

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXII

HELSINKI 1988 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Antti Arjava	Divorce in Later Roman Law.....	5
Christer Bruun	<i>Caligatus, tubicen, optio carceris</i> , and the Centurions' Positions; Some Remarks on An Inscription in ZPE 71 (1988).....	23
Edward Courtney	Five Notes on the Appendix Vergiliana.....	41
Siegfried Jäkel	Philosophisch orientierte Ansätze einer Sprachtheorie bei Gorgias, Isokrates und Epikur.....	43
Iiro Kajanto	The Idea of Fate in Poggio Bracciolini.....	59
Mika Kajava	A New Catalogue of Roman Upper-Class Women....	75
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Bedas Predigten.....	95
Outi Merisalo	Aspects of the Textual History of Poggio Bracciolini's <i>De varietate fortunae</i>	99
Olli Salomies	Epigraphische Beiträge.....	113
Karl-Gustav Sandelin	Mithras = Auriga?.....	133
Timo Sironen	Un obolo di Fistelia da Fregellae.....	137
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica.....	141
Leena Talvio	Iohannis Lemouicensis <i>Morale Somnium</i> Pharaonis. Problemi di datazione.....	163
Toivo Viljamaa	From Grammar to Rhetoric. First Exercises in Composition According to Quintilian, inst. 1, 9.....	179
	De novis libris iudicia.....	203
	Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum.....	263
	Libri nobis missi.....	267

A New Catalogue of Roman Upper-Class Women

MIKA KAJAVA

Marie-Thérèse Raepsaet-Charlier: Prosopographie des femmes de l'ordre sénatorial (I^{er}-II^e s.). 2 voll. Académie royale de Belgique, Classe des lettres, Fonds René Draguet, tome IV. Aedibus Peeters, Lovanii 1987. X, 810 p. & 4 p., 72 tableaux généalogiques. BEL 2. 980.

Recent and past discussion on the women of antiquity has very often laid the major emphasis on the scope they had to carry on their own initiatives, to use personal power and to gain an accepted social position in society. Or, to put it in another way, the research sometimes concentrates on the lack of women's influence in politics and business, and rightly so, if the subject is viewed objectively. The position of women in the Roman society was of course largely regulated by class and rank, and standards of living and law were influenced by barriers and limits between the classes. On the whole, women of superior orders had a much better starting point to begin with in their lives, but even among the nobility apparent power was still something that was quite different from the real power which was upheld by the law. One cannot deny that Roman senatorial women, even those at the very top of society, were most likely to achieve lasting fame and position through either scandals or personal virtues, which were subsequently likely to be reported by writers. Apart from women's evident economic power such as landownership or, say, their presence as *patronae* of various kinds, and so on, the supreme power always lay in men's hands. But it would be naive to claim that women had no share in important political decisions. As is also sufficiently clear from the literature, an effective way to exercise an influence on those who made the final decisions at various levels of the administration was through

personal relationships, i.e. marriage, family connections and friendship. Though not always plainly on record, this factor should not be underestimated nor misunderstood. In order to delineate a framework of these family links and personal contacts a large-scale systematic research is called for, that is, a prosopography registering senatorial women and their relatives. And here is it now, Dr Raepsaet-Charlier's massive work in two volumes with thousands of names, persons, lineages and genealogies. Without such lists a great number of "ordinary" wives and daughters of senators would remain as bare names on inscriptions and pages of historians. Not all of them were Agrippinae or Messalinae, but a reliable picture of an entire social class cannot be created without admitting that all its members were in principle of equal status. The appearance of the present prosopography is a very welcome event, because many earlier catalogues were either totally devoted to men or at the most women were recorded marginally in relation to their husbands and fathers. In PIR¹⁻² and RE women have their own entries, as they also do in PLRE, but they are often short in comparison with those of their male relatives, and sometimes even totally absent.

Raepsaet-Charlier's work has been elaborated on the basis of her doctoral thesis from 1977 (Brussels). After that date she has published a number of articles relating to senatorial women, notably on their honorific titles, marriage and divorce. And marriage is also the central theme of this prosopography, not only in the way it casts new light on the social reality of upper-class Roman couples, but also because of problems in dating in general. In the absence of other information the marriage together with the husband's career constitutes a very useful criterion for a more or less precise dating. But, unfortunately, it often happens that iterated marriages and divorces are nowhere placed on record, and the ages when senators married could also present considerable variation (cf. recently Syme, *Historia* 36 [1987] 318ff.). As the catalogues also reveal, two important facts are closely linked with marriage, viz. senatorial endogamy and the tendency to strive for social differentiation (cf. intr. ix). Of course, exceptions occur in this respect, but they are mostly very instructive.

In an introductory section where the definitions and limits of the material are discussed, the author starts from a very essential subject, i.e. the Augustan legislation regulating senatorial marriages (p. 2ff.). The period from the enactment of *lex Iulia* in 18 BC is a terminus post quem for the whole catalogue. The legislative process originated in Augustus' measures must have been brought to a conclusion within a few years, and so it is only

for technical reasons that the year 10 BC is here chosen to be the chronological starting point. The second part of the law, as it is preserved in Paulus' *Digesta* (23, 2, 44) concerns the female descendants of senators (...*senatoris filia neptisve ex filio proneptisve ex nepote filio nato [nata]*...). Chastagnol's assumption that this could be an addition from Antonine time is here criticized with sound arguments, notably by referring to the SC of Larinum from the year 19 AD (AE 1978, 145) and to its juridical and formal similarities with the so-called 'addition'. And citations from Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio point in the same direction (cf. pp. 4-5).

As regards the legislation concerning senators' wives and their membership in the *ordo* (Ulp. dig. 1, 9, 8), one must agree with the author that it should be attributed approximately to the epoch of Marcus Aurelius. Here, too, the author has taken a different stand from Chastagnol, who dates these regulations reported by Ulpian to Caracalla's time. But Raepsaet-Charlier has good reasons for disagreeing. The author had already treated these questions in some earlier articles but now with more complete material and with additional arguments she is likely to be right.

