C. SILANUS, APPIA PARENTE GENITUS

A Note on Tac. Ann. 3, 68, 3
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Among the families attaining to remarkable prominence during the early principate and paying a price for it, the Iunii Silani occupy a conspicuous position. Consequently a great deal of ingenuity has been expended on the pertinent prosopographical problems evolving from testimony both literary and epigraphic. As far as one branch of the Iunii Silani is concerned—the descendants of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 19) who married a great-granddaughter of Augustus and fathered the pecus aurea M. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 46)—a fair consensus of opinion has been achieved. Questions affecting the relationships of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15), father-in-law of the emperor Gaius, have not been solved as satisfactorily. It may be expedient to subjoin the relevant data:

M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15) was the son of an otherwise unknown C. Silanus. His brother D. Iunius Silanus was implicated in the scandal of the younger Julia and permitted to return from exile in A.D. 20 as a result of his brother’s influential standing (Tac. Ann. 3, 24). His daughter Iunia Claudia (Claudilla) was married to Gaius and died in childbirth prior to A.D. 37 (Suet. Cal. 12; Tac. Ann. 6, 20.45). For reasons of nomenclature and chronology it has been surmised that M. Iunius Silanus was the brother of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) who was relegated to an island in A.D. 22, after having been charged with extortion (saevitia) and maiestas (Tac. Ann. 3, 66–69). Since Tacitus’ account of the trial shows Iunia...
Torquata, a Vestal Virgin,13 to have interceded on her brother’s behalf (Tac. Ann. 3, 69), she must then also be taken as a sister of M. Iunius Silanus.14

The fact that C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) had a son, emerges from another detail mentioned in connection with the trial:15 on the motion of Cn. Cornelius Lentulus the maternal property of C. Iunius Silanus was exempted from confiscation and bestowed upon his son (Tac. Ann. 3, 68). The assumption shared by Borghesi16 and Mommsen,17 that C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28)18 is to be identified with this son, has been disputed by Dessau on the following grounds: ‘Mirum autem esse damnationem patris filio non nocuisse; id ipsum mirum, filium duodeviginti annis post patrem consulatu ornatum’.19 C. Appius Iunius Silanus was therefore listed as brother of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15) and hence of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) by Dessau20 and Hohl.21 As Domitia Lepida’s22 third husband, since A.D. 41, he allegedly fell a prey to the machinations of his stepdaughter Messalina, seconded by Narcissus, during the course of the following year (Sen. Apoc. 11; Suet. C/. 29. 37; Dio 60, 14, 3f.; cf. Tac. Ann. 11, 29).

Since C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28) was the only member of the Iunii Silani to be endowed with the praenomen ‘Appius’, proper otherwise to the patrician Claudii Pulchri,23 and since the daughter of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15) was called Iunia Claudia or Claudilla, the existence of a common grandmother Claudia was deduced by Mommsen.24 Dessau and Hohl, failing to accept the view that C. Appius Iunius Silanus was the son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10), maintained for the same cogent reasons—viz. the nomenclature of C. Appius Iunius Silanus and of Iunia Claudia—that C. Appius Iunius Silanus was the son of a lady called Claudia,

