

# Children, Memory, and Family Identity in Roman Culture

Edited by  
VÉRONIQUE DASEN  
and  
THOMAS SPÄTH

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford ox2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore

South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Oxford University Press 2010

The moral rights of the author have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

First published 2010

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Library of Congress Control Number: 2010933158

Typeset by SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry, India

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn

ISBN 978-0-19-958257-0

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

## *Preface and Acknowledgements*

This volume presents a selection of the papers delivered at the Fifth Roman Family Conference, 'Secret Families, Family Secrets', which took place in June 2007 in Fribourg (Switzerland). The conference, held for the first time in Europe, assembled specialists from different academic and cultural traditions: American, Australian, Belgian, Finnish, French, German, Italian, and Swiss.

Thanks are due to a number of institutions for their generous financial support which made the conference possible: the Swiss National Sciences Foundation, the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Département des Sciences de l'Antiquité of the University of Fribourg. We are also very grateful for the editorial assistance of Oxford University Press, for the judicious comments of OUP's readers, and to Lukas Grossmann and Diana Valaperta who contributed to the preparation of the final version of the volume.

Our thanks go above all to Beryl Rawson, for the outstanding impulse she gave to Roman family studies and for her trust and continuous encouragement.

V.D. and T.S.



## Contents

<i>List of Contributors</i>	ix
<i>List of Figures</i>	x
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
<i>Véronique Dasen and Thomas Späth</i>	
I. FAMILY IDENTITIES AND TRADITIONS	
1. Remembering one's Ancestors, following in their Footsteps, being like them: The Role and Forms of Family Memory in the Building of Identity	19
<i>Catherine Baroin</i>	
2. Roman Patchwork Families: Surrogate Parenting, Socialization, and the Shaping of Tradition	49
<i>Ann-Cathrin Harders</i>	
3. Children and the Transmission of Religious Knowledge	73
<i>Francesca Prescendi</i>	
4. Women and Children in Ancient Landscape	95
<i>Michel E. Fuchs</i>	
5. Wax and Plaster Memories: Children in Elite and non-Elite Strategies	109
<i>Véronique Dasen</i>	
6. Cicero, Tullia, and Marcus: Gender-Specific Concerns for Family Tradition?	147
<i>Thomas Späth</i>	
7. Children and the Memory of Parents in the Late Roman World	173
<i>Ville Vuolanto</i>	

## II. CHILDREN ON THE MARGINS?

8. Degrees of Freedom: <i>Vernae</i> and Junian Latins in the Roman <i>familia</i> <i>Beryl Rawson</i>	195
9. <i>Modestia</i> vs. <i>licentia</i> : Seneca on Childhood and Status in the Roman Family <i>Francesca Mencacci</i>	223
10. <i>Delicia</i> -Children Revisited: The Evidence of Statius' <i>Silvae</i> <i>Christian Laes</i>	245
11. The Sick Child in his Family: A Risk for the Family Tradition <i>Danielle Gourevitch</i>	273
12. Hidden in Plain Sight: <i>Expositi</i> in the Community <i>Judith Evans Grubbs</i>	293
13. Rome: The Invisible Children of Incest <i>Philippe Moreau</i>	311
<i>References</i>	331
<i>General Index</i>	363
<i>Index of Ancient Authors and People</i>	367
<i>Index of Latin and Greek Terms</i>	372

## *List of Contributors*

**Catherine Baroin** is Maître de conférences of Latin Language and Literature at the University of Rouen (France).

**Véronique Dasen** is Professor in Classical Archaeology at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland).

**Judith Evans Grubbs** is Professor of Roman History at Emory University (USA).

**Michel Fuchs** is Professor in Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Lausanne (Switzerland).

**Danielle Gourevitch** is Directeur d'études at the École pratique des Hautes Études in Paris (France).

**Ann-Cathrin Harders** is Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Münster (Germany).

**Christian Laes** is Assistant Professor of Ancient History at the University of Antwerp, and Assistant Professor of Latin and Ancient History at the Free University of Brussels (Belgium).

**Francesca Mencacci** is Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Siena (Italy).

**Philippe Moreau** is Professor of Latin Language and Literature at the University Paris Est Créteil (France).

**Francesca Prescendi** is Professor in History of Religions at the University of Geneva (Switzerland).

**Beryl Rawson** is Professor Emerita and Adjunct Professor in Classics at the Australian National University, Canberra (Australia).

**Thomas Späth** is Professor in Ancient Cultures and Constructions of Antiquity at the University of Bern (Switzerland).

**Ville Vuolanto** is Lecturer at the Department of History and Philosophy, University of Tampere (Finland).





## Cicero, Tullia, and Marcus

*Gender-Specific Concerns for Family Tradition?\***Thomas Späth*

Various recent studies have suggested that the love of fathers and mothers for their children was not only one of the ideals of Roman culture but also a natural everyday occurrence. This perspective can be seen as a reaction to Philippe Ariès's opposite claim, advanced in his landmark study of children and families in the Ancien Régime (1960). Contrary to recent views, Ariès argued that a proper notion of childhood emerged only in the modern period, and that the high child mortality rate in pre-modern societies thwarted the development of an emotional bond between parents and children, especially infants and small children.<sup>1</sup> Over the past few decades, such claims have met with increasing criticism. In her contribution to the second *Roman Family Conference* (1988), Suzanne Dixon, for instance, asserts that a 'sentimental ideal of Roman family life' had already arisen in the Late Republic. She compares this emotional ideal without further hesitation with the modern ideal of the family as a haven of

\* I began developing the ideas set forth in this essay in a seminar on 'Gender Relations in Cicero's Letters', co-taught with Leonhard Burckhardt at the University of Basel in the summer semester 2002. I am indebted to discussions with both him and the seminar participants, and gratefully acknowledge Dagmar Bargetzi's seminar paper (2002) in particular. I am very grateful to Mark Kyburz for rendering my German thoughts into English prose.

<sup>1</sup> Ariès 1973; for details, see the Introduction to this volume.

peace and refuge against a hostile outside world.<sup>2</sup> In the same collection of essays, edited by Beryl Rawson, Emiel Eyben observes that sons would have likewise benefited from increasing paternal ‘warmth and tenderness’, and dates this development to the turn of the third century BCE.<sup>3</sup>

Seen against this background, the present essay discusses Marcus Tullius Cicero’s relationship with his children—Tullia and Marcus—on the basis of his letters.<sup>4</sup> A glance at earlier studies would lead one to expect support for Eyben’s notion of ‘paternal love’<sup>5</sup> and also for Dixon’s ‘sentimental ideal’. The relevant literature does indeed mention Cicero’s almost obsessive love for Tullia,<sup>6</sup> his ‘unbounded affection for Tullia,’<sup>7</sup> or at the very least observes that he loved his daughter more than his son.<sup>8</sup> Can our modern notions of parental love, however, actually grasp Cicero’s ‘paternal love’ for his daughter?

<sup>2</sup> Dixon 1991: 113. Likewise, Judith Hallett (1984) emphasizes the emotional bond between father and daughter (see also Suzanne Dixon’s critical review of Hallett’s essay in *American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986), 125–30); see further Pomeroy 1976.

<sup>3</sup> Eyben 1991: 142 seems to believe in ‘natural’ feelings when he speaks of ‘maternal instinct’ (117), which he would probably set alongside paternal ‘instinct’. In her contribution to the fourth *Roman Family Conference*, Susan Treggiari (2005: 18) also uses the term ‘paternal instinct’, but places it in its historical and cultural context, defining it as ‘defence of hearth, home, fortunes, household gods, wives and children’ rather than as a purported universal. Her essay analyses the *Roman* perception of ‘natural affection’ in family relations in terms of their rhetorical use in Cicero’s political and court speeches.

<sup>4</sup> Hereinafter, I refer to M. Tullius Cicero (106–43) as ‘Cicero’, and to his eponymous son (65–after 25) by his first name ‘Marcus’; ‘Q. Cicero’ designates Cicero’s younger brother (c.102–43), and ‘Quintus’ his son (67/66–43). All dates refer to the period BCE.

<sup>5</sup> The second section of Eyben’s essays bears this title; see Eyben 1991: 116–21.

<sup>6</sup> Hallett 1984: 134.

<sup>7</sup> Carp 1981: 351.

<sup>8</sup> Eyben 1991: 139. Elizabeth Rawson (1979: 197) also emphasizes how close Cicero was to his daughter, who showed greater understanding for him than his wife Terentia, for whom their son Marcus possessed ‘his mother’s practical outlook and abilities’, thus explaining his father’s lack of continuous interest in him (Rawson 1979: 223). See also Treggiari 2007: 161–2, especially n. 49, which cites the relevant literature, and n. 51, which collates the diminutives and other epithets used to refer to Tullia (see further Ermete 2003: 232 n. 1311). For a general discussion of paternal affection, specifically of fathers favouring daughters over sons, see especially Hallett 1984: 62 ff.; Pomeroy (1976: 215) refers to Plutarch’s *coniugalia praecepta* 36, *mor.* 143 B, in which he observes that fathers would love their daughters more than their sons because they felt more needed by the former.

Or does his behaviour instead reveal a specifically Roman type of parental affection? Did Cicero's endeavour as *pater familias* to secure and perpetuate both the tradition of a consular *domus* and the name of the Tullii Cicerones, which he had founded as a *homo novus*, determine his relationship with his children? If so, however, how would this dovetail with Cicero favouring his daughter over his son, who could after all hand down his name from one generation to the next? Was not a male child,<sup>9</sup> specifically, obliged to follow in the 'footsteps of his ancestors', as Catherine Baroin describes the prevailing social norms and expectations about male descendants? Would not Marcus therefore, by virtue of *imitatio patris*, have been obliged to imitate his father's founding of the family's consular standing?<sup>10</sup>

These questions raise two issues: first, Cicero's specific concerns for his children; and, second, the gender-specific differences between Cicero's treatment of his daughter and his son. In what follows, I will first compare Cicero's comments in his letters about his children's education and schooling. Secondly, I will discuss his views on promoting his children's careers (that is, grooming Marcus for a career in politics and preparing Tullia for her various marriages—and thus for her integration into society and occupation of a particular social rank). This comparative approach to Cicero's treatment of his children serves to illuminate the everyday practices involved in establishing a tradition in a 'new family',<sup>11</sup> how such a tradition was passed on to its children, and how it thus became established as a *tradition*.

<sup>9</sup> Compared to the numerous studies on the relationship between Cicero and Tullia, his relationship with his son has hitherto received scant attention; see, however, Hall 2005. In the early 1930s, James Stinchcomb (1932/3) compared the biographical facts about Quintus and Marcus with the corresponding passages in the letters. He claims that Marcus received Cicero's continuous support, even though he hands down the negative image of Marcus still evident in Syme (1939: 303, 498) and even in Fündling's more recent *DNP* essay ('[I 10] Tullius Cicero, M., in *DNP* 12 (2002), 902–3).

<sup>10</sup> See Baroin's contribution to this volume; for a discussion of *imitatio patris* as a social norm in Roman culture, see Scholz 2006.

<sup>11</sup> Even though the relevant literature and scholarship customarily speaks of *homo novus*—and not, for instance, of *domus nova*—I would like to coin the term 'new family' to identify the family of the *novus homo*, because individual social ascendancy obviously also implies that of the narrower and wider kinship. On the close relationship between the *domus*, that is, the domestic sphere and socio-political status and prestige, see Burckhardt 2003.

Finally, I will consider the nature of Cicero's 'paternal love', and discuss the similarities and contrasts with present-day conceptions.

## 1. SCHOOLING AND EDUCATING CHILDREN

This first area of paternal care reveals a radical difference between daughter and son: Cicero utterly ignores his daughter's education in his letters, unlike his son's. It would be mistaken, however, to assume that Tullia remained uneducated. In the aristocratic *domus*, daughters quite obviously took part in social events, such as invitations to cultivate friendships and the conversations held on such occasions. Cicero's earliest surviving letters to Atticus, written in 68 and 67, attest to his daughter's involvement. For instance, Tullia, who was about 10 years old at the time,<sup>12</sup> asks her father to be remembered to Atticus, whom she admonishes for not yet giving her the small gift that he had promised her.<sup>13</sup> What Beryl Rawson has observed about the Roman aristocracy in general thus also applies to Tullia's acquisition of knowledge and social customs:<sup>14</sup> in an intellectual milieu in which Roman poets and Greek intellectuals moved freely, the everyday communication about philosophy, literature, and politics in the aristocratic *domus* contributed to the socialization of daughters as well as sons.<sup>15</sup> Accordingly, Tullia would have had access to Cicero's library, and we can assume that father and daughter would have discussed books.<sup>16</sup> Later letters reveal that Cicero looked upon his daughter as an educated woman: for not only does she write to

<sup>12</sup> Tullia's precise year of birth is unknown; she must have been born between 79 and 76. See further Hallett 1984: 140 n. 77.

<sup>13</sup> Cic. *Att.* 1.5.8 [SB 1], 1.8.3 [SB 4], 1.10.6 [SB 2]; here and in the following, the first numeral refers to the *Vulgata* edition of Cicero's *Letters*, the second to Shackleton Bailey's edition. For the English translation and the dating of the letters, I follow Shackleton Bailey, unless otherwise mentioned.

<sup>14</sup> Rawson 2003: 153–7.

<sup>15</sup> See also Peter Scholz (2006: 128), who considers the parental home the site of 'primary socialization'. As Ann-Cathrin Harders mentions in the introduction to her contribution to this volume, *socialization* as the unintentional acquisition of knowledge must be distinguished from *education* as the intentional transfer of knowledge.

<sup>16</sup> Rawson 2003: 156.

him,<sup>17</sup> but she also reads the letters addressed to him over his shoulder,<sup>18</sup> and indeed shares her assessment of the critical political situation in 49 with him.<sup>19</sup> But the education she receives at home prior to her first marriage—somewhere between the age of 13 and 16—seems to have been so self-evident that it goes unnoticed in Cicero's letters.

By contrast, Cicero's correspondence contains many explicit references to his son's education. In a letter to Atticus written in April 59, Cicero conveys his 6-year-old son's request to 'give Aristodemus the same answer about him as you gave about his cousin, your nephew'. Shackleton Bailey suspects that Aristodemus, referred to only once in Cicero's letters, was the boys' private tutor, and that they were obliged to send their apologies for missing a grammar lesson.<sup>20</sup> Two weeks later, Cicero wrote two further letters to Atticus, on 16 (or 17) and 20 April respectively, whose final salutations each contain a line of Greek. In the first letter, this reads *καὶ Κικέρων ὁ μικρὸς ἀσπάζεται Τίτον τὸν Ἀθηναῖον*—'Le petit Cicéron salue Tite l'Athénien', as Shackleton Bailey translates the line according to his ingenious convention to render the Greek in French. He refers here to Wieland's nice idea, for which there is obviously no evidence, that Marcus, who had begun to learn writing Greek, had appended the line.<sup>21</sup>

Three aspects of this first reference to Marcus' education are worth noting: first, Cicero's paternal interest in his son's schooling; second, the sons of the two Cicero brothers are educated together; and third, the interesting reference to the essentially bilingual education of the Roman elite.<sup>22</sup> A survey of the other passages in the letters indicating

<sup>17</sup> Even though the correspondence contains no letter written by Tullia, explicit reference to such letters is made; see, for instance, *Cic. Att.* 10.2.2 [SB 192] (dated 5 or 6 Apr. 49) or *Att.* 10.8.1 [SB 199] (2 May 45).

<sup>18</sup> *Cic. Att.* 10.13.1 [SB 205].

<sup>19</sup> *Cic. Att.* 10.8.1 [SB 199].

<sup>20</sup> *Cic. Att.* 2.7.5 [SB 27]; see Shackleton Bailey 1965–70: vol. 1, 367.

<sup>21</sup> *Cic. Att.* 2.9.4 [SB 29]; see also *Att.* 2.12.4 [SB 30] and 2.15.4 [SB 35]. See also Shackleton Bailey's comments on the passages.

<sup>22</sup> Unlike a long tradition of German classics scholarship, which has postulated the fundamental difference between Greek and Roman culture since the nineteenth century, a view that is also held in this volume by Ann-Catherin Harders (with reference especially to the work of Ulrich Gotter), I assume the indistinguishable

Cicero's efforts on behalf of his son's education confirms the first two aspects mentioned above: Cicero's concern for his son's education and for good tutoring, and his mutual concern for his son and nephew. Another aspect is also evident, namely Cicero's paternal endeavour to oversee and ensure his son's progress and studiousness.

One of the letters written to his brother, Quintus, establishes quite clearly that Cicero was actively involved in the education of both his son and nephew. Should Quintus raise no objections, Cicero writes in 54, he would tutor his nephew himself, since he had now gained quite some practice through teaching Marcus during his enforced political inactivity.<sup>23</sup> Thereupon, his brother, Quintus Cicero, writes to his son, instructing him to now regard his uncle as his tutor.<sup>24</sup> Cicero sees his tuition as meaningfully complementing Paeonius' rhetoric lessons. He informs his brother, furthermore, that he will introduce Quintus to the declamation exercises himself.<sup>25</sup>

One important tutor for both Marcus and Quintus was Dionysius, a freedman of Atticus. In July 54, Cicero writes to Atticus, requesting his earliest possible visit so that Dionysius could teach both him and his son.<sup>26</sup> He reiterates his demand a few months later.<sup>27</sup> Three years later, Dionysius is in fact present in Cicero's household, who commends him in his letters to Atticus.<sup>28</sup> Even though he remarks that the two boys complain about Dionysius' fits of violent temper, Cicero defends their tutor to the utmost: never had a man been more learned, more virtuous, and more loving of Atticus and himself than Dionysius.<sup>29</sup> It is thus quite surprising that two years later, in 49, Cicero describes this once highly reputable tutor as lacking the

Graeco-Roman blending of educational ideals among the Roman elite; see further Späth 2007 (for a discussion of bilingual education, see 163–4 and the references to Dubuisson and Dupont/Valette-Cagnac).

<sup>23</sup> Cic. *ad. Q. fr.* 2.13.2 [SB 17]; see also Cic. *ad. Q. fr.* 3.4.6 [SB 24]: Cicero takes Marcus to the Tusculanum, not for recreational but instead for educational purposes.

<sup>24</sup> Cic. *ad. Q. fr.* 3.1.19 [SB 21].

<sup>25</sup> Cic. *ad. Q. fr.* 3.3.4 [SB 23]; for a general discussion of rhetorical education, see Rawson 2003: 147–53; for a detailed discussion of declamation, see Kaster 2001.

<sup>26</sup> Cic. *Att.* 4.15.10 [SB 90], letter dated 27 July 54.

<sup>27</sup> Cic. *Att.* 4.18.5 [SB 92], written between 24 Oct. and 2 Nov.

<sup>28</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.9.3 [SB 102].

