

TOMBSTONES AND ROMAN FAMILY RELATIONS IN THE PRINCIPATE: CIVILIANS, SOLDIERS AND SLAVES*

By RICHARD P. SALLER AND BRENT D. SHAW

Tombstones furnish perhaps three-quarters of the entire corpus of Latin inscriptions.¹ Many of these give no more than the name of the deceased, but tens of thousands also offer the historian a few additional details, such as age at death and the name and relationship of the commemorator. Previous studies of the tombstones *en masse* have focused on nomenclature and age at death.² In this study we wish to ask what conclusions can be drawn from the data about the commemorator's relationship with the deceased.

A great deal of research in the past two decades has been devoted to the study of the family in the late mediaeval and modern periods. The results have forced a rethinking of our received ideas about the development of the family unit. In the last century Le Play identified three basic family types: the patriarchal extended family (in which all sons and their families remain under the father's authority during his lifetime), the stem family (in which only the inheriting son and his family remain in the household to inherit), and the unstable, nuclear family (the mother-father-children triad). Le Play believed that there had been an evolution from the multi-generation family unit to the present-day, decadent nuclear family.³ It is Le Play's view that lies behind the old *opinio communis* that as one goes back in time one finds larger extended family units. Though heated debate continues over the place of the extended family, the work of Peter Laslett and the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure (among others) has shown that, as a general evolutionary scheme, Le Play's idea is a myth.⁴ In many areas (though not all) there is no evidence for extended family households being the norm as far back as records go. Of course, for the Roman period we do not have the sort of parish records used by Laslett and others, but we do believe that the tombstone data can shed some light on the important question of family type in the Roman empire. It is vital to make use of this evidence, because the linguistic and legal material alone might lead us to downgrade the significance of the nuclear family: both *familia* and *domus*, the two Latin words for family, regularly refer to the extended family or to the household including slaves.⁵ The Romans had no word whose primary meaning was the mother-father-children triad. Yet on the basis of the tombstone inscriptions we have come to the conclusion that for the populations putting up tombstones throughout the western provinces the nuclear family was the primary focus of certain types of familial obligation. Grandparents, uncles and other extended family members appear too infrequently as commemorators for us to believe that they were regarded as part of the core family unit.

The family has received relatively little attention from Roman historians, even though, as the basic unit of social reproduction, it must be inextricably involved with issues that have been studied at length—for instance, recruitment of the aristocracy and of the army.⁶ After setting out our data on family relationships in the civilian and military populations

* An early version of this paper was presented to the Cambridge seminar on the Society and Economy of the Ancient World; the participants' comments were much appreciated. We are also grateful to Sir Moses Finley, Professor Keith Hopkins, Dr Peter Laslett, Dr Jim Smith, Mr Gabriel Herman and the Editorial Committee of the Journal for help in improving the text. Finally, Swarthmore College generously provided support for the production of the typescript.

¹ The whole corpus of Latin inscriptions must now number *c.* 250,000 or more. R. MacMullen, 'The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire', *AJPh* 103 (1982), 233-46, at p. 238, estimates 156,000 in *CIL*, but this number has certainly increased greatly. In two test cases (Britain: *CIL* VII (1873) compared with *RIB* and subsequent publications; Africa: *CIL* VIII, 1-2 (1881-94) compared to *ILAlg* I, II, 1-2) we found that the number had about doubled in size. If so, funerary stones probably represent about 170-190,000 of the total.

² See n. 7 below.

³ M. Mitterauer and R. Sieder, *The European Family* (1982), ch. 2, 'The Myth of the Large Pre-Industrial Family'. R. Wall provides a subtle discussion of the difficulties of identifying appropriate criteria (e.g. household membership or participation in family production or consumption) for analyses of family type and points out that Le Play was not very precise on this issue (R. Wall *et al.*, *Family Forms in Historic Europe* (1983), 1-63).

⁴ P. Laslett and R. Wall (eds.), *Household and Family in Past Time* (1972). The various criticisms of Laslett's approach are summarized in M. Anderson, *Approaches to the History of the Western Family, 1500-1914* (1980), 27-38. Despite the criticisms, Mitterauer and Sieder still conclude that 'it cannot be maintained . . . that the dominant family form of pre-industrial times was the large family community in which several generations lived together' (op. cit., 39).

⁵ R. Saller, 'Familia, domus and the Roman Conception of the Family', *Phoenix*, forthcoming.

⁶ See p. 139 below.

of the western empire and discussing the issue of family type, we will then proceed to show how our information has a direct bearing on the much discussed problem of the development of local army recruiting.

Before moving into the analysis, we wish to emphasize a caveat. Within the body of data there are many unknowns which might vitiate any interpretation of any one sample. The fact that uniform patterns emerge across the more than two dozen sample groups suggests to us that we have good reason to believe that sound conclusions can be drawn from them. It would be extraordinary if all the differences in commemorative practices worked in such a way as to produce uniformities that would mislead us about the importance of nuclear family relations. Nevertheless, we recognize that the interpretation of the patterns is not straightforward, that the relationships expressed on the stones are not a direct reflection of any single type of bond (e.g. affection, heirship, kinship obligation). Consequently, our explanations must remain somewhat tentative and represent what seem to us to be the best of the possible hypotheses.

I. METHOD

This paper will utilize a method different from that of nomenclature analysis or of age-distribution to analyse the vast funerary epigraphy of the western Roman empire. The goal is to assess the types and variations of personal relationships (e.g. kinship, amity, or dependence) attested on tombstones. Unlike the use of age at death recorded on these stones to reconstruct Roman life-tables, the method adopted in our view yields valid results. Analogous approaches to the tombstone data have been used by Weaver in his study of the *Familia Caesaris*, and by Rawson in her study of family life amongst the lower orders in the city of Rome.⁷ Their use of the data, however, tends to combine information on age at death and nomenclature, in order to analyse familial links between groups of differing social status (primarily slaves and freedmen) within a context that accepts the family as a given. We, on the other hand, are attempting a more comprehensive comparative study of the western empire, employing tombstone data to measure variations in family and non-familial relationships within different regional and social contexts. That is to say, we tend to accept regional populations (e.g. from provinces or cities) or social groups (e.g. slaves) as our givens, and to concentrate instead on delineating the personal relationships recorded on tombstones in each region or group, and then to make comparisons between them. Further, we shall argue that our evidence, collated from more than 25,000 stones, is both significant and valid when analysed in this collective and comparative manner, in spite of the unknowns involved in funerary commemoration.⁸

Roman law drew a distinction between two types of funerary monument, *sepulchra familiaria* (tombs passed down through family lineages) and *sepulchra hereditaria* (tombs transmitted to heirs, related or not). Whatever force this distinction may have had in earlier Roman society, by the period from which most of our inscriptions derive, its significance was reduced to a largely legal one. As de Visscher has concluded, most tombs of the imperial period were *de facto* personal tombs and were not tied to any strong conception or practice of maintaining long agnatic family lineages—hence the doubt about the legal enforceability of the distinction between ‘family’ and ‘hereditary’ tombs.⁹ If any

⁷ P. R. C. Weaver, *Familia Caesaris: A Social History of the Emperor's Freedmen and Slaves* (1972); B. Rawson, ‘Family Life among the Lower Classes at Rome in the First Two Centuries of the Empire’, *CPh* 61 (1966), 71–83; their approach has also been used by S. Treggiari, ‘Family life among the staff of the Volusii’, *TAPA* 105 (1975), 393–401, and by M. B. Flory, ‘Family in *Familia*. Kinship and Community in Slavery’, *AJAH* 3 (1978), 78–95.

⁸ The figure of c. 25,000 is a rough estimate of the total number of stones read for this survey; of these, a large number were not useful for tabulation because they were too fragmentary, illegible, or ambiguous in meaning. Hence only some 12–13,000 stones actually yielded data tabulated on our charts (A–D and 1–32).

⁹ *Le droit des tombeaux romains* (1963), chs. 6–8. K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal* (1983), 205 f. has come to a similar conclusion. The formal distinction

is expressed by Gaius in *Dig.* 11. 7. 5: ‘Familiaria sepulchra dicuntur, quae quis sibi familiaeque suae constituit, hereditaria autem, quae quis sibi hereditibusque suis constituit’; cf. 11. 7. 6. *pr.* (Ulpian), *CJ* 3. 44. 4, 8, 13 (esp. the last, on the confusion and merging of the two types). Even in the Roman *columbaria* individualized commemoration is found, as for example in those of the *monumentum Liviae* (*CIL* VI, 3926–4307), the *monumentum familiae Marcellae* (ib., 4418–4708), the *monumentum inter Appiam et Latinam* (ib., 4881–5075), and the *monumentum familiae Neronis Drusii* (ib., 4327–4413). For the development of this type of tomb see J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* (1971), 113–18 and plates 27–8 (*columbaria*), and 132–43 (house-tombs); for the developments at Ostia see R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, 2nd ed. (1973), 459–61.

useful distinction is to be drawn in type of funerary commemoration it is that between ante-mortem and post-mortem monuments. For post-mortem commemoration the deceased depended on some other person, often named and connected by kinship, heirship, friendship, or some other bond. A Roman could avoid the uncertainty of relying on another to undertake this task by erecting a funerary monument to him/herself and perhaps other related persons while still alive. An ante-mortem monument offered wider scope for the inclusion of personal relations (often the principal's entire family, living and dead) than the post-mortem, because in the latter only those relations alive and available to participate at the time of death are named. Ante-mortem commemorations, found in varying numbers in different parts of the western empire, are most common in the regions of northern Italy, Noricum, Raetia, and eastern Gallia Narbonensis. In Noricum this type dominates in burial practice to the virtual exclusion of post-mortem memorials.¹⁰

In trying to draw conclusions about social relationships from the tombstone data, the historian must answer the critical question: what meaning did the act of commemoration have in Roman society? It is obvious that commemorators were not arbitrarily or haphazardly chosen. What, then, does commemoration tell us about the social relationship between the deceased and the commemorator? Was commemoration an intimate duty to be done by a man's closest relations, or a task to be carried out by lowly dependants? The latter possibility would seem to be excluded by the rarity of slave and freedman commemorators (5 per cent or less in most samples). Fortunately, it is unnecessary to speculate about these questions, because the Digest offers clear statements on this matter.

The jurists indicate that the deceased could specify in his will that an unrelated person undertake the responsibility of his burial and commemoration, sometimes in return for a legacy to be paid after performance of these duties. Our tables, which tabulate real commemorative relationships in the Roman world, clearly show, however, that the duty was in fact rarely assigned to non-kin legatees. If the testator specified no legatee in this regard, by law the financial responsibility for reasonable costs of burial and a memorial lay with the heir.¹¹ More important, the juristic discussion reveals that here popular sentiment was stronger than the legal rule: burial and commemoration were so closely associated with heirship in the minds of Romans that onlookers automatically assumed that the person overseeing the burial was *ipso facto* signalling his decision to enter into the inheritance. The jurists warned against making this assumption. For example, if a named heir who is hesitating over accepting the inheritance (perhaps owing to the debts burdening the estate) proceeds to bury the deceased testator, Ulpian cautions that he is on no account to be thought for this reason alone to have entered into the *hereditas*. In spite of this legal protection some prospective heirs still refused to participate in the burial of the testator out of fear that they would be thought to have accepted. Ulpian states that in such circumstances sons should see to the burial as a filial duty.¹² Sons in this position apparently tried to protect themselves from the assumption that they were acting as heirs by a public declaration that they were 'moved by feelings of duty'.¹³ Where designated legatees, heirs and sons were not available or not willing to undertake burial, the law stipulated that intestate successors or *cognati* in order of degree of relationship do so.¹⁴ In sum, the statements in the Digest suggest that where the deceased is associated with a named commemorator (and by no means all Romans were commemorated), the latter is very likely to be the heir or, failing that, the family member thought to be tied by the strongest bond of duty.

Another motive, affection, though difficult to measure, was no doubt also involved in the decision to erect an epitaph. This seems especially clear in the memorials for young children expressing the dedicator's affection and grief.¹⁵ Altogether, patterns of com-

¹⁰ Of all Noricum tombstones (N = c. 500) about 360 were clearly specified as 'se vivo' or 'sibi' types; another c. 100 not in these categories were deemed to be equivalent to them because of their context (i.e. no explicit sign of a deceased), as were ante-mortem commemorations.

¹¹ *Dig.* 11. 7. 3-5 (Ulpian), cf. 11. 7. 14. 2, 6-7 (Ulpian).

¹² *Dig.* 11. 7. 4 (Ulpian).

¹³ *Dig.* 11. 7. 14. 8 (Ulpian); on filial duty over-

riding heirship see *Dig.* 11. 7. 14. 13 (Ulpian).

¹⁴ *Dig.* 11. 7. 12. 4 (Ulpian).

¹⁵ For a discussion of the qualities of affection attributed to the deceased and commemorators on Spanish tombstones, see L. A. Curchin, 'Familial epithets in the epigraphy of Roman Spain', in *Mélanges Étienne Gareau* (1982), 179-82. On the more general question of grief and emotional ties to the deceased, see Hopkins, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 217 ff.

memoration offer a reflection, albeit indirect and inexact, of patterns of heirship, as well as of a sense of family duty and affection. It would be impossible to assess the relative importance of these three social bonds, and in any case it would be artificial, since they must have very often coincided.

Having established what sort of social bond the commemorative relationships reflect, we may now turn our attention to a second question: what social groups are represented in our samples? It is clear that not all people of the western empire received a funerary inscription. In our samples urban dwellers are much more fully represented than the rural masses, and the élite more fully than their inferiors. There is so little epigraphic material for the rural areas that it must be admitted that our conclusions do not apply to them. In contrast, the relatively humble urban dwellers (i.e. those below the curial order), though under-represented, make up the bulk of our samples in absolute numbers.

This point is worth stressing, since the assumption in some studies has been that only the well-to-do could afford funerary memorials. Romans attached considerable importance to the *monumentum*, a part of the burial designed 'to preserve memory' (in Ulpian's words).¹⁶ Petronius offers a glimpse of the Roman attitude towards commemoration in a scene from the *Cena Trimalchionis*. Trimalchio directs his freedman friend Habinnas, a *lapidarius* noted for his finely carved tombstones, to prepare his monument 'so that by your *beneficium* I may be able to live after death'. Trimalchio then describes in vivid detail the scenes from his life he wishes to be depicted on the monument, scenes celebrating his status, wealth, honours, and actions as patron and benefactor. He adds his wish for 'a sun-dial so that anyone who looks at the time will read my name whether he likes it or not'. Trimalchio completes his instructions by dictating the contents of the epitaph.¹⁷

The wish to perpetuate some memory of oneself after death was not confined to the wealthy, just as in many other pre-modern urban centres, where the poor have gone to considerable lengths to avoid the anonymity of the mass graves of paupers and to ensure for themselves the basics of 'burial in a genteel manner'.¹⁸ *Collegia* were organized in the Roman world to provide burial with some sort of inscribed stone for the humble (*temuiores*) through the collection of very modest dues. Only at the low level of the anonymous burials of the Isola Sacra at Ostia (large urns set in rows in the ground) do we reach the social stratum where burials are no longer marked by an inscription.¹⁹ The desire among humble Romans to have a funerary monument can be illustrated by one particular, identifiable group, the graves of gladiators. Two groups of gladiatorial tombstones, one from Rome and the other from Spain, reveal that most of these men, whose life-expectancy must have been an underwriter's nightmare, were married to women who erected stones recording their relationship to the deceased.²⁰

¹⁶ *Dig.* 11. 7. 2. 6 (Ulpian); cf. 11. 7. 42 (Florentinus, *Institutes*).

