



The Mausoleum of Iulii at Mustis (Africa Proconsularis). Onomastic and Family Relationships.

Sergio España Chamorro

► To cite this version:

Sergio España Chamorro. The Mausoleum of Iulii at Mustis (Africa Proconsularis). Onomastic and Family Relationships.. *Gephyra*, 2023, 26, pp.55-68. <10.37095/gephyra.1268129>. <hal-04284627>

HAL Id: hal-04284627

<https://hal.science/hal-04284627v1>

Submitted on 14 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

The Mausoleum of Iulii at Mustis (Africa Proconsularis). Onomastics and Family Relationships

Sergio ESPAÑA CHAMORRO*

The Roman *municipium*¹ of Mustis is near present-day Henchir Mest (Tunisia). It was a medium-sized town in the Roman province of Africa Proconsularis, but with an interesting corpus of at least 200 inscriptions. It was located on the *plain du Krib*, next to the *via Carthago-Theveste* and near other important towns such as Thugga (NE), Uchi Maius (NW), Sicca Veneria (SW) and the *fossa Regia*. Mustis received some veterans under Marius and then it was promoted to the status of *municipium* by Iulius Caesar. Marcus Aurelius took part in a refoundation, giving it the name and status of *municipium Iulium Aurelium*, and finally Antoninus Pius enlarged the territory².

Extensive excavations undertaken in the 20th century³ included the mausoleum which is the subject of this article. The last major update for the town was the so-called *Mustitana* corpus⁴. After the end of French colonial period, the site remained abandoned and no publications referred to it⁵ until a couple of years ago, when a team from the Uniwersytet Gdański (Poland) quietly resumed interest in it⁶.

After some years when international travel was not possible due to Covid-19, I focused my research on the study of North African epigraphic archives and I published a paper on Libyan Studies (España-Chamorro 2022), with some unpublished inscriptions from Mustis found in the Parisian archives⁷. Continuing the research in the archives, I found new material concerning this archaeological site that allows us to reconstruct the archaeological campaigns from 1930s and 1960s from the Fond Poinssot.

* Sergio España-Chamorro, Università degli Studi “La Sapienza” di Roma, Dipartimento di Scienze dell’Antichità Department, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellow (IMPACTVM, Grant Agreement no. 101025799) (sergio.espana@uniroma1.it).

¹ About the history of the city see Beschaouch 1967; 1968; 2014.

² Beschaouch 2005; 2014.

³ In 1932 with R. Bréjean and supervised by L. Poinssot, and then in 1960 supervised by C. Poinssot.

⁴ Beschaouch 1968.

⁵ Campedelli 2015 ; Brandt 2015 ; Recently also Abid 2021; España-Chamorro 2022; España-Chamorro - Gregori 2023.

⁶ Kłodziński 2020.

⁷ I am grateful to the staff at the *Institut National d’Histoire de l’Art* in Paris for kindly giving me permission to study, digitalise and publish the findings from the archives that are reproduced with permission. No modern photographs are provided because permissions and copyright belong to INP from Tunis and their partners.

A “famous” unpublished mausoleum: some insights into the history of this monument

It was a big surprise when the quadruple funerary inscription (España-Chamorro 2022, n. 4, and see Fig. 1) known from a photograph and archival documents found in Paris were rediscovered and found to correspond to the famous mausoleum in Mustis.



Fig. 1) Photograph of Claude Poinssot in 1961 (Fond Poinssot, INHA)

The history of this monument is interesting even from the historiographical point of view. The inscription is certainly the epitaph from the funerary monument that was already visible in the 19th century. Victor Guérin⁸ described its form and location during his visit to Henchir Mest in 1862. However, he did not provide the text of the inscription, as was his custom with all the inscriptions he found, probably because the text had yet to be unearthed (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2) Mausoleum before of the intervention, circa 1900 (Fond Poinssot, INHA)

⁸ « A une heure, en quittant l'henchir Mest, j'observe un peu au-delà de la grande porte triomphale de l'est les restes de plusieurs tombeaux, et, entre autres, ceux d'un mausolée rectangulaire presque entièrement démoli. » Guérin 1862/2, 105.

