

FRANCIS CAIRNS

ΕΡΑΦΗΡΟΔΙΤΗΣ, ΦΑΙΝΙΑΝΟΚΟΡΪΟΙΣ ΑΝΔ ‘ΜΟΔΕΣΤΟΣ’ (SUDA E 2004)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 124 (1999) 218–222

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ΕΡΑΦΗΡΟΔΙΤΗΣ, ΦΑΙΝΙΑΝΟΚΟΡΪΟΙΣ AND ‘MODESTUS’ (SUDA Ε 2004)

I. ΦαινιανοκορΪοίς

Suda ε 2004, on the *grammatikos* and bibliophile Epaphroditus, eminent (so it asserts) in Rome from the times of Nero to Nerva, declares that he lived ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις ΦαινιανοκορΪοίς δύο οἰκίας αὐτόθι κτησάμενος (he will have required two houses for his library of thirty thousand volumes). W. Pape and G. E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 2 vols, Braunschweig 1884<sup>3</sup> s.v. duly recorded ΦαινιανοκορΪοίς as an “Ort in Rom”.

The Suda text, in my view, is corrupt.<sup>1</sup> The location of Epaphroditus’ houses in Rome was, I suggest, the *horrea Faeniana* – the ‘granaries of Faenius’, built undoubtedly<sup>2</sup> by the Neronian *praefectus annonae* (AD 55–62) L. Faenius Rufus, whose career and life ended in some disrepute after the Pisonian conspiracy of AD 65.<sup>3</sup> The corruption in the Suda text can be explained simply: the κ of ΦαινιανοκορΪοίς is a conflation of minuscule ι and ς; and ‘ορΪοίς’ is a transliteration of Latin *horreis*, i.e. ὄρρα with a single ρ – as in *SEG* 4.106 – rather than the more accurate ὄρρα (as, for example, in *IG* VII 24.11). The Suda entry therefore originally read ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις Φαινιανοῖς ὄρ[ρ]οίς κτλ. The reversal of noun and adjective in the Greek version of *horrea Faeniana* is standard Greek idiom.<sup>4</sup>

The *horrea Faeniana* are only otherwise attested in *CIL* VI 37796, a funerary inscription erected by the slave Speratus, who worked there, for his *contubernalis* Soteris:<sup>5</sup>

SOTERIDI IVLIAE  
EPIPHANIAE SER V A XXX  
BENEMERENTI SPERATVS  
CONTVBERN EX HORREIS  
FAENIANIS FECIT

Apart from the fact that the *horrea Faeniana* were in Rome, nothing more is known about them;<sup>6</sup> and there were *horrea* in every *Regio* of Rome.<sup>7</sup>

The context of the new attestation of the *horrea Faeniana* in Suda ε 2004 revives an old problem, namely whether all the traders who describe themselves epigraphically as *del/ex horreis* actually traded

<sup>1</sup> For some older, and other, attempted solutions, cf. C. Ulrichs, Pamphilos, der Maler und Grammatiker, *Rh.M.* N.F. 19, 1861, 247-58, 253 note. See also the Addendum to the present paper.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 102: “Ab eo sine dubio praefecto videlicet annonae dicta horrea Faeniana.”

<sup>3</sup> For this individual, cf. *RE* s.v. Faenius 1); *Kl. P. s.v.* Faenius; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 102: H. Pavis D’Escrucac, *La préfecture de l’annone. Service administratif impérial d’Auguste à Constantin*, Rome 1976, 322; S. Demougin, *Prosopographie des chevaliers romains julio-claudiens (43 av. J.-C. – 70 ap. J.-C.)*, Rome 1992, 478-9 (no. 577). In view of his post, his *horrea* will have been specifically for grain storage.

