ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXIII

HELSINKI 1989 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Cornelia Africani f. Gracchorum*

Mika Kajava

In his Natural History Pliny the Elder gives an interesting testimony to Republican attitudes towards setting up female statues in Roman provinces, namely that Cato the Censor was strongly opposed to such a practice in 184 BC.[1] Pliny goes on to say that Cato could not prevent similar things from happening in the city of Rome, as is shown by the case of Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, and daughter of Scipio Africanus. Cornelia's statue, showing her seated and wearing strapless sandals, was first placed in the portico of Metellus. Later, it appeared in the *porticus Octaviae* of early Augustan date, which was a restored version of the previous construction. It is not clear when the original statue was manufactured, yet it was undoubtedly not before Cato's death in 149 BC. The construction of the *porticus Metelli* began in 146 BC, and the building complex may have been dedicated as late as in 131 BC.[2]

---

* I would like to thank Paavo Castrén and Heikki Solin for useful comments on the first draft of this article. My thanks also go to Jaakko Aronen for some bibliographical advice.

[1] Plin. nat. 34,31: *extant Catonis in censura vociferationes mulieribus statuas Romanis in provinciis poni* (now registered in G. Lahusen, Schriftquellen zum römischen Bildnis I, Bremen 1984, Nr. 2).

[2] Plin. ibid.: *nec tamen potuit inhibere quo minus Romae quoque ponerentur, sicuti Corneliae Gracchorum matri, quae fuit Africani prioris filia. Sedens huic posita soleisque sine ammento insignis in Metelli publica porticu, quae statua nunc est in Octaviae operibus.* For the site and its

A passage in Plutarch seems to provide more information. In 123 BC, at the beginning of his tribunate, C. Gracchus, obviously still having in mind the murder of his brother Tiberius, proposed a bill against M. Octavius, the tribune who had been one of Tiberius' most violent opponents. It is told that Gaius withdrew the legislation at his mother's request.[3] Plutarch goes on to state that the Roman people (δῆμος) respected Cornelia, not only on account of her father but also because of her sons; afterwards (ὕστερον), i.e. at some time after 123 BC, they erected a bronze statue in her honour with an inscription indicating that the statue represented Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi.[4] Unfortunately, we do not know exactly how many years Cornelia lived after the death of her son Gaius in 121 BC.[5] The statue was perhaps not posthumous,[6] and considering the

---

date, cf. L. Pietilä-Castrén, Magnificentia publica. The Victory Monuments of the Roman Generals in the Era of the Punic Wars, Helsinki 1987, 130ff. The Plinian diction (*nec tamen potuit inhibere*, etc.) does not by itself exclude the possibility that the statue already existed in Cato's lifetime. But as will be seen, there is clear evidence pointing to a considerably later date. Moreover, a reference to the sons in the inscription (*Gracchorum*) would be somewhat strange at a time when they were still young boys (Tiberius was born about 163/162 BC, and Gaius nine years later).

3 Plut. C.Gracch. 4,2ff.; cf. also Diod. 34/35,25,2; D. Stockton, The Gracchi, Oxford 1979, 116f. For the *inimicitiae* between C. Gracchus and M. Octavius, see D.F. Epstein, Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218-43 BC, London – New York – Sydney 1987, 2f., 115f.

4 Plut. C.Gracch. 4,4: ὁ δῆμος... τιμῶν τὴν Κορνηλίαν οὐδὲν ἧττον ἀπὸ τῶν παίδων ἢ τοῦ πατρός, ἧς γε καὶ χαλκῆν εἰκόνα στήσας ὕστερον ἐπέγραψε Κορνηλίαν μητέρα Γράγχων.

5 The account of her life after 121 BC given by Plut. C.Gracch. 19,1-3 only shows that she may have lived for a further several years. The fact that it was Sempronia, sister of the Gracchi, and not their mother who identified a pretender called Equitius (in 100 BC he claimed to be a son of Ti. Gracchus [tr.pl. 133]) is often taken to show that Cornelia was already dead by 100 BC (cf. Val.Max. 3,8,6).

