

MIKA KAJAVA

CORNELIA AND TAURUS AT THESPIAE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 139–149

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

CORNELIA AND TAURUS AT THESPIAE

From the Boeotian city of Thespieae originates a fragmentary "tabula lapidis leucophaei, quae quondam imposita erat basi statuae" (thus IG). Lolling "exscripsit" the text and it was subsequently (in 1892) published by Dittenberger as IG VII 1854:


 Ν Κ Ο Ρ Ν Η Λ Ι Α Ν Σ Ε Ι Σ Ε Ν Ν Α
 Τ Α Υ Ρ Ο Υ Α Ρ Ε Τ Η Σ Ε Ν Ε Κ Ε Ν


The remaining two lines were restored as follows:

[Ὁ δῆμος Θεσπιέω]ν Κορηλίαν Cειcéννα
 [Cταιτελίου] Ταύρου ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν.

This is the form in which the inscription has always appeared and still does in various prosopographical studies, and indeed it has been much discussed because of its importance as regards the history of the Statilii Tauri and their family relations in the early Imperial period. From the restoration, as it stands in IG, it would necessarily follow that a woman called Cornelia was honoured by the people of Thespieae, and that she was somehow related to Sisenna Statilius Taurus, who is certainly the consul of 16 AD. In this connection one must note that the praenomen of Sisenna Statilius Taurus is usually explained by supposing that his father had married a daughter of a Cornelius Sisenna.¹ As regards the identity of the Cornelia recorded in the Thespian text, scholars have maintained that she is either Sisenna's daughter,² his wife,³ or even his mother.⁴ In the first case, the explanation usually goes that "Ἰουγατέρα omissum esse more Graeco" (see Dessau, PIR S 613, p.263). But if Sisenna was her husband, it is stated that "uxoris vocabulum supplendum esse more Latino" (Dessau, PIR S 623), that is, the word γυναῖκα would have been omitted in the Roman way. At present and in fact for some time the inscription has usually been interpreted to say that Cornelia was Sisenna's daughter, notably because of the stamp CIL XV 7440 on a water

¹ Borghesi, Oeuvr. II, 325. Dessau, PIR S 613. Groag, RE IV, 1597-98, Nr. 420; Id., PIR² C 1455, 1477. Nagl, RE III A, 2204, Nr.35 (stemma on col. 2197f.). Cf. further, M.-Th.Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 271 = (Cornelia), with references. For the praenomen and its use, cf. T.P.Wiseman, HSCPh. 74, 1970,211f. = Roman Studies (1987),46f., and now esp. O.Salomies, Die römischen Vornamen, Helsinki 1987,329f., 334.

² Dessau PIR S 613, 623 (cf. the following note). Groag, RE IV, 1597ff., Nrr. 420,427. Id., PIR² C 1477. Nagl, RE III A, 2208, Nr.41 (cf. the following note). Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 271,727.

³ Dittenberger, ad IG VII 1854. Dessau, PIR S 613,623 (cf. the previous note). Nagl, RE III A, 2208, Nr.41 (cf. the previous note). Cf. G.Camodeca, Epigr.ord.sen. I (Tituli 5), 156, Nr.4, who thought that Sisenna "sposa prob. una Cornelia".

⁴ Nagl, RE III A, 2198, Nr.33.

pipe recording a 'Cornelia Tauri f. T. Axi' (I will discuss this and other relevant inscriptions below).⁵ Supposing that she was Sisenna's wife, we should be prepared to accept that both Sisenna (cos. 16 AD) and his father had married a Cornelia.

Before advancing too far, it seems reasonable to have another look at the Thespian inscription. As has been duly noted, the diction is somewhat peculiar because of the absence of any words indicating whether Sisenna was the father or the husband. Furthermore, why was the person honoured, being the daughter of a Statilius, called 'Cornelia'? The normal answer is that she was in fact called '(Statilia) Cornelia',⁶ and that she did not use her father's gentilicium. Admittedly, in the early Imperial period such a practice might sometimes be true in special cases when it was not necessary that the name be recorded in full, as in instrumentum inscriptions or in the epitaphs of slaves and freedmen, which usually abbreviate the name of the master or patron. And it might also be possible that in Augustus' or Tiberius' time a woman used (or at least officially had) a double gentilicium, even though it was extremely rare at such an early date.⁷ But it seems to me to be out of the question that a Roman, whether man or woman, would be honoured in public with an abbreviated name of this style. In the rare Republican or early Imperial cases when the name of a woman receiving public honours in the Greek East was written with the sole cognomen (supposing that her name consisted of gentilicium and cognomen), the father's gentilicium had to be on record,⁸ but here the name (Cornelia) is primarily a gentilicium diverging from that of Sisenna, her alleged father. To sum up, a name form 'Κορνηλία, Cειέννα Cτατειλίου Ταύρου' sounds most odd. But this is not all. The whole phrase (except the opening and ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν) employed in the inscription is quite anomalous. As was stated above, scholars usually assume that the words θυγατέρα or γυναῖκα have been omitted more Graeco or more Latino, but this cannot possibly be true. Either way, the present text would be a unique instance. In the Republican and early Imperial time there is not a single honorific inscription set up for a Roman upper-class lady in the whole Greek East which would show