The catalogue itself, the *anonymae* included, registers 901 senatorial women. All those who were either certainly or probably members of the *ordo* are listed in alphabetical order, i.e. daughters of senators, even if they had married a man of equestrian rank, and senators' wives, no matter if their father did not belong to the *ordo*. Mothers and sisters of senators are also included in case the senators in question were not *homines novi*. This is a good principle, and it is consistently followed here. If the woman is only thought to be senatorial, she is listed as *incerta* and her name is printed in Italics. As the author is well aware, these *incertae* form a rather problematic group. In many cases it is obviously only a matter of personal judgement that a certain lady has been either added to the catalogue or omitted from it. This concerns above all women with no indications of senatorial status, like many proprietors of *fistulae aquariae* and the brick producers or the Vestal Virgins. To cite one instance, Attia Campanilla (n^o 123) is an *incerta* approximately from the 3rd century (she is known from a *fistula*), but the senatorial [Aurel?]ia Severiana (BullCom 1941, 191, nr. 29; also a *fistula*) from around the Severan period is not included. It might be better to list both as *incertae* or to leave both aside.

The honorific titles are a good indication of one's belonging to the senatorial class. On pp. 16-18 the author presents their use and chronology in a clear and concise way. As regards the Christian *clarissimae*, they are in

principle excluded for chronological reasons (cf. p. 17, n. 8), but there is still e.g. Numisia Fonteia Vera (n^o 580) from the coemeterium Praetextati (ICVR 14513). As regards Domitia Heraclia (n^o 325) and her sarcophag (the lid is preserved) found on the Via Appia, there seems to be nothing in the inscription (ICVR 15374) nor in the relief decoration to suggest that Heraclia was a Christian (I have examined the fragment in the Museo Nazionale of Naples).

Names and identities are always a crucial problem, and the same is also true with the present catalogue. Postulated persons and hypothesized family connections are often based on onomastic evidence. Who is to be left out of the list and who is to be regarded as an *incerta*? It is of no use to go into details here, the final decision being after all something of a personal opinion and, furthermore, the disputable cases being so numerous. In general the author's criteria are reliable and her arguments well-reasoned. Of course, the existence of many other women could be assumed, especially for onomastic reasons, but it would be like tilting against windmills to find and get to know every possible person. It is better to apply common sense and, to be sure, in this respect Raepsaet-Charlier has done a research worthy of admiration. The mere energy and time required for a work of this magnitude is considerable.

As stated above, the catalogue registers the senatorial women of the first two Imperial centuries. The terminating year around 200 AD has been properly chosen because under the Severan period (and naturally also earlier) the position of the Senate gradually became less important and the equestrian order was gaining more and more prominence in many parts of the Roman society. The alphabetic list includes 855 women known by name even if at times fragmentary, and 46 *anonymae*. Each name is followed by various references and sources and by a "liens familiaux" section. The entries are clear and well-composed, but they could have been even more informative if the "liens familiaux" had also included the daughters and sisters of each lady. Another minor but sometimes disturbing point is that the numbers of the footnotes are so small that it is rather difficult to find them in the text itself. Some kind of symbols might also have been of use in separating the different types of *incertae* from each other. The persons are classed according to the gentilicium. As regards the order followed, it is of course faultless, but in a couple of cases it could have been chosen by an alternative method. E.g. Attia Cervidia Vestina (n^o 208) is listed after 'Cervidia', that is, her father's gentilicium (thus also in PIR² C 681a), but to collocate her under the name

'Attia' could also be justified. N^o 623: Polla An[tonia?] (or some other gentilicium beginning with *An-*) is listed under 'Polla', but perhaps she should have been placed after the n^o 46 (Alliaria) (even if she is PIR P 408). The names of the relatives given in each entry are of course not always their full names nor do they need to be so. But the name forms are sometimes inconsistent in so far as the abbreviations, usually very carefully indicated, are now and then neglected (cf. e.g. n^o 221: *Tib.* instead of *Ti.* and *Cl.* instead of *Claudius/a* : "fils" and "fille"; the same is true with a number of other *Ti. Claudii/ae*, too). As is necessary in this kind of work the catalogue is followed by a copious bibliography and useful thematic indices.

While the two volumes were in print and also after their publication new relevant studies and sources have come to light (cf. e.g. PIR² N-O and many important articles), but I will not tackle them here. In the following it is my purpose to present a short selection of observations on the material, mainly from the onomastic point of view. That the names are particularly important in discovering new identities, is self-evident. A considerable number of persons figuring on the pages of this prosopography are postulated "d'après l'onomastique". Following these lines I will also make a couple of new proposals of identification.

1: The name form (Accia Marulla) recently proposed by Vidman, PIR² N 57, is somewhat improbable. If she ever had such a name, the cognomen should rather be *Marullina*.

3: (Acilia) Faustina. The name should be written [Acilia] Faustina (cf. XIV 2484). As regards the problematic identification of M. Acilius Vibius Faustinus (PIR² A 86) with M'. Acilius Faustinus (Roxan II 123), cf. now Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987, 386, n. 117.

4: Here it might have been appropriate to express clearly that the inscr. IGUR 160 presents not one but two priestesses called Μαλίολα (I A, 14-15). As the author states on p. 255, one of these might be Cornelia Manliola (n^o 286).

14: Iunilla's brother Capito Aelianus (PIR² C 412) is here presented with the name 'Dec. () Capito Aelianus' and in stemma X as 'Dec. (Aelius) Capito Aelianus' (Stein, PIR² C 412, also opted for 'Aelius'). But his praenomen was not *Decimus* (as it is e.g. in R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 307), the abbreviation *Dec.* of the *Fasti* naturally referring to the month December (Vidman, FO², Cbd 27). For possible

adoptive fathers (certainly not an Aelius), cf. Vidman 65 and Syme, *ibid.* 307f.

15: *Aelia Licinia Petili[a]*. The last name may also be Petili[a - - -] (cf. V 871).

