



# TYCHE

## Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte Papyrologie und Epigraphik

Herausgegeben von

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer  
Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

Band 5, 1990

1990





**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte,  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

# TYCHE

**Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte  
Papyrologie und Epigraphik**

**Band 5**

**1990**



**Verlag Adolf Holzhausens Nfg., Wien**

**Herausgegeben von:**

Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber

**In Zusammenarbeit mit:**

Reinhold Bichler, Herbert Graßl, Sigrid Jalkotzy und Ingomar Weiler

**Redaktion:**

Johann Diethart, Wolfgang Hameter, Bernhard Palme  
Georg Rehrenböck, Walter Scheidel, Hans Taeuber

**Zuschriften und Manuskripte erbeten an:**

Redaktion TYCHE, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Beiträge in deutscher, englischer, französischer, italienischer und lateinischer Sprache werden angenommen. Eingesandte Manuskripte können nicht zurückgesendet werden.

Bei der Redaktion einlangende wissenschaftliche Werke werden besprochen.

**Auslieferung:**

Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien

Gedruckt auf holz- und säurefreiem Papier.

Umschlag: IG II<sup>2</sup>2127 (Ausschnitt) mit freundlicher Genehmigung des Epigraphischen Museums in Athen, Inv.-Nr. 8490 und P. Vindob. Barbara 8.

© 1990 by Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Wien

Eigentümer und Verleger: Verlag A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Herausgeber: Gerhard Dobesch, Hermann Harrauer, Peter Siewert und Ekkehard Weber, c/o Institut für Alte Geschichte, Universität Wien, Dr.-Karl-Lueger-Ring 1, A-1010 Wien. Hersteller: Druckerei A. Holzhausens Nfg., Kandlgasse 19-21, A-1070 Wien. Verlagsort: Wien. — Herstellungsort: Wien. — Printed in Austria.

ISBN 3-900518-03-3

Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

## INHALT

Guido Bastianini (Milano), Una dichiarazione di un cammello. SPP XXII 97 riconsiderato (Tafel 1) .....	1
Guido Bastianini (Milano) e Claudio Gallazzi (Milano), Dati per un oroscopo. O.Tebt. NS inv. 89/1 (Tafel 2) .....	5
Björn Forsén (Helsinki), A Rediscovered Dedication to Zeus Hypsistos. EM 3221 (Tafel 3) .....	9
Claudio Gallazzi (Milano) e Guido Bastianini (Milano), Dati per un oroscopo. O.Tebt. NS inv. 89/1 (Tafel 2) .....	5
Dorottya Gáspár (Budapest), Eine griechische Fluchtafel aus Savaria (Tafel 4)	13
Ulrike Horak (Wien), Eine alphabetische Steuerliste und ein Grundkataster aus byzantinischer Zeit (Tafel 5, 6) .....	17
Mika Kajava (Helsinki), A New City Patroness? (Tafel 7, 8) .....	27
Johannes Kramer (Siegen), Lateinisch-griechisches Glossar (Tafel 2) .....	37
Johannes Kramer (Siegen), Zwei neue Augustalpräfekten auf einem lateinischen Protokoll (Tafel 9) .....	41
Dirk-Joachim Kukofka (Heidelberg), Waren die Bundesgenossen an den Land- verteilungen des Tiberius Gracchus beteiligt? .....	45
Leslie S. B. MacCoul (Washington), φιλοτιμία in Byzantine Papyrus Docu- ments .....	63
Brian McGing (Dublin), Melitian Monks at Labla (Tafel 10–12) .....	67
Peter van Minnen (Leiden) and Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam), A New Edition of Ostraka from Akoris .....	95
Rosario Pintaudi (Firenze), Oxyrhynchos e Oxyrhyncha. P.Vat. Gr. 65: Lettera di Dionysodoros ad Asklepiades (Tafel 13) .....	101
Genc Pollo (Tirana), Die Germanicus-Inschrift aus Buthrotum (Tafel 14) .....	105
Athanasios Rizakis (Athen), La <i>politeia</i> dans les cités de la confédération achéene (Tafel 15) .....	109
Ralf Scharf (Heidelberg), Der <i>comes sacri stabuli</i> in der Spätantike .....	135
Wido Sieberer (Innsbruck), Zur Lokalisierung des homerischen Ithaka .....	149
Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), Five Byzantine Papyri (Tafel 16–19) .....	165
Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), Liste mit Getreide-, Öl- und Geldzahlungen (Tafel 20, 21) .....	171
Pieter J. Sipesteijn (Amsterdam), A Dedication to Isis. SEG XXXI 1532 Re- dated .....	175
Johannes Triantaphyllopoulos (Athen), Zu Corpus Papyrorum Raineri XIV (Griechische Texte X) .....	177