13 PIR 2, 253, n. 579; Hohl, RE 10, 1114, n. 207.
14 cf. Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 8, 201; PIR 2, 245, n. 544; Hohl, RE 10, 1087, n. 158.
16 Oeuvres 5, 187.
17 Ges. Schr. 8, 201. In view of this Hohl’s misleading statement: ‘Borghesis Aufstel­lungen (Oeuvr. V. 187) über den Vater unseres Appius sind durch Mommsen widerlegt’ (RE 10, 1085) stands in need of correction.
18 PIR 2, 244, n. 541; Hohl, RE 10, 1085, n. 155.
19 PIR 2, 244, n. 541; cf. also PIR 2, 245, n. 545.
20 PIR 2, 244, n. 541; cf. 247, n. 551.
21 Hohl, RE 10, 1085, n. 155; cf. 1087, n. 158.
22 PIR 3, 56, n. 180; Groag, RE 5, 1511, n. 102.
23 R. Syme, Historia 7, 1958, 173f.; cf. also ThLL 2, 289, 1. 40; Münzer, RE 3, 2664; W. Schulze, Lateinische Eigennamen (Berlin 1933) 511f.
24 Ges. Schr. 8, 203.
the grandmother of Iunia Claudilla.\textsuperscript{25} Unfortunately the clue furnished by Tacitus as to the maternal connections of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) and, by implication, of Iunia Torquata, M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15) and D. Iunius Silanus, only seems to offer further complications. As mentioned above, Cn. Cornelius Lentulus presented the motion \textit{separanda Silani materna bona, quippe alia parente geniti}, when the confiscation of Silanus’ property came up for discussion (Tac. \textit{Ann.} 3, 68). Although \textit{alia parente} has been defended as meaning ‘of far different character’\textsuperscript{26} or as testifying to the existence of a mother and a stepmother of C. Iunius Silanus,\textsuperscript{27} the majority of scholars has either done away with the phrase \textit{quippe alia parente geniti} as a gloss\textsuperscript{28} or suspected a corruption of the text\textsuperscript{29} and hence pleaded for various emendations such as \textit{Iulia, Manlia, Cornelia or Aelia}.\textsuperscript{30} However, since Madvig proposed the reading \textit{Atia},\textsuperscript{31} this has been generally accepted,\textsuperscript{32} although it was left to Hohl and Syme to draw the necessary inferences: ‘Wenn man die einleuchtende Konjektur von Madvig \textit{Atia} für das unmögliche, wenngleich von Baiter verteidigte \textit{alia} annimmt, wie es Furneaux und Andresen tun, so ist der Sinn in schönster Ordnung: die Mutter des Silanus entstammte demnach der Gens Atia, einem Geschlecht, dem auch die Mutter des Augustus angehörte; damit ist auch die gehobte Nachsicht ohne weiteres erklärt’;\textsuperscript{33} and, ‘Though most of the items discussed seem to be little more than questions of orthography, in some an identity is at stake, as when an emendation reveals a new Atia (a member of the family of Augustus on the maternal side) . . . ’.\textsuperscript{34}

The premises set out above lead to the conclusion that the otherwise unrecorded father of C. Iunius C.f. Silanus (cos. ord. 10) and M. Iunius C.f. Silanus (cos. suff. 15) must have been married twice and that M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15), D. Iunius Silanus and possibly also C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28) were the children of his marriage to a certain Claudia, whereas C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) and Iunia Torquata issued from a previous marriage to an Atia. Various items fail to please: (a) C. Appius

\textsuperscript{25} cf. PIR 2, 244, n. 541; RE 10, 1085, n. 155.
\textsuperscript{26} e.g. by G. Walther, cited ad loc. in the edition of Orelli/Baiter (1859). Cf. also Furneaux (1896) ad loc.
\textsuperscript{27} e.g. by J. Lipsius and C. Pichena, cited ad loc. in the edition of Pichon (1821).
\textsuperscript{28} e.g. Nipperdey, \textit{Tacitus} (Berlin 1871) ad loc.; Mommsen, \textit{Ges. Schr.} 8, 203.
\textsuperscript{29} e.g. Borghesi, \textit{Oeuvres} 3, 17; 5, 183.
\textsuperscript{30} For details cf. the edition of Bekker (1831). \textit{Manlia} proposed by Grotius and supported by Borghesi (\textit{Oeuvres} 3, 17; 5, 183) has been proved questionable by Mommsen (\textit{Ges. Schr.} 8, 202f.; cf. also R. Syme, \textit{JRSt} 39, 1949, 8).
\textsuperscript{31} cf. \textit{Adversaria critica ad scriptores Graecos et Latinos} (1871–1873) I 148, n. 1.
\textsuperscript{32} cf. Furneaux (1896) and Nipperdey–Andresen (1915) ad loc.; ThLL 6, 1981, 1,47; Gerber–Greef, \textit{Lexicon Taciteum} 499.1053.1329, as also recent editions of the \textit{Annals}.
\textsuperscript{33} RE 10, 1088; cf. also R. Rogers, \textit{Trials} 69; R. Syme, \textit{JRSt} 39, 1949, 9.
\textsuperscript{34} JRSt 39, 1949, 7.
Iunius Silanus, born ca. 6 B.C., would be considerably younger than both of his brothers, since M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15) was probably a coeval of Germanicus and C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) must have been born ca. 24 B.C., provided that he reached the consulate at the earliest permissible age, i.e. during his thirty-third year. (b) The son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) remains unidentified. (c) The identity of the Atia emerging from Madvig’s emendation is subject to conjecture: she might be the younger sister of Augustus’ mother—in this case the timely death of her husband L. Marcus Philippus (cos. suff. 38 B.C.) must be postulated—or possibly the daughter of a younger M. Atius Balbus, whose existence has been deduced from coins of the triumviral period. Since no further evidence can be discovered and the nomenclature of the Iunii Silani offers no clue, the question subsists.

