

# ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXVII

HELSINKI 1993 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

MAARIT KAIMIO	Henrik Zilliacus in memoriam	7
CHRISTER BRUUN	"Berichtigungsliste" to G. Forni's Posthumous New List of the Provenances of Roman Legionaries	11
MAARIT KAIMIO	The Protagonist in Greek Tragedy	19
IIRO KAJANTO	Analysis of a Verse <i>parentatio</i> : Johannes Ihre's Funeral Oration in Memory of Torsten Rudeen	35
WOLFGANG KUHOFF	Die Beziehungen des Römischen Reiches zum Volksstamm der Baquaten in Mauretanien	55
BENGT LÖFSTEDT	Weitere Notizen zu Justus Lipsius' Briefen	73
LEENA PIETILÄ-CASTRÉN	Incisioni e graffiti su ceramica a vernice nera di Ficana, settore 6b	79
OLLI SALOMIES	On the Interpretation of Epigraphical Filiations of the Type <i>L. f. f.</i>	95
JUHA SIHVOLA	Why Does Contemplation Not Fit Well into Aristotle's εὐδαιμονία?	103
HEIKKI SOLIN	Analecta epigraphica CL – CLIV	123
ASKO TIMONEN	Emperor's " <i>ars recusandi</i> " in Biographical Narrative	133
G. MICHAEL WOLOCH	Ammianus, Alpine Passes and Maps	149
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	155
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	217
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	221

## ON THE INTERPRETATION OF EPIGRAPHICAL FILIATIONS OF THE TYPE *L. f. f.*

OLLI SALOMIES

The Latin words *pater* 'father' and *filius* 'son' are often used as attributes to names to distinguish sons from fathers, a possible translation in such cases being 'the Elder' and 'the Younger'. For example, Cicero, when mentioning one of the two men called C. Scribonius Curio, both active in Roman politics in the mid first century B.C., might use the expressions *Curio pater* and *Curio filius* to make clear to whom of the two he was referring (*Curio filius* e.g. in Att. 2, 19, 3; 24, 2). The habit of distinguishing sons from fathers by the use of the words *pater* and *filius*, often abbreviated *fil.* or *f.*, is of course also common in inscriptions. For example, on two funerary monuments from the second century B.C., found together at Praeneste, we find the inscriptions *L. Oppi(us) L. f. Flacus pat(e)r*<sup>1</sup> and *L. Oppi(us) L. f. Flacus filius* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> 216f.); and two senators called L. Scribonius Libo, father and son, call themselves *L. Scribonius L. f. Libo pater* and *L. Scribonius L. f. Libo fil.* (*f.* in text a) in the inscriptions of late Republican date from Caudium, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1744 a + b (= CIL IX 2171f.); from Aquileia there is the inscription Pais, Suppl. Ital. 275 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 3450, *L. Pinarius L. f. Natta / pater / L. Pinarius L. f. Natta f.*<sup>2</sup> However, in many similar cases the attribute *pater* is dropped and the distinction between father and son is established simply by the addition of *filius* to the nomenclature of the son. For instance, *C. Fúrius C. f. Clu. Tiro ... C. Fúrius C. f. Clu. Tiro f.* (CIL XI 4572 from Carsulae); and in the list of the members of the *consilium* of the proconsul of Sardinia in A.D. 69 (CIL X 7852 = ILS 5947) a certain *M. Stertinus Rufus f.* is mentioned at place 3, *M. Stertinus Rufus*, the last person in the list, at place 8; the son, obviously

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Wachter, *Altlat. Inschriften* (1987) 53 n. 124; on the date, H. Lauter-Bufe, *MDAIR* 80, 1973, 277.

<sup>2</sup> For a similar example, but where the attribute *f(i)lius* is collocated in front of, not behind the cognomen, see below (CIL X 858/859 = ILS 6359/6359a).