There are no other reports of this mausoleum until 1961, when Claude Poinssot (1928–2002) visited the archaeological site for the purpose of documenting several monuments and inscriptions. Only the fragmentary inscription was photographed and identified as a part of a mausoleum next to the triumphal arch, as it was described on the back of the photograph (*insc. du mausolée voisin de l'arc*).

Shortly after, the French architect Jacques Vérité was commissioned to reassemble and restore the triumphal arch between 1966 and 1968⁹. It was at this time that the remaining stones of the mausoleum were reassembled (but not restored) between late 1966 and early 1967. However, Vérité's reassembling and restoration of both monuments were truly a botched job, as he himself publicly recognised¹⁰. In that document, he proposed a rectification of the project and a new integration of the arch with an addenda on the mausoleum in which he explained that this project was aimed at safeguarding the rest of the monument and not actually reconstructing it¹¹ (Fig. 3 and 4).



Fig. 3) Mausoleum in 1967 (Vérité 1988)



Fig. 4) Mausoleum under works of reassemble in 1967 (Vérité 1988)

The main inscription of the funerary monument was not only to be relocated in the mausoleum, but also to be reintegrated with a missing fragment documented again in Poinssot's photographic expedition preserved in the INHA¹² archives shortly after the reassemble of the arch (Fig. 5 and 6), as well as leaving others around the area. In spite of all this work undertaken next to the

⁹ Vérité 1988.

¹⁰ Vérité 2014 ; 2021.

¹¹ « En 1966, le mausolée des *Julii* était très ruiné mais un certain nombre de pierres en provenant parmi lesquels l'inscription et une corniche gisaient à proximité. Une étude rapide a montré que la restauration n'était pas possible car rien ne permettait de définir leur position respective et leur niveau sur l'édifice. Afin de protéger ces quelques éléments, on a remonté, dès le début du chantier, une partie des murs du podium en remplaçant les deux pierres qui manquaient, par des blocs de béton avec un gravier 3/8 (cela signifie que le gravier ne passe dans un tamis de 3mm de maille et passe dans un tamis de 8mm de maille). On a constaté immédiatement que cette apparence serait trop proche de celle des pierres dès qu'il serait patiné ce qui nous a conduit aux choix commentés ci-dessus. J'insiste sur le fait que cette intervention n'est pas une restauration mais, seulement, une sauvegarde des restes », Vérité 2021.

¹² Dondin-Payre 2016.

mausoleum, no publication was issued. Some epigraphic blocks that once formed part of the text were not repositioned and remained in the surroundings. Vérité also remarked that several blocks could not be identified, especially those from the upper part of the monument.




Fig. 5




Fig. 6

Sketches of the mausoleum in its current situation. Front and side. Grey parts are the blocks in non-original position (author based on Vérité 2021)

Nobody paid any attention to the Mustis mausoleum or the archives until my publication in 2022, although some interesting studies have been published recently¹³. Now, only few months after publication, this new unexpected connection with new photographs from the Fond Poinssot allows me to correct and expand on the insights into the prominent family interred in this mausoleum.

A new edition of the text

Last year I published the inscription as fragmentary. Now, with these new documents, the text can be expanded without any lacunas.

Block 1:

1. *D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum)*¹⁴

Block 2. Inscription 2a:

[Q(uitus) Iuliu]s Q(uiti) fil(ius)

[Mu]cianus

v(ixit) an(nos) XVIII d(ies)

5. *VII Bizacius.*

Block 2. Inscription 2b:

Q(uitus) Iulius Q(uiti) fil(ius)

Restitutus

v(ixit) an(nos) XXI m(enses) III

5. *Dancharrus.*

¹³ Chaouali 2014; 2015; Campedelli 2015; Brandt 2015; Kłodziński 2020; Kłodziński – Abid 2021; España-Chamorro 2022; España-Chamorro - Gregori 2023.

¹⁴ There is no photograph of the other blocks. However, archaeological reports from 1930-32 (Poinssot 106.111.02, Musti) speaks about the archaeological excavation along the road and quoted the site. They speak about the mausoleum and some other blocks with bigger letters (*DMS* and *HSS*) around the monument. They are still in situ (as I could see in December 2022 where I checked their *capitalis quadrata*) and visible in fig. 7.