These difficulties might resolve themselves if the arguments advanced against the assumption that C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28) was the son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) could be refuted and if an emendation of alia to Appia could be sustained. The identity of the son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) would then be established, the existence of an unknown Atia need no longer be posited and, finally, the mother of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) might be proved to have been identical with Claudia, the mother of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15).

As shown previously, Dessau’s disinclination to accept C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28) as son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) stemmed from the following considerations: the conviction of C. Iunius Silanus, against whom charges of extortion and maestias had been preferred, must surely have proved detrimental to his son’s career; further, an interval of 18 years between the consulates of father and son might be regarded as exceptional. Contemporary evidence fails to support either objection: L. (Cn.) Calpurnius Piso, in spite of being the son of Cn. Calpurnius Piso (cos. ord. 7 B.C.), defendant in a cause célèbre in A.D. 20, not only reached the consulate in A.D. 27, but also seems to have succeeded Cossus Cornelius Lentulus as praefectus urbi in A.D. 36. As far as the intervals between the consulates of fathers and sons are concerned, it may suffice to point out that L. Volusius Saturninus (cos. suff. 3) was the son of L. Volusius
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36 cf. Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 8, 194.
37 cf. Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 8, 196.
40 PIR² 2, 69, n. 293; Groag, RE 3, 1383, n. 76.
41 PIR² 2, 58, n. 287; Groag, RE 3, 1380, n. 70.
42 cf. Groag, PIR² 2, 69,335.
43 PIR 3, 483, n. 661; cf. A. Degrassi, I Fatti consolari dell’impero Romano (Rome 1952) 6.
Saturninus (cos. suff. 12 B.C.), while L. and C. Cassius Longinus, sons of L. Cassius Longinus (cos. suff. 11), held consulates in A.D. 30 as ordinarius and suffectus respectively.

One other point remains to be raised: it has been suggested by Mommsen that C. Appius Iunius Silanus reached the consulate at an early age. If the same is held to apply to C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10), the difference in age would then be a bare 18 years. On the other hand it has already been remarked that Silanus ‘might have suffered some retardation, like other nobles in this period, especially those whose fathers had missed the supreme magistracy’. If this is taken for granted, there seems to be no reason left why Borghesi’s and Mommsen’s proposition, that C. Appius Iunius Silanus was the son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10), should not be regarded as valid once more.

