 (= *ELarino* 16) (Larinum, Samnium); *CIL IX*, 2249 (= *EAOR*-3, 32 = *AE* 2006, 359) (Telesia, Samnium); *CIL IX*, 2475 (= *D* 5583) (Saepinum, Samnium); *ELarino* 84 (= *AE* 1966, 75) (Larinum, Samnium); *CIL IX*, 3524 (Furfo, Samnium); *CIL X*, 1026 (= *D* 6372) (Pompeii, Latium et Campania); *CIL X*, 1030 (= *D* 6373) (Pompeii, Latium et Campania); *CIL X*, 1217 (= *D* 5651) (Abella, Latium et Campania); *CIL X*, 4760 (= *D* 6296) (Suessa Aurunca, Latium et Campania); *D* 6500 (Beneventum, Apulia et Calabria); *Latium* 60 (= *AE* 1996, 374) (Minturnae, Latium et Campania); *CIL V*, 7618 (= *InscrIt*-9-1, 131) (Pollentia, Liguria). Ten out of these thirteen record some form of benefactions, five give a reason for the *bisellium* privilege: *ob munificentia* or *ob merita*.

beneficence that surpassed normal expectations'.⁽⁷⁶⁾ The *sella curulis* on the other hand, was a symbol of the *potestas* (and for the consuls and the praetors also of *imperium*) of the magistrate. The folding stool itself was encrusted with precious ivory.⁽⁷⁷⁾ The curule chairs were instrumental in putting everyone's position in the social hierarchy on display during public events: at a glance one could see who was in charge in the city.⁽⁷⁸⁾

The *Cena Trimalchionis* confirms that **augustales* in office were entitled to *insignia*. Many scholars have discussed these passages at length:⁽⁷⁹⁾ three fragments merit attention. First of all, when the main characters of the *Satyrica*, Encolpius, Ascyltos and Giton enter Trimalchio's house, the narrator describes the mural in the hallway. Encolpius finds one feature astonishing: at the entrance of the dining room, 'rods and axes [were] fixed on the doorposts' – i.e. *fasces* with an axe.⁽⁸⁰⁾ Secondly, when Trimalchio's friend Habinnas arrives, a *lictor* knocks at the door. When the party enters, the toga worn by Habinnas stuns the drunken narrator of the story, Encolpius, who mistook Habinnas for a *praetor*.⁽⁸¹⁾ Thirdly, the part of the text in which Trimalchio describes his funerary monument – which precedes the sickening scenes in which he shows his guests his funeral robes and forces them to imagine they are in fact attending his funeral – offers some additional information. He explains to his friend, the building contractor Habinnas, that he wants to be depicted on his grave monument 'sitting in official robes on my official seat', and Petronius lets him use the word *praetextatus* here.⁽⁸²⁾

Duthoy gave a very brief evaluation of the matter: the badges of honour emphasised all the more the official nature of the position, and increased their resemblance to the municipal magistrates and decurions.⁽⁸³⁾ Kleijwegt argued that *insignia* were not at all an 'empty honour'. They could be used 'to increase the number of *munera*-performers, to provide extra income for

(76) LAIRD, 2015, p. 43.

(77) SCHÄFER, 1989, p. 48-50.

(78) This preoccupation with distinguishing social classes (*discrimina ordinum*) culminated in the *Lex Iulia de Theatralis* that stipulated seating of the orders in the theatres. Suetonius (*Aug.* 40.) refers to the reserved seating arrangements in (amphi) theatres. See also RAWSON, 1987, p. 83-114.

(79) EGGER, 1844, p. 45-50; MOURLOT, 1895, p. 91-112; VON PREMERSTEIN, 1895, p. 848; TAYLOR, 1914, p. 231-232, 238, 244; NOCK, 1934, p. 629-630; ETIENNE, 1958, p. 279; ALFÖLDY, 1958, p. 435-436; TUDOR, 1962, p. 208; DUTHOY, 1974, p. 145-147, 149, 152-153; 1978, p. 1266-1270, 1281-1282; AUSBÜTTEL, 1982, p. 254-255; CHRISTOL, GASCOU and JANON, 1987, p. 394-395; RODÀ, 1992, p. 400-404; ABRAMENKO, 1993, p. 142; ZEVI, 2000, p. 61; JORDÁN, 2003, p. 541; TRAN, 2006, p. 157, 175 -188, 219, 229; MOURITSSEN, 2006, p. 245-248; CORAZZA, 2010, p. 233-240; AMIRI, 2010, p. 97, p. 99.

(80) Petron., 30: [...] *in postibus triclinii fasces erant cum securibus fixi* [...].

(81) Petron., 65: *Inter haec triclinii valvas licitor percussit, amictusque veste alba cum ingenti frequentia comissator intravit. Ego maiestate conterritus praetorem putabam venisse.*

(82) Petron., 71: [...] *et me in tribunali sedentem praetextatum.*

(83) DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1268: 'Les insignes auxquels les *seviri augustales* avaient droit mettaient encore plus en lumière la position officielle qu'occupaient les *seviri augustales* dans leur cité, et augmentaient leur ressemblance avec les décurions et magistrats municipaux.'

the public treasury and to speed up a career to bypass imperial decrees'.⁽⁸⁴⁾ In sum, he evaluated *ornamenta* and *honores* as an opportunity for some social strata to use their economic capital to make a name for themselves. He did not stress the honourable side of *ornamenta* but instead stressed the way they were used as instruments for economic purposes.⁽⁸⁵⁾ Laird, on the other hand, focuses on the 'demography of use' of *insignia* on funerary monuments and the use of such imagery on tombs as part of a larger monumental context – or, as she calls it 'grammar of representation'.⁽⁸⁶⁾

These magisterial *insignia* profiled **augustales* in office (and by extension the association they could join as former officers) as powerful players in local society and were a confirmation of their integration in that society. This makes it unlikely that these men were of an inferior civic status, i.e. Junian Latins. This is reinforced by the evidence of **augustales* acting as heirs or drawing up testaments.

Competitive advantages

If we were to assume that Roman citizenship was *not* generalised among **augustales*, would it have offered a competitive advantage to those **augustales* who were Roman citizens? Was Roman citizenship a 'strategic market asset', which gave these **augustales* a head start when it came to socio-economic interaction (i.e. network building)?

