

BRADUA ATTICUS, THE CONSUL OF A.D. 185, AND BRADUA ATTICUS, THE PROCONSUL OF AFRICA

I. AVOTINS

Until the publication of *IRT* 517¹ no one doubted that Bradua Atticus, the consul of A.D. 185, was identical with Ti. Claudius M. Appius Bradua Regillus Atticus (*PIR*² C 785, henceforth Bradua I), the son of the famous Athenian sophist and multi-millionaire Herodes Atticus (*PIR*² C 802). Recently, however, a Bradua, proconsul of Africa (henceforth Bradua II for convenience), has emerged, sufficiently similar in nomenclature to the son of Herodes to have caused a problem in identification. Some have felt that this new Bradua was identical with the son of Herodes; others have separated the two, in some cases suggesting that it was Bradua II who had been the consul of 185. The purpose of this article is to show that this new Bradua should not be identified with Bradua I; it also considers questions relating to his career and to his place within previously known families.

IRT 517 has this reading:

<i>M(arco) Atilio Metilio</i>	
<i>Bra[d]uae Cauci</i>	
<i>[dio Tertullo Claudio At]tico</i>	
<i>[Vibu]llo Pollion[i] Gaudio</i>	
<i>[L]atiari Atrio Basso</i>	5
<i>proco(n)s(uli)</i>	
<i>D(ecimus) Iunius Crescens</i>	
<i>D(ecimus) Iunius Galba</i>	
<i>Q(uintus) Calpurnius Capito</i>	
<i>L(ucius) Plautius Octavian[us]</i>	10
<i>patrono</i>	

Nearly all the names of Bradua II in this version are found also among those of the members of the families of Herodes Atticus and his wife Regilla (see stemma, *PIR*² C 802). These names indicate that Bradua II is of the same generation as the children of Herodes Atticus and closely related to them. The inscription offers few other clues for precise dating. One of the dedicators, D. Iunius Galba, may be identical with the Iunius Galba who appears in an inscription (*IRT* 534) dated by the African proconsulship of L. Hedi Rufus Lollianus Avitus, *cos. ord.* in A.D. 144 and proconsul around 157–158 (B. Thomasson, *Opuscula Romana* 7 [1969] 172). Barbieri states that the lettering seems to belong to the second half of the second century (*L'albo senatorio da Settimio Severo a Carino* [Rome 1952], 608).

¹*The Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania*, edited by J. M. Reynolds and J. B. Ward Perkins (Rome and London 1952).

However, several of the names on the inscription were, without any argumentation, restored wholly or in part by the editors of *IRT*. Since subsequent work has in all essentials been based on their text, it may be useful here to discuss explicitly the plausibility of each of their major restorations.²

First the *Cauci[di]o Tertullo . . .* in lines 2–3. A look in *PIR*² and the subsequent issues of *L'année épigraphique* reveals no *Cauci*—not completed by *-dius*. Furthermore, in each occurrence the name *Caucidius* is immediately followed by *Tertullus*. Hence these two names can be plausibly restored without making any use of the family relationships suggested by the other names of Bradua II. When once restored, they form yet another link in the connection between Bradua II and the family of Regilla, the wife of Herodes Atticus, whose fullest known name is Appia Annia Regilla Atilia Caucidia Tertulla (*PIR*² A 720).

Next, the restoration of . . .] *tico*. Among the senatorial families of the second century there seem to be only three names current which end in *-ticus*: *Atticus*, *Rusticus*, and *Asiaticus*. In line 3 of 517 the editors of *IRT* appear to allow up to about 10 letters between the end of [*Tertullo . . .*] and . . .] *tico*. Accordingly there is room for any of the three names, alone or together with another name, entire or abbreviated. None of the persons in *PIR*¹ or *PIR*² with a *Rusticus* or *Asiaticus* in his nomenclature shares even a single name with Bradua II or any known member of the clans of Regilla or Herodes. This lack of names in common indicates a lack of family relationships; consequently the names *Rusticus* or *Asiaticus* should be chosen only if no more appropriate one is available to complete *-ticus*. There are however clear reasons for giving preference to the completion *Atticus*. Firstly, his other names connect Bradua II beyond any doubt with at least the family of Regilla and her brother Bradua. With Regilla married to Herodes Atticus, her family, in turn, became related to that of her husband. Hence even if Bradua II were not related by blood to the family of Herodes one would still prefer, if required to choose among possible names, those connecting him with attested and illustrious relatives.