¹⁷ Petronius, *Satyr.* 71, 'Horologium in medio, ut quisquis horas inspicit, velit nolit, nomen meum legat. Inscriptio quoque vide diligenter si haec satis idonea tibi videtur...' A real example of similar behaviour is attested by *CIL* XIII. 2. 1, 5708 (Germania superior, *Andemantunnum*, later the *civitas Lingonum*, Langres); for comment see J. J. Hatt, *La tombe gallo-romaine* (1951), 65 ff.

¹⁸ M. Dorothy George, *London Life in the Eighteenth Century* (1925; reprint, 1976), 294 and 391, n. 94, quoting a London advertisement: one shilling entrance fee plus two pence a week, age restriction 14-60, with a full description of the funeral assured to the subscriber. Such 'Friendly Societies', as they were called, like Roman *collegia*, were an urban social phenomenon not limited to funeral concerns alone.

¹⁹ Hopkins, op. cit. (n. 9), 205 ff. discusses funerary *collegia* and mass graves. For *collegia* see also J. P. Waltzing, *Étude historique sur les corporations professionnelles chez les Romains* (4 vols., 1895; reprint, 1970) I, 141-53 and 256-300; on their extension to the provinces see J. J. Hatt, op. cit. (n. 17), 77-84; for examples of their constitutions and practices see *CIL* VI, 10251-10423, and Meiggs, op. cit. (n. 9), 334,

citing *ILS* 7212 (Lanuvium) and *CIL* XIV. 1, 4548 (Ostia). For inscriptions in *columbaria* see n. 9 above; for the burials at *Isola Sacra* see G. Calza, *La necropoli del Porto di Roma nell'Isola Sacra* (1940), 46, figs. 10 and 80; cf. Toynbee, op. cit. (n. 9), 82-7, 101-3, and plates 18-19 for *Isola Sacra*, and 22-5 for poor burial types elsewhere in the empire. As in life, the 'houses of death' of the poor are cramped in the spaces between the more magnificent homes of the rich. For the burial of the poor in other early modern societies see P. Ariès, *The Hour of Our Death* (1983), 56 f., 207 f., and 270 f. (and cf. 185 f. on 'confraternities').

²⁰ For the Rome gladiators see *CIL* VI. 2, 10168-10202; for the Spanish gladiators see A. García y Bellido, 'Lapidarias funerarias de gladiatores de Hispania', *AEA* 33 (1960), 123-44 (= *AE* 1962: 44-58). On family life amongst gladiators see G. Ville, *La gladiature en occident des origines à la mort de Domitien* (1981), ch. 4, 5, 329-32. He believes that most of these 'marriages' were ephemeral affairs with gladiatorial groupies (*ludiae*), but the consistent mention of husbands and wives using the formal terminology of marriage (i.e. *uxor*, *maritus*, *coniunx*) and of children shows that at very least the forms of nuclear family relationships were observed.

It should be pointed out in this regard that the cost of modest memorials was not so high as to be prohibitive for working Romans. Among the tombstones for military and civilian inhabitants of Lambaesis, some cost hundreds or thousands of sesterces, but those typical of ordinary soldiers could be purchased for less than a hundred sesterces.²¹ Furthermore, the thousands of stones found at sites like Cirta, Thubursicu Numidarum, Sicca Veneria and Thugga are markedly smaller and cruder than the ordinary soldier's, suggesting a price in the tens of sesterces.²² Of course, the cost at Rome was no doubt higher, but the rules of funerary *collegia* there and the *funeraticium* granted by Nerva as a *beneficium* to the urban plebs imply a funeral cost, including memorial marker, of no more than a couple of hundred sesterces.²³ Our conclusion is that, while not all Romans were commemorated after death, memorial stones were within the means of modest men, many of whom felt a strong impulse to preserve their own memories or those of their relations. Though the Roman leisured classes are no doubt over-represented in our samples, those identifiable as members of the senatorial, equestrian or curial classes constitute only a fraction of the commemorated. The bulk of our tombstone data offers evidence of social relationships of those Romans between the élite and the very poor, a group for which our literary sources give little information—hence the importance of expending so much effort on such intractable data.

Within the wide range of tombstone data, there are pronounced regional and social variations in practices of commemoration. One example of each type of variation, and its significance for our interpretation of the data, must suffice here. As an example of a distinct regional variation in commemoration we might take the case of the funerary epigraphy of North Africa (see Table A). Here there seems to be a high correlation between the practice of commemorating the deceased with an epigraph that includes the mention by name and relationship of the commemorator(s), and the presence of the army or other administrative elements of the Roman state. At Lambaesis, for example, tombstone inscriptions from both the military camp and the municipality include a high percentage with designated commemorators (81 and 80 per cent, respectively). Funerary stones from four sites selected from outside the military zone (Thugga, Sicca Veneria, Thubursicu Numidarum, and Castellum Celtianum), on the other hand, are marked by an almost complete absence of this practice (2, 4, 6, and 0 per cent, respectively). In the town of Theveste, on the edge of the military zone in the south, the practice of noting the relationship between the commemorator and the deceased appears once again in strength (81 per cent of all stones). It can be no coincidence that the town was once a headquarters of the legion, which left

²¹ The price attested for *CIL* VIII, 18162 = 3042 is 96 HS. For a survey of costs see R. Duncan-Jones, *The Economy of the Roman Empire: Quantitative Studies*, rev. ed. (1982), 99–101, nos. 213–44; most are from Lambaesis (cf. p. 70: there are 49 prices from the city, more than from any other African centre; two-thirds of them refer to tomb costs). Since most of these prices are expressed as expenditures *ex n.* sesterces, it is not certain that the whole amount must refer to the cost of the monument alone; in one case (*CIL* VIII, 3079) the funeral is mentioned as a separate item of cost, though its price is not noted separately. The claim that a 2,000 HS payment recorded in the charter of the *collegium* of the *cornicines* at Lambaesis (*ILS* 2354) is for burial costs seems unfounded. It seems to be merely the sum of money that would otherwise have been paid to the member on leaving the society because of promotion or retirement from army service; on his death the amount is to be paid to his heir, 'Item si qui obitum naturae red(diderit), acc(ipiet) her(es) ips(ius) sive proc(urator) * D'. On the variables of decoration and form that affect cost see R. Weyand, 'Form und Dekoration der römischen Grabsteine der Rheinlande im ersten Jahrhundert', *Bj* 108–9 (1902), 185–238.

²² For the size and description of the Cirtan stones see *ILAlg.* I, 2, 845 f.; for Castellum Celtianum, *ib.*, 2117 f.; for Thubursicu Numidarum, *ILAlg.*

I, 1, 1337 f.; for those of Thugga see the periodic reports on them by L. Poinssot in *CT* 16 (1909) and 17 (1910). On the average the latter were 0.50 × 0.20 m. and the three lines or so of text include only DMS plus the name and age of the deceased.

²³ Compare the burial costs noted for Africa in Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.* (n. 21) with those for Italy, pp. 161–71, nos. 550–636; for costs related to income see Table 2, p. 79 (for Africa) and Table 3, p. 130 (for Italy). We can say, for example, that the more expensive tombs erected by soldiers represented a cost of about 2% of their nominal annual income. For allowances made by funerary *collegia* in Italy see Duncan-Jones, *op. cit.*, 131. Burial costs for poor unmarked graves are probably best reflected in the municipal laws governing costs of burials and execution (and other punishments) set for public *libitinarii* at Puteoli and Cumae, indicating a total cost of under 50–60 HS; see L. Bove, 'Due nuove iscrizioni di Pozzuoli e Cuma', *RAAN*, n.s. 41 (1966), 207–39, cf. *Labeo* 13 (1967), 22–48 (= *AE* 1971: 88–9). For the *funeraticium* of Nerva see *Chron. Min.* (ed. Mommsen) I, 146, and A. Degrassi, 'Nerva Funeraticium Plebi Urbanæ Instituit', ch. 52 in *Scritti Vari di Antichità*, vol. 1 (1962), 697–702. Pliny, *Pan.* 40. 1 mentions the possibility of spending the whole of a *parva hereditas* on a *sepulchrum* for the deceased.

TABLE A. THE LATIN FUNERARY EPIGRAPHY OF NORTH AFRICA

	Thugga		Sicca Veneria		Thubursicu Numidarum		Cirta		Castellum Celtianum		Theveste		Theveste Region		Lambaesis Civilian		Lambaesis Military	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Commemoration by named relative(s)	5	1	4	1	11	3	8	1	3	—	130	68	91	48	598	65	390	76
by unnamed relative(s)	4	1	14	3	12	3	102	12	0	0	24	13	37	19	133	15	27	5
by unknown person(s)	532	98	422	96	368	90	777	86	985	100	22	12	53	28	146	16	54	11
by heir(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	—	0	0	8	4	8	4	16	2	28	5
<i>Se vivo</i> — <i>Sibi</i>	0	0	0	0	16	4	7	1	0	0	7	4	2	1	22	2	17	3
Total	541		440		407		895		988		191		191		915		516	

Sources :

- Thugga, Sicca Veneria, Theveste, Lambaesis : *CIL* VIII (all)
- Cirta : *Inscriptions L[atines de l'Algérie]* II. I (1957) (first 1000, nos. 778-1777)
- Castellum Celtianum : *ILAlg.* II. I (first 1000, nos. 2114-3113)
- Thubursicu Numidarum : *ILAlg.* I (1922) (all, nos. 1335-1982)

a permanent garrison detachment in it, and that it was also a regional centre of the provincial administration staffed by imperial slaves.²⁴ Hence in Africa a discernible regional pattern emerges which precludes entirely the measurement of personal relationships in most regions.

An example of social variation in commemorative practices is to be found in the varying propensity to commemorate different age-sets ('cohorts') of deceased. In the Roman world there must have been massive infant and child mortality, and we might reasonably expect that funerary commemorations would not adequately mirror actual levels of mortality in low age groups. A significant under-representation in commemoration of those under ten years of age is indeed typical of some populations in the empire. In rural towns like Thagaste, Arcasal, and Thibilis in North Africa commemorations of children under ten years of age constitute a very small proportion of all commemorations (about 1-2 per cent), while the proportion of elderly (those over seventy years of age) is correspondingly high (30-45 per cent). In the larger towns such as Cirta and Lambaesis, commemoration of children and infants is found more frequently (about 8-10 per cent of all gravestones). In urban centres such as Carthage and Ostia, dedications to children under ten form the largest single category (20 and 40 per cent, respectively), whereas the commemoration of the elderly falls, correspondingly, to a very small percentage of the total (1-2 per cent in the cases just cited).²⁵ These variations seem to correlate with population density and the proportion of slave and freed elements in the cities, urban and servile populations giving greater attention to the commemoration of young children.²⁶ This pronounced skewing in the data is an insurmountable problem for those attempting to use the recorded ages at death to reconstruct model life tables, because the variation in age samples is affected by cultural variations in funerary commemoration.²⁷ The very skewing which produces such erratic distortions in reconstructed life-tables, however, poses no obstacle to our analysis. The skewing is not an effect upon our data but rather is produced by the very differences in cultural preferences for funerary commemoration that we are studying. Whatever skewing there is in these data, therefore, represents the phenomena that we are seeking to measure.²⁸

Before advancing to the analysis of the data, we might first give a brief description of their type, and the manner in which they were processed. We began by defining broad social groups (for this survey, 'civilians', 'soldiers', and 'servile' populations) in different geographical regions of the empire (provinces, districts such as Regio XI and Latium in Italy, and urban centres such as Rome and Lambaesis). Where possible, all late imperial and Christian inscriptions were eliminated from these samples since the funerary practices

²⁴ In the rural regions influenced by Theveste the proportion of tombstones with named commemorators is quite high (67%), while at Cirta, an administrative centre not heavily influenced by the army, only 13% of commemorators mention a relationship with the deceased and most of those do so without giving their own names (12%).

²⁵ See M. Clauss, 'Probleme der Lebensalterstatistiken aufgrund römischer Grabinschriften', *Chiron* 3 (1973), 395-417, at 404-5, and Table VII, a phenomenon already noted by I. Kajanto, 'On the Problem of the Average Duration of Life in the Roman Empire', *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, ser. B, no. 153. 2 (1968), 12-13.

²⁶ Clauss, art. cit., Table X, pp. 415-17 for the towns concerned; those with low commemoration of under 10s have about 1-2% average attested servile population, whereas those with relatively high infant-child commemoration average about 10% or more servile population. The urban size differential is also evident, the former being towns of the 2-4,000 range, the latter larger cities of the 10,000 plus range.

²⁷ Infant and child mortality for $e^0 = 25$ would be about 530 out of 1,000 live births by age ten, see A. J. Coale and P. Demeny, *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations* (1966), South Level 3. There is also a clear conflict with actual burials. At

the Roman town of Sitifis (Sétif) in North Africa, for example, where funerary epitaphs yield a fairly normal distribution according to our 'civilian' pattern, about 40% of all burials (N = 228) were those of children one year of age and under (N = 88), and 62% were of children ten years of age and under (N = 141); see P. A. Février and R. Guery, 'Les rites funéraires de la nécropole orientale de Sétif', *Ant. Afr.* 15 (1980), 91-124. The same problem of the discrepancy between actual burials and information on commemorations was noted by L. Henry for modern cemeteries: 'La mortalité d'après les inscriptions funéraires', *Population* 12 (1957), 149-52, and 'L'âge du décès d'après les inscriptions funéraires', *ib.* 14 (1959), 327-9.

²⁸ On this skewing see K. Hopkins, 'On the Probable Age Structure of the Roman Population', *Population Studies* 20 (1966), 245-64, at pp. 251 f. At least part of this skewing in some of the populations we have studied can be explained as the result of cultural patterns in the practice of commemoration that exist prior to the act of commemoration itself. The cultural pattern of heavy emphasis on parents' celebration of children, for example, that is evident in some of our samples, will necessarily skew the average age at death downwards considerably, irrespective of the actual demographic make-up of that whole population.

of the Christian period deserve separate treatment.²⁹ Although most of the inscriptions in these samples cannot be dated precisely, the dominant impression, borne out wherever inscriptions are datable, is that the inscriptions from the provincial areas are concentrated in the period from the mid-second to the first quarter of the third century A.D.³⁰ As stated above, these inscriptions were divided into three social groups. The process of including or excluding slave-freedman inscriptions from the 'civilian' and 'military' groups was somewhat arbitrary. An attempt was made to maintain as a separate group those slave-freedman inscriptions that clearly came from distinct servile communities (e.g. the *Familia Caesaris*) in order to gain some measure of servile commemorative practices in distinction from the other two social groups. In Rome and most Italian districts, however, it was futile and, in any event, unjustifiable, arbitrarily to separate slaves and freedmen from the general civilian population, so integral were they to its make-up.