<sup>29</sup> Cic. *Att.* 6.1.12 [SB 115]: *pueri autem aiunt eum furenter irasci; sed homo nec doctior nec sanctor fieri potest nec tui meique amantior.*

gift of teaching. He would therefore rather teach his son and his nephew himself. In a letter to Atticus written two days later, he reports the dismissal of Dionysius.<sup>30</sup>

These references suggest that, as a father, Cicero was intensely concerned with his son's progress and tutoring, just as he was as a *patruus* (a paternal uncle) with his nephew's.<sup>31</sup> This concern involved strict supervision. Various letters concerning Marcus' study visits to Athens in 45 and 44 attest to his father's surveillance: Marcus, on the one hand, writes his father letters that demonstrate that his writing style and knowledge of literature were progressing—in two letters to Atticus, Cicero praises his son's letters, written 'in a good archaic style indeed and pretty long'.<sup>32</sup> Cicero, however, is not content to let the matter rest there. In several letters to Atticus written in the spring of 44, he expresses his intention to travel to Athens to observe his son's progress for himself.<sup>33</sup> This intention never materialized. Failing his own inspections, Cicero commissioned various tutors, including Leonidas and Herodes, to send regular progress reports.<sup>34</sup> C. Trebonius, one of Cicero's fellow senators, visits Marcus in Athens on his journey to assuming office as proconsul of the province of Asia. In a letter dated May 44, he congratulates Cicero on his

<sup>30</sup> *Att.* 8.4.1–2 [SB 156], dated 22 Feb. 49; see, however, 8.5.1 [SB 157] (written on the same day) where Cicero mentions reconciliation with Dionysius and demands a sharp letter from him, addressed to Atticus, in return; *Att.* 8.10 [SB 159], dated 25 Feb. 49, reports the dismissal of Dionysius; in this letter, Cicero mentions that while he is reluctant to see him leave as the boys' tutor, he is pleased to see the back of an *homo ingratus*, an 'ungrateful fellow'.

<sup>31</sup> On Cicero's conduct as *patruus*, see Bettini 1986: 47–9.

<sup>32</sup> *Cic. Att.* 14.7.2 [SB 361; my translation is slightly modified]: *litterae sane πεπρωμέναι et bene longae*; see also *Cic. Att.* 15.16 [SB 391].

<sup>33</sup> *Att.* 14.16.3 [SB 370], dated 2 May 44, and beforehand 14.13.4 [SB 367], dated 26 Apr. 44.

<sup>34</sup> *Cic. Att.* 14.16.3–4 [SB 370]. Incidentally, Cicero quite as a matter of course also informs his brother, Q. Cicero, about his son's progress during his absence from Rome—Quintus is obviously quite often at his uncle's house, for instance in March 56 when Cicero reports his nephew's good progress, since he was being taught by Theophrastus of Amisus (referred to as Tyrannio in the letter); see *Cic. ad Q. fr.* 2.4.2 [SB 8]. See further *Cic. ad Q. fr.* 3.1.14 [SB 21], where Quintus' studiousness is praised; in the same letter, Cicero assures his brother that he forgives his 'continual enquiries' about young Quintus; the letter also requests his brother's wife Pomponia to come to Arpinum, since Cicero would like to have Quintus' company during the *otium* (3.1.7 [SB 21]).

son: 'I came to Athens [ . . . ] and there saw what I most desired to see, your son devoting himself to liberal studies and bearing an extraordinary reputation on account of his modesty.'<sup>35</sup> He also mentions that following Marcus' interest in becoming acquainted with Asia, he had invited Cicero's son to visit him during his governorship. Trebonius assures Cicero that Marcus would be accompanied by Cratippus, his tutor, so that his education would suffer no interruption.<sup>36</sup>

Cicero was not afraid to impose decisions concerning tutors upon his son, even against his will. Thus Plutarch mentions that Cicero suspected one tutor, Gorgias, of inciting Marcus to indulge in merrymaking and excessive drinking. He had therefore forbidden his son from attending any more lessons with Gorgias.<sup>37</sup> With Cicero's *Letters to Friends*, a parallel body of correspondence has survived, allowing us to verify Plutarch's statement. In a letter to Tiro, Cicero's secretary, dating from the summer of 44, Marcus mentions not his father's reasons but indeed his directive, observing that his 'kindest and dearest father' (*humanissimus et carissimus pater*)<sup>38</sup> had imposed upon him the dismissal of Gorgias, his teacher of rhetoric. While Marcus found the latter's lessons useful, he realizes that he would have been 'taking a lot upon myself in judging my father's judgement' (*grave esse me de iudicio patris iudicare*).<sup>39</sup>

These references to Cicero's paternal concern for his son's studies suggest a notion of education that differs markedly from modern educational goals: in ancient Rome, sons were not meant to develop their individual abilities and interests, but instead lessons were aimed

<sup>35</sup> Cic. *fam.* 12.16.1 [SB 328]: *Athenas veni [ . . . ] atque ibi, quod maxime optabam, vidi filium tuum deditum optimis studiis summaque modestiae fama* (I adapt Shackleton Bailey's translation in order to retain the literal sense of the Latin *modestia*).

<sup>36</sup> Cic. *fam.* 12.16.2 [SB 328].

<sup>37</sup> Plut. *Cic.* 24.8.

<sup>38</sup> Cic. *fam.* 16.21.1 [SB 337]; Shackleton Bailey dates this letter 'August (?) 44', Kasten (1997) suspects a date 'between the end of July and the end of October 44'. In addition, we can refer to Marcus' remark in *fam.* 14.25 [SB 338], where he writes in a further letter to Tiro: *de sua in me voluntate semper ad me perscribit pater* ('my father constantly writes to me about his kind feelings towards me'—on the phrase *voluntas in aliquem*, see Shackleton Bailey's commentary on this passage); while scholars have often referred to Cicero's apparently less obvious sympathy for his son (see nn. 8–9 above), such passages advise caution.

<sup>39</sup> Cic. *fam.* 16.21.6 [SB 337]. For an excellent analysis of this letter, see Jon Hall's essay (2005, especially 260–3).



at imparting skills designed to enable male children to further pursue the social and political prestige established by their fathers. The purpose of paternal control was to maintain a certain social standing for male offspring, and to thus safeguard the family name. Cicero's funding of Marcus' education plainly reveals this underlying intention: his repeated enquiries to Atticus about the safe receipt of monies,<sup>40</sup> and his frequent requests that Marcus be well endowed indicate his concern about his son possessing sufficient freely disposable assets to afford a lifestyle commensurate with his status. Marcus must be amply provided for (*honestissime copiosissimeque*), not simply as a matter of paternal duty but also as a matter of safeguarding his father's social standing and dignity.<sup>41</sup> Cicero compares Marcus to the sons of other senators, and observes that his expenditure should not be lower than that of Bibulus, Acidinus, or Messalla, who were all staying in Athens at the same time.<sup>42</sup> Consequently, Marcus' lifestyle in Athens must at the very least match but preferably surpass that of his peers. He thus becomes his father's *alter ego*, whose political and social standing he must display outwardly. What Cicero has achieved for his *domus*, Marcus must show before the Greeks and Romans in Athens.

Various other aspects of the education of Marcus and his cousin Quintus illustrate how the Tullii Cicerones sought to establish a *joint* family tradition. Cicero's comments to his brother, Quintus, about Paeonius' rhetoric lessons are remarkable in this respect. He informs his brother that he will teach his son and his nephew additional lessons.<sup>43</sup> He asserts that his own rhetorical training is more learned and more abstract than Paeonius'. He therefore intends to introduce their sons to a declamatory technique that both fathers 'have been

<sup>40</sup> See, for instance, Cic. *Att.* 12.24.1 [SB 263], 12.32.2 [SB 271].

<sup>41</sup> Cic. *Att.* 14.7.2 [SB 361]: *id cum ad officium nostrum pertinet tum ad existimationem et dignitatem* ('That is for me a matter both of duty and of reputation and prestige'); see also 14.11.2 [SB 365].

<sup>42</sup> Cic. *Att.* 12.32.2 [SB 271]; see further the comparison with the sons of other senators in Cic. *Att.* 12.7.1 [SB 244]. Here, Dixon (1984: 94) also acknowledges: 'It was partly affection which prompted the wish, but also a matter of Cicero's own standing.'

<sup>43</sup> See above, p. 152 and n. 25.

through [...] ourselves'.<sup>44</sup> In so doing, he resorts to the fathers' own youth. Is the joint education of Marcus and Quintus not aimed precisely at establishing a tradition, or indeed at continuing a tradition based on the bond between their fraternal fathers?<sup>45</sup> On account of its only recently achieved upward social mobility, and on the basis of unique historical sources,<sup>46</sup> I would argue that the case of the Tullii Cicerones allows us to explore how family identity was established in Roman culture. Whereas established aristocratic families could model themselves upon a more or less long line of ancestors selected on the basis of their success, thereby allowing descendants to 'follow in their footsteps', as Catherine Baroin's contribution to the present volume suggests, or whose images function as continuous reminders or admonishment, as Véronique Dasen and Ann-Cathrin Harders demonstrate, the Tullii Cicerones must first establish their connection with a glorious past. One constituent element of this endeavour is Cicero's active involvement in the education of his son and nephew. He thus assumes the task of both *pater* and *patruus severus*—even though he later reproaches himself for not having been strict enough with either boy. Marcus' letter to Tiro allows us a glimpse of the Roman notion of *severitas*: even at the age of 20, Marcus would never dream of questioning his father's judgement, at least not in a letter to his secretary which ran the risk of being seen by Cicero. Evidently, the relationship between father and son was such a fundamental part of Roman culture that a son's obligation to exercise *pietas* and dutiful respect of his father's will made open criticism inconceivable.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Cic. *ad Q. fr.* 3.3.4 [SB 23].

<sup>45</sup> See Bradley 1991*d*: 169 and nn. 56–8.

<sup>46</sup> With regard to Andrew Lintott's (2008) warning about placing too much faith in the accuracy of facts in Cicero's speeches and letters (on the need to situate the texts in their pragmatic context of utterance, see Hall 2005), I would argue that the relevance of family tradition and identity concepts have nothing to do with Lintott's concern for positivist facts but rather with conceptions and meanings; Cicero's *representation* of matters is thus singly decisive in historical terms, irrespective of whether it coincides with extratextual reality. For a more detailed discussion of the relationship between text and reality, see Späth 2006.

<sup>47</sup> See also Scholz 2006: 128–36; for a discussion of the social and especially legal dimensions of the relationship between fathers and sons, see Thomas 1983.

Cicero's endeavour to establish a family tradition along the lines described above becomes evident in areas other than schooling and education; these concern his daughter as much as his son.

## 2. CICERO'S SUPPORT FOR HIS CHILDREN'S CAREERS IN POLITICS AND SOCIETY

In the aristocratic *domus*, a son's *cursus honorum* corresponded to a daughter's marital career.<sup>48</sup> In a culture in which her father's and her husband's positions in society determined a woman's social standing, marriage represented a crucial decision for daughters. In the 1970s and 1980s, women's studies heavily criticized the fact that women served solely to secure relationships between men, and that their personal interests were ignored as a result.<sup>49</sup> Does such an assessment of marriage as a means of abusing or exploiting daughters not amount to a rather simple projection of current notions onto another, foreign society such as ancient Rome? Closer examination of Tullia's marriages suggests that our modern concept hardly corresponds to Tullia's and Terentia's perception. While a Roman father by all means 'instrumentalized' his daughter by marrying her off to political friends, and thereafter dissolved the marriage depending upon political and financial developments, to subsequently remarry her, he instrumentalized his son in exactly the same fashion. *Instrumentalization* must here be conceived as a descriptive rather than as an evaluative term.

### Tullia's 'Marital Career'

Tullia's first engagement was to C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi in December 67. Cicero conveys this news to Atticus in a somewhat terse comment: *Tulliolam C. Pisoni L.f. Frugi despondimus*—'We betrothed

<sup>48</sup> See Clark 1991: 28 for a discussion of Tullia's 'marital career'.

<sup>49</sup> See, for instance, Teresa Carp's observation (1981: 352): '[...] Cicero, no less than other Roman aristocrats, did not fail to exploit her [scil. his daughter's] political value'.

Tullia to C. Piso Frugi, son of Lucius.’ In his letters, Cicero routinely uses the diminutive *Tulliola*, which carries an affective connotation, to refer to his daughter. Tullia, however, was also ‘small’ with regard to her age: she was aged between as little as 9 and no more than 12, by no means an unusual age for *sponsalia* in the Roman elite.<sup>50</sup> Her fiancé, aged about ten years older,<sup>51</sup> was the son of a praetor and descended from a consular family with whom Cicero entertained friendly relations on a political level.<sup>52</sup> There are no records of the exact date of the marriage. In 63, Cicero refers to Piso as *gener* in his fourth Catiline Oration; the designation could apply not only to an actual son-in-law, but in a broader sense to a man only engaged to be married to his daughter.<sup>53</sup> Calpurnius Piso was appointed quaestor in 58, and died either while holding office or shortly thereafter. He had stood up for his father-in-law during Cicero’s exile.<sup>54</sup>

Tullia became a widow as early as 58 or 57, that is, when she was about 20. Her next marriage was instigated in 56 when she became engaged to Furius Crassipes, a rich patrician,<sup>55</sup> who attained the quaestorship in 51. Cicero mentions the engagement in various

<sup>50</sup> Cic. *Att.* 1.3.3 [SB 8]; I replace Shackleton Bailey’s impersonal translation (‘Tullia is engaged . . .’) with the exact *pluralis maiestatis* employed by Cicero in the original text. On the age of marriage, see, among others Hopkins 1965; Shaw 1987*b*; Lelis, Percy, and Verstraete 2003.

<sup>51</sup> Presuming that he became quaestor in 58, at the earliest at the age of 30 (in accordance with Sulla’s *lex Cornelia de magistratibus* of 82), he would have been born in 88. See Treggiari 2007: 42.

<sup>52</sup> The father of Tullia’s fiancé, L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, was made tribune of the plebs in 90 and appointed praetor in 74, together with Verres; his grandfather, who also served as praetor, was killed in the Hispania ulterior in 112; his great-grandfather, the annalist C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, was appointed tribune of the plebs in 149, held the office of consul in 133, and probably became censor in 120. See Shackleton Bailey’s commentary on *Att.* 1.3.3 [SB 8].

<sup>53</sup> See Beryl Rawson (2003: 247; nn. 105–6) and Patricia Clark (1991: 33–4); all that is certain is the *terminus ante quem*: as Rawson notes, the marriage must have occurred before 58. For a reference to Piso as *gener*, see Cic. *Catil.* 4.3. Treggiari 2007 (43, 47) suggests dating the marriage to the end of Cicero’s consulship or immediately thereafter in 62.

<sup>54</sup> Cicero mentions that he had accompanied him to the unsuccessful discussion with L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, who was consul in 58, and whose assistance he sought against Clodius, the tribune of the plebs; see also Cic. *Pis.* 12–3.

<sup>55</sup> Clark (1991: 28 n. 2) refers to Treggiari 1984: 441. Treggiari 2007: 75 describes Furius Crassipes as ‘young, wealthy, a patrician and a prospective senator’, and who possessed ‘the great attraction of a house and park on the outskirts of Rome’.

letters written to his brother, Quintus, in April 56. One letter, for instance, refers to an engagement dinner hosted by Cicero to celebrate the occasion.<sup>56</sup> In a letter to Lentulus<sup>57</sup> dating from July 56, he mentions the engagement and closes by thanking Atticus for extending his congratulations.<sup>58</sup> Scholars have on the whole assumed that Tullia and Crassipes married shortly afterwards, and that they were divorced in 51. No direct records of either occasion have survived.<sup>59</sup> In an essay published in 1991, Patricia A. Clark asks whether the marriage ever occurred.<sup>60</sup> Her interesting reasoning contrasts with Susan Treggiari's hardly disputable view that it is difficult to imagine a young widow remaining unmarried for six years, and that Cicero would have waited for five years to urgently pursue his objective to remarry his daughter shortly before leaving Rome to assume the governorship of the province of Cilicia.<sup>61</sup>

Cicero was indeed looking for a new husband for Tullia in 51, the year in which he left Rome to assume his duties as proconsul. Much has been written about Tullia's third marriage. This episode offers a striking example of how in Roman culture the *mater familias* conducted the affairs of the *domus* in the absence of the *pater familias*, and also took decisions independently of her husband.<sup>62</sup> Not only did Terentia, Cicero's wife, and Tullia, his daughter, choose the

<sup>56</sup> The engagement is first mentioned in Cic. *ad. Q. fr.* 2.4.2 [SB 8] (mid-March 56), thereafter 2.6.1 [SB 10] (9 Apr. 56), which gives the date of the engagement as 4 Apr. and of the banquet as 6 Apr.

<sup>57</sup> In Cic. *fam.* 1.7.11 [SB 18], Cicero thanks P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther, consul in 57, for his congratulations on Tullia's engagement.

<sup>58</sup> *Att.* 4.4a.2 [SB 78]; see also Clark 1991: 31.

<sup>59</sup> This might be connected to the fact that Cicero wrote only infrequently to Atticus between 56 and 55, and not at all from November 54 to May 51 when they were both in Rome. About 50 letters *ad familiares* have survived from the same period, but these are scarcely concerned with family matters. From Cic. *Att.* 4.4a.2 [SB 78], we can infer that in June 56 (Shackleton Bailey dates letter 78 to 'circa 20 June (?) 56'), Tullia is still staying at Cicero's country estate at Antium. In a letter to P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther written in December 54 (*fam.* 1.9.20 [SB 20]), Crassipes is referred to as *gener*, which need not, however, as suggested above in n. 53, imply a formal marriage.

<sup>60</sup> Clark 1991.

<sup>61</sup> Treggiari 2007: 76.

<sup>62</sup> See especially the letter to Appius Claudius Pulcher dating from either 3 or 4 Aug. 50 (Cic. *fam.* 3.12.2 [SB 75]): *Quibus ego ita mandaram ut, cum tam longe afuturus essem, ad me ne referrent, agerent quod probassent* ('I had told them [i.e. my family] not to consult me since I should be so far away, but to act as they thought best.')

latter's new husband during his absence but they also proceeded with the engagement and shortly thereafter with the marriage between May and early June 50.<sup>63</sup> This placed Cicero in a delicate political situation: shortly before the marriage, his future son-in-law, Dolabella, had accused Appius Claudius Pulcher, Cicero's predecessor as proconsul of Cilicia, of a breach of official duties, thereby preventing his triumph. Shortly thereafter, Dolabella instigated legal proceedings for electoral bribery.<sup>64</sup> Immediately upon his appointment as Appius' successor (in the first months of 51), however, Cicero sought to establish amicable relations with Appius Claudius Pulcher.<sup>65</sup> In a letter to this influential politician,<sup>66</sup>

<sup>63</sup> In a letter written at the beginning of June 50, Caelius Rufus congratulates Cicero on the marriage alliance with Dolabella (Cic. *fam.* 8.13.1 [SB 94]); for a discussion of the possible assumptions about the date of the marriage, for which no historical evidence exists, see Treggiari 2007: 97 f. At the time of the marriage, Tullia was between 26 and 29 years old; while Dolabella's age has remained uncertain, there is good reason to believe that he was born around 74 (see Shackleton Bailey 1965–70, vol. 3, 269; Treggiari 2007: 93), thus making him two to five years younger. The marriage lasted almost four years. Various letters contain references to the fact that payment of the *dos* in three instalments in 49, 48, and 47 meant a considerable financial burden (see Ioannatou 2006: 225, 426–9).

