



AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ

Fructus, Attianus, Ariomanus

Restoring two altar-inscriptions from Poetovio

Melinda SZABÓ* 

Department of Classical and Roman Provincial Archaeology, ELKH – ELTE Research Group for Interdisciplinary Archaeology, Eötvös Loránd University, Múzeum körút 4/B, 1088 Budapest, Hungary; e-mail: szabo.melinda@btk.elte.hu

Received: July 17, 2023 • Accepted: August 23, 2023
Published online: September 25, 2023

Archaeologiai Értesítő

148 (2023) 1, 1–7

DOI:

[10.1556/0208.2023.00056](https://doi.org/10.1556/0208.2023.00056)

© 2023 The Author(s)

STUDY



ABSTRACT

The study includes two inscriptions from Poetovio both on altars, one dedicated to Mithras, the other to Isis, both erected for the wellbeing of a person. In addition to the findspot they have in common that both persons mentioned in them were employees of the publicum portorium Illyrici customs office. This insight is the basis for the new additions to the study, as for both inscriptions it was possible to reinterpret the previously known inscriptions based on the pattern used by customs post employees, which could be observed on other inscriptions. The new addition will allow the two inscriptions to be included in the research on the operation and staffing of the Illyricum customs district.

KEYWORDS

vilicus, vikarius, conductor, publicum portorium Illyrici, Mithras

ABSZTRAKT

A tanulmányban két poetoviói felirat szerepel, az egyik egy Mithras oltár, a másik pedig egy Isisnek szentelt oltár, mindkettőt egy-egy személy jólétéért állították. A lelőhelyen kívül a két oltár között kapcsolatot teremt, hogy a rajta szereplő személyek mind a publicum portorium Illyrici vámhivatali alkalmazottai voltak. Ez a felismerés az alapja a tanulmányban szereplő új kiegészítéseknek, hiszen mindkét felirat esetében a vámállomások alkalmazottai által használt, más feliratokon megfigyelhető séma alapján lehetett a korábban is ismert feliratok feloldását tovább gondolni.

Az új kiegészítés segítségével a két felirat bekerülhet az illyricumi vámkörzet működésével és alkalmazotti körével kapcsolatos kutatásokba.

KULCSSZAVAK

vilicus, vikarius, conductor, publicum portorium Illyrici, Mithras

A large number of inscriptions belonging to the Publicum Portorium are known from Poetovio, and the two inscriptions under discussion are among them. Although both were already known, they can be further supplemented based on the parallels from other inscriptions referring to customs employees.

Without going into detail about the operation of the publicum portorium Illyrici and the changes that took place in its organisation, it is necessary to mention a few posts and responsibilities in order to make the analysis below clear.

The publicum portorium Illyrici was initially administered by tax farmers, conductors. Later, these entrepreneurs were replaced by public officials, procurators.¹ In the customs

*Corresponding author.

E-mail: szabo.melinda@btk.elte.hu

¹For a detailed description of the periods, the transition period see: Hirschfeld (1905) 77–87; De Laet (1949) 236–384; Dobó (1940); Ørsted (1985) 147–319; Zaccaria (2010) 56–64; Szabó (2021a) 37–39; Szabó (2021b) 153–183; Sarkisjan (2022) 229–296. The fundamental difference between the two periods is that the conductors employed their own slaves at the customs stations, while the procurators used imperial slaves. P. Beskow, also quoted later, is inaccurate here in that during the procuratorial period, he considers the customs station employees to be slaves of the procurator. This does not otherwise affect his other remarks (Beskow (1980) 1).

district administered by the conductors, the persons employed at the stations were the slaves of the conductor,² and some of his stations (stationes) were headed by vilici. The vicarii were employees of the vilici.³ In addition to the vilicus, the contrascriptores, arcarii, scrutatores and tabularii were directly subordinate to the conductor.⁴ This shows that although the vilicus was the head of the customs station, the only person directly subordinate to him was the vicarius, who was the only other employee.

The first inscription in question is the following:

[Is]idi / [My]rio/[ny]mae / [pro] Fructo / [Sabi]ni Verani / [co]nduct(oris)⁵

From the surviving text of the inscription, it is clear that it was dedicated for a certain Fructus, who was associated with Sabinius Veranus. Quintus Sabinius Veranus, as conductor of the publicum portorium Illyrici from 166 to 171, is a known person.⁶ Fructus was his slave. This is clear from another inscription in Celeia,⁷ which mentions both of them, and refers to Fructus as Q(uinti) Sabini Veran(i) c(onductoris) p(ublici) p(ortorii) ser(vus) vilic(us). In the scientific literature there is also the addition of conductoris publici portorii servus vilicus for Fructus' service in Statio Enesis.⁸ This supplement, however, is based only on the Celeian inscription, the part of the text relating to Fructus' office is completely missing, and the supplement is merely an (otherwise logical) unjustified transposition of information from the Celeian inscription.⁹

Because of the conductor Quintus Sabinius Veranus, it can be assumed that the Fructus on the three inscriptions is the same person. However, it is not clear from this fact or from the inscription in Celeia that Fructus functioned as vilicus in both Poetovio and Statio Enensis. In the case of the slaves employed at the customs posts, the change of function was an existing phenomenon.¹⁰ This would also suggest that

Fructus may have been a vilicus at some stations, but previously a vicarius vilici.