Latin inscriptions record a plethora of specialised professions, magistracies, functions in private *collegia* and privileges or honours attained, which also allowed members of the lower strata to describe and affirm their social status as minutely as possible. Is there a marked difference between privileges or titles recorded by **augustales* with confirmed Roman citizenship and those of which we are not sure? I take into account a number of 'markers': collegiate titles such as the *quinquennialitas*, curatorship and *duplicarius*, magisterial titles such as *primus*, *iterum* or *bis*, *perpetuus*, *honoratus* and other honours or positions, such as a public funeral, *gratuitas*, the accordeance of a plot of public land, *ornamenta*, *bisellium*, attestations of professions and benefactions.

Within the association of **augustales*, the highest profile title is undoubtedly the *quinquennialitas*. These collegiate *quinquennales* differ from *duumviri quinquennales*, not appointed for just one year, but for a five-year term.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Sometimes, someone could even be named *quinquennalis* for life and add *perpetuus* to his title. According to Duthoy, *curatores* ranked just below the *quinquennales*,⁽⁸⁸⁾ and epigraphic evidence indicates that the curatorship was taken up before one could obtain the *quinquennialitas*. *Curatores* could be appointed for several years but could also be named for life (*per-*

(84) KLEIJWEGT, 1992, p. 131.

(85) KLEIJWEGT, 1992, p. 133.

(86) LAIRD 2015, p. 46, 48.

(87) ROYDEN, 1988, p. 14; LASSÈRE, 2005, p. 479-480.

(88) DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1276.

petuus) as can be seen on the first *album* from Liternum.⁽⁸⁹⁾ *Duplicarii* were members of the association of **augustales* who were entitled to a double share of *sportulae* or other gifts.⁽⁹⁰⁾

The title *primus* or *primi* is generally agreed to be an indication of chronology rather than of a prominent position (*primus inter pares*). It should be understood as *augustalis anni primi*.⁽⁹¹⁾ *Iterum* or *bis* indicated that this person had taken up the magistracy not once but twice.⁽⁹²⁾ Nomination for life was expressed by the phrase *augustalis perpetuus*, disproving the hypothesis that perpetuity was standard procedure.⁽⁹³⁾ These positions *never* referred to the association but *always* to the one-year office. *Collegia* sometimes used the term *honoratus* to refer to their officials and in some cases *honoratus* designates an honoured *collegiatus*.⁽⁹⁴⁾ It seems that *honoratus* could be equivalent to *factus* or *creatus*, expressing an honorary appointment of an officer by decree of the city council, rather than it being an additional privilege.⁽⁹⁵⁾ The expression *gratuitus*, or a variant, is not found that often, since it was an exceptionally rare privilege. It meant that someone, in this case an **augustalis*, was appointed or accorded some special position without involving a return benefit, compensation or consideration: for instance exemption from payment of the *summa honoraria*.⁽⁹⁶⁾

Honores outside of the collegiate or magisterial mechanisms could include a public funeral, the *ornamenta decurionalia*, the accordance of a plot of public land, *bisellium*, positions in other *collegia*, record of a profession or benefactions.

*

Was Roman citizenship a ‘strategic market asset’? Not that we can establish, based on our corpus of Italian inscriptions. Comparing the corpus of confirmed citizen **augustales* to that of those whose civic status we could not determine with certainty, the percentages of *quinquennales*, curators and *duplicarii* are very similar. Also all of the ‘magisterial’ titles are equally well represented among confirmed citizen **augustales* as throughout the rest of the corpus. Perhaps only the *primi* were better attested among the corpus of citizens (1,7% vs. 0,5%) but given the limited number of inscriptions involved (4 among confirmed citizens, 5 among other **augustales*), these

(89) *AE* 2001, 853.

(90) The term *duplicarius* could also designate legionaries who, on account of their valour, received a double share of grain, double pay or double rations, or refer to a deputy commander of a troop of thirty horsemen or *turma*, who ranked just below the *decuriones*, and had – at least according to the third century writer Pseudo-Hyginus – two horses. Ps.-Hyg, *Mun. Castr.* 16: *Alunt equos singuli decuriones ternos, duplicarii et sesquuplicarii vinos.*

(91) MOURLOT, 1895, p. 111; DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1284.

(92) ABRAMENKO, 1993, p. 29: ‘Von daher müßte est etwa statt ‘*augustalis iterum*’ o.ä. natürlich ‘*augustalium honore functus iterum*’ heißen.’

(93) DUTHOY, 1978, p. 1270, 1278-1279; MOURITSEN, 2006, p. 246-247.

(94) TRAN, 2006, p. 141-145.

(95) ABRAMENKO, 1993, p. 25-33.

(96) DE RUGGIERO, 1886, t. III, p. 592.

percentages mean little. As to other *honores* accorded to **augustales*, as observed in the collegiate and ‘magisterial’ honours, there is little substantial difference to be seen between the group of confirmed citizens, and those **augustales* of whose civic status we are unsure. Only the public funeral was better recorded for confirmed citizens (1,7% vs. 0,2) however this draws on only four inscriptions, so again, it is of little statistical value.

None of the honours or titles reviewed here were substantially better attested in either of the groups (confirmed citizens or the unsure). Since the answer to the question on the strategic market asset is ‘no’, i.e. no marked difference can be seen, perhaps this could be an additional argument in favour of generalised Roman citizenship.

		Roman citizen * <i>augustales</i> (n=229)		* <i>Augustales</i> unclear civic status (n=986)	
		Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Collegiate	<i>quinquennialitas</i>	18	7.9%	72	7.3%
	curatorship	2	0.9%	19	1.9%
	<i>duplicarius</i>	1	0.4%	9	0.9%
Office	<i>primus</i>	4	1.7%	5	0.5%
	<i>iterum/bis</i>	3	1.3%	10	1.0%
	<i>perpetuus</i>	1	0.4%	3	0.3%
	<i>honoratus</i>	3	1.3%	13	1.3%
	<i>gratuitas</i>	5	2.2%	15	1.5%
Other	<i>funus publice</i>	4	1.7%	2	0.2%
	<i>locus datus decreto decurionum</i>	15	6.6%	56	5.7%
	<i>ornamenta</i>	3	1.3%	9	0.9%
	<i>bisellium</i>	4	1.7%	9	0.9%
	membership <i>collegia</i>	13	5.8%	69	7.0%
	professions	15	6.6%	49	5.0%
	benefactions	90	39.9%	320	32.5%

Conclusion

In order to address the curious situation in which research of the civic status of **augustales* has left us – i.e. a broad consensus on generalised Roman citizenship, based on a widely refuted interpretation of a very limited set of sources – this paper has attempted to piece together the scraps of (potential) evidence of the civic status of **augustales* and evaluate what they mean to us.