6 At least there is no clear evidence to show that it was. Thus also G. Lahusen, Untersuchungen zur Ehrenstatue in Rom, Roma 1983, 96 n. 158

historical context one would not be rash in assuming that it dates from around the year 121 BC, or perhaps some time after that. It might, in fact, be possible to link Cornelia's monument chronologically with the events following Gaius' death: the Roman people set up statues for the Gracchi ἐν φανερῷ, consecrated the places where they had been slain, brought offerings and made sacrifices to them, and prostrated themselves as they did before the sanctuaries of the gods.[7] But as F. Coarelli[8] has suggestively proposed, a later date might also be considered, most likely between 107 and 100 BC, when the *populares* began to gain more political power after a 15-year period in which the *optimates* had held sway. Coarelli, assigning Cornelia's statue more precisely to the year 100 BC, argues (p. 24) that its erection in the portico of Metellus was a conspicuous act of political provocation, as it is a well-known fact that the Metelli were strong opponents of the Gracchi.[9] But whatever interpretation is given, there is no reason

---

("wahrscheinlich noch zu Lebzeiten der Cornelia"); *contra* e.g. J.P. Hallett, Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society, Princeton 1984, 56, who takes it for granted that Cornelia was "publicly identified in that way long after her death"; A.H. Bernstein, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus. Tradition and Apostasy, Ithaca – London 1978, 43 states somewhat ambiguously that a statue of her was *eventually* erected in Rome.

[7] Plut. C.Gracch. 18,3 (cf. esp. εἰκόνας τε γάρ αὐτῶν ἀναδείξαντες ἐν φανερῷ προὐτίθεντο, etc.); A. Alföldi, Die zwei Lorbeerbaüme des Augustus, Bonn 1973, 24 suggested that the statues of the Gracchi may have been placed at the *compita*. For the statue of Cornelia's husband (Ti. Sempronius Gracchus) in the Forum Augusti, see the new evidence provided by G. Camodeca, Puteoli 7-8 (1983-84) 65f.; Id., Athenaeum 64 (1986) 505ff.: it seems to have been set up in an intercolumniation of the forum.

[8] In: Le dernier siècle de la république romaine et l'époque augustéenne (Contr.trav.inst.hist.rom.Univ.Strasbourg, 1), Strasbourg 1978, 13ff. It seems to me that his theory is perhaps too clear-cut in that it excludes *a priori* an earlier date.

[9] That Cornelia's statue with its inscription (esp. the genitive *Gracchorum*) marked the political stand of the *populares*, reflecting their desire to represent Cornelia's loyalty to the political aims of her sons, is in fact an

to think that Cornelia would have had a public cult of her own after her death. The statue, which was primarily of honorific nature, and possibly (but not certainly) erected while she was still living, does not point to any such conclusion. And a passage in the much-discussed letter which Cornelia wrote to Gaius, shows that she had no greater expectations than a private family cult on the style of that of the *divi parentum: ubi mortua ero, parentabis mihi et invocabis deum parentem.*[10] Nor should the cult of Cornelia's sons be interpreted as indicating that they were worshipped as deified persons, or that they possessed divine powers. Rather, it manifested a spontaneous gratitude towards the two great benefactors, the sons of Cornelia. The cult of the Gracchi seems, in fact, to have remained a temporary phenomenon for no permanent cult of the family was ever established. It is sometimes claimed that the elder Africanus, Cornelia's father, also had a cult after his death. But the truth is that all the evidence that might support such an idea, is basically constituted of legends and family tradition, which later found their expression in poetry and rhetorical histories.[11] It is a different matter that Africanus himself accepted his remarkable position and the public esteem in which he was held in contemporary society. It is quite natural that Cornelia was regarded as one link in the legendary tradition of the Scipiones family, and so being

---

old idea: thus e.g. Ed. Meyer, in: Kleine Schriften I^2, Halle 1924, 370; J. Carcopino, Autour des Gracques. Etudes critiques, Paris 1967^2, 109.

[10] Nep. frg. 15 (= HRR 2, p. 39). For this, see C.J. Classen, Gymnasium 70 (1963) 324; S. Weinstock, Divus Julius, Oxford 1971, 295 n. 1; D. Fishwick, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West I:1, Leiden 1987, 53. For the relation between the original letter and the later stage(s) of reworking it, cf. N. Horsfall, Athenaeum 65 (1987) 231ff. (p. 230: "Cornelia may be the author of the excerpts' original; or she may not").

