

The Text of the *Senatus Consultum De Agro Pergameno*

Robert K. Sherk

IN 1877 there appeared in several local periodicals of Smyrna the text of a Greek inscription found in Adramyttium which proved to be part of a letter sent by some high Roman magistrate. It contained the report of a decision made by a Roman official, almost certainly the *praetor urbanus*, in the matter of a dispute over land between the *publicani* and the city of Pergamum.¹ Although the details of the decision itself were missing, the inscription did contain a list of members of the *consilium* which the Roman official had consulted before reaching his decision. The *consilium* was surprisingly large, 33 names recorded before the stone broke off. The whole document was variously dated by scholars after the *Lex Sempronia* of 123 or 122 B.C. One of its most important features was the fact that the names of the Romans forming the *consilium* were given quite fully: praenomen, nomen, filiation and tribe. An invaluable aid to prosopographical research in the Republican period.

Then in 1934 F. Miltner and Selahattin Bey published another copy of the same inscription, this one found in the agora of Smyrna.² It was considerably larger than the one from Adramyttium, but was still incomplete at the beginning and end. Unfortunately the *editio princeps*

¹ G. Earinos, *Ἰωνία* 1877, no. 111, and *Ὁμηρος*, September 1877, p.396 (cf. also *Μουσείον καὶ Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Σχολῆς* I (1875) 137; T. Homolle, *BCH* 2 (1878) 128–32; E. Pottier, A. Hauvette-Besnault, *BCH* 4 (1880) 376; T. Mommsen, *Ephemeris Epigraphica* 4 (1881) 213–22 (= *Gesammelte Schriften* VIII.344–55); P. Willems, *Le Sénat de la république romaine* I² (Paris 1885) 693–708; P. Foucart, *BCH* 9 (1885) 401–403; T. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* III³ 2 (Leipzig 1888) 967–68 n.4; P. Viereck, *Sermo Graecus* (Göttingen 1888) 62, no. 15; P. Foucart, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 37 (1904) 337ff; T. Wiegand, *Athenische Mitteilungen* 29 (1904) 267; C. Cichorius, *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius* (Berlin 1908) 1–6 and 19; G. Lafaye, *IGRR* IV 262.

² F. Miltner and Selahattin Bey, *Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve etnografya Dergisi* II (1934) 240–42 (cf. *AE* 1935, 173); A. Passerini, *Athenaeum* 15 (1937) 252–83; M. Segre, *Athenaeum* 16 (1938) 124; L. Robert, *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler* (Manchester 1939) 227–30; G. I. Luzzatto, *Epigrafia giuridica greca e romana* (Milan 1942) 136–41; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* II (Princeton 1950) 1055–56 n.25; T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* I–II (New York 1951–52) with a Supplement (New York 1960), to be cited simply as Broughton; G. Tibiletti, *JRS* 47 (1957) 136–38; L. R. Taylor, *The Voting*

was inadequately published. Its general inaccessibility in a Turkish periodical and the incompleteness of the report in *L'Année Epigraphique* (1935, 173) made it difficult for scholars to use it, but when A. Passerini republished it in 1937 with greater accuracy and added a long—and still indispensable—commentary, it was at last possible to evaluate it more fully. Especially so, because he included other fragments belonging to the same text and the same dossier. His publication produced a number of different reactions from historians, for it seemed to indicate that Roman *publicani* were operating in Asia in 129 B.C. Hitherto it had been assumed that the *publicani* began collecting taxes in Asia only after the *Lex Sempronia*.³

Because of its obvious historical and prosopographical importance the opinion has often been expressed that a new investigation of the text be made and that it be republished with photographs.⁴ Mr Pierre MacKay has very kindly furnished me with many photographs of the stone and an excellent squeeze. He has also measured the stone anew and described its present location.⁵ These materials now make it possible to prepare a new edition of the text based on an independent examination of both photograph and squeeze. The accompanying photographs of both stone (PLATE 10) and squeeze (PLATE 11) will enable the reader to check the text for himself. Interest will center here on the text, on recording as faithfully as possible what is on the stone. Far-reaching interpretations and possible identifications of individual Romans will therefore be avoided.

