

## GRAVES, NAMES AND KINSHIP: *MATERTERA* AND *AMITA* IN ROMAN LIBURNIA

**Abstract:** Among many thousand titles about Roman family<sup>1</sup> only a few concern the extended family, aunts, uncles and cousins.<sup>2</sup> They are seldom mentioned by the ancient authors. The inscriptions provide the main evidence in the research. Progress in study could be expected from the empirical research based on them. However few in number, they are important in defining the relations within the family. The pages that follow are dedicated to the study of *matertera* and *amita* in Liburnia. The inscriptions from Liburnia, the coastal zone of the northern Adriatic, deserve special attention, because Liburnians differ from other people in the province of Dalmatia in terms of their social structure. The women were dominant in the family and economy. The study is based on onomastics in the inscriptions. *Nomen* in Roman society passed along the male line. *Mater*, *matertera* and *avunculus* are biologically connected as children of the same parents and as they had common father, they must also have had a common family name. The same rule is to be expected in the parallel agnatic group on the father's side. *Pater*, *patruus* and *amita* must have had the same family name. Different practice in the inscriptions from Liburnia, and in some cases from other parts of the Roman Empire, suggest a special relationship in the family and deserve comment. They will be analysed in the pages that follow.

**Key words:** *matertera*, *amita*, cognatio, matrilineal origin, *mater*, missed *pater*, onomastic, cognatio.

---

1 As P.Laslett, 1972, 1, counted, over 12 000 titles were published until 1964.

2 For a critical survey of methods see Saller, 1997, 7 ff. His remark that less attention has been given to the bonds of extended kinship, particularly to aunts, uncles and cousins is right, when it concerns aunts. *Avunculus* was the subject in theoretic studies as well as in the anthropologic researches into primitive societies.

\*

Aunts, the mother's sister *matertera* and the father's sister *amita*, belonged to the Roman cognate kinship system. *Cognatio* is formulated in Codex Iustinianus XXXVIII 10: *Gradus cognationis alii superioris ordinis sunt alii inferioris, alii ex transverso sive a latere. Matertera and amita are a latere and found their place in a long systematised list of lateral kin that follows. The particular lateral family members, as are the mother's sister matertera and the father's sister amita, are attested in the inscriptions. It is assumed that as extended kinship members they did not belong to the family and the household*<sup>3</sup>.

## Documents

The inscriptions from Liburnia reflect specific social relations. Liburnians are mentioned by ancient authors as a people where women played a prominent role in the family, in society and the economy. The native names in the inscriptions represent testimony of the common national identity on one side<sup>4</sup>, and on the other they offer the opportunity to gain an understanding of the social structure, connections and kinship relationship, if they are analyzed within the family context. The pattern of Roman nomenclature in the inscriptions reflecting the relationships in the family and often in wider kinship groups, shall be used in the following analysis as the basic arguments<sup>5</sup>.

### I. *Matertera, the mother's sister*

In discussing *matertera*, Bettini quotes two inscriptions, both from Liburnia<sup>6</sup>:

- I. CIL III 2737, Aequum: *Cornelia Ferocilla Corneliae Ferocillae obsequentissimae filiae mater et matertera deposuerunt.*

3 However, if we keep in mind the Laslett's (1972, 28) classification of the household, *matertera* and *amita* could belong to the extended family household with lateral extension in some cases.

4 The structure of Illyrian names in general is studied by D. Rendić-Miočević, *Ilirska onomastica*, Split 1948; the Illyrian names were also collected and studied by H. Krahe, *Lexicon altillyrischen Personennamen*, Heidelberg 1920; E. Mayer, *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier*, Zagreb 1957; Rendić-Miočević studied Liburnian names in a paper *Onomastičke studije e teritorila Liburna, (Prilozi ilrskoj onomastici)*, *Iliri i antički svijet*, Split, 1989, 711-727, G. Alföldy, in *Die Namengebung der Urbevölkerung in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia, Beiträge zur Namengebung* 115, 1964, 66 ff.