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Klaas A. Worp (Amsterdam) and Peter van Minnen (Leiden), A New Edition of Ostraka from Akoris .....	95
Bemerkungen zu Papyri III <Korr. Tyche 28 – 34> .....	179
Buchbesprechungen .....	183
Massimo Pallotino: <i>Etruskologie. Geschichte und Kultur der Etrusker</i> , Basel 1988 (193); A. Valvo: <i>La „Profezia di Vegoia“</i> , Roma 1988 (183); <i>La formazione della città in Emilia Romagna</i> , Bologna 1988 (184); <i>Celti ed Etrusci nell'Italia centro-settentrionale dal V secolo a. C. alla romanizzazione</i> . Atti del Colloquio Internazionale. Bologna 1987 (186); Gilda Bartoloni [u. a.]: <i>Le urne a capanna rinvenute in Italia</i> , Roma 1987 (187); M. Milanese: <i>Scavi nell'oppidum preromano di Genova (Genova-San Silvestro)</i> , Roma 1987 (188: Luciana Aigner Foresti) — St. Leontsini: <i>Die Prostitution im frühen Byzanz</i> , Wien 1989 (189: Johannes Diethart) — A. Rengakos: <i>Form und Wandel des Machtdenkens der Athener bei Thukydides</i> , Stuttgart 1984 (190); Appian v. Alexandria: <i>Römische Geschichte</i> , 2. T., übers. O. Veh, Stuttgart 1989 (191); J. Buckler: <i>Philip II and the Sacred War</i> , Leiden 1989 (191); H. H. Brouwer: <i>Bona Dea</i> , Leiden 1989 (192); R. v. Haehling: <i>Zeitbezüge des T. Livius in der ersten Dekade seines Geschichtswerkes</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (193); Th. Schäfer: <i>Imperii insignia. Sella curulis und fasces</i> , Mainz 1989 (194); G. Alföldy: <i>Die Krise des römischen Reiches</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (194); J. D. Minyard: <i>Lucretius and the Late Republic</i> , Leiden 1985 (195); J. Hahn: <i>Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (196); H. E. Herzig, R. Frei-Stolba: <i>Labor omnibus unus. G. Walser zum 70. Geburtstag</i> , Stuttgart 1989 (196); G. F. Hertzberg: <i>Die Geschichte Griechenlands unter der Herrschaft der Römer</i> , Nachdruck Hildesheim 1990 (197: Gerhard Dobesch) — R. Pintaudi [u. a.]: <i>Papyri Graecae Wessely Pragenses (P. Prag. I)</i> , Firenze 1988 (199: Bernhard Palme) — P. Garnsey: <i>Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World</i> , Cambridge 1989 (202); P. Garnsey, R. Saller: <i>Das römische Kaiserreich. Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft und Kultur</i> , Reinbek 1989 (203: Walter Scheidel) — G. Dragon, D. Feissel: <i>Inscriptions de Cilicie</i> , Paris 1987 (204: Peter Siewert)	
Corrigendum zu Tyche 4 (1989), 160 .....	206
Indices: Johannes Diethart .....	207

Tafel 1 – 21

MIKA KAJAVA

## A New City Patroness?\*

(Tafel 7, 8)

Beside the amphitheatre of the ancient Abella in Campania, a few hundred metres beyond the built-up area of the modern Avella, there is a large statue base of white marble lying on its left side (m.  $1.35 \times 0.66 \times 0.58$ )<sup>1</sup>. The mouldings on top and underneath and the framing of the epigraphic area are well preserved. The right-hand side shows the remains of the normal *patera*. However, the eight lines of the inscription have suffered considerable damage owing to a deliberate erasure of the script (the letters appear to have been about 5 cms. high). Fortunately, however, the man who did the work was not that effective for he did not destroy every single letter of the text. An erased inscription can often still be deciphered, and even though one may not be able to read all the text, one may at least ascertain a general idea of the contents.

In the present case the photographic evidence clearly suggests that the person honoured was a lady whose name was engraved on the first three lines of the inscription. What is particularly interesting is that the third line seems to end with the honorific predicate *c(larissima) f(emina)*. Despite the erasure, the shapes of the letters *C* and *F* are still visible, as are the three interpuncts showing the abbreviation *c. f.* Considering the space available on the first three lines, the name of this senatorial lady presumably consisted of five elements. A detailed examination of the first name reveals that she was an Atilia (read *ATILIAE*; the oblique bar between the third and fourth letter, which at first sight might seem to be part of a possible *N*, probably does not belong to the script). What follows *ATILIAE* is a problem, but perhaps there is a name beginning with an *A*. Some vertical and curved strokes are discernible, but they are not enough to suggest any particular name. At any rate, the first line ends with *AE*, or perhaps better, with *IAE*. The beginning of the second line is better preserved: at least *LVCILL* seems clear, and *LVCILLIAE* may indeed be the correct reading (the remains of *AE* can be seen in the middle of the line). The first two letters closely resemble *EV*, but any name beginning with the Greek prefix *Eu-* does not seem plausibly here. The initial letter of the fourth

---

\* I saw and studied the monument and its inscription on 2 June 1985 with H. Solin, who took the photographs on the same day. For the permission to publish the inscription I wish to thank Dott.ssa G. Tocco (Soprintendente archeologico per le province di Salerno, Avellino e Benevento) and Dott.ssa G. Colucci Pescatori (Avellino). I also owe thanks to O. Salomies and H. Solin for commenting on my manuscript, and to G. Camodeca for discussing the photographic evidence.

<sup>1</sup> The monument is reported to have been found west of Avella, but its original location is unknown. For the area and borders of Abella, cf. S. De Caro, A. Greco, *Campania*, Bari 1981, 182 ff. (Guide archeologiche Laterza, 10).

name following *LVCILLIAE* seems to be an *S*, and the line clearly ends with *AE*. What we need here is the dative of a name of six or seven letters. A gentilicium or a cognomen could be considered, and in fact I first thought of a gentilicium ending in *-RTIA* / *-RGIA* / *-TTIA*, or the like. But at present I would be more inclined to see here a cognomen beginning with *SE* such as *SEVERAE*, or more plausibly *SERENAE* (one should note that the two strokes roughly in the middle of the name, which may look like the inferior angle of a *V*, do not belong to the original inscription). The last name (or names?) before *c. f.* remains indecipherable. On the whole, it is extremely difficult to distinguish between strokes belonging to the original engraving and those caused by the erasure. Therefore, any definitive interpretation of names other than *ATILIAE* and *LVCILLIAE* seems impossible. Furthermore, Atilia's filiation may also have been included in the name form she used. As regards the gentilicia and cognomina, their relation with each other remains unknown, too. Longer female names in general show a great variety in the combination of gentilicia and cognomina; they could indeed be recorded in a rather fortuitous order (of course, a 5-element name could well be formed of five gentilicia, too).