In most of our regional samples all commemorations recording personal relationships were included in the count. In some instances, however, the quantity of data made a total count both prohibitive and unnecessary, and so a sample was taken.³¹ Where possible a count of at least two hundred relationships was sought, though we are satisfied with the general validity of smaller samples. When we doubled three of our smaller samples from c. 150 to c. 300 there was no significant change in the percentage in any category. Similarly, even relatively small samples, such as Africa: Caesarea, seem usable since they do not diverge from the pattern of personal relationships found in our other samples. Altogether, we are confident that much additional effort in searching out and counting more inscriptions would have produced very little reward in the reduction of the margin of error.

Since funerary dedications are far from uniform, they had to be reduced to a common format in order to measure and compare the data from them. This process requires that the peculiarities of given data sets be suppressed in order to gain comparability. Our method was to establish a grid of personal relationships, the final form of which lists the most frequently found types: family, amity, and dependence (see Tables 1-32 in the Appendix). Any single type of relationship recorded on a tombstone was then entered on the grid as one relationship ($N = 1$).³² In order to achieve comparability between samples, multiple occurrences of the same type of personal relationship were counted as equivalent to one relationship. For example, a tombstone that recorded a dedication by two sons to their father was reduced to one 'son-to-father' relationship on the ground that only one such type of relationship was involved. The great majority of all stones studied by us recorded rather simple patterns of relationships (i.e. usually one-to-one, or two-to-one), but in some regions (e.g. Italy: Regio XI, Noricum) and among some social groups (e.g. officers in the army) the funerary monument is often a larger, more elaborate work, with a lengthier inscription recording a whole series of personal relationships. One Regio XI stone, for example, is a commemoration by a man for himself, his father, his mother, his wife and his freedman.³³ Here the whole matrix of relationships could not be kept intact, but had to be broken down so that the stone yielded five separate entries on our grid. If this reductionist method were not followed, the alternative of processing all the data as they are grouped on the stones would lead either to a hopelessly complex grid or to methodological absurdities. For instance, where a unit of soldiers commemorated a

²⁹ See n. 37 below.

³⁰ There are some groups of dated tombstones as, for example, those from Sitifis (dated by the provincial era, most to the first half of the third century); others, such as the military stones from Britain, can be dated by the known movements of military units (see A. R. Birley, *The People of Roman Britain* (1979), chs. 3-5). Otherwise, one is left with changes in formulaic expressions to indicate a very approximate date, a method which does not as yet command great confidence, see J.-M. Lassere, 'Recherches sur la chronologie des épitaphes païennes de l'Afrique', *Ant. Afr.* 7 (1973), 7-152; for the general temporal distribution of all dated stones in the empire see MacMullen, art. cit. (n. 1), graph p. 243 (derived from Mrozek).

³¹ For the inscriptions from Cirta, Castellum

Celtianum, Regio XI in Italy, and Rome: Servile the first thousand stones were surveyed; for Rome: Lower Orders every fiftieth stone out of the c. 20,000 available in *CIL* VI was used.

³² It should be emphasized that, as a result, the tables do not give the number of tombstones examined.

³³ *CIL* v. 2, 6091. A survey of the typical mid-range Lambaesis sample reveals that about 80% of all stones contain 1-1 or 2-1 relationships (they represent an even higher proportion (95%) of all those in which relationships are actually expressed). Commemorations involving a group of more than three were rare among Lambaesis epitaphs: 4% involved four; less than 1% involved five; and less than 0.5% involved six.

colleague, it would introduce a gross distortion into the ratios of personal relations if we entered it as, say, three hundred separate instances of 'amici' commemorations.³⁴

Two broad groups emerged as the data were tabulated: relationships within the nuclear family, and relations outside it (e.g. extended family, non-kin heirs). The nuclear family category, by far the larger, was subdivided into four major subcategories for the sake of enabling better comparisons:

1. the conjugal family (commemorations between husbands and wives)
2. the 'descending' nuclear family (commemorations from parents to children)
3. the 'ascending' nuclear family (commemorations from children to parents)
4. the siblings.

The remaining relationships outside the nuclear family have been grouped under four major headings: extended family, heirs, friends, and servile relationships. The rubric 'extended family' includes all kinship relationships except those within the nuclear family (e.g. nephew to uncle) and some quasi-kin relations such as *alumnus* ('foster child'). 'Heredes' include only non-kin heirs.³⁵ The category of 'amici' or friends includes, for the most part, those commemorating the deceased who are designated as such (*amicus*), though in military inscriptions it also includes persons designated as 'fellow soldiers' (*commilito*, *commanipulis*, *contubernalis*) and in civilian inscriptions other amity relationships such as 'fellow townsman' (*municeps*). These persons are not designated as heirs (though they may have been); where they are so designated, their relationship to the deceased as 'heir' was considered to have priority and was recorded in that category instead. 'Servile' relationships are largely self-explanatory.³⁶

Finally, two residual categories—'no commemorator known' and 'sibi-se vivo'—were not computed with the above categories in the determination of the relative emphasis of personal relationships, but nevertheless are important in their own right. The 'no commemorator known' category includes all those stones which simply record the name and perhaps the age at death of the deceased, with no indication of who set up the stone, or of any personal relationship between that person and the deceased. In some samples (e.g. civilian Spain) as many as half of the epitaphs fall into this category. The 'se vivo' category comprises the cases where the principal set up the funerary stone to himself or herself while still alive. In some regions (e.g. those from North Africa) this type of stone is, in effect, equivalent for our purposes to the 'no commemorator known' type since in both cases we are unable to discover the personal relationships in which the deceased participated. In the other, more usual case, however, the principal, say a father, might set up the stone while alive to himself, to his wife, his daughter and his two freedmen. In this case the entry in the 'se vivo' category reflects one instance of this practice, while the remaining commemorations are recorded as individual personal relationships separately from the 'se vivo' category.

On first consideration, the group of 'no commemorator known' stones might seem to pose an obstacle to our analysis. To take the case of Spain, the sceptic might object that the half of the tombstones in which relationships were specified would predictably reflect familial patterns because the practice of commemoration would flow naturally from strong

³⁴ Certain formulaic expressions of a cumulative and non-specific nature were also excluded from the count of personal relationships. For example, the formulaic expression 'libertis libertabusque' found most frequently on stones from Rome (N = 122 for our Familia Caesaris sample) and Ostia (N = 91) in our samples, was not included in our survey because it is not a specific expression of the commemoration of known individuals. For a different type of analysis of funerary groups in Greece see S. C. Humphreys, 'Family Tombs and Tomb Cult in Ancient Athens: Tradition or Traditionalism?', *JHS* 100 (1980), 96–126 = ch. 5 in *The Family, Women and Death* (1983), 79–130.

³⁵ Occasionally wives and children were also labelled 'heredes', in which cases they were counted only in the appropriate kinship category. Our

assumption that commemorators designated solely as 'heres' were unrelated was often corroborated by differences in nomenclature or by the additional label of 'amicus'.

³⁶ Because we were seeking to measure the extent of attachment of *servi* and *liberti* to free populations, large or autonomous servile groups such as the Familia Caesaris were excluded from our civilian and military samples and were counted separately. There were, of course, a few ambiguous cases of servile (and other) relationships. Where there was any question or doubt as to the correct placing of such inscriptions, they were excluded from our count. Such cases were never numerous enough to make any significant difference to the ratios of personal relationships in the tables.

nuclear family bonds. And he might object further that behind the remaining 50 per cent where no commemorator is known there could be an entirely different configuration of personal relationships that would substantially alter the picture emerging from the 'known' sample. The objection does not convince us for several reasons. We would have to believe that the 'no commemorator known' stones, and they alone, were concealing from us in every part of the empire some wholly unknown and aberrant patterns of personal relationships that are nowhere apparent in the 'known' samples. This seems unlikely for several reasons. First, consider examples at the extremes of the spectrum. The practice of not recording commemorators is a result of economic, social and cultural factors. In the samples from the African towns where no commemorators at all are noted, it is impossible to believe for this reason alone in an unattested familial pattern. At the other end of the spectrum, the practice of ante-mortem commemoration in Noricum virtually eliminated 'no commemorator' stones (less than 1 per cent). Yet the absence of 'no commemorator' stones does not yield a wholly new or unusual pattern of familial or personal relationships. Secondly, the proportion of 'no commemorator' stones varies widely from region to region, and yet the pattern within the 'commemorator known' group remains remarkably consistent. This fact corroborates our position that the personal relationships of those without named commemorators were not very different from those with commemorators—it is simply a matter of cultural and social factors whether they are revealed on the inscriptions. Thirdly, the stones with no known commemorator seem to be distributed in age groups much as are the 'known commemorator' stones. Here again, there is no reason to believe that those without named commemorators belong to any special or unusual group; rather, the practice seems to be linked to wealth, and cultural and ideological influences.³⁷

In the tables (1–32) the columns labelled 'N' give the total number of relationships counted for each group; the adjoining column headed '%' gives the percentage of any one type out of all relationships. In order to provide a better understanding of the importance of types of nuclear family relationships, a second calculation is presented in brackets after the first, giving the percentage in the family subcategories out of all nuclear family relationships. There are two final points to be noted about these figures. First, the sum total 'N' gives the number of all relationships, not of tombstones. Second, a most important methodological point: many of the individual entries and percentages for subcategories and even some categories in our tables are quite small. They have been included for the sake of completeness but one should not make much use of them. In this study we have not based any arguments on the small subcategories within the nuclear family. With regard to small categories outside the nuclear family, it would be a mistake to place any emphasis on the precise numbers and percentages; rather, it is enough to say that they are quite small. Our focus will be on the proportions in the larger categories within the nuclear family for each region and, most important, the general patterns that emerge across the table for the western empire as a whole.

II. THE CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PATTERNS OF COMMEMORATION

An examination of the tables reveals two distinctive patterns of relationships between commemorators and the deceased, the first typical of civilian populations and the second found in many of the military populations. The military type is characterized by weak family representation among the commemorators and is exemplified by the *equites singulares* (Table 20). The great majority of *equites singulares* were recruited on the northern frontiers from the *alae* units and hence were separated from their families while serving in Rome.³⁸ This is surely the main reason for the relative scarcity of family relationships. Only 29 per cent of the commemorators were members of the immediate family of the dead; a further 3 per cent were from the extended family. Rather than depending on kin to set up memorials, most *equites singulares* relied on unrelated heirs (55 per cent) and *amici* (8 per

³⁷ See B. D. Shaw, 'Latin Funerary Epigraphy and Family Relations in the Later Empire', *Historia* 33 (1984).

³⁸ M. Speidel, *Die Equites Singulares Augusti* (1965), 1–2, 16–21.

cent) who were fellow soldiers. In addition, a few master-slave and patron-freed relationships appear (only 5 per cent). Overall, then, it is clear that, separated from their kin, most *equites singulares* developed close friendships with their fellow soldiers, who provided for their final commemoration. Even the figure of 29 per cent for nuclear family relations is misleadingly high, because more than one-half of these are brother-to-brother commemorations, where both are soldiers serving in Rome. Other family members constitute only 14 per cent of the dedicators, suggesting that these soldiers left the family into which they were born and rarely developed new ties by marriage with the local population in Rome.

The military pattern acquires significance when compared with a sample of tombstones from a civilian population. To illustrate the civilian pattern the sample from Regio XI in northern Italy (Table 6) was chosen because the area was Romanized but did not have the unusual proportion of servile population found in the city of Rome. In the Regio XI sample 79 per cent of the relationships between commemorator and deceased are from the nuclear family. The remaining fifth is divided more or less evenly among extended family, *amici*, patron-freedman and freedman-patron (about 5 per cent each). The relationships are clearly concentrated within the nuclear family. Within that category by far the largest subcategory is conjugal (44 per cent of nuclear family relationships), where husband-to-wife dedications predominate over wife-to-husband by four to one—a reflection in part of the family style of funerary dedication mentioned above (i.e. ‘to myself, to my wife, to my son, my daughter’ and so on).³⁹ The next two subcategories concern parent-child relations: 21 per cent of family dedications are parent-to-child and 26 per cent child-to-parent. By comparison, siblings are recorded as commemorators much less often (9 per cent)—about as often as friends or freedmen. Brother-to-brother is the most common type of sibling commemoration, but still only 5 per cent of all relationships as compared with 15 per cent of all relationships among the *equites singulares*.

To summarize the differences between the civilian and military patterns, we may say that there is a heavy predominance of nuclear family relations on civilian tombstones (four in five) and the reverse of that pattern among the *equites singulares*, of which one in three are nuclear family and fewer than one in seven if soldier-brothers are excluded. The cohesive feeling among the *equites singulares* was in fact so strong that even those who did marry occasionally followed the custom of their celibate fellow soldiers and instituted a *commiles* as heir in preference to, or along with, their wife.⁴⁰

III. THE CIVILIAN FAMILY

Using the Regio XI data as a point of comparison, we may now identify and interpret the characteristics shared with the other civilian populations. The most notable feature of the civilian table is that the nuclear family commemorators regularly constitute about 75–90 per cent of the total. This proportion does not vary much, regardless of chronological, geographical, or social differences. A comparison of Tables 1–4 reveals that in Rome, from the Republic to the Principate and from the lower classes to the senatorial aristocracy, a strong urge was felt to perpetuate the memory of the family relationship between the commemorator and the deceased (72 to 78 per cent of commemorators being from the nuclear family). This uniformity seems to us to highlight the consistent centrality of the family as the basic social unit and to militate against Veyne’s view about the development of the Roman family expressed in an influential *Annales* essay.⁴¹ Veyne believes that fundamental changes in the Roman family occurred in the Principate, changes that anticipated Christian mores and in some respects were similar to the development of the

³⁹ The large proportion of memorials to wives set up by husbands is partly to be explained by the legal rules which place the financial responsibility on the person receiving the woman’s dowry. Where no *dos* is left or it is inadequate to cover funeral expenses or an inheritance is also left, the woman’s father or heirs may be held responsible (*Dig.* 11. 7. 16, 20, 22, 28). In such cases, as in others, the law did not require husbands to pay for inscriptions perpetuating

the memory of their relationship: the fact that they did so is a sign of affection and sense of duty.

⁴⁰ *CIL* VI, 3194, 3267, 3282, 3288, 3300.

