Chapter 13

Women and elections in Pompeii

Liisa Savunen

L(ucium) P(opidium) S(ecundum) Aed(ilem) O(ro) V(os) F(aciatis) D(ignum) R(ei) P(ublicae) Successa Rog(at)

(*CIL* IV, 1062)

A number of electoral inscriptions from electoral campaign posters are still visible in the main streets of Pompeii. These posters, *programmata*, are a unique source for scholars of municipal elections in the ancient world.[1] The elective *comitia* in which upper magistrates, aediles and *duoviri*, were elected for a year, was held every year in March.

Women also participated in canvassing. Although many scholars have considered their role important, it has never been systematically studied.[2] My aim in this paper is to analyse in detail the electoral posters made by Pompeian women and to discuss the role of women in Pompeian municipal politics. Why did women endorse candidates publicly? What were the relationships between candidates and supporters? I work on the assumption that the women were not a homogeneous group, but differed in terms of, for example, social status. I also assume that the *programmata* made by women did not differ from those made by men or groups in terms of either format or motives. In this way analysis of *programmata* made by women can also shed light on the background and underlying motives of *programmata* in general.

Programmata fall into two categories: *programmata antiquissima*, dating back to the period immediately following the establishment of the Roman colony in 80 BC, and *programmata recentiora*, originating in the last 17 years of Pompeii.[3] The two types differ in a number of ways, the most obvious of which is that in *programmata antiquissima* the supporter (= *rogator*) is seldom mentioned and is never a woman.

The simplest of the *programmata recentiora* consisted of the candidate's name – or merely his initials – and the office, both in the accusative case. The name was usually followed by standard phrases and abbreviations such as *OVF* = *oro vos faciatis*, *VB* = *virum bonum*, *DRP* = *dignum reipublicae*. The name of the supporter was not required. Of the more than 2,500 *programmata* discovered only about 30 per cent include the supporter's name.

Fifty-two posters were made by women, and in all we have 54 women supporting 28 different candidates.[4] Fifty-two of these women used their own name, either *cognomen* or *nomen gentilicium*. Most women (33) had a poster of their own, but some featured alongside a man (13) or another woman (four). Behind two women there seems to have been a larger group called *suis*. Two inscriptions have preserved an attribute which probably refers to a woman: *CIL* IV, 913, *Hilario cum sua*, and *CIL* IV, 7213, *Amandio cum sua*. However, *sua* can also refer to *familia* or *domus*.[5] Scholars have found it difficult to assign Pompeian women and the electoral notices they produced to a specific place within the more general framework. Bernstein and Mouritsen have both tried to clarify the role of kinship in the *programmata*. According to Mouritsen, the direct involvement of women in an election campaign would have cast a doubtful light on the candidate, unless the women featured in the capacity of members of the candidate's *clientela*.[6] Mouritsen's general idea concerning personal connections is interesting, but his theories on women's involvement are far from convincing.

FEMINA POLITICA

A great deal of satisfactory work has been written on the role of women in politics and public life. The most substantial work has been done in the field of Roman law by studying the duties and status of women.[7]

According to the well-known Ulpian passage, women were excluded from all duties whether civil or public, and were thus unable to become judges or magistrates.[8] Only free-born and emancipated male citizens had the right of access to the magistracy and to vote in *comitia*. Women, slaves, condemned persons and foreigners who did not have permanent residence in the city were not allowed to vote.[9] Women could take part in *contiones*, preliminary public meetings, in which citizens appeared unsorted.[10] It is very likely – although we have no evidence – that women also participated in *contiones* in Pompeii.