Block 2. Inscription 2c:

[I]ulia Q(uinti) f(ili)a
Quieta
flamin(ica)

5. p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos) ▲ LXXXI.

Block 2. Inscription 2d:

Q(uintus) Iulius Am-
pliatu(s) Ve-
teranu(s) v(ixit)

5. ann(os) LXXXV.

Block 2. Inscription 2e:

Q(uintus) Iulius Q(uinti) f(ilius)
Respectus
v(ixit) an(nos) XVIII m(enses) +

5. Castricius.

Block 3:

6. H(ic) S(iti) S(unt)



Fig. 7



Fig. 8



Fig. 9

Mausoleum after 1960 (Fond Poinssot, INHA)




Fig. 10) Detail of the inscriptions (Fond Poinssot, INHA)




Fig. 11) Sketch of the new proposal of restitution (author based on Vêrité 2021)




Fig. 12) Proportions hypothesis of the mausoleum (author based on Vêrité 2021)

New insights into the Roman society of Mustis

In the first Parisian photograph only the right-hand side of the text was visible and two names were missing. I could only read the final part of the second name, thinking that it was the second person of the epitaph with a lacuna of the first missing name. Now, we can see that it is not a quadruple epitaph, but a monumental mausoleum in which five people were interred. The new reading also allows to fill in a lacuna in the epitaph of Quintus Iulius Respectus and to correct an erroneous hypothesis. I speculated that Castricius was a possible member of the family who had died unexpectedly and that his name had been inscribed in this small space.

This bizarre theory was proposed because it is not common to find a name here of another deceased person after the indication of the years. These new data allow us to explain that this was a *supernomen*¹⁵, like the other *supernomina* documented in the same inscription. These particular nicknames theoretically distinguished between individuals, often with similar names, but in this case, the *cognomina* of all three were different: Restitutus, Mucianus and Respectus. Therefore, we have to imagine that explicitly quoting the *supernomina* just after the age of death had other intentions.

The first person, Quintus Iulius Mucianus, has the very rare *supernomen* of Bizacius. The only close parallel to this is a Christian epitaph from Carthage that refers to a Bizacinus (*ILT* 11147). This rare name can be connected to the name of the region Byzacena¹⁶ with no clear origins

¹⁵ Kajanto 1967. He also said that Africa was, after the Balkans, the region with the greatest number of documented *supernomina* (p. 14).

¹⁶ Byzacēna or Bizacena or Bizzacena or Bidiacena or Byzacium in Latin; Βυζακίς or Βυσσάτις in Greek. This region is quoted by the Classics (Polyb., XII, 1, 1 e III, 23, 2; Ptol., IV, 3, 6) and it was reused in the Late Antiquity for naming a province.

(perhaps the name of an African tribe¹⁷). His *cognomen* Mucianus¹⁸ derives from a *gentilicium* (gens Mucia) that has already been attested in Mustis¹⁹ and its surroundings²⁰.

The second person, Quintus Iulius Restitutus, also bears the particular *supernomen* Dancharrus with not even a close parallel: a hapax. Restitutus is a very widespread *cognomen*²¹ with 166 attestations in Africa.

Finally, the fifth person on the inscription, Quintus Iulius Respectus, has the *supernomen* Castricius, which has several parallels, especially in Thugga²². His *cognomen*, Respectus²³, was not as popular in Africa with only 13 attestations, although two of them are from Mustis²⁴.

Bizacius and Dancharrus mark the indigenous onomastic particularity of this prominent family. In contrast, Castricius is Latin and was a very common name linked with *castra*. The main way these three people were identified was probably by their nickname.

The complete text now opens itself up to another interesting analysis. If we look at the ages of each person, we can see big differences: Bizacius 18, Dancharrus 21, Quieta 91, Veteranus 85 and Castricius 19. There are also important variations in the palaeography that allow us to differentiate at least three phases in the inscription. *Capitalis quadrata* were used in the Quieta epitaph that matches the first and second blocks. In contrast, *libraria* were used for the Veteranus epitaph²⁵. A slightly different *libraria* can be identified in the Bizacius, Dancharrus and Castricius epitaphs. Both *libraria* seem to follow the “African style” in their narrowness and stylisation of letters. This allows me to propose three different phases for this epitaph:

- First phase. The construction of the mausoleum and engraving of the Iulia Quieta inscription after her death. Blocks 1 and 3 could have been engraved just before or at the same time as Quieta’s epitaph.
- Second phase. Engraving of the Veteranus epitaph.
- Third phase. Engraving of the Bizacius, Dancharrus and Castricius’ epitaphs.