of higher rank, was thus already a senator, the father only an *eques*.<sup>3</sup> In the instances cited above, both father and son have the same *tria nomina*, but of course one also finds examples of father and son being distinguished from each other by the addition of *filius* also in cases where the two do not have in all respects identical names. Fathers and sons often have different praenomina and/or cognomina: what was important was to point out that someone named in a text was the son of another man with the same nomen named (usually) earlier in the same text.<sup>4</sup> In some examples only the son already has a cognomen; e.g. CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1294 = VI 16503 *P. Cosoni(us) T. f. Rom. ... P. Cosonius P. f. Rom. Rufus filius*; CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1924 = CIL IX 5557 (Urbs Salvia), *C. Turpidi(us) P. f. Hor., / [- Tu]rpidius C. f. Severus f(ilius)*; or, to adduce also an example in which the father is designated as *pater*, CIL V 1225 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 3421, *C. Gabius / C. f. / Senecio / filius //* (in the middle) *C. Gab[ius] / C. f. / pate[r]*.<sup>5</sup> In other cases, father and son have different cognomina; e.g. CIL X 5663 (Frusino), *[L.] Magneius L. f. Ouf. Niger IIvir, / [L.(?)] Magneius L. f. Rufus f(ilius), / [(e.g.) Q.] Magneius L. f. Ouf. Sardus / ... / Magneia Iucunda testamento / suo fieri iussit* (Magneius Sardus is most probably a brother of Magneius Niger and thus, of course, the uncle of Magneius Rufus; since this is obviously a fairly early text I have assumed that he had a praenomen differing from that of his brother);<sup>6</sup> or CIL IX 1697 (Beneventum), *Q. Opimius Q. l. Celadus ... Q. Opimio Q. f. Rufo f(ilio), ... uxori, ... patri, ... matri*. In those cases in which a man is designated as *filius* without another man<sup>7</sup> with the same nomen being mentioned in the same inscription we may, or rather must, assume that the text is fragmentary or that the father was mentioned in another inscription set up beside the one in question. The (now lost) funerary

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Stein, RE IIIA 2456 no. 17; id., *Der römische Ritterstand* (1927) 309.

<sup>4</sup> In the case of freedmen a father and his son could, of course, also have different nomina; for an example of an inscription in which a father and his son having different nomina (but the same praenomen and nomen) and being designated as *pater* and *filius* see CIL VI 4964, *Ti. Iulius Aperos f(ilius), Ti. Claudius Aperos pat(er); f(ilius) vix(it) ann(os) VI*.

<sup>5</sup> For the interpretation of the nomenclature see my *Die römischen Vornamen* (1987) 284ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Die römischen Vornamen* 362ff. Observe, by the way, that the son is not given a tribe; perhaps it was thought evident that he should have the same tribe as his father. In any case this, combined with the fact that Magneius Sardus does have a tribe, shows that Magneius Sardus is not a descendant (e.g. a grandson) of the *duovir* but most probably a brother (although he may in theory also have been a cousin; I do not think that he could have been the *duovir*'s father).

<sup>7</sup> Or possibly a woman, i.e. the mother of the man designated as *filius*, as e.g. in CIL I<sup>2</sup> 1556 = X 8271 (Tarracina), *Orcilia C. f., / Q. Caecilius C. f. / Ouf. Pollio f.*

inscriptions of the fathers of *P. Laterius P. f. Niger f(i)lius* (CIL IX 6394 from Brundisium) and of *Cn. Gavillius Cn. f. Ganea filius* (CIL V 1235 = Inscriptiones Aquileiae 1141) were surely originally placed somewhere in the vicinity of those of the sons. On the other hand, when we find an inscription mentioning a man designated as *pater* but not a person suitable to be thought of as the son, as e.g. in CIL X 1455 from Herculaneum (*M. Remmio M. f. Rufo patri municipes*),<sup>8</sup> we may again conclude that the son was mentioned in another inscription set up in the vicinity.