The analysis of powerful women known from literary sources has also been valuable. During the Republic upper-class women took part in political affairs, and in the principate the women of the imperial family in particular were able to influence Rome's destiny. The lack of franchise was not the crucial point, as women could exercise political power through *amicitia* and *clientela*.[11]

Bauman has recently argued that the entire basis of male politics changed under one-man rule and the system became more advantageous to women. In Rome elections and voting for proposals in *comitia* were in decline: the decreased importance of the popular assembly made the denial of the franchise to women less relevant.[12] However, as electoral notices show, in small municipal towns like Pompeii political life was on the increase.[13] The participation of women in elections in Pompeii seems to call into question the significance of the franchise and the idea of citizenship.

WOMEN IN POMPEIAN POLITICS

In order to be able to study *programmata* made by women, one first has to collect, count and classify all posters of all candidates.[14] This is no easy task, as the names of both the candidates and supporters are fragmented and therefore open to various interpretations. There are many candidates with the same *nomen*, and it is difficult to decide which candidate is concerned in any given case. For example, Franklin and Mouritsen have arrived at different results, and the numbers in this paper differ from theirs.[15]

The next step after collecting the posters is to divide candidates into two categories, those with women supporters and those without. The *programmata* of each candidate can also be divided into those with *rogator* support and those with non-*rogator* support. The latter means posters with no mention of a supporter. The *rogator* support category can in turn be divided into individual and collective support. Individual support means that the names of individual men or women were given. Collective support refers to posters made by specific groups, such as *fullones universi, dormientes, furunculi,* etc., some of which may even seem ridiculous. There are thus four distinct categories of support: women, men, groups and non-*rogator* support.

One poster can include more than one supporter and also more than one candidate. In this paper I use the concept of support expression, which includes all supporters and non-*rogator* support of one candidate. It has to be emphasised that poster and support expression

are two totally different concepts. One poster can contain more than one support expression (e.g. in *CIL* IV, 171, *Caprasia cum Nymphio* there are two).

Comparison of different groups highlights some very interesting details. First, no candidate had only women supporters. Second, only 28 candidates had women supporters, but they got 1,286 posters and 1,356 expressions of support. In the group without women supporters there were 110 candidates with a total of just 1,253 posters and 1,298 expressions of support. Third, in a survey of all posters and expressions of support the percentual distribution between non-*rogator* support and *rogator* support is relatively similar regardless of whether or not there were women among the supporters (69 per cent if there were women, 75 per cent if not). Fourth, the distribution of collective support is also the same in both groups (5 per cent). Fifth, in the relative division of support the share of women is 2 per cent (men 21 per cent, collective 5 per cent, non-*rogator* support 72 per cent).

The similar distributions show that we are dealing with a random sample and in fact the groups are similar. The greatest difference between the groups lies not in the support of women but in the number of posters and thus in the number of support expressions. The division between women supporters and others is artificial. It was very likely that a candidate would have women among his supporters, the more so if he had at least 50 support expressions. If he did not have women among his supporters, this was more a result of having fewer posters and thus fewer support expressions.

There are, however, exceptions to this rule. Aedile candidate C. Cuspius Pansa had so many posters (ninety-six) and support expressions (twenty-eight men plus seven collective) that he could have been expected to have had women among his supporters – but he did not. On the other hand, the *duovir* candidate C. Iulius Polybius had just eighteen support expressions, of which seven were from women. Aedile candidate Cn. Helvius Sabinus and *duovir* candidate L. Ceius Secundus likewise had more women supporters than their total level of support would lead one to presume. However, as the sample is not statistically very representative, one has to be cautious about drawing far-reaching conclusions.

It has already been mentioned that electoral posters were rather uniform in character. The supporter's being a man or a woman had no impact on the text of the poster. The same abbreviations, verbs and phrases were used in either case. The laudatory formulae used

were also, with few exceptions, very similar. The only exceptional formula to be found among women's *programmata* is *CIL* IV, 3678, *M(arcum) Casellium et L(ucium) Albucium aed(iles) O(ro) V(os) F(aciatis) Statia et Petronia rog(ant) tales cives in colonia in perpetuo.*[16]

The choice of verbs (*facere, rogare, cupere, volere*) has presented several problems.[17] Of all the theories put forward on this question, that of Gründel is the most interesting. He argues that the perfect tense *fecit* refers to supporters who wished to convey to the candidate after the election that they had voted for him.[18] *Facere* was used six times by women, but only once in the perfect tense.[19] In men's *programmata* this tense was also very rare.[20] This leaves Gründel's theory based on very poor evidence and unfortunately we have no other proof that Taedia Secunda or any other woman would ever have voted in the elective *comitia* of Pompeii. It does seem to me, however, that *facere* could imply a close relationship between supporter and candidate.