Four of the names of Bradua II—Pollio, Gavidius, Latiaris, Atrius—are found neither in the names of Regilla nor of Herodes Atticus nor in those of their contemporary or ancestral relatives. The corresponding feminine forms appear however in the names of the two daughters of

²Not having been able to consult the stone myself, I here assume that the undamaged part of the inscription was read and transcribed by the editors completely and accurately. The available photographs of the stone were kindly sent to me by the British School at Rome. Although they are well-focused, the surface of the stone is so rough and damaged that they cannot be used to support or oppose the editors' reading of the crucial lines 3 and 4.

Regilla and Herodes (see stemma, *PIR*² C 802). It is possible that in the case of the girls not all four of these names were derived exclusively from the friends or unattested relatives of Regilla's side of the family. If one or more come from the connections of Herodes, we have evidence of another link, perhaps that of blood, between Bradua II and the family of Herodes. Consequently, *Atticus* must be preferred in the inscription to *Rusticus* or *Asiaticus*. Not much need to be said about the completion of . . . *llio* in line 4. If the restoration *Atticus* is accepted on its own merits a closer connection is established with the family of Herodes Atticus. Therefore, *Vibullius* appears to be more plausible than any of several other attested names ending in *-llius*.

Finally the complete restoration [. . . *Claudio* . . .] in line 3. It, or its variants *Ti. Claudio* or *Ti. Cl.*, have been universally accepted (or at least not opposed). The series *Claudius Atticus Vibullius* appears quite suitable in the family of Herodes Atticus and may well be right. In the following discussion it will be first considered whether the reconstructions based on the reading *Claudio* are completely satisfactory. This reading would be inevitable if Bradua I and Bradua II were shown to be the same person. The editors of *IRT* considered this identification probable. No such identification was made by Barbieri (*L'albo senatorio* 607–608) and Degraasi (*I Fasti Consolari dell' Impero Romano dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo* [Rome 1952] 114). Both of them dissociate the proconsul of Africa from the son of Herodes Atticus and keep the latter as the consul of 185.

Further changes were subsequently advocated by Pflaum.³ While following Degraasi in dissociating the two, he also took the consulship of 185 from the degenerate son of Herodes Atticus, assigning it to Bradua II. Pflaum's change involves no difficulty with names. Of the eleven inscriptions collected by him, nine refer to the consul of 185 as *Bradua*; the other two have *Atticus*. In Pflaum's opinion Bradua II was preferable to Bradua I because of the latter's foolishness and debauchery (description in Philostratus *VS* 558). Using his names as evidence, Pflaum also suggested that Bradua II was the son of Appius Annius Atilius Bradua (*PIR*² A 636), *cos. ord.* in A.D. 160 and a brother of Regilla, the wife of Herodes Atticus; as mother he chose an unattested sister of Herodes Atticus. Pflaum's hypothesis is attractive; the names of Bradua II strongly require the generation and the degree of relationship postulated for him by Pflaum.

After some years Pflaum's work was attacked by Thomasson in his book on the proconsuls of Africa;⁴ he reverted to the position of *IRT*,

³H. G. Pflaum, "Inscriptions de la Tripolitaine romaine," *Syria* 30 (1953) 304–306.