But what if a son who was to be distinguished from his father by the addition of the attribute *filius* did not have a cognomen? If the tribe was given in the inscription, the attribute might be collocated after the tribe, as e.g. in CIL X 3899 (Capua), *L. Viccius C. f. Arn. f(i)lius*, or in CIL IX 4288 (Amiternum), *L. Pompullius L. f. Qui. filius*. If the tribe was omitted (which was, of course, always possible), the attribute would have to follow after the filiation, as e.g. in CIL X 5812 (Aletrium), *M. Allius M. f. ... M. Allius M. f. fil(i)us*; or CIL X 6163 (Formiae) *C. Mari C. f. / Aem. Papi, / C. (Mari) C. f. fili*;<sup>9</sup> or AE 1966, 24 (Rome), *C. Calpetani C. f. fili*; or CIL IX 2135 (from Vitulano near Beneventum) *M. Munatius M. f. fil[i]us*. More often the attribute *filius* was simply abbreviated as *f.* as in many of those cases in which it was collocated after the cognomen; and so we find quite a few inscriptions in which, in the filiation, the praenomen of the father is followed by not one but two *f.* For some examples, cf. e.g. CIL X 3870 = I<sup>2</sup> 679 = ILS 3341 (Capua, 104 B.C.), *L. Annius L. f. f.* (the son, that is, of [*L. An]nius L. f.* in line 1);<sup>10</sup> CIL VI 33144, *M. Numitorius / M. f. Col., / Pacquia C. f. uxor* (the parents), */ M. Numitorius M. f. f.*; CIL X 5477 (Aquinum), *M. Helvi M. f. Ter. Baiae, / Ferroniae M. f. Rufae* (the parents), */ M. Helvi M. f. f.* If the tribe was to be added, it could be collocated after the second *f.* as e.g. in CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3141a (from Blera, rendered incorrectly in AE 1981, 363), *C. Rosio C. f. Arn. eq(uiti), / Turranae C. f. uxori* (the parents), */ C. Rosio C. f. f. Arn., / [-] Rosio C. f. f. Arn. Sabino* etc. If one would wish to render a nomenclature like this in Greek, something like Αὔλος Κασκέλλιος Αὔλου υἱός, ὁ υἱός, Ῥωμιλία would be the result (thus the nomenclature of the jurist A. Cascellius in R. K. Sherk, Roman Documents

<sup>8</sup> Cf. CIL X 1439. 1449. 1874.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Die römischen Vornamen 295ff. for examples of men with cognomina having sons not using one.

<sup>10</sup> Or possibly, if I am mistaken in assuming that the man in line 1 is an Annius, of [*L. Ann]ius L. f.* in line 2.

from the Greek East [1969] no. 23, where members of the senate in 73 B.C. are listed).<sup>11</sup>

In the inscription from Blera, along with a son who does not have a cognomen, C. Rosius in line 3, another son is mentioned in line 4. This other son, [-] Rosius Sabinus, already has a cognomen,<sup>12</sup> but also in his case the fact that he is the son of the man in line 1 is indicated by the attribute *f(ilius)* collocated right after the filiation instead of collocating it behind the cognomen as in the examples given above. Of this collocation of the attribute *filius* there are in fact quite a few examples. Sometimes it is written out in full (e.g. CIL X 5091 from Atina, *C. Luccio C. f. Ter. Paeto, C. Luccio C. f. filio Rufo, Gentia C. f. fecit*), but more often the normal abbreviation *f.* is used. Thus e.g. CIL XIV 2691 = I<sup>2</sup> 1444 (cf. S. Priuli, NSA 1979, 335 no. 2; P. Castrén, *Arctos* 14, 1980, 9ff.; from near Frascati), [*M. Co*]rneli *M. f. Pup. / Mamullai, / M. Corneli M. f. f. / Mamullai* etc.; or CIL XIV 2317 (ager Albanus), *M. Antisti M. f. Fab., M. Antisti M. f. f. Saturnini, Precilia Q. f. Tertia fecit sibi, viro, filio*; or Epigraphica 53, 1991, 259-61 no. 4 (Luca), *L. Cornelius L. f. Fa[b.] Macer ... L. Cornelius L. f. f. Primus*. The most representative examples are, however, surely the inscriptions mentioning the two notables of Pompeii, C. Cuspius Pansa and his son of the same name, on one hand those set up in the forum in honour of the two (CIL X 790/791 = ILS 6360/6360a), on the other those set up by the two men themselves at the gate of the amphitheatre (CIL X 858/859 = ILS 6359/6359a): in these texts the father is called *C. Cuspius C. f. Pansa* (in the inscription in the amphitheatre *pater* is added after *Pansa*), the son *C. Cuspius C. f. f. Pansa*.

