

MIKA KAJAVA

THE NAME OF A CLARISSIMA RESTORED (CIL VI 1629)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 125 (1999) 277–278

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## THE NAME OF A CLARISSIMA RESTORED (CIL VI 1629)

The monument, funerary or honorific, bearing the inscription CIL VI 1629 (“in platea post aedes Datariae in Quirinali”) has been lost for centuries, but the text is preserved in an old manuscript in the following form: *Publicio Regino, equiti Romano, procuratori merenti fecit* LEVNIAN · MISIA · PROCVLA · C · L (sched. Barberin. 30, 182 f. 6’ [in Lucas Holste’s hand] from the seventeenth century). According to Hülsen, the end of the text should be emended to either C · F or CL · F. Quite recently, the female nomenclature has been registered in PIR<sup>2</sup> VI (P) p. 412 in the form LEVNIAN (?) MISIA (*sic*) PROCVLA, c. f. (?) with the following observation: “Quo modo nomina corrupta emendanda sint, non liquet. Num re vera femina nobilis fuerit, dubium est.” Similar information is provided under the entry no. 1043a listing the knight to whom Procula had erected the monument: “Levnian (?) Misia (?) Procula c(larissima) f(emina) (?) . . . Nomina feminae corrupta sunt”.

The last affirmation is true, yet I think that the woman’s name has not been so hopelessly corrupted that it could not be restored. Since MISIA before *Procula* is nonsense, it must go together with the preceding N, thus forming the female form of the gentile name *Numisius*. The letter V in NVMISIA was probably simply dropped when the text was copied, unless it was already omitted by the stonecutter; in fact, after having finished the N, he perhaps thought that he had already written the V, being thus blurred by the similarity of the two letters. In any case, it goes without saying that the interpunct(s) of the ms. should not be taken as significant, for we do not know whether they correspond to reality. Now, the names *Numisia Procula* recall the senatorial Numisia Procula (PFOS 582 with stemma LXI) known from the water pipe stamps CIL XV 7459 β: *Numisie Proclae*, and γ: *Numisiae Q. f. Proclae*, which most probably record one and the same woman.<sup>1</sup> A further stamp on the same conduit (7459 α) exhibits the name of L. Fulvius Gavius Numisius Petronius Aemilianus, praetor in 169 (PIR<sup>2</sup> F 541 +(?) 527), in the abbreviated form *Fulvi Petroni Aemiliani c.v.* Groag already argued that Numisia Procula may have been Aemilianus’ mother and also that Procula was perhaps married to L. Fulvius Rusticus Aemilianus, consul towards the end of Antoninus Pius’ reign (PIR<sup>2</sup> F 557).<sup>2</sup> This is, in fact, a plausible reconstruction, and that the praetor of 169 was the consul’s son is further suggested by the form of his abbreviated nomenclature: not only does it occur in the above-mentioned form but also as *Fulvius Aemilianus*, thus concisely amalgamating the paternal nomenclature.<sup>3</sup>

Turning back to CIL VI 1629, I cannot help thinking that the woman’s nomenclature has something to do with Numisia Procula and her (alleged) husband. And since, as we have seen, the problem is not LEVNIAN but LEVNIA, I think there is only one way to resolve the problem: the woman used the praenomen *L(ucia)* followed by her gentile name. The praenomen is not a problem, as praenomina are sufficiently well attested for senatorial and other women in the second and third century A.D.;<sup>4</sup> so only EVNIA would remain to be explained. Perhaps IVNIA, but considering the prosopographic evidence discussed above, the most likely alternative is that EVNIA is a misreading for FVLVIA. In the late second century writing, E and F could be very similar to each other, and it is also evident that LV (with a short bar of L and, as was normal, with the two letters engraved close to each other) could be erro-

<sup>1</sup> The Cocceia Bassula Numisia Procula known from CIL VIII 626 (Mactar, cf. XI 5672, Attidium) is hardly identical with the Procula known from the stamps (*pace* PIR<sup>2</sup> N 220; also at M 738), see PFOS 264 with stemma LXI.

<sup>2</sup> RE VII 248 ff. no. 66; PIR<sup>2</sup> F 541. For water pipe stamps recording family members together, see Chr. Bruun, *The Water Supply of Ancient Rome*, Helsinki 1991, 94 (examples of a man and a woman appearing together are listed in footnote 75).

<sup>3</sup> For this and similar cases, see O. Salomies, *Adoptive and Polyonymous Nomenclature in the Roman Empire*, Helsinki 1992, 112.

<sup>4</sup> For *Lucia*, see M. Kajava, *Roman Female Praenomina*, Rome 1995, 156 ff.

neously read as N. This would mean that the dedicator of CIL VI 1629 was called *L. Fulvia Numisia Procula* and, probably, that she was of senatorial rank, the title most probably having to be emended to C · F (unless it was CL · F). If this is correct, she must have been closely related to Numisia Procula and L. Fulvius Rusticus Aemilianus which would further corroborate the genealogical reconstruction as it was, though hesitatingly, advanced by Groag. There would be no onomastic obstacles to even regarding her as a daughter of the couple. If not a daughter, she will still have lived in the late second century, or in the early third at the latest, for the onomastic and prosopographic evidence makes a later date less likely. The use of the honorific title would also fit this period perfectly. In any case, if the senatorial Procula was really married to the equestrian, whose procuratorship remains undefined, this would be a further case to be added to those where a *clarissima* retains her title in spite of a marriage to a man of lower rank. Since the use of honorific titles began to be more strictly controlled under Marcus Aurelius, the present case could perhaps be explained by assuming that it dates from the 150s (–160s) when the legislator did not yet intervene at all. This, however, would mean that Procula's title is among the earliest examples of *c.f.* recorded. But if the text is somewhat later, which I think is more likely, Procula will have needed special permission to bear the title of *clarissima femina*.<sup>5</sup> These problems would naturally disappear if Procula and Reginus were not a married couple. In fact, the lack of any specific reference to marital relationship (*uxor, coniugi, marito*) combined with the somewhat cool and laconic expression *merenti fecit* would suggest that Reginus was not Procula's husband.

Helsinki

Mika Kajava

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. M.-Th. Raepsaet-Charlier, PFOS p. 9 ff.