5 G. Alföldy (1961, 307-319) focused his investigation on the structure and size of the Liburnian family. See also idem, 1963, 81-87. For the opposite opinion see A. Kurilić, *Family structure and relationships in Early-Roman Liburnia. Liburnian 'Upper class' Families*, Pre-atti XI Congresso di Epigraphia greca e Romana, Roma, 1997, 379-384.

6 M. Bettini, 1992, 80 ff.

Cornelia Ferocilla appears again in another inscription from the same place,

2. CIL III 2738, Aequum: *Cornelia Ferocilla et Coelia Oclatia Coeliae Marcellae def.ann. XXXV mater et matertera filiae infelicissimae et obsequentissimae posuerunt.*

The names in both cases pose a problem. It is difficult to connect the name and person. In no.1 *matertera* is either not named, or it is possible that both the mother and daughter, or all three, the mother (*mater*), her sister (*matertera*), and the daughter, bear the same name. The third possibility is that Cornelia Ferocilla was at the same time *mater* and *matertera*, that is, she substituted the mother, as was the custom in the primitive organisation of the social group where all women were the mothers of all children. Logically, it is possible, but *deposuerunt* and *posuerunt* which means two persons, *mater* and *matertera*, at the end of the inscriptions, does not speak in favour of the last solution. Both, or all three, have the same name. Either daughter or niece, Cornelia Ferocilla is named *filia*.

*Mater* and *matertera* in no.2 have not, as it would be expected when sisters are in question, the same family name. Besides, it is not clear who the mother or the mother's sister is. If *mater* is Cornelia, Coelia is the name of *matertera* and of the niece. Coelia Marcella could be the daughter of one or the other. If she was the daughter of Coelia Oclatia, she bears the same name as her mother, which could mean that the father was *incertus*, and she was *spurii filia*; as the daughter of Cornelia Ferocilla, she has the name of her aunt on her mother's side. That means that she followed matrilineal kin by her name. Bettini's explanation that the mother and her sister were the daughters of two different fathers is not the only possible solution. Cornelia Ferocilla and Coelia Oclatia were not necessarily biological sisters.

Both quoted examples from Liburnia suggest that *mater* and *matertera* were equal in their relation to the posterity. It could be assumed that traces of the classificatory system are preserved in some cases in the community which passed to the descriptive kin system and that all women in the group were potentially the mothers of all children.

The names in some examples outside Liburnia point to the close relationship between *matertera* and her sister's child. The same name of *matertera* and her nephew or niece is known in inscriptions in Hispania and Italy:

AE 1993, 903, Merida: the nephew *Ar(gentarius) [Ve]getinus*, has the same name as *matertera* [*Ar]gent(aria) Verana Emer(itensis)*; she was probably not the mother's biological sister, because she is *matertera* and at the same time his *patrona*;

CIL II 6299, Hispania citerior: the nephew's name Aninus derives from the *matertera*'s name Anna, which points to the connection with the mother's kin and matrilineal origin. He erected the monument for his *matertera* Anna Calediga and mother Dovidena Calediga. The mother's family name is Calediga.

CIL VI 11086: Aemilia Restituta *matertera* erected a monument for Q. Aemilius Maximus, who died when he was 2 years and 30 days old; as *mater* she buried the 14 year old Aemilius Cupito. Is Aemilia Restituta the same person, once in the role of *matetera*, once as the *mater*? The father is not mentioned in this case either. Aemilius, the name of the mother's family borne by all the persons in the inscription could mean that the children were *spurii* or *spurio patre nati*.

CIL IX 899: *D(is) M(anibus) L. Vitorio Fortunato vixit a(nnos) XIII mens(es) VIII Vitoria Briseis matertera et P. Tamullius Eros tata et sibi fec(erunt) in f(ronte) p(edes) XII in agr(o) p(edes) XVII*. Tamullius Eros is designated as *tata*. The word is interpreted as signifying the father. The names Briseis and Eros could have been those of slaves or former slaves. A family of freedmen must be in question. This could offer one possible explanations for the same name of *matertera* and nephew or niece.