The analysis of the first three lines of the inscription thus reveals a lady of senatorial rank called *Atilia ... Lucillia (?) ...*. She appears to be otherwise unknown. The little we know of her names does not by itself suggest any link with any senatorial family where those names are on record. Before discussing the onomastic evidence and other dating criteria in a more detailed way it seems appropriate to have another look at the inscription, especially its fourth line. This line indeed seems to give important information of our Atilia. On the basis of a personal inspection in 1985, and in particular the photographic evidence (see Taf. 8 showing a close-up photograph of ll. 3–5), I believe that the fourth line begins with *PATRONAE*. The form of nearly every letter is still visible, and the top of at least six letters is preserved (*A, T, O, N, A, E*). The first letter clearly shows a vertical stroke, and the curved form of the *O* can be easily discerned. What follows *PATRONAE* also gives support to our reading. At the beginning of line 5 there is the ending of a superlative in *-issima (SIMAE)*. Thus *PATRONAE* must have been accompanied by a qualifying adjective like *dignissima* (very usual in similar contexts). The text may have continued with an honorific formula such as *ob merita eius ...* (this may in fact be the correct reading: see Taf. 8)<sup>2</sup>. The dedicators were evidently the citizens of Abella and/or the local *decuriones* (e. g. *ordo splendidissimus (?) Abellanus* / *ordo A.* / *ordo populusque A.* / *populus A.* / *ordo civesque* / *civitas Abellana* / *cives Abellani* / *Abellani* / *colonia Abella* / *coloni* / *coloni et incolae*, etc.). Some evidence in favour of *civitas* or *cives* is perhaps found at the beginning of l. 6, where the reading *CIV* may be justified (cf. esp. the possible remains of a *C* and the inferior part of a *V*. Between these there are two vertical traces which may belong to an *I*). Whatever the exact contents of ll. 4–8 may be, I would think that Atilia was rather the patroness of the city than of some local collegium (even if this alternative cannot be automatically excluded).

Of the more than 1000 city patrons attested from Italy and the western provinces

<sup>2</sup> A large range of various honorific expressions in senatorial inscriptions can be conveniently found in Dessau's ILS. For various epithets (mostly in the superlative) given to *patroni*/ *patronae* of both communities and individuals, cf. A. Soffredi, *Il patronato in Italia alla luce delle iscrizioni latine*, Epigraphica 18 (1956) 158 f.; E. P. Forbis, *The Language of Praise in Roman Honorary Inscriptions for Italian Municipals, A. D. 1–300*, Diss. Univ. North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1988, 131 ff. (*merita*: p. 291).



down to the end of the third century A. D., only a handful appear to be women<sup>3</sup>. I will here discuss exclusively those cases where the patronage is indisputably documented. It is certainly plausible that a woman, whether senatorial or not, who is known to have benefited a certain city, or served there e. g. as priestess of the Imperial cult<sup>4</sup>, may also have been a *patrona* of the city concerned. Any such case, however, where there is no direct evidence to suggest a woman's patronage over a given city, has been here omitted. On the other hand, women clearly attested as patronesses were often praised by the citizens for their benevolence and generosity. It is, however, somewhat problematic whether common expressions such as *ob merita* / *amorem* / *benevolentiam*, etc. always indicated some concrete benefactions on the part of the persons honoured, or were examples of mere laudatory topics. Moreover, cities undoubtedly also bestowed honours on patrons so as to secure their benevolence in the future<sup>5</sup>.

The following list includes only the *patronae* of Italian towns<sup>6</sup>:

<sup>3</sup> For the total number of city patrons, cf. W. Eck, *Wahl von Stadtpatronen mit kaiserlicher Beteiligung?* Chiron 9 (1979) 489. From this point on I use the following abbreviations:

Duthoy = R. Duthoy, *Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire*, Anc. Soc. 15–17 (1984–1986) 121–154.

Eck = W. Eck, *Die Präsenz senatorischer Familien in den Städten des Imperium Romanum bis zum späten 3. Jahrhundert*, in: *Studien zur antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift F. Vittinghoff*, Köln 1980, 283–322.

Engesser = F. Engesser, *Der Stadtpatronat in Italien und den Westprovinzen des Römischen Reiches bis Diokletian*, Diss. Freiburg 1957 (not published).

Harmand = L. Harmand, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire*, Paris 1957.

Krause = J.-U. Krause, *Das spätantike Städtepatronat*, Chiron 17 (1987) 1–80.

As regards the differences between the statistical results from Italy presented by Duthoy and others, it should be noted that Duthoy did not list the 39 patrons of Canusium (of which 31 were of senatorial rank) attested in the *album decurionum* from A. D. 223 (CIL IX 338 = ILS 6121), cf. Duthoy 136, and earlier, *Quelques observations concernant la mention d'un patronat municipal dans les inscriptions*, Ant. Class. 50 (1981) 305, which clarify the motives for the omission.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the examples in the catalogue provided by Eck 286 ff., *passim*. For benefactors as city patrons (and vice versa) in late antiquity, see Krause 14 ff.

<sup>5</sup> This is clearly shown by the cases where the patron was still relatively young. Thus Pliny the Younger writes that Tifernum-Tiberinum in Etruria *me paene adhuc puerum patrum cooptavit* (ep. 4, 1, 4), cf. J. Nicols, *Pliny and the Patronage of Communities*, Hermes 108 (1980) 368 ff. For other similar cases, see Krause 15 f.