[11] Cf. Classen, art.cit. 320f.; H.H. Scullard, Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician, London 1970, 247f. n. 11; Weinstock, op.cit. 294f., opted for "a public cult however short-lived it may have been".

honoured with a statue could be partly explained by her ancestry. But what ultimately will have counted more, was the fact that she was the mother of the Gracchi, and for a period of many generations a highly esteemed *exemplum* of maternal love for her children.[12]

That a woman was publicly honoured with a statue at so an early date, was quite exceptional in Rome, as is also shown by the above-mentioned Plinian passage.[13] It is true that there is some evidence of similar honours to women from a still earlier period, but these cases were largely based on myth and legend, being primarily connected with important and decisive moments in the history of early Rome. Thus Cloelia, the female hostage praised for her achievements in the fights against Porsenna, is reported to have had an equestrian statue of bronze put up on the Via Sacra in her honour.[14] It is also said that Gaia Caecilia, wife of King

---

[12] The ample literary evidence on Cornelia and her subsequent standing in antiquity is collected and discussed by B. Kreck, Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Rolle der Frau in der späten römischen Republik, Diss. Marburg/Lahn 1975, 47ff.

[13] For this, cf. Th. Mommsen, Römisches Staatsrecht I^3, Leipzig 1887, 448 n. 2. The evidence from the later Republican period is very scarce (by contrast, funerary *imagines* for senatorial women are now and then documented in literary sources); the passage of Nep. Att. 3,2, sometimes held to show that Pilia, wife of Pomponius Atticus, would have been honoured with a statue, is not relevant here; Lambinus' conjecture *'Piliae'* (for *'Phidiae'* and *'et fidiae'* of the mss.) cannot evidently stand; *'effigies'* proposed by Wagner (Hermes 56 [1921] 439ff.) is very plausible. Moreover, the statues were not erected in Rome, but in Athens.

[14] Plin. nat. 34,29, citing the testimony of Annius Fetialis, tells that it was Valeria, daughter of the consul Poplicola, likewise associated with the same heroic episode, who had an equestrian statue opposite the temple of Jupiter Stator; according to Plutarch (Popl. 19,5; de mul.virt. 14,250) there was uncertainty over whether an equestrian statue near the Via Sacra represented Cloelia or Valeria (for this, see J. Gagé, La chute des Tarquins et les débuts de la république romaine, Paris 1976, 74ff., 91, 191 n. 46, and the view of L. Arcella, SMSR 51 [1985] 33ff.). For the literary evidence, cf. esp. F. Coarelli, Il foro romano. Periodo arcaico, Roma

Tarquinius Priscus, had a statue dedicated to her in the temple of the Sabine deity Semo Sancus Dius Fidius.[15] A further example of honours given to a woman is provided by Pliny the Elder who wrote that a statue was erected to the legendary Vestal Gaia Taracia, because she had given the *campus Tiberinus* as a gift to the Roman people. The distinction given to her was all the more remarkable, as the statue was to be placed where Gaia herself wished.[16] Finally, there is the case of Quinta Claudia. When a ship carrying the holy symbol of Cybele to Rome ran aground in the Tiber in 204 BC, Quinta Claudia resolved the critical situation through her personal intervention. Afterwards, evidently on account of her deed, she received a statue *in vestibulo templi Matris*; in later times this statue was to remain miraculously untouched despite two fires in the temple.[17] In none of the instances mentioned above is there any evidence of inscriptions on the bases of the statues.

Cornelia's statue is no longer extant, in fact it may have already disappeared or at least been damaged in antiquity, either

---

1983, 36 (with n. 11); Hallett, op.cit. 118f.; Lahusen, op.cit. in n. 6, 34, 56, 109; Id., op.cit. in n. 1, 17ff., Nrr. 86-9.

15 Plut. quaest.Rom. 30; Fest. p. 276 (L). A more common tradition named Tarquin's wife Tanaquil. According to Plin. nat. 8,194 Gaia Caecilia (=Tanaquil) had her distaff preserved in the same temple. For Semo...Fidius and the various forms of his name, cf. G. Radke, Zur Entwicklung der Gottesvorstellung und der Gottesverehrung in Rom, Darmstadt 1987, 115ff.

16 Plin. nat. 34,25 (who also reports Gaia Taracia's alternative name *Fufetia*; likewise Gell. 7,7).

17 Val.Max. 1,8,11; Tac. ann. 4,64: *apud aedem matris deum*; cf. F. Münzer, RE III 2899, Nr. 435. As regards the legend of Quinta Claudia and her share in the introduction of the cult of Cybele to Rome in 204 BC, one should keep in mind that it was created considerably later; cf. J. Gerard, REL 58 (1980) 153ff., who opts for a period between 50 and 16 BC.