<sup>64</sup> See Cicero's letter to Appius Pulcher, Cic. *fam.* 3.10.1 [SB 73]; in the same letter, dating from the the first half of April 50, Cicero also mentions that he had defended Dolabella twice against a capital charge (*capitis iudicia*), and therefore considered Dolabella's action against Appius Pulcher as a breach of the obligation to friends (*fam.* 3.10.5 [SB 73]). Moreover, he assures Appius Pulcher that Dolabella's 'silly, childish talk' (*sermo stultus et puerilis*)—that is, his allusions to a prospective marriage with Tullia—should under no circumstances be taken seriously. This clearly suggests that in April 50 Cicero was utterly unaware of the marriage negotiations between Tullia and Dolabella, or that he at least followed Caelius Rufus' advice to postpone such a possibility (see Caelius Rufus' letter to Cicero, *fam.* 8.6.1–2 [SB 88], written in February 50—which Cicero probably received in April). See, moreover, Cicero's direct congratulations on Appius Pulcher's acquittal from both the charge *de maiestate* (*fam.* 3.11.1–2 [SB 74], 26 June (?) 50) and *de ambitu* (*fam.* 3.12.1 [SB 75], 3 or 4 Aug. 50).

<sup>65</sup> See his letters to Appius Pulcher, Cic. *fam.* 3.2–13 [SB 65–76], written between February/March 51 and August 50. The letters written between February and August 51 reveal that before leaving for the province he did his utmost to arrange a meeting with Appius Pulcher, who was on the return journey; the meeting, however, never took place (which Cicero complains about politely but none the less assertively; see *fam.* 3.6.3–4 [SB 69]).

<sup>66</sup> One indication of his eminent network of friends is that Appius Pulcher's daughters were married to the eldest son of Pompeius and to M. Junius Brutus, the son of Servilia and M. Junius Brutus (*tr. pl.* in the year 83).

written in August 50, Cicero emphasizes his embarrassment about the ‘arrangement made by my family without my knowledge’ (*ea quae me insciente facta sunt a mei*),<sup>67</sup> meaning Tullia’s marriage with Dolabella. Cicero thanks Appius Pulcher for conveying his tactful good wishes for the couple’s marriage fortunes.

Even though the reasons prompting Terentia and Tullia to choose Dolabella can be discerned no more than hypothetically through a web of conjectures, closer scrutiny of this affair is worthwhile—since it allows us to at least make substantiated assumptions about what determined the choice of husband from a *female* viewpoint, and about the scope of action available to female Roman aristocrats. Based on a reading of three letters written by Cicero to Atticus,<sup>68</sup> John H. Collins suggested some time ago that there were originally three marriage candidates.<sup>69</sup> From the letter that Cicero wrote to Atticus on 12 May 51 from Beneventum,<sup>70</sup> Collins deduces the identity of an unnamed candidate, whom he calls ‘B’; Cicero rules out this candidate because he would not be acceptable to Tullia. Marriage negotiations with the second candidate (‘C’), whom Cicero refers to as ‘Servius’, could be conducted, as he writes, through Servilia, the mother of Brutus, acting as an intermediary. This candidate can be identified as Servius Sulpicius Rufus, the son of Postumia and Servius Sulpicius Rufus, a jurist, who stood for election in 52 to become consul in 51. The third candidate (‘A’), finally, remains

<sup>67</sup> Cic. *fam.* 3.12.2 [SB 75]; see also the reiteration two sentences later: *in quo unum non vereor, ne tu parum perspicias ea quae gesta sint ab aliis esse gesta*, ‘On one point, though, my mind is easy—you will not fail to realize that what has been done has been done by others’; this follows on from the apology cited above (see n. 62) concerning the assignment of decision-making powers to his family during his absence—these passages clearly show how Cicero is desperate to maintain good political relations and pulls out all the stops of epistolary-rhetorical courtesy.

<sup>68</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97] (Beneventum, 12 May 51), 5.21.14 [SB 114] (Laodicea, 13 Feb. 50), and 6.1.10 [SB 115] (Laodicea, 20 Feb. 50). Cicero also admonishes Atticus—without being more specific—in *Att.* 5.13.3 [SB 106], 5.14.3 [SB 107], and 5.17.4 [SB 110] (written between July and August 51) to attend to what he considers an important ‘domestic affair’ (*domesticus scrupulus, ἐνδόμυχον, mea domestica*).

<sup>69</sup> Collins 1951: 164.

<sup>70</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97].

unnamed, but Cicero mentions that he comes on the recommendation of a woman known as Pontidia.<sup>71</sup> Writing to Atticus on 13 February 50 from Laodicea in the province of Cilicia, Cicero approves of the advice given by Atticus in an earlier letter which has not survived: Atticus had evidently recommended Sulpicius Rufus (candidate 'C'), Postumia's son, 'since Pontidia is trifling' (*quoniam Pontidia nugatur*), thus ruling out candidate 'A'.<sup>72</sup> One week later, however, in a letter to Atticus written on 20 February, he returns to the matter on the basis of newly received letters (from either Terentia or Atticus, or indeed from both). He writes, 'I much prefer Pontidia's candidate ['A'] to Servilia's ['C']', citing one of Atticus' previous letters: 'you had written to me "but I wish you had gone back to your old gang"'.<sup>73</sup> Thus Cicero had made up his mind, and a letter containing a corresponding instruction was duly dispatched to Terentia and Tullia. Given six to eight weeks conveyance time,<sup>74</sup> the letter would have reached his wife and daughter in mid-April. Who was 'Pontidia's candidate', however, who would return Cicero to his 'old gang'—whether socially in terms of his knightly status, or indeed in terms of his Arpinate origins.<sup>75</sup>

Based on Cic. *Brut.* 70.246, which mentions a Marcus Pontidius as *municeps noster*, Collins suggests that candidate 'A', who meets with the unanimous approval of Atticus and Cicero, must have belonged to a *gens Pontidia* and would have stemmed from an Arpinate family of equestrian rank. He argues that it 'seems clear that Pontidia had proposed some good, solid *eques*, perhaps an Arpinate, but certainly

<sup>71</sup> She is mentioned in Cic. *Att.* 5.21.14 [SB 114] and 6.1.10 [SB 115].

<sup>72</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.21.14 [SB 114].

<sup>73</sup> Cic. *Att.* 6.1.10 [SB 115]: *De Tullia mea tibi adsentior scripsique ad eam et ad Terentiam mihi placere; tu enim ad me iam ante scripseras 'ac vellem te in tuum veterem gregem rettulisses' [...] multo enim malo hunc a Pontidia quam illum a Servilia: 'I agree with what you say about my Tullia, and have written to her and to Terentia to say that I approve; you had already written to me "but I wish you had gone back to your old gang" [...] for I much prefer Pontidia's candidate to Servilia's.'*

<sup>74</sup> Collins 1951: 167.

<sup>75</sup> With regard to *vetus grex*, Shackleton Bailey observes: 'the implication here is doubtless partly social' (Shackleton-Bailey 1965–70: vol. 3, 244).



not a member of a patrician family active in politics.<sup>76</sup> Consequently, in December 51 or at the beginning of January 50, Terentia and Tullia found themselves in the following situation: the negotiations with Pontidia, whose respectability had at first been doubted, had resulted in a tangible outcome, since Atticus supported Pontidia's candidate; Tullia and Terentia obviously knew, moreover, that Atticus would write to Cicero along these lines. Apparently, however, rumours about a possible marriage between Dolabella and Cicero's daughter<sup>77</sup> were afloat in Rome as early as February 50, suggesting that discussions between Tullia, Terentia, and Dolabella had already taken place—despite, or as I would suggest, because Atticus, Cicero's adviser, had begun to express his preference for the Arpinate *eques*. As mentioned above, Cicero's wife and daughter did not receive news of his explicit approval for Pontidia's marriage candidate until April. Cicero, moreover, changed his mind again a few weeks later—presumably in April 50<sup>78</sup>—after Tiberius Claudius Nero had conducted negotiations with him about the marriage in the province. He now dispatched 'reliable persons' to Rome—but these evidently only arrived after Tullia's engagement to Dolabella. In a letter to Atticus written in early August, Cicero observes: 'Here am I in my province paying Appius all manner of compliments, when out of the blue I find his prosecutor becoming my son-in-law!'<sup>79</sup>

The circumstances surrounding Tullia's third marriage point to various interesting aspects: first, women quite evidently performed a decisive role in proposing possible marriage candidates; negotiations

<sup>76</sup> Collins 1951: 166. Shackleton-Bailey (1965–70, vol. 3, 195) thus speaks of 'a mere *eques*', and Susan Treggiari (2007: 87 f.) suspects that the man in question could have been either a young *eques* at the beginning of his political career, or that fathers in Cicero's situation 'might lower their sights to a husband not active in public service'—for instance opting for a 'cultured, wealthy, well-born *eques*, rather like Atticus himself'.

<sup>77</sup> See Caelius Rufus' letter to Cicero written in February 50, *fam.* 8.6.1–2 [SB 88].

<sup>78</sup> Shackleton Bailey assigns 'April (?) 50' as a date to Cicero's letter of recommendation concerning Tiberius Claudius Nero, *Cic. fam.* 13.64 [SB 138], addressed to Minucius Thermus, propraetor of the province of Asia (Shackleton Bailey amends the traditional name of the addressee 'Publius Silius' thus).

<sup>79</sup> *Cic. Att.* 6.6.1 [SB 121], dated 3 Aug. 50: *ego dum in provincia omnibus rebus Appium orno, subito sum factus accusatoris eius socer*; on the charges brought by Dolabella against Appius Claudius Pulcher, see n. 64 above.

were conducted with Servilia and Pontidia, and the correspondence between Cicero and Atticus specifies marriage candidates under reference to their *female* brokers. Such arrangements constitute a remarkable form of identifying suitable men in a society in which individuals were routinely named after their father and grandfather. Secondly, we can infer from Cicero's first letter to Atticus, in which the subject is broached, that a daughter's views were much heeded: Cicero, as observed, rules out candidate 'B' because he doubts whether Tullia 'could be brought to consent'.<sup>80</sup> Thirdly, the episode provides a concrete example of how marriages served to establish and cultivate political and amicable relations (which amounts to the same) in the Roman elite. Tullia's first two husbands, whom Cicero helped choose, belonged to a highly prestigious and considerably affluent *domus*. The engagements and marriages enable Cicero to secure amicable relations. It is thus neither accidental that Calpurnius Piso committed himself to Cicero's return from exile,<sup>81</sup> nor that Crassipes visited Cicero at his country estate in 49 to convey news of the situation in Pompeius' camp.<sup>82</sup>

While securing advantages for himself, these marriages also enabled Cicero to establish circumstances for Tullia commensurate with her social standing.<sup>83</sup> In this respect, the episode surrounding the third marriage reveals another important aspect: Tullia and her mother quite obviously proceeded in full compliance with the criteria applicable to marriages among the Roman elite, aimed at enhancing the social prestige of one's own family—and, by further implication, of one's daughter. Not only did they take decisions in Cicero's absence but they in effect took advantage of it to avert a mistake on his part. If Cicero and Atticus were actually seriously considering someone born into an Arpinate equestrian family as

<sup>80</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.4.1 [SB 97]: *vereor adduci ut nostra possit*. We must consider, however, that Tullia was between 25 and 28 years old in 51; she obviously had less influence on her first engagement when she was aged no more than between 9 and 12.

<sup>81</sup> See above, p. 158 and n. 54.

<sup>82</sup> Cic. *Att.* 9.11.3 [SB 178].

<sup>83</sup> See Servius Sulpicius Rufus' reference to Tullia's husband as belonging to 'young men of distinction' in his letter to Cicero, Cic. *fam.* 4.5.5 [SB 248].

Tullia's third husband, this would have entailed her clear social demise. Just like her father, this marriage would have returned Tullia to what Atticus calls the 'old gang' (*vetus grex*), which Cicero's brilliant career had catapulted him out of, and which her first two marriages had elevated her above. I would argue, possibly somewhat daringly, that faced with the impending decision for wedlock with a man from a rural equestrian family, mother and daughter forged ahead with negotiations with Dolabella. Choosing him contributed decisively to safeguarding Tullia's social prestige but also brought about a better decision for the *domus Tullia* than the *pater familias* would have reached himself. The episode demonstrates that Terentia and Tullia made an essential contribution to protecting and continuing the family tradition. Given that Dolabella held the promise of good connections to Caesar's camp, we can perhaps even surmise that Cicero's wife and daughter made a very conscious political choice based on their assessment of the circumstances prevailing in Rome at the time.<sup>84</sup>

Along these lines, the episode discussed above exemplifies my introductory remarks about so-called 'instrumentalization.'<sup>85</sup> It is by no means impossible that women were themselves actively involved in employing marriage and matrimony to serve political ends. Given the opportunity, for instance in the absence of the *pater familias*, as shown, they took matters into their own hands or brokered engagements. Hence, we can justifiably speak of a female *marriage career*, one which by all means compares with the male political career in terms of social standing.

<sup>84</sup> By no means is this the only passage revealing the independent political deliberations of the women in Cicero's *domus*: see, for instance, the decision at the beginning of 49 about whether to remain in Rome or to flee the city in *Cic. Att.* 7.14.3 [SB 137], 7.16.3 [SB 140], 7.17.5 [SB 141], or Cicero's complaint that while he had been mindful of his family, they were now reproaching him for his indecisive wavering between Caesar and the Pompeians, *Cic. Att.* 9.6.4 [SB 172]. As mentioned above (n. 19), in *Cic. Att.* 10.8.1 [SB 199], Cicero alludes to letters written by Tullia in which she advises her father on how to assess the political situation in the spring of 49.

<sup>85</sup> See above, p. 157.

### Preparing Marcus' Career

Cicero's efforts to advance his son's career are at first the subject of great concern in his letters. In the letters to his wife and family, and to Atticus and his brother, during his exile in 58, Cicero incessantly reproaches himself for what he has brought upon his family, and in particular upon his son.<sup>86</sup> In November 58, he tells Atticus how unfortunate his son is for having a father who has passed on nothing other than resentment and an ignominious name: *invidia* and *ignominia nominis mei*.<sup>87</sup> Cicero's complaint reveals how much it mattered to him as a father to hand down a *good* name to his son.<sup>88</sup> Almost ten years later, this concern has dissipated and self-assuredness has returned. In a letter to M. Caelius, Cicero writes that his son Marcus will be ideally placed should the *res publica* somehow survive the Civil War, for his name would ensure a 'grand heritage', *amplum patrimonium*.<sup>89</sup>

Cicero's governorship of Cilicia clearly illustrates how he paves the way for Marcus' future career. He takes his son and his nephew, Quintus, along on his journey east in early summer 51. Their slow progress and numerous stopovers en route to the province, among others in Athens, Delos, and Ephesus, undoubtedly served to introduce the two boys to the Greek Orient.<sup>90</sup> During the military campaign in the summer and autumn of the same year, Cicero entrusts the boys to the younger Deiotaros, the son of the King of the Galatians, upon whom the Senate had already conferred the royal title during his father's lifetime.<sup>91</sup> Deiotaros returned Marcus and Quintus to Cicero in Laodicea in February 50. Cicero confers upon

<sup>86</sup> See the letters written between April and November 58, for instance *Cic. fam.* 14.1 [SB 8], 14.2 [SB 7], 14.3 [SB 9]; *Cic. Att.* 3.19 [SB 64], 3.23 [SB 68], *ad Q. fr.* 1.3 [SB 3]; in *Cic. fam.* 14.3.1, he laments the *acerbissimos dolores miseriasque* ('bitter sorrow and suffering') that his guilt has brought upon his son.

<sup>87</sup> *Cic. Att.* 3.23.5 [SB 68] (29 Nov. 58).

<sup>88</sup> For a detailed investigation, see Catherine Baroin's Chapter 1 in this volume.

<sup>89</sup> *Cic. fam.* 2.16.5 [SB 154] (2 or 3 May 49).

<sup>90</sup> See Stinchcomb 1932/3: 443, who has gone to great lengths to collate the passages in the letters concerning the course of the journey.

<sup>91</sup> *Cic. Att.* 5.17.3 [SB 110], 5.18.4 [SB 111], 5.20.9 [SB 113].

Quintus the *toga pura*<sup>92</sup> while Marcus receives the adult's toga a year later at Arpinum.<sup>93</sup> Cicero and the two boys thereafter travelled to Rhodes where Poseidonios and Molon had taught him philosophy and rhetoric twenty-five years before.<sup>94</sup> From Rhodes they continued their return journey to Athens and then to Rome.<sup>95</sup>

Following the outbreak of the Civil War, Cicero is undecided whether to take the boys along to Greece or, should he hold out in Italy, to send them there on their own.<sup>96</sup> He also considers fleeing to Malta, but does not wish to create the impression that he has no stomach for danger. Cicero commends Marcus, whose chief concern is his father's dignity, for being more courageous than himself.<sup>97</sup> In 49, Cicero finally decided to join Pompeius in Greece, accompanied by his son, his brother, Quintus Cicero, and his nephew. Soon afterwards, in 47, he returns to Brundisium, and contemplates dispatching Marcus as an envoy to Caesar.<sup>98</sup> A year later, Marcus himself considers joining Caesar in Spain, thus following his uncle and cousin who had already broken away from Cicero following the defeat of the Pompeians at Pharsalos in August 48 to join Caesar's forces. Cicero, however, calls this decision into question: Atticus had

<sup>92</sup> Cic. *Att.* 5.20.9 [SB 113], 6.1.12 [SB 115].

<sup>93</sup> In Cic. *Att.* 9.6.1 [SB 172], Cicero also contemplates whether Caesar might take offence if he did not perform the ritual in Rome; on conferring upon Marcus the *toga virilis*, see also 9.17.1 [SB 186], 9.19.1 [SB 189]; the letters were written between 11 Mar. and 2 Apr. 49, thus before and after the traditional dates of the ritual, the festival of Liber and Libera on 17 Mar. On the ritual, see Dolansky 2008 (including further references in n. 2, 59 f.)

<sup>94</sup> See Plut. *Cic.* 4.5–7.

<sup>95</sup> Cic. *Att.* 6.7.2 [SB 120], *fam.* 14.5.1 [SB 119].

<sup>96</sup> See Cicero's deliberations in the letters written to Atticus in January and February 49: *Att.* 7.13.3 [SB 136], 7.17.1, 4 [SB 141], 8.2.4 [SB 152], 8.3.5 [SB 153].

<sup>97</sup> Cic. *Att.* 10.9.1–2 [SB 200].