19: The praenomen of Platonis' husband should be put in curved brackets: (Ti.).

22: For Paullus Aemilius Regillus, quaestor of Tiberius, see Salomies 320f.: perhaps rather a grandson of the consul of 34 BC, whose name, by the way, should be given in the form 'Paullus Aemilius Lepidus' (Salomies 320, with note 105).

31: Aemilia Lepida. The gentilicium is nowhere on record, therefore (Aemilia) Lepida.

34: It might be better to put a question mark after 'Messia'.

41: Quintina's husband also had the cognomen *Piso* (cf. AE 1949, 23). In the stemma XVII his name is given in full, otherwise without '*Piso*'.

42: *Aiace Maxima*. Despite the negative statement of PLRE I 572 ("her name is unusual and should not be confused with the nomen '*Aiacia*'"), her gentilicium is most obviously *Aiacia*. On the fistulae (NSc. 1932, p. 300ff.; in the Museo Nazionale of Naples there are at least three exemplars with the same text) the name is written in the genitive, AIACES MAXIMAES. Phenomena of the kind were common on various instrumentum inscriptions, cf. e.g. XV 8584: [L]arg(i)aes Granillae / c.f. (=A. Ferrua, *Sigilli su calce nelle catacombe [Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane, VIII]*, Città del Vaticano 1986, 31-32, nr. 39). The variation *ae/e* in one and the same text is not at all uncommon, cf. e.g. XV 8470: *Sentiaes/Iustines*. Accordingly, I would read the name "*Aiac(i)es Maximaes*".

45: [Alfia?] Prima. The author is quite right to put a question mark after 'Alfia'. I would even add another one (cf. the discussion in *Tituli* 5, 198-199). We cannot in fact be absolutely sure that P. Alf. Primus (Wiseman, nr. 521) was really an Alf(ius). For the Alfii of Marruvium cf. recently S. Segenni, *Stud. Class. Or.* 37 (1987) 448f.; the *gens Alfena*, *ibid.* p. 461.

64: The second name of Annia Maleca? Avita is probably corrupt. Cf. the names of Iulia Avita Mamaea (PIR² I 649) and Marcius Avitus (PIR² M 217).

78: Iulla (Antonia). Despite the fact that her alleged father and brother used *Iullus* as a praenomen (cf. Salomies 326), I would regard *Iulla* as her cognomen (note that *Iulla* is also otherwise known as an individual

name). Groag, ad PIR² A 800, writes '(Antonia) Iulla'. Another possibility might be to emend LVLLAES of VI 11959 to IVLIAES, but it would be difficult to find an identity to (Antonia) Iulia, daughter of a M. Antonius.

87: (Apronia Caesia) [ou Caesiana]. It is also possible that she was simply called (Apronia L.f.). I agree with the author that Caesennia n^o 169 is another lady.

99: Arria Fadilla. It is very good that all exemplars of one and the same stamp are registered. However, some kind of concordance might also have been of use for the reader, and the same naturally goes for all the other women known from brick stamps as well (the similar cases being quite numerous I will not tackle them in the following). In particular the Ostian stamps of LSO are mainly new exemplars of those already published in CIL XV, Bloch's Supplement or both. At present the catalogues often list the same stamps twice or three times in different places and in consequence do not show which ones are identical.

109: Aṣiatica. The name is fragmentary: [---] Aṣiatica (cf. IGR I 967).

110: [Ar]ria Magia Secundil[la]. The restoration of the first gentilicium is not sure, therefore [---]ria (cf. AE 1938, 177=IGLS III 762).

112: Asinia. As regards the reading of the stamps XV 858-9=LSO 709 and RBS 239 (not 259, as is stated here), it is to be noted that Bloch in fact thought that the two stamps present the same error in common, i.e. ASINIAF instead of ASINIAE. Therefore, the name appears in his index (p. 19) in the form 'Asinia Marcelli' (without 'f.'). Personally I am inclined to think that Asinia had a cognomen, not *Marcell(a)*, because RBS 239 (=XV 859) gives MARCELLI, but *Marcelli(na)* instead. There would be nothing peculiar in the fact that the same name was abbreviated in two different ways [in our case XV 858: *Marcell(ina)*; XV 859: *Marcelli(na)*]. This was quite common in brick stamps. The reading *Asinia f. Marcelli* does not seem very happy to me, because this kind of name form would be exceptional. Firstly, the father's cognomen was very rarely used in filiations and then nearly always for some special reason and, moreover, the indication 'f (*ilia*)' should be found after the father's name. It would also be strange to find a senatorial lady appearing without a cognomen as late as under Antoninus Pius (her sister (?) was Asinia Quadratilla, n^o 115). And finally, would it not be odd if the name of the *domina figl.* were in the nominative on the stamp? The names of the owners of the *figlinae* are regularly written in the genitive.

121: (*Atilia Sabina*). It might have been better to write only (*Atilia*) or at least to put a question mark after 'Sabina'.

127: As concerns Attica's possible link with the Pomponii Attici and Pomponia Graecina, the author is quite right to regard McDermott's hypothesis as very uncertain.

136: The praenomen *L[uc]ia* is possible, but the first name may also have been a gentilicium, e.g. *L[iv]ia*, *L[us]ia* or the like.

143: CIL XV 7129 should be cited: *Belliciae Modeste / v(irginis) V(estalis)* [not *Belliciae Modest(a)e V(irgo) V(estalis)*].