I have discussed a number of ways in which we can ascertain the Roman citizenship of two hundred and twenty-nine out of twelve hundred and fifteen Italian **augustales*. In other words, at least one in five Italian **augustales* held Roman citizenship. I have also explained why I do not find it likely that

**augustales* were Junian Latins (since they can inherit, draw up testaments and were entitled to *insignia*).

What do these figures mean? I compiled a dataset that gives forty-five times more indications of Roman citizenship held by **augustales* than the five exceptional documents on which the previous conclusion was based. At the same time, however, it also implies that we are left in the dark as to the civic status of almost 80% of Italian **augustales*. Since **augustales* were in fact not a single unified category at all (nor was it recognized as some sort of separate class), the notion that all **augustales* must have held the same civic status and the degree of uniformity implied in such a conclusion seems unlikely. Even if some members of some associations might have been Roman citizens that does not imply that they all were.

However, the epigraphic records of **augustales* with Roman citizenship, the lack of differentiation between privileges accorded to and titles held by **augustales* who certainly were Roman citizens and those who were perhaps not – if Roman citizenship was not a clear strategic market asset, does this imply a level playing field? – and the absence of any imperial grants, all point in the same general direction. Can we justify extrapolating the findings to all of the Italian **augustales*? It may feel counter-intuitive to claim uniformity of civic status in an institution that consistently shows remarkable diversity. Nevertheless, one cannot ignore the indications found in epigraphy: Italian **augustales* seem to have been Roman citizens. This is a highly relevant conclusion, since it suggests the civic (and only civic) homogeneity of the group, which in turn has major implications for their degree of integration – or, if you will, for their degree of Romanisation.

Bibliography

- ABRAMENKO, 1993 = A. ABRAMENKO, *Die munizipale Mittelschicht im kaiserzeitlichen Italien. Zu einem neuen Verständnis von Sevirat und Augustalität*, Frankfurt am Main, 1993.
- ALDINI, 1831 = P.V. ALDINI, *Sulle antiche lapidi ticinesi con appendice sopra un'epigrafe di Casteggio esercitazioni antiquarie di Pier Vittorio Aldini*, Pavia, 1831.
- ALFÖLDY, 1958 = G. ALFÖLDY, *Augustalen- und Seviratgesellschaften in Pannonien*, in *Acta Antiqua Academia Scientiarum Hungaricae* 6, 1958, p. 433-458.
- AMIRI, 2010 = B. AMIRI, *Les seviri augustales dans les Germanies: Etude des inscriptions*, in *Klio* 92, 2010, p. 94-103.
- ARANGIO RUIZ, 1959 = V. ARANGIO RUIZ, *Lo 'status' di L. Venidio Ennio ercolanese*, in *Mélanges Henry Lévi-Bruhl*, Paris, 1959, p. 9-24.
- ARANGIO-RUIZ and PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, 1955 = V. ARANGIO-RUIZ and G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, *Tabulae Herculanae*, in *Parola del Passato. Rivista di studi antichi* 40, 1955, p. 448-477.
- AUSBÜTTEL, 1982 = F. M. AUSBÜTTEL, *Das Ende des Sevirats*, in *Historia* 31, 1982, p. 252-255.
- BARJA DE QUIROGA, 1998 = P.L. BARJA DE QUIROGA, *Junian Latins. Status and Number*, in *Athenaeum* 86, 1998, p. 133-163.
- BORGHESI, 1860 = B. BORGHESI, *Oeuvres complètes*, Paris, 1860.
- BOURDIEU, 1979 = P. BOURDIEU, *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement*, Paris 1979.

- BUTTERWORTH and LAURENCE, 2005 = A. BUTTERWORTH and R. LAURENCE, *Pompeii. The Living City*, New York, 2005.
- CAMODECA, 2002 = G. CAMODECA, *Per una riedizione dell'archivio Ercolanese di L. Venidius Ennychus*, in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 32, 2002, p. 259-260.
- CAMODECA 2004 = G. CAMODECA, *Per un riedizione dell'archivio di L. Venidius Ennychus II*, in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 36, 2004, p. 189-211.
- CAMODECA, 2008 = G. CAMODECA, *La popolazione degli ultime decenni di Ercolano*, in M.R. BORIELLO e.a. (eds.), *Ercolano. Tre secoli di scoperte*, Milano, 2008, p. 87-103.
- CANCIK and SCHNEIDER, 2015 = H. CANCIK and H. SCHNEIDER, *Brill's New Pauly. Brill Online*, Leiden and Boston, 2015.
- CHRISTOL, 1992 = M. CHRISTOL, *Composition, évolution et renouvellement d'une classe dirigeante locale: l'exemple de la cité de Nîmes*, in E. FRÉZOULS (ed.), *La mobilité sociale dans le monde romain*, Strasbourg, 1992, p. 187-202.
- CHRISTOL, GASCOU and JANON, 1987 = M. CHRISTOL, J. GASCOU and M. JANON, *Les seviralia ornamenta gratuita dans une inscription de Nîmes*, in *Latomus* 46, 1987 p. 388-398.
- COHEN, 1984 = B. COHEN, *Some Neglected Ordines: the Apparitional Status-Groups*, in C. NICOLET, *Des ordres à Rome*, Paris, 1984, p. 23-60.
- CORAZZA, 2010 = G. CORAZZA, *Gli *augustales della Campania. Un quadro generale*, in *Il Mediterraneo e la Storia Epigrafia e Archaeologia in Campania: lettere storiche*, Napoli, 2010, p. 217-241.
- D'ARMS, 1981 = J.H. D'ARMS, *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, 1981.
- DEBROHUN, 2001 = J. DEBROHUN, *Power Dressing in Ancient Greece and Rome*, in *History Today* 51, 2001, p. 1825.
- DE RUGGIERO, 1886 = E. DE RUGGIERO (ed.), *Dizionario epigrafico di antichità Romane*, Roma, 1886.
- DI STEFANO MANZELLA, 2000 = I. DI STEFANO MANZELLA, *Accensis: profilo di una ricerca in corso, a proposito dei 'poteri collaterali' nella società romana*, in *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 11, 2000, p. 223-257.
- DROGULA, 2007 = F.K. DROGULA *Imperium, Potestas, and the Pomerium the Roman Republic*, in *Historia* 56, 2007, p. 419-452.
- DUFF, 1928 = A.M. DUFF, *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1928.
- DUTHOY, 1974 = R. DUTHOY, *La fonction sociale de l'augustalité*, in *Epigraphica* 36, 1974, p. 134-154.
- DUTHOY, 1978 = R. DUTHOY, *Les *augustales*, in *ANRW* 16.2, 1978, p. 1254-1309.
- EGGER, 1844 = A.E. EGGER, *Recherches sur les Augustales, suivies des fragments du testament politique d'Auguste, connu sous le nom de monument d'Ancyre*, Paris, 1844.
- ETIENNE, 1958 = R. ETIENNE, *Le culte impérial dans le péninsule ibérique d'Auguste à Diocletien*, Paris, 1958.
- GARNSEY, 1981 = P. GARNSEY, *Independent Freedmen and the Economy of Roman Italy under the Principate*, in *Klio* 63, 1981, p. 359-371.
- GARNSEY and DE LIGHT, 2012 = P. GARNSEY and L. DE LIGHT, *The Album of Herculaneum and a Model of the Town's Demography*, in *JRA* 25, 2012, p. 69-94.
- GORDON, 1931 = M.L. GORDON, *The Freedman's Son in Municipal Life*, in *JRS* 21, 1931, p. 65-77.
- HIGHET, 1941 = G. HIGHET, *Petronius the Moralist*, in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 72, 1941, p. 176-194.