<sup>6</sup> City patronesses in the western provinces: *Africa Proconsularis*: Gallonia Octavia Marcella, and her daughters Accia Asclepias Castorea and Accia Heuresis Venantium (Engesser, Nos. 63–65; Utica, 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.), Aelia Celsinilla (Engesser No. 91 = Harmand 282 = Krause No. 20; Thuburbo Minus, early 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.; but Krause opts for late 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.), Seia Potitia Consortiana (Engesser No. 97 = Harmand 281; Thibar, Severan), Iulia Memmia ... Aemiliana Fidiana (Engesser No. 108 = Harmand 281 + 380; Bulla Regia, Commodus / Septimius Severus), Aradia Roscia ... Calpurnia Purgilla (Engesser No. 110 = Harmand 282; *ibid.*, 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> cent.), Oscia Modesta ... Patruina Publina (Engesser No. 140 = Harmand 301; Aviocala, early 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.). *Numidia*: Fabia ... Iovina (Engesser No. 196; Cirta, [late?] 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.), Publiliae Caeciliae et Numis(iana?) (Engesser Nos. 220–221 = Harmand 241, sisters; Verecunda, 3<sup>rd</sup> cent.). These women were all senatorial except Fabia ... Iovina. — Engesser also catalogued two women from Hispania Citerior, but nothing indicates that they would have been city patronesses: Valeria P. f. Verecunda (CIL II 3269, Engesser No. 285; Castulo, A. D. 41/54), Valeria Severina (CIL II 5812, Engesser No. 299; Segisamo, A. D. 239; Severina and the four *patroni* recorded in this bronze *tessera* appear to have been patrons of a *collegium* formed of a number of male and female citizens). Concerning Ulpia M. f. Aristonice (AE 1933, 70; Diana Veteranorum, A. D. 183/185), Engesser 95 n. 5 may be right in that she was not patroness of Diana: the inscription only tells that two local magistrates dedicated the monument *patronae sua pec.*

1. Abeiena C. f. Balbina<sup>7</sup> (Pitinum Pisaurense)

She was *patrona municipi Pitinatium Pisaurensium* as well as *flaminica Pisauri et Arimini* in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century A. D. The monument was erected *decurionum decreto* at the time of her husband's election as *duovir quinquennalis*. They were granted the honours because of their *merita*. Balbina presumably belonged to the Pisauran bourgeoisie.

2. Aurelia Crescentia<sup>8</sup> (Trebula Mutuesca)

Crescentia, *honestissima et pudicissima femina*, is simply called *patro(na)*. The diction of the inscription is somewhat ambiguous, but it seems to suggest that the monument was given by the citizens of Trebula Mutuesca to their patroness *ob merita et beneficia saepe in se conlata*, and that a collegium of "*tricliniales*" also took part in the dedication. The husband Aurelius Felicissimus, *e. v.* and *procurator*<sup>9</sup>, was also patron of the city. Crescentia's statue was dedicated *decurionum decreto* in A. D. 243. She may have been a native of Trebula, but there is of course no way to show that she was. It is also quite uncertain whether Felicissimus had his origins in the city, or anywhere in the Sabine territory in Samnium.

3. Capertia Maximi f. Valeriana<sup>10</sup> (Bellunum)

Nothing more specific is known about Valeriana, daughter of a Maximus, except that the *plebs urbana* of Bellunum honoured her as their patroness. These Capertii were evidently of local stock, and they may have been somehow related to the Capertia Valentina, wife of C. M[ — ] Valerianus, who is recorded in CIL V 2050, likewise from Bellunum. The inscription presumably dates from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A. D.

4. Domitia Melpis c. f.<sup>11</sup> (Tarquinii)

The *ordo et cives Tarquiniensium* set up a monument in honour of their *patrona dignissima* Domitia Melpis c. f., wife of Q. Petronius Melior, *vir consularis*. Another Tarquinian inscription shows that Melior, too, was patron of the city, and that he served as *curator r. p. Tarquiniensium et Graviscanorum*<sup>12</sup>. His *cura r. p.* in Tarquinii dates from around the middle of the 240s A. D.<sup>13</sup> Melior evidently had his origins in Etruria, and the same might very well be true of Melpis<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> CIL XI 6354 = ILS 6655 = G. Cresci Marrone, G. Mennella, *Pisaurum* I, Pisa 1984, 257 ff., No. 65. Engesser No. 833 = Duthoy 136, No. 1 (not "Abeinia"); cf. *Idem*, *Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie*, *Epigraphica* 46 (1984) 34.

<sup>8</sup> CIL IX 4894 = ILS 6554. Engesser No. 893 = Duthoy 139, No. 57.

<sup>9</sup> H.-G. Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain*, Suppl. 1982, 150.

<sup>10</sup> AE 1976, 250 = Suppl. It. IV: Bellunum 10. Not listed by Duthoy.

<sup>11</sup> CIL XI 3368. Engesser No. 884 = Duthoy 142, No. 142.

<sup>12</sup> CIL XI 3367 = ILS 1180 (cf. Eck 301, No. 92). The inscriptions were presumably engraved at the same time: XI 3366 was re-used for both XI 3367 and 3368.

<sup>13</sup> W. Eck, *Die staatliche Organisation Italiens in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, München 1979, 240; G. Camodeca, *Ricerche sui curatores rei publicae*, ANRW II: 13 (1980) 516 f.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Eck (above n. 13) 200; M. Torelli, *Italia: Regio VII (Etruria)*, *Tituli* 5 (1982) 288 regards the Petronii Meliores as coming from Faesulae.