160: [C]aecinia Larga. As regards the much discussed name and origin of the consul of 13 AD, C. Silius P.f.P.n. A. Caecina Largus, is it necessary to think about any kind of adoption? He might ultimately be one of the earliest cases of polyonymy (cf. e.g. Panciera, *L'onon. lat.*, Paris 1975 [1977], 198 and recently Salomies 412). Being a natural son of a Silius, he might have attached to his name the elements 'A. Caecina', but for what reason it is difficult to say. Perhaps the mother was a (Caecinia) [cf. Syme, *Tituli* 4, 406]. As C. Silius (cos. design. 47) was certainly his son, it would be somewhat surprising (though not at all impossible) that the other son (cos. 42) was called C. Caecina Largus (=PIR² C 101). Therefore, it might be that the father of the cos. 42 and the paternal grandfather of Caecinia Larga (n^o 160; she was *A.f.*) was an otherwise unattested Caecina Largus (it has also been thought that C. Caecina Largus, brother of A. Caecina Severus [cos. suff. 1 BC], was the father of the consul of 42 AD). For the origin of Larga and her husband A. Larcius Lepidus Sulpicianus, cf. recently M. W. Baldwin Bowsky, *Historia* 36 (1987) 502ff.

162: The reading of III 1988-89 as proposed by J. Šašel, *Tituli* 5, 563-4, is problematic in so far as we should accept that *Crispinilla mater* had two children with different gentilicia. The same reading is repeated in ILJug. 2077 where, however, the authors state that "potius de duobus fragmentis separatis cogitandum est". Unfortunately, the fragments no longer exist nor are there any photos of them.

166: (Caepia) Crispina. Being the daughter of A. Caepio Crispinus she cannot possibly have been called 'Caepia' (this is the feminine form of *Caepius*). In VI 31765 (cf. AE 1973, 33) she is mentioned by the cognomen only. Her gentilicium was rather 'Caepionia', i.e. the feminine form of *Caepionius* used to denote the female members of the Caepiones (cf. e.g. *Cepo* : *Gebonia* ; *Tappo* : *Tapponia* and *Tenagino* : *Tenagenonia* ; Schulze, ZGLE 303f.; for Tenagenonia cf. Alföldy, *Tituli* 5, 345).

167: Caepia Procula. For the above reasons (cf. n^o 166) it seems to me rather unwise to suppose with Corbier, Schumacher and others that Procula is (“d’après l’onomastique”) the sister of Galeo Tettienus Severus M. Eppuleius Proculus Ti. Caepio Hispo (consul in Trajan’s time). Moreover, *Proculus/a* is not a particularly unusual name.

172: Calpurnia. For the nomenclature of Calpurnii Serranus and Torquatus, see Salomies 329. As the author states on p. 167, n. 1, an intermediary generation between L. Nonii Asprenates, coss. in 36 BC and 6 AD, respectively, is perhaps called for. In VI 1371 the filiation may have been *L. Pisonis [f (iliae)]* instead of ...*[filiae]* (the inscription is no longer extant and it was copied centuries ago).

179: Calpurnia Lepida. The author is right in rejecting Oliver’s strange idea concerning the name and person of the consul ord. of 149, Ser. Cornelius Scipio Salvidienus Orfitus. On the double praenomen of the consul cf. Salomies 414, n. 183. As regards the variation *Sergius/Servius*, it is clear that in the relevant inscriptions Σέργιοϛ was written instead of Σέρβιοϛ, but considering the number of attestations of this phenomenon during the Imperial period, it is difficult to say whether it was always a simple error or whether some other explanation lies behind it, cf. Salomies 48-49, notes 88-89 with additional material.

189: *Carminia App(h)ia*. It would be better to write *Apphia*, without brackets (the same also on p. 545: Flavia Apphia).

198: Casta. As concerns her gentilicium, we should remember the Numidian Iulii Casti of the 2nd century (cf. Le Glay, Tituli 5, 770). In this family the cognomen *Pudens* was also in use: one of the sons of the consul of 165 (himself probably son of the consul of 130 ca.) was called C. Iulius Pudens (PIR² I 504). On the other hand, *Pudens* is found among the African Caecilii Pudentes from the early 3rd century (Corbier, Tituli 5, 743). And what is more, Casta’s husband was also a Caecilius (=Caecilius Classicus, PIR² C 32), a native of Africa, as is the testimony of Pliny (epist. 3, 9, 3).

201-202: The gentilicium (Caucidia) being much less hypothetical than the cognomen (Tertulla), it could be reasonable to put a question mark after the cognomen.

206: Celerina (ou Caelerina). The name was not ‘Caelerina’, that form being only a graphic variant.

214: Appia (Claudia). Weidemann’s emendation ‘Appia’ (Tac. ann. 3, 68, 2) seems to me apposite and it aptly fits the historical context. But what is disturbing here is that ‘Appia’ as a female praenomen would be unexpected.

The Tacitean passage describes the prosecution against C. Silanus (cos. 10 AD) after his proconsulate of Asia in 22 AD. The session presided over by the Emperor took place in the Senate. At the end of it Lentulus the Augur is reported to have recommended a partial relief from the punishment: “*separanda Silani materna bona, quippe alia parente geniti*”. The emendation 'Appia' (cf. above) means that Tacitus calls the daughter of Ap. Claudius Pulcher (cos. 38 BC) by the name 'Appia'. He may well have done so, but in that case he obviously made an error, or perhaps his source did. I think that she was called 'Claudia Ap.f.', and with her husband's name 'Claudia Ap.f. Silani'. It is to be noted that her brother (PIR² C 185) was homonymous with his father, whilst the sister had the name Claudia Ap.f. Quirini (VI 15626; wife of P. Sulpicius Quirinius, cos. 12 BC; for some reason modern scholars sometimes give her the name 'Appia Claudia').— As regards the name of the consul of 28 AD, it was 'Appius Iunius Silanus', without the praenomen C. (this should also be corrected on p. 287), see Salomies 417.

215: For safety's sake, it would have been better to catalogue Claudia Aesernina as an *incerta*.

229: (Claudia) Callisto. A question mark would have been appropriate after (Claudia). As the author rightly states, her father was perhaps called P. (Antonius?) Claudius Attalus.

236: For various connotations emerging from the Persian name *Mandane*, cf. L. Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine I*, Paris 1963, 217f.

239: (Claudia) Livia Iulia. CIL VI 5198 with the name 'Iulia Drusi Caesaris' might in theory also refer to her daughter Iulia. She seems to have mainly been called 'Livia' or 'Claudia Livia' followed by the name of her husband. A name with three gentilicia does not seem very plausible to me.