The stone at present is still in the agora of Smyrna and located at the west end of the great north basilica.⁶ It is a massive block 1.17m. high, 0.82m. wide and 2.31m. thick. It has been re-used as the front face of a platform. It contains numerous cuttings, shows clear anathyrosis top and back, and has a bevelled inset (0.008m.) on the left

Districts of the Roman Republic (American Academy in Rome 1960), to be cited simply as TAYLOR; J. H. Oliver, *GRBS* 4 (1963) 141–43; A. H. J. Greenidge and A. M. Clay, *Sources for Roman History 133–70 B.C.*, 2nd ed. rev. E. W. Gray (Oxford 1960) App. II A, p.278; C. Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312–43 av. J.-C.)* I (Paris 1966) 348–50.

³ See M. Rostovtzeff, *SEHHW* II p.813 (with n.86 in III p.1525), but especially Passerini, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 277–83. Magie, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.2), challenges the date.

⁴ J. Keil, *Istanbuler Forschungen* 17 (1950) 54; Taylor p.171; E. Badian, review of Taylor in *JRS* 52 (1962) 208.

⁵ I wish to thank him here publicly for the excellence of his photograph and squeeze and above all for the time and effort expended in my behalf.

⁶ See R. Naumann and S. Kantar, "Die Agora von Smyrna," *Istanbuler Forschungen* 17 (1950) Tafel 46.

side 0.71m. back from the front face. Originally it may have formed the anta block of some large public building in the ancient agora. The inscription on the front face is damaged on all sides, the inscribed surface (fragment A) being 1.00m. high and *ca.* 0.55m. at its widest point. Of the four fragments known to Passerini (A, B, C, D) only A and B have been located by Mr MacKay, but these two are by far the largest.

Fragment B has been cemented to the block in what is approximately the correct alignment, and measures 0.21m. in height, 0.25m. in width. In the present photograph of the squeeze it had to be moved slightly lower than its correct relative position to fragment A in order to allow for better technical results.

Fragment C is a mere sliver, containing only 14 letters at the ends of lines 34–36. Fragment D (0.10m. high on the left, *ca.* 0.18m. on the right, and 0.12–0.13m. wide) contains part of eight lines of text which Passerini had brilliantly fitted into the ends of lines 45–52.

The letters of all fragments are not uniform in size. They vary from 0.010 to 0.015m. in height, and are sometimes squeezed together so that whereas in one place (line 10) eight letters occupy a space 0.14m. wide, in another place (line 25) fourteen letters fill the same amount of space. When one expands this ratio to cover the entire line, it will be apparent that there can be a very large difference from line to line in the number of letters. Passerini estimated that the number varied from about a minimum of 60 (lines 34–36) to about a maximum of 70 (lines 25–27), but it must be emphasized that as many as 75 might easily appear in one line and as few as 58 or less in some other. Furthermore there is no great consistency within each line, for often the size and spacing of the letters are greater in part of the line than they are elsewhere: see line 29. The difference between lines 10 and 11 is striking. Precision is therefore impossible. At most one can estimate the total number of letters per line to a tolerance of two, plus or minus. This may not be very helpful in identifying part of a Roman name or calculating the number of letters in his tribe, but to do more would be misleading. For each line the number of missing letters will be estimated by the size and closeness of the extant letters, each line demanding separate calculation. The best lines for estimating in general the approximate number of letters are 34–36, where fragment C appears to contain the right margin of the text. The restoration of names in those lines is assured by a comparison with the copy from

Adramyttium. Line 34 has 59 letters, line 35 has 58, and line 36 has 62. And in these lines the letters are not squeezed together as they are in 25–27.

From the character of the lettering M. Segre (*apud* Passerini, *op.cit.* 254) concluded that the inscription had been engraved in the first century before Christ. This requires explanation. Besides the four fragments belonging to the *senatus consultum* and the *sententia*, two other fragments (E and F, published by Passerini, *op.cit.* 272–77) contain part of a letter of Julius Caesar and a fourth document recording boundaries of Pergamene land.⁷ From this it would appear that the question of Pergamene land was raised again in the age of Julius Caesar and that then all the important documents connected with it were collected and published on the anta block of the building. This would explain the difference in dates. The date of the engraving proves nothing about the date when the *senatus consultum* was passed.