5. Helvidia Burrenia Modesta *c. f.*<sup>15</sup> (Interamna Nahars)

Modesta, patroness of Interamna, was posthumously honoured by the citizens *utriusque sexus* on 15 January A. D. 338 for the sake of her *meritum* and *amor*<sup>16</sup>. The diction of the inscription seems to suggest that it was a matter of some importance to indicate whether the dedicators were men, women, or both male and female citizens. Another inscription records that honours were paid to the city patroness by women alone (see No. 6). Modesta's origin is nowhere on record, but of course she may have been a native of Interamna, or at least an Umbrian by birth. On the other hand, her ties with the city may have been based solely on economic interests. The same inscription mentions her mother Burrenia Severa *c. f.*, and the maternal grandfather Helvidius Burrenius Severus *v. c.*<sup>17</sup>.

6. Laberia Hostilia Crispina<sup>18</sup> (Trebula Mutuesca)

Crispina was the daughter of M'. Laberius Maximus who was suffect consul in A. D. 89, and *consul II (ord.)* in A. D. 103. It is generally thought that the family's *patria* was in Lanuvium. Inscriptions seem to suggest that she had personal interests, probably landed property, both at Trebula Mutuesca and Amiternum in Samnium<sup>19</sup>. It is quite evident that Crispina's patronage over Trebula derived from her financial ties with that city (it is worth noting that her name has been found there on a water pipe<sup>20</sup>). She evidently benefited the Trebulan people in various ways. The monument which dates from the Antonine period<sup>21</sup> was dedicated to her *ob merita* by *mulieres Trebulanae*. It is not clear why women alone were at the bottom of the dedication (cf. above No. 5), but one could well imagine that they decided to bestow honours on Crispina in gratitude for some particular benefits<sup>22</sup>.

7. Nummia Varia *c. f.*<sup>23</sup> (Peltuinum, Vestini)

She is the only woman whose patronage over a city is known to have been commemorated in a *tabula patronatus*<sup>24</sup>. Her family, the Umbrii Primi, originally came from Compsa, but they had close and lasting ties with Beneventum, too (Varia's father is called

<sup>15</sup> CIL XI 4180. Not recorded by Krause.

<sup>16</sup> There are also other examples to show that a statue was set up for a patron after his lifetime, and that the act of co-opting someone as patron did not automatically mean that he was immediately honoured by the client-community, cf. Krause 10 n. 39.

<sup>17</sup> *PLRE* I 605 (Modesta), 827 (Severa), 835 (Severus). The nomenclature may suggest that Modesta's maternal ancestry was more prominent than the paternal one. Moreover, the inscription records neither the father nor any other paternal relative.

<sup>18</sup> AE 1964, 106. Duthoy 144, No. 198 (cf. Eck 298, No. 48 + 299, No. 67). For further epigraphic evidence, and her full name, cf. M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, *PFOS* 478.

<sup>19</sup> See the evidence in G. Camodeca, *Italia: Regio I, II, III*, Tituli 5 (1982) 152.

<sup>20</sup> M. Torelli, *Laberia Crispina e un praefectus castrorum in due epigrafi inedite di Trebula Mutuesca*, *Epigraphica* 24 (1962) 67.

<sup>21</sup> The inscription records the second consulate (in A. D. 139) of the husband Bruttius Praesens.

<sup>22</sup> Torelli (above n. 20) 67 f. thought that she may have been responsible for the construction of the *thermae* and other buildings whose ruins are still visible at Trebula. Could it be possible that she was praised by the *mulieres* for financing the building of the women's baths?

<sup>23</sup> CIL IX 3429 = ILS 6110. Engesser No. 887 = Harmand 317, 343 = Duthoy 146, No. 254.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. J. Nicols, *Tabulae patronatus: A Study of the Agreement between Patron and Client-Community*, *ANRW* II: 13 (1980) 544, 561 No. 30.

*civis et patronus* of Beneventum in AE 1969/70, 169, but this does not imply a *civis* by origin)<sup>25</sup>. The bronze *tabula* reveals that not only Nummia Varia but also her parents had benefited the city of Peltuinum in Samnium, and protected the citizens' interests in general<sup>26</sup>. A further fact of interest shown by the *tabula* is that Varia served as priestess of Venus Felix at Peltuinum<sup>27</sup>. The decree concerning the patronage was passed on 12 April in A. D. 242: *placere universis conscriptis ... pro splendore dignitatis suae patrociniū praefecturae nostrae deferri petique ab eius claritate et eximia benignitate, ut hunc honorem sibi a nobis oblatum libenti et prono animo suscipere et singulos universosque nos remque publicam nostram in clientelam domus suae recipere dignetur et in quibuscumque ratio exegerit, intercedente auctoritate dignitatis suae, tutos defensosque praestet*, etc. In addition to this *tabula*, Varia's name appears in another document at Peltuinum. It was in her honour that the local *plebs* erected a monument to M. Nummius Iustus, likewise a patron of the city, and evidently a close relative<sup>28</sup>. Finally, a freedwoman's funerary inscription is attested at Canusium<sup>29</sup>.

In some other cases, too, scholars have claimed that a woman was honoured as city patroness, but all such instances are either very uncertain, or must be explained in a different way<sup>30</sup>.

We may now return to the inscription of Abella which seems to add a further item to the list of patronesses of Italian towns. Until now three patrons of Abella were known<sup>31</sup>.