in the fire of AD 80, or later.[18] What is particularly interesting is that in 1878 a large statue base made of marble, measuring 80 cm x 112 cm x 135 cm,[19] was found in the *porticus Octaviae*, with a perfectly preserved inscription of Augustan date on its frontal face: *Cornelia Africani f. / Gracchorum*.[20] Another inscription, dating from the early third century AD, stands on a superior list of the same face: *opus Tisicratis*. There is no doubt that this is the monument which Pliny saw *in Octaviae operibus*. It has usually been thought that the original base of Cornelia's statue was replaced by a new one when the old *porticus Metelli* was restored and renewed, thus transforming the old *porticus* into the portico of Octavia. However, Coarelli (art.cit. in n. 8, 17f.), following a reasonable line of argument, has shown that the original base was never replaced: the Augustan base is in fact the original one. Only the inscription on the base was erased, being replaced by a new one in Augustan times (there are in fact some traces of erasure still visible on the surface of the stone). In Coarelli's opinion, the Severan inscription (*opus Tisicratis*), perhaps originally written in Greek, had from the beginning been directly connected with the statue itself, showing that the statue should be attributed to a Greek artist called Tisicrates, who was

---

[18] Fires known to have affected the portico of Octavia were in AD 80 (Dio 66,24) and AD 191. Restoration work took place after the latter (CIL VI 31231 = 1034, dating from AD 203). For archaeological evidence, cf. H. Lauter, Bull.Com. 87 (1980-81) 37ff.

[19] The measures given by Degrassi (83x119x173) are not quite correct (note especially the thickness). I have seen and studied the base in October 1989.

[20] CIL VI 31610 (= 10043) = CIL I^2 p. 201, Nr. XXXIX = Eph.Epigr. IV 816 = ILS 68 = ILLRP 336 = Inscr.It. XIII,3,72 (with a photograph) = Helbig, Führer[4] (1966), Nr. 1679; cf. A. Stein, Römische Inschriften in der antiken Literatur, Prag 1931, 28. The base is preserved in the Musei Capitolini (Museo Nuovo, Passaggio del muro Romano; Catal. epigr. 6969), cf. G. Molisani, La collezione epigrafica dei Musei Capitolini, Roma 1973, 13 and *passim*.

active in Italy in the late 2nd century BC. Later, in the Augustan period, the artist's Greek signature would have been intentionally erased, a procedure reflecting the Augustan cultural policy which laid emphasis on ancient Roman habits at the expense of Greek "luxury" and philhellenistic ideas (Coarelli 19, 27). At the same time, the main text of the base was erased, and a new text was put in its place. If this is true, there was obviously some difference between the two inscriptions, because otherwise the later substitution would have remained practically useless. One cannot, however, totally exclude the possibility that the original text was faithfully copied and rewritten in Augustan times, but for what reason this might have happened remains very uncertain. Coarelli (15, 19) claims on the basis of Plut. C. Gracch. 4,4 (cited above in n. 4) that the original text was "*Cornelia Gracchorum*".[21] This may or may not be true; at any rate the Plutarchan passage, derived from an intermediate source, should not be regarded as indisputable evidence of "*Cornelia Gracchorum*" being the original inscription. Entering into even deeper speculation, one could also assume, in contrast to what Coarelli thought, that the base (which is still preserved) did not originally support the statue of Cornelia, but rather some other statue, and this base was reused in Augustan times. If this was the case, one must suppose that the base of Cornelia's statue had either been destroyed or it was not for some reason suited to the Augustan programme of building monuments. Needless to say, this theory remains pure guesswork. Turning to the artist's inscription, Coarelli (15ff., 19f.) argues that it was rewritten over the erasure in the Severan period, and this accords with the style of the inscription's lettering. He links the text with the

---

[21] Thus also E. Cantarella, Pandora's daughters (originally published as "L'ambiguo malanno", 1981), Baltimore – London 1987, 130 n. 35 (where Dessau, ILS 68 is criticized without reason; moreover, he did not write "wife of Africanus").

restoration of AD 203, which set out to repair the damage the portico suffered in the fire of AD 191 (cf. above n. 18). It was in the Severan period in particular that the cultural inheritance in Rome was catalogued and classified by engraving the original artists' names on the monuments (p. 20). In the case of Cornelia's statue this would evidently mean, following Coarelli, that the statue still existed in the beginning of the third century. But whether this statue was the original or just a copy, remains uncertain. In later times Cornelia's statue, itself probably manufactured on the model of the sitting Aphrodite of Phidias (likewise preserved in the *porticus Octaviae*; Plin. nat. 36,15), was to be an important model for a great number of replicas representing Roman women down to the fourth century AD; among these statues the figure of the Empress-mother Helena is also represented (Coarelli 20f.).