⁵ Cf., however, R.Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford 1986, 73, n.73, who thinks that Cornelia was Sisenna's wife and that "her daughter, 'Cornelia Tauri f.'", married T.Axius.

⁶ This is the usual name form to be found in various reference books.

⁷ The following ladies show the earliest instances: Aedia Servilia (Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 6, wife of M'. Acilius Aviola, cos. 54 AD); Albia Terentia (PFOS 44, mother of Emperor Otho); Metilia Marcia (PFOS 547, granddaughter of the annalist Cremutius Cordus); Milonia Caesonia (PFOS 550, one of the wives of Caligula).

⁸ Cf. e.g. IGR IV 1716 = SEG I 383 from Samos: 'Ο δῆμος Παυλλεῖναν, Φαβίου / Μαξίμου θυγατέρα, γυναῖκα δὲ / Μάρκου Τιτίου Λευκίου υἱοῦ, κτλ. She was Fabia Paullina, daughter of the consul of 45 BC. It seems that in the fragmentary inscriptions IG II/III² 4232 (Acropolis, Athens; "Κεθηγίλλα Κεθήγου θυγάτηρ") and SEG XXX 433 (Patrae; "Κηνωρεῖνα Κηνωρεῖνου θυγάτηρ") the reading should be slightly modified. IG VII 1851-52 + BCH 50 (1926) 440f., Nr.76 (Thespieae) is a special case: the wife and mother of M.Iunius Silanus (quaestor in Achaea in 34/33 BC) are both recorded by a single name ('Crispina' and 'Sempronia'), but there is no mention of their fathers. For these inscriptions in detail, cf. my remarks in 'Senatorial Women and the Greek East. Epigraphical Evidence from the Republican and Early Imperial Period', *Com.Hum.Litt.* (Helsinki), forthcoming.

something similar. However, there is no need to give way to despair. If the text form cannot stand as it is printed in IG, it must be corrected. A useful and simple remedy is available: the second line should be restored in a new way:

[Ἵ δῆμος Θεεπιέω]ν Κορνηλίαν, Cειέννα
[θυγατέρα, γυναίκα δὲ] Ταύρου, ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν.

Following this restoration, the total number of letters on lines 1-2 would be 31 and 35, respectively (in the earlier restoration the ratio was 31 : 28). The second line would begin only a little further from the left than the first one, but this is by no means disturbing. Anyone dealing with Greek epigraphy knows that single lines were in theory centred in relation to each other, but in practice there were often slight divergencies in that respect. Yet there might be still another way of restoring the text, and that is by putting θυγατέρα at the end of the first line. In this way both lines would be almost perfectly centred together. There is, however, the problem whether the right side of the monument is original or not (IG conceals that). Anyway, this alternative would be as follows:

[Ἵ δῆμος Θεεπιέω]ν Κορνηλίαν, Cειέννα [θυγατέρα,]
[γυναίκα δὲ] Ταύρου, ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν.

Both proposals strongly suggest themselves. However, the form does not matter. What is more important here is the final result and the consequences it brings about. All the difficulties connected with this inscription disappear, and now we see that the Cornelia honoured by the Thespians was in fact the daughter of a Sisenna and the wife of a Taurus. There is no doubt that this is the first direct and indisputable document testifying to the link between the Statilii Tauri and the Cornelii Sisennae, a link long ago divined by Borghesi, Dessau, Groag and others (see note 1).

In order to identify the persons recorded on the statue base, it is best to start from Taurus. As we know that Sisenna Statilius Taurus (cos. 16 AD; his brother T. Statilius Taurus was consul in 11 AD) could only derive his praenomen through a marriage contracted during an earlier generation (and there is now evidence for such a marriage), it seems most probable that the Taurus of IG VII 1854 is Sisenna's father. It has usually been thought that the father is Taurus, the *monetalis*⁹ who never reached the consulship because he died so young. But as R. Syme plausibly argues, Taurus did not serve as *monetalis* earlier than 10 BC, and so he cannot have had a son who was a consul in 11 AD.¹⁰ Therefore he might, in Syme's opinion, be an elder brother of the two consuls (11 AD and 16 AD), possibly by an earlier wife.¹¹ On that evidence it seems that Cornelia's husband cannot be anyone else than the

⁹ RE III A, 2203-04, Nr.35. Cf. the bibliography cited by Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 271 (p.243).