240: (*Claudia Macrinia*). It would be reasonable to add a question mark after 'Macrinia', not necessarily after 'Claudia'.

241: That Alexandra's mother was called Alexandria (n^o 129) seems to be a graphic variation. They were very probably both either *Alexandrae* or *Alexandriae*.

262: Clodia [P]a[tru]ina? (ou [I]a[tr]ina??). This lady has always appeared in prosopographies with one of these “alternative” cognomina, restored by Ramsay (JRS 16 [1926] 214: *Iatrina*) and Groag (PIR² C 1193: *Patruina*). But there is naturally a large number of other possibilities, too, e.g. *Faustina*, *Maximina*, *Paul(l)ina*, *Salonina*, etc.

268: There are still problems to be solved concerning the family connections of the Neratii, notably those between L. Neratius Marcellus (cos. 95; II 125) and his alleged adoptive and natural father, see recently Salomies 384.

278: Fausta (Cornelia). As the author affirms (n. 1), it is not at all certain that *Fausta* was used as a praenomen. To her relatives could perhaps be added (Faustus? Cornelius) [Sulla] Felix, fr. Arv. 21 AD (=PIR² C 1463).

281: The author is right in supposing that Cornelia...Plancina could also be the sister of the consul of 110 and the mother of the consul of 127. It would be most interesting to know more about the elements 'Aemilia Plancina'.

292: Cornelia Sabina. It is not certain that the inscription on the Pompeian amphora Nsc. 1933, 303, nr. 231, here listed as testimony nr. 1, should be attributed to her (*Cornelia Sab*[---]). In fact the amphora shows two texts: [---]sco / *Cornelia Sab* [---] and *M (?) C O / C F* (uncertain). If the letters *C F* were interpreted as an honorific title, the amphora is clearly much later than the life-time of our lady. She has usually been identified as the wife or the daughter of L. Cornelius Pusio Annius Messalla (cos. suff. 90). This is possible, but not absolutely necessary. In the inscription AE 1915, 60 (=Inscr. It. IV, 1, 107) from Tibur there is no indication of *pater, coniunx* or *uxor* and, moreover, the expression *honoris causa* is not particularly typical in dedications between either husbands and wives or parents and children. *H.c.* was usually employed in texts of a more official nature, and the dedicators were mostly slaves, freedmen and various communities (cf. e.g. the instances listed in ILS V, p. 771). Accordingly, if these considerations are followed, her identity should be left undetermined (the fact that they both had the same gentilicium might suggest that she was Messalla's freedwoman).

294: Cornificia. In addition to the name (Aurelia) Cornificia the daughter of Marcus Aurelius may have used other combinations of names as well, as was common among the Emperor's children.

295: *Cornificia Faustilla*. The gentilicium, being deduced from the name of her freedwoman, should be put in brackets (cf. VI 16481).

297: (*Cossonia*). According to the nomenclature of L. Cossonius Eggius Marullus (cos. 184) Camodeca has assumed that his parents were a (*Cossonia*), daughter of L. Cossonius Gallus, and an (*Eggius*), son of L. Eggius Marullus (cos. 111). But would it not be more easy to explain the son's name by changing the names of the couple so that an (*Eggia*) married a

(Cossonius)? As the author states, IX 1248 could well refer to the *familia* of the cos. 184.

302: Crepere[ia]. The name continues: *Crepere[ia ---]* (cf. Pighi IV, 16).

303: *Crispina*. VI 31707 is fragmentary: [---] *Crispina*.

308: For the idea that P. Dasumius Rusticus (cos. 119) would have been adopted by his uncle L. Dasumius (Hadrianus?), as Syme thinks it, see now Salomies 228, n. 203.

309: *Decia (Daecia) Tertulla*. The gent. is naturally *Decia* (VI 1399).

321: I do not think it is probable that Domitia Calvina used the gentilicium (Calpurnia), at least in addition to the elements 'Domitia Calvina'.

325: VI 1404 is also ICVR 15374.

331: [Domit]ia [P]ollia. Her cognomen was not 'Pollia'. The inscription Pais, Suppl. It. 899 from Vercellae is to be read [---]iae / [Apoll]inaris f(i)liae) / [---]dillae. The gentilicium was most probably 'Domitia' and the cognomen '[---]dilla', cf. S. Roda, *Iscrizioni latine di Vercelli*, Torino 1985, nr. 20 (with a good photo).

335: V 4331 is also published in *Inscr. It. X, 5, 1, 118*. She is found in another Brixian text, too, V 8883 = *Inscr. It. X, 5, 1, 108*, cf. Salomies, *Arctos* 19 (1985) 289.

357: Favonia. The inscription is fragmentary: *Favonia [---]* (Solin, *Epigr. Unters.*, nr. 111).

358: Faustina. According to XIV 2484 [---] *Faustina* (cf. above n^o 3 and below n^o 657).

360: Flaminia is also in PIR² F 175.

379: It might have been better not to list the Pedanii Salinatores in the "liens familiaux" section at all. After Gregori's article in *ZPE* 65 (1986) 239ff. it is clear that Sabina was not married to Cn. Pedanius Salinator (PIR P 145).

389: Fulvia Paulina. Cf. the same elements in the name of [B]aebia Fulvia Claudia Paulina Grattia Maximilla (n^o 140; first half of the 2nd cent.).

419: (Hosidia). For the name of her son, cf. Salomies 251, nr. (1): the praenomen *C.* may have been chosen in honour of her maternal grandfather.

420: The inscription is also IGUR I 61.

429: [?Iu]lia [Ap]ronia Saephare. She may have been a relative of the senatorial L. Iulii Apronii etc., who are also known from Lambaesis, cf. PIR² I 159-161, 646-647.

444: Iulia Lupula Arria Fadilla. For onomastic reasons the identification 'Iulia Fadilla' = 'Iulia Lupula' = 'Arria Lupula' seems to me very suspect. Long name forms could naturally be abbreviated, but if a person was called by two totally different names, there would be no recognized identity for him/her, cf. also my remarks in vol. II of the Actes du IX^e Congrès internat. d'épigraphie grecque et latine (Sofia 31.8.-7.9. 1987), in print.

