

C. F. KONRAD

‘DOMITIUS CALVISIUS’ IN PLUTARCH

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 103 (1994) 139–146

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

'DOMITIUS CALVISIUS' IN PLUTARCH

A decade ago, a small marvel (merely one in a dauting parade) of prosopographical enquiry graced the pages of this journal.¹ P.Calvisius Ruso (*suff.* A.D. 79, *pro cos.* of Asia 92/3) must be distinguished from his brother, P.Calvisius Ruso Julius Frontinus (*suff.* ?84, *pro cos.* of Asia ?97/8, *leg. pro pr.* of Cappadocia-Galatia c. 106), so it was shown. From the disjoining of identities and careers issued a pair of suggestions pertinent to Ruso Frontinus' illustrious son. P.Calvisius Tullus Ruso, consul ordinary in 109, took for wife Domitia Cn. f. Lucilla, the daughter (by adoption from his brother) of the eminent, and eminently wealthy, Domitius Tullus (*II suff.* 98). More splendour attached to the next generation. Their daughter, Domitia P. f. Lucilla, was secured as bride for his son by M.Annius Verus (*suff.* 97, *cos.* II 121, *cos.* III 126). The successful union made Tullus Ruso the grandparent of a future philosopher and Princeps. That much was known.² Next, just short of certitude, L.Dasumius Hadrianus (*suff.* 93) forfeits identity as the author of the Testamentum Dasumii, indited in the summer of 108. So a new fragment and attendant disquisition revealed.³ No less compelling, lastly, the brief but satisfactory recognition of Cn.Domitius Tullus, departed within a year of the inscribed will, in Dasumius' place.⁴ It wins support. Among its wide and noteworthy ramifications, the identity of the testator's *amicus rarissimus*, named, *sub condicione nominis ferendi*, second among the principal heirs. He is found in the son-in-law, P.Calvisius Tullus Ruso.⁵

The novel adjunct, evidently owed to his matrimonial connexion, could have accrued in a twofold manner. Gratitude for the resplendent match - contracted perhaps as late as 104 or 105 - prompted its assumption, it may be surmised. Greater verisimilitude attaches to the alternative. The ancestor of Marcus became polyonymous upon annexing his inheritance, as enjoined by the testator. In consequence, P.Calvisius Tullus Ruso might also have styled

¹ "P.Calvisius Ruso, One Person or Two?" *ZPE* lvi (1984), 173-192 = *Roman Papers* iv (1988), 397-417.

² See Pliny, *Ep.* viii 18.2-7, on the elder Domitia and Cn.Domitius Tullus. The latter's iterated consulship was conjectured in *JRS* xliii (1953), 156 = *RP* i (1979), 246.

³ See W.Eck, "Zum neuen Fragment des sogenannten testamentum Dasumii," *ZPE* xxx (1978), 277-295. The Testamentum: *CIL* vi 10229; C.G.Bruns, O.Gradenwitz, and Th.Mommsen, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui*⁶ Freiburg and Leipzig, 1893), no. 98 = *Fontes*⁷(1909), no. 117. Its date is secured by line 124, *Ael]io H[adria]no et Trebatio Pr[isco cos.:* May 1 to August 31, 108.

⁴ As argued by C.Castillo, "El famoso testamento del Cordobés 'Dasumio'," in *Actas del I Congreso Andaluz de Estudios Clásico s*(Jaén, 1982), 159-163. Also briefly entertained, then discarded, by E.Champlin, "Miscellanea Testamentaria," *ZPE* lxii (1986) 247-255. Of Tullus' decease and *speculum morum*, Pliny discloses detail both ample and edifying: *Ep.* viii 18. The letter is commonly dated to 107 or 108.

⁵ "The Testamentum Dasumii: Some Novelties," *Chiron* xv (1985), 41-63 = *RP* v (1988), 521-545.

himself 'Cn.Domitius Tullus Calvisius Ruso' or 'Cn.Domitius P. f. Tullus Ruso'.⁶ The conjecture attracts and seduces.