<sup>4</sup> Among many similar phrases cf. πρὸς τοῖς καλουμένοις Κορνίκλοις ὄρρασι (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.16.5); παρὰ ταῖς καλουμέναις Μουγωνίσι πύλαις (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.50.3); ἐν τοῖς καλουμένοις ἄσπροῖς χωρΪοίς (Aelian *NA* 1.26). Such phrases can sometimes, as here, introduce Latin names (cf. the Dion. Hal. exx. above and (e.g.) Suda ζ 73: τῶν καλουμένων αὐτοῦ [i.e. Σαλουστίου] Βελῶν); but their general function is simply to indicate that a proper name or a distinguishing adjective is about to be introduced.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, Rome 1993-, III H-O (1996) s.v. *Horrea Faeniana* (p. 40); pp. 37–51 cover all known Roman *horrea*. On these cf. also E. Rodríguez Almeida, *Il Monte Testaccio. Ambiente · storia · materiali*, Rome 1984, 35–65.

<sup>6</sup> The reputed find-spot of *CIL* VI 37796 (outside the *Porta Pia* near the church of S. Agnes) is unhelpful; the known *tegulae* of L. Faenius Rufus (*CIL* XV 1136 and 1137), found on the Esquiline, were produced during his period as *praefectus praetorio*. One (1136) names him as *PR PR*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. G. Rickman, *Roman Granaries and Store Buildings*, Cambridge 1971, 323–5.

from the particular *horrea* named or whether some merely had shops in the area of those *horrea*<sup>8</sup> – i.e. whether some references to individual *horrea* are in fact references to the district in which they were situated rather than to the actual warehouse buildings. Up to now the prevailing view has been that, since there were shops inside the *horrea*, all such references can be explained as references to the warehouses and not to the areas in which they were sited.<sup>9</sup> Suda ε 2004 seems to contradict this view; and it is not immediately easy to explain away. It is unlikely, since new *horrea* were being built throughout this period, that the *horrea Faeniana* had been demolished and replaced by houses. Again it is improbable that Epaphroditus had in fact hired<sup>10</sup> two rooms in the *horrea Faeniana* to store his books: the whole point of the anecdote is that Epaphroditus needed two houses to accommodate his vast library. It looks, then, as though we either have to hypothesise severe abbreviation by the Suda of its source<sup>11</sup> or/and multiple errors in that source, or to accept that the Suda’s source used the term *horrea Faeniana* for the district in which Epaphroditus acquired his two houses. A verdict of *non liquet* on the facts is inevitable; but unless and until Suda ε 2004 can be plausibly discounted, it will need to be noted in this connection.

## II. ‘Modestus’ and the Prefects of Egypt

The standard reference works<sup>12</sup> are in agreement about the early life of Epaphroditus: he was first *verna* of the *grammaticus* Archias of Alexandria before being acquired by M. Mettius Modestus, Prefect of Egypt, as tutor to his son Petelinus, and subsequently manumitted. His full Roman name, i.e. M. Mettius Epaphroditus, is (so they claim) confirmed by a statue found in Rome and now in the Villa Altieri, with the inscription (*CIL* VI 9454):

M. METTIUS  
EPAPHRODITUS  
GRAMMATICUS GRAECUS  
M. METTIUS GERMANUS L FEC

However, this account (mainly based on Suda ε 2004) will not stand up to scrutiny. Some of its flaws have been highlighted in isolation; but they deserve to be assembled.

Suda ε 2004 identifies Epaphroditus’ second master (and presumed manumitter) as ‘Modestus’. The supposed statue of Epaphroditus is of a M. Mettius Epaphroditus, and two men (if they are not one and same man) named M. Mettius Modestus are known epigraphically, i.e. PIR<sup>2</sup> M 566 (a *procurator Augusti*, probably in Syria and possibly in the reign of Claudius) and PIR<sup>2</sup> M 567 (of whom nothing further known). Hence the Suda’s ‘Modestus’ has been assumed to be a ‘M. Mettius Modestus’. But the statue of “M. Mettius Epaphroditus grammaticus Graecus” is of the Antonine period,<sup>13</sup> whereas, according to Suda ε 2004, our Epaphroditus died not later than January AD 98 (the end of Nerva’s reign). The extended time-scale demanded by the identification of the statue’s honorand with our Epaphroditus must therefore give pause. It could, of course, be maintained that a freedman of our

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Rickman (n. 7) 173–6, 316–22 (Appendix 5: *Horrea* as a place name, noting its use in *Regio* 13 of Rome – the Aventine); G. Rickman, *The Corn Supply of Ancient Rome*, Oxford 1980, 140–1.