449: The restoration of Fidiana's name in ILAfr. 454 is somewhat problematic. Firstly, the cognomen *Rufa* would be exceptional in the senatorial class. While always being well attested among senatorial and other men, in women's nomenclature it is totally superseded by suffixed derivations (above all *Rufina*). Secondly, as is informed in Tituli 5, 715, RV[FA] is not enough to fill the lacuna before AEMI[---]. Therefore one might think about *Ru[fia]* or even *Ru[filla, -ilia]* (*Rufilianus* appears in the name of [---] Fronto Aemilianus [---] Calpurnius [---] Rufilianus [VII 98 = RIB 320], who seems to show a family connection with our lady, cf. Tituli 5, 715, 739). [PRIS]CA is of course uncertain. According to the reading of Y. Thébert, reported in Tituli 5, 715, the letter C is also questionable. Groag's proposal 'Calpurnia' is not impossible at all (cf. PIR² C 264), but a lacuna would still remain before that name (the short gentilicium 'Ceia' might be possible here, cf. 'Calpurnia Ceia Aemiliana', Tituli 5, 739, certainly a relative).

461: Iulia Taria Strat[o]nice. Cf. also Tib. Iul(ius) Stratonicus from Cappadocia (AE 1968, 507).

463: Either Crispinilla's husband or her stepfather is present in a fragmentary inscription from Gortyn recently published by L. Gasperini, Gortina I (Monogr. Scuola Arch. At. Miss. It. Or. 3), Roma 1988, 333-4, B (fig. 271).

476: It is by no means sure that the first gentilicium of Maxima's husband should be restored as *Ca[ssius]* (cf. VI 37067 and RE Suppl. XIV, 745, 31).

497: The name of this lady was in fact 'Licinia Ç.f. Victorina' and she was *c.m.f.* (not *c.f.*). *Hispella* belongs to the husband's name, cf. my remarks in Tyche 3 (1988).

516: Magia. The name is fragmentary: *Magia* [---] (Pighi IV, 15-16). Her husband was [---]*uricus*, currently identified with Bradua Mauricus

(cos. 191), but a restoration like *[Isa]uricus* would be equally possible. That name is attested in the senatorial album of the same period.

525: Marcia Furnilla, wife of Titus. Two of her slaves are known to us (VI 31768, 36456) but whilst writing this paper H. Solin informed me of the existence of a *libertus*, the first one attested so far. His name is engraved on an unpublished inscription found at Anzio: *[Q.] Marcius Marciae Divi Titi lib. Stichus*.

527: *[M]arciana*. She also had a gentilicium: *[--- M]arciana* (VI 1522).

528: *[M]arciana*. The gentilicium probably preceded 'Marciana' (lines 12/13 of I. Eph. 710B): *[--- M]arciana*.

533: The epigraphic evidence strongly points to the conclusion that Matidia's (=Matidia II) first name was 'Mindia'. VI 28804 seems to refer to her sister Vibia Sabina (n^o 802).

535: *Maxima*. The name on VI 32430 seems to be fragmentary: *[---] Maxuma* (sic).

553: As concerns the career of Paetina's husband Rutilius Gallicus, cf. also R. Syme, *Arctos* 18 (1984) 149ff., and W. Eck, *Am. Journ. Phil.* 106 (1985) 475ff.

559: For *Mummia* see now *Arctos* 21 (1987) 37ff.

564: I also think with the author that Woloch's hypothesis of a local genealogy is not a very happy one. From the onomastic point of view it is quite possible that *Mundicia Secundilla* was the daughter of L. Antistius *Mundicius Burrus*. Various ways to explain such a name are available.

573: (*Nonia*?). The name has disappeared: *[Nonia ?]* (Tarraco, nr. 137).

580: AE 1937, 164 is also ICVR 14513.

585: *Octavia Lucana* is *M' f.* (not *M. f.*) in AE 1954, 69.

587: *Oscia Modesta Cornelia Valeria?? Patruina Publiana*. VIII 23832 gives the following name form: *Oscia Modesta [---]ia [---]ia Cornelia Patruina Publiana*. IG XIV 1960 = IGR I 336 is also IGUR 1311.

599: For the variation *Passienus/-ius/Passenus/-ius*, cf. Schulze, *ZGLE* 213, n. 6.

600: *[?Pa]ulla*. Eck's identification of her husband as Q. Anicius *Faustus* (Tituli 4, 218, n. 103) is also made more difficult by the fact that her name *[---]ulla* might be restored in some other way, too (in *BullCom* 1941, 191, nr. 32 she is called *[---]ulla Fausti*, and on the other hand the name *Paulinus* is found among the descendants of Anicius *Faustus*).

602: Paxaea. VI 36058 does not refer to her. It only records the same gentilicium, not previously known from inscriptions.

605: (*Pedia*) (*Casca* ?). If this woman ever existed (it is Panciera's hypothesis that she did), her cognomen was not 'Casca', because it is a masculine *a*-ending name.

609: New and most important epigraphic evidence concerning Plancia Magna and her family (cf. also n^o 462 Iulia Tertulla and her alleged father C. Iulius...Tertullus) is now provided by R. Merkelbach – S. Şahin in *Epigr. Anat.* 11 (1988) 113-114 (nr. 18 with comments), 119-120 (nr. 28a-b with comments), 132-133 (nr. 57 with a new stemma).

617: XIV 2845 is also in ILS 994.

637: The reading variant *Fidicula* could have been mentioned (there is also '*Fadicula* '), even if *Fadiula* (= *Fadiola*) seems the most plausible alternative.

641: (Pomponia Longina). The cognomen is very hypothetical, therefore a question mark could be put after 'Longina'.

649: Postumia. The name continues: *Postumia* [---] (Pighi IV, 20).