An unknown father could be another reason for the same name of *matertera* and nephew, as in CIL X 7640: *Ti. Claudius Sp(uri) f(ilius) Gemellus vixit annis VIII mensibus IIII diebus XV Ti. Claudius Actes l(ibertus) Herma et Claudia Ianuaria matertera fecerunt*. The same *nomen gentile* is due to the fact that they were freed by the same master.

The father is missing in the majority of cases concerning *matertera*. He is not mentioned in the two quoted inscriptions from Liburnia, or in the following two:

3. CIL III 8551, Epetium: *[D.]m...Varro Luci def. an. XXX Panico mater et Dasto matertera pientissimo posuerunt*.
4. CIL III 12962, Salona: *D(is) M(anibus) [...]ntia Maximina Corne[liae] Secundinae materterae b.m.*

In the first all names are native; in the second the *matertera* bears the name Cornelia, frequent in Liburnia. That means that *matertera* preserved importance both in the native as well as in the Romanized family.

## II. Amita, the father's sister

*Amita* is connected with her brother and his family in the juridical sense. She could have inherited him. Together with her niece, *fratris filia*, she was *legitima heres*, Gaius I 156,3,14. In CIL IX 899 = AE 2001, 876, (Luceria, Apulia-Calabria), she is mentioned together with somebody who was named *tata*, who could have been a father, once together with *matertera*, CIL XII 5866, Vienna, Galia Narbonensis); the epitaph in Lusitania, Erbeira 104 is consecrated to *pater, mater* and *matertera*. As the father's sister she must have borne the same *nomen gentile* as him and his children, her nieces and nephews. This rule is not always respected in inscriptions from Liburnia concerning *amita*.

*Amita* appears seldom in the inscriptions from Liburnia, but still more frequently than in the rest of the province of Dalmatia. Three examples are known from Liburnia and four in the entire province of Dalmatia:

5. CIL III 2891, Corinium: *Calpurnia C. f. | Ceuna v(iva) f(ecit) sibi et Oppiae [..S]ecunde | matri [et] Oppiae Oep|li f.Voltisae amitae | et Calpurniae C.f. | Oeplae sororis [---]*.

The names in this inscription are significant and deserve comment.

It is a native family with two sisters, their mother and their aunt from the father's side. The father is not mentioned. The developed name pattern of the Liburnians, like other Illyrians, consists of the personal and family name with the addition of the father's name<sup>7</sup>. *Calpurnia C.f. Ceuna* and her sister *Calpurnia C.f. Oepla* follow the usual name pattern, with the Roman *gentilicium* and filiation, in addition to the native name which occupies the position of the cognomen. The Roman *nomen gentile Calpurnia* of the two sisters could be either the name inherited from the father who is not mentioned in the inscription or may have been acquired along with Roman citizenship; *C(ai?) f(ilia)* in the nieces' names is frequent in Liburnian inscriptions and probably does not denote any real connection with the father. The patronym could also be the name of the grandfather. The real link with the native gens could be the names *Ceuna* and *Oepla*. Both belong to the native, Illyrian onomastic (Mayer 1957, s.v.; Rendić-Miočević 1948, 35, 42, and passim). *Oeplus/a* appears as the filiation of *amita* and as a cognomen of one of the nieces. It could represent the patrilineal familiar name. *Ceuna* in the name of the other niece might be the name of the grandmother or of the matrilineal grandfather. *Ceuna* and *Oepla* could represent two exogamic *gentes* in Roman Dalmatia. They appear as names of husband and wife, for instance in ILJug. 908, Nin: *C. Ennius Oepli f. Aetor, Ennia C. f. Ceuna*; *Tullia Oepli f. Voltisa* and *Ceunus* are attested in CIL III 2900 (Corinium).