Women supported the same candidates as men and their posters were similar – there was no feminine way of producing posters. The candidates supported by women were also those with the most posters and support expressions. Women supporters cannot be distinguished from any others. On the contrary, it would seem that female support constituted part of a candidate's campaign and as such was as acceptable and as legitimate as posters produced by men and groups. There is nothing that would indicate clearly that candidates supported by women needed more posters than others on account of their being less well-known or of less distinguished descent.[21]

SOCIAL STANDING AND POLITICAL POWER

There can be four derogative motives underlying *programmata*: gender, social status, disrepute or shameful profession. It has been argued above that there appears to have been no difference between women supporters and others. It is therefore likely that gender itself was not considered suspicious by Pompeians. The fact that women often produced *programmata* together with men reinforces this hypothesis.[22]

Assessing the social standing of supporters is a difficult enough task, but research into profession and possible disrepute presents even greater problems. In most cases a name is preserved in only one inscription. Indications of status are very rare in electoral inscriptions. The identification of supporters as slaves or freedwomen is of course a feasible proposition but accuracy cannot be guaranteed. The site of the inscription can also provide clues as to identity but is highly

problematic. Most inscriptions cannot be dated exactly, and the function of the building may have changed in the course of time.

Della Corte[23] identified persons who featured as supporters in an electoral notice on the exterior of a house as occupants of that very building. However, this is mere conjecture, as it is unclear whether Pompeians actually wrote electoral *programmata* on the walls of their own houses or on those of others.[24] There are indications that walls were regarded as parts of public streets and would thus have been at the disposal of scribes.[25]

The only indicator of a supporter's social status is his or her name. However, even though onomastic analysis allows us to determine a supporter's social status, there remains the task of demonstrating the extent of the supporter's personal prestige and/or influence over the election process. This is greatly complicated by the fact that we do not know which candidates were elected.

In our sample of women we have twenty-four different *nomina gentilicia*. Two women had both *gentilicium* and *cognomen* (Sutoria Primigenia, Taedia Secunda); all the others used either *gentilicium* or *cognomen*. It may be that the others had only a *gentilicium* or that they had a *cognomen* but they did not use it. Posters had to be short, and the use of the whole name formula would have taken up too much wall space. Forty-three per cent of these *gentilicia* belonged to politically active families.[26]

Twenty-three women featured only by *cognomina*. Helpis Afra had a double *cognomen*, one Latin and the other Greek. The proportion of Latin and non-Latin *cognomina* is otherwise equal. The question of Greek *cognomina* and the social status they implied is a widely disputed one. According to Solin,[27] Greek names in Rome were a sign of servile origin in the first or second generation. This also seems to have been valid in Pompeii.

A *nomen gentilicium* indicates at least the status of a freedwoman. On the other hand, a *cognomen* implies a slave. However, the distinction is not quite so clear-cut. In a number of posters written by men only a *cognomen* was used, and in some cases that same *cognomen* is known to have belonged to a person who was undoubtedly free-born.[28] This could suggest that certain supporters were so well-known that the use of *cognomen* alone was sufficient to convey the person's identity. It could also suggest that the *cognomen* was the name normally used by Pompeians. A candidate's support also seems to have been published only in certain districts of the city, and as supporters were well-known among their immediate neighbours the use of the whole name

formula was unnecessary. The number of *gentilicia* is noteworthy and shows that the low status of women cannot be taken for granted. This is confirmed by the number of non-Latin *cognomina*. Only 25 per cent of the total names were Greek *cognomina* and hence belonged to lower-class women.