To complete the Poetovian inscription, it is worth first examining the general characteristics of the vicarius inscriptions. The following vicarius inscriptions are known from Poetovio: CIL 03, 14354, 26.¹¹ CIL 03, 04015.¹² CIL 03, 15184, 24.¹³ CIL 03, 14354, 25.¹⁴ CIL 03, 14354, 29.¹⁵ CIL 03, 14354, 30.¹⁶ The examples listed show that the names on the inscriptions erected by vicarii are given in the following order: the name of the vicarius, the name of his vilicus, the name of the conductor. In contrast, the inscriptions relating to the customs station staff, where a name is given followed by the name of the conductor in the genitive, always show slaves who were directly subordinate to the conductor.¹⁷ In the Poetovio inscription in question, the name of the conductor appears after 'pro Fructo'.

The pro + ablativus formula itself does not appear in the inscriptions associated with the Poetovio customs station, but its content parallels that of CIL CIL 03, 15184, 7. On this inscription the wording pro salute Charidemi Augusti nostri vilici stationis Enesis is used. Although the inscription was commissioned in the procuratorial period, so that the emperor is mentioned as the slave-owner instead of the conductor, the form of the inscription clearly shows that the name of the direct slave-owner is written in genitive after the pro + name. Since in the case of Fructus it is the conductor himself, his function being to be found among vilicus, contrascriptor, arcarius, scrutator, tabularius,¹⁸ he could not be vicarius, in which case the name of a vilicus would have to appear on the inscription before the name of the conductor (cf. above, vicarius inscriptions).

On this basis, it can be ruled out that in the inscription from Poetovio Fructus would be in the capacity of vicarius. Of the other possibilities, vilicus is the most probable, given the Celeian inscription. In principle, the other possibilities can also not be ruled out, but there are only two examples in Pannonia where a slave employed at a customs station was assigned a new function¹⁹ and did not become vilicus from vicarius, so it is more likely that the Poetovio inscription should also be completed to vilicus. The same reasoning is valid for the inscription found in Statio Enensis, so although

²De Laet (1949) 384; Hirschfeld (1905) 86.

³Weaver (1972) 200–202.

⁴Dobó (1940) 154.

⁵CIL 03, 04017. Fragmentary, marble votive altar. Only the top right corner of the slab was preserved. Findspot: Poetovio.

⁶Ørsted (1985) 337–338; Fitz (1993) 721–722; Szabó (2021b) 164.

⁷CIL 03, 05146.

⁸AE 2008, 1020. [Inv]ic[to] / Mi[t]hr[ae] / [F]ructus Q(uinti) / [Sa]bini Verani / [con]d(uctoris) p(ublici) [p(ortorii) ser(vus) vil(icus?) st?]a [t(ionis?)] / [--- templ(um)? de]di[c]/[avit a]ramq(ue) m[armoream? ---?].

⁹J. Sarkisjan also adopts, without further justification, the vilicus amendment (Sarkisjan (2022) 251). However, on page 365 the same author now refers to Fructus as vilicus/contrascriptor?

¹⁰This can be accurately recorded in the case of a certain Prudens at the Poetovio customs station. Prudens was on duty at the customs station in Poetovio. His career can be traced by two inscriptions. In the CIL 03, 14354, 29. inscription he was employed as the vilicus vicarius of Primus. However, in the CIL 03, 14354, 30. inscription a certain Felix is mentioned as Prudens' vilicus vicarius. Since in both cases the inscription refers to the subordinates of the conductor Antonius Rufus, the Prudens on both inscriptions is most probably the same person (Szabó (2021a) 39; Szabó (2021b) 178).

¹¹Optimus / Vitalis / Sabini Verani / p(ublici) p(ortorii) vil(ici) vic(arius).

¹²Marti/alis / Firmini / Q(uinti) Sabini / Verani / t(ertiae) p(artis) / conduc(toris) / portori(i) / Illyrici / ar[c]ari(i) vic(arius).

¹³Epictetus / et Viator / Servandi / Q(uinti) Sabini Veran[i] / t(ertiae) p(artis) c(onductoris) p(ublici) p(ortorii) vilici / vicari(i).