A contrary hypothesis calls for mention, and brief response. Disallowing Domitius Tullus, Alicia Canto proposed to install as testator the prepollent minister of Trajan, L.Licinius Sura (*cos. III* 107), with for best friend and second inheritor, none other but L.Julius Ursus Servianus, brother-in-law of Hadrian and thrice consul (*suff.* 90, *cos. II* 102, *cos. III* 134). Servianus stands high on prominence in the text that survives.⁷ By good fortune, the testator's identity lacks crucial relevance for an investigation concerned chiefly with the name of Calvisius Tullus. That man's relation to Domitius Tullus has to stand, even if the Testamentum were adjudged to a different author.⁸ But "experiment helps, and error can clarify."⁹ Thus the injunctions against Domitius Tullus, summed up on short statement, and answered:

(1) 'Tradition' assigns letter 18 of Pliny's Book VIII to A.D. 107, anterior to the Testamentum by one year. Inaccurate, and not valid. On the standard acceptance, Book VIII comprises missives from 107 and 108; as for letter 18, "no close indications of time."¹⁰ The latest study uncovers evidence, better than tantalizing, that favours the winter of 108/9.¹¹

(2) Letter 23 of the same book deplors the untimely decease of the orator's protégé, young Junius Avitus. He also finds mention, along with a handsome bequest, on the Testamentum (line 20). His death, no earlier than September of 108.¹² Hence the second objection, "mas arduo": letter 18, the *testamentum Domitii*, must precede the Testamentum Dasumii. For how could a man already dead be the object of a legacy?¹³

The quandary baffles. The will inscribed on stone was indited between May and August of 108. It displays the name of Junius Avitus, dead in autumn. September follows hard upon the heels of August, in most years. A man dying in the autumn of 108, but included in a will drawn up during the summer. That is conceivable. Also that the testator might have prolonged his existence beyond that of the beneficiary, without adjustment in his final

⁶ "Calvisius," 187-189 = *RP* iv 411-414.

⁷ A.M.^a Canto, "CIL VI 10229: ¿El testamento de Licinio Sura?" *Chiron* xxi (1991), 277-324. Servianus in the Testamentum: lines 8, 111-114.

⁸ "Testamentum," 61 = *RP* v 543.

⁹ *Ibid.* 50 = *RP* v 530.

¹⁰ A.N.Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford, 1966), 468; cf. pp. 38-41, with full and careful analysis. The commentator has been alleged to date *Ep.* viii 18 to "106 or 107" (Canto, 281 n. 29). That is his estimate for Book VI, not VIII: see p. 41. Also without meaning, the allusion to viii 14, expounding an affair of the year 105. For its belated inclusion in the collection, see Sherwin-White, 39 and 461.

¹¹ "The Dating of Pliny's Latest Letters," *CQ* xxxv (1985), 176-185 = *RP* v (1988), 478-489.

¹² Better, perhaps, October or November: see "Pliny's Latest Letters," 180-182 = *RP* v 483-486.

¹³ Canto, 282.

dispositions. As for letter 18, it could have been written prior to letter 23, or subsequently. Or at the same time.

(3) Domitius Tullus had amassed an immense collection of statues in his warehouses, enough to populate overnight a vast park newly acquired. An auction was now expected (viii 18.11). That clashes with instructions issued by the author of the Testamentum, so it is averred: *rogo autem pie]tatem tuam, ut cures in pub[lico proponi signa deorum imperatorumque,] quae ubique habeo, in ampl[iorem nominis nostri honorem* (lines 75-76).¹⁴

Not valid. The restorations are Mommsen's; nothing compels to accord them greater faith here than elsewhere in this document.¹⁵ And nothing stands in the way of a sale (expected merely, not advertised) of part of the collection. That ought to be evident.