¹⁰ Op.cit. in n.5,376f. (note 54). For earlier views concerning the chronology, see Nagl, RE III A, 2203f., Nr.35. Cf. also the following note.

¹¹ T.P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.-A.D. 14*, Oxford 1971, 263, Nr.413, regarded him as identical with Sisenna's brother, the consul of 11 AD. Cf. Id., HSCPh. 74,1970,213f. = *Roman Studies* (1987) 48f., where the question about the identity of the Augustan moneyer was wisely left without a definitive answer.

homo novus T. Statilius T. f. Taurus, the first great man of the family, suffect consul in 37 and ordinarius in 26 BC.¹² Taurus (born towards the end of the seventies BC), may have been aged about fifty when the future consul of 11 AD was born, but it is known that for various reasons members of the Roman nobility sometimes married when they were advanced in years.¹³ Statilia, a sister of the consul (11 AD), wife of Piso the Augur (cos. 1 BC), was perhaps born some years earlier,¹⁴ but there is no mention of her mother. The monetalis in turn must have been born around the year 30 BC (certainly not later), and assuming that his mother was someone else than Cornelia, the new marriage might have been contracted somewhere in the early twenties or at least during that decade. Because the evidence is rather scarce and scattered as it stands, there is no way of determining precisely when Taurus and Cornelia were married. Then there is the problem concerning the identity of Cornelia's father. He was a (Cornelius) Sisenna, certainly a descendant of the historian L. Cornelius Sisenna, who served as praetor in 78 BC.¹⁵ For chronological reasons it seems somewhat difficult to identify him with any of the Sisennae on record from the Augustan time (cf. PIR² C 1454ff.).¹⁶ Perhaps he is an otherwise unattested Sisenna, representative of an intermediate generation between the Historian and the Sisennae of Augustan time.

Let us now recapitulate the facts. Cornelia, daughter of a late Republican Cornelius Sisenna, was honoured by the Thespian demos with a statue. Her husband recorded in the inscription was T. Statilius Taurus (cos. 37 BC, II 26 BC), Caesar Augustus' marshal and confidant, clearly the most famous exponent of the Tauri family. Their sons were consuls in 11 AD (T. Statilius Taurus) and in 16 AD (Sisenna Statilius Taurus). The next problem concerns the presence of Cornelia and his husband at Thespieae. Why was she honoured at that site, and why are some other Tauri on record in Thespian and other Greek inscriptions? Before going into details it seems appropriate to present a list of inscriptions attesting members of the Tauri family in Greece:¹⁷

¹² Nagl, RE III A, 2199ff., Nr.34. Cf. Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 271 (p.243), with references.

¹³ For some cases, cf. recently R. Syme, *Historia* 36, 1987, 329ff.

¹⁴ Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS 725; cf. esp. Syme, op.cit. in n.5, 377.

¹⁵ For him, see B. Niese, RE IV, 1512ff., Nr.374; E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 1974, 45, with note 139.

¹⁶ As far as I can see, only the Sisenna, who governed Sicilia in Augustan time, might be taken into consideration (= PIR² C 1455), cf. B. E. Thomasson, *Laterculi praesidum I*, Göteborg 1984, col.1, Nr.2, with references (the dating "20-12 BC" was proposed by Grant; see now also G. Manganaro, ANRW II:11,1 [1988] 86). Very little is known about (Cornelius) Sisenna, adoptive son of A. Gabinius (cos. 58 BC), cf. Münzer, RE IV, 1510f., Nr.371; better D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (Amer. Class. Stud. 3), New York 1976, 116f. Note also that an ancestor (Cn. Sisenna) governed Macedonia in late 2nd cent. BC; Münzer, RE IV, 1511f., Nr.373; Broughton, MRR III Suppl. (1986) 73.

¹⁷ For these inscriptions and the connections of Tauri with Thespieae, cf. esp. L. Moretti, *Athenaeum* 69, 1981, 74ff. In the early Principate the Tauri family seems to have had close social links with some prominent Epidaurians as well, cf. esp. A. J. S. Spawforth, *ABSA* 80, 1985, 216f., 248ff. Cf. also note 31.