Regardless of whether or not the filiation *Africani f.* followed the gentilicium in the original inscription, the text always seems to have shown the genitive *Gracchorum*. The Latinity of the inscription has caused much perplexity, because the noun *mater* is omitted. In the epigraphic usage the sole genitive following the filiation regularly denoted the woman's husband, but if one wanted to indicate the maternal relationship, the differentiating *mater* was needed. All editors and commentators have noticed this anomaly.[22] Inscriptions do not provide any parallels (so it is usually claimed), and there seems to be no comparable case from Latin literature either, as has been also recently confirmed by R.G. Lewis.[23] To solve the riddle, Lewis presents an interesting hypothesis: "Cornelia's statue was one of

---

[22] See n. 20 (add J.J. Bernoulli, Römische Ikonographie I, Stuttgart 1882, 73). Cf. e.g. Bormann – Henzen, Eph.Epigr. IV 816: "maxime igitur mirum bona aetate opificem quod vellet ita non Latine expressisse".

[23] Athenaeum 66 (1988) 198-200. The author (p. 200) is perhaps right to reject the evidence of Val.Max. 6,7,1 (for stylistic reasons).

several famous Roman mother-figures displayed *ensemble*" (p. 200), which would mean that there was practically no need to insert the noun *mater* into the inscription; all the statues in the same group represented Roman mothers. That would be one manifestation of Augustus' idea of promoting the reverence for Roman *matronae* and maternal descent in general. In the present case the "mother-cult" (a term used by Lewis, as he says, "for want of a better one") would be combined with a characteristic feature of the Augustan cultural programme, that is, restoration and conservation of various monuments. Thus, the new *porticus Octaviae* would indeed be a suitable place for celebrating Roman mothers in statue form. Whether or not the hypothesis formulated by Lewis hits the mark, remains very uncertain. It is true that there seems to have been a clear ideological link between Cornelia's statue and the portico of Metellus/Octavia.[24] Cornelia was an exemplary mother who gave birth to twelve children, Metellus, father of seven children, was the author of a speech entitled *de prole augenda* from the year of his censorship (131 BC; Augustus himself is said to have read it to the Senate[25]), and finally, Octavia was the mother of Marcellus, Augustus' nephew, who had good prospects of becoming the Emperor's heir.[26]

---

[24] Of course, the places where honorific monuments were set up, were not chosen at random (see now Lahusen, op.cit. in n. 6, 7ff.). On the other hand, the reasons why a statue was placed in a certain site are often hard to discern; cf. in general, W. Eck, in: Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects, Oxford 1984, 157 n. 45, referring to the illuminating case of Volusius Saturninus (cos.suff. AD 3): one of his statues was erected in the *porticus Lentulorum*, evidently as a token of Saturninus' ties with the Lentuli family; he was married to the daughter of a Cornelius Lentulus.

[25] Liv. perioch. 59; Suet. Aug. 89. Whether or not the speech, "delivered as if it had been written for the present day", was read verbatim, remains uncertain.

[26] However, Marcellus died in 23 BC at the age of nineteen. It is noteworthy that Octavia honoured her son's memory by founding a library in the same portico (Plut. Marc. 30,11). After her death in AD 11 she was

Certainly, the "mother cult" seems to have been intentionally emphasized in the building complex, and there are also obvious connections with contemporary legislation on marriage and morals (officially enacted in 18 BC after a campaign of several years).[27] However, concerning Lewis' theory, I would just like to note that there is no archaeological or literary evidence to show that a statuary group of mother-figures would have been displayed among the *opera* preserved in the portico of Octavia.[28] On present evidence at least, Cornelia was the only Roman mother to have been honoured with a statue in the portico. The fact that the female members of the Imperial family, including, of course, those who were mothers, were often honoured with statues in both Rome, Italy and the provinces (like Livia, the younger Antonia, and many others), is a different matter. Such statues were strictly connected with the emergence of the Imperial cult.[29] Therefore, it is somewhat imprudent to maintain that all mother-statues were expressions of the Augustan ideology. In brief, I am not quite convinced that the name form *Cornelia Africani f. Gracchorum* would really have been affected by the statuary context in the way proposed by Lewis. There seems to be another and very simple explanation.

---

buried in the Mausoleum of Augustus by the side of Marcellus (AE 1928, 88); cf. PIR^2 C 925 and PIR^2 O 66; R. Syme, The Augustan Aristocracy, Oxford 1986, 83.