⁴¹ ‘La famille et l’amour sous le Haut-Empire romain’, *Annales*, E.S.C. 33. 1 (1978), 35–63. The impact of the article is clear in the review of J. Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (1983) by the eminent mediaeval historian, Georges Duby (*TLS*, Oct. 14, 1983, 1107).

affectionate family suggested by Stone and others for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁴² In Veyne's view, ties of affection were weak in Republican families: children were disinherited; sons murdered their fathers; marriage was principally an institution for those who wished to transmit property to legitimate descendants.⁴³ Others who had no such wish and the humbler classes for whom property transmission was of no great concern did not enter into marriages. Then in the first two centuries of our era came the great revolution in which the affectionate nuclear family came to the fore, first among the élite who spread it to their social dependants and inferiors. 'La généralisation individuelle et sociale du mariage aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère s'explique par la transformation morale que l'on sait: de féroces oligarches rivaux deviennent de fidèles serviteurs de l'État.'⁴⁴ 'Explained' is meant in the strongest sense of the word: elsewhere Veyne says that the political change is a 'sufficient' explanation.⁴⁵

Our data from Rome show that there is in fact little change to explain. Already in the Republic men and women of the lower classes (who comprise most of the Republican sample) regarded themselves as members of families and attached enough importance to the family to perpetuate its memory on stone. The contents of the inscriptions reveal the sort of traditional family values that Veyne claims emerged only in the Principate. For example, *CIL* I², 1221 has a sculpture of a man and woman holding hands. The woman, said to be 'casta, pudens, fida viro', survived her freed husband, a butcher, with her body chaste. Although most funerary inscriptions of the Republic do not provide as much information about marital virtues, we think it unlikely that this couple would have advertised qualities that were not held as ideals by others around them. Certainly Republican literary evidence, such as Lucretius' poignant lines about man's expectation of intense longing for his wife and children after death, reflects an assumption about strong bonds within the nuclear family:

Iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta, neque uxor
optima nec dulces occurrent oscula nati
praeripere et tacita pectus dulcedine tangent.⁴⁶

Aside from its inability to explain the empirical evidence, Veyne's view appears to us to be highly improbable on general grounds. Is it at all probable that a change in the way six hundred men competed for office in an empire of tens of millions could have altered something as fundamental as family life throughout the social hierarchy? Veyne makes much of the fact that the Republican competition to dominate was no longer a trait of the new service aristocracy under the emperors and that this affected family mores. Not only is this a grossly oversimplified view of the political changes in senators' lives, but, more fundamental, it overlooks the fact that domination of others continued to permeate a society still based on slavery (at least in Italy).⁴⁷ Far from being the source of a new, tighter

⁴² *ibid.*, 35. L. Stone, *The Family, Sex and Marriage in England, 1500-1800* (1977), argues for the increasing discreteness of the nuclear family, with a growth in the intensity of emotional bonds within that unit. For a summary of other recent work on this subject, together with a critique of the approach, see Anderson, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 39-64.

⁴³ Veyne, *art. cit.* (n. 41), 36.

⁴⁴ *ibid.*, 40.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, 60.

⁴⁶ *De rerum natura* 3. 894 ff. In this passage the meaning of *domus* would appear to be 'household' including the immediate family (see Saller, *art. cit.* (n. 5)). There seems little point in adding all the well-known evidence from Cicero's letters about his concern for Terentia, his children and his brother during his exile, or about his grief at Tullia's death, or about his efforts to keep together his brother's marriage and to discipline his nephew.

⁴⁷ Though the arenas changed, the competition for offices, honours and wealth obviously continued. One of the clearest public indications of this continuity was the morning salutation—an open sign of

social subordination of the client and of the power of the patron to provide goods and services, in particular the ability to dominate adversaries in the law courts (Tacitus, *Dialogus*, especially 6 and 11 where Maternus explains his withdrawal from public life on the grounds that he does not want to participate in the competition any longer). See R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (1982), chs. 3-4 for the fallacy of the 'service aristocracy' and *art. cit.* (n. 5) for the importance of the *domus frequentata*. We do not deny the possibility of developments in the institution of the family (e.g. toward an increasing recognition of cognates in law), but these were already largely in place by the late Republic when our evidence becomes adequate to discuss changes with any confidence. See Y. Thomas, 'Mariages endogamiques à Rome. Patrimoine, pouvoir et parenté depuis l'époque archaïque', *RD* 58 (1980), 362 ff., where he is forced to rely on legends from the regal period in his analysis of incest taboos. For a brief statement of the importance of the nuclear family similar to ours see S. Treggiari, 'Libertine ladies', *CW* 64 (1971), 198.

family unit, imperial senators and their relatives had the lowest proportion of nuclear family commemorators out of all our civilian samples. Altogether, the tombstone evidence suggests that the family, like most other basic institutions, underwent no radical changes during the transformation from the Republic to the Principate.

The heavy concentration on nuclear family relationships in funerary dedications at Rome is also found in every other civilian population of the western empire sufficiently influenced by Roman culture to erect funerary monuments (Tables 5-16). For Latium and Regio XI just under four-fifths of all expressed relationships are within the nuclear family, while for Gallia Narbonensis, Spain, Britain, both Germanies, Noricum and Lambaesis the figures are over 80 per cent (Tables 5-13).

In contrast to the frequent commemoration by spouses, parents and children, it is notable that sibling and extended family dedications are relatively rare. Brothers and sisters never constitute more than 11 per cent of all dedicators and the proportion is usually closer to 6-8 per cent. The extended family (grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins and *alumni*) are still less well represented at 5 per cent or less, if *alumni* are excluded. Not only is this percentage small in comparison with the nuclear family, but it also represents only a fraction of the commemorators from outside the nuclear family. In other words, when a man or woman could not rely on his nuclear family for a funeral dedication, he or she usually turned to unrelated friends or dependants rather than more distant relatives.⁴⁸

This seems to us to offer important information about the nature of the Roman family and to run counter to the traditional view based on legal concepts, which stresses the central position of the senior living male in the agnatic line. If the patriarchal family had been of great importance, how are we to explain the rarity of agnatic kin, especially paternal grandfathers (the distinctive feature of a patriarchal family), in commemorative relationships reflecting patterns of inheritance and feelings of familial duty and affection? None of the commemorators from the extended kin category in our samples for Rome: Lower orders, Gallia Narbonensis and Lambaesis, was a paternal grandfather (out of a total of 237, 361, and 785 relationships, respectively); in Latium one paternal *avus*-to-grandchild relationship was found in a sample of 219. The largest number of paternal grandfather dedicators appeared in the Regio XI group, with its many lengthy family funerary inscriptions, but even there they comprised only three out of 420 (0.7 per cent). Part of the reason for the marked absence of paternal *avi* must lie in demographic factors: short life expectancy and late age of marriage for men meant that only a small minority of children would have had a paternal grandfather alive. On that basis alone we can say that the extended patriarchal family must have been uncommon. But it is possible to go further: the proportion of paternal grandfather dedicators is so low for every population (0-0.7 per cent) that it is virtually certain that many more were alive and could have participated in commemoration than actually appear.⁴⁹ Young siblings of the deceased are sometimes included along with parents in the memorial, but not grandparents—something that would be rather odd if the paternal grandfather had been active as head of the family. Not even in the small group of all grandparents named as deceased or commemorators in our samples is the paternal grandfather especially prominent, being no better represented

⁴⁸ With the exception of the Noricum sample, extended family members (excluding *alumni*) never supply more than about one-third of those outside the nuclear family, and for most civilian populations the proportion is under one-fourth. The Noricum sample is extraordinary in its proportion from within the nuclear family (91%), and it is because of this that the extended family, though not a large proportion of all relationships (7%), provides the bulk of the commemorators outside the nuclear family. These features are to be explained by the prevalence of extended ante-mortem commemorations (i.e. 'to myself, to my wife, to my sons and daughters'). This practice meant that hardly anyone in Noricum found him/herself in the position that a significant fraction in other areas did—of dying with no immediate family left alive to commemorate.

⁴⁹ By our calculation on the basis of the life table cited above, n. 27, something like 12% of children

at age 10 would have had a paternal grandfather alive and perhaps 5% at age 16. Since a large proportion of all dedications were set up to young children (one-third or more in some samples), we would expect paternal grandfathers to represent 3-4% of commemorators, if they had regularly participated when alive, rather than the 0-0.7% that we actually find. *Patru*, whom we might also expect to find in commemorations if the extended family had been important, are no more common than paternal *avi* (a total of four scattered in the samples for the Roman lower orders, Latium, Regio XI, Narbonensis and Lambaesis, comprising 2,022 relationships). Some perspective on these figures can be gained by comparison with a society in which the extended family was normal: in Russia of the last century 66% of all households contained three or more generations (Mitterauer and Sieder, op. cit. (n. 3), 29).

than maternal grandfathers or grandmothers (whether paternal or maternal cannot be determined from nomenclature).⁵⁰ In sum, the facts that (1) extended family members, especially the paternal *avus*, are absolutely few in number in funerary dedications, that (2) paternal grandfathers are relatively few in comparison with the number alive and able to participate in the dedication, and that (3) the paternal *avus* is not even the most common type in commemorations involving grandparents—all these facts point away from the patriarchal family being a common reality in the population of the western empire erecting tombstones.

This conclusion about family type, in accord with the general trend in current historical scholarship of discarding received ideas about the pervasiveness of the extended family unit in earlier times, is corroborated to a certain extent by literary evidence.⁵¹ In the *De officiis* Cicero sets out a quasi-historical hierarchy of family bonds, which he (*pace* Veyne) takes to be instinctive in human nature.⁵² First comes the bond between husband and wife, then parent-child bonds, third are bonds within the *domus*, fourth are sibling bonds, and finally come obligations between cousins. Cicero's statement suggests that Romans felt that the mother-father-children triad was the nexus of primary kinship obligations, not just at time of death as represented in our tombstone data, but more generally. Furthermore, his distinction between those in the *domus* and siblings and cousins outside it shows that in Cicero's mind the household unit, one possible determinant of family type, did not normally include several nuclear families of adult brothers or sisters.

That Cicero's normative statement has more than theoretical validity is shown by examples and a few exceptions which prove the rule. When Cicero's son went off to study in Athens, the alternative was for him to set up his own household in Rome, as other aristocratic young men such as Caelius had done.⁵³ Out in the Italian countryside among the wealthy it was also common for adult sons to take up separate residences. In a somewhat tendentious statement in defence of Sex. Roscius, Cicero claims that wealthy *domi nobiles* with several farms customarily sent their adult sons to live on and to manage outlying properties.⁵⁴ Seneca and Pliny the Younger had occasion to extol the unusual virtues of adult sons who remained at home, but these sons are treated as very much the exception.⁵⁵

The subject of family household types deserves a more detailed study, but the above passages imply a norm of separate residences for nuclear families among the élite. In stressing the nuclear family as the primary household unit, we do not mean to suggest that extended family residences never existed or that extended kin felt no obligations toward one another—Cicero was obviously close to Quintus though they lived in different households. But the primary bonds, as Cicero himself emphasized, were between husband and wife, and parents and children within the *domus*.

While our tombstone samples show important uniformities related to family type, there are also variations in the frequency of particular types of relationships both within and outside the family. The explanations for some of the variations seem clear; for others we can only make informed guesses. One important factor influencing the pattern of distribution of relationships in the subcategories within the nuclear family was the propensity to commemorate young children, presumably a result of cultural values which the

⁵⁰ In the Regio XI sample there are three paternal *avi* as compared with three maternal *avi*; two paternal *avi* as compared with six grandmothers and one maternal *avus* in Lambaesis; one paternal *avus* and four *aviae* in Latium; no paternal *avus* and four maternal grandparents in Narbonensis; no paternal *avus* and two maternal grandparent couples in the Roman lower orders.

⁵¹ Weaver, *op. cit.* (n. 7), 95, correctly noted the centrality of the nuclear family in Roman society. De Visscher, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 118, pointed out that most funerary dedications from the imperial period include only a very narrow circle of family.

⁵² *De officiis* 1. 58. Cicero's hierarchy has a pseudo-historical element, as well as a moral element in it.

⁵³ Cicero, *Ad Att.* 12. 32. 2 (also 12. 7 concerning the practice of giving sons living allowances). In *Pro Caelio* 18 Cicero indicates that Caelius' separate

household had been brought up by his accusers as a criticism, but he argues that at Caelius' age such behaviour was hardly reprehensible. It may be that this passage reveals the tension in the late Republic between the old values associated with the patriarchal household and the new values which accommodated the practical advantages of separate households.

⁵⁴ *Pro Sex. Roscio* 43.

⁵⁵ Seneca, *Cons. ad Marciam* 24. 1; Pliny, *Ep.* 9. 2 (in which Pliny's praise for the recently deceased Pompeius Quintianus as *optimus filius*, because he continued to live with his difficult father, would have little force if most adult sons did the same). J. Crook, 'Patria Potestas', *CQ*, N.S. 17 (1967), 119, discusses the problem of reconciling the custom of father and adult son having separate households with the legal institution of *patria potestas*.

historian today can only speculate about in the absence of literary evidence. In some samples the parent-to-child dedications constitute one-third or more of those in the family; in others the proportion is much smaller, about one-fifth. We have examined the ages at death for samples from each pattern and have found that in a sample with a high proportion of parent-child commemorations, such as the lower orders of imperial Rome (Table 4) people were more inclined to go to the expense of erecting a memorial to children under ten. In Narbonensis (Table 7), where only 24 per cent of nuclear family dedications are of the descending type, children under ten are heavily, or much more heavily under-represented than in Rome.⁵⁶

The proportion of conjugal family relationships varies even more noticeably, from 66 per cent of family relationships in the Republican, mainly lower order, inscriptions to as low as 22 per cent of imperial senatorial family dedications (Tables 1–2). Between these extremes the proportions in the other samples cluster around 40 per cent. The low number of conjugal dedications in the senatorial sample is balanced by a significantly higher proportion than usual of child-to-parent dedications. Two possible reasons for this contrast may be offered. One of them finds some support in studies contrasting propertied family relations with those of the working class in modern Europe.⁵⁷ Among the wealthy the transmission of property from the deceased to his or her descendants was a central factor in shaping family life. In the hope of an inheritance adult children tended to remain in closer contact with parents (though not necessarily to live in the same house). As pointed out above, in Rome the descendant-heir's reciprocal duty was to commemorate the dead—hence the greater frequency of dedications to parents by children.⁵⁸ Humble families, on the other hand, were primarily working units (rather than property-transmitting units), in which the wife often participated and from which children drifted away as they grew up. Modest Romans may have transmitted inheritances, but the relative importance of inter-generational property transmission in shaping family obligations, particularly at time of death, was probably greater among wealthy aristocrats. The second possible reason is based on a general characteristic of servile populations. A glance at the samples from the Familia Caesaris (Tables 17–19) reveals that they, like the Republican and lower order samples from Rome, have a very small proportion of child-to-parent dedications (10–15 per cent) in comparison with other civilian populations. In view of the relatively high status and wealth of imperial freedmen in Rome, this cannot be attributed solely to the lack of a significant estate to hand on to children-heirs. Rather, the explanation may lie in the late age of manumission and legitimate marriage to produce free children, who would be of a sufficient age to commemorate their freed parents when they died.