⁴B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* (Lund 1960) 2. 101–104.

i.e., that there was only one Bradua Atticus, the son of Herodes Atticus. Thomasson's arguments were however rather ineffective since he did not answer Pflaum's question as to why among the fourteen or so names of Bradua II we apparently find neither Appius nor Regillus, both present in the much shorter name of Bradua I. In a review of Thomasson's work E. Birley rightly pronounced himself in favour of Pflaum's proposals.⁵ The combined weight of Pflaum's and E. Birley's opinions have however failed to convince Thomasson, who has recently reaffirmed his belief in the oneness of Bradua I and Bradua II.⁶

I feel that the differences in the nomenclature of Bradua I and Bradua II are sufficiently important to require their separation. There is moreover an additional piece of evidence which appears to require the existence of both Braduas. Bradua II was a proconsul of Africa. Yet on a Smyrnaean inscription a Marcus Atilius Bradua is attested as a proconsul of Asia:

Νεωκόρος Σμυρναίων
 δῆμος ἐτείμησεν
 Μάρκον Ἀττίλιον (*sic*) Βραδούα
 τὸν ἀνθύπατον
 ἐπιμεληθέντος Μάρκου
 Αὐρηλίου Περπέρου τοῦ
 ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλῶν στρατηγοῦ.

5

[From CIG 3189 (= IGRR 4.1413)]

If, as was believed for example by Dittenberger (*SIG*³ 862, note 2), this proconsul of Asia is identical with Bradua I, then Bradua II should not be identical with Bradua I. Only one man, Marius Maximus, is attested to have held the governorships of both Africa and Asia.⁷ No demonstration should be based on postulating another occurrence of this exceptional phenomenon, especially since the separation of Bradua I and Bradua II has been made likely on nomenclature alone.

The Smyrnaean inscription has been ignored, as far as I know, by all scholars dealing with the identity of the two Braduas. The cause of this neglect may be Groag's opinion in *PIR*² A 1303, which would give this inscription to M. Atilius Postumus Bradua, a proconsul of Asia under Domitian. Although a Smyrnaean strategos Marcus Aurelius Perperes appears on it Groag states: *titulum non ante M. Aurelium positum esse ex nomine Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Περπέρου τοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ὀπλῶν στρατηγοῦ nequaquam concludere licet*. He may have thought that the absence on the inscription of Smyrna's second neocory, granted under Hadrian (*IGRR* 4.1431),

⁵E. Birley, *JRS* 52 (1962) 224.

⁶B. E. Thomasson, "Verschiedenes zu den Proconsules Africae," *Eranos* 67 (1969) 190–191.

⁷For his career see now R. Syme, *Emperors and Biography* (Oxford 1971) 135–137, 141–143 and *passim*.

strongly suggested a date prior to the rule of Marcus Aurelius. However, the beginning of the inscription appears to be defective (commentary to *CIG* 3189). If so, the word *dis* may have originally been present before *νεωκόρος*. Even the omission of *dis* before *νεωκόρος* would not be unparalleled on stone; it occurs, e.g., in *IGRR* 1.797. Coins, too, display irregularities (*IGRR* 4.1413, note 1). These considerations, especially the imperfect condition of the stone, make it inadvisable to date the inscription from the number of Smyrna's neocories. Perhaps Groag considered it likely that the Perperes, or one of his ancestors, was granted Roman citizenship and took the name Marcus Aurelius before the reign of the emperor of that name; he could also have been the descendant of some Italian emigrant to Smyrna. It is, of course, impossible to prove with mathematical certainty that a Greek of unknown antecedents did not inherit his imperial name from a homonymous distant *negotiator*. However, an investigation of the occurrence of the name *Marcus Aurelius* shows, I believe, that in the Eastern part of the empire it is extremely rare before the rule of Marcus (161–180). This appears to be the case even in Latin inscriptions, at least in those selected by Dessau. Consequently, an otherwise undated inscription from the Greek East mentioning a Greek called Marcus Aurelius (and the name Perperes, as well as his office of strategos, show that our man was a Greek by race or culture) must, in principle, not be put before A.D. 161. A pattern of the temporal distribution of the name appears clearly in inscriptions.