<sup>98</sup> See the two letters written to Terentia on 14 and 19 June 47, *fam.* 14.11 [SB 166] und 14.15 [SB 167]. While Cicero does not ask for his wife's opinion, he promises to inform her should he send their son to Caesar. In the second letter, he informs her that he has decided against sending him to Caesar. Written shortly before his divorce from Terentia, scholars have often interpreted these terse letters as a clear indication of the alienation of affection and breakdown of relations between Cicero and his wife (see, for instance, Claassen 1996: 217, or the unacceptable simplification in Dixon 1984: 88). Notwithstanding these circumstances, Cicero none the less keeps his wife abreast of the questions and plans he is turning over in his mind.

evidently raised the subject,<sup>99</sup> and Cicero recalls his ‘very open’ (*liberalissime*) discussion with his son, in which he held out the prospect of financial assistance compatible with the funds available to the sons of other dignified aristocrats. Cicero, however, bids his son remember that his father had faced a volley of reproaches for leaving the optimates to return to Italy; Marcus’ prospective journey to Spain, moreover, would be interpreted as Cicero himself switching allegiances. This is a further indication of how self-evidently father and son were considered one and the same. Besides, Cicero warns Marcus that he could feel excluded once he realized how much more popular and well-connected his cousin Quintus, who had been staying with Caesar in Spain for quite some time, was. The letters reveal no more about the further deliberations between Marcus, Cicero, and Atticus.<sup>100</sup> Eventually, however, Marcus travelled to Athens in 45 rather than to Spain.<sup>101</sup>

The available evidence shows how Marcus was groomed for aristocratic duties through accompanying his father, thus providing him with first-hand experience, through acquiring the necessary intellectual skills like the art of conversation and rhetoric, and especially through his introduction to vital social networks. The correspondence, however, provides only one example of Cicero actively boosting his son’s political career, namely when he has Marcus, his nephew

<sup>99</sup> The wording in Cic. Att. 12.7.1 [SB 244]—[ . . . ] *de Cicerone, cuius quidem cogitationis initium tu mihi attulisti* (‘[ . . . ] about Marcus, you started me thinking about this’)—leads one to suspect that Marcus had first conferred with Atticus before disclosing his intentions to his father. Does this perhaps point to the downside of Marcus’ above-mentioned respect for his father, namely that he does not in the first instance seek to conduct an open discussion with his father?

<sup>100</sup> It is difficult to interpret the following remark in Cic. Att. 12.8.1 [SB 245]: *de Cicerone multis res placet* (‘About Marcus, many people approve the plan’). The *res* has been seen mostly as a reference to the decision to travel to Athens; as Shackleton Bailey has quite rightly suggested, however, it could also refer to joining Caesar in Spain. Presumably, this letter was written towards the end of the second intercalary month (that is, the month of November according to the actual calendar) in 46 while Att. 12.7.1 [SB 244], mentioned in the previous note, was written at the beginning of this intercalary month, so that the *res* could very well refer to the preceding letter.

<sup>101</sup> See pp. 153–5 above.

Quintus, and his friend M. Caesius elected aediles in Arpinum to manage municipal finances.<sup>102</sup>

Cicero died too soon to properly lead his son, aged only 22 at his father's death at 43, to the *cursus honorum*. The above elements suggest, however, that Cicero actively laid the foundations for Marcus' political career in a manner characteristic of the Roman aristocracy, specifically through involving his son in his own activities. The above division between 'Schooling and Education', on the one hand, and 'A Career in Politics' on the other, would therefore have made little sense from a Roman perspective. Other than grammar and rhetoric, a son's education would have included practical instruction alongside his father: male children were assigned duties and tasks serving their father's ends. Such instrumentalizing, however, enabled sons to obtain the necessary career qualifications. This permitted Marcus, the sole male family member surviving proscription, to become pontifex, without his father's support but due to Octavian's patronage; ultimately, he even became suffect consul in 30.<sup>103</sup>

Comparing Cicero's advancement of his children's respective social careers shows that Tullia and Marcus received equal attention. The gender-specific difference in his attention lies simply in the distinction between socially determined female and male careers. The children's welfare and social standing, on the one hand, and their father's prestige and position, on the other, are all inextricably bound up in his paternal concern. 'Instrumentalizing' one's children thus befitted a Roman citizen and a *pater familias* who instrumentalized himself to safeguard for the longer term his family's social esteem and name. Both Tullia and Terentia's decision concerning her marriage and Marcus' pious obedience demonstrate that Cicero's children and wife adopted and internalized Cicero's conception of self. Far from being mere 'victims' or 'objects' of his paternalistic decisions, they

<sup>102</sup> In a letter to M. Brutus, who is based in Gaul at the time, Cicero requests him to assist the Arpinate delegation of knights to collect tributes so that municipal finances can be rehabilitated; he refers to the office held by his son, nephew, and friend. See Cic. *fam.* 13.11.3 [SB 278], presumably written in the first half of 46.

<sup>103</sup> The letters make no reference to a marriage involving Marcus—which would have also been part of his political career—with the exception of an allusion to a marriage offer in connection with a discussion about financial matters in a letter to Atticus written on 8 July 44 (*Att.* 16.1.5 [SB 409]).

instead contributed as active subjects to attaining social prestige, if necessary redressing his indecision; they thus became an integral part of family tradition.

### 3. EMOTIONAL AFFECTION OR FAMILY TRADITION?

Examining Tullia and Marcus' education and how Cicero sought to advance their careers (and the expenses he incurred in pursuing both objectives) has revealed his very rational motives, aimed at constructing and maintaining family tradition in social and political respects. Obviously, such motives do not exclude emotional affection. Closer scrutiny of Cicero's expressions of love and affection,<sup>104</sup> however, reminds us to exercise caution about all too readily assuming 'paternal love' or 'unbounded affection' on his part. Contrary to claims for an ahistorical, universal 'paternal love,' Cicero's letters reveal a specifically Roman paternal love, situated within a concrete historical context in which family tradition is a decisive element.

Cicero, as observed, conveys the prestige of the *domus* onto his children through advancing their respective careers, thus establishing a family *tradition* in the first place; doing so obviously presupposed his own ascendancy, through which he acquired the necessary social and political capital for himself and for the Tullii Cicerones. The love and affection that he expresses for his children fits into this context. Cicero protests his love through recourse to prevailing norms of expressing esteem and appreciation. Rather than valuing particular individual attributes, Cicero commends Tullia, 'the most loving, modest, and clever daughter a man ever had', for her *pietas, modestia, ingenium*.<sup>105</sup> In a letter to Terentia written in 47 while anxiously awaiting Caesar's benevolence at Brundisium, he praises

<sup>104</sup> On the emotional connotations of the vocabulary used with regard to Tullia, see Treggiari 2007: 161 f. and Ermete 2003: 232 n. 1311.

<sup>105</sup> Cic. *ad Q. fr.* 1.3.3 [SB 3]; Cicero wrote this letter to his brother from exile, on 13 June 58, and it becomes generally apparent that his exuberant expressions of love and affection occur especially in letters written in extreme circumstances.



his daughter's *virtus*,<sup>106</sup> *humanitas*, and *dignitas*,<sup>107</sup> for she is 'so wonderfully brave and kind'. Likewise, Marcus must embody his father's *dignitas*, and Cicero praises his *fortitudo* and *modestia*, 'courage and modesty'.<sup>108</sup> Apparently, Cicero's love for his children focuses not on specific behaviour or abilities but instead on their highest possible conformity with those aristocratic values that he expects every *vir bonus* to possess, and for which he commends both his children and his friends.

Notwithstanding that his esteem for his children has nothing to do with their individual personality but instead with conforming to overarching social norms and values, we need not refute claims to Cicero's 'paternal love'. His esteem, however, allows us to recognize the historical and cultural contingency of this particular 'love'. Cicero expresses his affection for his children because this corresponds to the requirements and moral rules that he expects from the *boni* and that serve as the yardstick with which he measures his own life. For it is precisely this yardstick that determines whether a name will find the approval of the senatorial aristocracy in Rome or not.<sup>109</sup> In Cicero's case, the essential condition of Roman 'paternal love' is the successful adoption of a family tradition and its continuation. Cicero loves his children as images of the Tullii Cicerones family. Tullia and Marcus follow in the footsteps of their father, each according to their gender, in what amounts to the transmission of tradition through

<sup>106</sup> In this context, *virtus* designates 'virtue' or 'reaching one's highest human potential' (in the sense of Greek *aretē*). Even though it is undisputed that the etymology of the Roman notion of virtue refers to *male* virtue in the first instance (and thus also to Greek *andreia*), I would argue that attempts to reduce the re-emergence of the word in texts written in Latin during the Republican period to an exclusive 'manliness'—see, for instance, McDonnell 2006, who postulates a semantic field with exclusively military connotations—fail to capture actual usage. While *virtus* is attributed much more frequently to male figures, assigning this quality to Tullia is by no means an isolated case.

<sup>107</sup> Cic. *fam.* 14.11 [SB 166] (14 June 47).

<sup>108</sup> See the above-cited references to *dignitas* (Cic. *Att.* 14.7.2 [SB 361], 14.11.2 [SB 365]), to *fortitudo* (Cic. *Att.* 10.9.1–2 [SB 200]), and to the son's *modestia* mentioned in Trebonius' letter (Cic. *fam.* 12.16.1 [SB 328]).

<sup>109</sup> Cicero refers to those values which *conventionally* decide on social ascendancy; during his lifetime and amid the turmoil of several civil wars, however, these values were severely called into question.

their metonymization: each part of the family refers to the family as a whole.

In a letter to his brother written from exile in June 58, Cicero observes that Tullia is ‘the image of my face and speech and mind’,<sup>110</sup> thus lavishing the highest praise on her. This might also account for the *fanum*<sup>111</sup> that Cicero intended to erect following his daughter’s death. Cicero’s unbounded grief and his obsession with such a ‘monument’ or ‘shrine’ puzzled his contemporaries—Atticus showed little enthusiasm for the idea—as much as it has continued to mystify scholarship.<sup>112</sup> If we, however, assume paternal love along specifically Roman historical and social lines, that is, as love for one’s own image, one’s own name and its prestige, Cicero mourning his daughter’s death could be conceived as the loss of part of his own identity. Identity was considered to be neither autonomous nor individual in Roman culture, but instead it was strictly aligned with generational lines of transmission. Cicero’s endeavour to erect a *fanum* as a means of solace thus amounts not merely to an emotionally upset father’s overstrung reaction to his daughter’s death. Erecting such an edifice would have served not only to render eternal homage to his virtuous daughter but also to immortalize the Tullii Cicerones.<sup>113</sup> If ever erected, it would have acted as a substitute for the loss of Tullia as a bearer of family tradition.

<sup>110</sup> Cic. *ad Q. fr.* 1.3.3 [SB 3]: *effigiem oris sermonis animi mei*; thereafter follows the remark addressed to his brother *tuum filium imaginem tuam*, ‘Likewise your son, your image [...]’. Catherine Baroin’s chapter in this collection examines in depth the physical and moral similarities between father and son, which also serve to recall the father; see especially Sect. 8, pp. 37–47, of her chapter. Baroin’s reflections on the similarity not only between sons and fathers but also between daughters and fathers (see pp. 41–2) place Cicero’s comments on Tullia in their social context.

<sup>111</sup> See Treggiari 1998: 16 and n. 58 on the relevant passages.

<sup>112</sup> See, for instance, Pierre Boyancé’s critical reflections (1944) on the possible philosophical backgrounds of the construction of the *fanum*. Boyancé takes issue with what he considers to be Pierre Grimal’s untenable claims about the neo-Pythagorean foundations and mystical religious beliefs involved. Treggiari 1998: 14–23 analyses the various phases of Cicero mourning Tullia’s death based on a (modern) three-phase psychological model of grief, and thus postulates an ahistorical-universal emotionality of human ‘nature’: she suggests that Cicero’s ‘bitter grief [...] was *entirely natural*’ (16, my emphasis).

<sup>113</sup> The significance of the monument built to commemorate Tullia would be comparable to the inscriptions for *deliciae*, which Christian Laes refers to as ‘monuments of self-representation in a status-conscious society’ in the conclusions to his contribution to this volume.

## References

- AASGAARD, R. (2006), 'Children in Antiquity and Early Christianity: Research History and Central Issues', *Familia. Revista de ciencias y orientación familiar*, 33: 23–46.
- ADRIANI, A. (1970), 'Ritratti dell'egitto greco-romano', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 77: 72–109.
- ALDHOUSE GREEN, M. J. (1999), *Pilgrims in Stone: Stone Images from the Gallo-Roman Sanctuary of Fontes Sequanae*, Oxford.
- ALFONSO, G., and BLAIZOT, F. (eds.) (2004), *La villa gallo-romaine de Champ Madame à Beaumont (Puy-de-Dôme): Habitat et ensemble funéraire de nourrissons* (Documents d'Archéologie en Rhône-Alpes et en Auvergne 27), Lyon.
- ALLMER, A., and DISSARD, P. (1885), *Trion, Antiquités découvertes en 1885, 1886 et antérieurement: Au quartier de Lyon dit de Trion*, Lyon.
- AMERIO, A. (1968), 'Galeno "puericultore"', *Pagine di storia della medicina*, 12/5: 24–7.
- ANDREAU, J., and BRUHNS, H. (eds.) (1990), *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'Antiquité romaine*. Actes de la table ronde des 2–4 octobre 1986, Paris (MSH), Rome.
- ANKUM, H. (2005), 'D.40.4.29 Scaevola L.23 Digestorum: Un drame matrimonial romain ayant des conséquences juridiques complexes', in Z. Słuzewska and J. Urbanik (eds.), *Marriage, Ideal—Law—Practice, Proceedings of a Conference Held in Memory of Henryk Kupiszewski in Warsaw on the 24th of April 2004*, Warsaw, 1–5.
- ARGENTO, R. (1972), 'Due epicedii di Papinio Statio. *Silvae* II.2, V.5', *Rivista di Studi Classici*, 20: 331–62.
- ARIÈS, P. (1973 [1st edn. Paris 1960]), *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'Ancien Régime*, Paris.
- ARJAVA, A. (1996), *Women and Law in Late Antiquity*, Oxford.
- ASCENZI, A. (1994), *La mummia romana di Grottarossa, Corso di perfezionamento in paleopatologia*, Pisa, private document for students.
- BIANCO, P., NICOLETTI, R., et al. (1996), 'The Roman Mummy of Grottarossa', in K. Spindler (ed.), *Human Mummies: A Global Survey of their Status and the Techniques of Conservation*, Vienna and New York, 205–18.

- ASSMANN, A. (1991*a*), 'Fest und flüssig: Anmerkungen zu einer Denkfigur', in A. Assmann and D. Harth (eds.), *Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument*, Frankfurt a.M., 181–99.
- (1991*b*), 'Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument', in A. Assmann and D. Harth (eds.), *Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument*, Frankfurt a.M., 11–25.
- and ASSMANN, J. (1988), 'Schrift, Tradition und Kultur', in W. Raible (ed.), *Zwischen Festtag und Alltag* (ScriptOralia 6), Tübingen, 25–49.
- ASSMANN, J. (1988), 'Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität', in J. Assmann and T. Hölscher (eds.), *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt a. M., 9–19.
- (1997<sup>2</sup> [1st edn. 1992]), *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich.
- ASTIN, A. E. (1967), *Scipio Aemilianus*, Oxford.
- ATHERTON, C. (1998), 'Children, Animals, Slaves and Grammar', in Y. Lee Too and N. Livingstone (eds.), *Pedagogy and Power*, Cambridge, 214–44.
- AUBERT, M.-F., and CORTOPASSI, R. (2004), *Portraits funéraires de l'Égypte romaine*, I, *Masques en stuc*, Paris.
- AUFFARTH, Ch. (2005), 'How to Sacrifice Correctly—without a Manual?', in R. Hägg and B. Alroth, *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*, Stockholm, 11–21.
- BACKE-DAHMEN, A. (2006), *Innocentissima aetas—Römische Kindheit im Spiegel literarischer, rechtlicher und archäologischer Quellen des 1. bis 4. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*, Mainz.
- BADEL, C. (2005), *La Noblesse de l'Empire romain: Les Masques et la vertu*, Seyssel.
- BADIAN, E. (1957), 'Caepio and Norbanus: Notes on the decade 100–90 B.C.', *Historia*, 6: 318–46.
- (1965), 'M. Porcius Cato and the Annexation and Early Administration of Cyprus', *JRS* 55: 110–21.
- BAGNALL, R. (1997), 'Missing Females in Roman Egypt', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 16: 121–38.
- and FRIER, B. (1994), *The Demography of Roman Egypt*, Cambridge.
- BAILLS-TALBI, N., and BLANCHARD, P. (2006), 'Sépultures de nouveau-nés et de nourrissons du 1er âge de Fer au haut Moyen Âge découvertes hors des contextes funéraires traditionnels sur les territoires carnute, turon et bituriges cube: Inventaire, synthèse et interprétations', *Revue archéologique de Centre*, 157–205.
- BAKKE, O. M. (2005), *When Children Became People: The Birth of Childhood in Early Christianity*, Minneapolis.

- BALCH, D., and OSIEK, L. (eds.) (2003), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, Cambridge and Grand Rapids.
- BALDASSARRE, I., PONTRANDOLFO, A., ROUVERET, A., and SALVADORI, M. (2006), *La Peinture romaine de l'époque hellénistique à l'Antiquité tardive*, Arles and Milan.
- BARBET, A., and COMPOINT, S. (1999), *Les Cités enfouies du Vésuve: Pompéi, Herculanium, Stabies et autres lieux*, Paris.
- BARCLAY, W. (1959), *Educational Ideals in the Ancient World*, London.
- BARDON, H. (1972), 'Le Concept de similitude à Rome', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, I.2: 857–68.
- BARGETZI, D. (2002), *Cicero und Tullia: Einblicke in eine Beziehung zwischen Vater und Tochter im alten Rom* (Seminararbeit, Seminar für Alte Geschichte Basel), Basel.
- BAUMAN, R. (1992), *Women and Politics in Ancient Rome*, London.
- BÉAL, J.-C. (1983), *Catalogue des objets de tableterie du Musée de la civilisation gallo-romaine de Lyon*, Lyon and Paris.
- BEARD, M. (1993), 'Looking (Harder) for Roman Myth: Dumézil, Declamation and the Problems of Definition', in F. Graf (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft: Das Paradigma Roms*, Stuttgart–Leipzig, Teubner, 44–64 (trans. by B. Mezzadri, in *Mythe et mythologie dans l'Antiquité gréco-romaine*, *Europe* 904–905, 2004: 190–218).
- BELLEMORE, J., and RAWSON, B. (1990), 'Alumni: The Italian Evidence', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 83: 1–19.
- BELTRAMI, L. (1998), *Il sangue degli antenati: Stirpe, adulterio e figli senza padre nella cultura romana*, Bari.
- BERGER, P. L., and LUCKMANN, T. (1967), *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, New York.
- BERNSTEIN, N. W. (2005), 'Mourning the *Puer Delicatus*: Status Inconsistency and the Ethical Value of Fostering in Statius, *Silvae* 2.1', *American Journal of Philology*, 126: 257–80.
- (2008), 'Each Man's Father Served as his Teacher: Constructing Relatedness in Pliny's Letters', *Classical Antiquity*, 27/2: 203–30.
- BERTIER, J. (1991), 'La Médecine des enfants dans l'Oribase latin', in P. Mudry and J. Pigeaud (eds.), *Les Écoles médicales à Rome*, Geneva, 269–84.
- (1996), 'La Médecine des enfants à l'époque impériale', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.37.3: 2147–227.
- BETTINI, M. (1986), *Antropologia e cultura romana: Parentela, tempo, immagini dell'anima*, Rome.