One other regional variation in family dedications is worth a brief comment: in Spain women appear as commemorators noticeably more often than in the other civilian samples, with nearly as many wife-commemorators as husbands and far more mother-commemorators than fathers (see Table 8). This unusual pattern may well be connected with a feature of Spanish society regarded as noteworthy by the ancient ethnographers such as Strabo and Poseidonius. For the ethnic groups of north-western Spain, considered paradigmatic of the 'uncivilized' parts of the empire, it was reported that husbands gave wives 'dowries', daughters were customarily left as heirs, and brothers were given in marriage by their sisters. Strabo disparagingly noted these practices as marks of a 'gynaecocratic' society, leading some modern scholars to speak (no doubt mistakenly) of a 'matriarchal' Spanish social structure.⁵⁹ There are, however, some attested practices, especially the ritualistic role of women and the unusual institution of the *couvade*, which

⁵⁶ In the Roman lower orders sample 85 dedications with relationships (about one-third) give age at death: of the 85, 39% are under 10 years old, 21% are 11–20, 25% are 21–30, and 15% are older. In the Gallia Narbonensis sample 62 dedications with relationships (about one-sixth) give age at death: of the 62, 23% are under 10, 44% are 11–20, 23% are 21–30, and 10% are older. We do not suggest that these proportions hold for the majority of the dedications in which no ages are given, and consequently they are of very limited value.

⁵⁷ Anderson, *op. cit.* (n. 4), 78.

⁵⁸ See above, p. 126.

⁵⁹ Strabo 3. 4. 18; see J. Caro Baroja, 'Organización social de los pueblos del norte de la península ibérica en la antigüedad', in *Legio VII Gemina: Coloquio internacional, León, 16 al 21 de septiembre de 1968*, ed. A. Viñayo González (1970), 26–30. For the difficulties of such structuralist interpretations of the 'savage' and the 'civilized' in local Mediterranean societies, see S. Pembroke, 'Women in charge: the function of alternatives in early Greek tradition and the ancient idea of matriarchy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 30 (1967), 1–35.

point to an element of 'matrilineality' in property devolution.⁶⁰ The unusual sight of women involved in hard labour in the fields, in construction, and in the mines also seems to offer corroboration of the unusual place of women in Spanish society.⁶¹

Finally, we should consider to whom people turned when they could not rely on kin to perpetuate their memory—whether they looked to servile dependants or to friends (including heirs in our table). As might be expected, the ratio of servile to *amicitia* relationships is strongly related to the concentration of slaves in the sample area, with the highest ratio (7 : 1) among the urban masses in Rome (that is, outside the kinship category patrons, freedmen, masters and slaves turned to each other for commemoration seven times as often as to friends). Elsewhere in Italy, heavily populated by slaves, the ratio remains high (11 : 5 in Latium, 3 : 1 in Regio XI).⁶² The ratio is nearly even in Narbonensis (7 : 6) and is quite low in the other western provinces with the exception of Germania Superior where the numbers are too small to be meaningful (1 : 2 in Spain, 3 : 11 in Britain, 4 : 9 in Germania Inferior, 2 : 3 in Noricum). It seems to us that two inferences are possible from the marked contrast between Italy and the western provinces: either slavery was much less widespread in these provinces, or, more narrowly, the slaves were there but rarely had such close personal relationships with their masters as to be asked to commemorate them. The former inference seems more probable to us, since we can see no obvious reason why the quality of the slave-master relationship should have varied in such a geographical pattern. There is one exception to the correlation between concentration of slaves and the frequency of servile dedications—the senatorial aristocracy for which the ratio of servile to *amicitia* commemorations is lower than in the provincial samples (1 : 4). Roman senators usually depended on kin for burial and commemoration like other civilians, and when they did not, they rarely turned to freedmen. In view of the link between commemoration and heirship, we must conclude that the success story of Trimalchio, resulting from his closeness to his senatorial *dominus*, must have been the rare exception. The social distance between a senator and his servile dependants was normally too great for the dependant to be chosen to succeed his master as head of the *domus*, and hence to appear as commemorator.

IV. THE MILITARY POPULATIONS

In analysing the military patterns of funerary commemoration our starting-point is the best documented sample, from the legionary base at Lambaesis in North Africa. Here a sufficient number of epitaphs is available from *CIL* VIII alone to permit a subdivision into samples of 'officers', 'serving soldiers', and 'veterans' (Tables 28–31). All three samples are characterized by a high proportion of relationships within the nuclear family (over 80 per cent), in stark contrast to the soldiery of the north-western provinces (35–40 per cent) and the *equites singulares* (29 per cent). The samples from the Pannonias and Spain present patterns similar to that of Lambaesis (more than 70 per cent in the nuclear family category). The central problem with the military epitaphs, then, is to explain the differences and similarities in patterns of family relationships—why some samples have a pattern similar to that of civilians, and others do not.

A detailed comparison of the three military samples from Lambaesis is useful because these groups are unusually well defined in terms of status and age. The wealthier officers (*principales*, centurions and above) put up far more funerary inscriptions *per capita* and

⁶⁰ A. Tranoy, *La Galice romaine : recherches sur le nord-ouest de la péninsule ibérique dans l'antiquité* (1981), 106–7.

⁶¹ On their position in work see Strabo 3. 4. 17 ; 3. 2. 9 ; *Sil. Ital., Pun.* 3. 348–53 ; Justin 44. 3. 7 ; cf. Caro Baroja, *op. cit.* (n. 59), 28. For the practice of *covade* (Spanish *covada*) see Caro Baroja, *op. cit.*, 27 ; Tranoy, *op. cit.*, 107, objects that women at work are not necessarily women in power (backed up with many examples of male dominance in Spanish society), but he misses the critical point that women involved in field work were exceptional in

the Mediterranean (see J. Goody, *op. cit.* (n. 41), 30).

⁶² J. Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, ed. H. T. Rowell and transl. E. O. Lorimer (1956), 96, laments the degeneration of the Roman family, as evidenced by the thousands of petite bourgeoisie epitaphs 'where the deceased is mourned by his freedmen without mention of children'. Our tables demonstrate that in every area this type of dedication constituted only a small fraction of all commemorations. Carcopino's statement shows the danger of making sweeping generalizations on the basis of an impressionistic study of tombstones.

longer inscriptions recording more relations.⁶³ Nevertheless, the three samples exhibit broadly similar proportions of commemorators within the nuclear family (from 77 per cent for *milites* to 86 per cent for *veterani*). To the extent that serving soldiers were commemorated less often by family, heirs and friends appear more often in the epitaphs (18 per cent *amici* and *heredes* in comparison with 9 per cent for officers and 4 per cent for veterans).

Within the nuclear family category, African officers, *milites* and veterans display somewhat different patterns of relationships, explicable in part by age differences. The average age at death attested for *milites* is 36, for officers over 43, and most veterans have a recorded age of death of over 50 years. Being younger and married for a shorter period on average, fewer serving soldiers had children of an age to take the responsibility of burial and commemoration (17 per cent of family dedications compared with 35 per cent or more for the other two groups). The older veterans, on the other hand, were less likely to have siblings alive and to need to rely on them instead of a wife or children (1 per cent siblings compared with 12 per cent for officers and 37 per cent for *milites*).

While these African military samples display proportions of nuclear family relationships similar to the civilian pattern, they also show some of the characteristics typical of the military pattern. Wife-to-husband dedications outnumber husband-to-wife in all three groups—a characteristic of most military populations, but very rare among our civilian samples (see Tables B and C). The predominance of wife-to-husband commemorations

TABLE B. RATIO OF CONJUGAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS: MILITARY

(Husband-to-Wife : Wife-to-Husband)

Germania superior	1.2
Pannonias	1.2
Rome: Soldiers	0.7
Noricum	0.6
Germania inferior	0.5
Britain	0.5
Spain	0.5
Equites singulares	0.4
Africa: Lambaesis	0.4
Africa: Caesarea	0.3

Mean = 0.6, Mode = 0.5, Median = 0.5

TABLE C. RATIO OF CONJUGAL FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS: CIVILIAN

(Husband-to-Wife : Wife-to-Husband)

Republican Rome	5.1
Italy: Regio XI	3.7
Noricum	3.5
Britain	3.4
Rome: Senators	3.0
Germania inferior	2.6
Germania superior	2.6
Rome: Senators/equit.	2.0
Africa: Lambaesis	2.0
Italy: Latium	1.8
Ostia	2.4
Rome: Lower Orders	1.5
Gallia Narbonensis	1.5
Africa: Caesarea	1.3
Spain	1.1
Africa: Auzia	0.8

Mean = 2.4, Median = 2.2

⁶³ We counted 244 tombstones for officers and ex-officers, as compared with 272 for *milites* and retired *milites*. Since *milites* outnumbered officers by

eight or ten to one, the rate of finds of officers' tombstones is at least seven times greater *per capita* than of ordinary soldiers'.

over husband-to-wife is strongest among the serving soldiers at Lambaesis (a ratio of almost 8:1), who also display the military characteristic of numerous brother-brother dedications (29 per cent of nuclear family relationships).⁶⁴ In the end, however, the stress should be on the resemblance of the North African military commemoration patterns to those of civilians in the strong emphasis on family relationships.

The distribution of commemorative relationships in our Spanish and Danubian military samples is not very different from that at Lambaesis (Tables 25–27). The importance of family to the soldiers of the Pannonias and Noricum, moreover, is reflected in the funerary iconography. On aniconographic tombstones unrelated commemorators are much more common than kin. The stones with iconographic representations can be classified as family commemorations or fellow-soldier commemorations (*amicus*, *heres*, soldier-brother). Among the former, family portraits are five times as frequent as portraits of the deceased soldier alone. By contrast, those stones set up by soldier-brothers, *amici*, or *heredes* feature representations of a soldier, usually in full military gear, or, in the case of a cavalryman, a scene of a soldier on horseback trampling a sprawling figure of the enemy. None of the stones in the latter category offers any family portraiture (see Table D).⁶⁵

TABLE D. TOMBSTONE ICONOGRAPHY OF SOLDIERS OF PANNONIA-NORICUM
(Iconographic stones: % distribution in each group)

Dedication by :	Portraiture	
	Soldier Alone	Family Group
Kin	11	56
Brothers/Heirs/Freedmen	33	0

Given the stress on the family in funerary dedications and/or iconography in Africa, Spain, and the Pannonias, explanation is required for the difference between these areas and the north-western provinces. In Britain relationships with the nuclear family constitute only 40 per cent and, at 34 per cent, still less in Lower and Upper Germany.⁶⁶ Even these figures may exaggerate the importance of family ties at death to common soldiers. The samples are too small to permit a breakdown into *milites* and officers, but it is noticeable that a considerable number of the husband-wife and parent-child dedications involved centurions and other officers whose greater wealth, age and status allowed more of them to marry and to move their families when transferred from command to command.⁶⁷ The common soldiers for the most part do not have marriage or other family ties represented in their epitaphs, much like the *equites singulares* at Rome, and like the *equites singulares* they

⁶⁴ In most civilian populations 'brother-brother' dedications represent 4–5% of all relationships. Although some military populations reveal similar 'brother-brother' proportions (notably Britain, 3–7%; Spain, 5–7%), most are higher (the mean is 9.5% of all relationships). In some highly militarized units, such as the *equites singulares* at Rome and the troops in Germany, the 'brother-brother' relationship accounts for almost half of all nuclear family relationships.

⁶⁵ The figures are based on an analysis of the data in the study of A. Schober, *Die römischen Grabsteine von Noricum und Pannonien*, Sonderschriften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien, Bd. 10 (1923). For the aniconographic stones see nos. 16 f.; for the military iconography see nos. 153 ff.; cf. the earlier work by H. Hofmann, *Römische Militärgrabsteine der Donauländer*, Sonderschriften des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes, Bd. 5 (1905) for supplementary materials

and illustrations.

⁶⁶ A sample collected for Raetia showed that it belonged more to the Noricum-Upper/Middle Danube pattern of more 'civilian' type relations amongst the soldiers. It therefore represents the eastern boundary of the 'military' pattern on the British-Rhine frontier.

⁶⁷ On the social status and mobility of centurions see E. Birley, 'Promotions and Transfers in the Roman Army, II: the Centurionate', *Carnuntum Jahrbuch* 7 (1963–64), 21–33, and B. Dobson, 'The Centurionate and Social Mobility during the Principate', *Recherches sur les structures sociales dans l'Antiquité classique* (1970), 99–116. Centurions and other high ranking officers represent about 20% of the British sample of conjugal relationships; they, together with veterans who settled in Britain (i.e. those who decided to remain in the country), form the great majority of the conjugal dedicators and celebrands.

turned to friends and non-kin heirs for commemoration. In Britain these two latter groups constitute 49 per cent of all relationships and in the Germanies about 60 per cent.

Both the relative rarity of family commemorations and the recourse to non-kin point to the low level of family formation and maintenance of family ties among soldiers stationed in Britain and on the Rhine. In seeking an explanation, we may return to the *equites singulares*, whose lack of family ties in epitaphs was surely the result of permanent posting in a place distant from home and the consequent separation from kin. In order to decide whether this explanation is likely to be valid for the soldiers of the north-western provinces, we must examine the evidence for the traditional view about military recruitment and posting in these provinces.

Let us consider the case of Britain first. The positive evidence bearing on army recruiting is meagre. For the level of officers (including both equestrian officers and centurions) there is no unambiguous evidence that any Briton contributed to these high ranks anywhere in the empire.⁶⁸ As for the recruitment of the military units stationed in Britain, out of the hundred or so legionaries whose *origines* are specified there are only three cases of men of British origin; of the eighty or so auxiliary soldiers, two examples of Britons, and of the dozen veterans from both groups whose origins are specified, no British.⁶⁹ Both in the case of the three legions stationed in the province and of the large number of auxiliary units (over thirty at any one time), all attested recruiting is overwhelmingly external. Legionaries and auxiliary soldiers were drawn mainly from Gaul, Spain, the Germanies, and to a lesser extent, from provinces on the Upper Danube.⁷⁰ Recruits from Britain flowed mainly into auxiliary units (sixteen, three of them military). All of these units were sent out of the province to form part of the defensive garrison of the Danubian provinces.⁷¹ The apparent conclusion of this survey would seem to be that Britons made little or no contribution to the military garrison of their own province, and that the camps in Britain were filled, in the main, with outsiders brought into the region.

Nevertheless, leading scholars on Roman Britain and the Roman army have consistently maintained the opposite, claiming that by the second century A.D. Britons constituted most of the local garrison of the province. One finds statements to the effect that: '... no case can be made out for so striking a difference from Roman practice as continued recruiting of the army of Britain from abroad would constitute, and ... it is therefore more likely that the same situation prevailed in Britain as elsewhere in the empire ...' and 'it seems likely that Britain did in fact conform to the general pattern of army recruiting'.⁷² By 'Roman practice' and 'the general pattern' these authors mean a general development wherein both recruiting and posting became more and more local in nature, beginning with the Flavians and reaching a peak of almost total local recruitment and posting by Antonine times. The core reason for holding this position seems to be reluctance to adopt the alternative—i.e. that 'we must believe ... that the contribution made by Britain to the Roman army (sc. in Britain), apart from *numeri*, was negligible'.⁷³ But where can the evidence for local recruiting then be found? The answer is that 'there are a number of legionary tombstones with no *origo*: many of these men must be Britons ...'.⁷⁴ The general position held by most historians on the make-up of the Roman army in Britain is therefore founded on two assumptions: first, an emotional one, that Britain must have

⁶⁸ Birley, *op. cit.* (n. 30), 34–81, is the most comprehensive and fully documented survey.