- JORDÁN, 2003 = A.A. JORDÁN, *El habito epigrafico funerario de los *augustales béticos. Entro el mito y la realidad*, in C. ALONSO DEL REAL e.a.(eds.), *Urbs Aeterna. Actas y colaboraciones del coloquio internacional. Roma entre las literatura y la historia. Homenaje a la profesora Carmen Castillo*, Pamplona, 2003, p. 531-542.
- KLEIJWEGT, 1992 = M. KLEIJWEGT, *The Value of Empty Honours*, in *Epigraphica* 54, 1992, p. 131-142.
- KNEISSL, 1977 = P. KNEISSL, *Die Berufsangaben auf den Inschriften der gallischen und germanischen Provinzen. Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Marburg, 1977.
- KRIER, 1981 = J. KRIER, *Die Treverer außerhalb ihrer Civitas: Mobilität und Aufstieg*, Trier, 1981.
- LASSÈRE, 2005 = J.M. LASSÈRE, *Manuel d'épigraphie romaine*, Paris, 2005.
- LAIRD 2015 = M. LAIRD, *Civic Monuments and the Augustales in Roman Italy*, New York, 2015.
- LERAT, 1977 = L. LERAT, *La Gaule romaine. Textes choisis et présentés par Lucien Lerat*, Paris, 1977.
- MACMULLEN, 1974 = R. MACMULLEN, *Roman Social Relations, 50 B.C. to A.D. 284*, New Haven, 1974.
- MORCELLI, 1780 = S.A. MORCELLI, *De stilo inscriptionum Latinarum*, Roma, 1780.
- NORIS, 1681 = E. NORIS, *Caji et Lucii Caesarum dissertationibus illustrata*, Lausanne, 1681.
- MOURLOT, 1895 = F. MOURLOT, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'augustalité dans l'Empire romain*, 1895.
- MOURITSEN, 2006 = H. MOURITSEN, *Honores Libertini: Augustales and Seviri in Italy*, in *Hephaistos* 24, 2006, p. 237-248.
- MOURITSEN, 2011 = H. MOURITSEN, *The Freedman in the Roman World*, Cambridge and New York, 2011.
- NOCK, 1934 = A.D. NOCK, *Seviri and Augustales*, in *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 2, 1934, p. 627-638.
- NORIS, 1681 = NORIS, *Cenotaphia Pisana*, 1681.
- ORELLI and HENZEN, 1828 = J.C. ORELLI and W. HENZEN, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 3 v., Turici, 1828-1856.
- PAGANO, 2000 = M. PAGANO, *Il foro*, in M. PAGANO (ed.), *Gli Antichi Ercolanesi. Antropologia, Società, Economia. Catalogo mostra Ercolano, 30 marzo – 26 luglio 2000*, Napoli, 2000, p. 86.
- PAGANO, 2002 = M. PAGANO, *Per un riedizione dell'archivio di L. Venidius Ennychus*, in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 32, 2002, p. 257-280.
- PALMIERI, 1980 = R. PALMIERI, *Ricerche sull'augustalità capuana a proposito di un nuovo Augustalis Capuae*, in *Miscellanea greca e romana : studi pubblicati dall'Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica* 7, 1980, 447-458.
- PESANDO, 2003 = F. PESANDO, *Appunti sulla cosiddetta Basilica di Ercolano*, in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 33, 2003, p. 331-337.
- RAWSON, 1987 = E. RAWSON, *Discrimina Ordinum: The Lex Julia Theatralis*, in *PBSR* 55, 1987, p. 83-114.
- RODÀ, 1992 = I. RODÀ, *Consideraciones sobre el sevirato en Hispania. Las dedicatorias ob honorem seviratus en el conventus Tarrconenses*, in *Religio deorum : actas del Coloquio internacional de epigrafía Culto y Sociedad en Occidente, Tarragona 1988*, Barcelona, 1992, p. 399-404.
- ROSTOVITZ, 1957 = M. ROSTOVITZ, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1957.
- ROYDEN, 1988 = H.L. ROYDEN, *The Magistrates of the Roman Professional Collegia in Italy from the First to the Third century A.D.*, Pisa, 1988.