The plausibility of the emendation Appia from alia must be appraised not only by criteria of orthography and style but also by the measure in which it fulfils the requirements of prosopography and history. As far as orthography is concerned, it must be called to mind that Appius was the Roman version of the originally Sabine name Attius, which varied with Attus or even Atius: hence the ancestor of the patrician gens Claudia is mentioned as Attius Clausus (Liv. 2, 16, 4), Attus Clausus (Tac. Ann. 4, 9; 12, 25), Atta Claudius (Suet. Tib. 1) and Atius Clausus (Liv. 10, 8, 6 codd. optimi, cf. ThLL 2, 1168, 1.84). A scribal error could thus easily be accounted for. A case can be made for Appia parente on different grounds: since Appius is one of those rare praenomina which can be employed like gentilicia—Tacitus uses the expression Appiana caedes when referring to the doom of C. Appius Iunius Silanus (Ann. 11, 29) and Suetonius likewise reveals a certain preference for Appius in describing the fatal happenings (Cl. 37)—and since its close association with the Claudii Pulchri served to distinguish this branch from the rest of the Claudian family, it might reasonably be assumed that Appia parente was meant to denote a lady of

43 PIR 3, 482, n. 660; cf. A. Degrassi, op. cit. 4.
45 PIR² 2, 119, n. 502; cf. A. Degrassi, op. cit. 7.
46 cf. A. Degrassi, op. cit. 10.
47 Ges. Schr. 8, 194.
49 cf. notes 16 and 17 above.
50 According to McAlindon (AJPh 77, 1956, 120) C. Appius Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 28) may have been the son of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15). The difference in age between the two consuls (their dates of birth are given as 6 B.C. and 15 B.C. respectively by Mommsen, Ges. Schr. 8, 194.196) makes this highly improbable.
53 cf. Borghesi, Oeuvres 5, 186f.
Claudian lineage and, more specifically, a member of the Claudii Pulchri. In parenthesis it may be noted that Tacitus takes care not to obscure identities: whereas Claudia parens, evoking phrases such as Claudia domus, familia or gens, might be taken to indicate a member of the ruling house, Appia parens could not give rise to confusion, Appia being as it were a certain label of identity. In claiming Claudia, wife of Gaius, for the Iunian gens, another device is employed: the mark of parentage is attached (Ann. 6, 20: M. Silani filia) or reference made to what has been related previously (Ann. 6, 45: quam nuptram ei [sc. Gaio] rettuli).

Enquiry must next be made whether a suitable Appia Claudia can be produced as mother of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10). The most likely candidate appears to be a (Claudia) who has already entered PIR² (cf. C 1058), where the following genealogical links are established: 'Ex nominibus Appii Iunii Silani consulis a.28 p.C. et Iuniae Claudiae vel Claudillae, M. Silani C.f. consulis a.15 p.C. filiae, apparent Iunium Silanum nescio quem aetatis Augusti in matrimonium duxisse feminam ex domo patricia Claudiorum; fortasse filia fuit alterius utrius Appiorum Pulchrorum (n.982. 983'). Nevertheless Groag's tentative suggestion (loc. cit.) that the elusive C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 17 B.C.)² was her consort, might yet prove an obstacle to a definitive identification: according to Dio (ind. l. 54) C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 17 B.C.) was C(ai)f(ilius), whereas the father of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) must have been M(arci)f(ilius), and it was for this very reason that mommsen dismissed Borghesi's conjecture, that C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) was the son of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 17 B.C.). But C. Iunius Silanus C.f. (cos. ord. 17 B.C.) may well have been a cousin-german of C. Iunius Silanus M.f., the father of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10). If this possibility were admitted, no further objection could be raised.