Even if their family relations were not carved into the inscription, mausolea culture is basically used by nuclear family groups as well as the household²⁶. The reconstruction of family relations

¹⁷ See Steph. Biz. s. v. Βύζαντες.

¹⁸ Kajanto 1982, 18, 32, 151.

¹⁹ Beschtaouch 1968, no. 10 (= AE 1968, 597).

²⁰ In Uchi Maius (CIL VIII, 26352; 26378), and Thugga (CIL VIII, 27069; 27072).

²¹ Kajanto 1982, 356.

²² In the province we can find 14 people with Castricius as a *nomen* or *cognomen*, although in Thugga it is cited 8 times (Khanoussi – Maurin 2002, nos. 200-207).

²³ Kajanto 1982, 355.

²⁴ Beschtaouch 1968, no. 18 (= AE 1968, 603); CIL VIII, 15581.

²⁵ However, the L in Ampliatus is lengthened and this is part of the “écriture africaine” style (Bouard et al. 1997).

²⁶ “Mausoleum were a typical way of Tombs were most frequently founded as multigenerational mausolea that gained in significance with every new user generation. In elite families, the idea of the gentilicial family clan lived on into late antiquity with mausolea constituting a prime location for celebrating the longevity and dignity of a family.” Borg 2019, xxi. The same idea in Yasin 2005.

between the five members of the Iulii is hypothetical but based on the different chronological phases and onomastics:

- Iulia Queta died at the age of 91. She had been a prominent woman in the town, as we can see from the title of *flaminica*, which is only attested on three²⁷ other occasions in Mustis. She is the only one for whom the epigraphic formula *p(ia) v(ixit) a(nnos)* was used. Her name is right in the centre of the inscription with a perfect *ordinatio* that demonstrates the pre-eminence of her position. It would have been aligned with Blocks 1 and 3.
- Quintus Iulius Ampliatus probably died at the age of 85. His epitaph is the only one to use the abbreviation *ann(us)* and it does not have the filiation. He died younger than Queta and the palaeography shows that his epitaph presumably was inscribed later. All this suggests he was possibly Queta's nephew²⁸. Ampliatus' *praenomen* and *gentilicium* came from his father, probably Quintus Iulius. The relationship is not clear, but the chronological sequence persuades us to interpret a later chronology.
- Bizacius, Dancharrus and Castricius died young (18, 21 and 29 years old). They could have been brothers and possibly Ampliatus' sons. One difference is that the months or days are quoted on their epitaphs and they also had a kind of nickname added after their ages. Only they had *supernomina* after the mention of the age, an uncommon characteristic in the area.




Fig. 13) *The Iulii family tree (author)*

As I stated before, there are other inscriptions from Mustis quoting other *flaminicae* in the town. One of them was *Iulia Q. f.*²⁹, but she was clearly a different person, because the inscription is

²⁷ Beschaouch 1968, no. 20 (= AE 1968, 588); Chaouali 2015 (= AE 2015, 1836); CIL VIII, 1578 = España-Chamorro 2022, no. 7.

²⁸ Brother cannot be totally excluded, but Queta and Ampliatus' ages and the differences in palaeography suggest a distance of several years between their deaths. Siblings would normally have a closer date of death and probably share the same palaeography.

²⁹ Beschaouch 1968, no. 20 (photo in EDCS-12000419): Cereri Aug(ustae) sac(rum) pro [salute] / Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris) «M(arci) Aureli» Severi A[lexandri] / Pii Felicis Aug(usti) [[[et Iuliae Mamaeae Aug(ustae)]]] / [[[[matris Aug(usti)]]]] et senatus et cas[trorum et pa]l[ati]ae munus quod Iulia Q(uinti) f(ilia)

dated in the period of Severus Alexander and also the inscription palaeography is very different. However, it is possible that this important family identified and studied by Beschtaouch would have been the descendants and both inscriptions could be related.