¹⁴Festus / Primi p(ublici) p(ortorii) vil(ici) / vic(arius).

¹⁵Prudens Primi / Antoni Rufi p(ublici) p(ortorii) / vil(ici) vic(arius).

¹⁶Felix / Prudentis Antoni / Rufi p(ublici) p(ortorii) vil(ici) vic(arius).

¹⁷For their listing see the introduction. From Poetovio the following examples are known: AE 1986, 0571: Apollinaris / Q(uinti) Sabini / Verani t(ertiae) p(artis) / cond(uctoris) portori(i) / Illyrici / ser(vus) / tabularius. HD075025: Verus T(iti) Iuli / Ianuari cond(uctoris) / p(ortorii) p(ublici) Illyr(ici) servos(!).

¹⁸See note 5.

¹⁹Szabó (2021c) 192–193; Szabó (2021b) 181–182.



its addition has so far been unexplained in the scientific literature, it is probably correct.

The supplementations assume that the Fructus on the three inscriptions is the same person. This is based on the person of the conductor, who is surely the same person on all three inscriptions. However, it needs to be explained why Fructus, the slave, is mentioned from three different settlements. There was no obstacle in principle to the transfer of slaves working at the customs stations, since they were the slaves of the conductor,²⁰ who could move them between the stations he hired at his discretion.²¹ This may have been necessary simply because some stations did not operate all year round, e.g. those at the passes in the Alps, which would have been pointless to maintain in winter when the area was impassable.²² In addition, there are also the stationes near legionary camps or for trading with barbarians, which were not continuously in operation.²³ Therefore, there was no need for permanent staff at these stations.²⁴ There were two possible solutions to this problem. One was to have these slaves on duty in a town near the temporary station when they were not needed for temporary customs clearance. The other possibility is that there was a single centre where these slaves served until that time, which, based on the concentration of inscription material in Poetovio, could be Poetovio. Here, the centrality of the town and the year-round traffic²⁵ along the Amber Road meant that more slaves would have been needed constantly.²⁶

In the case of Fructus, his service and presence in Celeia and Statio Enesis is likely given the possibility of relocations. On both inscriptions his name is in the nominative case, presumably he is the erector of the two altars. The question arises as to his presence in Poetovio. Although Poetovio's central role²⁷ may have led to senior custom officers from

other stations had to appear here from time to time to report or for controlling,²⁸ or, as mentioned above, temporary station employees were sent to Poetovio, there is no documentary evidence of this. The formula *pro Fructo* on the altar implies the possibility that Fructus himself was not in Poetovio, but only the person who erected the altar for his well-being. P. Beskow noted that altars were also erected in the mithraeums of Poetovio for persons who did not serve in this locality.²⁹ He cited as an example the mentioning of a soldier of *legio II Italica*, who according to him was identical with Quintianus, who was a *beneficiarius* in Atrans.³⁰

At the end of the inscription, the erector of the altar and his or her position had to be mentioned. As the analysis shows, Fructus must have been a *vilicus* and *Sabinus veranus* the conductor. Based on the examples given in footnotes 11 to 16, the pattern of inscriptions relating to the slaves of customs posts suggests that there were three persons named on them: *vilicus*, *vicarius* and *conductor*. This suggests that the present fragmentary inscription was made by a *vicarius* subordinate to Fructus.

On this basis, the proposed supplementation of the inscription is as follows:

[Is]idi / [My]rio/[ny]mae / [pro] Fructo / [Sabi]ni Verani / [co]nduct(or)is [vilico --- vicarius? v(otum)? s(olvit)?]

On this basis, Fructus was certainly not a *vicarius* in any of his posts. He was probably a *vilicus* at all his stations, but other customs duties directly under the control of the conductor cannot be ruled out entirely. It is not yet possible to determine whether Fructus served in Poetovio, either at the customs station or at the centre of the *publicum portorium Illyrici*. The inscriptions from the *Statio Enensis* and *Celeia* suggest that he was transferred from one station to another during his work. Thus, it is not impossible that Poetovio was among his places of service, but at the same time, because of the *pro Fructo* formula, another person could have set up an altar for him in Poetovio, not necessarily having to be personally in the city himself.

²⁰The cases mentioned in the previous footnote (*Primitivus* and *Haeliodorus*) are concrete examples of this. For the relationship between the conductor and his slaves: De Laet (1949) 384; Hirschfeld (1905) 86; Weaver (1972) 200–202.

²¹Indirect evidence of the transfers may be the spread of Mithraism itself, which Beskow theorises was spread by customs station employees moving from one station to another, making it particularly popular among the employees of the *publicum portorium Illyrici* (Beskow (1980) 14).

²²Ørsted (1985) 281. The staff was moved from these stations to northern Italy for the winter.