Occasionally empty spaces were used to set off one document or one phrase from another: see lines 17, 20 and 47. These are at most one letter space in width, sometimes less.

Iota adscriptum is usually omitted, except in lines 17–19, 21 and 23. *Apices* are employed throughout. Noteworthy are the appearances of *beta* (larger lower loop) and *upsilon* (the two upper bars are straight and meet the lower vertical bar quite near the bottom). The interval between lines varies from 0.005 to 0.015m.

A small, new break appears in fragment B which obliterates several of the letters once seen by Passerini on his squeeze. These letters are underlined in the present edition. Fragments C and D are given as Passerini saw them.

The copy from Adramyttium demands a few words. Earinos conjectured from the lettering that it had been engraved in the last twenty or thirty years of the second century before Christ, and it may well have been engraved immediately after the *sententia* had become known in Asia. I have consulted the Berlin squeeze of this copy.⁸ The reason why a copy of a text or texts relating to Pergamum had been engraved at Adramyttium is probably, as Passerini first suggested, that her boundaries were also involved in the boundary dispute with

⁷ See on these L. Robert, *op.cit.* 227–30.


⁸ Professor G. Klaffenbach has very kindly sent me very many squeezes in the past two years in preparation for a publication of all the extant Greek copies of *senatus consulta* and *epistulae* of the Republic.



SMYRNA INSCRIPTION (COPY B) OF SENATUS CONSULTUM DE AGRO PERGAMENO
THE STONE: FRAGMENTS A AND B

(photograph by Pierre MacKay)

PLATE 11 SHERK



SQUEEZE OF FRAGMENTS A AND B, SMYRNA TEXT OF SENATUS CONSULTUM
DE AGRO PERGAMENO

(squeeze made by Pierre Mackay)

Pergamum to the south. Any decision made by Rome on Pergamum's northern border would also involve Adramyttium. As for Smyrna, the same reasoning does not seem to be valid.⁹ Information on this point is lacking. But the most interesting fact about the copy from Adramyttium is that it appears to be in the form of a letter originating with a Roman official. Its extant text begins at line 21 of the Smyrna copy, which does not seem capable of the same construction. See the note on this line. The one copy therefore differs from the other in certain ways.

We turn to the text, using the Smyrna copy (B) as the basis and indicating in the notes to the text any differences in the Adramyttium copy (A). It is important to indicate also the places where copy A supports and supplements copy B, so that restorations in those places may be assured beyond reasonable doubt.