651: Postumia Siria? As the author states, the cognomen proposed by Alföldy, Tarraco, nr. 34, is somewhat strange and unexpected (cf. Hübner, II 4076: "*Postum(ia) / Aem(ilia) Iustina* ", and Dessau, ILS 2297: [---]ia). Alföldy's proposal $\S[i]ria$ shows that the interpretation of the first letter is problematic and yet it is also decisive. Considering the names of her close relatives, I would not exclude the reading $\mathring{V}[a]ria$ (what is visible on the photo, Alföldy, Tarraco, Taf. LXII. 3, by no means contradicts this interpretation, cf. in particular the form of the letter V elsewhere in the inscription). One of her grandsons was called T. Flavius Postumius Varus (*praef. urbi* 271). As I have shown in *Arctos* 21 (1987) 37ff., *Varia* could be used as the feminine form of *Varus*. Accepting that she was called 'Postumia Varia', it would be tempting to identify 'Flavia Postu[mia] Varia' as her daughter. This *clarissima puella* is attested as participating in the *ludi saec.* of 204 AD. So far no established place has been found for her in the genealogy. Because Postumia Varia's (?) husband was T. Flavius Titianus, cos. about the year 200 AD, the daughter would inherit the first gentilicium from her father, and the rest from the mother. It might also be that Titianus' wife, the Postumia on the inscription of Tarraco, is the same lady as Postumia Varia *c.f.*, who is known from Urbinum (XI 6076). Unfortunately, this inscription cannot be dated precisely, but she certainly lived in the 3rd

century, possibly in the first half of the century. Admittedly, this last-mentioned identification is very hypothetical.

656: [Pr]iscilla. X 8292 is fragmentary: [--- Pr]iscilla. The cognomen is in fact very badly preserved ([---]ișçilla) so that in theory it might be e.g. [--- F]ușçilla as well. However, De Rossi's restoration is by far the most trustworthy.

657: [? Pris]cilla Aciliana. The full name was obviously longer: [---?Pris]cilla Aciliana (cf. XIV 2484).

659: Publia (ou Publilia?) Prisca. 'Publilia' sounds much better than 'Publia', preserved in various Dionian mss.

666: (Roscia) Pacula. The gentilicium has disappeared from V 4342 = Inscr. It. X, 5, 1, 136: [Roscia] Pacula (the full name is [Roscia] L.fil. [P]acula).

667: The praenomen of Bassa's grandson was not *M.* but *Sergius*, cf. Salomies 162f. (with note 417).

670: *Ruffia Marcella*. As the author rightly points out, she was certainly related to Lusia Rufia Marcella (n^o 513), perhaps she was one and the same person. Marcella's husband 'Sabinianus' is, on the other hand, only a name on the Sardinian inscription X 7586 (Carales). However, some useful information comes from Britain, where a man called Q. Lusius Sabinianus functioned as imperial procurator of the province probably in the Antonine period (see A. R. Birley, *The Fasti of Roman Britain*, Oxford 1981, 294). Several factors might link him with Marcella (despite the fact that he was of equestrian rank), but uncertainties concerning the chronology and the fact that the names in question are not particularly distinctive render any identification pure guesswork.

677: Sab(inia?) Quinta. V 8110, 288 (brick stamp) is here cited incorrectly as *Sab* [...] *Quinta C.f. Must. Aug.* The text runs *Sab. C.f. Quintāe Mus̄. Auḡ.*

686: Satria Galla. After her first marriage to Domitius Silus, she became the wife of Piso the Conspirator. It is generally believed that the marriage produced a child called Calpurnius Galerianus (his name thus in Tac. hist. 4, 11; 4, 49). The name *Galerianus* is a problem. There is no evidence that it was inherited from the paternal side (cf. PFOS II, st. XXII), nor is it attested among the known Satrii of the Early Empire. *Galerianus* as an adoptive name is also excluded. We could in theory suppose that Piso was sometimes married to a Galeria and their son was called Galerianus after the mother. Of Piso we know that earlier he had married Cornelia

Orestina/Orestilla (n^o 285). On the wedding day, about 38 AD, Cornelia was abducted by Caligula, but later she and Piso continued to live together. There is no positive evidence to suggest that Piso was married a third time. So it is very probable that Galerianus' mother was Satria Galla. One solution to explain the emergence of the name *Galerianus* might be an emendation of Tac. ann. 15, 59: *Gal<er>ia* (or perhaps *Gale<ri>a*). If the letters *er* (*ri*?) were dropped, it is easily understood that in ms. writing *Galia* (*Galea*?) and *Galla* were very likely to be confused with each other. If the cod. Medic. II presents a corrupted form (note that *Satria* is also an emendation from *Atria*), she was in fact called 'Satria Galeria', this style being quite possible in the nomenclature of the time. The first century shows many parallels of names in *-anus* deriving from the gentilicium of the mother.

690: *Secunda*. V 4364 = Inscr. It. X, 5, 1, 152 is fragmentary: [---]
Secunda.

694: [?Sembro]nia Laeta. A great number of other restorations of the gentilicium also suggest themselves (cf. Pighi IV, 14).

705: *Servaea Flavia Stianilla Valeriana*. *Flavia* is abbreviated in VIII 11337 (=238): *Fl(aviae)*. The stone is said to show *Fl*, which is to be read as either *F^l* (*aviae*) or *Fl* (*aviae*).

724: That the abbreviation *Stat.* stands for *Stat(ia)* is very probable (cf. VIII 2746), but in theory e.g. *Stat(ilia)* cannot be excluded (it was, however, usually abbreviated to *Statil.*).

742: The appearance of the praenomen *Servius* among the descendants of P. Cornelius Dolabella (cos. 55) may not solely be due to the marriage of a certain P. Dolabella to the family of the Sulpicii Galbae (Groag's hypothesis). For the use of *Servius* among the Cornelii of the Imperial time, see Salomies 177.

748: *Sur dini[a]*. VIII 1223: *Sur din[ia]*.