The indexes to the three volumes of *IGRR* list 148 *Marci Aurelii*. So far as I can see, only one occurs in an inscription which may require a date before the rule of Marcus (1.135). Other sections of the Greek-speaking part of the Roman Empire show a similar shortage of earlier *Marci Aurelii*. Box found that in Laconia the most common nomina of Roman citizens were imperial ones: Aelius, Aurelius, Claudius, Flavius, Iulius, and Ulpus. According to him no Laconian inscription containing these *nomina* needs to be dated before the rule of the respective emperor.⁸ In Attica, according to Kapetanopoulos, of the twenty-six attested *Marci Aurelii* none must precede the emperor of that name.⁹ Even in the Latin-speaking part of the Empire, very few *Marci Aurelii* appear in inscriptions earlier than the rule of the emperor Marcus. Of the 139 *Marci Aurelii* listed in the index of Dessau's *ILS* only two must be dated before A.D. 161 (Nos. 3185 and 1949). It appears, then, if the evidence of the inscriptions adduced above is representative, that any undated Marcus Aurelius, especially from the Greek-speaking part of the Empire, will probably have obtained his citizenship during or after the rule of Marcus Aurelius. If out

⁸H. Box, "Roman Citizenship in Laconia," *JRS* 21 (1931) 201.

⁹E. Kapetanopoulos, "Attic Inscriptions: Notes," *Archaiologike Ephemeris* (1968) 182 and note 1.

of 287 inscriptions in *IGRR* and *ILS* only 3 (or 0.9%) record Marci Aurelii earlier than 161, with only one (*IGRR* 1.135) ostensibly of the same social and national background as Perperes, then it would appear to be doubtful method to date any otherwise undateable Marcus Aurelius before the rule of Marcus. Consequently the inscription mentioning Marcus Aurelius Perperes and Marcus Atilius Bradua the proconsul was probably set up after A.D. 161. If so, at least two consular Braduae Attici should be postulated for that period, governors respectively of Africa and of Asia. On chronological grounds, the proconsul of Asia mentioned in *IGRR* 4.1413 (= *CIG* 3189) could also have been Appius Annius Atilius Bradua, *cos. ord.* in 160 (*PIR*² A 636). The *praenomen* Marcus is not, however, attested for him.¹⁰ In our present state of documentation preference has to be given to Bradua I, who does have Marcus among his attested names. There seems to be no good reason for dating the Smyrnaean inscription to a period later than that of Braduae I and II since no one with the name *Marcus Atilius Bradua* is available. In short, the approximate date of the inscription from Smyrna as well as the differences in the nomenclature of Bradua I and Bradua II strongly require their separation. Thomasson's case is thus further weakened.

However, objections can be made to Pflaum's hypothesis as well. It seems that some of the many names of Bradua II can be better explained if one assumes for him parents different from those proposed by Pflaum. If the consul of 160 Appius Annius Atilius Bradua had been the father of Bradua II one would expect among the numerous names of the latter not only the *praenomen* Appius but especially the *nomen gentile* Annius; both are attested in the male line for several consecutive generations (see

¹⁰There can be little doubt that among his names Appius is a *praenomen*. The names of his presumed father and paternal grandfather are Appius Annius Gallus (*PIR*² A 674) and Appius Annius Trebonius Gallus (*PIR*² A 692). The latter's father may have been Appius Annius Gallus (*PIR*² A 653). In each of the 3 cases Annius is obviously the *nomen*; hence Appius will normally be taken as a *praenomen*. There is no compelling reason to interpret differently the nomenclature of Bradua.

Furthermore, the longest attested form of Bradua's name is Appius Annius Atilius Bradua (*CIL* 6. 2896 = *ILS* 2109). Although inscriptions of the period sometimes omit *praenomina* in names consisting of two or even three constituent names, there seem to be exceedingly few examples of longer names not beginning with a *praenomen*. A Mummius Niger Valerius Vegetus appears in *CIL* 11. 3003 (= *ILS* 5771). Although his precise chronology and family affiliations are uncertain (*RE* 8A.1. 237, s.v. Valerius 375), he probably belongs in the second century and may be identical with the senator L. Mummius Niger Q. Valerius Vegetus Severinus Caucidius Tertullus (*JOAI* 29 [1935] 197-198). Trebonius Proculus Mettius Modestus listed by Pierre Lambrechts, (*La Composition du sénat romain de l'accession au trône d'Hadrien à la mort de Commode* [Antwerp 1936] No. 91) is not an example of 4 names without a *praenomen*. There is a gap on the inscription just before Trebonius which could have contained the *praenomen* (*JHS* 10 [1889] 74 No. 27).