The mother's name poses a problem. The same *gentilicium* of *amita* *Oppia Oepli f. Voltisa* and the mother of her nieces *Oppia Secunda* is unusual. It does not correspond to the rules and naming practice in the Roman family, because the *amita* and the mother, i.e. her brother's wife, could not have belonged to the same gens. The same *nomen gentile* of the *amita* and the mother of her nieces could be explained in a different way. The main difficulty is posed by the absence of the father. It could be assumed that he was *Oppius*, like his sister, the *amita* in this inscription, if the naming followed the patrilineal ancestry. In this case the mother might have had the same name as her supposed husband, and the father of her two daughters, i.e. the *amita's* brother. The same *nomen gentile* of husband and wife was not rare among the natives in Liburnia. For instance, *C. Ennius Oepli f. Aetor* and *Ennia C. f. Ceuna* in ILJug 908 or *Octavia Secunda* and her husband *T. Octavius Sex. fil. Gracilis* in CIL III 2870. In the

7 D. Rendić-Miočević, 1948; G. Alföldy, 1964, 66-76

latter example both families, that of Octavia Secunda and that of her husband, belonged to the city magistrates. It is possible that Oppia Secunda, the mother of the nieces in the inscription from Corinim, was either a freedwoman or she received Roman citizenship and the Roman name together with her husband.

The *amita's* full name is *Oppia Oepli f. Voltisa*. Her cognomen Voltisa deserves explanation.

The name Voltisa is recorded in many inscriptions in Liburnia and always as part of the Illyrian female name<sup>8</sup>:

IIJug 207, Asseria: *Vadica Apli f(ilia) Titua v(iva) f(ecit) sibi et Pasinae Q. f(iliae) Voltisae matri suae adiutorio Aetoris et Ceuni Vadici fecerun(t)*.

Pasina Q. filia Voltisa was the mother of Vadica Apli Titua, who erected the monument with the help of two Vadici (her brothers?), Aetor and Ceunus. The common name Vadica and Vadici (*fili*) could mean that their father who is not named in the inscription was Vadicus.

Tulia Oepli f. Voltisa in CIL III 2900 is the mother of Iulius Acirrius; the father is not recorded:

*Tullia Oepli f. Voltisa sibi et et Iulio Ceuni f. Acirio filio et Orpiae Q. f. Opiavae matri v(iva) f(ecit) in f. p. Vzz in agr. P.xczz.*

Quinta Voltisa was the mother of the woman bearing the Roman name Octavia Q.f. Secunda in the multiple family in CIL III 2870:

*Octavia Q.f(ilia) Secunda v(iva) f(ecit) sibi et Octaviae T.f. Gracillae f(iliae), Octaviae Sex. F. Celsinae nepti, Q.Octavi patri aed. II viro III Quintae Voltisae matri...etc.*

Voltisa could commemorate the wider kin group, such as *cognatio* which is attested in many inscriptions in this region. It might suggest the matrilineal ancestry. Its function was probably the same as the second name of the *amita* and niece in the inscription from Komini near Pljevlje (Municipium S.). This region in the interior of the province of Dalmatia has much in common with the onomastic in the coastal zone in Dalmatia<sup>9</sup>:

Spomenik SKA 71, 1931, 248 = M.Mirković, Municipium S( ), 2012, p. 45, no. 46, could serve as a model of the name pattern:

*D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum) Aur(eliae) Titullae Argurianae que (!) v(ixit) an(nis) LX Aur(elia) <sup>5</sup> | Titulla Cam|bria amitae | p(ientissimae) p(osuit)*

The full name of the *amita* is Aurelia Titulla Arguriana and that of the niece Aurelia Titulla Cambria. If we put aside the name Aurelia as signifying status of Roman citizenship, as a badge of a citizen<sup>10</sup>, *amita* and her niece bear the same *gentilicium* as expected, but a different third name which could represent the

8 Alföldy, 1964, 66 ff.

9 G. Alföldy, 1965, 57 f.; M. Mirković, 2012, 9 ff.

10 Salway, 1994, 135.

link with the wider group or the mother's *gens*. *Amita* is *Cambria*, the niece's cognomen is *Arguriana*. Both names are not unknown in the community of Municipium S.: the former appears as the cognomen *Cambrianus*, in Mirković, Municipium S(), no.47. The latter is attested in the position of the cognomen in the inscription *ibidem* no. 48 from the same place, in the unusual name form, *Aplis Aureli Argurinus*<sup>11</sup>. *Voltisa* in the inscription from Corninium corresponds to *Cambria* and *Arguriana* in the inscription from Municipium S(), which means it could represent the name of maternal kin. The same could be supposed for *Vesclavensis* in CIL III 3038, *Flanona*:

- a) *Avita Suoca Vesclavensis f(ilia) v(iva) f(ecit) sibi et...* b) *Velsovnae ? Suio-cae Vesclavensis f(iliae)*.