²³Ørsted (1985) 281–282.

²⁴They were not even built properly, and a temporarily set up tent could have served as a *statio* on these occasions.

²⁵Ørsted (1985) 282.

²⁶Poetovio would thus have served as a “base” from which slaves representing the customs service could be sent to the temporary stations if necessary. Even if one accepts this kind of central role for Poetovio, it would have been territorially limited. The practical reason for this is that it would not be an efficient solution if the distance was too great, it would not be worth sending slaves from the settlement in question too far away for temporary duty.

²⁷There was both a customs station and the centre of the *publicum portorium Illyrici*: Panciera (1957) 66; Horvat et al. (2003) 157; Hirschfeld (1905) 87; Beskow (1980) 4.

²⁸It is also possible that *beneficiarius* travelled around and checked the stations. Cf. the inscription of the *beneficiarius* at Atrans: CIL 03, 11676. -----]us Qui[nt]ianus(?) b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis) / leg(ionis) II Ital(icae) templum vetustate conlab/sum(!) et in ruina conversum sumptu s[uo] / [restituit ---]. Beskow (1980) 6.

²⁹Beskow (1980) 6. The Poetovian inscription mentioned as a parallel: AE 1991, 1301. D(eo) S(oli) I(nvicto) M(ithrae) / num(ini) sanct(o) / et praest(antissimo) / L(ucius) Vander(ius?) / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito) / XIII Kal(endas) Novem(bres) / Severo et -----Quint(iano) / p(---) p(---) SII(?)[---]. For further examples of custom officers serving elsewhere, mentioned by inscriptions from Poetovio see Beskow (1980) 7.

³⁰Beskow (1980) 6. However, P. Beskow has not provided a detailed explanation of this statement here, so it cannot be accepted as an argument beyond reasonable doubt. The Atrans inscription mentioned by him: CIL 03, 11676. -----]us Qui[nt]ianus(?) b(ene)f(iciarius) co(n)s(ularis) / leg(ionis) II Ital(icae) templum vetustate conlab/sum(!) et in ruina conversum sumptu s[uo] / [restituit ---].



The other inscription under discussion is:

D(eo) [S(oli) I(nvicto) M(ithrae)] / pr[o salute] / Att[---] /
Sat[---] / ARII(?)[---] / vik[arius!](?) [---]³¹

The various editions have tried to complete some of the details of the inscription. These, however, ignored each other's results, although taking them into account, the supplementation can be continued.

The name fragment Sat[---] was completed by Dobó³² to the name Titus Iulius Saturninus.³³ This is an acceptable version, because of the office of vikarius in the last line of the inscription, which should be associated with the publicum portorium Illyrici. Apart from Saturninus, no other customs officer with the initial Sat--- is known from the publicum portorium Illyrici.

The pro salute formula specifies that the next line is followed by a personal name. The following line begins with the cognomen Saturninus, and in the bottom line is the office of vikarius appears. Based on these parameters, the structure of the inscription can be imagined to be as the altar to the well-being of Fructus analysed above. The Att--- fragment is the name of a vilicus, followed by the name of the conductor and the word vilicus. The remainder of the altar to Fructus is not known, but there too the name of the erector may have followed the word vilicus. In this case, the Ari--- fragment is the beginning of the name of the vikarius who made the dedication.

The name beginning with Att--- must be in genitive, and the abbreviated gentilicium of Saturninus must appear at the end of the line, because of his social status. To complete the name, P. Selem has proposed the names Attius or Attidius, because of the cult of Attis, as a theophoric name.³⁴ Given the length of the upper line and the possible IVL gentilicium abbreviation³⁵ at the end of this line, Attidius would seem to be the more likely choice. However, even though it is an altar dedicated to Mithras, the followers of the religion do not necessarily have to bear a theophoric name. Thus, other names of similar length beginning with Att- cannot be excluded. Moreover, the name Attidius is unknown in Pannonia,³⁶ its occurrence being confined mainly to Italy, and within it to Rome.³⁷ The following names are known

from Pannonia:³⁸ Atticius,³⁹ Atticus,⁴⁰ Attianus⁴¹ names are not found in Pannonia, but the existing ones of appropriate length in the publicum portorium Illyrici are the following: Attilius,⁴² Attucius,⁴³ Attusius.⁴⁴ Considering the frequency of the names, Attianus seems to be the most probable name. The dating⁴⁵ of the four Pannonian examples described above and the Illyricum portorium lease of Iulius Saturninus share a common time range,⁴⁶ so the name was present in Pannonia at the time of Iulius Saturninus.