1. IG VII 1854 (Thespieae; cf. above):

[Ὁ δῆμος Θεσπιέω]ν Κορνηλίαν, Cειcéννα
[θυγατέρα, γυναῖκα δὲ] Ταύρου, ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν.

2. P.Jamot, BCH 26,1902,291, Nr.1 (Thespieae; "base de pierre blanche en forme de corniche à bande plate"). The inscription has been republished and commented on by C.P.Jones, HSCPh. 74,1970,227f., Nr.6:¹⁸

Πολυκρατίδης Ἀνθεμίονος ἱερατεύων Τίτου
Cτατείλιον Ταῦρον, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάτρωνα,
θεοῖς.

3. Eph.Epigr. V 1471; CIL III 7301 (Thebes; but the provenance is Thespieae, cf. J.Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris 1919,68f.; L.Robert, *Hellenica* 2 [1946] 8; Jones, art.cit. 227); P.Roesch, *Etudes béotiennes*, Paris 1982,173ff. - The inscription, which dates from the year 14 AD, records a dedication made by a group of Roman citizens and freedmen as well as native Greeks. Among these there are four freedmen called:

1.5: T.Stat[ili]us T[a]uri l. Eros

1.7: T.Statilius Tauri l. Faustus

1.8: Cn.Stat[ilius] Ta[uri] l. Rex ?

1.9: T.Statilius Tauri l. Festus

The reading, slightly differing from that in CIL (originally of Foucart) on lines 5, 7 and 9, is here presented after the revision by Roesch. On the eight line (erased) CIL gives only the initial C and REX, but Roesch claims that N STAT...TA...L is also visible.¹⁹ However, there is room for doubt because of the rarity of the combination 'Cn.Statilius' (cf. esp. O.Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen*, Helsinki 1987,164, n.420). Moreover, a libertus called Cn.Statilius among T.Statilii seems somewhat peculiar. And finally, who would a patronus called Cn.Statilius Taurus be? Perhaps the stonecutter made an error, and the text was subsequently erased.

4. Th. Spyropoulos, *Arch.Delt.* 26,1971, Chron. 222; J.-P.Michaud, BCH 98,1974,649, Nr.3 (fig. 176) = AE 1973,494; cf. J. and L.Robert, *Bull.ép.* 1974,272; P.Roesch, *Teiresias. Epigraphica* 1976,48; Moretti, art.cit. 73ff.; SEG XXXI 514; Roesch, *Etud.béot.* 181, n.180. - Fragment of a catalogue of victors at the Thespian Mouseia. On l.10 the catalogue records an

ἐγκωμιογράφος εἰς Ταῦρον,

¹⁸ On line 1 Jamot wrote "Θεμίονος", but the name was Ἀνθεμίον, cf. A.Plassart, BCH 50,1926,436, n.1; Jones, *ibid.*; Moretti, art.cit. 75. L.2: Cτατείλιον (Jamot, Plassart); Cτατίλιον (Jones). L.3: omitted by Jamot and Jones, but cf. Plassart, *ibid.*

¹⁹ Thus on p.175. Concerning the rare name Rex, his reference (175, n.147) to ILS 868 (Argos) is not correct: Q.Marcus Rex (cos. 68 BC) was of course not a businessman at Argos.

that is, a person who composed an elogium "εἰς Ταύρου" to be included in the programme of the contests. As has been duly noted, the catalogue clearly dates from the period between 14 and 29 AD, and more precisely perhaps from around the year 20 AD (cf. Moretti, art.cit. 74).

5. IG VII 1787; A.Plassart, BCH 50,1926,393f., Nrr. 9-12 (with note 4); P.Lazaridis, Arch.Delt. 28,1973, Chron. I 287 - Nine small cippi from Thespieae (two of them unpublished, cf. Moretti, art.cit. 75, n.15, and Roesch, Etud.béot. 181, n.180), all recording the same inscription:

Θεοῦ Ταύρου.

As Moretti (art.cit. 75ff.; cf. J. and L.Robert, Bull.ép. 1981,284) has shown, these stones should perhaps be connected with a divine cult in honour of a (Statilius) Taurus, benefactor of the city.

6. IG VII 86 (Megara):

Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος
Τίτον Στατίλιον Ταύρου,
ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν
καὶ εὐεργεσίας.