⁶⁹ Birley, *op. cit.*, 84–5, citing *RIB* 156 (Bath), a man described as a *Belga*, 'pretty certainly he was from the British *Belgae*'; P. Holder, *The Roman Army in Britain* (1982), 47 counts the possible pre-Hadrianic case of Pomponius Valens. For auxiliaries see Birley, 104 and Holder, 51; both accept two cases, one of which seems very questionable: Nectovellius, son of Vindex, a man *nationis Brigans* (*RIB* 2142), and a man with the cognomen [Satu]rnius from the colony of *Glevum* (Gloucester) who is probably of immigrant descent (*CIL* xvi, 130).

⁷⁰ For a list of the known sources of external recruiting see Birley, *op. cit.*, 84 f., 97–8, and Holder, *op. cit.*, 47–51.

⁷¹ Birley, *op. cit.*, 101.

⁷² B. Dobson and J. C. Mann, 'The Roman Army in Britain and Britons in the Roman Army', *Britannia* 4 (1973), 201, repeated at 204–5; echoed by Birley, *op. cit.*, 95, 104–5, and by Holder, *op. cit.* (n. 69), 49. The thrust in all these arguments (e.g. Birley, 82 f.) is to demonstrate that the general pattern must also be true of the British instance.

⁷³ Dobson and Mann, *art. cit.*, 201.

⁷⁴ *ibid.*, 203; see Birley, *op. cit.* (n. 30), 95–6: 'In the second century local recruitment *must* have gradually become normal, limited though our direct evidence is ... The *presumption* really *must* be that men with Gallic, or colourless Latin names, were British, from the second half of the second century onwards, *unless the contrary is stated*' (our italics). A dubious method also subscribed to by Holder, *op. cit.* (n. 69), 48.

made some contribution to its own garrison, and second, that Britain must be part of the pattern of local recruitment and posting typical of the rest of the empire.

Our evidence on personal relations, however, corroborates the bare empirical record on recruitment and posting in Britain. The comparative rarity of local family ties among soldiers in the British garrison (both as compared with the British civilian population and as compared with military populations elsewhere in the empire) is best explained by geographical separation from family—that is, by recruitment from abroad.⁷⁵

We discovered a similar military pattern, even more pronounced, among the soldiers of the Rhine legions and auxiliary units. There too the empirical evidence on recruitment and placement, meagre though it is, points to the deliberate movement of local recruits out of the region, especially after A.D. 69–70, west to Britain and east to the Danubian frontier.⁷⁶ This seems to have been a deliberate policy designed to split up ethnic groups recruited into army service and to remove them far from their place of origin. The problems of enforcing discipline and ensuring a dubious loyalty would appear to be the obvious reasons.⁷⁷ The positive evidence for recruiting of the Rhine legions and for the composition of the *auxilia* stationed in the Germanies indicates the same general situation as found in Britain, namely the importation of outside elements.⁷⁸ When combined with our evidence for a low level of maintenance of family bonds in the German garrison, this policy of the deliberate separation of local army recruits from their family origins in both Britain and Germany then makes sense of repeated statements in our literary sources about the effects of this policy on local society. One of the frequently voiced complaints about Roman rule made before or in the course of local rebellions in these regions concerns the effects of the *dilectus*. It appears in Britain in accounts of the 'Boudicca' rebellion of A.D. 61, in Calgacus' speech at Mons Graupius in A.D. 84, and most specifically in Civilis' speech in the troubles in Germany in A.D. 69. All these speeches emphasize how the draft tears children away from the family, forces them to serve far from home, and destroys family life—as Civilis expresses it most forcefully, 'the draft which separates children from parents, brothers from brothers as finally as death itself'.⁷⁹ The profound resentment reflected in these oratorical passages probably has a firm basis in fact, not only owing to the decades of separation felt by all recruits during their service, but more especially because of the severe spatial separation from family endured by recruits from Britain and the Germanies.⁸⁰

The correlation between low marriage rates, low levels of local family formation, and peculiar patterns of distant posting and external recruitment of local garrisons thus offers us a new perspective on relations between soldiers and civilians in different parts of the empire. We noted above that the military populations of the Pannonias and of Spain

⁷⁵ Birley, *op. cit.* (n. 30), 104 does express some doubt about his conclusion concerning local recruitment because of the rarity of 'cases of soldiers' parents or sisters on record'.

⁷⁶ See G. Alföldy, *Die Hilfstruppen der römischen Provinz Germania Inferior* (1968), 100 f., and K. Kraft, *Zur Rekrutierung der Alen und Kohorten an Rhein und Donau* (1951), 44 f., arguments summarized by Dobson and Mann, *art. cit.* (n. 72), 193–5.

⁷⁷ See Alföldy and Kraft, *opp. cit.* The troubles of A.D. 68–9 were crucial in ensuring a decisive change in imperial policy toward the north-western frontier. Africa and Spain were less affected by these events and tended, subsequently, to keep more of their auxiliary units locally, see G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army* (1914; reprint, 1971), 164 f. Dalmatia already experienced the effects of a similar policy after the revolt of A.D. 6–9, see Alföldy, *op. cit.*, 88 f. and his 'Die Auxiliartuppen der Provinz Dalmatien', *AArchHung* 14 (1962), 259–96, and indeed, it was probably being instituted along the north-western frontier before A.D. 69, see n. 80 below.

⁷⁸ See G. Forni, *Il reclutamento delle legioni da Augusto a Diocleziano* (1953), 216–17 (Legio I Minervia, Germania inferior), 225 (Legio VI Victrix, Germania superior, to A.D. 122), 235 (Legio XXII

Primigenia, Germania superior), and 227 (Legio VIII Augusta, Germania superior). In all these units external recruiting predominates—some from Noricum and Thrace, but most from the Gauls.

⁷⁹ Tac., *Agr.* 15. 3, '... nihil iam cupiditati, nihil libidini exceptum. In proelio fortiolem esse qui spoliat: nunc ab ignavis plerumque et imbellibus eripi domos, abstrahi liberos, iniungi dilectus, tam quam mori tantum pro patria nescientibus...'; 31. 1 (Speech of Calgacus), 'Liberos cuique ac propinquos suos natura carissimos esse voluit: hi per dilectus alibi servituri auferuntur; coniuges sororesque etiam si hostilem libidinem effugerunt, nomine amicorum atque hospitium polluantur'. In *Hist.* 4. 14. 1 Tacitus begins by explaining that the *dilectus* was regarded as a most serious burden 'by nature' because of the sexual aggression and greed of Roman recruiting officers; but later Civilis is made to state explicitly that 'Instare dilectum quo liberi a parentibus, fratres a fratribus velut supremum dividantur' (14. 4. 3).

⁸⁰ Kraft, *op. cit.* (n. 76), 40 sees this as a crucial passage that illuminates our understanding of motives behind the local revolts in the region in A.D. 69; he takes it to refer both to the twenty-five-year period of service, and to the policy of transferring auxiliary units far away from their homelands, a process which he thinks to be well under way before A.D. 69.

display patterns of emphasis on nuclear family that are closer to those of the Lambaesis garrison. Logically, then, given our model, this ought to suggest a strong element of both local recruitment and posting for these provinces (though not quite at the African level). Studies of the attested *origines* and nomenclature of soldiers in both regions would seem to suggest that this is true. In the sphere of army recruiting a clear distinction can be drawn between the Pannonias and Upper Moesia on the Danube. In the latter province local recruitment, even for lower-status auxiliary units, did not begin until the reign of Marcus Aurelius. And after Upper Moesia was formally established as a separate province and local colonies were available as sources of legionary recruits, these regional sources were drawn upon only rarely and exceptionally. The pattern of army recruitment in the Pannonias is entirely different. By the time of Claudius, Pannonians were already being recruited for local auxiliary units. The recruitment for the local legions followed a fairly normal pattern with local recruitment beginning in the Flavian period and a majority of all legionaries in the provinces being derived from local men, especially from the colonial settlements, by the mid-second century.⁸¹ Much the same is true of the major Spanish military unit, Legio VII Gemina (Table 27). Although many elements of the local Galician population where the legion was stationed, notably the Astures, were drafted into auxiliary units which were then transferred elsewhere in the empire, by the second century recruitment for the legion itself was primarily from local Spanish elements: the sons of soldiers either in the legion itself or in auxiliary units in the province, some Galicians, and men from elsewhere in Spain.⁸² In the cases of Pannonia and Spain, therefore, one finds the formation of nuclear family units among the soldiery of the local garrisons, though not with the exceptionally strong emphasis true of the African garrison. It is possible that the difference may relate to the degree of recruiting that was not local in these cases.⁸³

One conclusion that our study of personal relationships can offer in the military sphere, therefore, relates to the causal connection between army recruitment on the one hand, and family life on the other.⁸⁴ The commonly asserted generalization that there exists a single recruiting pattern for the western empire (and indeed, for much of the east as well) may be challenged. As stated above, this generalization asserts a development in favour of local recruitment and posting in the Roman army, beginning with the Flavians and culminating in nearly total local recruitment and posting by the mid-second century. This dogma, it should be noted, began as a hypothesis suggested by Mommsen in his fundamental paper on army recruiting published in 1884.⁸⁵ Mommsen based his hypothesis mainly on the evidence for the legion in North Africa, with some ancillary data from Egypt. But as we have seen, in their 'civilian type' emphasis on the nuclear family the soldiers of the legion in Africa were at the extreme end of the spectrum of all military

⁸¹ A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia* (1974), 154-8; for Upper Moesia see his *Gesellschaft und Romanisation in der römischen Provinz Moesia Superior* (1970), 166-75; a glance at Forni, op. cit. (n. 78), 222-3 (Legio IV Flavia) and 225-6 (Legio VII Claudia) reveals that all known recruiting was external for the latter province.

⁸² For recruiting to the legion in Spain see J. M. Roldán Hervas, *Hispania y el ejército romano. Contribución a la historia social de la España antigua*, Acta Salmanticensia, Filosofía y Letras no. 76 (1974), 245-50 and maps 3-6, pp. 349-52 (most are Spaniards); for the region of Galicia in which the legion itself was stationed, and for the recruitment of Asturians, see N. Santos Yanguas, *El ejército romano y la romanización de los Astures* (1981), who shows, with Roldán Hervas, 65-158, that most auxiliaries taken from the region were shipped out of the region to the Rhine-Danube frontier; see Forni, op. cit. (n. 78), 226-7 (Legio VII Gemina) 7/24 (c. 30%) of known post-Hadrianic recruits to the legion are from external sources.

⁸³ For Spain see n. 82 above; for the Pannonias see Forni, op. cit. (n. 78), 216-17 (Legio I Adiutrix, 6/21 external), 228-9 (Legio X Gemina, 8/15 external), 230-1 (Legio XIV Gemina, 7/17 external),

and 236 (Legio XXX Ulpia Victrix, all external).

⁸⁴ As can also be seen in the patterns of known marriages as attested on the military *diplomata* of auxiliary soldiers. First, a large proportion seem to be unmarried (N = 40/78, 52%); secondly, those who have named wives (N = 21/78, 27%) have obviously brought them with them to their posting from their home region, since the wives are specified as being of the same ethnic origin as themselves; and lastly, the latter pattern would seem to be true even of those men with no specified wife, but whose children are noted (N = 17/78, 22%), to judge from their children's nomenclature. For the data see M. Roxan, 'The distribution of Roman military diplomas', *Epigraphische Studien* 12 (1981), 265-86, esp. 276-7, with attention to her caveats about the significance of the temporal distribution of the evidence—i.e. the patterns are significant for the period before A.D. 120; between A.D. 120-140/60 there would seem to be a trend towards more frequent marriage by auxiliary troopers.

⁸⁵ T. Mommsen, 'Die Conscriptionsordnung der römischen Kaiserzeit', *Hermes* 19 (1884), 1-79, 210-34 = ch. 3 in *Gesammelte Schriften*² VI (1910; reprint, 1965), 20-117, esp. 22-30.

populations in the empire. The continuing family ties were related to the fact, noted by Mommsen himself, that most legionaries in Africa were locally recruited and posted, with increasing frequency from the late Flavian period, to reach total African recruitment and posting by the early second century.⁸⁶ From our investigation, we can see that this pattern is true of only some military populations of the empire (the Pannonias and Spain), and then only in varying degrees. By contrast, another whole sector of the empire to the north-west, including Britain and the two Germanies, does not fit into this category at all, and by implication, their patterns of recruitment and posting are quite different from the 'African pattern' on which Mommsen based his hypothesis. It would seem risky, then, to use the pattern proposed by Mommsen as one generally true for the whole empire and as one by which different patterns in the data might be assessed.⁸⁷ Rather, it would seem better, and more accurate, to postulate not one, but several different patterns of recruitment typical of different parts of the empire, with all the implications such a hypothesis bears both for family life and for relations between soldiers and civilians in those regions.

V. CONCLUSION

The family was the fundamental unit of social reproduction in the Roman world, and yet it has received little systematic study by social historians. In this essay we have attempted to employ the widespread funerary commemorations of the western empire to draw conclusions about the relative importance of family and other personal relationships. It has emerged that in dedications from civilian populations across the western empire relationships within the immediate family greatly outnumber every other type. This fits well with Cicero's statement that the father-mother-children triad was the primary focus of family obligations. Our tombstone evidence is the best available for extending this conclusion to populations below the élite. Though on the narrowest view these tombstone inscriptions tell us only who fulfilled the duty of providing a memorial to the deceased, there are strong reasons for believing that fulfilment of this duty was closely related to transmission of property, to a sense of familial duty and feelings of affection. Consequently, we believe that the emphasis in the funerary inscriptions on the nuclear family and the rarity of more distant kin offer a vital counterweight to linguistic and legal evidence which highlights the extended family, particularly the patriarchal family under *patria potestas*.

With regard to the range of populations in the western empire for which this conclusion is valid, there remained rural regions in which the structures of pre-Roman ethnic groups continued as the basic form of social organization. From the *Tabula Banasitana* it is clear that the family unit existed in these areas, but in the absence of tombstone and other evidence it is difficult to know what form or meaning the family had within the ethnic group.⁸⁸ Our data come from those areas where local social structure was most influenced by urban settlement, the characteristic element of the Roman world. Associated with the city throughout the western provinces was the nuclear family unit.

Our findings also add a new dimension to recent progress in historical studies of the family. Modern historians have shown that in most areas of western Europe the nuclear

⁸⁶ For the literature, and a complete review of the evidence, see B. D. Shaw, 'Soldiers and society: the army in Numidia', *Opus* 2 (1983), 133-60, esp. 144 f.