The name fragment Ari--- must be a nominative name, since it is the name of the person who dedicated the inscription. Based on the length defined by the previous lines, 5–6 more letters are possible in the line. Since the next one begins with the title of vikarius, there is no other name between it and the name, and the whole of the line beginning with Ari-- is therefore filled by the name of the vikarius. The possible names on this basis, in terms of the number of letters, are Arimanus, Ariomanus, Ariortus and Aristaeus. Of these, only one occurrence of Aristaeus is

³⁸When considering the occurrences, the names that only survive in the female form should also be taken into account.

³⁹RIU 878 Mercurio Aug(usto) sac(rum) / L(ucius) Atticius Atticinus et / C(aius) Atticius Verecundus dec(uriones).

⁴⁰CIL 03, 3585: -----] / CVM DECIAN / MISTORI AEDI / MAGISTRATVI / L(ucius) Attic(i?)us / Patrinus / heres f(aciendum) c(uravit).

⁴¹Although, Attianus is longer by one letter, but there are several possibilities for ligature in his name. RIU 991 [D(is)] M(anibus) / [---] Propinco(!) / [---] annos? XV[-] et Ael(ius) Attian/[us --- v]ixit an(nos) XVII Ael(ius) / [---]it[us] con(i)ugi? / [-----].

RIU 556 C(aio) Iul(io) C(ai) f(ilio) Fab(ia) Attiano an(n)o[rum ---] / stip(endiorum) XL C(aius) Iul(ius) Crescens lib(ertus) [---] / f(aciendum) c(uravit) HS L n(ummum) et eo amplius [---] pa[tr]oni piissimi adiecit [---] / P FAM et SP(?)E(?) vivus CVN[---] / [-----?]

RIU 1409 M(arcus) Ulpius / Attianus / v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) l(aetus) m(erito).

RIU 1522 D(is) [M(anibus)] // Hic iacet in tumulo Aur(elia) Sabina / pientissima coniux / annor(um) XXV quem / lapis ist[e] tegit / rapta [est] d[e] luce / serena q[uae] magis / debuerat fe[ss]os / sepelire parentes / o dolor o pietas / o funera tristia co[n]iugis Marcus Aur(elius) / Attianus dec(urio) al(a)e I Trh(!)/acum et Aur(elia) Sabinilla / filia eorundum(!) vivi / sibi faciendum curarunt.

⁴²In Raetia the female form of the name survived: Wagner (1957) 225. D(is) M(anibus) / Iuli(ae) -----Attili(ae) / coinage / Cl(audius) Florin[us] / [et?] sibi [-----]. Raetia could during the 2nd c. CE belonged to the publicum portorium Illyrici (Gabler (2014) 55–57).

⁴³The name is known from four inscriptions from Noricum: AE 1984, 709. Venimaro / Secconis f(ilio) / Messilla -----At/tuci f(ilia) uxor v(iva) f(ecit): AE 1974, 475. Ti(berius) Claudius Trausi fil(ius) / -----Attucius missicius coh(ortis) I / Nor(icorum) ann(or)um L stip(endiorum) XXVIII t(estamento) f(ieri) i(ussit) sibi et / Primo Fusco Prisco lib(ertis) idem / liberti et heredes fecer(unt). ILLPRON 465. -----] / [---]RC(?)V(?)[-] / [-]L(?)C(?) [-] / et(?) Augnuni / -----Attuci f(iliae). ILLPRON 647. -----Attucio / Adnama[ti] / f(ilio) et -----Attuci[ae] / Veterani f(iliae) u(x)ori / f(ili?) v(ivi?) f(ece)run(t) et Sammae [so]/rori.

⁴⁴AE 1997, 1205. -----Attusi lagona AT[---]

⁴⁵CE 71–150 (RIU 556), CE 101–200 (RIU 1409), CE 101–300 (RIU 991), CE 201–250 (RIU 1522).

⁴⁶Iulius Saturninus leased the Illyricum customs between CE 146–166: Ørsted (1985) 315–316; Szabó (2021b) 158.

³¹CIMRM 1588; Selem (1980) 127–128. Fragmentary, marble votive altar. Only the left side of the slab was probably preserved in full height. Findspot: Poetovio, 3, Mithraeum.

³²Dobó (1940) 155.

³³Titus Iulius Saturninus most likely rented a part of the Illyrican portorium between CE 146–166 (Ørsted (1985) 315–316).

³⁴Selem (1980) 128.

³⁵The gentilicium most likely appeared in Saturninus' name.

³⁶AE 2010, 1272. It does appear on a military diploma found near Siófok, but only as part of the consular date, so it cannot be considered a Pannonian occurrence.