In the past, scholars have always, in my opinion correctly, taken for granted that, whatever the collocation of an additional *f.* or *filius*, the interpretation should be same, that is, that the attribute indicates that the man with the attribute is the son (and not e.g. the brother or cousin or nephew) of a man mentioned in the same inscription or in one set up in the vicinity.<sup>13</sup> That is, one has to interpret [-] *Magneius L(uci) f(ilius) Rufus, f(ilius)* (CIL X 5663) on one hand, and *M(arcus) Cornelius M(arci) f(ilius), filius, Mamulla* (CIL XIV 2691) on the other. But then something must have

<sup>11</sup> One has thus to conclude that A. Cascellius' father, too, was a member of the senate in 73 B.C. (cf. F. Münzer, RE Suppl. III 236).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Die römischen Vornamen 288ff.

<sup>13</sup> Examples of scholars representing the traditional view are noted by S. Priuli, NSA 1979, 340 n. 84. Add e.g. Dessau on ILS 6359, n. 4.

happened, for between the early sixties and the late seventies one encounters scholarly articles in which it is claimed that filiations of the type *L. f. f.* are in fact to be interpreted otherwise, as *L(uci) f(ilii) f(ilius)*. First there is the article of W. Seston, *Les donateurs de l'amphithéâtre des Trois-Gaules*, in: *Hommages A. Grenier III* (1962) 1407-17 (esp. 1409ff.), reprinted in the same scholar's *Scripta Varia* (1980) 321-31 (cf. Seston's observation quoted in *L'onomastique Latine* [Paris 1977] 60). Then there are the comments by S. Priuli on the inscription referred to above, CIL XIV 2691 = I<sup>2</sup> 1444, in NSA 1979, 340.<sup>14</sup> Of the two scholars, Priuli does not really say much concerning why he thinks the classical interpretation is not acceptable. Seston, on the other hand, does expand on the question, but his exposition seems rather confused and contains much which the author would, on second thought, no doubt have stated differently. Both, however, seem to insist on the importance of the fact that in a filiation of the type *L. f. f.*, as interpreted by them, the grandfather, and the fact that he is a Roman citizen, is brought into play, *L(uci) f(ili) f(ilius)* being the equivalent of *L(uci) f(ilius)*, *L(uci) n(epos)*.

Now, I must confess that I have seldom encountered a scholarly opinion on some detail which right from the start has seemed less impressive. It seems strange that someone should seriously think that the first *f.* should be interpreted otherwise in cases like *Cn. Gavillius Cn. f. Ganea filius* on one hand and *C. Luccius C. f. filius Rufus* on the other; or *L. Pompullius L. f. Qui. filius* on one hand and *C. Rosius C. f. f(ilius) Arn.* on the other. Neither is it made clear why someone who wanted to include a reference to his grandfather in his filiation would have preferred to use an obscure (to say the least) formula like *L. f. f.* instead of the normal *L. f. L. n.*, the meaning of which would be understood by all (to say that the Romans liked extreme abbreviation in their inscriptions would not, in my opinion, be a good answer).<sup>15</sup> Of course it was of some importance to be not only the

<sup>14</sup> Accepted by M. Buonocore in his commentary on *Suppl. Ital.* 4 Sulmo 65. And cf. also W. Eck, *Epigraphica* 41, 1979, 108-111 no. 16 on the inscription referred to above as CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3141a.

<sup>15</sup> It is true that one sometimes finds "abnormal" filiations such as AE 1983, 286 = CIL I<sup>2</sup> 3170 (Uria), *L. Seppius L. f.*, *L. Seppius L. n.* or CIL I<sup>2</sup> 2521 (Rome), *A. Fabreinius A. f.*, / *A. Fabreinius A. f. A. n.*, / *A. Fabreinius A. f. A. pron.* (noted by Seston, op. cit. p. 1413); *L. Seppius L. n.* is the son of *L. Seppius L. f.*, *A. Fabreinius A. f. A. pron.* the son of the second Fabreinius and the grandson of the first. Since all this must have been clear to those expected to read these inscriptions, it was apparently thought in these two cases that one could drop an intermediate stage from the filiations - unless, of course, one assumes that the respective stonecutters are to be blamed for the omissions (as I think is the case in NSA 1907, 698 = ILS 9389 from Teanum Sidicinum, [*M.(?) F*] *ufidius L. f. L.*