*Vesclavensis Petronius Trifi f(ilius)* is recorded in an inscription from *Alvona*, CIL III 3058. The position of *Voltisa* also corresponds to the three name formula of *Malavicus* in CIL III 10121:

*L. Baebio Opiavi f. Ser(gia) Oplo Malavico aedili decurioni II viro ann(orum) LX et Seiae Opli f. Tertullae uxori eius ann(orum) LV t(itulum) f(ieri) i(ussit)* or *Aetor* in the mentioned inscription IIJug. 908, *C. Ennius Oepli f. Aetor*. Both cases concern persons of native origin. In the former the wife is *Opli filia*, and the husband *Oplus Malavicus*. The same function of distinguishing one *Ceunus* from another with the same name is shared by *Curticus* in IIJug. 215, *Aenona: C. Iulius Ceuni f. Ser(gia) Curticus Aetor*. The names *Voltisa*, *Malavicus*, *Aetor* or *Curticus* must have had the same function, that of designating the connection with another, probably the mother's *gens*.

If we return to the inscription 5 from *Liburnia*, the family stemma could be reconstructed in the following way:

*Oppia Oepli f. Voltisa amita*, her brother (*Oppius Oepli f.?*), married to *Oppia Secunda*

Calpurnia C.f.Oepla	Calpurnia C.f. Ceuna

The family name on the father's side could be *Oplus* and *Ceunus* on the mother's.

If the nieces' names *Oepla* and *Ceuna* in this inscription were inherited, probably one from the mother's (*Ceuna*), and one from the father's (*Oepla*) family, we could go further in guessing and suggest that they represent two exogamic groups. Both names, *Oeplus/a* and *Ceunus/a*, are common in *Liburnia* and both are connected with *Voltisa* in two further cases: in CIL III 2900, from *Corinium*: *Tullia Opli f. Voltisa* is the mother, and her son is *C. Iulius Ceuni f.* He is mentioned as

11 It is not the only example of three names in the inscriptions from *Komini* (Municipium S). It appears in some of them in abbreviated form in the family of *Paconii*: *Paconia Montana R* and her mother *Aurelia Panto G. R* are also attested in the name of *L. Paconius Barbarus dec. Municipii R, 5*.

M. Mirković, 2012, 61, ff.

(her) *filius*, which means that he has the matrilineal origin. His unmentioned father was Ceunus. Voltisa's mother was Orpia Q.f. Opiava. The origin on the mother's side is also attested in the inscription concerning the daughter of Pasina Voltisa, Vadica Apli in IJug. 207: *Vadica Apli f. Titua v(iva) f(ecit) sibi et Pasinae Q.f. Voltisae matri suae adiutorio Aetoris et Ceuni Vadicis fecerun(t)*.

There are two further inscriptions from Liburnia in which *amita* is mentioned:

7. CIL III 10039, Raetinium: *D(is) M(anibus) Diana DRI an(norum) LXI Caius Iulius Certus amite(!) dignissime (!) et [n]utrici posuit h.s.e.*

In Flanona, CIL III 13286, *amita* and *mater* are named together.

8. Flanona: *Valen[t]ina mater et Cr[e]scent[i]lla amita P[re]pon[t]i filio.*

In all the quoted inscriptions which mention *amita*, the father is missing.

\*

## Some concluding notes

Epigraphic evidence concerning *matertera* and *amita* from Liburnia as well as from other regions in the Roman State contains indices which permit some conclusions about this lateral kin.