It is immediately to be noted that these inscriptions do not present any direct indications as to the identity of the persons honoured. There are no titles or offices on record, nor is anyone of the Tauri attested as governing Achaëa/Achaëa-Macedonia or as holding some other post that would directly explain their presence in Greece. Only inscr. (1) can now be firmly attributed to the wife of Taurus, the consul of 37 and 26 BC. As the principal criterion for the identification of the Tauri of Thespieae, scholars have usually taken inscr. (3), which dates from the year 14 AD (Sex.Appuleio Sex. Pompeio cos.). That would necessarily point to the consul of 11 AD, so it is claimed.²⁰ But it is also stated that an additional proof in favour of this identification would be inscr. (1), showing the consul of 16 AD (Sisenna Statilius Taurus). The presence of both Sisenna and his brother at Thespieae has been considered somewhat problematic, and rightly so. The solution would be an alternative one: either they were both benefactors of the city or they were one and the same person, Sisenna, who was in some inscriptions called "T.Statilius Taurus".²¹ But as has been shown above, such considerations are no longer necessary, and so the alleged evidence that inscr. (1) refers to the generation of the consuls 11 and 16 AD vanishes.

Inscr. (2) tells that Polycratides, son of Anthemion, honoured his patron T.Statilius Taurus. Polycratides, coming from a rich local family, is a well-known figure at Thespieae, who appears to have been on particularly good terms with the Romans. It is generally agreed that the Taurus of this inscription would be the same man whose freedmen are on record in

²⁰ Cf. e.g. Nagl, RE III A, 2204, Nr.36; Jones, art.cit. 227; Moretti, art.cit. 75.

²¹ Moretti, art.cit. 75: "chiamato per maggiore semplicità T.Statilius Taurus"; J. and L.Robert, Bull.ép.1981,284.

inscr. (3). And so again, because of the date of 14 AD for inscr. (3), the patron of Polycratides is identified with the consul of 11 AD. There is, however, another inscription concerning Polycratides, son of Anthemion, which deserves to be remembered in this connection.²² Roesch observed in 1965 that the name of the honorand in this inscription is not 'Polycrates' but 'Polycratides'.²³ It is given in this document that the Roman community at Thespieae honoured Polycratides for being the first to give it a gymnasium and to supply it with oil. What is important here, the lettering of this inscription, would seem to suggest a general dating to the first century BC,²⁴ and likewise the foundation of the gymnasium, the first one reserved for Roman negotiatores par excellence, has been attributed to the first century BC.²⁵ It follows, therefore, that inscr. (3) attesting that Polycratides, son of Anthemion, honours his patron T. Statilius Taurus, was not necessarily composed in the late Augustan period. I do not see any reason why it could not be attributed somewhere to the late first century BC as well.²⁶

As regards inscr. (3), it was a collective dedication by a number of Roman citizens and freedmen residing at Thespieae as well as by some native Greeks. The date, 12 November in 14 AD, might suggest that it was a posthumous dedication in honour of the dead Caesar Augustus. As has been stated above, the fact that among the dedicators there are some freedmen of a certain Taurus, is normally considered as a firm testimony to the assumption that the patronus is the consul of 11 AD. But we do not know precisely when they were manumitted, nor is there any way to conclude how old they were in the November of the year 14 AD.

Then there are the small stones (inscr. 5) with Θεοῦ Ταύρου engraved on them. On the basis of palaeographical analysis these can be dated either to the first century BC or to the first century AD.²⁷ So it is by no means certain that the Taurus would be the consul of 11

²² P. Jamot, BCH 26, 1902, 297, Nr. 16; Jones, art. cit. 225, Nr. 3 (cf. H. Müller, ZPE 3, 1968, 220); Roesch, *Etud. béot.* 171f., Nr. 24; cf. SEG XXXII 500.

²³ *Thespies et la Confédération béotienne*, Paris 1965, 231, n. 1. However, his correction was not noted by the other scholars mentioned in the previous note.

²⁴ Cf. Roesch, *Etud. béot.* 172 ("fin du IIe ou Ier siècle av. J.-C. d'après la gravure"), 176 ("Ier siècle"). For some reason SEG XXXII 500 states: "CA 100 B.C."

²⁵ Roesch, *op. cit.* in n. 23, 230f.; J. Delorme also stated in his special study that the new gymnasium was constructed somewhere during the first century BC, but "a une date que nous ne pouvons fixer", *Gymnasion. Etude sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce* (BEFAR 196), Paris 1960, 206.