The ultimate vindication of Appia Claudia as mother of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) hinges upon the following observations: according to the stemma proposed in PIR² (C, facing p. 236) Appia (Claudia) was the
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54 cf. Tac. Ann. 1, 4; 5, 1; 6, 8 and 51; 12, 2 and 26; 15, 23. For the substantive Claudii cf. Tac. Ann. 2, 43; 3, 5, 4, 9 and 64; 12, 17; Hist. 1, 16; 2, 48.
55 Evidence accrues also from Frontinus' treatise on the aqueducts of Rome: the Aqua Appia took its name from Appius Claudius Caecus, censor in 312 B.C. (Front. Aqu. 5, 1), whereas the Aqua Claudia was inaugurated (and hence named Claudia) during the principate of Claudius (Front. Aqu. 13, 3).
56 On the showing of the Fasti Capitolini (CIL I², p. 29 = I It 13, 1, 63) C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10) was C(ai)f(ilius) M(arci) n(epos).
57 Ges. Schr. 8, 195f.; cf. also Dessau, PIR 2, 244f., nn. 543 and 544 and Hohl, RE 10, 1087, nn. 157 and 158.
58 Oeuvres 5, 182.
59 I am indebted to Dr. H. G. Pflaum for this observation.
daughter of Appius Claudius Pulcher (cos. ord. 38 B.C.), who has been revealed as an early adherent of Caesar Augustus, husband of his first cousin Claudia. Pulcher's younger daughter was the first wife of P. Sulpicius Quirinus (cos. ord. 12 B.C.), whose services to Augustus and Tiberius alike were rewarded with a public funeral (Tac. Ann. 3, 48). Finally the marriage of Appia Claudia's brother M. Valerius Messalla Barbatus Appianus (cos. ord. 12 B.C.) to the younger Claudia Marcella established ties of relationship with the family of Augustus. The scope of this note will not permit the exposition of further connections: suffice it to say, that this far-reaching nexus of family alliances may in itself help to account for 'the remarkable prominence of the Silani in the early Empire'.

To conclude. The context of Ann. 3, 68, 3 'assigns the distinction and identity of Silanus' mother as the reason for exempting the maternal property from confiscation'. If the arguments submitted above are deemed sufficiently strong, the passage in question might be read as follows: *eadem ceteri, nisi quod Cn. Lentulus separanda Silani materna bona, quippe Appia parente geniti, reddendaque filio dixit, adnuente Tiberio.*

The connections of M. Iunius Silanus (cos. suff. 15)

[The table has been adapted from the stemma drawn up by Mommsen (Ges. Schr. 8, 201) and indicates the main connections only. For the sake of convenience the reference numbers of RE 10 are attached.]
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62 *PIR* 2, 237, n. 982; Münzer, *RE* 3, 2853, n. 298 and *RE* Suppl. 3, 254.
64 *PIR* 2, 257, n. 1057; Stein, *RE* 3, 2886, n. 390.
60 *PIR* 3, 265, n. 1103; Groag, *RE* 3, 2891, n. 423.
61 This will be attempted in a forthcoming publication (*Die Statthalter von Africa und Asia in den Jahren 14–68 n. Chr.*). Meanwhile it may be noted that these connections embrace not only the Aemilii Lepidi, the Valerii Messallae and the Statilii Tauri, but also the kinsmen of P. Quinctilius Varus (cos. ord. 13 B.C.), on whom cf. R. Syme, *Roman Revolution*, Table VII. A recent epigraphic find from Aeolian Cyme (to be published in *Arch. Anz.* 1963) has revealed furthermore that P. Quinctilius Varus was the brother-in-law of Sex. Appuleius (cos. ord. 29 B.C.), son of Octavia maior.
71 cf. R. Syme, *JRSt* 39, 1949, 9. The quotation is taken from a passage stipulating for an Atia as the mother of C. Iunius Silanus (cos. ord. 10). Madvig (op. cit.) may also be consulted on this point.
72 Exception might be taken to this accumulation of labials, but phrases such as quippe oppidana lascivia (Tac. Ann. 14, 17) or accita quippe Epicharis (Tac. Ann. 15, 5) demonstrate that it was nothing to be shunned. On the other hand the Codex Medicus has transmitted *Apuleius* (Tac. Ann. 1, 7) instead of the more usual form *Appuleius* (cf. R. Syme, *JRSt* 38, 1948, 124), hence, possibly, *alia* from *Apia.*
The connections of Appia Claudia

[The table is taken from the stemma given by Groag (PIR², C, facing p. 236) and only serves to illustrate relationships mentioned in the text. The numbers refer to PIR², C.]
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