It is assumed that *matertera* as well as *amita* might have taken the place of one or both parents, *loco patris* or *matris*, in the simple family, if they were dead<sup>12</sup>. In this case they appear to have been included in the family or in the household, substituting the absent parents, both or one of them. However, *matertera* and *amita* were not necessarily a substitution for the missing family members, as Laslett suggests<sup>13</sup>. In contrast to other parts of the Empire *matertera* and *amita* in Liburnia appear not instead of the mother, but together with her, in three of four inscriptions mentioning *matertera* (1,2,3) and twice in four inscriptions concerning *amita* (5, 8), also in Issa, CIL III 13286 = 14333 and in other provinces. In example no. 1 *matertera* and *mater* are equated as bearing the same name. That could mean that the mater and her sister had the same function in the social group and that one could be replaced by the other. If so, *matertera* is at the same time the mother of her sister's children, and originally of all the children in the community. The connection niece (or nephew) – aunt probably represented, as Wissowa suggested, the trace of an archaic matrilateral kin system.<sup>14</sup> It was probably

12 Bettini, 1992, 76 suggests that *matertera* assumed the role of the mother if she was absent.

13 Laslett, 1972, 28.

14 G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, München 1912<sup>2</sup>, 111. In difference to this Bettini, 217, n.56, quoting modern theoretical anthropologists. Theoretical works can not always help to solve problems in inscriptions which reflect real life.

rooted in the old Roman or Indo-European custom which left traces in the festival of *Mater matuta* in Rome when women pray not for their own children, but for those of their sisters. In some of the quoted examples they appear together with mother. In all the quoted inscriptions *matertera* alone or together with the mother took care of the erection of the monuments. *Amita* appears in the inscription as *mater* and *patrona*. Her *arbitrio* was erected as a monument, *ex testamento*. In the inscription from Raetinium, CIL III 10039, *amita* is also *nutrix*.

This peculiar habit of raising children in Liburnia might be the survival of this archaic social organisation. Nicolaus from Damascus reports, fr. 111, FGH III p.458, that the Liburnians shared their women and brought up their children all together until they were five or eight years old. Then they matched up the children to the men and allotted one to each based on their resemblance to the fathers. Once a father had taken a child he would bring him up as his own. This is probably why Liburnians are defined by Pseudo-Scymnus as *gunaikokratou/ntej*. The father appeared in the child's life when he was five or eight years old. The same name of the mother and daughter or aunt and niece in inscriptions 1 and 2 could be explained by the specific structure of the Liburnian society where all the women in the community probably represented the common mothers of all the children. Nephews and nieces appear as *fili* and *filiae* in the inscriptions from Liburnia, for instance CIL III 2738, and elsewhere, for instance CIL XII 5866, Vienna. The father is missing in the majority of the known inscriptions.

Women in Liburnia had a specific social position. They could marry free men, but they enjoyed sexual freedom and could cohabit with slaves and strangers<sup>15</sup>. Fathers were less important. Varro, *RR* II 19, 6 transfers the information that the Liburnians allowed women, often as old as twenty (and they called them maidens too), to mate with any man they pleased before marriage, to wander around by themselves, and to bear children. Liburnian women also worked independently of men in the economy. Speaking of women in a cattle-breeding society in Liburnia Varro *RR* 10, 6 reports: "As I have heard you say that when you were in Liburnia, you saw mothers carrying logs and children at the breast at the same time, sometimes one, sometimes two; showing that our newly-delivered women, who lie for days under their mosquito-nets, are worthless and contemptible." "It is quite true," I replied; "and in Illyricum I have seen something even more remarkable: for it often happens there that a pregnant woman, when her time has come, steps aside a little way from her work, bears her child there, and brings it back so soon that you would say she had not borne it but found it".