²⁶ Polycratides also drew up a decree in honour of a Roman proconsul of Achaëa called [-] Futius Longus (the praenomen is uncertain), AE 1973, 495 (Thespieae; photo in BCH 98, 1974, 650, fig. 177), cf. W. Eck, *RE Suppl.* XV, 107f., Nr. 2, who dated Futius' proconsulship to the late Augustan period, which might very well be true. We do not in fact know how old Polycratides was at that moment. He may have been politically active at Thespieae some forty or fifty years. Jones, art. cit. 228, thought that Polycratides might also be found among the presiding officials in a fragmentary list of victors at the Thespian games (published by A. Plassart, BCH 82, 1958, 158f., Nr. 9, from a copy of Jamot; cf. AE 1960, 307 and SEG XXII 385), dating between 6 BC and 2 AD (cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bull. ép.* 1959, 184, and now L. Moretti, *XII Misc. Gr. Rom.*, 1987, 74, Nr. 738).

²⁷ Roesch, *Teiresias. Epigraphica* 1978, 15.

AD (or his brother, cos. 16 AD). Moreover, one should note that if these cippi really refer to a divine cult of a benefactor of the city, which is quite plausible, then it was of course not necessary for the object of such a cult to be still alive (the predicate θεός is not decisive here, because the Greeks employed it for both living and dead persons).²⁸ As is sufficiently well known, posthumous cults not only for the Emperor and the Imperial family but also for Roman governors and generals are now and then attested in the Greek East.²⁹ These cults mostly originated from the Republican period (starting from M.Marcellus at Syracuse and T.Quinctius Flamininus in various Greek cities), but festivities involved with them, like Luculleia at Cyzicus, or the hero cult of P.Servilius Isauricus (proconsul of Asia in 46-44 BC) at Ephesus, etc., were often still celebrated in the Imperial time. The last time we hear of divine honours bestowed on a Roman proconsul was in the beginning of the first century AD, when C.Marcus Censorinus (cos. 8 BC; procos. Asiae 2-3 AD) was honoured at Mylasa by οἱ γεγονότες ἀγωνοθέται τῶν Κηνῶρινήων as *πατήρ* and *εὐεργέτης* of the city (SEG II 549). Here, too, the Kensorinea were celebrated after his death.³⁰ In the same way, it is not impossible that the Thespians also honoured a (Statilius) Taurus after his death, and the same might well be true with the programme included in the Mouseia. That the fragment recording an ἐγκώμιον εἰς Ταῦρον (inscr. 5) dates from around the year 20 AD (cf. above), does not by itself mean that this Taurus would have been alive at that moment. In fact, he may have died many years earlier, and his memory was honoured, perhaps at regular intervals, during the Mouseia.

Inscr. (6) from Megara has been alternatively attributed to all the early Imperial Statilii Tauri: cos. 37 and 26 BC, cos. 11 AD and cos. 44 AD. The consul of 11 AD seems to be the candidate most authorities support, notably because of the reasons presented above (cf. *passim*). But in principle, anyone of those Tauri might be the man whom the Megarian Council and demos honoured because of his ἀρετή and εὐεργεσία (inscr. 6). As is so often the case with Greek inscriptions from the late Republican and early Imperial period, in this instance, too, there is very little help from the analysis of lettering.

As is perhaps anticipated, I am inclined to think that not only inscr. (1) but all the other documents as well may refer to T.Statilius Taurus (cos. 37, II 26). He is in fact the only exponent of the Tauri who is indisputably attested in Greece, and not only in inscr. (1). ILS 2678 from Dyrrhachium reveals that he was an honorary duovir of that city,³¹ obviously sometime or other after the Battle of Actium, where he was in command of Caesar

²⁸ Cf. Moretti, *art.cit.*, 76, and esp. S.R.F.Price, *JHS* 104,1984,79ff.

²⁹ Cf. the evidence collected by D.Fishwick, *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West* I,1 (EPRO 108), Leiden 1987,46ff.

³⁰ Cf. L.Cerfaux-J.Tondriau, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine*, Tournai 1957,279; Ç.ahin-H.Engelmann, *ZPE* 34,1979,215f., with new epigraphical evidence; *PIR*² M 222; Fishwick, *op.cit.* 48.

³¹ Cf. Dessau, *PIR* S 615; R.Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939,302, n.4, hypothesized that this could possibly suggest that he was Octavianus' first governor of Macedonia.

Octavianus' land forces.³² There is no doubt that he was relatively well known at least in some Greek cities (like Thespieae and Megara) in early Augustan times. He was Octavianus' close political companion, and the new Augustus shared the fasces with him in 26 BC. At the end of his proconsulship of Africa in 34 BC he had triumphed in Rome after a victory over local African tribes. He received the military title *imperator* three times, and he also held important priesthoods, such as the *augur* and *curio maximus*.³³ His last office we hear of was that of City Prefect of Rome. He remained in this post from 16 to 10 BC, and *potestatem tamquam provecta aetate egregie toleravit*, as is the testimony of Tacitus (ann. 6,11). After the year 10 BC there is no attested reference to him. In that year he was aged about sixty or perhaps a little older. It is not clear when he died, perhaps soon after 10 BC,³⁴ but he may have lived for some ten or twenty years more. But if his person and career is compared with that of his son, the consul of 11 AD, the latter remains only a name in the consular *fasti*. On the basis of these considerations, too, it could be more plausible that it was Taurus, the triumphalis and Augustus' general, who is attested in all the Thespian inscriptions.