749: Ta[rri]a? Cornelia Asiana (ou éventuellement Tampia?). There are also other ways of restoring the gentilicium.

754: In order to explain the emergence of the elements 'Terentius Gentianus' among the Hedii Lolliani of the 2nd and 3rd cent. it might be sufficient to postulate one marriage only, most probably that between (Terentia, n^o 753) and the consul of 114. Otherwise we should assume that Lollianus Avitus (cos. 144) married his cousin.

776: *Valeria Polla*. VI 28244 certainly belongs to another lady called 'Polla Valeria' (thus not strictly speaking a homonym). And can we ultimately be sure that the Valeria Polla recorded in VI 9125, 9127, 9349 is

the same person as the *domina figl.* on XV 235 = LSO 245 of early Antonine time?

785: Vedusia. The author is right to point to the fact that the paternal gentilicium was now and then omitted in daughters' names. Therefore, her name could have been (Statilia) Vedusia.

786: Venu[leia]. In XI 1433 = Inscr. It. VII, 1, 17 the name continued in the lacuna: Venu[leia ---]. (A. Neppi Modona, Inscr. It., opted for Venu[leiiis ---]).

790: Verulana Gratilla. It is not necessary to read 'Verulania' instead of 'Verulana'.

795: *Veturia Gratilla Thais*. The name *Thais* may suggest some connection with the East, cf. the senator Veturius Paccianus of the later 2nd cent., honoured at Epidaurus and possibly also present at Corinth (see J. H. Oliver, Tituli 5, 595). Another exponent of the Veturii, the κράτιστος Veturius Quintianus certainly had very close ties with Athens (Oliver, *ibid.* 593).

796: Vibenn[ia]. The name continued: Vibenn[ia ---] (Pighi Va, 23a).

804: *Vibia Se[rena ?]*. In addition to *Se[rena]* there are also other possibilities to restore the cognomen (or perhaps there were two gentilicia, though this is less probable), cf. XII 5804.

819: Vitia. Still another question mark could be added before the inscr. VI 29095: *Ossa / Vitiae / Chelidonis*, listed as testimony (2).

822: The element 'Appuleia', being strongly hypothetical, should be followed by a question mark.

After these comments some words of a more technical nature might be apposite. Both volumes are very accurate and elegant, what else should we expect? However, no book, in particular if it is of this size, can be free from minor slips, either a printing or some other error. When reading the volumes, I have noticed the following small errors: p. 69 (under the name of Commodus Pompeianus): the number of the testimony (V. Caracallae 3, 8) is (7), not (4). – p. 118 (l. 9 from below): n. 119 (not 118). – p. 185 (n^o 194): *Iunoni* [not *Iunon(i)*]. – p. 201 (n^o 215): *Asinia* is n^o 110 (not 109). – p. 204: Ἀρχιέρεια (not Ἀρχιερεία). – p. 208: μητροπόλεως (not μετροπόλεως). – p. 211 (l. 2): Πουσινιανός (not Πουσονιανός). – p. 216 (l. 4 from below): *Apicata* is PIR² A 913 (not PIR¹). – p. 269 (n^o 304, l. 13 from below): *Crispus* (not *Priscus*). – pp. 319-20 (n^o 367): in the Suetonian passage *delicatam* (not *delicata*) and *Flavio* (not *Flavia*). – p. 325 (l. 4 from

below): Ἀρχιέρεια (not Ἀρχιερεία). – p. 351 (l. 9 from below): p. 694 (not 494). – p. 368 (bibl. of n^o 428): Gaertringen (not Gaetringen). – p. 398 (bibl. of n^o 464): Groag, RE...n^o 129 (not 229). – p. 453 (l. 3 from below): 396 (not 596). – p. 479 (l. 11 from below): VI 32411 (not 31411). – p. 494 (n^o 609): θυγάτηρ (not θυγάτηρ). – p. 517: Claudius Gallus should be “beau-perè?” (not “beau-frère?”). – p. 522 (l. 9): *pulchritudine* (not *-i*). – p. 527 (l. 10): 945 (not 975). – p. 545: Agathus (rather than Agathos; husband of Frontina). – p. 560 (l. 10 below): ὑπάτων (not ὑπατῶν). – p. 578 (l. 9): 694 (not 494). – p. 603 (l. 3): XV 7554a-b (not 7553). – p. 616 (l. 4): Iunia (not Iulia). – p. 642 (l. 5 from below): X 4635 (not 4625). – p. 646 (n^o 824): testimonies (15)-(16): *Inscr. Cret.* I, XVIII (not XVI). – p. 649 (l. 6): *pantomimos* (not *pantominos*). – p. 705 (bibl.): Balsdon (not Baldson). – p. 746 (l. 9): angrenzenden (not angrenzende). – p. 793 under 'Teidia Polla': VI 21363 (not 12363; note, however, that her name was '[---]a Teidia '). – As for the genealogical tables of vol. II, there are some small divergences from the text: n^o 311 (*Didia*) in st. XXXV (cf. vol. I, p. 275: “au fils de son frère”). – In st. XIV the son of Cn. Domitius Corbulo (D 141) should be “D 142 cos. suff. 39” (not D 141 pr 17, etc.). – Domitia Lepida's number (n^o 326) is erroneously '325' in the stemma 'J.-Cl'. One further point concerning the second volume: consulting the tables would have been made easier and handier if the number of the stemma had been printed on the first blank side of each folding sheet.

After these remarks, which by no means diminish the high quality of Raepsaet-Charlier's work, there is not much to be said, at least nothing negative. What is especially pleasing is the author's careful and critical analysis of many difficult identities such as those of the female members of the Volusii Saturnini (n^o 270, 492) or of the Neratii from Saepinum (n^o 566ff.; cf. n^o 268). A careful and mature deliberation between two or more alternative solutions is a virtue in prosopographical studies. In this respect Raepsaet-Charlier's research is a remarkable achievement. To sum up, this catalogue is not only a basic collection of Roman senatorial women, it will also be a general reference book for anyone interested in the upper-class political and social life of the first two Imperial centuries.