³⁷Rome: AE 1982, 57; AE 2000, 97; AE 2000, 179; CIL 06, 41225b; Italy: AE1989, 292; AE 1990, 326.



known from Hispania,⁴⁷ one of Ariortus from Dacia,⁴⁸ and two of Arimanus, both from Noricum.⁴⁹ The phonetic similarity of the name with Arimanius, which is not unknown in Mithraic culture, is striking.⁵⁰ However, as with the names Attius and Attidius, a follower of a cult does not necessarily bear a theophoric name of this kind, even if two altars dedicated to Arimanus are known from Aquincum.⁵¹ Of the possible names, Ariomanus occurs three times in Pannonia⁵² and twice in Noricum.⁵³ Thus, statistically, this name has the highest probability. However, Ariomanus is a Celtic, Boius name,⁵⁴ and although the core area of the Boii extends north of Poetovio, it is not certain that the persons on the altars associated with the customs station at Poetovio also served there.⁵⁵ The three examples from Pannonia include a slave,⁵⁶ a vicarius, implying that Ariomanus the name is possible, while the name Attius or Attidius,⁵⁷ which is given in earlier literature, can be rejected.

As with the above-analysed inscription it is possible that Fructus himself was not in Poetovio at the time of the dedication, the same can be said of Attianus. For, although the altar was erected for his well-being, he himself was not necessarily in the settlement.⁵⁸

On this basis, the proposed supplementation is as follows:

D(eo) [S(oli) I(nvicto) M(ithrae)] / pr[o salute] / Att[(iani)
Iul(i)] / Sat[urn(ini) conductoris] vil(ici)] / Ari[omanus] /
vik[ar(ius) v(otum)? s(olvit)? l(ibens)? m(erito)?]

Although the supplementation of the inscription is still not beyond doubt, it can be said that the Att- is the name of a vilicus, and the vik- at beginning of the last line is the word vikarius. Thus, as a result new people emerge connected to the customs station at Poetovio, unknown in the earlier literature. Among the persons mentioned on the inscription,

the conductor Iulius Saturninus was already known, but the person unknown so far is his slave Attianus,⁵⁹ who was a vilicus, and his subordinate Ariomanus, who was a vicarius.

In conclusion, the structure of the two inscriptions is similar, and the text of the altars with similar content found in the territory of the publicum portorium Illyrici provides the principle basis for the supplementation. The scheme of inscriptions, based on the staff of the customs posts and their operational hierarchy, is as follows: the beneficiary slave (vilicus), his master (the conductor), the other slave who dedicates the inscription, the deputy of the vilicus (vicarius).

The addition of the two previously known inscriptions, even if the second one is not quite sure in terms of the names, provides an opportunity to include them in the research on the publicum portorium Illyrici. In the absence of supplementation, the inscription mentioning Fructus was, if not entirely omitted from previous research, not taking Fructus as vilicus into account. The other inscription, which was thanks to the supplementation of Á. Dobó, also entered the field of research on the portorium because of Iulius Saturninus, but in the absence of vilicus and vicarius it has so far been omitted from the more detailed work on the functioning of the publicum portorium Illyrici.

CORPORA

- AE L'Année épigraphique. Paris, 1888–.
CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Berlin, 1863–.
CIMRM Vermaseren, M. J. (1956, 1960). Corpus Inscriptionum et Monumentorum Religionis Mithriacae.
ILLPRON Hainzmann, M. and Schubert, P. (1986–). Inscriptionum lapidariarum Latinarum provinciae Norici usque ad annum MCMLXXXIV repertarum indices. Berlin.
RIU Die römische Inschriften Ungarns. Budapest, 1972–.
TitAqu Kovács, P. and Szabó, Á. (2009). Tituli Aquincenses. Volumen I: Tituli Operum Publicorum et Honorarii et Sacri. Pytheas, Budapest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beskow, P. (1980). The Portorium and the Mysteries of Mithras. *Journal of Mithraic Studies*, 3(1–2): 1–18.
De Laet, S.J. (1949). *Portorium. Étude sur l'organisation douanière chez les Romains surtout à l'époque du Haut-Empire*. De Tempel, Brügge.
Delamarre, X. (2007). *Noms de Personnes Celtiques dans l'Épigraphie Classique*. Errance, Paris.

⁵⁹In this case, Atticius/Atticus, or the Norican Attucius variant, is still not a completely unlikely possibility, Attianus is only statistically more likely.

⁴⁷Lőrincz and Szabó (2005); CIL 02, 496.

⁴⁸AE 2007, 1205.

⁴⁹CIL 03, 11502; CIL 03, 11661.

⁵⁰Arimanius may be the same as Aryaman, the attendant of Mithras (Merkelbach (1984) 104).

⁵¹TitAqu 257; TitAqu 258.

⁵²AE 1939, 0261. Tudro / -----Ariom/ani l(iberto) an(norum) / XL h(ic) s(itus) e(st).

CIL 03, 11311. -----Ariomanus / Iliati f(ilius) Boi(us) / annorum / XV / h(ic) s(itus) e(st) / pater posuit.