As concerns inscr. (1), it should be noted that in similar cases from the Republican and early Imperial time (there are about 40 of them), it was in practice always the husband (or the father), mostly functioning as proconsul or legate, who was the primary object of the dedication. Moreover, in the Republican period the female family members of Roman administrators could accompany their husbands and fathers to the provinces only in exceptional cases.³⁵ The old convention which did not allow a governor's wife to travel to the province during the term of her husband's office was to be gradually abandoned only under Tiberius' reign.³⁶ Accordingly, there is no need to suppose that Taurus' wife Cornelia was ever at Thespieae. She was probably honoured in absentia, and for the sole reason that she was married to Taurus. The precise date of the inscription naturally remains uncertain (cf. above for the time of their marriage), but what is more significant, it testifies to his particular interests and ties with Thespieae, perhaps already created in the years following Actium. And if all the other documents here discussed refer to him as well, which in my opinion is quite plausible, he appears to have been a great benefactor to the city to the extent that the Thespians instituted a cult in his honour. In this connection one should also remember that old-established and favourable relations already existed between Rome and

³² The literary sources are listed in PIR S 615; Broughton, MRR II 422.

³³ Cf. Vell. 2,127, who states that the modest origin of Agrippa and Taurus (they were both *homines novi*) was no obstacle for them *quoniam ad multiplicis consulatus triumphosque et complura eveherentur sacerdotia*.

³⁴ Thus Mommsen, *Röm.Staatsrecht II*³, Berlin 1887, 1060, n.1.

³⁵ Cf. e.g. the wives of Sulla (Caecilia Metella, at Athens in 86 BC) and Pompeius (Cornelia, at Mytilene in 49/48 BC), both of them refugee wives.

³⁶ Cf. esp. A.J.Marshall, *Anc.Soc.* 6,1975,113ff.; Id., *Greece & Rome* 22,1975,11ff.; C.Venturini, *Iura* 32,1981, app. 1984,106ff. Cf. also my study cited above (n.8).

the Thespians, at least from the point of view of Roman foreign policy. Thespieae was in fact the only Boeotian city to remain on the Roman side in the war against Mithridates.³⁷ After that close ties between the Romans and Thespians are not only indicated by a number of honorific dedications to Romans (including Sulla),³⁸ but also by the fact that Thespieae was virtually the only Boeotian city with a firm Roman settlement in the first century BC (it may be that some Romans traded at Thespieae already in the late second century BC).³⁹ But at the same time one should keep in mind what Strabo, writing in Augustan times, wrote about Thespieae: together with Tanagra it was the only Boeotian polis that still endured in his time, τῶν δ' ἄλλων δ' ἐρείπια καὶ ὀνόματα λέλειπται (9,2,25 [C 410]). These facts also go to explain why it was Thespieae among the Boeotian cities where Taurus was honoured.

I shall now return to the Roman fistula aquaria mentioned at the beginning of this paper, CIL XV 7440, recording a Cornelia, daughter of Taurus and wife of T. Axius. It is generally believed that she would be a daughter of Sisenna Statilius Taurus (cos. 16 AD). And indeed, the name form suggests such an identification. Reasons given are that she must in any case be a daughter of a (Statilius) Taurus, her husband was consul during Claudius' reign,⁴⁰ and finally, there is clearly a link between the name elements 'Sisenna' and 'Cornelia'. I also think that she must have been Sisenna's daughter. As I stated in the beginning of this paper, an abbreviated name like '(Statilia) Cornelia' would be possible in an instrumentum inscription like the present fistula. The use of the name 'Cornelia' could be explained in many ways. Firstly, names and other information on various stamps (fistulae, bricks, stamps on pottery) as well as on coins⁴¹ were in general more likely to be abbreviated than in other kinds of documents. Secondly, Cornelia's identity must have been sufficiently clear even without the element 'Statilia', because the stamp records 'Tauri f. T. Axi'. Furthermore, 'Cornelia' seems to have been used as an individual name adopted after the paternal grandmother, and such inheritance of a name is quite likely.⁴² Perhaps it was preferred that the element 'Statilia' should be suppressed, possibly for reasons of prestige.