Fig. 14) Palaeography of the inscription

In terms of the chronology, we again have to resort to the onomastics. Unfortunately, the use of *supernomina* cannot be taken as a chronological hint, because there are no parallels or evidence of their use in any particular period in Africa. An important clue could be the *nomen* Respectus. This was a widely used *cognomen* in the Trajanic and Hadrianic periods³⁰. Although it is not a strong argument, this clue can help us elucidate the construction date of the funerary monument. If Respectus was Iulia Quieta's nephew, we should assume a date no earlier than Nero's reign, although it was more likely to have been during the Flavian period. Quoting the abbreviation *DMS* in Africa means it was probably after the Julio-Claudian period³¹. Although the abbreviation was used for all members of the family and this must be understood in the plural, their similar palaeography determines that it was carved in the first phase of the mausoleum. This means that the first inscription (Inscriptions 1, 2c and 3) would have been made at the same time. Of course,

[--- ho]/nestae memoriae flaminica imi[tata paren]/tes maioresq(ue) suos qui munifici in [patriam] / extiterunt id est C(aium) Iulium C(ai) f(ilium) Cor(nelia) Fe[licem] / Felinianum flam(inem) perp(etuum) qui statuam Iov[i Victo]/ri in foro posuit patriae suae per decr[etum] / universi ordinis promisit inlata suo [tempo]/re legitima summa honoris et ampli[s curi]/ae honestiss(imae) Aug(ustae) classi prim(a)e summam p[ecu]/niae dignam ex cuius usuris annuis redac[tis] / omnib(us) annis in perpetuum epularetur t[ri]/buit donoq(ue) dedit epulumq(ue) decedens ob dedi[c(ationem)] / curiis dari iussit Q(uintus) Iulius Felix frater eius / et Iulius Homullus et Iulius Honoratus eius / ab ea statuam adlat(am) statuer(unt) et epulo curiis dato ded(icaverunt).

³⁰ It was quite a common name for generations, but according to Kajanto (1982, 355), it was more popular during the Trajanic and Hadrianic periods.

³¹ Lassère 1973, 58; Chaouali 2015, 215.

palaeographic evidence is extremely difficult to interpret and only hypothetic; however, together with the onomastics, it is all we have to be able to move forward in the analysis of this inscription.

Are palaeography and abbreviations determining factors for dating funerary inscriptions? Dating by writing is risky³², but sometimes almost the only clue for providing a chronological context to the monuments. Taking into account Lassère's work on the chronology of pagan epitaphs in some of the Roman towns in North Africa also allows us to make some appreciations. I have already spoken about the different types of palaeography used in the inscription. The *capitalis quadrata* of Quieta is associated with the general palaeography of the 1st century, while the *capitalis libraria* of both the second and third period is clearly linked to the Antonine era, especially considering the forms of the L, Q and R (see Fig. 14). This can be seen as part of the "African style". Taking into consideration the provincial context and local variants of the script in the published texts from Mustis and the surrounding towns, such as Dougga, we can make further appreciations.

Without a major study in this region, we can only work with a few examples of published texts and photos. We do not have many epitaphs from Mustis with a clear date. The tombstone of Cornelia Fortunata³³ has been dated to the Julio-Claudian period: it uses an irregular *capitalis quadrata*, makes no mention of the Manes and uses the abbreviation *Pia Vixit Ann(os)*, *HSE* and other formulae (*OTBQ//TTLS*). The clearest is the tombstone of Marcus Ulpius Fortunatus³⁴. It explicitly states he was Trajan's freedman, thus providing a clear chronology of circa 100-130 BC. *Capitalis quadrata* is used on this gravestone, as well as some abbreviations (*DMS* and *HSE*), although we can find the formula *Pius Vixit Ann(is)* without the general abbreviation for the town and region (*PVA*). The epitaph of C. Orfius Urbanianus³⁵ is also dated to the Antonine period and uses a different *capitalis quadrata* for the formula *Pius Vixit Ann(os)*. These data prove that there is apparently no correlation between chronology and abbreviations in the town. In Mustis, we have many examples of the abbreviation *PVA*, although in undated inscriptions and also without a published photo to help us to contrast the hypothesis. We can only compare it with Lassère's study of epitaphs from Thugga. He had already cautioned that different abbreviation systems were used during the same period, although some were more common than others. In the first (1st century AD) and second (2nd century AD) phases of inscriptions, the formula *PVA* is more common than other variations in general and this does not allow us to proffer a date. However, he did say that quoting the full name and filiation of women was more common in the first period. With all these data we can hypothesise a first chronological phase after the Julio-Claudian period and before Trajan: Iulia Quieta would have built the mausoleum and died during the Flavian period. The "African style" of the *capitalis libraria* of both second and third inscriptions should be placed in a range between the Antonine and Severan periods. The stylised L was more frequent in the Severan period, although we have evidence of its use from the time of Trajan in well-dated examples³⁶. Taking into account that a generation is calculated at around 35 years for the Roman