<sup>25</sup> See esp. G. Camodeca (above n. 19) 140, 143 f. The father M. Nummius Umbrius Primus M. f. Gal. Senecio Albinus (cos. ord. 206) may have been adopted by a Nummius Albinus, cf. L. Petersen, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 238 (the still current idea that he was adopted by M. Umbrius Primus, the suffect consul of ?186, and that his natural father was Nummius Albinus, the stepbrother of Didius Iulianus, seems to me very suspect; for this case in detail, cf. O. Salomies in his forthcoming study *The Adoptive Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*). A very tentative hypothesis concerning Varia's identity was given by M. Kajava, *Varus and Varia*, *Arctos* 21 (1987) 40 f.

<sup>26</sup> ..., *ea adfectione atque prono animo circa nos agere coepisse pro instituto benivolentiae suae, sicut et parentes eius semper egerunt, ...*

<sup>27</sup> Eck 289, No. 57; R. Duthoy (above n. 7) 24 f.; Idem, *Sens et fonction du patronat municipal durant le Principat*, *Ant. Class.* 53 (1984) 145 f.

<sup>28</sup> CIL IX 3436 = ILS 6528 (the *ordo* also granted him the right to *bisellium* and *cubitus*). Dessau, *PIR* N 186 thought that they may have been brother and sister (no identification is proposed in *PIR*<sup>2</sup> N 234, 240 f.). R. Duthoy (above n. 7) 48 n. 45: «même famille?».

<sup>29</sup> CIL IX 395.

<sup>30</sup> Antonia Cn. f. Picentina (CIL IX 5428 f., Falerio; Antonine period; regarded as *patrona* by Harmand 375), Egnatia Certiana c. f. (CIL IX 1578, Beneventum; 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. A. D.; listed with hesitation by Harmand 282), Petronia Sabina (CIL IX 5898 = ILS 1386, Ancona; latter half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. A. D.; Duthoy 147 n. 62 notes that the abbreviated form *patron.* might be considered to refer to either L. Petronius Sabinus or his daughter Sabina; the abbreviated form is found in three epigraphic codices. Mommsen gives *patroni*, Dessau *patron.*). For Hispania Citerior, cf. above n. 6.

<sup>31</sup> 1. N. Marcus N. f. Gal. Plaetorius Celer (CIL X 1202 = ILS 2660, after A. D. 117; Engesser No. 732 = Harmand 258).

2. Tarquinius Vitalio v. p., native of Abella, also called *principalis loci* (CIL X 1201; 4<sup>th</sup> cent. A. D.; Engesser No. 733 = Harmand 220 = Krause No. 93, cf. Id. 7 f.).

3. [- - -] Proculus (CIL X 1199 = ILS 5510, A. D. 333; Harmand 213 = Krause No. 94). — The fragmentary inscription CIL X 1200 (*Sex. Pom[- - -] | cos. pat + [- - -]*) does not necessarily show that this Sex. Pompeius was patron of the colony in the late Republican or Augustan period (thus, however, Harmand

As has been stated above, the nomenclature of *Atilia ... Lucillia* (?) does not give any clue to her identification. The form of the letters would seem to suggest a general dating from the late Antonine or (rather) Severan period down to the early 4<sup>th</sup> century A. D. The honorific title *clarissima femina*, introduced at the latest under Marcus Aurelius to denote wives of senators (unmarried daughters were titled *clarissimae puellae*), remained in use up until the 6<sup>th</sup> century A. D.<sup>32</sup> As regards the name form, a senatorial woman's 5/6(?) -element name is most likely to be found in the late 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> century A. D. Such a name less plausibly occurs in the 4<sup>th</sup> century when polyonymy gradually began to lose its significance in the Roman onomastic system<sup>33</sup>.

As far as we know, no senatorial Atilii of the Imperial period derived their origin from Abella or the nearby regions<sup>34</sup>, but in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries A. D. there may, naturally, have been Atilii of senatorial rank who came from Campania, too<sup>35</sup>. On the other hand, it is quite possible that Atilia's family had its origins somewhere else, for instance in Northern Italy where Atilii are frequently on record<sup>36</sup>. It is ultimately rather useless to speculate about her origin. One could in fact assume that Atilia's presence at Abella did not derive from any previous family ties with the city, but should rather be explained by the husband's activities in the region (and/or by his Campanian origin? But we do not even know whether Atilia was married at the time of her patronage). As we have seen above, the husband of a patroness could also be patron and *curator* in the same city. They may both have had personal interests at Abella. Finally, it is also possible that Atilia acted on her own, without father and husband, perhaps conferring benefits on the city, and even serving there as a priestess. It may have been for such *merita* that the citizens rewarded her with the title *patrona*.

There still remains the problem concerning the erasure of the text. It seems hard (though not impossible) to believe that the decision to destroy Atilia's memory would have been merely a local decision. Nor is it plausible that the text was intentionally erased so that the base could be attributed to a new recipient (or that it was to be re-used for some other purpose). This would be peculiar indeed because the honorand was the city patroness, and was also of very high social standing. As far as I can see, such a procedure might have been possible only long after Atilia's death, when the act of erasing the

---

126; for the identification, cf. Dessau, *PIR* P 449 f.; R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 99 n. 33, 414 n. 76). T. Caesius Anthianus *v. e.* was not patron of Abella (thus Harmand 212), but of Abellinum instead (see ILS 9014).

<sup>32</sup> A recent survey of senators' honorific titles is given by A. Chastagnol, in: *La terza età dell'epigrafia*, Faenza 1988, 41 ff. (Epigrafia e antichità 9) (there is an up-to-date bibliography for *c. f.* on p. 42 n. 134).

<sup>33</sup> Of course, the 4<sup>th</sup> century still shows many senators with relatively long compound names, but in women's nomenclature polyonymy hardly ever appears after the 3<sup>rd</sup> century; only the type "2 gentilicia + 1 cognomen" (e. g. Anicia Faltonia Proba, Faltonia Betitia Proba, *PLRE* I 732) still endured.