The peculiarity of such habits was inherited in some families from the pre-Roman Liburnia in the Roman times. Matrilateral kin preserved importance

15 On Liburnians see G. Alföldy, 1965, 68 ff. J.J. Wikes, 1969, 159 f.; D. Rendić-Miočević, *Onomastičke studije s teritorija Lburna (Prilozi ilirskoj onomatsici)*, Iliri i antički svijet, 711.751.

in the native families, as for example IJug. 207: Tullia Oepli f. Voltisa adduced C.Iulius Ceuni f. Acirius as her *filius*. A good example of matrilineality through three generations is provided by the inscription from Rider, CIL III 2792: *Tritanoni Lavi f. an. LX et Aploni Tritanonis an. XII Tritano Acali matri et filiae fecit*.

The absence of the father is significant for all the inscriptions from Liburnia concerning *matertera* and *amita*. This allows us to assume the existence of social matrilineality and the rejection of the biological paternity even in the Roman époque. *Amita* is recorded seldom together with somebody who could be a father also in the inscriptions outside Liburnia. *Pater* is mentioned together with *amita* in AE 1984, Cluvium (Samnium). Mostly the father is either unknown or unimportant in the family, inheritance and similar.

The patrilineal and patriarchal system was accepted in the native communities in Liburnia as in the rest of the province of Dalmatia with the coming of the Romans. However, the mother as the only origin in many inscriptions might mean that in Liburnia even under Roman rule the maternal kin was more important than the patrilineal in part of society<sup>16</sup>. A large number of native Illyrian names, some of them known only in Liburnia, and inscriptions consecrated to native deities, testify that they also preserved their national identity under Roman rule.

The appearance of *cognatio* in many inscriptions from Liburnia and surrounding regions speaks in favor of the assumption that the mother's kin also preserved importance in Roman Liburnia; Bull. Dalm.37, 1909,67, CIL III 8687, CIL III 8675, CIL III 8676, VHAD 55,1953,361, VHAD 46, 1923, 53–54. IJug. III 1997. They are devoted to *Matres magnae* in the majority of cases. Significant is IJug. 944a, found in Burnum or Varvaria: *Marti sac. Turus Longini f. dec. et sacerdotali(s) pro suis et cognation(e) Nantania de suo v.sl.m.* Publishing the inscription, Rendić-Miočević recognized *cognatio* as the larger group which might correspond to the Roman *gens*.<sup>17</sup> Alföldy developed this idea further, quoting juristic texts which confirm that *cognatio* represented the matrilineal kin<sup>18</sup> and saw in it new confirmation that the Liburnian society also kept the rule of matrilineal kinship under the Romans. The words *pro suis et cognatione Nantania* – for his own (patriarchic) family and blood relatives – seems to confirm the view, firstly that it was a social unit larger than the family, and secondly that it was a matrilineal kinship group. *Cognatio* probably coexisted with the patriarchic *curia* mentioned in the inscription from Klis near Salona, CIL III 8567: *Curia Prisca Matri Magnae fanum refecit signa posuit larophorum cymbala tympana catillum forfices*.

16 As stated by J. Bachofen in the 1870's, the matrilineal system was known in many societies in the antiquity.

17 Rendić-Miočević, 1960, 163-171.

18 G. Alföldy, 1963, 81-87. More about it M.Šašel-Kos, *Kybele in Salona: a Note*, Collection Latomus 226, Mélanges à la mémoire de Marcel Le Glay, 1994, 780-791.

Matrilineal kin is preserved in other regions of the Roman empire as relics of the indigenous kinship system, as for instance in some parts of Lusitania<sup>19</sup>, or the best known example in Lycia, attested in Herodotus and in many inscriptions until the third century AD<sup>20</sup>.