³² Bouard et al. 1997.

³³ Chaouali 2015 (= AE 2015, 1836).

³⁴ Chaouali 2014 (= AE 2014, 1525); Kłodziński 2020.

³⁵ Beschaouch 1968, no. 13 (= AE 1968, 605); photo in EDCS-09701764.

³⁶ We have some examples from Dougga, where the corpus of well dated inscription is larger: CIL VIII, 26615 or CIL VIII, 26528b.

period³⁷, we have to imagine between 50-80 years difference between Quieta's epitaph and those of Bizacius, Dancharrus and Castricius. That means that if Quieta was buried at the end of the Flavian period (80-90 AD), the three men would have been interred around 140-170.

Its architectural form does not help us much with the question of chronology, although it is worth exploring this aspect. We can imagine a tower-shaped mausoleum, a very typical form in the region. However, the architectural remains around the tomb do not indicate a possible upper storey. I therefore propose to identify it as a typical altar-shaped mausoleum of a type very well known in central Italy but very rare in Tunisia³⁸. Its shape is simpler than other mausolea with a pulvinar and a Doric frieze³⁹. This type of monument is thought to have originated in central Italy around the 3rd century BC and to have spread to other areas such as Hispania⁴⁰ and Gallia Narbonensis in the early 2nd century BC, continuing in use until at least the 2nd century AD. No capitals, pilasters or friezes were used as decoration and its architectural simplicity provides no clue as to its possible chronology. Nevertheless, we can link it to some Pompeian examples, e.g. the tombs of Naevoleia Tyche and C. Munatius Faustus (60 AD) and C. Calventius Quietus (70-79 AD). If the late Flavian chronology is accepted, this could be the fifth mausoleum from the 1st century in Africa and probably the only one from the Flavian period known to date.

Some notes about the onomastic particularities of Mustis

The epigraphic corpus being prepared by Polish colleagues with almost a hundred new inscriptions may allow us to study in depth certain onomastic particularities of the town's inhabitants. There are no direct parallels for these new *supernomina* in the corpora of Punic and Neo-Punic inscriptions. However, they complete other regional indigenous demonyms present in Mustis: Namphamina (CIL VIII, 1603), Zabulla (CIL VIII, 1604), Mazica (CIL VIII, 15593), Palmula (CIL VIII, 15620), Mutthumbal (CIL VIII, 15619) or the *cognomina* Nampamus (CIL VIII, 15599), Mustulus (CIL VIII, 15626) or Primasius (CIL VIII, 15628). The use of these specific onomastic forms is restricted to Africa.

It is also important to note other interesting examples of demonyms. For example, it is remarkable to note *cognomina* such as Lania (CIL VIII, 1589) or Obellianus (CIL VIII, 15591) that are possibly onomastic fossils, as they only have direct parallels in Italy. There are also numerous hapax such as the *cognomina* Egassius (CIL VIII, 1596), Tamurianus (CIL VIII, 1607), Barcius (CIL VIII, 15596), the diminutive form of the demonym Quartinula (CIL VIII, 1590), the demonyms Ca[ll]osina (CIL VIII, 15592), Arraniana (CIL VIII, 15595), Fuxida (CIL VIII, 15607), Caivenius (CIL VIII, 15601), Sarganis (CIL VIII, 24002) or the hypothetically reconstructed *cognomen* Fortunatianus (CIL VIII, 15586), which could simply be a single example of the *cognomen* Fortunnianus with a gemination process of the nasal, present in the region with other *cognomina*, such as Fortunnatus.