TEXT

- [-----]
- [----- ca. 40 -----] και πε[ρι] ----- ca. 15 -----]
- [----- ca. 25 ----- περι τούτου τ]οῦ πράγματ[ος οὕτως ἔδοξεν Περ]-
 [γαμηνοῦς πρεσβευτὰς ἀνδρας καλοῦς κάγαθ]οῦς και φίλο[υς παρὰ δήμου καλοῦ]
 5 [κάγαθοῦ και φίλου συμμάχου τε ἡμετέρου προσ]αγορευσαι, χάριτα, φιλίαν, συμμαχίαν]
 [τε ἀνανεώσασθαι. περι δὲ τῆς χώρας, ἥτις ἐ]ν ἀντιλογίᾳ ἐστὶν κα[ὶ] περι -- ca. 10 --]
- [-- ca. 10 -- ὅπως περι τούτων] τῶν πραγμ[άτ]ων, περι ἂν λόγους ἐπ[οιήσαντο, -- ca. 6 --]
- [-- στρατηγὸς κατὰ δήμον? ἐ]πιγνώ τίνες ὄρο[ι] Περγαμηγῶν εἰσίν, [ἐὰν αὐτῶ φαίνηται]
 [----- ca. 20 ----- ὄρι?]σμα ὑπεξειρημέ[νο]ν πεφυλαχ[μένον] ἐστὶν μὴ καρπί[ζεσθαι?]
 [καὶ Μάνιος Ἀκύλλιος Γάιος Σεμπρώ]νιος ὑπατοι ἀνὰ μέ[σ]ον αὐ[τῶν] φροντίσωσι ὅπως ἦ]
 10 [αὐτοὶ ἦ -- ὁ δεῖνα -- στρατ]ηγὸς κατὰ δήμον, [ᾧ ἂν αὐτῶν φαίνηται, τοῦτο δ ἂν]
 [ὁ δεῖνα στρατηγὸς κατὰ δήμον?] ἐπιγνώ περι τούτων τῶ[ν] πραγμάτων εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον
 [ἀπαγγελάωσι. Ὡσαύτως τῆ]ν σύγκλητον θέλειν κα[ὶ] δίκαιον ἡγεῖσθαι ἕκ τε τῶν]
 [ἡμετέρων δημοσίων] πραγμάτων διαλαμβάνειν [εἶναι ὅπως, οὕτως καθὼς ἂν τῶ δεῖνα]
 [στρατηγῶ κατὰ δήμον? δοκῆ] περι τούτων τῶν πραγμάτων, [ἄρχοντες ἡμέτεροι, οἱ τῆ] Ἀσίᾳ]
 15 [προσόδους ἐπιτιθῶσιν ἢ] τῆς Ἀσίας τὰς προσόδους μι[σθῶσιν, φροντί[ζωσι] οὕτως ὡς ἂν]
 [αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων π]ραγμάτων πιστεύς τε τῆς ἰδίᾳ[ς] φαίνηται, ταῦτα οὕτως ποιεῖσθαι?]
 [ὅπως τε Μάνιος Ἀκ]ύλλιος ὑπατος, ὅ ἐὰν αὐτῶ φαίνηται, ΘΙ[--- nomina legatorum --- ca. 20]
 [τόπον παροχῆν] ξενία τε κατὰ τὸ διάταγμα {ἐὰν αὐτῶ φαίν[ηται]} τὸν ταμίαν μισθῶσαι]
 [ἀποστεῖλαι τε κελύ]σῃ οὕτως καθὼς ἂν αὐτῶ ἐκ τῶν δημοσίων [πραγμάτων πιστεύς τε]
 20 [τῆς ἰδίας φαίνηται. ἔδο]ξεν. ὁ Κρίμα περι τῆς χώρας. ὁ Δέλτος ὁ Β ὁ Κ[ήρωμα] ----- πρὸ]
 [ἡμερῶν τριῶν καλανδῶ]ν Κοινκτελίω ἐν Κομετίω μετὰ συμβουλ[ίου] ----- ὁ δεῖνα -----]
 [στρατηγὸς κατὰ δήμον?] περι χώρας ἥτις ἐν ἀντιλογίᾳ ἐστὶν δημοσ[ίων]αὶ πρὸς τοὺς Περ]-
 [γαμηνοῦς ἐπέγνω. ἐ]ν τῶ συμ]βουλίῳ παρῆσαν Κόντος Καικίλιος Κόντου Ἀνήνησις, Γάιος]
 [... ἰος Γάιου Με]νηγία, Μάαρκος Πούπιος Μαάρκου Σκαπτία, Γά[ιος] Κορνήλιος Μαάρκου]
 25 [Στελατεῖνα, Λεύ]κιος Μέμμιος Γάιου Μενηγία, Κόντος Ουάλλιος [Μαάρκου ... ἰα],
 [Λεύκιος Ἰούλιος Σέξτ]ου Φαλέρνα, Γάιος Ἀννιος Γάιου Ἀρνήνησις, Γάιος [Σεμπρώ]νιος Γάιου]
 [Φαλέρνα, Γάιος Κοί]λιος Γάιου Αἰμιλία, Πόπλιος Ἀλβιος Ποπλίου Κυρίνα, [Μαάρκος Κοσκῶ]-
 [νιος Μαάρκου Τηρητ]εῖνα, Πόπλιος Γέσσιος Ποπλίου Ἀρνήνησις, Λεύκι[ος] Ἀφείνιος]
 [Λευκίου Ὠφεντεῖ]να, Γάιος Ρούβριος Γάιου Πουπεινία, Γάιος Δικίννιος Γάιου [Τηρη]-

⁹ See L. Robert, *op.cit.* 228 n.3, where he suggests that a copy was sent to Smyrna for publication because it was one of the largest cities in the province and the center of a *conventus*. Elaea borders on Pergamene land in the south, but Smyrna does not.