⁸⁷ That is to say, if there are divergences from what is believed to be the pattern, then some *ad hoc* explanation is required. A case in point is the divergence from the normal pattern revealed by the publication of an inscription from Egypt detailing the *origines* of 133 soldiers of Legio II Traiana (*AE* 1955: 238); the men, discharged in 157, were recruited in the early 130s A.D. Since most of their origins are non-Egyptian, an explanation for the abnormal recruiting pattern was sought in the emergency created by the war in Judaea; see J. F. Gilliam, 'The Veterans and *Praefectus Castrorum* of the Legio II Traiana in A.D. 157', *AJPh* 77 (1956), 359-75. It is only fair to note that Gilliam stresses

both the paucity of the other evidence on recruiting in Egypt and notes Mommsen's principle with the caveat that 'We should not be too hasty in erecting "principles" on scanty evidence or assume inflexibility on the part of the imperial government; policies may have changed from decade to decade' (p. 361). The limited point being made here is the use of the principle to measure 'aberrant' cases.

⁸⁸ *AE* 1971: 534 (Banasa, Mauretania Tingitana) where the *domus* and *familia* culminate in the ethnic group, the *gens*, of the Zegrenses, in a context where the city is no longer the central organizational unit of the society; cf. Tac., *Germ.* 15 and 25 for the extended family as an integral part of local social structure. Both the *Tabula Banasitana* and the *Germania* are cited only as examples of different patterns of social organization that may have dominated in some rural areas of the empire.

family was the main type of familial organization as far back as dependable records are available. On the basis of our evidence, it seems a reasonable hypothesis that the continuity of the nuclear family goes back much further in time and that it was characteristic of many regions of western Europe as early as the Roman empire. Of course, studies of the intervening period will be required to substantiate this hypothesis. Whatever the findings of such study, the Roman data offer a control on studies of death and family life in the modern period, providing a check on generalizations that connect supposedly unique modern developments in commemorative practices with the growth of capitalist society.⁸⁹

Swarthmore College
University of Lethbridge

⁸⁹ See, e.g. Ariès, *op. cit.* (n. 19), a most influential work, some of whose more adventuresome statements are clearly contradicted by our analysis of funerary commemoration and family life in the Roman empire. For example, Ariès claims that the addition of the age at death to the tomb from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries onwards 'corresponds to a more statistical conception of human existence in which life is defined more by its length than by its content, a conception which is that of our

bureaucratic and technological civilization' (p. 222), a generalization which would seem to be refuted by the Roman data. And again (p. 230) he sees the rise of funerary commemoration on stone in the late Middle Ages, and its spread downwards to common people, as 'the expression of a *new* feeling, *the sense of family*'. But clearly vast numbers of people over equally vast areas of western Mediterranean Europe had already felt this 'new feeling' centuries before the novel development noted by Ariès.

APPENDIX. FUNERARY COMMEMORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

CIVILIAN POPULATIONS—I

Table No. :		1			2			3			4		
Dedication		Republican Rome & Latium			Rome : Senators			Rome : Senators & Equites			Rome : Lower Orders		
From	To	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Husband	Wife	29	41 (55)	6	11 (17)	10	12 (16)	48	20 (26)				
Wife	Husband	6	8 (11)	2	4 (6)	5	6 (8)	31	13 (17)				
Total : Conjugal Family		35	49 (66)	8	16 (22)	15	18 (24)	79	33 (42)				
Parents	Son	—	—	2	4 (6)	6	7 (10)	24	10 (13)				
	Daughter	—	—	1	2 (3)	1	1 (2)	6	3 (3)				
Father	Son	4	6 (8)	2	4 (6)	7	9 (11)	9	4 (5)				
	Daughter	2	3 (4)	3	6 (8)	3	4 (5)	6	3 (3)				
Mother	Son	2	3 (4)	3	6 (8)	6	7 (10)	11	5 (6)				
	Daughter	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	3 (3)				
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		8	11 (15)	11	22 (31)	23	28 (37)	62	26 (33)				
Son	Father	2	3 (4)	4	8 (11)	7	9 (11)	6	3 (3)				
	Mother	4	6 (8)	2	4 (6)	2	2 (3)	13	5 (7)				
Daughter	Father	—	—	8	15 (22)	11	13 (17)	2	1 (1)				
	Mother	—	—	1	2 (3)	2	2 (3)	5	2 (3)				
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		6	8 (11)	15	30 (42)	22	27 (35)	26	11 (14)				
Brother	Brother	—	—	—	—	1	1 (2)	12	5 (6)				
	Sister	4	6 (8)	—	—	—	—	1	— (1)				
Sister	Brother	—	—	2	4 (6)	2	2 (3)	3	1 (2)				
	Sister	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1 (2)				
Total : Siblings		4	6 (8)	2	4 (6)	3	4 (5)	19	8 (10)				
Total : Nuclear Family		53	75 (100)	36	72 (100)	63	77 (100)	186	78 (100)				
Extended Family		1	1	4	8	4	5	11	5				
<i>Heredes</i>		—	—	3	6	4	5	1	—				
<i>Amici</i>		7	10	5	10	8	10	5	2				
Patron	Freedman	4	6	—	—	—	—	6	3				
Master	Slave	1	1	—	—	—	—	3	1				
Freedman	Patron	5	7	2	4	3	4	25	11				
Slave	Master	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>		(Conservi counted as amici in Roman civilian samples)											
Total : Servile		10	14	2	4	3	4	34	14				
Total : Relationships		71		50		82		237					
'No Commemorator' <i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		74		24		26		116					
		33		—		5		28					
Total		178		74		113		381					

CIVILIAN POPULATIONS—II

Table No. :		5			6			7			8		
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Italy : Latium</i>			<i>Italy : Regio XI</i>			<i>Gallia Narbonensis</i>			<i>Spain</i>		
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Husband	Wife	43	20	(26)	115	27	(35)	71	20	(24)	112	13	(15)
Wife	Husband	24	11	(14)	31	7	(9)	47	13	(16)	98	11	(14)
Total : Conjugal Family		67	31	(40)	146	35	(44)	118	33	(40)	210	24	(29)
Parents	Son	17	8	(10)	7	2	(2)	10	3	(3)	33	4	(5)
	Daughter	8	4	(5)	4	1	(1)	5	1	(2)	16	2	(2)
Father	Son	9	4	(5)	25	6	(8)	14	4	(5)	34	4	(5)
	Daughter	6	3	(4)	18	4	(5)	10	3	(3)	22	3	(3)
Mother	Son	12	5	(7)	10	2	(3)	17	5	(6)	75	9	(10)
	Daughter	9	4	(5)	4	1	(1)	15	4	(5)	77	9	(11)
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		61	28	(36)	68	16	(21)	71	20	(24)	257	30	(36)
Son	Father	5	2	(3)	38	9	(11)	27	7	(9)	62	7	(9)
	Mother	8	4	(5)	37	9	(11)	25	7	(8)	50	6	(7)
Daughter	Father	5	2	(3)	5	1	(2)	13	4	(4)	32	4	(4)
	Mother	5	2	(3)	7	2	(2)	15	4	(5)	40	5	(6)
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		23	11	(14)	87	21	(26)	80	22	(27)	184	21	(25)
Brother	Brother	9	4	(5)	22	5	(7)	14	4	(5)	26	3	(4)
	Sister	6	3	(4)	6	1	(2)	3	1	(1)	17	2	(2)
Sister	Brother	2	1	(1)	2	—	(1)	6	2	(2)	7	1	(1)
	Sister	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	(1)	22	3	(3)
Total : Siblings		17	8	(10)	30	7	(9)	27	7	(9)	72	8	(10)
Total : Nuclear Family		168	77	(100)	331	79	(100)	296	82	(100)	723	83	(100)
Extended Family		18*	8*		20	5		18*	5*		41	5	
<i>Heredes</i>		2	1		1	—		5	1		36	4	
<i>Amici</i>		8	4		17	4		17	5		34	4	
Patron	Freedman	9	4		23	5		6	2		6	1	
Master	Slave	2	1		1	—		—	—		1	—	
Freedman	Patron	12	5		27	6		18	5		20	2	
Slave	Master	—	—		—	—		1	—		1	—	
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>		—	—		—	—		—	—		6	1	
Total : Servile		23	11		51	12		25	7		34	4	
Total : Relationships		219			420			361			868		
'No Commemorator'		25			99			51			852		
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		30			147			64			25		
Total		274			666			476			1745		

CIVILIAN POPULATIONS—III

Table No. :		9			10			11			12		
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Britann</i>		<i>Germania Inferior</i>			<i>Germania Superior</i>			<i>Noricum</i>			
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>		
Husband	Wife	27	28 (35)	26	26 (30)	29	20 (23)	89	14 (16)*	137	22 (24)		
Wife	Husband	8	8 (10)	10	10 (11)	11	8 (9)	39	6 (7)	39	6 (7)		
Total : Conjugal Family		35	36 (45)	36	36 (41)	40	28 (31)	255	41 (45)	255	41 (45)		
Parents	Son	1	1 (1)	3	3 (3)	4	3 (3)	48	8 (8)	48	8 (8)		
	Daughter	3	3 (4)	1	1 (1)	1	1 (1)	6	1 (1)**	28	5 (5)		
Father	Son	8	8 (10)	10	10 (11)	13	9 (10)	42	7 (7)	42	7 (7)		
	Daughter	8	8 (10)	5	5 (6)	3	2 (2)	30	5 (5)	30	5 (5)		
Mother	Son	2	2 (3)	5	5 (6)	6	4 (5)	14	2 (2)	14	2 (2)		
	Daughter	3	3 (4)	3	3 (3)	1	1 (1)	7	1 (1)	7	1 (1)		
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		25	26 (32)	27	27 (31)	28	20 (22)	175	28 (31)	175	28 (31)		
Son	Father	1	1 (1)	6	6 (7)	12	8 (9)	37	6 (7)	37	6 (7)		
	Mother	3	3 (4)	6	6 (7)	11	8 (9)	43	7 (8)	43	7 (8)		
Daughter	Father	2	2 (3)	2	2 (2)	10	7 (8)	16	3 (3)	16	3 (3)		
	Mother	2	2 (3)	2	2 (2)	10	7 (8)	17	3 (3)	17	3 (3)		
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		8	8 (10)	16	16 (18)	43	30 (34)	113	18 (20)	113	18 (20)		
Brother	Brother	5	5 (6)	5	5 (6)	11	8 (9)	10	2 (2)	10	2 (2)		
	Sister	3	3 (4)	3	3 (3)	3	2 (2)	6	1 (1)	6	1 (1)		
Sister	Brother	1	1 (1)	—	—	1	1 (1)	4	1 (1)	4	1 (1)		
	Sister	1	1 (1)	—	—	1	1 (1)	2	—	2	—		
Total : Siblings		10	10 (13)	8	8 (9)	16	11 (13)	22	4 (4)	22	4 (4)		
Total : Nuclear Family		78	80 (100)	87	86 (100)	127	89 (100)	565	91 (100)	565	91 (100)		
Extended Family		6	6	1	1	6	4	41	7	41	7		
<i>Heredes</i>		11	11	3	3	1	1	9	1	9	1		
<i>Amici</i>		—	—	6	6	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Patron	Freedman	1	1	4	4	1	1	3	—	3	—		
Master	Slave	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	3	—		
Freedman	Patron	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—		
Slave	Master	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—		
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>		1	1	—	—	6	4	—	—	—	—		
Total : Servile		3	3	4	4	8	6	6	1	6	1		
Total : Relationships		98		101		142		621		621			
'No Commemorator'		26		5		55		8		8			
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		3		21		4		263		263			
Total		127		127		197		892		892			

CIVILIAN POPULATIONS—IV

Table No. :		13			14			15			16		
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Africa : Lambaesis</i>			<i>Africa : Auzia</i>			<i>Africa : Caesarea</i>			<i>Rome : Ostia, Portus</i>		
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>%</i>	
Husband	Wife	181	23	(25)	25	12	(13)	29	15	(17)	111	26	(32)
Wife	Husband	90	12	(13)	32	15	(16)	22	11	(13)	46	11	(13)
Total: Conjugal Family		271	35	(38)	57	26	(29)	51	26	(30)	157	37	(45)
Parents	Son	8	1	(1)	5	2	(3)	6	3	(3)	18	4	(5)
	Daughter	8	1	(1)	8	4	(4)	6	3	(3)	20	5	(6)
Father	Son	50	6	(7)	21	10	(11)	28	14	(16)	32	7	(9)
	Daughter	47	6	(7)	7	3	(4)	7	4	(4)	18	4	(5)
Mother	Son	34	4	(5)	15	7	(8)	16	8	(9)	18	4	(5)
	Daughter	26	3	(4)	6	3	(3)	10	5	(6)	12	3	(3)
Total: Descending Nuclear Family		173	22	(24)	62	29	(32)	73	38	(43)	118	28	(34)
Son	Father	14*	1	(2)	28	13	(14)	8	4	(5)	19	4	(5)
		62	8	(9)									
	Mother	69	9	(10)	19	9	(10)	10	5	(6)	14	3	(4)
Daughter	Father	11	1	(2)	6	3	(3)	5	3	(3)	9	2	(3)
		18	2	(3)									
	Mother	27**	3	(4)	10	5	(5)	7	4	(4)	9	2	(3)
Total: Ascending Nuclear Family		201	26	(28)	63	29	(32)	30	16	(18)	51	12	(15)
Brother	Brother	38	5	(5)	9	4	(5)	9	5	(5)	10	2	(3)
	Sister	15	2	(2)	1	—	—	2	1	(1)	9	2	(3)
Sister	Brother	5	1	(1)	5	2	(3)	3	2	(2)	4	1	(1)
	Sister	12	2	(2)	1	—	—	2	1	(1)	2	—	(1)
Total: Siblings		70	9	(10)	16	7	(4)	16	8	(9)	25	6	(7)
Total: Nuclear Family		715	91	(100)	198	91	(100)	170	89	(100)	351	82	(100)
Extended Family		30	4		12	6		8	4		16	4	
<i>Heredes</i>		16	2		3	1		2	1		4	1	
<i>Amici</i>		9	1		4	2		9	5		12	3	
Patron	Freedman				—	—		—	—		13	3	
Master	Slave				—	—		—	—		4	1	
Freedman	Patron				—	—		2	1		16	4	
Slave	Master				—	—		—	—		2	1	
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>					—	—		1	—		11	3	
Total: Servile		15	2		—	—		3	2		46	11	
Total: Relationships		785			217			192			429		
'No Commemorator'		146			43			86			37		
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		22			5			1			85		
Total		953			265			281			551		

SERVILE POPULATIONS—I

Table No. :