(4) If 'Dasumius' were Domitius Tullus, he was survived by his mother, his maternal aunt (*Septumae materterae*, lines 79, 83, and 85), and his nurse (*Dasumiae Syche nutric[i]*, line 35; cf. 47). Extreme decrepitude marked Domitius in his waning years, Pliny vouchsafes (18.8-9). That it to say, extreme old age, rendering improbable the threefold survival.¹⁶

First, the mother. Not on show in the extant will. That must be announced with requisite firmness. Dasumia Polla (it is true), fourth among the principal heirs, has been accorded identity as the testator's mother.¹⁷ She may have been his relict, as has been with conviction argued.¹⁸

Second, the aunt. Whose aunt, that is a question. Perhaps that of the testator's daughter, who is visibly the object of injunctions decreed in the preceding lines (66-78).¹⁹ If that of Domitius Tullus, his age will be relevant. Born *c.* 40/41, not yet seventy in 108.²⁰ An aunt might surpass him by a mere decade, even less. Besides, Pliny ascribes his decay to failing health (*seni ita perdit morbo*, 18.8), rather than senescence.

As for the aunt, so for the nurse. They do not disallow Domitius.

(5) On the alternative proposition, Julius Servianus is installed as heir (next to Sura's daughter), his son to assume the testator's name and transmit it to his descendants. *Heres meus erit* (sic) *L.Iulius Servianus] amicus rarissimus si intra t[riginta dies post obitum*

¹⁴ Canto, 286.

¹⁵ The new fragment of lines 1-19 (above, note 3) furnishes salutary instruction. Of Mommsen's supplements in *CIL* (1882), not one can be accorded vindication. For further and substantial corrections (lines 66-87, 120-124), see Champlin, "Miscellanea" (above, n. 4), 252-255.

¹⁶ Canto, 287.

¹⁷ E.g., Eck, "Fragment" (above, n. 3), 283.

¹⁸ "Testamentum," 54 = *RP* v 535.

¹⁹ Thus G. Di Vita-Évrard, "Le testament dit 'de *Dasumius*': Testateur et bénéficiaires," in *Novedades de Epigrafía Jurídica Romana* (edd. C.Castillo et. al., Pamplona, 1989), 159-174, p. 163, advancing a strong case. See also Champlin, "Miscellanea," 252.

²⁰ Domitius Lucanus was the elder brother. Domitius Afer adopted both in 41/2, so Tacitus (*Ann.* xiv 19) and Pliny (viii 18.5) combine to reveal. Tullus was elevated to the patriciate, by intervention of Vespasian in 73 or 74, it seems while praetor designate (*ILS* 991): not much above thirty.

meum filius eius nome]n meum laturum posterosque [suos laturos pollicitus erit, the restoration goes. It invokes the great Mommsen, "in part".²¹ That will not do.

A technicality supervenes. No *filius in potestate* could make the declaration envisaged here. In reverse, no emancipated son would be thought adequately identified by the curt *filius eius*; not in a legal document. And the abnormal procedure - the father to inherit, the son to assume the name - invites a parallel, on minimal argument. None is offered. Mommsen had conceived of the son to be both the inheritor and subject to 'testamentary adoption,'²² the father merely affirming compliance. As was proper (and inevitable, given the nexus of identities proposed). Jurists may "inhabit a world of their own,"²³ but they know the law. In the Testamentum the *condicio nominis ferendi* was enjoined upon the sole male heir, be he father or son.

Perplexity arises when Servianus is mooted. He exhibits no sign of ever annexing 'Sura' or 'Licinius' to his style. The year 134 finds him still 'L.Julius Ursus Servianus,' consul for the third time.²⁴ That may be why allegedly Sura enjoined Servianus' son alone to take his name, if a nascent suspicion must be voiced. Perhaps, however, the son himself was the inheritor - on Mommsen's example.