- 30 [τέινα, Μάαρκος Φα]λέριος Μαάρκου Κλαυδία, Μάνιος Λευκείλιος Μαάρκου Πα[μμεντείνα,]
 [Λεύκιος Φί]λιος Λευκίου Ώρατία, Γάιος Δίδιος Γαίου Κυρίνα, Κόντος [Κλαυδίου]
 [Ἄππιου Πολλία,] Λεύκιος Ἀνθέστιος Γαίου Μενηρία, Σπόριος Καρουί[λιος Λευκίου
 [Σαβατεία,] Πόπλιος Σείλιος Λευκίου Ουαλερία, Γναίος Ὀκτάν[ιος Λευκίου]
 [Αίμιλία, Μάα]ρκος Ἀππολῆιος Μαάρκου Καμιλία, Λεύκιος Ἀφείνιος Λε[υκίου]
- 35 [Λεμωνία, Γάιος] Ναύτιος Κοίντου Ουετυρία, Γάιος Νεμετώριος Γαί[ου Λ]εμ[ω]-
 [νία, Λεύκιος Κορνῆ]λιος Μαάρκου Ῥωμιλία, Γναίος Πομπῆιος Γναίου Κρ[οσ]τομεί-
 [να, Πόπλιος Ποπίλ]λιος Ποπλίου Τηρητεία, Λεύκιος Δομέτιος Γν[αίου Φαβία?]
 [--- ca. 15 --- Μαάρ]κου Πουπ[ε]νία, Μάαρκος Μούνιος Μαάρκου Λεμ[ωνία, ...]
 [--- ca. 15 ---]ου Λεμωνία, Κόντος Ποπίλλιος Ποπλίου Ῥωμ[ιλία,]
- 40 [--- ca. 12 --- Μαι]κία, Κόντος Λαβέριος Λευκίου Μαικία, Γάιος Ἐρέγ[νιος]
 [--- ca. 15 ---]ος Κοίντου Ὁφεντεία, Μά[α]ρκος Σέρριος Μά[α]ρκου]
 [--- ca. 15 --- Τ]ηρητεία, Λεύκιος Γενύκιος Λευκίου Τηρη[τεία, --- ca. 10 ---]
 [--- ca. 15 ---]α, Λεύκιος Πλαιτώριος Λευκίου Παπειρία, [--- ca. 15 ---]
 [--- ca. 15 --- Μ]άαρκος Λόλλιος Κοίντου Μενηρία, Γάιος [--- ca. 15 ---]
 45 [--- ca. 15 ---]είλιος Σέξτου Καμιλία, Γναίος Αὐφ[ίδιος --- ca. 10 ---]να,
 [--- ca. 17 ---] Ουελείνα, Λεύκιος Ἀνθέστιος [--- ca. 13 ---]να, Πόπλι-
 [ος --- ca. 18 ---] Σαβατεία, Μάαρκος [--- ca. 22 ---]ισσε. ὁ Ἀπό
 [συμβουλίου γνώμης γνώμη ἀπεφῆνατο τὰ]τ[ην --- ca. 23 ---]νης εἶναι δο-
 [κεῖ --- ca. 20 ---]ωι δς καλεῖται [--- ca. 18 ---] αὐτῶ τῶ ποτα-
 50 [μῶ --- ca. 20 ---] ἐστὶν ἐκ τούτου τ[οῦ ποταμοῦ? --- ca. 10 ---]ασκαωμανεῖτ[---]
 [--- ca. 25 ---]σ[...τ?]γμβην [--- ca. 20 ---] ἐγγιστα εἶ[ναι]
 [--- ca. 30 ---] ἀπὸ δὲ [--- ca. 25 ---] ἦσπα[---]
 [--- ca. 30 ---] ὄριον [--- ca. 30 ---]
 [-----]

TEXTUAL NOTES

Restorations are by Pass(erini) except where noted.