<sup>34</sup> Of the home-towns of any senatorial Atilii the nearest to Abella may be Sora in southern Latium (AE 1984, 39; presumably late 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> century A. D.). For other senatorial Atilii, one may consult various topographical works. The real *patria*, however, usually remains obscure.

<sup>35</sup> It cannot presumably be shown that the Republican Atilii who used the names *Caiatinus/ Calatinus* and *Calenus* would have really been Campanian by birth (thus e. g. M. Cécéillac-Gervasoni, *Italia: Regio I*, Tituli 5 [1982] 63), cf. M. Frederiksen, *Campania*, Roma 1984, 231.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. R. Syme, *People in Pliny*, JRS 58 (1968) 142 = RP II 705 f.; Id., *Correspondents of Pliny*, *Historia* 34 (1985) 342 = RP V 459. The *origo* of the senatorial Braduae may have been Libarna in Liguria: G. Alföldy, *Senatoren aus Norditalien. Regionen IX, X und XI*, Tituli 5 (1982) 327 f.

inscription was no longer felt to be impious. At any rate, if the monument was really intended to be re-used for another person, this purpose was never fulfilled<sup>37</sup>. Nothing suggests either that Atilia would have belonged to an Imperial family, and thus possibly suffered the measures passed against it by a new Emperor, or by the Senate<sup>38</sup>. The mere fact that she was *patrona* of a city makes this unlikely: after the early Principate it was very rare that members of the Imperial families served as patrons of individual cities (as *pater patriae* the Emperor, and with him to a large extent the whole Imperial house, was in a sense patron of the entire Roman Empire. The titles *pater patriae* and *patronus coloniae / municipii* were obviously felt to be incompatible with each other)<sup>39</sup>.

It may be a more plausible assumption that either Atilia's husband (or father) was accused and subsequently condemned for some crime, and not only the man's name but also that of the wife (or daughter) was erased from inscriptions. In fact, it was sometimes the case that a female relative, usually the wife, had to share the charges declared against the man<sup>40</sup>. On the other hand, individual women were also at times accused of crimes of more or less public nature, but in these cases, too, the husband's earlier activity may have

<sup>37</sup> It was not unknown for erased statue bases to be rewritten in antiquity, but instead of being simply carried out in order to give way to a new text, an erasure of an honorific inscription would most likely have been the result of an epigraphic *damnatio memoriae*, cf. H. Blanck, *Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkmäler bei Griechen und Römern*, Diss. Köln 1963, 108 ff. At Abella there is also another statue base where a new inscription was engraved over an erased one (CIL X 1216).

<sup>38</sup> For such cases, cf. R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton 1984, 356 ff.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Harmand 155 ff.; W. Eck, *Christen im höheren Reichsdienst im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert? Zu zwei Thesen Th. Klausers*, Chiron 9 (1979) 489 ff.; A. Wallace-Hadrill, in: *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London, New York 1989, 78 ff. (for the Emperor's universal patronage); J. Nicols, *Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate*, ZPE 80 (1990) 82 f. The only city patroness was Vibia Aurelia Sabina, one of the daughters of Marcus Aurelius. She was patroness of Calama in Africa Proconsularis (ILS 388 = ILAlg. I 241), and of Thibilis in Numidia (ILAlg. II 4661; the term *patria* assigned to Thibilis does not, of course, refer to the family's origin). As O. Salomies has suggested to me, it may be of some relevance here that Sabina's father had already been dead for more than thirty years when these inscriptions were set up. On the other hand, the expressions employed in these texts, "*divi Marci filia*" and "*divi Severi soror*", unmistakably manifested her identity and relation to the Imperial houses (though the latter expression did not reflect the reality of the situation; cf. D. Kienast, *Römische Kaisertabelle*, Darmstadt 1990, 140, 158).

<sup>40</sup> This was very usual in the Imperial houses down to the Late Antiquity (see esp. Kienast [above n. 39] *passim*). Other condemned women are recorded in the following list (which, like that which appears in n. 41, is not claimed to be complete; women who merely accompanied their husbands into exile are not included):

*Aelia Iunilla*: Seianus' daughter, executed, A. D. 31.

*Arria* the Elder: committed suicide with her husband, who was condemned for conspiracy, A. D. 42.

*Caedicia*: exiled, A. D. 65; the husband was accused of conspiracy.

*Claudia Basilo*: victim of Commodus together with her husband, A. D. 190 – 192.

*Cornelia*: charged with adultery and other crimes, committed suicide with her husband C. Calvisius Sabinus in A. D. 39; the husband had already been accused of *maiestas* in A. D. 32, and the same charge was evidently repeated in A. D. 39.

*Licinia*: it is very uncertain whether the erasure of CIL VI 31727 recording a Licinia can be linked with the death sentence of her alleged father M. Crassus Frugi in A. D. 46.

(*Marcia*) *Servilia*: committed suicide with her father in A. D. 66; the husband was exiled after the conspiracy of A. D. 65.

*Munatia Plancina*: accused with her husband of having murdered Germanicus in A. D. 20, but was acquitted; charged again in A. D. 33, committed suicide.

*Paxaea*: committed suicide with her husband before trial, A. D. 34.

*Publia (?) Prisca*: committed suicide with her husband who was charged with *maiestas*, A. D. 30.



often played a prominent role<sup>41</sup>. In any case, if a crime was really involved with our case, it was presumably one of *maiestas*, perhaps in connection with other charges too. It is true, an *erasio nominis* following a verdict of guilty is not particularly frequent in in-

*Sextia*: committed suicide in A. D. 34 with her husband who was charged with *maiestas*.