- BETTINI, M. (1989), 'Le riscritture del mito', in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli, and A. Giardina (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*, I, *La produzione del testo*, Rome, 15–35.
- (1992), *Familie und Verwandtschaft im antiken Rom*, Frankfurt/M. and New York.
- (1999 [1st edn. 1986]), *Antropologia e cultura romana*, Rome (Eng. trans. Baltimore 1991).
- (2005), 'Death and its Double: *Imagines*, *Ridiculum* and *Honos* in the Aristocratic Funeral', in Mustakallio, Hanska, Sainio, and Vuolanto 2005, 191–202.
- (2008a), *Voci*, Turin.
- (2008b), 'Weighty Words, Suspect Speech: *fari* in Roman Culture', *Arethusa*, 41: 313–75.
- BIANCHI BANDINELLI, R. (1980), *La pittura antica* (F. Coarelli and L. Franchi dell'Orto eds.), *Biblioteca di storia antica*, 11, Rome.
- BIEZUNSKA-MALOWIST, I. M. (1971), 'Die *Expositio* von Kindern als Quelle der Sklavenbeschaffung im griechisch-römischen Aegypten', *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 2: 129–33.
- (1977), *L'Esclavage dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine*, II, *Période romaine*, Wrocław.
- BINDER, G. (1985), '*Lusus Troiae*: L'Enéide de Virgile comme source archéologique', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 44: 349–56.
- BIONDI, B. (1954), *Il diritto romano cristiano*, III, *La famiglia: Rapporti patrimoniali: Diritto pubblico*, Milan.
- BIRLEY, A. (1997), *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, New York.
- BLANC, N., and MARTINEZ, J.-L. (1998), 'La Tombe de Patron à Rome', in N. Blanc (ed.), *Au royaume des ombres: La Peinture funéraire antique, Catalogue d'exposition*, Paris and Saint-Romain-en-Gal-Vienne, 82–95.
- BLÜMNER, H. (1879), *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, Leipzig, II.
- BODEL, J. (1999), 'Death on Display: Looking at Roman Funerals', in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Studies in the History of Art 56), Washington, DC, 259–81.
- BOËLS-JANSSEN, N. (1993), *La Vie religieuse des matrones dans la Rome archaïque*, Rome.
- BOETHIUS, A. (1942), 'On the Ancestral Masks of the Romans', *Acta Archaeologica*, 13: 226–35.
- BONNARD, J.-B. (2006), 'Il paraît en effet que les fils ressemblent aux pères', in F. Prost and J. Wilgoux (eds.), *Penser et représenter le corps dans l'Antiquité*, Rennes, 307–18.

- BONNER, S. F. (1977), *Education in Ancient Rome: From Cato the Elder to Pliny the Younger*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- BOOTH, A. D. (1979), 'The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 109: 11–19.
- BORDENACHE BATTAGLIA, G. (1983), Corredi funerari di età imperiale e barbarica nel Museo nazionale romano, Rome.
- BORGEAUD, P. (ed.) (1988), *Mémoire des religions*, Geneva.
- (2004), 'L'Enfance au miel dans les récits antiques', in Dasen 2004, 113–26.
- BOSWELL, J. (1988), *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance*, New York.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1972), *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique*, Geneva.
- (1982), *Ce que parler veut dire: L'Économie des échanges linguistiques*, Paris.
- BOYANCÉ, P. (1944), 'L'Apothéose de Tullia', *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 46: 179–84.
- BRADLEY, K. R. (1986a), 'Wet-Nursing at Rome: A Study in Social Relations', in Rawson 1986, 201–29
- (1986b), 'Seneca and Slavery', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 37: 161–72.
- (1991a), *Discovering the Roman Family*, New York and Oxford.
- (1991b), 'Child Care at Rome—The Role of Men', in Bradley 1991a, 37–75.
- (1991c), 'Dislocation in the Roman family', in Bradley 1991a, 125–55.
- (1991d), 'Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Family at Rome', in Bradley 1991a, 156–76.
- (1991e), [Review of] 'Thomas Wiedemann, Adults and Children in the Roman Empire, London 1989', *Classical Philology*, 86: 258–63.
- (1998), 'The Roman Family at Dinner', in I. Nielsen and H. Sigismund Nielsen (eds.), *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*, Aarhus, 36–55.
- (2005), 'The Roman Child in Sickness and Health', in George 2005, 67–92.
- BRAUN, M., HALTENHOFF, A., and MUTSCHLER, F.-H. (eds.) (2000), *Moribus antiquis res stat Romana: Römische Werte und römische Literatur im 3. und 2. Jh. v. Chr.*, Munich and Leipzig.
- BRECHTER, S. (1941), *Die Quellen zur Angelsachsenmission Gregors des Grossen*, Münster.
- BRELICH, A. (1969), *Paidēs e partenoi*, Rome.
- BREMMER, J. A. (1995), 'The Family and other Centres of Religious Learning in Antiquity', in J. W. Drijvers and A. A. MacDonald (eds.), *Centres of*

- Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, Leiden and New York, 29–38.
- (1997), ‘Jokes, Jokers and Jokebooks in Ancient Greece’, in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Humour from Antiquity to the Present Day*, Cambridge, 11–28.
- BRENNAN, T. C. (2000), *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- BRETIN-CHABROL, M. (2007), *La Naissance et l’origine: Métaphores végétales de la filiation dans les textes romains de Caton à Gaius* (stirps, propago, suboles, semen, satus, inserere), Doctoral Dissertation, under the supervision of P. Moreau, Université Paris XII.
- BRISSON, L. (1994), *Platon, les mots et les mythes*, Paris.
- BROMMER, F. (1953–4), ‘Zu den römischen Ahnenbildern’, *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 60–1: 163–71.
- BROWNING, R. (2000), ‘Education in the Roman Empire’, in A. Cameron et al. (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History XIV. Late Antiquity: Empire and Successors, A.D. 425–600*, Cambridge, 855–83.
- BRUHNS, H. (1990), ‘Parenté et alliances politiques à la fin de la République romaine’, in Andreau and Bruhns 1990, 571–94.
- (1994), ‘Verwandtschaftsstrukturen, Geschlechterverhältnisse und Max Webers Theorie der alten Stadt’, in C. Meier (ed.), *Die okzidentale Stadt nach Max Weber*, Munich, 59–94.
- BRULÉ, P. (1987), *La Fille d’Athènes: La Religion des filles à Athènes à l’époque classique: Mythes, cultes et société*, Paris.
- (2007), *La Grèce d’à côté: Réel et imaginaire en miroir en Grèce antique*, Rennes.
- BUCKLAND, W. W. (1908), *The Roman Law of Slavery*, Cambridge.
- BÜLL, R. (1959), *Vom Wachs: Hoehster Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Wachse*, I, *Beiträge 10/11*, Frankfurt a.M.
- and MOSER, E. (1973), s.v. Wachs, *RE*, Suppl. Bd. XIII: 1347–416.
- BURCKHARDT L. (2003), “‘Zu Hause geht Alles, wie wir wünschen . . .’— Privates und Politisches in den Briefen Ciceros’, *Klio*, 85: 94–113.
- and UNGERN-STERNBERG, J. VON (1994), ‘Cornelia, Mutter der Gracchen’, in M. H. Dettenhofer (ed.), *Reine Männersache? Frauen in den Männerdomänen der antiken Welt*, Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 97–132.
- BURGUIÈRE, A., KLAPISCH-ZUBER, C., and SEGALEN, M., et al. (eds.) (1986), *Histoire de la famille*, I–II, Paris.
- BUTLER, S. (1998), ‘Notes on a “*membrum disiectum*”’, in S. R. Joshel and S. Murnaghan (eds.), *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*, London and New York, 236–55.



- BUTRICA, J. (2005), 'Some Myths and Anomalies in the Study of Roman Sexuality', *Journal of Homosexuality*, 49/3–4: 209–69.
- BUTTERWORTH, A., and LAURENCE, R. (2005), *Pompeii: The Living City*, London.
- BYL, S., and BARGIBANT, A. (1991), 'L'Enfant chez Galien', in J. A. López Férez (ed.), *Galeno: Obra, pensamiento e influencia*, Madrid, 107–17.
- CALAME, C. (1996 [1st edn. 1990]), *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien*, Lausanne.
- CAMERON, A. (1939), 'Threptos and Related Terms in the Inscriptions of Asia Minor', in W. M. Calder and J. Keil (eds.), *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Butler*, Manchester, 27–62.
- CANCIK, H. (1973), 'Römischer Religionsunterricht in apostolischer Zeit: Ein pastoralgeschichtlicher Versuch zu Statius *Silvae* 5, 3, 176–184', in H. Feld and J. Nolte (eds.), *Wort Gottes in der Zeit*, Düsseldorf, 181–97.
- CANFORA, L. (2001), *Caesar: Der demokratische Diktator, Eine Biographie*, Munich.
- CANTARELLA, E. (2003), 'Fathers and Sons in Rome', *Classical World*, 96: 281–98.
- CAPASSO, L. (2000), 'Indoor Pollution and Respiratory Diseases in Ancient Rome', *The Lancet*, 356, Nov.: 1774.
- CARP, T. (1981), 'Two Matrons of the Late Republic', in H. P. Foley (ed.), *Reflexions of Women in Antiquity*, New York, London, and Paris, 343–54 [1st publ. in *Women's Studies* 8, 1981: 189–200].
- CATALANO, P., et al. (2003), 'Studio del microclima per la conservazione della Mummia di Grottarossa', *Materiali e strutture: Problemi di conservazione*, 2: 135–61.
- CENNINI, C. (1933 [1st edn. 1390]), *Libro dell'Arte* (Eng. trans. by D. V. Thompson, *The Craftsman's Handbook: The Italian 'Il Libro dell' Arte'*, New York).
- CERULLI IRELLI, G., AOYAGI, M., DE CARO, S., and PAPPALARDO, U. (eds.) (1993), *La Peinture de Pompéi: Témoignages de l'art romain dans la zone ensevelie par (le) Vésuve en 79 ap. J.-C., I–II*, Paris.
- CHAMPEAUX, J. (1982), *Fortuna: Recherches sur le culte de la Fortune à Rome et dans le monde romain des origines à la mort de César*, I, *Fortuna dans la religion archaïque*, Rome.
- CHAMPLIN, E. (1991), *Final Judgments: Duty and Emotion in Roman Wills 200 B.C.–A.D. 250*, Berkeley.
- CHARLES-LAFORGE M.O. (2007), "Imagines Maiorum" et portraits d'ancêtres à Pompéi, in *La Norme à Pompéi (Ier siècle avant – Ier siècle après J.-C.)*, Colloque organisé par M.-O. Charles-Laforge, Centre Jacob

- Spon, Romanitas, Université Lyon 2—le 17 novembre 2004 (Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 21), Rome, 158–71.
- CHARLIER, P. (2003), 'Les Maladies infantiles: Cas paléopathologiques en Gaule romaine', in Gourevitch, Moirin, and Rouquet 2003, 184–8.
- CICHORIUS, C. (1921), 'Ein Heiratsprojekt im Hause Caesars', in *Festgabe Friedrich Bezold. Dargebracht zum 70. Geburtstag von seinen Schülern, Kollegen und Freunden*, Bonn and Leipzig, 59–80.
- CLAASSEN, J.-M. (1996), 'Documents of a Crumbling Marriage: The Case of Cicero and Terentia', *Phoenix*, 50: 208–32.
- CLARK, G. (1993), *Women in Late Antiquity: Pagan and Christian Lifestyles*, Oxford.
- (1994), 'The Fathers and the Children', in D. Wood (ed.), *The Church and Childhood* (Studies in Church History 31), Cambridge, 1–28.
- CLARK, P. A. (1991), 'Tullia and Crassipes', *Phoenix*, 45: 28–38.
- CLARKE, J. R. (1991), *The Houses of Roman Italy, 100 B.C.–A.D. 250: Ritual, Space, and Decoration*, Oxford.
- (1995), 'Landscape Paintings in the Villa of Oplontis', *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 9: 81–107.
- COARELLI, F. (1969), 'Le Tyrannoctone du Capitole et la mort de Tibérius Gracchus', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité*, 81: 137–60.
- COHEN, A., and RUTTER, J. (eds.) (2007), *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (Hesperia suppl.).
- COLGRAVE, B., and MYNORS, R. A. B. (1969), *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Oxford.
- COLLINS, J. H. (1951), 'Tullia's Engagement and Marriage to Dolabella', *Classical Journal*, 47: 164–8.
- CORBEAUD, E. (1900), s.v. *imago*, in Daremberg and Saglio, III: 412–14.
- CORBELL, T. (1996), *Controlling Laughter: Political Humour in the Late Republic*, Princeton.
- (2001), 'Education in the Roman Republic: Creating Traditions', in Y. L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 261–87.
- CORBETT, P. B. (1986), *The Scurra*, Edinburgh.
- CORBIER, M. (1987), 'Les Comportements familiaux de l'aristocratie romaine (II<sup>ème</sup> siècle avant J.-C. – III<sup>ème</sup> siècle après J.-C.)', *Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 42: 1267–85.
- (1991), 'Divorce and Adoption as Roman Familial Strategies', in Rawson 1991, 47–78.
- (1999), 'La Petite Enfance à Rome: Lois, normes, pratiques individuelles et collectives', *Annales: Histoire, sciences sociales*, 6: 1257–90.
- (2001), 'Child Exposure and Abandonment', in Dixon 2001b, 52–73.

- (2006), 'Parenté et alliance dans le monde romain (II<sup>e</sup> siècle a.C. – VI<sup>e</sup> siècle p.C.)', in A. Bresson (ed.), *Parenté et société dans le monde grec de l'antiquité à l'âge moderne*, Bordeaux, 199–208.
- CORCORAN, S. (2000), 'The Sins of the Fathers: A Neglected Constitution of Diocletian on Incest', *Journal of Legal History*, 21: 1–34.
- COUDRY, M., and SPÄTH, T. (2001), *L'Invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique/Die Konstruktion der grossen Männer Altroms. Actes du colloque du Collegium Beatus Rhenanus, Augst 16–18 septembre 1999* (Collections de l'Université Marc Bloch—Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne), Paris.
- COULON, G. (1994), *L'Enfant en Gaule romaine*, Paris (2nd revised edn. 2004).
- CROISILLE, J.-M. (2005), *La Peinture romaine*, Paris.
- (2010), *Paysages dans la peinture romaine*, Paris.
- CROOK, J. A. (1967), *Law and Life of Rome, 90 B.C. – A.D. 212*, Ithaca, NY.
- D'AMBRA, E. (2002), 'Acquiring an Ancestor: The Importance of Funerary Statuary among the Non-Élite Orders of Rome', in J. M. Hojte (ed.), *Images of Ancestors*, Aarhus, 223–46.
- DAMON, C. (1997), *The Mask of the Parasite: A Pathology of Roman Patronage*, Ann Arbor.
- D'ARMS, J. (1999), 'Performing Culture: Roman Spectacle and the Banquets of the Powerful', in B. Bergman and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, New Haven, 301–19.
- DASEN, V. (2003), 'L'Enfant malade', in Gourevitch, Moirin, and Rouquet 2003, 178–82.
- (ed.) (2004), *Naissance et petite enfance dans l'Antiquité, Actes du colloque de Fribourg, 28 novembre – 1er décembre 2001*, Fribourg and Göttingen.
- (2005), *Jumeaux, jumelles dans l'Antiquité grecque et romaine*, Kilchberg.
- (2006), 'La Mort des enfants à Rome: L'Impossible chagrin?', in *L'enfant, La Vouivre*, 15: 29–37.
- (2009a), 'Empreintes maternelles', in *La madre/The Mother, Micrologus XVII*, Florence, 35–54.
- (2009b), 'Roman Birth Rites of Passage Revisited', *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 22: 199–214.
- (2010), 'Naissance et petite enfance, grec', in *ThesCRA VI*.
- LETT, D., MOREL, M.-F., and ROLLET, C. (2001), 'Dix ans de travaux sur l'enfance', in *Enfances: Bilan d'une décennie de recherche, Annales de démographie historique*, 2: 5–100.

- DAUT, R. (1975), *Imago: Untersuchungen zum Bildbegriff der Römer*, Heidelberg.
- DAVID, J.-M. (1980), 'Maiorum exempla sequi: l'exemplum historique dans les discours judiciaires de Cicéron', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen-âge*, 92/1: 67–86.
- (1992), *Le Patronat judiciaire au dernier siècle de la République romaine*, Rome and Paris.
- (1998a), 'De l'action exemplaire à la mise en scène des actes à Rome aux deux derniers siècles avant notre ère', in *Travail sur la figure, travail de la mémoire*, Strasbourg, 5–16.
- (ed.) (1998b), *Valeurs et mémoire à Rome. Valère Maxime ou la vertu recomposée* (Coll. de l'Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne), Paris.
- and DONDIN, M. (1980), 'Dion Cassius, XXXVI, 41, 1–2: Conduites symboliques et comportements exemplaires de Lucullus, Acilius Glabrio et Papirius Carbo (78 et 67 a. C.)', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité*, 92/1: 199–213.
- DEANESLY, M., and GROSJEAN, P. A. (1959), 'The Canterbury Edition of the Answers of Pope Gregory I to St. Augustine', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 10: 1–49.
- DIDI-HUBERMANN, G. (1994), 'Ressemblance mythifiée et ressemblance oubliée chez Vasari: La Légende du portrait "sur le vif"', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen-âge*, 106: 383–432.
- (1999), 'Wax Flesh, Vicious Circles', in *Encyclopaedia Anatomica: A Complete Collection of Anatomical Waxes*, Cologne, 64–74.
- DIXON, S. (1984), 'Family Finances: Tullia and Terentia', *Antichthon*, 18: 78–101 [= (abridged) in Rawson 1986, 93–120].
- (1991), 'The Sentimental Ideal of the Roman Family', in Rawson 1991, 99–113.
- (1992), *The Roman Family*, Baltimore.
- (1999), 'The Circulation of Children in Roman Society', in M. Corbier (ed.), *Adoption et fosterage*, Paris, 217–30.
- (2001a), 'Rape in Roman Law and Myth', in S. Dixon (ed.), *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres and Real Life*, London, 45–55.
- (ed.) (2001b), *Childhood, Class and Kin in the Roman World*, London and New York.
- (2007), *Cornelia: Mother of the Gracchi*, London and New York.
- DOLANSKY, F. (2008), 'Togam Virilem Sumere: Coming of Age in the Roman World', in J. Edmondson and A. Keith (eds.), *Roman Dress and the Fabrics of Roman Culture*, Toronto, 47–70.
- DONATI, F. (2005), 'Pueri nell'arena: Fonti per una iconografia', *Archeologia classica*, 56, NS 6: 80–129.