Perplexity sharpens when that contingency is pondered. No sons for Servianus - none, at least, on attestation. A remedy subsists. It warrants exposition in full. The deceased willed that his bier be carried *per Serviani mei li[beros* (line 112). Thus Mommsen, and the supplement earns approval: "Syme's correction, *li[bertos]*, is less adequate. The former implies the existence of male offspring of Servianus (and nephews of Hadrian), which the epigraphical and literary sources have not yet permitted us to recognize."²⁵ *Li[beros]*, not *fi[lios]*. Daughters (one is on record, line 8) of Servianus carrying the bier? "The spectacle boggles."²⁶ And no divination of Mommsen can gestate sons of Servianus that are nowhere certified. The remedy falters. With it, lapses the notion of Julius Servianus, *amicus rarissimus* and heir to Sura's fortune and name.²⁷

²¹ Canto, 311.

²² A misleading term, enjoying ecumenical devotion since antiquity. See "Clues to Testamentary Adoption," *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio* i (Tituli iv, 1982 [1984]), 397-410 = *RP* iv (1988) 159-173.

²³ "Testamentum," 59 = *RP* v 541, n. 113. Canto, 317, misquotes, by mishap or from memory.

²⁴ For the evidence, *PIR*², I 631 (1966). 'Ursus' accrued through 'testamentary adoption,' by L.Julius Ursus (*cos. III* 100), about the year 101. Formerly, Ser.Julius Servianus.

²⁵ Canto, 288 n. 55. L.Julius Ursus Valerius Flaccus (*CIL* xv 521-522; i.e., L.Valerius Flaccus, *suff.* 128) "might be a son of Servianus adopted by C.Valerius Flaccus." Better the reverse, or ("on the normal criterion") a Valerius Flaccus whose father had annexed the daughter of a Julius Ursus: see "Testamentary Adoption" (above, n. 22), 400 = *RP* iv 162; and "The Paternity of Polyonymous Consuls," *ZPE* lxi (1985), 191-198 = *RP* v (1988), 639-647. On any count, no hint of adoption by Licinius Sura.

²⁶ "Testamentum," 59 = *RP* v 541. There the notion was dismissed in two words: "Not conceivable." It warrants no further comment.

²⁷ It imports perturbation anyway. "That Servianus and Sura abode in concord and amity demands a robust faith": see "Hadrian's Autobiography: Servianus and Sura," *Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1986* = *RP* vi (1991), 398-408, p. 402.

Enough of Sura and Servianus. They counsel disbelief. Therefore, to resume. By rational conjecture, P. Calvisius Ruso (*cos.* 109) is assigned the nomenclature of Domitius Tullus, issuing from the device of 'testamentary adoption.' That only the second element is certified (he is P. Calvisius Tullus in the *Fasti Ostienses*), no impediment. Patterns of polyonymy conform,²⁸ and the daughter is styled Domitia everywhere. Still, one prefers attestation.

Help avails from an improbable corner. Plutarch in the *Parallel Lives* tells of a hapless proconsul in Hither Spain, his life and career abruptly halted following an encounter with a lieutenant of Sertorius, in 80 or 79 B.C. He is a Domitius owing to a second name, nebulous in contour and nature: the codices treat us to καλούσιον, κλούσιον and καὶ Λούσιον.²⁹ Further to vex an enquirer, other sources reporting the same incident cannot agree on the man's *praenomen*. 'Marcus' in the *Periochae*, 'Lucius' if Eutropius is to be believed.³⁰ Some chose to trust the *Breviarium* - hence the Δομίτιον δὲ Λεύκιον met with in earlier editions.³¹ Not persuasive as a restoration; it fails to account for the κ(α) exhibited by all the manuscripts. Read, therefore, Καλουῖνον, and forthwith emerges the father, otherwise on attestation only in his son's filiation, of Cn. Domitius M. f. M. n. Calvinus (*cos.* 53 B.C.). More recent editors print accordingly.³²

For nomenclature and identity, no other remedy satisfies.³³ However, Plutarch's text so emended affords no comfort. That he wrote Καλουῖνον is believed with difficulty: no -v- can be conjured up from the paradosis, and everywhere -c- obtrudes, defiantly.³⁴ Nor were scribes overtaxed during other encounters with the name 'Calvinus.'³⁵ A solution offers, palaeographically impeccable, two hundred years of age and still awaiting a fair hearing. Johann Jacob Reiske had proposed to read Καλούσιον.³⁶ Few were persuaded.³⁷ Most chose Καλουῖνον, for reasons that impose no strain on the imagination. Calvisii are not on

²⁸ "When abridged on the *Fasti*, polyonymous consuls normally register the paternal name": see "Pliny's Latest Letters" (above, n. 11), 182 = *RP* v 485, n. 43. For further elucidation, see "Testamentary Adoption" and "Paternity" (above, nn. 22 and 25).