## Bibliography

- Alföldy G. 1961. Die Stellung der Frau in der Gesellschaft der Liburnen. *Acta antiqua Academiae scientiarum hungaricae*. 9: 307–319
1963. Cognatio Nantania. *Acta antiqua Academiae scientiarum hungaricae*. 11: 81–87.
1964. Die Namengebung der Urbevölkerung in der römischen Provinz Dalmatia. Beiträge zur Namengebung. 115: 66 ff.
1965. *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*. Budapest 1965.
- J.J. Bachofen. 1897. *Das Mutterrecht, Eine Untersuchung über der Gynokokratie der alten Welt, nach ihrer religiöser und rechthlicher Natur*. Basel.
- Bettini, M. 1992. *Familie und Verwandtschaft im antiken Rom*. Frankfurt/New York.
- Krahe, H. 1920. *Lexicon altillyrischen Personennamen*. Heidelberg.
- Mayer, E. 1957. *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier*. Zagreb.
- Laslett, P. 1972. Introduction. In: *The History of the Family, Household and Family in Past Times*. (ed) P. Laslett and R. Wall. Cambridge, 1–88.
- Medini, J. 1986. *Cognationes Salonitanae*. Godišnjak XXIII Centra za Balkanološka ispitivanja 21: 8–43.
- Mirković, M. 2012. Municipium S(), A Roman town in the Central Balkans, Komini near Pljevlja, Montenegro, BAR Intern. Series 2357, 2012.
- Rendić-Miočević, D. 1948. *Ilirska onomastica*. Split
1989. Onomastičke studije s teritorila Liburna, (Prilozi ilrskoj onomastici), Iliri i antički svijet, Split, 711–727.
1960. Ilirske onomastičke studije (I). *Živa antika* 10: 163–171.
- Saller, P. 1997. Roman Kinship: Structure and Sentiment in The Roman Family in Italy, Status, Sentiment, Space, ed. B. Rawson and P. Weaver, Oxford. 8–34.
- Salway, B. 1994. What's a name? A Survey of Roman onomastic practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700. *JRS*. 84: 124–45.
- Šašel-Kos, M. 1994. Kybele in Salona: a Note. *Collection Latomus 226, Mélanges à la mémoire de Marcel Le Glay*. pp. 780–791.
- Wilkes, J.J. 1969. *Dalmatia*. London.
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. München.

Primljeno: 22.04.2017.

Prihvaćeno: 15.06.2017.

19 J. Edmondson, Family relations in Roman Lusitania, in *The Roman Family in the Empire, Rome, Italy and Beyond*, ed. M. George, Oxford, 120 ff.

20 For bibliography see M. Mirković, Son-in-law, Mother's brother, and Father in Lycian Inscriptions, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 128, 2011, 352–365

Miroslava Mirković

## Grobovi, imena i srodstvo: *matertera* i *amita* u rimskoj Liburniji

**Apstrakt:** U obimnoj modernoj literaturi o rimskoj porodici mali je broj onih posvećenih problemima proširene porodici u koju spadaju brat majke, sestra majke i oca i ostali laterarni srodnici. O njima je mali broj podataka u antičkih pisaca. Natpisi, pre svega oni na nadgrobnim spomenicima, ostaju glavni izvorni materijal za proučavanje njihovih međusobnih odnosa. Stranice koje slede posvećene su ženskim srodnicima s očeve i majčine strane, *materteri* (majčinoj sestri) i *amiti* (očevoj sestri) u Liburniji, obalskoj oblasti na severozapadu rimske provincije Dalmacije. Dva su razloga što je ta oblast izabrana za ispitivanje: prvo, iz nje potiče relativno veliki broj natpisa, drugo, u društvu Liburnije žena je i u istorijsko doba sačuvala važnu ulogu u porodici i u ekonomiji. Istraživanja o *materteri* i *amiti* bazirano je na analizi imena, u Liburniji i u drugim oblastima Carstva. Ime, pre svega *gentile*, u istraživanju ima važno mesto. Ono se prenosilo muškom linijom. Po tom pravilu bi *amita* i otac kao i *matertera* i majka morale imati isto *gentilno* ime kao i muški srodnici. Od toga ima odstupanja, što zahteva objašnjenje, jer ime reflektuje socijalne odnose u porodici. Istraživanje vodi zaključku da su tetke s očeve ili majčine strane mogle zameniti biološke roditelje. Odnos sestrića i bratanaca i tetke, kako se reflektuje na natpisima Liburnije mogao bi se tumačiti i kao trag starinskog matrilateralnog srodstvenog sistema.

**Ključne reči:** *matertera*, *amita*, *cognatio*, matrilinarno poreklo, *mater*, nedostajući *pater*, onomastika.