- DONDIN-PAYRE, M. (1993), *Exercice du pouvoir et continuité gentilice: Les Acilii Glabrones du 3<sup>ème</sup> siècle ap. J.-C. au 5<sup>ème</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.*, Rome.
- DRERUP, H. (1980), 'Totenmaske und Ahnenbild bei den Römern', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 87: 81–129.
- DUDAY, H., LAUBENHEIMER F., and TILLIER, A.-M. (1995), *Sallèles d'Aude: Nouveau-nés et nourrissons gallo-romains* (Centre de recherche d'histoire ancienne 144), Paris.
- DUNAND, F., and Lichtenberg, R. (1998), *Les Momies et la mort en Égypte*, Paris.
- DUNBABIN, K. M. D. (1999), *Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World*, Cambridge.
- DUPONT, F. (1998), 'Imago identique et imago identitaire: Le Jeu du double dans la comédie romaine', in C. Auvray-Assayas (ed.), *Images romaines*, Paris, 247–60.
- DURAND, R. (2003), 'La Mortalité infantile en Gaule romaine'; 'Les sépultures d'enfants', in Gourevitch, Moirin, and Rouquet 2003, 94–97, 112–15.
- DURLING, R. J. (1993), *A Dictionary of Medical Terms in Galen*, Leiden.
- DWYER, E. J. (1982), *Pompeian Domestic Sculpture: A Study of Five Pompeian Houses and their Contents*, Rome.
- ECK, W. (1986), 'Inchriften aus der Vatikanischen Nekropole unter St. Peter', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 65: 245–93.
- (1993), 'Das s. c. de Cn. Pisone patre und seine Publikation in der Baetica', *Cahiers du Centre Glotz*, 54: 189–208.
- EHRHARDT, W. (1998), *Casa di Paquius Proculus (I 7,1.20)* (Häuser in Pompeji 9), Munich.
- EIJK, T. VAN (1972), 'Marriage and Virginity, Death and Immortality', in J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (eds.), *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris, 220–35.
- ERMETE, K. (2003), *Terentia und Tullia—Frauen der senatorischen Oberschicht*, Frankfurt a.M.
- ESTIENNE, S. (2005), 'Saliens', in *ThesCRAV*: 85–7.
- PRESCENDI, F., SCHEID, J., and VAN HAEPEREN, F. (2005), 'Les Enfants (*pueri patrimi matrimique, camilli*)', in *ThesCRAV*: 116.
- EVANS GRUBBS, J. (1993a), 'Constantine and Imperial Legislation on the Family', in J. Harries and I. Wood (eds.), *The Theodosian Code: Studies in the Imperial Law of Late Antiquity*, London and Ithaca, 120–42.
- (1993b), "'Marriage more Shameful than Adultery": Slave–Mistress Relationships, "Mixed Marriages", and Late Roman Law', *Phoenix*, 47: 125–54.

- EVANS GRUBBS, J. (1995), *Law and Family in Late Antiquity: The Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation*, Oxford.
- (2000), 'The Slave who Avenged her Master's Death', *Ancient History Bulletin*, 14: 81–8.
- (2005), 'Parent–Child Conflict in the Roman Family: The Evidence of Justinian', in George 2005, 93–128.
- (2009), 'Church, State, and Children: Christian and Imperial Attitudes toward Infant Exposure in Late Antiquity', in A. Cain and N. Lenski (eds.), *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, Aldershot, 119–31.
- (forthcoming), *Children without Fathers in Roman Imperial Law: Paternity, Legitimacy, and Freedom*, to be published by Oxford University Press.
- EWALD, P., and HARTMANN, L. E. (1899), *Gregorii I Papae registrum epistolarum*, II, Berlin.
- EYBEN, E. (1986), 'Sozialgeschichte des Kindes im römischen Altertum', in J. Martin and A. Nitschke (eds.), *Zur Sozialgeschichte des Kindes*, Freiburg and Munich, 317–64.
- (1991), 'Fathers and Sons', in Rawson 1991, 114–43.
- (1993), *Restless Youth in Ancient Rome*, London and New York.
- FANTHAM, E. (1999), 'Chironis Exemplum: On Teachers and Surrogate Fathers in Achilleid and Silvae', *Hermathena*, 167: 59–70.
- FARMER, H. (1959), 'St Gregory's Answers to St Augustine of Canterbury', *Studia Monastica*, 1: 419–22.
- FAYER, C. (1994), *La familia romana*, I, Rome.
- FEHRLE, R. (1983), *Cato Uticensis*, Darmstadt.
- FENTRESS, J., and WICKHAM, C. (1992), *Social Memory (New Perspectives on the Past)*, Oxford.
- FERAUDI-GRUÉNAIS, F. (2001), *Ubi diutius nobis habitandum est: Die Innendekoration der kaiserzeitlichen Gräber Roms*, Wiesbaden.
- FERRARY, J.-L. (1988), *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome.
- FLAIG, E. (1995), 'Die *Pompa Funebri*: Adlige Konkurrenz und annalistische Erinnerung in der Römischen Republik', in O. G. Oexle (ed.), *Memoria als Kultur*, Göttingen, 115–48.
- FLESS, F. (1995), *Opferdiener und Kultmusiker auf stadtrömischen historischen Reliefs*, Mainz.
- FLEURY, J. (1933), *Recherches sur les empêchements de parenté dans le mariage canonique des origines aux fausses décrétales*, Paris.

- FLORY, M. B. (1993), 'Livia and the History of Public Honorific Statues for Women in Rome', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 123: 287–308.
- FLOWER, H. I. (1996), *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford.
- (2002), 'Were Women ever Ancestors in Republican Rome?', in J. M. Hojte (ed.), *Images of Ancestors*, Aarhus, 159–84.
- FORBES, C. A. (1955), 'The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 86: 321–360.
- FORTGENS, H. W. (1959), 'Publius Papinius Statius, de Latijnse dichter van het kinderleven', *Hermeneus*, 31/1: 52–9.
- FOSSATI VANZETTI, M. B. (1983), 'Vendita ed esposizione degli infanti da Costantino a Giustiniano', *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris*, 49: 179–224.
- FRANCIOSI, E. (1988), 'Il regime delle nozze incestuose nelle *Novelle giustiniane*', *Estudios en homenaje al Profesor Juan Iglesias*, II, Madrid, 727–46.
- FRANÇOIS, E., and SCHULZE, H. (2001), *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*, I–III, Munich.
- FRASCHETTI, A. ([1st Ital. edn. 1994] 1996), 'Jeunes romaines', in G. Levi and J.-C. Schmitt (eds.), *Histoire des jeunes en Occident*, I, *De l'Antiquité à l'époque moderne*, Paris, 63–100.
- FRIESEN, B. (2006), 'Answers and Echoes: The *Libellus Responsionum* and the Hagiography of North-Western European Mission', *Early Medieval Europe*, 4/2: 153–73.
- FUCHS, M. (2007), 'Peintures de paysages au nord des Alpes romaines', in C. Robotti (ed.), *Disegni e progetti di città e paesaggi fortificati. Atti del Quinto Colloquio internazionale di Studi Castello di Carlo V, Capua 3–4 dicembre 2005*, Lecce, 188–99.
- (2008), 'Petite vieille ou noble dame: Portraits de femmes âgées sous l'Empire romain', in V. Dasen and J. Wilgaux (eds.), *Langages et métaphores du corps*, Rennes, 73–89.
- GABORIT, J.-R., and LIGOT, J. (eds.) (1987), *Sculptures en cire de l'ancienne Egypte à l'art abstrait*, Paris.
- GARDNER, J. (1986), *Women in Roman Law and Society*, London and Sydney.
- (1989), 'The Adoption of Roman Freedmen', *Phoenix*, 43: 236–57.
- (1998), *The Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, Oxford.
- GARTHWAITE, J. (1984), 'Statius, Silvae 3.4: On the Fate of Earinus', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.32.1: 111–24.
- GAUDEMET, J. (1993), *Les Sources du droit canonique. VIII<sup>e</sup>–XX<sup>e</sup> s.*, Paris.

- GEHRKE, H.-J. (1994), 'Römischer mos und griechische Ethik: Überlegungen zum Zusammenhang von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung im Hellenismus', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 258: 593–622.
- GEIGER, J. (1972), 'Canidius or Caninius?', *Classical Quarterly*, 22: 130–4.
- (1973), 'The Last Servilii Caepiones of the Republic', *Ancient Society*, 4: 143–56.
- GELZER, M. (1918), s.v. Iunius (Brutus) No. 53, *RE* X.1: 973–1020.
- GENNEP, A. VAN (1981 [1st edn. 1909]), *Les Rites de passage*, Paris.
- GEORGE, M. (ed.) (2005), *The Roman Family in the Empire: Rome, Italy and Beyond*, Oxford.
- GIBSON, N. J. (2006), *Statius Silvae 5. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford.
- GIPPERT, J. (1997), *Index Galenicus: Wortformenindex zu den Schriften Galens*, Dettelbach, 2 vols.
- GIULIANI, L. (1986), *Bildnis und Botschaft, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Bildniskunst der römischen Republik*, Frankfurt a.M.
- (2008), 'Imagines maiorum, öffentliche Bildnisstatuen und die Extensivierung der *res publica*', in M. Bernett, W. Nippel, and A. Winterling (eds.), *Christian Meier zur Diskussion*, Stuttgart, 143–59.
- GLADIGOW, B. (1997), 'Erwerb religiöser Kompetenz: Kult und Öffentlichkeit in den klassischen Religionen', in G. Binder and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Religiöse Kommunikation: Formen und Praxis vor der Neuzeit*, Trier, 103–18.
- GOETTE, H. R. (1989), 'Römische Kinderbildnisse mit Jugendlocken', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, 104: 203–17.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1963), *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*, Glencoe, Ill.
- GOLDEN, M. (1988), 'Did the Ancients Care when their Children Died?', *Greece & Rome*, 35: 152–63.
- (2004), 'Mortality, Mourning and Mothers', in Dasen 2004, 145–57.
- GOMBRICH, E. H. (1972), 'The Mask and the Face: The Perception of Physiognomic Likeness in Life and Art', in E. H. Gombrich, J. Hochberg, and M. Black, *Art, Perception and Reality*, Baltimore and London, 1–46.
- GONZENBACH, V. VON (1957), *Untersuchungen zu den Knabenweißen im Isiskult der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Bonn.
- GOTTER, U. (2001), *Griechenland in Rom? Die römische Rede über Hellas und ihre Kontexte (3.–1. Jh. v.Chr.)* (unpub. Habilitation), Freiburg.



- GOUREVITCH, D. (1975), 'A propos de la simulation dans l'Antiquité: Galien et sa monographie princeps, *Quomodo morbum simulantes sint deprehendendi libellus*, *Médecine légale et expertise médicale*: 13–18.
- (1982), 'La *gestatio* thérapeutique à Rome', *Centre Jean Palerne. Mémoires*, 3: 55–65.
- (1987), 'L'Esthétique médicale de Galien', *Les Études classiques*, 55: 267–90.
- (1988), 'Galien, médecin décideur', *Prospective et santé: La Clinique demain*, 46: 81–8.
- (1990), 'La Malade, sa maladie et ses thérapeutes dans la Rome impériale', *Actions et recherches sociales*, Mar. 1990: 42–7.
- (1991), 'Un enfant muet de naissance s'exprime par le dessin : A propos d'un cas rapporté par Pline l'Ancien', *L'Évolution psychiatrique*, 56: 889–93.
- (1992), 'Is it Beautiful, is it Ugly? Considerations on the Aesthetics of Newborn Babies during the Roman Empire', *Forum*, 2, *History of medicine*: 5–11.
- (1994), 'Comment rendre à sa véritable nature le petit monstre humain?', in P. J. van der Eijk, H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, and P. J. Schrijvers (eds.), *Ancient Medicine in its Socio-Cultural Context*, II, Amsterdam, 239–60.
- (1995), 'Les Noms de la maladie, continuités et nouveautés', in D. Gourevitch (ed.), *Histoire de la médecine: Leçons méthodologiques*, Paris, 52–7.
- (1998), 'Les Sociétés antiques connaissaient-elles l'addiction?', in *Les Passions dangereuses*, Paris, *Dossiers de l'IEPS*, 9–11.
- (2001), *I giovani pazienti di Galeno*, Rome and Bari.
- (2006), 'L'Enfant handicapé à Rome: Mise au point et perspectives', *Medicina nei Secoli*, 18/2: 459–77.
- and GOUREVITCH, M. (1983a), 'Chronique anachronique, XI, Un enfant boulimique?', *L'Évolution psychiatrique*, 48: 853–7.
- (1983b), 'Chronique anachronique, IX, Marc-Aurèle devint-il toxico-dépendant?', *L'Évolution psychiatrique*, 48: 253–6.
- and GRMEK, M. (1986), 'Medice, cura te ipsum: Les Maladies de Galien', *Études de lettres*: 45–64.
- MOIRIN, A., and ROUQUET, N. (eds.) (2003), *Maternité et petite enfance dans l'Antiquité romaine. Catalogue de l'exposition, Bourges, Muséum d'histoire naturelle, 6 novembre 2003 – 28 mars 2004*, Bourges.
- GOYON, J.-C. (ed.) (1972), *Rituels funéraires de l'ancienne Egypte: Le Rituel de l'embaumement, le rituel de l'ouverture de la bouche, les livres des respirations*, Paris.

- GRIFFIN, M. T. (1976), *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*, Oxford.
- GRIMM, G. (1974), *Die römischen Mumienmasken aus Ägypten*, Wiesbaden.
- GRMEK, M. D. (1983), *Les Maladies à l'aube de la civilisation occidentale*, Paris (2nd edn. 1994; Eng. trans. Baltimore, 1989).
- and GOUREVITCH, D. (1998), *Les Maladies dans l'art antique*, Paris.
- GRUNDMANN, M. (2006), *Sozialisation: Skizze einer allgemeinen Theorie*, Konstanz.
- GUASTELLA, G. (1985), 'La rete del sangue: Simbologia delle relazioni e modelli dell'identità nella cultura romana', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, 15: 49–123.
- GUITTARD, C. (1988), 'Naissance et développement d'une légende: Les "Decii"', in D. Porte and J.-P. Néraudau (eds.), *Hommages à H. Le Bonniec. Res sacrae* (Latomus 201), Brussels, 256–66.
- GUROIAN, V. (2001), 'The Ecclesial Family: John Chrysostom on Parenthood', in M. J. Bunge (ed.), *The Child in Christian Thought*, Grand Rapids, 61–77.
- GWYNN, A. (1964), *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*, New York.
- HAAKE, M. (2007), *Der Philosoph in der Stadt: Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philosophen und Philosophie in den hellenistischen Poleis*, Munich.
- HACKWORTH PETERSEN, L. (2006), *The Freedman in Roman Art and History*, Cambridge.
- HALBWACHS, M. (1968 [1st edn. 1950]), *La Mémoire collective*, Paris (Eng. trans. New York, 1980).
- (1971 [1st edn. 1941]), *La Topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte: Étude de mémoire collective*, Paris.
- (1994 [1st edn. 1925]), *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris.
- HALL, J. (2005), 'Cicero Fam. 16.21, Roman Politeness, and the Socialization of Marcus Cicero the Younger', in K. Welch and T. W. Hillard (eds.), *Roman Crossings: Theory and Practice in the Roman Republic*, Swansea, 259–78.
- HALLETT, J. P. (1984), *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family*, Princeton.
- (2004), 'Matriot Games? Cornelia, Mother of the Gracchi, and the Forging of Family-Oriented Political Values', in F. McHardy and E. Marshall (eds.), *Women's Influence on Classical Civilization*, London and New York, 26–39.
- HALLIWELL, S. (1991), 'The Uses of Laughter in Greek Culture', *Classical Quarterly*, 41: 279–96.
- (2008), *Greek Laughter*, Cambridge.

- HALTENHOFF, A., HEIL, A., and MUTSCHLER, F.-H. (eds.) (2005), *Römische Werte als Gegenstand der Altertumswissenschaft*, Munich.
- HANDEL, G. (ed.) (2006 [1st edn. New York, 1988]), *Childhood Socialization*, New Brunswick and London.
- HANKINSON, R. J. (ed.) (1998), *Galen on Antecedent Causes*, Cambridge.
- HARDERS, A.-C. (2007a), 'Die verwandtschaftlichen Beziehungen der Servilia, Ehefrau des L. Licinius Lucullus: Schwester oder Nichte des Cato Uticensis?', *Historia*, 56: 453–61.
- (2007b), 'Die Identität der Iunia, *Dékmou thugátēr* und Ehefrau des P. Servilius Isauricus (cos. 48): Überlegungen zu BMusImp 3:3,1, PH 206 und IG XII Suppl. 60', *Klio*, 89: 403–16.
- (2008), *Suavissima Soror: Untersuchungen zu den Bruder-Schwester-Beziehungen in der römischen Republik*, Munich.
- HARLOW, M., LAURENCE, R., and VUOLANTO, V. (2007), 'Past, Present and Future in the Study of Roman Childhood', in S. Crawford and G. Shepherd (eds.), *Children, Childhood and Society (IAA Interdisciplinary Series 1/BAR International Series 1697)*, 1–14.
- HARRIS, W. (1994), 'Child-Exposure in the Roman Empire', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 84: 1–22.
- (1999), 'Demography, Geography, and the Sources of Roman Slaves', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 89: 62–75.
- HEDRICK, C. W. (2000), *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*, Austin.
- HELBIG, W. (1963), *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, I, *Die Päpstlichen Sammlungen im Vatikan und Lateran*, Tübingen.
- HENRIKSÉN, C. (1997), 'Earinus: An Imperial Eunuch in the Light of the Poems of Martial and Statius', *Mnemosyne*, 50/3: 281–94.
- HERRMANN-OTTO, E. (1994), *Ex ancilla natus*. Untersuchungen zu den 'hausgeborenen' Sklaven und Sklavinnen im Westen des römischen Kaiserreiches, Stuttgart.
- HÖLKESKAMP, K.-J. (1996), 'Exempla und mos maiorum: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität', in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (eds.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewusstsein*, Tübingen, 302–38.
- HÖLSCHER, T. (1978), 'Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 85: 315–57.
- HONORÉ, T. (1994; 1st edn. London, 1981), *Emperors and Lawyers*, Oxford.
- HOPKINS, K. (1965), 'The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage', *Population Studies*, 19: 309–27.

- HOPKINS, K. (1983), *Death and Renewal*, Cambridge.
- HORN, C. B. (2005), 'Children's Play as Social Ritual', in V. Burrus (ed.), *A People's History of Christianity, II, Christianity in the Roman World*, Minneapolis, 95–116.
- (2007), 'Children as Pilgrims and the Cult of Holy Children in the Early Syriac Tradition: The Cases of Theodoret of Cyrillus and the Child-Martyrs Behnām, Sarah, and Cyriacus', *ARAM Periodical*, 19/1–2: 439–62.
- HORSEFALL, N. (1989), 'Virgil and Marcellus' Education', *Classical Quarterly*, 39: 266–7.
- (1996), *La cultura della plebs romana*, Barcelona.
- HÜBNER, S. R., and RATZAN, D. M. (eds.) (2009a), *Growing up Fatherless in Antiquity*, Cambridge.
- (2009b), 'Fatherless Antiquity? Perspectives on "Fatherlessness" in the Ancient Mediterranean', in Hübner and Ratzan 2009a, 3–28.
- HUET, V., and WYLER, S. (2005), "'Copies romaines d'un original grec", ou les arts grecs revisités par les Romains', *Métis*, ns 3: 151–77.
- HUMPHREYS, S. C. (1993 [1st edn. 1983]), *The Family, Women and Death: Comparative Studies*, Ann Arbor.
- HUNECKE, V. (1994), 'The Abandonment of Legitimate Children in Nineteenth-Century Milan and the European Context', in J. Henderson and R. Wall (eds.), *Poor Women and Children in the European Past*, London and New York, 117–35.
- HUNZIKER, E. (1887), '*Camilli, camillae*', in Daremberg and Saglio, I.2: 858–9.
- HUYS, M. (1995), 'The Spartan Practice of Selective Infanticide and its Parallels in Ancient Utopian Tradition', *Ancient Society*, 27: 47–74.
- ILBERG, J. (1905), 'Aus Galens Praxis: Ein Kulturbild aus der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, 15: 276–312 (republished in H. Flashar (ed.), *Antike Medizin*, Darmstadt 1971, 361–416).
- IOANNATOU, M. (2006), *Affaires d'argent dans la correspondance de Cicéron: L'Aristocratie sénatoriale face à ses dettes*, Paris.
- ISKANDAR, A. Z. (1988), *De optimo medico cognoscendo: On Examinations by which the Best Physicians are Recognized*, edn. of the Arabic version, with English translation and commentary (CMG Suppl. Or. IV), Berlin.
- ISNENGI, M. (ed.) (1996–8), *I luoghi della memoria*, I–III, Rome.
- JACQUES, F. (1987), 'L'Éthique et la statistique à propos du renouvellement du sénat romain (Ier–IIIe siècles de l'Empire)', *Annales: Économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 42: 1287–1303.
- KASTEN, H. (1997<sup>5</sup>), *Marcus Tullius Cicero, An seine Freunde*, It.–Dt., Düsseldorf and Zurich.