1. καὶ περὶ Pass., but the last two letters are not visible.
3. φίλ[ους Pass.
4. χάρι[τα Pass.
5. A new break in the stone (frag. B) appears here. Underlined parts were seen by Pass. but are no longer extant.
7. εἰσί[ν Pass.
10. στρατη]-γὸς Pass., but the right vertical bar of the *eta* can be seen.
15. τὰς] τῆς Ἀσίας προσόδους Pass., who failed to note the presence of the article on the stone.
17. Θη[--- Pass., but the squeeze and photograph show only one vertical bar with part of the horizontal bar. It may be an *eta*. It is important to note here that the consul—and he can hardly be any other than Manius Aquilius—is actually in office. Despite the objections of Magie, he is almost certainly the consul of 129 B.C. See the arguments of Broughton I. 496–97, and Tibiletti, *op.cit.* 136–138.
20. Cf. the S.C. *de Itanorum et Hierapytniorum Litibus* in *Inscr. Cret.* III 4, no. 10, pp.106–111, line 75: δέλτου ὀγδόης κηρώματι [τεσσαρεσ] καιδεκάτω.
21. Κοινκτελίων Pass., KOINKTEILION stone. Copy A begins at this point and continues to line 37 of B. At the start A differs from B in the construction. It begins with the letters [---]ατ[...]ον, which Foucart correctly restored as a reference to the praetor: [στρ]ατ[ηγ]όν. There followed the date and place of meeting of the *consilium*, and then the word ἐπεγνωκότα. This clearly indicates a different construction, an accusative and infinitive in indirect statement, for which copy B has no counterpart. Pass. explains it by pointing out that A was engraved toward the end of the second century B.C., while B was published in the middle of the first century, according to the lettering. Hence they are not simply two contemporary copies published for the same reasons. The decision of the magistrate would normally have been

communicated to the various cities involved in the proceedings by means of an official letter. This could account for a difference in construction. Other differences between A and B might be due simply to local errors at the time of engraving or the preparation of a copy. 23. In view of ἐ]πεγνωνκότα in A, Pass. restored ἐπέγνω(?) in B. But since B calls the *sententia* a κρῖμα in line 20, ἐπέκρινεν cannot be discounted as a possible restoration in line 23. 23–47. It will be convenient to number each of the names exactly as Passerini and Taylor have done, and to treat them in the order of their appearance in B.

1. Q. *Caecilius* Q.f. *Aniensis*. Tribe assured by A. The names of the members forming this *consilium*, as in others, were almost certainly listed in the order of rank. Such a procedure was followed in the listing of witnesses to Senatorial decrees, and the formalistic attitude of the Romans in this regard seems to have affected lists of Senators in general. See Mommsen, *op.cit.* 350, and Taylor 170. Thus it would appear that Q. *Caecilius* was the senior member and he may easily be the consul of 143, as generally assumed. Taylor 198. A high ranking consular would have been a necessity in such an important *consilium*.

2. C. . . . ius C.f. *Menenia*. The restored portions are preserved in A. The Berlin squeeze gives MEAIHNIA for the tribe. Taylor 223 (C. *Laelius*?); Broughton, Suppl. 33.

3. M. *Pupius* M.f. *Scaptia*. Taylor 249.

4. C. *Cornelius* M.f. *Stellatina*. Copy A assures the restoration. Taylor 207.

5. L. *Memmius* C.f. *Menenia*. Taylor 233–234; Broughton, Suppl. 40–41.

6. Q. *Valgius* M.f. lia. About five letters are lost in the name of the tribe. Taylor 262; Broughton, Suppl. 67.

7. L. *Iulius* Sex. f. *Falerna*. The praenomen, nomen and filiation are in A. Taylor 222; Broughton, Suppl. 32.

8. C. *Annius* C.f. *Arnensis*. Delayed in A to post 23. Taylor 190–191.

9. C. *Sempronius* C.f. *Falerna*. Delayed in A to post 24. Restoration assured by A. Taylor 252–253.

10. C. *Coelius* C.f. *Aemilia*. Assured by A. Taylor 199.

11. P. *Albius* P.f. *Quirina*. Taylor 188.

12. M. *Cosconius* M.f. *Teretina*. Assured by A, where, however, only -]ητεί-
να<ι> remains of the tribe. Taylor 208.

13. P. *Gessius* P.f. *Arnensis*. Taylor 218. See also E. Badian, *Historia* 12 (1963) 134.

14. L. *Afinius* L.f. *Ufentina*. Taylor 187.

15. C. *Rubrius* C.f. *Pupinia*. Taylor 251; Broughton, Suppl. 54. Copy A has ΠΟΠΙΛΛΙΑ.

16. C. *Licinius* C.f. *Teretina*. Tribe is assured by A. Taylor 224–225; Broughton, Suppl. 33.

17. M. *Falerius* M.f. *Claudia*. The praenomen and nomen are in A. Taylor 213.

18. M'. *Lucilius* M.f. *Pomentina*. Assured by A. Taylor 227; Broughton, Suppl. 37.

19. L. *Filius* L.f. *Horatia*. The praenomen and nomen are in A, but the tribe there given is the *Sabatina*. Taylor 213.