In certain cases the archaeological evidence, in other words the original physical context of the inscription, can play a part in the identification. However, as the problems occurring in the following example illustrate, one has to be very cautious.

The electoral posters of four women – Asellina, Maria, Zmyrina and Aegle – may be seen to this day in the Via dell'Abbondanza on the wall of a house identified as a *thermopolium*. On the basis of this location della Corte identified Asellina as the owner (the place is commonly called Caupona di Asellina) and the others as her barmaids.[29] In fact, there is no other evidence to identify them and even onomastic analysis is of little help.[30] The evidence of the location is also disputable because bars in main streets were ideal sites for electoral posters as there they could be seen by as many people as possible. The disreputable character and suspicious profession of these women is a very feasible proposition but not certain.

It is important to note that the social structure of Pompeii changed in the last period of the city. The clearest evidence for this is in the construction boom following the earthquake in AD 62. Reconstruction took time because the Pompeians were impoverished. Aristocratic families moved to their country estates, abandoning town life and political activity. Their houses were turned into workshops. In contrast to the earlier period, builders were now freedmen or freedwomen. According to Castrén, many completely new families as well as sons of freedmen gained access to the Pompeian *ordo* in this period.[31] *Lex Malacitana* from about the year AD 84 also suggests that already in the first century there was a shortage of people voluntarily applying for office. If this were the case, it would be no wonder that the majority of supporters were freedmen or freedwomen.

CLIENTELA OR INDIVIDUAL MANIFESTATION?

The most interesting point regarding *programmata* is the relationship between candidates and supporters. Was there a personal connection underlying *programmata* or did supporters have more general motives when choosing whom to endorse?

Unfortunately very little is known about electoral procedure or the official organisation of elections. Who was responsible for posters? Was it the candidate himself or persons connected with him who selected the supporters?[32] Or did people go to the organisers and grant them licence to use their names in electoral posters? Or was there any organisation at all?

The significance of electoral districts is another problem that remains unsolved. It seems that the town area of Pompeii was divided into four districts probably known as *vici*. The fifth district lay outside the town walls. However, it is not known whether these administrative districts also formed the basis of the voting districts. It appears that the electoral procedure required a candidate to secure a majority of the districts in order to be elected. Thus each candidate had to ensure that he won in at least his own electoral district.[33] This in turn would suggest that the inhabitants of a district supported the candidates chosen by that district.

Among women's *programmata*, the posters of candidates such as L. Albucius Celsus, M. Cerrinius Vatia, C. Iulius Polybius and M. Licinius Faustinus seem to have been concentrated in certain areas. In some cases, the candidate's own house can also be traced back to that same area. The support of Minia, Pollia, Caprasia, Miscenia, Specla, Zmyrina, Cuculla and Euhodia follows this pattern.[34]

However, the concentration of posters is not a full explanation of the *programmata*. Political merit also appears to have played a role. The praise of Statia and Petronia for L. Albucius Celsus and M. Casellius Marcellus, *tales cives in colonia in perpetuo*, probably refers to the aediles' responsibility for organising games. This was probably also Olympionica's motive for supporting M. Casellius Marcellus. Primigenia is likely to have referred to the *duovir's* role as custodian of the public funds.[35]

Personal relationships between supporters and candidates, such as kinship (Taedia Secunda was grandmother of her candidate), vicinity (Appuleia), religion (Biria?), *clientela* or *amicitia* (Caprasia, Primilla),[36] were undoubtedly important, but as we do not know the *nomen gentilicium* of all the women it is difficult to determine the extent of the significance of patronage or *clientela*.