- KASTER, R. A. (1988), *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- (1995), *C. Suetonius Tranquillus De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*, Oxford.
- (2001), 'Controlling Reason: Declamation in Rhetorical Education at Rome', in Y. L. Too (ed.), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden, 317–37.
- (2005), *Emotion, Restraint and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- KERTZER, D. (1993), *Sacrificed for Honor: Italian Infant Abandonment and the Politics of Reproductive Control*, Boston.
- KIERNER, C. (2004), *Scandal at Bizarre: Rumor and Reputation in Jefferson's America*, Charlottesville.
- KING, M. (2000), 'Commemoration of Infants on Roman Funerary Inscriptions', in G. J. Oliver (ed.), *The Epigraphy of Death*, Liverpool, 117–54.
- KOCH, C. (1949), 'Patrimi et matrimi', in *RE* XVIII.4: 2250–2.
- KOTILA, H. (1992), *Memoria mortuorum: Commemoration of the Deported in Augustine* (Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 38), Rome.
- KRASSER, H. (2002), 'Poeten, Papageien und Patrone: Statius Silve 2, 4 als Beispiel einer kulturwissenschaftlichen Textinterpretation', in J. P. Schwindt (ed.), *Klassische Philologie inter disciplinas: Aktuelle Konzepte zu Gegenstand und Methode eines Grundlagenfaches*, Heidelberg, 151–68.
- KUNST, C. (2005), *Römische Adoption: Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation*, Hennef.
- LA MONACA, V. (2007), 'Festius: Un caso emblematico di *delicatus*?', *Epigraphica*, 69: 169–80.
- (2008), 'I *Delicati* nella Cisalpina', in P. Basso, A. Buonopane, A. Cavarzere, and S. Pesavento Mattioli (eds.), *Est enim ille Italiae flos . . . Vita economica e sociale nella Cisalpina romana. Atti delle giornate di studio in onore di Ezio Buchi, Verona 30 novembre – 1 dicembre 2006*, Verona, 211–19.
- LAES, C. (2003), 'Desperately Different? Delicia Children in the Roman Household', in Balch and Osiek 2003, 298–326.
- (2004a), 'High Hopes, Bitter Grief: Children in Latin Literary Inscriptions', in G. Partoens, G. Roskam, and T. Van Houdt (eds.), *Virtutis Imago. Studies on the Conceptualisation and Transformation of an Ancient Ideal*, Leuven, Paris, and Dudley, Mass., 43–77.
- (2004b), 'Romeinse "paedagogi" tussen minaching en waarding: Een voorbeeld van "differential equations"', *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Zuid-Nederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal-en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis*, 58: 161–80.

- LAES, C. (2004*c*), 'Children and Accidents in the Roman Empire', *Ancient Society*, 34: 153–70.
- (2006), *Kinderen bij de Romeinen: Zes eeuwen dagelijks leven*, Leuven.
- (2010*a*), 'When Classicists Need to Speak Up: Antiquity and Present Day Pedophilia', in V. Sofronievski (ed.), *Aeternitas Antiquitas. Proceedings of the Symposium Held in Skopje (Ziva Antika)*, Skopje, 30–59.
- (2010*b*, forthcoming), 'The Educated Midwife in the Roman Empire: An Example of Differential Equations', in H. F. J. Horsmanshoff (ed.), *Hippocrates and Medical Education. Selected Papers read at the XIIth International Hippocrates Colloquium, Universiteit Leiden, 24–26 August 2005*, Leiden.
- LAGUNA, G. (1992), *Estacio, Silvas III. Introduccion, edicion critica, traduccion e comentario*, Madrid.
- LAHUSEN, G. (1982), 'Statuae et imagines', in B. von Freytag *et al.* (eds.), *Praestant Interna. Festschrift für Ulrich Hausman*, Tübingen, 101–9.
- (1985), 'Zur Funktion und Rezeption des römischen Ahnenbildes', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 92: 261–89.
- (1995), 'Sur l'origine et la terminologie des portraits romains', in *Le Regard de Rome: Portraits romains des musées de Mérida, Toulouse et Tarragona*, Toulouse, 246–59.
- LAIRD, M. L. (2008), 'Interpreting Children in Roman Imperial Art' [Review of J. D. Uzzi, *Children in the Visual Arts of Imperial Rome*, Cambridge 2005], *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 21: 509–14.
- LANCIANI, R. (1892), *Pagan and Christian Rome*, Boston and New York.
- LASTEYRIE, R. DE (1878), 'Notice sur un cimetière romain', *Revue Archéologique*, 19/35: 371–83.
- LAUBENHEIMER, F. (2004), 'La Mort des tout petits dans l'Occident romain', in *Dasen 2004*, 293–315.
- LAVAGNE, H., BALANDA, E. DE, and URIBE ECHEVERRIA, A. (eds.) (2001), *Jeunesse de la beauté: La Peinture romaine antique*, Paris.
- LAWRENCE, R., and PATERSON, J. (1999), 'Power and Laughter: Imperial Dicta', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, 67: 183–97.
- LAZZARONI, S. (1991), *Sepulcra familiaria: Un'indagine epigrafico-giuridica*, Padua.
- LEACH, E. W. (1988), *The Rhetoric of Space, Literary and Artistic Representations of Landscape in Republican and Augustan Rome*, Princeton.
- (1990), 'The Politics of Self-Presentation: Pliny's Letters and Roman Portrait Sculpture', *Classical Antiquity*, 9: 14–37.

- LE GOFF, J. (1986), *Storia e memoria*, Turin [1st published in *Enciclopedia Einaudi*, Turin, 1977; French edn.: Paris, 1986; German trans. Berlin, 1999].
- LEHNHERR, Y., and SCHUSTER CORDONE, C. (eds.) (2003), *Au-delà du visible: Reliquaires et travaux de couvents*, Fribourg.
- LEITH, D. (2008), 'The Diatribe and Therapy in Graeco-Roman Medicine', *Classical Quarterly*, 58: 581–600.
- LELIS, A. A., PERCY, W. A., and VERSTRAETE, B. C. (2003), *The Age of Marriage in Ancient Rome*, Lewiston [etc.].
- LENTANO, M. (1995), 'Nupta verba—Praetextata verba: Considerazioni sul frammento 68 Lindsay di Plauto', *Aufidus*, 25: 7–17.
- LEO, F. (1901), *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*, Leipzig.
- LÉVI-STRAUSS, C. (1967), *Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté*, Paris.
- LEYERLE, B. (1997), 'Appealing to Children', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 5/2: 243–70.
- LIFTON, R. J. (1977 [1st edn. 1973]), 'The Sense of Immortality: On Death and the Continuity of Life', in H. Feifel (ed.), *New Meanings of Death*, New York, 273–90.
- LING, R. (1977), 'Stadius and the Beginnings of Roman Landscape Painting', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 67: 1–16.
- (1991), *Roman Painting*, Cambridge.
- (1993), 'The Paintings of the Columbarium of Villa Doria Pamphili in Rome', in E. M. Moormann (ed.), *Functional and Spatial Analysis of Wall Painting. Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress on Ancient Wall Painting (Amsterdam, 8–12 September 1992)* (Babesch Suppl. 3), Leiden, 127–35.
- (1998), 'Le Columbarium de la villa Doria Pamphili à Rome', in N. Blanc (ed.), *Au royaume des ombres: La Peinture funéraire antique, Catalogue d'exposition*, Paris, 45–7.
- LINKE, B., and STEMMLER, M. (eds.) (2000), *Mos Maiorum: Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart.
- LINTOTT, A. (2008), *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*, Oxford.
- MCDONNELL, M. (2006), *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
- MAIURI, A. (1933), *La casa del Menandro e il suo tesoro di argenteria*, Rome.
- MALASE, M. (1972), *Les Conditions de pénétration et de diffusion des cultes égyptiens en Italie*, Leiden.
- MANCA MASCIADRI, M., and MONTEVECCHI, O. (1984), *I contratti di baliaatico* (Corpus Papyrorum Graecorum 1), Milan.

- MANTLE, I. C. (2002), 'The Roles of Children in Roman Religion', *Greece & Rome*, 49: 85–106.
- MARGANNE, M.-H. (1991), 'L'Égypte médicale de Pline l'Ancien', in *Le Latin médical* (Centre Jean Palerne, Mémoires X), Saint-Étienne, Université de Saint-Étienne, 155–71.
- MARINESCU, C. A., COX, S. E., and WACHTER, R. (2005), 'Walking and Talking among Us: Personifications in a Group of Late Antique Mosaics', in H. Morlier (ed.), *La Mosaïque gréco-romaine IX*, II, Rome, 1269–77.
- (2007), 'Paideia's Children: Childhood Education on a Group of Late Antique Mosaics', in Cohen and Rutter 2007, 101–14.
- MARROU, H.-I. (1957), *Geschichte der Erziehung im klassischen Altertum*, Freiburg and Munich.
- MARTIN, J. (1984), 'Zur Stellung des Vaters in antiken Gesellschaften', in H. Süßmuth (ed.), *Historische Anthropologie: Der Mensch in der Geschichte*, Göttingen, 84–109.
- (1997), 'Zwei Alte Geschichten: Vergleichende historisch-anthropologische Betrachtungen zu Griechenland und Rom', *Saeculum*, 48: 1–20.
- (2002), 'Familie, Verwandtschaft und Staat in der römischen Republik', in J. Spielvogel (ed.), *Res Publica reperta: Zur Verfassung und Gesellschaft der römischen Republik und des frühen Prinzipats*, Festschrift für Jochen Bleicken zum 75. Geburtstag, Stuttgart, 13–24.
- and NITSCHKE, A. (eds.) (1986), *Zur Sozialgeschichte der Kindheit* (Kindheit, Jugend, Familie 2), Freiburg and Munich.
- and ZOEPFFEL, R. (eds.) (1989), *Aufgaben, Rollen und Räume von Frau und Mann*, I–II (Kindheit, Jugend, Familie 3), Freiburg and Munich.
- MARTINEZ-PINNA, J. (1995), 'L'Oenoché de Tragliatella: Considérations sur la société étrusque archaïque', *Studi Etruschi*, 60: 79–92.
- MAVROUDIS, A. D. (1986), 'Critical Notes on a Medical Papyrus (PSI III 252)', *Aristotelian University of Thessalonica, Annual of the Faculty of Medicine*, 16: 187–209.
- MENCACCI, F. (1996), *I fratelli amici: La rappresentazione dei gemelli nella cultura romana*, Venice.
- (2001), 'Genealogia metaforica e maiores collettivi (prospettive antropologiche sulla costruzione dei *Viri illustres*)', in Coudry and Späth 2001, 421–37.
- (2005), *Parentela e quasi parentela: Pedagoghi, nutrici e altri ruoli 'vicari' nella letteratura latina*, Pisa.
- MEYVAERT, P. (1959), 'Les Responsiones de S. Grégoire le Grand à S. Augustin de Cantorbéry', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 54: 879–94.



- (1971), 'Bede's Text of the *Libellus responsionum* of Gregory the Great to Augustine of Canterbury', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, Cambridge, 15–33.
- (1986), 'Le *Libellus responsionum* à Augustin de Cantorbéry: Une œuvre authentique de saint Grégoire le Grand', in J. Fontaine, R. Gillet, and S. Pellistrandi (eds.), *Grégoire le Grand*, Paris, 543–50.
- MICHEL, D. (1990), *Casa dei Cei (I 6, 15) (Häuser in Pompeji 3)*, Munich.
- MIELSCH, H. (1975), *Roemische Stuckreliefs*, Heidelberg.
- (2001), *Römische Wandmalerei*, Darmstadt.
- and VON HESBERG, H. (1995), *Die heidnische Nekropole unter St. Peter in Rom, die Mausoleen E-I und Z-PSI*, Rome.
- MINARD, P. (1991), *Grégoire le Grand: Registre des lettres*, I (Livres I et II), Paris.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. (1971), 'La libertà di parola nel mondo antico', *Rivista storica italiana*, 83: 499–544.
- (1973), 'Freedom of Speech in Antiquity', in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, II, New York, 252–63.
- MOREAU, P. (1990), 'Adfinitas: La Parenté par alliance dans la société romaine (I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C. – II<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.)', in Andreau and Bruhns 1990, 3–26.
- (2002), *Incestus et prohibita nuptiae: Conception romaine de l'inceste et histoire des prohibitions matrimoniales pour cause de parenté dans la Rome antique*, Paris.
- MORGAN, T. (1998), *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge.
- MOTOMURA, R. (1988), 'The Practice of Exposing Infants and its Effects on the Development of Slavery in the Ancient World', in T. Yuge and M. Doi (eds.), *Forms of Control and Subordination in Antiquity*, Leiden, 410–15.
- MUDRY, P. (2004), 'Non pueri sicut viri: Petit aperçu de pédiatrie romaine', in Dasen 2004, 451–62.
- MÜLLER, E. W. (ed.) (1985), *Geschlechtsreife und Legitimation zur Zeugung (Kindheit, Jugend, Familie 1)*, Freiburg and Munich.
- MÜLLER, R. J. (1993), 'Tradierung religiösen Wissen in den Mysterienkulten am Beispiel von Andania', in W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur*, Tübingen, 307–16.
- MÜNZER, F. (1918a), s.v. Iunius (Brutus) No. 52, *RE X.1*: 972–3.
- (1918b), s.v. Iunius (Silanus) No. 163, *RE X.1*: 1090–1.
- (1920), *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien*, Stuttgart.

- MUSTAKALLIO, K., HANSKA, J., SAINIO, H.-L., and VUOLANTO, V. (eds.) (2005), *Hoping for Continuity: Childhood, Education and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, Rome.
- NAGLE, B. R. (2004), *The Silvae of Statius. Translated with Notes and Introduction*, Bloomington, Indianapolis.
- NANI, T. G. (1943–4), ‘Threpto’, *Epigraphica*, 5–6: 45–84.
- NATHAN, G. (2000), *The Family in Late Antiquity: The Rise of Christianity and the Endurance of Tradition*, London and New York.
- NAUTA, R. R. (2002), *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian*, Leyden.
- NAVA, M. L., PARIS, R., and FRIGGERI, R. (eds.) (2007), *Rosso Pompeiano: La decorazione pittorica nelle collezioni del Museo di Napoli e a Pompei*, Milan.
- NEILS, J., and OAKLEY, J. (eds.) (2004), *Coming of Age in Ancient Greece: Images of Childhood from the Classical Past*, Hanover and New Haven.
- NÉRAUDAU, J.-P. (2008 [1st edn. 1984]), *Être enfant à Rome*, Paris.
- NEWLANDS, C. (2002), *Statius’ Silvae and the Poetics of Empire*, Cambridge.
- NILSSON, M. P. (1955 [1st edn. 1941]), *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Munich.
- NORA, P. (1997 [1st edn. 1984–92]), *Les Lieux de mémoire*, I–III, Paris.
- NORBERG, D. (1982), *S. Gregorii Magni registrum epistularum. Libri I–VII et Libri VIII–XIV*, I–II, Turnhout (*Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina*, CXL et CXL A).
- NUTTON, V. (1990), ‘The Patient’s Choice: A New Treatise by Galen’, *Classical Quarterly*, 40: 236–57.
- (1997), ‘Galen on Theriac: Problems of Authenticity’, in A. Debru (ed.), *Galen on Pharmacology: Philosophy, History and Medicine*, Leiden, 133–51.
- OPPKA, A. (1934), ‘Amphithaleis in griechischen und hellenistischen Kult’, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, 31: 42–56.
- OOST, S. I. (1955), ‘Cato Uticensis and the Annexation of Cyprus’, *CPh* 50: 98–112.
- O’ROARK, D. (1999), ‘Parenthood in Late Antiquity: The Evidence of Chrysostom’, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 40: 53–81.
- PARKER, R. (1983), *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- PATTERSON, C. (1985), ‘“Not Worth the Rearing”: The Causes of Infant Exposure in Ancient Greece’, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 115: 103–23.
- PEDERZANI, O. (1995), *Il talamo, l’albero e lo specchio: Saggio di commento a Stat. Silv. I, 2, II 3, III 4*, Bari.
- PEDICINI, R., and PEDICINI, L. (eds.) (1986), *Le Collezioni del Museo Nazionale di Napoli*, Naples.

- PELLING, C. B. J. (1980), 'Plutarch's Adaptation of his Source Material', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 100: 127–40.
- PERTZ, G. H. (1837), *Monumenta Germaniae historica. Legum II, Pars altera. Capitularia spuria. Canones ecclesiastici. Bullae pontificum*, Hanovre.
- PETERS, W. J. T. (1963), *Landscape in Romano-Campanian Mural Painting*, Assen.
- (1993), *La Casa di Marcus Lucretius Fronto a Pompei e le sue pitture. Scrinium V*, Amsterdam.
- PETERSEN, J. M. (1994), 'The Education of Girls in Fourth-Century Rome', in D. Wood (ed.), *The Church and Childhood* (Studies in Church History 31), Cambridge, 29–38.
- PETERSEN, L. H. (2006), *The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History*, Cambridge.
- PIGEAUD, J. (1978), 'Du rythme dans le corps: Quelques notes sur l'interprétation du pouls par le médecin Hérophile', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 258–67.
- POLY, J.-P. (2003), *Le Chemin des amours barbares: Genèse médiévale de la sexualité européenne*, Paris.
- POMEROY, A. G. (1992), 'Trimalchio as *Deliciae*', *Phoenix*, 46: 45–53.
- POMEROY, S. B. (1976), 'The Relationship of the Married Woman to her Blood Relatives in Rome', *Ancient Society*, 7: 215–27.
- PRESCENDI, F. (1996), 'Il lutto dei padri nella cultura romana', in F. Hinard (ed.), *La Mort au quotidien dans le monde romain, Actes du colloque organisé par l'Université de Paris IV (Paris, Sorbonne 7–9 octobre 1993)*, Paris, 147–54.
- PROSPERI VALENTI, G. (1985), 'Attori-bambini del mondo romano attraverso le testimonianze epigrafiche', *Epigraphica*, 47: 71–82.
- PULLIATTI, S. (2001), *Incesti crimina: Regime giuridico da Augusto a Giustiniano*, Milan.
- RAWSON, B. (1966), 'Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire', *Classical Philology*, 61: 71–83.
- (1986) (ed.), *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, London and Sydney.
- (1989), 'Spurii and the Roman View of Illegitimacy', *Antichthon*, 23: 10–41.
- (1991) (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce and Children in Ancient Rome*, Oxford.
- (1997a), 'Representations of Roman Children and Childhood', *Antichthon*, 31: 74–95.
- (1997b), 'The Iconography of Roman Childhood', in Rawson and Weaver 1997, 205–32.