<sup>9</sup> Rickman (n. 7) tends to this conclusion; and it is assumed in Rickman (n. 8).

<sup>10</sup> Hiring, not sale, is involved in known uses by third parties of Roman *horrea*, in whole or part. Doubtless security was the main reason.

<sup>11</sup> On which see below, II and n. 28.

<sup>12</sup> I.e. *RE* s.v. Epaphroditos 5), *Kl. P.* s.v. Epaphroditos 3, *Der Neue Pauly* s.v. Epaphroditos [3], *OLD*<sup>3</sup> s.v. Epaphroditus (2). Cf. also J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden 1979, 103–4; PIR<sup>2</sup> M 563.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the authorities (Richter and Eck) cited at PIR<sup>2</sup> M 563.

Epaphroditus erected a statue of his former master 40+ years after the latter's death; and indeed an attractive context for this action could be hypothesised, viz. Germanus was also a *grammaticus*, Epaphroditus founded a school, and Germanus was its head in the Antonine period. But on the other hand 'Epaphroditus' = 'Felix' was a very common slave name (there are 284 known Epaphroditoi from Rome alone in the first and second centuries AD<sup>14</sup>); and there is always the possibility that 'Epaphroditus' became a 'trade-name' for some *grammatici Graeci* because of the celebrity of our Epaphroditus. The statue and its inscription could, then, only carry conviction if supported by other evidence, which turns out not to be the case.

To begin with, the 'Modestus' named by the Suda as Epaphroditus' second owner is described further in the words ἐπάρχου Αἰγύπτου.<sup>15</sup> Now PIR<sup>2</sup> features a Mettius Modestus (M 565), suffect consul in AD 82. But there is no evidence that he was ever Prefect of Egypt, any more than was M. Mettius Modestus PIR<sup>2</sup> M 566 or PIR<sup>2</sup> M 567 (on whom see above). Another Mettius (M. Mettius Rufus, PIR<sup>2</sup> M 572), probably related to one or more of the others mentioned, was indeed Prefect of Egypt – from AD 89–91/92. But, apart from his different cognomen, his tenure of the post falls too late for him to have been Epaphroditus' second owner during his prefecture, or, probably, at any point. Hence the 'M. Mettius Modestus' who was supposedly (on the basis of Suda ε 2004 alone) Prefect of Egypt in the Neronian period is a historical embarrassment. Although Stein (1950) 32–3 welcomed him uncritically into his list,<sup>16</sup> Reinmuth expressed strong doubts;<sup>17</sup> and the relegation of 'M. Mettius Modestus' to a footnote by G. Bastianini, *Lista dei prefetti d'Egitto dal 30<sup>a</sup> al 299<sup>p</sup>*, *ZPE* 17, 1975, 263–328, 273 n. 1, almost speaks for itself. I propose, then, that 'M. Mettius Modestus' be definitively struck out of the list of Prefects of Egypt.