- RUPPRECHT, 1975 = G. RUPPRECHT, *Untersuchungen zum Dekurionenstand in den Nord-westlichen Provinzen des römischen Reiches*, Kallmünz, 1975.
- SCHÄFER, 1989 = T. SCHÄFER, *Imperii insignia Sella curulis und Fasces: zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate*, Mainz, 1989.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, 1966 = A.N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Letters of Pliny. A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford, 1966.
- STEWART, 2013 = R. STEWART, *Tribus*, in *Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, Oxford, 2013.
- TAYLOR, 1914 = L.R. TAYLOR, *Augustales, Seviri Augustales, and Seviri: a Chronological Study*, in *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 45, 1914, p. 231-253.
- TAYLOR, 1960 = L.R. TAYLOR, *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: the Thirty-Five Urban and Rural Tribes*, Rome, 1960.
- TAYLOR, 1961 = L.R. TAYLOR, *Freedmen and Freeborn in the Epitaphs of Imperial Rome*, in *AJPh* 82, 1961, p. 113-132.
- TRAN, 2006 = N. TRAN, *Les membres des associations romaines. Le rang social des collegiati en Italie et en Gaules sous le Haut-Empire*, Rome, 2006.
- TUDOR, 1962 = D. TUDOR, *Le organizzazioni degli Augustales in Dacia*, in *Dacia* 6, 1962, p. 199-214.
- VEYNE, 1961 = P. VEYNE, *Vie de Trimalcion*, in *Annales. Economies, societies, civilisations* 16, 1961, p. 213-247.
- VON PREMERSTEIN, 1895 = A. VON PREMERSTEIN, *Augustales*, in E. DE RUGGIERO (ed.), *Dizionario Epigraphico di Antichità Romane*, Vol. I, Roma, 1895, p. 824-877.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, 2004 = A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *Imaginary Feast: Pictures of Success on the Bay of Naples*, in *JRA, Suppl.* 57, 2004, p. 109-126.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, 2011a = A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *The Monumental Centre of Herculaneum: in Search of the Identities of Public Buildings*, in *JRA* 24, 2011, p. 121-160.
- WALLACE-HADRILL, 2011b = A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *Herculaneum. Past and Future*, London, 2011.
- WALSH, 1974 = P. G. WALSH, *Was Petronius a Moralist?*, in *Greece & Rome*, 2nd ser. 21, 1974, p. 181-190.
- WEAVER, 1967 = P.R.C. WEAVER, *Social Mobility in the Early Roman Empire: The Evidence of Freedmen and Slaves*, in *Past and Present* 37, 1967, p. 3-20.
- WEAVER, = P.R.C. WEAVER, *Familia Caesaris; a social study of the Emperor's freedmen and slaves*, Cambridge, 1972.
- WEAVER, = P.R.C. WEAVER, *Where Have all the Junian Latins Gone?: Nomenclature and Status in the Early Empire*, in *Chiron* 20, 1990, p. 275-305.
- WEAVER, 2001 = P.R.C. WEAVER, *Reconstructing Lower-Class Roman Families*, in S. DIXON (ed.), *Childhood, Class and Kin in the Roman World*, London, 2001, p. 101-127.
- WIERSCHOWSKI, 2001 = L. WIERSCHOWSKI, *Fremde in Gallien-‘Gallier’ in der Fremde. Dei epigraphisch bezeugte Mobilität in, von un nach Gallien vom 1. bis 3. Jh.n.Chr.*, Wiesbaden, 2001.
- WILSON, 2011 = A. WILSON, *City Sizes and Urbanization in the Roman Empire*, in A. BOWMAN, and A. WILSON (eds.), *Settlement, Urbanization, and Population*, Oxford, 2011, p. 161-195.
- WOOLF, 1998 = G. WOOLF, *Becoming Roman. The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*, Cambridge and New York, 1998.
- ZEVI, 2000 = F. ZEVI, *La documentazione epigrafica*, in P. MINIERO (ed.), *Il sacello degli Augustali di Miseno*, Napoli, 2000, p. 47-62.
- ZIMMER, 1989 = G. ZIMMER, *Locus datus decreto decurionum: zur Statuenaufstellung zweier Forumsanlagen im römischen Afrika*, München 1989.

SUMMARY

The title **augustalis* was used during the first three centuries A.D., to refer to an honorary position in local society. It was mostly bestowed on wealthy freedmen who, because of their servile birth, could not partake in the official *cursus honorum*. Scholars have considered **augustales* to be Roman citizens, but this academic consensus is based on a broadly refuted interpretation of only five documents concerning one exceptional case. Although the value of these documents for the discussion of the civic status of **augustales* was dismissed, the presumed Roman citizenship of **augustales* inferred from them was not.

This paper addresses three questions: (1) What (potential) evidence do we have for the civic status of Italian **augustales*? (2) How do we evaluate and work with the information and figures obtained from these? (3) If only some of the **augustales* were Roman citizens, did this offer them a competitive advantage vis-à-vis their fellow **augustales* who were not, and is this recorded in epigraphy?

**augustales* – Italy – Roman citizenship – epigraphy

Appendices

1. Tribal affiliations (n=46)

1.1 Geographical diversity tribus indications

	Indications of <i>tribus</i> <i>*augustales</i>		Compared to attestation <i>*augustales</i> in the region	
	<i>Abs.</i>	<i>Rel.</i>	<i>Abs.</i>	<i>Rel.</i>
1 Latium/ Campania	10	21.7%	360	2.8%
2 Apulia/Calabria	0	0%	105	0%
3 Bruttium/Lucania	0	0%	25	0%
4 Samnium	4	8.7%	191	2.1%
5 Picenum	2	4.3%	25	8.0%
6 Umbria	2	4.3%	103	1.9%
7 Etruria	0	0%	65	0%
8 Aemilia	2	4.3%	37	5.4%
9 Liguria	2	4.3%	25	8.0%
10 Venetia/Histria	11	23.9%	209	5.3%
11 Transpadana	13	28.3%	69	18.8%
	46		1214	