CIL 03, 14355, 17. -----A[ri]om/anus T(iti?) F(lavi?) / Samionis / serv(u)s (a)n(norum) III / HOPTE / Samio p(osuit).

⁵³CIL 03, 4880. -----Ariomanus / Terti f(ilius) et / Quarta Mas(cu)li f(ilia) v(ivi) f(ecerunt) sibi et / Vibio f(ilio) an(norum) XXV.

CIL 03, 11569. Ceudo -----Ario/mani f(ilius) Caesi/ae sorori et / Suavi nepot(i) / d(e) s(uo) v(ivus) f(ecit). The same person is also found on another inscription: CIL 03, 14101. Ceudo -----Arioma/ni f(ilius) et Tocia / Veriugi f(ilia) / Admatae filiae / sibi et suis / v(ivi) f(ecerunt).

⁵⁴Delamarre (2007) 26.

⁵⁵Szabó (2021b) 176–177.

⁵⁶See note 53.

⁵⁷Selem (1980) 128.

⁵⁸Cf. a soldeir of the legio II Italica, note 29. and 30.



- Dobó, Á. (1940). Publicum Portorium Illyrici. *Archaeologiai Értesítő*, 1: 144–194.
- Fitz, J. (1993). *Die Verwaltung Pannoniens in der Römerzeit*, Vol. I–IV. Encyclopaedia, Budapest.
- Gabler, D. (2014). A belső vámok szerepe a rajnai és dunai provinciák importált érámiasspektrumában. *Dissertationes Archaeologicae*, 3.2: 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.17204/dissarch.2014.45>.
- Hirschfeld, O. (1905). *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*. Weidmann, Berlin.
- Horvat, J., Lovenjak, M., Dolenc Vičič, A., Lubšina-Tušek, M., Tomanič-Jevremov, M., and Šubic, Z. (2003). Poetovio. Development and Topography. In: Šašel Kos, M. and Scherrer, P. (Eds.), *The autonomous towns of Noricum and Pannonia/Die Autonomen Städte in Noricum und Pannonien*, Vol. 41. Situla, National Museum of Slovenia, Ljubljana, pp. 153–189.
- Lőrincz, B. and Szabó, Á. (2005). *Onomasticon Provinciarum Europae Latinarum (OPEL) 1. ABA – BYSANUS – Editio nova aucta et emendata*. Archaeolingua, Budapest.
- Merkelbach, R. (1984). *Mithras*. Königstein, Wien.
- Ørsted, P. (1985). *Roman Imperial Economy and Romanization: a study in Roman imperial administration and the public lease system in the Danubian provinces from the first to the third century A.D.* J. Martin Stafford, Copenhagen.
- Panciera, S. (1957). *Vita economica di Aquileia in età romana*. Associazione Nazionale per Aquileia, Lido-Venezia.
- Sarkisjan, J. (2022). *Publicum Portorium Illyrici a Mithraismus v Dunajské oblasti* (Publicum Portorium Illyrici and Mithraism in the Danube region). PhD dissertation, Charles University, Prague.
- Salem, P. (1980). *Les religions orientales dans la Pannonie Romaine. Partie en Yougoslavie*, Vol. 85. Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, Brill, Leiden. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004295650>.
- Szabó, M. (2021a). Szervezeti váltás a poetoviói vámhivatalban. *Acta Numismatica Hungarica Supplementum*, 3: 37–45. <https://doi.org/10.37790/anhs.3.3>.
- Szabó, M. (2021b). *Pannonia kereskedelmének társadalmi háttere* (The social background of trade and commerce in Pannonia). PhD Dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. <https://doi.org/10.15476/ELTE.2021.190>.
- Szabó, M. (2021c). Status or role? Differences between the social Status and role in Brigetio. *Dissertationes Archaeologicae*, 3.9: 189–195. <https://doi.org/10.17204/dissarch.2021.189>.
- Wagner, F. (1957). Neue Inschriften aus Raetien. Nachträge zu Fr. Vollmer, *Inscriptiones Baivarum Romanae*. *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission*, 37–38: 215–264.
- Weaver, P.R.C. (1972). *Familia Caesaris. A social study of The Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Zaccaria, D. (2010). Dall' "Aquileiense portorium" al "publicum portorii Illyrici": revisione e aggiornamento della documentazione epigrafica. In: Zerbini, L. (Ed.), *Roma e le province del Danubio. Atti del I Convegno Internazionale Ferrara, Cento, 15–17 Ottobre 2009*. Rubbettino, Catanzaro, pp. 53–78.