20. C. *Didius C.f. Quirina*. Taylor 210.
21. Q. *Claudius Ap.f. Pollia*. Restored from A. Taylor 203.
22. L. *Antistius C.f. Menenia*. In A the nomen is Ἀνότιος confirmed by the squeeze. Clearly a mistake. Taylor 191.
23. Sp. *Carvilius L.f. Sabatina*. Extant in A. Taylor 201.
24. P. *Silius L.f. Galeria*. Copy A has Γαλερία<ι>, for the tribe, which must be correct. There is no tribe called *Valeria*. Taylor 255.
25. Cn. *Octavius L.f. Aemilia*. Confirmed by A. Taylor 239.
26. M. *Appuleius M.f. Camilia*. Confirmed by A. Taylor 192.
27. L. *Afinius L.f. Lemonia*. Tribe confirmed by A. Taylor 187.
28. C. *Nautius Q.f. Veturia*. Fully extant in A, where, however, the editors of IGRG print Νούτιος. Mommsen has Ναύτιος, which is confirmed by the squeeze. Taylor 237.
29. C. *Numitorius C.f. Lemonia*. Fully extant in A. This assures the correct placement of frag. c in copy B. Taylor 238.
30. L. *Cornelius M.f. Romilia*. Confirmed by A. Taylor 207; Broughton, Suppl. 18.
31. Cn. *Pompeius Cn. f. Crustumina*. Confirmed by A. Taylor 245.
32. P. *Popillius P.f. Teretina*. Confirmed by A. Taylor 247; Broughton, Suppl. 49.
33. L. *Domitius Cn. f. Fabia*. Here copy A breaks off with the reading Λεύκι[os --- 22 ---]ΕΙΣ. On the Berlin squeeze can be seen the top halves of what appear to be the letters Υ Φ Α Β near the end of the *lacuna*. This must be part of his name: [Γναίο]υ Φαβ[ία]. Taylor 211; Broughton, Suppl. 23.
34. [-----] M.f. *Pupinia*.
35. M. *Munius M.f. Lemonia*. Taylor 236.
36. [-----] *Lemonia*.
37. Q. *Popillius P.f. Romilia*. Taylor 247; Broughton, Suppl. 49.
38. [-----] *Maecia*. Pass. did not see the *iota*. It is squeezed between the *kappa* and the *alpha*.
39. Q. *Laberius L.f. Maecia*. Taylor 223.
40. C. *Herennius* [-----].
41. [----] Q.f. *Ufentina*.
42. M. *Serrius M.f.* [----].
43. [-----] *Teretina*.
44. L. *Genucius L.f. Teretina*. Taylor 218.
45. [-----] a.
46. L. *Plaetorius L.f. Papiria*. Pass. read the name as if it were *Plattorius*, but there is no top cross-bar on what he took to be a *tau*. It is an *iota*. Taylor 243.
47. Missing.
48. M. *Lollius Q.f. Menenia*. Taylor 226.
49. C. [-----].
50. [----]ilius Sex. f. *Camilia*. See E. Badian in *Historia* 12 (1963) 132.
51. Cn. *Aufidius* [----]na. Taylor 196.
52. [-----] *Velina*.

53. *L. Antistius* [---]na. Taylor 191.

54. *P.* [----] *Sabatina*.

55. *M.* [-----].

Line 47. The small *vacat* near the end of the line indicates the beginning of a new section. It is clearly the *sententia* proper. It is not possible to tell exactly what the decision of the magistrate was, but certainly it was in favor of the Pergamenes (why else should they have published it?) and certainly it spelled out the exact borders of the land. Beyond that one can only guess. The letters --]!α[- which Pass. prints for line 54 are not visible. There are traces, but it is difficult to decide what letters they are.

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO
September, 1966