Mausoleum culture was part of the middle and upper-class of Africa due to the complexity of its architecture and high cost⁴¹. This is why it had its own vocabulary and social implications,

³⁷ Bouard et al. 1997.

³⁸ Ferchiou 1995, 133.

³⁹ As the mausoleum of C. Iulius Felix in Henchir Messaouer, see Ferchiou 1987.

⁴⁰ Beltrán Fortes 2004.

⁴¹ Ferchiou 1980, 246; 1995, 113.

especially in North Africa⁴². This single monument has demonstrated the importance of having a whole text in order to interpret correctly the context of the names and the chronological phases. The mausoleum inscription expands on an intimate part of the social history of Mustis by providing new data on the family links and the evolution of onomastics with the local implications visible in the *supernomina*. The integration of this mausoleum into the list of the other mausolea in Africa also expands the use of this funerary monument in the province.

Bibliography

- Abid 2021 H. Abid, *Publica Mustitanorum* : essai de delimitation, in: A. Mrabet Frontières (ed.), Territoires et Mobilités au Maghreb (Antiquité et Moyen Âge), Centre de Publication Universitaire de Sousse, Sousse 2021, 295-330.
- Beltrán Fortes 2004 J. Beltrán Fortes, “Monvmenta” sepulcrales en forma de altar con pulvinos de los territorios hispanorromanos revisión de materiales y estado de la cuestión, *Archivo español de arqueología* 189-190, 2004, 101-142.
- Beschaouch 1967 A. Beschaouch, *Municipium Iulium Aurelium Mustitanum*, *Cahiers de Tunisie* 15, 1967, 85-102.
- Beschaouch 1968 A. Beschaouch, *Mustitana. Recueil des nouvelles inscriptions de Mustis, cité romaine de Tunisie*, Paris 1968.
- Beschaouch 2005 A. Beschaouch, Un témoignage sur la prospérité de l'Afrique pro-consulaire au milieu du IV^e siècle : le forum transitorium aménagé à Mustis sous Magnence et Décence, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 149.3, 2005, 1071-1084.
- Beschaouch 2014 A. Beschaouch, *Municipium Iulium Aurelium Mustitanum : de Tibère à Marc Aurèle, l'histoire Municipale de Mustis, cité romaine de Tunisie*, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 158.4, 2014, 1585-1595.
- Borg 2019 B. Borg, *Roman Tombs and the Art of Commemoration: Contextual Approaches to Funerary Customs in the Second Century CE.*, Cambridge 2019.
- Bouard et al. 1997 V. Bouard – N. Demaison – L. Maurin, *CIL*, VIII, 26580 et l'écriture “africaine”, in: M. Khanoussi – L. Maurin (eds.), *Dougga (Thugga). Études épigraphiques*, Pessac 1997, 209-236.
- Brandt 2015 H. Brandt, Konstantin der Grosse in einer Ehrung aus Mustis, *ZPE* 193, 2015, 304-309.
- Campedelli 2015 C. Campedelli, La strana vicenda di una statua di Iuppiter Optimus Maximus a Mustis (Tunisia), in: P. Ruggeri (ed.), *L'Africa Romana. Atti del XX Convegno Internazionale di studi*, (Alghero-Porto Conte Ricerche, 26-29 settembre 2013), Roma 2015, 1375-1380.

⁴² Moore 2007, no. 75i.