son, but also the grandson of a Roman citizen; but did a man like C. Cuspius Pansa the Younger, *pontifex* and *duovir iure dicundo* in Pompeii, really need to point out that his status was that of "une ingénuité ... plus exigeante que celle que définissent les manuels"<sup>16</sup> (Seston op. cit. 1410), especially when he is always mentioned along with his father C. Cuspius C.f. Pansa (being named along with their fathers is of course common to all of those who have a filiation of the type *L. f. f.*), so that it is hard to see who could have gotten the idea of suspecting that Pansa's grandfather had not been a Roman citizen. Further, interpreting *L. f. f.* as equivalent to *L. f. L. n.* would in practice mean that in inscriptions like those of Cuspius Pansa the Younger, his father, a most distinguished local notable, would have been referred to not as *Gaius*, but as *Gaii filius*. Referring to a Roman simply as the son of someone else is, however, not customary in Latin inscriptions. Still further, taking *L. f. f.* to stand for *Lucii filii filius* leads to strange interpretations of absolutely unproblematical epigraphical texts. Of those who read the text of CIL IX 1042 (ager Compsinus: *Cn. Mucio C. f. Ste., / C. Mucio Cn. f. f. Ste. Rufo, / Cn. Mucio Cn. f. f. Ste. Basso, / Perenniae Maximae uxori, / M. Mucius C. f. Ste. fecit*), who could doubt that we have here a father, his two sons, the mother and the father's brother, i.e. the uncle of the sons? But to Seston (op. cit. 1412) Rufus and Bassus are the sons of someone who is *Gnaei filius*, and so he thinks that Cn. Mucius C. f. is in fact not the father, but the grandfather of the two.

But the interpretation *L. f. f.* = *Lucii filii filius* can be shown to be not only most unlikely, but simply wrong. We have already seen that the filiation *A. f. f.* of A. Cascellius the Younger was rendered in Greek as Αὔλου υἱός, ὁ υἱός. On the interpretation of this there can be no doubt (of course there have been people who have thought that one has to delete something in this filiation, but we can dismiss that here). As for Latin inscriptions, one of the problems of the "new" interpretation is, of course, that one has to assume that only those people used a filiation of this type

---

*n. L. pr[on.] Ter. Proculus ... [- Fu]fidius M. f. L. n. pron. - i.e. (L.) pron. ? - Max[imus]*). But to say *L. Seppius L. n.* instead of *L. f. L. n.*, when the father L. Seppius has just been mentioned, is not at all the same thing as saying *L(uci) f(ili) f(ilius)*. For a further example of a filiation in which only the grandfather is referred to see CIL X 1682 = ILS 933 from Puteoli, *Cn. Asinio Pollionis et Agrippae* (the friend of Augustus) *nepoti Puteolani patrono publice*; but this is of course a special case (for a possible parallel cf. W. Eck, ZPE 95, 1993, 234f., on a Greek inscription from Paphus mentioning a descendant of the orator Hortensius).

<sup>16</sup> This refers to Gaius and others who say that one is *ingenuus* if one has a father who is a Roman citizen, i.e., one is entitled to a filiation of the Roman type (*L. f.* or the like).



whose fathers had the same praenomen as their grandfathers. But what if we find people with a filiation of the type *L. f. f.* whose fathers are Lucii but whose grandfathers have some other praenomen? I should think that one would then definitely have to dismiss the strange notion of Seston and Priuli. Let me therefore conclude by citing three texts in which men having a filiation of the type *L. f. f.* are in fact not grandsons of Lucii: (1) *Rend. Linc.* 1971, 434 no. 9 (Casinum): [*L.*] *Mursonio C. f. Ter.*, / [-] *Mursonio L. f. f. Ter.* / *Rufo*. (2) *Rend. Linc.* 1973, 477 no. 19 (also from Casinum; incorrectly in *AE* 1973, 187): *M. Clodio A. f. patr(i) M. Clodius M. f. f.* (3) *CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 3134 (Pompeii): *C. Stronnio P. f. Pap. pater* (sic), / *C. Stronnio C. f. f. Pap.* / *M. Stronnius C. l. Meinius ... patroneis sueis*.<sup>17</sup>

*University of Helsinki*

---

<sup>17</sup> For some further examples of filiations of the type *L. f. f.* see the articles of Seston and Priuli; add e.g. *CIL* X 4991 (Venafrum); *Suppl. It.* 11 Parma 11; *CIL* III 705 (Philippi); *Suppl. It.* 4 Sulmo 65 (a woman: *Lollia C. f. f.* - the father was no doubt mentioned in an inscription in the vicinity).