Therefore, Appius in the name of Bradua is best interpreted as a *praenomen*.

stemma to *PIR*² C 802). Neither name is there. The attested complete name (in the *IRT* version) of Bradua II seems too long to assume the accidental omission of the two names. One possible improvement on Pflaum's reconstruction would be to consider as parents of Bradua II the brother of Herodes Atticus, Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodianus and an unattested, possibly older, sister of Regilla, the wife of Herodes Atticus. If objections are made to postulating an unattested sister as the mother, it must be remembered that of the parents suggested by Pflaum the mother is likewise unattested. With Herodianus as the father the absence of Appius and Annus is not surprising. Among the sons of Herodes Atticus, Bradua I lacks Annus; Regillus has neither Appius nor Annus. The mother's side was here of less importance. Little is known of Herodianus. He seems to have predeceased his father Atticus since Herodes Atticus appears to have been the sole heir of the family fortune (Philostratus *VS* 547–549). The name Herodianus may indicate that he was younger than his better-known brother. Nothing known about his life-span prevents him from having been the father of a son of Bradua II's apparent generation. He could have been close in age to his brother Herodes Atticus (born ca A.D. 101). He is attested only from two undatable inscriptions from the island of Ceos (*IG* 12.5.631 = *SIG*³ 855, and *BCH* 78 [1954] 335–336, No. 12). Since it is not known in which year Atticus, his father, died, there is no firm date *ante quem* for the death of Herodianus. Atticus was still alive around 134–135 and his death most likely occurred in the first part of the 140's¹¹ (for sources and a reasonable interpretation see *PIR*² C 801).

A chronological objection can be made to the above interpretation. It is commonly assumed that the father of Regilla, the wife of Herodes Atticus, was Appius Annus Gallus, consul designate in A.D. 138 (for the

¹¹Even in recent literature (e.g., *Der kleine Pauly*, 2. 1095 and D. J. Geagan, *The Athenian Constitution After Sulla* [Princeton 1967] 99) one still encounters followers of either Münscher or Graindor, both of whom claimed to have demonstrated that Atticus must have predeceased Hadrian (A.D. 138). Their arguments appear to be invalid. Münscher (*RE* 8 [1913] 927–928) adduces 3 inscriptions supposedly showing that Herodes Atticus succeeded his father at Athens as *archiereus* of the emperors already under Hadrian. They, in fact, offer no such proof. A good account of the priesthood is given by J. H. Oliver (*The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law* [Baltimore 1950] 73–101).

Graindor, while rightly rejecting Münscher's argument, bases his proof on the Roman law of inheritance (*Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* [Cairo 1930] 30–37 and 71–79). His chronology rests on the assumption that *fideicommissa* to peregrines were abolished under Hadrian. Since they were prohibited already under Vespasian (The Gnomon of the Idios Logos, section 18; a discussion with bibliography in S. Riccobono jr. *Il Gnomon dell' Idios Logos* [Palermo 1950] 135–136). Graindor's interpretation of the will of Atticus is legally unsound and no safe conclusions regarding the year of Atticus' death can be drawn from it.