CONCLUSIONS

Although personal connection between supporters and candidates seems to have played an important part in elections, it was not the sole motive for producing posters. It seems only natural that people who endorsed candidates were in some way closely connected with them. If different districts had their own candidates, it is also natural that candidates received support from their local constituents. The latter also had a chance to participate in preliminary assemblies where the candidates were nominated. In this way they were informed about the elections and candidates.

The problems of electoral organisation may seem crucial, but from the point of view of women supporters they are, in fact, of lesser importance. If women produced posters by themselves it was because they knew how to make them. If, and this is more likely, professional *scriptores* painted posters on their behalf, they must have been allowed to do so.[37] Had it been illegal or otherwise undesirable the *scriptores* would either not have painted the posters at all or if they had the candidates would have defaced them. Even if the campaigns were controlled by the candidates themselves and supporters selected beforehand, this would have no effect on the role of women, who would also have been selected beforehand along with the male supporters. As supporters women and men were equal. Posters produced by women had the same basis as those of men and as such they can be considered to have been as independent as the *programmata* of men and groups. No magisterial lists have been preserved and therefore we are not even able to assess the influence of men's *programmata*. It seems that *programmata* made by women constituted a part of a candidate's campaign. However, there is no evidence to suggest that women ever voted in Pompeii.

Other researchers have already observed that gender was not the sole determinant of public capacity.[38] In Roman society citizens were not equal and therefore all citizens did not have identical rights and duties. The same holds true in the question of Pompeian *programmata*. Among male supporters there were some excluded from the franchise who nevertheless took part in the *programmata*. There is thus no reason to overstate the denial of franchise to women. The crucial issue beyond women's *programmata* is the whole question of the significance of elections and of electoral *programmata* in Pompeii.

Elections were part of Pompeian public life. Posters did remain *in situ* after elections and revealed to newly elected magistrates who had

supported them. The *programmata* may be regarded as a collective activity in which women took part not only as members or clients of the family but also as members of the community and the electoral district. Participation in the *programmata* could have been more important than the elections themselves.

NOTES

* I would like to thank Professor Päivi Setälä, Professor Paavo Castrén and Dr Katariina Mustakallio for their valuable comments and suggestions. All errors remain mine.

1 There is no reason to assume that they were typical only of Pompeii, however. Literary and epigraphical sources show that they existed elsewhere as well. *CIL* V, 1490, 1641; *CIL* VI, 14313, 29942; *CIL* IX, 4126. See Zangemeister in *CIL* IV, p. 10. For the magistrates and election in Pompeii see Castrén 1983; Franklin 1980; Jongman 1988; and Mouritsen 1988.

2 For example, Castrén 1983: 79; Mouritsen 1988: 60f. The only existing study on the role of Pompeian women is d'Avino 1967, which does not fulfil scientific requirements. The article of Will 1979 is only superficial. I shall pursue Pompeian women and also the subject of this article in more detail and with more extensive documentation in my forthcoming book, *Women and the Public Sphere in Pompeii*. For women and elections in Pompeii see Scalera 1919: 387–405; and more recently Bernstein 1988: 1–18.

3 For the survival of *programmata*, problems of dating the magistrates and reconstructing the Pompeian *fasti* see Franklin 1980: 33f.; Castrén 1983: 113–114; Mouritsen 1988: 37f.

4 It is not always easy to ascertain sex because there are some contentious names. The names Heracla, Ascla and Sucula have usually been interpreted as women's names but they are men's. Cf. Solin 1982: 355–356 and 482–483; and Kajanto 1965: 329. The sex of Cuculla and Animula is unknown but these names are more likely to have belonged to women, cf. Kajanto 1965: 345, 365. *CIL* IV, 99 has been preserved in a fragmentary state and there are three different ways of interpreting it. Della Corte 1965: 31 n. 2 reads *Cæpari*; Mouritsen 1988: 175 *cupari*; the amendment in *CIL* IV, p. 460 *Chypare*, which is preferred also in this paper.