- RAWSON, (1999), 'Education, the Romans and Us', *Antichthon*, 33: 81–98.
- (2003), *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*, Oxford.
- (2005), 'Circulation of Staff between Roman Households', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 151: 223–5.
- and WEAVER, P. (eds.) (1997), *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space*, Oxford and New York.
- RAWSON, E. (1979), *Cicero: A Portrait*, London.
- RICHLIN, A. (1992), *The Gardens of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, New York and Oxford.
- RIETH, A. (1973), 'Antike Goldmasken', *Antike Welt*, 4: 28–34.
- RIPOSATI, B. (1939), *M. Terenti Varronis: De vita populi Romani. Fonti, esegesi, edizione critica dei frammenti*, Milan.
- ROLLER, M. B. (2006), *Dining Postures in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- ROMANO, G. (2005), 'Luperques', *ThesCRAV*: 89–91.
- ROSENBAUM, E. (1960), *A Catalogue of Cyrenaican Portrait Sculpture*, London.
- ROSSINI, O. (2006), *Ara Pacis*, Roma, Musei in Comune, Milan.
- ROSTOWZEW, M. (1904), 'Pompejanische Landschaften und römische Villen', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 19: 103–26.
- (1911), 'Die hellenistisch-römische Architekturlandschaft', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung*, 26: 1–186.
- ROUSSELLE, A. (1986), 'Gestes et signes de la famille dans l'Empire romain', in Burguière et al. 1986, 231–69.
- RUDHARDT, J. (1988), 'Mnémosyne et les Muses', in P. Borgeaud (ed.), *Mémoire des religions*, Geneva, 37–62.
- RÜHL, M. (2003), 'Confer gemitus pariterque fleamus! Die Epikedien in den *Silven* des Statius', *Hyperboreus*, 9/1: 114–26.
- (2006), *Literatur gewordener Augenblick: Die Silven des Statius im Kontext literarischer und sozialer Bedingungen*, Berlin and New York.
- SAGLIO, E. (1887), s.v. *cera*, in Daremberg and Saglio, I: 1019–20.
- SALLER, R. P. (1984), 'Familia, Domus, and the Roman Conception of the Family', *Phoenix*, 38: 336–55.
- (1994), *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge.
- (1997), 'Roman Kinship: Structure and Sentiment', in Rawson and Weaver 1997, 7–34.
- SALZMAN, M. R. (2000), 'Elite Realities and *Mentalités*: The Making of a Western Christian Aristocracy', *Arethusa*, 33: 347–62.
- (2001), 'Competing Claims to *Nobilitas* in the Western Empire of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 9/3: 359–85.

- SCAMUZZI, U. (1964), 'Studio sulla mummia di bambina cosiddetta "Mummia di Grottarossa" rinvenuta a Roma, sulla via Cassia, il 5-2-1964', *Rivista di studi classici*, 12: 264-80.
- (1965), 'La "Mummia di Grottarossa"', *Aegyptus*, 45: 74-83.
- SCARPAT, G. (1964), *Parrhesia: Storia del termine e delle sue traduzioni in latino*, Brescia.
- SCHÄFER, T. (1989), *Imperii insignia: Sella curulis und Fasces: zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate*, Mainz.
- SCHEID, J. (1990), *Romulus et ses frères: Le Collège des frères arvales, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*, Rome.
- (1998), *La Religion des Romains*, Paris.
- (2003), 'Religion romaine et spiritualité', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte*, 5: 198-209.
- (2007), 'Le Sens des rites: L'Exemple romain', in J. Scheid (ed.), *Rites et croyances dans les religions du monde romain* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique, Fondation Hardt 53), 39-63.
- and SVENBRO, J. (2003), *Le Métier de Zeus: Mythe du tissage et du tissu dans le monde gréco-romain*, Paris.
- SCHUIDEL, W. (1997), 'Quantifying the Sources of Slaves in the Early Roman Empire', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 87: 156-89.
- (2005), 'Human Mobility in Roman Italy, II: The Slave Population', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 95: 64-79.
- (2009), 'The Demographic Background', in Hübner and Ratzan 2009, 31-40.
- SCHLANGE-SCHÖNINGEN, H. (2003), *Die römische Gesellschaft bei Galen: Biographie und Sozialgeschichte*, Berlin and New York.
- SCHLOSSER, J. VON (1910-11), 'Tote Blicke: Geschichte der Porträtbilderei in Wachs: ein Versuch', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 29: 171-258 (French trans. *Histoire du portrait en cire*, Paris, 1997).
- SCHMITZ, T. A. (2002), *Moderne Literaturtheorie und antike Texte: Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt.
- SCHNEGG-KÖHLER, B. (2002), *Die augusteichen Säkularspiele*, Munich.
- SCHOLZ, P. (2004), 'Der Senat und die Intellektualisierung der Politik— Einige Bemerkungen zur Krise der traditionellen Erziehung in der späten römischen Republik', in C. Kretschmann, H. Pahl, and P. Scholz (eds.), *Wissen in der Krise: Institutionen des Wissens im gesellschaftlichen Wandel*, Berlin, 17-27.
- (2005), 'Zur öffentlichen Repräsentation römischer Senatoren und Magistrate: Einige Überlegungen zur (verlorenen) materiellen Kultur

- der republikanischen Senatsaristokratie', in T. L. Kienlin (ed.), *Die Dinge als Zeichen: Kulturelles Wissen und materielle Kultur*, Bonn, 409–31.
- (2006), 'Imitatio Patris statt griechischer Pädagogik: Überlegungen zur Sozialisation und Erziehung der republikanischen Senatsaristokratie', *Jahrbuch des Historischen Kollegs 2005*: 121–48.
- (2007), 'Senatorisches Mäzenatentum: Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Dichtern, Gelehrten und römischen *nobiles* in republikanischer Zeit', in U. Oevermann, J. Süßmann, and C. Tauber (eds.), *Die Kunst der Mächtigen und die Macht der Kunst: Untersuchungen zu Mäzenatentum und Kulturpatronage*, Berlin, 25–46.
- SCHOLZ, U. (1992), 'Von der Bildung eines römischen Politikers', *Humanistische Bildung*, 16: 25–37.
- SHACKLETON BAILEY, D. R. (1965–70), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, Lat.–Engl., 7 vols. (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 3–9), Cambridge.
- (1968), *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, III, CUP, Cambridge.
- (1980), *Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem et M. Brutum*, Lat.–Eng., (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 22), Cambridge.
- (1991 [1st edn. 1976]), *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature*, New York.
- SHAW, B. D. (1987a), 'The Family in Late Antiquity: The Experience of Augustine', *Past and Present*, 115: 3–51.
- (1987b), 'The Age of Roman Girls at Marriage: Some Reconsiderations', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 77: 30–46.
- (2001), 'Raising and Killing Children: Two Roman Myths', *Mnemosyne*, 54: 31–77.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, A. N. (1966), *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford.
- SHRIMPTON, G. S. (1997), *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*, Montreal.
- SIGISMUND NIELSEN, H. (1990), 'Delicia in Roman Literature and in the Urban Inscriptions', *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, 19: 79–88.
- (1991), 'Ditis examen domus? On the Use of the Term "Verna" in the Roman Epigraphical and Literary Sources', *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 42: 221–40.
- (1998), 'Roman Children at Mealtimes', in I. Nielsen and H. Sigismund Nielsen, *Meals in a Social Context: Aspects of the Communal Meal in the Hellenistic and Roman World*, Aarhus, 56–66.
- SLATER, W. J. (1974), 'Pueri, turba minuta', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 21: 133–40.
- SLIM, H. (1976), 'Masques mortuaires d'El-Jem (Thysdrus)', *Antiquités Africaines*, 10: 79–92.
- (1996), *El Jem: L'Antique Thysdrus*, Tunis.
- (2001), *La Tunisie antique: De Hannibal à Augustin*, Paris.

- SLUITER, I., and ROSEN, R. M. (2004), *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden.
- SMITH, C. J. (2006), *The Roman Clan. The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*, Cambridge.
- SMITH, R. R. R. (1981), 'Greeks, Foreigners and Roman Republican Portraits', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 71: 24–38.
- SPÄTH, T. (1998), 'Faits de mots et d'images: Les Grands Hommes de la Rome ancienne', *traverse*, 5/1: 35–56.
- (2006), 'Geschlechter—Texte—Wirklichkeiten', in C. Ulf and R. Rollinger (eds.), *Frauen und Geschlechter: Bilder—Rollen—Realitäten in den Texten antiker Autoren der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Vienna, 39–76.
- (2007), 'Blick auf Helden statt Blick auf Rom: Plutarchs Rezepte für ein globales Bankett der Moral', in M.-L. Freyburger and D. Meyer (eds.), *Visions grecques de Rome/Griechische Blicke auf Rom*, Paris, 143–70.
- SPINAZZOLA, V. (1953), *Pompei alla luce degli scavi nuovi di Via dell'Abbondanza*, I, Rome.
- SPITZBART, G. (1997), *Beda der Ehrwürdige: Kirchengeschichte des englischen Volkes*, Darmstadt.
- STEIN-HÖLKESKAMP, E. (ed.) (2006), *Erinnerungsorte der Antike: Die römische Welt*, Munich.
- STINCHCOMB, J. (1932/3), 'The Two Younger Tullii', *Classical Journal*, 28: 441–8.
- STOCKTON, D. (1979), *The Gracchi*, Oxford.
- STONE, L. (1990), *Road to Divorce: England 1530–1987*, Oxford.
- STUVERAS, R. (1969), *Le putto dans l'art romain*, Brussels.
- SYME, R. (1939), *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford.
- (1960), 'Bastards in the Roman Aristocracy', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 104: 323–7 (= *Roman Papers*, II, Oxford 1979, 510–17).
- (1980), 'No Son for Caesar?', *Historia*, 29: 422–37.
- (1986), *The Roman Aristocracy*, Oxford.
- TANNER, J. (2000), 'Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 90: 18–50.
- TAYLOR, L. R. (1960), *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: The Thirty-Five Urban and Rural Tribes*, Rome.
- TEMKIN, O. (1934), 'Galen's Advice for an Epileptic Boy', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 2: 179–89.
- (1971 [1st edn. 1945]), *The Falling Sickness: A History of Epilepsy from the Greeks to the Beginnings of Modern Neurology*, Baltimore.
- THOMAS, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture 18), Cambridge.

- THOMAS, Y. (1983), 'Pauro dei padri e violenza dei figli: Immagini retoriche e norme di diritto', in E. Pellizer and N. Zorzetti (eds.), *La paura dei padri nella società antica e medievale*, Rome and Bari, 113–40.
- (1984a), 'Vita Necisque Potestas: Le Père, la cité, la mort', in *Du châtement dans la Cité: Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique. Table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome avec le concours du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (Rome 9.–11. Novembre 1982)*, Rome, 499–548.
- (1984b), 'Se venger au Forum. Solidarité familiale et procès criminel à Rome', in R. Verdier and J.-P. Ply (eds.), *La vengeance. Vengeance, pouvoirs et idéologies dans quelques civilisations de l'Antiquité*, Paris, 65–100.
- (1986), 'Rome: A Rome, pères citoyens et cité des pères (II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C. – II<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C.)', in Burguière *et al.* 1986, 195–229.
- (1988), 'Le Droit romain: Le Traité des computs du juristeconsulte Paul', in P. Legendre, *Leçons IV, Le Dossier occidental de la parenté: Textes juridiques indésirables sur la généalogie*, Paris, 27–119.
- TILLY, L., FUCHS, R., KERTZER, D., and RANSEL, D. (1992), 'Child Abandonment in European History: A Symposium', *Journal of Family History*, 17: 1–23.
- TIMMER, J. (2008), *Altersgrenzen politischer Partizipation in antiken Gesellschaften*, Berlin.
- TREGGIARI, S. (1969), *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, Oxford.
- (1975), 'Family Life among the Staff of the Volusii', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 105: 393–401.
- (1979), 'Questions on Women Domestic in the Roman West', in *Schiavitù, manomissione e classi dipendenti nel mondo antico* (pubblicazioni dell'Istituto di storia antica, Università degli studi di Padova 13), Rome, 185–201.
- (1984), 'Digna condicio: Betrothals in the Roman Upper Class', *Échos du Monde Classique*, 3: 419–51.
- (1991), *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*, Oxford.
- (1998), 'Home and Forum: Cicero between "Public" and "Private"', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 128: 1–23.
- (2003), 'Ancestral Virtues and Vices: Cicero on Nature, Nurture and Presentation', in D. Braund and C. Gill (eds.), *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T. P. Wiseman*, Exeter, 139–64.
- (2005), 'Putting the Family Across: Cicero on Natural Affection', in George 2005, 9–35.
- (2007), *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia: The Women of Cicero's Family*, London.



- TURCAN, R. (1995), *L'Art romain dans l'histoire: Six siècles d'expressions de la romanité*, Paris.
- TYRRELL, R. Y., and PURSER, L. C. (1969 [1st edn. Dublin and London, 1914]), *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, III, Hildesheim.
- UZZI, J. D. (2005), *Children in the Visual Arts of Imperial Rome*, Cambridge.
- VALETTE-CAGNAC, E. (2003), 'Être enfant à Rome: Le Dur Apprentissage de la vie civique', *Terrain*, 40: 49–64.
- (2004), 'La Figure de la *reticentia* dans les traités de rhétorique', in L. Louvel and C. Rannoux (eds.), *La Réticence*, Rennes, 101–21.
- VAN DAM, H.-J. (1984), *Papinius Statius. Silvae Book II. A Commentary*, Leiden.
- VANSINA, J. (1985), *Oral Tradition as History*, Madison [= revised edn. of *De la tradition orale*, Tervuren 1961].
- VATTUONE, R. (2004), *Il mostro e il sapiente: Studi sull'erotica greca*, Bologna.
- VERSTRAETE, B. (1989), 'Panegyric and Candour in Statius, *Silvae*, 3, 4', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Brussels, 405–13.
- VESSBERG, O. (1941), *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik*, Lund and Leipzig.
- VEYNE, P. (1991), *La Société romaine*, Paris.
- VIAZZO, P. P. (1994), 'Family Structures and the Early Phase in the Individual Life Cycle: A Southern European Perspective', in J. Henderson and R. Wall (eds.), *Poor Women and Children in the European Past*, London and New York, 32–50.
- VOLLMER, F. (1898), *P. Papinii Statii, Silvarum libri: herausgegeben und erklärt*, Leipzig.
- VOLTERRA, E. (1939), 'L'efficacia delle costituzioni imperiali emanate per le provincie e l'instituto dell'*expositio*', in *Studi di storia e diritto in onore di Enrico Besta*, Milan, 449–77.
- VÖSSING, K. (2004), *Mensa Regia: Das Bankett beim hellenistischen König und beim römischen Kaiser*, Munich and Leipzig.
- VOUT, C. (2007), *Power and Eroticism in Imperial Rome*, Cambridge.
- VUOLANTO, V. (2002), 'Women and the Property of Fatherless Children in the Roman Empire', in P. Setälä *et al.* (eds.), *Women, Wealth and Power in the Roman Empire*, Rome, 203–43.
- (2003), 'Selling a Freeborn Child: Rhetoric and Social Realities in the Late Roman World', *Ancient Society*, 33: 169–207.
- (2009), 'Choosing Asceticism: Children and Parents, Vows and Conflicts', in C. Horn and R. Phenix (eds.), *Children in Late Ancient Christianity* (Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 58), Tübingen, 255–91.

- WALKER, S. (ed.) (2000), *Ancient Faces: Mummy Portraits from Roman Egypt*, London.
- WALTER, U. (2002), 'Geschichte als Lebensmacht im republikanischen Rom', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 53: 326–39.
- (2003), 'AHN MACHT SINN: Familientradition und Familienprofil im republikanischen Rom', in K.-J. Hölkeskamp et al. (eds.), *Sinn (in) der Antike: Orientierungssysteme, Leitbilder und Wertkonzepte im Altertum*, Mainz, 255–75.
- (2004), 'Ein Ebenbild des Vaters: Familiäre Wiederholungen in der historiographischen Traditionsbildung der römischen Republik', *Hermes*, 132: 406–25.
- WARBURG, A. M. (2008<sup>3</sup> [1st edn. 2000]), *Der Bilderatlas Mnemosyne* (Gesammelte Schriften, II.1, M. Warnke and C. Brink, eds.), Berlin.
- WATSON, A. (1985), trans., *The Digest of Justinian*, Philadelphia, 4 vols.
- WATSON, P. (1992), 'Erotion: Puella delicata?', *Classical Quarterly*, 42: 253–68.
- WEAVER, P. R. C. (1972), *Familia Caesaris*, Cambridge.
- (1990), 'Where Have All the Junian Latins Gone? Nomenclature and Status in the Roman Empire', *Chiron*, 20: 275–305.
- (2001), 'Reconstructing Lower-Class Roman Families', in Dixon 2001b, 101–14.
- WHITEHEAD, A. (2009), *Memory*, London.
- WIEDEMANN, T. (1989), *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire*, London.
- WILLIAMS, W. (1990), *Pliny the Younger: Correspondence with Trajan from Bithynia (Epistles X). Translation and Commentary*, Warminster.
- WLOSOK, A. (1978), 'Vater und Vaternormen in der römischen Kultur', in H. Tellenbach (ed.), *Das Vaterbild im Abendland*, I, Rom, frühes Christentum, Mittelalter, Neuzeit, Stuttgart, Berlin, and Cologne, 18–54.
- WREDE, H. (1981), *Consecratio in formam deorum: Vergöttlichte Privatpersonen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz am Rhein.
- YATES, F. A. (1966), *The Art of Memory*, London.
- ZADOKS-JOSEPHUS JITTA, A. N. (1932), *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic*, Amsterdam.
- ZAMBON, S. (2005), *Una voce tu sei e null'altro: L'usignolo nella tradizione culturale del mondo antico* (Tesi di dottorato), Siena.
- ZANKER, P. (1975), 'Grabreliefs römischer Freigelassener', *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, 90: 267–315.
- ZIOLKOWSKI, J. M. (1998), 'Obscenity in the Latin Grammatical and Rhetorical Tradition', in J. M. Ziolkowski (ed.), *Obscenity: Social Control and Artistic Creation in the European Middle Ages*, Leiden, Boston, and Cologne.
- ZOZ, M. G. (1970), 'In tema di obbligazioni alimentari', *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano* 'Vittorio Scialoja', 73: 323–55.