This does not mean, however, that the Suda's information about the names of Epaphroditus' second master and his son is incorrect. First, there is no reason to doubt that the master was a 'Modestus'; second, the name given for his son, Epaphroditus' tutee, i.e. Πετηλῖνον (= 'Petelinus' – there are no manuscript variants), involves a combination of rarity and genuineness which enhances its credibility. 'Petelinus' is the ethnic of the town of Petelia in Bruttium, famous for its loyalty to Rome in the Hannibalic war. This presumably explains its (otherwise unattested) use as a *cognomen*.<sup>18</sup> It is possible that our Modestus or his family originated from Petelia and that he gave his son the *cognomen* 'Petelinus' to commemorate this;<sup>19</sup> but this cannot be assumed or even regarded as likely since the bearers of geographical *cognomina* often have no known connections with the areas after which they were named.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Cf. P. R. C. Weaver, Epaphroditus, Josephus, and Epictetus, *CQ* n.s. 44, 1994, 468–479, 468 and n. 2, referring to H. Solin, *Die griechischen Personennamen in Rom: ein Namenbuch*, Berlin 1982, 320–4. Weaver tentatively accepts the traditional view of our Epaphroditus (475).

<sup>15</sup> It is unnecessary to insert (with A. Daub, *Studien zu den Biographika des Suidas*, Freiburg im Breisgau and Tübingen 1882, 107) τοῦ before ἐπάρχου: references in Greek to Prefects of Egypt as ἐπαρχος regularly omit the article. Cf. e.g. A. Stein, *Die Präfecten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Berne 1950, 19, 31, 39, etc.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also H.-G. Pflaum, *AE* (1973) 548.

<sup>17</sup> O. W. Reinmuth, Prefects of Egypt 30 B.C to 299 A.D., *Bull. Am. Soc. Pap.* 4, 1967, 75–128, 81–2; cf. esp. "Aside from the reliability of the *Suda* as a source, the absence of supporting evidence would suggest that Modestus, for the time being, be kept outside the roster of the prefects of Egypt" (82).

<sup>18</sup> The link was first suggested by H.-G. Pflaum (n. 16). It is not weakened by the possibility that the name of a 'Petelia Iusta' recorded at *CIL* X 3474 (Misenum) also refers to the town. There was a *Petelinus lucus extra Portam Flumentanam* at Rome: cf. Liv. 6.20.11; 7.41.3; Plut. *Cam.* 36.6. But a connection with it seems unlikely. The variant orthography 'Petil-' in Livy MSS (of the *lucus*) and, e.g., at Val. Max. 6.6.ext.2, Frontin. *Strateg.* 4.5.18 where the town is in question, is not significant in the present context.

<sup>19</sup> If the arguments presented here are correct, PIR<sup>2</sup> M 569, which, with some hesitation, records our Petelinus as '(Mettius?) Petelinus', refers to Suda ε 2004, and notes Pflaum's suggestion (above n. 18), should be deleted.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. esp. H. Solin, Zur Tragfähigkeit der Onomastik in der Prosopographie, in W. Eck (ed.) *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte*, Köln – Wien – Weimar, 1993, pp. 1–33.

The errors in Suda ε 2004<sup>21</sup> can be accounted for readily. Epaphroditus' first owner is named by the Suda as 'Archias'. He is doubtless the homeric scholar Archias whose views are preserved in Hesychius, the homeric scholia and elsewhere.<sup>22</sup> One of his recorded opinions<sup>23</sup> coincides with a verdict on the same question attributed to Epaphroditus by a different text,<sup>24</sup> which confirms the Suda's account of their relationship; and, since the point at issue involved controversy with another school (that of Dionysius of Sidon),<sup>25</sup> it is even more likely that Epaphroditus was adhering loyally to his master Archias' view. None of these other sources refers to Archias as an Alexandrian; and some Suda MSS<sup>26</sup> describe him as "Archias, son of Alexander" (Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου), rather than "Archias of Alexandria" (Ἀρχίου τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως), as do the rest. Nevertheless, and despite the fact that the MSS showing Ἀλεξάνδρου are in general more reliable, and despite also the opinion of Daub to the contrary<sup>27</sup>, the reading Ἀλεξανδρέως is to be preferred since Ἀλεξάνδρου is clearly the result of assimilation. The Suda's ultimate source, Hermippos of Berytos in his 'Slave-Professors' (Περὶ τῶν διαπρεψάντων ἐν παιδείᾳ δούλων),<sup>28</sup> (or, less likely, his excerptor Hesychius of Miletus) will, then, have described Epaphroditus as the house-slave of an Alexandrian *grammatikos*.