5 *CIL* IV, 1053 *Lollia cum suis*; and *CIL* IV, 7464 *Sutoria Primigenia cum suis*. Cf. *cum suis* in the following posters *CIL* IV, 235, 707, 1053, 3482, 7191, 7464, 7708, 9919; and Giordano and Casale 1990: 278 no. 10. Scalera 1919: 391, 400 argues that in the case of Lollia *cum suis* is similar to *cum familia* while the expression *cum sua* refers to a woman whose participation remains almost concealed but shows more serious participation.

6 Bernstein 1988: 6f.; Mouritsen 1988: 62.

7 Gardner 1986; and especially Gardner 1993: 85–109.

8 Ulp. *D.* 50, 17, 2; Paul. *D.* 5, 1, 12, 2. See especially Gardner 1993: 87–89.

9 Scholars are unanimous that when *contio* changed into *comitia*, the non-voters were removed. For example, Ross Taylor 1966: 3. The formula giving dismissal is known from Festus (*Gloss. Lat.* 72): *Exesto, extra esto. Sic enim lictor in quibusdam sacris clamitabat: hostis, vinctus, mulier, virgo exesto; scilicet interesse prohibebatur.*

10 During the early Republic women were not allowed to participate even in *contiones*, but attitudes became more permissive later. It is not known when this change took place or what lay behind it. Val. Max. 3, 8, 6. states *Quid feminae cum contione? Si patrius mos servetur, nihil.* Gell. *NA* 5, 19, 10. See also Botsford 1909: 326 n. 1. Livy 34, 2, 11 puts into Cato the Elder's mouth (234–149 BC) that before his generation women were not allowed to take part in politics or to be present at meetings and assemblies (*comitiis contionibus immisceri*), which is, however, an exaggeration. After the time of Gracchi, women could also speak at *contiones*, as did Hortensia in 43 BC: see Dio Cass. 83, 8; Val. Max. 3, 8, 6 and 8, 3; App. *BCiv.* 4, 32–34.

11 Bauman 1992; Dixon 1983: 91–112; Saxonhouse 1985: 100, f.

12 Bauman 1992: 5.

13 Staveley 1972: 223f. However, the *Lex Malacitana* of about AD 84 points to the fact that this interest was of short duration. According to Franklin 1980: 120, in the last years of Pompeii there were never more than two *duoviral* candidates for the two places to be filled. Cf. also Macrob. *Sat.* 2.3.11–12 where Cicero says to his friend P. Mallius who asks his support to obtain a *decurionate* for his stepson in Pompeii: *Romae, si vis, habebit; Pompeis difficile est.*

14 There are, of course, posters in which the name is no longer legible. If the name seems to have been in the plural, it has been classified among groups, otherwise among the posters of men.

15 Mouritsen 1988: 125f. *Catalogue of programmata recentiora*; Franklin 1980: 96–97, tables 8, 9; and especially J. L. Franklin, 'The Chronology and Sequence of Candidates for the Municipal Magistracies Attested in the Pompeian Parietal inscriptions AD 71–79', dissertation, Ann Arbor 1975: 162f. appendix B.

16 Other examples include *CIL* IV, 187, 429, 597, 720, 4999, 6626.

17 Castrén 1983: 79 suggested that this problem and the role played by women in the Pompeian elections may have a joint solution. It was suggested already by Willems 1887: 84f. that the verbs *facere* and *rogare* correspond to two different stages of the election procedure. See also Mau 1889: 298–305.

18 Gründel 1967.

19 *CIL* IV, 7469 *L(ucium) Popi(dium) S(ecun)d(u)m aed(ilem) O(ro) V(os) F(aciatis)/Taedia Secunda cupiens avia rog(at?) et fecit.* Other cases *CIL* IV, 425 (*Animula facit*), 7873 (*Appuleia f*), 923 (*Caprasia fac*), 457 (*Iphigenia facit*), 7347 (*Vatinia facit*).