- Chaouali 2014 M. Chaouali, Épitaphe inédite de Mustis sur l'administration des domaines impériaux en Afrique du Nord au début du II^e siècle apr. J.-C., *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 25, 81-88.
- Chaouali 2015 M. Chaouali, Cornelia Fortunata, flaminique du culte impérial à Mustis (Tunisie), *Antiquités africaines*, 51, 2015, 213-216.
- Dondin-Payre 2016 M. Dondin-Payre – H. Jaïdi – S. Saint-Amans – M. Sebaï (edd.), *Autour du fonds Poinssot: Lumières sur l'archéologie tunisienne (1870–1980)*, Paris 2016.
- España-Chamorro – Gregori 2023 S. España-Chamorro – G. Gregori, I tetrarchi a Mustis (Africa Proconsolare). Nuove e vecchie iscrizioni, *Scienze dell'Antichità* 29, 2023.
- España-Chamorro 2022 S. España-Chamorro, Mustis revisited. Unpublished inscriptions from the Parisian archives, *Libyan Studies* 53, 2022.
- Ferchiou 1980 N. Ferchiou, Une cité antique de la Dorsale tunisienne, aux confins de la Fossa Regia: Aïn Rchine et ses environs. *Antiquités africaines*, 15, 1980, 231-259.
- Ferchiou 1987 N. Ferchiou, Le mausolée de C. Iulius Felix à Henchir Messaouer. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts - Römische Abteilung* 94, 1987, 413-463.
- Ferchiou 1995 N. Ferchiou, 'Architecture funéraire de Tunisie 'à l'époque romaine,' in P. Troussset (ed.), *Monuments funéraires, institutions autochtones en Afrique du nord antique et médiévale (VI^e colloque international sur l'histoire et l'archéologie de l'Afrique du Nord)*. Paris 1995, 111-137.
- Guérin 1862 V. Guérin, *Voyage archéologique dans la Régence de Tunis*. Tome Second, Paris 1862.
- Kajanto 1967 I. Kajanto, *Supernomina, A Study in Latin Epigraphy*, *Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes humanarum litterarum*. Vol. 40.1, 1967, 1-115.
- Kajanto 1982 I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Rome 1982.
- Khanoussi – Maurin 2002 M. Khanoussi – L. Maurin, *Mourir à Dougga. Recueil des inscriptions funéraires*, Bordeaux-Tunis 2002.
- Kłodziński – Abid 2021 K. Kłodziński – M. Abid, Fulvius Paternus: a New [pr(imi)p(ilaris)] e(gregius) v(ir) from Mustis/Musti (Tunisia), *ZPE* 217, 2021, 293-298.
- Kłodziński 2020 K. Kłodziński, New procuratores regionis Thuggensis?, *ZPE* 213, 2020, 305-312.
- Lassère 1973 J.-M. Lassère, Recherches sur la chronologie des épitaphes païennes de l'Afrique, *Antiquités africaines* 7, 1973, 7-152.
- Moore 2007 J. P. Moore, The 'Mausoleum Culture' of Africa Proconsularis, in: D. L. Stone – L. M. Stirling (eds.), *Mortuary landscapes of North Africa*, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2007, 75-109.

- Vérité 1988 J. Vérité, Restauration d'un arc romain en Tunisie. *Archeologia* nr. 240, 1988, 52-61.
- Vérité 2014 J. Vérité, L'arc est de Mustis en Tunisie : proposition de rectification d'une restauration erronée. Project Report. N/A 2014, <http://open-archive.icomos.org/id/eprint/1464/>
- Vérité 2021 J. Vérité, L'arc dit de Gordien III a Mustis (Le Krib), Tunisie. Un arc mithriaque et honorifique ... à la communauté de Mustis (Unpublished paper located <https://hal.science/hal-03240142v1>).
- Yasin 2005 A. M. Yasin, Funerary Monuments and Collective Identity: From Roman Family to Christian Community, *The Art Bulletin* 87.3, 2005, 433-457.

Mustis'teki (Africa Proconsularis) Iulii Anıt Mezarı. Onomastik ve Aile İlişkileri
Özet

Bu makale, daha önce yayımlanmış bir yazıtın metnini tamamlayan yeni bir okuma sunmaktadır. Bu yeni okuma, aile ilişkileri, onomastik çalışma ve anıtın kronolojisi ile ilgili önemli yeni bilgiler içermektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Epigrafi; Roma Kuzey Afrikası; Roma anıt mezarı; Mustis.

The Mausoleum of Iulii at Mustis (Africa Proconsularis). Onomastic and Family Relationships
Abstract

This article presents a new reading that completes the text of an already published inscription. This new reading has important new information regarding the family relationships, the onomastic study and the chronology of the monument.

Keywords: Epigraphy; Roman North Africa; Roman Mausoleum; Mustis.