27 Cf. Coarelli, art.cit. 27. On the Augustan campaign in general and its visual expressions in Rome, cf. P. Zanker, Augustus und die Macht der Bilder, München 1987, 161f., who also refers to a statue set up to a particularly fertile slave woman.

28 Cf. Lewis 220 n. 19, admitting that "no close connection can be discerned between any of the remnant epigraphic fragments and the statuary, known or surmised, of the Porticus Octaviae".

29 For the cults and importance of the *whole* Imperial family in the Augustan political system, cf. F. Millar, in: Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects, Oxford 1984, 55f.

As has been stated above, the problem with the name form *Cornelia Africani f. Gracchorum* is thought to be the fact that *Gracchorum* stands alone after the normal filiation, without the noun *mater*. But even if such a style were unique, it is still highly informative, the differentiating factor being the use of the plural instead of the singular. Of course, there was no danger that *Gracchorum* and *Gracchi* could be confused: the former could not indicate anything other than the children,[30] and the latter always denoted the husband. Cornelia could have used the form *Cornelia Africani f. Gracchi* as well, but in that case, the genitive would unmistakably refer to her consort, Ti. Sempronius Gracchus (cos. 177, II 163 BC), who died in 154 BC. In its present form the inscription must have been informative enough to anyone who was capable of reading it. Cornelia was such a well-known figure in Roman society, and not solely in her own lifetime but also for many subsequent generations, that only illiterates would have been unaware of Cornelia's identity when they saw her statue in Octavia's portico. What was obviously of great importance in the composition of an epigraphic document, was the clarity of the diction, so that the persons involved could be conveniently identified. This was especially true when the monument was a honorific one that was aimed at the general public. Furthermore, it would be somewhat strange if a public monument erected in a very noticeable and remarkable place presented an inscription with "incorrect" Latinity.

Cornelia's statue is, of course, a special case, because it publicly honoured a Roman mother at so an early date. True, such a practice was not totally unfamiliar to the Romans in the first century BC, but it occurred in the Greek East and not in Rome or elsewhere in the West. Among the inscriptions honouring Roman governors, administrators and their family

---

30 The Romans may also have conceptualized the plural to include the husband as well: "mother of the Gracchi and wife of a Gracchus".

members in the Republican and Augustan time, there are thus at least four instances from Asia Minor and one from Greece, showing that the mother of a Roman official received a statue from the local demos.[31] However, this phenomenon was, of course, in good accordance with Greek traditions, and it should not be directly confused with the very different epigraphic habits prevailing in the city of Rome during the first century BC.

---

[31] In alphabetical order: *Baebia* (mother of L. Valerius L.f. Flaccus, proconsul, cos. 100 BC; I.Magnesia 144; cf. F. Coarelli, in: Epigr.ord.senat. I [Tituli 4], Roma 1982 [1984] 437ff.). *Nonia Polla* (mother of L. Volusius Saturninus, proconsul, cos.suff. AD 3; Alt.Pergam. VIII:2,427 = IGR IV 429). *Octavia* (mother of Sex. Appuleius, proconsul, cos. 29 BC; Alt.Pergam. VIII:2,419 = IGR IV 323 = OGIS 462). *Sempronia* (mother of M. Iunius Silanus, quaestor in Achaea in 34/33 BC, cos. 25 BC; IG VII 1851-52+BCH 50 [1926] 440f., Nr. 76; Thespiae). *Polla Terentia* (mother of A. Terentius A.f. Varro, legate of L. Murena in 82 BC; LeBas–W 320 = ILS 8773; Euromus).

In I.Kyme 18 (=AE 1966,422) the people of Cyme honoured *Quinctilia*, her husband Sex. Appuleius (cos. 29 BC), their daughter Appuleia Sex.f. Varilla and probably also the son Sex. Appuleius Sex.f. (for the son's presence in the monument, cf. K. Tuchelt, Frühe Denkmäler Roms in Kleinasien I: Roma und Promagistrate [Ist.Mitt., Beiheft 23], Tübingen 1979, 53; *contra*: U. Weidemann, Arch.Anz. 1965, 452 n. 10, 463). – The inscription IG II/III^2 4159a-b, where the Athenian demos honoured *Terentia Cn.f. Hispulla* and her son L. Valerius L.f. Catullus, might be as early as the Augustan age (cf. T.P. Wiseman, Roman Studies, Liverpool 1987, 339). As concerns I.Délos 1630, honouring *Minucia*, mother of a Q. [---], the identification of the son remains very uncertain.