date see H. G. Pflaum, *Historia-Augusta-Colloquium* Bonn 1963 [publ. 1964] 110–112). As a patrician (*PIR*² A 654) he would have been born around A.D. 105. Even if Herodianus, his supposed son-in-law, had lived into the early 140's Gallus still would have been a grandfather before the age of 40. Of course, he probably married early. His postulated son Bradua, consul in A.D. 160, would be born no later than 127. A daughter born, for example, in 126 could have given birth at 16 in 142. It should also be remembered that this Gallus is not directly attested to have been the father of Regilla and Bradua. All we know is that the father of Regilla was called Appius Annius Gallus (*Olympia* 5: *Die Inschriften von Olympia*, No. 619). The consul of A.D. 108, Appius Annius Trebonius Gallus (*PIR*² A 692), usually assumed to have been Regilla's grandfather, may not have been too old to be the father. If he, like the younger Gallus, was a patrician, he would have been born around A.D. 75 and possibly 52 years old at the birth of his son Bradua, the consul of 160. An entirely plausible situation, especially if one considers that Regilla was pregnant when she died ca 160 (Philostratus *VS* 555). Herodes was about 59 years old at the time. If a son of his had been born in 160 he would have been consul in 193 at the earliest (if made a patrician)—a span of 50 years between the consulates of a father and a son. Therefore, one cannot reject the paternity of the older Gallus, as has been done, simply because of the 52-year gap between his consulship (108) and that of Bradua (160). To sum up, Herodianus and a sister of Regilla would be chronologically possible parents and would account better than Pflaum's candidates for the names of Bradua II.¹²

Apart from accounting better for the names of Bradua II these parents are also better able to withstand an objection proffered against the parents proposed by Pflaum. Thomasson plausibly remarks that if Bradua, the brother of Regilla, had married a sister of Herodes Atticus,

¹²It could be objected that this reconstruction takes no account of the identity of the first 4 names of Bradua II with those of the consul of A.D. 108 M. Atilius Metilius Bradua (*PIR*² A 1302). I do not think that this identity of names directly affects the present argument. Because of his names Bradua II is almost certainly of the same generation as the daughters of Herodes Atticus. Therefore, a consul of A.D. 108 would be too old to have been his father. Furthermore, Bradua the consul of 108 is probably identical with M. Appius Bradua (*PIR*² A 1298), the maternal grandfather of Regilla (B. E. Thomasson, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinzen Nordafrikas von Augustus bis Diocletianus* [Lund 1960] 2. 103–104; R. Syme, *REA* 67 (1965) 344; G. Alföldy, *Fasti Hispanienses* (Wiesbaden 1969) 26 and note 136). If so, Bradua the consul of 108 would be the great-grandfather of Bradua II and appears in his polyonymous nomenclature because of blood relationship. The initial position of the four names need not imply that they must have been derived from his father. In the case of Herodes Atticus, for instance, his fullest attested name is L. Vibullius Hipparchus Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes, although his father Atticus' main *praenomen* and *nomen* were Ti. Claudius rather than L. Vibullius (*PIR*² C 801).

Philostratus could be expected to notice this double relationship when dealing with the murder charge brought against Herodes Atticus by the same Bradua (*Die Statthalter* 102, notes 406 and 409). Philostratus had much less reason to mention Herodianus. In general, it is not the habit of Philostratus to expatiate on the relatives of his sophists.

There is, however, a third, and perhaps the best, way of dealing with the name and ancestry of Bradua II. As was seen above, the names of Bradua II as given in *IRT* did not correspond to the expected degree with those of Pflaum's suggested father, the consul of 160. On the other hand, while the names of Herodianus, the other suggested father, agreed better with those of Bradua II, the latter's postulated mother, a sister of Regilla, could have been too young to have been the wife of Herodianus if he was dead by the early 140's. Both the reconstruction of Pflaum and the one suggesting Herodianus as father were based on the text of *IRT*, including the restoration [... *Claudio* ...] in line 3.

The third reconstruction consists in changing the *IRT* restoration [... *Claudio* ...]. It contains 7 letters. If one substituted [... *Ap. Annio* ...] (7 letters) or [... *App. Annio* ...] (8 letters) the difficulties in nomenclature connected with Pflaum's restoration would be largely removed. With *App. Annius* among his names Bradua II would have in his nomenclature the elements expected in a son of Bradua the consul of 160. (The form *App. Annius* is attested for the latter in *CIL* 13. 1751 = *ILS* 4131). There would be no difficulties in chronology. As a patrician and a consul in 160 Bradua the father was probably born around 127. His son Bradua II could then have been of precisely the right age to be a patrician *consul ordinarius* in 185. However, since Bradua I was a patrician too, they are both equally strong candidates for that consulate. This last reconstruction then appears more plausible than the other two, and should be preferred to them.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO, LONDON