Dedication		17		18		19	
		<i>Familia Caesaris : Rome</i>		<i>Familia Caesaris : Carthage</i>		<i>Noricum</i>	
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Husband	Wife	150	22 (26)	53	21 (24)	18	15 (18)*
Wife	Husband	151	22 (26)	41	16 (19)	22	18 (22)
Total : Conjugal Family		301	44 (53)	94	37 (43)	53	45 (52)
Parents	Son	22	3 (4)	7	3 (3)	3	3 (3)**
	Daughter	11	2 (2)	1	1 (1)	7	6 (7)
Father	Son	45	7 (8)	29	11 (13)	8	7 (8)
	Daughter	18	3 (3)	14	6 (6)	5	4 (5)
Mother	Son	25	4 (4)	16	6 (7)	4	3 (4)
	Daughter	5	1 (1)	9	4 (4)	2	2 (2)
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		126	18 (22)	77	30 (35)	30	25 (30)
Son	Father	31	4 (5)	10	4 (5)	6	5 (5)
	Mother	18	3 (3)	9	4 (4)	5	4 (4)
Daughter	Father	19	3 (3)	3	1 (1)	3	3 (3)
	Mother	6	1 (1)	4	2 (2)	1	1 (1)
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		74	11 (13)	26	10 (12)	15	13 (15)
Brother	Brother	46	7 (8)	11	4 (5)	3	3 (3)
	Sister	13	2 (2)	5	2 (2)	—	—
Sister	Brother	8	1 (1)	2	1 (1)	—	—
	Sister	1	—	2	1 (1)	—	—
Total : Siblings		68	10 (12)	20	8 (9)	3	3 (3)
Total : Nuclear Family		569	82 (100)	217	85 (100)	101	85 (100)
Extended Family		18	3	9	4	2	2
<i>Heredes</i>		2	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Amici</i>		27	4	9	4	2	2
Patron	Freedman	4	1	1	—	—	—
Master	Slave	2	—	—	—	—	—
Freedman	Patron	25	4	6	2	2	2
Slave	Master	2	—	1	—	—	—
<i>Conserui/liberti</i>		42	6	11	4	3	3
Total : Servile		75	11	19	7	14	12
Total : Relationships		691		254		119	
' No Commemorator '		97		506		2	
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		183		1		56	
Total		971		761		177	

MILITARY POPULATIONS—I

Table No. :		20		21			22			23			
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Rome : Equites Singulares</i>		<i>Rome : Other Soldiers</i>			<i>Britain</i>			<i>Germania Inferior</i>			
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>		
Husband	Wife	3	2	(8)	22	12	(20)	10	9	(23)	8	6	(19)
Wife	Husband	7	5	(18)	31	14	(22)	19	17	(43)	15	12	(35)
Total : Conjugal Family		10	8	(26)	58	26	(42)	29	27	(66)	23	18	(42)
Parents	Son	—	—	—	2	1	(1)	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Daughter	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Father	Son	4	3	(11)	10	4	(7)	1	1	(2)	2	2	(5)
	Daughter	—	—	—	8	3	(6)	—	—	—	1	1	(2)
Mother	Son	1	1	(3)	6	3	(4)	—	—	—	1	1	(2)
	Daughter	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	(2)
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		5	4	(13)	26	12	(19)	1	1	(2)	5	4	(12)
Son	Father	3	2	(8)	14	6	(10)	4	4	(9)	3	2	(7)
	Mother	—	—	—	4	2	(3)	1	1	(2)	—	—	—
Daughter	Father	—	—	—	4	2	(3)	2	2	(5)	2	2	(5)
	Mother	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2	(5)	—	—	—
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		3	2	(8)	22	10	(16)	9	8	(20)	5	4	(12)
Brother	Brother	19	15	(50)	26	12	(19)	3	3	(7)	9	7	(21)
	Sister	—	—	—	1	—	(1)	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sister	Brother	1	1	(3)	5	2	(4)	2	2	(5)	1	1	(2)
	Sister	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total : Siblings		20	15	(53)	32	14	(23)	5	5	(11)	10	8	(2)
Total : Nuclear Family		38	29	(100)	138	61	(100)	44	40	(100)	43	34	(100)
Extended Family		4	3	—	2	1	—	3	3	—	2	2	—
<i>Heredes</i>		71	55	—	—	—	—	45	41	—	54	43	—
<i>Amici</i>		10	8	—	61	27	—	9	8	—	21	17	—
Patron	Freedman	2	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Master	Slave	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Freedman	Patron	3	2	—	23	10	—	8	7	—	6	5	—
Slave	Master	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Conserui/liberti</i>		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total : Servile		7	5	—	24	11	—	8	7	—	6	5	—
Total : Relationships		130			225			109			126		
' No Commemorator ' <i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		{ 6			{ 94			56			17		
Total		136			319			165			148		

MILITARY POPULATIONS—II

Table No. :		24		25		26		27	
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Germania Superior</i>		<i>Noricum</i>		<i>Pannonias</i>		<i>Spain</i>	
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Husband	Wife	10	5 (14)	8* 6 (8)	8 6 (8)	35 13 (18)	10 9 (12)		
Wife	Husband	8	4 (11)	13 8 (13)	30 11 (15)	20 17 (24)			
Total : Conjugal Family		18	9 (26)	29 22 (29)	65 24 (33)	30 26 (37)			
Parents	Son	—	—	19 14 (19)	8 3 (4)	2 2 (2)			
	Daughter	—	—	1 — (1)	4 1 (2)	4 3 (5)			
Father	Son	1	— (1)	11 8 (11)	17 6 (9)	10 9 (12)			
	Daughter	1	— (1)	2 2 (2)	8 3 (4)	1 1 (1)			
Mother	Son	1	— (1)	6 5 (6)	13 5 (7)	7 6 (9)			
	Daughter	2	1 (3)	1 — (1)	4 1 (2)	5 4 (6)			
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		5	2 (7)	40 30 (40)	54 20 (27)	29 25 (35)			
Son	Father	3	1 (4)	7 5 (7)	20 7 (10)	6 5 (7)			
	Mother	2	1 (3)	7 5 (7)	12 4 (6)	1 1 (1)			
Daughter	Father	2	1 (3)	1 — (1)	12 4 (6)	9 8 (11)			
	Mother	1	— (1)	1 — (1)	5 2 (3)	1 1 (1)			
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		8	4 (11)	16 12 (16)	49 18 (25)	17 15 (21)			
Brother	Brother	33	16 (47)	12 9 (12)	23 8 (12)	6 5 (7)			
	Sister	2	1 (3)	2 2 (2)	3 1 (2)	— —			
Sister	Brother	3	1 (4)	1 — (1)	4 1 (2)	— —			
	Sister	1	— (1)	— —	— —	— —			
Total : Siblings		39	19 (56)	15 11 (15)	30 11 (15)	6 5 (7)			
Total : Nuclear Family		70	34 (100)	100 76 (100)	198 73 (100)	82 71 (100)			
Extended Family		5	2	9	6	13	5	7	6
<i>Heredes</i>		106	51	9	6	29	11	7	6
<i>Amici</i>		14	7	8	6	17	6	10	9
Patron	Freedman	2	1	1	—	4	1	1	1
Master	Slave	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Freedman	Patron	10	5	5	4	11	4	8	7
Slave	Master	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total : Servile		12	6	6	5	15	6	10	9
Total : Relationships		207		132		272		116	
' No Commemorator '		26		4		24		9	
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		—		33		34		1	
Total		233		169		330		126	

MILITARY POPULATIONS—III. AFRICA: LAMBAESIS

Table No. :		28			29			30			31		
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Legion : Officers</i>			<i>Legion : Milites</i>			<i>Legion : Veterani</i>			<i>Legion : Total</i>		
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	
Husband	Wife	27	10	(12)	4	3	(4)	11	10	(12)	42	8	(10)
Wife	Husband	46	17	(21)	32	24	(31)	39	36	(41)	117	23	(28)
Total : Conjugal Family		73	27	(33)	36	27	(35)	50	46	(53)	159	31	(38)
Parents	Son	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
	Daughter	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—
Father	Son	12	4	(5)	6	5	(6)	5	5	(5)	23	5	(6)
	Daughter	4	1	(2)	1	1	(1)	2	2	(2)	7	1	(2)
Mother	Son	17	6	(8)	4	3	(4)	2	2	(2)	23	5	(6)
	Daughter	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	(1)	1	—	—
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		35	13	(16)	11	8	(11)	10	9	(11)	56	11	(14)
Son	Father	44	16	(20)	8	6	(8)	24	22	(26)	76	15	(18)
	Mother	19	7	(9)	7	5	(7)	2	2	(2)	28	6	(7)
Daughter	Father	19	7	(9)	2	2	(2)	6	6	(6)	27	5	(7)
	Mother	2	1	(1)	—	—	—	1	—	(1)	3	—	—
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		84	31	(38)	17	13	(17)	33	30	(35)	134	26	(32)
Brother	Brother	22	8	(10)	30	23	(29)	1	—	(1)	53	10	(13)
	Sister	3	1	(1)	1	1	(1)	—	—	—	4	1	(1)
Sister	Brother	2	1	(1)	7	5	(7)	—	—	—	9	2	(2)
	Sister	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total : Siblings		27	10	(12)	38	29	(37)	1	1	(1)	66	13	(16)
Total : Nuclear Family		219	81	(100)	102	77	(100)	94	86	(100)	415	82	(100)
Extended Family		16	6	3	2	4	4	23	5				
<i>Heredes</i>		10	4	16	12	2	2	28	6				
<i>Amici</i>		13	5	8	6	3	3	24	5				
Patron	Freedman	6	2	1	1	—	—	7	1				
Master	Slave	3	1	—	—	—	—	3	—				
Freedman	Patron	4	1	2	2	4	4	10	2				
Slave	Master	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
<i>Conservi/liberti</i>		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
Total : Servile		13	4	3	2	4	4	20	4				
Total : Relationships		271		132		107		510					
' No Commemorator '		11		33		10		54					
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		6		2		9		17					
Total		288		167		126		581					

MILITARY POPULATIONS—IV

Table No. :		32		
<i>Dedication</i>		<i>Africa : Caesarea</i>		
<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	
Husband	Wife	4	7	(11)
Wife	Husband	12	20	(32)
Total : Conjugal Family		16	27	(43)
Parents	Son	1	2	(5)
	Daughter	—	—	—
Father	Son	4	7	(11)
	Daughter	1	2	(5)
Mother	Son	3	5	(8)
	Daughter	1	2	(5)
Total : Descending Nuclear Family		10	17	(27)
Son	Father	3	5	(8)
	Mother	2	3	(5)
Daughter	Father	1	2	(5)
	Mother	—	—	—
Total : Ascending Nuclear Family		6	10	(16)
Brother	Brother	5	9	(14)
	Sister	—	—	—
Sister	Brother	—	—	—
	Sister	—	—	—
Total : Siblings		5	9	(14)
Total : Nuclear Family		37	63	(100)
Extended Family		1	2	
<i>Heredes</i>		11	19	
<i>Amici</i>		8	14	
Patron	Freedman	—	—	
Master	Slave	—	—	
Freedman	Patron	—	—	
Slave	Master	2	3	
<i>Conserui/liberti</i>		—	—	
Total : Servile		2	3	
Total : Relationships		59		
' No Commemorator '		17		
<i>Se vivo — Sibi</i>		2		
Total		78		

Sources : Civilian Populations

- Republican Rome and Latium : *C[orpus] I[nscriptionum] L[atinarum]* 1, 2nd ed., *Inscriptiones Latinae Antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem*, ed. G. Henzen, C. Huelsen, and T. Mommsen (1893) (all from Rome and Latium)
- Rome : Senators : *CIL* VI, *Inscriptiones Romae Latinae*, 1-5, ed. G. Henzen, I. B. de Rossi, and E. Bormann (1876-1885) (all), and *I[nscriptiones] L[atinae] S[electae]*, ed. H. Dessau (1892-1916), 3 vols. (all)
- Rome : Senators and Equites : *CIL* VI (all) and *ILS* (all)
- Rome : Lower Orders : *CIL* VI, every 50th inscription (10425-29675)
- Italy : Latium : *CIL* XIV, *Inscriptiones Latii Veteris Latinae*, ed. H. Dessau (1887) (first 1000 inscriptions, 2040-3039, excluding Ostia)
- Italy : Regio XI : *CIL* V. 2, *Inscriptiones Galliae Cisalpinae Latinae*, ed. T. Mommsen (1877) (first 1000 inscriptions, 5092-6091)
- Gallia Narbonensis : *CIL* XII, *Inscriptiones Galliae Narbonensis Latinae*, ed. O. Hirschfeld (1888) (first 1000 inscriptions, 165-1164)
- Spain : *CIL* II. 1 and Supplement, *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Latinae*, ed. A. Hübner (1879 and 1892) (all)
- Britain : *The Roman Inscriptions of Britain*, ed. R. G. Collingwood and R. P. Wright (1965) (all) ; *JRS*, 'Roman Britain', vols. 44 (1954) to 59 (1969), and *Britannia*, 'Epigraphy', vols. 1 (1970) to 12 (1981) (all)
- Germany Inferior : *CIL* XIII. 2. 2, *Inscriptiones Germaniae Inferioris*, ed. A. von Domaszewski (1907) (all)
- Germany Superior : *CIL* XIII. 2. 1, *Inscriptiones Germaniae Superioris*, ed. C. Zangemeister (1905) (all)
- Noricum : *CIL* III. 2, *Inscriptiones Asiae, Provinciarum Europae Graecarum, Illyrici Latinae*, ed. T. Mommsen (1873) (all)
- Africa : Lambaesis : *CIL* VIII. 1, *Inscriptiones Africae Latinae*, ed. G. Wilmanns (1881) (all), and VIII, Supplement, 2, *Inscriptionum Provinciae Numidiae Latinarum Supplementum*, ed. R. Cagnat and J. Schmidt (1894) (all)
- Ostia : Portus : *CIL* XIV, and H. Thylander, *Inscriptions du Port Ostie*, 2 vols., *Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rome*, 4. 1-2 (1952) (all)

Servile Populations

- Rome : Familia Caesaris : *CIL* VI. 2 (first 1000 inscriptions, 8404-9422)
- Carthage : Familia Caesaris : same as the civilian population, Africa (*CIL* VIII)
- Noricum : same as the civilian population (*CIL* III)

Military Populations

- Rome : Equites Singulares : *CIL* VI (all)
- Rome : Other Soldiers : *CIL* VI. 1 (four out of every ten : 01, 03, 06, 08)
- Britain : same as the civilian population
- Germany Inferior : same as the civilian population, plus Weynand (1902)
- Germany Superior : same as the civilian population, plus Weynand (1902)
- Noricum : same as the civilian population, plus Hofmann (1905) and Schober (1923)
- Pannonias : *CIL* III, 1-2, plus Hofmann (1905) and Schober (1923)
- Spain : same as the civilian population, plus J. Vives, *Inscriptiones Latinas de la España romana* (1971), and *Hispania Antiqua Epigraphica*, nos. 1-2 (1950-1969) (all)
- Africa : Lambaesis : *CIL* VIII

Notes

- Civil. : Italy : Latium * = 9 of the 18 (or 4% of the total) are *alumni*
 Gallia Narbonensis * = 11 of the 18 (or 3% of the total) are *alumni*
 Noricum * = joint husband-wife dedications
 Noricum ** = parent-children dedications
 Africa : Lambaesis * = children to father
 Africa : Lambaesis ** = children to mother
- Serv. : Rome * = excluding 13 *alumni*
 Noricum * = joint husband-wife
 Noricum ** = parents-children
- Milit. : Noricum * = joint husband-wife