*Sosia Galla*: accused of *maiestas* along with her husband, and subsequently exiled; cf. Tac., *ann.* 4, 19: ... *et uxor socia* ...).

*Statilia Tauri f.*: wife of Piso the Augur, cos. 1 B. C.: names of the couple erased at Samos, P. Herrmann, *Die Inschriften römischer Zeit aus dem Heraion von Samos*, Ath. Mitt. 75 (1960) 130 ff., No. 30.

*Verulana Gratilla*: exiled with her husband in A. D. 93.

*Vibia*: exiled in A. D. 42 after a conspiracy against Claudius; the husband was killed; she was accused again in A. D. 52, when her son was exiled.

Anonymous:

PFOS 876: exiled and executed with her sons after the downfall of her husband, Pescennius Niger, in A. D. 194.

PLRE Anonyma 19: committed voluntary suicide after the execution of her husband Fl. Rufinus cos. 392.

PLRE Anonyma 27: sent to hard labour after the execution for treason of her husband, Theodorus, in A. D. 371/372.

<sup>41</sup> The following lists only cases where a sentence was passed and subsequently executed (members and close relatives of the Imperial house as well as condemned Vestals are excluded):

*Acutia*: condemned for *maiestas*, A. D. 37; the husband P. Vitellius had meddled in Seianus' conspiracy.

(*Aemilia*) *Lepida*: PFOS 28; exiled for adultery, poisoning, etc. in A. D. 20.

*Aemilia Lepida*: PFOS 30; nominally accused of adultery, committed suicide in A. D. 36; note that earlier Seianus had utilized her against Drusus, the second son of Germanicus, but she remained unpunished until the death of her powerful father.

*Anepsia*: accused of adultery; executed in the 370s.

*Antistia Pollitta*: committed suicide in A. D. 65; her husband Rubellius Blandus had been exiled and put to death in A. D. 62.

*Appuleia Varilla*: charged with *maiestas* and adultery in A. D. 17, but exiled for the latter reason alone.

*Arria* the Younger: exiled with her daughter Fannia by Domitian.

*Calpurnia*: exiled in A. D. 49 by Agrippina.

*Domitia Lepida*: sentenced to death by Claudius in A. D. 54 in consequence of Agrippina's intrigues.

*Euchrotia*: executed with a number of Priscillianists in A. D. 385.

*Flavia Domitilla*: *impietas*, exiled in A. D. 95.

*Fulvia Paulina*: adultery and sympathy for the Jewish faith; condemned by Tiberius.

*Gallitta*: adultery, condemned in A. D. 106–107.

*Iulia Procilla*, Agricola's mother: murdered by the Othonians.

*Iunia Calvina*: incest; exiled in A. D. 49.

*Iunia Silana*: intrigues against Agrippina; exiled in A. D. 55.

*Lollia Paulina*: exiled and put to death in A. D. 49 for charges mostly intrigued by Agrippina.

*Marcia Aurelia Ceionia Demetrias*: sent to death by Didius Iulianus after a series of manifold intrigues.

*Poppaea Sabina*: accused of adultery; committed suicide in A. D. 47.

*Rufina*: accused of adultery and executed in A. D. 374/375; the husband was earlier accused of treason.

*Sextia*: committed suicide with her granddaughter Antistia Pollitta (see above) and son-in-law in A. D. 65.

*Silia*: exiled after the death of Petronius Arbiter in A. D. 66.

*Vistilia*: exiled because of her irregular life in A. D. 19.

*Vitia*: executed in A. D. 32 *quod filii necem flevisset*, Tac., *ann.* 6, 10; her son was sentenced to death a little earlier.

*Vitrasia Faustina*: executed by order of Commodus about A. D. 182.

Anonymous:

PFOS 859: accused of having caused the death of her son Sex. Papinius in A. D. 36/37; exiled.

PFOS 867: accused of attempting to poison her son, Vettius Crispinus; condemned by Domitian.

PLRE Anonymae 5–8: three anonymous female friends (and a daughter of one of them) of Galeria Valeria, Diocletian's daughter; executed by Maximinus in A. D. 311/312.

scriptions, an overwhelming majority of the known *maiestas* cases being documented from literature (thanks to the reports of Tacitus in particular, the first century A. D. is well represented, cf. nn. 40 f.). It is also known that the name of the persons convicted was not always consistently erased, and the extent to which the *damnatio* was carried into effect at different times and places could show considerable variation. It was evidently public honorific monuments that were in the first place erased<sup>42</sup>.

If the erasure of Atilia's inscription really resulted from a *damnatio memoriae*, it remains unknown exactly when the penalty might have been prescribed. A possible link with M. Atilius Severus, the suffect consul of about 183, who was exiled by Commodus (SHA, *Comm.* 4, 11), would be very arbitrary. But one is perhaps not too rash in assuming that Atilia's memory was obliterated at some time during the restless decades following the Antonine period, when a considerable number of senators were exiled and put to death (and there would have been many more of them than the preserved evidence suggests)<sup>43</sup>. But of course a later date should not be excluded either.

Institutum Classicum  
Universitatis Helsingiensis  
Hallituskatu 11 – 13  
SF – 00100 Helsinki 10

Mika Kajava

<sup>42</sup> The discussion of these problems by F. Vittinghoff, *Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Diss. Bonn 1936, 29 ff., is still of current interest.

<sup>43</sup> A recent study lists all the senators condemned in the period between Commodus and Severus Alexander: P. M. M. Leunissen, *Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Commodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.)*, Amsterdam 1989, 399–403 (for the known evidence and the historical reality, cf. 7f.).





Zu Kajava, S. 27 ff.