1.2 Status by tribus

		<i>Italian</i> <i>*augustales</i> <i>with this</i> <i>tribe</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>Incerti</i>		<i>Liberti</i>		<i>Ingenui</i>	
				<i>Abs.</i>	<i>Rel.</i>	<i>Abs.</i>	<i>Rel.</i>	<i>Abs.</i>	<i>Rel.</i>
Urban	Palatina	4	8.7%	0	0 %	4	100 %	0	0 %
Rural	Aemilia	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %
	Arniensis	1	2.2%	0	0 %	1	100 %	0	0 %
	Claudia	1	2.2%	0	0 %	1	100 %	0	0 %
	Camilia	3	6.5%	0	0 %	0	0 %	3	100 %
	Clustumina	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %
	Fabia	9	19.6%	2	22.2%	0	0 %	7	77.8%
	Falerna	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %
	Lemonia	2	4.3%	0	0 %	0	0 %	2	100 %
	Menenia	3	6.5%	0	0 %	0	0 %	3	100 %
	Oufentina	4	8.7%	0	0 %	0	0 %	4	100 %
	Poblilia	2	4.3%	0	0 %	1	50 %	1	50 %
	Pollia	2	4.3%	0	0 %	0	0 %	2	100 %
	Quirina	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %
	Scaptia	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %
	Sergia	2	4.3%	0	0 %	1	50 %	1	50 %
	Stellatina	6	13.0%	0	0 %	0	0 %	6	100 %
Velina	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %	
Voturia	1	2.2%	0	0 %	0	0 %	1	100 %	
		46		2	4.3%	8	17.4%	36	78.3%

2. Onomastics: *Augustales passing their name to children – i.e. patrilinear (n=91)

	Reference		Region	City	Relation		
					*Augustalis	Family member(s)	
1	CIL V	3409	Venetia et Histria	Verona	C. Magius Sex.f.	Magia C.f. Procula	daughter
						Octaviaia (mulieris) I. Coelia	wife
2	CIL V	3440	Venetia et Histria	Verona	Q. Vitorius L.f. Severus	Q. Vitorius Q.f. Festus	son
3	CIL V	4295	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	L. Vettius Telesphorus	Vettia L.f. Secundina	daughter
4	CIL V	4437	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	L. Lepidius L.I. Philemus	M. Lepidius Primus	son
						Meliae L.f. Maxima	wife
5	CIL V	4465	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	M. Romanius M.I. Suavis	M. Roman(i)us Probus	son
						Cincia Modesta	wife
6	CIL V	4876	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	T. Atestas Priscus	C. Atestas Servandus	son
						C. Atestas Securus	son
						Vera Primula	wife
7	CIL V	4877	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	M. Helvius Ursio	M. Helvius Primus	son
8	CIL V	4968	Venetia et Histria	Camunni	P. Valerius Crispinus	P. Valerius Numisius	son
9	CIL V	4896	Venetia et Histria	Sabbio Chiese	M. Mestrius Severus	M. Mestrius Primus	son
						Caecilia Valentina	wife
10	CIL V	5303	Transpadana	Comum	L. Romatius Trophimus	Romatia L.f. Severina	daughter
						Publicia L.f. Atilia	wife
11	CIL V	5611	Transpadana	Sibrium	T. Annius Niphetus	T. Annius Caecilianus	son
						T. Annius Iuventianus	grandson
						Caecilia Lyde	wife
12	CIL V	5749	Transpadana	Modicia	Q. Audasius Acamazon	Audasia Q.f. Cales	daughter
13	CIL V	5894	Transpadana	Mediolanum	C. Valerius Eutychianus	C. Valerius Petronianus	son
14	CIL V	6349	Transpadana	Pompeia	M. Mascarpus Symphorius	Mascarpus Festus	son
15	CIL V	7025	Transpadana	Taurinorum	M. Cotobus Primus	M. Cotobus Verus	son
						Firmus Cotobus, Stati f.	father
						Cotoba, Stati f.	mother
16	CIL V	7167	Transpadana	Taurinorum	M'. Caelius M'.f. Traso	L. Caelius M'.f. Gallus	son
						M'. Caelius M'.f. Camilia Praesens	son
						Cornelia P.f. Quarta	wife
17	CIL V	7509	Liguria	Aeuae Statiellae	L. Vibullius Montanus	L. Vibullius	son
						L. Vibullius	son
						T. Vibullius	son
						Vibullia Procula	daughter
						Pollia M.f. Marcella	wife
						M. Pollius M.I. Certus	father-in-law
Aufidia T.f. Titulla	mother-in-law						
18	CIL V	7604	Liguria	Alba Pompeia	P. Castricius Saturninus	Castricia Saturnina	daughter
						Mettia Paulina	wife

	Reference		Region	City	Relation		
					*Augustalis	Family member(s)	
19	CIL IX	1648	Apulia et Calabria	Beneventum	L. Lollius Orio	L. Lollius L.f. Suavis	son
						Hirria Tertulla	wife
20	CIL IX	1697	Apulia et Calabria	Beneventum	Q. Opimius Q.l. Celadus	Q. Opimius Q.f. Rufus	son
						Papinia Anthidis	wife
21	CIL IX	1705	Apulia et Calabria	Beneventum	A. Vibbii Ianuarius	A. Vibbii Iustinus	son
						A. Vibbii Iustianus	son
						A. Vibbii Ianuarius	son
22	CIL IX	2128	Apulia et Calabria	Vitolano	C. Acellius C.et L.l.Syneros	C. Acellius C.f. Falerna Vementus	son
						Calpurnia Sp.f. Phyllidis	wife
23	CIL IX	2249	Samnium	Telesia	L. Cocceius Castor	L. Cocceius Luccianus	son
						Cassia Concordia	wife
24	CIL IX	2250	Samnium	Telesia	L. Fabius Callistus	Fabia L.f. Cycladis	daughter
25	CIL IX	3092	Samnium	Sulmona	C. Satrius Dextro	C. Satrius C.f. Sergia Secundus	son
						Caedia Ionice	wife
						C. Satrius C.f. Sergia Secundus	grandson
26	CIL IX	3101	Samnium	Sulmona	P. Octavius P.l. Pardus	P. Octavius Atticianus	son
27	CIL IX	3184	Samnium	Corfinium	Q. Caecilius Q.et (mulieris) l. Hermes	Q. Caecilius Q.f. Palatina Optatus	son
						Q. Caecilius Q.f. Palatina Paelinus	son
						Licina Repentina	wife
28	CIL IX	3353	Samnium	Pinna Vestina	T. Gavennius Mithres	Gavennia T.f. Iulitta	daughter
						Vibia Tigridis	wife
						Octavia Prisca	wife
29	CIL IX	3603	Samnium	Aveia Vestina	Ti. Caesius Festus	Ti. Caesius Quirinalis	son
30	CIL IX	3524	Samnium	Furfo	C. Betutius Eutyches	Betutius Palatina Maximus	son
						Betutia Palatina Maxima	daughter
31	CIL IX	812	Apulia et Calabria	Luceria	A. Pilius Epictetus	Pilia Valeria	daughter
						Ulpia Valeria	wife
32	CIL IX	1461	Apulia et Calabria	Ligures Baebiani	C. Clodius C.l. Lucifer	Clodia Id[---]	daughter
						Vibunia L.l. Uri[---]	wife
33	CIL IX	3676	Samnium	Marruvium	T. Alfenus Venafranus	T. Alfenus Ursionis	son
						T. Alfenus Clemens	son
34	CIL IX	3684	Samnium	Marruvium	C. Laberius Felix	C. Laberius Sabinianus	son
35	CIL X	435	Bruttium et Lucania	Muro Lucano	P. Equitius P.l. Primanus	P. Equitius Primanus	son
36	CIL X	446	Bruttium et Lucania	Corfinium	C. Spedius Atimetus	C. Spedius Asiaticus	son
						Allidia C.f. Statuta	wife
37	CIL X	1268	Latium et Campania	Nola	L. Calvidius L.l. Felix	L. Calvidius L.f.Clemens	son
38	CIL X	1886	Latium et Campania	Puteoli	Sex. Patulcius Apolaustus	Sex. Patulcius Eunus	son