Since Epaphroditus' first master originated in Alexandria, it may have been presumed without further thought that Epaphroditus himself was reared there as Archias' house-slave. Hence the (probably inappropriate) question how Epaphroditus got from there to Rome may have seemed to need answering. The theory (or fact) that his second owner had served as a Roman official in Egypt will have provided the answer. Hermippos of Berytos may in general have preferred to distinguish his heroes by making them the slaves of important individuals. Either this tendency, or pure confusion, could have led to the unhistorical promotion of 'Modestus' to the prefecture of Egypt by the addition of ἐπάρχου Αἰγύπτου, the process being aided by the use of Modestus as a *cognomen* in the family of a (later) genuine Prefect of Egypt (M. Mettius Rufus).<sup>29</sup> If this was the case, then Epaphroditus had less elevated early contacts than has been thought. His first master Archias will have trained him as a scholar and then sold him (doubtless on condition that he would be freed once his tutorial duties had come to an end) to an otherwise unknown 'Modestus'.\*

#### Addendum

This paper was already at proof stage when Professor W. Eck drew my attention to K. J. Rigsby, *Graecolatina 5. A Roman Address*, *ZPE* 119, 1997, 249–50, where the linkage of Φαινιανοκοροίος with the *horrea Faeniana* proposed by me had been anticipated. Apart from welcoming this independent confirmation, I note briefly a few differences of emphasis:

<sup>21</sup> On errors in the Suda, cf. the remarks of and material cited by Weaver (n. 14) 478 and nn. (exonerating Hermippos, on whom see below and n. 28).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *RE s.v.* Archias 21. Apart from the *loci* noted below, cf. Cramer *Anecd. Par.* 4.179.30 = 61.1 and 193.15.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* 156.26–31.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Schol. B ad Hom. *II.* 19.77ff.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Apoll. Soph. *Lex. Hom.* 156.27–9.

<sup>26</sup> For an account of the MSS and their relative value, cf. A. Adler (ed.), *Suidae Lexicon* (Lexicographica Graeca 1) 5 vols. Leipzig 1928–38, I viii–xiv.

<sup>27</sup> Daub (n. 15) 106–8.

<sup>28</sup> On Hermippos, cf. Christes (n. 12) 137–40.

<sup>29</sup> No 'Modestus' other than the supposititious Neronian Prefect 'M. Mettius Modestus' is attested or has been proposed as Prefect of Egypt.

\* Acknowledgements: I am most grateful for comments and corrections to Dr Malcolm Heath (who first drew Suda ε 2004 to my attention) and to Prof. Geoffrey Rickman. Prof. W. Eck valuably censured certain otiose speculations and provided a vital bibliographical pointer.

1) Prof. Rigsby (R.) believes (249) that the corruption goes back to undivided majuscule *FAENIANISHORREIS* becoming ΦΑΙΝΙΑΝΟΙΣΟΠΙΟΙΣ, then ΦΑΙΝΙΑΝΟΚΟΠΙΟΙΣ, whereas I suggest minuscule corruption.

2) R. is concerned (250) about the word order involved and regards καλουμένοις as having “led a Latin or a Greek writer to invert the regular order for emphasis”; contrariwise I argue that the word order is normal for Greek and that καλουμένοις has different implications (cf. n. 4).

3) R. thinks (250) that slaves lived in the Roman *horrea* and that Epaphroditus’ οἰκίας may render “‘apartments’ (*insulae, cenacula*)” <i.e. in the *horrea*>. I stress, however, that there is, in fact, no evidence of people residing in the *horrea*, that space there was hired not bought (and the Suda text refers to purchasing), and that for the anecdote to make sense, it must refer to houses.