Fructus, Attianus, Ariomanus

Két poetovioi oltárfelirat kiegészítése

Szabó Melinda

A Publicum Portorium tárgykörébe tartozó feliratok kimagasló számban ismertek Poetovióból, a tárgyalt két felirat is ezek közé tartozik. Bár már ismert feliratokról van szó, mindkettő esetében további kiegészítésekre van lehetőség a vámmállomások alkalmazottait említő feliratok párhuzamai alapján.

A CIL 03, 04017 számú oltár

A felirat megmaradt szövegéből egyértelműen látszik, hogy egy bizonyos Fructusért állították. Fructus Sabinius Veranus rabszolgája volt, ez kiderül egy másik, mindkettőjüket említő, celeiai feliratról. A poetovioi felirat kiegészítéséhez először érdemes megvizsgálni a vicarius feliratok általános jellegzetességeit. Ezeken látható, hogy a vicariusok által állított feliratokon a nevek a következő sorrendben szerepelnek: a vicarius neve, az ő vilicusának a neve, a conductor neve. Ezzel szemben a vámmállomás személyzetével összefüggésbe hozható feliratokon, ahol egy név, majd utána genitivusban a conductor neve szerepel, mindig olyan feladatkört ellátó rabszolgák szerepelnek, akik közvetlenül a conductor alá tartoztak. A kérdéses poetovioi feliraton is, a 'pro Fructo' megjelölés után a conductor neve szerepel. Tartalmilag párhuzam vonható a CIL 03, 15184, 7. felirattal, ami formailag jól mutatja, hogy a pro + név után genitivusban a közvetlen rabszolgatartó neve áll. Ez alapján kizárható, hogy a poetovioi feliraton Fructus vicarius feladatkörben lenne. A felmerülő többi lehetőség közül a celeiai felirat miatt a vilicus a leginkább valószínű. A felirat javasolt kiegészítése ezek alapján a következő:

[Is]idi / [My]rio/[ny]mae / [pro] Fructo / [Sabi]ni Verani /
[co]nduct(oris) [vilico --- vicarius? v(otum)? s(olvit)?]

A CIMRM 1588 számú oltár

Sat[---] névtörédket a felirat legutolsó sorában lévő vik(arius) tisztség miatt Saturninusra lehet kiegészíteni, hiszen a vikarius alapján a publicum portorium Illyrici-vel kell a feliratot

összefüggésbe hozni. Saturninuson kívül más, Sat--- névkezzel rendelkező vámügyi tisztségviselő nem ismert a publicum portorium Illyrici területéről. A pro salute formula meghatározza, hogy a következő sorban egy személynév következik. Azt ezt követő sor kezdődik Saturninus cognomenével, majd a legalsó sorban a vikarius tisztség olvasható. Ezek alapján a paraméterek alapján az előbb elemzett, Fructus jólétéért állított oltár mintájára képzelhető el a felirat szerkezete. Az Att--- kezdetű névnek genitivusban kell állnia, és a sor végén Saturninus rövidített gentiliciumának is szerepelnie kell. A publicum portorium Illyrici területén létező, megfelelő hosszúságú nevek: Attilius, Attucius, Attusius. A nevek gyakoriságát figyelembe véve az Attianus tűnik a leginkább valószínű névkiegészítésnek, ezt a feliratok keltezése is lehetővé teszi. Az Ari--- névtörék egy nominativusban álló név kell, hogy legyen. Mivel a következő a vikarius tisztség megnevezésével kezdődik, e között és a név között nem fordul elő más a feliraton, következésképpen az Ari- kezdetű sor egészét a vikarius neve töltötte ki. A lehetséges nevek ez alapján, a betűk számát tekintve az Ariomanus, Ariomanus, Ariortus és az Aristaeus. Ezek közül az Ariomanus Pannoniában háromszor fordul elő, Noricumban pedig kétszer. A három pannoniiai példa között egy rabszolgát is találunk, egy vikarius esetében ez alapján az Ariomanus név elképzelhető, a korábbi irodalomban szereplő Attius vagy Attidius elvethető. Bár a felirat kiegészítése továbbra sem minden kétséget nélkülöző, az elmondható, hogy az Att- névkezzet egy vilicus neve, a vik- sorkezzet pedig a vikarius szó. A feliraton szereplő személyek közül Iulius Saturninus conductor eddig is ismert volt, eddig ismeretlen személy viszont az ő rabszolgája, a vilicus feladatkörben tevékenykedő Attianus, és az ő beosztottja, Ariomanus, aki vicarius volt. Ezek alapján a javasolt kiegészítés a következő:

D(eo) [S(oli) I(nvicto) M(ithrae)] / pr[o salute] / Att[i(ani) Iul(i)] / Sat[urn(ini conductoris) vil(ici)] / Ari[omanus] / vik[ar(ius) v(otum)? s(olvit)? l(ibens)? m(erito)?]