	Reference		Region	City	Relation		
					* <i>Augustalis</i>	Family member(s)	
39	<i>CIL X</i>	3951	Latium et Campania	Capua	L. Volusius Threptus	Volusia Hermione	daughter
40	<i>CIL X</i>	4620	Latium et Campania	Cubulteria	L. Fulvius Clemens	L. Fulvius L.f. Quintilianus	son
						Fadia C.f. Vitalis	wife
41	<i>CIL X</i>	4762	Latium et Campania	Suessa Aurunca	M. Tofelanus Catulla l. Murranus	M. Tofelanus M.f. Honoratus	son
42	<i>CIL X</i>	4909	Samnium	Venafrum	Aulus Terentius Felix	Aulus Terentius Felix	son
43	<i>CIL X</i>	5419	Latium et Campania	Aquinum	M. Rubrius Proculus	M. Rubrius Procleianus	son
						Sergia Quartilla	wife
44	<i>CIL X</i>	6675	Latium et Campania	Antium	L. Afinius H[---]	L. Afinius Pro[---]	son
45	<i>CIL XI</i>	2	Aemilia	Ravenna	M. Caesius Chresimus	Caesia Chresime	daughter
						Saccidia Felicitate	wife
46	<i>CIL XI</i>	1063	Aemilia	Parma	Q. Octavius L.f. M[---]	L. Octavius Q.f. Festus	son
47	<i>CIL XI</i>	4198	Umbria	Interamna Nahars	L. Appuleius Epaphroditus	L. Appuleius Epaphroditus	son
						Scaefeia Nebris	wife
48	<i>CIL XI</i>	4394	Umbria	Ameria	Paccius Priscus	L. Paccius Priscianus	son
						Ianuarina Pa[wife
49	<i>CIL XI</i>	5221	Umbria	Fulginiae	T. Bruttius	T. Bruttius	son
						Lyria Ven[---]	wife
50	<i>CIL XI</i>	5411	Umbria	Asisium	C. Publicius municipum Asisinatium lib. Verecundus	C. Publicius Allius Primus	son
51	<i>CIL XI</i>	5427	Umbria	Asisium	T. Volcasius Cinnamus	Volcasia T.f. Saturnina	daughter
						Vettia Satunina	wife
52	<i>CIL XI</i>	5754	Umbria	Sentinum	C. Fullonius Honoratus	C. Fullonius C.f. LEMONIA Verecundus	son
						C. Fullonius C.f. LEMONIA Priscus	son
53	<i>CIL XI</i>	6231	Umbria	Fortunae	T. Flavius Eutichetus	T. Flavius Verus	son
54	<i>CIL XI</i>	7838	Umbria	Ameria	Iulius Braetius Cinnamus	Braetia Priscilla	daughter
55	<i>CIL XIV</i>	319	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	[---C]atinius Eliodorus	Q. Catinius Castor	son
						Q. Catinius Ilarus	son
						Q. Catinius Niceforus	son
56	<i>CIL XIV</i>	331	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	Clodius Lucrius	Clodia Victoria	daughter
57	<i>CIL XIV</i>	339	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	C. Cornelius C.l. Isochrysus	C. Cornelius Isochrysius	son
						C. Cornelius Silianus	son
						Silia Tyrannidis	wife
58	<i>CIL XIV</i>	407	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	L. Rennius L.l. Philodoxus	L. Rennius Proculus	son
59	<i>CIL XIV</i>	412	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	Cn. Sergius Cn.l. Anthus	Cn. Sergius Cn.f. Voturia Priscus	son