³⁷ App.Mithr. 29. Cf. J.A.O.Larsen, *Roman Greece (An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome IV)*, Baltimore 1938,424; S.Accame, *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*, Roma 1946,198; J.Deininger, *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland 217-86 v.Chr.*, Berlin-New York 1971,257f.; cf. also A.N.Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*, London 1984,132ff.

³⁸ Besides some instances in IG VII, cf. esp. A.Plassart, BCH 50,1926,436ff., Nrr. 72-85; AE 1973,495 (cf. above).

³⁹ J.Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique*, Paris 1919,26ff.; Moretti, art.cit. in n.17, 74, with note 11; Roesch, *Etud.béot.* 171ff., with references.

⁴⁰ For the date of his consulship, cf. W.Eck, ZPE 42,1981,252ff.; Chr.Bruun, *Arctos* 19,1985,15ff.

⁴¹ Cf. e.g. the much discussed group of Augustan moneyers (one of them was Taurus, see above); all the members in three of the four colleges which struck quadrantes are recorded by one name element only, cf. Wiseman, art.cit. in n.11, 213ff. = *Roman Studies*, 1987,48ff.; R.Syme, *AJPh.* 103,1982,69f. = RP IV 183f.

⁴² The influence of maternal descent on nomenclature has been well illuminated by R.Syme, *Epigr. ord. sen. I (Tituli 4)*, Roma 1982,402ff. = RP IV 164ff. The classical example is C.Ummidius Quadratus (cos. suff. 118 AD), grandson of the mighty Ummidia Quadratilla, cf. Syme, *ibid.*

The grandfather was after all a homo novus, who married a daughter of a Republican nobilis. Finally, who could have prevented her from using the name 'Cornelia'? There were certainly no official regulations in that respect.

In addition to the fistula, there are a number of epitaphs found in the monumentum Statiliorum recording both slaves and freedmen of a Cornelia or otherwise showing a connection with the Cornelii (VI 6264, 6322, 6356, 6365, 6371, 6424). Two of them use the agnomen Cornelianus, which means that before becoming the property of the Statilii Tauri they had been slaves of the Cornelian family.⁴³ This may be further evidence of the marriage between Cornelia and T. Statilius Taurus. One freedwoman,⁴⁴ two slaves,⁴⁵ and a freedman Statilius Phileros, *Corneliaes cubicularius* (6264 = ILS 7407c) are mentioned in the inscriptions. This is an interesting case, because for some reason the libertus has no praenomen, this being rather exceptional at such an early date. As for Phileros, one should not conclude from the text that he was manumitted by Cornelia, on the contrary, he was a freedman of a Statilius/a, functioning as Cornelia's chamberlain. But it is not clear whether he served Cornelia before or after the manumission (freedmen are also attested as cubicularii of private families).⁴⁶ Perhaps Statilius Phileros is the same Phileros who manumitted a certain Iasullus, who in turn served as paedagogus to Sisenna Taurus (cos. 16 AD).⁴⁷ If this is true, it does not seem possible that a chamberlain of the younger Cornelia (daughter of cos. 16 AD) would have manumitted a slave who served as her father's pedagogue. Because Iasullus must have been Sisenna's pedagogue around the year 10 BC, and he was manumitted by a Cornelia's cubicularius, it would follow that this Cornelia is Sisenna's mother instead.⁴⁸

Helsinki

Mika Kajava

⁴³ 6356: Scirtus / symphonicus / Cornelianus. 6365: Flaccus faber / tignarius / Cornelianus.

⁴⁴ 6424: Clite Corneliae l. (the gentilicium is omitted), manumitted probably by Sisenna's daughter, but his mother could also be considered.

⁴⁵ 6322: Boethus / Corneliaes / a monumento. 6371 (= ILS 7424a): Euticus Corneliae / veteranus. Fecerunt / fratres et Zena velarius. Cornelia is either Sisenna's daughter or his mother.

⁴⁶ Cf. L. Cesano, *Diz.ep.* II:2, 1291, s.v. cubiculum. Cornelia is here erroneously identified with the wife of the cos. 16 AD.

⁴⁷ Thus is assumed ad VI 6264. CIL VI 6328 (monum. Statiliorum): Ossa. / Iasullus Philerotis lib., / Sisennae paedagogus. Cf. from the same monument 6435,6: [E]ros Philerotianus (with the editor's comment "probabile Erotem Philerotianum appellatum esse a Statilio Philerote n.6264").

⁴⁸ Salomies, *op.cit.* in n.1, 400, n.142, also opts for the mother.