²⁹ *Sert.* 12.4; cf. *Sall. Hist.* 1.111. For date and circumstance, see B. Bischoff-H. Bloch, "Das Wiener Fragment der Historiae des Sallust (P. Vindob. L 117)," *WS* xiii (1979), 116-129.

³⁰ *Livy Per.* 90; *Eutrop.* vi 1.2.

³¹ Thus, e.g., Amyot (French translation, Paris, 1559), Xylander (annotations to the *Francofurtana*, 1599), Sintenis in his second edition (Leipzig, 1852-55), and Perrin in the Loeb (London/New York, 1919).

³² The reading was suggested by Sintenis in the apparatus to his first edition (Leipzig, 1839-46). Ziegler (second edition, Leipzig, 1964) and Flacelière-Chambry (Paris, 1973) follow suit in their texts.

³³ First applied by Mommsen, *RG* iii 21, and D. Wilsdorf, "Fasti Hispaniarum provinciarum," *Leipziger Studien* i (1878), 118; endorsed by Broughton, *MRR* ii (New York, 1952), 84-85; iii (Atlanta, 1986), 84, and not superseded since.

³⁴ It is time to acknowledge a debt and concomitant gratitude. Ernst Badian kindly yet firmly insisted on giving due weight to the implications of the manuscript evidence, thus prompting this enquiry. He must not be charged with any error or untoward speculation advanced therein.

³⁵ *Caes.* 44.2, καλβίνιον - an insignificant deviation; *Pomp.* 69.1, Καλβίνω.

³⁶ In his edition, Leipzig, 1774-82.

³⁷ Doehner (Paris, 1846-47) and Sintenis in the text of his first edition (1839-46). He subsequently favoured a vastly inferior reading (above, n. 31).

register in Sertorius' day, none prior to Octavian's marshal, the consul of 39. The name is not certified as a *cognomen*, and in this early season an instance of binary nomenclature, 'Domitius Calvisius,' can be dismissed with confidence. Such or similar observation, it is safe to venture, impelled editors to reject Καλουίσιον. Rather than produce a superior text, they may have corrected Plutarch. The amphictyonic biographer might have erred and mistaken 'Calvinus' for 'Calvisius.'

For that notion, support happens to be at hand. First, Calvinus. If Plutarch wrote Καλουῖνον, scribes could be expected to preserve that name faithfully, as will be recalled.³⁸ No incentive for them, either, to import a supposititious 'Calvisius,' entailing the corruptions now on display. That name commanded no more meaning in their world than the alleged original.³⁹

Second, Calvisius. Obscure at the dawn of the first century, the name was propelled to eminence in the "contest of despots over the corpse of liberty,"⁴⁰ in close association with the New Romulus. Its bearers duly claimed their reward under the new dispensation: Calvisii Sabini adorn the *Fasti* - on the First of January, no less - in 39 B.C., 4 B.C., and A.D. 26. Although no kin of theirs (it is safe to affirm), the house of Calvisius Ruso maintained the splendour of the name. In Plutarch's lifetime, four members of that potent family held the *fasces*: in 53, 79, and ?84 as *suffecti*, an *ordinarius* in 109.⁴¹ The wrong yet not wholly dissimilar name may have intruded, by slip of mind or recollection; to compose from memory was established practice, not only for the biographer, who had had occasion to record Calvisii twice before.⁴² That is not all. The possibility rapidly gains in certitude with the emergence, albeit by conjecture, of a Domitius Calvisius prominent at the time of writing.