20 In all *fecit* was used at least twelve times. In individual support *CIL* IV, 98 (p. 192), 221, 297, 935bd, 3582, 3583, 3760, 7618. 6667 is disputable. In collective support *CIL* IV, 1122. *CIL* IV, 7187 *multis fecit benigne* is more a laudatory formula.

21 In the year AD 79 there were six candidates. Aedile candidates gained

posters and support expressions as follows: C. Cuspius Pansa 96/101/no women; L. Popidius Secundus 71/73/3 women; M. Samellius Modestus 52/55/2 women; and Cn. Helvius Sabinus 140/153/10 women. *Duovir* candidates: C. Gavius Rufus 35/36/no women; and M. Holconius Priscus 38/51/no women. This could suggest that women especially supported aedile candidates who, applying for office for the first time, also needed more posters and more supporters than *duoviral* candidates (C. Cuspius Pansa is the only exception). However, C. Iulius Polybius gained a total of 21 (one woman) support expressions when applying for aedile office but 40 (seven women) as candidate for *duovir*. L. Ceius Secundus gained 23 (one woman) support expressions as an aedile candidate but 95 (six women) as *duovir* candidate. See also Franklin 1980: 98–100.

22 *CIL* IV, 3527 *Appuleia cum Mustio*; 207 *Nymph(odot)us cum Caprasia*; 171 *Caprasia cum Nymphio*; 7669 *Acratopinon cum Cassia*; 6610 *Epidia nec sine C[osm]o*; 3595 *Acceptus rog Euhodia rog*; 1171 *Min[ia?] Sprvois?*; 3674 *Pyramus Olympionica Calvos*; 3403 *Parthope cum Rufino*; 1083 *Recepta nec sine Thalamo*; 7658 *Scymnis nec sine Trebio*; 3746 *Ambriaeus cum Vibia*; 913 *Hilario cum sua*; 7213 *Amandio cum sua.* Some of these men were even magistrates, e.g. 7658 Trebius is very probably A. Trebius Valens who was an aedile candidate during the Flavian period.

23 Della Corte 1965: 20.

24 According to Mouritsen 1988: 18–19, the homes of only 21 *rogatores* can be located with reasonable certainty.

25 *CIL* IV, 7621 *Lanternari tene scalam* may show that posters were written at night.

26 *Gens* Vibia, Statia, Maria, Lollia, Iunia, Fabia, Epidia, Cornelia, Cassia and Appuleia.

27 H. Solin, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der griechischen Personennamen in Rom*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 48, Helsinki 1971: 135f.

28 For example Balbus in *CIL* IV, 935bdh, 2958 might be *duovir* candidate Q. Bruttius Balbus and Vatia in *CIL* IV, 132 aedile candidate M. Cerrinius Vatia.

29 *CIL* IV, 7862, 7863, 7864, 7866, 7873. See della Corte 1965: 307–309. Bars often functioned as brothels and prostitution was considered as a shameful profession. See Gardner 1993: 135f.; Evans 1991: 133f.

30 In the case of Asellina and Maria the names could have been either *gentilicium* or *cognomen*. See Kajanto 1965: 326; and Castrén 1983: 139 no. 47, 189 no. 242. For the name Asellina see also Väänänen 1937: 197–199. If Maria is a *cognomen* it is not Jewish as argued by della Corte 1965: 308, but Syrian. Cf. Solin 1983: 725. Zmyrina and Aegle are names of foreign origin which very probably belonged to slave women: see Solin 1982: 526 and 612–613.

31 Richardson 1988: 21 and 261f. Cf. *CIL* X, 846 concerning N. Popidius Celsinus who was co-opted into the *ordo decurionum* at the age of 6 after having restored the Temple of Isis following the earthquake. The Temple of Venus was still under restoration. For the rise of new families see Castrén 1983: 118f.

32 This is the idea of Mouritsen 1988: 44f.