	Reference	Region	City	Relation			
				*Augustalis	Family member(s)		
60	<i>CIL</i> XIV	415	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	C. Silius Epaphra I. Felix	C. Silius C.f. Voturia Nerva	son
61	<i>C I L</i> XIV	418	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	C. Similius Philocyrius	Similia Romana	daughter
62	<i>CIL</i> XIV	425	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	T. Testius Helpidianus	T. Testius Helpidianus	son
						T. Testius Priscus	son
						T. Testius Priscianus	son
						T. Testius Felix	son
63	<i>CIL</i> XIV	2981	Latium et Campania	Praeneste	Ti. Claudius Nicostratus	Claudius Nicephorianus	son
						Claudius Proculus	son
						Claudius Anneianus	son
						Annea Procilla	wife
64	<i>CIL</i> XIV	3003	Latium et Campania	Praeneste	M. Scurreius Fontinalis	Scurreius Vestalis	son
65	<i>CIL</i> XIV	3443	Latium et Campania	Afilae	M. Valerius Admetus	Valeria M.f. Quinta	daughter
						Valeria Sympherusa	wife
66	<i>CIL</i> XIV	5328	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	M. Marius [---]	M. Marius M.f. Palatina Primitivus	son
67	<i>InscrIt</i>	4-1-200	Latium et Campania	Tibur	C. Tiburtius C.f. Atticus	C. Tiburtius Atticus	son
68	<i>InscrIt</i>	10-5-243	Venetia et Histria	Brixi	C. Placidius Zoticus	C. Placidius Augendus	son
						Cornelia Brixiana	wife
69	<i>InscrIt</i>	10-5-1077	Venetia et Histria	Brixia	L. Tinnavius Robia	L. Tinnavius Quartus	son
						L. Tinnavius Lubiamus	son
70	<i>EE</i> -8-1	162	Samnium	Marruvium	Sex. Pontidius Helvi l. Fortunatus	Pontidia Sex.f. Severa	daughter
71	<i>AE</i> 1954	52	Venetia et Histria	Parentium	Ti. Volusius Ti.l. Hermes	Ti. Volusius Severus	son
						Ti. Volusius Maximus	son
72	<i>AE</i> 1982	133	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	M. Ulpus P[---]	Ulpus Quintianus	son
						Ulpus Polytimus	son
						Aufidia Tryphaena	wife
73	<i>AE</i> 1961	242	Samnium	Setia	C. Barbius Cleontis	Barbius Valens	son
						Uplia Crete	wife
74	<i>AE</i> 1980	435	Etruria	Rusellae	L. Titinius Vitalis	L. Titinius L.f. Arnensis Pelagianus	son
75	<i>AE</i> 1986	197	Apulia et Calabria	Canusium	P. Poppaedi P.l. Secundus	P. Poppaedi ?	son
						P. Poppaedi ?	son
76	<i>AE</i> 1966	84	Apulia et Calabria	Sipontum	Decimus Iulius Decimi l. Diochares	Iulia Decimi f. Tertulla	daughter
77	<i>AE</i> 1993	473	Latium et Campania	Misenum	L. Kaninius Hermes	L. Kaninius Philippus	son
						L. Kaninius Hermes	son
78	<i>AE</i> 1996	304	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	A. Aegrilius Heliades	Aegrilia Storge	daughter
						A. Egrilius A.f. Palatina Magnus	son
						Egrilia P[---]	wife
79	<i>AE</i> 1931	10	Aemilia	Brixellum	C. Concordius C.l. Rhenus	Concordia C.f. Festa	daughter
80	<i>AE</i> 1952	61	Umbria	Interamna Nahars	L. Appuleius Epaphroditus	L. Appuleius Epaphroditus	son

	Reference	Region	City	Relation			
				* <i>Augustalis</i>	Family member(s)		
81	AE 1953	34	Venetia et Histria	Patavium	P. Meclonius P.l. Salvianus	Meclonia Mansueta	daughter
						Meclonia [-----]	daughter
82	AE 1980	273	Apulia et Calabria	Vibinum	A. Allienus Primus	A. Allienus A.f. Galeria Laetus	son
83	AE 1985	354	Picenum	Ricina	Q. Petrusidius Q.l. Aristus	Q. Petrusidius Q.f. Velina Verus	son
84	AE 1985	408	Aemilia	Regium Lepidum	M. Raius M.f. Firmus	Raia M.f. Firma	daughter
						Raia M.f. Primula	daughter
						Cassia Supera	wife
85	AE 1986	166	Latium et Campania	Pompei	P. Vesonius (mulieris) l. Phileros	Vesonia P.f.	daughter
86	AE 1988	178	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	Q. Aquilius ---] O[---]	Q. Aquilius Dionysius	son
						Nonia M.f. Faustina	mother
87	AE 1988	189	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	A. Egrilius A.l. Polytimus Amerimnianus	Egrilia Irene	daughter
						Egrilia Zmyrna	daughter
						A. Egrilius Florus	son
						Iunia Aphrodite	wife
88	AE 1988	202	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	P. Attius P. et (mulieris) l. Felicius	Attia P.f. Vitalis	daughter
						P. Attius P.f. Palatina Silianus	son
89	AE 1999	410	Latium et Campania	Ostia Antica	S. Avienius Zosimus	Avienia Zosime	daughter
90	AE 2000	379	Sannium	Carsioli	C. Setidius Rufus	C. Setidius Romanus	son
91	AE 2007	435	Bruttium et Lucania	Copia Thurii	Q. Vaglius ?	Q. Vaglius ?	son

3. Heirs and wills (n=77)

	Link with * <i>augustales</i> ?	Number of inscriptions	References
Testamentum	drafted by * <i>augustalis</i>	36	<i>CIL</i> V, 513; 560; 1894; 1897; 3140; 3442; 4445; 4461; 7025; 7646; <i>CIL</i> IX, 2365; 2681; 3614; 4373; 4901; 4977; X, 1066; 1146; 1272; 3675; 3953; XI, 358; 1026a; 1161; 1939; XIV, 382; 397; 3492; <i>AE</i> 1946, 210; 1988, 193; <i>Suplt</i> -10-T, 11; <i>InscrIt</i> -10-4, 74; Pais 1254
	* <i>augustalis</i> made heir	1	<i>AE</i> 1991, 519
	Subtotal	37	
Heres	* <i>augustalis</i> named as heir	1	<i>AE</i> 1975, 253
	heir(s) * <i>augustalis</i> named	13	<i>CIL</i> X, 5143; XI, 128; 4825; 5401; 5648; XIV, 290; 425; 2996; 4645; 4655; <i>AE</i> 1919, 62; 1988, 177; 1996, 416
	tomb * <i>augustalis</i> will not go to his heir	26	<i>CIL</i> V, 72; 1896; 2523; IX, 1194; 1699; 2252; 2236; 2368; 4335; X, 1209; 1878; 4591; <i>CIL</i> XIV, 339; 356; <i>AE</i> 1982, 211; 1985, 354; 1988, 189; 199; 206; <i>AE</i> 1989, 129; <i>AE</i> 1996, 637; 2005, 556; <i>InscrIt</i> -10-1, 107; 111; <i>EE81</i> , 121;
Subtotal	40		
TOTAL		77	