Sertorius stands late in the sequence of *Parallel Lives*, posterior doubtless to 108/9, when, as has been affirmed, Calvisius Ruso became (Cn.Domitius) Calvisius Tullus.⁴³ 'Domitius Calvisius' - would it have rung true in the biographer's ear? Sundry elements of personal connexion now come in. The consul of 109 had for paternal grandmother a sister

³⁸ Above, n. 35.

³⁹ It did, however, prove troublesome to transmit. In *Ant.* 58.9-59.1, one variously encounters καλουίσιος, καλβίσιος, and κολουιβίσιος. Correct *Galba* 12.2, Καλβίσιος.

⁴⁰ *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford, 1939), 205.

⁴¹ "In this season, a distinction of abnormal rarity": "Calvisius," 187 = *RP* iv 411.

⁴² *Ant.* 58.9-59.1; *Galba* 12.2. On the presumable date of *Sertorius* see below.

⁴³ The *Lives* were conceived near the beginning of Trajan's principate, and execution continued apace until the biographer's decease, 125 or thereabouts: C.P.Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* lvi (1966), 61-74. The pair *Demetrius-Antony* precedes (not immediately) *Sertorius-Eumenes*, and both rest securely in the second half of the collection, as has been clarified by C.B.R.Pelling, "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives," *JHS* xcix (1979), 74-96, esp. 83 n. 68. B.Scardigli, *SIFC* xliii (1971), 33-64, likewise and persuasively propounds a late date of *Sertorius*. See now also C.F.Konrad, *Plutarch's Sertorius: A Historical Commentary* (Chapel Hill and London, 1994), forthcoming.

of Sex. Julius Frontinus, *consul tertium* in 100.⁴⁴ The great-nephew loyally extolled the memory of that 'vir magnus'.⁴⁵ Frontinus' daughter was wife to Q. Sosius Senecio (*cos. 99, cos. II 107*).⁴⁶ The marshal of Trajan has been called "a cardinal link between the philosopher and Rome."⁴⁷ With full and triumphant warrant. That most exalted of Plutarch's Roman friends is remembered as a frequent dinner companion, in both Greece and Rome.⁴⁸ *Table Talk* and the *Parallel Lives*, surely the most substantial, and demanding, of Plutarch's compositions, were dedicated to him.⁴⁹ Nor was the connexion limited to their persons: Sosius was a guest at the wedding of Plutarch's son Autobulus, and elsewhere finds description as ἑταῖρος of the biographer's sons.⁵⁰ No proof here of an intimate link between Plutarch and Calvisius Tullus, some will say. No need of one, either. A passing acquaintance is desiderated by the argument, nothing more. It will be assumed without discomfort. P. Calvisius Tullus Ruso (*cos. 109*) may also have been known as 'Cn. Domitius Tullus Calvisius Ruso.' That can now be announced with elevated confidence. When at work on the *Sertorius*, the familiar conjunction of names impinged upon the biographer's thoughts. He wrote Καλουΐτιον. It is the name future editors should print without dubitation. 'Immo Καλουΐτιον' in the apparatus, to alert the unwary.

The disclosure yields an added benefit. A second consulate is bestowed on Calvisius Tullus in the *Vita Marci* (l. 3). It would have to be suffect, in the early years of Hadrian. Ordinary to suffect, a sequence of diminished probability.⁵¹ Voice was given to disquiet in due course. The tenure of a Cn. Domitius[(thus the *Fasti Ostienses*) in 98 was vindicated for Domitius Tullus, thence *bis consul*. Calvisius Tullus in consequence found himself stripped of iteration. Attendant upon the exchange, an emendation in the life. "Mater Domitia Lucilla Calvisii Tulli <filia, avia materna Lucilla Domiti Tulli> bis consulis filia."⁵² No need, perhaps, for invasive surgery. Better to diagnose confusion. Cn. Domitius Tullus, *suff.* 98, and Cn. Domitius Tullus Calvisius Ruso, *cos.* 109. That sequence would appear innocuous and seductive in the eyes of an author nowhere prone to excesses of accuracy or restraint. By a conflation of identities, the maternal grandfather of Marcus Aurelius was promoted to the distinction of a second consulate.

⁴⁴ "Calvisius" 176-177 = *RP* iv 401.

⁴⁵ Pliny, *Ep.* ix 19.6. For the identity of this letter's Ruso - Tullus *cos.* 109 -, see *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958), 99, 802; and "Correspondents of Pliny," *Historia* xxxiv (1985), 357 = *RP* v (1988), 474-475. Not admitted by Sherwin-White, *Letters of Pliny* (above, n. 10), 502.

⁴⁶ *ILS* 1105.

⁴⁷ Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), 55.

⁴⁸ *Quaest. conv.* 612E.

⁴⁹ Also the little discourse *On Progress in Virtue*.

⁵⁰ *Quaest. conv.* 666D, 734E.

⁵¹ 'Diminished' may be too hesitant an expression. No iterated consulate is on attestation in the suffect category after 103.

⁵² *JRS* xliii (1953), 156 = *RP* i (1979), 246.

The switch of consulships has not gone unchallenged, along with revisions in the stemma of the Calvisii. In varied and extensive discourse, Ginette Di Vita-Évrard essayed to claim Calvisius Ruso Julius Frontinus as a son (*suffectus* in 102) for P. Calvisius Ruso (*suff.* 79), with for mother a daughter of Old Frontinus.⁵³ The reconstruction is not devoid of seductive appeal. Which cannot be said of its corollary. Rather than assign Calvisius Tullus (*cos.* 109) as younger brother to Ruso Frontinus, that scholar would equip him with the identity of the latter's father: *consul iterum*, that is, in 109, the son-in-law (by re-marriage in late season) and heir to name and fortune of Domitius Tullus. The double consulate of Marcus' grandfather, averred by the *Historia Augusta*, can thus be rescued from condemnation. Three pieces of evidence, all documentary, tell against and dismiss the alleged identity.

The *Fasti Ostienses* duly display the second consulship of his colleague, A. Cornelius Palma, one of the military men. No sign of iteration after Ruso's name, though ample space offers. None either in the *Fasti feriarum Latinarum*. Lastly, and most damning ("chose plus grave," the author allows), a birth certificate from Egypt. Ruso's name was listed in full.⁵⁴ There is no iteration. With admirable frankness, the French scholar submits all the impeding evidence,⁵⁵ but her attempt to dispel it adumbrates desperation. Late in the year 108 (or early in the next), Calvisius Ruso became Calvisius Tullus Ruso. Deceived by the recent mutation, record-keepers and other bureaucrats, from Ostia to the Fayoum, engendered two distinct persons. Thus the second consulate of Marcus' ancestor was despoiled of all official record. That passes belief.

Epilogue

Evoked by a treatise on the Calvisii Rusones and perturbation about a name in Plutarch, the investigation converged on text and nomenclature. It lends confirmation to one hypothesis, dispels sundry others, and restores to its rightful place an emendation long consigned to oblivion. A conjecture supporting a conjecture. That must be admitted, and due warning is signalled herewith. "The test of a reconstruction is whether it coheres, even though it has to invoke the unascertained," wrote Ronald Syme.⁵⁶ In that spirit, the present disquisition is offered.

University of Colorado, Boulder

C.F.Konrad

⁵³ "Des Calvisii Rusones à Licinius Sura," *MEFRA* xcix (1987), 281-338, and, with greater brevity, "Le testament dit 'de *Dasumius*'" (above, n. 19).

⁵⁴ [P. Calvisius Tullus] Ruso, *BGU* vii (1926) 1691.

⁵⁵ "Calvisii Rusones" (above, n. 53), 313-314.

⁵⁶ "Calvisius," 191 = *RP* iv 416. For notable advice and material difficult of access, I am happy to thank Jerzy Linderski.